U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89— PART 3

APRIL 6, 1943, TO MAY 13, 1943
(PAGES 2941 TO 4388)

UNITEL STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NOV 24 '43

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. We are grateful for the mystic wonder of this yearly miracle, as the world is turning green again and Nature climbs to a soul in leaf and flower.

May our ears be atuned to the voices in blossoming boughs, speaking still as they did to Thy servant of old who found tongues in trees declaring "God will surely hasten His word, to keep it. He will not faint nor be discouraged until He hath set justice in the earth." May the tinted branches be to us a parable of Thy faithfulness and Thy constancy, reminding us that even the tomb of winter is but Thy laboratory where spring flowers are being fashioned. So in gloomy days may the gospel of the springtime reassure us that, in our bare and barren winters of despair, where we see but withered leaves, God sees sweet blossoms growing. Thus, from the lowly earth where our weary feet stumble and falter, may the exultant notes of our faith and hope rise like the lark on morning wing, singing its song at heaven's gate. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting and withdrawing nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 1037. An act preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1284. An act relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy;

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2087. An act to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 886. An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government;

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;

H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R 2070. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS] laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION RELATING TO DEFENSE HOUSING (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision continuing the availability of the appropriation "Defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, until June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential report from the Secretary of War, submitted pursuant to law, relating to the number of land forces personnel under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 in training and service on February 28, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE TO ADMINISTER OATHS, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, in the performance of their official duties (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter signed by the chairman and secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential financial report covering operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1942, inclusive (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON TRANSFER OF TRAILERS TO MURPHY, N. C.

A letter from the General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of the Authority in connection with the transfer to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the Farm Security Administration of 100 trailers and a utility building (provided by the Farm Security Administration) from a temporary defense shelter project near Nashville, Tenn., for use at Murphy, N. C., designated by the President as a defense locality, where by reason of national defense activities a housing shortage existed, and also the establishment of auxiliary facilities to house employees engaged at the Hiwassee projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture (5); and The National Archives (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Richard Knaust, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the expansion of activities of the civil affairs section of the Army so as to include a political promotion department to aid in preventing the spread of Communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from William H. Leach, publisher of the magazine Church Management, of Cleveland, Ohio, calling special attention to an article entitled "Religion Must Contribute to World Peace"—an open letter to the President and Congress, suggesting and praying that an eminent Christian scholar be intimately connected with the peace parleys after the close of the present wars (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring provision for constructive post-war plans for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Philadelphia Fur Workers Union, Local No. 53, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the President's veto of Senate bill 660, the so-called Bankhead farm parity price bill, be sustained; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the Board of Managers of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in executive session at Atlanta, Ga., on September 24–27, 1942, representing a membership of 2,685,000 in 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, again urges that immediate steps be taken to guarantee budget and authority to the proper agency for uniform registration and identification of all children; and

"Whereas no national step has been taken; and

"Whereas the State of Washington is in a critical location, the parents and educators feel apprehensive of imminent danger to their children; and

"Whereas many communities large and small have requested action to provide this protective measure in a uniform system; and

"Whereas every effort has been made to secure a priority rating on a suitable noncombustible, noncorrosive metal without avail; and

"Whereas certain war industries have offered quantities of scrap material suitable and highly desirable for this vitally necessary protective measure; and

"Whereas the return of this scrap material 'to source' does not yield itself to more constructive material for war production; and

"Whereas we feel that there is a definite need for a precautionary measure to assure our parents and children that every step has been taken to keep the family together in case of disaster, bombing, or evacuation, by means of registration, identification, and fingerprinting: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington does hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and particularly the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, to do everything possible to secure a priority rating for this scrap aluminum material, that will make suitable identification tags for the children of the State of Washington, at a reasonable price; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, providing for waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers that were compelled to suspend publication because of war conditions

"Whereas numerous newspapers throughout the Nation and particularly those in towns in smaller communities have been and in the future will be compelled to suspend publication because of the economic conditions and the loss of manpower brought about by the war emergency; and

"Whereas the country newspaper is a valuable economic and social asset in the community life of the Nation and should therefore be encouraged; and

"Whereas newspapers of Minnesota, as those in the Nation, have made great contributions to the war effort through the medium of news articles and advertisements bearing upon the successful prosecution of the war, said contributions in the aggregate being many millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we memorialize, petition, and urge Congress to take such steps as are necessary to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, which provides for the waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers which were compelled to suspend publication during the war and because of war conditions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution T

"Whereas during the drought years in the State of North Dakota, when Federal authorities were of the opinion that certain lands of this State were submarginal lands, and unfit for farming purposes; the United States Government created various game reserves and refuges in this State, including in such reserves, some of the land classified as submarginal, and also some of the best

farming land in the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the creation of such game reserves took many thousands of acres of lands from the tax rolls of the State, thereby financially crippling the governmental subdivisions in which such lands are located; and

"Whereas the creation of such game reserves has brought about a great increase in the number of migratory waterfowl as well as predatory animals, such birds causing great and an untold amount of damage by the destruction of grain crops of farmers for miles around such game refuges, such damage running into thousands of dollars annually; and the damage caused by such predatory animals to poultry and livestock being enormous; and

"Whereas the Government is in the process of taking additional land for purposes of extending the number and the size of game refuges in the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to abandon any action for the further acquisition of land and the extension of game refuges in the State of North Dakota; that the Congress enact appropriate legislation to provide for the making of certain payments in lieu of taxes to the taxing subdivisions of the State in which such refuges are located, or in the event that this cannot be done, to provide for the return of such lands to private ownership; that Congress pass appropriate legislation to provide for the filing and the payment of claims by landowners in the locality of such game refuges, whose crops have been destroyed by the large number of migratory waterfowl and predatory animals found on such reserves; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate concurrent resolution

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and a lowering of the rates on war damage policies hereafter issued

"Whereas the premiums charged for war damage insurance already issued have proven to be far in excess of the rate that should have been charged in the light of actual experience; and

"Whereas such policyholders in the continental United States have been charged premiums which have been proven to be far higher than needed for the coverage during the period of the policy; and

"Whereas it is only fair and equitable that lower premiums be charged on policies hereafter issued and that an extension of the period of coverage be given to those who have already paid such high premiums for present coverage: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring):

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to provide for a lowering of the rates to be charged for war damage insurance on policies to be issued in the future and to provide an extension of the period of coverage on policies already issued so that the premiums on future policies and the period of coverage on present policies shall reasonably reflect the low loss experience.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in Congress, and the Chairman of the War Damage Corporation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate concurrent resolution

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress against the construction of a proposed Bordentown-Sayreville ship canal

"Whereas the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors has passed a resolution authorizing the construction of a ship canal between Bordentown and Sayreville in the State of New Jersey; and

"Whereas the cost of the construction of such ship canal is estimated at $185,000,000; and

"Whereas the minimum estimate of time required for the construction of such canal is 3 years; and

"Whereas such construction will require a diversion of much strategic war materials; and

"Whereas the proposal includes a requirement that the State of New Jersey provide rights-of-way and bridges which will entail expenditures of several million dollars by this State; and

"Whereas the operation of such canal would entail a tremendous draught on the water supply sources of the State of New Jersey which will seriously endanger the health and safety of the people of the State of New Jersey: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring):

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to refuse to approve any proposal for the construction of a ship canal between Bordentown and Sayreville in the State of New Jersey.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in Congress and the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of a tax on gasoline

"Whereas the Federal Government in the levying of a tax on gasoline has invaded a field of taxation heretofore exclusively reserved to the States; and

"Whereas there has never been any direct relationship between such Federal taxes and Federal aid to the States for highway purposes; and

"Whereas it appears that normal Federal aid for highways may not be continued beyond the end of the present fiscal year; and

"Whereas gasoline rationing has drastically and seriously reduced State revenue for highway purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has sources of revenue not available to the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized and requested to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of a tax on gasoline.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Immigration:

"Whereas the demonstration of loyalty to the Government of the United States by the residents of the United States of Italian origin has been noteworthy; and

"Whereas this exemplary conduct on those numbers of our population of Italian origin—on the part of those who had not become citizens, as well as those who had perfected United States citizenship—has been deemed worthy of praise by the Attorney General of the United States; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the legislature that, notwithstanding the recent expressions of the Attorney General of the United States, considerable obstacles and delay appear to prevent these worthy residents of our country from finally perfecting their United States citizenship during the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jennings, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. DAVIS):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 35

"The scarcity of farm labor is threatening the production of foodstuffs necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

"The greater need of the armed forces for the youth of this Nation has deprived the farm of the labor required to seed and plant and cultivate and harvest the crops required to feed the Nation and our allies.

"There are now confined in special camps throughout the Nation a large number of strong and capable men whose help on the farm at this time would be of inestimable help in producing the food that will be so much needed during the months that lie ahead. These men are the conscientious objectors whose scruples against war have kept them out of military service.

"A number of farmers working 72 hours a week receive wages far below those paid in any other employment furthering the ends of the war.

"To utilize the services of these conscientious objectors on the farms of the Nation would assist in the production of food so sorely needed at this time: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States as will be necessary to authorize the use of all utilization of all able-bodied conscientious objectors on the farms of the Nation for the purpose of increasing the production of crops essential to the needs of the people of the Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Representatives and Senators from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.)

LIMITATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in keeping with the immortal spirit of the great Thomas Jefferson, whose anniversary the whole Nation is about to celebrate devotedly, the Michigan State Legislature has just adopted resolutions in the Jeffersonian spirit and dedicated to one of the greatest of all the objectives which Jefferson deemed essential to the preservation of American democracy. It occurs to me that the Congress, as a part of its share in this Jeffersonian celebration, might well dramatize its own fidelity to this basic Jeffersonian tradition by making this great Jeffersonian anniversary the occasion for initiating the Jeffersonian action which the Michigan Legislature seeks. I present and ask that the Michigan legislative petition in the Jeffersonian pattern be read by the clerk and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

Concurrent resolution applying to the Congress of the United States under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the term of office of the President of the United States by prohibiting any one person from serving for more than two terms of 4 years each

Whereas the Constitution of the United States now contains no limitation on the number of terms which may be served by one person as President; and

Whereas the sound traditional limitation of two terms for any one person, first suggested and subscribed to by George Washington, has been adhered to by all Presidents from the creation of the United States until the year 1940; and

Whereas the wisdom of the traditional limitation has been amply demonstrated to the people of the United States by the first breach thereof; and

Whereas the tradition should be translated into a positive mandate of the people by action of the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature, for the State of Michigan, invokes its power, granted under Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to apply to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the States for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the holding of the office of President of the United States by any one person to 2 terms of 4 years each; and be it further

Resolved, That this action of the legislature on behalf of the State of Michigan is a continuing application for the call of a convention for the purpose named herein, and the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to provide by resolution that this application be presented to each succeeding Congress until two-thirds of the States have made similar application; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and all Members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to complete this brief Jeffersonian ritual this morning, I here wish to read one sentence from Jefferson's famous letter to Mr. Weaver in June 1807:

If some period be not fixed, either by the Constitution or by practice, to the services of the First Magistrate, his office, though nominally elective, will, in fact, be for life; and that will soon degenerate into an inheritance.

Mr. President, in these days it is very good to have the country remember Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. In what year was the quotation written?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was written in 1807.

Mr. GUFFEY. There are many quotations bearing on the same subject of later date than that cited by the Senator from Michigan which he may find by obtaining access to the Jeffersonian Encyclopedia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to have the Senator's advice. He has run out on Thomas Jefferson so often that I am not surprised that he does so again this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE—FARM AND FARM LABOR NEEDS—ALLOCATION OF WAR CONTRACTS TO CHICAGO PLANTS

Mr. BROOKS. I present for appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 21, adopted by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and request unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD. This resolution deals with the food situation, farm needs, and action of the selective-service board in the drafting of farm labor.

I invite the attention of the Senators to the recommendation of the Illinois General Assembly in this resolution.

I also present for appropriate reference Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, adopted by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and request unanimous consent to have it included following my introduction. This resolution deals with the labor scarcity areas established by the War Manpower Commission. It places the city of Chicago in the labor scarcity area, thereby prohibiting the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago plants.

I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 21

Whereas it is a matter of the most extreme urgency that our agricultural production resources be maintained at a level which will insure a food supply adequate to meet the extraordinary demands of our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas the imminent food crisis with which this Nation is faced constitutes a grave threat to the successful prosecution of the national war effort; and

Whereas an important contributing factor to this emergency has been the short-sighted selective-service policy which permitted the indiscriminate drafting of essential farm labor; and

Whereas unless this policy is altered immediately to defer or exempt farm labor from military service, we are faced with a complete break down of our internal stability and a consequent impairment of our war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact such measures as will immediately defer or exempt from military service all essential farm labor and services for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, and to the War Manpower Commission and the National Selective Service Headquarters at Washington, D. C.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

A joint resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Whereas the War Manpower Commission has classified the city of Chicago and all Illinois cities as a labor scarcity area and placed an immediate ban on the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago manufacturers; and

"Whereas the significance of Chicago's contribution to the national war effort and the indispensable and vital function it must continue to serve during the pendency of the war cannot be too much emphasized; and

"Whereas the tremendous productive facilities of Chicago, which include the war plants proper, the immediate availability of water and electrical supplies and power, its nearness to vital war materials and natural resources, and its preeminent position as the hub of the greatest railroad, air, and water network of transportation facilities in the world make it imperative that no action be taken which would impair even slightly the magnitude of its contributions; and

"Whereas in addition to the above factors, authoritative statistics disclose that there is no acute labor shortage and a less degree of labor absenteeism in the Chicago war zone than in any other part of the Nation; and

"Whereas the factors which induced the War Manpower Commission to make its ruling should be reconsidered immediately in order to prevent needless and dangerous impairment of the war effort: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully urge Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to reconsider immediately the order of said Commission banning the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago and adjacent area for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to Hon. Paul V. McNutt and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, to the end that those of the same view may collaborate in their efforts to effectuate the purpose of this resolution."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 212. A bill to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 155).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 156).

By Mr RUSSELL (for Mr. McKELLAR), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 157).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 961. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, the Buffalo Insurance Co., and the Miller Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 963. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr CLARK of Missouri:

S. 964. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella W. Hoback; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 966. A bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 967. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 968. A bill for the relief of the Norfolk Plumbing & Heating Co., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1037. An act preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state;

H. R. 1284. An act relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; and

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; and

H. R. 2087. An act to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BONDING FEDERAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 26) to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 128), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

AMERICAN - RUSSIAN - BRITISH FRIENDSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at a mass meeting dedicated to the consolidation of American-Russian-British friendship, held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 4, 1943, under the auspices of the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OBLIGATION OF EVERY AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Obligation of Every American," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Rock County Bar Association at Janesville, Wis., March 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the Army Day dinner of the Military Order of the World War, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF ELECTRICITY ON THE FARM—ADDRESS BY VINCENT D. NICHOLSON

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to use of electricity on the farm, delivered by Vincent D. Nicholson, before the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., relative to the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, and also a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 43, introduced by him on March 16, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

CHURCHES CAN END WAR—LETTER BY TOM BURNS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Tom Burns, of Portland, Oreg., and printed in the Portland Oregonian of April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER — EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the production of rubber entitled "How About a Reccunt?" written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER QUESTION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT L. NORTON

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "All Must Join in To Win War" written by Robert L. Norton and published in the Boston Sunday Post of April 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to policies for the post-war period, by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLOW TO ISOLATIONISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE LORAIN (OHIO) JOURNAL

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow to Isolationism," published on March 17, 1943, in the Lorain (Ohio) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOMAN'S HOME COMPANION OPINION POLL—AFTER WAR—PEACE?

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of an opinion poll taken by the Woman's Home Companion in April 1943 on the question After War—Peace?, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LABOR AND FOOD PRODUCTION—ARTICLE FROM THE MILLER (S. DAK.) GAZETTE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers Out in Fields for First Time on Thursday," from the Miller (S. Dak.) Gazette of March 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last Friday, automatically the veto message of the President comes up for consideration, and I understand it is now before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the agreement was merely informal.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it was only an informal agreement, I should like to have it made formal by asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message and the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States withholding his approval from Senate bill 660.

(For veto message, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1943, p. 2828 et seq.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been fearful that our schools were failing to teach the youth of the country the true significance of the events which lie behind our Nation's history. I have gained this information from talking to youths of 15 and to middle-aged citizens who are utterly ignorant of the great political events without which no one can understand our national heritage. These persons have shown little knowledge and even little interest concerning the founders and builders of our country, whose aims and ideals we are now attempting to safeguard forever.

It is a well-known fact that State legislatures have been interested in deleting chapters and statements from history books at the insistence of certain powerful groups which are unwilling to have the public know the truth.

A further cause for ignorance lies in the fact that for the past decade or more the enthusiasts of the so-called social science studies have convinced many of our educators that these subjects should be taught in place of history, insisting that social trends rather than real historical events were sufficient for understanding our Nation's history. A few years ago I happened to see a book on civics and social studies which was being widely used in my own city of Pittsburgh, and I was amazed to find the account of a famous society murder trial taking up much space.

What this had to do with training youth along lines of proper conduct I have never been able to comprehend. But it proved that high-school students were being taught such sordid facts rather than the glowing events of our own local history.

We are greatly indebted to the New York Times for the service it has rendered by exposing the lack of proper teaching of history in our schools. At the same time, all of us must feel a deep sense of humiliation to realize that our students are being not only improperly taught, but that this teaching must be due to the exceedingly poor textbooks.

I know that we, as members of the National Legislature, cannot legislate wisely for a people which is being kept ignorant of its own history, in order to close our eyes to facts which might prove inconvenient to the great vested interests, including, of course, the great political interests.

How can we deal with farm legislation if we do not link present emergencies with a long chain of facts stretching back through the First World War, to populism and free silver, to free land and slavery, back to debt and taxes, including facts relative to Shay's rebellion, and beyond?

I might even include in that story a reference to the so-called Whisky Rebellion in my own State, except that I doubt that there are many people, outside a handful of students of history, who understand that the Whisky Rebellion was an armed uprising of Pennsylvania farmers against high and discriminatory taxes. How many of us really know why France helped the American Revolution against England?

How many of us know the part played by the Masonic order in the formation of the Republic.

How many of us know why Thomas Jefferson led the American revolt against Hamilton and the Federalists?

How many of us know the real story of how Nicholas Biddle and the Bank of the United States bought up Members of Congress in the battle when Jackson led the forces for financial freedom?

How many of us know the reason why Abraham Lincoln was attacked so bitterly by his own party, and was only saved from the impeachment which was brought against his Vice President by the fact that he was assassinated?

How many of us know how business stole the country blind in the 1870's, and how or why a Presidential election was stolen in 1876?

We are fighting a war to preserve the freedoms of which the men in the front lines are ignorant. The Army has already taken steps to instruct the soldiers regarding the real meaning of this war. I trust every other branch of the armed forces is doing the same. But again I say, this cannot be properly done without accurate textbooks. This is now a challenge to the educators and textbook writers of this country.

This month we are celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, and yet, according to the New York Times, a large percentage of the freshmen in 36 colleges

and universities of this country apparently have little idea of the great contribution which Jefferson has made to our Nation and the war.

We cannot preserve our democracy without knowing what lies in our past. In the words of that brilliant patriot of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek—

We live in the present, we dream of the future, and we learn eternal truths from the past.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution bearing on this subject, which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas recent investigations by nonpartisan and unbiased persons have disclosed an appalling neglect of United States history in our public secondary schools; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States was adopted to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; and

Whereas this salutary object cannot be achieved in full and sufficient measure unless our children and our children's children possess at least a minimum understanding of the principles that gave this Nation birth and the processes by which it has been maintained since its inception; and

Whereas we are now engaged in a great war testing whether popular government shall endure on this continent or anywhere on earth; and

Whereas this means yielding to our Government in this time of war powers over life and property which are properly denied to it in time of peace; and

Whereas even in the midst of war it is our duty to see that the principles of constitutional government are upheld and that the spirit which animates these principles are kept vital, and that a knowledge of such principles are preserved inviolate for the times of peace; and

Whereas the future welfare of our Nation is utterly dependent on what our children learn; and

Whereas the present astonishing neglect of the history of the United States in our high schools and elementary schools could not have existed without the approval of educational forces directly or indirectly concerned with the direction of the schools; and

Whereas Congress now has before it many proposals to strengthen American secondary and elementary school education; and

Whereas none of these proposals expresses a concern over the woeful status of instruction in the history of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved (a) That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be instructed to study the ways and means by which the Federal Government may most effectively promote a more thorough study of the history of the United States.

(b) That committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its proceedings, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the Senate is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, and to employ such clerical and other employees, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Time for Americans to Know Their Country," published in the Philadelphia Record of April 6, 1943. The editorial bears on the subject matter I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME FOR AMERICANS TO KNOW THEIR COUNTRY

"Of thee I sing."

Yes, we sing of America, most of us fervently, and with genuine love of country in our hearts. But if the survey by the New York Times, of 7,000 freshman college students, means anything, a great many of us know almost nothing about those "woods and templed hills" and even less of the history of the "land where my fathers died."

Fifty students believed George Washington was President of the United States in the War of 1812. Only 13 percent knew who was. Twenty-one percent did not know Lincoln was President during the Civil War; 26 percent didn't know Woodrow Wilson was President during the World War.

Most students who answered the American history test, which appears on another page of the Record today, had the feeblest notion of what their "native land" looks like. Some put Nebraska, Texas, and Portland, Oreg., on the Atlantic coast. Oregon, Mississippi, Wyoming were listed as among the Thirteen Original Colonies.

Discount some obvious smart-aleck answers in this test, and it is still pretty plain that America has been shameful in neglecting to inform its sons of its own history.

The reason is not hard to find. Last summer the Times learned that only 18 percent of our colleges require the study of American history, and only 28 percent of them require credits in American history for admission.

In short, our schools have not done a job.

We do not have to go to the fantastic lengths of nationalism which the totalitarians favor in order to inform American youth on the way their country developed and grew. The present is only an extension of the past—

And it is saddening to think how little some of our supposedly educated youth know of the institutions, ideals, and rights which the United States is now fighting to preserve.

We do not enjoy the rights and material benefits we have through magic or miracle; they are the product of generations of hard work, hard fighting, earnest thought, and great statesmanship.

History as it is taught often seems barren, cold, and unrealistic. Memorizing dates and places without knowing what they mean—in terms of our own lives—can be deadly and futile. And it is true that academicians too often have shouted down such realistic historians as Charles Beard, and too often have made our statesmen seem like statues instead of human beings.

All right, you say: What's to be done about it?

No; we wouldn't pass a law. We would expect, however, that our schools and colleges, without compulsion, begin to teach American history as an essential subject—and teach it well.

We could also require that some basic knowledge of American history be an integral part of civil-service examinations for public offices, State as well as Federal.

But even with all that, you may say, how to teach American history so it will have that meaning which so many students obviously failed to grasp?

We have a suggestion.

Let's start teaching history backwards.

Let's not start from the far past, which seems remote and academic. Let's start from now—and trace, on back, the steps which brought us, as a people, to the proud nationhood which now is ours.

That way we would reach the past naturally. When we got back to the Revolution students might have a broad perspective and background to give it meaning—in terms of the world in which they live.

That way they would discover why it is important today that the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed back in 1823. They would come to realize that every strong President has had battles with Congress and has been hotly assailed by the press. They would find, against the background of America in 1943, how much it means—to us—that Jackson scotched the Nullification Act, and how important the Homestead Act was in the light of its consequences.

This is just a "hunch" suggestion. But often the unorthodox way is the one which will produce surprising results.

The necessity for more and better teaching of the history of this world's greatest democracy is more imperative now than ever before.

How can we judge the acts of our present Chief Executive, Congress, and the Supreme Court if we have no yardstick with which to measure them?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words concerning the resolution which has just been submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I think that all other persons who saw the article by Mr. Benjamin Fine, published in the New York Sunday Times of April 4, giving the results of a survey taken among 7,000 students in 36 colleges in the United States, must have been greatly shocked at the revelation of the lack of historical and general information possessed by these students. I make this statement, Mr. President, regardless of whether there may be any legitimate criticism by experts on the breadth of the questions, or the selection of subject matter, or the statistical sample involved. Making allowance for every possible explanation or criticism, the fact remains that there is a shocking lack of knowledge of the history of this country, the cultural forces and historical achievements which go to make it the Nation that it is today.

It is particularly significant at a time when we are not only fighting literally for the preservation of this country, but at a time when we must all realize that problems have accumulated, and problems will arise in the future which are calculated to test the survival of the democratic process itself. How can we hope, Mr. President, for a survival of democracy if the educated youths, those who have had the opportunity for education, are ignorant of the basic history of their country? Unless the oncoming generation has some knowledge of United States history we are in grave danger of losing our essential liberties. Some of the young men in these age groups will be required in the near future to lay down their lives for this Government. Others will return from a dozen far-flung battle fronts to face the gravest problems this Nation ever has confronted. How can we expect them to cherish to the full our institutions unless they know how they were established?

Mr. President, I wish to read briefly from this article:

College freshmen throughout the Nation reveal a striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history, and know almost nothing about many important phases of this country's growth and development, a survey just completed by the New York Times has shown.

Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. For the most part these students had taken courses in American history, social studies, or government in high school. Questionnaires were given to the freshmen of the various colleges under the supervision either of the history department or some responsible faculty member.

Few of the students were studying American history in college. The test was designed to determine the amount of United States history that the high-school graduate retains from his secondary course.

* * * * *

One of the conclusions from the present study is that the students are in need of United States history on the college or university level, even though they have taken courses in this field in high school.

More impressive than the lack of knowledge is the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

Mark this, Senators:

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of elementary aspects of American history. They could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt, and they had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the Nation it is today.

Yet, Mr. President; these youths are upon the threshold of the Selective Service System, and will soon find themselves on the battlefields scattered all over the world fighting for this Nation.

How can we expect to overcome this shocking lack of understanding and appreciation of all the warp and woof that has been woven for 150 or more years to make this Nation what it is today by a few propaganda films and pamphlets prepared under the auspices of the United States Army, effective though those may be? I am not criticizing them; but without the basic knowledge of historical fact and development of this Nation I contend that it is obvious even to a layman such as I, that we cannot with a brief, even though a hot-house type of propaganda or education, overcome this shocking lack of historical knowledge.

I wish to say here, Mr. President, that I do not intend to indict the youth of today. I think this is an indictment of the failure of our educational system to drive this knowledge home in significant enough terms to have it register and remain in the memory of students who have had the opportunity for education. Mind you, we are speaking now of college freshmen. It takes no account of the fact that a large number of persons—no one knows how many—have been rejected for service in the United States armed forces because they are functionally illiterate, which is a euphemistic phrase indicating that they have not had the equivalent of a fourth-grade education.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has it occurred to the Senator from Wisconsin that probably one of the causes for that situation is the trend in modern college life to allow the students a larger discretion as to selective courses, rather than sticking to the old classical courses which were adhered to 40 or 50 years ago? It seems to me that to broaden the selective process and let a student simply study the subjects he wants to study frequently must result in overlooking some of the most valuable and fundamental things in a general education.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think that, so far as the Senator from Wisconsin is concerned, he will have to take refuge by saying that he feels that this is a subject which is worthy the consideration, study, and attention of the Congress and of the Government of the United States. I would not pretend that I am competent, without at least the benefit of a long study, to come to any conclusions with respect to what is responsible for this situation. I certainly would not want offhand to indict what is known as progressive education, or such influence as progressive education has had upon the curricula of our elementary and secondary schools, but I say that here is the result of our school system so far as United States history is concerned. There is something glaringly wrong somewhere when a student who has had the advantage, the priceless privilege of reaching the status of a college freshman in his educational climb up the ladder, lacks, as is indicated by this survey, the knowledge of our history and the events which have made this country great.

The questionnaire was prepared under the supervision of Hugh Russell Fraser, chairman of the committee on American history, and Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University.

Mr. President, this is a long article, and I know the Senate wishes to proceed with the business at hand, but I desire to point out a few things which struck me as being startling. I wish to be entirely fair. The article says:

Although it is likely that some of the students were not serious in answering the questions, it is evident, even after discounting that possibility, that the students simply do not know American history.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students, or 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War.

Mr. President, those students were freshmen college students in 36 colleges in the United States.

The article continues:

Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been President during that highly important period in American history. Other men listed as having been President during the Civil War included Woodrow Wilson, Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, William Taft, Herbert Hoover, Andrew Jackson, or Warren G. Harding.

Many students attending southern colleges thought that Jefferson Davis had been President of the United States during the Civil War. Well over 150 college freshmen listed Davis as having been President of this country during that period.

Fifty or more students believed that George Washington was President of the United States during the War of 1812.

* * * * *

As for the Mexican War of 1848, Presidents listed included John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Jefferson, and James G. Blaine. More than 40 names are listed by the students of men who were supposed to have been President of this country at one period or another in American history but who never held that office.

Mr. President, I digress to say that most of them probably desired to do so.

The article continues:

Evidently the McKinley administration during the Spanish-American War has left little impression upon our students. A little over 1,000 of the 7,000 who answered knew that McKinley had been President. The most common reply was Theodore Roosevelt. Evidently the students did not recognize the fact that Roosevelt came into office after the Spanish-American War.

Moreover, 2,077 students, or 30 percent, did not know that Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during the last World War.

The men frequently listed as having been President during the last World War were Grover Cleveland, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Warren G. Harding, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, William McKinley, John Nance Garner, Alf Landon, and Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 students thought that Hoover had been President, while 125 listed Coolidge.

I skip a part of the article—

More than 100 students said that Lincoln had caused the Civil War. To others, Lincoln was famous because he had "emaciated"—

E-m-a-c-i-a-t-e-d—

"the slaves," was a great pacifier, prevented union, created a fasting day, and permitted the Negroes to vote. Again, various students said that he was the first President of the United States. One college freshman wrote that Lincoln achieved his fame by heading a reconstruction commission to improve the South after the Civil War ended.

Jefferson, likewise, has attained stature in the eyes of the students by many unhistoric accomplishments. He was, for example, president of the Confederacy, founder of The Saturday Evening Post, a Salvation Army worker, and the originator of the Monroe Doctrine. One student wrote that he was a farmer who bought the West with cash. Thirty or more thought that Jefferson earned his right to immortal fame by discovering electricity.

Evidently Andrew Jackson, despite his place in history, is one of our obscure Presidents. Nearly 50 percent of the students listed him as the famous "Stonewall" Jackson of the Civil War. Others thought he was a "common man," that he instituted the "big stick" policy, and was the father of the United States Constitution.

He is also listed as being a trust buster, of having initiated the Monroe Doctrine, of freeing the slaves, of solidifying the Union, of being a hero in the Spanish-American War of 1898, of taking Texas by force, and of being the first President to be impeached.

Mr. CONNALLY. Who was said to have taken Texas by force?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some of the students were laboring under the misapprehension that Andrew Jackson had done so.

Mr. WILEY. It "ain't been took" yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has been taken by force several times since. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I read further from the article:

Although Theodore Roosevelt's name is important in American history, 81 percent of the college freshmen could not cite two contributions that he had made. However, they did credit him with many obscure and fallacious contributions. Several hundred students said that he was the founder of the National Recovery Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and various other New Deal agencies.

One student wrote that Roosevelt was famous in American life because "he showed that an invalid is not lost." Another said that he "walked on a big stick with a soft voice."

Mr. President, let me come to some of the more statistical data. One of the questions asked was:

On what principal body of water are the following cities located: Cleveland?

Of course, the correct answer is "Lake Erie." The number of students responding correctly was 1,465, or only 21 percent of those who answered.

They were also asked to name the home State of a number of our most famous figures in history. The correct answers varied all the way from being 1 percent to 21 percent of the total number. Twenty-one percent was the highest percentage correct.

Mr. President, I shall not take more time of the Senate in this connection, although I think the subject is of extreme importance. I believe that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania should have early and earnest consideration on the part of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I believe Hugh Russell Fraser and Dr. Allan Nevins have rendered a great service to our country in conducting this survey. I think that the New York Times should be given great credit for having given the results of the survey wide circulation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a part of my remarks the articles on the general subject appearing in the New York Times of April 4 and in the New York Times of April 5.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1943]

IGNORANCE OF UNITED STATES HISTORY SHOWN BY COLLEGE FRESHMEN—SURVEY OF 7,000 STUDENTS IN 36 INSTITUTIONS DISCLOSES VAST FUND OF MISINFORMATION ON MANY BASIC FACTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

College freshmen throughout the Nation reveal a striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history, and know almost nothing about many important phases of this country's growth and development, a survey just completed by the New York Times has shown.

Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. For the most part these students had taken courses in American history, social studies or government in high school. Questionnaires were given to the freshmen of the various colleges under the supervision either of the history department or some responsible faculty member.

Few of the students were studying American history in college. The test was designed to determine the amount of United States history that the high school graduate retains from his secondary course.

Last June a survey conducted by the New York Times revealed that 82 percent of the colleges of this country do not require the teaching of United States history for the undergraduate degree. At that time many educators and college presidents declared that inasmuch as the students had taken courses in American history in high school, no need existed to give it again on the college level.

One of the conclusions from the present study is that the students are in need of United States history on the college or university level, even though they have taken courses in this field in high school.

More impressive than the lack of knowledge is the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of elementary aspects of American history. They could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt, and they had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the nation it is today.

The questionnaire was prepared under the supervision of Hugh Russell Fraser, chairman of the Committee on American History, and Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University. An attempt was made to include questions dealing with important phases of our history in economic, political, cultural or social fields.

An analysis of the results indicates that either the college freshmen, recently out of high school, were poorly prepared on the secondary level, or they had forgotten whatever they had learned about United States history. On many aspects of American growth and development they indicated a serious lack of knowledge or understanding.

Although it is likely that some of the students were not serious in answering the questions, it is evident, even after discounting that possibility, that the students simply do no know American history.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students or 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War. Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been President during that highly important period in American life. Other men listed as having been President during the Civil War included Woodrow Wilson, Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, William Taft, Herbert Hoover, Andrew Jackson, or Warren G. Harding.

DAVIS CIVIL WAR PRESIDENT

Many students attending southern colleges thought that Jefferson Davis had been President of the United States during the Civil War. Well over 150 college freshmen listed Davis as having been President of this country during that period.

Fifty or more students believed that George Washington was President of the United States during the War of 1812. Others listed for this war include Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and John Jay. A dozen or more students said there was no President at that time but that the United States was under the direction of George Washington, acting as commander in chief of the Army.

As for the Mexican war of 1846 Presidents listed included John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Jefferson, and James G. Blaine. More than 40 names are listed by the students of men who were supposed to have been President of this country at one period or another in American history but who never held that office.

Evidently the McKinley administration during the Spanish-American War has left little impression upon our students. A little over 1,000 of the 7,000 who answered knew that McKinley had been President. The most common reply was Theodore Roosevelt. Evidently the students did not recognize the fact that Roosevelt came into office after the Spanish-American War.

Moreover, 2,077 students, or 30 percent, did not know what Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during the last World War.

The men frequently listed as having been President during the last World War were Grover Cleveland, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Warren G. Harding, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, William McKinley, John Nance Garner, Alf Landon, and Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 students thought that Hoover had been President, while 125 listed Coolidge.

The test called upon the students to identify at least two of the contributions to the political, economic, or social developments of the United States by such famous Americans as Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson, and Theodore Roosevelt. Only 22 percent of American students had mastered enough history in their high school days to identify two contributions made by Lincoln to this country.

Even though this is the bicentennial year for Jefferson, only 1,126 of the 7,000 students, or 16 percent, were familiar with the contributions made by this famous American. Andrew Jackson fared worse, as only 12 percent recognized what he had done, while 19 percent knew something about Roosevelt.

"EMACIATED" THE SLAVES

More than 100 students said that Lincoln had caused the Civil War. To others, Lincoln was famous because he had "emaciated the slaves," was a great pacifier, prevented union, created a fasting day, and permitted the Negroes to vote. Again, various students said that he was the first President of the United States. One college freshman wrote that Lincoln achieved his fame by heading a reconstruction commission to improve the South after the Civil War ended.

Jefferson, likewise, has attained stature in the eyes of the students by many unhistoric accomplishments. He was, for example, president of the Confederacy, founder of the Saturday Evening Post, a Salvation Army worker, and the originator of the Monroe Doctrine. One student wrote that he was a farmer who bought the West with cash. Thirty or more thought that Jefferson earned his right to immortal fame by discovering electricity.

Evidently, Andrew Jackson, despite his place in history, is one of our obscure Presidents. Nearly 50 percent of the students listed him as the famous "Stonewall" Jackson of the Civil War. Others thought he was a "common man," that he instituted the "big stick" policy, and was the father of the United States Constitution.

He is also listed as being a trust buster, of having initiated the Monroe Doctrine, of freeing the slaves, of solidifying the Union, of being a hero in the Spanish-American War of 1898, of taking Texas by force, and of being the first President to be impeached.

Although Theodore Roosevelt's name is important in American history, 81 percent of the college freshmen could not cite two contributions that he had made; however, they did credit him with many obscure and fallacious contributions. Several hundred students said that he was the founder of the National Recovery Act, the Work Projects Administration, and various other New Deal agencies.

COLLECTION OF ANIMAL HEADS

One student wrote that Roosevelt was famous in American life because "he showed that an invalid is not lost." Another said that he "walked on a big stick with a soft voice." Again he was a forest ranger, head of a troop of Negroes which helped free Texas, established price ceilings, was a hero in the War of 1812, fought Pancho Villa, helped quiet the Indians, was a general in the last World War, was President during the World War, purchased Alaska, saved the country from depression, and was the first new dealer.

A student from a western university declared that Roosevelt's greatest contribution to the United States was that "he collected large quantities of animal heads."

Although the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States are significant milestones in this Nation's life, the students indicated that they were only slightly acquainted with both of these great documents. Less than half of the American students could name two of the many specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, while only 45 percent could name four specific freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Among the powers granted to Congress, according to the students, are these: power to issue letters of "morque and appraisal," woman suffrage, amending the Constitution, power to make and take away laws, equality of citizenship, keep the Supreme Court checked, right to constrict freedom of President, let bright Negro vote, and power of "empeachment." One student indicated that one of the specific powers in the Constitution is the "power of voting on the appeasement of the President."

It was found that college students have extreme difficulty in expressing themselves clearly or intelligently. Some of the specific powers, listed in the answers, include: "To make laws providing they are upholding the Constitution"; "its Members shall be elected, not chosen"; "power to impeach the President if majority vote"; "could either approve or not the people the President appointed, if not they couldn't be judges or diplomats"; "amendment power with certain majority for and against"; "has the power to hold office and vote."

A graduate of an eastern high school, with a course in American history and social studies, listed as two of the important powers granted to Congress:

"Congress has the right to pass bills which the President does not wish. Congress has the right to veto bills that the President wishes to be passed."

NEW "FREEDOMS" GUARANTEED

Many new "freedoms" found their way into the historic Bill of Rights. For example, about 500 students listed "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" as basic parts of the document. Several hundred listed "freedom of thought" or "freedom to think as one wishes." Nearly 1,000 students thought they were guaranteed the right to vote, the right to go to school or the right to work. Freedom to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness proved common.

Among the more popular freedoms cited are these: Freedom of choosing own recreation, freedom of labor, freedom from no jobs, freedom for women's votes, freedom of politics, freedom from governmental opinion, freedom to criticize the Government, freedom to buy and sell, freedom from bondage, freedom of way of life, freedom of protection.

Many "rights" were also included. Among them were: Woman suffrage, right to revolution under oppression, right of ownership of property and to do anything you wish with it, right for no prohibition, right to enter any business, right to referendum and recall, right to livelihood, right to get ahead, "wright of assylum," right to "bare" arms, right to no slaves, right to impeach the President.

A midwestern student said the Bill of Rights provided the right "not to be punished by whipping," while another replied that it gave "white people in the South the right to lynch Negroes"; another said that "citizens had the freedom to organize for overthrow of government if that government did not act as a government of the people and for the people."

Few of the students displayed any notion of the geographic or historic formation of the United States. For example, of the 7,000 students representing the 36 colleges, only 445, or 6 percent, could name the Thirteen Original Colonies. Frequently the students mentioned such States as Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Texas, California, Idaho, Wyoming, or Illinois as being among the Thirteen Original Colonies.

American history test by 7,000 students in 36 colleges

Question	Correct answer	Number right	Percent right
1. Name the Thirteen Original States	New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island; Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia.	445	6
2. On what principal body of water are the following cities located:			
(a) Cleveland	(a) Lake Erie	1,465	21
(b) St. Louis	(b) Mississippi	2,056	29
(c) Cincinnati	(c) Ohio	1,561	22
(d) Portland, Oreg	(d) Columbia	1,052	15
(e) Memphis	(e) Mississippi	1,141	16
(f) Milwaukee	(f) Lake Michigan	1,311	19
3. Name two of the specific powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.	To borrow money; raise armies; regulate commerce; provide a Navy; establish naturalization laws; coin money; establish post offices; regulate land and sea forces; provide a militia; etc.	3,098	44
4. Name four of the fifteen specific freedoms guaranteed to the individual in the Bill of Rights.	Freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of press; freedom of assembly; freedom of petition; right to bear arms; secure in persons, houses; unreasonable seizure; right to speedy and public trials; not deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; trial by jury; no excessive bail; etc.	3,122	45
5. Identify at least two of the contributions of the following famous Americans to the political, economic or social development of the United States:			
(a) Abraham Lincoln	(a) Emancipation Proclamation; President of the United States; humane reconstruction plans; approved Homestead Act (1862); many other specific acts.	1,556	22
(b) Thomas Jefferson	(b) Louisiana Purchase; President of the United States; author Declaration of Independence; founder of University of Virginia, etc.	1,126	16
(c) Andrew Jackson	(c) Battle of New Orleans; destroyed Bank of United States; paid off national debt; scotched nullification; etc.	842	12
(d) Theodore Roosevelt	(d) President of United States; opposed trusts; civil service reformer; conservation pioneer; enforced Sherman anti-trust laws; Panama Canal; etc.	1,313	19
6. Put in their proper sequence:			
(a) 1. Election of William Henry Harrison	(a) 3. Monroe Doctrine		
2. Jackson's war on the Bank of United States	2. Jackson's war on bank		
3. Proclamation of Monroe Doctrine	4. Depression of 1837		
4. Depression or panic of 1837	1. Election of Harrison	1,189	17
(b) 1. War with Spain	(b) 2. Homestead Act		
2. Passage of Homestead Act	4. Civil service reform		
3. Inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt	1. War with Spain		
4. Civil service reform	3. Inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt	713	10
(c) 1. Dred Scott Decision	(c) 4. Nullification Act		
2. Mexican War	2. Mexican War		
3. Compromise of 1850	3. Compromise of 1850		
4. Nullification Act	1. Dred Scott Decision	419	6
(d) 1. The Boy Scout movement	(d) 3. Transcendentalism		
2. First social settlement houses	4. First women's college		
3. Transcendentalism	2. Social settlement houses		
4. The first women's colleges	1. Boy Scout movement	345	5
7. Name the home State of the following men during their political prominence:			
John C. Calhoun	South Carolina	1,421	20
Andrew Jackson	Tennessee	1,079	15
John Quincy Adams	Massachusetts	1,118	16
Daniel Webster	Massachusetts	1,441	21
Thomas Hart Benton	Missouri	74	1
James K. Polk	Tennessee	214	3
Henry Clay	Kentucky	669	10
Mark Hanna	Ohio	225	3
William H. Seward	New York	1,007	14
Grover Cleveland	New York	1,210	17
8. What was the Nullification Act of South Carolina and how was the controversy resulting settled?	South Carolina passed a law nullifying a tariff act passed by Congress; President Jackson threatened to hang its instigator (Calhoun) and invade the State; Clay put through a compromise tariff and South Carolina backed down; repealed the law.	453	6

American history test by 7,000 students in 36 colleges—Continued

Question	Correct answer	Number right	Percent right
9. After each of the following, write what he was principally famous as:			
Charles W. Eliot	Educator, college president	614	9
John D. Rockefeller	Oil tycoon, banker	4,935	71
Jay Cooke	Financier, banker	344	5
William James	Psychologist	642	9
Francis Parkman	Historian, novelist	720	10
Carl Schurz	Statesman, reformer	294	4
James G. Blaine	Statesman, Secretary of State	964	14
Walt Whitman	Author, poet	4,083	59
Henry Thoreau	Essayist, author	1,159	16
John Burroughs	Naturalist, author	809	12
James J. Hill	Financier	671	10
Nicholas Biddle	Financier	452	6
Alexander Hamilton	Financier, Secretary of Treasury, statesman	3,360	48
Roger Taney	Chief Justice of United States Supreme Court	551	8
De Witt Clinton	Governor of New York State, statesman	1,183	17
Eli Whitney	Inventor of cotton gin	4,738	68
Jay Gould	Financier	1,202	17
Henry Ward Beecher	Preacher	597	9
Alexander H. Stephens	Statesman, Vice President of Confederacy	111	2
Roger Williams	Minister, founder of Rhode Island	1,450	20
10. Who was President of the United States during:			
1. The War of 1812	James Madison	918	13
2. Mexican War	James K. Polk	910	13
3. Civil War	Abraham Lincoln	5,296	75
4. Spanish-American War	William McKinley	1,027	15
5. World War No. I	Woodrow Wilson	4,923	70
11. What were the two principal nationalities to migrate from Europe to the United States between 1845 and 1860?	1. Germans; 2. Irish	969	14
12. Name the Presidents of the United States who were assassinated	1. Garfield	1,734	25
	2. Lincoln	4,370	60
	3. McKinley	2,141	31
13. Identify:			
Henry L. Stimson	Secretary of War	4,475	64
Jesse Jones	Secretary of Commerce	3,231	46
Sumner Welles	Under Secretary of State	3,263	46
Norman Thomas	Leader of a minor political party in the United States	2,891	40
George C. Marshall	Chief of Staff of the United States Army	3,532	50
James F. Byrnes	Director of Economic Stabilization	2,659	38
Sam Rayburn	Speaker of the House	2,896	40
Carter Glass	Senator from Virginia	2,125	30
14. What has been the traditional American policy toward China?	Open Door	1,050	15
15. When was the Homestead Act passed?	1862	287	4
Before the passage of the Homestead Act what was the minimum price per acre of Federal public lands sold at auction?	$1.25	109	2
16. Name three prominent figures identified with railroad history in the United States.	Vanderbilt, Harriman, Baker, Whitney, Huntington, Stanford, Gould, Washburne, Pullman, etc.	472	7
17. Name any two prominent figures connected with the growths of trusts and monopolies in the United States.	Rockefeller, du Pont, Mellon, Morgan, etc.	1,425	20
18. With what inventions are the following names connected:			
Robert Fulton	Steamboat	4,239	60
Elias Howe	Sewing machine	3,436	49
Eli Whitney	Cotton gin	5,131	73
S. F. B. Morse	Telegraph	4,061	58
George Westinghouse	Air brakes	797	11
Alexander Graham Bell	Telephone	4,372	60
Charles Goodyear	Rubber vulcanizing	4,089	58
19. Name two areas added to the United States by purchase, and from what nations did we acquire them?	Alaska—Russia; Virgin Islands—Denmark; Louisiana Purchase—France; Gadsen Purchase—Mexico; etc.	1,472	20
20. Name the following:			
A prominent figure, not now living, connected with the organization of labor in the United States.	Samuel Gompers	981	14
One such figure connected with the movement for women's rights.	Susan B. Anthony	928	13
21. Which was the first United States census in which railway mileage could have been reported?	1840	128	2
22. Beginning with Massachusetts, name the 11 States in their geographical order from north to south.	Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.	168	3

In naming the Thirteen Original States, one student wrote: "Washington, New York, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, North Carolina, Texas, Minnesota, Maryland, and Delaware." Another student in a well-known eastern college listed the Thirteen Original States as being: "North Carolina, South Carolina, Maine, Delaware, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Utah, Nebraska, Vermont, Ohio, Michigan, and East Virginia."

More than a hundred students listed Texas, Florida, and Missouri as being among the Thirteen Original Colonies. In fact, virtually every one of the 48 States in the Union is included by the students in this category. A typical reply runs something like this: "Oregon, Nebraska, Tennessee, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kentucky, Indiana, Louisiana, Vermont, Maine, Florida, Ohio, and Missouri."

IDEAS ON GEOGRAPHY

Most of our students do not have the faintest notion of what this country looks like. St. Louis, located on America's most famous river, the Mississippi, was placed on the Pacific Ocean, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, the Atlantic Ocean, Ohio River, St. Lawrence River, and almost every place else. Only 15 percent of the college freshmen had any idea where Portland, Oreg., was located. Two hundred and fifty students thought that Portland, Oreg., was on the Atlantic Ocean, while scores of others placed it on the Ohio River, Tallahassee River, Lake Ontario, Mississippi River, Lake Superior, and Tennessee River.

Twenty-five students replied that Portland was on the Hudson, while several others listed it as being on Long Island Sound. Memphis suffered similar transformations. It was placed on the Colorado River, Cumberland River, Red River, Arkansas River, and Hudson River. Milwaukee was found on Chesapeake Bay, Lake Illinois, Missouri River, Connecticut River, Lake Wisconsin, Salt Lake, Delaware River, and the Pacific Ocean.

Inasmuch as America's history unfolds in a geographic setting, without some concept of this setting an understanding of local and sectional trends would appear impossible. The students were asked to name the States starting with Massachusetts in their geographic order from north to south. Only 3 percent of the students—193 out of 7,000—could list the States along the eastern seaboard with any degree of accuracy.

Many bizarre combinations were received. Hundreds of students wrote that Oregon, Texas, Utah, Tennessee, Illinois, and Nebraska were along the eastern coast. One student who had taken American history in high school listed the States beginning with Massachusetts, and going from north to south, as follows: "Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Oregon, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Texas."

Here is another typical reply: "Delaware, Rhode Island, California, West Virginia, Kentucky, Oregon, Maine, Long Island, Arizona, Massachusetts, and Florida." Still another wrote: "Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, New Hampshire, Florida, Texas, and Utah."

In one question the students were asked to name the Presidents who were assassinated. This was considered an Index question. It was felt that the ability to identify three such landmarks in American history as the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley might indicate an ability to identify other important landmarks.

Rather startling results were obtained. For some reason hundreds of students

thought that Harrison, Harding, and Cleveland were the three that were assassinated. A sizable number thought that "every fourth President" was assassinated. Virtually every President of the United States from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt were listed as having lost their lives in this manner.

Once again, it is the misinformation that deserves attention. Among the assassinated Presidents were McClellan, Calhoun, William Jennings Bryan, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Alexander Hamilton, Garner, Aaron Burr, Douglas, William Lloyd Garrison, James G. Blaine, and Jefferson Davis. One student from a southern college evidently was still fighting the Civil War, for in response to the query as to the names of the Presidents who had been assassinated, he replied: "Lincoln, and it was a good thing, too."

FAMOUS MEN MISCALLED

An equally poor showing was made by the students when asked to identify famous Americans, both living and dead. Only 30 percent could identify Carter Glass; 38 percent knew who James F. Byrnes is; 46 percent could identify Jesse Jones; 40 percent had heard of Norman Thomas; 40 percent knew Sam Rayburn; 46 percent could identify Sumner Welles; 29 percent had never heard, evidently, of John D. Rockefeller. Nearly 1,000 freshmen, or 14 percent, listed Rockefeller as being either a steel magnate or an oil magnate.

Even the most superficial knowledge of American history implies an understanding of outstanding individuals. Those selected in this survey contributed in some measure to the growth and historic development of the United States. Yet, again, it is the amount of misinformation recorded that is little less than startling.

For example, 35 percent of the students listed Alexander Hamilton as being principally famous as President of the United States. Hamilton was cited also as being Secretary of State, British officer, preacher, founder of Poor Richard's Almanac, traitor, admiral, and inventor of the telephone. A goodly number of students listed Hamilton as being historically important because of his watches.

Typical misinformation concerning other figures who in the varying degree influenced the cultural, political, or social life of this country include:

Charles W. Eliot: Actor, professor of Yale, lawyer, politician, inventor, author of Silas Marner, news correspondent, judge, financier, head of Boy Scouts, and a misguided social worker.

Jay Cooke: Sports, soldier, Secretary of State, racketeer, seaman, traveling bureau, labor agitator, Revolutionary War patriot, signer of Declaration of Independence, pamphleteer. Nearly 1,000 students called Cooke a North Pole explorer, while 500 or more identified him with the Jay treaty with England.

William James: Bandit, brother of Jesse, cowboy, news commentator, founder of Jamestown, robber, author of western stories, gangster, hold-up man, outlaw, lone cowboy. About half of the American college students identified America's pioneer psychologist as having been a bandit or the brother of Jesse.

Carl Schurz: Nazi, World War spy, bund leader, maker of musical instruments, writer of modern poetry, judge, musician, playwright, Bolshevik, black shirt leader, and traitor. Possibly because of his name, one-third of the students identified Schurz as being a Communist or a Nazi.

WALT WHITMAN A MISSIONARY

Walt Whitman: Missionary in Far East, pioneer, colonizer, explorer, speculator, unpatriotic writer, humorist, musician, composer, famous cartoonist, father of blank verse, English poet, and columnist. Hundreds of students listed Whitman as being an orchestra leader.

John Burroughs: Cartoonist, manufacturer of typewriters, commentator, writer of Tarzan stories, plow inventor, politician. Although 12 percent could identify Burroughs as an essayist and author, 40 percent identified him as a maker of typewriters or adding machines.

Nicholas Biddle: President, Speaker of the House, Attorney General, newspaperman, Ambassador, reformer, Cabinet Officer under Washington, theologian, Senator, postmaster, Marine officer, recent naval officer, Prussian prince. Evidently confusing him with Francis Biddle, many students listed Nicholas Biddle as the Attorney General of today.

Roger Taney: Gangster, Taney murder ring, Boy Scout leader, racketeer, reformer, French envoy, pioneer, writer, cartoonist, Governor of New York, Vice President, swindler, secretary under Washington.

Jay Gould: Leader of rebellion, newspaperman, department store, political pamphleteer, composer, peacemaker, member of Washington Cabinet, author, inventor of Gould pump, song writer, cartoonist, man of mustard fame, signer of Declaration of Independence, Broadway entertainer.

Henry Ward Beecher: Senator, poet, Presidential candidate in 1883, scientist, journalist, humorist, financier, sewing machine, agitator, priest, civil-service reform. Two thousand of our high-school graduates declared that Henry Ward Beecher wrote Uncle Tom's Cabin.

ROGER WILLIAMS, MOVIE STAR

Roger Williams: Movie star, Revolutionary hero, Williams and Clark expedition, Virginia settler, inventor of silverware, helped settle Maryland, traitor, manufacturer of silver spoons, Governor of Massachusetts, military leader, founded Delaware, printer, founded Pennsylvania, founder of Williams College, Quaker, Methodist Church founder, Protestant church founder, witty news commentator, settled New Hampshire, expedition to Oregon, in Washington's Cabinet, founder of Baptist Church.

Few students could name the home State of a list of 10 prominent men who helped make American history. It was felt that students of United States history should have some idea of the section of the country that such men as Calhoun, Clay, Jackson, Adams, or Webster came from. Yet the responses by the students indicate that they had not the faintest notion of the home States of our former political leaders.

However, it is the astounding misinformation that deserves attention. Calhoun is listed as being a native of Arizona, Kansas, Maine, New York, Vermont, Illinois, and various Northern or Western States. Daniel Webster and John Quincy Adams, famous in Massachusetts history, are listed from Kentucky, Missouri, Florida, Virginia, South Carolina, or Georgia.

Six percent of the students knew what the Nullification Act of South Carolina was, and how the resulting controversy was settled. Most of the replies indicated that the students were ignorant of this period of American history. The first great challenge to the supremacy of the Union was made by the South Carolina Legislature in 1832. This incident, including the role played by Calhoun and Clay, is a vital segment in the over-all picture of American history.

Typical answers provided by 94 percent of the students are:

"South Carolina refused to pay the whisky tax"; "South Carolina refused to nullify act of union and formed southern confederacy"; "South Carolina declared the slaves law of the Constitution null and void"; "the refusal of South Carolina to have prohibition"; "South Carolina wanted to nullify its claim as being a member of the Union"; "when slaves were born in South Carolina"; "nullify the signing of the Declaration of Independence"; "Negroes were not allowed to vote, settled by arbitration, North seceded"; "South Carolina refused to ratify the Constitution."

Immigration has played an important part in the development of this country. The students disclosed a woeful ignorance on this subject. Fourteen percent of the students knew that the Germans and Irish were the principal nationalities to migrate from Europe to the United States between 1845 and 1860. Nearly 500 listed the Chinese and Japanese as being the two principal races to migrate here from Europe during these years. Other hundreds listed such nationalities as Greeks, Armenians, Russians, Spanish, Slavs, Polish, Swedes, Mongolians, Norwegians, Italians, Dutch, Balkans, French, Ethiopians, Turks, Huguenots, and Czechs.

On questions of straight factual knowledge the college freshmen were extremely misinformed. Only 4 percent knew that the Homestead Act was passed in 1862, and 2 percent knew that before the passage of this act the minimum price for an acre of Federal public lands sold at auction was $1.25. Hundreds of students thought that the Homestead Act was passed in 1920, 1930, or even 1940, while on the other extreme the years 1610, 1630, or 1690 were mentioned. One student thought it was passed "a long time ago."

The value of land in this country ranged all the way from nothing to $1,000 an acre. Other answers were 2 cents a square foot, 6 cents an acre, $475 an acre, $900 an acre. One student who had studied American history in high school wrote that the Homestead Act was passed in 1660, and before the passage of that act land sold at $900 an acre.

HAZY ABOUT RAILROADS

Although railroads have played an important role in American life, the college freshmen were almost ignorant of developments in this area. Only 7 percent could name three prominent figures identified with railroad history in the United States, and 2 percent knew when the first United States census in which railway mileage could have been reported was taken.

Prominent railway figures included such men as Andrew Jackson, DeWitt Clinton, Samuel Fulton, Jesse Jones, Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, and Thomas Jefferson. Fifteen hundred students listed Casey Jones as a famous railway man, while a large number cited Wells Fargo, Buffalo Bill, or Jim Brady. Many students said that the first railroad was founded in this country in 1941, 1940, 1910, or 1905. On the other extreme many thought that the railroads first came here in 1590, 1610, or 1650.

An almost endless list of names, except the right ones, were given by the students when asked to identify two prominent figures connected with the growth of trusts and monopolies in the United States. Among those listed were William Green, Jefferson, Stimson, Monroe, Coolidge, Morgenthau, Gompers, Rayburn, Hamilton, and Lincoln Steffens.

One of the questions called upon the students to name a prominent figure not now living connected with the organization of labor in the United States, and a comparable figure connected with women's rights. Here again the students indicated that they had no conception of the important leaders in either the labor or the suffrage fields.

Although the question asked for the naming of a labor leader not now living, 1,000 students listed John L. Lewis, while about half that number listed William Green. Others commonly named were Mark Hanna, Daniel Webster, Harriet Stowe, Samuel Insull, Huey Long, Henry Clay, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Karl Marx, Harry Bridges, and Abraham Lincoln.

An even more diffuse list was cited in connection with women's rights. Most com-

monly listed were Frances Perkins, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Claire Booth Luce.

SAMUEL GOMPERS MISNAMED

Many of the students have a hazy or sloppy idea of correct spelling. For example, Samuel Gompers, the labor leader, was listed as S. Goeppers, Samuel Goebbels, Sam Grumpers, Sol Gomphers, and Samuel Goobles. Frequently the student would cite William Lewis or John L. Green as important labor leaders not now living.

On another factual question, that of naming two areas added to the United States by purchase, the students once again revealed their ignorance of United States history. Although they had a number of possible replies to choose from, 80 percent of the students either did not know or gave entirely false replies to this question.

Some of the purchases made by this country, according to the students, include: Alaska from the Dutch, Japanese, Mexicans, Great Britain, Denmark, Spain, or China; Louisiana from Sweden; Philippines from Great Britain, Holland, France, and Russia; Kentucky from France; Virgin Islands from Spain; Nova Scotia from Holland; Hawaii from Norway; Iceland from Germany.

Students were asked to indicate the traditional American policy toward China. Only 15 percent knew that we have maintained the open-door policy. For the most part the students thought that our policy had been to prevent immigration, to send them missionaries, and to exploit her.

Some of the typical responses are: "Try to wake China up and become a successful nation," "Get as much as possible for as little as possible," "America has always used China as a source of revenue for its rich businessmen who established themselves there," "Sympathize but do little else," "One of not much interest, but had one eye on her," "A fatherly attitude, although sometimes not concerned," "Exploitation until she became underdog to Japan," "Wanting China to win and sending damn little to help her," "The closed-door policy."

COMMENT ON CHINA

Other typical comments are: "To help China out if it doesn't require too much effort on our part"; "Express friendship but ignore them when they need help"; "We have sent supplies to her but not in quantities"; "We have looked down on her"; "Exclusion of all Chinese immigrants into the United States except students and only there a quota"; "Arrused tolerance and exploitation"; "Bringing the light of modern ways to this darkened land"; "To be on friendly but not intimate terms."

One student in some indignation declared that our policy was to "buy their rice, drink their tea, starve their poor." Another student said that "we like China but never fooled around with her relations until she became an ally."

Analyzing the results of this Nation-wide test, the conclusion is inescapable that high-school students now possess an insufficient knowledge of United States history. One way to remedy this defect would appear to be that of requiring all college students to take courses in this important field.

Institutions that participated in the survey included Boston University, Brooklyn College, Bucknell, City College, University of Cincinnati, Colgate, College of Good Council, Dartmouth, George Washington University, Hunter, Illinois Institute of Technology, Indiana University, Kansas University, Kentucky University, Marquette, Maryland University, Massachusetts State College, Mount Holyoke, New York University, North Carolina University, Pennsylvania State College, Pennsylvania University, Pittsburgh University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Rhode Island State College, Smith College, Texas University, Tulane, Virginia University, Washington University, State College of Washington, Central Washington College of Education, Eastern Washington College of Education, Western Reserve, William and Mary, and Yeshiva College.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1943]

SENATORS DEPLORE STUDENT IGNORANCE OF NATION'S HISTORY—GUFFEY CONSIDERS CALLING FOR INQUIRY ON MEANS TO PROMOTE BETTER TEACHING—"OUTRAGEOUS," SAYS BUTLER—OTHER EDUCATORS ARE EQUALLY VEHEMENT OVER CONDITIONS REVEALED BY SURVEY

Results of the Nation-wide survey revealing deplorable ignorance on the part of college freshmen of basic fundamentals of United States history provoked widespread comment yesterday, not only in educational quarters, but in official circles at Washington.

At the National Capital, it seemed certain that the survey, conducted by the New York Times, would be a subject of discussion in the Senate tomorrow. Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Pennsylvania Democrat, announced he was considering introduction of a resolution calling for an inquiry into means by which the Federal Government can promote better instruction of history in the schools.

Other Senators expressed amazement at the results and indicated they would have something to say on the subject if the matter is debated in the upper House.

"OUTRAGEOUS," SAYS BUTLER

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, declared it was "perfectly outrageous that such a situation should exist."

"I not only read and reread the survey," he said, "but I cut it out of the paper and intend to discuss it from time to time to show what it means to this country. It is the most revealing and far-reaching exhibition of what we thought was going on in education."

Other educators were equally vehement in deploring the situation. Some thought the questionnaire, which was answered by 7,000 students in 36 colleges in every section of the Nation, had been drawn along too narrow lines, but all agreed that, even if it had been expanded, the results probably would have been the same.

Other outstanding educators refused to comment immediately, but indicated they intended giving the matter thorough study. Among this group were Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the Office of Education; Dr. Frank W. Hubbard, of the National Education Association; Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of Barnard College; and Ellsworth Buck, president of the New York City Board of Education.

EXTREMISTS ARE BLAMED

Hugh Russel Fraser, official of the Office of Education and chairman of its committee on American history, issued a statement at Washington placing responsibility on social studies extremists for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation.

He asserted that while there was no charge that they were trying to teach any particular ism, they just were not teaching American history at all.

Dr. Ralph H. Gabriel, Larned professor of American history at Yale, said:

"American history is a normal senior-year study in high schools and other preparatory schools and, therefore, students have American history the year before they enter college. The Time's survey of the knowledge of American history which college freshmen have suggests that the teaching in the high and other preparatory schools is inadequate. In view of this disclosure the matter might well be further investigated."

Dr. Harry N. Wright, president of City College, declared one could not draw hard and fast conclusions from the survey, though the results were obviously bad.

"All must agree the results are bad," he said, "but why are they bad? And is this lack of knowledge confined solely to history or does it crop up in all other required subjects in the secondary schools?"

Dr. Albert Bonaschi, vice president of the city board of education, declared it was "discouraging and disheartening to see that so few young persons who soon will be in the Army, are going to fight for their country without knowing the very basic facts about our American democracy." He asserted the situation must be remedied for the test itself was, if anything, "too elementary."

A similar reaction was registered by Prof. Wilbur Hallenbeck of Teachers College, Columbia, who held the survey provided "a clue to the need of getting a better understanding in the minds of the rising generation of the background of democracy." He felt, too, that the test had been too limited in scope, but agreed results might not have been a whit different had it been expanded.

One of the members of the board of higher education in New York City felt the questionnaire dealt too much in names and dates and too little in the great eras and fundamental movements in American history. He nevertheless agreed the results were appalling.

Prof. Eugene B. Riley of the history department of Fordham University, said he thought the survey's results were typical of those which might be expected from college freshmen. He pointed out that in many high schools, social science courses are substituted for history courses and, in addition, by the time the student has reached his freshman year it is a long time since he has had a history course.

Professor Riley said he agreed with the conclusion that courses in American history should be required in the undergraduate course. He said he thought the test, on the whole, was fair if adequate time was allowed and the scoring fair to the student; several questions, however, were not satisfactory, he believed. He did not think students should be required to retain the connection of Westinghouse with the air brake, and he pointed out that the question designed to suggest the name of Samuel Gompers was ambiguously worded, as well as of questionable importance.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1943]

SCHOOL TEST STIRS ACTION IN SENATE—GUFFEY CONSIDERING RESOLUTION FOR INQUIRY SEEKING WAYS FOR UNITED STATES TO SPUR HISTORY STUDY—DEBATE TUESDAY LIKELY—HEAD OF COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES HISTORY PLACES THE BLAME ON SOCIAL STUDIES EXTREMISTS

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The remarkable vagueness of American college freshmen on American history disclosed in a New York Times survey published this morning will probably be the subject of Senate discussion this week.

With the Committee on Education and Labor starting hearings Tuesday on Federal aid to education, Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, said tonight that he would take up with Chairman THOMAS the introduction of a resolution calling for Federal aid in teaching history in the schools of the country.

Several other Senators, some of them members of the committee, had strong views on the subject and felt that opportunity should be given to present them on the floor of the Senate.

The striking results of the survey seem likely to bring on a debate which will have repercussions in military as well as educational circles.

The War Department has already indicated to the Federal Office of Education that it

would like a higher status for American history in the Victory course for high-school students. The subject is required in the courses supervised by the Army in colleges.

Comment on the results of the survey was declined by those officials of the National Education Association who could be reached in Washington. Dr. Frank W. Hubbard said that he would want to know how the study was made. Reticence was also shown by Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the Office of Education.

SOCIAL STUDIES TECHNIQUE

But Hugh Russell Fraser, who, besides being an official of the Office of Education, is chairman of the Committee on American History, held "social-studies extremists" responsible for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation.

Exonerating them of any desire to teach communism or socialism, he said the trouble was not that they were trying to teach any particular "ism" in connection with American history but that they were not teaching American history at all.

The resolution which Senator GUFFEY is considering would call for the appointment of an education subcommittee of six members to study ways and means for the Federal Government to promote better instruction in American history in the schools.

SENATORS DIFFER ON TEACHING

Chairman THOMAS said it was no news that Americans had not learned their own history very well.

"I do not think, however, that this is the result of faulty teaching," he went on.

"Perhaps what it demonstrates is the need for more Federal aid to education so that we may have more equality of educational opportunity.

"Let us not forget that 800,000 boys who where physically fit had to be rejected by the Army because they could not read or write.

"What chance did they have to learn our history although there was never a battle in that history which the presence of 800,000 more soldiers on the battlefield would not have changed?"

Senator BONE, a member of the committee, thought poor teaching methods must bear part of the blame for the situation disclosed by the Times survey.

"This is one of the most remarkable documents I have ever seen," he said. "It is an indictment of our system of teaching. We are fighting a terrible war to preserve a system which rests on magnificent traditions, and it will be a shock to most people to know how little knowledge of our national history our high-school students have absorbed.

"Our emotions are deeply stirred by appeals to our patriotism and love of country, but, in the light of these startling revelations, one can only ask himself just how deeply we cherish the beautiful things we know so little about.

"It is time to take stock of some of our educational processes. If we love America as we think we do, the time is here to let our boys and girls know what we are fighting for."

DUTY SEEN FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Senator TAFT, also a member of the committee, said that he had never been able to see why our high schools did not teach more American history than they do.

"There is a fair amount of criticism of our whole educational program today," he commented.

Senator AIKEN, another committee member, said:

"Of course, I think people should know more about our own history than they do. This does not only apply to our boys and girls. It would not hurt some of our adults if they had a little more knowledge of the subject.

"I would approve an investigation of our educational system to see why we cannot attain this result. Americans must know American history not only because it is their own but because it is the most important part of the history of democracy and self-government and cannot be duplicated by any other country."

Senator O'MAHONEY, who put the results of the Times first educational survey last June in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

"Taken in conjunction with your survey a year ago your second one certainly demonstrates the need for more attention to American history. It indicates a lack of knowledge of the fundamental concepts of Americanism. That is the danger.

IGNORING OF FUNDAMENTALS

"It is evident we are training the present generation on lines that utterly ignore the basis on which the Bill of Rights was written.

"When you consider the lack of knowledge of United States history revealed by your two studies you begin to see why so many of our States and counties have got into the habit of looking to Washington for help instead of enjoying the thrill of free government and free enterprise.

"If the survey is a correct indication, our public-school system is failing to educate the rising generation in the fundamentals which led to the Declaration of Independence. It is especially strange that this revelation should be made in the week of Jefferson's Birthday, and only a few days before we are going to unveil a memorial to him here in Washington."

Senator LANGER said he thought that the results of the survey demonstrated the need for an immediate and thorough investigation of the Office of Education.

"It seems that an attempt was made, though perhaps unconsciously, to undermine the morale of our boys and girls," he said. "To my mind it is not an adequate explanation just to say that the teaching of history has been lost sight of in courses of social study."

Maj. Harold Kent, who acts as liaison officer between the War Department and the Office of Education, commented that the Army had made a 12-week intensive course in American history one of the required subjects which college students must take under Army supervision. As for the high schools, he said:

"The Army believes in the need for a strong course in the American background, for you cannot understand what the war means unless you understand the institutions which make up this country—and that means unless you know American history."

FRASER'S ANALYSIS OF SITUATION

Mr. Fraser's statement follows:

"Responsibility for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation must go to the social studies extremists," he said in a statement. "They have acted toward United States history instruction like the proverbial bull in the china shop.

"The pitfall they have stumbled into has been due to a failure to recognize that the structure of history does not lend itself to the technique of the social studies. And this failure has led to tragic results.

"Now, almost too late, some of them are beginning to realize that history, which is essentially the recording of events, requires, in its elementary stages, a chronological, time-sequence approach which is not necessarily characteristic of the social studies as a whole.

"And this chronological, time-sequence approach to American history, which the social studies extremists have abandoned, has led to some curious results.

"The tragedy really began in 1924 in Denver, Colo., when the superintendent of schools, acting on suggestions from Teachers College, Columbia University, moved to substitute a course in social science for the then-existing courses in American history and geography.

"Previously, a course outline in the social sciences or studies had been published by the State of South Dakota in 1915, but the documents issued at Pierre had only recommended the course as a supplementary one to American history. The Denver course was designed to replace American history.

WRONG TECHNIQUE CHARGED

"That day in 1924 in Denver should go down in the history of American education as a day of mourning. For on that day the professors of education, using Denver as a starting point, invaded the field of a subject with a technique that was wholly unadapted for it.

"It was a strange and incredible hour. Here was the dramatic story of Jefferson and Jackson, of Washington and Franklin, the drama of an America unfolding in logical and chronological form—the story, in fact, of 'the greatest experiment in democratic government in the history of the world'—and yet we see the professors of education walking in and saying in substance:

"'Here, none of this nonsense. We are not concerned with the details of your history. We are concerned with social trends and ideas. We want the students to analyze and describe social phenomena. That is what we mean by "social studies," and we cannot be bothered with your history unless it has some bearing on events now—today.'

"It was, of course, sheer and appalling insolence. Yet the idea spread like a prairie fire, and soon American history, for all practical intents and purposes, was on the way out.

"Illustrative of the extremes to which this apathy and indifference to the history of the United States has gone is the reply of a well-known social studies advocate who when asked if he did not think the school children of America should have some knowledge of Thomas Jefferson, replied:

"'Well, if there is anything about Jefferson that may be said to have a particular bearing on events today, I would say "Yes." Otherwise not.'

"It is this kind of approach to the history of the United States which the committee and millions of Americans would like to know how to combat.

SOME PITFALLS ARE LISTED

"First, however, there are several pitfalls to avoid. The friends of American history must note them well or the professors of education will still be smirking in their lofty perches in the great universities. And nothing will be done.

"These pitfalls are:

"1. Care must be taken not to assail the social studies extremists as Communists or Socialists. They are not. True, there may be here and there exceptions, but as a group they are not at all in this category. Naturally, they would like nothing better than this line of attack be taken up, for it is the easiest to disprove. The case against them is not that they are teaching any 'ism' connected with American history, but that they are not teaching American history at all.

"2. A campaign to make American history compulsory in the schools should be avoided. Twenty-six States require such study now, but the laws in every one of these States is worthless. There is nothing in any of these laws to stop educators, under the dominance of social studies extremists, from calling a miscellaneous discussion of sociology, civics, geography, psychology, and current events by the name of 'American history,' and getting

away with it. And this is being done today throughout the Nation in thousands of schools.

"The question then arises: What can be done?

"The committee suggests several preliminary procedures:

"1. National, State, and local educational and civic groups should demand that the schools throw off the shackles of the social studies extremists with regard to instruction in American history in its elementary stages. The subject should be taught in a chronological, time-sequence manner.

"All topical and arbitrary outlines of study should be discarded as superficial and arbitrafy. Any of the standard history texts constitute a better outline than any set of typewritten pages.

"2. In most high schools the course in American history is put off to the next to the last year. Hundreds of thousands of students never reach this year. A thorough chronological, time-sequence course should be instituted in the first year of high school and all students required to take it.

"3. The committee feels that once the student has a real background knowledge of the structure of American history, his interest in further study can be increased if he is required to make an original study of some phase or event of our history of his own choosing.

"Such a thesis should be required after the half-way mark in the course had been reached. A subject of his or her own selection, if made the subject of an original investigation, will enkindle an interest in the whole subject pattern.

"These are the committee's three preliminary suggestions and will involve, even in this preliminary stage, a radical revision in the approach to the subject as it is now being taught in thousands of our schools."

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota said he wanted to speak on the same subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator's permission to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who wishes to speak on the same subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thought I was accommodating the distinguished Senator. I desire to speak for only 5 minutes, so I think I shall carry on in my own right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the insertion in the RECORD of a matter having to do with the question discussed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the most interesting comment on this extraordinary educational survey is the one made by Mr. Hugh Russell Fraser, who was one of those who prepared the questions as an official of the Office of Education and as chairman of its committee on American history. I ask unanimous consent that his analysis of the situation, which apparently has been prepared with some care, and was a part of the investigation before the questionnaires referred to today came in, be printed in fine type in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprinted from Education for March 1943]

NEGLECT OF AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

The story of the neglect of American history, particularly in our secondary schools, is an astonishing one.

The New York Times, on June 21, 1942, brought the attention of the Nation to the general situation in the colleges. True, no mention was made at the time of the high schools and elementary schools. On May 3, however, Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University and twice Pulitzer prize winner, had charged that the treatment of the subject in the secondary schools was of a casual and incidental nature, meriting the most careful and exhaustive investigation.

The Times survey on the college level revealed that the study of American history is not required for graduation in 82 percent of our colleges; that 72 percent do not require it for entrance; that less than 10 percent of the undergraduate body in the spring semester, 1942, were enrolled in United States history classes; that only 8 percent of the freshmen classes were studying it, although 30 percent were enrolled in European history courses; that in 48 percent of the teachers colleges, where the teachers of tomorrow are trained, a study of American history is not required for graduation; that in many of our colleges and universities it is possible for a student to receive the stamp of approval as an expert in the field of government without ever having taken any course in the history of the United States; and that the percentage of the members of the graduating classes who had taken any instruction in college in American history varied from 2 percent to a rare high of 15 percent in some universities.

Hardly had the Times survey been published than emphatic press comment followed. The Detroit Free Press said the important issue now is: "What are the grade schools doing?" The Baltimore Sun observed that in view of the fact that the American citizen is the final authority on the matters of national policy, the assumption that his formal education need not include any study of how these have worked out in the past is hard to understand. The New York World-Telegram declared that a very large number of men and women who complete college courses have no knowledge of the background of their Nation beyond the juvenile, superficial, and limited courses given to children in the grade school.

Said the Indianapolis News: "Something is very definitely wrong when the majority of Hoosier colleges lump United States history courses in the so-called social-studies classification that is usually optional with all those students who are majoring in history. We surrender all too easily when we allow American history to be ladled out in small doses of civics, citizenship, economics, politics, and what-have-you. Can it be honestly affirmed that the student who takes one or two of these courses actually knows the history of his country?"

Soon after the Times survey, the Committee on American History, composed of representatives of various national organizations, was organized in Washington to investigate the status of American history in the secondary schools.

To that end, the social studies trend in certain so-called experimental or laboratory schools was examined.

Probably the No. 1 guinea pig of the social studies group is the Milne School, Albany, N. Y. Milne is the 6-year laboratory school of the New York State College for Teachers. Here instruction is given by senior students of the college. They work under the sharp eye of faculty members especially trained in latest developments in the social studies. A special report on their curriculuni was prepared for the national council for the social studies by Wallace Taylor and Donnal V. Smith.

The student at Milne comes into first contact with the history of the Nation in the eighth grade where he learns about "The National Community." This is a social-studies word for the United States. Here his instruction is divided into seven parts. But only one of these seven parts concerns the development of our political democracy.

The other six have such titles as: Geogfraphic Expansion, Extension of Social Democracy, National Unity, Changes in American Culture, Relation With Other Nations, and Citizenship.

Grade nine is devoted to a study of "The World Community and the Economic Problems of the Individual."

In grade ten the student is given an elaborate course in "Man's Advancing Culture." This seems to be a preparation for the last or final year, the twelfth grade—where the single topic is "Social Relationships."

Therefore, it takes only a simple process of deduction to note that the eleventh grade is left for American history. But here a riddle develops. The year is divided into five equal parts. The titles are: 1. Introduction to American Culture. 2. Government in the United States. 3. Growth of our Economic System. 4. Culture and Ways of Living in the United States. 5. World Relationships.

Now subdivision No. 2 appears to be American history. Indeed, part of it is. It is subdivided as follows: 1. Constitutional government. 2. Political parties and conflicting issues. 3. Development of suffrage. 4. Documents, laws, and doctrines that continue the democratic tradition. 5. Philosophers and leaders in democracy. 6. Services rendered by local and national governments.

Incidentally, all this adds up to only one-fifth of one grade. In this incredibly short interim the student is given a small—very small dose of American political history.

So singular is this situation that when the Committee on American History made this specific charge, the principal of the school, Dr. Robert W. Frederick, came back with this admission: "Yes; we do decrease our emphasis on political and politico-military history to provide opportunity for a consideration of economic, social, and industrial history." Yet there is hardly any presentation of American political history at all.

Is this a pattern for the schools of tomorrow?

Take another laboratory school, Wisconsin High School at Madison, Wis.

Examination of the curriculum discloses that the eighth grade opens with such topics as How May I Become Aware of and Sensitive to the Significant Social Problems of My Day? How May I Become Skilled in Techniques of Problem Solving? etc.

The ninth grade is devoted to ancient and medieval history. The tenth grade is given to world history.

In the eleventh grade we find a shade of our old friend again, American history. But the study course is subdivided into eight,

instead of five, parts. And here, curiously enough, only two of these eight parts concern the history of America's political development.

Miss Ruth Johnson, who prepared the course outline, explained that unit 3, as well as units 1 and 4, concerned American history.

Nevertheless, Wisconsin is one of 26 States that requires a year of American history.

Now for our third illustration, let's go to another major demonstration school, the one at Eugene, Oreg.

The topic for grade 7 is Industrial Problems Considered From Regional Viewpoint With a National Outlook. That is self-explanatory.

Grade 8 is entitled "The Growth and Development of American Culture." This looks like the real thing, but our first subdivision turns out to be "Orientation—How can I live effectively in my new school environment?" Subdivision 2 is "Personal, social adjustments: How can I get along with older people?"

Subdivision 4, it seems, is worth our attention. It is titled "Development of the West: What can the West Contribute to the Cultural Development of the United States?" Even this can hardly be termed truly United States history. Obviously, there is a difference between "What did the West contribute?" and "What can the West contribute?" Only the former is history.

The ninth grade is concerned with "Contemporary Problems of the Community." Grade 10 is entitled "The Growth of Mankind Toward the Democratic Way of Life."

Ordinarily there might be a little American history there—but no, a break-down of the title shows only 1 item out of 16 that might fairly be considered as relating even indirectly to the history of the United States.

At last we come to grade 11. Here we find the familiar 11 subdivisions, one of which is entitled "Social Security: How Can We Provide Social Security for All?" Other sections are variously headed "School government," "Municipal government," "State government," "Recreation and leisure," etc.

But only 1 subdivision out of 16 has a bearing on American history. This is titled "Freedom and Civil Rights: How Did We Get Our Freedom and Civil Rights, and How Can We Keep Them?"

This is Eugene's ration of American history. Just one-eleventh of a year's course.

In reply to the committee's charge of neglect, Superintendent J. F. Cramer, of the Eugene public schools, cites the number of hours devoted every day to the "social living" course which he says "includes all English and language activities, history, geography, civics, and orientation and counseling." Then he says:

"The Eugene social-living course has been formally accepted by the State superintendent of public instruction, Rex Putnam, as meeting all the requirements for the course in history and civics."

Oregon law, of course, requires a course in American history. The law, of course, is worthless. No penalty is attached to its nonenforcement and the matter is left wholly within the discretion of the State superintendent of public instruction. There is nothing in the law to prevent the latter official from accepting the latest edict of Teachers College, Columbia University, as to what is or is not American history.

Now it so happens that 26 States have laws requiring instruction in American history in the public schools. Not one of them can be enforced.

Wisely, for these reasons, Governor James, of Pennsylvania, in 1942 vetoed a bill passed in Pennsylvania imposing certain duties on the superintendent of public instruction in regard to United States history. Obviously, this kind of legislation is worse than futile, for unless a specific time-sequence course is directed and penalties attached, the social studies boys can ignore it. Nor is a proposal recently introduced in the New York Assembly by Assemblyman Glancy to require a year's study of United States history any wiser.

Prof. Samuel McKee, for 16 years a member of the Columbia University department of history, has recently put the whole problem succinctly. Says Professor McKee:

"The emergence of the social studies is in large part responsible for the disappearance of American history from the high-school curriculum. The amount of history in the average social studies course has almost reached the vanishing point. As a result, the students get through school knowing little about American history, and even holding this subject in contempt."

"Teachers' colleges are responsible," Professor McKee believes, "for this unwholesome development. Many persons in these colleges want to make names for themselves by advocating teaching methods that are novel or different, although not necessarily better."

His remedy is equally plain and sound:

"A good American history course of at least 1 year's duration should be required in every high school. Instead of teaching it in the glorified way now so popular in many schools, the course should primarily be concerned with the moving panorama of American history from the beginning to the present."

Now let us examine the curriculum in a typical American city, say, Pittsburgh. Here we find one-half a year's course is given to American history. Dr. Charles E. Manwiller, director of the curriculum department, explains the course is given in the first semester of the eleventh grade. Then he adds: "The work of the second semester is given a historical slant, and, therefore, I contend we offer a full year of American history in our high schools."

In the Pittsburgh Press of October 31, 1942, appeared a letter from a supervisor of a social studies department in a high school outside of Pittsburgh. He wrote:

"It is possible to become an American history high-school teacher in Pennsylvania without ever having taken a single hour of American history in college as part of one's preparation. In my judgment such conditions are disgraceful any time; but today they border on something more serious. In a letter I can hardly tell you how deeply I feel about this whole matter As a parent and as an educator, I am most concerned about saving our democracy. And I realize that we cannot save it if we aren't acquainted with it."

It would not be fair to contend, of course, that the plight of American history in Pittsburgh is essentially different from that of any other American city. Only a little more investigation has been made there. In 1936, for instance, a simple quiz was put to 400 students who had applied for work-relief under the National Youth Administration program. Only a few questions were asked as to their knowledge of United States history. One was: "Who is Herbert Hoover?" Out of 400, a total of 74 replied blithely he was "head of the G-men."

Incidentally, students who were normal on other subjects were found to be woefully ignorant of the simplest facts of American history. One 13-year-old girl, who made good grades in other subjects, could not name the first President of the United States. Another, 15 years old, could not say who Theodore Roosevelt was and finally guessed he was head of the Daughters of American Revolution.

In certain States—Alabama is a typical example—an orderly, chronological presentation of American history is not expected by the social studies advisors. In fact, a half a year is divided between the history of the United States and the history of Alabama—and even this half a year is based upon current events with occasional glances over the shoulder at the past.

The Alabama Department of Education published in 1941 an elaborately printed 270-page book entitled "Program of Studies and Guide to the Curriculum for Secondary Schools." It is a detailed description of the type of courses offered in the junior and senior high schools of the State, both required and elective, yet it contains only one paragraph in which its social-studies authors deign to even discuss what might be called the history of the United States.

In one paragraph the authors make it very clear that the past is to be considered merely as an appendage of the present—sort of a throw-back from events of today. Says the guide (p. 68):

"Beginning with present social and economic conditions and problems in community, State, region, and Nation, this course should develop abilities and interests in using history, biography, and related literature in interpreting present conditions and problems in such a way that pupils derive satisfaction and pleasure from the experiences."

That means, in other words, that Alabama social-studies teachers should give a little American history in the eleventh grade, but on two conditions: (1) That the starting point be always present social and economic conditions, and (2) that nothing be taught that will not give all the pupils pleasure and satisfaction.

Incidentally, there is only one other place in the guide where the authors are unable to avoid at least an indirect reference to the teaching of American history. That is a passing mention (p. 251) under School Laws of an enactment of the Legislature of the State of Alabama requiring instruction in the Constitution of the United States.

Yet there is discussion of problems of plant growth in the community; food problems in the community; study of family "trees" by pupils for their own satisfaction; and even half a page (p. 127) devoted to the problem of homemaking for boys.

The truth is that the neglect of our history in the colleges is mild compared to the neglect in the secondary schools. Indeed, there seems to be the false assumption everywhere that someone else is doing the teaching job. The colleges assume that the high schools are providing a basic understanding of American history; and the high schools assume the job is done in the elementary schools. When, as a matter of fact, it is not being done anywhere, except where the time-sequence form is used.

From Charles A. Beard, dean of American historians, and himself associated for years with the social studies movement, has come a sharp warning that the present trend must be checked.

Writes Dr. Beard: "The decline in emphasis on the teaching of American history has been accompanied by an increase in the amount of instruction in sociology, economics, current questions, problems of democracy, and other subjects pertaining to such interests. As a result the overwhelming majority of our adult citizens have had little or no instruction in American history, at least beyond the barest rudiments during the years of their elementary education."

Among social studies partisans, Dr. Beard's name is one to conjure with; texts written by him are among those used as the background of social studies courses in both junior and senior high schools. Yet Dr. Beard's warning has not appeared, nor has it been quoted, in any social studies publication, nor has it been given any publicity except through the medium of the civic education service.

And this, too, is the measure of the distrust and resentment of all criticism prevalent among the social studies people. They have been so accustomed to criticism of the

educational program of others that they cannot admit even the presence of dissent from a high source.

Yet the one bright hope in the situation is that there are schools which have not yet succumbed to the social studies' amazing "Now you see it—and now you don't!" technique in the presentation of the history of the United States.

This is not to suggest that the fusion treatment of American history, civics, sociology, economics, and what-have-you does not have its place in American education. It has. But it is of no value until and unless an orderly, chronological picture of American history is, at some point and some time in the educational ladder, presented in either the elementary or high school.

It is obvious that fusion, without something to fuse, is an impossibility. There is, for example, a similarity between the depression of 1837 and that of 1929–32. But the student can hardly recognize it unless he knows something about the depression of 1837 in its peculiar politico-economic setting. And this cannot be known in a historical vacuum. Obviously, the time-sequence panorama of American history is the first essential in an intelligent presentation of it.

And it is precisely this that the present development of the social-studies trend is eliminating.

In passing it might be noted that it is one thing to go back to the old textbook-memorizing days, and quite another to skip so rapidly from the present to the past and the past to the present that the student is confused and, in point of fact, develops no reference frame of events.

The truth is that a definite time-sequence presentation method must be insisted on if the student is to get any intelligible concept of American history. The past is not a mere appendage to the present. It is the basis and foundation of the present. And unless leaders in the social-studies movement wake up to the extent of the confusion and ignorance of our historical backgrounds, the present teaching techniques are producing in the secondary schools, they will face the wrath of an aroused public opinion.

Indeed, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently noted: "If our educators cannot see what is wrong with this situation, laymen can. We are fighting a war to preserve the American way of life, and countless Americans do not know what their way of life is."

Is it possible that we must be reduced to the humiliation of having the Army take over where our schools have failed? The Army is already doing it.

Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, commander of the Second Army, has reported he found the boys under his command so ignorant of the elemental facts of American history that he set up classes to teach them. It is also significant that it is spokesmen of the Army, not the educators, who are including American history as one of the basic studies in the new wartime curriculum.

This, too, is the measure of our incapacity.

As Admiral Nimitz has said: "The zeal to defend our heritage is based, in the last analysis, on an understanding of its origin and development."

And this fundamental understanding our present social-studies technique is not supplying.

MANPOWER-UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to the remarks of my distinguished colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with relation to the problem of lack of education in America. At some future time I should like to comment on that subject. Suffice it to say that it seems to me that back of it all is something which has existed in the past 10 or 15 years. We have thought it smart, and the American way of doing things, to discount industry, thrift, courage, and honesty, and the good old American trait of doing things on the basis of individual accomplishment. My memory goes back to articles by learned men discounting the great virtues of Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, and other great Americans. Of course, they were not gods; but men have written books which deprive youth of the exaltation which comes from reading about men who stand for morality, courage, and principle. That is one of the reasons why youngsters who go to our colleges or universities have not seen fit to become acquainted with the fundamentals of American history.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise for that purpose. At the present time we are told that this Nation is facing the most severe manpower crisis in our history. I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate today some very illuminating figures on this subject.

In view of this fact, it is interesting to survey the unemployment compensation benefit payments on the basis of data reported by State agencies to the Social Security Board in Washington.

During the past calendar year, in a period when our production demands were the highest in history, from January 1 to December 31, 1942, unemployment compensation benefits in this land amounted to $345,514,700. During the month of December 1942, unemployment benefits paid out amounted to $11,557,700, and it is estimated that the number of workers receiving benefits during December was 267,700.

Mr. President, I have not been able to secure the figures for January, February, and March of this year, but it is apparent that last December there were almost 300,000 men receiving unemployment compensation benefits, and this obviously is not the total extent of our unemployment. I realize that this represents a tremendous decrease from the unemployment of previous years. Nevertheless, it is appalling to discover a reservoir of some 300,000 unemployed.

At the present time there is increasing unemployment in the construction industry, and because of civilian curtailments there is unemployment in many other lines of endeavor.

I am not advised as to the extent of collaboration, if there is any, between the War Manpower Commission and the Social Security Board, and I have today written to the War Manpower Chairman, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, concerning this matter.

My purpose in addressing the Senate at this time is merely to draw the attention of this body to these figures, which I feel warrant serious study. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated as a part of my remarks a chart of unemployment compensation benefits, which lists the benefits paid in each State. This information was supplied to me by the Social Security Board.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment compensation benefit payments, Dec. 31, 1942

[Preliminary data reported by State agencies—based on operations of central offices]

State	Benefits paid during December 1942 [1]	Estimated number of workers receiving benefits during December	Benefits paid during calendar year Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1942 [1]	Total benefits paid since first payable, through Dec. 31, 1942 [2]
Total	$11,557,700	267,700	$345,514,700	$2,032,335,476
Alabama	258,900	7,100	3,297,600	23,619,872
Alaska	1,100	(3)	148,400	1,316,782
Arizona	9,700	300	477,600	6,070,801
Arkansas	33,100	1,500	992,800	7,998,894
California	719,100	16,300	37,502,100	216,335,736
Colorado	9,200	200	826,300	10,679,974
Connecticut	73,100	1,500	3,233,960	28,351,581
Delaware	8,400	200	511,500	2,584,063
District of Columbia	44,500	900	1,158,000	8,473,881
Florida	166,600	4,900	4,718,000	20,070,886
Georgia	221,700	6,100	4,408,400	15,160,917
Hawaii	2,900	100	158,700	880,554
Idaho	3,700	100	832,600	6,864,569
Illinois	1,703,600	38,200	38,181,200	126,819,112
Indiana	284,300	6,700	9,647,000	51,423,490
Iowa	43,200	1,300	2,065,300	16,467,407
Kansas	40,500	1,300	1,816,700	7,991,295
Kentucky	106,400	3,800	2,530,900	14,782,965
Louisiana	197,600	4,600	5,161,800	28,996,597
Maine	68,600	2,300	1,189,700	13,754,667
Maryland	136,600	3,400	3,845,700	31,258,440
Massachusetts	310,600	7,800	11,833,400	106,963,104
Michigan	457,100	9,900	40,987,600	160,476,859
Minnesota	158,100	3,700	5,636,500	38,202,457
Mississippi	42,400	1,300	1,582,600	8,346,291
Missouri	440,800	11,600	8,140,600	26,238,024
Montana	7,700	200	1,226,400	7,686,370
Nebraska	12,600	400	972,800	5,413,118
Nevada	3,100	100	274,100	3,028,430
New Hampshire	28,100	800	799,200	8,454,979
New Jersey	667,200	15,800	17,878,800	63,853,674
New Mexico	4,200	100	502,000	3,731,821
New York	3,221,600	58,900	65,640,500	398,851,146
North Carolina	114,360	5,200	2,997,500	23,664,412
North Dakota	4,600	100	367,300	2,040,150
Ohio	323,800	8,400	14,408,100	74,780,197
Oklahoma	49,700	1,400	2,795,300	13,424,549

[1] Not adjusted for voided benefit checks.
[2] Adjusted for voided benefit checks.
[3] Less than 100.

Unemployment compensation benefit payments, Dec. 31, 1942—Continued

[Preliminary data reported by State agencies—based on operations of central offices]

State	Benefits paid during December 1942	Estimated number of workers receiving benefits during December	Benefits paid during calendar year Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1942	Total benefits paid since first payable, through Dec. 31, 1942
Oregon	$50,700	1,100	$1,778,300	$18,303,176
Pennsylvania	622,700	14,700	15,090,900	208,772,506
Rhode Island	153,700	3,300	4,741,700	31,192,266
South Carolina	74,900	2,400	1,856,500	8,725,477
South Dakota	3,100	100	219,400	1,320,822
Tennessee	249,900	7,400	5,603,900	27,198,225
Texas	95,100	3,300	4,058,800	30,695,371
Utah	14,100	300	996,200	8,277,005
Vermont	13,800	400	316,400	3,083,100
Virginia	82,300	2,800	2,738,100	21,682,493
Washington	30,200	900	2,565,700	23,578,420
West Virginia	71,700	1,900	2,313,700	25,507,404
Wisconsin	115,900	2,700	4,133,400	26,651,933
Wyoming	1,700	(1)	353,900	3,378,248

[1]Less than 100.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, figures which the Census Bureau released yesterday indicate that unemployment in March was about 1,000,000. Think of it. We are talking of putting 15,000,000 men into the military service, with 1,000,000 unemployed in March. That is a low point and represents a decline of about 2,600,000 from March of 1942. It is nearly 10,000,000 less than in 1937.

The March figure of 1,000,000 also represents a decrease of about 400,000 from the February estimate. This is a very sharp decline since February of this year. Apparently some economists and the Census Bureau itself regard this as a level not far above "the irreducible minimum." A great many economists place "minimum" unemployment at between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000.

The estimate of 1,000,000 does not cover unemployables, but it does include some persons temporarily unemployed in the process of transferring from one job to another. It also includes some seasonal workers.

Personally I am reluctant to accept the theory that there is any "minimum" unemployment. It is difficult to reconcile our staggering manpower requirements with the figure of 1,000,000 unemployed. Think of it. We are reaching into homes to take women with children, and yet we are told that there must be a minimum unemployment. The projected increase in the armed forces means that our current employment and production volume will be maintained only if large numbers of persons now classified as nonworkers will enter the labor forces.

Let me point out the significant fact that the civilian labor force declined by 300,000 between February and March. In other words, we cannot attribute the drop in unemployment to our employment programs.

The drop in the civilian labor force was confined entirely to men. It marked the eighth consecutive month in which the male labor force declined.

According to the Census Bureau, the number of women in the labor market remains unchanged at 15,600,000. The labor force in March of 1943 was estimated to be 52,000,000. That was 700,000 less than in March of 1941. In other words, our factories and our farms are meeting wartime production requirements with a civilian-labor force which is less than pre-war levels.

Male employment between February and March dropped 100,000. The employment of women increased by 200,000. The net increase of 100,000 brings the total employment to about 51,000,000, and agricultural employment shows a gain of about 200,000 workers during the past month. That increase took place entirely among farm workers and undoubtedly resulted from military deferments of agricultural workers.

The estimates which the Census Bureau has made of unemployment are based on a representative cross-section survey. It covers approximately 25,000 families.

All these figures are very enlightening. They indicate that last month there were a million unemployed in this country, and they indicate that at the close of last year, of the total unemployed at that time, we were paying unemployment compensation benefits to almost 300,000 workers.

It seems to me that all of this points to one conclusion; namely, that it is high time for us to have made available all the expert recommendations regarding the manpower program which were supposed to have been made to the President recently. The normal peacetime estimates of the irreducible number of unemployed are obviously out of date today, and it is high time that we had a clearly defined, accurately charted program to absorb a reservoir of 1,000,000 workers.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator advise us whether any State laws permit the payment of unemployment-insurance benefits to those who are suffering from injuries or illness?

Mr. WILEY. I suppose they do.

Mr. BONE. The figures would be much more significant if we had some indication of the extent to which those who received unemployment-compensation benefits were ill or had been injured at work, and were therefore entitled to unployment-compensation benefits while they were away from work.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot say definitely. The figures have not been put on that basis. I have the figures pertaining to all the States. The significant thing is the large amount of money which is being paid out.

Mr. BONE. The figures as to injuries are appalling. The number of industrial accidents in the country is very great.

Mr. WILEY. I suppose that in most instances injuries would come under the workmen's compensation acts of the various States.

Mr. BONE. I assume they would, but I am wondering if in any State illness is brought within the bracket of personal injuries, for I suspect that in some States workmen's compensation laws are not in effect.

Mr. WILEY. I have concluded, Mr. President.

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to support the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I do so because of what I have also read in the article which was referred to and read in part by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. One of the questions in the article appearing in the Sunday New York Times was "What Were the Original Thirteen Colonies?" Some of the students replied that the colonies included Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Nebraska. After I read that I was impelled to get in touch with some of the historians, and one of those whom I consulted was Robert Haskell Cory, Jr., one of the distinguished historians of this country. He told me that one of the reasons for the lack of knowledge on the part of some students was the low pay which was received by most of the educators throughout the country. I then got in touch with the National Education Association and found that altogether there are 894,000 classroom teachers, principals, and supervisors in the public schools. I found that since the present war started 37,000 teachers have left their profession and are now engaged in war industry, farming, and other businesses. I further discovered that, as applied to the salaries of teachers, 40 teachers in every 100, or about 360,000 in all, are being paid less than $1,200 for the school year 1942–43. Nearly 8 in every 100, or approximately 66,000 in all, are being paid less than $600 for the present school year.

Low salaries for teachers are typical in the Southern States but they are by no means limited to that region. More than 169,000 of the teachers receiving less than $1,200 a year are outside the Southeastern and Southwestern States. Fifteen thousand receiving less than $600 a year are likewise in States other than Southern States.

There are about 61,000 Negro teachers in the Southeastern and Southwestern States where schools are segregated, and salaries differentiated. About 53,000 of these Negro teachers are paid less than $1,200 per year. About 30,000 are paid less than $600 a year.

Only 2 of the 48 States report that no teachers are being paid less than $1,200 for the year 1942–43. Nearly 15,000 teachers in Pennsylvania—23 percent—are being paid less than $1,200 for the year's work in 1942–43. The percentage is even higher in Illinois, where about 30 percent, or some 14,000 teachers, receive less than $1,200 a year.

Twenty-six of the 48 States are employing teachers at less than $600 a year.

Mr. President, I was intensely interested when I further ascertained that the amount of money spent in 1938 for alcohol was $3,444,000,000; for tobacco, $1,722,000,000; for movies, $1,433,000,000; cosmetics and chewing gum, $435,000,000, or a total of $7,639,000,000 spent for luxuries.

The total amount spent on education during the same period was $2,564,000,000, or 33.6 percent as much as was spent on luxuries in the United States during 1938.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for a moment to comment on the story of education which has been unfolded to the Senate today. It is one which should burn itself into the consciousness of the members of boards of higher curricula in all our States where such institutions are maintained.

We are presently engaged in the greatest war in human history, a war in which we shall probably and tragically pour out libations of blood which will stagger the imagination of the world. We are saying to ourselves, and to our boys who are making these sacrifices, that they are fighting to preserve all the worth-while things in our American system and our American way of life. So when we read this most astounding document it comes as a very rude shock to discover that the magnificent historical traditions of America have been obscured, and are no longer bright and shining inspirations to the students in American high schools.

We are telling our boys that they are fighting for great historical principles enshrined in our national life. Yet, according to this story, which is well verified in the experience of almost all of us, the students in our high schools, as well as those who are entering our colleges, have all too little acquaintance with the magnificent history and historical figures of our country We are telling our boys that they are fighting for these principles, and yet many do not understand what they are. We have seen enshrined in our national life a hatred of many evils—hell-born evils—and we wrote an iconoclastic thesis against them in fierce whirlwinds of fire. Men have died to keep the infant Republic from being strangled in its cradle and it is remarkable how many boys and girls, unfortunately, do not know the beautiful story of the man whose valor and genius carved a nation out of a wilderness.

Are we asking our boys to fight for something they do not understand? If so, it is a sad picture. We have a system of education in this country which is lacking in that it has robbed them of a knowledge of the most beautiful things in our American life. It seems utterly fantastic to me that a boy or a girl should not have an understanding of the rich and full meaning of American history.

I think Mr. Fraser and his associates have made a worth-while contribution in bringing to our attention this rather tragic picture of the failure of our school system to sufficiently teach American history.

The Senator from North Dakota referred to the financial status of school teachers. But obviously, if they graduated from high schools and universities, and lacked knowledge of the history of this country they cannot teach history. It is a vicious circle. I do not know what the Senate or the House, or the two bodies together, may or can do about it, but it is a challenging picture of failure. We are telling the world that we are fighting for our own magnificent traditions and for all of the beautiful things which have been enshrined in the fabric of American life, and yet millions of our own boys and girls may never come to appreciate their significance or cost. Certainly we owe it to the boys and girls coming on to bring about a change.

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained in New Hampshire.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regret that it is necessary to submit my views on this at a time when I know a great many Senators are going to leave the floor at the lunch hour. I also regret that some Senators who deliberately voted for the passage of this bill, and who are now said to be on the other side of the issue, are not present to hear a fair discussion of the measure. I state that especially for the reason that there have been so many misrepresentations about the effects of the bill that it is a pity, Mr. President, as I see it, that Members of this body should be misguided by representations which are not really justified, in my opinion, and very largely upon anonymous statements of the effects of the bill made by somebody in a department who may or may not be responsible for the figures which are presented.

In the first place, I wish to say that it is not my personal bill, if that is of any significance. This bill was sponsored by the four largest farm organizations in America. They requested me to introduce and handle it. With my knowledge of the subject, and being in absolute accord with their viewpoint and with the purposes of the bill, I was glad to take that action. When the bill was previously before the Senate I put into the RECORD letters from the four outstanding farm organizations, showing their support of the measure. A day or two later I received a telegram from the fifth farm organization, one which does not usually cooperate with the other four, namely, the National Farmers' Union, giving unqualified support to the bill. I have the telegram here. I have not heard from them since the President vetoed the bill. I want to make it clear that the statement they sent to me at the time when

the bill was previously under consideration was their position then. I do not know what their position is now, whether they still favor the bill or not. Let me read the telegram from the National Farmers' Union, since it has not heretofore been read into the RECORD of the Senate, for the reason that I received it the day after the Senate passed the bill. I think it is well, at least, for the public to understand the attitude of this farm organization in addition to the other four at a time when so much pressure was not to be resorted to to sustain the veto of the President. The telegram is signed by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, and reads:

We are tremendously pleased and encouraged by your effective work which resulted in the Senate's approval yesterday by an almost unanimous vote to protect agriculture against ceilings imposed by the Office of Price Administration at less than parity prices. We have always contended that parity prices were to provide parity of income, and soil and conservation payments were to compensate the farmer for taking land out of production and preserving the soil.

I also had a telegram at the same time sent by the National Farmers' Union by James G. Patton, president, and by M. W. Thatcher, vice chairman, National Executive Council of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. It is practically the same as the telegram I have just read, and in order to save reading it I will ask that it be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 27, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
Senate Office Building:

We are tremendously pleased and encouraged by your effective work which resulted in the Senate's approval yesterday by an almost unanimous vote to protect agriculture against ceilings imposed by the Office of Price Administration at less than parity prices. We have always contended that parity payments were to provide parity of income and soil-conservation payments were to compensate the farmers for taking land out of production and preserving the soil.

NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION,
JAMES G. PATTON, *President.*
M. W. THATCHER,
Vice Chairman, National Executive Council, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, since the veto of the bill by the President I have received a letter signed by the other four farm organizations, dated April 3, which I shall read. It is as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

We urge Congress to pass the Bankhead bill over the President's veto. At stake is the basic issue of whether we shall have government by law or by Executive decree.

With that statement I am in the fullest accord. I continue the reading:

The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle involved is fundamental.

In the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress stipulated that ceilings on farm products should not be set below parity prices to farmers. This provision of the law has been nullified by Executive decree. In our opinion it is the duty of the Congress to see that the law is carried out. This can be accomplished by passage of the Bankhead bill over the veto. Enactment of this measure would permit the farmer to obtain parity in the market place, instead of being forced to depend upon subsidies from the Public Treasury. Farmers do not want, and never have wanted, subsidies when they could obtain parity prices.

Unfortunately the issue has been clouded by assertions that the Bankhead bill will seriously increase the dangers of inflation. These assertions are based on misleading and distorted figures. Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from passage of the measure would be so small as to have little, if any, effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

It is most unfortunate that again and again the American farmer has been attacked and accused of reponsibility for inflation. It is apparent that once more agriculture is to be used as the whipping-boy to further appease the wage demands of organized labor and to divert attention from the real source of inflation. This is seriously undermining the morale of the farmer and impairing his heroic efforts to produce to the utmost of his capacity. Not only farmers but the general public are becoming increasingly concerned over the ability of American agriculture to produce adequate food and fiber under present Government policies.

So that the public may know where the true blame for inflation lies, we submit the following facts based on Government records:

1. While American farmers constitute more than 22 percent of our population, they receive less than 10 percent of our national income.

2. In 1942, farm income had increased only $1,000,000,000 over the peak figure of the last World War, while nonfarm income increased more than $55,000,000,000.

3. Farm prices today are 10 percent below farm prices prevailing during the last World War. Hourly pay of industrial workers is nearly two and a half times greater than the peak hourly rates of World War No. 1.

I ask the attention of my colleagues, particularly to the following statement:

4. Today the average nonfarm family is paying a lower percentage of its income for food than at any time during the past 30 years. Today 22 percent of the average nonfarm family income is spent for food compared to 38 percent at the peak of World War No. 1.

Permit me to digress from the reading of this statement to say that these figures are taken from statements released from time to time by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, one of which, and the latest of which, I have here among my papers. I continue to read:

There is, therefore, absolutely no justification for organized labor to use either the Bankhead bill or the cost of food as an excuse for demanding further wage increases. In view of the grave food shortage now confronting the country, we believe it is time to stop kicking the farmer around and to fix the blame for inflation where it properly belongs.

Agriculture has always urged that stability could be maintained only through a fair balance between industrial wages and agricultural prices. Had labor and the administration agreed to this, today the cost of living would be substantially lower. Feeling that passage of the Bankhead bill will still leave a disparity between agricultural prices and industrial wages, and therefore does not justify labor's demands for higher pay, we believe it to be the duty of labor to join with us in an honest attempt to reach the fair balance necessary, to the end that America may win the war and write an enduring peace.

Yours very sincerely,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
A. S. GOSS, *Master.*
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
CHARLES C. TEAGUE, *President.*
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, this statement, signed by these four great farm organizations, presents a good picture, an accurate picture, broadly speaking, of the facts so far as I know them to be, and I urge the earnest attention of Senators to the representations, statements, and arguments made by this group of representatives of organized agriculture in this country.

Mr. President, I also have a letter from Mr. C. C. Teague, president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, one of the greatest farm organizations in the United States so far as membership is concerned. I shall not read the letter, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1943.

Re President's veto, Bankhead bill, S. 660.
To Members of Congress:

GENTLEMEN: We have just held a 3-day session of the executive committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, an organization with a membership of more than 2,000,000 farmers distributed in every State and almost every county. Members of the executive committee came from all parts of the country. There does not exist a more able, representative, or patriotic group of men connected with agriculture.

They came together, not because of a profit motive, but because of their grave concern over the serious national food situation.

Each of them expressed the conviction that there was impending a crisis that promised to be calamitous in the production of the foods essential to feeding our armed forces, assisting our allies, and supplying our civilian population on even a greatly restricted diet.

They were unanimously of the opinion that under the present policies of Government the minimum requirements of these essential foods would not be produced for the following reasons:

1. Before the establishment of price controls and the Little Steel formula, labor unions, supported by the Government and the device of cost-plus contracts, had raised the wages of common labor in many cases to double that of the pre-war period. Farmers, in order to get labor, have, in many cases, had to pay even higher wages than those paid in defense plants and still cannot get the necessary labor for production and harvest.

2. One-third to as high as one-half of the agricultural laborers and farmers in many areas have been taken from agriculture into defense plants and into the armed forces. The work performed by these workers cannot, except in small measure, be done by inexperienced women and children.

3. Under priority rulings material could not be obtained for machinery, repair parts, replacements, and other essential farm supplies.

4. Ill-considered application of ceiling prices has caused many maladjustments in production and distribution.

All of these conditions are discouraging and restricting production.

In many high-cost crops the risk is so great that farmers will not plant without assurance of a labor supply and a price that will at least return to them their out-of-pocket expense.

Since the establishment of price ceilings, it has been the policy of the administration to hold down the price of food.

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices or prices to farmers as an end in themselves is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

Ceiling or maximum prices should be used to safeguard the public from inflationary and speculative prices, but prices necessary to cover the costs of producing a supply of foods sufficient to provide resonably adequate diets for the armed forces, our allies, and the civilian population cannot properly be called "inflationary prices"; they are necessary prices—necessary to cover costs, necessary to provide a reasonably adequate food supply, necessary to keep foods flowing through normal distributive channels rather than to a select few via the "black market," necessary that everyone may have enough of something to eat even though it may not be just what he'd like to eat.

We urge the support of the Bankhead bill (S 660) in overriding the President's veto as one step in the direction of the assurance of an adequate production of essential foods.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. TEAGUE, *President*.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I read one paragraph from the letter which I have just had inserted in the RECORD:

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices, or prices to farmers, as an end in themselves is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

I was deeply impressed with that statement, because it is in line with my philosophy, that, instead of having controversies about the difference in the cost of beets, squash, and cucumbers, or even major commodities, the great outstanding proposition, from the standpoint of the welfare of our country, is the matter of production, quantity production, production sufficient to meet the requirements of our people, the armed forces at home and abroad, and to fulfill the promises made to our allies through the lend-lease program.

Permit me again to call attention, as I did on a former occasion, to the views held by Mr. Herbert Hoover on the subject. Mr. Hoover has had a wider experience than any other living man with the subject of food supplies and food distribution during periods of emergency. Whether or not we agree with Mr. Hoover's economic philosophy, we all know that his experience and his record of success as food administrator of this country and distributor of food in foreign lands was the primary factor in advancing him in the consideration of the American people for the office of the Presidency of the United States, which was later bestowed upon him. Are we to disregard the judgment of such an experienced man merely because we do not agree with all his economic views? I submit that in a trying time it is well for us to take advantage of the experience and the judgment of such a man on this subject. When the first price-control bill was under consideration in the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, Mr. Hoover said that the time would come when the American people would be more interested in the subject of floors under prices so as to bring about adequate production than they would be about price ceilings.

Senators, we all know it to be a fundamental principle of economy that prices are largely fixed by the law of supply and demand, and the chief factor in any price fixing is the quantity of commodities offered on the market. The best way to hold down prices of any commodities, and especially of agricultural commodities, is to produce in ample quantities, and the ample supply will in itself automatically bring about fair and reasonable prices.

I will illustrate my point by referring to watermelons. Let us say a load of watermelons a day comes to a town in which the people consume a load of watermelons a day. Let us assume that a little later two or three loads of watermelons a day come to the same town, in which there are the same number of consumers. Down goes the price. On the other hand, let us suppose that the watermelon producers carry their melons to some other market, or that their production of melons is short for reasons beyond their control; is there anyone who does not know how rapidly the price rises because the number of melons is less than the requirements to supply the market?

So it is with all agricultural production. It is not only desirable from every standpoint during wartimes to have an ample production of food, but it is the best way known to man to bring about reasonable and fair prices for the commodities.

Mr. President, let me now move to another subject. The bill, as Senators know, is the result of an Executive order issued by the President promptly after the approval of the last Price Control or Stabilization Act, under which the President directed that all parity payments, all soil-conservation payment, and all subsidies of every kind be deducted in fixing both the parity prices and the ceiling prices of commodities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Executive order providing for the stabilization of the national economy, to which I have referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt is as follows:

TITLE IV. PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

* * * * *

2. In establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In his order the President said:

Appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price—

Not parity income—

from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies.

The deductions are to be made—

in establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

That order was dated October 6, 1942, 4 days after the approval of the act.

Mr. President, I am approaching the subject in the same spirit that the President said he was approaching it, when he said he gave due credit to those who differed with him, and that he expected the same treatment from those who differed with him. I am approaching the subject in that way. I fundamentally differ with the President on this subject, and unfortunately it is not the first time, though I have not often differed with him. But, Mr. President, the Price Control or Stabilization Act had just been passed by this body, after a full discussion of its provisions, and no part of that act or of the first Price Control Act received more attention and more consideration than the provision fixing the ceiling price on agricultural commodities. Every Senator present knows that to be true.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will it disturb the very able Senator from Alabama if I make an observation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. I shall be glad to have the Senator make it.

Mr. McNARY. I think some confusion has arisen concerning the agricultural commodities to which either the Bankhead bill or the President's veto of that bill applies. Is it not true that the

bill deals only with corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It does not even deal with cotton.

Mr. McNARY. We are dealing with the so-called basic commodities named and defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Oregon goes a little further than the bill went. I may say to the able Senator that there are only two commodities directly involved, and those are corn and wheat. There has been no effort to change the status of any of the other agricultural commodities.

Mr. McNARY. We will not quarrel on that subject. I simply say that speaking of the application of the measure it could only refer to the five basic commodities.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It refers to only two, however, because they are a little below the parity price.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I want to make clear. Let me observe that when there is talk about inflation, which I shall discuss in my own time, the so-called basic commodities, five in number, produce only about one-third of the gross income of the farmers of the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as my information goes, I think the Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. President, directly involved in the question before the Senate are the statements made by radio commentators and other molders of public opinion who in the last few days have been indulging in great activity and have in large measure tried to create the impression that the increases in the prices of cucumbers, beets, peas, turnip greens, radishes, onions, and potatoes have occurred because of the contemplated operation of the Bankhead bill. Many persons believe that the apparently excessive prices which they are required to pay at retail stores for the rarities and delicacies which many of us enjoy have been caused by the Bankhead bill. That thought has stirred them up. They honestly think so. They think the Bankhead bill has caused increases in the prices of everything in the grocery stores, including canned goods, preserves, fruits, and vegetables. I have heard arguments to that effect. I have received a letter from a friend at home saying that the people there were under the impression that the bill covers everything the farmer produces, and will cause a rise in prices. He said they believe that because the radio commentators have continually said so, without distinguishing in any way or giving to the public the fact that really nothing except corn and wheat is involved. The impression the radio commentators have created is not a fair one.

I am sure that all other Members of the Senate have heard such remarks made by commentators, and I know they have read the editorials in the anti-farmer metropolitan press denouncing, without rhyme or reason, and without any distinction, the Bankhead Act as one which was likely to turn loose the forces of inflation, and result in a rapidly climbing price level for the food the people must have.

How can the poor farmers, who, to a large extent, are unorganized, refute those great media of publicity to the people? They have no way to do so. If they cannot find enough stanch friends in this body to repudiate the untruthful and exaggerated statements made time after time that mislead the people, they are lost; they are helpless. The American form of government is helpless when a great mass of people, such as our farmers, are imposed upon on the basis of untrue, prejudicial statements, and when the farmers have no way to act in the face of such a situation except through their Senators and Representatives, who do not get much publicity when they are defending the cause of the farmers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator just referred to the tendency toward inflation by price advances of possibly 6 or 8 cents that would be possible under the proposed act. As a matter of fact, in the wheat market, for instance, the price of wheat has declined approximately 6 cents during the past week or 10 days, while the question has been before the Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. During the time of the prospect of the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator if he has seen any sign of any terrible deflation taking place because of the drop in the market—not a drop of 1 cent in the price of a loaf of bread, but a drop of even one-tenth of 1 cent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If such a drop has occurred, my grocer has not found out about it, and neither have the diligent newspaper reporters.

Mr. President, I intend to discuss the constitutional question, because I regard it as fundamental, and I shall return to it.

Now, as to corn, let me say that I consulted the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, who has had long experience. As a civil-service employee he has served under various administrations for years. He has the confidence of everyone associated with him and of everyone who knows him, and he has had greater experience than any of those connected with the O. P. A. ever will have. I called him and asked him what effect the passage of the Bankhead bill would have in terms of increased cost to consumers. He said that, so far as corn is concerned, the effect would be negligible. The people do not eat much corn; and yet all the talk in opposition to the bill is about the food supplies of the people. I am talking about corn.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In just a moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I simply wanted to point out to the Senator that the reference was to field corn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; field corn used for both humans and animals. People do not eat much field corn. They eat a few roasting ears when they can get them.

Mr. TYDINGS. But those are not involved in this question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

The Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics said that not much of the corn raised this year would be consumed this year. Of course, he was talking about corn used for feed. The livestock-raising season is approaching. The supply of corn for feed for livestock has in large measure been laid in; and he said that as to corn the increased cost to consumers this year because of the effect of the Bankhead bill would be negligible. However, if we read many of the daily newspapers represented by our friends in the press gallery, and especially if we read the farmer-hating newspapers of Washington—the Post and the Star—we would think that the bill is about to bring on a regular cyclone and tornado of inflation.

What about wheat? Wheat is not directly involved. An order affecting wheat has not been issued. An order has been issued only as to corn. That commodity was picked out. I do not know whether that was done to test the matter or why it was done. An order was issued as to flour, and I have been advised that the order did not reflect parity on wheat. I am sure that the matter will later be discussed by the Senator from Kansas, which is the greatest wheat-producing State of the Union.

At any rate, there was no direct order on wheat. So far as the present activity of O. P. A. is concerned, so far as Executive orders under the Price Stabilization Act are concerned, corn is the only commodity which has been directly operated upon or affected by the Administration's program. Wheat has been affected only indirectly.

Now, let me ask the Members of the Senate why we should become stampeded by a false alarm of inflation.

Why should we run to cover? There are reports in circulation to the effect that a number of able and conscientious Senators who deliberately voted for the passage of this bill are very greatly disturbed by newspaper and radio statements, and by telephone calls which are coming to them from sources about which we might think a little later.

The difference between the present market price and the parity price of wheat is about 8½ cents a bushel. Only about 15 percent of the corn crop is cash corn. The rest is fed on the farms. Only about 600,000,000 bushels of corn are bought by consumers for feed and other purposes. The cash corn crop represents only about 600,000,000 bushels. The figures were given to me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Those are the figures not for this year but for next year, a full, normal year. It can be seen how small are the figures which it is alleged would result in a run-away inflation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The figure for corn is about $50,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the figure before me. It is $51,000,000. I thank the Senator. There would be an increase in the purchase price of cash corn of only $51,000,000. The cash corn represents about 600,000,000 bushels. Seventy-eight Members of the Senate voted for the bill.

With respect to wheat the difference is somewhat larger. At the present time the difference between the parity price of wheat and the market price is about 20 cents a bushel. I do not know whether or not wheat will ever be involved. It is not involved now, but many persons are acting as though wheat and all the other grains and agricultural commodities were involved. The difference between the present market price and the parity price is only 20 cents a bushel. With a 700,000,000-bushel supply of wheat, assuming that the whole crop were subjected to sale at a figure representing the present difference between the parity price and the market price, the difference would be $140,000,000, making a total of $190,000,000 for wheat and corn, which are the basis—if there is any basis—for the cry of threatened inflation.

Let us see whether statements which have been made constitute a genuine argument against the unorganized as well as the organized farmers. A year or so ago the wages of railroad employees were increased. The Board first gave them about $200,000,000. They protested, and it was currently stated that the President thought they ought to have more. Finally the amount was raised, and the result was that they received an increase of approximately $300,000,000. Did anybody cry inflation?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator might point out that in connection with corn and wheat, as I recall, the parity payments amounted to approximately the figure which the Senator has mentioned—namely, $190,000,000. Such payments, if made through a subsidy, would be as inflationary as would payments made by the consumer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in full accord with the Senator's views on that question. As I view the situation, they would be more inflationary. When the difference is paid out of the Treasury with borrowed money, as the Government is now obliged to do, who will dispute the assertion that that is much more inflationary than letting the farmer get the same amount of money from the consumer in the market place? I take it that no one will deny that assertion.

The opponents of the bill wish to cling to the most inflationary method that could be devised to carry on their program, rather than to let the farmers get their parity prices in the market places, when the pockets of the people are bulging with money.

As has been stated, only 22 percent of the income of the average family is used for the purchase of food.

Mr. DOWNEY. The figure is 32 percent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the figure for industrial workers. There is quite a difference. The revised figure for industrial workers is 28 or 29 percent. I am talking about the average family. In the case of industrial workers, only 28 or 29 percent of their income is devoted to the purchase of food—the smallest percentage of income for the past 30 or 40 years, if not in the history of the country.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does not that figure include all food? It is not limited to the cost of the food commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It covers all food consumed at the tables of workers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The percentage would be very much smaller if it applied only to the commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. The percentage on corn alone, or on corn and wheat, would be so small as to require an expert mathematician to figure it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has been referring to the alleged inflationary increases which would result from the passage of the bill. He called attention to some figures which are very significant in one sense, and very insignificant in another sense.

I think it would be pertinent to call attention to the fact that yesterday Congress completed action on a Federal pay bill and sent it to the White House for signature. The bill provides for an increase of $563,000,000 a year in the Federal pay roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. I had intended to refer to it, because I brought out the comparison when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was obtaining passage of the bill relating to postal employees. That was the same day on which the so-called Pace bill was recommitted to the committee. It went off the calendar for the time being. Promptly afterward, on the same day, the junior Senator from New York obtained consideration of the bill to increase the pay of postal employees.

While he had the floor I asked him to tell us the total amount of increases within the past few months in the pay of civil service employees. He began to figure one and then another. Finally I asked him if the increases did not average approximately $300 to each employee, and he said they averaged between $250 and $300. Then it developed—and he agreed—that more than 2,000,000 civil service employees were participating in that program. I do not object to it. I am not mentioning it for critical purposes; but more than 2,000,000 Federal employees are participating in that program.

Just as we dismissed temporarily consideration of the farmer's costs, the admission was made on the floor of the Senate by the authors of the bill that an increase of $600,000,000 in money to be spent had been voted. Whoever heard a word suggested here that the increases would be inflationary? No; the beneficiaries were not farmers. But when the farmers come, they receive different treatment, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who sits by my side, knows full well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the question of parity, let me ask if it is his understanding that, under the present law, the President has the authority, if he wishes to exercise it, to stop parity payments on the crops which the Senator has heretofore mentioned?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that is not exactly the situation. The law provides what shall happen without the necessity of the President's action. Two years ago, at the instance of the President, there was included in the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I took part in having the language inserted—a provision pertaining to that point. I intended to come to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will not be diverted by my question. I thought he had left the subject of parity for the time being.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I really had not come to it, but I shall come to it directly; and I shall read the provision to which I have referred, which appears in the appropriation act. I never knew why the administration was not satisfied with it. It had the provision put in the act, and it is still in it. The provision reads as follows:

> If the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate * * * or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1942 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

Mr. President, we included that provision in the agricultural appropriation bill in 1941. We had no agreement with the President about it, but to be sure that we were acting in good faith, we included it in the appropriation bill for 1942, and that provision is now the law. It has been in the law for 2 years. Appropriations for parity are cut off and stopped whenever the amount received by the farmer, either in the market place or under a loan plus soil-conservation payments, reaches the parity level. Then parity appropriations may no longer be paid.

Instead of regulating the farmer by Executive decree or proclamation, if the Senate wishes to eliminate either the parity or the soil-conservation payments, there is the regular constitutional and legal process for doing if. If it is desired to carry the matter further, Congress has the power to do it, but no one ought to undertake to do it except the Congress of the United States.

There was much controversy about the soil-conservation payments. It developed that the Congress was unwilling to eliminate those payments, because they were counted, in order to figure the amount of money a farmer received, in determining whether or not his parity appropriations should be cut off, but they were reduced, because that money was appropriated for soil conservation, soil-improvement practices, to prevent erosion, to rotate crops, to pay a farmer, for instance, for some reason or other, for following certain soil practices, for the discontinuance for a year or so of production, so that the amount of his production was diminished.

In carrying out the soil-conservation program adopted by the Department of Agriculture, Congress was unwilling to count the payments, but after a long controversy it did not permit cutting off soil-conservation payments, figuring, as it was argued, that they were made in the interest of future generations, that as rural population decreased and city population increased, it became more important to have a higher yield per acre on the cultivated land, not only for today, but for 50 and 100 years from now, when possibly the fertility of the soil would be of more importance even than it is now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. While the distinguished Senator is discussing the question of parity, am I to understand that it is his view that the Executive order of the President would permit the O. P. A. to fix a ceiling under parity on any of the five commodities?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. I am glad my attention has been brought back to that subject.

I have the price-control bills before me. I now wish to come to the real, fundamental question in this situation, so far as I am concerned. The question is simple and plain. Because of an emergency situation, or one which it deems to be an emergency situation, shall Congress abandon the American processes in the matter of constitutional government? That, of course, leads back to a discussion of whether or not this act gave the President the power to do what he did, which was to change parity prices, by subtractions, and thereby change ceiling prices by reducing parity prices. Was that ever in the mind of any Member of the Senate? It is recent history. Every Senator now present, who was here at the time of the debate on the subject, knows that such an idea was in no way contemplated, or even mentioned on the floor of the Senate. It was not mentioned in the conference committee, of which I happened to be a member. All Senators need to do is to read the law. It is so plain that a wayfaring man can understand it. There is no ambiguity about it. There is no uncertainty about it.

Let me read from section 3 of the Price Control Act, which is the agricultural commodity section.

Now listen:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained—

That is what we call the ceiling price—

for any agricultural commodity under the authority of this act—

Does it stop there? No.

or otherwise—

Those words were deliberately put in: I helped to put them in. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] I am sure will remember the discussion, because there had been intimations and suggestions made as to what might be done. So those words were written in. They are not found in many statutes.

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to the producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

Not by the O. P. A., not by the executive departments of the Government, but in the old, long established way followed by the Department of Agriculture, which has been publishing month by month the parity prices for practically all agricultural commodities. So, in order to make sure that there should be no transgression of this law, and that there should be no circumvention of it by anybody who wanted to have something in the law that was not included in it, we deliberately inserted the words "or otherwise." The law continues:

1. The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or—

It proceeds—

2. The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 19 and September 15, 1942.

And so forth It will be noted that no price can be fixed under the act, "or otherwise," below the parity price of such commodity as ascertained and published by the Secretary of Agriculture. Whether that is a wise provision, Mr. President, is not the question before the Senate today. It was before the Senate on a previous occasion, and what I have read expresses the very last word of the Congress on the subject.

The amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act, from which I have quoted, went to the White House; it was approved, and within four or five days the order was issued with no change intervening in the law, which provided that no price below the parity price as ascertained and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be fixed.

The section of the law from which I have quoted is in absolute conflict with the Executive order issued by the President, who proceeded to establish parity prices for the purpose of ceiling prices, not as proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture, not in line with the limitation that the price must not be below parity. Deliberately, the President himself issued the order and fixed in the case of corn and in the case of processed flour produced from wheat, a parity price below the regular, lawful parity price as published and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture every month for a long time before the order was issued, and every month since it has been issued. I call the attention of the Senate to another thing.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not feel that the very able Senator has precisely answered my inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to have the Senator restate his question.

Mr. McNARY. I do not want to force the issue if the Senator is prepared to explain the matter later. I rose a few moments ago to inquire—and to me it is very important in the decision of this question, and it comes now with particular application, because the Senator has just read from the Price Control Act—if, under the Executive order, it is the opinion of the able Senator that the President can fix a price under parity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think he has no sort of authority to take such action, if that is the question the Senator is asking.

Mr. McNARY. Let me give an illustration, if I may. I do not desire to consume too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator may take all the time he pleases; I shall not hold the floor much longer.

Mr. McNARY. Suppose that the parity on wheat was a dollar and a half a bushel and the current or market price was $1.30, and under the basic act we add to the $1.30 by an appropriation of money benefit payments and conservation payments to bring the price up to $1.50 for the farmer; does the Senator think that by Executive order, the President could fix the price of wheat at the current market value of $1.30?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the President had no power to fix a parity, and, therefore, a ceiling price, at any point below the regularly established parity price for the commodity, regardless of income from other sources to the farmer, for we are not dealing with income.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator is unquestionably right in his answer based on the law, but the Senator's bill having been vetoed, suppose the veto should be sustained, would the Senator then believe that a price could be fixed by O. P. A. under the ceiling?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think O. P. A. or anybody else would have any legal right to fix any price other than the parity prices proclaimed by the Department of Agriculture. I think any other action would be a usurpation of power and without justification in the law.

Mr. McNARY. I quite agree with the able Senator, but I assumed from what he said a little while ago that he was laboring under the theory that if we sustained the veto, and the Bankhead bill should fall, the President could fix or the O. P. A. could fix a ceiling under parity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is perfectly clear to me that there would be no legal right to do it, but what they have done they

could do again, and include other commodities, so far as that is concerned, if the Senate and the Congress should not override the veto. It seems to me that our failure to override the veto would give them full liberty of action to make any orders the President might see fit along the line of ceiling prices.

Mr. McNARY. Probably I am having difficulty in making myself clear to the very able Senator. Does he share the view that it is possible, and might be likely, that the President would reduce below parity the ceiling price of any agricultural commodities?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would be in line with the action in this case. That is all I can say to the Senator. The President would be released to do it again if he wanted to do so if we should fail to override his veto.

Mr. McNARY. So the Senator's particular contention is that if we should stand by this law the farmer would be assured that he would get the parity price?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly correct; and he would have confidence that in the future he could plant his crop and make his arrangements with that understanding.

Mr. McNARY. I think I understand the Senator. One of his points is that he desires to remove any fear that the President might reduce the price and place a ceiling which would be below parity.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. REED. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Alabama for a moment upon the point he has been discussing. This body passed the Bankhead bill by a vote of 78 to 2, because it involved a fundamental principle. Wher the conference report was brought in, it was adopted unanimously, without a roll call.

If the President's veto shall be sustained, what protection will the farmer and the farm States have against any action the President and the administration might desire to take, regardless of whether there was the slightest semblance of authority in the law or not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have expressed the opinion that they would have no protection.

Mr. REED. If the President's veto can be sustained in this instance, any bill Congress might pass, no matter how fair, how equitable, how just, would logically meet the same fate if it were vetoed by the President. So what are we to do about it? If the President's veto shall be sustained today, the power of this body to do anything on the farm question will be gone.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Along the line of the discussion which has just taken place, as to what the effect will be, the President has made it definite in his veto message. He called attention to the fact that the Congress was advised of an interpretation—to which I shall refer in a moment—that included the different payments. He said:

> The Congress was advised of this interpretation before it passed the act of October 2, 1942.

He said at another point:

> The meaning of "parity" under the original Emergency Price Control Act had been established by administrative interpretation. Furthermore, the Price Administrator's construction had been upheld by the Attorney General prior to the introduction of the act of October 2, 1942.

Then he proceeds to say that there had been an administrative interpretation, which the Attorney General had sustained, and that we knew that when we passed the act of October 2, 1942; and, as the Senator has just stated, we wrote definitely into the act a restatement of our position entirely at variance with that statement. But the President in his veto message has again called attention to the fact that administrative interpretation is to be the guiding star in the administration of the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, this is the answer made by Congress to the very suggestion along that line.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am free to say that I never knew of any administrative act fixing parity different from that provided by law, but if anyone else has heard of it, we made it absolutely clear and certain that any act of that sort hereafter would be in conflict with the law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I not right in my understanding that the purpose of the Bankhead bill, which we are now considering, is to prevent the Office of Price Administration from placing ceilings on farm products below the level which was intended by the Congress when it enacted the Price Control Act of October 2?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If today a majority of the Senate shall vote to override the veto by the President of the Bankhead bill, will not that action reiterate the determination of Congress or the intent of Congress that no ceiling should be placed below the parity price level?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is a fair interpretation, but the difficulty about the matter is that we have no way of enforcing the determination if we merely have a majority vote.

Mr. AIKEN. But the intent of a majority of Congress will be made clear by a majority vote here today, whether or not we secure the two-thirds vote to override the veto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct. Now I wish to call the attention of Senators, if they have time to read it, to the latter part of section 3, where the subject of parity prices, not income, is referred to 12 or 13 times, always using the words "parity price."

Now, I wish to bring the discussion to a close for the present. The President issued two Executive orders. One fixed a limitation on salaries of $25,000. I did not object to salaries being limited to any size, but from going through the debates, and the hearings, and the discussions here and in the conference committee, I knew, as well as I could know anything, that Congress did not intend by the act to delegate to the President the power which was sought to be exercised. I think that was practically the unanimous view of this body, as well as the view of the House of Representatives.

A bill was brought forward to remedy the situation, to displace the Executive order, and to insure that whatever action was taken would be taken by Congress; and it was taken by Congress, almost without objection, on the ground that the act did not vest in the President the power which he had tried to exercise.

There were many persons with large salaries—industrialists, bankers, and others—who bitterly protested against the limitation imposed by the President's order. There were some who did not draw salaries at all who protested against it, because they felt that it was an abandonment of the American form of government, the taking of power by the Executive which was not intended to be vested in the Executive.

What was done? Almost unanimously this body eliminated the Executive order, and proceeded to do the job in its own way, under the constitutional provisions which govern us all. No one here objected. We agreed that the power was not in the Executive. After we agreed that such action was not authorized, we did not insist that it be taken because of the good contained in the move for the limitation of salaries.

Are we to treat the farmers in a different way? I challenge any lawyer to point out, in the debates or anywhere else, anything to indicate authority conferred by the act on the President of the United States, or on the O. P. A. Administrator, to fix a parity price, or a ceiling price, which is related to and rests upon the parity price.

Then why, because some say the proposal is inflationary, should we temporarily abandon, as a matter of exigency, one of the old, orderly constitutional processes? Why should Congress permit the taking of power which was desired by the President but which was not given in the act? I believe that most fair-minded men, regardless of their position on this subject, will agree that the act not only did not grant the power but specifically prohibited anyone from making an order such as that issued by the President in the case we are discussing.

In the first place, it is not fair to corn producers. About 60 percent of the corn crop is produced in the commercial corn area. The producers of such corn are the only ones who receive benefit payments. The corn producers outside the commercial area do not receive such payments. If a farmer who is located in the commercial area does not comply with the program, if he is a noncooperator, or a nonconformer, or an individualist, or whatever one may call him, he does not benefit. I think they

all should comply, but about 25 percent in the commercial corn area, I understand, do not comply, and that is their constitutional right; but the farmers who do not comply receive no benefit payments.

Mr. President, simply because producers in the commercial area have received benefit payments, a ceiling price on corn is fixed. But that ceiling price operates all over the United States, and bears down the ceiling price for all corn producers outside the commercial area, and all inside who do not comply with the program. That is not fair. That is not equal justice. That is the rankest sort of discrimination. But still the President's order takes away from parity the amount received in the commercial belt and applies that rule to corn producers everywhere. That shows the difficulty of legislating by Executive decree or proclamation. Perhaps some man fixes the order who is not familiar with the corn situation. In Congress an injustice of that sort probably would not be permitted.

Mr. President, if the veto shall be sustained, that rule will exist and may be applied to any crop in America. Nearly every farm commodity is now above parity, except wheat and corn. Other commodities have not stopped at parity. Ceilings have not been put on them. I do not know whether ceilings ought to have been put on them or not. I am not discussing the merits of that question; but they have not been, and since the passage of the Price Control Act some of the commodities have gone from below parity to as high as 148 per cent of parity.

In the case of corn producers, as I have said, the noncompliers and the ones outside the commercial area, not only will their products not be allowed to go above parity, as the products of all the other agricultural producers are permitted to go, but their products will be pulled down below parity, while their neighbors across the road are producing something else which is far above parity. If anyone desires the list of commodities read, and their position with respect to parity shown, I have the list before me. The statement with respect to agricultural prices is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics under date of March 30, 1943. With respect to all other farm commodities than wheat and corn the percentage of price compared with parity ranges upward to as high as 148 per cent. Certainly the corn producers, and later the wheat producers, are going to be held down, and it will effect their loan rate. The loan rate is based upon the parity tied to it. When the payments in question are deducted the floor under these commodities is lowered. That is rank injustice as between farmers. It does not represent equality between them. The commodities produced by some farmers are permitted to be above parity, while others are help down below parity.

Mr. President, in conclusion I submit that we ought not to be deterred by influences which are operating in this matter from various directions, from downtown and high sources, from industrialists who wish to whip John L. Lewis. I am not concerned with that. I have nothing to do with it. But every Senator knows that that is something which looms large in the decision here of the question dealing with the farmers. Influences are at work on that subject. The poor unorganized farmer cannot have such powerful influences on his side. He does not know that such influences are at work, but they are and, from what I hear, some of them are quite effective.

Mr. President, I submit that we cannot afford to suspend the Constitution and permit the assumption of power not granted to any agency of the Government, however high that agency may be. If we are satisfied that the act did not grant the power, then, if we are going to preserve the Constitution, our duty is, as I see it, very plain.

Mr. President, I do not like to vote against the President. I vote with him whenever I can, but whenever I cannot do so in line with my conscience, I do not, as Senators who have been in the Senate for some years know. I contend that the claim of inflation is not justified, but, whether justified or not, if we are going to suspend our constitutional processes because of pressure and because of the emergency, based on the contention that more money will have to be paid out, then we are bargaining off our constitutional heritage for a mess of pottage. Whenever we yield to pleas for action because of emergency, whether made by John L. Lewis or by anyone else, if the Constitution itself is involved, then we are walking on dangerous ground. We ought not to yield to such pleas from the standpoint of expediency, however great the emergency may be, because when once we knowingly do it, how long will it be before we submit to such pressure in some more dangerous form, merely because it seems to be in accord with some popular wind which is blowing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said that the President, as the basis for his veto, mentioned an administrative act which was upheld by an opinion of the Attorney General, and that that was the basis for his veto message. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama to tell us, before he sits down, if he knows anything about that particular opinion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask if any other Senator knows anything about the particular opinion which was mentioned by the President as the basis for his veto?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Such opinion has never been made public. I do not know whether or not it was a written opinion. In fact, we have no evidence of it except the statement contained in the message.

Mr. GILLETTE. No; there has never been any such opinion made public.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, in the course of my remarks a short time ago I stated that I had not heard from the National Farmers' Union or the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives since the President vetoed the bill, and that I was not in a position to state their attitude.

I have just had delivered to me a telegram signed by W. M. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We have given vigorous support to the Bankhead bill which would protect certain farm commodity prices as regards ceilings to be determined by the Office of Price Administration. We disagree with the President's views and for the reasons assigned as the basis for his veto of your bill. We urge the Senate to override the President's veto.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES,
W. M. THATCHER, *President.*
NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION,
JAMES G. PATTON, *President.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that puts all five of the farm organizations in line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

On this question the yeas and nays are required by the Constitution.

Mr. CAPPER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to vote to pass the so-called Bankhead bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President. I feel I ought not cast that vote without giving my reasons for doing so. I shall try to give those reasons as simply and straightforwardly as possible.

I cannot agree with the President that the enactment of this bill will result in a tornado of inflation. To say that fixing the ceiling price on wheat at parity, instead of at about 90 percent of parity; to say that to set the ceiling price on corn at 100 percent of parity, instead of at 92 percent of parity, to my mind is not the fact at all.

I mention corn and wheat at this time because they are the only foodstuffs involved in the veto. The President, in his veto message, confined his objections to the alleged increase in the cost of foodstuffs that would result from the enactment of this bill. Wheat and corn are the only two major foodstuffs or feeds that go into the making of foodstuffs that are involved.

Prices on all other major foodstuffs are already far above and beyond parity, ranging all the way from 120 percent of parity to 148 percent of parity, as of March 15 last.

Wheat and corn are below parity—wheat about 86 percent of parity, corn about 92 percent of parity.

For 10 long years this administration has preached up and down the breadth of the land, in campaign years, and frequently between campaign years, that the farmer is entitled to parity prices for his commodities. Specifically it has maintained long and loudly that the wheat grower is entitled to parity price; that the corn grower is entitled to parity.

But now, when it looks as if the law of supply and demand may, at some time in the future, cause the prices of wheat and corn to rise to parity, this administration insists, "No; you are not entitled even to a ceiling price, a maximum price of parity. You are only to get 85 percent of parity at the most, or 92 percent of parity at the most, and we will try to see that you get even less than that."

Mr. President, that is not simply inconsistency. That is hypocrisy. Also it is economically unsound. A time when this country is engaged in a world war, an all-out war, in which the great need is for production, is not the time to discourage production of vital foodstuffs. It is the time to encourage their production. Does this administration realize that it has contracted to help feed the armies and populations of other nations—foreign populations totaling hundreds of millions? Does not this administration realize that to do that is going to require greatly increased production of cereals as well as vegetables and poultry products and meats?

In administering the war program—I am trying to state this factually; if the facts constitute a criticism, that cannot be helped—the Government has aided and abetted in taking from the farms of this country hundreds of thousands of men. Many have been drafted into the Army. Still more have gone into industrial plants where they can get more money and have much easier hours. In administering this program, the Government has refused to provide the necessary farm machinery and equipment for increased farm production. The administration also has seen wages go up, production costs go up, taxes go up, sales of bonds go up, and prices of commodities go up. The prices of most farm products have gone up far beyond parity. But the administration sets its teeth firmly today and says, in spite of all this, the prices of wheat and corn must be held not merely down to parity but below parity

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the enactment of this bill should not raise the cost of foodstuffs any appreciable extent.

If the parity concept is correct, and I believe it is, then the wheat grower and the corn grower are entitled to parity prices, especially considering that all other major farm commodities are selling well above parity.

More than that, Mr. President, if the parity formula is even approximately correct, then under present conditions a parity price for corn or a parity price for wheat cannot and will not push up the price of hogs or cattle, or even of dairy or poultry products.

Let me state why that is so: If the parity formula is correct, then when hogs, cattle, dairy products, and poultry are selling at parity or better, the feed for them should sell at parity without destroying a proper relationship between feed prices and the prices of livestock, poultry, and poultry products.

Now let us see what are the facts in this connection. On March 15, according to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, hogs were selling at 125 percent of parity, veal calves at 133 percent of parity, cattle at 147 percent of parity, lambs at 148 percent of parity, and dairy and poultry products at from 118 to 120 percent of parity.

What was the market price of wheat? It was 86 percent of parity. That of corn was 92 percent of parity, and wheat for feed was selling at between 85 and 90 percent of corn parity.

Can it be contended that putting the price of wheat for feed up to corn parity, even, and the price of corn to parity would drive up hog and cattle prices?

The plain facts are, Mr. President, that at the present time the prices of beef, hogs, sheep, lambs, and dairy and poultry products are not based on the cost of feed grains at all. They are being fixed by the law of supply and demand, except insofar as price controls are limiting the effect of rising prices resulting from large demands against short supplies.

Again I say that the enactment of the so-called Bankhead bill, affecting as it does only two grain feeds, wheat and corn, will not materially affect—probably not at all—the prices of hogs, cattle, and so forth. Both the O. P. A. brief on this point and the President's message are based on assumptions that do not square with the facts.

Now I desire to discuss briefly another angle. Judging from most of the editorials, messages, and harangues on the subject of the Bankhead bill, one would naturally suppose that it proposes an increase in parity price levels. It does nothing of the sort. All it attempts to do is to prohibit certain Government agencies from deducting conservation and other payments in ascertaining the parity prices and fixing the resultant new war parity prices lower than the lawful parity prices for those two feed grains.

It was very unfair, in my opinion, for the President to try to pass to these two commodities the blame for the inflation trend, just as it was unfair last fall to make the charge that the "greedy" farmers are responsible for the inflation. If wages had been stabilized, instead of being allowed to rise, the Bankhead bill might not have been necessary.

One more point, Mr. President, and I am through: At about the same time the Bankhead bill went to the White House, what was really a companion bill also went to the White House—the debt-limit bill which also repealed an Executive directive, one reducing salaries above $25,000 net after Federal taxes to the $25,000 net level. The same principle was involved in both measures: Whether the Executive could by directives repeal acts of Congress or whether he could write law by directive.

In the Anti-Price Inflation Act, the Congress had directed that price ceilings on farm commodities and on products from farm commodities should not be fixed below levels that would give or reflect parity prices to producers.

Congress also had refused to reduce salaries to any specific level. It had provided for the stabilization of salaries and wages at certain existing levels.

The executive branch of the Government—and I do not question the motives back of its actions; they are well understood, I believe—had by directives attempted to do what Congress had either refused to do or had declared by statute should not be done.

The President vetoed the bill protecting farm legislation, and in doing so threatened that labor's wages would be raised unless his veto were sustained. I have not seen any veto of the other measure, which also repealed a directive.

Mr. President, in both instances the principle involved is perfectly plain.

If the executive branch of the Government had no right to issue the salary-reduction directive, it also had no right to issue the directive which makes parity on wheat and corn less than what Congress said by law that parity should be.

If the Congress was justified in repealing the salary-reduction directive from the Executive, it was right in repealing the directive which says that parity shall be, not what Congress said parity is, but some figure less than lawful parity.

On principle, if the President vetoed one of those measures, he should have vetoed both of them.

On principle, if Congress makes one of them law, I say it should also insist that the companion act be made law.

I shall vote to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement from the heads of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, sustaining the position I have taken.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1943.*

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

We urge Congress to pass the Bankhead bill over the President's veto. At stake is the basic issue of whether we shall have government by law or by Executive decree. The amount of money involved is relatively small The principle invo'ved is fundamental.

In the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress stipulated that ceilings on farm products should not be set below parity prices to farmers. This provision of the law has been nullified by Executive decree. In our opinion it is the duty of the Congress to see that the law is carried out. This can be accomplished by passage of the Bankhead bill over the veto. Enactment of this measure would permit the farmer to obtain parity in the market place, instead of being forced to depend upon subsidies from the Public Treasury. Farmers do not want, and never have wanted, subsidies when they could obtain parity prices.

Unfortunately the issue has been clouded by assertions that the Bankhead bill will

seriously increase the dangers of inflation. These assertions are based on misleading and distorted figures. Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from passage of the measure would be so small as to have little, if any, effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

It is most unfortunate that again and again the American farmer has been attacked and accused of responsibility for inflation. It is apparent that once more agriculture is to be used as the whipping boy to further appease the wage demands of organized labor and to divert attention from the real source of inflation. This is seriously undermining the morale of the farmer and impairing his heroic efforts to produce to the utmost of his capacity. Not only farmers, but the general public, are becoming increasingly concerned over the ability of American agriculture to produce adequate food and fiber under present Government policies.

So that the public may know where the true blame for inflation lies, we submit the following facts based on Government records:

1. While American farmers constitute more than 22 percent of our population, they receive less than 10 percent of our national income.

2. In 1942 farm income had increased only $1,000,000,000 over the peak figure of the last World War, while nonfarm income increased more than $55,000,000,000.

3. Farm prices today are 10 percent below farm prices prevailing during the last World War. Hourly pay of industrial workers is nearly two and a half times greater than the peak hourly rates of World War No. 1.

4. Today the average nonfarm family is paying a lower percentage of its income for food than at any time during the past 30 years. Today 22 percent of the average nonfarm family income is spent for food, compared to 38 percent at the peak of World War No. 1.

There is, therefore, absolutely no justification for organized labor to use either the Bankhead bill or the cost of food as an excuse for demanding further wage increases. In view of the grave food shortage now confronting the country, we believe it is time to stop kicking the farmer around and to fix the blame for inflation where it properly belongs.

Agriculture has always urged that stability could be maintained only through a fair balance between industrial wages and agricultural prices. Had labor and the administration agreed to this, today the cost of living would be substantially lower. Feeling that passage of the Bankhead bill will still leave a disparity between agricultural prices and industrial wages, and, therefore, does not justify labor's demands for higher pay, we believe it to be the duty of labor to join with us in an honest attempt to reach the fair balance necessary, to the end that America may win the war and write an enduring peace.

Yours very sincerely,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
A. S. GOSS, *Master.*
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
CHARLES C. TEAGUE, *President.*
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1943.

Re President's veto Bankhead bill, S. 660.

To Members of Congress:

GENTLEMEN: We have just held a 3-day session of the executive committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, an organization with a membership of more than 2,000,000 farmers distributed in every State and almost every county. Members of the executive committee came from all parts of the country. There does not exist a more able, representative, or patriotic group of men connected with agriculture.

They came together, not because of a profit motive, but because of their grave concern over the serious national food situation.

Each of them expressed the conviction that there was impending a crisis that promised to be calamitous in the production of the foods essential to feeding our armed forces, assisting our allies, and supplying our civilian population on even a greatly-restricted diet.

They were unanimously of the opinion that under the present policies of Government the minimum requirements of these essential foods would not be produced for the following reasons:

1. Before the establishment of price controls and the Little Steel formula, labor unions, supported by the Government and the device of cost-plus contracts, had raised the wages of common labor, in many cases, to double that of the pre-war period. Farmers, in order to get labor, have, in many cases, had to pay even higher wages than those paid in defense plants, and still cannot get the necessary labor for production and harvest.

2 One-third to as high as one-half of the agricultural laborers and farmers in many areas have been taken from agriculture into defense plants and into the armed forces. The work performed by these workers cannot, except in small measure, be done by inexperienced women and children.

3. Under priority rulings, material could not be obtained for machinery, repair parts, replacements, and other essential farm supplies.

4. Ill-considered application of ceiling prices has caused many maladjustments in production and distribution.

All of these conditions are discouraging and restricting production.

In many high-cost crops the risk is so great that farmers will not plant without assurance of a labor supply and a price that will at least return to them their out-of-pocket expense.

Since the establishment of price ceilings it has been the policy of the administration to hold down the price of food.

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices, or prices to farmers as an end in themselves, is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

Ceiling or maximum prices should be used to safeguard the public from inflationary and speculative prices, but prices necessary to cover the costs of producing a supply of foods sufficient to provide reasonably adequate diets for the armed forces, our allies, and the civilian population cannot properly be called inflationary prices—they are necessary prices; necessary to cover costs, necessary to provide a reasonably adequate food supply, necessary to keep foods flowing through normal distributive channels rather than to a select few via the black market; necessary that everyone may have enough of something to eat even though it may not be just what he'd like to eat.

We urge the support of the Bankhead bill (S. 660) in overriding the President's veto as one step in the direction of the assurance of an adequate production of essential foods.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. TEAGUE,
President.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have come to what is, in my opinion, perhaps the most important question that has been before the Senate in my 4 years of service here. Two issues are involved. If the veto by the President of the Bankhead bill is sustained, then a majority of the Congress, including a majority of this body, will have lost the power to function.

The bill passed this body by a vote of 78 to 2. A conference report from a conference committee of the two Houses was agreed to without a yea-and-nay vote. Even if a majority of the Senate should reassert the former opinion of the body, but fail to do so by the necessary two-thirds, then, so far as concerns important legislation affecting the farm, labor, the war, finance, or anything else, the power of a majority of the Congress to function will be lost if that majority has a difference of opinion with the President of the United States.

That is the fundamental question. There are other important questions which I shall discuss; but, stripped to its bare bones and stated in bare fundamentals, that is the only permanent long-range issue. Some immediate issues are also involved.

Mr. President, I sat in my place in the Senate on the 7th of last September and listened to a message from the President of the United States, in which he declared a dictatorship unless Congress should take certain action within 30 days or less. If that is thought to be an overstatement, let me read very briefly from the President's message. He charged the Congress, first, with delay. I beg my colleagues to recall this, because I shall recur to it in a few minutes. He said that that delay on our part—

has now reached the point of danger to our whole economy.

Then he went on to say:

I ask the Congress to take this action by the 1st of October—

This was September 7, Mr. President.

I ask the Congress to take action by the 1st of October. Inaction on your part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by threat of economic chaos.

In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act.

What was the thing about which the President was talking, which was so urgent that he had, in effect, declared a dictatorship, graciously postponing the effective date from the 7th of September to the 1st of October? Let me go back to the first sentence. He charged a lack of control over prices—farm prices in particular—because of the language which Congress had written into the first Price Control Act, passed in January 1942. He claimed that his hands were tied in controlling the prices of farm products. That was what threatened the economic welfare of the people. That is what the President meant when he said that—

That delay has now reached the point of danger to our whole economy.

What did the President propose to do about it? He had a program of his own, and he said that if he were given the power his purpose would be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever were higher.

That joined the issue. There was a situation about which the President complained and for which he charged Congress with responsibility. He wanted power to carry forward his own program. He stated what that program would be. Manifestly, if the condition existing was so grave as to threaten the welfare of the country, then certainly the President's program would make a tremendous change in the conditions which then existed and had been existing. Was that the fact? No.

Mr. President, I am bringing up this old question because, on this floor, I charged the President with needlessly alarming the people of this country. Not since Orson Welles excited many persons about a supposed invasion from Mars had any responsible voice in this country so needlessly alarmed the people as did the President in his message.

Senators may recall that at that time I had printed in the RECORD studies made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, one of the most responsible statistical agencies known anywhere. As briefly as I can I wish to advert to them. I called attention to the fact that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculated that the sum total of the price established under the policy of Congress which would be received by the farmer for the commodities about which the President complained, and the price which would be received by the farmer for the same commodities in the same quantity under the policy of the President's program, differed by only one-tenth of 1 percent. On a $14,000,000,000 base the difference between the price received by the farmer under the program in existence, and that which would have been received under the President's program for the same commodities was $15,000,000, or one-tenth of 1 percent. Certainly a difference of one-tenth of 1 percent did not justify the note of alarm sounded by the President in his message to the Congress and people of this country.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has done the same thing again. That is why I have referred, in the detail which I have, to our experience of last year.

The President again agitates, alarms, misleads—one almost would be tempted to say deceives—the people of the country as to the present situation so far as his power, and so far as farm prices, and the effect of the Bankhead bill on farm prices is concerned.

I wish to read from the President's last message. I read from page 4 of the mimeographed copy:

It is difficult to forecast the actual price increase which would result under the Bankhead bill, and the estimates I have received differ widely. They all agree, however, that they will be substantial, although there is some difference of opinion as to the time when they will occur.

The President, however, in the next paragraph—and this is the statement I particularly challenge—says this:

The Bankhead bill would certainly deprive the Government of power to prevent these price increases which might—

This is the point—

which might—add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' food budget.

Mr. President, so far as any effect of the Bankhead bill on food prices is concerned, that is arrant nonsense, not to call it by a stronger term. The President of the United States owes a duty to the people greater than that shown in statements of that nature.

I now desire to proceed to a demonstration of the facts which are in direct conflict with the President's statements. I have asked the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to furnish me with basic figures dealing with the situation pertaining to the cost of food and food prices. I ask that a copy of the statement be distributed so that Senators, who are patient enough to listen, may have the figures in front of them.

On the sheet to which I have referred is a list of all the important staple food products which go to make up almost the entire food bill of the people of the United States. The table was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The figures are not mine. They are official figures given out by the most authoritative official source, the most careful and conscientious official source in the country.

Please refer to the table at the bottom of the sheet. Let me first make a preliminary statement. Many persons attach more weight to the term "parity" or the term "parity price" than they should. As a matter of fact, a parity price is only a statement of the price a farmer should receive, and nothing in the law, in and of itself, or in the Bankhead bill or anything else, does anything by way of helping the farmer to obtain that price in the market place. As a matter of fact, Congress supports certain prices by loans upon wheat, cotton, and corn. But they are always far below the parity price. No loan of which I have any knowledge is fixed at more than 90 percent, and in most cases 85 percent of the parity price.

I ask Senators to observe the items appearing in the table. For example, lambs are selling at 148 percent of the parity price. The parity price of beef cattle is $8.73 per hundred pounds. The farm price which is actually received is $12.80. That is 147 percent of the parity price. Suppose, for illustration, the parity price were moved up several points or down several points. It would have no effect on the price actually received and paid. The price of beef cattle and of meat in this country today is based on the law of supply and demand. During the past year, mostly within the past 6 or 7 months, we have gone away almost entirely, though not quite, from any legislative influence. All the commodities listed are selling and being bought on the basis of a price fixed by the relation of demand to the available supply, and yet the President of the United States, and Mr. Prentiss M. Brown, and the "snake doctors" in the Office of Price Administration, who manufacture statistics to prove some particular point, have in a statement put out this kind of "guff" to the country. They unfairly, unnecessarily, and needlessly alarm the people of this country. I say, without any hesitation or fear of being successfully contradicted, that the effect of passage of the Bankhead bill upon the price structure of food to the consumers of the country would be negligible. It would have some effect in about three instances to which I shall return.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have the table and accompanying statement inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table and statement are as follows:

The table below, prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, shows actual average prices received by farmers in the United States for food products as of March 15, 1943. The items listed include every important item of staple food consumption, except wheat and corn. These are given separate treatment. Vegetables, except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, and fruits, except apples, are not included because the influence of the Bankhead bill, if any, would be negligible in the whole food-price equation.

The parity price is shown in column 2. The actual average farm price is shown in column 3. The percentage relation of the actual price to the parity price is shown in column 4. Each and every price is now from 8 to 48 percent higher than the parity price. Each of these commodities is selling at a price which reflects the law of supply and demand. The actual price is not controlled by the parity price.

Price Administrator Brown, in his letter to Senator BARKLEY, and read to the Senate on March 25, intimated that the Bankhead bill would increase food prices perhaps as much

as 7 percent or $1,500,000,000. In the President's message of April 2, it was suggested that the Bankhead bill would increase food prices more than 5 percent, or more than $1,000,000,000. There is no basis in fact for these statements.

The effect of sustaining the Presidential veto of the Bankhead bill would be to establish a wartime parity which would be several points lower than parity as now calculated. The Administration will subtract from the present lawful parity price the amount of parity and soil-conservation payments. The Administration is doing this now. Sustaining the veto would legalize this practice.

Food prices may and probably will go somewhat higher, but that will be because of the demand as measured against the supply and not by any influence direct or indirect of the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill can have no possible effect upon the current price of these commodities. The most it could do would be that the higher parity, maintained by virtue of the Bankhead bill requirements, would establish a floor if food prices should decline sufficiently to reach such a floor. This is not in the least likely.

Prices received by farmers for food products and percentage of parity or comparable price, United States, Mar. 15, 1943

Commodity	Parity or comparable price, Mar. 15, 1943	Farm price, Mar. 15, 1943	Percentage actual price is of parity price
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Percent*
Lambs, per 100 pounds	9.47	13.98	148
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds	8.73	12.80	147
Rice, per bushel	1.309	1.802	138
Veal calves, per 100 pounds	10.87	14.45	133
Chickens, per pound	.184	.235	128
Cottonseed, per ton	36.31	45.73	126
Potatoes, per bushel	1.161	1.451	125
Hogs, per 100 pounds	11.70	14.67	125
Turkeys, per pound	.232	.287	124
Milk, wholesale, per 100 pounds	2.54	[1] 3.04	[2] 120
Eggs, per dozen	.284	.340	[2] 120
Apples, per bushel	1.55	1.85	119
Butterfat, per pound	.429	.505	[2] 118
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	1.414	1.536	109
Butter, per pound	-------	.444	108

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Parity prices adjusted for seasonal variations.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the table deals with every food crop, every food product of great importance except wheat and corn and perhaps sugar—and to that point I shall return.

I come from the great wheat-producing State, and I have read with alarm and disapproval and a bit of despair what the President said in his message about bread. Let me say that bread is the lowest priced food product anyone can buy. Relatively and actually, based upon food values, based upon the price of wheat, bread is now and has been at a subnormal level.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to ascertain if I understand the Senator's argument. As I understand, his contention is that, regardless of whether or not the Congress should override the President's veto of this bill, the price could still be regulated by the O. P. A., and that, after all, it would depend largely upon supply and demand rather than upon this particular legislation.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana is correct. We thought we had the matter nailed down in the recent Price Control Act so that there could not be fixed [illegible] the highe[illegible] 1, 1942, [illegible] Senator [illegible] well as I, [illegible] ing out [illegible] price ceil[illegible] I have lef[illegible] the admi[illegible] downtow[illegible] knows; I [illegible] ance is ar[illegible] tion, once [illegible] Congress [illegible] know wh[illegible]

Mr. W[illegible] the Sena[illegible]

Mr. RI[illegible]

Mr. W[illegible] attentior[illegible] which t[illegible] Brown, [illegible] March 24[illegible]

Not o[illegible] risen four[illegible] farmers p[illegible] times as n[illegible]

I call a[illegible] a represe[illegible] Agricultu[illegible] before th[illegible] threatene[illegible] not that s[illegible] itated ab[illegible] is not tru[illegible] are conce[illegible] has not [illegible] acknowle[illegible] true.

I do no[illegible] ment whi[illegible] was prep[illegible] O. P. A[illegible] economist[illegible] absolutely [illegible] sustained [illegible] ator agree with that statement?

Mr. REED. I disagree with the statement of Mr. Brown.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I mean.

Mr. REED. I agree with anyone who says that what the Senator has quoted is not true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Price Administrator was talking about was the average increase in costs and prices.

Mr. WHEELER. But that is not what the letter says.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was talking about the average costs of production and of farm prices. Of course, one could pick a single item out of a hundred and say that the statement did not apply to that particular article, but what Mr. Brown was talking about was the total picture of farm prices with the farmer's costs, and not simply as to one crop.

Mr. WHEELER. If that theory is correct, then one could pick out some few items which are inordinately high and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

and I, know that Prentiss Brown, our former colleague, is a fair, square, straightforward, honorable gentleman, but he was made a sucker of last year by O. P. A., and there is a fair basis for the assumption that he is to be made a sucker of by the O. P. A. now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is fair to former Senator

AVY

GES

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that would not affect anyone in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to proceed for a moment with the discussion of wheat, because it has been asserted that a great injustice was going to be done to the consumers of bread. I wish to go back and repeat what I have already said, that of all the articles of food, bread is the lowest in price. Th price is subnormal. It has been subnormal for a long time. There was a group of Members of this body who actively fought with the O. P. A. last winter to keep the O. P. A. and the Secretary of Agriculture from going into an extensive campaign to keep the price of wheat down.

I do not know where the President gets the figure of a cent or a cent and a half a loaf. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I shall again refer to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They furnished me this time, as they always do, with a great many figures. I depend on them, it is true.

Mr. President, I wish now to distribute to Senators a statement to which I shall call attention. I distribute copies of this statement because it contains an opinion of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics

P. A. I should ent distributed t of the wheat,

no reasonable Bankhead bill e market price er of the pres- h ends June 30, f wheat on the 1943, was $1.423. price received by 1943, was $1.227, e parity price. percent of the ty price is not the grain mar- e. The actual

parity over a wheat, parity is hat the farmer ng the wheat e market place fulfilled. The the dominant

President, will

ar as wheat is whether or not d, the bill would o with bringing o parity. not have the re- Bankhead bill, ld not have the ect, and only a the future, on

matter of fact, very little to do at any time. important but or.

nas very little to do with it. It has something to do with it, but very little to do with the price of bread anywhere in the United States.

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall come to an authoritative expression of opinion upon the bread question, and the extent to which bread might be affected by the price of wheat. I now return to my statement.

The loan value of wheat for the 1942 crop was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 1, 1942, before the marketing of the new crop began. It is 85 percent of the average farm parity of wheat during the preceding year.

The 1942 wheat crop loan value is 85 percent of a parity price of $1.34, or $1.14 on the farm. Let us now move from the farm to the market place.

The great winter wheat market is Kansas City. To the farm-loan price of $1.14 on the farm, 13 cents is added to cover freight charges and country elevator costs. The loan value of wheat at Kansas City is $1.27 per bushel. Cost of storage, insurance, handling, and other charges may amount to as much as 13 cents per bushel. Wheat, in the market at Kansas City, has a base value of $1.27. When sold in the market, whatever portion of the total carrying charge—13 cents—has accrued, must be added to the price unless the seller takes a shrink in his price. He does not usually do this. If wheat is stored under loan on the farm, the farmer storing it may receive 7 cents a bushel for the storage. Storage costs are added to the loan price. The farmer storing his own wheat receives this addition to his price.

Wheat is selling at Kansas City at between $1.35 and $1.39—mostly at $1.37 or $1.38.

The big factor is:

When the market price at Kansas City goes above $1.27, which is the loan value, plus an amount sufficient to meet the accrued carrying charges, which at this season may average 10 cents a bushel, loan wheat comes freely into the market from the farm where it has been stored. This is what holds the price range around $1.37. That price covers the loan and the carrying charges. If the farmer has stored his own wheat, he gets the benefit.

Mr. President, I wish to add at this point that the parity price of wheat in Kansas City at this time is $1.55, and wheat is being bought and sold on the market every day at $1.37. In the name of Heaven, how could the Bankhead bill affect that? It simply could not do it. Whoever makes the claim that it would, makes a mistake. Whoever holds out to the people of this country the idea that their food costs may be determined by such "bosh" as that, is guilty of action which brings on disunity.

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in order to emphasize the point which the Senator from Kansas is making, I should like to ask a question or two. If I am correct there are approximately 600,000,000 bushels of wheat available under Government loans.

Mr. REED. I could not give the figure as of this date. The last time I had occasion to inquire it was in the neighborhood of 600,000,000 bushels; that is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. That is approximately the amount today. Under the market conditions which have prevailed until the consideration of this bill became rather warm, it was possible for the owner of wheat who had a Government loan on it to dispose of the wheat and have a little margin left over and above the original loan. In other words, there was a continual flow of wheat into the market channels from the owner, the farmer, in

as 7 percent or $1,500,000,000. In the President's message of April 2, it was suggested that the Bankhead bill would increase food prices more than 5 percent, or more than $1,000,000,000. There is no basis in fact for these statements.

The effect of sustaining the Presidential veto of the Bankhead bill would be to establish a wartime parity which would be several points lower than parity as now calculated. The Administration will subtract from the present lawful parity price the amount of parity and soil-conservation payments. The Administration is doing this now. Sustaining the veto would legalize this practice.

Food prices may and probably will go somewhat higher, but that will be because of the demand as measured against the supply and not by any influence direct or indirect of the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill can have no possible effect upon the current price of these commodities. The most it could do would be that the higher parity, maintained by virtue of the Bankhead bill requirements, would establish a floor if food prices should decline sufficiently to reach such a floor. This is not in the least likely.

Prices received by farmers for food products and percentage of parity or comparable price, United States, Mar. 15, 1943

Commodity	Parity or comparable price, Mar. 15, 1943	Farm price, Mar. 15, 1943	Percentage actual price is of parity price
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Percent*
Lambs, per 100 pounds	9.47	13.98	148
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds	8.73	12.80	147
Rice, per bushel	1.309	1.802	138
Veal calves, per 100 pounds	10.87	14.45	133
Chickens, per pound	.184	.235	128
Cottonseed, per ton	36.31	45.73	126
Potatoes, per bushel	1.161	1.451	125
Hogs, per 100 pounds	11.70	14.67	125
Turkeys, per pound	.232	.287	124
Milk, wholesale, per 100 pounds	2.54	[1] 3.04	[2] 120
Eggs, per dozen	.284	.340	[2] 120
Apples, per bushel	1.55	1.85	119
Butterfat, per pound	.429	.505	[2] 118
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	1.414	1.536	109
Butter, per pound	-------	.444	108

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Parity prices adjusted for seasonal variations.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the table deals with every food crop, every food product of great importance except wheat and corn and perhaps sugar—and to that point I shall return.

I come from the great wheat-producing State, and I have read with alarm and disapproval and a bit of despair what the President said in his message about bread. Let me say that bread is the lowest priced food product anyone can buy. Relatively and actually, based upon food values, based upon the price of wheat, bread is now and has been at a subnormal level.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to ascertain if I understand the Senator's argument. As I understand, his contention is that, regardless of whether or not the Congress should override the President's veto of this bill, the price could still be regulated by the O. P. A., and that, after all, it would depend largely upon supply and demand rather than upon this particular legislation.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana is correct. We thought we had the matter nailed down in the recent Price Control Act so that there could not be fixed a ceiling below parity or below the highest price paid between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942. The Senator will remember that, for he, as well as I, participated actively in working out a further limitation upon the price ceilings. I say to the Senator that I have left not a particle of confidence in the administrative integrity of officials downtown. What they will do, God only knows; I do not. If their past performance is any indication of their future action, once we lose our control here in the Congress of the United States I do not know what they will do.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that in the letter which the head of the O. P. A., Mr. Brown, sent to Senator BARKLEY on March 24 he made this statement:

> Not only have prices the farmers receive risen four times as much as the prices the farmers pay, but they have also risen four times as much as farmers' cost of production

I call attention to the fact that I asked a representative of the Department of Agriculture this morning, who appeared before the committee after he had been threatened with a subpena, whether or not that statement was correct. He hesitated about it, and I said, "Certainly it is not true so far as the wheat farmers are concerned, is it? The price of wheat has not risen four times." He finally acknowledged that he thought that was true.

I do not know who prepared the statement which was sent here; probably it was prepared by some official of the O. P. A., by some of the so-called economists in that organization, but it is absolutely misleading and cannot be sustained by the facts. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. REED. I disagree with the statement of Mr. Brown.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I mean.

Mr. REED. I agree with anyone who says that what the Senator has quoted is not true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Price Administrator was talking about was the average increase in costs and prices.

Mr. WHEELER. But that is not what the letter says.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was talking about the average costs of production and of farm prices. Of course, one could pick a single item out of a hundred and say that the statement did not apply to that particular article, but what Mr. Brown was talking about was the total picture of farm prices with the farmer's costs, and not simply as to one crop.

Mr. WHEELER. If that theory is correct, then one could pick out some few items which are inordinately high and say that prices of the great majority of farmers were four times higher than their costs. Of course, that would be absolutely unfair to a great majority of the farmers of the country. The statement does not say the average; it says the prices to the farmers have "risen four times as much." I say that the statement is misleading and is not in accord with the facts.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana knows as well as I do, and as well as does the Senator from Kentucky, that anyone who makes the statement that the average price the farmer receives on all his products has increased four times—400 percent—is not stating the fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Price Administrator was doing was drawing a comparison between the increased price of farm products and the increased cost to the farmer who produces the products. It would be manifestly unfair to pick out some one crop and say that because it does not apply to that crop the whole statement is false.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kentucky knows as well as does the Senator from Montana and I do, that, taking the average, farm prices have not increased four times.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about comparative increase of farm prices relative to the cost of producing.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read the statement; let us see what Administrator Brown said.

> Not only have prices farmers receive risen four times as much as the prices farmers pay—

I submit that that statement alone is not correct, whether we take the average or take some particular farm crop.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Montana as to that.

Mr. WHEELER. Secondly, Administrator Brown says:

> but they have also risen four times as much as farmers' cost of production.

The Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department this morning said they did not have the statistics and could not figure out what the cost of production is. So I say those two statements are misleading. I do not attribute that to former Senator Brown; I know he was taking the word of some of his statisticians in the organization who know about as much concerning farming and farm prices and agricultural products as a young man who is just out of Columbia or Harvard University.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana and the Senator from Kentucky

and I, know that Prentiss Brown, our former colleague, is a fair, square, straightforward, honorable gentleman, but he was made a sucker of last year by O. P. A., and there is a fair basis for the assumption that he is to be made a sucker of by the O. P. A. now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is fair to former Senator Brown for the Senator from Kansas to rise here and say that he was made a sucker out of by somebody.

Mr. REED. If Dave Ginsburg did not make a sucker out of Mr. Brown, I do not know what the significance of the expression is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever may be said of Mr. Ginsburg, I think it would take a far better man than he to make a sucker out of Mr. Brown.

Mr. REED. Ginsburg is a pretty smart man.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is true, as I presume even the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Montana, along with the Senator from Kentucky and all other Senators, must admit, that we have to have people help us obtain the facts we present here.

We ourselves do not have the time to dig them all out. Frequently I obtain figures which I have requested from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Treasury Department, and all other departments, but if someone wishes to condemn the figures I present, or figure presented by the Senator from Kansas, all he has to do is to rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "The Senator himself did not ascertain those facts; he asked some little statistician or some little bureaucrat in Washington to get them for him." We create a bureau and someone appoints a man to be the head of the bureau, and we immediately criticize him as a bureaucrat.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will pardon my relating something that occurred at a lunch table discussion, a Senator stated that when the supplemental appropriation bill came before us he intended to move to strike out provision for all economists in general, and the economists of the Office of Price Administration in particular.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that would not affect anyone in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to proceed for a moment with the discussion of wheat, because it has been asserted that a great injustice was going to be done to the consumers of bread. I wish to go back and repeat what I have already said, that of all the articles of food, bread is the lowest in price. The price is subnormal. It has been subnormal for a long time. There was a group of Members of this body who actively fought with the O. P. A. last winter to keep the O. P. A. and the Secretary of Agriculture from going into an extensive campaign to keep the price of wheat down.

I do not know where the President gets the figure of a cent or a cent and a half a loaf. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I shall again refer to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They furnished me this time, as they always do, with a great many figures. I depend on them, it is true.

Mr. President, I wish now to distribute to Senators a statement to which I shall call attention. I distribute copies of this statement because it contains an opinion of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which controverts the O. P. A. I should like to have the statement distributed because it goes to the heart of the wheat, flour, and bread question.

Mr. President, there is no reasonable ground for belief that the Bankhead bill will have any effect on the market price of wheat for the remainder of the present marketing year, which ends June 30, 1943. The parity price of wheat on the farm as of March 15, 1943, was $1.423. The actual average price received by farmers on March 15, 1943, was $1.227, which is 19 cents below the parity price. The price received was 86 percent of the parity price, but the parity price is not the controlling factor in the grain market at the present time. The actual marketing situation is:

Wheat has been below parity over a long period of years. In wheat, parity is merely an expression of what the farmer ought to receive. Giving the wheat farmer a parity price in the market place is a pious hope yet to be fulfilled. The loan value of wheat is the dominant influence.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as wheat is concerned, regardless of whether or not the veto shall be sustained, the bill would not have anything to do with bringing the price of wheat up to parity.

Mr. REED. It would not have the remotest influence. The Bankhead bill, enacted or rejected, would not have the remotest immediate effect, and only a very negligible effect in the future, on the price of wheat.

Mr. WHEELER. As a matter of fact, the price of wheat has very little to do with the cost of bread at any time.

Mr. REED. It is an important but not the controlling factor.

Mr. WHEELER. It has very little to do with it. It has something to do with it, but very little to do with the price of bread anywhere in the United States.

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall come to an authoritative expression of opinion upon the bread question, and the extent to which bread might be affected by the price of wheat. I now return to my statement.

The loan value of wheat for the 1942 crop was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 1, 1942, before the marketing of the new crop began. It is 85 percent of the average farm parity of wheat during the preceding year.

The 1942 wheat crop loan value is 85 percent of a parity price of $1.34, or $1.14 on the farm. Let us now move from the farm to the market place.

The great winter wheat market is Kansas City. To the farm-loan price of $1.14 on the farm, 13 cents is added to cover freight charges and country elevator costs. The loan value of wheat at Kansas City is $1.27 per bushel. Cost of storage, insurance, handling, and other charges may amount to as much as 13 cents per bushel. Wheat, in the market at Kansas City, has a base value of $1.27. When sold in the market, whatever portion of the total carrying charge—13 cents—has accrued, must be added to the price unless the seller takes a shrink in his price. He does not usually do this. If wheat is stored under loan on the farm, the farmer storing it may receive 7 cents a bushel for the storage. Storage costs are added to the loan price. The farmer storing his own wheat receives this addition to his price.

Wheat is selling at Kansas City at between $1.35 and $1.39—mostly at $1.37 or $1.38.

The big factor is:

When the market price at Kansas City goes above $1.27, which is the loan value, plus an amount sufficient to meet the accrued carrying charges, which at this season may average 10 cents a bushel, loan wheat comes freely into the market from the farm where it has been stored. This is what holds the price range around $1.37. That price covers the loan and the carrying charges. If the farmer has stored his own wheat, he gets the benefit.

Mr. President, I wish to add at this point that the parity price of wheat in Kansas City at this time is $1.55, and wheat is being bought and sold on the market every day at $1.37. In the name of Heaven, how could the Bankhead bill affect that? It simply could not do it. Whoever makes the claim that it would, makes a mistake. Whoever holds out to the people of this country the idea that their food costs may be determined by such "bosh" as that, is guilty of action which brings on disunity.

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in order to emphasize the point which the Senator from Kansas is making, I should like to ask a question or two. If I am correct there are approximately 600,000,000 bushels of wheat available under Government loans.

Mr. REED. I could not give the figure as of this date. The last time I had occasion to inquire it was in the neighborhood of 600,000,000 bushels; that is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. That is approximately the amount today. Under the market conditions which have prevailed until the consideration of this bill became rather warm, it was possible for the owner of wheat who had a Government loan on it to dispose of the wheat and have a little margin left over and above the original loan. In other words, there was a continual flow of wheat into the market channels from the owner, the farmer, in

the country. But the market the last few days has declined a total of about 6 or 8 cents a bushel. A farmer who has a loan on his wheat cannot sell the wheat and cash in. Therefore as a matter of necessity, with the wheat loans all falling due on April 30, the last of this month, the wheat which is under loan will all come into the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Will there be any opportunity for a further advance in the market when the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, owns all the available wheat?

Mr. REED. I have not followed the market as closely as has the Senator from Nebraska, but the fact of the matter remains, assuming the information given by the Senator from Nebraska to be correct, that this agitation, the deep fears which have been created in the country, are penalizing the farmers whose crop is already below, and has been for 25 years below the point we call parity. If there has ever been a greater injustice done to any class of people in this country than is being done to the farmers now in general, and to the wheat farmers in particular, then I am not conscious of it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no way by which wheat can be brought up to parity under the Bankhead bill.

Mr. REED. Absolutely not.

Mr. WHEELER. It can be brought up to parity if the Government makes a loan practically at the full parity price, or if the surplus wheat now on hand should be taken off the market by being consumed.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Wheat is not going to parity until that occurs. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous for anyone to make a statement that the price of wheat is going to go up as the result of the passage of the Bankhead bill. I am not speaking for the farmers of other sections of the country, but in Montana the majority of the farmers, aside from the stockmen and cattlemen, are wheat raisers, and I resent statements being given out by the O. P. A. and by others intimating that the farmers of my State are the cause of inflation. Such a statement is perfectly ridiculous. The truth about the matter is that the wheat farmers of my State have not complained and are not complaining particularly about the price of wheat at the present time. They realize the situation. They realize that it is going to be difficult for them to get any higher price for wheat than they are receiving at the present time no matter what is done by Congress. What is causing the farmer in my State more trouble than anything else is the wage the laboring man is receiving in some war industries. I am not complaining about that, but I call attention to an advertisement appearing in the Miles City, Mont., daily newspaper, as follows:

MEN WANTED FOR VITAL WAR INDUSTRY

CARPENTERS, HELPERS, LABORERS

Immediate employment. Excellent working conditions. Help win this war—build cargo barges for use against the enemy.

This is a real war job where your help is urgently needed. Act immediately.

Top wages—9 hours per day—6 days per week. Time and one-half after 40 hours.

An inexperienced man can earn $250 per month.

Lodging accommodations available.

J. C. BOESPFLUG CONSTRUCTION CO.,
Marine Division, Anacortes, Wash.

Will someone tell me how we can keep the farmer on the farm when, whether he is experienced or inexperienced, he can go into war industry and earn as much as $250 a month? The advertisement says that an inexperienced man can earn $250 per month. There is only one way the farmer is going to be able to compete with such a condition as that, or keep help on the farm, and that is to be given a reasonable price so he can afford to pay more wages. That is as simple as that 2 and 2 make 4. The statisticians can argue all they want to, but they cannot get away from the plain facts in the case.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana knows that we have discussed the farm labor question on the floor of the Senate for almost a year past. I agree with the inference which I think the Senator from Montana intends to leave, that at no time have we ever gotten into the heads of the administrators downtown, the "bureaucrats," if the Senator from Kentucky does not object to the term, any consciousness of the trouble, of the actual situation, of the danger which threatens the country in respect to a food shortage.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Kansas, that as he states the facts, the bill will not increase the price of wheat to the farmer. But if it will not increase the price of wheat to the farmer what is the use of voting for it?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio has given me an opening to deal immediately with a question which I intended to discuss later.

Mr. TAFT. I think now is the time to deal with it, because there is before the Senate a bill which undoubtedly will give the country the impression of general inflation.

Mr. REED. Why? Because of——

Mr. TAFT. I do not care why. I am saying that is the fact. I want to know what is the use of passing it if it will not raise the price to the farmer?

Mr. REED. Because there is a principle involved which is much bigger than the mere question of the price of any farm commodity at this time, and if the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. What is the principle? Frankly, I do not quite see what the principle is.

Mr. REED. I intend to come to that later, if the Senator will be patient until I reach that point.

Mr. TAFT. We have deducted these payments on farm loans and in other cases, but, while I do not think they ought to be deducted, I do not regard that as any great question of principle.

Mr. REED. I have not said that. If the Senator from Ohio will have patience and listen, I will come to the question of principle. I think it will interest even the Senator from Ohio. I wish to discuss that particular question.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly there is a question of principle involved it seems to me, in whether the President or the executive departments have the right——

Mr. REED. And the power.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; whether they have the right and the power under the law to deduct. I contend they do not have any right under the law to deduct. They do not have any business to deduct. There are certain kinds of wheat of which we do not have a surplus, but in my judgment the passage of the bill would not affect to any appreciable extent the price of the wheat of which we do have a surplus. I doubt if it will affect it at all. But in my judgment there is a matter of principle involved, as to whether under the law the President has the right or does not have the right to deduct these payments.

Mr. TAFT. When we passed the anti-inflation bill in October my impression was that the payments in question were not to be deducted, but I must say I think the act is ambiguous, and I have studied it with great care. I think an argument can be made that they can be deducted. Certainly under the conference report they can be deducted. That may have been wrong. I did not know that such language was in the report. I do not think I would have agreed to it had I known that it contained such language; but it does contain it.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio was a member of the conference committee.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. REED. And the Senator did not know anything about it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not remember the subject being discussed.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is in the conference committee. But unfortunately the wording of the bill is ambiguous. The conference report is ambiguous. I am not saying that the President is correct. I only say that I do not see any great question of principle involved in the interpretation of the Price Control Act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, while the Senator from Ohio is on that point, let me say that the President put his interpretation on the bill in his Executive Order No. 9250, as I recall, issued on October 2 of last year. The Bankhead bill, as we passed it, was nothing more than a reiteration of the Senate's position. There was nothing new in that. In October of last year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 308 declaring the Senate's position on the question of deductions of these payments from parity prices. Later it was written into the Bankhead bill, which was introduced in the present session, and which the Senate passed.

The point is that we passed the Bankhead bill by a vote of 78 to 2. In doing

so, we stated and reiterated what I thought was a proper construction of the law. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio voted for the bill. The bill went to the House, was slightly amended, came back to the Senate, was further considered by the Senate, and was sent to conference; and the conference report was agreed to by the Senate by unanimous vote. In the bill the President is told what in our opinion is the proper construction of the law. Either we did not know what we were doing when we passed the bill in the Senate by a vote of 78 to 2, and we did not know what we were doing when on the conference report we reaffirmed our action by unanimous vote, or now, if we accept the veto of the President, we are stultifying ourselves.

If we do that, a majority of this body and a majority of the House have absolutely lost all control over legislation. That would mean that unless the President of the United States in exercising his undoubted constitutional privilege and duty of veto agreed with the majority in both Houses, a majority would be powerless.

We passed the law. There was not very much difference of opinion about it. It is true that there was a great deal of confusion and discussion relative to it. The Senator from Ohio referred to that. I have never questioned the good faith or integrity of Prentiss Brown. I do not do so now. I do say that in the closing days of the consideration of the price-control bill there was around him a bunch of people who would mislead anyone. I ran into them in the lounge—a group including Mr. Ginsburg. They talked to me about their conception of the bill and their understanding of it. I told them that their construction and their understanding was not mine. But they caused the then Senator Brown to put into the RECORD a statement which never was read on the floor. It was a piece of bad faith for which I never charged Mr Brown with any responsibility, and I do not do so now. I simply say they made a sucker out of him. I said that a while ago. I think that is the case, and is about the shortest way to explain this matter.

Now I desire to talk about the price of wheat. I am sure the Senator from Montana will be interested. First, I read a paragraph from a memorandum on wheat prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. The Senate has heard the discussion, has heard the President's message, and has heard what Mr. Brown said about the possibility of the price of bread going up. Let us see what the most authoritative source in the country said:

> Since the outbreak of the war the price of wheat has advanced materially, but this has been from a very low level. The price of wheat and the income to farmers from wheat are still considerably below levels reached in the previous war period. At the outbreak of war in Europe in August 1939, the farm price of wheat averaged only about 55 cents per bushel. This was only 49 percent of parity and the price has remained below parity, now in March being up only to 86 percent. The cash income from wheat in 1942—
>
> The cash income for farmers from all the wheat marketed in the United States in 1942, a period of prosperity for the farmer—and there can be no doubt it was a prosperous period, and, relatively speaking, the farmer of today is better off, but even now he is receiving only 53 percent as much cash income as that which the wheat farmers received during the First World War period.
>
> Mr. President, bread, the finished product of wheat, is the cheapest thing in the entire range of foods. It was selling below a fair price at the time when ceilings were set, and is still selling below a fair price. The price of bread could be increased, as a matter of fact, about 2 cents a loaf without throwing it out of line with comparable food costs at this time. Neither Administrator Brown nor the President claim that an increase of more than one-half cent to a full cent would be brought about by any action of the Bankhead bill. This is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel when viewing the food situation as a whole.
>
> The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of the Department of Agriculture, has advised me that on the average an advance of about 50 cents a bushel in the price of wheat would be necessary in order to justify an addition of approximately 1 cent to the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread. An increase of one-half a cent in the average price of bread would be more than adequate to cover the increased cost of material in the event wheat prices rose to the present parity. They are not likely to advance even that far.
>
> Now I shall refer to a subject which I think will interest the Acting President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is the present occupant of the chair. That subject is corn. Both the President and Mr. Brown, and the economists, mention three products. They mention corn and sugar and one other product. What is the corn situation? The parity price on corn now would be approximately $1.06 a bushel. They hold out and express the fear that if the price of corn were allowed to go up a little, feed costs would be affected so greatly that the price of meat would be increased. Their view finds no support from any reliable, authoritative source. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has told me definitely that, in its opinion, the price of corn could go up from the present ceiling of about $1.01 or $1.01½ for No. 3 yellow corn in Chicago to the full parity price, which, as I remember, is about $1.06, without having any effect upon the price of meat, whether meat from beef, lambs, pork, chickens, or what-not, the consumer buys.

They also refer to sugar. I have always deferred to the Senator from Michigan—I am sorry he is not present at this moment—the Senator from Nebraska, the Senators from Colorado, and the Senators from Utah on the beet-sugar question. I shall leave that question largely to them; but I desire to make one statement regarding it: As I remember, the President and Mr. Brown held out the idea that there may be an added cost to the consumer of $200,000,000 a year in the price of beet sugar.

Mr. President, there is already under way a program by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture to handle an increase in beet-sugar production. That program may be made successful, granting higher prices to beet-sugar producers, at a cost, not of $200,000,000, but $25,000,000. I have that statement before me in writing from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The Bureau did not make the statement because it shared my view. I do not ask the Bureau to endorse what I say. The Bureau told me the truth. That is the difference between honest economists and statisticians and what I have referred to as the "snake doctors" in the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was absent when I laid the sugar question in his lap.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment before he leaves the sugar question? It has given me more trouble than any other.

Mr. REED. The authorities on sugar are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. TAFT. The difficulty is that with respect to sugar the benefit payment, which is not to be deducted, is already paid by the consumer through a tax. It differs entirely from the corn and wheat situation.

Mr. REED. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. There seems to me to be much more justification for deducting the payments made in the case of sugar than there is in the case of wheat and corn, but the bill lumps them all together, so that we cannot deal separately with each commodity.

Mr. REED. If I had been drafting the bill I should have exempted sugar, or changed the Sugar Control Act. The Senator from Alabama did not do so.

Let me read to the Senator from Ohio a confirmation of the statement I made a moment ago, that this problem can be handled at a cost of $25,000,000, instead of $200,000,000, and without raising the price to the consumer.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see how that can be done.

Mr. REED. Let me read a letter written to me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in response to my request for information on the sugar question. It is a long letter, but this is the salient point:

> The Secretary of Agriculture has already announced plans for the Commodity Credit Corporation to subsidize processors of the 1943 beet crop $1.50 per ton of beets.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me conclude this brief paragraph. The memorandum can be found in the Federal Register for March 18, 1943, at page 3331. Continuing—

If this subsidy rate were raised to about $2.38 per ton, the difference between the estimated 1942 farm price of sugar beets and the estimated 1943 parity price, the price ceilings on sugar could be maintained at their present levels and farmers would receive a return equal to the parity price plus the Government payments, or about $11.50 per ton. This subsidy would cost the Commodity Credit Corporation about $25,000,000. A comparable subsidy to continental cane growers would amount to around $7,000,000.

That would make a total of $32,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The difficulty with that proposal, as I see it, is that the Bankhead bill provides that those farmers shall not be subsidized, or, if they are, the subsidy must not be considered in computing the parity prices. So the subsidy plan which the Senator is suggesting is one which is ruled out by the Bankhead bill, which would make it impossible of accomplishment.

The Bankhead bill says, in effect, that the price must be increased. We cannot increase the price of beet sugar without increasing the price of cane sugar. It would cost the public a minimum of a cent a pound, which would mean $120,000,000.

The Bankhead bill says that we must meet the situation by increasing the price, and we cannot afford a subsidy, because we cannot deduct the subsidy from the prices which the farmer must receive. He must get both the price and the subsidy.

Mr. REED. I am not an authority on sugar. I think I know something about wheat, and a little about corn, cattle, hogs, and such things as that, but I do not know much about sugar. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] told me that he would protect the interests of the beet sugar growers, but he has failed to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Ohio, and then I shall be happy to take on the Senator from Michigan.

I shall be glad to turn over to the Senator from Ohio a copy of the memorandum to which I have referred, which is rather lengthy. It is intended to handle the subsidy program through the processors. At the present time the price is based upon the sugar content of beets. As I remember, every ton of beets produces about 310 pounds of raw sugar. Not being entirely familiar with the arrangement, I may perhaps be in error. As I understand the arrangement, after the processing reaches a certain point, the processor and the farmer divide the profit. The farmer gets his price based upon the sugar content of his beets. I think it is the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to handle this subsidy program through the processors, if that answers the question raised by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will read the Bankhead bill, he will see that it provides that no subsidy to the processor, any more than to the original farmer, may be taken into account or deducted in fixing the parity price. So we must pay the parity price, and then add any subsidy. The suggested plan may be a very good one; but I say that it will be made impossible if we pass the Bankhead bill.

Mr. REED. I differ with the Senator from Ohio on that point. I am constitutionally opposed to a subsidy if there is any way to avoid it. One of the main differences of opinion between Mr. Leon Henderson and myself was that he had a wholesale scheme for subsidizing consumers. I believe that production can be handled on a subsidy basis to some extent. For example, copper and sugar are now being handled on that basis. All that was suggested to me was that a variation of that plan could be followed. I asked for it in connection with my discussion of the Bankhead bill.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has never yet misled me, so I feel safe in saying to the Senator from Ohio that it is the belief of the officials of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that this problem can be handled in the way I have suggested, at a cost to the consumer not of $200,000,000 but approximately $30,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. I agree that we can give the beet-sugar growers an increase of $1.90 or $2 a ton for beets at a very much lower cost than would be involved in raising the price of sugar. However, the Bankhead bill would nullify the possibility of doing so, because under the terms of the Bankhead bill if we raise the price of beets to the producers $2 a ton we must pass it on in the price of sugar to the consumer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry I missed the Senator's discussion of this subject. I listened very faithfully to the first 20 minutes of his address, which was the extent of my original contract with him. I was called from the Chamber in connection with conferences with respect to this bill, or I should have returned sooner.

This has nothing particularly to do with the argument which the Senator has had with the Senator from Ohio, but I should like to keep the record straight. The Senator has been complaining about unreliable information. He presents a memorandum which says that the Secretary of Agriculture has already announced plans for the Commodity Credit Corporation to subsidize processors of the 1943 wheat crop $1.50 per ton of beets. Has the Senator any information about any subsidization of processors in connection with this program?

Mr. REED. The memorandum is my authority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe the Senator will find that the subsidy would go directly to the grower. The processor has been ground down to a contract under which he will be very fortunate if he can even survive. In many instances processors will have to go out of business, and as a result the sugar-beet producer will find himself without any opportunity to have a processor. Therefore he will be harmed just as much as though he had been harmed in the first instance.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator from Michigan called my attention to that. This memorandum or letter is dated April 3, 1943, and reads as follows:

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REED: In response to your telephone call yesterday I am enclosing a statement about the effect of the Bankhead bill on prices for sugar.

It is signed by the Agricultural Economic Statistician, who, upon request, always furnishes me with information of this nature from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. If they have made a mistake, it is the first time in all my contact with them that they have made an erroneous statement on an important subject such as this.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Unless I am totally misinformed—and I do not think I am—the statement that the new sugar program subsidizes processors of the 1943 beet crop is totally inaccurate.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I will leave the processors to him. If I can take care of the beet-sugar farmer I think I shall be doing my duty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly; and that is the mistake which the Department of Agriculture is making. It has taken care of the beet grower; but a beet grower without an available neighborhood processor might just as well have no beets.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Michigan a complete copy of the memorandum to which I have referred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the remainder of the memorandum is anything like what I have read, I am not much interested.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan is pitting his knowledge, or lack of knowledge—whichever he chooses to call it—against a definite statement from the best and most authoritative source on matters of this kind in the whole Government. The Senator may be right. Far be it from me to say who is right. If this information is in error—and there is always the possibility of an error—it is the first serious error I have ever detected in information given me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. President, I wish to bring my remarks to a close. I should like to return to what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said. If he cannot see the principles involved, it is most unfortunate for him, for the principle, and for the Senate.

Questions of price and subsidy, the cost of this or that commodity, and the matter of price ceilings are temporary. For the moment such factors may be of advantage or disadvantage. However, there is one definite, long-range, far-reaching, fundamental principle involved in the question and in the vote which we shall cast. Stating it as tersely as I can, the question is whether we shall continue to have a Government of law

under the Constitution, the principal source of power being the people, whose will is expressed through Congress in the passage of legislation by a constitutional majority of the two Houses, or whether we shall have a Government by Executive decree. Shall Congress abdicate? Are the people willing that Congress shall turn over to the President the power to issue decrees which are at variance with the plain intent of Congress?

Let us agree with the statement of the Senator from Ohio that the language of the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, may be ambiguous. I do not agree with the statement. The intent was plain to me. I had some part in the adoption of language in an attempt to prepare a formula which would meet the objections of everyone and save the face of everyone. It was not ambiguous to me; but let us assume that the language was ambiguous.

Last October I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 308 to clear up that very point. I never pressed it for passage. The Seventy-seventh Congress was drawing to a close. The question was bound to arise during the present Congress. The bill of the Senator from Alabama is nothing more or less than a reiteration by the Congress of what we understood we were doing when we enacted the Price Control Act. That is all.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the point which I wish to make. I say that unless the Bankhead bill is passed over the President's veto, the majority of the Congress—the majority in each House—will have lost its power. The question as to what Congress meant or what ought to be done is directly in issue. We expressed our intent when we enacted the original law. By a vote of 78 to 2, we reaffirmed our statement of intent. The bill went to the House of Representatives and was there passed by an overwhelming vote. The conference report was agreed to by the Senate by a unanimous vote.

Were we playing and fooling around all that time, or were we in earnest? We were in earnest. We were saying, "This is what we intended to say, and this is what ought to be done." A vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress, not merely a majority, is required to reaffirm the intention of Congress in the first place and to make effective legislation which has been under consideration in the Congress during the past year or two.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Eastland
Austin	Byrd	Ellender
Bailey	Capper	Ferguson
Ball	Chandler	George
Bankhead	Chavez	Gerry
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Gillette
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Green
Brewster	Connally	Guffey
Brooks	Danaher	Gurney
Burton	Davis	Hatch
Bushfield	Downey	Hawkes
Hayden	Millikin	Taft
Hill	Moore	Thomas, Idaho
Holman	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tydings
La Follette	Overton	Vandenberg
Langer	Pepper	Van Nuys
Lodge	Radcliffe	Wagner
Lucas	Reed	Wallgren
McCarran	Revercomb	Walsh
McClellan	Reynolds	Wheeler
McFarland	Robertson	Wherry
McKellar	Russell	White
McNary	Shipstead	Wiley
Maloney	Smith	Willis
Mead	Stewart	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, since I obtained the floor I have been informed by the senior Senator from Alabama that he intends to make a motion to refer to the committee the bill with the veto message of the President. I rise to speak in behalf of sustaining the veto of the President and also for the purpose of opposing the motion to refer.

What we are dealing with, Mr. President, is not, primarily, a matter of prices or a matter of wages. We are dealing with the necessity of stabilization. The issue before the Senate is not a farmer issue nor is it a labor issue. It is not a party issue in any sense. It is a national issue; the national interest is involved. We will either stabilize the American economy now or we will go faltering and trembling down the road to economic wreck and national disaster.

We have been undertaking for some time to reach the point of stabilization, and there has appeared to be a conflict of interest, a competition, and I might say a rivalry, as between one group, which we will call the workers represented by organized labor in their several organizations, and the other group, the farmers, represented by the farmer organizations. There are two standards. Unfortunately each of them is variable, and we have reached the point where we must put an end to the variation.

One of the standards set up is the standard of the cost of living. Labor is saying, "We can never have stability of wages; we can never arrest the tendency of wages to rise; we will not permit you to find a level by which you and the country can abide so long as under us and under our wages the cost of living constantly rises." That is a reasonable position.

On the other hand, we have the standard of parity for the farmers. Parity, as we generally understand it, is a price to the farmers which gives them the status of equality in the market in buying and selling. So long as wages rise the farmer's cost in buying rises, and he answers, "I will not be content with any parity formula; I will not be content with any sort of price arrangement you may make so long as my costs in the market are rising." That, too, is a reasonable position.

That is the situation which is presented here; that is the situation which was presented to the President of the United States. We must deal now with those two standards, and we must deal with them with a view to a lasting stabilization. We must arrest the progress of each firmly and instantly.

One of the Senators said that the Bankhead bill was a small matter, that its consequences would be light. I am not disposed to debate that point. I do not know whether its consequences would be heavy or light, but I am inclined to think that, in the important matter of prices, they will be greater than we anticipate. Let us, however, consider the matter from the standpoint of the proponents of the bill and of its author. He said the consequences in the markets on the cost of living would be relatively small. Let us grant that, for the purpose of the argument; but I remind the Senate that a small breach in the barrier of stabilization at this time is just as disastrous as a great one, and the small breach predicates the great one.

We are dealing with an extremely serious situation. Stabilization is the antidote to inflation, and there is no other antidote. While a great deal has been said in the Senate in the past 7 or 8 years, more lately and ever increasing, about inflation, I question, nevertheless, whether most of us realize how serious are the implications of that word. If we ever yield to inflation, if we ever lose control of the forces which make for inflation, we are sunk. We not only lose the American economy, but we make it infinitely difficult to win the war. I do not wish to say anything that would give aid or comfort to our enemies; things are going very well for us on the battlefields; but today there is more of danger on the American battlefield than there is on the European or the Asiatic or the African. Shoot the American economy to pieces, let the chaos and the disaster of inflation come upon us, lose our last opportunity to stabilize our economy here today, and I will not venture to say at what time or under what conditions this country would recover the morale, the revenue, and the spirit necessary to win the war and win the peace.

Mr. President, we have already entered into the period and into the process of inflation. Our problem now is not to prevent inflation, but to control it, arrest it, and prevent its consequences.

Here are the evidences of inflation: First, the rapidly rising prices in all directions. We do not have to go far. There are the rapidly rising prices in the dining room downstairs, the rapidly rising prices down the street, in the stores; the loss of money values and the increase of commodity values, and the ever-increasing demand for more wages. Miners are coming forward now and saying, "Why, $7 a day is not sufficient." "Why is it not?" "Because $7 a day does not pay the bills for our children, for breakfast and dinner and supper."

We have also the factor of inflation in the constantly increasing public expenditures paid for by borrowed money. We probably cannot help that. We are in the war, and we must see it through at any cost; but there has never been a country which could spend money at the rate of $75,000,000,000 a year, most of it borrowed, without running into inflation.

I was reading in the newspaper last night a simple statement that the War Department is spending money at the rate of $4,000,000,000 a month—$48,000,000,000 a year—in one branch. I read a statement a few days ago, which I think is true, that in this war we are spending on battleships and cargo ships alone more than we had to spend in the First World War.

I think I can add to those statements another of very great significance. The United States of America is spending in this war at the present time more than all the other nations engaged on both sides are spending. And coupled with that is the statement of Mr. Jesse Jones that the excess of national income, estimated at $119,000,000,000, over consumable goods available for purchase this year will be between forty and fifty billion dollars and that excess will seek something to purchase.

All those things mean that we are in the very vortex of inflation. Senators say we should refer the bill, and delay it. It is not possible to delay when we come to put out a fire. We cannot hesitate when we come to deal with such factors making for inflation as these, and when the evidences of the inflation are all about us, even as the flames in a burning house. We must act firmly, we must act instantly, we must act with the utmost intelligence, not in the interest of the farmers, not in the interest of labor, not in the interest of the politicians, but in the national interest, which embraces the farmers, the workers, and the politicians and which carries at this hour the last best hope of earth.

I could mention other evidences of inflation. Look at the black market growing up all over America. That is a manifestation of the inflationary flame licking out here and there. To mention another, look at the stock market today. There is a new demand for equity stock. Once again there are large turn-overs, for men distrustful of the value and purchasing power of money are trying to find somewhere to place it.

Another evidence is the general unrest throughout the country. Our people are not discontented with what the boys are doing in the war. They are their sons, and they are proud of them. But from one end of the country to the other—and I hope I am not saying anything now that gives aid or comfort to our enemies—from one end of the country to the other there is a restlessness, there is a discontent, there is a fear, and it is based on the fact that when the housewives and the mothers and the fathers go to the market in the morning, they do not know what to expect. The prices are rising all the time, the situation is running out of their hands, and they are complaining about their Government, when, as a matter of fact, they are really complaining about the instability in the midst of which they have been cast.

I do not know of anything that would bring more happiness to the American people right now than some strong word from the Senate—which they still trust—that from now on we are going to have stability in the United States; that we are going to save our economy, that we are going to arrest the rise in wages, that we are going to grapple with the labor leaders, who constantly stir the workers up with discontent, to demand more and more and more, and that we are going to grapple, too, with the farm leaders, with all due respect to them, well knowing that it is their business to make a new demand every day.

I am not blaming them for that, for by that means they have their living; but we should be ready to say to them that the hour has come in America when they, too, along with the workers, with Senators, with the consumers, with the soldiers and the sailors and the men in the air shall rally around the flag and demand that the conomy of their country shall be stabilized, thereby to effect a saving to all persons within the country.

So, Mr. President, we must succeed with this matter of stabilization, and succeed promptly, or face consequences which I do not undertake to describe. I know that some Senators will say "this is a small matter; let it go." Another question will come before us tomorrow, and some Senators may say "this, too, is a small matter; let it go." And on and on we shall go. I say we have reached the point where we must meet the wage situation, the cost of living situation, the worker situation, and the farmer situation, and strike a firm note and say, "Here we stand for stability and we will not be moved."

Mr. President, we have a program for stabilization. The program was established by the Congress, and I feel that if any program can succeed, that program can. But I am here to say that it cannot succeed if we tamper with it or trifle with it. What is the program? We have rationing, and we cannot have stabilization now without rationing I do not want to make a speech today about rationing. I have one word to say about it, and I say it to all the American people. The time has come for us to quit quarreling about rationing, and to take it as it is. Quit going home and complaining about rationing. It is a necessity. It is a part of the stabilization program.

The next portion of the stabilization program is the price and wage ceilings involved in the measure before us and its veto. We undertook in October of last year to establish the principle of wage and price ceilings. From the day we began until now there has been no end of kicking and quarreling and complaining. Very naturally, in a democracy perhaps the administration of the program was not perfect by a long shot, and it is not now perfect, and never will be perfect; but it is a program fixed by the law, not derived from any dictator, but derived from the Congress. We remember that the former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Brown, discussed the bill, and we must stand by that program. We cannot shoot it down without shooting down the whole structure of our country and plunging our economy and our people into chaos.

Mr. President, so we have two great factors, and I say about the last one that there are merchants and manufacturers who complain about the ceilings. They complain that the ceilings are too low, and they complain about the regulations, that they are too many, or that they are too drastic. Perhaps they are for peacetime. Let us agree that our Government officials have sent out too many questionnaires. We must have ceilings, and we must have officials to impose them, and we must have officials to stand up for them, and we must have Senators who will stand up for those who do stand up for them. We cannot go along arguing and quarreling through a period such as this.

Mr. President, I am in favor of standing by the program, and I am not for weeping on the necks of my constituents. When they write complaining letters I do not complain back to them. There might be circumstances under which I would do so. It is a very fine thing to sympathize with complaints.

Hear me, Senators. We have reached the hour when we as Senators must stand up for the country. We must tell our constitutents that we are in this war and that the American people must undergo its disciplines. If they do not undergo them voluntarily the time will come when they will thank God for some one who compelled them to do so.

Mr. President, this is total war. I was reading today that the Russian Army which whipped Napoleon was composed of 200,000 men. The present Russian Army is composed of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 men and it is struggling with the Germans. We ourselves are planning for an armed force of fully 11,000,000 men. All the population must stand by in the matter of manpower, the matter of production, the matter of sacrifice, and the matter of discipline, and hold its peace. Let us quit the miserable quarrels. Let us quit the light and airy joke about the situation, and realize that this is not a matter which involves any political party. It is not a matter which involves the political life of any man. We have reached the stage in which the whole American people must rise to the high levels of sacrifice and self-discipline.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] spoke a short while ago about government by law or government by Executive order. He was praying against government by Executive order. I will pray with him. But if we want to maintain government by law in the United States of America through the present situation the Congress must be equal, as a lawmaking body, to sustaining the processes of the disciplining of 130,000,000 democrats. I mean that in the generic sense and not in the party sense. We are used to having our way. We are used to obtaining a favor. We are accustomed to having the Government do our will. The time has come when we must become accustomed once in a lifetime to doing the will of the Government, and not to complain, and not to hesitate, and not to tarry.

Mr. President, we can make some progress by keeping alert; we can make some criticism which may be helpful; but we cannot stir this Republic with the fires of discontent and dissatisfaction in a situation such as now faces us and hope to get through.

We have another remedy for our inflation, another effort to control it, and that is the program of impoverishment by taxation—that is the proper word for it, too. It is not taxation for revenue. I think the present tax structure calls for approximately twenty-one or twenty-two billions of dollars, and I understand that the one which is proposed is to call for sixteen billion more. While the Government needs the revenue, the authorities do not hesitate to say to us that one of the objectives of the heavy taxation is to recapture and absorb the excess money in the market, to extinguish the buying power of the people. I hope we may not come to that, but come to it we will unless we arrest this competition or counterirritation as between wages to the workers on the one hand and prices to the farmers on the other. It is a gun behind the door. It is a control to which we must have recourse if nothing else will avail.

I am thinking that we have toyed with this program since October, we have debated about it to suit ourselves, we have complained and criticized. We have sympathized with our constituents and, I think, have encouraged the American people to believe that they might escape the disciplines of the situation, that we may have the war without having its horrors, that we may have the war economy and still have a good time with ourselves and with our money. But the hour has come when we must straighten up—not merely the Members of the Senate but the whole American people—and must prove ourselves equal to the disciplines entailed by circumstances. The very first thing we have got to do is to learn how to cooperate with the National Government and the national policies—all of us, Republicans and Democrats, farmers and workers, and everyone else. We have got to maintain this program, as I have just said, whatever the cost. We cannot retreat. We cannot give away here and recover there. We have laid down our line. We have erected our fortifications. We have established our controls. We cannot run away from them; and the last body in the world to run is the Senate of the United States.

I think I have something to say about that. Senators are leaders of the people in their States, whether they would so classify themselves or not. The people are looking to us. They do not know what to do; they do not know what to think. We may not be political leaders; we may not be political bosses; and we may not be able to have our way; but we are Senators. When the people in their homes all over the country begin to think about what is going on and about what to do, they are thinking in terms of the men whom they elected to represent them here. We cannot afford to give out an uncertain sound. If the watchmen on the tower give forth an uncertain sound, what shall the people say, and what shall the people do?

So, Mr. President, in this policy of cooperation we have got to give the American people a leadership in accepting the disciplines and controls demanded by the situation into which fate has cast us.

Now I come to the President's message. I shall be rather brief about it, I hope. When I first read the message it occurred to me as being the most earnest and one of the most important of all the President's messages to the Congress, and I lingered on the words. Here are his first words:

I am compelled to this action—

To this veto. Those are the words of the mighty man who is President, the man of whom so many of us are afraid lest he become a dictator. That is the leader of the Nation speaking for the national interest, and with all the powers of the Presidency; but he is compelled. What compels him?

I am compelled to this action by the deep conviction that this measure is inflationary in character. It breaks down the barriers we have erected and which we must maintain in order to avoid all the disasters of inflation.

That is not a scarecrow. That is not a bogey. That is not a boy crying "Wolf, wolf!" That is the President of the United States saying that the bill—

Breaks down—

Does not tend to break down, but breaks down—

the barriers we have erected and which we must maintain in order to avoid all the disasters of inflation.

The President then says:

It is wholly inconsistent with our stabilization program—

Meaning to say that it shoots that program all to pieces, it undoes the acts we have been enacting here, it destroys the program—

and therefore, dangerous alike to our constructive farm policy and to our whole war effort.

I believe the President's farm policy has been constructive, and I think something might be said here in behalf of the President as a friend of the farmer. I heard the letters from the farm agencies read today.

I have been in the Senate 12 years, and have seen acts to aid agriculture passed—a great tide of them—year after year, beginning with the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which I opposed when it was brought up in 1933, and continuing to the present hour. I am here to bear witness that the President of the United States has supported all those acts; he has been responsible for the passage of most of them. I do not deny that the farm organizations are friends of the farmers. Of course they are. But I think the President of the United States is a better friend of the farmers of the United States than are all the farm leaders and all the farm organizations, and I think the record will so show.

I read further from the President's message:

In my message of September 7, 1942, I advised the Congress that "our entire effort to hold the cost of living at its present level is now being sapped and undermined by further increases in farm prices and in wages, and by an ever-continuing pressure on prices resulting from the rising purchasing power of our people." I requested the Congress "to pass legislation under which the President would be specifically authorized to stabilize the cost of living, including the price of all farm commodities."

We cannot stabilize anything in America until we have stabilized the cost of living. There is no use in having any debate about that. I am for stabilizing wages; but how can we go about stabilizing wages until we stabilize the cost of living of the wage earner? The two things should be considered together. If we fail to do the first, we open the door to attacks from a thousand directions.

I shall not go into the argument of the President. It is perfectly satisfactory to me. It appears that he was attacked because of his interpretation of parity. I think a full answer to that attack occurs in four or five paragraphs of the message. However, I shall pass that by. I come to one sentence:

I have referred to the legislative history—

The history of parity—

only because of some of the criticisms of my action. I know that some Members of the Congress differ with my interpretation of the law. I credit them with sincerity. I ask that they credit me with equal sincerity.

I think that is a fair proposition. Agreed that there is debate about the interpretation; give the President credit for good faith. Give him credit for an interpretation in the interest of stabilization, and do not override his veto on the ground that he usurped power or acted improperly. Read his own explanation and see how it is reconciled with the interpretations of the Congress.

I come to page 4 of the message.

There has been an increase in the cost of living since May 1942. This increase is due mainly to our failure to bring food costs under control. But the War Labor Board is resolutely adhering to the Little Steel formula which compensates labor, in its wage rates, for the increase in the cost of living which occurred between January 1, 1941, and May 1, 1942.

The Board believes that if the formula is broken now it will start an inevitable inflationary spiral that would ultimately cancel out whatever gains labor has made, and place an intolerable burden on widows and old folks with fixed incomes, and on teachers and unorganized workers in low-paid occupations.

It will become impossible to hold this line if the cost of living is still further increased—not from imperative war needs, but by the action of the Congress in departing from its declared policy to stabilize all prices and wages.

* * * * *

If by this bill you force an increase in the cost of the basic foodstuffs—

No one denies that the bill would bring about an increase in the cost of sugar;

no one denies that it would bring about an increase in the cost of flour; no one denies that it would bring about an increase, indirectly, in other costs.

If by this bill you force an increase in the cost of the basic foodstuffs, and as a result the National War Labor Board increases wages, no one can tell where increases will start or what those increased wages will ultimately cost the farmers and all people of the Nation.

The President is dealing directly with the menace of inflation because of the failure of Congress and the country to recognize the necessity for stabilization.

Notice the last paragraph from the President's message. It begins in an odd way:

I appeal—

The President appeals, upon considerations duly set forth, to the considered judgment of the Congress to reject the Bankhead bill.

I appeal to the considered judgment of the Congress to reject the Bankhead bill which I am returning unsigned. It will not help the farmer with his immediate war difficulties. It will make it infinitely harder for the farmer to protect himself from wartime inflation and post-war chaos. It will add to the burdens of those most heavily burdened. It will make the winning of the war more difficult and gravely imperil our chances of winning the peace.

That is the judgment of the President, and that is the appeal of the President of the United States to the Congress. I do not think he has ever said anything to us of more solemn import than what he says in the last paragraph of his message. I reecho that appeal.

Ordinarily, and in time of peace, I might, with some lightness of heart, consider overriding a Presidential veto. I might simply say, "That is his judgment; this is mine, and I shall exercise mine." But even so, I should remember that the President was given the veto power in order that he might speak to me in the national interest, and I think I would hesitate. But in time of war, when he sends a bill back to us unsigned and appeals to us, in the name of winning the war, in the name of the welfare of the farmers, and in the name of winning the peace—when he makes an appeal such as that, I would have to have an overwhelming conviction, and an exceedingly great weight of evidence even to suggest to me that I override his veto.

In conclusion, if the Congress fails to bring about stabilization now, if the Congress now yields the line which we have erected, if the Congress now hesitates, if the Congress now waivers in sustaining the policy of stabilization, fully warned by the President and fully informed by events, we must take the responsibility for the consequences. As Abraham Lincoln said, "We shall not be able to escape history."

After this veto message and this warning, if we vote to override the veto, if we neglect to maintain control, and inflation comes, with chaos and disaster, history will lay the accusation at our feet and not at his.

Mr. President, our situation in this country is very good in many respects. I am inclined to think that the farmers have done and will do their part. I am not among those who say that unless we do this or that for them they will not produce. I have watched them for more than 60 years. They go forth in seed time and harvest, in the early and the latter rains, and bring home the wealth to feed themselves and their country.

I am not so much inclined to complain of the workers. I know there are excrescences, delinquencies, and bad aspects. But after all, measured by the miraculous production of the last 2 years, the workers have done quite well, and are doing better today.

Nor am I inclined to complain of the industrialists. The way in which they have gone about putting their capital, their energies, and their plants into war production is something to hearten every American. We owe it to those classes to do our duty, to maintain them, and to stabilize them. They cannot carry on if we shake the foundations under them.

With regard to our sons, there were people who said we had a softened and careless generation and that our young men—and, I may add, our young women—would not be equal to the ordeals of such a time as this. But we now know better. A million and a half are abroad, and probably 4,000,000 are in camps in this country, and millions more will follow. They are fine, manly, valiant fellows. Women are working in the factories and helping the men who are engaged in the various activities.

Of our soldiers and sailors overseas there are stories of Homeric heroism coming home to us every day. We read of those things, and we read of our young men doing just as well as the ancients in the great traditions of Roman and Greek literature. We have a right to be proud. We have a right to be grateful. We have a right to be courageous.

Mr. President, we also have an obligation. We must maintain this country back of our people in the armed services. We must maintain this country equal to them. We must maintain it solidly behind them, and maintain its competence to sustain them. We must move the whole country up to higher levels of discipline and self-sacrifice and eliminate selfishness, just as they have done.

Mr. President, the other night I read some lines written by a British poet by the name of Alfred Noyes. He lived during the First World War. He had attended a memorial service for British sailors held in Trinity Church in New York. He left the church undertaking to interpret his heart, his emotions, his duty, and his obligations.

Mr. President, we have our sailors and our soldiers. They are going forth by the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, to fill graves in other lands. We must measure our duty as we measure theirs for them, and as they measure theirs for themselves.

I read what the poet Noyes wrote on the occasion to which I have referred:

There's but one gift that all our dead desire,
One gift that men can give, and that's a dream,
Unless we, too, can burn with that same fire
Of sacrifice; die to the things that seem.

Die to the little hatreds, die to greed;
Die to the old ignoble selves we knew;
Die to the base contempts of sect and creed,
And rise again, like these, with souls as true.

Nay, since these died before their task was finished,
Attempt new heights, bring even their dreams to birth;
Build us that better world, oh, not diminished
By one true splendor that they planned on earth.

And that's not done by sword, or tongue, or pen,
There's but one way: God make us better men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I stated a few days ago that in my judgment the purposes and the issues involved in the bill, as well as the effect of the bill, have been misunderstood in some quarters. After further consideration, and after discussion with friends on the floor, I am convinced that more time should be given to appraise the situation, and allow Members of the Senate to better understand the issues, as well as the consequence of passing the bill over the President's veto. Recognizing that many factors are involved, and after consultation with associates and friends on both sides of the issue, I have decided to move that the bill, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Alabama to refer the bill with the accompanying papers to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. The motion is debatable. It is obvious that we cannot dispose of it today. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, I should like to have the Senate suspend until tomorrow. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no desire to resist the procedure suggested by the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is now 5 o'clock, and there will be some discussion of the motion of the Senator from Alabama, and I doubt that it would be proper to ask Senators to remain to vote tonight. Therefore, within a few minutes it will be my purpose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow.

CHILD-CARE MAINTENANCE UNDER LANHAM ACT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago a very great deal of discussion took place on the floor of the Senate concerning the use of Lanham

Act funds and applications being made for child-care centers and development of facilities for such purposes.

I took the matter up with the Federal Works Agency, with the request that General Fleming advise me so as to remove much of the confusion which seems to surround our thinking on the subject. He has brought us down to date in a splendid letter which I have received from him. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, March 25, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Responsive to your letter of March 18, I am glad to pass along certain data in which you have expressed interest relative to the activity of the Federal Works Agency in helping to meet the urgent need for supervisory care of school age or preschool age children of mothers who are filling or are about to fill jobs essential to the winning of the war.

All of us know that the employment of women workers is increasing in most war plants. Although there is a definite Federal policy against the recruiting of mothers of young children, a considerable number of such mothers are working. There are also working a very much larger number of mothers whose children are somewhat older but still in need of care. Quite apart from an understandable patriotic impulse to make some definite contribution to the war effort, many mothers have been impelled by economic considerations to take war jobs. This is especially true of the wives of soldiers whose allotments have been insufficient to meet family needs. Then too, from the standpoint of the employer, it has been found necessary in some crowded war industry areas to hire mothers even of small children because inadequate transportation and housing facilities have made it infeasible to bring in workers from the outside. A large proportion of these women workers are mothers of children from 2 years of age up to the age of 14. It is clearly necessary to make provision for the care of these children while their mothers are at work. Many communities are trying to provide facilities to meet this need.

Inevitably problems of financing arise. Some of the war-working mothers are earning wages above the average earned by women in peacetime. On the other hand, many earn only the minimum prescribed by the wage-and-hour or public-contracts laws, and are able to pay only a part of the cost for day care of their children. Similarly the resources of the communities are modest, and often strained. The Federal Works Agency is meeting these needs through strictly limited contributions to eligible applicants from Lanham Act funds to the extent that such funds are available. As you are aware, the Lanham Act expires 6 months after the emergency.

As of March 20, 1943, 29,800 children in war-affected communities had been provided for through nursery schools or extended school services aided by Lanham Act funds. Applications were pending for the care of 80,220 additional children in war-affected communities. Including applications approved and pending, a total of 110,020 children in war-affected communities shortly will be cared for with the assistance of Lanham Act funds. Of this total, approximately half are being cared for by nursery schools and the other half by centers for the care of school children from 6 to 14 before and after classes, while their mothers are at work. A total of $2,451,438 in Federal funds thus far has been approved by the President for the purpose. This sum will be increased, of course, as projects still pending are approved.

Applications may be made for Lanham Act funds for group services for children from 2 to 14 years old. Required to accompany all applications is a statement with supporting data showing the war needs for the activities for which funds are requested. Corroboration is obtained from employers. Before funds are granted a certificate of need is required from other Federal agencies, more especially from the United States Office of Education. Of 142 applications for nursery schools pending March 20 in the office of the Federal Works Agency, 126 were awaiting certificates of necessity from the Office of Education.

The applicant is responsible for the selection of children to whom the services shall be given. It is well understood, however, that services should be limited to children of working mothers. Enrollment is not limited to the children of parents working in any given plant. Employment in civilian trades and services and in agriculture, as well as in war factories, is considered an essential contribution to the war effort. Special justification is required from applicants for the care of other children, such as those living in trailers or migratory camps. Applicants must be public agencies, such as boards of education and welfare bodies, or such nonprofit private organizations as can show legal authority to operate the service requested.

The total amount of fees collected from parents plus other local contributions must be sufficient to defray at least 50 percent of the current operating costs of the program.

On January 1, 1943, there were approximately 1,500 Work Projects Administration nursery schools. Operation of these facilities by the Work Projects Administration will cease on or before April 30, 1943. Applications have been approved or are pending through which local communities will take over, with Federal Works Agency assistance under the Lanham Act, the majority of those—but only of those—which are meeting a war need. Since in the greater proportion of communities there is no local budgetary provision for this type of service the only presently established means of financing them is through local contributions of buildings, facilities, or services, fees to be collected from parents and Lanham Act funds.

Attached is a recapitulation of Lanham Act applications for child-care maintenance and operation facilities as of March 20, 1943, together with a list of locations of Lanham Act nursery schools and school services as of March 12, 1943. Some of the projects on this list have since been approved by the President.

If I can be helpful in clarifying any other points regarding the operation of the Federal Works Agency child-care program, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Status of Lanham applications for wartime school facilities (maintenance and operation of child-care facilities), Mar. 20, 1943

	Number of units	Number of children	Number of applications
Approved by the President:			
Nursery schools	475	16,315	79
Extended school services	251	13,485	[1] 48
Total	726	29,800	80
Pending: [2]			
Nursery schools	934	38,590	142
Extended school services	564	41,630	[1] 70
Total (of this total, 126 are awaiting certificate of necessity from the U. S. Office of Education)	1,498	80,220	145
Totals:			
Nursery schools	1,409	54,905	221
Extended school services	815	55,115	[1] 118
Grand total	2,224	110,020	225

Federal funds approved by the President, $2,451,438

[1] Application for extended school services is usually included in the application for nursery schools. To date there are only 4 separate applications for such services.

[2] Includes applications being reviewed in Washington, awaiting Board review, and awaiting certificate of necessity.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Marine Corps (and withdrawing several other nominations), which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward M. Connelly, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, vice Lyle D. Keith, resigned;

Charles W. Robertson, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota;

George Philip, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota;

Edmund J. Brandon, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts; and

Irving J. Higbee, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York, vice Ralph L. Emmons, term expired.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clarence Mullins, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama; new position.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Pannie Dixon Welch, of Columbia, Conn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn. (reappointment).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Stanley N. Bailey, from the State of California, to be assistant area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission;

James P. Blaisdell, from the State of California, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission;

William Royle, from the State of Nevada, to be area director for Nevada, at $4,600 per annum, in the Reno office of the War Manpower Commission;

Alexander C. Martin, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be principal manpower utilization consultant at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Orland V. Steele, from the State of Washington, to be senior administrative officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Walter L. Sundstrom, from the State of Washington, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Osborne B. Hardison to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 29, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis S. Low to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph R. Redman to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire from what committee the Public Health Service nominations come.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that they come from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TAFT. I have never seen any such nominations. I do not think there is anything very serious involved, but I do not remember any action by the Committee on Finance on several hundred Public Health Service nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no further information on the matter.

Mr. TAFT. I was merely curious to find from what committee the United States Public Health Service nominations came. I do not remember any action by the Committee on Finance on these nominations. It is not stated on the calendar from what committee they come.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot inform the Senator about it. They are on the calendar. I do not know when they were reported.

Mr. TAFT. I am a member of the Committee on Finance, and I do not remember any action by that committee on the nominations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I, too, am a member of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] reported the nominations.

EDWARD M. CONNELLY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, there is on the clerk's desk at the moment the nomination of Mr. Edward M. Connelly to be United States district attorney for the eastern district of Washington. The nomination is not on the calendar, but it has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered at this time and disposed of.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Connelly to be United States district attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6, 1943:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

William G. Winters, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

George Wolly, a citizen of Florida, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of June 1942.

John R. Napton, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942.

Francis J. O'Connor, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

Kenneth H. Sayre, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December 1942.

Platoon Sgt. George W. King, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of February 1943.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 6, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Reuben B. Resnik, to be field supervisor in the Dallas regional office.

George P. Williams, to be senior housing and transportation specialist in the Atlanta regional office.

George W. Caylor, to be senior manpower utilization consultant in the New York regional office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6, 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward M. Connelly to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be temporary medical directors from April 1, 1943:

Richard B. Holt	Frank V. Meriwether
Calvin C. Applewhite	Winfield K. Sharp, Jr.
Lynne A. Fullerton	
William Y. Hollingsworth	

To be temporary senior surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Alfred J. Arelmyer	George G. Holdt
George W. Bolin	Ernest E. Huber
Edwin H. Carnes	Gerald M. Kunkel
James A. Crabtree	John R. Murdock
Joseph O. Dean	William W. Nesbit
Warren P. Dearing	Edgar W. Norris
Alexander G. Gilliam	Robert H. Onstott
Ralph Gregg	Edward R. Pelikan
Victor H. Haas	Adolph S. Rumreich
Franklin J. Halpin	James B. Ryon
Claude D. Head, Jr.	Mark P. Schultz

William H. Sebrell, Jr.
Homer L. Skinner
Calvin B. Spencer
Fletcher C. Stewart
Joseph F. Van Ackeren
Gregory J. Van Beeck
Langdon R. White

To be temporary surgeons from April 1, 1943:

James C. Archer
Richard C. Arnold
Llewellyn L. Ashburn
Theodore J. Bauer
Fred J. Black
Bert R. Boone
Frederick J. Brady
Ralph R. Braund
Lawrence W. Brown
Leroy E. Burney
Roy E. Butler
Don S. Cameron
John W. Cronin
Dorland J. Davis
Thomas R. Dawber
Austin V. Deibert
Anthony Donovan
Virgil J Dorset
John E. Dunn
Harry Eagle
David C. Elliott
Robert H. Felix
Howard D. Fishburn
Robert H. Flinn
Havelock F. Fraser
Michael L. Furcolow
Edward B. Gall
Kenneth E. Gamm
Alfred B. Geyer
Eugene A. Gillis
William H. Gordon
James A. Grider, Jr.
Robert L. Griffith
Leland J. Hanchett
Floyd A. Hawk
Roger E. Heering
John R. Heller, Jr.
Clifton K. Himmelsbach
Henry A. Holle
John B. Holt
John W. Hornbrook
George H. Hunt
Benjamin F. Jones
Marion K. King
Harry C. Knight
Harold L. Lawrence
Benton O. Lewis
Albert G. Love, Jr.
Robert K. Maddock
Charles R. Mallary
Hollis U. Maness
Ralph W. McComas
John R. McGibony
Thorburn S. McGowan
Thomas B. McKneely
Charles T. Meacham, Jr.
Seward E. Miller
Ralph J. Mitchell
Edgar W. Moreland
Ward L. Mould
Marion B. Noyes
John W. Oliphant
Carroll E. Palmer
Donald W. Patrick
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr.
Michael J. Pescor
Arthur B Price
Thurman H. Rose
Leonard A Scheele
Walter E Sharpe, Jr.
Leslie McC Smith
Wilson T. Sowder
Charles G. Spicknall
James G. Telfer
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.
George G. Van Dyke
Seymour D. Vestermark
Victor H. Vogel
Paul E. Walker
James Watt
Waldemar J A. Wickman
Oliver C. Williams
John L. Wilson
William G. Workman
John T Wright
Francis T Zinn
Jonathan Zoole

To be temporary senior dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

David Cooper
Frederick W. Harper
James S. Miller
Allen M. Perkins

To be temporary dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

James O. Blythe, Jr.
Mark E. Bowers
William W. Calhoun, Jr.
Henry F. Canby
Edward J. Driscoll
Joseph J. Dunlay
Leonard R. Etzenhouser
Bruce D. Forsyth
John M. Francis
Donald J. Galagan
Charles B. Galt
George E. Jones
John W. Knutson
William P. Kroschel
Frank E. Law
Ralph S. Lloyd
Clovis E. Martin
Oscar Mikkelsen
Robert H Moore
Walter J. Pelton
Robert A. Scroggie
Dwight K. Shellman
Leland E Weyer

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Frederick K. Albrecht
William S. Baum
Buell B. Bindschedler
William G. Budington
Wayne W. Carpenter
Nunzio J. Carrozzo
Michael J. Clarke
Bruce Cominole
John C. Cutler
Selwyn H Drummond
Henry D. Ecker
George F. Ellinger
James A. Finger
Vernon W. Foster
Timothy J. Haley
Jesse D. Harris
William S. Hotchkiss
Dean B. Jackson
Linden E. Johnson
Arnold B. Kurlander
Stephen J. Lange
John L. Lincoln
Robert N. Lord
Paul W. Lucas
Joseph A. Moore
Douglas S Nisbet
Raymond S Roy
Albert N Sarwold
David W. Scott, Jr.
Richard C. Siders
James A. Smith
Randall W Snow
James L. Southworth
William H Stimson
Evert A. Swensson
Ray H. Vanderhook
Verne C. Waite
Roy E. Wolfe

To be temporary passed assistant dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Vernon J. Forney
Francis J. Walters

To be temporary pharmacists from April 1, 1943:

Thomas C. Armstrong
Raymond D. Kinsey
Clarence H. Bierman

To be temporary senior sanitary engineers from April 1, 1943:

Henry A Johnson
Charles T. Wright

To be temporary sanitary engineers from April 1, 1943:

Allen D. Brandt
Mark D. Hollis
Vincent B. Lamoureux
James H. LeVan
Henry A. Johnson
Charles T. Wright

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Francis S. Low to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 27, 1942.

Joseph R. Redman to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 1, 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clyde A. Brooks
Maxie R. Williams
Harry O. Buzhardt
John C. Lundrigan
Houston Stiff
John C. Sheffield, Jr.
William P. Oliver
John Lovell
William M. Graham, Jr.
William P. Nesbit
Roland H. Makowski
Edward H. Greason
Andrew Andeck
James P. Young, Jr.
Albert F. Topham
William H. Clark
Harry L. Givens, Jr.
William E. Maiser
Horace C. Reifel

POSTMASTERS

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant.
Alice L. Robertson, Pope.
James Vertner Gage, Port Gibson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

How manifold are Thy mercies, our Heavenly Father, upon earth. We praise Thee for a Saviour who died on a cross that love had stricken bare. We pray that we may humble ourselves and be lifted into the upper air of spiritual aspiration; allow not temptation to befall us nor to weaken or wither our powers. Send us forth today with broader thoughts and nobler qualities to build into the circles of life that men may love and honor our country; this is possible only with a new heart and right spirit as lived by good parents, obedient children, just masters, and honest servants.

Blessed Lord, time is priceless, and we pray that we may unite our powers so that our supreme passion shall be our country, forever one and inseparable. Send Thy benediction upon every heart so that youth and age shall be free to walk the lanes and streets of this world. Merciful Father, in this time of woe and anguish reconcile us to assume our urgent responsibility to take our full share in dethroning the hierarchies of inhumanity; give us that peace which nothing can out-weary because our minds are stayed on Thee. In the name of Thy well-beloved Son. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from 11 memorials and resolutions just received as being passed by the Montana Legislature. I am not inserting the memorials themselves. I am taking out the gravamen of these memorials and resolutions and asking to insert them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from my district on the Rumi plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include an editorial in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 201

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 201) from the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the time allowed for taking testimony in the election contest, James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, shall be extended for a period of 65 days, beginning April 12, 1943, and the testimony shall be taken in the following order:

The contestant shall take testimony during the first 30 days, the contestee shall take testimony during the succeeding 30 days, and the contestant shall take testimony in rebuttal only during the remaining 5 days of said period.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a concurrent resolution of the State Legislature of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter, a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Lester F. Alexander, president of the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by James B. Carry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA ORANGES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy and generosity of one of my good neighbors, Mr. Harry Damerel, a citrus grower in the San Gabriel Valley, Los Angeles County, Calif., I bring to the House of Representatives today the compliments not only of Mr. Damerel and myself but of the State of California in the form of several boxes of the world's finest oranges, which you will find in the cloakrooms and which I hope Members will take proper advantage of.

As you eat them, I trust you will gain from their sweetness and from the excellent nutritive and vitamin content thereof something of the greatness of the State from which they came.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement prepared by the Alaska committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

JAKOB ZOLLER

The Clerk called the first bill, H. R. 192, for the relief of Jakob Zoller.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr. CLEVENGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

JOSEPH ARREAS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2172, for the relief of Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes, shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding proceeding rests, and he shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted at Baltimore, Md., on September 15, 1927, as an immigrant for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Portuguese quota of the first year that the Portuguese quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZEL M. LEWIS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 52, for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Hazel M. Lewis, of Powers, Oreg., the sum of $1,798.85, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for damages as a result of personal injuries sustained by Hazel M. Lewis when assaulted by Richard T. Foster, an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps assigned to Camp China Flats F-105, Fifty-four Hundred and Forty-third Company, on September 5, 1938, at Powers, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD BARKER

The Clerk read the next bill, S. 404, for the relief of Richard Barker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard Barker, of Lockport, La., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in moving his residence adjoining the Government right-of-way due to caving of the bank of the Intracoastal Waterway Canal, at Lockport, La., during the year 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORREST W. DICKEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 235, for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Forrest W. Dickey, the sum of $25,000, plus all medical and surgical expenses in the amount of $882.05, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by said Forrest W. Dickey, who was shot without provocation by an armed soldier of the United States Army at Barstow, Calif., on January 27, 1942. The said Forrest W. Dickey will be maimed and physically incapacitated for the balance of his natural life: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 5, strike out the remainder of page 1 and all of page 2 and insert the following: "of Bakersfield, Calif., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, sustained when shot without provocation by an armed soldier of the United States Army at Barstow, Calif., on January 27, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LILA A. WEMP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 292) for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp.

Mr. BUFFETT, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ALVA BURTON RICKEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alva Burton Rickey, 615 North Alphine Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif., the sum of $5,583.29. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alva Burton Rickey against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on June 29, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving was in collision with a United States Army truck on Golden State Highway No. 99, near Tulare, Calif.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Rickey", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the language, "810 South Spring St., Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $4,443.15, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, sustained when the automobile he was driving and a United States Army truck collided on United States Highway No. 99, near Visalia Airport, Calif., on June 29, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT H. PULLIAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1557) for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert H. Pulliam, of Walnut, Miss., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained as a result of the collision of the car in which he was riding and a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on September 20, 1941, near Walnut, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$700."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOSEPH SPEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1597), for the relief of Joseph Spear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph Spear, New Orleans, La., the sum of $272.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joseph Spear against the United States for losses incurred as the result of personal injuries sustained on November 19, 1941, in an accident involving an Army truck on United States Highway No. 171 at its intersection with United States Highway No. 90, near Lake Charles, La.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$272.25", strike out period and insert in lieu thereof a comma, and strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the language "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained when a United States Army truck struck an automobile at the intersection of United States Highway No. 171 and United States Highway No. 90, near Lake Charles, La., on November 19, 1941."

Add at end of bill ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANUEL G. SOUZA AND MANUEL SOUZA, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1837) for the relief of Manuel G. Souza and Manuel Souza, Jr.

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

H. M. REID & CO., MACON, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2067) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga., for damages sustained as a result of allegedly being wrongfully deprived of the right to cut timber on certain land acquired by the United States in the State of Florida.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of the bill, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in the trial of said cause, the Government shall be permitted to avail itself of all defenses to which it is entitled under the law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JENNIE WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of Jennie Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jennie Walker, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the personal injury resulting when she was struck by a United States mail truck on May 2, 1941, in Tacoma, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of the services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARION O. CASSADY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 309) for the relief of Marion O. Cassady.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Marion O. Cassady, a deputy United States marshal in the western district of Kentucky, the sum of $1,000, to reimburse him on account of personal and property damages sustained by him on and about January 3, 1942, while in the discharge of his official duties as a deputy United States marshal.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Marion O. Cassady", add the language "of 2328 Mount Clair Avenue, Louisville, Ky."

Page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", strike out the language "$1,000, to reimburse him on account of personal and" and insert in lieu thereof the language "$400, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

At end of bill strike out period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. HAROLD SHACKLEFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. Harold Shackleford, Washington, Ind., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. Harold Shackleford against the United States on account of the serious and permanent personal injury sustained by him on February 11, 1942, in Burns City, Ind., when he was struck, while engaged in his lawful occupation, by a bullet fired by a marine on sentry duty at the naval ammunition depot.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the language "$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. Harold Shackleford against the United States on account of the serious and permanent personal injury" and insert in lieu thereof the language "$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries."

At end of bill strike out period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EAST COAST SHIP AND YACHT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corporation, at Noank, Conn.

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MR. AND MRS. JUAN RAMIREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 159) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez, of Mesquite, N. Mex., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their daughter, Anita Ramirez, as the result of being struck by a Soil Conservation Service truck, operated by Alonzo Zamarripa, a Civilian Conservation Corps camp assistant, on April 12, 1938, south of Mesquite, N. Mex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of," strike out the language "$7,500, in full satisfaction of their claim" and insert in lieu thereof the language "$2,000, in full settlement of all claims."

At the end of bill, strike out period, insert comma and add the words: "and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LYNN MORROW AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estate of Maurice Jones, and Mrs. Avis McDonald.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Lynn Morrow, Fort Valley, Ga. $100; to Mrs. W. A. Jones, Fort Valley, Ga., $350; to the administrator or executor of the estate of Maurice Jones, Fort Valley, Ga., $11,000; and to the administrator or executor of the estate of Mrs. Avis McDonald, Fort Valley, Ga., $10,000: The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of Mary Lynn Morrow, damage to the automobile of Mrs. W. A. Jones, injury and death of Maurice Jones, and injury and death of Mrs. Avis McDonald, when struck by a United States Army plane, while seated in a parked automobile near Harris Field, Peach County, Ga., on June 2, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "the", strike the words "administrator or executor" and insert in lieu thereof the words "duly authorized representative."

Page 1, line 9, strike the figures "$11,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,404.55."

Page 1, line 9, after the words "to the", strike the words "administrator or executor" and insert in lieu thereof the words "duly authorized representative."

Page 1, line 10, strike the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,428.78"; and strike period at end of line and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

Page 2, line 1, strike "The payment of such sums shall be."

At end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

E. F. HATHORN AND E. D. HATHORN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1041, for the relief of E. F. Hathorn and E. D. Hathorn.

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. PRIEST objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK, HUNTSVILLE, TEX.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1321, for the relief of the First National Bank, of Huntsville, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 854, an identical bill, be substituted for the bill H. R. 1321.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank, Huntsville, Tex., the sum of $105.61, in full settlement of the claim of the said bank on account of two checks, numbered 4120725 and 5455048, dated November 1, 1940, in the amounts of $27.66 and $77.95, respectively, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, over symbol No. 894-404, in favor of Jesse Cooper Hickman, and cashed by the said bank on the endorsement of Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman as temporary guardian, such checks thereafter being erroneously canceled by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and the amounts thereof included in a new check issued to Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to relieve the said Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman from any liability to the United States on account of any amounts improperly received by her: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1321) was laid on the table.

REUBEN T. LITTLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1583, for the relief of Reuben T. Little.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of Reuben T. Little, of Fort Smith, Ark., in the sum of $70.66, for per diem and mileage during the month of January and February 1, 1941, when he was employed by the Federal Housing Administration, Little Rock, Ark., such amount being disallowed on account of change in official station from Little Rock, Ark., to Fort Smith, Ark.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIDA B. ROGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1627, for the relief of Vida B. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Vida B. Rogers, of Rapid City, S. Dak., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction and settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Walter S. Rogers, who was killed on April 20, 1942, when his automobile was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 14 between Rapid City and Sturgis, S. Dak.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,194."

At end of bill strike out period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SARAH ANN ELIZABETH HOLLIDAY FOXWORTH AND ETHEL ALLENE BROWN HABERFELD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1712, for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth, the widow of P. E. Foxworth, an assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and the sum of $5,000 to Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld, the widow of Harold D. Haberfeld, a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the said Foxworth and Haberfeld having been killed in an airplane accident in Dutch Guiana on January 15, 1943, in the line of their official duties.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill change the period to a colon and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LEONARD LEWIS GAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1783, for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Lewis Gay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Leonard Lewis Gay, Carlsbad, N. Mex., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Leonard Lewis Gay against the United States on account of the loss of one eye and damage to the other eye sustained by him on January 16, 1942, by an exploding cartridge as a result of the United States Army maneuvers, Louisiana.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out name "Lewis" and insert in lieu thereof initial "L."

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the language "$3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Leonard L. Gay by an exploding cartridge during United States Army maneuvers in Louisiana on January 16, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay."

LEW O. CALHOUN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2129, authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 258, an identical bill, for the bill H. R. 2129.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed (1) to consider the claim against the United States of Lew O. Calhoun, of Marshfield, Oreg., arising out of an allotment of his pay to the National Bank of Tacoma, Tacoma, Wash., while the said Lew O. Calhoun was an enlisted man in the United States Army during the World War, and (2) to certify to the Congress any amount found to be due the said Lew O. Calhoun as a result of the making of such allotment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2129) was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE LUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2130, for the relief of Christine Lund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 257, an identical Senate bill, for H. R. 2130.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christine Lund, of Lane County, Oreg., care of Slattery and Slattery, Eugene, Oreg., the sum of $2,646, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her when struck on December 16, 1937, at 1½ miles north of Florence, Oreg., by an automobile of the United States operated by H. T. Schinaman, an employee of the Lighthouse Service, then engaged in the performance of his duties as such employee.

SEC. 2. The payment authorized to be made by this act shall not be made until the said Christine Lund has released, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, any judgment or other claim arising out of such accident which she may have against the said H. T. Schinaman.

SEC. 3. *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2130) was laid on the table.

EVERETT A. ALDEN, ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2312, for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Eruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are hereby canceled the claims of the United States against Everett A. Alden (formerly Chief, Duplicating Section, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and now Chief, Duplicating Unit, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $218.51, against Robert Bruce (formerly Chief, Machine Tabulation Section, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and formerly Chief, Machine Tabulation Unit, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $427.74; against Edgar C. Faris, Jr. (formerly Assistant Secretary, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and now Chief, Records Section, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $669.73; against Kathryn W. Ross (formerly senior clerk-stenographer, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and now senior clerk-stenographer, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $218.51; against Charles L. Rust (formerly Assistant Chief, Voucher Audit Section, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and now Assistant Chief, Voucher Audit Unit, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $109.25; and against Frederick C. Wright (formerly Assistant Chief, Central Graphic Section, National Bituminous Coal Commission, and now Assistant Chief, Central Graphic Unit, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior) in the amount of $109.25; arising from the fact that the rate of compensation for personal services to each above-named person authorized by the National Bituminous Coal Commission was, during all or part of the period from June 28, 1939, to February 28, 1941, both dates included, in excess of the average of the compensation rates specified by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the grade under which the position of such person was classified, contrary to the provisions of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939, the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, whereby each such person became and was liable to make restitution to the United States in the amount by which the compensation paid to him or her exceeded the amount lawfully payable; and the Comptroller General is hereby directed to allow credit in the accounts of the disbursing officer and to cancel any claims against the certifying officers for such payments of compensation so made.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANE THAYER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1870, for the relief of Jane Thayer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. BUFFETT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the bills H. R. 2351, to amend title I, section 5, of the Alien Registration Act, 1940 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 9); and H. R. 2352, to amend title I, sections 1, 3, and 5, of the Alien Registration Act, 1940 (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 9 and 11), were referred to the Committee on Immigration. I ask unanimous consent that these bills be re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Union Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a bill I introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], ranking minority member of the committee, and myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises tonight.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think that will give us ample opportunity to debate this measure and for those who desire to make speeches on other subjects to be heard also.

I have no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that general debate on the bill shall continue throughout the afternoon, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California, the first section of the bill to be read before the Committee rises?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	O'Toole
Arnold	Gilchrist	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gordon	Plumley
Barden	Gorski	Poulson
Bates, Ky.	Green	Randolph
Bates, Mass.	Griffiths	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Guyer	Robertson
Bonner	Hale	Robsion, Ky.
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Rogers, Calif.
Bradley, Pa.	Hinshaw	Rolph
Burgin	Howell	Rowan
Byrne	Izac	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Sadowski
Case	Judd	Schwabe
Clark	Kearney	Sheppard
Compton	Kee	Sheridan
Cooley	Kelley	Sikes
Costello	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Cox	Lambertson	Smith, Va.
Culkin	Lewis, Colo.	Sparkman
Cullen	McGranery	Spence
D'Alesandro	McKenzie	Stevenson
Dawson	Maas	Thomason
Dies	Madden	Tolan
Dingell	Magnuson	Treadway
Dirksen	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Doughton	May	Walter
Elliott	Merrow	Wasielewski
Ellison, Md.	Miller, Conn.	Weaver
Englebright	Mott	Weiss
Fisher	Murphy	Wene
Fogarty	Myers	White
Ford	Newsome	Winter
Furlong	Norman	Woodrum, Va.
Gavagan	O'Brien, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2397, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a policy which has been adopted by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which, in my judgment, may well be followed by the various committees of the House of Representatives.

There is frequently a great deal of misunderstanding and lack of collaboration between the legislative and administrative branches of the Government. That misunderstanding and lack of cooperation are frequently due to the fact that very seldom the representatives of these two branches of the Government have an opportunity to get together and confer. Consequently when the administrative authorities come before our respective committees with reference to bills pending before those committees we have an accumulation of misunderstanding for approximately 1 year.

In order to keep current with the business of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, especially insofar as it pertains to housing under legislation emanating from that committee, we are holding on the first Tuesday of each month an informal conference of the committee and these administrative authorities so that the necessary explanations can be made, misunderstandings obviated, and collaboration and cooperation increased. If any Member of the House of Representatives has a problem in his district bearing upon legislation emanating from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, we shall be glad to have that Member appear at these stated meetings on the first Tuesday of each month in order that the necessary explanations and corrections may be made.

If this policy were followed by the various legislative committees of the House of Representatives, in my opinion, we could with very much greater smoothness and efficiency get the laws which we enact administered in accordance with the legislative intent. We are, insofar as we know, pioneers in this field of collaboration, and we hope that we are setting a laudable example for the other committees of the Congress. And I may say that the administrative authorities have indicated their complete accord with this program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on inaugurating this program. I am wondering if he would not be good enough to extend this invitation to all Members of the House rather than to those who may have problems? I think the gentleman's program should be adopted; and if he will set the example and allow us to come in and see what he is doing, we who are serving on other committees may urge our chairmen to do likewise. Therefore, I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will extend his invitation to all Members rather than to those who have problems concerning matters pending before his committee.

Mr. LANHAM. The invitation, of course, is extended to all Members, but specifically to those who have problems concerning which our committee may help in the solution.

The first meeting of that character was held in our committee room this morning. It was very, very helpful. We were able to eliminate a great deal of the confusion that exists and to effect a basis of mutual effort to carry out the laws in accordance with the legislative intent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted to hear of the gentleman's innovation so far as the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is concerned. I am only sorry that I did not know about this meeting today before this, because just over the week end a very serious problem respecting defense housing has arisen in my congressional district. If I had thought that the committee was having that sort of meeting this morning, I certainly would have appeared. It strikes me as a very fine innovation on the part of the committee. However, the committee will not meet again for the same purpose for another month. My problem must be taken care of very shortly.

Mr. LANHAM. In the meantime I would suggest to the gentleman, who was a former distinguished member of this committee, that he confer with the administrative authorities, and the committee will be glad to be of any assistance possible in getting his problem solved.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I think the arrangement proposed by my distinguished friend from Texas is very valuable. I am wondering if it would violate the Constitution of the United States if we could get these executive heads on the floor of the House to give us all information at one time.

Mr. LANHAM. I defer, of course, to the judgment of my very erudite and distinguished friend from New Jersey as to whether that could be done without some amendment of the law or Constitution. But the policy which we have inaugurated, of course, can be carried out without any legislation and I think it will afford an abundant opportunity to keep current with reference to these problems and not have an accumulated mass of misunderstanding annually.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I, too, want to congratulate the chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, of which

I was at one time a member and served with the gentleman.

I am sorry I did not know you had this meeting, because just now I received the following telegram from the Governor of Nebraska:

Schools not eligible for Lanham Act funds unless they show deficit in operating costs. Going broke to get aid is wrong principle. Federal Government should assume all increased educational costs in local schools due to war activities in school district. Condition serious in many Nebraska communities where airports have been built.

I am sure it was not the committee's intent that a State would have to go broke to ask benefits from the Lanham fund. I am sure that is not the philosophy of the chairman.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and those of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] indicate the wisdom of the policy the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has adopted. I hope this example will be generally followed in order that legislation may be administered in accordance with the intent of those who enacted it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my debate on the State Department appropriation, I want to read a telegram I have just received from Andrew J. Higgins, of New Orleans. This telegram was also sent to the various Members of the Louisiana delegation in the House and to the two United States Senators from Louisiana. It reads as follows:

The following telegram was sent to Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana:

"Associated Press dated Washington, April 1, carried account Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, charged that Donald Nelson had made a serious mistake in permitting Higgins Aircraft, Inc., to build and equip a plywood factory in New Orleans, stating such plant was not definitely needed, that the approval given would cost into millions of dollars, that industry experts advised establishment of such plant was a direct threat to war production, that records of the War Production Board and the Aircraft Scheduling Unit at Wright Field proved present industries were producing more aircraft plywood than needed, that the keymen and personnel required was manpower problem, as keymen and personnel would have to be acquired from present northern plywood manufacturers."

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana, has telegraphed to the undersigned Andrew J. Higgins, Sr., a copy of a telegram given him and apparently sent to other United States Senators. The telegram was signed by Lawrence Ottinger, president of the United States Plywood Corporation, and also reputedly one of the most active men in the plywood industry, its organizations and combines. It is alleged and believed by many that the United States Plywood Corporation has contracts with or otherwise handles the output or has some control over the sales of many plywood manufacturers not actually owned outright by the United States Plywood Corporation. It is significant that Ottinger would refer to his previous connection with Plywood and Veneer Section of the War Production Board. He did not refer to the fact that at the present time there are several principals in the Plywood and Veneer Section of the War Production Board that were recently active in the veneer and plywood industry and also in the plywood manufacturers' associations.

The telegram sent by Ottinger to Senator OVERTON follows:

"The Higgins Industries, of New Orleans, La., have been granted equipment by Executive order for the manufacture of plywood over the protest of the War Production Board and the Aircraft Scheduling Unit at Wright Field. The plywood industry, including many small manufacturers, has at its own expense so equipped itself that its production is now several times present or anticipated requirements. The granting of machinery and equipment as well as the buildings for a plywood plant to Higgins, who has no experience, with Louisiana as a very bad location, is a waste of public funds and interference with the war effort and involves the use of a large quantity of critical materials needed for other purposes. As we operate large plant in your State we request you immediately to file a vigorous protest with Senator TRUMAN and Donald Nelson. The undersigned was until recently technical consultant to the Plywood and Veneer Section of the War Production Board.

"LAWRENCE OTTINGER."

Contrary to Senator WILEY's misinformation the veneer and plywood machinery including buildings will cost considerably less than $500,000, not as stated into the millions of dollars.

It is a well-known fact there is largely in the Northern States and on the Pacific coast a considerable amount of veneer and plywood facilities and many if not most of these must secure the logs and the veneer for the plywood facilities in locations remote from the location of the plants. The movement of logs from point of growth over long distances is double burden on the railroad transportation system particularly as but 50 percent of the finest selected logs can produce veneers that will pass the rigid inspection for aircraft use. Less than 5 percent of aircraft veneer is producible from the No. 1 and up run of the forest. New Orleans is the chief and cheapest port of entry for Central and South American mahogany. Why ship these logs to the North and again burden the railroad transportation with a rehaul on the veneer or the plywood? Temperatures and humidity cannot be controlled in railroad cars; again there is considerable breakage in transportation. The plywood manufacturing groups and their spokesmen in the Plywood and Veneer Section of the War Production Board claim there is sufficient capacity for the present aircraft manufacturing need. If this is so then why has it been the case repeatedly and why is it the case right at this time that we have been unable to secure proper quantities or deliveries of plywood panels of poorer—that is, an easier—specification for our use in bulkheads in motor torpedo boats or get adequate deliveries in sufficient quantities of ordinary gum and/or fir plywood panels for building barges for the Army? Our plants have shut down repeatedly because even the largest of plywood manufacturers do not make deliveries of a common medium grade specification of plywood panels for vitally needed landing craft. These are not claims or allegations but facts that can be proven by us and the United States Navy and the United States Army. Sometime ago in desperate need, we financed a small plywood plant in Louisiana but found purveyors of the necessary veneers for making plywood asked exorbitant prices for same and many veneer plants with surpluses on hand refused to sell. We refused to give one of these veneer manufacturers a letter they requested for their assistance in their effort to get allocation of ship tonnage for additional mahogany logs. We made this refusal because of the exorbitant prices they asked. We understand that the Office of Price Administration has not as yet put ceiling prices on veneer. What are the facts and the records of these people who talk about waste of taxpayers' funds and speak of retarding the war effort? Before Pearl Harbor one big veneer concern required a high price of $42.50 per thousand for one-eighth mahogany veneer, rotary cut from the run of sawmill logs. In September 1942 they raised the price on the same material to $69 per thousand and strangely other producers asked similar prices. As a comparison, before Pearl Harbor, Higgins Industries was building tank-carrying lighters at a cost of $32,000. Since Pearl Harbor this equipment has been improved and enlarged and the cost has been progressively reduced down to $18,200 per unit. Similar reductions have been made on all articles we manufacture in spite of increasing cost of materials and labor. We recently voluntarily refunded to the Navy over $3,000,000 on contracts competitively taken at lowest price. Improved manufacturing technique, control of and low overhead costs, patriotic and hardworking, earnest craftsmen have made these low costs possible, coupled with maximum quantity production; and, again, all made possible because on our own initiative and at our own risk and expense, we created and obtained facilities necessary for the accomplishments. Contrary to Senator WILEY's opinion or statement this small new plant is definitely, if not desperately, needed to insure success in rapidly, properly, and cheaply completing contract for Army's plywood cargo planes. We can control and develop high standards and effect advancements and improvements in the making of bonded wood for the improvement and advancement of aircraft fabrication and construction. A plant at New Orleans will not be paying freight on waste or offal.

Contrary to expressed opinion of Senator WILEY we do not and will not need additional keymen as we are very competent and well staffed and have been conducting research and have achieved important developments and improvements by our own efforts and at expense of Higgins Industries, Inc., and at no cost to the Government. Again, contrary to Mr. Ottinger's statement that we have no experience, I was an important factor in the timber business and manufacturing and exporting all forest products since 1907.

I also had extensive dealings with the German trusts or cartels in plywood and have had some dealing and considerable knowledge of German cartels, interest in control of synthetic resins as used in many plants of the American plywood industry. It is very strange that the plywood cartels are so actively opposed and concerned that this facility, long needed and justified by all economics, should be established here in the South. This possibly accounts for Mr. Ottinger's statement that Louisiana is a very bad location.

Presume Mr. Ottinger will admit plywood and veneer plants in the North have to depend on the South for a big percentage of the logs. Ottinger's statement that the scheduling unit at Wright Field protested these facilities is not correct. He also states that equipment which has been on order, and which is now nearly completed or ready for shipment, involves the use of a large quantity of critical materials and that this is unfair to other existing plants; then why is this a crime in face of the great amount of machinery furnished to many of the northern plywood corporation group or manufacturers associated or possibly combined with them? A representative of Haskelite made the statement to us recently that they had obtained from the Government approximately $4,000,000 of veneer machinery to go into a plant in a northern State location although their source of supply for timber most likely lies largely in the Southern States. The log supply for our small plant at New

Orleans will come largely by barge or by raft down the many rivers from the banks of which and the adjacent territory where timber abounds. The lumber and the off fall below airplane grade veneers, will relieve another alleged critical item.

It is a recognized fact that there are many changes during manufacture of airplanes. If we depended on remotely located suppliers for veneers or panels, such to be expected change orders would multiply the difficulties, whereas a small plant here being elastic and facile for our needs will prevent delays. The Higgins Industries and its large organization and plants were built without 1 cent of Government subsidy. This organization has absorbed considerable costs of research and development and has many years of experience not alone in timber and lumber but in veneers, but more particularly in the latest techniques and practice in bonding of all species of woods.

This has been a contribution for the benefit of all in the war effort. This small plywood facility is needed to advance and improve the fabrication and the manufacture of cargo planes of wood for the Army Air Corps. The facility is to be provided by the Defense Plant Corporation. There is no contract with the Defense Plant Corporation whatsoever, for any of our interests taking over these facilities at any time during or after the war. We volunteered and insisted on negotiating the lowest-fee contract for the manufacture of these planes.

Despite many handicaps, accidentally or intentionally imposed, we are considerably ahead of schedule in building facilities and preparation for manufacturing the airplanes, and if we are not hindered by ignorance or by greed, or by red tape we will construct these planes excellently, fast and at a surprisingly low cost. The Government and the taxpayers will benefit by our efforts and the war may be won the sooner.

We intend to submit to the United States Attorney General's Office a considerable accumulation of facts and circumstances that some time ago forewarned us of the objections and obstructions and the protests that have been made and are now being made.

We ask on the basis of simple common sense that continued protests and hindrances be stopped regardless of the possible inconvenience our operation of a Government-owned facility may cause certain manufacturers during or after the war.

We ask you to analyze Mr. Ottinger's statement that "the plywood industry including many small manufacturers has at its own expense so equipped itself that its production has now several times their present or." The question arises, Did they do this to stifle the building of veneer and plywood facilities at a seaport at which the mahogany logs arrive and at New Orleans the local point for many rivers down which could be rafted large quantities of timber that now is being picked over for the choice logs to be shipped to the North by railroads?

At the risk of burdening this telegram I do not consider extraneous the comment that there is a wide range of interpretation and considerable latitude allowed under the present Army and Navy specifications of plywood. Obtaining plywood from different sources involves many important matters such as moisture control and the variance of humidity at the plants in different locations and the exposure of panels or fabrications not alone to the burden of freight breakage but to changes caused by various fluctuations in humidity and in temperature. On the contrary we will control all the conditions from the felling of the tree to the finished plane, maintain uniform and high standards, and develop new processes and improvements so that the planes we build can be flown by your son or mine with safety.

We have been advised by the various manufacturers that had been in default on deliveries their inability was due to scarcity of logs, scarcity of veneers, or labor troubles. These facilities at New Orleans will not have any of these burdens.

We have the timber available cheaply transportable from point of growth by flotation or by barging.

We have ample storage and no labor troubles. Labor here for this operation is abundant and loyal and we are not exposed to the threat of strikes because there exists here a proper understanding and cooperation between management and labor.

Ottinger has charged the granting of machinery and equipment is a waste of public funds. In this connection Higgins Industries, as a private concern, endeavored to secure this equipment a considerable time ago at its own cost but this attempt was blocked. In this connection Higgins Industries still stand ready to purchase the equipment for their own account and cost if it were now possible to so arrange.

At this point for clarification Higgins Industries in all their plants and activities are a private concern and have received no Federal financial help or any subsidy. Be it understood that Higgins Aircraft is actually an agent of the Government building facilities for the Defense Plant Corporation without fee and operating same on a contract with the Army Air Corps to build 1,200 cargo planes at a fee of 3 percent which fee we insisted upon and is considerably lower than any other similar contract. In addition several important officers, including A. J. Higgins, Sr., president, have been working for the Aircraft Corporation without a salary, their reward being an expected successful production in the war effort.

By incorporating these facilities in the Defense Plant Corporation project producing for the Army Air Corps, there will be no excessive profits as may be desired elsewhere, the low cost production of plywood and veneers, burdened only with the low agents fee of 3 percent.

Plywood manufacturers attempted to justify their terrific high cost of aircraft plywood—attribute it necessary due to their acknowledged heavy losses for nondisposal of rejections and off falls and freight cost burdens.

These facilities are a proper economical development for the South at any time but are a vital one in time of war.

In view of the great efforts made to block this project Donald Nelson and his deputy, Charles Wilson, displayed both courage and good judgment in approving the project.

ANDREW J. HIGGINS,
President, Higgins Industries, Inc.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I shall start my debate on the appropriation. My remarks shall be confined to the appropriation asked by the State Department.

For 1942 the State Department asked for $700,300. For 1943 the State Department asked for $1,685,000, an increase of almost 300 percent. For 1944 the State Department is asking for $6,000,000, or an increase over 1942 of approximately 900 percent.

Mr. Chairman, to get down into this proposition I am going to take up some of your time. I am not going to try to burden you with too many figures, yet I am going to go step by step and try to give you, to a certain extent, exactly what the State Department is trying to do in regard to getting far more money than it should get and than it is entitled to.

Let us begin with agriculture. It says here: No. 1. Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and development of complementary agricultural products other than rubber, $4,028,200. In the 1942 appropriation Congress gave them only $36,775, and the 1943 appropriation was halved when they asked for $200,000.

The State Department now asks for a bureau of plant industry for the development of rubber production, asking for $275,000. The last appropriation was $150,000 for 1943.

There are many agencies of the Federal Government that are today doing everything they possibly can to get all the rubber they can out of South America and the Central American countries. You can bet your last dollar that the State Department will not get 1 pound of rubber out of South America no matter how much money you give them. You have in full charge of the rubber production, Mr. William Jeffers, who incidentally is doing a wonderful job, I think. He is one of the few bureaucrats here who is not afraid, who will speak out his mind and say what he believes is right, and stands up for his convictions. You have working on the rubber problem the Bureau of Economic Warfare as well as other agencies, and millions of dollars are being spent down there in South America for rubber projects. I believe I could successfully eat every pound of rubber the State Department will get with its $275,000, for the simple reason that they will not get any rubber.

The total amount of the agricultural appropriation is approximately $939,000, which is almost a million dollars. That compares to a 1942 appropriation of how much? Fifty thousand dollars. In other words, for 1942 they asked for $50,000, but it looks like the gravy train is getting good, so for 1944 the State Department asks for approximately $1,000,000.

To go on, we have here the Department of Commerce. In 1942 the Department of Commerce got approximately $15,000 for civilian air pilot training. They now ask for $1,211,040. There perhaps would be some excuse for giving this amount for civilian air patrol and training down there in South America and Central America, but I just heard in the argument yesterday that $19,000,000 was given to other departments to do this job. If there are any millions to be given for the training of air pilots in South America and Central America, I assure you that the last department in the world to do a good job on that is the State Department. If the State Department handles that as it has handled the Martinique situation and other jobs that have been fumbled, there will not be one pilot trained in South America, regardless of how much money is spent.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. No, I am not going to yield just now, but I will take on all comers when I get through. I do not have much time, so I want to keep on going at this time.

We had for the Coast and Geodetic Survey a total appropriation for 1942 of $32,000. In 1943 they raised that to almost double, $52,000. In this appropriation they want $95,000.

We have now here the Weather Bureau. For 1942 the Weather Bureau got a total of $15,000. For 1943 that Bureau got $50,000, and for 1944, they want $196,000. In other words, there is an increase of practically 300 or 400 percent.

We come now to the Federal Security Agency. The 1942 appropriation for this was $12,000. For 1943 it was $30,000, and this year they want in that particular item $50,000. In other words, the total for the United States Health Agency for 1942 was $39,000; in 1943, $30,000, a little reduction, quite an unusual thing; for 1944 it is $175,000.

Here is a real good one, and this one takes the cake. The Department of the Interior: No. 1, Fish and Wildlife Survey, and Mexican Fish Commission; (B) Fishery Exploratory Project; Fish Stocking Project; Fish Resurvey of the Amazon Basin; Fishery Science, just a little item of $125,000. For 1942 they got $15,300 and this year they want $125,000. What do you think the men in the armed forces, those soldiers up there in the gallery, think of the State Department asking Congress for $125,000 for fishing in South America? The fishing is not very good in my district, and if there is any money to be spent for fisheries, I have been taught that charity begins at home, and I would just as soon that money for fishing would go into my district in Louisiana.

We have another proposition here, and here is one for the book. The Department of Justice got out a pamphlet last year and got $6,000. Something evidently happened to the State Department, because they did not ask for anything in this appropriation for 1944. But, my friends, that is only a small amount, just $6,000. To go on, we have the Department of Labor. For 1942 the Department of Labor got $15,000; for 1943 the Department of Labor got $30,000, but what do you think they are asking for today? $94,000.

Here is another, and this is a good one—the Woman's Bureau. They did not get anything in 1942, and they started out in 1943 with $10,000, and today they want $16,000. Here is the Division of Labor Standards. This is a new one. They did not get a dime for 1942 or 1943, but today they figure it is an easy gravy train, and the money is flowing like water.

I am not going to burden you with too many figures, but I want to take up those that are interesting. We have here a music division. For 1942 they asked for $13,000 and got it. For 1943 they asked for $16,000. Something must have gone wrong in the State Department, because for 1944 instead of asking for three times more, lo and behold, they ask for a little less—only $9,500. That is really one for the book.

We have here something more—Cooperation in the Field of Anthropology. I imagine that anthropology is very, very important to the Department of State, but to the American public in time of war, it is certainly unimportant, and for the study of anthropology they asked for $116,000. They did not get a dime for 1942, for the study of anthropology and they did not get a dime for the 1943 appropriation for the study of anthropology, but now that money seems to be flowing so well and so easily, they ask for over $116,000.

They have what they call a Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission did not get anything for 1942, and for 1943 it got $8,000. This year they asked for an increase of $2,000, or $10,000.

We now come here to the Department of State for cultural relations, and so forth. The Department of State for 1942 got $252,000, for 1943 they got $675,586, and this year they ask for $2,454,260. They have another division here in the Department of State which they call the Division of Cultural Relations, which takes care of students they send from South America up here. That takes care of the transportation and expenses of various men from South America. In other words, that amounts to a total of over $1,000,000. I checked into those records to see exactly what those provisions were made for. In other words, I wanted to see where that money was going, and incidentally I may say they asked for nothing in 1942, and that they asked for very little in 1943, but this year they want a large amount of money. So I have a few records here of what they intend to do with this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I would like to have an additional minute or two.

Mr. RABAUT. I have no more time.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Maybe I can get a little more over here on the Republican side. I am just getting started.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I am going to change from the Red Network over to the Blue Network.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is referring to the items in this bill which make appropriations for cooperation with the South American countries.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Exactly.

Mr. STEFAN. This money to which he refers is for part of the program for evolution of industry in South America. In other words, it is a one-way passage—the money is not coming back.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. That is correct. It goes down there. But this is not the only money that is going to South America and Central America. We just gave Mexico $20,000,000 and now the State Department wants more. We are also sending millions of dollars to South America through other departments.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman also noticed that we are sending 5,000 fishhooks down there?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Well, I did not know about the fishhooks, but I thank the gentleman for telling me.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know anything about the relief program in Honduras, where we are spending about $1,000,000 a year?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. No; but I am glad to know about those fishhooks, because my folks down home cannot get any.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, this is a part of a program.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Now, I have a few propositions here about where these millions are going. Remember, this is not peacetime; it is wartime. After all, American boys are going into the armed forces and are spilling their blood and losing their lives, while at the same time the State Department asks Congress to send millions down to South America so that South American boys can come to the United States and attend colleges in America free of charge. Many an American boy cannot do that now, because he is in the armed forces. Many young boys and girls cannot go to college because they lack funds. Many men and women in America today who have a young son or a young daughter are sacrificing, depriving themselves of every luxury to send that boy or girl to some college. Soon that boy will be in the Army. Soon that girl may be in one of the women's Army organizations.

Well, here are a few of them from South America. We have here from Costa Rica, travel grant to study mathematics at a college in Missouri. We have another party who is going to study psychology up here at Ohio State University. From Cuba we give a gentleman from there a maintenance grant of $100 a month to study architecture at Harvard University. Then we have another fellow from Mexico. This is a real good one. You want to get this. Remember, we just gave Mexico $20,000,000, and here we are giving a man in Mexico enough money to come to the United States to go to Harvard University, to learn what? What do you think? To study alcoholism and epilepsy.

Now, we sent a sum of $3,700 down to Santiago, Chile, for the Institute of North American Culture. Then we have a grant-in-aid of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, to send a prominent scholar to certain other American republics, $5,800. Then we have a working fund for the distribution of donated books, $1,500; continuation of national extempore discussion contest on inter-American relations for college students, $15,000.

Here is a good one: From Argentina we are paying $90 a month to a gentleman by the name of Simonelli to go to the University of Michigan to study library science. Remember, Argentina has not severed relations with the Axis. Argentina has not declared war on the Axis Powers. Here we are sending our tax money, if this appropriation is agreed to, down to Argentina to send one of their distinguished gentlemen up here to Ann Arbor, Mich., to study what? Library science. Maybe the idea is that Argentina wants to get that student close to Detroit where our munitions are being made so that he can report to Argentina,

free of charge, what is going on here in America.

Here we have another one: Bolivia, maintenance grant $100 a month to study social work; not in one of the southern schools, but they go away up to Boston, to the Boston College of Social Work. I know that my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], had nothing to do with that.

Now, we come down to Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, and all these other countries. They all have one or two or more students who are going all over the United States to schools to study anything from psychology, social science, political science, and anything and everything except what pertains to the main thing that we are all vitally interested in, the winning of the war.

For instance, funds were transmitted through the following agricultural institutes: Rio de Janeiro, $3,700. Caracas did not get very much. They only got $750. And there are other countries. Buenos Aires got $10,000. Cordova got $2,500.

Now, I come to another man from Argentina. I thought I was through with him. We have a man by the name of Marisa Regules. He gets $100 a month to study what? Where? He gets $100 a month to study piano at the Philadelphia Conservatory of Music. In other words, here is another case of Argentina, which has not broken with the Axis, sending a student at the expense of our taxpayers right up here to Philadelphia to study what? Piano.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Perhaps this is just the forerunner of a world-wide W. P. A.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I am coming to that in just a minute. You are a little ahead of me. When you consider these piano lessons, that is humorous. But when you consider Philadelphia, is that humorous? We have a port of debarkation there. We have the Baldwin Locomotive Works that manufacture our tanks. We have a naval base there. We have a quartermaster's depot there. Here we are, at the expense of the taxpayers, bringing a man from a country that evidently is not friendly, to Philadelphia, so that he can go to school to learn piano and look out of the window or run around and see what he can find to report back to Argentina.

There is a lot more here, but I will skip over this because my time is limited, and as I am now on the blue network.

Mr. SHORT. I wonder if they overlooked the fan dancers.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. If they provided for them they did not put it down in writing.

We have here the amount of $3,700 that goes to Rio de Janeiro. They talk about their getting $10,000, these are funds for an institution in Brazil, funds that have been requested by the American Council of Learned Societies.

Here is another item that may interest the Members, Mr. Chairman, and that is the State Department does not seem to feel that the people in South America are getting enough magazines and periodicals from North America. What do they do? They ask for $105,000 to distribute the latest magazines and periodicals down there in South America. Let us look at the names of some of the periodicals. I could not believe my eyes when I read one of them. Here they are: The Pocket Book. I always thought a pocketbook was something in which one kept one's money, but this is not that kind of pocketbook; this is a pocket book on America; it is an anthology of prose and poetry. All right; then we have another one for which they are spending part of this $105,000 and this is called the Pocket Reader. This also is an anthology of United States literature with less emphasis on political subjects than the previous book. They said they did not put much political emphasis on that, but just listen to this one and I will leave it to you how much political emphasis there is. I could not believe my eyes when I read this, Mr. Chairman. Here is the other book, "This Is America," which has photographs of the American scene and commentaries by none other than Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could the gentleman enlighten us as to how many miles the lady has traveled since there has been a shortage of transportation?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I do not know how far she is traveling, but I do know that, according to this appropriation of $105,000, her books ought to go a long way.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. I am afraid the gentletention that now having isolated ourselves from the rest of the world we should proceed to isolate ourselves from South America and to have no contact with the hemisphere culturally, economically, or spiritually?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Lady, I am very grateful for that question because I was going to get to that in a few minutes, but this has saved me the trouble.

Mrs. LUCE. I am afraid the gentleman may forget to answer my question.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I will answer the gentlewoman's question first; it will save my having to deal with this a little later. Here is the proposition: If this were all the money that the South and Central American countries were getting, I would say that we should shut our eyes and let the State Department send it down there, but they are getting millions and millions and millions of dollars from other countries; and if there ever was a group of people that ought to be thankful—that ought to get down on their knees and pray to the good Lord every night that they have as a neighbor such a land as the United States of America, it is the Central and South American countries because we have done more for those groups of people than any other people on the face of the earth or for any other country. I will go even further: We have not only got down on our knees but we have begged, we have pleaded, we have given them everything they wanted, lowered our pride and done everything to help South American and Central America. Rather than being in any position of the United States being isolated from South or Central America, exactly the opposite has taken place. I am one of those who firmly believe in and will support any measure that will cement the Americas and the United States together more closely. I do not believe anything has been left undone by the Congress or by the various departments of the American Government, as far as South and Central America are concerned. I do say, however, that it is time we reviewed some of the things this Department has been doing, and I do not feel I should be criticized for taking the floor and objecting to money being wasted and squandered by a department that does not know what it is doing. According to the figures I have been furnished, this Department is asking for 900 percent more than they asked for 1942. I say it is time to call a halt on this Department.

If that money were given to some other department I would say surely and gladly, and instead of speaking against that appropriation I would speak for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the gentlewoman's "gentle" question.

Mrs. LUCE. There is nothing "gentle" about it and I would like a straightforward answer. Does the gentleman want to be isolated from South America as well as from the rest of the world?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Absolutely I do not. There is not a man or woman in this assembled, honorable place here called Congress, who wants to be isolated from South America or Central America, and the closer we get the better I like it. As a matter of fact, I think that our great traveler, the honorable Vice President, is doing a very noble job in going to South America and in going to Central America, and whereas he disagrees with a few of the gentlewoman's political policies, and I refer to the gentlewoman who just asked me that question, nevertheless I think he is doing a very good job, a very fine job in bringing together better relations with Central America and South America. I understand the Vice President travels rather nicely and on a good-sized expense account, but it is a whole lot cheaper to send him down there than it is to appropriate approximately $6,000,000 of which $4,000,000 will be squandered more or less in sending different people of the State Department down there and back up here again.

May I ask, How many people do you think it is going to take to carry on this program to spend $6,000,000? They spent only $700,000 in 1942. They are going to need many men in the State Department and according to what I heard that is a good place for men who are trying to get deferred from the draft. If you cut this appropriation the Army will be better off because there will be many men in the State Department of draft age who will join the armed forces of America.

I have here a little ad that came out in one of the magazines. It shows a tender little girl, an average American girl, praying. She has her hands up to the Lord and says: "Please, dear Lord, send my brother the airplanes he needs quick."

The ad goes on and says:

The scene—America—the home of millions of decent men who are willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom.

Surely, these ungrudging, unselfish millions who are giving their lives—surely these heroes are not only worth praying for—but paying for, too.

Before victory and peace we've got a war to pay for first. You, me, everybody.

Ten percent of our pay? Yes. Every pay day. At least a dime out of every dollar—a dollar out of every ten. More if we can. We're in this together so let's pay for it together.

In other words, this ad urges the American public at every turn to sacrifice and give money, yet on the other hand the State Department wants more, more, and more money, 900 percent more than in 1942. To do what? Send fishhooks to the Amazon? I told you what they want to do. Anything that the State Department handles in this line I assure you will be bungled.

This picture or ad should say: "And please, dear Lord, keep the good Congress from giving our money to the State Department who gives so much of it away on nonessential work instead of the war effort."

Here we have another one:

War bonds buy victory.

No. 1. It shows a man buying a bond:

Every time you buy a War bond you are bringing victory a little closer.

No. 2 shows an airplane:

They fight with your dollars, your guns and ships, your bonds help to buy.

Now, we have another one here in which a captain says:

I am going to shock you? Because I am going to hit right from the shoulder, starting now.

Out there, our boys are fighting, and they are falling, not 1 or 2 at a time, picked off by a nice clean bullet. But 50 at a time in the roaring, flaming hell of a shell burst.

It says further:

Give to the Red Cross to help save lives and to help the wounded.

How does that sound in comparison with the money that the State Department is asking you to give to South America to send a student or two to Harvard to study epilepsy and alcoholism? How does that sound when the State Department asks for $65,000 to help out the fisheries in South America? Think of what that $65,000 would mean to an organization like the Red Cross.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen little newsboys, school kids, boys and girls, go around sacrificing to buy those 10 cents in War stamps, the 25 cents in War stamps. The reason they buy them is because they know that those dollars are going, or they think those dollars are going, to help the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, here we have a poster put out by the Department of the Treasury. It says:

Do your part to win the war. Buy more Savings stamps.

And it tells us that one 25-cent stamp will pay for 1 month's feed for one carrier pigeon. Six 25-cent stamps will buy one hand grenade. And it goes on to say that three 10-cent stamps will pay for two sandbags.

Twenty-seven 25-cent stamps will pay for one blanket. One 25-cent stamp will pay for a clip of bullets. Twenty-two 25-cent stamps will pay for one pup tent. And so it goes on.

Have you not seen those little newsboys that take their Saturdays to go around and sell War stamps? Have you not seen those little school kids go by a store and see a big red apple there or a bag of candy? Will they buy that? No. They go to the supreme sacrifice, and they go there and buy that 10-cent War stamp or that 25-cent stamp. Why? Because they are helping out this war effort.

What do you think they would think of you people here in Congress if you gave away to the State Department to squander all these millions and millions of dollars that they are asking for, so many more than in 1942?

This is most serious. I say that these bureaucrats can sit up there and figure out all kinds of ways of spending money, but they do not provide that money; all they do is think about spending it. They are not accountable to anybody, but we Congressmen are accountable to the people. I say that we must lower this appropriation, and lower it to a large degree to help those taxpayers who are counting on us.

This reminds me of a man who finds that the roof of his house is on fire. He has $10 in his pocket, or he may have $25. He could take that $10 and run up town and get a fire extinguisher to help put out that fire. But what does he do? He does not go get that fire extinguisher; he runs down the street and sees a man that he wants to stay in good with, and buys him a $10 bowl of goldfish. In other words, our house is on fire, and every dime, every dollar, all the money should go to winning this war and winning it in a hurry.

We have done everything we possibly could to help out our South American neighbors in peacetime and wartime. They are at war as much as we are. Their lives are being threatened as our lives are. Their country is being threatened as our country is. Talk about sticking together, we have got to stick together. They need us just as we need them, and maybe they need us a little more than we need them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. In other words, when you have a good baseball team that is playing raggedy baseball, what do you do when they are losing games? Do you give the players more money? No; you do not give them a dime extra. You change the line-up. If that does not work, why, you get some new players. If that does not work, why, you get a new coach. That is just exactly what should be done about the State Department.

You have a four-cornered proposition in the State Department. You have Mr. Hull, the Honorable Cordell Hull, and the Honorable Sumner Welles. For a long time they have not even been on speaking terms socially. There is a lot of dissension there. On the other hand, you have Mr. Adolf Berle, the Honorable, and you also have Mr. Dean Acheson, the Honorable. The latter are so busy worrying about trying to outdo each other on post-war planning that they have forgotten about the present crisis that looks us square in the face today.

When you boil it down, this is what you have. You have a 1942 appropriation of $700,000. You have a 1943 appropriation of $1,685,000. Today they are asking for $6,000,000. From the way they have been going in the past, by the same percentage, next year they will want $20,000,000, and the following year they will want $65,000,000.

Now is the time to call a halt to it. Now is the time for the State Department to clean up its own house and start doing its own job, instead of trying to ask for more money from the taxpayers of this country.

Remember, our great Ways and Means Committee chairman got up and said about the Ruml plan, "We need money. We need money to fight this war. We need money. We cannot forgive anything. We must have more money for the Treasury." For the Treasury to do what with? Send men to Harvard to study epilepsy?

Mr. Chairman, it looks to me that if we do not nip this in the bud, if we do not cut down this appropriation—and personally I favor an amendment not to give them a dime more than they got last year—we will be setting the stage for the beginning of a world-wide W. P. A. Since I was a little boy I have been taught that charity begins at home. If you are going to start a world-wide W. P. A., do not start it down in Central America, do not start it down in South America, but begin it with those poor farmers and working people that I represent down there in the Sixth District of Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I never so thoroughly recognized the truth of the old adage that a little knowledge of a subject is very dangerous.

In the second place, the sum was not $6,000,000 but $4,500,000.

In the third place, the State Department only coordinates the foreign relations of all agencies in the foreign field. It does not perform the functions. If the gentleman had read the committee's report on this bill he would have seen that the 32 major projects contained in the cooperative program are to be actually carried out by 10 different agencies and departments of the Government, and not by the Department of State alone. It is only because of the fact that the Department of State is directly responsible for the determination and execution of the Government's policy in relation to our international affairs that this program was placed under its jurisdiction and general supervision.

The gentleman spoke about the weather. He is such an isolationist that he thinks we could control it within the United States. We are trying to gain all the knowledge we can about the weather, with the idea of protecting our aviators and those who fly for us. It should be pointed out that this country's interest in aviation and in flying conditions extends at this time far beyond the limits of our borders, and the money recommended for this purpose is to be used for the purpose of securing for this country information necessary for a clearer understanding of the weather processes and for determining the depth, extent, and rate of movement of moisture-laden streams of air passing over the United States. This information is vital both to our aviation industry and to agriculture.

Moreover, the whole of the gentleman's statement was very much uncalled for at a time like this, when 11 of the countries in South America have joined us in the war effort and 20 have broken off relations with the Axis.

The gentleman talked in a very lucid way about fishhooks. Those fishhooks have been sent down to the Amazon district in order that food may be caught by means of them for Americans who are down there directing the program for the obtaining of rubber, that the gentlemen and the rest of us may ride in our automobiles. This country cannot afford at this time to overlook any possible source, no matter how limited, of this strategic and scarce material which is now desperately needed for every conceivable instrument of warfare—on land, on sea, and in the air.

The German Government spent $6,000,000 for schools alone during the period between 1933 and the outbreak of the war. It is further estimated that the three members of the Axis spent many times the amount of the appropriation recommended for this item on political, cultural, and scientific projects in the South American republics between 1933 and the outbreak of the war, and most of the countries were flooded with professors, students, lecturers, scientists, and other individuals whose sole interests were the interests of their respective countries. We at last have seen the light, and are trying to get down there now and do things that we should have done years ago.

American statesmen have recognized for a century that the defense of the United States is inextricably interwoven with the defense of all of the American countries, and vice versa. This program seeks to develop mutual appreciation and support of that view on a sound basis throughout the hemisphere at an incredibly small cost. We are spending billions for battleships, bombs, and guns, yet none of these can produce the friendly relations, understanding, and support that flows from a program of this kind. The conquered countries of Europe are living evidence that peace cannot come through force. If the mutual understanding and good will which this program seeks to establish had existed throughout the world prior to 1939 it would not be necessary now to spend the billions we are called upon to appropriate for war today.

This program of cooperation with the American republics is a program of peace and friendship. Friendship is never based on all take and no give. The United States has asked its American neighbors for extensive and material cooperation and assistance in connection with the war. They expect, and are entitled to, assistance and cooperation in return. If our friendship is to be trusted we must not fail to demonstrate its existence in a practical way. As a part of the Western Hemisphere, the American republics are of immeasurably greater interest to this country—economically, socially, and politically—than to any other nation. Yet the Axis aggressors have so far been ahead of us in the cultural field. Let it not be said again that our efforts are too little and too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I tremendously enjoyed the entertainment furnished by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]. About a year ago it was my good fortune to visit 16 countries of South and Central America. Before I get into that, let me say this: I think there is no one in this House who will accuse me of being bureaucratic or in sympathy with bureaucracy. My record on that score is pretty well known by all of you. I have never stood in this Well and defended bureaucrats. When we were in South America, however, we wondered why it was the countries of South and Central America seemed to have so little liking for us of the United States, their neighbor. We started looking around, and we found, and you will find, and no one will dispute this, that the culture of South and Central America today is European—British, Italian, German. Why? Because those countries and the countries of Europe long since have interested themselves in the welfare of the people of South America. My distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] says that the United States has done great things in the past for South America. No, my friends. We have been very negligent in that respect. Anyone advised on the subject must know that. Yes; we must start now if we are ever going to start. We must win this war, of course. It is idle, I think, to wave one's arms and scream at the top of one's voice, that all the money must be now expended to win the war. Everyone agrees to that. That is not an original thought. After the war is over we will have something else to do, I think; that is, to maintain a peace that I hope we are able to win. If we do, we have to live with our neighbors in South and Central America, all of the neighbors down there, who will mean more to us in the post-war period than any other neighbors of the world.

This is chicken feed that we are spending. I doubt that it is enough. I doubt that even with this thing that distresses my friend so much it is even a beginning. Why, Germany and Italy have sent subsidized colonies throughout the past 50 years at government expense, into all of the countries of South America. Great settlements are there, of the German and Italian people, financed by their governments. They have moved in with the South Americans. Not only do they trade with them, but they marry them, and thus the culture of South America today is European, and thus it is that we have today such a need for proper relationship with our neighbors, the countries in South and Central America.

For many years past Germany has expended large sums of money to take South American soldiers, officers, and men to Germany for the purpose of teaching them German war tactics and imbuing them with German philosophy. The European and particularly German culture which is predominant in the Argentine is probably the reason that she has not yet joined the United Nations.

Do not be alarmed by this yapping. All this is nice vaudeville, but it is too serious to be laughed off. I do not know what is in this bill; I do not know how much is provided for better relationship between South America and this country, but whatever amount there is in the bill I doubt that it is enough. I am one who would like to appropriate vast sums of money to send students of the United States to the universities and colleges of South and Central America. I am one of those who would like to see Spanish a compulsory course in the public schools of this country.

Furthermore, I believe that anyone from Louisiana should be the last person to complain about anything that would be of aid to South America because Louisiana is probably the beneficiary of South American trade to a larger extent than any other State in the Union. New Orleans is the largest port in the United States for the export and import of South American goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, war always breeds crime. Under the strain and stress of these trying times there has been an alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. Only yesterday morning before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations the Chief of the F. B. I., Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, a competent, courageous, and efficient public servant who has rendered such valiant and valuable services to this country in time of peace and war, stated:

That prostitution by girls under 21 had increased 64.8 percent as compared with last year, other sex crimes by girls 104.7 percent, that arrests for assaults by males under 21 had gone up 17.1 percent, and rape 10.6 percent.

Mark you, most of these arrests, practically all of them, were of a civilian character, notwithstanding the fact that millions of the youth of this land have been inducted into the armed services. There are many and varied reasons, of course, for this increase in crime—the high wages paid to youths today, the fact that some of them, perhaps, would rather spend time in jail than in the armed services of the country, and with others it is done simply for the thrill, with a "don't care" attitude, realizing that they perhaps will soon be on the battle front, a "let's go" attitude, which always lowers all moral standards and which always happens in war. Also, perhaps, of course, the increase in this delinquency is further caused by decreased control of parental care, because of so many fathers and mothers who are engaged in industry today. I think it is generally admitted that what we need most in this country at this hour, more than ever before in our history, is more internal conviction and less external compulsion, and more attention and care given to the youth of the land, not only in the home but in the church and in the school, and I am glad that Mr. Hoover stated before the committee yesterday morning:

You cannot disregard the home and the church in the building of a nation.

However, the sad fact remains because of human nature there will always be necessary law-enforcement officers.

That is the reason I have arisen to address you today, because, under the recent Executive order of work or fight, many of our law-enforcement officers, sheriffs, State highway patrolmen, detectives, employees in our State prisons, with this threat issued by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, work or fight, feel that they must give up their jobs, go into industry, go to work on the farms, or go into the armed services. Therefore they are leaving their present jobs that are so essential to the protection of the life and property of our civilians left on the home front.

There is in the gallery at this minute the director of the penal institutions of the State of Missouri, Col. Loyd "Boots" Miller, who came to Washington a few days ago to urge the War Manpower Commission to declare that employees of our State penal institutions are engaged in an essential industry or occupation; not asking for their deferment but that they might remain unmolested until their time of call arrives. He has received a flat, cold denial, and today in Missouri we are threatened with the loss of 130 chefs, guards, superintendents of industries, and officers in our penal institutions that will be very difficult if not impossible to replace. I know that you gentlemen have received similar requests.

I want to read to you this telegram which I received last month from the sheriff of the largest county in my congressional district:

CARTHAGE, MO., *March 10, 1943.*

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Congressman, Seventh District, Missouri, Washington, D. C.:

Throughout our county experienced law-enforcement officers such as sheriffs, highway patrolmen, policemen, and detectives are being inducted into the armed service, leaving the law enforcement of our entire county in the hands of older inexperienced officers. When we take into consideration that the majority of the criminals are exempt or in the IV–F class it makes us wonder how such inexperienced law-enforcement officers are going to cope with experienced criminals. I personally feel that any man who has been connected with law enforcement for a period of 2 years and is still in that service should be deferred. I wish here to say that I have no relative or personal friend whom I am interested in seeing deferred but know from experience that proper enforcement requires officers in the apprehension of criminals or the prevention of crime to spend long hours without relief and much physical exertion which older men cannot do successfully.

I might say here that at the present I have 1 deputy sheriff inducted into service last November and on this coming Friday night 2 more well-trained, experienced men are called up for their physical examination. This will practically clean my force out as far as competent men are concerned. Jasper County is the fifth largest county in Missouri. We have in operation 3 big powder plants, 5 big flour mills, and a population of 80,000. Twenty-two miles to the south is an Army camp with 50,000 soldiers, and I feel that urgent action should be taken immediately to correct this situation. Feeling this a matter of importance to every citizen of the land, I am wiring requesting your prompt consideration and such action as you may be able to take to make secure our law-enforcement organizations.

GEORGE H. TATUM,
Sheriff, Jasper County, Carthage, Mo.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. I think it is generally agreed by all fair-minded and well-informed people that our present war manpower muddle is in a terrible mess. We have the Army pulling for men, the Navy asking for men. We have the Selective Service System in operation, the War Manpower Commission and the Department of Agriculture making their demands. What we need is an over-all, unified, authoritative, and absolute command of this whole problem in order that we may prosecute this war in the most effective manner. Unless we do this we will lose this war.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I merely want to make an observation. In Michigan where everyone will agree a great contribution to the war effort is being made, several State police posts have been closed because the Manpower Commission has refused to designate police work as essential. Commissioner Oscar Olander stated in a letter to me last November that his department had lost 140 men to the armed services, and that more were leaving each week. In fact, 22 percent of the men have left the department. These are all highly trained officers and cannot be replaced. I complained to the Selective Service Commission and the Director, General Hershey, passed the buck to the State director, stating that local boards are responsible and are expected to give proper consideration in the deferment of trained police officers.

Mr. SHORT. I also want to say that the telegram from the sheriff of Jasper County comes from the third most important defense area in the United States, near Camp Crowder in my district, Fort Leonard Wood to the north, Camp Chaffee in the district represented by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS], the Jawhawk ordnance plant in the district represented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]; and yet this sheriff has been robbed of his most experienced officers, and the War Manpower Commission in Washington arbitrarily and stubbornly refuses to declare it an essential industry or occupation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin my remarks with this understanding, that I am for everything that is necessary in order to win this war, and to win it quickly and decisively. I am for anything that these departments think they want if they can make a record to convince me they need it to aid materially for that victory and to speed it up. I cannot minimize the good work that I think this committee has done by recommending a $17,000,000 cut below the 1943 appropriation bill and a $6,000,000 cut below the estimates for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments' bill for this year. The entire bill recommended by the committee would supply the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments with $189,729,000.

I think the committee did a good job from the standpoint of the objective that we pursued. The objective that we pursued was to hear the requests of the departments, to listen to the Budget Bureau recommendations, and try to come to determine what employees, what branches of the service, could be eliminated and not disturb the present system as it is now established by the Chief Executive. We just provided funds for these three departments so they could conduct their essential services as presently organized. With this point of view we did the best job we could considering the relative numerical positions of the minority and the majority Members. It

is a compromise bill, but I think that we cannot continue to look at appropriation bills from the point of view with which this committee has recommended this bill and not unlike the committees that have recommended other bills in the past. The fundamental differences in point of view between some of us on the committee and the majority concept as reported and written into this bill represents a postponement of the job that Congress inevitably must do. The hearings demonstrate beyond a doubt that there is a duplication of effort between the old-line agencies and the new war agencies. I think the hearings will demonstrate that they are treading upon each other's work, that they are all into the same fields, and that they waste manpower, money, and material that we cannot afford. We may have afforded it in peacetime. Both political parties may have condoned it in the past; however, if we could afford it in times past we definitely cannot afford this waste now, when there is a shortage of manpower and when the Treasury is being raided as it has been during the last 10 years.

I am not unmindful of the letters that appear in the hearings on the State, Commerce, and Justice appropriation items. At page 44 you will find one of those letters which is part of an exchange between Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State. It is an attempt to state to the committee that everything between those two agencies, the State Department cultural-relations program and the Coordinator's program has been straightened out to the complete satisfaction of both agencies and that neither one does the work of the other. It reminds me of the ad one frequently sees in the personal columns of the newspaper, and if I may be pardoned for doing so I paraphrase it in this discussion by summarizing it this way: "Dear Sumner, all is forgiven; come home. Nel." If these letters ended the matter, it would be all right, but we must discount them in the light of past performance. The State Department came before us and presented their claims for the Budget estimates a year ago. In their testimony we were given every assurance that there was no duplication of effort between the Coordinator's Office of Inter-American Affairs and the cultural-relations program of the State Department. They said they had arbitrarily divided via an arrangement with the Bureau of the Budget the programs for South America. Mr. Rockefeller's group was to handle all that was immediately necessary to be done in South America. It seems from their testimony that the State Department had the over-all, long-range, cultural-relations program. There continually crept into the hearings such a confusion of this stated division presented by the State Department that the hard-working, sincere, and able chairman of the committee, always alert to duplication, felt it necessary to call Mr. Nelson Rockefeller before our committee for an explanation of some of the things the Coordinator was doing that seemed to be similar to what the State Department was doing.

I do not want to hide the fact that I asked Mr. Rockefeller how much money he had this last fiscal year. Bear in mind that we had spent several weeks on the cultural-relations program and thought we had done a fine job—I believe we did the best job we could under the circumstances—in giving them $1,685,000 to continue the State Department's long-range program. Imagine the surprise of the committee—we were nearly bowled over—when we learned that Mr. Nelson Rockefeller during the fiscal year had the sum of $15,000,000 in cash and $3,000,000 in contract authorizations. I ask you here and now: How can this committee do a good appropriating job for the State Department under its control when the Coordinator's organization beyond its control gets nearly nine times as much money in the same fiscal year to cover competitive Government work in the same territory? These are the fundamental bases of duplication of effort that Congress fails year after year to solve.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman's committee have anything to do with the appropriation for the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. JONES. No; we do not. I will cover that in due time. I thank the gentleman for this reminder, because I am anxious to cover B. E. W.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am introducing a resolution of inquiry to find out exactly what are the functions of Mr. Rockefeller's office. I should think a complete report as to the functions would be very helpful to the gentleman in his work on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES. It would be a much desired contribution. Certainly, we have not eliminated the duplication by the division the Bureau of the Budget has made; the agencies in question have not confided in us. The committee can make no adequate survey. We have only general statements of the top-ranking officials who have written these love letters to each other. That is all there is to enlighten the committee.

Bear in mind we did not ask that the love letters be written. They were written in August of 1942. They were written last summer. The heads of these two organizations must have had in mind that there was confusion of functions which each Department handled in the South American program. I think the gentlewoman's suggestion will be very good.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am under the impression the gentleman would rather continue an existing office and improve that rather than to branch out and have another duplicating office?

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentlewoman. I was about to give my theory of how to straighten it out. In the first place, I have great confidence in the old-line establishments of the Government. I think it is a crime and a shame that the administration, as each new problem came up, started out a new war agency with great fanfare and extravagant publication. They start out with a new crew, a new research staff, publicity bureau, and everything on the administrative menu from snobs to nuts. When they start to get the basic material for their research the world-horizon long beards and new world-order boys at once become isolationists. They isolate themselves from basic facts and costly research already to be had in the old-line establishments of the State, the Commerce, the Justice, and Interior Departments, and all the way down through the old line agencies of Government. It is a crime and a shame to me to let a new deified war agency tackle each new problem that might be solved by these old-line agencies—it is a crime and a shame I say—to dissipate their manpower, their experience in handling the problems that these new agencies take over. It is a shame to dissipate them in favor of some new panacea that accompanies the publication of the establishment of the new agency. I am for the old established agencies.

But here is our problem. We have here only the appropriations for the old established agencies. We have to consider these appropriations and these requests for appropriation in light of the fact that we do not get to touch B. E. W., O. W. I., Lend-Lease, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and others. We never get to see them except as we may call them in to get straightened out on some item that they are doing, that we learn from the many press releases that they spew from their offices. This year we do not know just what will be in Nelson Rockefeller's program for the year 1944. His application or request for funds has not come before the House. I have just talked with members of the subcommittee that would handle it and they say they have not come up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The Chair will count. Seventy-four Members being present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	Judd
Barden	Doughton	Kearney
Bates, Ky.	Elliott	Kee
Bates, Mass.	Ellsworth	Kelley
Beckworth	Fisher	King
Bell	Fogarty	Knutson
Bonner	Ford	Lewis, Colo.
Bulwinkle	Furlong	Luce
Burch, Va.	Gavagan	McGranery
Burdick	Gibson	McKenzie
Cannon, Fla.	Gordon	McLean
Celler	Gorski	Maas
Clark	Green	May
Cooley	Guyer	Merrow
Cox	Hale	Miller, Conn.
Culkin	Howell	Mott
Cullen	Izac	Myers
D'Alesandro	Jarman	Newsome
Dawson	Johnson, J. Leroy	Norman
Dies		O'Brien, Ill.

O'Toole	Sabath	Thomason
Peterson, Fla.	Shafer	Tolan
Peterson, Ga.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Plumley	Sheridan	Walter
Poage	Sikes	Weaver
Randolph	Smith, Maine	Weiss
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Va.	Wene
Robertson	Sparkman	Whelchel, Ga.
Robsion, Ky.	Starnes, Ala.	Winter
Rogers, Calif.	Steagall	Woodrum, Va.
Rowan	Stevenson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2397, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, before the quorum call I was talking about duplication of effort between the old-line agencies and the new war agencies, and calling attention to the letters on page 44 of the hearings of the State Department.

I was also discussing the apparent shotgun wedding between the State Department and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Whether it was caused by the action of the subcommittee or by the country at large, we deplore the duplication of effort. But I do not want the Committee to be fooled by this transfer of $4,000,000 from the Coordinator's program to the State Department, because it is not known at the moment just how much more the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs will get for his program of cultural relations in South America.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Can the gentleman tell us where Mr. Rockefeller gets his money?

Mr. JONES. He originally got his money from the President's emergency fund, and he has had that sum supplemented since then by appropriations from another subcommittee. Another subcommittee will hear his request for the fiscal year 1944.

The proof of duplication is in a common, ordinary request coming from the Lima, Ohio, school officials in my district for moving-picture material on South America and our cultural-relations program. I wrote to the O. W. I., Nelson Rockefeller's group, and the State Department, and each of them had moving pictures on the South American program. Further, each of them had a separate distribution system. For the district schools in my district to get films on cultural relations with South America they would have to go through two or three different distributors in the State of Ohio and pay private distributors for the use of public films made with public funds. I have this request from the public schools of Lima, Ohio. The moving pictures from these three agencies, covering the same subject matter, will be sent to them.

I have thus far been talking about the duplication in Washington. I have been informed that throughout the field the O. W. I., the Lend-Lease Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs have one and one-half representatives for their agencies for every one in the Foreign Service of the State Department. How far these special agencies for the war emergency have grown; how far they have gone. Examine the Executive orders creating them and see the extent of the power of these agencies to the exclusion of the old-line agencies.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman stated something to the effect that the Board of Economic Warfare has more employees than the Foreign Service of the State Department.

Mr. JONES. The Board of Economic Warfare, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Lend-Lease Administration, and the O. W. I.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the Board of Economic Warfare has a lot of employees down there who are developing some strategic material for war purposes, naturally it would have perhaps thousands of employees down there in a particular field. Therefore, I say that the gentleman's figures do not mean anything.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will wait until my speech is concluded, he will find that I will cover that point in my remarks later. I do not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to take my word for the duplication, or take my statement that these men are traipsing all over the world doing the same things, or that in the city of Washington they are all covering the same subject. I need only refer the gentleman to the study made by the Legislative Reference Service of this Congress, whose employees are appointed by the Democratic patronage committee, and who work in the Congressional Library, the head of which is appointed by the President of the United States. This is their study, Research No. T-175. As it applies to the State Department, I shall read portions of it. This thing is too serious to be mixed up with political sniping, and that certainly is not the purpose of my address. My purpose is to release this wasted manpower from wasteful bureaus and enlist them in the war effort. I believe this Government is the biggest waster of manpower in the country. I think we could get 1,000,000 men for the Army from these bureaus, on the basis of this study made by appointees of men on your own side of the aisle.

The Legislative Reference Service says this:

> Any Government agency which sets out to solve a particular problem almost necessarily finds itself wanting to control or influence other more or less closely related areas which may have been assigned to other agencies for consideration. This is particularly true in wartime administration when a whole new set of agencies is superimposed upon an existing governmental structure.

I quote further from this report:

> A second cause of duplication and conflict may be seen in the origin of many of these Government agencies. Frequently an agency is the result of the activity of a particular group in the economic life of the country. Most agencies have their specific clienteles in the electorate—trade unions, small business, banks, wheat farmers, fruit growers, etc. Insofar as these groups use government to assist them, it frequently means that conflicts in the economic life of the country are reflected in conflicts between the corresponding agencies in the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, that is shown in the Division of Commercial Affairs of the State Department, in the Cultural Relations of the State Department, the Bureau of Economic Operations in the State Department, the Division of American Republics in the State Department, the Division of World War and Intelligence in the State Department, the Division of Monetary Research in the Treasury Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, the Export-Import Bank, the Supply Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

On the subject of economic warfare, there is the Maritime Commission, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Foreign Funds Control Division of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Economic Relations in the State Department, the Division of Exports and Defense Aids of the State Department, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, and the rest of them, which I will put in the RECORD.

In the matter of the subject of planning for the post-war period, you have the whole bailiwick of governmental agencies, with all of their separate plans, that never could anticipate anything at all for the domestic or home front needs of the Government an hour before imminent peril in this country, as for instance in the failure to get enough rubber in our stock pile or in the fact that we had to ration sugar shortly after the war began. We have these additional agencies in post-war planning:

We have the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Commerce Department, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Labor Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the Division of Monetary Research of the Treasury Department, the Canadian-American Economic Committee, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Agricultural Department, the Department Committee on Post Defense Planning, the Army Industrial College, the National Resources Planning Board, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, the Division of Special Research of the State Department, and the United States Housing Authority.

Where the trouble comes with these agencies is just as I have indicated, and I hope that Members will read in

the RECORD the list of duplications of the old-line agencies and the new agencies, so that we can put our shoulder to the wheel and cut down on this waste of manpower, and release them so that they may be by the side of the people in our respective districts, who are sacrificing and struggling to bring their boys back to this country safe and victorious.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. He is an able member of our committee, and would he not state in fairness to the people that he has just discussed, that in the office of every Ambassador in South and Central America sits his right-hand man from the Board of Economic Warfare, and that the Ambassador, the head of the representatives of our country in every foreign country, is in complete knowledge of whatever our activities are in those countries.

Mr. JONES. I would say that the gentleman has stated the testimony correctly, but I want to point out this, I attempted to ask the State Department, first Mr. Shaw, I think it was, how much we were going to spend all over South America. Nobody had a comprehensive picture. They said then that Mr. Sumner Welles would be up to testify about it, and I asked him, and I did not get any comprehensive picture from him. Then Dean Acheson came, and still I did not get a comprehensive picture, and then they finally said that we would have an off-the-record session, and a young lad, Larry Dugan, came up who testified before us. The stenographers were sent out, and we were in executive session. I asked him how much we were going to spend all over South America under the over-all program. I do not believe his answer is any military secret if I let out what he said, because it amounted to nothing. He said that they had never added it up yet. All of the time I had in my hand a publication from the United States News that went into detail as to the extent of our operations in South America, to the tune of $2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Think of it, Mr. Chairman—$2,000,000,000 of our hard-earned toil and sweat is proposed for expenditure in South America, and yet the State Department does not have a coordinate knowledge of all that is being done in their agency and the several war agencies, or they are unwilling to take us, the Congress of the United States, into their confidence. They are in two horns of a dilemma. I have a shelf of books containing every one of the hearings of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. Then I have that five-foot shelf of books you see so much advertised, promising the owner a liberal education. There is a distinction between the five-foot shelf of books, containing the appropriation hearings, and the five-foot shelf of books recommended by Dr. Eliot. I must confess that the five-foot shelf of the books of appropriation hearings leaves one with absolutely little knowledge of what is going on in the executive branch of the Government, and what the people may expect from the Government. We have to look to the American magazine of this month to find out what the planners have in view, in an article by Harry Hopkins, and we have to find out what is necessary for us in rationing and prices in the same magazine in an article by Prentiss Brown. We had to look last week to find out what is happening in the Interior Department, and the general economic outlook from Mr. Ickes' penthouse window at the top of the Interior Building, by reading the Collier's magazine. Time and time again in the last few years in an unparalleled crescendo of volume misery baiting and "Harry Kari" horoscope we have to learn, along with the general public, what is planned for Congress and the American people.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GORE. In connection with the gentleman's remarks that we are expending $2,000,000,000 in South America, whether correctly or not I do not know, will the gentleman tell us some of these strategic materials we are getting from that area, which are absolutely vital to the war effort as a result of our activity in South America?

Mr. JONES. It goes without saying, and I do not want to minimize the fact that we are getting some supply of rubber, and the gentleman can find that in the hearings. There was testimony as to our program in the Cultural Relations Division of the State Department appropriation bill, which amount to $250,000, as I recall, for the hothouse rubber-seedling program, and that we are getting some rubber from there. Lo and behold, the Board of Economic Warfare has spent some $7,000,000 to develop another program in South America. My criticism is not directed at the expenditure of money if it is necessary to solidify the South American people with the people of the United States to win the war. That is not my criticism at all. The gentleman misses the point of what I am trying to get at. I say that this program ought to be coordinated in one branch, an old-line branch, so that somebody, somewhere, in the State Department or any place else may handle it. If the administration does not have confidence in the State Department, let the Board of Economic Warfare take it over, but for goodness sake give somebody over-all control of what we are spending so that there is not this waste of manpower, running men from different agencies in the same place, doing a multitude of different things, when it might all be coordinated into one program. That is my criticism, and I ask the unified, unanimous approval of everybody on either side of the aisle to get that job accomplished in the name of the parents of the boys who are giving their all at the battle fronts.

SUMMARY

I am not unmindful of the fact that our committee chairman and this entire subcommittee have done their best to eliminate duplication from the appropriations that we have recommended, but I oppose our approach with every ounce of strength at my command.

The United States is making a bid for granting liberty and the four freedoms to all the peoples in the world, and I say today that if we cannot put our own administrative house in order better than we have to this date in war, God pity the peoples of the world if we foist our system upon them. If this Congress does not straighten out the duplication in the executive branch of the Government we will be the laughingstock of the world. We could save the waste of a million men that might well be used in direct war work—building munitions, building planes, tanks, and guns—if Congress tackles this problem of duplication and grabs the whiskers of the long-haired professors and theorists who want to make the country over and consider Congress an unnecessary hurdle to jump with glowing generalities and beautiful publicity material.

The entire hearings are replete with this struggle and jealousy between agencies that is attempted to be glossed over by love letters from administrators of the old and new agencies while down in the working ranks of these same agencies the workers are slugging it out with each other and calling each other names that could not be printed in these hearings.

I quote further from the Legislative Reference Service Study:

(E) ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Commerce Department.
Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Agriculture Department.
Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Department.
Federal Reserve Board.
Division of Monetary Research, Treasury Department.
Division of Special Research, State Department.

PLANNING FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Canadian-American Economic Committee.
Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Agriculture Department.
Departmental Committee on Post-Defense Planning, Agriculture Department.
Army Industrial College, War Department.
Committee on Economic Policy, Business Advisory Council, Commerce Department.
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Commerce Department.
Economic Defense Board.
Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Board.
Committee on Post-War Plans, Federal Security Agency.
Public Works Reserve, Federal Works Agency.
Division of Post Defense Labor Problems, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Department.
National Resources Planning Board.
Office of Inter-American Affairs.
Division of Special Research, State Department.
United States Housing Authority.

It is not at all certain that actual control need enter in. Much might be accomplished by informal suggestions and consultation. This might lead to each researcher placing his findings at the disposal of the others and

thereby lessen the work and strengthen the quality of the results. These suggestions would be particularly effective if they came from the Bureau of the Budget, in view of the ultimate control of the latter over appropriations. It has been suggested in certain quarters that the Library of Congress would be an appropriate location for such a registry of research. It would be particularly appropriate if the Library were to agree to service governmental researchers individually with notice of all new material relating to the field of their interest. In such a case, registration might well be obtained voluntarily, in view of the advantages thereby obtained by the researchers.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The problem of duplication is one of growing seriousness. Particularly during wartime, there must be conservation and allocation of the limited administrative and scholarly resources among our people. Duplication is so much lost motion.

Congressional activity may be effective along two lines: (1) Investigation. (2) Directives. Directives could concern themselves with such matters as (a) establishment of a registry of research, (b) limitation of appropriations to agencies obviously duplicating.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry. I do not have much time.

At page 9 of the hearings Mr. Hull said:

Finally I ask the grant of moneys ample to enable the Department to carry on its publication program uninterruptedly.

If it had not been my fine friend and able statesman, the Secretary of State, I might have interrupted him at that point and said, "Where is Elmer?" There you run into another duplication of effort. Elmer Davis has more writers who have more ideas than a tomcat has sweethearts on a backyard fence; yet we have a plea by the State Department to get more writers in the Publication Division of the State Department. Where is it all going to end?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Can we not look at this thing from the standpoint of the great statesman from England, Hon. Winston Churchill, who on the 10th of November 1936 uttered the criticism, when the British Minister of Defense refused to undertake radical changes in organization and defense supply until there was urgent proof of its necessity? Winston Churchill said:

So we go into a strange paradox, decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful to be impotent.

We cannot afford, in the name of the boys who are giving everything that they have, working all around the clock, eating what they can get hold of, wild rice or anything else; they know no hours or minimum wages or minimum standards. All they know is to listen to the command. "Theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die." Can we not look at it from the standpoint of the men at the front and decide that we shall not as a Congress be irresolute, but that we shall tackle this problem with all the will at our command, and say that one man shall do the job, and if the old-line agency has been equipped over long years of study to do the kind of a job that needs to be done today, we ought to build on that, instead of creating a new one from soup to nuts to flounder around and lose time and manpower and effort?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I now yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I just want to express my hearty sympathy for what the gentleman has had to say. I should like to call attention to the fact that by his own showing the State Department is not in a position to give information with regard to these other agencies, which, although they are under certain nominal control of the ambassadors to different countries, they are not under the control of the State Department. I should like to join with the gentleman in a full investigation of the Board of Economic Warfare, not only to the extent of its operations but as to the method by which untrained men are being selected to represent this country in other countries. But I do want to remind the gentleman and the Committee that it is the State Department bill we are considering.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us how many of these different employees of the Government and of the different bureaus are over in South America at this time?

Mr. JONES. I do not have the figure. Partial information is scattered through different parts of the hearings.

Mr. O'HARA. Approximately the number.

Mr. JONES. I cannot give approximately the number because we did not have a report on O. W. I., Lend-Lease, and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is not opposed to certain of these activities?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, very briefly I want to discuss a matter in which the House of Representatives is placidly assuming responsibility and I think not looking out for itself.

As I have warned in the House of Representatives repeatedly, we are running rapidly into a shortage of oil for the purposes of the war and for domestic consumption. Pipe lines to the East from the Southwest may ease the oil situation on the seaboard, but a shortage of oil to transportation is imminent.

On December 16 I gave the House a report on conditions and trends in the petroleum industry. I presented statistics on supply and showed from the figures then available that current production was not adequate to meet the demand.

We were running behind then, and we are running behind now. The discovery record of 1942 was poor. Throughout the year, it was necessary to take oil from storage and the total of all oils, crude and products, was fifty-seven and one-half million barrels—about a 10-percent withdrawal.

In 1942, the Bureau of Mines' figures show, the demand for crude oil produced from the fields of the United States totaled 1,395,000,000 barrels and the wells of this country lacked 10,000,000 barrels of producing that quantity. There is some reserve producing capacity, but it is in areas not adequately supplied with the means of transportation. A committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council recently asserted that by the end of 1943 the demand for crude oil will exceed the maximum efficient producing capacity from all present fields in the United States, even assuming that new outlets could be provided for the few areas not well supplied with transportation.

There will then be no margin, no safety factor. Unless new, substantial fields are discovered soon, we shall be scraping the bottom of our national oil barrel.

We do not know exactly what the demand for petroleum will be. The factors which we lack in estimating the over-all amount are the amounts which the Army and Navy expect to use. Such information cannot be revealed publicly. We do know that every official utterance on the subject points to sharp rise in petroleum requirements. The Bureau of Mines, on March 2, said:

Possibly the clearest factor, at the present time, is that the 1942 reduction of over 58,000,000 barrels in stocks of all oils cannot be repeated. If the total demand for all oils and imports in 1943 should approximate the 1942 levels, and there were no withdrawals from total stocks, an increase of about 4 percent in crude production would be required.

From somewhere we would have to get more than 57,000,000 barrels of crude oil in excess of that which was produced in 1942.

In 1942 we used 1,395,000,000 barrels.

In 1942 we produced 1,385,000,000 barrels.

In 1942 we used storage stocks to the extent of 57,950,000 barrels.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman's information mean that they are going to increase the amount of oil they will permit to be pumped from these wells? Some wells are going out of business because they are not allowed to pump enough to keep the wells in operation.

Mr. DISNEY. I think that will probably come about but the present price is too low to make it profitable. Price is really the subject I am discussing. The shortage of oil is going to continue unless we have a price which induces pro-

ducers to bring in new wells and is such that they can afford to produce.

Mrs. BOLTON. It must be such as to provide an incentive to operate wells that could be productive.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, indeed. From somewhere we would have to get 57,000,000 barrels.

Here is a brief summary that can be easily assimilated.

The statistics on discoveries of reserves are even more startling:

In 1934 we discovered 1,699,000,000 barrels of reserve oil.

In 1942 we discovered only 317,000,000 barrels.

That does not mean it was ready for production, but that is the amount of new discoveries that were made in 1934.

In 1942, 8 years later, we discovered only 317,000,000 barrels, less than one-sixth.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the gentleman have to suggest to encourage exploration for more oil?

Mr. DISNEY. I think the O. P. A. with its stupid theory that you can continue the present price levels must be modified. Manufactured articles are not produced for pastime, they are produced with the idea of the producers making a profit. I am going into the question of price in just a little bit in such a way as will, I think, open your eyes. If you were in the oil business at the present time I do not think you would have any great encouragement to continue.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there any shortage of adequate drilling machinery so far as the gentleman knows, for the development of new areas and wildcatting?

Mr. DISNEY. There is some shortage of steel, but men will always find a way to drill oil wells if they can get a price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. In regard to the matter of stocks on hand, last year there were 555,000,000 barrels of stock on hand. As I said, we used 57,000,000 of those stocks. But all those stocks are not available for consumable use; about 40 to 60 percent of that is necessary in the pipe lines to keep the oil moving, necessary in our refineries. So the only conclusion we can reach is that not more than half that quantity is what you would call consumable stocks instantly consumable.

In 1941 we drilled 20,089 productive oil wells. In 1942—listen to these startling figures—we drilled 10,988, half as many. Productive oil wells drilled from January 1 to March 22, to compare other years with this year: In 1941 in the period of time from January 1 to March 22 we drilled 3,618 wells; in 1942, 3,435 wells; in 1943, 1,787 wells—about one-third as many. Then total oil wells, gas wells, and dry holes drilled January 1 to March 22: In 1940, 6,937; in 1941, 6,051; in 1942, 5,742; in 1943, 3,812.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wonder if the gentleman would not also indicate the reduction in the amount of actual oil produced? The gentleman has shown the decline in the number of wells drilled, but along with that the amount of oil produced has declined even more than the number of new wells drilled.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; the gentleman is correct. I do not have the exact statistics on that subject.

The outstanding fact is that last year we produced 10,000,000 barrels less than we used, and we do not know what the needs of the Army and the Navy are going to be.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. They cannot tell us because it is a military and naval secret. We do know however that there is no supply of oil from the East Indies to the United Nations. We do know that the available supply of the Near East, in Asia, is hampered by transportation and warfare problems. Nearly all of the world's high-octane gas is manufactured in the United States, manufactured for all the allies. We do not manufacture much high-octane gas from South American oil.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And the fact is that the demand is greater than our supply.

Mr. DISNEY. Tremendously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And we are not doing a solitary thing to increase the supply; rather we are holding it down.

Mr. DISNEY. Not a thing. We have heard that there will probably be an announcement about price tomorrow, but I doubt whether that price will be sufficient to create the incentive to bring in new wells. Let me go into this for just a moment. The cost of producing a barrel of oil has risen enormously since 1937. The price of crude oil, except for rayon, has been at the bottom of the list of commodity prices for years. The price now of crude oil has very little effect on the rate of production, yet it is the independents who produce 75 percent of the production. They have been working under low crude prices for years.

Here is a summary of our situation:

In 1942, we used 1,395,000,000 barrels.

In 1942, we produced 1,385,000,000 barrels.

In 1942, we used storage stocks to the extent of 57,950,000 barrels.

The statistics on discoveries of reserves are even more startling:

In 1934, we discovered 1,699,000,000 barrels of reserve oil.

In 1942, we discovered only 317,000,000 barrels.

I call your attention to the following table. This is authentic, coming from Mr. E. DeGolyer, Assistant Deputy Administrator of Petroleum:

Year:	Barrels
1934	1,699,000,000
1935	1,934,000,000
1936	1,894,000,000
1937	2,119,000,000
1938	1,894,000,000
1939	943,000,000
1940	945,000,000
1941	361,000,000
1942	317,000,000

When reserves of petroleum are discussed, we must keep in mind that these reserves produce slowly. It has taken over 25 years to recover 20,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum, during which time the average number of productive oil wells drilled was approximately 16,000 wells per annum and approximately 6,000 dry holes per annum.

The monthly production of crude petroleum is interesting. The range is downward as illustrated by the following table taken from the reports of the United States Bureau of Mines—except February 1943, which was procured from the Oil and Gas Journal:

Monthly production of crude petroleum

Month and year:	Barrels
December 1941	128,434,000
January 1942	128,262,000
February 1942	113,961,000
March 1942	114,473,000
April 1942	105,053,000
May 1942	110,192,000
June 1942	108,595,000
July 1942	111,782,000
August 1942	120,429,000
September 1942	115,801,000
October 1942	120,311,000
November 1942	116,101,000
December 1942	120,519,000
January 1943	117,227,000
February 1943	108,301,000

Referring again to the use of petroleum stocks, 57,950,000 barrels of which were withdrawn from December 1941 to January 1943, the following table is authentic from reports of the United States Bureau of Mines:

All petroleum stocks (above ground)

Month and year:	Barrels
December 1941	555,810,000
January 1942	553,291,000
February 1942	555,982,000
March 1942	546,108,000
April 1942	532,556,000
May 1942	524,356,000
June 1942	515,132,000
July 1942	507,779,000
August 1942	513,641,000
September 1942	512,050,000
October 1942	512,249,000
November 1942	502,533,000
December 1942	497,405,000
January 1943	497,860,000

Decrease, December 1941 to January 1943, 57,950,000 barrels.

It must be borne in mind that a large portion of the oil in stocks above the ground is static—40 to 50 percent—needed for retained use in pipe lines and in refineries. So the entire volume of petroleum stocks on hand are not available for use as consumable products.

Looking into the matter of productive oil wells drilled, the following figures are authentic, in my opinion:

Productive oil wells drilled

1941	20,089
1942	10,988

Productive oil wells drilled from Jan. 1 to Mar. 22

1941	3,618
1942	3,435
1943	1,787

Total oil wells, gas wells, and dry holes drilled, Jan. 1 to Mar. 22

1940	6,937
1941	6,051
1942	5,742
1943	3,812

The slump in field work that has been forecast in recent weeks has been definitely under way for some time. It is noted that there were only 33 completions in the week ending March 24 in both Kansas and Oklahoma, as against 57 completions the preceding week, followed by only 50 completions the following week. My information is that this trend is continuing in all the oilfields.

As I have stated, the Army and Navy uses and needs of oil for all purposes are matters of military and naval secrets. However, we do know that there is no supply of oil from the East Indies for the United Nations. We do know that the available supply of the Near East, in Asia, is hampered by transportation and warfare problems. We do know that the United Nations are depending almost entirely upon production in the United States for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline. Without new discoveries and a real incentive for the production of oil, we may reasonably expect that the shortage of oil, with the downward trend of production that I have pointed out, will continue until there is a rude awakening.

The average daily production of crude petroleum, based on the reports of the Bureau of Mines, for October, November, and December 1941, and January 1942 was 4,114,300 barrels daily. The average daily production of crude petroleum from February 1942 through February 1943, inclusive, was 3,776,438 barrels per day, indicating a drop in the latter period averaging 337,862 barrels per day.

The report of the United States Tariff Commission indicates that operating, general, and administrative expenses of crude production increased for the second quarter of 1942 over the third quarter of 1941 a total of 14 percent.

In this connection, the price statistics are interesting. In January 1937, Oklahoma 36-gravity crude oil brought $1.22 per barrel. On March 15, 1943, the same quality of oil brought $1.17 per barrel. During the same two periods, 63–67 octane gasoline, f. o. b. tank cars in Oklahoma refineries was priced on January 25, 1937, 5.125 cents per gallon while on March 15, 1943, the price was 5.5 cents per gallon. In other words, the refineries, chiefly the large major companies, have gotten a raise in the price of their refined products, while the independent producer of crude oil is getting less now for his oil than in 1937.

We hear it currently stated that "the independent oil producer, really the backbone of the industry, is on his way out." Such statements are not surprising. Independents are selling out to the major companies constantly because they cannot continue in business profitably under existing circumstances.

As in every other industry, the price produces the goods or vice versa. In 1920, $3.07 per barrel for crude oil resulted in the drilling and reopening of 56,000 oil wells or a net increase of the total number of operating oil wells of 40,163. In 1931, 67 cents per barrel for oil resulted in the abandonment and shutting-in of over 22,000 oil wells. A net loss of producing oil wells during that year, 1931, of 15,020.

The cost of producing a barrel of oil has risen enormously, by comparison, since 1935. Oil has been at the bottom of the index for years. The price of every other commodity has gone up, except oil. The price of crude oil has little effect on the price of refined products. So, it is the producer, chiefly the independent producer, who has taken the gaff on low crude oil prices for many years. The public has not suffered, since the price of gasoline has not advanced appreciably.

It is conservatively estimated that it costs 50 cents per barrel more to produce oil than in 1937, chiefly due to rising prices of labor and materials.

It should be obvious to every Member of Congress where the fault lies. Men do not produce cotton, wheat, manufactured articles, or oil for pastime. Like any other article of commerce, oil is produced for a profit. If it cannot be produced at a profit, it remains in the ground. The time approaches, in my judgment, when a cry to the high heavens will go up about the shortage of oil. We will then look back and see that the executive department's delays, stubbornness and shortcomings have brought about this shortage. I believe that the Congress should act before it is too late, because it is apparent that the executive department will not act effectively.

The public has not suffered on account of refined products because that has moved along at an even keel.

It is conservatively estimated that the cost of a barrel of oil has risen at least 50 cents per barrel since 1937 owing to higher labor costs and the higher cost of materials. The average daily production of crude petroleum based on the report of the Bureau of Mines for October, November, and December 1941, and January 1942, was 4,114,300 barrels daily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, here is the solution to your problem. In 1920, $3.07 a barrel for oil resulted in the drilling and reopening of 56,000 oil wells or a net increase in the total number of operating wells of 40,163. In 1931, 67-cent oil resulted in the abandonment and the shutting in of over 22,000 oil wells, a net loss of producing wells during that year of 15,020. If we are going to sit here and take the responsibility of saving the face of the O. P. A. then we are not as intelligent as we ordinarily deport ourselves.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It ought to be indicated that even though there may be a rise in the price on a barrel of oil of 50 cents, as far as a gallon of high-octane gas is concerned, it is infinitesimally small.

Mr. DISNEY. It will not change the price of refined products at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us for consideration carries with it an appropriation for three of our executive departments, $33,358,100 for the State Department, $102,657,300 for the Department of Justice, and $53,714,000 for the Department of Commerce, a total of $189,729,400, or a decrease of $17,895,155 compared with last year. It would be impossible in the few minutes allotted me to attempt to analyze the justifications submitted to your committee upon which the appropriations are based. No doubt you will find a number of items in these appropriations that are somewhat misleading. This is particularly true of items in the appropriation for the State Department. I think it is proper to say that some of the titles to these appropriations do not register the real purpose of the appropriation. Some of them are entirely new. They did not exist 2 years ago or 5 years ago and some of them not even 1 year ago. But we are in a great war and we are making appropriations to be used for the execution of this war in the most efficient way possible.

The State Department today has been subjected to a great deal of criticism. The appropriations for the Department have been subjected to some criticism. Reference has been made to a number of the items, and it would be impossible for me in the time allotted to make public the exact grounds upon which these appropriations are based. One illustration, however, might serve.

We have an appropriation in here for the Bureau of Fisheries to be administered in the State Department, but that appropriation is going to be used or a similar appropriation was used last year ostensibly to investigate or study the fishing industry in South American waters but the real purpose was to investigate and report on the activities of our enemies in these waters. The evidence before your committee was to the effect that the appropriation for last year contributed materially in finding out definitely and unmistakably the plans, the purposes and the designs of our war enemies in the waters adjoining South America. The information obtained as to their plans and placed in the hands of our military experts or those charged with the responsibility of prosecuting this war, aided materially in frustrating the plans of the enemy activities in those waters.

A number of other appropriations have been made available that on their face appear to be absolutely useless and without the information brought to your committee off the record I would be constrained to question the wisdom or the advisability of some of them.

I make this statement for the purpose of showing that while we would not subscribe to some of these appropriations and your committee would not subscribe to some of these items as they appear on their face, unless we felt and had infor-

mation to the effect that they were going to be used for the welfare and best interests of our country in this emergency. Some of you who serve on other committees, particularly subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, know that all the appropriations for the prosecution of this war are not confined primarily to appropriations for the War Department or to the Navy Department or the Marine Corps. They are often lodged in the appropriation for some of the other executive departments.

The question has been raised why appropriations should be made for other departments and included in the State Department appropriation bill, for example. One reason is that the expenditure of funds in various countries, for the purposes named, looking toward the prosecution of the war, the State Department is that department of our Government which is charged with the responsibility of maintaining State relationships that probably have existed under treaty, under agreement, or otherwise, for many years. The State Department, therefore, is well advised, is well posted, is familiar with all the laws, all the practices, all the customs, and all the diplomatic arrangements with such countries. It would be unfortunate to make an appropriation for one department to be expended in a foreign country, it matters not how efficient the individuals who expend them may be in their particular line of work or activity, they may not be in position to know how far they could go under existing diplomatic relations and how far they could go under the diplomatic relationship between the two governments. Therefore, it is necessary that the State Department be associated or connected in some way with these appropriations so that the expenditures might be correlated and expended without violating long-established rules, long-established understandings, or long-established agreements between our Government and governments of other countries in order to avoid what might develop to be serious complications. They might develop complications as serious as some of those existing with countries with which we are now at war.

I wish it were possible to take some of these items and discuss them, so far as I might be justified in doing so, but that would not be possible in the 10 minutes allotted. But before leaving the State Department let me reply to the question raised here this afternoon as to what kind of war materials we obtain from South America, indicating by the question that we are not getting anything in the way of materials for the money spent for this purpose in South America. Now, what kind of strategic materials are we obtaining from South America? I took the liberty to jot down a few of them. Aluminum is one; antimony is another; asbestos, chrome, copper, commercial diamonds, graphite, iron, lead, manganese, tin, platinum, tungsten, mercury, and so forth, all of which are highly essential materials. It may be that some of these materials are obtainable from other sources, but they are all available and are being obtained from South America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, we all know they are highly essential, and they must be obtained. Some of us believe that some of them must be obtained at any price, because they are indispensable in the manufacture of equipment so essential in the prosecution of this war.

The State Department, therefore, carries these appropriations in its appropriation bill, and obtains experts from various other departments to supervise the expenditures in such a way that we shall be able to obtain the greatest amount of strategic material and avoid the possibility of going contrary to long-established relations of our Government with others.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

I would not attempt to minimize the activities of other divisions in this Department, but I want to give a few moments' attention to the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice. In 1943 its appropriation was $1,800,000. The estimate for 1944 is $1,600,000. The committee approved that estimate, so the estimate for next year will be $1,600,000, or a decrease of $200,000.

Evidence before the committee was that the work of this Division had materially increased on account of additional work brought to the Division by the Board of Economic Warfare, the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, and other newly created agencies of the Government following the declaration of war. This Division inherited additional work from the Board of Economic Warfare, primarily because it had valuable information on the business activities, the business policies, and the business programs in Germany and Japan.

The many cases arising in the War Production Board on account of priorities logically found their way into this Division.

The Office of Price Administration soon found in its work the possibility of a real monopoly problem which commanded immediate and prompt action. Some of us have heard that the activities of the War Production Board, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, and the Office of Price Administration have tended to create monopolies instead of decrease them. Consequently, the work of this Division has materially increased.

I am convinced by the testimony that one of the drawbacks to the efficiency of this division is a mistake made by Congress in the passage of the original antitrust law. The penalties placed in the original law were too low. Since the passage of the original antitrust laws the penalties have become of little value as to what they should be today. Monopolies have grown to such enormous proportions that the penalties placed in the original act today amount to nothing more than chicken feed and have little or no restraining effect.

For instance, the Antitrust Division brought suit 2 years ago against a number of fertilizer companies, charging them with violating the antitrust laws. Last year 100 of these companies plead guilty at Winston-Salem, N. C., by coming into court and entering a plea of nolo contendere. What was the fine? The maximum under the law, as I understand, is $500 on a count. The court fixed a fine totaling a little less than $300,000. They paid the fine, snapped their fingers, and walked out, and then by agreement increased the price of fertilizers in some cases as much as $5 per ton, when 6 cents per ton would have paid the fine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. My thought is that the penalty clause in the antitrust laws should be amended, and be amended to a great extent so that the penalty would be much higher, particularly when the plea of nolo contendere is entered. I think the penalty in that case should be fixed by law at not less than $10,000 on every count. Monopolies would not then come into court and innocently as they say plead guilty, take a little fine, and go out and appear to have a clear conscience.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word now with reference to the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice.

According to the testimony furnished, the appropriation for 1943, combining both the regular and national defense items, totaled $38,836,000, the estimates presented by the Bureau of the Budget for 1944 being $43,568,000, or an increase of $3,932,000. Of the total amount requested, $7,908,000 is for what is called the regular appropriation of the Bureau and the national defense appropriation requested for 1944 is $35,560,000. The committee reduced the total appropriation $800,000.

We would not have the time to call attention to the various activities of this Bureau, but in order to give some idea as to the volume of work required we find for 1943 appropriations were made for 13,921 employees and 14,337 are requested for 1944, there being 7,218 of this number employed in the city of Washington and 7,119 in the field service, of which latter number 4,677 are classed as special agents and 2,422 as clerks. The Director of the Bureau stated in his justifications of the appropriation that all employees are now on a 48-hour work-week program and that the voluntary overtime service last year amounted to 9,992,346 hours. The Identification Division, where all fingerprint records are received and recorded, will have 5,158 employees this year In this Division they maintain a 24-hour-a-day work basis, the total number of fingerprints recorded to date being placed at 61,778,536, and the number is increasing progressively. During the first 6 months of 1942 this Division received 4,071,230 sets of fingerprints and during the first 6 months of 1943 15,507,377, an increase of over 11,000,000 prints in the first 6 months of this year, the daily receipt

being 105,914 sets. Of course, the increase is largely due to the fact that all United States Government employees, military personnel, and applicants for employment in war industry and civilian agencies of the Government are required to be fingerprinted and placed with this Bureau for handling and recording.

During the first 6 months of 1942 2,406,523 sets of fingerprints of employees in war industries were received, and 11,662,431 such sets were received during the first 6 months of 1943. It is said to be highly important for the reason that these persons are working in commercial industry, aircraft factories, munitions factories, and other plants engaged in the manufacture of military equipment, and so forth, for the Army and Navy with the hope that they would obviate as much as possible sabotage or espionage in our war-production program.

There has also been a decided increase in the administrative and investigative work of the Bureau, which is not only an important factor in law enforcement throughout the country but in furnishing information relative to crime trends as well as the probable causes or influences which give rise to what appears to be a substantial increase in different types of offenses against society. We will not attempt to go into this phase of the Bureau's activities at length, but some of us were impressed at some of the data presented to your committee and the suggestions of Mr. Hoover, Director of the Bureau, as to the causes and possible influences necessary to avoid continued increases in crime. For example, the arrest for assault in 1942 by males under 21 years of age increased 17.1 over the number of arrests for previous year; rape by men under 21 increased 10.6 and disorderly conduct by men under 21 increased 26.2, despite the fact there is a large volume of young men who have gone into the military and naval service. The arrest for prostitution among girls under 21 years of age increased 64.8 and other sex offenses increased 104.7. The highest number of arrests made in the calendar year 1942 for any single age group, including both sexes, was 18 years of age, the number of arrests for this age reported were 26,371, the number 19 years of age 25,738, at 21 years of age 22,465, at 20 years of age 22,455, and at 22 years of age 19,996, and as you go on into the adult age the number drops off.

In response to an inquiry I made of the Director, Mr. Hoover, of his opinion as to the underlying causes of these offenses and their increases and whether he had any suggestions to offer as a remedy he stated there were a number of factors contributing to this situation, and, in view of his long experience, study, and observation of crime, its causes and consequences, I feel justified in quoting some of the observations he made before your committee. Referring to some of the factors that contributed to crime he said:

> Today, of course, youth is able to obtain employment at very large compensation when you compare it with what they could get 3 or 4 years ago; we have also fathers and mothers working away from the home which tends to lessen the home influence; we have also the lack of recreational facilities available for public use.

Proceeding further, he said:

> The matter of juvenile delinquency is one which can be remedied only by the combined efforts of homes, churches, schools, and civic organizations of our country. If, during this trying period, we forget the moral needs of the next generation we have not fulfilled the trust placed in us. You cannot disregard the home and the church in the building of a nation. It cannot and never has been done in the world and the thing that we need today, I think, is the return to the old-fashioned method of life so far as the home and the church are concerned.

In concluding this particular statement in his justification, he said:

> Today these young men and young women are going to work in factories, they are getting large salaries, making them feel free and independent; this feeling leads them into the crimes they are committing. The restricting factor of the home and the church playing the part they should play is not there.

The figures shown by this agency of the Government to me are alarming. They cannot be passed by with a wave of the hand.

It is a question this country cannot ignore. Here is a great problem for somebody. I do not know whether it is solely for the Congress to solve. It may be for the people—our constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, to my mind, this picture presents to us more than a legislative problem; it brings a challenge to the churches of this country; it brings a challenge to the homes of this country; it brings a challenge to the civic life of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members of the House, I give a full explanation of the various publications on the continuity of objectives and the program of marketing laws survey. I have a list of publications regarding this survey and respecting its several interests which I now present.

In press release No. 4–1663, issued by Works Progress Administration on April 3, 1938, announcing the marketing laws survey, Corrington Gill, then Assistant Administrator of W. P. A., stated that a project had been approved—

> to survey State marketing laws throughout the United States * * * to obtain legal and economic data concerning laws on the State statute books, and make it available in useful form to all Federal and State governmental agencies, trade associations, businessmen, lawyers, students, and teachers of law and marketing.

In this same press release in announcing the type of studies to be undertaken, Mr. Gill listed as group I the State antitrust laws modeled after the Sherman Act; group II as including cooperative marketing, food, drugs, cosmetics, and chain tax laws; and group III as State laws pertaining to the marketing of specific agricultural and industrial products.

This same release said further:

> To assist in the planning and execution of the survey a Federal advisory committee will be established on which representatives from the following bureaus and departments will be asked to serve: Department of Commerce, Treasury Department, Federal Trade Commission, Business Advisory Council, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Consumers Council of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Consumers Council of the Coal Commission, Department of Justice, and National Resources Board.

The men who served on that committee were:

Joseph J. O'Connell, special assistant to the General Counsel, Treasury Department.

Donald E. Montgomery, Consumers' Council, Department of Agriculture.

Frederick V. Waugh, Department of Agriculture.

Nathanael H. Engle, Department of Commerce.

Walter White, assistant to chairman, Business Advisory Council, Department of Commerce.

Francis Walker, Chief Economist, Federal Trade Commisison.

Dr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

Dr. Stuart A. Rice, Chairman, Central Statistical Board.

George T. Toss, Consumers' Council, Bituminous Coal Commission; and

Robert M. Cooper, special assistant to Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Outlines of studies which had been prepared by the marketing laws staff which on the economic side was headed by Dr. John H. Cover, of the University of Chicago, and on the legal side by Dr. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the George Washington University, were considered in detail by the advisory committee.

It was the advisory committee which decided the objectives for the survey, defined the basic methods to be followed and the character of the published findings. The basic outlines are presented in volume V.

During considerations of what the survey should seek to discover in the complexity and confusion of State and Federal marketing laws and the objectives that would best serve to promote the welfare of government and business, Maj. A. H. Martin, who had organized the survey under the general supervision of Corrington Gill, set up a board of legal consultants, or a legal advisory council, seeking the foremost authorities among the law professors of the country in the field of trade regulations. This council was to work directly with the staff, act as a final board of review and analysis. Its major

purpose was to give legal validity to the findings of the survey.

This advisory council, which met regularly until its work was completed, was composed of James A. McLaughlin, Harvard; Breck McAllister, Yale; Frank A. Strong, Ohio State; Frank Horack, Indiana; A. W. Fuchs, Washington of St. Louis, and S. C. Oppenheim, George Washington.

Since 1938 to the present March of 1943, there has been no change in the direction of these studies and objectives. There has been a sharpening of focus since December 7, 1941, attention being given primarily to problems which have been brought into bold relief by the war effort. Among others, outlines were drawn up and approved by the Advisory Committee of governmental departments and the legal advisory council for a study of food supply and controls.

The trade-barrier work of the Department of Commerce began in 1939, and was originally located in the Secretary's office. At that time an interdepartmental committee on interstate trade barriers was organized, with the Department of Commerce representative acting as chairman. In January 1940 all of this work was transferred to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. When the Marketing Laws Survey was transferred to the Bureau in November 1941, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, it was consolidated with the Trade Barrier Section, the new organization being called the Marketing Laws Unit. The Chief of this Unit also acts as chairman of the interdepartmental committee.

The interdepartmental committee was organized at a time when trade-barrier problems assumed significant proportions. A national conference was decided upon to be held by the Council of State Governments in Chicago in April 1939. Marketing Laws was requested by the Council of State Governments to prepare for publication from its statutory findings a complete chart of typical trade barriers.

The council asked the Marketing Laws Survey to limit its report to the following categories: Liquor legislation; motor vehicles; itinerant truckers; ports of entry; oleomargarine; dairy products; livestock, poultry, and general foods; nursery stock; use taxes; general preferences for State products and labor.

President Roosevelt endorsed the national conference of the Council of State Governments on these subjects in these words of his message to the conference April 1, 1939:

> The last few years have seen the rise of virtual tariff barriers along State lines—damaging restrictions that have hindered the free flow of commerce among the several States.
>
> Business, agriculture, and labor have all suffered because of State and regional discriminatory measures adopted in the vain hope of protecting local products from the hazards of economic fluctuations. * * *
>
> The Federal Government is seeking to break down trade walls between this and the other nations of the world, and to remove the hampering restrictions that have been placed upon world commerce.
>
> Interstate trade barriers, if allowed to develop and mutiply, will, however, constitute social and economic problems even more serious than international tariffs.

So much interest was aroused by this conference that the Survey had to rush into print its charts and scope notes on the trade barriers considered by the conference. The result was a volume entitled "Comparative Charts of State Statutes Illustrating Barriers to Trade Between States." Public demand has exhausted 3 printings at the Government Printing Office and the first edition issued by Marketing Laws Survey—considerably more than 10,000 copies.

Immediately after this conference, the advisory council decided that the general study of food markets should be completed, not only because of the Nation's concern with the consumer's market basket and rising legislation in the field of price controls and regulation, but as sound research in illustration of the changing patterns in national distribution caused by shifting and multiplying State legislation. But the bulk of legislation in the whole field of food supply was so immense, it could not be compressed into a single volume. Therefore it was determined to break down the general project and as a result a study of milk and dairy legislation became volume III in the Marketing Laws series. This volume was issued in 1941 although all work had been completed in 1940.

In the foreword to volume III, State Milk and Dairy Legislation, appears this statement over the signature of A. H. Martin, Jr., director of the Survey:

> The Survey undertook as the second phase of its research, the compilation and analysis of State legislation dealing directly with specific commodities.
>
> The first of these studies in immediacy of interest to government, business, and the consumer is the milk and dairy products industry. The present volume is the result of that research. * * *
>
> The intricately detailed regulations governing the Nation's general food markets are now being analyzed and charted for final manuscript and as early publication as possible.

During 1939 and 1940, Marketing Laws Survey continued its commodity studies and, in cooperation with the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Barriers supplied the Council of State Governments with trade-barrier data in the milk and dairy industry, butter, oleomargarines and other margarines, motor-vehicle transportation, use taxes, State preferences.

From November 1941 on, the Survey's W. P. A. projects in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago carried on research on divisions of the established objectives. Studies in oleomargarine, dairy products, milk-control acts, meats and meat products, cheeses and substitutes, grains and cereals, fruits and vegetables (to mention food products only in the 75 special studies) were completed by the W. P. A. projects for analysis by the review staff of the Marketing Laws Unit in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Early in 1942, the Survey and the Marketing Laws Unit in active daily consultation and cooperation with the war agencies—W. P. B., O. P. A., War Department, Navy, Office of Defense Transportation, Manpower Commission, Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor—prepared the agenda for the statutory compilations to be considered by State representatives, the specific restrictions in foods, transportation, construction, and labor supply for the Federal-State Conference on War Restrictions called by President Roosevelt to be held in May 1942, under the auspices of the Department of Commerce.

The materials on food supplies used at the conference were drawn from the compilations of the Marketing Laws Survey for its study on milk, butter, oleomargarine, and other foods, and from experts of the Department of Agriculture who appeared on the program of the conference.

In the final report on the proceedings of the May 5, 6, 7, 1942, Federal-State Conference on War Restrictions, issued by the Department of Commerce, appears this statement:

> In the field of agricultural products, restrictive legislation and barriers were cited as to milk and dairy products, oleomargarine, eggs, commercial feeds, and commercial fertilizers. * * *
>
> In the milk and dairy industry the most serious barriers are caused by lack of acceptance by one locality of the inspection made by other localities.
>
> Of the 17 States which have one or more of such restrictive provisions, only two stated an intention at the conference to take any real action to eliminate such restrictions. * * *
>
> Filled milk * * * is prohibited in some 30 States. Recommendations for the removal of this proscription met with little acceptance. * * * Two of the States did indicate, however, that consideration would be given to repeal of the law. * * *
>
> Of the States imposing excise taxes and license fees on margarine, only three stated that they would recommend repeal, and then repeal only for the duration.
>
> * * * The results further indicated, however, that this initial conference was only a beginning and must be followed up by continuous action and encouragement.

The current studies on trade barriers in the food industry, including milk, butter, oleomargarine, meat products, are in direct line and in direct fulfillment of the established objectives of Marketing Laws Survey from its organization in 1938.

Below is a complete list of publications of the Marketing Laws Survey, the Trade Barrier Section, and the Marketing Laws Unit, including one bulletin prepared by the University of Michigan and published by the Department—to illustrate a research technique which could be used in other parts of the country:

Name	Prepared by—	Published by—
Comparative Charts of Trade Barriers Between States	W. P. A. (1939)	W. P. A. (1939).
Vol. I—State Antitrust Laws (880 pp.)	W. P. A. (1938-39)	W. P. A.
Vol. II—State Price Control Legislation (558 pp.)	do	Do.
Vol. III—State Milk and Dairy Legislation (595 pp.)	W. P. A. (1939-40)	Do.
Vol. IV—State Liquor Legislation (910 pp.)	W. P. A. (1940-41)	Do.
Vol. V—Interstate Trade Barriers—Outline of Studies (244 pp.)	W. P. A. (1939-40)	Do.
Vol. VI—State Occupational Legislation (457 pp.)	W. P. A. (1941-42)	Do.
Vol. VII—Trade Barriers in Food Industry (308 pp.)	W. P. A. (1942)	Do.
Digest of State Laws Relating to Trade Barriers—Nine States (42 pp.).	W. P. A. (1939)	W. P. A. and interdepartmental committee.
Source and Citation Manual (31 pp.)	W. P. A. (1939-40-41)	W. P. A.
Master Memoranda and Outline of Specific Categories (72 pp.)	W. P. A. (1940)	Do.
Bibliography of Barriers to Trade (87 pp.)	W. P. A. (1941-42)	Do.
State Oleomargarine Legislation (55 pp.)	W. P. A. (1942)	Do.
Bibliography of Defense Production Associations and Community Pools (16 pp.).	do	Do.
Interstate Trade Barriers and Michigan Industry (42 pp.)	University of Michigan	Commerce.
5 articles on Food Trade Barriers published in Domestic Commerce.	Washington staff—Marketing Laws.	Do.
Aspects of Trade Barriers (McLean report) (mimeograph)	Commerce (1940) and interdepartmental committee.	Do.
Trade Barriers—Summary of testimony before T. N. E. C. (40 pp. and charts).	W. P. A (1940)	W. P. A. for 7,500S copies, Commerce 3,500 copy reprints.
Supplement to Vol. I—State Antitrust Laws (79 pp.)	W. P. A. (1941-42)	W. P. A.
Supplement to Pt. 1 of Vol. II—Price Control (197 pp.)	W. P. A. (1942)	Do.
Supplement to Pt. 2 of Vol. II—Price Control (185 pp.)	do	Do.
Summary of proceedings: Federal-State Conference on War Restrictions (172 pp.).	Commerce	W. P. A. funds.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, today the Members of this House have had the opportunity of hearing the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] analyze the oil problem confronting the Nation in a very able, constructive, and intelligent address.

I want to go on record endorsing his position and the facts he has so ably set forth. For several years now I have lived close to the oil problem, particularly as it affects Illinois and the tri-State area. The first oil wells in Illinois in 1937 touching off the big oil boom for my State were drilled in my district, the leading oil pool in the State being located in my county, known as the Salem-Centralia pool. I have seen it develop from that time to some 2,500 wells in my county, with thousands of other producing wells being brought in in my district spreading out to many counties over southern Illinois.

I have seen it bring prosperity to our entire section of the State, benefiting millions of people who by reason of such prosperity have not only built up their communities, redeemed their farms, and paid off their debts, but such production has placed our people in a position which enables them now to throw their full financial strength into the war effort, with the result that in every oil county in Illinois every Red Cross drive and every bond issue has been oversubscribed.

Better than that regardless of bureaucratic harassment and at times governmental restrictions there has been built up in this central industrial and farming section of the Nation a great oasis of oil reaching a production of 340,000 barrels per day. With such production within 65 miles of St. Louis and within from 50 to 300 miles of every war plant in Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, and Kentucky, I need not dwell on the importance of Illinois oil and the tri-State area in its support of the civilian needs and the striking power of the tri-State area in the war effort now of the Nation.

I would like to make this point here. Had it not been for the efforts of a group of us men who were willing to go out and fight to protect this oil industry in its infancy this great production would not have been developed to a point where it can now render such substantial aid to the economic and civilian demands of the people, the Nation, and the war effort.

In 1941 in the midst of the development and expansion of the oil industry in Illinois there were those then, as there always have been, who wanted to slow down production by the passage of a proration bill. A number of businessmen and leading citizens of my section of the State who stood for continued and greater production organized public thought and sentiment against this move, defeating the proposition before the Illinois Legislature.

Later in that year, in an effort to conserve steel, a Federal order known as M68 was issued by the Petroleum Administrator which restricted drilling to 1 well to 40 acres. That move struck a disastrous blow at oil development in Illinois. It almost stopped the bringing in of new wells. We again called upon public sentiment to exert itself and in the fall of 1942 this order was modified, permitting the drilling of 4 wells to 40 acres, by the new order known as M63-5.

Within the past few days this order has been extended indefinitely, and I am glad to commend Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Coordinator for War, and his assistants on the wisdom of their decision. It is to be hoped now that there will not be further attempts by the Federal Government or by any of the States to restrict the production of oil, now so vital to the Nation and to our allies. We need more production, more new wells. We need to explore and build up our reserves, not restrict them. Any move restricting oil development now cannot be justified on any grounds.

Now, I want to call the attention of you Members from the New England States and you of the eastern seaboard, who with your constituents have been shivering and suffering for the want of heat during the past winter and who may be suffering again next winter, to the importance to you of Illinois and tri-State oil production.

This production is of first importance to you and your people because these oil fields lie 1,000 miles nearer to your homes than do the oil fields of the Southwest. For this reason, twice as much oil can be freighted to you in railway tank cars in the same time at less expense and wear and tear on rails and railway rolling stock. It is important that you understand and remember this, for there likely will come a time when we in this oil-producing area will call upon you for help in this Congress, call for your moral support in keeping oil production up to top limits in Illinois and the tri-State area.

What the Nation needs now is more oil. To get more oil, there must be less interference with production, less restriction, more material and equipment allotted to the oil industry, a liberalization by the Interstate Commerce Commission of its red tape, which prevents thousands of trucking lines from freely crossing State lines and delivering the goods wherever they are needed. We need to use the scissors and cut red tape wherever it hinders production and distribution.

And in addition to the above suggestions there is one major necessary move that should be made at once. The price of crude oil should be immediately raised 50 cents per barrel. There has not been an advance in the price of oil since early in 1941.

In fact crude prices were frozen by the O. P. A. Administrator at that time. Since that time wages of oil workers have been increased, lack of proper truck transportation and various restrictions with loss of man-hours while waiting for repairs has caused the expense of production to be greatly increased. Added to that, many efficient young men working in the oil fields have volunteered or been drafted into the armed forces, their places being filled with inexperienced help and often by older men. These difficulties have greatly increased the cost of production.

Those responsible for fixing oil prices, those whose job it is to see that enough oil is produced to keep our war plants and our Air Force, Navy, and land armies supplied to their utmost striking power are now confronted with an oil problem which plainly calls for more wildcatting, which means more exploration, more new oil wells.

To get this—and we must have it—requires only two major normal moves. First, a higher price. Second, less restrictions. It is that simple. You cannot expect operators to gamble their money and effort on bringing in new wells, when they know the price they get, if they get oil, will not pay off the price of production. This move, it seems to me, should have been made a year ago.

It is imperative now. It cannot wait. Profit will increase production.

Our demand for oil for the war effort and the Nation increases with the production of every tank, truck, airplane, and battleship. We are spending billions for such expansion. The Government spends nothing for oil development. It should now make a move to let the civilian make such a profit on his investment as will permit him to stay in business and supply this vital product. This point must be admitted and seen before it is too late, before we are facing an oil-shortage crisis.

Since the present price was set at 1941 levels, production and reserves have gone down every month, to a low now of 3,860,000 barrels daily. The percentage drop has been 6 percent. The trend must be reversed. It cannot and will not be reversed until the price is raised. It will be difficult then, because of lack of skilled labor.

At this point I want to quote from a speech made by the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Ickes, at Milwaukee on January 21, this year, 1943, in which he said, and I quote:

> The figures previously cited with respect to residual oil depicts a condition which has been with us since August. They show a condition of steady and continuous decline of inventories. Our stocks have been going down, down, down in inverse ratio to the steadily mounting requirements of the war program. The war plants and the great steel mills are consuming heavy oils in tremendous quantities, and there has been an ever-continuing demand for more and more oil from the railroads.

In this same speech he says again, and I quote:

> Your association in the main is composed of independent operators and distributors. As such, it is representative of the men who constitute the backbone of the American oil industry.

Following Mr. Ickes' statement let me point out that the independent operators by the thousands have always been regarded as the ones who do the most pioneering or wildcatting. If this be true, they do the most exploring and bring in the most new wells. The Petroleum Coordinator wants more new wells brought in in 1943 than in any year of the past. The little fellow, the independent, cannot do his full share because his capital is so limited he cannot carry on for a longer time at a loss. The major companies can carry on for longer, but it is grossly unfair to them to ask them to produce oil at a loss.

It comes down to these hard cold facts, the little fellow referred to by Mr. Ickes as the backbone of the oil industry is being forced out of business. Thousands of them have been forced to quit. This must be stopped. A price raise will help to do it. They must have this relief.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman know of any way on earth whereby we can get more oil and new reserves, except by a rise in the price, so that oil men will at least get their cost of production and enable them to make a profit?

Mr. VURSELL. I see no other possible way.

Mr. DISNEY. In other words, there is no way to get a larger production of oil unless there is a rise in price?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Now let me make an observation with which most of you Congressmen are familiar.

Over a year ago the manpower question came before this House. The executive department practically informed the Congress the matter would be handled without congressional interference. You know it was not done. You know it now confronts the Nation with a crisis that has spread a wicked and unnecessary confusion throughout the land that has hurt tremendously the morale of the Nation.

The Congress saw a food shortage coming. It passed legislation in the hope of helping to prevent it. The President vetoed the bill and the Secretary of Agriculture, backed by the President, as evidenced by his vetoing of the Bankhead bill last week, refused to allow parity prices to the farmers, as was the intent of Congress. Now we have a food shortage impending which is inexcusable and tragic.

I hope such a condition will not be brought about as will affect our ability to produce the oil our Nation must have. I have confidence that Mr. Ickes and his Department will not allow this to happen.

This oil question is of such constant and continuing importance to the Nation that I feel the Congress should keep, at all times, close to and conversant with the facts. We must keep in close touch with it. It is our duty.

It is for this reason that I have presumed upon your time today to discuss the oil question briefly as it affects our national life. I hope the Members of this House, whether or not you live in an oil area, will take the same interest in oil as we Members who do. You all must use oil. It is of tremendous importance to all of us. Many of our comforts come from it, and we must produce it to win the war. Our national security, our liberty, depends upon it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to comment on one phase of this bill. I shall address my remarks with respect to the field services of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and before I do I should like to commend the committee for the very intelligent way in which they have approached the problem presented by the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for the elimination of these field-service offices. It is to be expected, of course, that the great Committee on Appropriations, and this most efficient subcommittee on the three great departments of the Government, State, Justice and Commerce, would approach that problem in the constructive manner they have. We must be in agreement with the general policy of this committee in its intent to keep down to a minimum the expenditures and appropriations that are not entirely necessary. But, in my opinion, that theory might be carried to a dangerous extreme, and I believe that the Bureau of the Budget in its recommendation for the discontinuance of the field service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, has been guilty of carrying it to such an extent.

These officers, located as they are in about 12 of the principal cities of the country, have been rendering valuable service to the business interests of the country for many years. They not only have been rendering valuable service to the business interests but in the past 2 or 3 years they have likewise been rendering invaluable aid to the prosecution of the war. A review of the activities of those officers will, in my opinion, prove the case for the continuance of the field service more than anything I or anyone else could do.

I am familiar with the activities of the office in the city of New York. There they have one of the most active and probably the largest field office in the Service. In connection with its activities and on the basis of the present service which is being rendered, this field service office should certainly be continued. Ranking very high in the category of the effective contributions to the war effort which was performed by that office, and I am sure by the other offices of the Service, was the work it performed with regard to the proclaimed list of certain blocked nationals. This involved the elimination of undesirable business connections in our neighboring countries. In this work alone there were more than 600 visits made by representatives of the New York office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to the exporters in and around New York City. That has been a tremendously important task, and they have done it in their usually fine and efficient manner.

In addition to that, the field service has rendered confidential services to exporters, importers, and to financial institutions. They have cooperated with the State Department, with the Treasury Department, and with the Board of Economic Warfare. They have been the most complete fact-finding organization we have had in existence.

Apart from the foregoing, there is another and very cogent reason why the field service should be continued even if on a somewhat limited scale than heretofore. I believe that it is most important that we maintain as far as possible our normal peacetime industrial economy. The service renders such important and available aid to the civilian business of the country that it should not be permitted to disintegrate even during these difficult days. It should be maintained in order that with the coming of victory and peace it will be ready immediately to continue the services it has so long rendered. Especially is this possible since it is generally conceded that the services rendered presently

will have to be continued if not by the field service offices then by some newly created agency or an extension of some agency already in existence. It appears to me to be unwise and unnecessary to do this latter and, therefore, it is hoped that the special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will conclude that the field service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce should be retained.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

JEFFERSONIAN REPUBLICANISM VERSUS MONOCRACY

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to disturb the deafening New Deal silence that marks the approach of Thomas Jefferson's Bicentennial, and the dedication of his memorial one week from today, by calling attention to this thought:

> It is both curious and interesting that those supposed to descend politically from the party opposed to Jefferson should now be celebrating his birthday while those claiming political descent from him have nearly ceased to breathe his name everywhere. * * *
>
> I remember being very much amused at seeing two partially intoxicated men engaged in a fight, with their greatcoats on, which fight, after a long and rather harmless contest, ended in each having fought himself out of his own coat and into that of the other. If the two leading parties of this day are really identical with the two in the days of Jefferson and Adams, they have performed the same feat as the two drunken men.
>
> But soberly, it is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, these are the words of Abraham Lincoln, which he wrote 84 years ago today, April 6, 1859. They apply with peculiar force today in the struggle going on between Jeffersonian Republicanism and what Jefferson called the Monocrats. Less advance publicity is being given to Thomas Jefferson's birthday than was given this year to the President's birthday ball. This cannot be because of the war, for that would affect both birthday celebrations equally. I believe the reason is that any prolonged attention to Jefferson's life and work will show, as Lincoln suggested, that the parties of today have changed coats and that the New Deal Party is the Federalist Party of today, and the New Dealers are the Monocrats that Jefferson fought all his life.

Thomas Jefferson was a very great man, versatile and complex in his life and work. Being President was not his most important work, according to his own estimate. In addition to being author of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, and the father of the University of Virginia, as he wrote in his own epitaph, he was a lawyer, an architect, a State legislator and Governor, a diplomat, a Cabinet officer and Vice President, a farmer, a militia officer, a violinist, a scientist, botanist, paleontologist, a scholar, philosopher, and educator, a manufacturer, a parliamentarian, a theologian, an inventor, and an excellent politician. His correspondence covers 40,000 letters in 236 volumes. This remarkable man through a long, active life of thought and action was not always perfect, was not always consistent. By picking thoughts of his out of his context, by dwelling on single actions of his, a text can be found for almost any position. We will see examples of this in connection with his anniversary. There was one principle, however, which permeated his whole being and characterized his whole life. He was a Republican who believed in rotation in office, as opposed to the Monocrat principle of perpetuation in office.

In 1789 he wrote of the new Constitution:

> I disapproved also of the perpetual reeligibility of the President.

On May 13, 1792, he christened his party when he wrote:

> The Republican Party, who wish to preserve the Government in its present form, are fewer in number than the monarchical Federalists.

In 1807 he wrote:

> Believing that a definite period of retiring from this station will tend materially to secure our elective form of government, I have felt it a duty to withdraw at the close of my present term, and to strengthen by practice a principle which I deem salutary.

In 1808 he wrote:

> Having myself highly approved the example of an illustrious predecessor in voluntarily retiring from a trust which, if too long continued in the same hands might become a subject of uneasiness and apprehension, I could not mistake my own duty when placed in a similar situation.

In 1809 he wrote:

> If the principle of rotation be a sound one, as I conscientiously believe it to be, with respect to this office, no pretext should ever be permitted to dispense with it; because there never will be a time when real difficulties will not exist and furnish a plausible pretext for dispensation.

In 1812 he wrote on the subject when it was suggested that as ex-President he serve as Secretary of State:

> I profess so much of the Roman principle as to deem it honorable for the general of yesterday to act as a corporal today if his services can be useful to his country.

In 1818 he again described his Republican principles, which he called Republican, as opposed to Hamilton, who wanted an Executive for life or during good behavior, and noted that Adams had returned to "the Republican ranks."

In 1821 he wrote:

> Should any President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views.

This is no antiquarian, academic question in history or political science. This question is squarely before the country now, not because of conditions like war or depression, which arise from a number of circumstances, controlled by no one man, but because of the ambition of one man. The fourth-term candidacy, which is embarrassing and distracting our war effort, is diametrically opposed to Jefferson's whole life and teachings.

The only force that has a chance of opposing this Federalist monocratic movement is the party that bears the name of Jefferson's party, the Republican Party. This fight to maintain Jefferson's principles can only be won by the union of all the forces supporting Republican principles and opposing New Deal monocracy.

In the solid South leaders who oppose the New Deal are talking about the creation of a new third party. They forget the lessons of history. They realize that the one-party system in the South has disenfranchised them in national elections. A third party, sectional in character, would continue this disenfranchisement. The South needs to remember that Thomas Jefferson's Republican Party was founded in the South. The Civil War and Reconstruction have not caused Civil Service or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be objectionable in the South. The dead hand of ancient wrongs should no longer bar the South from reclaiming its original right to the good Jeffersonian word "Republican." When Lincoln wrote his famous letter, he said it was 70 years ago when two great political parties were first formed in this country. He then belonged to a Republican Party that had been revived 5 years before at Jackson, Mich. Here is the way Lincoln ended his letter:

> All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and sagacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

It is 84 years since Lincoln wrote these words. It is time to forget the differences which have separated Jeffersonians in the past, to remember the eternal principles that have united them in spirit for more years than they have been separated.

On July 4, 1826, the fiftieth anniversary of the young Republic, Thomas Jefferson died. His last clear words were "the Committee of Safety ought to be warned." Was his mind going back to Revolutionary days, or was this prophetic soul looking ahead? On that same day, John Adams died. The man under whom Jefferson had served as Vice President, his old antagonist and then once more his old friend. The last words of Adams were, "Thomas Jefferson still lives." These words were prophetic for Jefferson still lives and his spirit in this year of crisis is a warning to those who are committed to protect the safety of this country against tyranny and despotism.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it appears from the remarks of my good friend who has just preceded me that not content with having taken Wendell Willkie as their candidate in the last Presidential election, the Republi-

cans now propose to appropriate a good portion of the history and traditions of the Democratic Party. We appreciate the compliment, but we resent the tactic.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry. My time is very limited.

Mr. CURTIS. Just for a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If the gentleman will guarantee me that no one else will ask me to yield, I will yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, I cannot do that, but I wondered if you were using these principles of Jefferson that we have adopted?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am coming to that, if the gentleman will permit.

It so happens that my purpose in asking for this time was in order to make a little speech about American history apropos of the article that appeared in the New York Times of last Sunday. I might say, however, to my namesake from Ohio, that, as far as I am personally concerned, my record is clear on Thomas Jefferson. During the course of the past few months I have been at some pains to write a book, the publication date of which has been deliberately fixed to come on Jefferson's birthday, and the major portion of that book is devoted to an exposition of the need of this Nation today to understand fully and profoundly the views of Jefferson upon the subject of public finance, and to apply some of the principles for which he stood.

The fundamental thing that divides political parties is, after all, the question as to whether those political parties stand for the opening of a wider and more certain field of opportunity for the common man, or whether they stand for the protection of privilege where it exists. I shall not offer any invidious comparisons except to say that the fundamental thing about the party of Jefferson was not the name by which it was known, but the fact that Jefferson fought a battle all through his life, the key to which has always seemed to me his insistence that the lands of the West should be open to settlement by any American, at a very low price. He was opposed by the forces led by Alexander Hamilton, who insisted that those western lands should only be for sale in large blocks, because, forsooth, it would take people of great resources and business wisdom in order to administer those lands in the West, and to see that they were "settled properly." No, Mr. Chairman, the fundamental thing about Thomas Jefferson was his faith in the common man, his determination that America, all through her life, should offer that common man the greatest degree of opportunity of which he was capable. It is for us to say—shall I say regardless of political party—whether we shall be devoted to that same fundamental purpose. Jefferson stood, in a day when it was not easy to do so, for the principle that men are capable of self-government; that the cure for the shortcomings of democracy, if there be such, is more democracy and more faith in the common man. It seems to me that I may follow with some remarks about American history which happens to have been my field of endeavor most of my life.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. At that point, the gentleman will not disagree, will he, that the name which Jefferson gave to the party he founded was the Republican Party?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I disagree to a certain extent.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Let me answer and then I will yield. The name of the party of Jefferson, as I am quite positive, was "The Democratic-Republican Party."

In the course of time and usage it is true that a good many people used the term "Republican" by itself in referring to the party. I do not, however, believe that the gentleman will claim that the Republican Party of today would trace its ancestry back to Jefferson and repudiate completely its connection with such leaders of that day as Alexander Hamilton. Perhaps it would, but it must take its choice and either trace its ancestry to Jefferson or to Hamilton; you cannot have both, for the two men stood at the opposite poles of political opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I was going to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio through the courtesy of the gentleman from California that Jefferson also advocated the election of Federal judges for a definite term and also contended that these judges should be retired by a majority vote of the two Houses of Congress without an impeachment trial. If the gentleman wants to hug Jefferson to his bosom I could suggest many other Jeffersonian heretical theories that today might even be regarded as communistic, but I shall hope to get time in my own right to do so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Parties, of course, change throughout the years, but can the gentleman conceive of a party devoted to the principles of Thomas Jefferson advocating a fourth term for a President?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know that any party advocates a fourth term for a President; I only know that we are in a great war, that we have got to do the best we can to win through to the end of that war.

I was deeply disturbed by an article I read in the New York Times on Sunday about the ignorance of college students of American history. Having been an American history teacher most of my life, I should like to take just a very few moments on the part of the House in order to express some views on this subject which I hope may be helpful.

There has taken place in our country a controversy which seems to be coming to a head. It takes place between those people on the one hand who have advocated a factual and chronological teaching of the history of our own country with emphasis upon the mastery by the student of the facts of that history in chronological sequence. On the other hand there have been those people who have emphasized the need of students in their preparation for participation in the life of our Nation to have the subjects taught in such way as to emphasize the relationship of the subject matter to the problems which those students would as a practical matter face in their everyday lives. It seems to me most unfortunate that these two points of view should be regarded as mutually exclusive. I do not believe they are. I want to say with all the earnestness at my command that I do not believe there is any subject of study in the curriculum of either primary, or secondary schools, or institutions of higher education in this Nation that offers so rich a field of profound education as the subject of the history of our own country. Could I make a choice as to the one occupation I would rather have for 1 hour before I died I would choose to stand before a class of American school children and discuss with them the history of their Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. Some time ago I went to the Library of Congress and asked for the best history that was taught throughout the country. They gave me a history written by a very distinguished doctor in a great northeastern university. I read it through, and among other misstatements it said that Col. David Crockett, who served in this House for 6 years, could not read or write. So I was not surprised when I read in this New York Times article the other day—I was not surprised at the ignorance of American history that prevails among the students when the history writers will palm off such stuff as that on the people who have to study history.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. It is most important for American citizens to be familiar with all the important facts of the history of their Nation. Nor does the teaching of those facts or the heroism of the leaders of our Nation or the struggles of its common people, exclude the possibility of relating the important matters connected with our history to the problems of today. I should like to illustrate what I mean. For example, in teaching the life of General Washington the teacher of understanding can point out that perhaps the greatest aspect in the life of that great man was the fact that although belonging to the group which enjoyed the highest social and economic position of his time, nevertheless, he espoused and brought his talents to the cause of the common people and their freedom and gave it leadership at a time when that leadership was greatly needed. What more practical application could be given to a lesson of history? What greater advantage from

a historical fact could be brought to a group of American students than that?

In the teaching of the facts regarding the Constitution of the United States and its formation, it is not only possible to teach the facts thereof but to illustrate the need on the part of a great people of a Government possessed of at least certain fundamental powers which our Government, immediately preceding the adoption of the Constitution, lacked.

It is altogether possible in teaching the period when our Constitution was formed to point out the amendments that have been subsequently made to that great document and to point out to students the importance to them of retaining into the future the fundamental freedoms and liberties and the tripartite form of government which that Constitution provides.

I could go on and I could illustrate that in the period of Theodore Roosevelt one could not only teach the facts about that period but point out that two fundamental battles were started in the period, one the battle for conservation of the natural resources of this country and the other to preserve the opportunities of people of small resources by preventing the control of business on the part of huge monopolies.

I could illustrate over and over again to show that there need not be a conflict insofar as these points of view regarding American history are concerned. I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by simply saying that I pay tribute to those people who today are pointing out the vast importance of widespread knowledge of our history and the great opportunity that exists for developing throughout the length and breadth of this land a deep and fundamental understanding on the part of all of our people of not only the facts of our history but its interpretation and significance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, because I think it is high time that Congress became really concerned over inflation, I take this time this afternoon in support of the President's veto of the so-called Bankhead bill.

I do not think that I am seeing things under the bed when I say that this country is in the first stages of the most dangerous cycle of inflation that we have ever faced. If we can hold the line, and that means on the Little Steel formula, as well as on the farm front, we stand a good chance of avoiding that cycle.

If we fail—and I am fearful lest a Congress fearful of the displeasure of various groups will cause us to fail—we light the fuze that sets off the first blast against the dam of inflation.

It will be argued, I have no doubt, that this bill, this Bankhead bill, is just a little charge of dynamite. That its effect on prices is small. Perhaps that may be true. But make no mistake about it, it is the charge that will ignite the next bigger charge up the line—the Pace bill, which has already passed the House and stands waiting in the Senate for passage as soon as this Bankhead bill is boosted through over the President's veto.

So it becomes impossible to consider one without the other—both these devices to move up parity prices to new and higher formulas that will unquestionably increase the cost of living for all—the farmers included—by several points.

And, likewise, it also becomes impossible to consider them without taking into consideration their direct effect upon a new wave of widespread demands for wage and salary increases in all of our far-flung industries.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I am very reluctant to interrupt the gentleman, but I want to concur with all of the emphasis at my command in the statement the gentleman has made that this House has reached the point where we must decide whether we are in dead earnest about this battle against inflation. May I say also, if the gentleman will indulge me for one more brief observation, that many times during the past year as we have battled against the recurring threat to the barricades we have attempted to erect against inflation, my thoughts have gone back to the fall of 1941, before Pearl Harbor, when the gentleman from Oklahoma joined with my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and with other Members of this House in an attempt to persuade the House at that time to accept an over-all price-control bill that would have been effective. I congratulate the gentleman on the position that he is taking with reference to the veto of the Bankhead bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I also wish to congratulate the gentleman on the stand he took and which I took along with him in reference to the over-all price-control bill. I knew then that if we did not get it inflation would begin. But to the gentleman who has just been talking or addressing the Speaker may I say that it seems to me that he as well as the gentleman who is yielding to me wants to make the farmer the scapegoat in that they themselves have voted for inflation measures that have been turning loose wild money. Only yesterday the gentleman who has just taken his seat voted to increase the outflow of money by allowing an increase in salary amounting to nearly $700,000,000. A few days ago the gentleman again voted to increase the inflationary flow of money by over $5,000,000. Since that price-control bill passed we have increased the output of inflationary funds more than the whole output of farm commodities, more than the net farm income, would amount to in the last year or year before last. Let us not make that class of citizens who have been the most patriotic of any class in the country the scapegoats now and say, "You are the only ones who are trying to scalp the people and to bring on inflation," when it is altogether inconsistent with the actions we take here in this House.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the gentleman from Texas I did not support the wage-increase vote yesterday. It is not we who are protesting against this inching up of parity and inching up of prices who render a disservice to the farmers. It is the consumers that are making the farmers the scapegoats for any price increases. I will try to prove to the gentleman from Texas it is those who claim to be the farmers' friends who are going to make the farmer the scapegoat in this matter, without even benefiting him in his net farm income.

The demand by John L. Lewis for his miners for as much as $2 per day is only one of the thousands these farm bills will touch off. One—the little one—is the Bankhead bill. Two, the Pace bill, and then the block buster that breaks the Little Steel formula, and we are in the center of the flood stream.

Coming from an agricultural district, it is no easy matter to deny to my farmers advantages that many undoubtedly seek. Especially is this so since I have, and still feel, that the farmer is grossly underpaid for his work and the products he produces. He has not and is not now receiving his fair share of the national income. I would like to see his lot improved.

But I do not feel I would be doing the proper job of representing him if I followed a policy that to me is short-sighted for his part and is dangerous to the Nation itself. At best the farmer stands to profit but a few cents a bushel or a pound on the Bankhead bill—or even under the Pace bill.

But I am convinced from a 2-year study of this inflation problem that these few cents will be the motive force that breaks our controls on inflation. They are the few straws that will break the camel's back.

That this is not an idle fear is evidenced by the veto message of the President, when he charges that even the Bankhead bill will result in increasing the price scale that housewives everywhere will have to pay by 5 percent. Add to that the additional increase that will be occasioned by the Pace bill and you will begin the cycle that cannot help but result in the destruction of the Little Steel formula and the ever-upward spiral of increasing wages and prices.

I have repeatedly claimed that the farmers as a whole would get mighty little benefit from either the Bankhead bill or the Pace bill. That what few will be helped by their few cents' increase, others will be injured, and in turn the farmer will be blamed by everyone for breaking the dam against inflation.

It is an utter impossibility to wage a war without dislocations and inequities for everyone. Every man in the service, and every serviceman's family, is suffering from these inequities. They are glad to make this sacrifice for they know we are in total war.

With most of the farm families also touched directly in this way, I am sure

that the farmers understand the inevitability of such inequities and know that in wartime these cannot be avoided. To try to correct them, desirable as some of the corrections might be, would be to multiply our difficulties as a nation and to damage our war effort. The adjustments sought by the Bankhead bill may be desirable to the farmers—but his net gain will be so insignificant compared to the damage it will do to the Nation's fight against inflation that I feel it is unwise to demand it now.

Whether the Bankhead bill will be a bonanza to the farmer, as some of its supporters have implied, or whether it is just the harmless little gesture, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] contends, you will have to be the judge.

Under Mr. PACE's claim in the RECORD under date of March 24, he says:

> There are really two principal commodities involved in this bill. Those are corn and wheat.

Later he amplifies this to state that only 6½ cents per bushel on 15 percent of the corn crop is involved. This represents payments of $22,500,000 to these commercial corn farmers.

On the wheat side of the picture the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] says:

> The supply of wheat up in the Minnesota area, the supply of wheat on the western coast on hand is so enormous that, whether this bill passes or not, it will have no appreciable effect upon the price of wheat.

Thus, the claim is the only two commodities involved in this bill are corn and wheat. And of these two he claims that wheat will not be affected because of the enormous surplus. And corn will be affected only as to the 15 percent of the crop that is sold commercially, and that to the extent of only 6 cents a bushel.

This procedure looks to me as though we were using "block-buster" bombs to swat a few flies. Surely, the net gain to the average farmer is not sufficient to justify the risk of upsetting the critical situation as it exists at this hour regarding price and wage control.

I am inclined to feel that many of my colleagues are taking the easiest way out of trying to help the farmer in his hour of need. I have recently circularized my district with farm-bulletin lists. This, as every Member knows, usually brings in numerous responses from the dirt farmers as to what they are thinking.

Strange to say, those asking for price increases of their products have been few and far between. True, they have problems that they want Congress to help solve. These, in principle, include the following:

First. More and better farm labor.

Second. More machinery and equipment.

Third. Fewer reports and less delay in securing small items needed in farm repairs.

But this Congress, instead of trying to help him solve his real and pressing problems—the problems that involve greater and more efficient production of foodstuffs—is intent only on rewriting the parity formula and to quarrel over a few cents on a bushel of commercial corn.

Perhaps it is because they can simplify the problem and raise a banner of higher prices and thus say that all who fight under that banner are loyal to the farmer—all who resist revising parity formulas now fight against him. As Members of Congress, we, as individuals, have the right to question the wisdom of any such leadership. And some of us sincerely feel that such tactics lead the farmer into a blind alley—sell him a gold brick and make him the scapegoat of public resentment that must obviously follow skyrocketing wages and prices.

It is my opinion that the farmer knows far more about this danger of inflation than many in Congress give him credit for knowing. He has seen already his living costs advance 15 percent in 1 year's time. He knows that his parity price goes up with this advance, as it does with other farm production costs that he must meet. But he also knows that it is not the price that makes him well, but the real purchasing power of the money he receives for his product.

The same is true of the laborer, who should know that by this time it is not the wage but what it will buy that is important. The farmer, the laborer, the white-collared worker, the teacher, the small businessman—yes, and the veterans and the dependents of the 8,000,000 men in the service also will know that Congress has failed if living costs are permitted to skyrocket.

I have sat in on most of the discussions on price control since it first began. I have studied the charts of the last war and am convinced that no one—the very big or the very little—can escape the destructive influence of uncontrolled inflation. You just simply cannot win a race against it.

Much has been said that the President acted without authority in the Executive order providing for the inclusion of benefit payments paid the farmers in the computation of parity prices.

I believe that the evidence is on the side of the President in these instances for it has been shown, repeatedly, that the Congress in the 1943 Appropriation Act provided that such benefits be taken into account—88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6151.

Amendment No. 81, inserted by the Senate in the parity provisions of the bill, provides for taking into account of the soil conservation payments in determining the market price received for his agricultural commodities. The House receded from its position of opposition to this amendment and the Senate agreed to the bill.

The Wickersham amendment, offered to section 3 of the second price control bill, sought to provide that these benefit payments could not be considered in arriving at the parity figure. The amendment failed of passage.

I think there is ample precedent in these actions of Congress for the President's position in this matter. It cannot be claimed that Congress was not on notice when this second Price Control Act was passed as to the President's intentions. For, in his message to the Congress on September 7, 1942, requesting amendments to the Price Control Act, he said:

> In computing parity, we should continue to use the computations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics made under the law as it stands today, and in determining whether a commodity has reached parity we should include all benefits received by the farmer from his Government under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program allocable to the particular commodity. For it is unfair to give a farmer a parity price, and, in addition, to pay him benefits which will give him far more than parity.

It will be repeatedly argued that the Bankhead bill and the Pace bill are absolutely necessary if we are to have the food so vital to winning the war. I would like to call your attention to the fact that almost all of the vital war products are now at such a figure that the proposed additions to parity will have little effect on increasing the farmers' income who raise them. True, the proposed increases of feed prices for livestock will increase the farmers' cost of production in poultry, hogs, dairying, cattle raising and many other similar lines, without increasing his real net income.

I would like to show here a few of the most needed food products that cannot be affected as to the farmers' earings by these two bills:

	Parity or comparable prices	Average prices received by farmers, Feb. 15, 1943
Hogs	11.63	14.63
Beef cattle	8.67	12.36
Lambs	9.41	13.77
Butterfat	43.2	50.00
Milk, wholesale	2.63	3.06
Chickens	18.2	22.8
Eggs	30.3	34.2
Potatoes	114.9	125.7
Apples	1.54	1.71

It seems high time that this Congress should concern itself primarily with prevention of inflation, instead of encouraging it. Since the beginning of price-control efforts, the main basis for debate in this Chamber has been to insist upon bigger and better prices, ignoring the complete danger of internal fiscal collapse that would occur with uncontrolled inflation.

Most of the initiative in this whole affair of inflation prevention has had to come from the Executive, rather than from the direct representatives of the 135,000,000 people of this Nation. Again we hear the familiar cry of higher prices or higher profits or higher wages.

This country should awaken to the danger that this attitude of Congress presents. But perhaps they will wait calmly until the cycle of inflation has begun in full to realize that their life savings, their stocks and bonds, their insurance policies, and their earnings have been sacrificed because Congress wanted to be popular with all special groups, rather than fighting with their political lives to prevent such an occurrence.

Now with the veto of the Bankhead bill, the matter comes squarely up to

Congress. Either we can override the President's efforts to maintain price control and hold to the Little Steel formula for wages, or we can sustain him.

If we refuse to sustain the President on this test, then the public will place the full blame for the inflation that is sure to follow right at the door of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, when I requested this time I did not know that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was going to discuss the Bankhead bill and the veto message. I intend to discuss the same subject and I will in the course of it differ somewhat from the viewpoint expressed by the gentleman, although not altogether.

Mr. Chairman, the principal issue confronting the Congress in its consideration of the veto of the Bankhead bill is not that of inflation. Rather, it is a question as to whether Congress or the executive departments are going to write the laws of this country. The language in the second Price Control Act prohibiting ceiling prices on agricultural products at less than parity was clear, specific, and unequivocal. Nothing was left open to interpretation. The President, in his veto message, makes a feeble but unconvincing effort to justify the interpretation placed on the law by the executive departments. However, apparently in realization of the weakness of this justification, the President devotes the main part of his message to an attempt to further promote his consistent campaign to hold farmers, and farmers alone, responsible for whatever inflation has occurred or may be expected to occur in the future. I for one am getting mighty tired of the continued distortion of facts and figures carried on so persistently by the President and his aides in an effort to prove that the farmer, and the farmer alone, is responsible for whatever inflationary tendencies are now under way.

The effect of the Bankhead bill on either farm or consumer prices would be very small. The figures given by the President in his message are fantastic. The President seems to have ignored all figures submitted to him excepting a report from the Office of Price Administration. This report ought to be published. If it is, it will go down in history as one of the greatest pieces of fiction ever written. Its author, whoever he is, has a bright future as a writer of bedtime stories. There is no possible way to prove by legitimate figures that farm prices will be increased by the Bankhead bill more than $200,000,000. It may not be nearly that much, depending upon whether there is a natural price rise to parity. In any event, the increase which occurs will mean very little in the way of increases in farm income for the reason that when prices rise to parity farmers will cease to receive parity payments out of the Federal Treasury. In other words, all the farmer is asking for under the Bankhead bill is that the Federal Government shall not, through the imposition of price ceilings and the payment of doles, prevent him from getting parity prices in the market place. Our agricultural policy, reiterated time and time again by Congress and the administration, is that the farmer is entitled to parity in the market place. The present policy, and the one advocated by the President in his veto message, is to place price ceilings below parity and give the farmer a subsidy in an amount sufficient to bring his returns to parity. Of course, only those farmers who submit to Government control will receive the subsidy.

Farmers do not want inflation. They have fought for years, not for doles and subsidies, but for a balanced relationship between farm prices and other prices. They will and should continue to stand back of that principle.

Certainly no one can say that I am in favor of inflation. I was one of the few Members of the House who spoke for and voted for the Gore amendment when the first price control bill was under consideration by the House. The Administration bitterly opposed that amendment, which would have put ceilings on all prices and wages, mainly because of its opposition to ceilings on wages. This opposition to the Gore amendment on the part of the President and the administration is the first of a long chain of circumstances which clearly indicates that the administration has not and is not today willing to make a real fight to prevent inflation. Its sole effort up to date along that line has been an attempt to smear the farmer and try to convince the country that, individually and collectively, farmers are possessed with a swinish impulse not possessed by any other element of the population to get rich out of the war.

If I thought for one moment that the administration had any desire or inclination to wage an effective war against inflation I would be willing to waive the question of legislative integrity which is involved in any discussion of this veto message. I would be willing to say that although the executive departments have absolutely misinterpreted the will and intent of Congress that I would let that stand providing there is a real war on inflation. I am not willing to do so, however, unless the administration will clearly demonstrate by its acts that it means business.

Why do I say that so far we have had purely a phony war on inflation? I say it because up to date the administration has done nothing to meet the real cause of inflation which is the tremendous difference between buying power and the amount of goods and services available for purchase. The administration has talked about stabilizing wages. Up to date those have been mere words. Furthermore, the administration has not only failed to stop this expansion of purchasing power but by its very policies has brought about these increases. A few weeks ago the President announced that the workweek had been changed from 40 hours to 48 hours with time and a half for the extra 8 hours or, in effect, a 30-percent increase in weekly wages for all who had been working 40 hours per week previously, with a greater or lesser increase for those whose weekly hours had been either above or below 40 hours. The President did not seem to worry as to whether the several billion dollars in wage increases which these increases would bring about would cause inflation.

Yesterday the House passed under suspension a bill which will cost the Federal Government almost $600,000,000 in salary increases to Federal employees above the basic wage rates. This bill will contribute to inflation. I voted for it, as did many other Members of the House, because I felt that if general wage increases were taking place they should be given to Government employees and particularly because this bill, in effect, only gives Federal employees additional pay for additional hours at what amounts to practically straight time rather than overtime rates. However, if the President wants to start a real war against inflation and decides that in order to do so he must veto this bill, I will vote to sustain the veto.

We have a threatened coal strike and certainly no one is so naive as to doubt that there will be an increase in wages granted to these miners. The administration will, as it has done in the past, carry out a policy of appeasement toward John L. Lewis and his organization.

Some people may have the idea that wages were stabilized under the Second Price Control Act. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The regional offices of the War Labor Board are weeks and weeks behind with applications for increases for wages on the part of both employers and employees. These increases are being granted without any reference to the Little Steel formula. In many cases it is essential to grant increases in order to enable small business institutions to meet the competition of high wages in defense and other highly organized industries.

The best evidence that wages have not been stabilized is shown by the fact that weekly earnings from January 1942 to January 1943 in all manufacturing industries increased by 21.5 percent and that hourly earnings in the same industries during the same period increased from 80.1 cents to 91.8 cents. The increase in hourly earnings alone for the 1-month period from December 1942 to January 1943 was 1.1 cents. I do not have later figures, but if that rate is continued throughout the year the increase in hourly earnings for 1943 will be just as great as it was for 1942. The increase in weekly earnings will probably be greater because of the President's order putting into effect a 48-hour week with time and a half for overtime.

I believe that in spite of the poor showing made so far, the President should be given another chance to demonstrate that he is opposed to inflation. I think this House might well give him that chance before we take final action on the Bankhead bill. I do not know what the Senate may do today in its consideration of the veto message. If the veto is over-ridden, however, the House will have the issue squarely before it. I believe that when the matter comes up

in the House that we should refer the veto message and the bill to the Committee on Agriculture or Committee on Banking and Currency, with the understanding that it will not be brought up in the House until the executive branch of the Government has had an opportunity to demonstrate that it intends to really do something about inflation. If the Bankhead bill were to come up for a vote today I would vote to over-ride the veto. If the bill should be sent to the committee, however, and during the next 30 days the President takes definite action to halt inflation, then I would be willing to vote to sustain the veto. What do I mean by definite action? Well, for one thing, the President might rescind that part of his Executive order setting up a 48-hour week which provides for time and a half for overtime. That would get rid of a tremendous amount of potential inflation. As a second step the President might veto the bill providing for increased pay to the Federal employees. Another very salutary step would be to meet the coal-strike issue fairly and squarely by saying that the administration's soft policy on such matters was over and that there would be no increase in wages.

A fourth step would be to take some action to stop this steady rise in wages which is going on every day and at a rate in excess of the increase in the cost of living.

I have no authority to speak for the farmers of this country, but I know them well enough to feel certain that if the President will actually begin a war on inflation along the lines I have suggested that they will follow his leadership, irrespective of the effect on farm prices. I think I know the temper of Congress well enough to be safe in predicting that Congress will follow this type of leadership. I therefore feel that the wisest thing which this House can do at the present time is to send the bill back to the committee and give the President one more chance.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, today is the twenty-sixth anniversary of our declaration of war against the Central Powers and their associates. Twenty-six years ago we entered the first World War and at the end of 19 months we had won that war and conquered our enemies.

We are now engaged in a second World War, the greatest in the history of our country, an all-out war of service and sacrifice until we have won a final victory. In the last war we did not adopt a conscription or draft law until we had already been in the war for some time. This time we adopted the draft at least a year before we entered the war. I know that many of us who served in the last war were on the battlefields of France within a year of its declaration. Tomorrow this war will have been going on for 16 months, and we have hardly started the war in Europe. We are fighting on the fringes of the Japanese Empire, and our troops so far have not met great forces of the enemy. No one knows, of course, how long this war will last, whether it will last another year or whether it will last 2 or 3 years. Anyone would be foolhardy to make any prediction at the present time. We are all of accord and determined to win the war as soon as possible with the least casualties.

We know that our soldiers and sailors morally, mentally, and physically are superior to any in the world. We know that they are being given the very best possible training and the most modern weapons, and that when they meet the enemy on equal terms they will defeat the enemy on land, in the air, and on the sea.

Before we declared war there were those who told us that we could destroy the Japanese Navy in 3 weeks' time and take Tokyo in a month. Certainly that timetable has slipped up considerably. The European theater of war is of necessity of paramount importance to Great Britain and Soviet Russia, but it seems to me that the far Pacific is of paramount importance to us and that we should realize it and concentrate a large part of our strength there in order to carry the war to Japan without further delay.

Every day we fail to conduct an offensive against Japan, she gets stronger and stronger. She makes use of the raw material that she has taken in the East Indies and builds up great defensive strength in those islands. If we wait another year, it will be a very costly and bloody undertaking to conduct a great offensive against Japan after she is entrenched in her conquered possessions and has had time to develop the natural resources of those nations. For that reason, I repeat what I have said on the floor of this House on several occasions. I believe President Roosevelt ought to appoint Gen. Douglas MacArthur as supreme commander in the far Pacific, and give him control of all our armed forces there, including our air forces and the Navy, and furnish him with sufficient supplies so that he can carry on an offensive on a large scale against Japan in the immediate future, instead of waiting until we have defeated Germany in Europe. We all hope that that will be this year or within a year, but none of us knows and can guarantee it for a fact. I am convinced that unless we carry that war to Japan this year it will be far more difficult to defeat her a year from now, because by that time she will have made use of the vast resources she has conquered since the war began to build up her military, naval, and air strength, and particularly in fortifying her widespread naval and air bases.

I should also like to take this occasion to say that when the Kilday bill comes before the House I propose to offer an amendment to provide that there shall be no draft deferment in any Government department, agency, or bureau of any unmarried man under 38 years of age, without one single exception. We are in an all-out war, and it calls for all-out service and sacrifice. I see no reason why any department of the Government should ask for deferment for a single unmarried man or for a married man without any dependents, under 38. If this means that some department, maybe the War Department, needs a technician and he is unmarried, then take him into our armed forces and put him into a uniform, promote him to a technical sergeant, if you will, and send him back to do the same duty if it is essential to our war effort. But once you begin to make deferments there is no end to them. The only deferments that are recognized by law are for dependency, physical disqualifications, essential employment in industry, and farming. Ships, guns, tanks, and airplanes are useless without food. Farmers have to be deferred to produce the necessary food to supply ourselves, our armed forces, and those of our allies.

I shall offer an amendment to provide that no draft deferment be given to single men and married men without dependents in the Government service. We should set the example. If I had my way and could do it legally, I would say that no one should be a Member of the House of Representatives or the Congress who is unmarried and under 38 years of age, but we cannot control that by law. That is a matter for the electorate to decide. But we can control the governmental departments, agencies, and bureaus. I submit there should not be one single unmarried man under 38 who is physically fit retained in any Government department or bureau. Older men or those physically disqualified for the draft or women could fill their places for the duration of the war without much impairment to the Government service.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest on this twenty-sixth anniversary of the entrance of the United States into the first World War, that there should be a supreme war council appointed just as we had in the last war, composed of the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, with equal rights and equal treatment for all, and may I add in conclusion that we should make more of an effort to get supplies into China. Half the Congress has spoken about it. I submit that where there is a will there is a way, and that we can find some way to get our airplanes into China. Put 1,000 airplanes into China, and the Chinese Army will change from the defensive to the offensive, and will begin bombing Japan. Let us get on with the war, let us carry the war to Japan, let us bomb the Japanese cities, and do not let us wait until we have defeated Germany to do it. It is our mission, it is our destiny to defeat Japan. Let us not delay any longer, but let us give General McArthur the troops, the ships, and the airplanes with which to do it, and if you do, he will find a way to get airplanes and supplies into China and to destroy the Japanese armies, sink their ships, crush their air force, bomb their cities, and to carry the war to Japan and final victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the statement made to us a few minutes ago by my colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. MONRONEY]. I think it is especially praiseworthy, because he comes from a district which contains a very large percentage of farmers. It probably requires very little courage on my part, coming from a city, composed mostly of industrial workers in the great steel mills of Pittsburgh, and in their offices, workers in the railroads, with no farming population, to agree most heartily with his statement and his desire that the President's veto of the Bankhead bill should be upheld; but I am not speaking in an effort to be unfair to the farming people, because I certainly think that they are an essential part of the welfare of our Nation, and particularly a part of the war effort. I am concerned about the impact of this bill upon the already tight emotional situation in the attempt of the workmen to obtain increases and to break the so-called Little Steel formula. I feel that even though the figures given by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] may be correct—I do not know that they are, but they disagree with the figures given by the President in his veto message—that nevertheless this act can have an impact far greater than any cost which it specifically might add to the price of farm products, because it will be an opening wedge in this battle front we are maintaining against inflationary tendencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the cafes a head of lettuce is sold for better than 50 cents to the consumer. The farmer realizes 4 cents out of that same head of lettuce. What does the gentleman say, and what is his position as to what is causing the rise in the cost of living so far as this head of lettuce is concerned? The consumer pays 46 cents more than the farmer who produced it receives.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not pretend to be an authority on agricultural affairs. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] has himself given quite a lot of study to that subject The only thing we know who do live in the cities is that the cost of living is terrifically high. You may say that increased wages of industrial workers makes it possible for them to pay these high prices, but we have large classes of salaried employees who have received little or no rise in their salaries and pay checks, and they are just not able to meet the burden. Even though the farmer might be entitled to more money than he is getting, and I would never be the person to try to keep the farmer from getting a decent return for his labor, because I know that it is hard work, but I think he would be better off in the long run if this veto be upheld. If the upholding of this veto be a means to stop the inflationary spiral, I think he would be far better off than if the veto is overridden and he gets a small increase in the price of his product.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for his fairness, which he has always shown in this Congress. The illustration I gave him was for the purpose of showing it is not the farmer and the price the farmer receives for his commodity that is causing the high spiral in the cost of living. I wanted to show the gentleman that the farmer is getting the blame, and the credit, not only in the administration but in the Congress for this increase in the high cost of living, when it does not belong there.

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, I assure the gentleman that I have never blamed the farmer for any deliberate attempt to get prices skyrocketing. I think there might possibly be some individuals who purport to represent the point of view of the farmer, who might make such an attempt, but I think the farmer himself does not. I know that the farmer is an honest, fine citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know that the farmer himself has a terrific stake in the winning of this war, the same as the industrial worker, the same as the business executive, the same as all classes. I know that his boys are fighting together alongside with the boys from my home State and city, and I know they want to win the war to save the country. But frequently legislation is introduced in an attempt to benefit the farmer, or to benefit the worker or the businessman, that takes a very shortsighted view, and that will in the long run work more of a hardship upon not only him, but on the country as a whole than would be offset by the small amount of benefit that he would presently receive.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, 26 years ago I was sitting in the gallery right behind where members of the Appropriations Committee are sitting on the minority side and I heard war declared. I can picture that tense and dramatic scene as if it were yesterday. It is mirrored in my mind and heart. I little thought that 25 years afterward I would be called upon to vote for another war.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the present war is just a continuation of that First World War. At the end of that period we had just an armistice, not a real peace. Only the continuation has grown into a far more horrible war, a global war with far-flung fronts. I should like to pay tribute to the men who gave their lives for us in the first world conflagration and also to the disabled men who are still suffering as a result of that. We are grateful for their great contribution. We owe to them as well as to the soldiers of this war every bit of energy, every bit of thought that we have in the conduct of the second half of world fighting.

One of those duties we have is to make sure that this Government spends wisely at home as well as abroad; spends wisely for the men in the service at the front and wisely on the home front in the conduct of the business of the country.

Mr. Chairman, only a short time ago we heard a very able address by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] in defense of appropriating for existing bureaus and facilities instead of adding new facilities, facility upon facility, with duplication of effort, duplication of manpower, and duplication of expenditure. It was a very able address. To my mind, he made a most able plea indirectly—I may say almost directly—for the continuation of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, an existing agency, the officers of which have done remarkably fine work. They are manned by men who are thoroughly trained, men who can take on added duties which come from the Board of Economic Warfare and other offices. The Appropriations Committee has eliminated the appropriation of the small sum of $430,000 for carrying on those offices. They have proved of great assistance to other Government agencies which must open offices of their own, if these facilities are abolished, thereby creating an added expense. Their elimination, I have pointed out, would be a crushing blow to business; especially will it injure small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the appropriation bill, H. R. 2397, providing funds for the State Department is of special interest because of the fact that it involves funds to be expended directly by the State Department and other funds to be disbursed under their supervision. These funds will be used for matters of current importance, such as the developing and cementing of better relationships with the Central and South American countries.

In passing upon the sums appropriated for use in Latin America we must be mindful of the background and culture of these countries. In my opinion, this element cannot be too strongly emphasized. I was sorry to hear one of my colleagues discuss certain phases of this bill in a flippant and ungracious manner. I feel sure that we shall overlook most of his quips.

We know full well that when the white men first came to the New World they found on the northern continent wandering tribes of savages or semisavages, the highest of whom had scarcely reached the nomadic state. However, when the white men came to South America they found a real civilization—cities, temples, monuments, statues, elaborate and ornate costumes, gold, jewels, an intricate and, according to our archaeologists, highly accurate astronomical system, and a method of keeping the calendars. The Spanish explorers and conquerors were delighted with the immediate riches of gold and emeralds, but

they had scarcely seized them from the hands of the Incas before they began a thoroughgoing program of colonization. Where the New Englanders and the Virginia settlers had to break soil for their own fortresses to keep out the savage redskins, the Spaniards enslaved their predecessors and used them as workmen to build magnificent cities. I do not wish to give the impression that South American culture has any basis in slavery, for today the proudest boast of a fine gentleman in South America is his Inca or other noble Indian blood. The enforced labor soon turned into a partnership and undoubtedly hastened the growth of culture there.

The first university in the New World was founded long before our famous Harvard. It is the University of San Marcos in Peru, founded in 1552 by the Jesuit Fathers under royal decree from Spain. Today, from it and to it travel scholars from every part of our globe. The oldest church was built in Santo Domingo in 1511. The first printing presses of the New World were set up in Mexico in 1532; the first book was printed there in 1539. By 1641, both Mexico and Lima, Peru, had regularly published newspapers.

I scarcely need mention South American music, today a mixture of Indian and Spanish influences, which we enjoy equally in our great concert halls and for the gayer purposes of dancing. We know less of the artists and poets, but I can truthfully say that the one great epic folk poem of the Americas, El Gaucho, the only true epic folk poem which this hemisphere has yet produced, was written by a poet from the Argentine. His name was José Hernandez, and his fame, and that of his poem, far surpass any acclaim extended to his North American brothers.

Perhaps you saw, several weeks ago, that magnificent exhibit of South American photographs held here in Washington, at the Pan American Building. I mention it as an example of the combination of the purely artistic and the purely modern and mechanical accomplishments of just one phase of Latin American culture.

Our money spent to promote better relationships with our southern neighbors is not going to be scattered over a thousand unimportant mechanical gadgets. That is neither the desire nor the intention of this bill. We should encourage serious students from Latin America to exchange with our own serious students, so that both cultures will benefit by each other's universities. We want our art galleries to show exhibitions of Latin American paintings. We want more Latin American concert music. We want more translations of our books into their languages, and their books into ours. We want everything that will strengthen our comradeship and our shoulder-to-shoulder existence. We want no one to think that once more we are trying to buy Manhattan Island for $24.

Projects under the leadership of President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and Mr. Frederick H. Hasler, president of the Pan American Society, are sure to bring about the right results. They know their jobs. Let us be guided by them and support the financial requests contained in H. R. 2397 for the use of the State Department.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2 years ago I spoke to this House about the United States Weather Bureau. My purpose then was to discuss that Bureau's responsibility for forecasting floods in the rivers of the United States. Today I want to discuss its responsibility in the much more serious matter of the war.

I have learned recently that the Weather Bureau, in cooperation with the State Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, is organizing an important new service. The purpose of this new service is to help safeguard and increase production in the Nation's food supply. This will be accomplished by helping the farmer to make better use of the weather than he has ever been able to make before—by telling him when and where and how the weather will help him most. Without giving out any news that might be useful to an enemy, this service will advise the farmer when to plow, when to cultivate, when to spray, when to pick tomatoes, or cut hay, or shear, or slaughter. Advice will be given also to aid in assignments of our wartime army of farm labor, and later on to guide the operations of logging, lumbering, and the movement of barge fleets and other large-scale transportation projects. I have called it an important service because it will improve our use of farm manpower, enlarge our harvests, and save precious man-hours in our basic industries, and I think anything that can do those things deserves to be called important.

These plans remind us again that the weather is everywhere; and wherever American interests operate, weather service may operate also to the Nation's advantage. The Weather Bureau knows this well, and has demonstrated that the economic benefit of every investment we make in this service is paid back many times. The cost in the present case is not great; the accomplishment means simply that an organization always pushed to the limit for additional service has taken on another job to help win the war.

Not many of us understand very clearly the war work of the Weather Bureau. We read a great deal in the newspapers and in magazines about how weather influences military operations, and we can easily see that low-lying clouds may spoil a bombing raid. We have all read the recent statements from General MacArthur that a Japanese convoy approached New Guinea shielded for awhile by a weather front—which means in simple terms that the Japanese naval officers were taking advantage of what their meteorologists had told them, namely, that so long as the convoy kept a certain position with relation to that weather frontal zone the ships would be hard to see and hard to hit from the air. The forecasters of the United States Weather Bureau have pioneered in the kind of service the Japs are now giving to their fleet, and American forecasts now guide the flights of thousands of aircraft from factories to embarkation points and across the oceans to our theaters of war.

The necessity and importance of these jobs are obvious, and we notice them because they are associated with vital and spectacular operations. But they are by no means the only jobs the Weather Bureau is doing for the war. For example, in my State and some others in the central part of the country, where a large part of our war munitions are being manufactured, there are thousands of plant employees and very valuable stocks of explosives that must be protected from the risks of lightning. There is no way to control a lightning storm; but there is a way to find out when one is approaching so that munitions may be properly protected and employees sent to safe places. The Weather Bureau has organized a reporting system using hundreds of people—farmers, townspeople, telephone and telegraph operators, and so forth—to give reports of the development and movement of these storms. It has also sponsored the development of a mechanical detector in the laboratories of a Southwestern university to indicate precisely the intensity of these storms and has aided in the installation of these instruments in the munitions plants.

In the Great Lakes region, the shipment of ore from our northern mines to the smelters and manufacturing plants of the Northeastern States represents an essential link in our wartime production. Weather conditions influence these shipping operations in three ways—cold may freeze the ore in the holds of the ships so that unloading becomes an expensive and time-consuming job; the formation and drift of ice may seriously disrupt the movement of the boats in transit; and Great Lakes storms may endanger shipping. To prevent the loss of cargoes, ships, and men, and also to prevent costly delays in this traffic, the Bureau has set up a special Great Lakes weather-forecasting service. It has proved eminently successful—a major contribution to the success of an essential wartime traffic that counts its volume in millions of tons.

I mentioned the transport of aircraft across the United States and the oceans to our theaters of war. Most of the details of the Weather Bureau's part in this process are not for public mention—they involve the location of forecasting centers, schedules of communication, new and more accurate ocean-weather forecasting techniques, methods of advice to pilots during flight, and codes for the transmission of information that might be of value to our enemies. But we all know that icing in the clouds can plunge a plane into the ocean, that lightning and violent turbulence in the upper atmosphere may bring it to disaster, that the difference between tail winds and head winds is the difference between speed and delay, safety and loss, economy and high costs. We have no way of

knowing accurately the values of the weather forecasting service that guides this air traffic, either in time, planes, cost of fuel, or human life. It is enough to say that everyone who knows anything about it considers the service indispensable. From the economic standpoint, it is worth while to remember that we manufactured in this country last year about 30,000 planes and all of them flew somewhere, and that aircraft accidents due to unexpected bad weather are extremely rare. Without weather reports and forecasts modern air commerce is impossible, and the Weather Bureau's cost to the Nation is fully repaid by the increased efficiency and safety its services provide for air operations alone.

Besides these wartime functions the Weather Bureau operates the hurricane-warning service whose advices are transmitted directly to every aviation base and air-training school in our Southern States. It maintains the fire-weather service for the protection of the national forests at a time when our timber resources are of greater value than ever before. It conducts, in direct collaboration with the Army, a research unit for interpreting the meteorology of the entire world in military terms for military use. It still serves the farmer who produces our food; the land or water carrier who transports our goods; the merchant who markets them; and the consumer who uses them. If we look critically at the size and complexity of the job this Bureau is expected to do, most of us, I think, will admit that it is vastly bigger and more difficult than we had ever supposed.

Part of the Bureau's ability to handle that job is to be explained by its experience, by the fact that its observations and reports, its studies and forecasts, its judicious use of unpaid cooperation and other economies in operation, and its adjustments to changing needs, have been its schedule for 24 hours every day for nearly three-quarters of a century. That experience has taught the Bureau very thoroughly what the United States needs in weather service and how to meet such needs in the most effective and economical manner. This Bureau is useful now; it could be vastly more useful than it is. Every passing year sees this Nation pay a billion dollars in unnecessary losses caused by weather simply because the possibilities of our national weather service have not yet been fully realized. In my previous speech about this Bureau, I pointed out, and I think it well worth repeating, that its services cost each citizen of the United States about as much as one airmail stamp a year, and that its per capita return in the actual saving of property, working time, crops, and shipping is not less than $20. No one can question the profit of an investment like that; and no one who has looked into the unrealized possibilities of this Bureau can question the wisdom of maintaining and improving its service.

It is natural enough that we should ask how they do it. I cannot answer that question completely. However, there is one basic and very important feature of the service that I may speak of as its working foundation. In the Weather Bureau's language, this part of the organization is called the "basic synoptic network." It includes some hundreds of observing stations located in every State in the Union, in Alaska, in the Caribbean, and in our island possessions. Some of these stations are large in order to serve the varied interests of large cities or extensive farming or industrial areas; many of them are located at airports; some of them are in isolated places on mountains or in deserts. All of them make weather observations. They are the source of information upon which all weather forecasting in the United States is based. The stations are connected by wire, either by teletype or by telephone or telegraph lines that can reach a teletype circuit directly. The weather observations they make consist of measurements or computations of all weather elements prevailing at the station when the observations are made. The observations are made by established schedule at hourly intervals at some places, 3-hour intervals at others, and 6-hour intervals at others. They are all assembled in split-second order and placed on the teletype circuits which carry them to the points where they are needed—to the forecasting centers, to the Bureau's field offices, and to military and civil airports, where they are placed at the disposal of pilots and dispatchers. At the forecast centers they are entered by expert plotters upon blank base maps, which emerge from the plotting process as completed and analytical pictures of weather conditions prevailing simultaneously all over the country. This is the well-known weather chart from which the preparation of weather forecasts starts. What that preparation involves in way of experience, science, memory, judgment, talent, responsibility, and general skill I shall not try to discuss here; but the number of things that depend upon the result are very important and very numerous.

This forecast may start orchard heaters in California or Florida; it may send fire-weather crews into the forests of the Northwest; it may open a hydroelectric reservoir; it may call for the issue of flood warnings; it may ground a hundred airplanes for several hours; it may change the course of Army maneuvers; it may send 10,000 children home from school; it may forestall the pouring of concrete for a war factory, a stretch of highway, or a flood-control dam; it may hold some portion of a trans-Atlantic convoy in port. To do a job like that certain requirements must be satisfied. First, the observations on that weather chart must be as numerous as possible and highly accurate. Second, the forecaster must be an expert—he must know his science; he must know how his interpretations are going to be used; he must have a self-confidence backed by long experience and proved skill; and he must bring to his job a responsibility that can be trusted with human lives and million-dollar values.

During the present war the uses of weather information in military plans and actions have been far greater than ever before. This is partly because aviation, which is so important in modern war, cannot get along without weather reports and forecasts. Another reason is that forecasting skill, efficiency of communications, and the character and content of weather reporting are of a much higher order than ever before; and still another that many modern military actions are so much faster than formerly that they require the closest coordination of all arms for complete success. One result of all these things is that the Army and Navy themselves have found it well worth while to assign specialized meteorological units with their field forces. The development of these units has required the high-speed training of weather personnel, along with close coordination in order to prevent overlaps and to make the new military units and the basic civilian service most useful to the military program. Naturally, a large part of the handling of these problems has fallen directly upon the Weather Bureau. A number of its keymen have been released to the military services as weather officers; several of its scientists have accepted assignments as instructors in the military meteorological courses; new codes have had to be developed to assure the transmission of weather information around the globe in such a manner as to be useful to our own and Allied forces without benefiting our enemies; the testing problems of a vastly increased aircraft production have absorbed Weather Bureau men to help with test-flight programs; forecasters have been assigned to advance aviation-training programs; military requirements have called for a large number of new stations and an increase of observations at many of the older ones.

Recognizing that its first purpose is to contribute everything it possibly can to the winning of the war, the Weather Bureau has gone the limit in meeting these wartime needs—at the same time never losing sight of its obligation to the civilian economy of the Nation, which has in many ways increased with the requirements of war. Needless to say, the closest meteorological liaison exists between the Weather Bureau and the military weather staffs. The duties performed by each are different in purpose, but they rest on the common ground of the basic synoptic organization of the Weather Bureau, without which they could not function at all. The maintenance of this organization is the established responsibility of the Weather Bureau, and we must see that it is maintained in thoroughly practiced hands. Its output of observations and forecasts is available at all times to the Army and the Navy; and as their activities of training, transportation, and operations increase and shift from place to place, the work of the civilian service keeps pace. We have seen during this war a number of more or less successful examples of the coordination of civilian and military activities. Some of them, especially in industry, have been excellent; some have resulted in confusion, wastage of money, and even more disastrous wastes of time. I think we would look far to find a better example of military and civilian cooperation than has been demonstrated in the

use of our weather service. It has called for the conversion of talents, facilities, personnel, and products into new channels without loss of benefit in old ones. The men who direct these operations have solved many difficult problems where the cloak of secrecy denied them public credit for their work.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the benefits of weather service developed for the war will not end with the war. No new idea or method or instrument or station will lose its usefulness. The lightning detector will serve the peacetime mill and factory as well as the munitions plant; the ocean-weather forecasting for bomber transport will be needed for post-war air traffic between our shores and those of Europe and Asia; the weather researches for military use in foreign theaters of war will guide our foreign post-war commerce; the young men being trained in the meteorology of war are learning a science that will also serve the commerce and industry and agriculture of peace. The wartime lessons are of first importance now in wartime uses; their lasting values will come later, in improvements in the service that helps to safeguard our crops and livestock and natural resources, our aviation and land and water shipping, our manufacture and merchandising, our utilities and industries, and, not least, our comfort and health and homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2397 had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, after the disposition of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the regular legislative business of the day and other special orders, my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF H. R. 323

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 323, which was heretofore considered by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House, and unanimously reported favorably by that committee, and is now on the Consent Calendar, be taken from that calendar and rereferred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a privileged resolution I have just introduced asking the President to submit certain information regarding the Office of Inter-American Cultural Relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 50 minutes.

V-FOODS TO FIGHT U-BOATS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, something over a year ago an officer in the Quartermasters Corps showed me a captured Japanese mess kit with the food packed therein for Japanese fighters in the South Pacific. An investigation of this mess kit showed that it contained a small compact square of powdered rice, some chlorine, and a tube about the size of a toothpaste tube filled with fish oil. The officer of the United States Army showing me this mess kit pointed out, as I recall, that it contained enough rations to supply a member of the Japanese fighting forces with rations for about 12 days. The chlorine was used to purify the water wherever it was found—in swamps, and jungles, or in flowing streams. The rice was then soaked in the water and caused to expand. The fish oil was applied to the rice or rubbed on the taste buds of the gums and tongue, and thus the fish-flavored rice provided a satisfactory and nutritious diet for a Japanese soldier.

Since that time, I have made as careful and complete study of dehydrated and compressed foods as time would permit, because I was then convinced and am growing more so daily, that our Army and Navy and the Lend-Lease Administration can greatly reduce the shipping needs of this country by moving in the direction of the use of compressed foods, in addition to and in substitution for the dehydrated foods which are now used in part.

If I needed any further encouragement in this connection it would have to come in this afternoon's issue of the Washington Times-Herald which carries this banner headline across the entire top of the front page: "'U-boat toll rising,' says Knox. 'Wolf packs' in Atlantic reinforced. New tactics used to cut supply lines." I shall read the first two or three paragraphs of the news article:

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox today reported that the Germans are concentrating more U boats in the Atlantic in an attempt to cut off vital supply lines to England and Africa, and disclosed that sinkings of allied ships increased considerably last month.

The sinkings of the cargo vessels have increased because the U-boats "have changed their tactics," the Secretary declared.

At his weekly press conference the Secretary declined to elaborate on the reported change in tactics, but said that more German submarines are concentrating in the mid-Atlantic.

INCREASED ACTIVITY

"There is evidence of increased submarine activity," Knox emphasized. "There have been more sinkings. The sinkings in March were worse than February, considerably."

Faced with that incontrovertible evidence from the Secretary of the Navy it seems to me we might all well devote a little more of our thinking and action these days to any problem which envisions the possibility of reducing the shipping needs for our armed forces overseas and for the United Nations with whom we are associated in this war.

On February 23, just 6 weeks ago today, during the lend-lease hearings an interesting coincidence occurred in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It happened that both Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Administrator of Lend-Lease, and I, without either one of us knowing the other was doing so, brought an exhibit to the committee room that day to demonstrate how modern processes of food preparation and processing could help solve the shipping problem about which the committee had been taking testimony for almost a month. This testimony had proved that shipping and shipping shortages were the details that were holding up American war activities throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include a portion of the lend-lease hearings of that date to bring out the colloquy between Mr. Stettinius and me on the subject of the various new-type foods being displayed before the committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[Excerpts starting on p. 328 of the printed hearings]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Stettinius, throughout these hearings and certainly throughout your whole Administration one of the big difficulties which permeated the whole proposition all the time was the matter of shipping. I have had some representatives in my office calling attention to what they conceive to be a good way in which the shipping situation could be relieved by doing considerably more than they claim is now being done in the matter of paying attention to the shipping of compressed foods, not only dried foods but compressed foods, and some of them have said

they have had some difficulty in getting their message across to the proper lend-lease officials. And I said there need not be any such difficulties because you certainly would be happy to have something on that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you wish to answer that?

Mr. STETTINIUS. I brought a food exhibit this morning. I don't know why, but I just brought it. I thought you would like to see the kind of thing we were doing in this whole matter of dehydration.

Mr. MUNDT. That's fine. I hope you will say something on the record about that.

Mr. STETTINIUS. I have six exhibits here with a detailed explanation of each stating exactly what it is that we are doing. I will be glad to tell you some of the technological advances in this whole question of dehydration for the record.

* * * * *

Mr. STETTINIUS. Practically everything can be dehydrated, Mr. Chairman. It is perfectly amazing the number of vegetables and the number of cereals and the number of meats that can be dehydrated. And the technological advance in this field in the last 18 months has been one of the interesting chapters of this war.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Stettinius, in addition to the dehydration of these foods there is a process of compression, compressing them. There has been some experience, when we simply ship down dehydrated vegetables, of course, it results in some loss because they have a tendency at times to crumble, and there are losses in powder. It has been brought to my attention by compressing them for example, this cube of cranberries brings it down 10 to 1.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. This is similar to that. This is carrots, compressed.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. This is onions.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. And there are a large number of idle compressors in the country at the present time, which could be used for that purpose, and I just wondered what investigation your agricultural expert had made from the standpoint of the second step after dehydration in the matter of compressing so that there will be no such loss. Obviously we do not have to discuss that here. I am highly gratified at the progress you are making. I am wondering if you could tell me for the record to whom I shall send these experts in the field of compression of dehydrated vegetable foods.

Mr. STETTINIUS. Have the gentlemen call on me. I will introduce them to Mr. Byron Spence, our agricultural expert, and I will be delighted to take it up with Mr. Roy Hendrickson, Mr. Wickard's assistant in the actual carrying on of the research. Send them to me.

Mr. MUNDT. I will send them to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are your own samples?

Mr. MUNDT. They are my samples.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to have those for the record? Are those the samples submitted by Mr. Stettinius?

Mr. MUNDT. These are mine.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I say, they are your own. Do you want that for the record?

Mr. MUNDT. My testimony shows what they are. I want to keep my samples.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in tribute to the extraordinary capacity of Mr. Stettinius and to his initiative and his cooperative spirit, too, I want to go on record here and now as to the great amount of progress that has been made in this whole program of food compression during the past 6 weeks.

At the conclusion of the colloquy which I have inserted in the RECORD, you will recall that Mr. Stettinius was asked whether or not he would give an audience or provide for somebody in his Administration to have an audience with certain food experts in this country who have been studying food compression. He said he would not only be glad to give an audience but that he himself would like to hear the story, and so, on the 25th day of February, just 2 days later, we held a conference in the office of Mr. Stettinius. Present at that meeting were the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], whom I see sitting here today, and I, together with two of these food experts to whom I had referred in the hearing. These were Mr. W. W. Black, the secretary of the joint dehydration committee, and who coincidentally has done a terrific piece of research and salesmanship work in bringing the whole subject of the compressed-food program to the attention of the proper governmental authorities, and also Mr. Carlos Van Leer, a writer for the American Chemical Society on war foods, who likewise has devoted a tremendous amount of time to help bring before the proper people the possibilities contained in these foods. Along with Mr. Stettinius was Mr. Byron Spence, his agricultural adviser. This conference resulted in some rather definite decisions. With his characteristic dispatch and decisiveness, Mr. Stettinius took immediate action to expedite the use of compressed food for a trial lend-lease shipment abroad.

On March 17, as you recall, there was a well-publicized lend-lease banquet down at the Statler Hotel which some 800 newspapermen, Members of Congress, and governmental officials attended. Those guests were served a luncheon comprised entirely of dehydrated foods. However, I want to emphasize here that there were no compressed foods served at that luncheon. The display which we have provided here in the Speaker's lobby is a display of compressed, dehydrated foods. The foods are dehydrated to take out the water; that is the first step. The second step, compression, extracts the air, and it is to this second step of the process that I am going to devote my remarks today. I have here a menu of the food that was served at that luncheon in the Hotel Statler which I ask at this time, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

MENU OF LEND-LEASE LUNCHEON, HOTEL STATLER, MARCH 11, 1943

Menu composed entirely of dehydrated foods, rehydrated and prepared here today. The total weight of today's luncheon in dehydrated form was 278 pounds, as compared with a weight of 1,850 pounds for the same foods not dehydrated.

PUREE OF SOYA

This soup is almost a complete food in itself. It contributes the valuable proteins of soya, and the minerals and vitamins of milk. Soya soup is enriched with added vitamins and minerals. It is supplied principally to Russia. Dehydration reduces shipping bulk by approximately 90 percent.

MEAT LOAF WITH SAUCE

A dehydrated mixture of beef, pork, and soya, a highly concentrated source of proteins. Russia and Britain are receiving meats in dehydrated form, with a saving in shipping bulk of approximately 87½ percent. Such meats do not require refrigeration.

CRANBERRIES

Prepared from dehydrated whole cranberries, with a weight and bulk saving of 90 percent. Our armed forces are using this product abroad.

MASHED POTATOES, CARROTS, CABBAGE

These dehydrated vegetables, plus dehydrated onions, sweetpotatoes, spinach, turnips, and rutabagas are being shipped to the Russian and British armed forces. Dehydration of these vegetables reduces shipping bulk by from 4 to 1, to 15 to 1.

BEET SALAD

Prepared from dehydrated beets, which have been ordered for supply to the Russian and British as well as our own armed forces.

FIELD RATION BISCUIT, MARGARINE

This biscuit is a dehydrated and concentrated product, used by the United States Army, and supplied also to the British armed services. Vegetable oils suitable for margarine are being supplied in large quantities to Russia and Britain.

EGG CUSTARD

Dried eggs and dry milk are being supplied to Russia, Britain, and dry milk to North Africa. Dried eggs are unbreakable, require no refrigeration, and reduce shipping space requirements to 8.7 percent of that needed for shell eggs.

CHEESE

Cheese in this dehydrated form has gone only to United States armed forces.

MILK

The milk is reconstituted from dry whole milk which requires one-sixth the space needed to ship the equivalent quantity of evaporated milk.

Dehydrated foods such as are being supplied on lend-lease are produced in 37 States of the Union, and are processed in plants located in 32 States. United States dehydrated food production is going to the armed forces of the United States and to lend-lease countries.

Because of the much greater Chinese need for other supplies, Lend-Lease has sent no food to China. Lend-Lease is currently shipping to China medical supplies, munitions for air and ground forces and raw materials for the arsenals of China.

(All expenses of the luncheon are being borne personally by 150 members of the Lend-Lease organization.)

NOTE.—Total weight of these dehydrated foods for serving 800 guests was 278 pounds as compared with a weight of 1,850 pounds for same foods not dehydrated.

Mr. MUNDT. All of the food served at this luncheon which had been dehydrated is also subject to compression, and through the process of compression tremendous saving can be made in the shipping requirements. It is an incontestable fact that a saving amounting to from 35 to 55 percent can be made when dehydrated foods are subject to compression.

Of course, an additional saving is made through the elimination of packaging materials which are needed in dehydrated foods and which are not needed when foods are compressed. I want to

express today the fact that dehydration and the use of compression after foods have been dehydrated will make important savings in six different fields: First, in the matter of shipping space; second, in the matter of critical materials, especially such as tin which is very critical in our war effort; third, in the saving of manpower, because less manpower is required since less packaging is involved and less weight and space is involved from the standpoint of the movement of the goods; fourth, saving in money; fifth, saving in warehousing requirements; and sixth, saving in transportation requirements in the battle areas.

BOTH DEHYDRATION AND COMPRESSION NEEDED

It is my contention that this second step, the step of compression, is fully as important as the first step, which is the step of dehydration. In terms of meeting the shipping challenge confronting this country today, and which was dramatized and illustrated by the quotation I read from Secretary Knox on the increasing U-boat menace, I feel it is even more important.

At this time I want to read you the first two paragraphs of a special report which was prepared for me under date of April 2 by an officer in the Subsistence Research Laboratory of the Chicago depot of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army. This laboratory has done an outstanding piece of work from the standpoint of making experiments and showing the definite, practical utility value of dehydrated foods which have been treated to the compression process.

In this report it is stated:

While dehydration of various foodstuffs markedly reduces the moisture content and consequently the weight of the product, the reduction in cubage or bulk is not as great as one might expect, particularly with those items of large particle size such as Julienne or stripped cut root vegetables.

The next approach to reduction in space occupied by dehydrated foods obviously is some method for reducing bulk with a corresponding increase in density of the packaged product. This can be accomplished in many instances by the use of presses for the compression of dehydrated products.

In other words, this research laboratory is the authority for the wisdom and the practicability of carrying out the processes which we have attempted to demonstrate and display out here in the Speaker's lobby today whereby these large bulk packages of dehydrated foods are condensed down into small units and small packages by this process of compression.

COMPRESSION NOT A COMPLICATED PROCESS

I want to point out also that compression is not a complicated or expensive process. In a single sentence it can be stated as follows: Compression simply squeezes the air out of the dehydrated foods and presses them together so firmly that their bulk is reduced on an average of 50 percent, their perishability is greatly retarded, their requirements for packaging materials are substantially reduced, and their nutritive values are completely preserved.

Let us get down to actual cases and see what food compression means in terms of actual saving in ship space and other wartime desiderata of fundamental importance.

SAVING IN SHIP SPACE

Let us take the matter of eggs. The charts and exhibits out in the Speaker's lobby, which Members have been examining all afternoon, portray in graphic and pictorial form the statistics which I am now going to quote in part and then insert as a part of my remarks as a chart in the RECORD. Compression will result in saving in shipping space from the standpoint of eggs of 50 percent, soup 35 percent, coffee 42 percent, beef 65 percent, potatoes 75 percent. It should be recalled that these savings are based on a comparison with space now used by dehydrated food. If we made the comparison with fresh produce or canned foods, of course, the percentage would be even greater.

I also have here a chart which I shall insert in the RECORD, showing just how much greater those savings would be if the food is compressed from fresh foods, instead of dehydrated foods.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert these charts labeled 1 and 2 in the RECORD to bear out the statistics which I have just recited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

The charts referred to are as follows:

CHART NO. 1.—*Compression will conserve transportation, men, and materials as indicated below, with ships alone*

	Percent reduction
Eggs	50
Soup	35
Coffee	42
Beef	65
Potatoes	75
Beets	65
Carrots	55
Onions	65
Dried whole milk	30
Chocolate pudding	47

Plus savings in warehouses, trucks, freight, fuel, and manpower.

These savings are based on a comparison with space used by dehydrated foods. They are greatly increased when compared with fresh produce or canned goods, as is shown in the succeeding table.

CHART NO. 2.—*Chart showing savings in weight and volume when fresh produce is dehydrated and when it is both dehydrated and compressed*

Produce	Dehydrated	Dehydrated and compressed	Total reductions from both processes
Potatoes:			
513 pounds	57 pounds	57 pounds	456 pounds (88.75 percent).
11.6 cubic feet	4 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	10.6 cubic feet (91.4 percent).
Onions:			
525 pounds	52.5 pounds	52.5 pounds	472.5 pounds (90.25 percent).
12 cubic feet	2.9 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	11 cubic feet (91.75 percent).
Cabbage:			
1,000 pounds	54.5 pounds	54.5 pounds	945.5 pounds (94.55 percent).
22.8 cubic feet	5 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	21.8 cubic feet (95.75 percent).
Carrots:			
510 pounds	51 pounds	51 pounds	459 pounds (90 percent).
11.5 cubic feet	2.9 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	10.5 cubic feet (91.3 percent).
Beets:			
510 pounds	51 pounds	51 pounds	459 pounds (90 percent).
11.5 cubic feet	2.9 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	10.5 cubic feet (91.3 percent).
Cranberries:			
830 pounds	55.5 pounds	55.5 pounds	774.5 pounds (93.20 percent).
21 cubic feet	5 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	20 cubic feet (95.25 percent).
Apples:			
500 pounds	50 pounds	50 pounds	450 pounds (90 percent).
13.1 cubic feet	3.3 cubic feet	1 cubic foot	12.1 cubic feet (92.4 percent).

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I also have some figures here prepared by the Cambridge Tile Manufacturing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio. I may mention incidentally that this company has already processed some powdered eggs in compressed form which represent the only shipments of compressed foods which the Government at any time has sent overseas thus far in the whole war effort. There are now 3,000 pounds of compressed eggs en route to Great Britain which will arrive there either today or tomorrow and we expect an early report from the standpoint of the reaction of the English Army officials and the English public to these new-type foods.

These eggs, processed by the Cambridge Tile Manufacturing Co., were purchased, handled, and shipped through lend-lease, and I quote now some figures resulting from experiments made by this company which has had actual experience in the business. These findings are based on 100,000,000 pounds of compressed egg powder as contrasted with ordinary dehydrated egg powder now being shipped in 14-pound packages.

A saving of 5.2 percent in weight would accrue from saving in packaging material.

A saving of 47.8 percent in cubic feet of shipping space would accrue in shipments made overseas, and a similar saving, of course, from the standpoint of railroad and truck transportation.

Put in terms of dollars saved to the American taxpayers, by compressing 100,000,000 pounds of egg powder, these savings would accrue in terms of dollars saved to be used for other purposes in the war program. I may say these figures are based on computations made on eggs compressed in Cincinnati, Ohio, sent to the seaboard, shipped to Liverpool, England, and distributed to points of use in Great Britain with an estimated total inland freight haul of 1,000 miles.

Savings in containers, $348,400.

Savings in storage, $39,300.

Savings in manpower in handling, $13,100.

Savings in inland freight charges, $42,500.

Savings in ocean freight charges, $2,310,700.

A total saving to the American taxpayers of $2,754,000.

This is the saving in the compression of 100,000,000 pounds of egg powder alone as contrasted between the present and prevailing practice of shipping dry egg powder without compression and the more scientific and equally valuable process of concentrating it in compressed form before it is shipped.

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental thing today is to save the lives of the men going down to the sea in ships and to provide the necessary additional ships to transport and equip the men needed to win this war. When food is compressed one ship can do the work of two as contrasted with ships carrying dehydrated foods. One ship carrying compressed foods can do the work of three or four as contrasted with ships carrying fresh produce. It is imperative that we stop shipping air and water across the seas.

However, I respectfully submit to this Congress and the country that the tremendous savings in dollars and cents is also an important factor in the program of developing and using more compressed foods and the foregoing report of the Cambridge Tile Manufacturing Co. shows, specifically, how dollars can be made to work more effectively in the winning of this war and the preservation of our national solvency.

Mr. Speaker, I have still additional evidence to show the savings we can make if we devote our best talents to the task of developing and utilizing compressed foods.

From the very outset of the war the Army Quartermaster Corps has worked closely with the Food Distribution Administration.

A recent report from the Army Quartermaster Corps stressing the space and weight saving afforded by dehydrated vegetables disclosed that through dehydration 3,928 pounds of sweetpotatoes can be stowed in a ship's ton, which is 40 cubic feet, as against 920 pounds net of canned sweet potatoes—a ratio of about 4.7 to 1 in the saving of space.

Similarly, dehydration has been favored by the War Production Board as a means of conserving critical packaging materials. Goals for 1943 covering vegetables, fruits, soups, milk, eggs, and meat will save more than 136,177 tons of packaging material, 1,239,524 cars of railroad shipping space, and many, many manhours, according to War Production Board estimates, if dehydrated.

It should be noted that if these foods are compressed after being dehydrated an additional saving on top of what I have just recited will accrue, to the extent of from 35 to 50 percent, depending upon the product involved, and that resulting economies will follow from the standpoint of domestic railroad requirements, warehousing demands, manpower needs for handling, and railroad and truck transportation requirements in the battle areas themselves.

FOOD COMPRESSION—NO ALCHEMIST'S DREAM

Let me now call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that food compression is no alchemist's dream but it is today a practical process of food preparation ready to be used on a wide-scale basis, largely with existing equipment, if we can succeed in breaking the bottlenecks of indifference and ineptitude which are retarding this development in certain quarters.

FOOD COMPRESSION IS PRACTICAL

From the standpoint of practicability, the charts which are on display out in the Speaker's lobby point out how readily these compressed foods can be made available for civilian uses, the attractive packaging, the means of handling, the ease with which they can be stored, and their preservability.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate with my remarks a chart, prepared by the Quartermaster Corps, of items which are subject to compression.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

ITEMS SUBJECT TO COMPRESSION

Beverages: Cocoa, powdered concentrated lemon, tea.

Dairy products: Milk, dry skim; milk, dry whole; milk, dry malted; cheese, dehydrated; eggs, dry whole.

Fruits: Apples, apricots, peaches, prunes, raisins, cranberries.

Grains and cereals: Cereals, assorted dry; corn meal; cereal, breakfast rolled oats; cereal, breakfast wheat meal; cereal, breakfast wheat, whole.

Spices, extracts, condiments: Allspice; powdered chili; cinnamon; cloves; ginger; nutmeg, powdered; pepper, black; salt; extract, maple tablet; extract, vanilla tablet; salt, celery; powder, curry.

Questionable: Flour, buckwheat; flour, wheat; hominy grits; macaroni; noodles; rice; spaghetti; potatoes, white, shredded and julienne; potatoes; sweet.

Sugars: Sugar, brown; sugar, powdered; sugar, granulated.

Vegetables, dehydrated: Onions, sliced and powdered; cabbage; carrots; beets; tomatoes, cocktail; soup, pea; soup, chick pea; soup, navy bean; rutabagas.

Rations: K-5-in-1-jungle-mountain; desert, combat lunch.

Miscellaneous: Dessert powders, flavored gelatin; dessert powders, flavored starch; powder, baking; soda, baking; cornstarch; yeast; coconut, shredded; mincemeat; bouillon cubes; tablets, sodium chloride; tablets, multivitamin; gelatin, plain powdered.

Class 67: Hay, grain, salt, soda ash, dog food.

COMPRESSED FOODS HAVE UTILITY VALUE

Mr. MUNDT. Now, from the standpoint of utility, there is no question about the nutritive value, the preservability, or the general utility of compressed foods.

Let me give you here the statement of Col. Paul P. Logan, of the Quartermaster Corps, appearing in hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, on page 817 of volume 3, at a time when they were discussing technological mobilization. Colonel Logan said, in answer to a question concerning whether or not an item of food which he was discussing was dehydrated and whether it could be successfully compressed:

It is dehydrated. Perhaps the outstanding one is the compressed apple nugget. When we dehydrate apples they are rather fluffy and you can get only 6 pounds in a 5-gallon can. By compression and without loss of texture, flavor, or quality—

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize those words—

By compression and without loss of texture, flavor, or quality you can save 86 percent of the space that you would have otherwise used.

I submit in all candor that, at a time when the submarine menace is threatening the lives of thousands of our boys and when it is even threatening the success of the war, we would do well to devote some pretty serious attention to getting some quick action on anything which can save us 86 percent of our shipping space without in any way decreasing the quality of the food from the standpoint—and I quote again—of texture, flavor, or quality.

We have also the undisputed testimony, Mr. Speaker, of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Grover B. Hill, on the subject of the utility value of compressed foods. I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks at this point several paragraphs of a letter which Mr. Hill wrote to Senator WILEY, and which I have Senator WILEY'S permission to include with these remarks. May I say, too, that Senator WILEY is one of those who has been very much interested in the expansion of use of compressed foods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

There are many disadvantages to the packaging of dehydrated vegetables in the loose form. They have in general very low bulk densities; they are very brittle solids and are easily reduced to a coarse powder by rough treatment. In addition, these dehydrated vegetables are capable of puncturing the moistureproof film of nonrigid containers even with reasonable handling. When the vegetables have been compressed, the resultant package is one of high density compared with the loose material and therefore the cost of packaging in terms of the reconstituted and cooked material is much reduced and there is far less risk of damage to the actual dry vegetables through rough treatment. The greater strength and density are advantageous if packaging in moistureproof containers is contemplated. The penetration of water vapor and air into such compressed material is very slow and it is to be expected that these blocks would deteriorate much more slowly in air than the corresponding loose material. Inasmuch as the dehydrated vegetables are compressed in a steel mold, the block has a relatively smooth surface that would be very unlikely to damage or puncture wrapping materials.

Experiments so far have proven that the reconstituted material was in every way equal to the corresponding product from the original loose material. Dried leaf vegetables are best compressed after the completely dried vegetables have been subjected for a few minutes to a high humidity whereby the leaves but not the stocks become pliable. Vegetables high in sugar content are usually compressed at a temperature of 150° F. and the sugar substance tends to act as a binder holding the material together.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall not take the time to read this letter now except to emphasize that Grover Hill also goes on record to show that dehydrated foods can be compressed and that the compression does not in any way detract from their utility in any form.

It is clear from this statement, it seems to me, that compressed foods have already demonstrated their utility. It is tragic to realize, therefore, that in some instances we have been shipping loose dried vegetables at a cost of 400 percent extra shipping space, and that in so doing we have also at many times delivered to the United Nations food of substandard quality while actually magnifying our own shipping problems through our failure to move forward faster on a program of processing compressed foods.

The makers of Kraft cheese, for example, have done some work from the standpoint of compression of cheese, and they have demonstrated that while cheese can be satisfactorily preserved for 4 months under refrigeration it can be equally well preserved for 2 years when dehydrated and compressed.

What is true of cheese should also be true of egg powder and milk powder, because the same conditions which tend to destroy them through the exposure of fatty substances to the air are eliminated as the foods are compressed, just as in the case of compressed, concentrated cheese.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the package of food is not only dehydrated but compressed, as the gentleman has described, can it be broken and a portion of it used without spoilage beginning at once?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; it is not necessary to use the whole package at once, because the material has been dehydrated, and, of course, the wrapping is simply cardboard or cellophane wrapping, and you have a much smaller area open to the air, so that you still retard the process of spoilage.

Mr. MURDOCK. If it will not break into the gentleman's discourse I would like to have him yield further.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the first place, I want to express my appreciation for the information I am now receiving, which will be of value to all of the membership, as well as to the country at large, and thank the gentleman for his study. Without going into the philosophy of whether good can come out of evil, or taking either side of that question, which was one of our old debating subjects, is it not true that out of these terrible wars many good things have come, and this food processing is apt to be one of them, that this new process of handling as well as preserving food is in its infancy and may have a great effect upon our future in peacetimes?

Mr. MUNDT. I would hesitate to subscribe to the doctrine and I know that the gentleman does not subscribe to it that something as awful as war is essential to the development of good, but I do believe that as a result of the experiences which are being forced upon us by the exigencies of war, the peacetime effect of certain developments will be tremendously felt. I shall come to that a little bit later if the gentleman will now allow me to pursue my remarks.

FOOD COMPRESSION NOW MOVING FORWARD

I want to recite now the progress which has been made, and the definite direction, under the compression process, in which I think we could move more rapidly. I have already mentioned the 3,000 tons of compressed eggs that are now en route to Britain because of quick action and the efficient administration of lend-lease.

On March 26 Mr. George Poindexter was appointed as Coordinator on Compression in the Office of the Food Distribution Administration. I stop here to say a word in praise of Mr. Poindexter, because despite the fact that he has been there for less than 2 weeks, he has already taken definite steps for expediting this whole program of food compression. He has been kind enough to come to my office for conferences with me, and he is enthusiastic about the possibilities of what he is doing. I believe we have in him a man who will go out and get results, and not be stopped by a lot of red tape that may be put in his way.

Mr. Donald Payne in the Department of Agriculture has been pushing forward the program of concentrating soup readily adaptable to compression, and while it has not been carried forward to the stage of complete compression, it has a degree of compression in it and is definite progress in the right direction.

Mr. M. V. Johnson, of Detroit, Mich., now has two large presses available for compressing 90,000,000 pounds of food per year. Mr. Johnson is America's outstanding compressor of coal briquettes.

Auto Ordnance of Greenwich, Conn., has done a vast amount of exploratory work and prepared many of the exhibits I put on display today.

The Cambridge Tile Manufacturing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, has done a large amount of compression work and prepared the compressed eggs now en route to Britain.

The Cuneo Press of Chicago has done much work in the matter of food compression, and is ready to go ahead on a large scale if they get encouragement by an order from the Government.

The du Pont Co. of Delaware has been experimenting from the standpoint of packaging compressed foods, and I am indebted to them for some of the pictures on display in the lobby this afternoon.

I want to say again that the Quartermaster Corps Subsistence Research Laboratory of Chicago has done a perfectly grand type of work in getting away from the beaten path and in taking steps which are going to tend to expedite this program. This laboratory has done a great deal to demonstrate the practical qualities of compressed foods.

GENERAL ADVANTAGES OF COMPRESSED FOODS

Mr. Speaker, the scientific and sizable use of compressed food in our overseas food shipments opens up new vistas of opportunity for this country to secure greater results with smaller expenditures of manpower, material, and money, and it provides a method for taking direct and early action in the fundamental problem of winning our fight against the submarine menace.

Shipping is today the bottleneck holding back our war program on almost every front. For lack of sufficient ships we are unable to provide the aid to China which America so universally desires to provide. For lack of sufficient ships, we are unable to get the supplies to General MacArthur which he needs to carry the war closer and closer to the heart of Japan so that the men of the Mikado can be prevented from consolidating their ill-gotten gains in the Pacific. For lack of sufficient ships we are unable to get the supplies through to Russia in the quantity required to provide the necessary striking power so that the fighting men of Russia can crown their heroic rescue of Stalingrad and Leningrad by a complete break-through in the Nazi lines. For lack of sufficient ships we are unable to divert the men and materials needed to drive the Japs out of Kiska and the Aleutian Islands, where they continue to menace our security in the north. For lack of sufficient ships we cannot move men and materials to Britain, to north Africa, and to a dozen other battle zones with the rapidity and safety that the war situation requires.

We are engaged in a mighty program of shipbuilding and the increased menace provided by the new submarine drive against our shipping has been met by increased vigilance and heroism by the navies and air fleets of the United Nations. Still we are told the sinkings continue, shipping space remains at a premium, and the losses in March are reportedly as serious as any sustained in any month since Pearl Harbor.

In view of the great need for ships and the tremendous part which adequate shipping space plays in securing an early and complete victory in this war, we can ill afford to miss a single opportunity to conserve shipping space and to utilize science in decreasing the unnecessary bulk and weight of ship cargoes. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the expanded use of compressed foods is the most immediate and practical method we can use to meet the challenge of the U-boats and to increase the shipping space available to the United Nations for the movements of men and materials of war.

In the neighborhood of 40 percent of United Nations destined cargoes consist of foods. The important factor in this great demand upon shipping bottoms is not the weight but the bulk of the foods which are shipped. By reducing the bulk requirements of food by one-half we would save 20 percent of our shipping space, thus providing for a 20-percent increase in the delivery of munitions or men to the points of battle. We are today sending out one ship out of every

five with a cargo of air through our failure to compress the air out of dehydrated foods so as to reduce the bulk of the shipments. One ship in five which is today leaving American ports could be entirely loaded with munitions, with men, with implements of war, and the other four would carry as much food as is now being shipped in all five if we put into practice what we now know about the methods of food compression. Mr. Speaker, I insist that the time has come to get wide-scale action on this program and to make the most efficient possible use of the shipping space of the United Nations. Let us cease torpedoing every fifth merchant ship leaving our shores through the sorry policy of failing to utilize what science and industry have provided in the matter of compressing and concentrating the foods we are shipping overseas.

COMPRESSED FOODS IN BATTLE AREAS

Mr. Speaker, while I have stressed overseas shipments in these remarks because of their importance as we continue our war against the submarine, let me point out that the use of compressed foods develops many additional economies of great significance in our war program. In the first place, the internal shipments of food from the points of processing in this country to seaboard will—when compression becomes common practice—require much less rolling stock and power from our domestic railroads. When the food shipments are being warehoused at docks before shipment and when they are being stored in warehouses as reserves on the other side, the warehousing requirements can be cut from 60 percent to 80 percent through the use of compressed foods. Also, there will be a great economy in the use of manpower for handling the less bulky and lighter quantities of compressed foods. Finally, as the foods near the battle area where demands upon railroads and trucks are the heaviest, the economies provided by compressed foods will pay the greatest dividends in human lives as well as in savings in materials and money.

With one railroad car carrying the food that three now carry—when dehydration only is used and compression is not provided—it can readily be seen what the expanded use of compressed food will mean in stepped-up efficiency and stepped-down waste in the battle areas.

With one truck carrying the food that three now carry to the commissaries in the fighting zones, it does not require a four-star general or a military expert to determine the value of compressed foods from the standpoint of feeding an army and solving the transportation problems of mobile warfare.

With one warehouse serving the purpose of three, with one ship carrying the capacity of three, Mr. Speaker, the use of compressed foods opens up a great field for the optimum use of manpower, materials, and money which should challenge us all to do everything possible to expedite and develop the wider use of these foods without delay.

And it should be remembered that the foregoing examples of one unit doing the work of three are based on a comparison of compressed foods as against dehydrated foods. When the comparisons are figured as against the use of canned foods or fresh products we find that one ship, or one railroad car, one warehouse, or one truck would actually do the work of eight or nine. In this global war of all-out effort it is not only a question of how much we have. It is also a question of how well we utilize what we have available. With regard to this latter factor, America still has a great deal to learn.

Our enemies, with fewer resources than we, have been forced by circumstances to step up their adoption of scientific processes for cutting down the disparity between what they have and what we have. As part of this process, they have made great strides in the use of compressed foods and part of the mobility of the Nazi armies is attributable to the wide use of compressed foods which they have adopted.

COMPRESSED FOODS AS ANGELS OF MERCY

Mr. Speaker, I want to digress from my discussion of the purely practical reasons for accelerating our program of food compression, for a minute, to appeal to your imagination in pointing out what the use of compressed foods can mean to the gallant crews of merchant ships or hydroplanes who are forced to brave the wide expanses of the seas on life rafts or in lifeboats after disaster has caused them to abandon ship. Our sympathies have all been stirred by the harrowing tales of shipwrecked sailors and airmen who have scanned the barren skies for weeks and even months looking for rescue while they have fought to keep body and soul together without benefit of either food or water. Imagine with me, if you will, what a program of food compression can mean to men forced to confront such an unenviable emergency.

Packages of compressed food could be attached to every lifeboat and to every life raft, and because of the small weight and bulk of such a package the rations for a month or more could easily be made available to every group of shipwrecked men or women. Food enough for considerable periods of time could be provided in the space where ordinary food or even dehydrated rations could be stored sufficient only for a few days to a week.

Until very recently, of course, such life-saving precautions as attaching packages of compressed foods as angels of mercy to all lifeboats and rafts would still leave lacking an adequate supply of drinking water for those who were shipwrecked. It would also still leave unsolved the question of securing the necessary water for softening and reconstituting the compressed foods.

However, Mr. Speaker, science once again has proved the friend of man. Last week a number of Members of the Senate and the House heard Mr. F. H. Brownell, of New York City, chairman of the board of directors of the American Smelting & Refining Co., and one of the directors of the Chase National Bank of New York, describe an imagination-defying discovery worked out in the chemical laboratories of the University of California. This discovery is in the nature of a small packet containing silver in a secret formula and which when placed in sea water has a tendency to precipitate the salt from the water and to make it sufficiently clear and pure to drink. The man who discovered the formula is Dr. Alex Goetz, of the California Institute of Technology, and in describing the process Dr. Goetz said, "It is as simple as pouring water from one sea boot to another." A container about the size of a package of cigarettes would hold enough of this purifying product to clarify about 2 quarts of water, according to Dr. Goetz. Actual production of this purifying element, which contains silver, is expected to be begun immediately if, in fact, it is not already in production.

When I decided to give this talk on the challenge which compressed food is making to this country, I wired Mr. Brownell in New York City for confirmation of the facts he had recited before the meeting I attended. In reply, under date of April 2, I received the following telegram from him:

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Silver pellet was worked out at School of Technology of Southern University of California under charge of Dr. Milliken. Believe active investigator was research assistant Dr. Goetz. Understand has been accepted by Navy or airplanes, perhaps both, and is now in process of actual production. James White, Barr Building, can give you full information.

F. H. BROWNELL.

Mr. Speaker, this purifying element is a new discovery and may require additional refinements, but in conjunction with compressed foods I can see where it has opened up a great opportunity for our Government to reduce the hazards of the sea and to save the lives of the heroic men braving its dangers to keep transportation moving over the aquatic life lines of the United Nations.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the main purpose of this discussion, the encouragement of the early and energetic expansion of the Government's use of compressed foods as a direct and definite method of meeting the challenge of the submarine and of expediting our war program.

To summarize what I have attempted to demonstrate in these remarks let me list the values of compressed foods in tabular form:

COMPRESSION OF DEHYDRATED FOODS

Reduces their—
- Bulk (by 50 to 75 percent).
- Perishability.
- Packaging material requirements (especially critical metals).
- Need for gas for vacuum packing.
- Truck, rail, and ship cargo space requirements.
- Storage space requirements.
- Distribution manpower requirements.
- Packaging, handling, and shipping costs in dollars.

Increases their—
- Resistance to oxidation and moisture, hence durability.
- Convenience and speed of handling in packaging lines.
- Resistance to infestation.
- Durability through shipment.
- Availability to victims of shipwreck.

Mr. Speaker, while a great deal of commendable pioneering and initiative have been undertaken by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army and by the Lend-Lease Administration, there can be no denying that some of the Government agencies have adopted a superconservative attitude toward the whole food-compression development. The Department of Agriculture has not moved with the decision and dispatch, for example, which has been demonstrated by the office of the quartermaster general or of the Administrator of Lend-Lease. In time of war, decisions must be made quickly and continuing exhaustive tests must be supplemented by tests in the practical fields of operation. By the same token, the War Production Board has been reluctant to grant the necessary priorities to step up either dehydration or compression of foods as much as is needed despite convincing proof that a small amount of steel so utilized will save many, many times its amount in a more economical use of railroad cars, trucks, and merchant ships. For example, on just the eggs, milk, and soup we need to meet the 1943–44 armed forces and lend-lease requirements alone we would save at least 18,000 freight cars and a thousand 10,000-ton ships if the 1,000,000,000 pounds of these foodstuffs were to be both dehydrated and compressed. Such startling possibilities of a more economical and efficient utilization of our shipping resources and critical materials are too important to receive anything less than primary attention by all authorities in responsible administrative positions.

Late last fall, the Department of Agriculture announced a Nation-wide survey of food-processing facilities. The country has a right to know the findings of that survey. Have those findings been made public? Have steps been taken to improve any unfavorable conditions disclosed in the survey? Has an analysis cilities for dehydration and compression machinery now available in this country or readily adaptable for that purpose? Have requisitions been presented to the War Production Board for critical materials to supplement the existing facilities for dehydration and compression of foodstuffs? If not, why not? If so, why does progress lag so seriously? However, during the past few weeks more encouraging action has been observed in the Department of Agriculture. Let us hope it continues. Perhaps the appointment of Chester Davis as the new Food Administrator will help stimulate and sustain action by this Department.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this overlong address I wish to summarize the conclusions and recommendations which in my opinion grow out of a careful study and investigation of the food program of this country when considered in connection with the shipping requirements and the opportunities confronting the Government to use the compression and dehydration of foodstuffs.

I shall discuss these matters in the House again at a later date, at which time I expect to marshal additional evidence along these lines resulting from the studies I have made. It is my hope, however, that Members will increasingly devote themselves collectively and individually to the many ramifications of the application of the new findings of science to the problems of food preparation and transportation, because it is my conviction that we can give impetus and direction to changes in policy which will go far toward a more economical and continued use of shipping space and critical materials now available to the United Nations. In so doing we shall contribute greatly to the winning of this war.

I now have 10 recommendations and conclusions which I should like to list as growing out of the study I have made in this connection but I first yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], whom I see on his feet.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman mentioned Mr. Van Leer as attending the conference he spoke of.

Mr. MUNDT. In the office of Mr. Stettinius, yes. Mr. Van Leer and Mr. W. W. Black were there together with Government representatives, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CRAWFORD, and me.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman just mentioned, Mr. Van Leer, ought to be given credit for much yeoman service in regard to calling attention to one particular brand of food preservation, that is powdered milk particularly. Months ago he told me of the value of powdered skimmed milk as a food for human beings.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. Mr. Van Leer has gone beyond the realm of just powdered milk and is really an indefatigible worker, from the standpoint of crusading for this whole program of compressed food, and closely allied with him and rivaling him certainly in his interest and indefatigability is Mr. W. W. Black, who, because of his strategic position as chairman of the joint dehydration committee, has also found an opportunity to do a little work from within as Mr. Van Leer has worked from without. These two human millstones, grinding together, have brought out quite a grist of very valuable information to the country, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say just a word, if I may. The gentleman comes from one of those regions constituting the breadbasket of America, the great Middle West—perhaps the most productive of them all.

Mr. MUNDT. I would be the last to deny it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where the food of America is being prepared in great quantities at a time of great need and prepared under very scientific processes, but which processes may still further be improved.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the gentleman on adding this further contribution to food preservation and to its shipment. I think that this splendid address ought to be sent to every future farmer of America and every young person on the farm as a part of his education for the America to come.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GALE. I am sure the House is under a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from South Dakota for this very excellent presentation of a problem which is exceedingly important. We are all agreed, I think, of the necessity for developing further a program of compression of dehydrated foods. What in the gentleman's opinion, is the chief obstacle which lies in the way of a more aggressive prosecution of the program?

Mr. MUNDT. I should say that up until 2 weeks ago the first obstacle was failure to allocate the responsibility and fix the authority on any individual man who could say yes or no to the commercial concerns who are interested in the food-compression program. That has been to a large extent alleviated in the Food Distribution Administration and in the Lend-Lease Administration as I am going to announce very shortly. Then I have a list of 10 recommendations here which I am going to go into in just a minute. After confusion in authority and uncertainty in responsibility have been eliminated I should say that the next big problem is for the War Production Board to take similar action and select some one individual in that agency and give him some type of title so that the public at large will recognize him as the man charged with food compression problems. Authority should be lodged in someone to allocate critical materials to this part of the food program so that the necessary machinery can be secured by these food compressors. Just a small amount of such critical material would save a vast amount of steel from the standpoint of warehouses, trucks, railroad cars, and ships.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GALE. The gentleman is convinced, is he not, that the steel tonnage of one Liberty ship, we will say, approximately 10,000 tons, if applied to compressing machinery would amply repay itself many times over; is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. There is not any question about that in the world; it would repay itself many, many times over.

I now submit to the consideration of the Congress and the country the following list of recommendations and conclusions proposing methods by which we may all work together in advancing the solution of some of the problems which I have just discussed.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

No. 1: I believe that a coordinator of the compression and dehydration of foodstuffs should be appointed in the office of the Lend-Lease Administrator. This coordinator should have similar authorities and responsibilities in Lend-Lease to what George Poindexter now has in the Food Distribution Administration. He should be publicly identified so that commercial food processors would know whom to contact in

making available their dehydration and compression facilities in the food program.

I am happy to announce at this time that I wrote Mr. Stettinius, Jr., a letter on April 2 and told him I was going to make this address and would make this recommendation. I also told him I believed because of the splendid progress he has made in this that it would meet with his approval. He sent back a letter by messenger which I have just received, in which he stated that he has acted favorably to the recommendation and has appointed Mr. Byron Spence as coordinator on compressed foods. Mr. Spence is now in the office of Lend-Lease and from this time forward will be the coordinator of compressed foods in that office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the end of these remarks my letter to Mr. Stettinius, dated April 2, and his reply to me, dated April 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, that recommendation is part of my answer to the gentleman from Minnesota as to what should be done to expedite this whole program of the expanded use of compressed foods. Now that we have a compressed food coordinator in the Food Distribution Administration and one in Lend-Lease, we must have some similar kind of responsibility fixed in the War Production Board so that such a publicly designated authority will be charged with the responsibility of making available to legitimate food processors the small amounts of critical materials that are needed to get this program under way with large-scale operations.

Recommendation No. 2: A Nation-wide survey should be made to discover all available idle presses suitable for food compression. Adequate publicity should be given to this survey so that those with such presses would report them to the Department of Agriculture or to whatever agency makes the survey. The same survey should undertake to ascertain how much critical material is needed to convert tile presses and others to food compression and what new equipment is needed.

May I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is a splendid place for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, under Colonel Johnson, to render a Trojan service to the country by conducting this survey out over the country and among those people who are desperately seeking some kind of business in order to prevent bankruptcy and who can render a great service at the same time to the war effort as well as preserving their own economic integrity. I hope that the Smaller War Plants Corporation will seize time by the forelock and not wait for any further prodding or pressing to get under way with such survey. It opens up a real field of new opportunity to the smaller concerns which are now so sorely in need of some assistance.

Recommendation No. 3: The War Production Board should give a high, urgent priority to the manufacture of needed equipment to step up the Nation's production of dehydrated and compressed foods. A few tons of steel for such equipment will save many times that amount in railroad cars, warehouses, trucks, and merchant ships.

Recommendation No. 4: Congress should accept the responsibility of monitoring the program of overseas food shipments to assure itself that the most efficient and economical possible use is made of critical materials, manpower, and shipping facilities. Occasional reports should be demanded from the appropriate Government agencies and departments.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress should assume such greater responsibility in checking, observing, and verifying the wisdom with which the whole program of overseas food shipments is being handled in order to assure ourselves that the most efficient and economically possible use is made of critical materials, manpower, money, and shipping facilities.

Recommendation No. 5: Evidence indicates that this country's food-dehydration program should immediately be doubled in size and substantially supplemented by food compression, as an essential corollary thereto.

Recommendation No. 6: The Lend-Lease Administrator should be asked to include a separate section in his next quarterly report to the Congress showing the shipping savings made by use of dehydrated and compressed foods in overseas shipment.

I believe that we can look forward with considerable confidence to the fact that that section will be incorporated in the Lend-Lease Administrator's next report to Congress.

Recommendation No. 7: The high resistance to perishability of dehydrated compressed food provides an opportunity to develop stock piles of food which, in the future, will prevent the hills and valleys of supply and eliminate such food shortages as that now threatening this country.

Had science brought this to the attention of the people and had the people acted upon it, say 6 years ago, how much better off we would be today.

Yes; how much better off we would be today as we are faced with rationing and food shortage from coast to coast and from border to border, because food in this form can be preserved and can be transported and utilized much more conveniently and economically than under any other method now available.

Recomendation No. 8: The use of dehydrated-compressed foods have distinct peacetime possibilities in America through reducing transportation charges between areas of production and concentrated areas of population, thus permitting Midwestern food producers and others to receive prices for their products which will encourage them to raise foods for distant markets.

Perhaps we do not always realize it, but the fundamental agricultural industry of this country is being carried on at the end of the longest and most expensive freight haul in the world, longer and more expensive than any other freight line leading to any other substantial agricultural area in any of the other civilized countries. So when we reduce transportation costs we increase the farmer's income, while at the same time decreasing the cost to the ultimate consumer and that, I may say to the gentleman from Arizona, indicates a very definite peacetime carry-over value which can come from some of these lessons we are learning through the cruel exigencies of war.

Recommendation No. 9: Dehydration and compression equipment for foodstuffs should be installed adjacent to the areas of food production in order to have the greatest peacetime value and to provide for the greatest savings in domestic transportation charges. This is also imperative in order to reap the greatest wartime benefits from the expanded dehydration-compression food program which I propose and for which I plead.

It follows that if we are to get the fullest benefit from transportation economies we should install this dehydration and compression equipment out where the raw produce is planted and produced.

Recommendation No. 10: Financial assistance, critical materials, and trial orders should be made available immediately to private concerns which are now willing to go ahead with the production and processing of compressed and dehydrated foods.

I hope that Members will take time to study those 10 recommendations and conclusions, and I hope that an interest may develop throughout the country which, along the lines of those recommendations and others, will expedite action so that we can get on with the business of making a wiser use of the shipping facilities available to the United Nations.

Before concluding, may I state that just yesterday, as a result of a meeting held in the Department of Agriculture, some additional progress was made in the right direction, because at this meeting undertakings were made to prepare for test shipments of the following compressed foods: Cheese, whole dry milk, skim dry milk, flour, meat, and the following vegetables: Carrots, onions, and beets. This is a very small beginning in the right direction, but it tends to bear out what I said earlier in my remarks, that there is an encouraging acceleration of attention in the Department of Agriculture and in other Government agencies from the standpoint of meeting this submarine menace by the application of science to the problem of food transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the letters which I earlier received permission to include at the conclusion of my remarks are as follows:

APRIL 2, 1943.

Mr. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS,
Lend-Lease Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: It was another manifestation of highly helpful cooperation on your part to send Mr. Byron Spence of your office to confer with me yesterday on the new developments in food compression. He was accompanied by George Poindexter, newly appointed Coordinator on Processes of Food Compression

of the Food Distribution Administration. We had a long and productive conference.

I also appreciate your making available the charts and exhibits which Mr. Spence is bringing over to add to the collection of graphic displays which I am exhibiting in the news lobby of the House next Tuesday.

It is the purpose of the talk which I shall deliver on Tuesday to focus attention on the part of Congress and the country on the steps which have been taken and can still be taken to save shipping space, decrease the demands on critical materials, better utilize manpower, and economize in money through the utilization of compressed and concentrated foods in our overseas shipments. From the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army, from the Department of Agriculture, and from your office, I am trying to collect the latest up-to-the-minute developments in the field of compressed foods for use in my talk next Tuesday.

I think that the appointment of George Poindexter in the office of the Food Distribution Administration is definitely a step in the right direction, since it concentrates authority in one man on this problem, insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned. I would like to respectfully recommend that you also select an individual to function on your staff as a coordinator through whom all information and authority on the problems of food compression could be channeled. In this way, Mr. Poindexter, from his department, and your coordinator, representing Lend-Lease, could work with corresponding authority in the Quartermaster Corps to greatly accelerate the progress being made toward securing the manifold advantages available in the widest possible use of compressed foods. In my mind, this program affords the most immediate opportunity of saving shipping space which we all realize is so badly needed for many other purposes at this time.

One of the recommendations I expect to make in my talk on Tuesday is that a similar coordinator be appointed in your office so that those interested in food compression will know with whom they should confer in Lend-Lease, as they now know with whom they should confer in the Food Distribution Administration. It is my personal conviction that Mr. W. W. Black, secretary of the Joint Dehydration Committee, would be an admirable choice for such a responsibility; it may also be that Byron Spence or someone now associated with your staff also has the necessary background and capacity for such a function.

If such a coordinator is given authority to represent you and get action when you and he feel action is warranted, it will contribute greatly to the development of definite progress. I am calling this proposal to your attention in advance with the hope that you might be able to write or telephone me before Tuesday that you have designated someone to serve such a function as I have above outlined, so I could advise the House during the course of my remarks as to his identity and give them the gratifying information that this man was in a position to represent Lend-Lease on matters concerned with the rapidly developing program in compressed foods. It would please me greatly to be able to do this, and such action would be a typically prompt and helpful response to come from you.

With all best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1943.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: Thank you very much for your letter of April 2. I am tremendously interested in your plans for making a talk on food compression on Tuesday. By stressing this important development, which, as you state, should result in great shipping economies, you are making a real contribution.

I note your suggestion that I appoint a coordinator in Lend-Lease on food compression, and specifically your suggestion that Mr. W. W. Black would be an admirable choice for the position. We know of him and his activity on the joint dehydration committee, and think favorably of him. In line with our policy of keeping our staff small, however, I do not feel that we can add another person to it for this purpose at this time.

Nevertheless, I am impressed by your suggestion and am more than happy to follow it. I am designating Mr. Byron Spence as our coordinator on compressed foods. He is greatly interested in the subject, is intimately acquainted with the people in the Department of Agriculture and the Quartermaster Corps who are working on it. I am certain he will be able to carry on in this field along the lines you have in mind.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OUTLAND, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. CULLEN (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for 10 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, indefinitely, on account of official business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;

H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2070. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the board of trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, April 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 1607.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval

Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8 and postponed until April 15 have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

304. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

305. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

306. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 201. Application for extension of time in which to take testimony, James C. Moreland against Leonard W. Schuetz, Seventh Congressional District of Illinois (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2409. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2410. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 2411. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2412. A bill extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the First World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2413. A bill to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing any act in Naval, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard bases or stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 202. Resolution authorizing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make a study and survey of needs arising, and likely to arise, from the existing emergency for medical, tuberculosis, and mental hospitals for veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 203. Resolution requesting certain information from the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to secure a priority rating for scrap aluminum material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to designate that certain air field now known as the Alamogordo Air Base as the Jack Lee Field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and lowering of the rates of war damage policies hereafter issued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect a land grant to the State of Nevada comprising 200,000 acres; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for a decision regarding its permanent political status; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation so as to provide conscientious objectors authorization to work on the farms so as to increase the production of crops essential to the needs of the people of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2414. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rocco Capodilupo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2416. A bill granting a pension to Annie Laura Radcliffe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

424. By Mr. FISH: Petition of a committee of 50 citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

425. Also, petition of 50 residents of Goshen, Orange County, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

426. Also, petition of 50 residents of the city of Newburgh, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, who contend that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

427. Also, petition of 41 residents of the city of Middletown, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

428. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and a lowering of the rates on war damage policies hereafter issued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

429. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of the Allen Parish School Board, Oberlin, La., endorsing Senate bill 637 and urging its early approval; to the Committee on Education.

430. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and a lowering of the rates on war damage policies hereafter issued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

431. Also, Senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing Congress against the construction of a proposed Bordentown-Sayreville ship canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

432. Also, Senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of a tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Concurrent resolution of the New Jersey State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and a lowering of the rates on

war damage policies hereafter issued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

434. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

435. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of postwar plans for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being, the light of all our seeing, our helper Thou amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific times which are upon us. The arm of flesh fails us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels.

Strengthen us, we beseech Thee, in the inner man, by the renewing, sustaining, undergirding grace which is able to keep us from falling and failing. So may our hearts be steadied and stilled, purged of self, emptied of strain and stress, filled with peace and poise, satisfied with each new morning just to wake and find Thee there. For Thine is the kingdom to which the future belongs, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 309. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes; and

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maloney	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

INTERCHANGE OF POSTAL CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS DURING THE WAR

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River

"Whereas during the winter season the Stanislaus River carries great quantities of storm and floodwaters which add to the flood menace in the valley below; and

"Whereas the impounding of these waters by a dam in the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River would provide for flood control, would make available water for irrigation during the time such water is needed, would provide for the equation of stream flow in the Stanislaus and the San Joaquin Rivers, and would provide a source of electrical power which is particularly needed in the present war emergency; and

"Whereas the cost of such a dam and its appurtenant works would be more than balanced by the benefits thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cause to be constructed a multiple purpose dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River to restrain the usual recurring excess flow of water of said river and to utilize the water so impounded for the generation of electric power, for irrigation, for domestic water supply, and for other useful and beneficial purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Substitute for House Joint Memorial 5

"To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"That for the past year or more a great amount of confusion and delay has been experienced in the handling of the United States mail to and from the Territory of Alaska, which has been and now is a great handicap to all residents of the Territory of Alaska, officials of the Government, both Federal and Territorial, contractors engaged in defense projects, those engaged in essential lines of business, and all others, entailing long and unwarranted delays in receiving and sending mail, great additional expense, and loss of letters and enclosures.

"That part of this delay may be attributed to war conditions, but a far larger part is apparently due to inefficiency, carelessness, and officials' restrictions and censorship.

"That mails intended for points in southeastern Alaska and for the interior of Alaska via Juneau are frequently loaded on steamers which do not call at Juneau, and they are carried to other points and thus delayed several weeks, sometimes months, in reaching their destination.

"That with the existing mail facilities the mail service to and from Alaska could be greatly improved and the time of delivery greatly shortened without any interference with the defense of the country or the war activities of the Army and Navy.

"That mail between Alaska and the United States is censored in Seattle, and this alone entails great delay, inconvenience, and annoyance.

"That some form of censorship of certain mail to and from the Territory may be necessary in time of war, but it seems that the Alaska censorship has been carried to extremes in many instances and apparently carried beyond the real purpose of wartime censorship.

"That it developed at a hearing in Washington before a congressional committee that those censoring the Alaska mail had in many instances taken extracts from letters passing to and from Alaska, oftentimes constituting official mail, and had published these extracts from letters much to the annoyance and inconvenience of Federal and Territorial officials and other inhabitants of the Territory.

"That we realize in time of war all people of every part of the country should be ready and willing to accept inconveniences, sacrifices, and hardship wherever it is necessary for the common good, but the inconveniences and annoyances caused by some of the present practices of those engaged in censoring Alaska mail do not seem to furnish any contribution to the Nation's defense, but have the opposite effect and are a positive detriment and additional burden to all people using the mails.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully and most earnestly prays that an immediate investigation be made of the handling of the mails to and from Alaska; that a little more care be exercised in dispatching mail both ways; that the censorship be investigated and so administered as to meet the requirements of the Nation while at war, and that the practice of taking or publishing extracts from letters which have no bearing on national defense be immediately discontinued.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House, March 5, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor, March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Whereas it has been the persistent policy of the Congress of the United States to grant a reasonable amount of home rule unto all the people over which it has plenary power and control; and

"Whereas the President of the United States gave voice to this principle when he recommended to the Congress to 'consider legislation' as soon as possible, to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor:

"Now, therefore, we, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider legislation, as soon as possible, granting unto the people of this Territory the right to elect their own Governor.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the HONORABLE FRANCIS E. BIDDLE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, unanimously adopted House Joint Memorial No. 5, requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money for the construction of a fireproof courthouse and Federal jail at Valdez, Alaska; and

"Whereas the present jail is housed in a rented frame building which is in a deplorable condition, a firetrap which jeopardizes the health and lives of the officials and inmates; and

"Whereas said town of Valdez, since the fire which destroyed the headquarters building of the third judicial division, has been without a court building or adequate office or jail facilities; and

"Whereas, because of the old and dilapidated condition of the present jail, the people of Valdez live in constant fear of jail breaks by dangerous criminals who are kept there pending trial by the District Court; and

"Whereas there now exists no safe and adequate place for the safekeeping of public documents and records of the United States, or marshal's office:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully petitions that the United States Department of Justice approve, and the Senate and House of Representatives appropriate, a sum of money which would enable the construction at Valdez, Alaska, of a fireproof structure capable of housing court headquarters and a Federal jail at Valdez, Alaska, along with the suggestion that space also be provided in said structure for all other Federal agencies existing and functioning and that said funds be provided and architectural plans for construction be submitted at the earliest possible date.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 15, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Yates Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A joint resolution of the General Court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

"House Joint Resolution 16

"Joint Resolution relative to a Federal pay-as-you-go plan of taxation.

"Whereas the burden of taxation placed upon the people of this country is very heavy under the present Federal statutes, and

"Whereas some plan should be adopted to distribute this tax in an equitable manner: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is urged to proceed at once to enact the so-called Ruml, or other similar pay-as-you-go plan for paying taxes on present income; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the New Hampshire Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the President of the United

States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, in Washington.

"Approved March 16, 1943.

"ROBERT O. BLOOD,
"Governor."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth Legislature of the State of Iowa (the State House of Representatives concurring therein), That—

"Whereas our Nation is engaged in the greatest war effort of our history, and the President has announced that 11,200,000 men will be in the armed forces of our country by December of this year; and

"Whereas our national economy has been converted from peace to war with several tens of millions of our citizens now engaged in producing the implements of war; and

"Whereas it has been stated by high Government authority that 65,000,000 of our citizens (both in and out of the armed forces) will be engaged in the war effort by the end of this year; and

"Whereas after the war is over the transformation of our country from a total war economy to a civilian peacetime economy, including the complete disruption of employment of fifty to sixty million people, is a problem of which the consequences can be almost as fateful as the result of the war itself unless proper steps are taken now; and

"Whereas it is inevitable that our National Government will of necessity spend many billions of dollars in the post-war period to cushion the transformation of the Nation's economy from war to peace; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the funds so expended shall be spent on useful work and in an efficient, economical, and businesslike manner so that the Nation will have something of value to show for the money spent after the unemployment problem of the post-war period shall have passed and to the end that the principle of self-help rather than public bounty shall be uppermost; and

"Whereas highway construction is useful work and will be vitally necessary and is one of the best means of providing employment for idle men and produces a durable, necessary public improvement for the convenience and welfare of all our people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the House concurring):

"1. That we hereby endorse the proposal submitted to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and the House Committee on Roads of the National Congress on March 4, 1943, by the American Association of State Highway Officials, for the immediate authorization of $3,000,000 to be expended on highway construction over a period of 3 years following the close of the war.

"2. That these funds be controlled and expended through the regular highway agencies of the States and the Federal Government, and that no new Federal agencies be created or empowered to handle such work.

"3. That the funds so authorized be allotted among all the States on some equitable fixed formula, to the end that each State will know as soon as the act is passed the approximate amount of such funds it will receive, and plan accordingly.

"4. That the funds so authorized be available for expenditure in the improvement of State primary roads, secondary roads, and municipal streets.

"5. That the work be done under contracts let at open, advertised, competitive, public bidding, to the lowest responsible bidder, and based on fixed, definite plans and specifications, thus avoiding and preventing the confusion, delay, waste, and extravagance of work done without adequate plans and specifications, or with no plans and specifications.

"6. That the Congress take immediate action on this matter to the end that time may be had to make surveys, prepare plans, secure rights of way, and get ready to let contracts and start construction promptly when the war is over and unemployment becomes acute.

"7. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa and to Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and Hon. J. W. ROBINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Roads, of the National Congress."

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 17

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant relief to the gold mining industry

"Whereas the gold and silver mines of the State of Nevada brought about the admission of the Territory of Nevada into the Nation as the 'Battle Born State' during the dark days of the Civil War; and

"Whereas these mines poured the blood of economic life into a nation whose Treasury was depleted and whose resources were sorely strained by years of war effort; and

"Whereas, by reason of the patriotic efforts of the mining industry of the State of Nevada, the credit of the Nation was strengthened and the final victory was hastened; and

"Whereas the gold mines of the State of Nevada, with lavish hand, through years of peace and war, have continued to pour their wealth into the Nation's economic structure; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of Nevada has always been, and now is, geared to the productivity of her gold mines, and many of her towns and communities have had birth and prosperity by reason thereof; and

"Whereas the loyalty of the people of Nevada again supports a nation once more engaged in war to the end that free government may continue to exist; and

"Whereas it has been necessary during the progress of this great war to impose drastic restrictions upon industry as well as upon individuals, all for the purpose of strengthening the Nation's economy and her military might; and

"Whereas among other restrictions heretofore imposed has been that of closing all gold mines and all operations connected therewith, thus striking at the very heart of the prosperity and welfare of the State of Nevada and her most loyal and patriotic people; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada are as willing now as they were during the civil war to give their lives and the fruits of their industry to the Nation that secures to them the priceless privileges of American citizenship, and it is not the thought nor desire of the State of Nevada, nor her people, to question or criticize any order promulgated for the common good; nevertheless the people of the State of Nevada do feel that the order closing the gold mines and all activity connected therewith was not, and is not, conducive to the welfare of the State of Nevada, the Nation, or the general war effort; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada feel that the loss suffered to her citizens and to the owners and operators of her gold mines and industries by reason of such closing order far exceeds the national gain, if any, from such order; and

"Whereas it appears that while certain restrictions have been placed upon the gold-mining industry in Allied Nations, the mines of those nations have continued to operate and produce, thus sustaining the domestic welfare and economy of such mining districts, this even though many millions of dollars of lend-lease aid is being given by the United States to such allies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the gold-mining industry in the United States should have opportunities equal to those had by the same industry in allied countries receiving lend-lease aid, particularly when the restrictions placed upon our domestic industry is upon the premise that our converted gold-mining industry will make possible the production of more essential commodities of war and lend-lease supplies; and be it further

"Resolved, That in this particular instance the gold-mining industry in the United States is the national stepchild, denied the right to protect and preserve the many millions of dollars invested, while compelled to labor in the so-called essential industries to the end that the sinews of war and lend-lease material may be shipped to other nations in which gold mining continues to flourish, affected only by the ordinary results of a war economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States give its considered thought to the discriminatory nature of the gold-mine-closing order, both as to the local effect and its international aspect; that Congress consider the little good that has been accomplished by such order as against the great local harm that has been done in every gold-mining district in the United States, and particularly in the State of Nevada; and be it further

"Resolved, That if the order cannot be rescinded, that Congress enact suitable legislation compensating the industry for the great financial burden and loss unfairly and discriminatingly imposed on it through being required to pay greatly increased taxes on idle property and equipment, interest on millions of investment denied a right to earn, millions expended to prevent watering and deterioration of mine workings, and in the maintenance of improvements generally;

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, D. C., and that copies of this resolution, certified by the proper officers of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, be transmitted to the legislatures of the several Western States now in session.

"State of Nevada, Executive Department: approved, March 24, 1943.

"E. P. CARVILLE,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to effect a land grant to the State of Nevada comprising 200,000 acres

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Nevada, hereby respectfully represents that

"Whereas the acreage granted the State of Nevada by the United States was far deficient as compared with the grants made to the other public land States, as shown by the fact that the other 10 public land States received an average of 9.1 percent of the total area embraced within their boundaries, as compared to 3.8 percent granted the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas through the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, all of the public domain within the State of Nevada was withdrawn from all forms of entry except mineral, which act virtually stopped the alienation of public lands to private interests; and

"Whereas section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269),

as amended (which provides for exchanges of land with the Government), has proven inadequate, ambiguous, and inoperative to the point where the lapse of time necessary to consummate an exchange is prohibitive and impracticable; and

"Whereas a definite need exists for more available State land to offer prospective settlers, which fact is borne out by the numerous requests to the State land office by people interested in acquiring business sites, home sites, and small ranches in our State; and

"Whereas the State of Nevada at the present time has only 126,000 acres of State land subject to entry, all of which is a decided handicap to the largest public land State in the Union, considering the degree of undevelopment and the fact that it is on the threshold of an unprecedented economic expansion; and

"Whereas there now exists in the State of Nevada, under the jurisdiction of the grazing service, several millions of acres of land not suited for grazing, for which reason said lands should not be permitted to continue under the jurisdiction of the grazing service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada (the Assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada make, and that said legislature hereby does make, application to the Congress of the United States for a land grant consisting of 200,000 acres, which grant shall be known as the State school grant. The selection of land embraced in this grant shall be made under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the selection and sale of lands that have been or may hereafter be granted by the United States to the State of Nevada," approved March 12, 1885. The selections shall be made subject to the approval of the Nevada regional grazier of the Grazing Service, Department of the Interior, and all revenue derived from the sale of this land shall be deposited in the State treasury, to be used only for the benefit of State schools; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Committees on Public Lands of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to each of our Senators and our Representative in Congress.

"State of Nevada, executive department: Approved March 20, 1943.

"E. P. CARVILLE,
"Governor."

JOINT MEMORIAL OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE—DESIGNATION OF ALAMOGORDO AIR BASE AS JACK LEE FIELD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for reasons which are set forth in the memorial which I present for printing in the RECORD, under the rule, and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee, it gives me pleasure to send to the desk the memorial in question for such disposition.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States and the War Department of the United States to designate that certain air field now known as the Alamogordo Air Base, as the Jack Lee Field

Whereas on the morning of November 18, 1942, First Lt. Jack Lee, copilot, squadron commander, Twenty-sixth Squadron, Eleventh Bombardment Group of the Seventh Air Force, as copilot and member of the striking force of 11 heavy bombardment airplanes, proceeded on a mission to bomb Japanese shipping at Buin-Tonolei, near Kahilli Airfield in the Solomon Islands; and reaching the target area, bombing runs were made through extremely heavy antiaircraft fire and fighter opposition, which resulted in the destruction of one enemy transport and damage to other ships; and

Whereas immediately following this action, Lieutenant Lee was mortally wounded in a frontal attack on his airplane by an enemy fighter pilot, but carried on with his duties for some time; and

Whereas the plane was forced to make a water landing and while rowing to shore, Lieutenant Lee lost his life; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee received his wings at Luke Field, Ariz., going to Hawaii in January 1942; and

Whereas he participated in the Battle of Midway and also in the Battle at Guadalcanal August 4, 1942, and was stationed in the Solomon Islands area from that time until his death on November 18, 1942; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee was posthumously awarded the Silver Star decoration for gallantry in action against the enemy on November 18, 1942, the day he met his death; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee was also awarded the Air Medal for meritorious achievement while participating in an air combat mission against enemy objectives on October 12, 1942, and was also awarded the Purple Heart decoration posthumously; and

Whereas Lt. Jack Lee, the son of Oliver M. Lee, deceased, and Winnie P. Lee, was born in Otero County, a native son of New Mexico; and

Whereas, Lt. Jack Lee, by his life and his heroic death, has set a noble example to the young men of the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas it seems fitting and proper that a perpetual monument to his memory be established in the county of his birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the senators and members of the House of Representatives of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico do hereby petition the President of the United States and the War Department of the United States to establish such a perpetual monument to his memory by designating that certain air base located in Otero County, State of New Mexico, now known as the Alamogordo Air Base as the Jack Lee Field; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

Approved by me this 30th day of March 1943.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor of New Mexico.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGES IN CERTAIN WESTERN STATES—ASSIGNMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCOMPANY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 113, and Senate Resolution 107, with an amendment. I desire to have unanimous consent to have the resolutions considered at this time. They provide further appropriations for investigations which are already in progress and for which small additional amounts of money are needed in order to carry the investigations through to success.

I understand there will be no debate on the resolutions. One of them has to do with an investigation of labor and transportation difficulties on the west coast, and the other has to do with the military.

Mr. McNARY. The able chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate being in the chair at present, I ask the Senator from Maryland whether the resolutions received the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. They did.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the first resolution, Senate Resolution 113, be considered at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 113), submitted by Mr. Downey on March 12, 1943.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 1, line 15 after the words "increased by", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and the Director of Defense Transportation are each requested to assign a representative of their respective departments or agencies to accompany the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress (relating to an investigation of the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort), to such places as may be necessary for the purpose of participating in such investigation and in hearings held in connection therewith.

The limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BETTER MOBILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 107.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 107), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. KILGORE), on February 22, 1943. The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 2, line 9, after the words "shall not exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee is authorized and directed to study the possibilities of better mobilizing the national resources of the United States for the more efficient prosecution of the war. The subcommittee shall report to the Military Affairs Committee from time to time the re-

sults of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ or borrow from Government agencies and departments such clerical, special, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATIONS BY MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RELATING TO MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 131), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such investigations and studies with respect to the Military Establishment as the committee deems advisable or expedient to keep the committee fully informed with respect thereto and to enable it to properly perform its functions in connection with matters referred to it. The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the action taken by it pursuant to this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $100,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 969. A bill for the relief of D. T. George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 970. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; and

S. 971. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 972. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); and

S. 973. A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 974 (by request). A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 25 years of service may retire on a full annuity, without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 975. A bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 976 (by request). A bill to increase the amount of the family allowances payable to dependent parents of enlisted men in the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 977. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 978. A bill relating to certain lands released to the United States by carriers by railroad pursuant to section 321 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 309. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker; and

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes; to the Committee on Immigration.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL—AMENDMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. CONNALLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 9, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

"For the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, including all incidental expenses such as may be incurred under the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works,' to be available immediately, $44,000,000."

OLEOMARGARINE OR BUTTER SUBSTITUTES FOR VETERANS' FACILITIES—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 62, line 2, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes, but if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds at any time that the procurement of an adequate butter supply is not feasible, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes to the extent that such Administrator finds to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration facilities for other than cooking purposes."

REPORTS ON WAGE INCREASES FROM NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. BYRD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 130), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the National War Labor Board is authorized and directed to submit to

the Senate as soon as practicable (1) an analysis of the effect of its decisions and orders since January 12, 1942, which have directed, authorized, or approved wage increases and reclassifications of employees, with the total cost of all such wage increases, together with a statement of the changes (expressed in percentages and amounts) in the basic hourly rates of wages and the average weekly earnings which have resulted from such decisions and orders in the case of each employer or industry affected thereby; (2) a statement with respect to any action taken by the Board since January 12, 1942, for the purposes of increasing substandard wages and correcting inequalities in wages, together with illustrative examples of situations in which, in the opinion of the Board, substandard wages and inequalities in wages exist and which in effect constitute a definition of such substandard wages and inequalities; and (3) a statement with respect to all cases in which wage increases have been authorized or approved by the Board which constitute a departure from the so-called Little Steel formula; (4) the first report shall be made not later than May 1, 1943, and thereafter the War Labor Board is directed to furnish a report on the 1st day of each month to the Senate containing this information.

THE WORK OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE WAR PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Work of the Committee to Investigate the War Program," delivered by Senator TRUMAN before the Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland, Ohio, April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHEN PEACE COMES, WHAT?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "When Peace Comes, What?" delivered by him on March 28, 1943, at a public forum on post-war problems, held at the Appleton Vocational Schools, at Appleton, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION OF CURRENCIES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of the Treasury statement on post-war monetary problems issued on April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing manpower, by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of April 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR SECURITY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON EVENING AMERICAN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defeat 'Gestapo Bill' ", from the Boston Evening American of April 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senate Resolution," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 15, 1943, and an article by Russell Weisman published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 25, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate, I hope briefly, on the motion to refer the President's veto message, and the bill involved in the message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am opposed to referring the bill and the message to that committee or to any other committee, for reasons which I shall give in a few moments. I am also opposed to overriding the veto of the President, for reasons which I shall also present.

I realize the very natural embarrassment which many Members of the Senate feel, and always feel, in regard to the Presidential veto of a measure in which they are interested, or which they have supported. Frequently when a veto message has come to the Senate in ordinary times it has been a matter of routine to send it to a committee, or to the committee from which the bill involved emanated, with the understanding, which has usually been carried out, that the bill and veto message would not again be taken up.

When I was approached on the floor of the Senate yesterday in private conversation and asked if I would agree to a reference of the President's veto message of Senate bill 660 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I indicated that I would agree provided it were understood that the bill was not to be brought back to the Senate and that such reference would be regarded as final action on it. That was not agreed to by the proponents of the pending motion, and notwithstanding what the Senate may do in regard to the motion to refer, I intend to vote against the motion, if mine shall be the only vote cast against it in this body.

In my opinion, it is not becoming in the Senate, in this great crisis and juncture of our affairs, to try to walk a tightrope on this or any other problem which we face. People go to a circus to see tightrope walkers; they should not be expected to come to the Senate in order to see that sort of a performance; and I say that without any intention to offend. But, in view of many private conferences and conversations to which I have been a party, I have not been able to divest myself of the idea that there is a feeling among many Senators that in order to avoid going on record on the veto message of the President, the smart thing to do is to send it to a committee.

It has been urged also that it should be sent to the committee in order that it might be kept behind the door as a club against wage increases for labor, with particular reference to the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis. I realize that some Members speak of John L. Lewis here in whispers. Most Members seem afraid to express their opinion of him in the open, one way or the other. I have been approached and urged to support this motion to refer the veto message to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so that it may be held as a club over Lewis, in order that, if by any sort of decision the United Mine Workers whom Lewis represents should receive an increase in wages, then the bill would be brought back to the Senate and acted upon in the light of any increase in wages which might be given to the miners by any agency of the Government set up to deal with questions of wages.

Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senate. I have always been. I have no reason to be otherwise. Whatever one may think of John L. Lewis, I do not suppose anyone will discount his ability. He is a very able man. He is a very skillful and able strategist in all matters involving the welfare and the wages of the United Mine Workers of the United States. If the veto message of Senate bill 660 is to be used as a club by somebody against somebody, I am not so certain that the club will not be used the other way. If it is to be used as a club, if it is to be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in order to be held there as a club, I am not so certain that in the scuffle to get possession of that club Mr. Lewis may not come out with the club, instead of the Congress of the United States, because, as I have said, he is a very skillful and able leader of his people. If some Senators may not think so, I suggest that they consult the Truman committee, which brought Mr. Lewis before it the other day to testify about some things concerning which they wanted to inquire.

Mr. President, I have a profound respect, as everyone knows, for this body. When I think of the Senate of the United States I think of the outstanding figures who have honored this body from the beginning of our history. I think of a body where Webster thundered, and Henry Clay charmed, where John C. Calhoun shook his ample locks before his colleagues. I do not like to think of this body, and I refuse to think of it in the midst of a great crisis such as this as merely being a temporizing body of men seeking the easiest way to dispose of something which is embarrassing.

I realize also that it is embarrassing frequently for men to reverse their position on measures on which they have taken a position, and on which they have voted. I am in that class. I not only voted for this bill when it was before the Senate, I made a speech in favor of it. But I am not embarrassed. Someone has said, "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Someone else has said, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." Senators may take their choice as to the definition of "consistency." Every man will be the judge of his own attitude and

his own consistency and his own obligation, but the only consistent attitude I feel I can take is to do my duty on each day as I see it on that day, and if my record may present devious lines which cannot be described as straight, or the shortest distance between two points, I will answer either to my constituents or to my conscience, and I am sure every other Senator feels the same way about it.

Mr. President, we have had a temperate discussion of the question before us, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] so ably and convincingly stated yesterday in that great speech which he made toward the conclusion of yesterday's session. It was a great speech. I have not heard a better one from him or from anyone else. It was a speech marked by deep conviction as well as profound emotion and a high sense of duty which lifted me out of the bog and mire of little things, I hope onto a firmer foundation and understanding of our problems in this Nation and in the Senate. I am glad that the debate so far on the whole situation has been temperate, judicious, and free from bitterness, and I am glad that the President's message was pitched on the same high level. In my judgment, it is the best veto message the President has sent to Congress; the most logical, the most temperate, the most reasonable since he has been President of the United States. However much anyone may disagree with him, either as to the facts which he submitted, or as to his reasoning, I think it must be conceded that the President is entitled to the same degree of sincerity on our part as we expect from him and from our colleagues. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to say or do anything or intimate anything that would in any way mar the high tone upon which this discussion has been pitched. But I am not embarrassed in the slightest degree by the fact that I voted for the bill upon its passage.

Mr. President, there is much mystery and confusion, not only in the minds of the farmers, of whom I am one, but in the minds of others. As I have said heretofore on this floor, I am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation, which has been one of the active organizations of farmers advocating this proposed legislation. There has been much confusion among the farmers, as there has been in the Senate, and as there still is, in regard to the complications involved in the question of parity, and parity payments, and soil conservation payments, and other benefit payments. When we wrote the original law, as I said the other day, we provided a formula for parity That formula was flexible, and must remain and will remain flexible. The higher the cost goes of the things the farmer must buy, the higher goes the parity formula, because that formula was intended to reflect an equality of his purchasing power now, his relative purchasing power, with that which he enjoyed in the base period from 1909 to 1914. Every time anything the farmer buys goes up in price, automatically parity goes up, and it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time to adjust the formula so that the purchasing power of the farmer, represented by his prices, no matter how high the ordinary things he must buy may go, will be reflected in that increase.

Mr. President, it is a mistake to assume that farmers buy only the things which are produced in factories. There are supposed to be 6,000,000 farmers in the United States. Very few, if any, of them are self-sustaining. They do not even produce all they eat and wear. They buy many things as articles of food which they cannot themselves produce; and the articles they buy—the food, the articles of clothing, many of them made out of wool taken from their own sheep—go into the general equation which makes up the price they must pay for what they buy, and such price goes into the formula used in deciding what parity shall be. So "parity" is not a static conception and never can be. It is flexible, and was intended to be, and has operated in that manner.

In fixing a ceiling on agricultural prices we either have to include all the farmer gets from the Government or we have to exclude it. We either have to take it away, or we have to add it. It is not merely a neutral quantity floating around in midair. It must be taken into consideration. If we take from it or if we add to it, we do not necessarily change the formula of parity which Congress has written. We cannot fix one parity formula or a parity ceiling for all those who draw benefits from the Government and fix another ceiling for those who do not do so. The ceiling on cotton is bound to be the same for those who cooperate in the cotton program and for those who do not cooperate in the program. The same thing is true as to corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and every other comparable agricultural product. We cannot provide one ceiling for those who draw benefits and a separate ceiling for those who do not draw benefits. If we add the benefits to the ceiling price, we add them to the price received by all those who do not cooperate and who do not draw benefits, and the latter constitute about two-thirds of the farmers of the United States, for, approximately only 38 percent of the farmers of this country cooperate in the soil-conservation and the various other programs. Sixty-two percent of the farmers do not cooperate in those programs. But if we are going to fix a ceiling high enough to include such payments for the benefit of those who are cooperating and who receive them, we must fix a ceiling high enough to include the two-thirds who do not cooperate, and thereby they will derive the benefit of those payments just as if they were cooperating. It seems to me there is no logical escape from that conclusion.

So it means that in addition to the $512,000,000, as I believe the figure was stated the other day when we were talking about the amount of all the benefits—$502,000,000 or $512,000,000; am I correct about that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The appropriations are approximately $212,000,000 and $450,000,000 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. BARKLEY. About $662,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the total appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But let me call the Senator's attention to the fact, since he has asked the question, that the Senator has talked about 62 percent of the farmers as not cooperating. My information is that nearly 6,000,000 farmers of the six and one-half million cooperate under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. BARKLEY. That information is very different from the information I have received.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. The relationship is 38 percent and 62 percent. However, be that as it may, what I was about to say was that, whether the amount which is drawn from the Treasury for soil conservation and parity and other benefits amounts to $512,000,000 or $662,000,000, when we come to calculate the cost of living to the consumer who buys the products after they have been processed and turned over from time to time, we find that the general public is not only required to pay either $512,000,000 or $662,000,000, as the case may be, but in addition, is required to pay whatever has been added to that amount or the result of the multiplication of that amount before the consumer finally buys the product at the retail store. According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, over a long period the farmer received 52 percent of the dollar which the consumer paid for farm products. The other 48 percent went to those who are the middlemen, or, as we used to say, the processors and distributors. I think the percentage for the farm part of that dollar is a little higher now; probably it has gone up to 54 percent; but, roughly speaking, the farmer receives a fraction more than half of the dollar which you and I and everyone else in the country pay for what he has produced. So if we multiply that amount by only two, the result is that because of this proposed legislation the public would have to pay more than $1,000,000,000 for the things which go on their tables and on their backs. If we add the increased price that an increased ceiling would give to those who draw no benefits and who do not participate in the program of the Department of Agriculture, the increased cost would amount, in my judgment, to from a billion and a half dollars to two billion dollars.

Of course, those figures are bound to be estimates; no one can be exact about the matter. We always accept the figures which agree with our theory, and if the figures do not agree with our theory we denounce the statisticians. That is a perfectly natural way of dealing with figures. I used to hear an old adage, down home, that there are three kinds of liars in the world: liars, damn liars, and statisticians. That all depends on whether the figures which are brought in array by the statistician agree with

our theory. However, I think it is fair to say that the result, at least in terms of the final cost to the consuming public, would run from a billion and a half to two billion dollars. It may be that that makes no difference; it may be that we are not concerned about that; it may be that we ought not stop even to debate it; but, after all, there are in this country men and women who are not drawing high wages. There are men who go down into the bowels of the earth to bring out the essentials of our life and our prosperity. Living in the great centers of population are men who for the time being may be drawing more than an average wage. They, as individuals and as a part of the population of this great Nation, are entitled to some consideration from us. They are entitled to have us give consideration to the question whether by our action we are going to break down the controls, relax the restrictions, and destroy the economic structure which we have tried to set up as a part of the war program. We cannot break it down in one place without inviting its collapse all along the line.

I have contended all along, and I still contend, that the farmers of the United States are not dissatisfied with the prices they are getting. I am not going to refer to the multiplication table or the statistics showing how much more or how much less the farmer's income has increased, or showing how someone else's income has increased. The question which confronts me now in the performance of my duty on this inflation front is whether the farmer of the United States, as a part, an essential and indispensable part, of the productive energy of our people, considering all the elements which enter into it, considering the war effort itself, considering the absolute necessity for us to keep these curbs within control, or else to lose control, is receiving his fair share of the reward to which he is entitled, to which our energies for years have been bent, and to which he should be entitled to receive for the products he brings out of the ground.

I represent an agricultural State, which produces all sorts of agricultural commodities—grain, hay, cotton, corn, wheat, livestock of every kind, rye, hemp, alfalfa, lespedeza, clover, and other kinds of grasses. Next to North Carolina I believe it is the largest tobacco-producing State in the Union, running North Carolina a very close race. The State of Kentucky is an average agricultural State. Its agriculture is probably more diversified than that of many other States.

I receive letters from my constituents, as other Senators do from theirs. I have not received any letters from farmers in Kentucky complaining about the prices they are receiving. The complaints which have been made are the same as the complaints which have been made to other Senators about the labor situation and, in the absence of a sufficient quantity of labor, the farm-implement situation, which I am glad to say is being given immediate attention in the effort to assure the farmers more machinery to take the place of their boys. There may not be time now to do very much about machinery for the cultivation of crops in time to affect the spring planting, but there certainly is time to do something about machinery with respect to the harvesting of crops.

When the Pace bill was before the Senate I made this statement:

> I represent an agricultural State. We produce a variety of farm crops.

I named some of them.

> I have not received any complaints from the farmers of my State about the prices they are receiving. The greatest complaint of the farmers of my State and of farmers all over the country is because of the labor situation. They will produce, at the prices they are now receiving, all the farm products they can grow with the labor they have. There is no question about that.

I repeat that statement now. The farmers of the United States will produce, at the prices they are receiving, all they can grow with the labor they have available. There is no doubt about it.

I have before me a letter which I received from the editor of a weekly newspaper, which is published in my State, and which circulates among the farmers. He says:

> MY DEAR SENATOR: I have taken the enclosed clipping from your remarks in the Senate last Thursday upon the subject of farm prices. * * * I am writing to say I think it presents a perfect picture of the farmer's attitude in relation to prices. Of course, my horizon is limited, but Harding County, I believe, represents a fair cross section of farming conditions in this State. I have not heard a single farmer here complain as to the price he is receiving. In fact, most of them are prosperous and more than satisfied.

I have received a telegram from a farmer in Trail City, S. Dak. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota knows where Trail City is, but I do not.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I know where it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Idaho says he knows where it is. This farmer says:

> Don't worry about prices.

I do not know why he has sent this telegram to me from South Dakota, but I am glad to have it.

> Don't worry about prices. See that we get our implements in order that we may produce and harvest crops.

Those are samples of the telegrams and letters which I have received. I received a telegram from the secretary of the Farm Bureau Federation in Kentucky, urging me to vote to override the veto of the President. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Calvert, who sent me the telegram.

I have a telegram from a local chairman of the board of directors of the Farm Bureau Federation in one county in my State. Except for those two telegrams, I have received no communication from my State urging me to vote to override the President's veto. I respect these men. I know how sincere they are. I know how devoted they are to the farmer's welfare. I have often said, and I now repeat, that the Farm Bureau Federation is one of the most effective farm organizations that has ever existed in the United States, not only from the standpoint of agricultural interests, but also in other ways. I have the greatest respect for it, and I have cooperated with it ever since it was organized. But there come times in the lives of all of us when we must be our own judges, not only as to our duty, but as to the wisdom of the advice which we receive as to how we shall vote.

Mr. President, I could continue at great length to show the effect of the bill upon the prices of flour, poultry, hogs, and other products. There is scarcely a farmer who produces corn and wheat or other feed grains who does not also raise cattle and hogs. By no means do all of them grow their own feed. Many of them are required to buy it.

The War Department, the Agriculture Department, and all the other departments concerned with the organization and equipment of an army have insisted that we must produce larger quantities of meat. A soldier cannot march all day or fight all day on a vegetarian diet. He must have meat. Because of that situation, soldiers have eaten and are now eating more meat than they would eat if they were at home following their ordinary peaceful pursuits. Therefore, it has been necessary to concentrate on furnishing meats, not only to our own armed forces but to a large extent for our lend-lease program. So the larger our Army and Navy become, the greater the quantities of meat the Government must buy. The larger our lend-lease contributions become, the greater the quantities of meat the Government must buy.

It is estimated in the message of the President and by the Administrator of the O. P. A that, in addition to the amount which would be added to the cost of living to the 130,000,000 people of the United States, the Government would have to pay another $500,000,000 to buy the necessary food, clothing, and other materials to equip the Army of the United States.

Senators may believe or disbelieve those figures as they see fit. They may regard them or disregard them as they are inclined to do. I have no power of persuasion to induce Senators to accept them if they do not wish to do so. Other Senators have just as much right to their own interpretations as I have to mine.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The difference between the parity prices and the market prices of the three principal commodities involved is as follows:

Corn, 8½ cents—600,000,000 bushels cash sales—amount of payments $51,000,000.

Wheat, 20 cents—700,000,000 bushels—making the payments $140,000,000.

Sugar, $60,000,000.

So a total of $251,000,000 represents the difference between the market price and the parity price.

I ask the Senator, in fairness and in reason, to explain how approximately

$250,000,000—which will be paid to the farmers anyway, but by the consumers of the United States instead of the taxpayers, assuming it is all paid—can be reconciled with such a stupendous figure as a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has given only the figure for parity, the difference between the market price and the parity price.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A ceiling can be put on when parity is reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has not taken into consideration the amount of soil conservation payments involved in the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am taking into consideration the entire difference, however it may be paid, between the market price and parity price. When the prices reach parity, ceilings can be put on them, and that would be at $251,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that the question of soil-conservation payments has no relationship to parity. Farmers receive such payments anyway, whether there is parity or not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is not proposing to change that arrangement, is he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not proposing to change it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, why bring it into the debate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Because the Senator's bill and the President's veto concerned not only parity payments, but soil-conservation payments, and all other benefits which the farmer receives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is including both soil-conservation and parity payments, and there is a difference of only $251,000,000 between the parity prices and the market prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to my good friend, I shall have to differ from him as to the amount. The figure $251,000,000 includes parity, but not all other payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Due to the spread.

Mr. BARKLEY. Spread is a different proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It shows how much additional money has to be spent; that is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. But there would be added to whatever ceiling it would be necessary to put on these products, parity payments, soil-conservation payments, and other benefits, which I need not detail. I do not believe there is any doubt that the amount of the appropriation for that purpose is $662,000,000. Whether it will all be paid out I cannot now say.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator understands the amount to be paid out is decreased as the market prices increase.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. The amount to be paid out for parity purposes would, of course, completely vanish if all crops were bringing parity prices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in conclusion I desire to say a word relative to the pending motion. I have no way of knowing how the Senate will vote on it. I think we now have reached such a juncture in the history of the country that the American people have a right to expect the Senate, the whole Congress, and those conducting the war effort, to meet the issue and the test. We cannot dilly-dally much longer with this question of inflation and uncertainty. That is true not only with respect to farm prices, wages, and profits, but of everything else involved in the compensation men are to receive for what they do. We know there is confusion at the present time. If it could have been done, I believe it would have been better at the very beginning for the O. P. A. to have fixed ceilings on all commodities, and advised the American people what those ceilings were to be, instead of fooling along with one commodity at a time, and announcing a week or a month in advance that they would do a certain thing at the end of a certain period providing something else might happen which did not happen.

We cannot remedy that situation. It may have been inevitable. It may be that the O. P. A. could not obtain all the information necessary to put into effect an over-all policy. But certainly one of the criticisms and one of the complaints which the American people have is that there is a lack of understanding of the rationing program. I do not believe we can play with it any longer. I believe the American people have a right to expect Congress to let them know where it stands upon these matters.

Mr. President, the issue is clear-cut: Shall we sustain the President's veto, or shall we override it? The people of the country have a right to know what we are going to do about it. I agreed with the Senator from North Carolina yesterday when he spoke of the Members of the United States Senate, two from each State, in whom the people have reposed their faith and confidence, and whom they know and trust, and I think they have a right to expect us to stand against the varying winds which blow in every direction, in order that we may take counsel of our fears, not knowing always which course will reflect the greatest degree of political wisdom.

We hear much about elections and reelections; we hear much about fourth terms and third terms. In my honest judgment, the American people are not now concerned about a fourth term for anybody in the United States, including United States Senators, some of whom may be running next year for their fourth terms.

I believe that I express the views of every Member of the Senate in what I am about to say. If I did not think so, I would not say so. If I did not believe I expressed their views I myself would not have the great confidence in this deliberative body which I have, and which I always have had, and have always expressed. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who, if he could win the war or contribute to winning the war by sacrificing his political life, would not do so. What right have we to play with the destiny of our Nation, and with the lives, limbs, and blood of our millions of boys, who are not at the battle front as Democrats or Republicans, who are not there as farmers, or millers, or mechanics, or clerks, or lawyers, or doctors? They are at the front as Americans. Their politics was not considered or consulted when the strong arm of our Nation reached into their homes and took them and put them into uniforms. Many of them will never return. Many of them will find graves in alien lands, as many already have. As we debate this question today our hearts are on every continent in the world, because our boys are on every island, on every continent, in every sky, and on every sea. There may be millions of casualties before the war shall end. When the casualty lists begin to come in there will be many sorrowful men in the Senate, as there have already been, because of the loss of their dearly beloved. With the greatset respect and admiration and affection for my colleagues, may I express the fervent hope that our conduct here may not in the slightest degree be controlled and determined by our desire to see that there are no political casualties on the floor of the United States Senate.

In this country, we hear much grumbling which is fed and fanned by those who thrive on discontent. We hear much grumbling because of the numerous inconveniences we must undergo in carrying on the war effort. Of course, we have got to change and lower and modify our standard of living. The man who has been in the habit for years of buying two automobiles each year cannot now buy one. Of course, that is a modification and a lowering of his standard. The man who buys each year two or three suits of clothes now can buy only one. That is a lowering of his standard; but he has not suffered any hardship.

There is no sacrifice we can make on the home front, whether in the price of labor, or of agricultural products, or of manufactured products, or in the price of political office at any election—and I include all elective officers of this Republic—there is no sacrifice, no inconvenience, no hardship we can endure that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with the hardships which are being endured by the boys in uniform, and by the girls and women also, on the dry sands of North Africa, and in the Solomon Islands, in New Guinea, in India, in China, in swamps and bogs and miasmas and perpetual malarias, where they not only are required to fight, but to sleep and to eat in the mud and mire and slime. There is no sacrifice, no inconvenience, no hardship, no lowering of our standard of life we are compelled to endure that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with the sacrifices these men are required to make in order that our Nation, its traditions, and the liberties which we enjoy may be preserved. When I think of that comparison and receive letters from persons who evidently have not thought things through, who are only concerned about their own little spheres and the little deprivation they are called upon in behalf of the war effort to undergo, I grow sick at heart.

I think the American people are determined, on the whole, to make whatever sacrifice and contribution may be necessary in order to win this war, whatever

may have been their attitude prior to our entry into it. As we all know, there were many honest people who disagreed about it; but, regardless of that, I think their determination is to win the war and to win it unequivocally and without reservation. I do not believe they will be willing to make the sacrifices the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, or perhaps more than 11,000,000, must make before it is over unless out of it shall come a complete victory not only in the war, but a complete victory so far as the world is concerned hereafter in the way of trying to preserve and perpetuate peace and good will among men.

I think these millions of people have the right to ask us today, Are you for the veto or are you against it? Let us not sidestep it; let us not park it out yonder in a committee where another agricultural bill has been parked and where hearings I believe are now in progress. Do not give to other people a club with which to beat you into insensibility by encouraging them to hold off in their effort and come to an agreement about other things. Do not deceive yourself into the belief that you can put a club behind the door in any committee of the Senate without running the risk that the club may be taken away from you and used against you by those you are seeking to threaten with it.

We have got to fight this battle all along the line, and I say to the Senate with all the sincerity I can command that those who are charged with the responsibility of conducting this war, not only on foreign battlefields but on the home front, will not know how to proceed completely and advisedly as long as this problem is suspended in midair and we have not determined it one way or the other.

If the Senate desires to enact this proposed legislation notwithstanding the President's veto, let us vote according to our convictions. If we do not think it ought to be passed over his veto, let us sustain the veto, but do not keep the question suspended in midair so that no one, including the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, including the Economic Stabilizer, including the President of the United States, or anyone else, will know how to proceed on other matters and on other fronts so long as this question is undecided.

For these reasons I hope the Senate will not adopt the motion made by my good friend, the Senator from Alabama. I am sorry he made it. I do not know that he did so with any great enthusiasm.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; to be frank, if I had had the votes, I would not have made the motion; I would have sought a vote immediately on the veto message.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is frank, as I believe everyone knows he is, in saying that if he had the votes to pass the bill over the veto the motion would not now be pending.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are too many beguilements.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend to go into that. Of course, it is a two-edged sword when it comes to beguilement. So far as I am concerned I do not think anybody will accuse me of trying to beguile anyone else. I certainly have not been buttonholing Senators all around the Chamber to get them to vote in a certain way. I have not spoken to a single Senator to get him to vote on the question of the veto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned, I can make the same statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disputing that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, but the Senator was looking at me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I like to look at the Senator; he is good looking.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will leave it to every Member of this body, that, so far as I am concerned, I have not approached anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not doubt that. I would not by even looking at the Senator, accuse him of doing so, and I hope he is not offended.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not offended, but I thought there was an implication in the Senator's smile and look.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was making no implication whatever. What I started to say was that I do not believe in legislation by buttonholing; I do not believe in legislation by going in advance to Senators, and, on personal grounds asking them to vote for or against a bill, and I like to think that every other Senator has the same method of approach to the subject that I have. I do not believe in that way of legislation. Sometimes I have been criticized because, in my capacity, I have not made a personal canvass of my colleagues more frequently to induce them to vote in a certain way. I do not believe in that sort of method, and I do not indulge in it. It may be that is one of my shortcomings; but I wish to say to the Senator frankly that if he had the votes to pass the bill over the President's veto he would have driven a hard bargain with us, which he would have had a right to do, and he would have exercised it with his great eloquence and influence. But, so far as I know, without any effort to influence Senators, a sufficient number of them made up their minds to sustain the President's veto. That is the situation. Why seek to put this matter off onto a sidetrack?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will tell the Senator why. It is because I think a great many Senators changed their position as the result of misinformation furnished them, some of it from official sources. I think we have a right to clear it up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to what extent the Senator may be correct, because I do not know of any Senator to whom misinformation was furnished.

The only information that has come to us has been in the debates. I suppose we have all asked the departments to give us their figures, whatever they may be, and we have debated them. There cannot be two sets of figures coming from the same department, but we can put our interpretation upon them.

Now that this matter is before us, and the American people want us to act on it, in order to settle it, I hope the Senate will reject the motion of the Senator from Alabama, and vote on the straight, clear-cut question, whether the President's veto shall be sustained or overridden.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it seems rather pointless to delay the vote the Senate is about to take, but there are a few things which I feel should be said before the vote is taken.

In the first place, I should prefer to vote on the question of the Presidential veto now. I shall vote for the motion made by the Senator from Alabama, because I deferred to the judgment of some of those who were associated with me in supporting the bill which has been before the Senate. In other words, I should prefer not to defer to the suggestion to refer; but the motion has been made, and I shall support it.

I was rather disturbed at the course of the discussion taken just now by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and taken last evening by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I agree with all these eminent Senators have said, except that I do not agree that there has been a suggestion made on the floor of the Senate that any one of its Members has been, is, or will be influenced by political consideration or partisan consideration in the vote he will cast on this or any other measure. I do not think so meanly of any Member of the United States Senate.

Nor do I think it is well worth our while to advert unnecessarily to the horrible war situation in which we find ourselves, and to suggest that everyone should be willing to make a sacrifice. If there is anyone in the United States of America worthy the name of United States citizen who is not ready to make such a sacrifice, or any sacrifice that is demanded of him, I have not heard from such person, and I pray to Almighty God that I shall not hear from him.

I say that I am ready to vote on the question of the veto now. I am ready to vote to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I listened to the Senator from North Carolina with the interest and profit which a Member of the Senate may always obtain from an address delivered by him. He is always persuasive, he is always fluent, he is always but little short of convincing, and usually, though not always, he is right. I was particularly interested in the prescription which he wrote for the American people so as to enable them to prevent the horrible advent of inflation. He suggested that they should be ready to accept every sacrifice and that the farmers likewise should be ready to take the same prescription.

Mr. President, I recall incidents of my boyhood, such as all of us have seen over and over again, when the father of the family takes hold of the small boy and drags him in, yelling and kicking, to take a dose of castor oil, and says, "Son, be a man; be a man. Take this. Watch papa. Papa loves it. See, papa likes it." But we never saw papa take it. Papa does not like it, and his pretended sip-

ping is for the purpose of inducing the boy to take the castor oil.

Says the Senator from North Carolina, "The farmers should take this prescription"; and they should. But when he says, "Papa is ready to take it," he falls short of stating what he should have stated on the floor of the Senate.

I picked up this morning's newspaper and saw that railroad profits had increased 800 percent. Therefore, stop the farmer from getting parity.

I saw that stocks had attained the highest level in 3 years, and that there was a transfer of nearly 2,000,000 shares at this high level. Therefore, the farmers should not receive parity.

I saw that the retail stores in the District of Columbia, which support the local newspapers, had during the month of March a 28-percent increase in sales, and that the retail stores of Baltimore had an increase in sales of 61 percent. Therefore do not let the farmers get parity, because it contributes to inflation, it starts the spiral

I saw Members of the Senate, some of whom have spoken on this floor, vote within the past few days for an increase in the salaries of the Federal employees in the District of Columbia, and other Federal employees, to increase their salaries by $573,000,000. Therefore do not let the farmers start the spiral of inflation.

I read the message of the President of the United States as of September 7 last, in which he said:

> Annual wage and salary disbursements have increased from forty-three and seven-tenths billion dollars in 1939 to an estimated $75,000,000,000 in 1942. This represents an increase of 71 percent. To obtain a full appreciation of what that increase means, we should remember that $75,000,000,000 is more than our total national income was during any single year in the 1930's.

Now listen. I am quoting the President of the United States:

> Due to constantly increasing employment, overtime, and wage-rate increases, the annual wage and salary bill for the entire country has been rising by more than a billion dollars a month.

Therefore do not let the farmers' prices go to parity.

Mr. President, I hear and I read that demands are to be made for increases in salaries and in wages in the bituminous coal industry, in the transportation industry, and in other industries. There may be justification for such increases, but why hang it all on the farmer as the whipping boy? Why brand the farmer with the "scarlet letter" as the one responsible for starting a spiral of inflation, when everywhere throughout the Nation there are not only the signs of an approaching inflation but the knowledge that an inflationary condition is inevitable? That does not mean that we should not impose every restriction and limitation and restraint to lessen the impact of that trend. But let me say, Mr. President, that we cannot take out of the productive effort of this country 11,000,000 persons and put them in uniform and engage them in a destructive effort, we cannot take other millions of persons out of productive industry and place them in industry which produces munitions to support the 11,000,000 who are engaged in a destructive effort, and not have such a diminution of the supply of the necessities in this country that there will be insistent demand and contest and jealousy for participation in the supply remaining.

When we add to that a purchasing power such as I have suggested we have inflation. When the debt of the United States of America is increased to $116,000,000,000, and the increase is represented in large measure by bond purchases by commercial institutions, and by purchasing power translated into deposits, how can it be denied that we are not going to have inflation? When everyone sees the specter of inflation coming, it is, to say the least, unfair to say, "Do not let the farmer get parity. Do not let him profiteer."

Mr. President, a committee of the House very recently established that agents of firms selling to the Government in this community and in others had made profits running into the millions of dollars. I heard one representative of a firm testify in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate that his profits were such that he would have to use a scoopshovel to handle his profits, and from a sense of shame turned some of them back to the United States Government. Shall we, therefore, see to it that the producer of food and fiber will not receive a parity position which we have tried to secure for him for 20 years, and particularly in the last 12 years? The farmer has not asked, and is not asking, for a premium position.

Mr. President, I spoke of what had appeared in the morning newspaper. Let me refer to two other items which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning. The first was a very delightful revelation, I will say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who referred to the same newspaper yesterday. It was a very delightful revelation, in the form of an editorial, setting forth that the newspaper now takes a position in opposition to parity prices for the farmer's product because it is so deeply interested in the welfare of the farmer. The only thing the newspaper has in mind is that it is not to the farmer's best interest, and it has only the farmer's best interest at heart.

Another matter appears on the same page of that newspaper which is of particular interest to me, and which ought to be of interest to every Member of the United States Senate. It is an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Bankhead Farm Bill." Mr. Sullivan says in part:

> Congress proceeded to undo the President's order, by a bill sponsored by Senator BANKHEAD. The heart of the undoing bill lay in five words: "No deduction shall be made." The purpose was put in words by Democratic Senator MCKELLAR of Tennessee: "The purpose of this bill is to reenact what was enacted in the original bill, but which was misconstrued by the (executive) department."

Now listen, Senators:

> In that spirit, the Senate passed the bill by an extraordinary majority, 78 to 2. Because the bill was a reproof to the President for trespassing upon legislative prerogative. Senators voted for it who had no interest in making crop prices high, who indeed wanted crop prices kept low. Senators reflecting the consuming centers of the East voted for the bill. Ardent New Dealers voted for it—WAGNER of New York, GUFFEY of Pennsylvania. The most faithful followers of the administration voted for the bill, including even Senate Leader BARKLEY of Kentucky. In the same spirit, the House passed the bill by 149 to 40.

Mr. President, I resent that attack. I do not believe there is a Member of the United States Senate who voted for that bill as a measure of reproof to the President. I believe that when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] voted, they voted their convictions.

Mr. SMITH. Why does the Senator put us in that crowd? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. I include the Senator from South Carolina because I believe every Member of the Senate votes his honest convictions when the time comes to vote, and I do not believe the Senator from South Carolina or any other Member of the Senate would vote for a measure simply as a reproof.

Mr. President, the suggestion is made that now that we have administered the spanking to the President of the United States we are willing to retreat; that we have picked up a club and taken a crack at him. I did not vote for the bill for that purpose, and I never have in the Senate cast a vote for the purpose of reproving anyone.

The Senator from North Carolina called specific attention, as did the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] today, to the fact that the President of the United States in his message said that he credits the Members of the Senate with sincerity, and I know he does, and that we should also credit him with sincerity, and I know we do.

Why raise the question of sincerity? The Senator from North Carolina—I wish he were present at the moment—was sincere when he voted last January for the Price Control Act which provided that the farmers should receive parity, and that a ceiling should not be placed on anything manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which did not reflect parity. The Senator from North Carolina was sincere then. He was sincere when he voted for the bill we passed October 2 last year, which again provided that the farmer shall be entitled to parity, and that no price ceiling shall be placed on anything manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which does not reflect parity.

When it became necessary, because of Executive interpretation, again to present a bill, which the Senator from Alabama presented, reaffirming what we had affirmed twice before, the Senator from North Carolina was again sincere, and he voted for it. He now says that, while he voted sincerely three times, he

is going to reverse himself, and I credit him once more with sincerity. I know he is sincerely mistaken. I am not criticizing in any way. I would be the last to criticize any Member of the Senate who reversed himself. Any Member has a right to reverse himself.

I wish now to refer to the matter of veto. Perhaps it is unnecessary, perhaps it is presumptuous for me to speak about it, but I want to do so. I have resented deeply, and have voiced my resentment on the floor of the Senate, the action of the executive department in sending here, while we are considering a measure under our constitutional authority based on the provision of the Constitution that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States," a letter or a message—not a message of the type envisioned by the Constitution, but a letter pertaining to the particular matter inhering—and have it read on the floor of the Senate. I say that such action is an unwarranted interference with the legislative function of the Congress of the United States. I, on this floor, have time and again expressed my disapproval of and my deep concern over any suggestion that one department of the coordinate departments of this Government is interfering with another. I would speak just as vehemently of any attempt on the part of the legislative department to interfere with the rights, functions, duties, and obligations of the executive department. In fact, I have done so. I resented, as did many other Members of the Senate, including the Senator from North Carolina, the attempt, as we saw it, by the executive department to encroach on the functions of the judicial department. I spoke, when I was sitting in the rear row of seats on this side of the Chamber, on what I thought was an attempt by the legislative branch to interfere with the rights of the executive.

After a measure is passed by the Congress, the Executive has the right—not only the right but the duty—to register his approval or disapproval. It may or may not be controlling to me, but I am willing to say that never has a measure for which I voted come back to the Senate with the disapproval of the President, so that I found my judgment challenged, that I did not search my soul to see whether or not I had been mistaken. Oh, the Senator spoke about democratic processes. The veto power in the Constitution of the United States was a compromise, a compromise between the views of those who, like our patron saint on this side of the aisle—Thomas Jefferson—believed that the greatest measure of legislation for the welfare of the entire country could be secured through the clash of opinion in debate by the representatives of the people, and the views of those like James Madison, George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and James Monroe, who gave voice to the sentiment that the people cannot be trusted. They are too easily swayed by emotions, by prejudices, and are apt to be misled by their prejudices. The welfare of the country could better be served by those who, by experience and education, are better able to judge for them. I am quoting almost word for word from George Washington, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton. In deference to their opinion there was placed in the Constitution the veto power, a power which to my knowledge—and perhaps I am making an extravagant statement—has no counterpart in any executive department anywhere else in the world. But we have it in our executive department. What is its effect? Its effect is that when the President returns a measure with his disapproval, majority rule by the representatives of the people is out of the window. No longer do democratic processes and majority rule exist. From that time on, the opinion of the President, sustained conceivably by 17 Members of the Senate—49 being a possible quorum and one-third being 17—can override the registered opinion of both Houses of the Congress. That is according to our Constitution.

Therefore, I believe that any Executive should approach with the utmost care, with the most consummate care, the question of disapproval of a measure passed by the Congress. I have no reason to suppose that that is not done. For the same reason, when an Executive has been impelled to such a decision and to such disapproval because of his deeply held conviction, I, as a Member of the Senate, will give it the most careful and prayerful consideration when it comes here.

If, after such reconsideration, any Member of the Senate finds he was previously mistaken, and therefore changes his viewpoint on a bill, as the majority leader has stated, he should not be criticized. The majority leader said over and over again, "I am not embarrassed." He should not be embarrassed. Neither can anyone accuse him of inconsistency. The decision is one which he must make, and one which he has a right to make.

Now let me refer very briefly to the veto message. I wish once more that the Senator from North Carolina were present. He called attention to some matters in the veto message which he felt reflected great credit on the Chief Executive, and on that point I am in full agreement with him. The Senator from North Carolina is never at a loss to maintain his position. Twice he said, "I will hurriedly go over this portion of the message," and he hurriedly went over it, and I do not blame him for doing so. If I were arguing for the position which he was maintaining, I would go over that part much more speedily than he did.

First, the President, to bolster his position, argues on the historic record as to the definition of "parity." I quote from the veto message:

I further stated—

In the message of September 7, 1942—

the purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. * * *

* * * * * *

My suggestion regarding the calculation of parity was not novel. It had received the previous approval of the Congress. Under an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (Public Law No. 74, 77th Cong.) the Commodity Credit Corporation was directed—

Now listen—

to make loans on certain 1941 crops at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year. In approving that act on May 26, 1941, I stated: "I have taken up the construction of the law with certain legislative leaders chiefly responsible for it and have received from them letters stating that for the 1941 crop the broad intention is that parity payments should, if necessary, be so curtailed as to avoid a price above parity if added to the loan and the soil conservation payments.

Not one word about changing the parity-price formula. It is the parity loans or the crop loans and the parity payments which are predicated entirely on a relationship between the market price and the parity price.

Again:

The meaning of "parity" under the original Emergency Price Control Act had been established by administrative interpretation. Furthermore, the Price Administrator's construction had been upheld by the Attorney General prior to the introduction of the act of October 2, 1942.

That is absolutely correct. We wrote into the act, in the most exact words that could be chosen by the drafters of the language, a restatement of the principle that no price ceilings shall be imposed which reflects less than parity under the provisions of the act, or, as the eminent Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said yesterday, "or otherwise."

In the face of that reaffirmation of our position there came the Executive interpretation, and again we presented a bill saying, "When we said that in October we meant it. If it is necessary to say it again, we will say it again." We said it again in the Senate by a vote of 78 to 2. The House said it again by a vote of 4 to 1; and now the bill is returned with Executive disapproval.

I shall not take the time to discuss all the inaccuracies in the message of the President, but let me call attention to one example:

In the past no one has fought harder than I to help the farmers get parity prices for their crops. With pride I recall that the parity idea was first put into law during my administration.

That is correct.

And by the act of October 2, 1942, the farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity prices for all basic crops—

Mr. President, there is not a word in the law to substantiate that statement. Whoever told the President that, or wrote it for him, or induced him to put it in his message, deliberately deceived him. Nowhere in the basic law or in the statute law of the United States is there a guaranty of 90 percent of parity for any crop.

What was probably referred to? Reference was probably made to section 8 (a) of the act of October 2, 1942, which provides as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available upon any crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concur-

rent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested, loans as follows:

(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(2) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 percent of the rate specified in (1) above;

(3) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

That is every word that appears in any law that could be construed as a guaranty of price; and everyone who knows the application of the loan provision knows that its purpose is to bolster price, but it is not a guaranty of price.

What is the commercial corn-producing area? It is a section of the United States in which there is produced on the individual farm more than 450 bushels of corn a year, or, on every acre of tillable land in the country an average of 4 bushels per acre per year. Otherwise farmers cannot participate in the 90-percent loan, or in the benefit payments so far as corn is concerned. They are outside the area.

Time and time again I have discussed on the floor of the Senate the subject of computation of the conservation payments. The farmer who receives a conservation payment has given value received for it, and it has nothing to do with the parity price. He has delivered value received. We said to him, "Take your land out of production and put it into soil-building crops, and comply with our rules and regulations. If you do not raise wheat, corn, or cotton, we will partially compensate you from the United States Treasury." For what? To guarantee him a parity price? No. To compensate him for what he did not raise. He rendered value received. Why should we charge him with it?

A few moments ago the Senator from Kentucky said that we must either add it or deduct it, and that we cannot leave it hanging in midair. Why not? We laid down the formula for computing parity. We said what should be included in it. It is not benefit payments. All that is necessary to do in the application of the Price Control Act is to refer to the parity-price level. Under the terms of that act no ceiling price can be established which does not reflect the parity price. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH] that that is why I am not supporting the Pace bill. I told him so, and he did not like it. It changes the parity formula, on which we have built a price structure, after the structure has been erected. I will not support it. I told the Senator from South Carolina that I would not speak in favor of it on the floor of the Senate, and I did not. If it comes up again I will speak against it. I am opposed to it.

However, this is a different proposition. The Senator from North Carolina said that the President has asked us to stabilize prices in order to meet the threat of inflation. We must stabilize wages, salaries, and prices of raw materials. The President asked us to do so, and we did so. We did so a year ago last January, and we did so again on October 2, 1942. Let me read the provision to which I refer:

That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

We clothed the President with plenary authority under that act. The President sent us a message saying, in effect, If you do not give me the power to stabilize wages, prices, and salaries within such and such a time I will exercise it anyway. I have the right to do so. I believe that under the existing statutes he had a perfect right to do so, but he asked us to give him the power, and we did so. We gave him full and complete power to stabilize wages, prices, and salaries. We laid down two limitations. We said to him, "You may not fix a price ceiling on articles manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which does not reflect parity prices to the farmer, the producer of the raw material." Then we said, "Under the authority of this act you may not fix a basis or a ceiling on wages which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended."

With those limitations we clothed the Chief Executive with absolute power to stabilize. What has been the result? I shall speak frankly, because I believe I know what I am talking about. The determination has been made that farm prices should not be allowed to go to parity. In my judgment, this is in order to lessen the pressure for increased wages. However, the determination has been made that farm prices should not be allowed to go to parity, and that because we are taking away from the farmer that to which he is rightfully entitled under the law, we should supplement the price which the farmer receives by incentive payments from the United States Treasury.

Mr. President, that policy might have been proper if the Congress had desired to follow it, but the Congress refused to do so. It refused by a specific legislative act. Instead, Congress stabilized wages and stabilized prices by using the formula it had prescribed and imposing the restrictions to which I have referred.

Earlier today I read to the Senate some facts which appeared in the newspaper this morning concerning the present rise in the price of stocks, the rise in wages, the rise in retail sales, and all similar inflationary registers. This morning the press carried the news that yesterday on the grain exchange, as well as on the commodity exchange, cotton broke from 60 cents to $1 a bale, because of the report that Congress would not override the President's veto. Yesterday, every holder of a pound of cotton lost money at the rate of 60 cents to $1 a bale, due simply to this threat. Yesterday, every holder of a bushel of wheat lost 2 cents because of this threat. Why? Because, as we have said over and over again, there are no other producers, no other workers, and no other segment of American industry, which cannot take a position and say what it costs them to produce, and what they want for their product, but there are agencies which the farmers cannot control, or have not been able to control, which are preventing their taking the same position. Unfortunate as it may be, when Congress writes specific directives into the law, there are agencies of the Government which find executive interpretation to bypass those directives.

The farmers of the United States ask for no premium position. They want the parity price for every commodity, which was fixed many years ago by a formula, and which we are trying to secure for them. The farmer has no patience with a manipulation which seeks to prevent that result. He is just as patriotic as anyone else; he is willing to make every sacrifice which he is called upon to make; but I submit to any fair-minded person that it is utterly inequitable, and utterly unjust, to hold the farmers responsible every time there is a rise in the cost of living, which may be due to a myriad of factors.

I once read on the floor of the Senate a letter from Secretary Wickard. I had said, "How do you justify the statement that an increase of the kind suggested will result in an increase in the cost of living by a billion and a half dollars?" He answered—and I read it here once before—"It is because of the pyramiding of charges that will be made on distribution, handling, commissions, and retailing costs."

Charge it all to the farmer, when he is asking nothing but the privilege of having the price for his product increased to the point to which the Congress of the United States said it should go.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I am now ready to vote on the question of the veto. In accordance with the policy which I have always had in my own mind, and which I follow in my own office, when the President sent in his veto message I carefully surveyed, to the best of the limited mental powers with which the Almighty has equipped me, the arguments which might sustain the position taken by the President, and I was ready without embarrassment, as the Senator said, to say that I was wrong if I was wrong. I did not find one scintilla of reason, and I have not heard one scintilla of reason presented on the floor of the Senate, for sustaining the veto. There is no reason why I, just as sincerely as the Senator from North Carolina, should not continue to take the position which he took aforetime and adhere to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make the record plain with

respect to my feeling relative to the entire problem which confronts the Senate, and I shall certainly do so in a very brief way.

First, I wish to deal with the Bankhead bill and the veto as the situation confronted us prior to the motion made yesterday by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. President, I voted for this bill in the first instance because I believed—and I still believe—that it is inherently sound. I believe that the President's Executive order respecting parity for agriculture violated the clear congressional intent. I believed—and I still believe—that it violated equity. I am prepared to reassert this belief through the medium of my vote whenever it can be done to agriculture's advantage. But, Mr. President, I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it cannot today be done to agriculture's advantage, nor to the advantage of the country, in the light of the President's veto message, and in the presence of what he says will be his interpretation of a repudiation of his veto, and that is the very fundamental and important thing to consult. Whether we like it or not, the final defense against suicidal inflation in this country is in the hands of the President. Whether we like it or not, we cannot ignore his attitude and his viewpoint in the midst of any crisis related to the war.

When the President puts the Bankhead bill into the status of an inflationary spark plug, virtually asserting that he can no longer attempt to control spiraling wages if the bill passes, I am bound, as a realist, to take official notice of the consequences. I am bound to concede that if he will construe the overriding of his veto as the "go" sign to new wage spirals the net results can be utterly deadly to America—yes, and deadly to agriculture, which will thus lose more in the long run than it can possibly gain in this immediate moment.

The President's interpretation of our action is more important than all the academic logic which can be marshaled in this debate, because his reactions are at the base of the whole situation.

In their statement of April 3 the great farm organizations of the country frankly asserted their belief that—

> The amount of money in the Bankhead bill is relatively small.

They deny the mathematics in the Presidential veto and say:

> Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from the passage of this measure would be so small as to have little if any effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

If they are right, Mr. President, then the collateral hazard of the passage of this bill over the veto, namely, the Chief Executive's stated belief, however wrong, that its passage will leave him relatively powerless to fight inflation, is calculated to cancel out many times over all possibility of tangible farm advantage from the thing we undertake to do. The hazard lacks any compensation for accepting it, and meanwhile the great common citizenship of America "pays the freight."

Mr. President, I shall never consciously accept any responsibility for the release of the inflationary plague upon our people. There is no current benefit which any group can get from a temporary income advantage which will not be tragically wiped out by the results of a runaway inflation. Therefore, though, in my view, the farmer has not had his relative desserts, and, though I cordially agree with the statement that the farmer "again and again has been unjustly accused of responsibility for inflation," I do not believe we are in a position today where we can serve him with this particular legislation at this particular time when the President frankly asserts that he believes it will, through sheer psychology, if nothing else, leave him powerless to hold the inflationary line.

Unfortunately, the President has the final say in this inflationary affair, and up to now he has been dangerously tolerant of other and far greater inflationary forces. Unfortunately, his attitudes will govern the repercussions to our action. So far as I am concerned, I shall leave the responsibility with him. I shall not rob myself of the right to hold him to strict accountability. I shall provide no alibi for breaking the national defense against inflation anywhere. I shall oppose inflation, whether Presidential or legislative, at any cost, and it will be my profound conviction that I am thus serving the best welfare of every man, woman, and child under the flag.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the pending motion, made by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] yesterday afternoon, to refer the President's veto message and the bill to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. What I am about to say is unrelated to any eleventh hour parliamentary strategy in respect to the disposition of the pending question. It is what I was prepared to say when this debate opened. I think it would be most unfortunate if the veto message should be submitted to a vote today. I prefer to send the message to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry there to await conclusive Presidential action in respect to his responsibilities regarding inflation on the labor front. If he performs pursuant to the spirit of his courageous message, then our duty to hold the line becomes crystal clear beyond the possibility of argument. If he does not perform there will be an obvious need to establish a new equilibrium. It will be up to him.

The stabilization problem is not quite so clear as it was stated yesterday in the eloquent address of the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. It is not solely in congressional keeping. On the contrary, the President plays a major role in it. With great respect, I assert that too frequently in the past he has been too hesitant to accept this role. By holding in abeyance action upon his veto, it is my opinion we can actually strengthen his hand and encourage his purpose in respect to the inflationary influences over which he exclusively presides. Action on the veto message ought to wait until the President himself demonstrates, at long last, that we are consistently to have high, effective leadership against inflation not only on the farm front but on other fronts where the President and his associated executives clearly are supreme. The veto message should be referred to the committee pending these developments because no one phase of this inflationary pattern can any longer be segregated from all other phases. If there is to be an ultimatum the ultimatum should go from us to the President as well as come from the President to us.

I am sorry, Mr. President, to hear the distinguished and able majority leader suggest that some support for the motion of the able Senator from Alabama might flow from a desire or a willingness on the part of some Senators to avoid what he calls an embarrassing vote. I do not conceive that any Senator is seeking a cyclone cellar in the presence of this challenge, but lest there be any doubt on the subject so far as I am concerned, I conclude my remarks, after again asserting my belief that there is logic and advantage to the country in referring the Bankhead bill and the veto message to the committee, by saying, so that neither the Senator from Kentucky nor anyone else may accuse me of seeking to hide from this challenge, that beyond any question of a doubt if this prudent and practical course is barred to us and if we must now vote the Presidential veto up or down, I shall vote to sustain the veto, because I shall not be in anywise a party to giving the President a reason or an excuse for surrendering to the forces of inflation on any front, and rightly or wrongly, that is the essence of his veto ultimatum.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, we have reached a point where one spark can ignite a powder train. The veto message is the powder train, and I decline to apply the spark; I decline to give anybody in this Government an excuse to let the spark be applied. The resultant conflagration could sadly burn us all. Agriculture will not be warmed by such fires; it will be consumed; and so will labor, and so will America. The President and the Congress must hold these lines together. I hope I am prepared to do my part.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes, and before I take my seat I expect to have accomplished both. The first purpose is to state my stand in regard to the veto message, and to give my reasons for being ready to vote to override the President's veto. The second part of my remarks, very closely related to the first part in logic, will deal with the opening of the Jeffersonian Bicentennial Celebration.

Mr. President, much has been said lately about history, about the teaching of history, and about speaking from history.

What I shall say today will be from history, and one who has had experience in talking from history knows that one does not keep audiences long when he becomes historical. It is when he becomes hysterical that audiences like to hear him, and those of us who imagine that newspapers, orators, and people in the world generally, would be satisfied with history,

make the mistake of all time. But since I am talking only to justify my own stand, I hope to stay with history, though none listen to me.

In regard to the veto message, I shall not add much to what has already been said, but I wish to say, speaking historically, that the message does talk loosely about inflation. I have been close to stabilization in France, I was close to inflation in Germany, I know the reason for the inflationary period in Russia, and I wish to say—and I believe history will bear me out—that if we are talking about a rise in prices, that is one thing, but there has never been in modern times, in any nation in the world where inflation has been started, an instance where it has not been started by government act, to accomplish a governmental purpose. To imagine that we grow into these things is the most fallacious notion imaginable.

One more point about inflation, a point which is completely lost sight of in the argument in regard to the pending veto message and the bill which has been vetoed, is that inflation never occurs if there is an increase in production, and if there are plenty of things to buy. The way to stop inflation is to have an abundance of goods.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I think there should be a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I am talking history, and no one would be inter-

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator can-

ested.

not be sure about that; I am interested.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fact is that if, by satisfying what has been a natural demand of the farmers for what they think in justice is due them, we bring about an increase of farm products by just a few percent, we then bring about a condition which will do more than any other single thing to overcome inflation, as the inflation is related to food products, and other products which come from the farm. That is not theory; that is fact.

There is discussion of the inflation theories as they were reported in the President's message. The logic of the message is based upon the notion that we had established in our country a freezing, so far as price fixing was concerned. That was not the case. We did just the opposite. It was suggested that we should freeze everything, prices, wages, and everything else, during the duration, but we turned our backs upon that when we dealt with the bill bringing into existence price control.

There was afforded in that bill, and there will always be afforded in any kind of a similar bill, if we are to be just, a proper chance to get rid of the inequities, injustices, and freezing proposals which are so deadly to man wherever we find him.

Mr. President, the evil of the veto message—and it is an evil—was emphasized by the previous speaker, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. He is going to cast an "expedient" vote because the President of the United States tells him that if he, the President, does not have control of agricultural prices, he will lose control of something else. That is a type of appeal we should not hear at this time. Our actions should be based upon justice, upon right, not upon expediency.

If, for example, the miners, through negotiations, through arbitration, prove their point in regard to an increase in wages, they should have the increase, and they should not be denied merely because it might affect a farmer somewhere, and upset what someone imagines is the equilibrium. There is no equilibrium. Anyone who knows anything about the economy of the United States knows that there is not an equilibrium. We established our price-control system and our wage control so that injustices and inequities might be ironed out by negotiation, and, if I remember my feeling when I voted for the bill which has now been vetoed, it was that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had done a good job in attempting to overcome an inequity, in attempting to bring about justice where justice should be brought about, and in attempting to give the farmers a chance to have something to which they were entitled.

I do not believe enactment of the bill would have brought bliss and happiness, but it would have been an encouragement, and there would have come, and there will come, if it shall become law, an increase in farm activities, and, as I said before, an abundance of production is the greatest deterrent to inflation that can be brought into existence in this country, so far as food prices are concerned.

Let us be just to those to whom justice is due. In times such as these we should throw expediency out the window. Why should we want to be harsh to one group of our citizens because it may be thought that if we are harsh to them we can be harsh to another group? Why is it that we always come to these expedient reasons about curbing the farmer, about curbing the wage earner, when they are the persons most affected? We know there has always been a struggle to attempt to take care of the under dog. We know that we have never gotten away from that struggle.

The appeals which are made for the under dog are always the same. Who in America wishes to be unjust to labor or to the farmer? No one when he speaks so he can be heard, utters such sentiments. But when an effort is made to help the under dog we find all the trouble in the world.

Mr. President, no one in the whole country is more interested than I in seeing brought to a successful conclusion the attempt toward wage stabilization which came into existence as the result of my own motion made in the industry-labor conference to do away with strikes and with lock-outs. No one is more interested than I in having all disputes between industry and labor settled by peaceful means. I should like to see disputes settled in that way. That is the American way. I should like to see such a result brought about, not only for the good of the laboring man but for the welfare of the women and children and others who are dependent upon him.

Let us stay with history in these matters. Let us not follow theory. Those of us who have been trained in scientific methods know that it is very well to theorize, but we do not dogmatize when we get into the realm of theory. When we argue we argue on the basis of fact.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more statement. We are spending billions upon billions of dollars today in connection with the war. Do you not think, Mr. President, that spending has something to do with the inflationary trend? No one mentions that fact, but some persons seem to believe that it would be a terrible mistake to give the farmer a half cent more for his wheat or for his corn, and that it would be inflationary. Yet we have appropriated in one Army bill $50,000,000,000, and we did so without winking an eye.

It is spending which causes inflation, and we must spend because we are in the war. Let us be historical about the matter and let us also be logical. The time may come when we shall be as deeply in debt as Germany was. Pray God that time may never come. If we provide proper controls, I think the time will never come because our wealth is so great that it need not come.

Mr. President, there are, however, in our country conditions which are extremely wasteful. When out of 600 men called to the colors in a given State 135 are rejected because they cannot read and write sufficiently to take their places in the armed forces of the United States, we have an economic waste which is so costly and so deadly that it ought to attract the attention of us all. More than 800,000 boys have been rejected by the Army of the United States because they could not read and write sufficiently to take the simple orders required of a private in the Army of the United States.

Mr. President, let us go back to history again. In all the history of wars and battles there is not a single battle the issue of which could not have been changed by 800,000 more men. Fifteen or 16 divisions would have changed the issue of any battle of any consequence which has been fought in all the history of the world. Yet some may say, "We do not want to teach those rejected boys to read and write."

The way to overcome inflation is to see to it that production continues in a normal way. If we are afraid of inflation, let us stimulate production and do what we can to see that there is greater production; then there will not be inflation. The proposed legislation had exactly that tendency. Let us not be against something because we think a certain laboring man somewhere will receive in wages a few dollars more than we may think he is entitled to. Let us be fair in this matter. Let us judge the question on its merits.

Mr. President, I wish to say one more word about the veto of the measure, because the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] caused my mind to turn again to history when he mentioned the veto. He

made the statement that the provision with respect to veto in the American Constitution is a rather unique thing in government. He said it was not spoken of by the fathers as a veto, but was spoken of as an objection. Finally the idea was adopted and became the law. But George Washington, who was quite close to the founding fathers, assumed that the only right of veto he had was to veto an act which he thought was unconstitutional. He assumed he had the power to bring about a reconsideration of a congressional act which was outside the bounds set by the Constitution.

There is no question concerning the constitutionality of the bill which has been vetoed. Presidents of the United States since Washington's time have gotten away from the original theory of the veto. A hundred years ago, back in the 1840's, great debates concerning the President's veto power took place in the House of Representatives, and in the course of those debates there was delivered one of the greatest speeches ever made in Congress, a speech which, describing the power of the President with respect to the veto, held that the President can suggest, he can do this and that, but he cannot say "Thou shalt not." I do not suppose our present President is trying to say, "Thou shalt not," but, especially since the days of Grover Cleveland, the power of the veto has become more or less of a personal thing.

Mr. President, we ought to study this subject. We ought to realize the tendencies which prevail. The present President of the United States twice vetoed a small bill. The second time it was passed by both Houses of Congress by unanimous vote. The power to override a veto resides in merely a two-thirds vote of the Congress.

Much discussion is taking place with respect to government by law as against government by decree. I do not accept the thesis of the Senators on the other side with respect to the veto, but I do say, since we are talking about a new world, since we are talking about the extension of democracy since we know that from our own experience will come practically every idea that will be of worth for the new world, that it is time for us to be thoughtful concerning our own constitutional provisions, and attempt to understand them. I should like to see one constitutional provision reopened, discussed, and revaluated, namely the power of the President to veto—when he should and when he should not veto. The will of the people of the United States is expressed in their Congress. The last word resides in the Congress. Democracy will die, representative government will cease to exist, when the right to have the last word no longer resides in Congress.

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. President, when I rose to speak I warned the Senate that I was going to be historical. I warned the Senate that I was going to talk in an academic way, and I warned Senators that if they remained in the Senate they would have to listen to a word or two which would open up what I hope will be the most magnificent year in American history, the year of the celebration of the birth of one of the great founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson.

We are just a few days away from a celebration of uncommon interest. Let me say that I am making these remarks by request. What has been prepared for delivery at this point has been prepared because I have been asked to do so. On next Tuesday, April 13, the Jefferson Memorial will be dedicated, and a year of celebration will be started. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission has representatives in this body. Both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and I are vice chairmen of the Commission; and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is the other Member of the Senate who is a member of the Commission. We are proud of what we have been able to accomplish. We are proud of the monument. We are proud to be able, at a time when the world needs it so much, to present to the world an evaluation of our great Jefferson. We trust that what will be said during the year will contribute to the coming of the new world which he tried so hard to bring into existence.

Let me suggest even to the Members of this august body that the next time they get a $1 silver certificate they turn it over and look at the reverse of the seal of the United States and refer to the Latin and get the spirit of the founding fathers, the spirit of Jefferson, and understand what they were trying to do, and perhaps even go so far as to interpret in some little way some of the remarks I have made today. Let me suggest that they study the words printed on the reverse of the certificate—the motto in which all of us should be interested: "Annuit coeptis novus ordo seclorum," or, in the English, "God bless our undertakings, God bless our beginnings, in this new order in the earth." That is the way to look at Jefferson, and that is the way to look toward the problems which we have facing us from time to time.

I am not afraid of American history. I hope and trust that the appeal being made for a more thorough study of American history will succeed.

Let me tell the Senate one thing about the Jefferson Monument, which is unique in the field of art. The design is old; the monument is a copy of what was Jefferson's favorite building in the world, a copy of the rotunda of the Pantheon at Rome. The architects of the monument, like all architects, of course, made suggestions for the pediment. They proposed for the pediment the figure of an eagle, or the figure of a goddess, or the fascist sign, or other symbols. I objected to the symbolic representation of anything in American history, when history is better than symbol. After 3 years of struggle the Commission let us have history depicted in the pediment. Every boy and girl who goes to see the monument will look up at it, and say, "Who are those men?" The five men shown there are the five members of the Continental Congress appointed as a committee to draft the Declaration of Independence. The effort was not an individual one; there were five men. Congress was functioning, and a committee was appointed. The members of the committee were not unanimous in their report; there was a minority report. Who are the five men? The committee was national in its make-up: Jefferson, of course, who was the chairman; Franklin, from Pennsylvania; Roger Sherman, from Connecticut; John Adams, from Massachusetts; and President Livingston, of Kings College, from New York. I will not say who was the one who dissented from the majority report; on that score I refer the Senate to history. However, Mr. President, let me say that there was not the wonderful unanimity of opinion which we always associate with the proceedings of that time. Those men were doing what we of today are doing.

When the question of the annexation of Louisiana was put to the Senate, believe it or not, there were seven Senators who actually voted against it. We can feel all right about being "out of harmony" with things. We are consistent with the past. But, Mr. President, may it never be said of one of us here that we would ever have cast our vote against the Louisiana Purchase, for example, or some enterprise equally important. Things just as important are looming on the horizon.

Mr. President, on April 13, President Roosevelt will represent the Nation in paying homage to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. The bicentennial ceremony and the new memorial building are the outward signs of America's tribute to one of its greatest founding fathers. As we know, the Jefferson Bicentennial Commission has planned for more than that. It has had the entire year designated as Jefferson's year, in the hope that there will be deeper interest in the meaning of Jeffersonian philosophy than ever before. Those who venerate Jefferson, as I do, are hoping that the people will someday realize why this man, who had nothing of the demagog in him, was a supreme advocate of the people's cause. When we, as a Nation, become aware of the full significance of the Jefferson Memorial, forming the third and last principal memorial in our Capital City, when we understand Jefferson's place in the triad of our American great—Washington, Lincoln, and now Jefferson—our conception of democracy will be richer than ever before.

By strange coincidence, Jefferson's fight against bigotry and oppression is the same fight in which we are now engaged. His enemies were different men, of course. But they were, after all, only incidents in the spiritual battle which Jefferson waged. He called them "Monarchomen" at home; he called them Caesars or Bonapartes abroad. Jefferson's habit was to take issue with tyrants wherever they were, whenever he could. That spirit behind Jefferson's fight is our own spirit. Where ours is sometimes confused, and inclined to stop short of necessary consequences, his was firm. Once having seen an issue of principle, Jefferson hardened like steel, and stood ready to make his fight complete.

The spirit of Jefferson's fight is hard to define, although in some mysterious

way it has already become part of our heritage. It borrows something from the ancient stoic "cosmopolitan citizen." It partakes of the liberties of Anglo-Saxon law. It is suffused by the equalitarianism of the French Revolution. It is the very language of the enlightenment, but tempered, made into native idiom suited to our American sense of realism and practicality. It is a spirit of revolt against those who would "draw the cords of power as tight as they could" around the necks of their victims. That spirit of freedom and justice, working in one's own home or in action far afield against the Barbary pirates of every age, is instinct with a mighty truth. Jefferson called it a palpable truth. He phrased it like this:

> That the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God.

This truth, I think, is the keynote to Jefferson's political testament. Is it not also the conviction of all Democrats today? This is the moral of democracy's warfare against the Axis Powers, who have amply shown their boots and spurs. They dare not claim them by the grace of God.

It would not be right, however, to remember only the persons and issues which Jefferson opposed. He was virtually driven into fighting by stubborn evils around him; but he was a complex man, and possessed the gentlest of natures. He was attached to everything good and with a devotion amounting to natural piety. No figure on the American historical scene has had a more genuine understanding of moral values. Morality was the heart of human life for Jefferson Moral manners had a chance for perfection provided society did not become obtrusive. If things had turned out as Jefferson wished, we should be living in a world where neighbors were bound in affection and common work to neighbors; wards to wards; counties to counties; States to States; nations to nations; and the "family of nations" would then be the last triumph of harmony and reason in worldly affairs. The morality of man would be a pattern for government; the morality of governments a test and proof of the morality of man.

Clearly Jefferson's vision was a vision of peace. "Peace is my passion," he had avowed. He would have liked to take his peace quietly, in the privacy he coveted. But the simple mode of life for which Jefferson yearned—his family, farm, and books—was seldom his lot. The difficulties of public service and the burdens of leadership filled his life with a thousand complications. He sometimes rebelled against ties which bound him, but passing moods never made him forget his mission. Peace was the basic value. It was the ground in which all virtue, all happiness, all civilization was rooted. No role a man might choose could be more freighted with personal trouble and mistrust than this one was, and none in Jefferson's Christian scheme of values could be more worthy.

The embargo should be seen as only one detail, one device in this strategy of peace. It brought a climax of scorpion abuse upon the head of the 65-year-old President. But Jefferson was used to abuse and ready to pay for his "passion for peace." There are times, however, when barbarism is afoot in the world and the passion for peace is powerless before it. The experiment of the embargo having failed, Jefferson concluded sadly, "the nineteenth century dawns with the vandalism of the fifth."

Despite these extraordinary proofs of Jefferson's service in the cause of peace, he was never once in his career associated with the disgraceful banner of "peace at any price." He had known, ever since the days preceding the Declaration of Independence, that some wars were justified in the sight of God and mankind. Where the issue is self-preservation, where the issue is the freedom and responsibility of men, there is no choice but fight to the death. The aged statesman's defense of the French Revolution, many years after the event, still has a formidable sound. He stated solemnly:

> Rather than it should have failed I would have seen half the earth desolated; were there but an Adam and Eve left in every country, and left free, it would be better than as it now is.

Let us remember, too, that the man who justified the sacrifices for peace was unrelenting about the sacrifices necessary for defending freedom. He spoke of the heavy price paid for instituting representative government in some countries, and instead of lamenting the cost, urged that free government be spread throughout the world. Listen to his words and see how prophetic they are:

> To attain this * * * rivers of blood must yet flow, and years of desolation pass over; yet the object is worth rivers of blood, and years of desolation. For what inheritance so valuable, can man leave to his posterity?

What is the object like, which Jefferson considered worth rivers of blood? It is nothing less than the preservation of good will; keeping open the channels of liberty, opportunity, education, and progress. But the object has two sides: at home, and abroad. At home, the object is harmony, order, protected civil rights, truth, government by the elected representatives of the people. Abroad, the object is peace, cooperation, a pattern of decent dealings between nations, justice.

When Jefferson came to the logical conclusion of his belief in the value of each individual person, he saw revealed the principle of federation. Federation had integrated America. We had applied it more widely than Europe at that time, and perhaps most widely in all the world for peaceful purposes. An Albemarle County farmer, for example, was not only a member of his county, and a native Virginian, but equally a citizen of the united American States. The associated States became the Nation. The dynamic push of this principle is inescapable: it ends in the federation of the sovereign states of the world. Just as membership in your county is perfectly compatible with membership in your State, so citizenship in one country implies no conflict with citizenship in the international community.

History records the care with which Jefferson tried a policy of isolation for his country. He learned so handsomely from his mistakes, however, that one wonders why the world has not learned with him. He saw that the health of Virginia farmers and Massachusetts merchants was an intricate function of the prosperity of other civilized nations. In his plain way he put the theory of interdependence on the agenda for political thinkers, by saying:

> Could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce, and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the number of mankind would be increased, and their condition bettered.

Jefferson said this of commerce and physical welfare. We are all familiar with the eloquence he brought to this theme as it involved the progress of knowledge and the arts of civilization.

In this war America stands beside the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and workers of the United Nations, to annihilate the most dangerous barbarism in all history. Jefferson's deep faith in our destiny should light our path and lighten our task. What he imagined as a possible cosmic union of the future, the blood and mire of the battlefield has almost forced into existence. Now we know only too well that the power, health, and intelligence of our British, Chinese, and Russian allies are a vital concern to us. The foundation for a Federation of Nations is already here. There is now a real chance for banding together one day on a world-wide scale. When we do so we may achieve exactly what banding together did for some straggling colonies along the eastern seaboard of North America in the days when Tom Jefferson was a young man.

Jefferson claimed that honest men could make no compromise between systems based on force and those based upon the will of the majority. That was a profound perception. There can never be good will and abundant opportunity at home when there is slavery, famine, and forced labor abroad. When men have been reduced to servitude, lacking will and soul, lacking even the capacities to act in their own behalf, they have been pushed alive into the land of the shades. They have been cheated of the functions of the living. Jefferson raised a great line of thought when he wrote, from Paris, asking "whether one generation of men has a right to bind another?" He knew the answer, and gave it quickly: "The earth belongs in usufruct to the living." The land belongs to the living for them to use. When the men in a land are slaves, the land is not theirs. One reason we must fight this war

through is to stop this violation of the prime social right.

Jefferson often stated that there was but one code of morality for men and for the family of nations. The land belongs to the living within a nation, and only a peaceful family of nations can tend this right. Take the solid basis of the right to work, to earn sufficiency, to security, which is implied in the land to the living theory. Combine it with the federated family of nations ideal. Together you have the spearhead of Jeffersonian vision for us today.

It will be our job, in cooperation with our mature and experienced allies, to recruit more and more land for the living after this war. We shall need strength, singly and together, to resist temptation first. None of us can afford to acquire territory for permanent empire; it is not practical and it is beyond the pale of morality. The Far East, with its subject millions, must come into its own—but justly—on the principle of majority rule, reason, order. The torn countries of Europe, the desolated places of Africa must be healed and helped on the road to political convalescence. If it takes provisional mandates to do this, or any other constructive control, the United Nations must be willing to see it through. A federated union of democracies cannot be forged without titanic work and inspired plan. In time even the enemy lands must, for selfish reasons, if no other, be put within the great circle of free society.

These are some reasons why we indeed have occasion to remember Thomas Jefferson in the midst of our trials. Unique American statesman that he was, his citizenship in the world brought us its true riches—wisdom, invention, purity of heart. The day we mark his two-hundredth birthday is an important day. The day America lives in the recognition of his spirit and labors in the service of his ideals is a day of hope for the society of men.

Mr. President, on Sunday last I delivered an address to a group of people in Carnegie Hall, New York City, who believed that something should be said in an attempt to overcome the propaganda of the Axis Powers in trying to divide the members of the allied group. I closed that address with a poem written in a far-off land, but which breathes so completely the spirit of America, and the spirit of Jefferson, that I cannot refrain from reading it here and using it as the closing of my remarks. The poem is as follows:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer the pending bill (S. 660), with the accompanying message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the merits of the pending measure again today, beyond reiterating my support of the Bankhead bill; but ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the following telegram which I have just received from Dr. C. O. Wolf, of Ottawa, Kans., President of the Kansas State Farm Bureau.

There being no objection the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS., *April 6, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

Kansas Farm Bureau Board of Directors in session today urgently recommend passage of Bankhead bill notwithstanding veto of President.

O. O. WOLF, *President.*

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that this message from the Kansas Farm Bureau represents the views of the majority of Kansas farmers, and I believe of the majority of the people of Kansas.

I believe that the purpose and effect of the Bankhead bill have been misunderstood and even misrepresented. The measure does not propose to increase the parity price on any farm commodity. It only prohibits the executive branch of the Government from lowering parity prices below the parity established through laws already passed by Congress and approved by the President. I look forward to the ultimate passage of the bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for a brief period of time for the purpose of making some observations on the matter under discussion. I do so because reference has been made to the historical significance of the discussion on price legislation in this body during the past 2 or 3 days.

The historian of the future will write the story of this period in the light of our legislative activities. He will find significance in the remarks of the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the remarks of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], because they are a part of history in the making.

The Senator from Iowa called attention to the criticism by certain newspapers of the efforts of farmers to achieve a return on their efforts in the form of recoupment for wages paid. I recall, for the purpose of the record, that one of those newspapers recently carried on its front page a statement that it was raising its rates to subscribers so as to make up for added costs of production, which, of course, include all labor costs. Historians of this period may ask why the Senate questioned the right of farmers, for instance, to recoup themselves for wages paid.

The price control law of January 30, 1942, was our first real effort at control of general prices. An amendment, called the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, contained a provision that it was not to be construed to authorize the regulation of rates charged by any public utility, or rates charged by any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper.

So as we debate the question of price control, we face the fact that two major enterprises in the United States, the press of America and the public utilities, came to Congress, as interested groups, and secured exemption from price control. I am not indicting anyone; I am merely reciting history. If anyone believes that I am misstating the facts I hope he will rise at this moment, and I will gradly yield the floor for a correction.

I repeat that I am merely reciting legislative history in saying that these two groups, representing probably one of the largest aggregations of capital investment in the United States, came to Congress and sought and received special consideration in that they were not brought under the Price Control Act. We refrained from any attempt to prevent them from raising their rates and charges for services rendered and products sold. I do not believe that any Member of this body will disagree with that statement because we are all fully aware of it being done by consent of the Senate and House.

A somewhat belated effort was made to backtrack on the first 1942 provision of the law, by an act which was passed and approved on October 2, 1942. In that second act the Congress, including our own body, said that no public utility could generally raise its rates, without 30 days' notice to the President. It would require a wizard of words to find much real authority to control utility rates in this ladylike language.

In the bill of October 2, 1942, to which I have referred, will be found the following language:

No * * * public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President.

How gentle we were. We merely required them to give notice that they were going to raise their rates.

The Senator from Michigan who is a very able gentleman with a fine mind, said this morning that he would not take upon his shoulders any shred of moral responsibility for supporting any step which might be inflationary, and that he would join in fighting anything of that character.

I understand his viewpoint. I am not making an argument at the moment, I am merely trying to read into the RECORD a little history which will be examined by students of the future who will try to understand our legislative actions. Raising utility rates would certainly add to

the cost of living of all of us. I know my friend from Michigan would agree with this conclusion.

The President, acting under the act of October 1942, sent representatives of the O. P. A., one of his agencies, before a public-service commission in the District of Columbia to protest a rate increase by the Potomac Electric Power Co. Their argument was that a rate raise would be inflationary because it added to the general cost of living. If one pays 5 cents a kilowatt-hour for electric energy in his home instead of 3½ cents, that increases his cost of living precisely as paying 5 cents for a loaf of bread instead of 3½ cents increases the cost of living. I know there are gentlemen who may not be able to bring themselves into agreement with that obvious truth, but it is a truth.

I am going to discuss a little later on this floor the position of the utilities in this matter of increases to pass along to consumers the added cost of war. It ought to be interesting to us because we are discussing the very fundamental and identical principle of a producer of another vital commodity passing along the cost of production of it to the public. The position of the Potomac Electric Power Co., in common with the position of other utilities concerning which we legislate, was that it had a right to pass along to the consuming public every single penny of its cost of operation, every conceivable form of operating overhead expense, including every penny of the taxes it paid to every public body, including the United States Government and including, of course, war taxes. Under such an agreeable arrangement, the company, as a corporate enterprise, would not pay one penny of tax. Consumers would bear the entire burden. The Treasury Department will probably be generous in the allowance of advertising costs as an operating overhead expense. So the company, in due time, will regale and titillate the Senate and the general public, with full page ads pointing out how much it has contributed to the war effort by the huge tax bills it pays, and that out of these taxes we are buying tanks and airplanes and guns for the courageous lads in Africa and in the Southwest Pacific. The ad will in no wise be frank in making it known that the light users, including Members of the Senate who have apartments, pay in their light bills all the taxes which the company says it pays.

The legal truth wrapped up in this statement is that the company by law wants to pass to the consuming public, every penny of its operating costs, including every penny of its taxes. Every lawyer in this body knows that to be true. That is not an argument; it is a statement of fact. I do not want to labor the point, but that principle is firmly grounded in all regulatory laws affecting power utilities.

The company naturally argues that: "We cannot operate unless we are able to do that. That principle has been sanctified by State legislation, by regulatory bodies in every State in the Union which has regulatory laws; it has been sanctified by decrees of courts in every State where such laws are on the books. That principle has been sanctified by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and historically it is an established principle of law."

I have not seen it assailed in this body; on the contrary, this body has, so far as it has passed judgment on it, ratified, confirmed, approved, and given its blessing to the principle. That is one reason why I am somewhat more understanding and tolerant toward the demands of workers and farmers for a sufficient amount of return to operate a farm or maintain their bodies in sound health. If it be a farmer operating his farm, or on the basis of human efficiency, if it be a worker working in a factory for wages, I want to see him get enough in the way of return to sustain his body, which is his invested capital. In a worldly sense all he has is his body; and he must get enough wages to keep his body in good operating condition, exactly as a utility of any kind must get enough out of the public to keep the utility property in good operating condition.

A utility goes even a step further in that it may lawfully collect in rates and lay aside funds for depreciation, so that when the winds and the rains and the sleet and ice wear out the system, the company has collected from the consumers enough to reproduce its property for the private owners. We make no such careful provision for the average worker, unless it be that by workmen's compensation acts we give him something for his broken and battered body, or set up a limited retirement system, which is a sort of effort to achieve the same thing as a depreciation fund. I want to comment later on this question, when the Potomac Electric Power Co. controversy is settled, for it has great significance. It is going to be a very interesting story, both to the workers and the farmers, and I hope that I shall be able to enshrine it in the RECORD in such fashion that it will be thoroughly understood by those interested in the various phases of price control.

I am wondering now what reception Congress might give the kind of a formula I am about to describe if it were applied to farm production in the United States. Suppose, as Members of the Senate, we were called upon to vote upon it. What would our attitude be? In order that Senators may contemplate this hypothetical principle at close range, I shall read into the RECORD a supposititious bill and assume that the Senate was to consider and to vote on it. Suppose we were asked by the so-called farm bloc to vote for such a principle. In reading this imaginary farm bill, I want to call attention to the fact that billions upon billions of dollars of business property come under this very price formula.

Captious critics of this theory would raise one objection; they would say the mechanics of enforcement would probably be too difficult. I want to say that we need not pass judgment on the mechanics of enforcement, because Congress would never pass such legislation, and it would be a work of supererogation to criticize it on that basis. All that need be done is to contemplate the principle of establishing prices to the public now approved for selected utility groups. If they oppose workers getting enough to take care of themselves decently, to keep their family life on a normal, decent basis, or the farmer getting enough to keep his farm going, how can they justify recapturing from the public all their costs of every kind, including all their taxes.

Read this imaginary law for farmers and recall that private power utilities have all that this formula suggests: "No maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any agricultural commodity, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will provide for the producers of the agricultural commodity a fair return for such commodity and for the property utilized in its production. For the purpose of determining a fair return for such commodity and such property, consideration shall be given to the elements and factors ordinarily taken into consideration in determining the earnings and regulating the rates of public utilities, and such fair return shall be fixed on a basis which is as nearly similar as is possible to the basis ordinarily used by regulatory bodies for fixing the rates which may be charged by public utilities."

I know that no such principle of law would ever be adopted, and yet, Mr. President and Senators, workers and farmers are certainly entitled to as much as we grant to private utilities.

The special privilege of passing along to the public all costs and all taxes and then capturing nice profits for owners affects the largest mass of business property in our business life.

Later I wish to discuss the record of the Potomac Electric Power Co. in relation to this matter, and point out that its president, in testimony a short time ago, announced that the company claimed the legal right to write into electric bills of the District of Columbia every penny of all its operating costs, including every penny of its Federal and local taxes. No wonder Uncle Sam is interested. He is paying in his own light bills the very taxes the company will hand back to him with the proud boast that it is helping with the war effort. It is a wonderful spectacle.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak only 4 or 5 minutes on the motion to refer.

The charge has often been made, when we have been considering agricultural bills, that the Senators from the South are interested only in cotton. Time and time again in the great Northwest I have heard the statement that the Senators from the Northwest should watch the Senators from the South, because they were primarily interested only in cotton.

As I view the situation, Mr. President, the great thing about the debate on the Bankhead bill has not been the President's veto, it has not been, as Mark

Sullivan said, the question of the sincerity of the President, but it has been the fine attitude of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who have led the fight for the bill, when cotton was not concerned at all, when at the most only corn—and wheat, to a very slight extent—were concerned.

The debate is significant for another reason. For the first time since I came to the Senate I find that all five major farm organizations are solidly behind one measure. So far as I know, that has never happened before. We have here the Farmer's Union, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, every one in favor of the Bankhead bill, and while the Farmer's Union has not said where it stands so far as the veto is concerned, the other four have, and the Farmer's Union not having sent word to the contrary, we can assume that they have joined the other four major farm organizations.

Who is fighting this measure? We find the American Federation of Labor and the C. I. O. against it. The only representatives of those organizations who have come to see me, the only ones who, as the distinguished majority leader put it, were out buttonholing people, were the head of the C. I. O. here in the city of Washington and some of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

I ask Senators who are in favor of the farmers, who was it who led the fight against the farmers a few years ago, when the farmers had a chance to get money during the drought at 1½ percent interest and save their homes? It was the same William Green who is still head of the American Federation of Labor, who wrote a letter to every Senator who was in Washington at that time saying that the farmer should not get money at 1½ percent. A leopard never changes its spots, and here we find him still fighting the farmer. I say, therefore, that it is no wonder that in the State of Kansas we find the farmers, who are in control there, passing legislation against the laboring men of this country, and it is no wonder that we find the example of Kansas followed in other States.

Mr. President, in the State of North Dakota the laboring men have a very small vote in comparison with the farmers. Yet the Senators from North Dakota, over a period of years, have been most sympathetic with the labor organizations.

What do we find today? There is only one labor leader who is not fighting the farmer. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a short time ago said that Mr. John L. Lewis was smart, that he was a great strategist, and the Senator intimated that we should reject the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama because John L. Lewis might get a club.

I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that I wish every labor leader in the United States were as sympathetic with the farmers as is John L. Lewis, and any time the Democratic Party does not want in its ranks John L. Lewis, who raised half a million dollars for them only a few years ago, I am sure the Republican Party would gladly welcome Mr. Lewis with open arms.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROOKS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reference to Mr. Lewis was occasioned by the fact that some of those who are advocating a motion to refer the bill thought it might be used as a club against Mr. Lewis, and I was wondering, and I still wonder, if that is the object of the motion to refer the bill—namely, that it may be pending and be used as a club against Mr. Lewis and those whom he represents, whether the threat of clubs might not be interchangeable, and that the very club they might want to use against Mr. Lewis might be used by him against them. I had no invidious remarks to make about Mr. Lewis' support of any party. As I understand, he is a very independent man; he supports whatever political party or whatever political candidate it seems to him at the time to be his duty to support. He has never been regarded, as I understand, either as a hide-bound Democrat or a hide-bound Republican, and is not so regarded now.

My reference to him has nothing whatever to do with any effort on his part to get out in the open field and find some other kind of club. I am talking about the club which was presented by the motion to refer the bill, because it could be held in the committee and used as a club against the laboring men in their demands for increase in wages. So if there is a club, it might be used by both sides; it might be used by either side; it might be an interchangeable club. That is the idea I had in mind in mentioning it at all. I still think that those who are trying to use it as a club against the working people may find it to be a club in behalf of the working people and in their interests.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that the able Senator from Alabama more than 2 hours ago answered very ably indeed the suggestion made about Mr. Lewis having a club. He answered it so ably that I am certainly going to vote with the real leader of the farmers in the Senate to refer the bill. I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to name to the Senate one farm leader who is opposed to the Bankhead measure. I ask him to name one farm leader of any standing in the country who is opposed to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not canvassed the farm leaders as to how they stand on the Bankhead bill. I know they were not unanimous at all with respect to the Pace bill, which was before the Senate a few days ago and which is the companion bill to the Bankhead bill. I have not made any effort to canvass, either by conversation or by letter, to find out what is the attitude of the men who claim to be leaders of the farmers. I have not been advised by all of them how they stand on the measure.

Besides that, Mr. President, with all respect to everyone who is a leader, or claims to be a leader, I think we should now and then exercise our own judgment concerning the wisdom of legislation. The Senator from North Dakota does not follow the dictates of all persons who try to control his vote. Probably if there had not been a farm leader in favor of this measure the Senator would have voted for it. I do not know about that, but I believe in all likelihood he would. The attitude of individual Senators ought to be controlled by their own judgment as to the wisdom of proposed legislation. When I referred to buttonholing awhile ago I was not referring to buttonholing done outside the Senate. I was talking about buttonholing done inside the Senate. I recognize the right of anyone to come here and talk to his Senator or to anyone else's Senator in regard to proposed legislation. That is a part of the right of petition which the Constitution guarantees to everyone. I do, however, deplore the habit which has prevailed for some time and which seems on the increase, that before the Senate shall have an opportunity to debate the merits of a proposition, Members of the Senate themselves buttonhole other Senators in an effort to commit them in advance, and frequently to their own embarrassment. I think Senators ought to use their own judgment and wait until they shall have themselves decided upon the wisdom of a measure before they act upon it. That is what I had reference to when I mentioned buttonholing.

Mr. LANGER. When I asked the distinguished Senator from Kentucky what farm organizations he knew that were opposed to the Bankhead measure, he very proudly stated—and it was necessary to hear him speak to know how proudly he said it—that he was a member of the Farm Bureau of the State of Kentucky. Yet, as a member of the Farm Bureau of the State of Kentucky, he now says he has not inquired with respect to the different farm leaders and their attitude toward the measure. He has not solicited them to ascertain their attitude. Yet the fact remains in the record that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has shown that every single farm leader, and that all farm organizations, are for once solidly behind this measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Methodist Church, but I do not know how all the members of the Methodist Church stand on any vote I cast in the Senate, and I do not feel it to be my duty to consult them as to how I should vote. I belong to many fraternal organizations, of which I am proud, but I do not feel that I should wait for them to state their attitude before I decide how I shall vote on pending legislation. When people of my State sent me here they expected me to exercise my own judgment, in view of the conditions which exist at the time I am expected to cast a vote. I think the Senator from North Dakota, on the whole,

and by and large, perhaps with some exceptions, takes the same position as to his duties in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to say that I noted with what pride the Senator from Kentucky read two telegrams received by him, one from a member of the Farm Bureau Federation in Kentucky, and another from a farmer of South Dakota, because they were in favor of not referring the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the telegram I read which came from my own State urged me to vote to override the President's veto, and the one I read from the farmer in South Dakota was in favor of sustaining the President's veto. They both came from farmers. I have not heard from either one of them respecting the motion to refer the bill, but I am satisfied that they would expect us to have the courage to do what we feel to be our duty in regard to the matter, in view of the situation that presents itself to us.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kentucky said a couple of hours ago that there is not a Senator on this floor who will not sincerely try to do his duty when it comes to the matter of voting on the question of referring the measure. Nevertheless, I maintain that when the farmers' organizations for the first time in years got together solidly behind a measure, as they are now, that very situation is entitled to very great weight.

In conclusion, I simply wish to say that coming from the State of North Dakota, which is 2,000 miles or more away from the States of Alabama and South Carolina, I believe the farmers of my State will take off their hats to two Senators who are not interested in wheat, one of them being but slightly interested in corn, but who are nevertheless willing to rise on the floor of the Senate and lead the magnificent and splendid fight they have led for the farmers of the entire country. I personally would be ashamed to go home and meet my farmer constituents if I did not vote to refer this measure, and if there had been a vote on the question of the veto I should have voted to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. If on yesterday, when we took up this matter, or on last Friday when the President's veto message was read, I had then moved to refer the bill and the President's veto to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry how would the Senator from North Dakota have voted on such a motion?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know how I would have voted on that motion. That is absolutely a hypothetical question. I cannot say how I would have voted.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not vote to refer the bill now except for the fact that he knows that enough votes cannot be obtained to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know about that. I have not buttonholed Senators to find out how they would vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not say that the Senator has buttonholed Senators, and I do not say that other Senators have buttonholed him, but, in view of the fact that the Senator is enthusiastically in favor of the motion to refer, I wonder how he would have voted if I had previously moved to refer the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I am not enthusiastic about the motion to refer. It will be my second choice vote. My first choice vote would be to override the President's veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why does not the Senator vote to override?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Kentucky will give me a chance to do so I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am begging that the Senator from North Dakota may get a chance to vote on that question.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Kentucky, as majority leader, can fix it up so I can vote on that question I shall certainly vote to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say that there are some Senators I cannot influence to "fix it up," and the Senator from North Dakota is one of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall vote to send the bill back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, if I had had the opportunity I would have voted to override the President's veto, not because I think such action would mean very much to the farmers of my State, and not because I think most of the farmers of my State are particularly interested in this particular piece of legislation. What the farmers of my State are interested in is to obtain sufficient labor to enable them to plant and harvest their crops. They have not been able to obtain sufficient labor, and are not going to be able to do so. The real problem confronting the farmer is that of getting sufficient help to plant and harvest his crops.

Mr. President, I think the farmers of the country are as patriotic a group as can be found in the United States. What irritates me most about the whole situation is that from the administration on down, the farmers of the country have been criticized as if they were responsible for the inflation which is with us. We have an inflation. Whether we override or do not override the President's veto, we shall have inflation in the United States. Neither the O. P. A. nor anyone else will be able to prevent it under existing circumstances.

I know, or I think I know, what is actuating some Members of the Senate. It is that if the bill is passed, the objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, labor will ask for higher wages for itself; and some Members of the Senate are afraid that passage of the bill over the veto might help John L. Lewis. I do not know why it would help him. After all, the problem of whether the miners of the country get a higher wage is a question for the mine operators and the union. I hear people denounce John L. Lewis. Let me say that I have disagreed with Mr. Lewis when he was with the C. I. O. I disagreed with him on the matter of sit-down strikes, and I told him very frankly that I thought they were un-American and that the American people would not stand for them. I disagreed with Mr. Lewis when he came to see me at one time, at the request of the administration, on the Court issue. I told him that the attempt to "pack" the Court was wrong, and I told every other labor leader who came to me and urged me to vote to "pack" the Supreme Court that, in my judgment, they were wrong and that the time would come when some of the labor leaders would be hanging onto the bootstraps of the Constitution and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Lewis says that the miners should have an increase in their wages. I do not know whether he should or not; but I say that when we are considering the wages which are paid to the coal miners we should consider the fact that they work only an average of 2 or 3 days a week during the summer months. During that time they have to live on $14 or $21 a week. A great many people say, "They are getting $7 a day; is not that enough for them?" But those who make that statement do not stop to think that the $7 a day is paid for a full workweek only during the period of time when the demand for coal is very great. A large surplus of coal is banked up at the present time.

I am as much opposed to run-away inflation as is any other Member of the Senate. I know the evils of it. I have seen what has happened. I saw what happened to Germany. I was in Germany when the German inflation was under way, when the German mark went from 4 marks for $1 to 20 marks for $1. Then within a month, I saw it go from 20 marks for $1 to 40 marks for $1. Then, within 2 weeks, I saw it go to 60 marks for $1, and then I watched it go from that, until it took almost a billion German marks—it seems incredible, but it is true—to buy a postage stamp with which to send a letter from Berlin to Washington, D. C. I do not want to see that sort of thing happen in these United States.

One thing which we must bear in mind when we talk about the farmers, and one thing which the labor leaders should bear in mind, is that it is necessary to have food, and that the farmer and his wife and his children are the ones who produce the food. If we do not allow the farmer a price for his products sufficiently high to enable him to hire labor and to pay higher wages to the labor he hires, how are we going to obtain the food we need? I think the labor leaders are making a serious mistake when they come to Washington and buttonhole Senators and urge them to vote against having the farmer get a decent price for his products. The farmer works, not 8 hours a day or 10 hours a day, but from early morning until late at night, and so does his wife, and so do his children. They work morning, noon, and night—all day, and sometimes late into the night—in order to produce the food needed by the very people who are complaining about them and who are urging that the Senate sustain the veto

to the bill, so that the farmers will not get higher prices for their products.

If there should be a sit-down strike by the farmers of the country, how could the laboring people live? If the farmers were to have an 8-hour day, how could the laboring people in the cities procure the food they need?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has mentioned the farmer's income. I should like to refer to testimony given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The testimony was given last Wednesday by Donald E. Montgomery, consumer's counsel for the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers, C. I. O. Mr. Montgomery testified as follows:

> The estimates of the Department of Agriculture for 1942 indicate that half, the lower half, of the farm population did not break even on a cash basis in 1942. Their living expenses—and God knows they were miserably small—were larger than their cash income in that year.

Mr. Montgomery further testified that a break-down of the farm incomes showed that three-fourths of the farm families of the country had an income of approximately $177 per capita a year, and that half of them had an income of only $495 to $500 per family, or about $100 per capita a year.

Then the following occurred:

> Senator AIKEN. According to your figures, the lower half, or 15,000,000 people, are living on farms which have an average cash income of only something like $100 per capita?
>
> Mr. MONTGOMERY. $495 or $500 per family.
>
> Senator AIKEN. And isn't that the largest group of low-income people we have in the country today, and isn't that one of our very most important national problems?
>
> Mr. MONTGOMERY. Undoubtedly. And in this group of low-income families that I referred to here in my statement, probably a larger proportion of them are receiving less income than those in the city, although there are still a great many in the cities, who, when you take the rent they have to pay, $23 or $27 a month for a few congested rooms, and the city food prices they have to pay, they are in just about the same kind of shape as some of those folks on the farm we are talking about.

The man who gave that testimony, Mr. Montgomery, is a representative of the C. I. O., not a representative of the farm organizations. He testified to the pitifully small income received today by three-fourths of the farm families.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his contribution.

Let me say that, although I do not know what the situation is in other States, I do know that in my State the farm organizations and the farmers generally have favored high wages for the laboring people, and have never opposed decent wages for them. They have felt that if the laborer got good wages he would have more money to spend for the things the farmers produce.

Yet, as I said, now when the farmers ask for a little higher prices for the things they produce, so that they can hire labor in competition with the manufacturers who are operating under war contracts providing for cost of construction plus profits of 10 percent, we find that immediately the heads of the labor unions are opposed to having the farmers get any higher prices for their products.

What has caused the farm situation in this country? Yesterday, I called attention to an advertisement appearing in the Miles City Star, a daily newspaper in Montana. The advertisement stated, in effect, "Come over to the State of Washington, to Seattle, and work in a war industry. You will then be exempted from the draft, and you will get $250 a month regardless of whether you have had any experience in the work."

Can any Member of the Senate tell me where in the United States there is a farmer—a cattle grower, a sheep grower, a wheat grower, or any other kind of a farmer—who can afford to pay his help $250 a month and live? He simply cannot do it.

What are such advertisements doing? Miles City is the heart of the great stock section—the sheep-raising and cattle-raising area. Where is the farmer to get any men to help in lambing, where is he to get men to take care of the sheep, where is the stockman to get anybody to take care of his stock, unless he can get a price high enough so that he can offer the laboring man enough money in competition with war industries?

One of the things which has caused inflation—let us be frank about it—is the fact that war industries have been willing to pay any price, because the more they pay for labor and for lumber and other materials, the more money goes into the pockets of the owners of the industries.

When I was in Honolulu about 2 years ago my attention was called by some labor representatives to the fact that some of the contractors in defense industries were buying cement and wasting it. They were buying lumber, using it once for forms, and then throwing it away, because the more they used the greater were their profits. Yet no Senator rises on the floor of the Senate to denounce the men who are receiving great sums of money from war contracts. Nothing is said about them. The administration is not denouncing them. The administration is responsible for the huge profits being made in the shipbuilding industry and other industries. Those are the things which are causing inflation. It is not the poor farmer and his wife and children, who are working 10, 12, 14, or 16 hours a day. I cannot understand the philosophy of anyone who says that the farmers are responsible for inflation. Anyone who knows anything about the stock business, whether he be a sheep grower or a cattle grower, knows that the price for which the farmer sells his wool has very little to do with the cost of clothing. We know very well that the price for which the farmer sells his wheat has very little to do with the cost of bread or pastry in the East; yet the argument has been made that the farmer is responsible for inflation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator will remember that testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry showed that when sweetpotatoes were selling in the South for a dollar a bushel on the farm, they were selling in grocery stores in the cities for $4 a bushel. The farmer received $1 and the consumer paid $4.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Irish potatoes were selling in Maine for approximately 60 cents a bushel at a time when the consumers in the cities were paying $6 a bushel. That was brought out in the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last fall.

The Senator will remember that there was complaint that farm prices were not what they ought to be. When we asked Mr. Henderson about it, he said that he could not establish the millennium. It was pointed out that those who bought potatoes at a dollar a bushel and sold them to the consumer for $4 a bushel were protected under the law. They had a millennium. The reason for that was, as he said, that when we enacted the law we included a provision that, no matter what the price was to the farmer, the regular practices of those who handled his commodities should not be interfered with.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to it.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I deplore the fact that labor leaders have taken the position which they have taken. They claim that they wish to make an alliance with the farmers, and that they are the friends of the farmers. Certainly the farmers generally have been the friends of labor, because they felt that if labor should receive a better wage the farmers would have a chance of obtaining more for their products.

I regret exceedingly that the administration has taken the position that the farmer is causing inflation. I think it is ridiculous for anybody to make the statement that the farmer is responsible. I believe that is the wrong approach. Consequently I regret that so many Senators who voted overwhelmingly to pass the bill immediately turn around and intend to sustain the veto. We march up the hill, turn around, and march down again whenever the whip is cracked.

What changed the minds of so many Senators overnight? Did some of the manufacturers get busy and say, "We want cheap raw materials"? Is that the reason? Was it because some of the mills wanted it? Was it because labor leaders wanted it?

Senators say that they will not be guided by somebody who asks them to vote this way or that way. The Senate voted overwhelmingly for the bill. There

were only two votes against it. Did Senators think it was right then? Did they think it was the honest thing to do then? Did they believe, when they voted for it, that it would cause a dangerous inflation which would destroy the country? Did they think then that it would give John L. Lewis a whip so that he could get an increase in wages for those whom he represents? Or did they vote blindly, without knowing what they were doing? Will Senators say that they did not know what they were doing, and that the only reason they have changed their minds is that the President sent Congress a message?

There is nothing new in the message, nothing that every Member of the Senate did not know. No new fact is stated. I will refuse to march up the hill, turn around, and march down again merely because the President sends a message to Congress saying that he does not like the bill.

We cannot blame the farmers for feeling aggrieved when they see manufacturers receiving large profits and growing rich from war contracts. We cannot blame the farmers for feeling that they have been mistreated when they see farm labor leaving the stockmen and cattlemen and going into war industries, leaving the farmers without help.

The farmers are asked to increase their output by 30 percent, and an appeal is made to their patriotism. As I stated a few moments ago, no class of people in the United States is more patriotic and more in favor of preserving democracy in the United States than are the farmers. If we are to destroy and put out of business the small farmer, we shall destroy democracy in the United States. The farmer and the small businessman constitute the backbone of a democratic republic.

Mr. President, I am sorry that it is necessary to send the bill back to the committee. If it is to be sent back to the committee I believe that the committee should hold hearings and give the whole question a thorough airing to show up the inconsistency of some of the economists in the O. P. A., and the false position taken by them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it was not my intention to make any comment with respect to the veto message, but in view of the fact that the basic commodity of corn is, in my humble opinion, the one most affected, and in view of the fact that no one on the floor of the Senate to whom I have listened has described what seems to me to be the true situation of the corn farmer in the Middle West, I believe I would be derelict in my duty as a Member of the United States Senate, and as one who comes from what is called the heart of the Corn Belt section, did I not at least briefly explain what I understand to be the true situation in the country today, insofar as the corn farmer is concerned.

Mr. President, I was a member of the House of Representatives when the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was passed by the Congress. Any of my colleagues who were Members of the Congress at that time, or any who are familiar with the farm legislation of the Congress, will recall that the act referred to was passed after the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated, on constitutional grounds, the triple A.

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is a creature of the Government and was passed by the Congress at the request of the President of the United States for the primary purpose of protecting the soil of this country which, through erosion and deterioration, and the lack of rotation of crops, had caused the best agricultural minds of the country to become alarmed at what might happen to the top soil of the agricultural sections of the Nation. The declaration of policy in the act said: "That it is hereby declared the policy of the Congress to conserve national resources, prevent the wasteful use of soil fertility, and preserve, maintain, and rebuild farm lands in the national public interest."

In the House of Representatives on February 20, 1936, in discussing the divided opinion of the United States Supreme Court in holding the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional, among other things, I said:

> Section 8 is the crux of the temporary program to meet the present emergency. An abstract of that section discloses that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments or grants to agricultural producers, based upon treatment of land for soil restoration, conservation, prevention of erosion, changes in the land, or a domestic allotment percentage. In obtaining this information county or community committees of agricultural producers may be utilized, but it is expressly stated that no one has any power to enter into a contract which is binding upon the producers. This provision was written to meet the objection laid down by the Supreme Court in the Butler case. No farmer is required to do anything under this program. He may cooperate with the committee on soil conservation and be rewarded therefor, or he may do as he pleases.
>
> The Federal Government, under this bill, is primarily interested in soil conservation and not in the control of agricultural commodities. Such control is only incidental to the main objective.

Mr. President, I repeat merely for the information of the Senate this expression which I made in the House of Representatives with respect to the soil-conservation program.

In other words, the control program, under which parity and benefit payments have been made, is incidental to the soil-conservation program. The soil-conservation program was initiated by the Government for the primary purpose of saving the soil of America for future generations. Those who were Members of the Congress at the time may recall the interesting debates we had with respect to soil conservation. China was cited frequently to show what soil erosion had done to that great nation. So, a legitimate argument can be made that soil-conservation payments in no way should be considered in connection with parity and benefit payments.

That is the position which the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have consistently taken for many years.

In other words, the Government has said "Mr. Farmer if you will protect your land for the future generations to come, we will pay you a commensurate amount for so doing."

I merely mention that in passing, because the soil-conservation payments are constantly referred to in the veto message as well as the debates here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, last September, the Thomas amendment was before the Senate—I was the only member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who voted against bringing the proposed legislation to the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Illinois said then that it was dangerously inflationary, and I also said that it would in no way help the farmers in my section of the country. It will be recalled that the Thomas amendment was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 42.

A few weeks ago when the Pace bill came before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, it was my misfortune to be absent, but after I learned that the Pace bill had been approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was reported favorably to the Senate, I immediately took the same position with respect to the Pace bill which I had taken with respect to the Thomas amendment last September. I maintained then, and I maintain now, that the Pace bill is dangerously inflationary, and that the veto message of the President upon the Bankhead bill could well be applied to the Pace bill.

I merely mention these two incidents, Mr. President, to advise the Senate and the country that the Senator from Illinois is just as much interested in the control of inflation in this country as is anyone else.

I appreciate what the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said with respect to turning loose a tornado of inflation upon the country. Both these distinguished Senators made thought-provoking speeches. Both are to be commended for the high, patriotic position they have taken.

I have also listened to other addresses. Certainly I cannot agree with those who say that inflation cannot be controlled. I know that a modicum of inflationary conditions is with us now, and I agree that we cannot turn an inflationary tornado loose, as has been suggested by some, without wrecking the economy of the home front, but I emphatically deny that what the corn farmer seeks at this moment will be the means of igniting the torch of inflation. Later on I shall submit facts and figures that convince me of the soundness of this position. I shall not discuss the wheat situation or the sugar situation; I shall discuss only the corn problem, as I see it, and I shall read certain portions of the veto message of the President as my premise for so doing.

On page 1 the President says:

> In my message of September 7, 1942, * * * I further stated: "The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. * * *

And in determining whether a commodity has reached parity, we should include all the benefits received by the farmer from his Government under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, allocable to the particular commodity. For it is unfair to give the farmer a parity price and in addition give him far more than parity."

Mr. President, that is the statement that caused me to refer as I did to the soil-conservation payments. Insofar as parity payments are concerned, we are appropriating at the present time $212,000 000 for certain basic commodities. Insofar as soil conservation is concerned, the payments on those commodities are made to every class of farmers who comply with the program. It should be understood that parity payments fluctuate. When the farmer gets a parity price for his wheat or his corn or his cotton or his rice or his tobacco, at that moment money ceases to be taken out of the Treasury of the United States and the farmer gets nothing in the form of parity payments. So today if the five basic commodities were selling for parity, it would not be necessary to take a dime or a nickel out of the Treasury of the United States to pay the parity price to the farmers who were cooperating with the program. So there would be eliminated the $212,000,000, or whatever portion thereof might be needed to pay parity to the farmer who cooperates with the program. Only two basic commodities are under parity, namely, wheat and corn.

On page 2 of the message, the President says:

In the past no one has fought harder than I to help the farmers get parity prices for their crops. With pride I recall that the parity idea was first put into law during my administration. And by the act of October 2, 1942, the farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity prices for all basic crops, not only during the war, but for at least 2 years from the 1st day of January following the declaration of the termination of the war.

Mr. President, there certainly can be no dispute about that statement. The present President of the United States has been the best friend of the farmer who ever sat in the White House. We all know about the farmer's plight back in 1932, when Roosevelt was elected. Leading agriculturists, both Democrats and Republicans, came to Washington in 1933 to talk with the President about the dire plight of agriculture. After a series of conferences he told the farmers to write a bill, and he said, "Whatever you decide will alleviate your economic troubles I will approve." The A. A. A. was the result of this conference and that was the first constructive step to aid the farmer. Franklin D. Roosevelt was the first President who demonstrated any sympathetic interest in a farmer's program. He was the first President who did not exercise his veto power on farm legislation for a period of about 12 years. During previous administrations, Republicans and Democrats alike from the great farm belts were constantly trying to put through the McNary-Haugen bill and other beneficial farm legislation but every time they passed a bill it encountered a veto by a Republican President of the United States.

Mr. President, even though the veto message on the Bankhead bill should be sustained, as it would have been if it had been voted on, the American farmers should not condemn the President of the United States on that account, because, after all, over a period of 10 years, he has been the greatest and the best friend the farmer has ever had. There is not a farmer in my section of the country who has not more money in the bank at this particular moment than he has had at any period during the last 30 years; but the farmer, like everyone else, is disturbed. He sees, as some have said, large wages being paid here and there in defense industries; he feels that he is being discriminated against, and, even though he is getting along all right, he still thinks he would like to get along a little better because someone else is earning more than he believes is justified. The President further says:

But it must be recognized that parity prices are only means to get parity income for the farmers. That income goal has been attained for the cooperating producers of all basic crops.

The word "cooperating" is exceedingly interesting, Mr. President. I shall discuss it later.

On page 5 of the message the President says:

It is difficult to forecast the actual price increase which would result under the Bankhead bill, and the estimates I have received differ widely. They all agree, however, that they will be substantial, although there is some difference of opinion as to the time when they will occur. It cannot be denied, however, that the Bankhead bill takes from the Government the power to prevent very substantial increases in food prices. That is its only purpose.

Mr. President, here is something in the message which to me is most interesting. I do not want to offer any criticism of anyone in connection with the Agricultural Committee of the Senate. However, this is another bill which has been reported to the Senate and passed by the House without any hearings. All this controversy now rages around inflation; even the President of the United States has not the facts and figures to tell exactly what is going to happen with respect to inflation, if this bill should pass and he so states in this message. Certainly the Senate has not the facts and the figures, and it seems to me that important legislation of this kind, when it comes before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee, instead of hurrying it through on to the floor of the Senate, should take some time to consider it and hold hearings upon it. Perhaps I am as guilty as is anyone else because I am a member of that committee. We have the example of this bill, and we have the example of the Pace bill, which was recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture for that very reason. Let us in the future profit by this experience.

The President further says in his veto message—

Under the Bankhead bill the price of sugar could rise a cent and a half a pound.

I have not looked into that.

He also says—

The price of bread might go up a cent a loaf and the price of flour proportionately.

I am not discussing the wheat situation or the bread situation; that is left for men who are more familiar with this problem.

He also states—

The price of corn could rise almost 10 percent, which might not necessitate, but would certainly call forth a demand for higher prices for hogs, and livestock, poultry, eggs, milk, and other dairy products. That demand would be particularly insistent in the case of poultry, eggs, milk, and other dairy products where customary feed cost ratios would be substantially reduced.

You will note the comment of the President should the price of corn rise 10 percent.

Mr. President, this is all important. I submit that no demand would be made for higher prices if this should happen. I now desire to quote some figures to prove my point. What is the situation with respect to the corn supply of the Nation? The total supply of corn in 1942–43 will be 3,660,000,000 bushels; the amount of corn to be used for feed will be 2,600,000 bushels.

The amount to be used for seed, meal, breakfast food, alcohol, and export, is 300,000,000 bushels. The remainder of the total supply to be carried over is 760,000,000 bushels.

Please follow me, Senators, on this.

Eighty percent of all the corn that is produced in this country is fed to hogs, cattle, horses, and poultry, and out of that 80 percent, 49 percent of the corn is fed to hogs, 11 percent to dairy cattle, 10 percent to beef cattle, 10 percent to horses, 18 percent to poultry, and 2 percent is used for stock in the cities.

Let us examine the parity and actual price of animals used for human consumption.

Mr. President, at the present time hogs carry an actual price of $14.67 a hundredweight. The parity price is $11.70 a hundredweight. Does anyone believe that because corn might go to the parity price, through the law of supply and demand, the producer of hogs is going to demand more for the hogs he produces? Forty-nine percent of the corn that is raised is fed by the hog producer to his hogs. There is not a chance for him to demand more. He is making today more money than ever before. His demand would be met by a flat "No" in the O. P. A.

The actual price of calves a hundred pounds is $14.45, the parity price is $10.87. The price of cattle per hundred is $12.80, the parity price is $8.73. Twelve percent of the corn is fed to cattle. Does anyone think the cattleman is going to ask for more for his cattle, when only 8½ cents more would be added to the price of the bushel of corn to feed those cattle, if it reached parity. There is not a chance for the cattleman to complain. He is in the same position as the producer of hogs.

What about chickens? The actual price of chickens is 23.5 cents a pound. The parity price is 18.4 cents. The actual price of butterfat, which comes

from dairy feed, is 50.5 cents a pound. The parity is 42.9 cents a pound. And so it goes.

There is not a single one of these commodities that is not far above the parity price, and the combined industries depend primarily upon corn as the commodity with which to produce the cattle, the hogs, and the poultry of this country. And it should be noted that these food supplies to civilians and soldiers are the basic ones.

If corn went to parity, it would not hurt anyone in this country except the farmers. The consumers are only slightly affected. We would say to the man who is selling hogs and cattle, "We are going to take from you a part of your profit involving the increase of 8½ cents per bushel in corn and give it to the farmer, who produces the corn for your hogs and your cattle and your poultry." That is all there is to this. What applies to the hog producer applies to all the other producers because their products are all far above parity.

With respect to the amount of corn that is to be used for seed, meal, breakfast food, alcohol, and exports, there are 300,000,000 bushels. The seed corn remains on the farm. The corn which goes for alcohol has no effect upon the consuming public. The corn which is exported has nothing to do with the price the consumer has to pay. So I imagine that for seed and meal a hundred million bushels of corn would be a large amount to be considered in this problem. Senators can figure what a hundred million bushels of corn at 8 or 10 cents a bushel would amount to, and how it would affect the consuming public, so far as that commodity is concerned, or insofar as inflation is concerned.

Mr. President, what is involved in this program is merely an economic and equitable adjustment among the farmers themselves. That is all that is involved. It will not injure the consumer one iota, in the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois.

The irony of the entire situation with respect to corn is that sometime ago a measure was passed in the Senate, also passed by the House and approved by the President, which provided that we could sell, at 85 percent of parity, the corn which the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand, for feed and alcohol purposes, but that if we sold any other corn for processing or export purposes, the Government must get the parity price for the corn.

What has happened? As a result of the impasse in Congress, as a result of the Executive decree which said that the corn farmer can get only a certain percent of parity for his corn—the corn farmer is holding his corn. He does not know what is going to happen. He knows that if it were not for the ceiling which has been placed upon the price of his corn by the Government decree, it would go to the parity price in a couple of weeks. So he is holding his corn. And what happens? The man who is raising hogs, the man who is raising cattle, the man who is raising poultry, is suffering right now because of his inability to buy corn from the corn farmer in this country. So serious is it that the Commodity Credit Corporation has been compelled to sell to certain processors some 2,000,000 bushels of corn for war purposes, at the parity price.

What an anomaly. We say to the Government, through a law, you cannot sell at less than parity the corn you have on hand as the result of taking it over under the Commodity Credit Corporation default loans. The President says by an Executive order, through the O. P. A., you cannot sell your corn for more than 94 cents a bushel.

Mr. President, that is the situation in which we find ourselves in respect to corn, and it is a serious situation. It is serious not only from the standpoint of the farmer getting another 8 cents a bushel for his corn, but it is serious from the standpoint of the war effort, and I am more interested in the war effort than any other thing. When the farmer has to sell his flock of sheep or his herd of cattle, or a carload of hogs at a time before they are ready for market—and that is exactly what he is beginning to wonder about and what he is doing—then we are just losing the poundage which should go into those hogs or cattle or sheep, as a result of the corn dilemma which exists in this country at the present time.

I received a message some time ago from a man living in the vicinity of Belvidere, Ill., who has 15,000 sheep, and he said, "If I cannot get some corn immediately, I shall have to sell these sheep on the market before they are ready to go on the market." That is what I am complaining about. When a man sells his sheep or hogs or cattle before they are ready to go, he is taking away the best part of the animal, so far as ultimate consumption is concerned, and it affects both civilian economy and military economy. I do not know on what basis corn was pegged at its present price by Executive order.

I repeat, Mr. President, all that is involved is an equitable adjustment among the farmers themselves, to give a little more to the man who produces and take it away from the fellow who is raising cattle and hogs and sheep and poultry. That is what we are doing, making an equitable adjustment so far as the corn situation is concerned.

There is another situation to which I should call attention. Many farmers are not cooperators with the program, and many cannot cooperate because they are not in the commercial corn-producing area.

I here and now present some figures for 1942. Bushels of corn in the commercial corn-producing area benefited by parity payments, 1,200,000,000. Bushels of corn in the commercial corn-producing area not benefited by parity payments, 970,000,000.

Sixty-eight percent of all corn is grown in the commercial corn-producing area, and unless a farmer produces in the commercial corn-producing area he is not entitled to any parity payments. He is entitled to soil conservation payments, but not to parity payments. Fifty-five percent of corn produced in the commercial corn area in 1942 received parity payments. Forty-five percent of corn in the commercial corn-producing area did not receive parity payments. Thirty-eight percent of all the corn in the United States received parity payments.

In other words, 62 percent of the corn raised in America did not participate in the parity payments because the farmers are not cooperators; some of them are not cooperators because they are outside the commercial corn-producing area, and some farmers who cooperate with the program cannot receive parity payments on every bushel they produce because we have what is called an acreage quota. For example, if I have 100 corn acres in Illinois and I am a cooperator I am told, "Senator, you can plant the 100 acres, and based on an average of 5 years we will give you a quota of 50 bushels per acre." If my land produced the next year 75 bushels per acre I do not receive any parity payments on the excess over 50 bushels per acre. So that excess is not figured in making up the payments.

Mr. President, only 38 percent of the farmers in the country, so far as the producing of corn is concerned, are benefiting by the parity payments. That is something that should be called to the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I have said all I wanted to say with respect to corn in Illinois and in the Midwest. The figures were of such importance to me that I thought I should lay them before the Senate of the United States at the present time for whatever they are worth.

I am alarmed so far as the corn situation is concerned. I honestly believe that sooner or later there must come an adjustment of some kind with respect to the corn if we expect to release it from the cribs and the warehouses and the bins where it is being held at the present time.

Mr. President, as I view the situation it is serious. I have talked on the subject before. I have given out statements to the press along this line. I have discussed the matter with men high in the Department of Agriculture and high officials in the Government, and have tried to give them the benefit of my advice, and whatever wisdom I may have upon a serious situation with respect to the way corn is being handled in the country today.

I sincerely hope that the corn dilemna of the Nation will soon be solved. It will do much to restore confidence and aid the war effort in the Midwest, because it is just—it is fair, it is right—and it is not inflationary.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote upon the motion. Hence I shall speak very briefly.

The bill passed the Senate on the 25th of last February. I was not present on that occasion. I was in my State of Oklahoma. It was passed by a vote of 78 in favor to 2 against. Had I been present one more vote would have been cast in the affirmative and the record of

the vote would have shown at least 79 to be for the bill and 2 against it.

After the bill was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House, it was considered by the House, and as I remember the bill received a favorable vote in the House in the ratio of 4 to 1. The bill then went to the President and the President has returned the bill with his objections. We have now before us the President's veto message. Under the Constitution, when a bill is returned with the objections of the President the House which originated the bill is presumed forthwith to reconsider the bill. We are now reconsidering the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill has to do with subsidies. The bill had for its purpose the elimination of subsidies. As I construe the bill and its provisions the Members of this body who voted for the bill voted to get rid of subsidies, and the vote on that bill was 78 to 2. So it is my construction now that those who are in favor of subsidy are against the bill, and those who are against subsidies are in favor of the passage of the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President.

Mr. President, I am against subsidies, and I regret that I will not be permitted to cast a direct vote upon that issue. The motion pending before the Senate is to refer the message, which carries the bill with it, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for further consideration and report.

Mr. President, the fight here today and the fight made yesterday is nothing more than a prelude to a fight which is yet to come. When the agricultural appropriation bill shall come before this body it probably will carry items in the nature of subsidy appropriations to enable the Department to make subsidy payments, either in the form of parity payments or soil-conservation payments or incentive payments to farmers who cooperate to the end that they may have a full parity income. So, Mr. President, it is the purpose of this bill, or the effect of the bill, if left in its present form, to keep the price of corn and the price of cotton and the price of wheat down below parity price—that is, to the farmer.

If the Department can keep the price of corn below parity, and can keep the price of cotton below parity, and can keep the price of wheat below parity, then the Department can come to the Congress later on during this session and ask Congress to appropriate money to enable the Department to make payments to these farmers, making up the difference between the price they receive and the full parity price.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that if this bill had become law, eliminating as it does parities, that the price of cotton would soon reach parity, and it is not far from parity now. The price of wheat would soon reach parity. It is not far from parity now. Likewise the price of corn would soon reach parity, and it is not very far from parity now.

So that if the bill should have become law the country would have known that we were against such subsidies, the parity prices of these commodities would have been reached, and there would be no occasion for the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate to carry items in the forthcoming bill to make up the difference between what the farmer receives for his commodities and the full parity price.

Mr. President, I am against subsidies. I am against a parity subsidy. I am against the incentive subsidy. I am against the soil-conservation subsidy. For that reason I was for the original bill. But I was in my home State at the time that the vote on it was taken, hence I could not vote upon it. The RECORD shows that had I been present I would have voted for the bill.

If this bill fails of final passage, which means if the veto is sustained, then many farm prices will be hammered down by means well known to the agents of the Government, and then in order for farmers to secure parity income they must accept subsidies to make up the difference between the prices received and the full parity prices.

From whence will these subsidies come? The answer is from the United States Treasury.

Where will the Treasury get the money to pay the subsidies?

The answer: There are but three possible sources: First, from taxes, which means that the people must pay additional taxes to raise more funds to pay subsidies to farmers; second, from funds derived from the sale of stamps and bonds; however, to get funds from the sale of stamps and bonds the people must buy more bonds and stamps. Third, from funds secured through the creation of credit in the banks of the country. This will mean that additional bonds will be printed and thereafter deposited in the banks, thereby creating the additional credit necessary with which to make the subsidy payments.

This program of a continuation of subsidies means that the people shall be required to pay more taxes, buy more stamps and bonds, and to pay more interest on more bonds to pay subsidies to farmers.

Again I say I am opposed to subsidies. At this time subsidies are not necessary and, in my opinion, they cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that this is simply the prelude to another fight which will come along later. This does not settle the issue. This bill which we have before us will be followed by another bill, as I understand, now on my desk before me, proposing to increase the salaries of the Federal employees of the Government. A short time ago the Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of certain of our Federal employees by 10 percent. A little later the Congress passed a second bill raising the salaries of postal employees by a considerable sum.

I understand that just as soon as the pending motion and the pending bill shall be disposed of, Senate bill 635 will come before the Senate. According to the committee report—

> The major purpose of S. 635 is to provide employees of the Government with additional compensation for the purpose of enabling them to meet wartime living costs.

We also have on the calendar House bill 8160. Both bills relate to the same subject and have for their purpose an increase—by the payment of overtime compensation—in the salaries of the public officials and employees of the Government. There are approximately 2,000,000 of them. If those bills are passed and if the salaries of Federal employees are raised on the average $300 per employee, we can determine what will be the resultant increase by multiplying 2,000,000 by $300; and we arrive at a sum of approximately $600,000,000.

Mr. President, there seems to be no trouble in getting through the Congress a bill raising salaries. There seems to be no trouble in getting through the Congress a bill for the benefit of certain classes of our citizens; but when there comes before the Congress a bill seeking to give the farmer some increase in income—not an enormous profit, perhaps not a profit at all, but to permit the prices for his products to go up to parity—we have difficulty and trouble.

Mr. President, we have a way of measuring prices and values. During the present discussion we have heard much said about the spiral of inflation that the country is in. I think the record should be made clear from time to time as to just what is the status of the inflation movement. On various occasions I have taken the floor to make the RECORD clear as to what is the status of inflation in the country. During the last 11 months beginning on the second day of May, 1942, and continuing to the present time—and that is a little more than 11 months—the general price level has risen 4.6 percent. I want that statement to appear twice in the RECORD; so I repeat that, since the 2d of last May, more than 11 months ago, the general price level in the country has risen only 4.6 percent. That rise has been at the rate of 1 mill a week, Mr. President. That is based upon wholesale prices, of course. Some 900 wholesale prices are considered in making up the price index; and of course wholesale prices are to a large extent based upon the prices of raw products. Farmers produce raw products; they produce wheat which must be processed; they produce corn which must be processed; most of the commodities the farmers produce must be processed before they reach the consumers. So I take it that the commodities considered in making up the wholesale price index are, in the main, raw products.

Therefore, Mr. President, the farmer does not share and has not shared the benefits of the so-called increase or so-called inflation. I contend that a price level which can be held down in times like these to a rise of 4.6 percent in 11 months does not mean that we are in a spiral of inflation, and I contend that so far as wholesale prices are concerned we have but little inflation. The inflation comes in the prices which the processors and retailers have added to the wholesale prices, and, of course, it is true that the processors and retailers receive as much, if not more, of the consumer's

dollar than is received by the men who produce the raw materials.

So, Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, the present situation is simply a prelude to a fight which will come later on. If the President's veto of the pending bill shall be sustained, nothing will have been settled, because the moment the Senate receives from the House the bill which it is contemplated will provide for the making of subsidy payments for agriculture, that bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and there the subject will be reexplored, and from that committee a report will be made to the Senate. If the bill, when reported, carries an item for subsidy payments, that issue must be fought out on this floor. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I say that unless I hear arguments which I have not yet heard, I shall vote against the inclusion of any subsidy payments of any kind or character in the forthcoming appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. Merely so that the RECORD may be correct, for the purpose of the discussion which will occur on the bill following the pending bill, let me say that I believe the Senator referred to it as a bill for the increase of pay of civil-service employees, and estimated that it might involve an increase of $300 a person for 2,000,000 employees, or a total pay increase of $600,000,000. I want the RECORD to show that the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, and as it will come before the Senate, retains the present rates of pay for Federal employees doing overtime work. Although the bill as introduced involved a $200,000,000 increase, as reported to the Senate it does not change the rate of pay. So far as the increased cost under that item is concerned, it amounts to only about $5,000,000. I merely wish to make that statement in order to have the RECORD made correct at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator make that statement. I know he is a member of the committee, and I know that any statement he makes is accurate. I am glad to have the RECORD made correct.

However, Mr. President, I had in mind a statement of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] that if the bill is passed, it and other bills previously passed will have the effect of raising the salaries of all Federal employees between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000 a year.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think the substance of the Senator's statement is correct. The bill we passed last December continued in effect about $200,000,000 of overtime pay previously authorized, and added approximately $200,000,000. There is the difference. Altogether the bills provide for increases amounting to approximately $600,000,000. The bill which is about to come before the Senate for consideration provided for an increase of approximately another $200,000,000 as it was introduced, but as it comes before the Senate from the Committee on the Civil Service this increase is eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the extent that I might have inferred that the one bill would raise the salaries $600,000,000, I was in error. The bill which shortly will come before the Senate will assist in raising the total salaries $600,000,000; and it, together with bills previously passed, will have the effect of raising the salaries some $600,000,000.

Mr. President, there is no charge that that increase is to be inflationary. It gives 2,000,000 people more money with which to buy less goods; and to my mind such a proceeding is a highly inflationary one. There is no charge that either one of the bills, taken either separately or together, will be the cause of further increasing the prices in the country, which in the end is inflation.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say, without encumbering the RECORD further, that I wish to point out that the measure passed last December was merely to bring the salaries of Federal employees approximately into line with those of all other persons in the United States, or at least nearly into line with their salaries, in order that there might be some additional allowance for the increased cost of living, even though it might not equal it fully. I believe that during the last war approximately $240 per person was added to the pay, and this time the increase amounts to approximately $300.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I appreciate the additional statement made by the able Senator; but, nevertheless, the bill does increase the salaries of approximately 2,000,000 persons; and to that extent the salary increase bills are inflationary.

Mr. President, where are we to get the $600,000,000 which we already have voted and are about to vote to our employees? I voted for the two bills which have previously been passed, and I shall vote for the one which is coming on. Likewise, every chance I get I vote to give the farmer a slight increase, along with the increases enjoyed by the other people of the country. For the industrial program which we now are carrying on, those in charge of it have been so liberal in making the contracts that the contractors—the corporations—have made so much money that some of them have become embarrassed and have voluntarily turned back to the Public Treasury a part of their profits.

On the other hand, the Congress has taken steps to enact legislation providing for the renegotiation of contracts. It is contended that already we have recovered for the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars of excess profits. It is further contended that before the renegotiation program is completed we shall have recovered for the Public Treasury at least $1,000,000,000 of excess profits. That means that the corporations, contractors, and others who have had dealings with the Government have not sustained losses but have made reasonable profits. When it comes to the farmer, however, Congress is not willing to give him even parity prices for his products.

Mr. President, there are five or six hundred thousand farmers who are not cooperators. The noncooperating farmers do not share in any of the subsidy payments. All they get for their produce is what they can secure in the market places; and when they sell their cotton, corn, cattle, or wheat on the market they get the market price, and that is all they get.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point some figures showing how the stockholders of the various corporations in the country are faring at the present time. I make the bold statement that everyone in this country except the farmer has the opportunity of making money at this time.

I have before me a statement prepared by Babson's Reports, Inc., published at Babson Park, Mass. This statement shows the names of approximately 200 corporations, the stock prices at the lowest point in 1942, the prices on March 16, 1943, and the percentage of increase from the low point in 1942 until March 16, 1943.

The first name on the list is Allied Chemical. The percentage of increase in the price of the stock of this concern from the low point in 1942 to March 16, 1943, is 31.2 percent. Let me read a few more of the items. In the case of Amerada the increase was 77.9 percent; American Can, 37.8 percent; American Car & Foundry, 68.7 percent; American & Foreign Power, 6 percent preferred, 263 percent; American Home Products, 68.1 percent; American Locomotive, preferred, 40 percent; American Power & Light, $5 preferred, 102 percent.

Mr. President, I shall not read all the figures. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the list of corporations, together with the percentage of increase in the price of the stock from the low point of 1942 to March 16, 1943. I do not ask that the values of the stocks in 1942 or 1943 be printed. I think it will suffice to show opposite the name of each corporation the percentage of increase in the price of the stock during the period mentioned. The average increase in the price of preferred and common stock during this period was 40.6 percent.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Percent
Allied Chemical	31.2
Amerada	77.9
American Can	37.8
American Car & Foundry	68.7
American & Foreign Power 6 percent preferred	263.0
American Home Products	68.1
American Locomotive preferred	40.0
American Power & Light, $5 preferred	102.0
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	38.8
American Tobacco B	49.1

	Percent
Atchison	93.2
Atlantic Coast Line	59.5
Bell Aircraft	106.6
Bendix	34.9
Bohn-Aluminum	82.0
Borg-Warner	57.6
Bulova	47.4
Campbell Wyant	52.6
Caterpillar Tractor	56.6
Celanese	115.9
Cerro de Pasco	34.7
Chesapeake & Ohio	50.9
Chrysler	66.3
Clark Equipment	33.0
Cleveland Graphite	64.2
Climax Molybdenum	38.0
Cluett Peabody	38.4
Coca-Cola	75.2
Colgate, Palmolive	59.8
Collins & Aikman	110.7
Columbia Broadcasting A	111.9
Commercial Credit	104.7
Commercial Investment Trust	79.8
Commonwealth & Southern preferred	113.0
Consolidated Edison	64.8
Consolidated Edison, preferred	25.6
Consolidated Oil	94.7
Continental Insurance	45.9
Continental Oil	85.3
Corn Exchange	71.5
Corn Products	36.7
Cream Wheat	85.0
Crucible Steel	46.8
Curtiss Wright	49.0
Curtiss Wright A	34.0
Douglas Aircraft	26.5
Dow Chemical	41.6
Dupont	39.1
Eaton Manufacturing	51.0
Electric Autolite	67.3
Electric Power & Light, $6 preferred	173.1
Electric Power & Light, $7 preferred	163.6
Erie Railroad	161.6
Firestone Tire & Rubber	127.0
Flintkote	105.2
Food Machinery	70.2
Gamewell	50.0
General Electric	65.1
General Foods	59.4
General Motors	61.2
General Railway Signal	73.8
B. F. Goodrich	164.3
Goodrich, preferred	65.1
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	220.0
Goodyear Tire & Rubber, preferred	62.2
Great Northern Ry., preferred	44.9
Greyhound	43.8
Gulf M. & O., preferred	89.6
Hazel Atlas Glass	27.0
Holland Furnace	131.5
Homestake Mining	50.0
Houdaille Hershey	44.0
Howe Sound	24.3
Inland Steel	33.3
International Business Machine	41.0
International Harvester	62.5
International Mercantile Marine	136.3
International Mineral & Chemical	350.0
International Nickel	40.9
International Telephone	333.0
Johns Manville	58.5
Kalamazoo Stove	180.0
Kayser Jr	105.5
Kennecott	24.6
Laclede Gas Pfd	102.1
Lambert Co	84.8
Lee Rubber & Tire	112.0
Lehn & Fink	45.0
Lerner Stores	69.5
Libby-O-F Glass	76.8
Lily Tulip Cup	46.2
Lion Oil Ref	66.2
Liquid Carbonic	62.6
Lockheed Aircraft	63.3
Loews Inc	34.8
Lone Star Cement	41.3
Lorillard, P	60.8
Louisville & Nashville	27.0
Mack Truck	20.5
Martin G. L. Co	26.1
Masonite Corporation	61.5
Mathieson Alkali	34.6
May Department Stores	47.6
McGraw Electric	76.9
McIntyre Porcupine	63.3
Mid-Continental Petroleum	88.8
Minneapolis Honeywell	74.7
Montgomery Ward	61.7
Motor Products	106.0
Motor Wheel	49.4
Mueller Brass	35.4
Nash Kelvinator	144.2
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	122.5
National Biscuit	46.1
National Cash Register	126.1
National Dairy	40.1
National Distillers	55.4
New York Air Brake	35.0
New York Central	117.0
New York City Omnibus	85.3
Norfolk & Western	21.0
Northern Pacific	161.0
Oliver Farm Equipment	126.5
Otis Elevator	54.4
Outboard M. & M	77.7
Owens Illinois Glass	38.2
Pacific Gas & Electric	71.0
Pacific Lighting	72.2
Pacific Telephone	34.5
Pan American Airways	137.1
Paramount Pictures	90.4
Parke-Davis	50.0
Patino Mines	88.8
Penick & Ford	35.2
J. C. Penney	48.2
Pennsylvania Railroad	57.6
Pepsi-Cola	172.1
Pet Milk	24.7
Phelps Dodge	17.1
Philip Morris	37.4
Phillips Petroleum	60.0
Pillsbury Flour	43.5
Postal Telegraph, preferred	115.9
Procter & Gamble	31.0
Pullman	62.0
Radio, preferred	35.0
Reynolds Tobacco B	36.2
Safeway Stores	26.3
St. Joseph Lead	48.9
Schenley	115.7
Scott Paper	57.9
Seaboard Oil	89.2
Sears, Roebuck	49.6
Servel	195.0
Sharp & Dohme	177.0
Shell Union Oil	109.9
Socony Vacuum	98.0
Southern California Edison	54.6
Southern Pacific	107.5
Southern Railway	66.0
Sperry Corporation	60.0
Square D Co	35.4
Standard Oil of California	87.5
Standard Oil of Indiana	58.8
Standard Oil of New Jersey	63.5
Sterling Products	51.8
Sun Oil	40.7
Swift Int	68.1
Texas Corporation	57.5
Texas Gulf Sulphur	37.9
Thompson Products	71.2
Timken Roller Bearing	48.8
Twentieth Century-Fox Films	152.9
Twin City Rapid Transit	254.0
Twin City Rapid Transit preferred	232.0
Underwood Ell	68.5
Union Carbide	41.2
Union Oil of California	87.5
United Air Lines	147.7
United Aircraft	44.0
United Biscuit	84.8
United Drug	102.8
United Fruit	33.0
United States Freight	154.0
United States Gypsum	65.1
United States Industrial Alcohol	39.3
United States Leather A	142.9
United States Plywood	80.0
United States Rubber	144.0
United States Rubber preferred	101.3
United States Steel	22.0
Universal Leaf Tobacco	56.7
Vick Chemical	40.0
Virginia-Carolina Chemical, 6 percent preferred	140.0
Wayne Pump	97.9
Western Auto Supply	82.4
Western Union Telegraph	44.4
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing	39.4
White Motor	52.1
Woolworth	62.8
Wrigley, W., Jr	74.4
Yale & Towne	52.8
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	26.6
Zenith Radio	190.0

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as the motion before the Senate is to refer the bill and the veto message thereon to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where the whole subject matter may receive further study, and where the bill in its original form and the veto message may be further considered and perhaps reported to the Senate at some opportune time, I shall vote for the motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go into the merits of the controversy because it has been fully debated for the past 2 days. However, since I addressed the Senate the situation has changed. We are now approaching a vote on the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope to consume not more than 10 minutes. I think we shall then be ready to vote. I know that Senators are anxious to vote.

When the price-control bill was before us for consideration one of the most controversial issues, as all Members of the Senate will recall, was what was known as the Thomas amendment, which provided that the increased cost of farm labor should be added to the parity prices.

The House approved that proposition. The Senate approved it in a different form, and the conference committee included it in the bill in the form in which it reported it, adopting an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is always devoted to the cause of the farmers, and who is always faithful and attentive when their interests are involved.

The amendment which went into the bill in conference provided that in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by the act, adequate weighing should be given to farm labor. That is the law, Mr. President, although we have not heard anything about it since it was enacted.

Instead of adding the labor costs, as Congress directed, which we all understood would result in some increases in agricultural prices, we find a movement to bring down prices and let them be supplemented by subsidy payments. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate and of the administrators of the law to that solemn declaration in the act, which was not inadvertently included,

but was included after much debate and thorough consideration by both Houses and the conference committee.

I should also like to invite the attention of the majority leader, in a friendly way, and not in any controversial spirit, to another factor in the introduction of the bill. The only order made by the President which resulted in the introduction of the bill required all agencies of the Government to deduct parity payments and soil conservation payments, which Congress had expressly declined to do, as well as all subsidies.

Mr. President, even if Congress should entertain a subsidy program and appropriate the money, what farmer would take a subsidy if it were to be charged against him—put into one pocket and taken out of the other?

The order provided that all subsidies should be deducted. Certainly parity payments, incentive payments, bonuses, and bounties are subsidies. Everything added to the income which does not come from the market, but is added by the Government, is a subsidy, notwithstanding the fact that that word has become odious and an effort is now being made to sugar-coat it by calling it an incentive payment. The result is the same.

There has been considerable discussion with relation to subsidy payments. I am not as firm on that subject as is the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I shall not take the time to go into a discussion of the question. I want the farmer to get his money in the market place, which is the proper place for him to get it. I do not want to require him to take up his time making out a lot of papers, or to have a great force of Government field agents checking the information received from him. If the market conditions, the supply and demand conditions, justify it, it is sound and just, and more satisfactory to the farmer to get his price in the market place rather than to come to the Government and ask for a check to make up the difference.

We cannot adopt a bonus, or subsidy, or incentive payment system under the order we are trying to repeal. I am calling attention to it in a friendly way because I am not so vigorously opposed to it if we can hold the prices down. I am not so strongly in favor of it. I merely mention it to show the majority leader the trouble we are drawn into today by the Executive order, in legislating on any program which seeks to change the present price situation. It has been called an incentive payment. Who will argue about it? Who will argue that under this order it must not be deducted from the parity price, or from the ceiling? Every amount which is paid in the form of a subsidy, as an incentive payment, for peanuts, potatoes, or anything else, under this order must be deducted from the parity price, and thereby bring down lower and lower the market and parity price, and especially the ceiling price.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the merits of this matter. In view of the variation between my information and that of the Senator from Kentucky about the number of non-cooperators among the farmers, I wish to put into the RECORD a statement showing that the number of farmers receiving soil-conservation payments is 5,956,206. The information of the Senator from Kentucky was that there were only 38 percent, I believe, not receiving benefit payments, and not participating in the soil-conservation program. It will be found that farmers all over the country are cooperating and participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments.

The number of farmers receiving parity payments is 5,696,930. I have a list showing commodities participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments, and the amount received for each of these commodities in 1941. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1941 the following commodities received soil-conservation payments (including soil building).

Number of farms receiving payments on these commodities not available: Cotton, corn, wheat, Irish potatoes, peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, all other tobacco, celery, commercial vegetables, general soil-depleting crops.

Number of farms receiving soil-conservation payments, 5,956,206.

In 1941 the following commodities received parity payments:

Cotton	2,553,703
Corn	1,196,094
Wheat	1,576,977
Rice	12,336
Flue-cured tobacco	274,361
Fire-cured tobacco	46,980
Other tobacco	36,487
Number of farms receiving parity payments	5,696,930

Figures not yet available for 1942 because they are still making 1942 payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The source of the information which I have just asked to be printed in the RECORD is the statistical summary of 1941, Agricultural Service and Payment Program, November 1942, compiled in the Division of Special Programs of the triple A from the reports of county, State, and regional triple A offices.

Mr. President, in conclusion I will say that I have heretofore stated that the bill about which we have been debating is here as a farmers' bill. It is not my bill, nor the bill of any other individual. The farmers, through their organizations, were disturbed by the Executive order which upset and changed the farm program outlined in the price-control law. They had been in Washington and fought these issues, and had adjusted themselves to the law as it was passed by Congress and approved by the President. The President's Executive order was then issued, and it upset and changed the program. In the interest of fairness and in justice to them, the farmers thought that the views adopted by Congress and approved by the President did not need any Executive order changing them, and that they ought to stand as the Congress, after considerable debate, had adopted them. Through their organizations the farmers brought the bill to me. I introduced it, and Senators know the remainder of its history.

When it developed yesterday that the supporters of the bill would probably be unable to muster the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the bill over the President's veto, the question then arose as to what should be done. Everyone knew that there were varying opinions concerning the facts. Everyone knew that sets of figures were being presented; even the President said so in his message. Some indicated that large amounts of money were involved, and more or less inflation. But even the President himself was unable to make up his mind and state the specific facts to Congress. The whole issue was beclouded, and we all know that extraneous factors have entered the minds of Senators in their consideration of what they should do under all the circumstances. So it was decided that the bill and the message ought to be referred to the committee, in the interest of justice, in the interest of decent and fair legislation, in the interest of historical accuracy, in view of statements being presented here from high official sources which were totally challenged, which stand challenged today, and which were challenged yesterday. They may be right, they may be wrong; I shall not go into that argument now. There are great and fundamental variations in the information given to the Senate and in the constructions placed on certain facts which have been presented, so far as the inflationary effect is concerned.

Some Senators seem to think that a few cents increase in the prices paid to farmers for a few agricultural commodities would be greatly inflationary. Some say that the only inflationary factor of great importance—and I agree with them—is the amount of money in the pockets of the people so greatly in excess of the quantity of the goods which are available. That is the great factor which threatens inflation. But these questions are all involved. Men in high authority do not even agree on what constitutes inflation, and what factors are inflationary.

In justice to the farm group, let me say that they do not bring many requests to Congress for legislation. They are usually content to accept what comes to them, with humility, patriotism, and loyalty. This program was brought before five big farm organizations. As I have pointed out, in recent history they have not agreed on anything else. They agreed on this program, not because it involved any large increase in the farmer's income. As we all knew, it involved more the source of their income than it did the amount they were to receive. But they thought it was unfair and unjust. In justice to them, in justice to Senators who will vote to recommit this bill, and who would gladly vote to override the President's veto, the farm organizations to which I have referred—and I am speaking for them by their authority—would like to have the bill sent to

the committee, in view of the controversies involving not only principles, but important facts, all of which have been developed, most of which have been developed since the bill was vetoed and returned to the Senate. What harm could result from such action? In the first place, we are not on the verge of any runaway inflation which will take place overnight, as some people thought when we undertook last October to change the price-control law.

Permit me to read one statement from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which will probably surprise a great many people who are almost ready to cry over the inflation now in effect. Inflation may come; I do not know. God knows I pray that it may not. But it does not hurt anyone to know the facts. During the past winter there were probably outrageous increases on the part of retailers in the prices of seasonal vegetables. There were severe freezes in the South which destroyed many of the vegetables and fruits which are shipped to the northern sections of the country at this time of the year. This condition probably resulted in an undue and unnecessary rise in the prices of certain commodities which go to the consumer's table.

What I wish to read is from the official issue of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on agricultural prices, a bulletin issued once every month, and distributed widely. Let me read the first few sentences:

> The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-March was 182 percent of the 1914–19 average, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today. An advance of 4 points from February 15 wiped out a decrease of 4 points during the previous month and restored the index to the level reached on January 15.

We are right now where we were on January 15, according to the official declaration of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and but for the rise in price, as they state here, as a result of the increase in the price of meat, there would have been a decrease in the last 2 months instead of wild inflation, as some people seem to thing is now prevalent.

These are the official records. Inflation may come, I do not know, but there is no harm in sending the bill back to the committee and letting the facts be developed. I am sure that no one is afraid of having the facts developed. I do not think anyone will vote against sending the bill back on that account.

Some may think they have the farmer where he cannot get out because he cannot get a two-thirds vote here at this time, and he may never be able to get a two-thirds vote. But a new issue is presented by the veto. The situation is different now, there are different facts presented.

Mr. President, I have made a motion to refer the bill to the committee, so that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may explore the whole field, bring the statisticians and economists before it, and do the best the committee—which is a good committee—can do to get the real truth of the situation. If the committee shall decide the bill should be reconsidered by the Senate, the committee can bring the bill back. I am sure there will be no hurry about it, and that the committee's conclusion will be judicially arrived at. If the committee shall decide the bill does not deserve further consideration, of course, it will not bring the bill back to the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should have a record vote on the motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Downey	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gerry	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] if present would vote "nay." I am advised that if present the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO]. If present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and I am advised the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hayden	Revercomb
Austin	Hill	Reynolds
Ball	Holman	Robertson
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Langer	Smith
Brooks	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Vandenberg
Connally	Moore	Van Nuys
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	Wilson
Hawkes	Reed	

NAYS—23

Bailey	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Truman
Burton	Gurney	Tunnell
Chandler	Hatch	Wagner
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Danaher	Kilgore	White
Davis	Lodge	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Caraway	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Scrugham
Bilbo	Maybank	Tobey
Buck	Murray	

So, Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 96, Calendar No. 158.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand it is not the desire of the Senator from Georgia to proceed with the measure today?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no intention of proceeding with the joint resolution today, but should like to have it made the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that on completion of the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96 tomorrow, which I believe will take only a few minutes, it is the intention to take up the Federal pay bill which is on the calendar, Senate bill 635. Probably a House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, but that will be the subject matter for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, in regard to the subject of history teaching in the United States public schools. This morning's New York Times contained a summary of comment among educators concerning this question. The lead of the story begins:

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS PRAISE UNITED STATES HISTORY TEST—NEW YORK TIMES SURVEY TERMED A "REAL SERVICE"—BLAME FOR IGNORANCE ANALYZED—POOR TEACHING CHARGED—OTHER PROBABLE CAUSES GIVEN AS HEAVY SCHEDULES, DISLIKE OF "ANNOYING FACTS"

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college. A charge was made that many teachers are doing a "poor job" in this field and were allowing students to "get by" with a minimum of effort.

In the study, made public Sunday, it was found that a majority of college freshmen have little knowledge about important historical events or figures connected with the United States. Seven thousand freshmen, in 36 representative colleges and universities, were examined.

Commenting on the survey, Dean William F. Russell of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared that the New York Times "has done a real service in calling to our attention the need for knowledge of American history." He remarked that at present we know "too little of it" but need to know much more.

CONDITION IS ANALYZED

"I am confident that the issue is not whether ignorance of American history is the result of the practice of teaching history, geography, economics, and civics in close relation to each other under such a title as social studies or of following the older procedure of teaching each subject separately," Dean Russell said.

Teachers College has had professors advocating each plan. Prof. Henry Johnson believed in the subject approach. Lincoln School has followed the social-studies plan.

"The real cause of our ignorance, not only in history, but of science and other fields, can be found in our short school year, our plan of four subjects taught five times a week in high school (with English, foreign language, and mathematics taking the bulk of the time), the poor pay of our teachers so that they cannot afford adequate postgraduate training, the large size of classes, and the excessive proportion of pupils taking academic rather than vocational classes.

"I am confident that if we should follow the plan of the progressive school where there is a core curriculum occupying about half of the time, devoted to the sciences, history, economics, geography, civics, and personal health and welfare; when this is required of every pupil every year; when this is taught by well-educated teachers, then the products of our schools will know enough to be good citizens."

SEES SERVICE DONE

Asserting that ignorance of the Nation's growth, institutions, and traditions is "dangerous from the point of view of the development of democracy," Prof. Robert G. Caldwell, dean of humanities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, declared that the Times' survey has "rendered a real service to American education."

Dean Caldwell placed the blame for students' lack of knowledge of American history on the teachers of the subject. In secondary schools, he said, a "poor job" of teaching can be found which allows youth to get by in the course with a minimum of effort. He charged that colleges have not all set as high standards in their history requirements as they have in mathematics and other sciences.

"The colleges and universities, yes, and the American people," he added, "are slipping in their standards. As a matter of fact, there are some that do not care for history. High schools can improve the teaching of American history by cutting down on wasted motion."

To remedy the existing situation which the Times disclosed, Dean Caldwell recommended higher standards for teachers and higher standards of accomplishments. Commenting on the questionnaire, Dean Caldwell asserted that "as a whole most questions were well chosen."

"The general impression one may gather from the survey is that American high-school youth has enough courses in history but that the students have not been held up in standards as they have in the fields of science.

"We can remedy the situation by getting better teachers with higher standards and by having the colleges adopt higher standards. I do not believe that we need any legislation for making our students more history conscious."

Observing that he was "not in the least surprised" by the results of the Times survey, Dean Alexander Baltzly, acting chairman of the history department at New York University's Washington Square College, predicted that a survey of students' knowledge of English or of any other subject would have the same results. His own students, who are largely graduates of the New York City school system, "are as bad as the rest," he said.

"In our schools there is an evident disrespect for 'annoying' facts on the part of the faculty, the curriculum makers, and the students," Dean Baltzly said. "It's so much easier to talk about a nice, long-term trend. Indeed it's an axiom in educational circles that college students are unable to read, write, or figure and that they are ignorant of geography. Of course, these students would be better prepared if high schools would eliminate the fancy stuff and teach those four skills.

"Our educational system is based on the premise that the student will read at home and will acquire some fund of knowledge independently. This is not the case, however, for many students come from homes where they do not learn the fundamentals. Why, I spend most of my time looking for English mistakes in my students' papers."

SUBJECT HELD UNSTYLISH

Dr. Andre A. Beaumont, Jr., associate professor of history at New York University, declared that the results of the survey have confirmed him in his belief that United States history has become an "unstylish" subject.

"The blame for the students' poor showing in the Times survey should be laid on the curriculum planners," Dr. Beaumont said. "Good, sound courses in American history are rare in our high schools. I do not think that the subsidiary school sciences are of much value without a sound background of political history, and I do not believe that the average high school history course could have prepared students for answering questions such as those asked on the Times questionnaire."

Revision of high school curriculums should be the first step taken to correct students' ignorance of our history, according to Dr. Beaumont. He declared that "then, when they have acquired this framework of knowledge, it will be time enough to teach them the subsidiary social sciences."

Disagreeing with Dr. Beaumont's interpretation of the survey, Prof. Clyde Eagleton of the government department at New York University, said that "students have had enough history to understand our traditions." He added that he had no use for the idea that students must be taught, in great detail, the lives and works of all the great men of the past.

"On the contrary," he held, "courses in American history should contain a lot more civics to prepare the student to become an intelligent voter. If anything, we need to put more emphasis on contemporary problems."

PRAISES AROUSING OF PUBLIC

"The New York Times has made a real contribution in arousing the public to the existing urgent need for more attention to United States history," Jacob I. Hartstein, assistant professor of education at Long Island University and Yeshiva College, declared. "Educators generally," he said, "must pay more attention to the methods and materials which contribute to a development of an appreciation of our democracy."

"This can be developed through an intimate acquaintance of our Nation's inspiring past," Professor Hartstein asserted. "This need has

never been greater nor the time more appropriate."

"American history should be taught with the idea of making the youth of the country more world-minded," Prof Nelson P. Mead, chairman of the history department at City College, declared. He pointed out that "even the most rabid isolationist must admit today that this country is destined to play a significant if not determining role in world-wide problems at the close of this war.

"A narrow nationalistic study of American history is not likely to prepare young men and women to play an intelligent part in helping to solve the serious problems which will confront the country when the war is over," Dr. Mead said.

According to Dr. Mead, American youth must become familiar with the history of the United States relations with the rest of the world if a lasting peace is to be concluded. He recalled that before the First World War the American people were abysmally ignorant concerning international relations and that our refusal to join the League of Nations was a natural result of this lack of information.

Dr. Mead condemned the high schools for their tendency to dilute American history by teaching mainly general concepts and underemphasizing familiarity with factual material. He said that only in the most recent textbooks has adequate consideration been given to the past and present relations of the United States with the rest of the world.

The findings of the Times survey merits the serious consideration of American high-school teachers, Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the higher education department of New York University, declared. It would appear evident, he said, that some high schools have given inadequate time to this subject and that some of the teachers have been inadequately prepared to teach history.

"The findings of this survey certainly provide excellent justification for greater attention to American history in our colleges," Professor Myers said. "Furthermore, they appear to provide an argument for much greater attention to the social sciences in connection with the Army and Navy program for the 18- and 19-year-old youths who are to be sent back to college."

ROOM SEEN FOR IMPROVEMENT

Although the conditions of secondary school education in American history may not be as bad as the figures brought out by The Times survey, there is certainly room for improvement, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve of Barnard College observed yesterday to an all-college assembly. Students who do not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War are hardly material for thoughtful and wise citizens, she said.

The survey, she continued, indicates some great lack in secondary school education, a fogginess on the part of high school graduates concerning facts which are fundamental to every American's education. However, this lack of knowledge is not applicable only to American history, she indicated, but to mathematics, foreign languages, or English.

It is obvious, Dean Gildersleeve said, that although some of the secondary school training is excellent, it can and certainly must be improved. These students must learn to discipline their minds and to be accurate on at least certain essential facts, she held.

The East Orange Board of Education, following a discussion of the survey, has instructed Superintendent of Schools Henry Kentopp to call a conference of all school principals in the local system to determine means of providing more adequate teaching of United States history. The board asked that particular attention be paid to stressing the subject in the two senior high schools in the city.

The conference will be called as soon as it can be arranged, Dr. Kentopp said. A special conference to consider the Times survey and its implications to education will be held under the auspices of Fairleigh Dickinson Junior College, Rutherford, N. J., on Monday afternoon, Dr. Peter Sammartino, president, announced. Prominent educators in New Jersey and outside of the State have been invited to participate.

In an editorial appearing yesterday, the Washington Post said that the New York Times' test revealing a great lack of knowledge of American history is disheartening, not so much because of the lack of factual knowledge displayed as because of the implied lack of grasp of the meaning of the great events of our history.

"If our students had received the right kind of instruction," the editorial said, "they would not have forgotten so speedily the accomplishments of our national leaders."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment as brigadier generals in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law:

Col. Arthur Ringland Harris, Field Artillery; and

Col. Claude Mitchell Adams (lieutenant colonel), Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

John L. Thomas, to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of Ordell Gross, removed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence Mullins to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edmund J. Brandon to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Philip to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Robertson to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fannie Dixon Welch to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that Calendar Nos. 677, 679, and 680 be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. In that connection, I may say that the chairman of the committee has no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what are the nominations?

Mr. McCARRAN. They come under the heading "War Manpower Commission."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Osborne B. Hardison to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Patrick Thomas Fagan, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Pittsburgh area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Faber A. Bollinger, from the State of Georgia, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Leo Kogan, from the State of New York, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Bernard Siess, from the State of New York, to be senior occupational analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Frances R. Gresham, Autaugaville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas Maxwell Karrh, Berry, Ala., in place of T. M. Karrh, transferred.

Thomas W. Brock, Mulga, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lucy P. Thomas, Section, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James H. Dunlap, Siluria, Ala., in place of J. H. Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

ARIZONA

Warren D. Judd, Fredonia, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARKANSAS

Walter D. Patton, Alma, Ark., in place of W. E. Bradley, transferred.

Verna P. Reitzammer, Arkansas City, Ark., in place of V. P. Reitzammer. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Etta C. Hendrix, Blevins, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charlie N. Parker, Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of W. G. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John T. Sumner, McNeil, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Fred M. Taylor, Greenville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costar, retired.

Marvin S. Wick, Hermosa Beach, Calif., in place of M. S. Wick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dale K. Campbell, Mariposa, Calif., in place of M. I. Paine, retired.

Charles S. Catlin, Saticoy, Calif., in place of C. S. Catlin. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Alfred R. Montegani, Tiburon, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles E. Conner, Torrance, Calif., in place of C. E. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

COLORADO

C. Alton Beck, Aspen, Colo., in place of John Bowman, retired.

Bert O. Benson, Heeney, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Ada Killin, Kiowa, Colo., in place of B. C. Killin, deceased.

Mary Winifred Laube, Rico, Colo., in place of J. O. C. Lutener, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Catherine S. Barnett, Suffield, Conn., in place of C. S. Barnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert E. Lennox, Windsor, Conn., in place of A. E. Lennox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

DELAWARE

Claborne A. Boothe, Frankford, Del., in place of C. A. Boothe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph C. Slack, Newport, Del., in place of J. C. Slack. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Arthur E. Woodburn, Marathon, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hollis F. Anderson, Mayport, Fla. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Cora L. Lott, Princeton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Lamar S. Smith, Bartow, Ga., in place of A. S. Chamlee, deceased.

Hezzie McWhorter, Cochran, Ga., in place of J. A. Walker, deceased.

Nathan C. Wilkes, Lincolnton, Ga., in place of J. M. Wilkes, retired.

Aligene B. Howard, Ludowici, Ga., in place of A. B. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

W. Brantley Daniel, Millen, Ga., in place of W. B. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert M. Causey, Tucker, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IDAHO

Clellan W. Bentley, Mullan, Idaho, in place of C. W. Bentley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

ILLINOIS

William L. Clark, Amboy, Ill., in place of J. A. Edwards, resigned.

Myrtle M. Hyland, Cherry Valley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Blanche Linebarger, Elwood, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George C. Guard, Equality, Ill., in place of I. B. Coyle. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Vernon F. Nixon, Lomax, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles H. Anderson, Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of W. D. Wacaser, deceased.

Rudolph Mueller, Sherrard, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Melvin Higgerson, West Frankfort, Ill., in place of Melvin Higgerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

Ora William Irwin, Attica, Ind., in place of Mary Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marshall Winslow, Greenfield, Ind., in place of Marshall Winslow. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Merton L. Hughbanks, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of M. L. Hughbanks. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cash N. Essington, Spiceland, Ind., in place of D. M. Liggett, resigned.

Wayne S. Simms, Waveland, Ind., in place of William Simms, deceased.

Mildred M. Shinn, Whiteland, Ind., in place of R. N. Hearn, resigned.

IOWA

Kirby J. Smith, Burt, Iowa, in place of M. M. Hanna, deceased.

Pearle A. Mace, Moville, Iowa, in place of Mattie Neustrom, resigned.

Albert H. Gray, Sergeant Bluff, Iowa, in place of H. M. Michaelson, retired.

KANSAS

Irvin T. Hocker, Baxter Springs, Kans., in place of I. T. Hocker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John K. States, Buffalo, Kans., in place of A. D. Spillman, transferred.

Frank M. Belding, Copeland, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arch E. Hosmer, Holton, Kans., in place of A. E. Hosmer. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1938.

Katharine A. Blasing, Ogden, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esta S. Riseley, Stockton, Kans., in place of E. S. Riseley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William J. Dehler, Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of W. E. Wohler, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Tandy M. Riddle, Pikeville, Ky., in place of George Pinson, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John H. Mitchell, Salem, Ky., in place of J. H. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

LOUISIANA

John A. Moody, Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Winnie H. Arras, Gramercy, La., in place of W. H. Arras. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Azalee W. Nelson, Haughton, La., in place of A. W. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Van J. Harry, New Iberia, La., in place of Silvio Broussard, retired.

Rosa V. Shipes, St. Francisville, La., in place of R. V. Shipes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Andrew C. Burns, Shongaloo, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elias C. Leone, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

MAINE

Nelson A. Harnden, Belgrade Lakes, Maine, in place of N. A. Harnden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Afton H. Farrin, South Bristol, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lucy H. Bromley, South Windham, Maine, in place of C. A. Magnusson, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

John E. Harrington, North Chelmsford, Mass., in place of J. E. Harrington. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen R. Erikson, Pembroke, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Walter J. Grace, Carson City, Mich., in place of W. J. Grace. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen M. Kucera, Cedar, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clara E. Burnett, Dimondale, Mich., in place of J. R. Burnett, deceased.

Bernice S. Tiedeman, Washington, Mich., in place of J. L. Whitney, retired.

MINNESOTA

Howard H. Gunz, Center City, Minn., in place of H. H. Gunz. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Henry A. C. Saggau, Ceylon, Minn., in place of H. A. C. Saggau. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert O. McEachern, Delano, Minn., in place of A. O. McEachern. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dagny G. Sundahl, Grove City, Minn., in place of D. G. Sundahl. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Earl Stanton, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles Smith, Lake Wilson, Minn., in place of R. B. Forrest, retired.

Joseph G. Bauer, Madison, Minn., in place of J. G. Bauer. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Carl C. Heibel, Northfield, Minn., in place of C. C. Heibel. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

John M. Lannon, Prior Lake, Minn., in place of J. M. Lannon. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1941.

Hjalmer A. Johnson, Soudan, Minn., in place of H. A. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Truett Carr, Heidelberg, Miss., in place of P. H. Morrison, retired.

Oscar T. Davis, Ocean Springs, Miss., in place of L. M. McClure, deceased.

Rebecca B. Quinn, Prentiss, Miss., in place of V. B. Duckworth, retired.

Herbert A. Robertson, Sallis, Miss., in place of D. E. Morgan, transferred.

James F. Howry, Sardis, Miss., in place of J. F. Howry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hermine D. Lamar, Senatobia, Miss., in place of H. D. Lamar. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrtle D. Baker, Wiggins, Miss., in place of Buren Broadus, deceased.

MISSOURI

Frances F. Klughart, Fornfelt, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Francis E. Patterson, Koch, Mo., in place of M. E. Gardner, resigned.

Joseph J. Nacke, Meta, Mo., in place of L. C. Sheckelsworth, deceased.

MONTANA

George T. Farrell, Polson, Mont., in place of G. T. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Darwin T. Murfin, Cairo, Nebr., in place of H. R. Boesen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

Donald S. Shaver, Ely, Nev., in place of Alfred Tamblyn, resigned.

Imogene West Van Camp, Ruth, Nev., in place of Zoe Kenyon, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Margaret M. Hildreth, Bethlehem, N. H., in place of R. T. Hildreth, resigned.

Florence G. Taylor, West Swanzey, N. H., in place of W. F. Hanrahan, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Rose B. Sokolowski, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Philip L. Fellinger, East Orange, N. J., in place of P. L. Fellinger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mildred Mullen, Oceanport, N. J., in place of W. I. Gaul, removed.

Theresa O'Farrell Wood, West Long Branch, N. J., in place of Roy Bowman, resigned.

NEW YORK

David L. Churcher, Big Flats, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George T. Morgan, Coxsackie, N. Y., in place of G. M. Lamb, deceased.

Raymond C. Nellis, Hastings, N. Y., in place of R. C. Nellis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bertha B. McCurry, Bostic, N. C., in place of J. M. Rollins, transferred.

Theron C. Dellinger, Crossnore, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joshua T. Winstead, Macclesfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ethel B. Casper, New London, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wilbur A. Pike, Pikeville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ralph E. Martin, Ronda, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie A. Hanson, Aneta, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Hanson, resigned.

Mary T. Huber, Fingal, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OHIO

Claude S. Coyle, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eva M. Tipton, Bloomingdale, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace G. Copeland, Bristolville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jessie K. Dilworth, Cortland, Ohio, in place of J. K. Dilworth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Daniel L. Pokey, Lakeside, Ohio, in place of D. L. Pokey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Susan M. Ramsey, Loveland, Ohio, in place of S. M. Ramsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William Ransom Shaw, McDermott, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Urban B. Menker, Maria Stein, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Daniel P. Miller, Montgomery, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ira Q. Rhoten, Mowrystown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jean E. Holden, Pierpont, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clara B. Dix, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Oscar E. Bailey, Calvin, Okla., in place of O. M. Morse, deceased.

James Jones Quarles, Jr., Fairfax, Okla., in place of J. J. Quarles, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Millard W. Grubb, Ashland, Oreg., in place of J. H. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1940.

Antoinette T. McKechnie, Gearhart, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

John B. Newhart, Alderson, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Arthur Walter, Claysburg, Pa., in place of Grace Brubaker, resigned.

Wilmer F. Sowers, Green Lane, Pa., in place of W. F. Sowers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Wilmer S. Knipe, Horsham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Edwin W. Henry, Jr., Hulmeville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nora J. Brendlinger, New Florence, Pa., in place of S. S. Ulerich, retired.

James W. Hatch, North Girard, Pa., in place of J. W. Hatch. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Peter Renaldo, Roseto, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Milton E. Spahr, Shepherdstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wave L. Blakeslee, Spartansburg, Pa., in place of H. B. Wallace, resigned.

George D. Arner, Weissport, Pa., in place of G. D. Arner. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

RHODE ISLAND

Irvin D. Follett, Howard, R. I., in place of W. H. Follett, retired.

Cecil A. R. Hopkins, Hoxsie, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

SAMOA

David J. McMullin, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of D. J. McMullin. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William T. Hemingway, Hemingway, S. C., in place of W. T. Hemingway. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Blanche B. Hudson, Ruffin, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Theresa W. DeBilzan, Andover, S. Dak., in place of Nicholas DeBilzan, deceased.

Albert E. Kostboth, Canistota, S. Dak., in place of W. C. Clark, resigned.

Josephine C. Eggerling, Orient, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Eggerling. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Thomas L. Dam, Rosebud, S. Dak., in place of A. H. Manion, resigned.

Kathryn M. McCoy, Tulare, S. Dak., in place of K. M. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Vola W. Mansfield, Duniap, Tenn., in place of V. W. Mansfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William P. Stone, Lynchburg, Tenn., in place of W. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1942.

Lois Caruthers, Whiteville, Tenn., in place of G. H. Rhodes, removed without prejudice.

TEXAS

Hugh L. Williams, Blanket, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Horace Hamilton, Franklin, Tex., in place of R. B. Truett, transferred.

Clyde E. Perkins, Kirkland, Tex., in place of C. E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Grace L. Fowler, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of B. H. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Charles G. Conley, Quanah, Tex., in place of C. G. Conley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

UTAH

Pearl Wilcox, Clearfield, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Richard F. Lambert, Jr., Kamas, Utah, in place of G. T. Williams, resigned.

VERMONT

Ward L. Lyons, Bennington, Vt., in place of W. L. Lyons. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth A. Tudhope, North Hero, Vt., in place of K. A. Tudhope. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

John J. Cain, Orwell, Vt., in place of J. J. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Patrick J. Candon, Pittsford, Vt., in place of P. J. Candon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary E. Gover, Sheldon Springs, Vt., in place of H. E. Whiting, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Claude B. Nolen, Ferrum, Va., in place of C. B. Nolen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edgar S. Moore, Stafford, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WASHINGTON

William E. Jones, Houghton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nikolai K. Nelson, Keyport, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Loraine A. Schultz, Reardan, Wash., in place of W. H. Padley, retired.

Lena A. Voreis, Richmond Beach, Wash., in place of Frank Williams, removed without prejudice.

Robert I. Matheson, Suquamish, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harry M. Bona, Tillicum, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Fairleigh B. Wilkins, Yakima, Wash., in place of F. B. Wilkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Krevosky, Grant Town, W. Va., in place of E. J. Rush, resigned.

Jeremiah W. Dingess, Huntington, W. Va., in place of J. W. Dingess. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Dominic W. Riley, Baldwin, Wis., in place of D. W. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bernard G. Schramske, Boyceville, Wis., in place of B. G. Schramske. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Shirley C. Harrison, Cottage Grove, Wis., in place R. M. Graves, retired.

Lola M. Meyer, Dane, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alfred P. Schwalbach, Germantown, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Wenzel M. Dvorak, La Crosse, Wis., in place of W. M. Dvorak. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Joseph F. Kaminski, Lake Delton, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Raymond J. Voemastek, Rib Lake, Wis., in place of J. J. Voemastek, retired.

Stephen J. McShane, Rice Lake, Wis., in place of S. J. McShane. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Katharine G. Lynch, Sullivan, Wis., in place of A. M. Clinton, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1943.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Clarence Mullins to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edmund J. Brandon to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

George Philip to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles W. Robertson to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Fannie Dixon Welch to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Alexander C. Martin, Jr., to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Walter L. Sundstrom to be senior training specialist, at $4,800 per annum, in the Seattle area office.

William Royle, of Nevada, to be area director for Nevada, at $4,600 per annum, in the Reno area office.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Osborne B. Hardison, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 29, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Maurice Primeaux, Kaplan.
Leo L. Ehrhardt, Simmesport.

MICHIGAN

Simon F. Blake, Bellaire.
Helen E. Daly, Carrollton.
LaVange M. Taggart, Cement City.
Marian A. Cleary, Clawson.
Mary Elliott, Haslett.
Helen B. Martin, Indian River.
Nellie I. Blemaster, Maple Rapids.
Margaret C. Cryan, Mendon.
Anna C. Kulish, Minden City.
Bert F. Taylor, North Adams.
Hallie C. Bunting, Port Hope.
Elizabeth J. Shannon, Powers.

OKLAHOMA

Gladys M. Walker, Choctaw.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, who at the creation looked on all Thy works and called them good, sound Thy trumpet over this sorrowing world until its pain shall be assuaged and all hearts turned to Thy holy will. Assailed by battle hosts and falsehood's crafty crews, O preserve our land from all evil fates and prosper her in all things worthy and guard our banner of the free.

O Son of the living God, save our country from the scorch of irreverence, irreligion, and moral decadence. Kindle in all breasts the warmth of persistent courage, by whose inspiration great difficulties are overcome and great tasks accomplished. Whatever there may be of confusion and doubt, guide us through these conflicting paths and strengthen us with earnest will, declaring the truth in love and power. O break up the bulwarks of egotism, selfishness, and intolerance which invade the soul and allow not the strife of the world to mirror our unrealities. With reason firm and temperate will, help us to leaven other lives, widening the circle until peace and unity are brought to mankind. Endow us with a set purpose to greet each duty with wise decision and thereby justify our cause, realizing that no earthly affluence can atone for labor neglected and unperformed. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. The National Archives.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Appropriations I present a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HARD OF HEARING AND THE DEAF—DIGEST OF STATE LAWS AFFECTING THE HARD OF HEARING AND THE DEAF

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 348) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 189) authorizing the printing as a document of a revised edition of House Document No. 151, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Digest of State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a document a revised edition of House Document No. 151, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "A Digest of State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf," compiled by the State Law Index Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, those interested in foreign commerce should read the article in today's issue of the Washington Post by Ernest K. Lindley. Some may be surprised that he should in that article damn with faint praise the reciprocal trade-agreements program, but if they will read the article with discriminating care, they will see that the real purpose is to implant the idea that in the post-war era it will be difficult, if not impossible, for private citizens in this country to trade with private citizens in foreign countries, and, therefore, our foreign trade

should be handled in the post-war era as it is now being handled, by the Board of Economic Warfare. All that the citizens of this country would have to pay for that method of handling foreign commerce would be to give up their liberty and our system of private enterprise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Food Distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, an unfair blow was struck against the American soldier and sailor in uniform in a political ukase of the administration at Washington, prohibiting servicemen and women from being candidates for public office, except for reelection. The wounded, the maimed, or the disabled are thereby held to be ineligible for office even though the citizens of their city, county, or State, prefer otherwise. In a degree this order disfranchises American voters. Much is heard about our own concern over freedoms for the rest of the world, but, first, let us make sure that we do not take away rights of the American men and women who are fighting to save America.

This order as promulgated by the War Department prohibits a person on active duty with the armed forces from becoming a candidate, seeking office, or accepting office unless one held by him when he entered the active service.

Another section provides that a member of the military forces may be honorably discharged for the purposes of performing the duties of a public office.

This would in effect permit a person to be discharged should he be elected to an office he held prior to entering the service, but it would not authorize a discharge to seek office.

The order is ridiculous on the face of it. Has the time come in free America when men and women performing a patriotic duty to their country in time of national emergency are to be penalized for performing that duty? If this order will hold, then any man or woman of induction age selected by the electorate of any community in our country can be speedily put into the armed forces and by such induction declared to be ineligible to hold public office, unless that particular office was held by him prior to such entry. The vast majority of the men and women in the service today are not professional soldiers, but men and women imbued with only the thought of doing their duty to their country.

If the order is contrary to an individual's constitutional rights, which I say it is, it should be immediately rescinded as absolutely un-American. We are living in a free America, under a democratic form of Government. We are fighting for those things that we hold dear, to preserve our American form of life.

It is the inherent right of every American to seek public office if he so desires, and no order to the contrary should prevent him from so doing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a gentlewoman of the Old South upon the subject of rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regarding Mr. Morgenthau's secret plan to establish an international stabilization fund: The people of this country must immediately be aroused to the crucial danger to our freedom and sovereignty that is involved in this clandestine movement.

Why all the secrecy?

Who wants to get control of our gold hoard?

Who are the real forces back of this sinister scheme?

Why did Mr. Morgenthau and the interests he represents, in setting up this plan, take the rest of the world into their confidence and fail to let our own people know anything about it?

I condemn this act as I consider it as being underhanded and wholly unfair to the American people.

I shall do all within my power to inform my people of the peril that is involved in this secret New Deal scheme.

KNOW-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I favor a tax plan that will let the American people know-as-they-go. This House has so far rejected all plans for pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn taxation. Precious months are slipping by, and we are not collecting taxes at the source nor are we providing a way for monthly payments. Much-needed revenue is being forever lost to the Treasury of the United States by the inaction of Congress.

What does the Government expect in the way of taxes from the 1943 income of our people and how can it be paid? The people have no way of knowing, yet half of the year will soon be gone. The least that this Congress can do is to let the taxpayers know what their current obligations are. Ten-twelfths of 1942 had gone by before the American taxpayer was advised of the 1942 rates.

If the taxpayer cannot get on a current basis so far as his payments are concerned, he should at least have current information as to what he must pay. If we cannot have pay-as-you-go, let us at least have know-as-you-go. The Ways and Means Committee ought to either report out a bill or advise the country that they do not expect to offer any tax legislation for this year.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes after the completion of the legislative program and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the St. Joseph News-Press of St. Joseph, Mo., April 3, 1943, regarding the plight of the independent meat packers in my district because of the unfair and unjust rulings of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, according to the news reports the War Department, a branch of the President's office, has made another move to further the fourth-term campaign by issuing an order which prevents a member of the armed services from seeking public office unless he held it before. This eliminates Gen. Douglas MacArthur for the present. It is a peculiar thing to do in war being fought allegedly to further the principles for which this one is being waged. With the selections thus narrowed down and our troops properly "educated" through censorship and the O. W. I. booklets promoting the personal prestige of the fourth-term candidate, the pattern takes on form.

Apparently the Postmaster General, who has just returned from a cross-country "inspection trip" at public expense has really had his ear to the ground and has given advice that it would be well for the administration not to enumerate its poultry before it incubates. The people are busy and preoccupied with winning the war, but do not miss the significance of politics as it is being played by some Washington leaders who should now be giving attention to public business rather than personal promotion.

Why was this order not issued before the congressional elections if it is necessary to win the war? Does the administration regret election of the gentleman from California, WILL ROGERS, Jr.? In fairness and out of respect for precedent the President should revoke the order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an extract from the Washington Times-Herald of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DAVID GINSBURG

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a very interesting letter from a constituent of mine. I know this man. He is a man of poor circumstances. The letter so inspired me that I felt it would be well to call it to the attention of the House. It is an example and an inspiration.

The letter reads as follows:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., *March 14, 1943.*

Hon JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I have been notified by the War Department that my youngest son, Daniel F. Mahoney, has been killed in action in the south Pacific area, on December 17, 1942. It is needless to tell you how I feel, because I have two other sons in the service also.

Like every other father who worked hard to bring up his family, I had looked forward to the day when I hoped my boys would be a help to me. I had not figured on the advent of a Devil, who would murder and enslave the world. When the call came, I willingly offered my sons to preserve freedom. That I have lost one already, is sad, but we must go on to victory, and I assure you that behind our tears is a firm resolve to dig in all the harder, and when victory comes I will know that my boy did not die in vain. I will carry on regardless of cost.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. MAHONEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX BILL

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on next Friday after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTION DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 3, 1943, immediately after reading the Journal on the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table, that I be permitted to address the House for 2 hours. May 3 is Constitution Day of our sister republic, Poland, and I desire this time to address the House with reference to the Polish Constitution Day, and I will yield such time as is requested by other Members to present their views on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND ADDITIONAL MIDSHIPMEN AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on a recent occasion when Kenneth N. Walker, Jr., received from the hands of the President the Congressional Medal of Honor for his father, Brig. Gen. Kenneth N. Walker, United States Air Forces, who was last seen diving with a bomb load on the harbor of Rabaul, the President expressed the hope that he might be enabled to appoint Kenneth N. Walker, Jr., to the United States Military Academy. It occurred to me on the way back to the House of Representatives from that occasion that the sons of all of the men who receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, whether they be soldiers, sailors, or marines or officers in the Army or Navy, should be entitled to that opportunity.

I am therefore introducing a bill today, the title of which is "An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor."

The Congressional Medal of Honor may be awarded by the President in the name of the Congress to an officer, soldier, sailor, or marine, who shall "in action involving actual conflict with an enemy distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty"—July 9, 1918, chapter 143, Fortieth Statutes, page 870.

Thus far in this war 10 Congressional Medals of Honor have been awarded to Army men, 6 of whom are either missing in action or are known to have lost their lives. Since the beginning of World War No. 1 approximately 110 Medals of Honor have been awarded Army men.

Navy men and marines numbering 36 have been awarded the Medal of Honor in this war and a total of 59 have received the award since the beginning of World War No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

USE OF FIBER CONTAINERS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one sometimes wonders how much conservation departments and agencies of the Government practice in administering conservation orders affecting critical materials.

Not long ago a wholesale drug company in my district of Indiana was denied permission by the War Production Board to continue use of paper or fiber containers with waste metal friction top for packaging medicinal tablets. This company asked me, as their Congressman, to cooperate in filing an appeal. The matter was promptly taken up with the proper official of the War Production Board and the case reviewed.

Of course, the appeals board again denied the company use of that type of container and sent me a letter of explanation with an attached marked copy of the restriction order on which the decision was based. But did I receive the letter through the regular mail? No. It was delivered to my office by special messenger. And, fortunately for the messenger, he was not required to wear out his rationed shoes by walking the short distance from the War Production Board office to the House Office Building. He rode a motorcycle.

I wonder how much vital gasoline and rubber was used in sending, by special messenger, on the Government pay roll, a letter advising me that my constituent could not use his customary cardboard container because it had a cap that involved critical scrap metal.

The service was splendid, but hardly consistent with the times and practice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I delivered last night on the subject What Follows This War?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial on certain expenses of the administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULLEN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COAST GUARD CUTTER "CAMPBELL"

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet tomorrow at 10:30 o'clock. It is hoped and expected that we shall have present Commander Hershfield of the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*. If Members of the House desire to meet Commander Hershfield I extend the invitation to be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* and to include therein the naval release with reference to the work of the cutter and other excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on the Coast Guard in war and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LICK THE PLATTER CLEAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, due to the interest that has been shown from one end of the country to the other in my lick-the-platter-clean campaign, I want to report to you today that we received from the War Department a number of posters, one of which I show you now, which they are in the process of distributing to all the Army camps, urging them to cooperate in my war on waste. Here also is a sticker which is being exhibited in a great many Washington restaurants.

Most of the restaurants in York, Pa., and many throughout the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania have them on display. The saving of food is quite evident.

I am glad the Republican leadership of this House in its wisdom has organized a committee to study the food situation. Those in authority have long ago declared that "Food will win the war and write the peace." I was made very happy yesterday when I was told that I was going to be asked to appear before this committee. I shall be pleased to turn over to them such information as I have with such recommendations as I think are helpful along this line.

Nothing is so important today as to conserve our food and conserve it while we still have something to eat. It is much better to save food than to hunt it.

I am grateful for the cooperation I have received, and I am going to continue my war on waste until everyone has enough to seat for the duration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Plumley
Arnold	Gordon	Randolph
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Richards
Baldwin, N. Y.	Guyer	Robsion, Ky.
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	Rogers, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Rowan
Bates, Mass.	Horan	Sabath
Bell	Howell	Sheppard
Bonner	Izac	Sikes
Boren	Johnson,	Smith, Maine
Cannon, Fla.	J. Leroy	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kee	Snyder
Cox	Knutson	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	LaFollette	Stevenson
Cullen	Lewis, Colo.	Thomason
Davis	McGranery	Treadway
Dawson	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Dingell	Maa	Weaver
Elliott	Magnuson	West
Ellison, Md.	Merrow	Winter
Fogarty	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Ford	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Myers	
Gavagan	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There was no objection.

ANSWERING AN UNJUST ATTACK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please state to the Chair his grounds.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 2, in discussing a bill before the House, I was calling attention to the execution by the Soviet Government of two men, named Erlich and Alter. I was interrupted by the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER], and after I got an opportunity to make my speech, which, by the way, was after he had made his speech, he took his manuscript to his office, or at least got hold of it, amended it, and inserted in it some statements that were false, libelous, slanderous, and that he would not dare make on the floor of the House, and that no man would dare intimate in my presence outside of the House.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman give the Chair the language about which the gentleman complains?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to send his amended manuscript to the Speaker's desk and I am going to read it as I have it underlined in the RECORD so that the Chair may see that the statements of which I complain were inserted in the RECORD and were not spoken on the floor of the House.

You will note the first correction, Mr. Speaker, that in referring to me he uses this language:

> He deliberately seeks to promote religious strife.

That is speaking about me.

He says further:

> He glories in such strife. It tickles his vanity to create racial animosities.

Mr. Speaker, those statements were not spoken on the floor of the House, as the RECORD now before the Speaker will show. They were inserted by pen and ink later.

A moment later he uses this language with reference to me:

> He singles me out in a way that shows his distorted point of view, his intolerance, his malice. When he adds a religious term to a Member he shows his contempt for the spirit and traditions of America. He brands himself as un-American.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that statement was not uttered on the floor. I could strike it from the RECORD, but I wanted to show to what depths these insertions go.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair believes that the language, not being spoken on the floor and no recourse being had at that time, is a reflection on the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the Chair recognizes the gentleman for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No, not now; be seated.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield later?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think when he characterized me as the Jewish gentleman from New York that that is fair and American?

Mr. RANKIN. No American Jew is ashamed of being called a Jew.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman say "The Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts?"

Mr. RANKIN. If I did, he would think it was a compliment. If we were discussing an issue that involved a religious question, and the gentleman from Massachusetts should refer to me as the Methodist gentleman from Mississippi and I should refer to him as the Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts. Neither of us would be offended. Now, I decline to yield further.

There has been many a man expelled from this body for less than these insertions, reflecting on the character of fellow Members.

Then he goes on to say:

I am proud to be of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Since when is it wrong or a crime to be born of the faith in which Jesus Christ and his Apostles were born? Can that be a crime? Is there anything reprehensible about it?

Mr. CELLER rose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Then he inserted these words:

The gentleman from Mississippi would have it so.

He did not say that on the floor.

Then he goes on further and says:

I am sure that if Moses himself would come into this Chamber he would meet the epithets—

Between the words "the" and "epithets" he inserted the word "contemptible," making it read:

I am sure that if Moses himself would come into this Chamber he would meet the contemptible epithets the gentleman directs toward me and my kind. Why?

He says:

My kind—

In the RECORD.

Then he says:

Why? Because Moses was of my faith.

Mr. Speaker, that is news to me.

Then a little later he inserted these words:

Even if Micah came into this Chamber the gentleman would cast at him mud and insults, only because he was a Jew.

Mr. CELLER. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield now; and I am not going to be disturbed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the words indicated by the gentleman were spoken in the House. Can the gentleman still have the right to rise to a question of personal privilege?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has already recognized the gentleman from Mississippi and has said that the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Mississippi certainly may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the part that I am referring to was inserted later in pen and ink, and it is before the Speaker now.

Then he goes on and inserts a paragraph, a whole paragraph, that was not spoken on the floor in which he said:

The pending bill seeks to meet the activities of these spies, seeks to anticipate, contrary to the short-sightedness of the gentleman from Mississippi, and prevent the carrying out of the nefarious designs of these Nazi and Axis conspirators.

I do not object to any man calling me "short-sighted." I know I have limitations, and I have no objection to that characterization, because it is within the rules. But I am just reading and getting down to the real thing.

Then he goes on and speaks of the T. V. A. dam being blown up, and so forth, and down at the bottom he says:

Until the information was sent forth with resulting sinking—

And so forth. Then at the last he adds these words:

As to his base remarks—

Now, I was discussing the execution of a couple of Communist traitor Jews in Russia. I was not coupling the gentleman from New York with them. I will come to that question in a minute. He inserted these words that were not spoken on the floor.

As to his base remarks the gentleman from Mississippi only bespatters himself. His cruel and menacing observations are all the more tragic in the light of what is happening to Jews in Axis-controlled countries, where they are being daily massacred, murdered, decimated, exterminated by starvation, lethal gases, suffocation, high-voltage electrocutions, and machine guns by the tens of thousands. Two million have already perished, 4,000,000 more await death or a slavery worse than death.

Nobody has condoned that mistreatment. My people are paying now, and have been for years, to try to relieve the suffering of Jews and Gentiles in the Axis countries, including the suffering Negroes in Ethiopia, as well as the people of China.

Then he inserted these words:

Never have I heard a word of pity or lament or protest from the gentleman from Mississippi. It is not in him to do so.

I wonder if the disabled veterans of this country would agree with that remark.

As to his derelictions—

That is, mine—

I repeat the words out of St. Luke—

Mr. Speaker, he is about the last man in this House who ought to call in St. Luke. He quotes St. Luke as follows:

Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Those were the words of the suffering Saviour, who had been persecuted by the fifth columnists of that day. He was not speaking of my kind, because the people I sprang from were not responsible for that horrible crucifixion.

Then he inserted this statement:

And I also remind the gentleman: "The Jew has stood at the graveside of all his persecutors" and tormentors and baiters.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what brought on this controversy. The reason I did not ask the House to strike these remarks from the RECORD is that I am tired of seeing patriotic Americans besmeared and beslimed and accused of being unpatriotic when they are doing everything they can to win this war and when their sons are dying on every battlefront in the world.

I showed the other day that there were a couple of men executed in Russia. I did not use my own words. I took PM, the prayer book of the highbrowed Communists in this country. Here is what PM says. These are the headlines:

Poles score Soviet charge. They insist executed Jews did not try to make peace.

Then it goes on to attack the Russian Government for executing these two Jews, Erlich and Alter.

Then I turned to The Ghetto, a publication that has been coming to the Members' desks attacking Members of Congress and attacking patriotic Americans who are doing their duty. I am going to read again what that publication said:

On Thursday, February 25, 1943, the American representation of the General Jewish Workers' Union of Poland received a telephone call from William Green concerning a letter which he had received from Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Ambassador in the United States, informing him about the execution of the two prominent anti-Fascists and Socialists, Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter. A similar letter was received by Philip Murray and Wendell Willkie. We are now publishing the letter for the first time.

I am going to read the letter again:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I am informed by Mr. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, of the receipt of him of a telegram signed by you concerning two Soviet citizens, Alter and Erlich. I am instructed by Mr. Molotov to inform you of the following facts:

For active subversive work against the Soviet Union and assistance to Polish intelligence organs in armed activities, Erlich and Alter were sentenced to capital punishment in August 1941.

At the request of the Polish Government, Erlich and Alter were released in September 1941.

However, after they were set free at the time of the most desperate battles of the Soviet troops against the advancing Hitler army, they resumed their hostile activities including appeals to the Soviet troops to stop bloodshed and immediately to conclude peace with Germany. For this they were rearrested and, on December 1942, sentenced once more to capital punishment by the Military Collegeum of the Supreme Court.

This sentence has been carried out in regard to both of them.

Yours sincerely,

AMBASSADOR MAXIM LITVINOV.

Mr. Speaker, that was what I was bringing out the other day, when those attacks were being made, not on the floor of the House, but in the cloakroom. Let me clear up one thing now once and for all. A year or two ago I made a short statement in which I happened to use the expression "Our Jewish brethren." One gentleman attempted to reply to me. He evidently did not understand what I said. He later had a heart attack and died, and I saw some men walk down in this well and perpetrate the most ghoulish performance I have ever witnessed in my life, and actually, throughout the country, they tried to accuse me of killing that man, with whom I was on the most friendly terms. I had no more to do with his death than one of you did.

Then the other day, when I was trying to prevent what I feared was a dangerous precedent in this House, and when I was bringing out the fact that these Trotsky Communists had been trying to overthrow the Stalin regime right in the middle of this war, when the Russian Army was fighting on the northern front to keep that vast horde of German soldiers off the American and English Armies, when I was bringing those facts out, these attacks occurred.

Let me say this here and now: I have never at any time attacked an American Jew. I have known them all my life. The old line American Jews are just as patriotic as you or I. Many of them are worried to death about this communistic group in this country, and all over the world, that is stirring up this trouble for them. I have not called attention to the fact that they have crowded into the Government departments. We have all remained silent because we did not wish to stir up trouble for these people. One leading Member of the House said the other day that there were 39 times as many Jews on the Government pay roll as they are numerically entitled to. I am the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and I am receiving protests all the time that 60 percent of the doctors sent into the hospitals come from them; but I have refrained from mentioning the question here on the floor, even in the face of the slime that was smeared throughout the country 2 years ago.

But when a man continues to sit like a drunken man on a keg of powder striking matches with both hands, then it is time for somebody to answer, and especially when one goes to this depth, to attack a fellow Member, and make such charges as have been made against me here, charges that every man on this floor knows to be untrue.

They were getting ready for a big mass meeting in New York in protest against the execution of these men, Erlich and Alter. How do you think that would sound to your boy in north Africa or in Guadalcanal? There is a picture here of the celebration of the meeting in protest against the execution of these men. Now, you may not like Stalin, you may not like Russia, but Russia is in this war with us, whether you like it or not, and the Russian Army is giving a wonderful account of itself, and anything that is done here to disturb the Russian Army or the Russian regime or stir up rebellion in Russia could but be fatal to the cause of the Allies, and cost the lives of untold thousands and tens of thousands of patriotic Americans. These Communists are what I am complaining of and not the patriotic American Jews. I am complaining of these Communists who are stirring up race trouble all over this country. They have gone among the Negroes and are stirring up trouble for the white people of the South, and here in the District of Columbia, as we have never had it stirred since the darkest days of reconstruction. What is that for? Is that to aid the cause of the Allies? There are no more patriotic people under the shining sun than the people of the Southern States. When your forebears and mine were locked in deadly conflict in the War Between the States, those old men will tell you that no soldiers on earth ever gave a better account of themselves than did the Confederate soldiers. So we, the sons of Confederate and Federal soldiers, are fighting to maintain our civilization, to maintain our way of life, and to save our institutions; and yet we have these communistic elements in this country going around trying to stir up trouble. Listen to this PM. After one of its tirades it says, speaking of the execution of Erlich and Alter:

> It is bound to haunt American-Soviet relations for a long time to come.

Haunt those relations with whom? Not with the patriotic Americans who glory in the victories of the Russian Army.

I hope if anybody else goes over there, Jew or gentile, and attempts to stir up a revolution, that Stalin does them the same way.

I was calling attention in that debate to that indictment which you will find in the RECORD of March 29. It goes on to smear people all over the United States. I submit it includes such organizations as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, and many other patriotic organizations.

I am not a member of the America First Committee. I never was; I never attended one of their meetings. I noticed the picture of a familiar face over in the southwest Pacific. I remember they attacked him 2 years ago because they said he was a member of the America First Committee which was disbanded as soon as we entered the war. He may have been, but God bless your soul, when I saw that bandaged form, a man who had gone through the hell of war, I recognized my old friend, one of the great patriots of America, Hanford McNider, of Iowa.

You should get this indictment and read it. I am for prosecuting all criminals, but I am not for smearing patriotic Americans. I am opposed to anyone abusing the Dies committee.

If you do not know it, you can find out that the American people are 95 percent behind the Dies committee. When this conflict is over, if we save our form of government, our institutions, and our way of life, the American people will build a monument to the Dies committee for the patriotic services it has rendered in trying to expose German, Japanese, Italian, Communist, and every other subversive fifth-columnist element in the United States.

Now they are trying to use the Negro as a smokescreen. Of all people on earth. They are trying to shove them into every place here for that purpose. You remember that Mr. Kopplemann had a bill here to make it a penalty not to take them into all the dining rooms, all the hotels, picture shows, and restaurants. The decent Negroes do not want that. I know more about the Negro than any of these flannel-mouth agitators who are running around trying to mislead you about his welfare. I grew up among them. It is no disgrace for him to be called a Negro. If I were a Negro I would want to be as black as the ace of spades. I would not want anybody to think I was anything but a real Negro, and if this gang would let me alone I would have the best time on earth.

I am going to read you this word, if I may, and I want you to listen to this. A great American once said—

I am bringing this to your attention. You cannot destroy the white man's civilization in this country. You cannot destroy the white people of the Southern States. You can sign all these crazy petitions you want to. They will rise up to haunt you in the years to come.

A great American said, in a great debate in this country:

> I will say that I am not and never have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social equality of the white and black races.

He said:

> I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two living on terms of social equality.

Do you know who said that? One of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. He said that in his debate with Stephen A. Douglas.

Now, we have a condition to deal with in the South. I am not worried about these attacks on me. I am able to take care of myself on the floor of this House. I know how to debate within the rules. I know how to respect the feelings and the rights of others. We have a condition down in the Southern States—and we have a condition here in Washington—that these Communists are making worse.

They are likely to bring on a race riot here any time. These Communists who go out here and eat and drink and dance with these Negroes are not only disgracing themselves, but the Negroes have contempt for them. They are bringing trouble to their own people and stirring up trouble for the white gentiles, as well as for the Negroes in the District of Columbia.

I have a letter in my pocket from two white girls, from my own State, who had to resign and go home because they said

they were forced to use the same wash room and the same toilet with a bunch of Negroes, a large proportion of whom the Health Department says are infected with venereal diseases.

There are only four solutions of the Negro question. One of them is extermination. No man would think of that. Another one is deportation, which is impossible, especially at this time. Another one would be amalgamation, which would destroy the white man's civilization, and the Negro's too. You go to those countries that have amalgamated with them and you will see that they have gone down.

The last method is segregation. The only possible hope to get along with them, and for the Negro to enjoy those blessings to which he is entitled, is to keep them segregated. They will have a better time and you will, too. It has been said that we mistreat them at home. That is all false; the Negro has a better time where I live than he does in Washington, because he behaves himself and gets protection. We see that he is not disturbed. If we were to catch a bunch of these flannel-mouthed agitators dancing with a bunch of Negroes in Tupelo, the Negroes would get a little lecture, but what would happen to the other crowd would be something to write home about. The Negroes at home can go out and shoot craps among themselves and you can hardly get a justice of the peace to fine them for it, but you let us catch a white man out there robbing them in a crap game and he gets all the law will allow and then we add a little for good measure.

They live in peace down there. They are living in harmony, and yet these communistic agitators are doing everything they can to stir up this trouble for them and for us.

Now, I do not want to take up your time. My people came here 300 years ago to get away from persecutions in the Old World. My ancestors went through the Revolutionary War. One of my great great uncles, as I said before, who once served in this House, followed Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812 and gave his life at the Alamo in order that Texas might be free. The only uncle I had of military age in the Civil War died at the Second Battle of Bull Run. Throughout the World War, and today in this war, my own people are on every front in the world, fighting for what? To preserve this Republic, to preserve our form of government and our way of life, and no scavenger is going to get up on this floor and smear me or any other patriotic Americans from now on if I can help it.

We are in a great war. We are not only in a war abroad, but we are in a war at home; we are in a war to keep subversive elements from undermining and destroying our form of government and our way of life. Let every American assert himself. As I said, I could have struck this material from the RECORD, but I wanted to show you the kind of stuff that has been used to smear me here and over the country.

I am convinced that if we lose this war we lose our form of government, our liberties, and our way of life. This intimation that men who are supporting the Dies committee are sympathetic with Hitler is the most contemptible slander I have ever heard. No; whether they be Jew or gentile, those men who are really fighting America's battles have my admiration. You know I did not want this war. God knows I knelt and prayed; I almost did so in this well and at the White House to plead that something might be done which I thought would avert this catastrophe before it ever broke out in Europe, because I thought I could see ahead crepe on the doorknobs of almost every home in Europe and America.

I could see the mothers, brokenhearted as they turned their faces to the chairs made vacant by the old fireside to weep the tears of broken hearts for those sons they are sending forth to fight to preserve this Republic. I could see the fathers, bowed as it were "by the weight of centuries, the emptiness of the ages in their faces, and on their backs the burdens of the world," bowed down in grief for those sons that your communities and mine are sending to this war. I had no respect for Hitler; I had none for Mussolini; but I was in hopes that something might be done to avert this calamity. When, however, my country became involved, and long before Pearl Harbor, I was for adequate preparedness. I was one of the advocates of Billy Mitchell here when Billy Mitchell was on trial. Had enough men backed us up at that time we would have had an adequate air force and there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster.

We are in this war to win, we are going to bend every effort to that end; but I want to tell you now the American people are not going to stand for certain subversive elements stirring up trouble in this country.

God grant that throughout the ages yet to come, no hostile power may ever set foot upon American soil. God grant that those principles laid down by Jefferson and Washington, and sustained by all our great statesmen down to the present time, may be preserved. May we, the recipients of American liberty, that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded, and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry, may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity that this great Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman in his remarks of April 2, Friday last, put into the RECORD statements which he did not make on the floor of the House. He said among other things:

> I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that he has been attacking the white people of the South ever since he has been in Congress. He is doing the Jews of this country immeasurable harm.

I believe it is a reflection upon my integrity when he states that I am doing the people of my faith immeasurable harm, and I should like to spend a few moments with reference to countering that charge.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman send that RECORD up to the chair? Does the gentleman from New York have the transcript and know that that was inserted?

Mr. CELLER. I have not the transcript with me, but I remember what was stated by the gentleman and it is not reflected accurately in the RECORD.

Furthermore, the gentleman made the statement that I was the Jewish gentleman from New York; and on that score I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to see the original transcript of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CELLER. I can read more; there is more in that RECORD, Mr. Speaker, which was not uttered on the floor of the House. I shall be very brief, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to rule on this question without seeing the original transcript and it is not here. If there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it violates unduly the esprit de corps that should exist in this House; it violates the decorum that should animate all Members thereof, to address anyone as "the Jewish Congressman from New York" as did the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] last Friday. If that were to go unabated and were to continue we would then have ourselves in this very anomalous and highly dangerous position where a Member would address another Member as "the Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts," as "the Protestant gentleman from Mississippi," as "the Czechoslovakian Member from Wisconsin," or "the Polish Member from Michigan," or as "the Mormon gentleman from Utah." That would violate beyond peradventure of doubt the spirit and traditions of the deliberations of this House. It would be violative of the very spirit of our Constitution.

Upon reflection, I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi regrets making the statement of characterization of me as "the Jewish gentleman from New York." I am sure that the man he praised the other day, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Judah P. Benjamin, of Civil War fame, would not have risen in the other Chamber and addressed the other distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Jefferson Davis, as "the Protestant Senator from Mississippi." Nor would Senator Davis have addressed the gentleman from Louisiana as "the Jewish Senator from Louisiana." Judah P. Benjamin held three Cabinet offices in the Confederacy and we are all proud of him. He was a Jew.

Danger, great danger, lurks in these characterizations and I do hope that the gentleman from Mississippi in the future will not use that type of address to any Member of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, if the gentleman does not want to be called the Jewish gentleman, I have no objection to never calling him that again, but I want to say one thing: Judah P. Benjamin never would have stuck that stuff in the RECORD that was put in there on the 2d.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for that statement and I hope he will abide by that good intention.

Mr. RANKIN. And I want to say this to the gentleman from New York: I am not withdrawing what I said about the gentleman from New York trying to stir up this fight against the South on these various bills that have been before the House.

Mr. CELLER. And I am not withdrawing the statements I may have made with reference to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You will not get outside of this House and make those statements, and if you make them against any other Member here you will probably be expelled.

The SPEAKER. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi must be careful.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Mississippi ought to be careful in more respects than one in that regard.

I have a perfect right to quote from the teachings of St. Luke. I firmly believe in many of the glorious observations made by the Apostles. There is much of glowing mercy and charity and forgiveness in the words of St. Luke and the Apostles and I glory in the fact that my memory permits me on the floor of the House to quote their ennobling phrases, their inspiring phrases.

The gentleman from Mississippi with one breath seeks to praise the race from whence I sprang and in another breath seeks in his subtle way to stir up animosity. I hope he will not do that again. I hope that better judgment will reside within him. But he has in the past handed the Members of my race and you gentlemen of the House a stick of dynamite in a silk glove. I do indeed hope that he will not repeat those characterizations of my people.

There have been goodly numbers of my people in all the wars of the United States. I shall not enumerate them. You know them all. I could read to you of the many war decorations received by the members of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as I did the other day. I shall not repeat those names. It is unnecessary.

I shall end this brief statement with what Washington said when he was visiting the Portuguese synagogue in Newport and was welcomed by its congregation in a pathetic letter of welcome. His reply is memorable and it is well oftimes to repeat:

> The citizens of the United States of America have the right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike, liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. Happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live—

And so forth; and he wound up as follows:

> May the children of the stock of Abraham who dwell in this land continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid.

If we continue to stir up religious animosities and racial difficulties, I fear that we cannot follow the admonitions of the glorious Washington.

I fear that we cannot sit in safety under our own vine and fig tree, for there will be those to make us afraid. I earnestly ask the gentleman from Mississippi in the future by his remarks and by his observations not to make us afraid.

Finally, in the revision of my remarks, it is well to quote from Peter, chapter 5, verse 5:

> Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2397, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Salaries: For Secretary of State; Under Secretary of State, $10,000; Counselor, $10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including not to exceed $6,500 for employees engaged on piece-work at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State; $5,693,000, of which $40,000 is hereby made available, without regard to civil-service and classification laws, for salaries of members and other employees of the Visa Board of Appeals and salaries may be paid to the members of such Board at a rate not exceeding $10,000 per annum each.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on February 9 the House passed the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. The Members will recall the sound and the fury of that debate when an amendment was offered to strike the names of 36 people from the public pay roll for reasons of subversive activity. Mark you well the date. It was the 9th day of February, according to the calendar, that that bill was enacted and passed by the House.

There was considerable storm and considerable controversy. As a result, a separate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was created for the purpose of taking testimony and of according fair hearing to those who had been so charged. Since the 9th of February there have been six or seven appropriation bills enacted by this House; the independent offices bill, the first deficiency bill, the additional Navy bill, the civil functions bill, and now the State, Justice, and Commerce bill, to be followed by the legislative bill. The House has shown admirable restraint and patience in letting this matter reside in that committee for a determination. But 60 days have elapsed.

I am wondering what this subcommittee has been doing. Frankly, it will be 60 days this week since that subcommittee has been created. Other appropriation bills will be submitted and they will include the names of some people on whom there has been a report by investigators of our own committee and whose names I propose to bring into this well unless some action is taken reasonably soon. I should like to hear from some of the members of this special subcommittee. I understand that only a single witness has thus far been brought before the committee.

I recognize, of course, that time is necessary for organization. I recognize that some procedural set-up must be developed. I recognize that a counsel has to be employed. But I submit on the other hand that assurance was given us by the chairman of the full committee that no time would be lost, and that we would not be foreclosed from an opportunity to deal with this thing on other appropriation bills in case that committee failed to report. So when we are ready to bring in the Agricultural appropriation bill sometime next week, I propose to exercise my rights and prerogatives, which I heretofore exercised when I had David Lasser stricken from the roll—and the Senate confirmed that action and the President signed the bill, and I propose to follow the same course unless there is some evidence and some indication of affirmative, positive, and speedy action on the part of the subcommittee that was created for this distinct purpose.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this House was led astray? We were definitely assured by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that these charges would be investigated immediately, and that is 60 days ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know particularly whether we were led astray, but I do know that we did have definite assurance that we would have action, and early action, and there has been no such action. This week will mark the sixtieth day since the House was in a mood to deal with the matter in connection with the Treasury-Post Office bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman that the committee was in session this morning from 10 o'clock until 12 and will go into session again at 2 o'clock this afternoon and stay in session most of the afternoon. All I should like to know is, What more would the gentleman require of us?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been no preliminary report—there has been no intimation whatever of action. Notwithstanding that fact, appropriation bills where the names of alleged subversive people are carried on the rolls are moving across the floor of this House week after week. So I believe that at least this House is entitled to some kind of information as to what the subcommittee has been doing.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am not trying to quarrel with the gentleman. I think he is trying to be fair in this matter. But I believe it is also important to point out that you cannot give a preliminary report as to whether a man is a fit or unfit person to stay on the pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, may I remind the Committee that we have been delayed now with this bill and that this is the third day we have had it on the floor. We are going to try to proceed in order. I am not going to object to this request, but we certainly must speed up the consideration of this bill today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the chairman says this is the third day we have had this bill under consideration, but many of us have not yet had a chance to speak. How much time are we going to have? Are we going to get the usual 5 minutes or not?

Mr. RABAUT. We are here until 20 minutes past 6 last night.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was here until 7.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will withdraw the request and remain within the rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am willing to let the gentleman have that additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Other Members can take the time and belabor this particular issue that has been raised because it is a matter of vital interest and many Members have made repeated inquiry concerning the action of the special subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his request.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am a Member of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know whether that counts or not.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized as a member of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair first recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and then, on looking further, he saw the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] on his feet. The gentleman from Wisconsin first got the eye of the Chair and asked for recognition. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the Chair mean that the chairman of the subcommittee is not to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair first recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, two Members, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the minority of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], of the majority, are both members of the subcommittee. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] happens to be the chairman of the particular committee that was appointed, concerning which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke a few moments ago. He is also the ranking member of the committee that has the bill before the House today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, is this parliamentary inquiry going to take up all of my time?

Mr. RABAUT. I shall ask that the gentleman have additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, a member of the Committee on Appropriations has the same right as those who are members of that committee who happen to be members of a subcommittee. That is the parliamentary procedure, as the Chair understands it. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin. Had he not done so, he certainly would have recognized the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be started here at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, apparently we are getting down to some pretty fine points here in the matter of obtaining recognition, and apparently physical size counts, because I am somewhat larger than the others, and will be seen first. I rise in view of the fact that I happen to be a member of this subcommittee that has been the subject of some inquiry by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I thought perhaps the House might be interested in knowing just a few of the things which have been inquired about. I would be very glad to defer to the distinguished chairman of the committee if I thought he was interested in making a statement, but perhaps I can mollify the apprehensions of the gentleman from Illinois with reference to the work of this subcommittee. I have been just as apprehensive as anybody else about this subcommittee. I have been available every day since the subcommittee was created, to go to work. But this job is not just as simple and just as easy as it may seem. I recall when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations came onto the floor of the House he said we were going to have this subcommittee appointed, and it would go to work and start reporting the next day. Apparently the members thought that is what the procedure would be. As a matter of fact the committee had to get organized, and the purpose of organizing this committee was to afford opportunity for those people who are subject to charges, to have an opportunity to know what the charges are and to be given an opportunity to come before the committee. It would be sensible, would it not, to suggest that they would require that the charges be preferred, and that the men against whom the charges are to be preferred, be advised of what the charges are. The fact of the matter is that we endeavored to secure an attorney, and went at it promptly, as the members of the committee know, and we have had just one terrific time to get any attorney to act as a counsel for this committee. We have one now. The committee is at work. We have had a great deal of difficulty getting the charges presented to the committee. All of the charges against all of these people are not before the committee yet. It has taken the Dies committee a tremendous amount of work in order to assemble this information and submit it in proper form to our committee, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], is present, and he will agree with what I am saying. They have not been able to get together the mass of information they have to see, so that the proper exhibits are photostated and submitted in proper form to our committee to give consideration to.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I wish my colleague on this subcommittee would also point out to the House that there are 38 or 39 Government employees that we are investigating. I wish he would also point out to the House that in every case there is a mass of testimony at least 3 feet high. We first have to look over the Dies committee testimony, and then the findings of the Department of Justice, and then the interdepartmental committee, and then the Civil Service Committee. There are four of them, and there are thousands and thousands of pages, and if anyone would like to have my job on that committee I wish he would take it and do it this afternoon, and they may have the opportunity of doing it very shortly.

Mr. KEEFE. And I will tender the same suggestion myself, that I would be happy to be relieved of that responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How could anybody get on that particular committee who is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations? That is fine for these two gentlemen to offer to resign, but how can anybody get on the committee?

Mr. KEEFE. The members of this House know that so far as I am concerned I have been more active trying to get at this thing, and get this job done, but if you think it is any little peanut job you have another guess coming. We have been now engaged for 3 or 4 days—4 day—with one witness, and we are going on again at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and if the witness has his way we will be there for 4 weeks to listen to the story that he wants to tell. This committee is trying to be fair, and so far as I am concerned we are going to get the facts, and the facts are going to be presented to this House. As far as I am concerned, the chips are going to fall where they will. That is all there is to it. You have to be patient and give us a chance to bring the truth and the facts to this House. You will get them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a correct statement with reference to the committee which was appointed to investigate the several charges made against various employees of this Government under a recent resolution.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has well said, this was a great deal larger job than any of us thought we had to undertake. I can say, and can say candidly and say truthfully, that we have endeavored as diligently as possible to organize our committee and to make these investigations. It might be interesting to say to you gentlemen that each member of this committee has had an opportunity to go back to his district and endeavor to get someone from his district or from his State to appear as attorney for this committee. It seemed to be impossible for us to secure a proper man, the kind of man that we wanted, here in Washington. The House can hardly realize that we have not only the duty of looking into the charges made by the Dies committee, but we are charged with the duty of taking five different investigations and going through them and examining the charges made against these Government employees charged with subversive activities, and then to invite the accused to appear before us if he wishes, in order that we may say to them, "Here is what you are alleged to have said. Here is what you are alleged to have done. What do you say as to your activities with this organization or this group of people?"

We have succeeded in getting an attorney. We have an attorney who, because of his knowledge of the law, his diligence, and his great character, will make a correct and judicious study of all of these charges and be able to bring them to the committee and tell us, "Here is what the evidence discloses in respect to this gentleman and in respect to the charges made against him."

There are 5 different batches of evidence—voluminous evidence—that have been taken against every one of these men charged with subversive activities. We are compelled, under this order and under this resolution not only to examine just what the Dies committee said about these employees or found out about them but we are charged with the duty of taking the records of the investigations made by the departments themselves with respect to these employees, and by the interdepartmental committee and the investigation made by the F. B. I. of these employees accused of subversive activities and by the Civil Service Commission. You can see what a job we have. Every man on this committee has been diligent and has been endeavoring to get it under way as quickly as possible. Although we have been asking for the last 6 weeks to get the full evidence upon which we could make inquiry and present it to the charged party, we have only been able to get the full evidence on 3 of the 38 men who are charged in this resolution.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman is mistaken on that.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. You have evidence on 10.

Mr. KERR. From the Dies committee.

Mr. DIES. From the Dies committee.

Mr. KERR. I think the gentleman is probably correct as to parts of the Dies committee evidence, but, as a matter of fact, I do not think there has been but three or not over four cases of the full charges and complete evidence made against these men furnished our committee to date. On April 1 we had only one case from the Dies committee which was full and complete and included recent testimony before the Dies committee. The accused in this one was heard before us the next day.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. May I suggest to my distinguished chairman "yes" on the first 10 cases we have the evidence from the Dies committee.

Mr. KERR. That is true.

Mr. POWERS. But the House must realize that we do not have all the evidence on those entire 10 cases. We have the evidence on 3, because the Dies committee evidence is only 1 portion of the evidence. Again let me state that all the interdepartmental evidence is needed; we need the F. B. I. evidence and we need the civil service evidence, and you have to get all those things and correlate them. It has been an impossibility to get 10 complete. If we take as long with every other witness as we have taken with this witness we will be at it for a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary at this point in the RECORD to develop the chronological history of what the Congress has been trying to do with reference to getting subversive people off the pay roll.

First, we establish the Dies committee, which has had the support of 95 percent of the people of the United States. Then it was claimed by the executive department that the Dies committee reports are based upon opinion. In order to double check these charges that the Dies committee made, I was the author of a resolution that was passed and made a part of the 1942 fiscal-year supply bill, which allocated $100,000 of the F. B. I. funds to investigate the employees on the Federal pay roll or the organizations whom the Dies committee said were subversive. I contemplated at that time that the F. B. I., as it completed its investigation, would report to the Congress on each employee. The positive mandate of the amendment required a report immediately to Congress. The argument on behalf of the amendment was to get factual information that the F. B. I. had uncovered on each subversive Federal employee or organization.

After about 9 months of the fiscal year had elapsed I had some correspondence and conversation with the Attorney General's office, and asked them to give Congress this factual information. Sixteen months ago, just before we reported out the first appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943, I tried to get this factual information for our supply bills that we considered last year. We did not get it. The Attorney General and his subordinates said they were not ready to report yet. Finally I talked with the Attorney General at the hearings in February of last year. He did not pose any objection to giving Congress this information. He said the investigation was taking a lot of time and that there was some question when to report. I kept urging an immediate report. Then after the fiscal year ended we got one report from the Attorney General's office.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I would like to proceed for just a minute and then I will yield.

Not until the end of the fiscal year did we get any kind of a report from the Attorney General. When that report came to Congress it did not contain the textual information on anybody that the F. B. I. had investigated. The Congress does not know and did not know then from reports submitted to it what individuals should be fired for subversive activities, because the textual facts reported by the F. B. I. stayed in the Attorney General's possession.

We then got a second report later on, the first of this calendar year. Congress still did not get the textual, factual information so that we could weed A, B, and C from the Federal pay roll. I insisted in the hearings this year that the Attorney General's office had not complied with the intent and purpose of Congress when it passed this amendment. In last year's supply bill—the one for this present fiscal year—another amendment was included earmarking $200,000 of F. B. I. funds to get this factual information. In that amendment I provided that the F. B. I. should report the findings forthwith to Con-

gress. I asked Mr. J. Edgar Hoover this year why we had not gotten the factual information on the individual cases. He testified, as appears on pages 242 and 243 of the hearings, that he was requested and directed by the Attorney General not to give the factual information to Congress but to give it to the boss, the Attorney General.

If the interdepartmental committee of the executive branch of the Government is holding up the information for this special committee of the Appropriations Committee to investigate these charges, I say that they were an illegal committee in the first place, in my estimation.

The time has come when we cannot be held up any further by the Attorney General's delay. The delay is not Mr. Hoover's fault, because he is willing to comply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, our committee has submitted to the special committee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina the evidence which we had in our files in 10 cases. We also subpenaed and heard these 10 witnesses.

I believe a great deal of the trouble arises from a lack of understanding of what the policy of the Congress should be. In almost every case these Government employees have admitted most of the charges that I made on the floor of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The statement was made that they had not been able to find any charges yet. Will the gentleman tell us something about that?

Mr. DIES. I do not think the gentleman meant that; what the gentleman meant, and what I am sure he will agree to, was that on this subject that has taken our committee nearly 5 years to understand, he and the other members of the subcommittee are experiencing the same difficulty we experienced for a long time after we began this work.

The point I want to make is this and I want our distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to listen to these observations: I think there will be no contest about the fact that these charges are substantially correct. I think that in the great majority of the cases these Government employees will agree, as they have agreed before our committee in the past 10 days, that they were associated and affiliated with these various organizations or that they were the authors of various books, pamphlets, and speeches expressing certain sentiments which I have heretofore read to the House and which in my opinion clearly show that at least at one time they were not in favor of our form of government. In no case has the author publicly repudiated his views as previously expressed.

We are not trying these people for crimes, we are not seeking to impose any penalty; it is just a question in my mind like this: Here is a man who not once but we will say upon a number of occasions has openly associated and affiliated with an organization which our committee unanimously found to be subversive. And in passing let me say we have three Republicans and four Democrats upon our committee, and everyone knows we have had some outstanding progressives on our committee such as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]; and all of our reports with the possible exception of one were unanimous findings of the committee. But you have more evidence than that. The Department of Justice was unwilling to accept our findings so they established their own interdepartmental committee, and this committee pursued its own independent inquiry into what organizations were subversive and they reached certain conclusions that were stronger than our findings. So you have our committee's findings, you have the Department of Justice findings, and you have the fact that certain Government employees were affiliated with organizations that are subversive. It seems to me that if you would require any committee to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a man is subversive or even to prove that he is a Communist that you could never accomplish anything, because manifestly the members of the Communist Party are secret members. Neither the F. B. I., nor our committee, nor any other agency has ever been successful in securing the membership list of the Communist Party. All members of the Communist Party are instructed to perjure themselves. They do not hesitate under oath to deny their affiliation with the Communist Party, although we have conclusive proof that there are approximately 165,000 dues-paying members. So it would seem to me that in dealing with merely the question of whether or not these people shall hold appointive jobs that we in the Congress should establish a policy that when any Government employee knowingly or carelessly affiliates or associates with a subversive organization that he should not be given employment in our Government. Let me show you how simple this is in the case of Nazi organizations. Our committee, of course, has exposed a number of Nazi organizations in this country. Suppose these 38 Government employees had been officers and members of the German-American Bund.

How long do you think it would take to strike them from the pay roll of this Government? Yet the Communist Party by the findings of our committee and by the findings of the Attorney General is just as revolutionary, just as disloyal and unpatriotic as the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I made an objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIES. I may say that the House really wants to have this explanation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the gentleman is going to apply the rule that he announced awhile ago or whether he is going to let this out-of-order debate continue?

Mr. RABAUT. I said to the gentleman from Illinois I would withhold objection in his case. I dislike to make an objection in this case. The gentleman realizes that we have been on this bill here for 2 days. This is a very interesting subject and all that, but it has nothing to do with this particular bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, at this point I think we ought to settle the question as to whether or not this debate is out of order. In my judgment, it is not out of order because it is applicable to every appropriation bill that might be reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIES. I think we would save time if we went ahead now.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman well knows that if we grant this extension it leaves the way open for anybody else to come up here and ask for an extension of time. We have been delayed a great deal this afternoon and we are being urged by the leadership to finish this bill as rapidly as possible.

Mr. DIES. Let me have 2 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. I am not going to object to any request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the House is going to have to determine this question sooner or later. It is a question of what degree of proof you want. I maintain—and I am willing to submit this question to a vote of the House—that in a case where an employee has agreed or where the evidence is clear that the employee has openly associated and affiliated with a subversive organization, whether it is Nazi, Communist, or a Fascist organization, or where he has given expression to utterances in which he has denounced our form of government, in cases of that sort he ought to be stricken from the pay roll without any question. If, in addition to that, you want the same rules to apply and the same degree of proof to obtain as in a case where you were trying a man for the commission of a crime, then, of course, there will be no way to strike these people from the pay roll because, as I have said before, we have had known Communists perjure themselves before the committee and it was on the basis of perjured testimony that some of them were convicted.

I think the time is rapidly approaching when we ought to have a determination of this issue on the floor of the House as to what the House wants to do. It is a great burden on the gentleman from North Carolina and these other gentlemen. I know what they are going through, and I believe they now know what we have gone through for 5 years. Their difficulty arises, and our difficulty

has arisen, from a lack of knowledge of just what the policy ought to be. I think that a Government employee's record ought to be beyond any suspicion. He holds an appointive job, not an elective job, and it seems to me that if by his own action he has knowingly or carelessly used his name and his influence to promote, to support, and to strengthen subversive movements in this country that fact, and that fact alone, ought to be sufficient to disqualify him from the Government service. If you have any doubt about that, then I ask, how many Members of this House would permit an officer, director, or member of the German-American Bund or the Kyffhauser Bund and these various Nazi organizations to remain on the pay roll? When we exposed George Detheridge, who was on the other side of the fence, it did not take Secretary Knox 5 minutes to throw him off the pay roll. We ought to be consistent about this. If we apply it in the case of people who have been active in German-American bunds we should apply it to people who have been active in other subversive organizations.

As to whether we were right in finding these organizations subversive, I submit to you that if the Department of Justice, pursuing an independent inquiry at a time in which some of the officials there were not on friendly terms with our committee, has arrived at the same conclusion as our committee, and you have your own agency and the Department of Justice agreeing as to what organizations are subversive, and you have Government employees who were affiliated and associated with those organizations, it seems to me that evidence ought to be sufficient to remove those people from the pay roll.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These Communists are Trotskyites. That is the same crowd that has been trying to stir up this revolution in Russia that I called attention to today. I submit they are just as dangerous as they can be and that they ought to be driven from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman that in the 5 years of the committee's existence I have never seen a case in which anyone would come before our committee and frankly say, "I was a member of the German-American Bund, with knowledge of its subversive nature" or "I was a member of the Kyffhauser Bund and knew the nature of the organization." All of them have explanations, all of them have alibis and apologies; so that when you get into the field of explanation you have the trouble that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] is complaining about. These people are adepts in the art of testifying and alibi-ing. They have spent years in this sort of business and you will be chasing yourselves around a ring and be considering this matter for the next 10 years. The first thing the House of Representatives ought to do is to insist upon a common-sense policy as to the character of proof you want in order to justify dismissal.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a fine thing to protect the rights of an individual, but in an instance like this, does not the gentleman believe that the rights of the people of the United States to have persons in its employ in whom they have confidence should be considered likewise?

Mr. DIES. I may say that if these people had run for public office they would not have received 2 percent of the votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion is extremely interesting to the House and I think it is important that it be taken up at this time. I simply want to lay down as my own thesis that the only thing that many of these people have in the world is a good name, and that the committee of which I am a member is going to see to it that if that good name is taken away from them it is taken away on the basis of proper evidence which can show it deserves to be taken away.

I do not care how long the committee procrastinates or how long it delays, if that is what people think we are doing. I, for one, am determined to see that no man or woman comes before that committee and goes away saying, "I have not had a fair hearing."

I commend the other members of the committee. I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has been extremely anxious to see some action and who has been demanding steadily that we bring in some sort of a report. Yet that gentleman and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and the other members of this committee have worked faithfully to see what evidence there is upon which we can base a report.

I want to comment just briefly upon what the gentleman from Texas has said. I am not quarreling with my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], when I say this. The Department of Justice has prepared a list listing certain subversive organizations. That is one step in a link. The other step is to prove that the man in question belonged to that subversive organization or to find sufficient evidence to make us believe that he was trying to promote its cause.

I suggest to you that until that second step has been taken you are not ready to strike any man from the pay roll, and so far we have not been able to determine whether we do or do not find conclusive proof. I am not saying that we will not find it, and I am not saying that all the members of the committee will not be happy when that day comes to say that we have gone far enough to say that proof exists, but certainly we are only on one witness, and we are finding in that particular case that, while it is easy to say that an organization is subversive, it is very difficult to say that because a man wrote for a magazine which had other people who were possibly Communists, writing for it, he, himself, was a member of the Communist Party.

If there came before us a single person who openly admitted that he was a Communist and was trying to strike down this Government, you would have a report to this House immediately, but that is not the situation. Those people who have admitted to that sort of a situation have disappeared from the public pay roll.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman expect any person to come before the committee and make such an admission as indicated by the gentleman?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not, and that is why I say you must proceed carefully and see if the information that has been presented really ties him to the cause.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that you should be careful, but what degree of proof is the committee requiring? That seems to be the subject which concerns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I cannot speak for any other member of the committee, but as for myself, if I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that this person was engaged in improper or subversive activities or was associated with people who were so engaged, I for one will be ready to condemn him. But let me say this to you, that the basis upon which this matter was presented to the House was that we would attempt to make sure that these people deserve to be stricken from the public pay roll as people unfit to serve.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It has been intimated to me that this witness has spent a great deal of the time of the committee on irrelevant dissertations, and that the committee has felt obliged to listen to them. Is there anything to that, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think the gentleman from New York will recognize that the person who perhaps should answer that is the chairman of the committee. The meetings of the committee are still executive. But I would say to the gentleman that in my personal opinion he has been dealing with matters that are not relevant. At the same time, here is a man who is trying to present his cause. He is explaining as best he can what the situation is. I am disposed to hear him through. After doing that, we may be able to establish a formula that will work better in other cases.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman feel that the burden of the 37 cases is so

heavy that one subcommittee alone cannot handle the proposition and arrive at a conclusion within a reasonable time for the Congress to act?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think that is a very fair question, and I would answer the gentleman from New York by saying that if each of the cases as we go along takes anywhere near as much time as this first case has, then we do have a burden that is too much for one subcommittee. It is my hope and belief, however, and I think it is the hope and belief of other members of the committee, that very shortly we shall reach a formula whereby these cases will fall into certain categories. We shall find, for example, that membership in the Friends of the Soviet Union either does or does not constitute a situation that requires a man to be removed from the pay roll. Once we have come to that conclusion, then we can move rather rapidly, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do it for the purpose of making the observation that I am very hopeful that we shall be able to take a recess a week from next Saturday, but that hope is going aglimmering.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that include action on the tax bill before we recess?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope so, but I cannot guarantee it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I sincerely hope so. I think it should be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman.

I was hopeful that we would be able to dispose of this bill today and get through with at least the general debate on the legislative appropriation bill. I know how practically every Member, if not every Member, is looking forward to a recess, that I should like to have start a week from next Saturday. I hope my observation will not be misunderstood, but I call to the attention of the Members that there must be cooperation if we are to recess starting a week from next Saturday.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the suggestion of the majority leader, I should like to see if we cannot make some arrangement to limit the time of debate on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the subject of this special committee close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do I get 5 minutes of that time?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; three gentlemen rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman submitting the request said I would get 5 minutes. Is that agreeable to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said these gentlemen ought to have a fair trial. That is all right. Everyone should have a fair trial when accused of an offense. I wonder if he would try to get a fair trial for those so-called conspirators who were arrested a year ago, accused of sedition. They have been indicted twice or three times—it is hard to keep track of how many times. He might try to do something about that, because they are not on the pay roll of the Government. These men named by the Dies committee were or are. What is the charge made against these men? Gentlemen of the committee said that no charge had as yet been made against them. I thought the charge was that we did not want them on the pay roll any more. I did not know that they had been accused of any criminal offense.

This Congress did fire in preceding sessions 4 white men who were on the Federal pay roll. They were discharged because we did not like the things they said; because we did not like the things they wrote. We did not like their views nor what they appeared to be trying to do. We did not want them any more. We did not want to pay them. So we stopped their pay and they resigned. Then along came this other group. Among the other group, the last group, was one who was on the pay roll of the Government, of a department, which would receive an appropriation from the bill we were discussing at that time. That was Mr. Pickens. What happened? It was admitted on the floor, and you cannot dispute the proof, that he was a member of at least 3 or 4 or perhaps 10 or 20 Communist organizations. A majority of the House decided at that time that they just did not want on the pay roll a man who was a member of a Communist organization. If he did not know that at least 1 of a dozen organizations to which he belonged was Communist, then he is too dumb to be on the Federal pay roll. If he did know it then he ought to be off that pay roll. To see that he was not on was our privilege, was it not? So we kicked him off in the Committee. We kicked him off because he was Red; had Red views. Then the politicians discovered that he was black. That he was a Negro. He was a colored man. So the House, when a roll call vote came on, put him back. It was urged that by so doing, those who voted to keep him on would get the Negro vote, so-called. Some fellow outsider said to me right afterward, "You kicked him off because he was Red. You put him back because he was black. What color does that leave you?" I went away without answering, for I did not vote to retain him and I could not, I would not give the obvious answer.

Now, here we are. We have the Dies committee. It has been in existence for 4 or 5 years. That committee has spent something like $495,000. We have expressed our faith in the judgment, patriotism, and kind of service it has rendered to this House. Then after the Dies committee made its report and after we acted on that report in Committee of the Whole, then when we went into the House we reversed ourselves for what was charged was a political reason and expressed our lack of confidence in the Dies committee, our own committee, by putting up another committee to review the work of the Dies committee.

I venture to suggest that when this committee gets ready to report, and they suggest that these gentlemen have not had a fair trial, Mr. Pickens has not had a fair trial, someone will suggest that this subcommittee should have its opinion reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary and we let Mr. RAMSPECK's civil service committee try him. Then, if they condemn him we will turn him over to the Labor Committee, and there it will lie buried until the end of time.

Now, if we are men capable of transacting business for our people, after we have learned, as we have learned from the report of the Dies committee, that these men or this one particular man does not believe in our form of government, that he is a member of an organization, as he admits he has been, which believes in the overthrow of our Government, which the Attorney General—think of it, the Attorney General even—has granted is an enemy of our Government, then why do we not go along with the Dies committee and get rid of this man, or why do we not just get rid of the Dies committee? Let us act like employers in private industry would act. When we know that this man is a man that we do not want let us discharge him, not because he is a colored man but because we do not want men who belong to subversive organizations. The greatest service we can do to the Negro race, to the white race, will be when we find a man of either race on the Federal pay roll who does not believe in our form of government will be to get rid of him. I say again we are not trying him for sucking eggs or for stealing chickens or stealing sheep. We just decided once, and the Dies committee did also, that we did not want him because of his associations and because of his beliefs and the things he advocated. Do we have to keep on paying him? Confidence in our Government is not strengthened by our failure to get those who belong to subversive groups off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the fact that I have continuously

opposed continuation of the Dies committee and continue to oppose it will be forgotten in the observations I have to make with respect to this controversy or debate that has arisen, and which I think has taken a turn that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] no doubt did not apprehend.

It appears now that there is a disposition on the part of some to tell this subcommittee, composed of excellent men both as to ability and as to character, how they shall conduct the affairs of that investigation in each particular instance. I trust the gentlemen will pardon me when I make the observation that regardless of what was the vote of any one of those gentlemen on the proposition of continuing the Dies committee, it will make no difference in their honesty and integrity and purpose in performing the duties assigned to them by the action of this House. I would not know where to find more patriotic, worthy, and dependable men than to go to this subcommittee in the person of the gentleman from North Carolina, my own State [Mr. KERR], in the person of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in the person of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], in the person of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and in the person of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. I could not find more reliable men, men of greater integrity and purpose than I would find there, in my humble judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think gentlemen mean that when charges are filed against a man by anybody, even by a grand jury of 18 men in your own county, or a majority of them, that must be accepted as guilt on the part of the person charged. We have never had such a system of justice as that since this Government was founded, and I pray God that we may never have it. In any forum, as to any charge that is made, the man who is charged will have a right to be heard and have his day in court. It is not a little thing for this Congress to find by solemn vote that a man who is an American citizen, whatever you may say about his affiliations, is unworthy to hold a position of trust or honor in the United States of America, and I pray that time never will come.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. As I understand from the gentleman's remarks and also from his past conduct in the House, he is very desirous of seeing that every person, no matter of what he is suspected, shall obtain a fair trial, and I am quite certain also that the gentleman would be heartily in favor of kicking off the public pay roll any person who he was convinced was a Communist or who had subversive intents?

Mr. FOLGER. Subversive from any point of view. Of course, I am particularly interested in the Nazi and Japanese situation now, but subversive from any point of view.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is making a fine statement on the question of subversive activities. If the gentleman will take the hearings in connection with this bill, the hearings on the appropriation bill for the Department of Justice, there are three or four pages of testimony by the Attorney General who also is considerably worried about the word "subversive." He tells us that Congress has not yet told him what subversive is, and he apparently is up against the same proposition that the committee is. I suggest that the gentleman read the hearings.

Mr. FOLGER. I may say to the gentleman in that respect that I have the fullest confidence in the ability of this committee to understand what the delegation of power is to them and to perform their duty with honesty as men and American citizens.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I purposely marked pages 20, 21, and 22 for the information of the committee and also for the information of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931 (22 U. S. C. 12), $210,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 9, line 17, strike out "$210,000" and insert "$150,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment applies to an item of $210,000 for so-called representation allowances and would reduce it $60,000. I called attention to a similar item in a deficiency bill considered by the House a few weeks ago. The Chair sustained a point of order I made against the item—that I made against a paragraph that contained the item. That particular item was for $50,000 in addition to an appropriation of $150,000 that had already been allowed. That was for 1943 and was for so-called representation allowances. You are asking in this bill for $210,000 under a further item for representation.

I want to direct your attention to the fact that our Government pays all of the expenses of these foreign representatives, gives them all funds that are required for all living expenses, including rent, heat, travel, and all other items. And let me remind you they are pretty high. In addition thereto, you insist on a liberal further expenditure for what you describe as entertainment. It is just an additional extravagance that we indulge in to allow our representatives and auxiliaries to put on various kinds of parties, dinners, and that sort of thing. I assume that, under the policy that is being followed, there must be a certain amount of expense required by our representatives to pay their share on account of celebrations of different kinds. But there can be no excuse or sense in using American taxpayers' money to buy champagne, liquor, or other such stuff in order to show a friendly feeling toward the officials of the countries where our representatives are located.

If we have any extra money to spend for things of that kind we had better spend it on the poor people of those countries rather than for extravagances of this kind. I think a deeper cut should be made, but I am suggesting $150,000 in place of $210,000, putting it back to at least where it was last year. As far as that is concerned I do not know to what foreign representation this goes anyway. I think a great deal of it probably goes down to South America where, of course, we are putting on a lot of entertainment; but if you have got to buy their friendship by throwing cocktail parties and things of that kind then we are getting off to a rather poor start. The thing to do is at least to cut it down to $150,000 and you will still have more than enough money for entertainment than is necessary. There is no sense in increasing this expenditure year after year. This thing started with $50,000 not long ago; then we put it up to $100,000, then to $150,000, and then in the deficiency of a few weeks ago, a request was made for $50,000 additional for this purpose. Now the committee come in for a further sum of $210,000 described as an item for "representation."

Of course, the bill does not say what the money is to be used for; just calls it "representation" to be used by our representatives abroad. The report filed with this bill does not give any details about this item.

The hearings, I will admit, are vague. On page 117 of the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] called attention to the use of this money for entertainment, including food and beverages. The witness, Mr. Davis, was asked if he knew what the money had been spent for, and whether he could give a break-down as to the use of the money. You will not find it in the record of the hearings. The break-down of the use of that $150,000 just is not in the record. There is a general statement in the hearings entitled "Purposes of Allowances" taken from certain regulations, but nothing about the items that go to make up the $150,000 already spent this last year.

All I am asking this House to do is to reduce the item by $60,000 and not make it more than it was last year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield for a question; yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not doubt the gentleman's sincerity, but I should like to know what evidence the gentleman has that the money has been spent for liquor and so forth. I do not want our money spent for those things any more than the gentleman does, but I would like to know what evidence the gentleman has of it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All right. If the gentleman will read the hearings on

the deficiency appropriation bill that passed this House just a short time ago he will find the use of funds for use of beverages, and so forth. If beverages, as used there, does not include liquor, I do not know what else it means.

Now I call attention to the hearings on the present bill on page 117, where the gentleman calls attention to the fact that this money is used for entertainment and for food and beverages. The term "liquor" was used when we discussed that item of $50,000 a few weeks ago. I think the committee itself would practically admit that at least part of this money goes for champagne and other liquor. I really thought the chairman of the committee believed that to be a fact.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. What particular language is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. REES of Kansas. To statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska on page 115. I will ask the gentleman from Nebraska if that question was not asked?

Mr. STEFAN. It is on page 115. What was the question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I ask if it is not a fact that the gentleman asked if it was not for entertainment and part was for beverage, and it was not denied?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, there is no question but what a representation allowance is an entertainment allowance.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And does it not include champagne and different kinds of liquor?

Mr. STEFAN. I used the general statement that it included food and beverages. I agree with the gentleman that they should not give too many cocktail parties, and I was averse to using too much money for that and insisted on cutting it down. I think it is still a little high.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think that beverages here would include champagne and other liquor?

Mr. Chairman, let me say again that in my humble judgment that, rather than turn over an additional quarter million dollars of the American taxpayers' money to our representatives to entertain the dignitaries of foreign lands, it would be a whole lot wiser and better and sensible to use it to buy food for the starving men, women, and children of those countries. It would create a whole lot more friendly feeling and understanding than to use it for extravagant cocktail parties and things of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas brings up the question about representation allowances. I would ask the House to realize the tremendous increase in the cost of food today and of all sorts of entertainment which enters into a general expense account under present conditions. There was an allowance for this purpose last year of $150,000. There was an additional allowance under a supplemental bill of $35,000 for a 3-month period which on a yearly basis would have made the amount for this particular item $270,000. The committee allowed the sum of $210,000.

The State Department is in competition with all the Axis Powers all over the world wherever there is competition in matters of this kind. If it is the consensus of opinion of this House that such competition should be reduced and that the United States should be put in the disadvantageous corner, that is all right with the committee, but personally I would not approve such action.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman speaks about the high cost of food. Of course, this does not include the food supply for our representatives abroad. This is for the purpose of putting on these parties.

Mr. RABAUT. This is an entertainment program and it has to compete with the entertainment program that is put on by the opposition. I do not want to have our Department of State pushed aside and have the others lord it over our State Department. I think we ought to be broad enough to see the situation as it is, in view of the conditions that exist in the world today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My contention is that you do not help this thing by throwing away and spending money for champagne.

Mr. RABAUT. There is a very light way you can talk about every subject. It can be dealt with in such manner as to make it look ridiculous. But, on the other hand, you have to take the facts and conditions as they are. We have something to fight about today and we are using every weapon at our command.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any place that a Member of the House could learn what this entertainment consists of and what it costs?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, the hearings have some information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about the hearings. I mean to get at the facts and know what the money is spent for.

Mr. RABAUT. We did not ask what size the meals were or what the entertainment consisted of. We thought, as figures go, that the allowances we made were such that we were very careful about the matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not know what the money was spent for except that it comes in under the broad, general term of "entertainment"?

Mr. RABAUT. It comes in under the broad, general term of "entertainment."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all the gentleman knows about it?

Mr. RABAUT. We have our own people traveling all over the world today, and when visitors arrive there are expenses involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about that. I go around once in a while myself.

Mr. RABAUT. If you will look on page 117, there is a whole set-up showing the purpose of the allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service, auxiliary (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Department of State during the fiscal year 1944 to continue to perform functions or activities in connection with the Auxiliary Foreign Service for the performance of which, during the fiscal years 1941 and 194', the Department of State received allocations of funds from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President" contained in the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, including the objects for which and subject to the conditions under which such allocations were provided or expended during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, $2,500,000: *Provided*, That cost-of-living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to make an observation at this point. The personnel appearing on pages 178 to 190 inclusive are paid their salaries and expenses in this item of the bill. They are called economic analysts.

I invite your attention to the ages of many of these young men. On page 178 there is a man aged 28, named Alexander Schnee. I do not know the gentleman and have heard nothing derogatory about him. He may be a fine young boy. But it seems to me that these persons have extraordinary power and authority to recommend distribution of our toil and sweat among the countries of the world.

I point this out in the hope that the Congress of the United States will have a care and preserve for itself the control of the purse strings of the Nation so that we, rather than employees of this caliber, will decide what shall be spent in foreign countries, how much, and what for.

These economic analysts on these pages are just a few of the economic analysts of the State Department. If you will refer to the First Deficiency Appropriation bill for 1943, you will find a like list, covering probably a larger number. If you will refer to the pay roll of the Lend-Lease Administration and the Board of Economic Warfare, you will find employees of similar class and grade. I think this is a subject the Congress of the United States might well go

into. These economic analysts are making the recommendations for our movements in world affairs. When Congress blindly follows Budget requests we may sometimes be following the voices of inexperience, I'm afraid.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman must confess that the background of these gentlemen is superb. There are a number of educated American businessmen who are going throughout all the world now negotiating business and inquiring about business, and doing business for the Government in this time of war. The gentleman will agree with me that this is a temporary set-up. It has had the approval of such men as Hull, Welles, Shaw, and Long. There is no finer corps of men in this Government than these gentlemen, and no men who are more interested in the welfare of this Government than these fine officials whose names I have just given.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I do not believe there is any substitute for experience. There is no substitute for age. The university of hard knocks, with its colors of black and blue, are the best credentials. I am convinced the billions of dollars that will be wrested from the taxpayers of this country should not be disposed of throughout the world on the recommendation, for instance, of Mr. Donald P. Downs, age 23, and three others from 21 to 25 years of age.

It seems to me the Congress of the United States is going to have to assume its full responsibility and reserve for itself the decisions as to where and when money is to be spent, rather than grant the power to corporations or special agencies with blank checks to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $125,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, monthly allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, internes, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics, and the expenses of transportation and subsistence of employees, including the cost of transportation of their immediate families and household goods and effects in going to and returning from posts of assignment in foreign countries, and living quarters allowances, including heat, fuel, and light, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a): *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase (not to exceed $10,950), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of books and periodicals; rental of halls and boats; and purchase, rental, and repair of microfilming equipment and supplies, and colored photographic enlargements, $4,500,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics, including the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture films, educational material, and such other material and equipment as the Secretary may deem necessary and appropriate, and such other gratuitous assistance as the Secretary deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; all without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That any funds herein appropriated which may be transferred to the Federal Security Agency for the Public Health Service shall be available for the salaries and expenses of not to exceed two additional regular active commissioned officers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1945.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 29, line 13, strike out "$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces by the sum of $1,500,000 the funds carried in this bill for cooperation with the American republics. The committee had considerable discussion on this particular item. It was reduced somewhat below the amount allowed by the Budget. The chairman of the subcommittee and his colleagues on the majority side felt that they could not vote to reduce it below $4,500,000. I most thoroughly and sincerely disagree with them. I think without hindering the war effort, without hindering the program that should be carried on down there at the present time, it would be ample if we gave them the sum of $3,000,000.

Last year they had for this same purpose $1,685,000. When we increase that to $3,000,000 we are making a very substantial increase.

I call your attention to some of the things the State Department say they are going to do with this money. I am quite in accord with some of the things they are going to do. I will admit that the $12,111,000 that will be spent by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the training of pilots in South America has a direct bearing on our war effort. There are ample funds in this bill; after adopting the amendment I propose to have that program and the other necessary programs carried on. But I am unwilling to vote away the money of the taxpayers for a number of things the State Department have listed as their program for the coming year.

Here is one:

Intern training in soil conservation.

It may be very desirable for us to help the South American people and go down there and indulge in some of these activities in ordinary times when this country is not battling for its very life and existence and when the taxpayers are not carrying a heavy burden.

Here is another one:

Intern training in map and chart reproduction. Intern training in hydrographic surveying and assignment of experts. Intern training in the field of radio communication.

I think it would be very lovely for us to make the South American people more proficient over the radio, but I do not believe that is something on which we ought to spend the money that is needed so badly for war purposes at the present time.

There is a long list of these activities. Here is another one:

Fishery exploratory projects; fellowships in fishery science—

Wholly unnecessary at the present time.

Assignment of representatives to American republics.

And listen to this—the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] yesterday in the course of his remarks told you about some man we were bringing up here to give piano lessons. Here is one that has a bearing on that:

Service of collections and preparations of bibliographies of Latin-American music.

Now, we might not object to that in ordinary times with a treasury full of money, but certainly in wartime, with a treasury depleted, it is a program that we should not think of entering into at all.

Here is another item that was referred to last year:

Preparation of handbooks of South American Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I always regret to take issue with my distinguished friend from California [Mr. CARTER], who has just addressed the Committee. It is always pleasant to cooperate with him, and I feel a sense of satisfaction when he and I can agree about matters. But I cannot agree with the gentleman in his proposition to reduce this appropriation 100 percent. Those representatives of the Department of State came before our committee and discussed this matter with us with great care and at great length. They also agreed fully with the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget approved, for this matter, $6,000,000. I assume they raised the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 because they felt that this agency was more important in this wartime than it was before. I am convinced that that assumption is right today. We will have to admit that the people of this Nation have sadly neglected their Western Hemisphere neighbors for a long number of years. We have not sought that relationship with them which would make them extremely fond of us. We were so busy here that we had other things to do and other business to attend to, and we allowed the European nations to go to the South American Republics and make friends with those people and get their trade and establish cultural relations with them. Every one of those great European activities has spent large sums of money in the last 20 years—many times the amount proposed in this appropriation—in order that they should stimulate friendship and fellowship that would give them advantage and get business from our neighboring republics.

For that reason the European people have been doing principal business with South America for a long number of years. Now, when these war eventualities came about, we realized what we had sadly neglected to do. This is a temporary measure. We propose now to go down and cultivate those people and make friends with them and tell them of our resources and our availability to do their business and to thank them for what they are doing for us now in these wartimes.

I call your attention to a clipping which I have recently cut out of a paper headed "Rio de Janeiro":

Brazilian troops were declared yesterday to be prepared to fight the Nazis on foreign soil. A high source made the announcement that two Brazilian military missions already are in North Africa, according to General Eisenhower.

By the little work we have done down there we have been able to have 8 or 10 of those nations declare themselves at war against the Axis nations. I cannot conceive of spending money to better advantage than that proposed to be spent here, namely, in teaching those people down there something of our institutions and something of our Government, and learning ourselves something about theirs.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell us what the Rockefeller committee does? I understood it had a duty somewhat similar.

Mr. KERR. The Rockefeller committee has a duty similar to this, but that has been practically transferred to this organization, and that is one of the reasons why the Bureau of the Budget undertook to increase the appropriation so much this year.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could the gentleman refer me to the pages in the testimony where that transfer is described?

Mr. KERR. I do not have that before me, but what I have stated is the fact. This activity has largely taken over the activities of the Rockefeller committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I was wondering whether the committee was furnished any information at all with respect to how much money the Axis Powers might be spending in the South American countries in order to maintain good will among our South American neighbors?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to tell you. You anticipated what I had in mind when I asked to have my time extended.

These are the recorded facts given us by the Department of State itself:

The French, soon after the Franco-Prussian War, began to extend their culture abroad through the Alliance Francais. French schools in foreign countries have had great appeal. French influence has been particularly strong over thought and education in the other American republics.

The German program in the other American republics has been acquiring cumulative force over two or three decades. It is estimated that since 1933 the Germans have expended $6,000,000 on schools alone. They have used to great advantage the large German colonies in Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, and Argentina. They have built up respect for German science and scholarship, have promoted the use of their textbooks in universities and have stimulated the study of the German language.

In the other American republics there are 67 centers of Italian culture with such names as Casa Italiana, Instituto di Alta Cultura, or Societa Dante Alighieri. In 1941 the Italians were reported spending approximately $4,000,000 a year on their cultural program.

Last summer the Japanese Government invited two Chilean newspapermen to visit Japan. Premier Tojo told one Chilean newspaperman "we have been able to maintain neutrality with Chile and Argentina. We are going to win the war because it is not one of force against force but of spirit against spirit, in which realm the Japanese are superior." The Japanese are also carrying on an active cultural relations program in far eastern areas. It is reported that the Japanese Government has made available to the military administration 150,000,000 yen (approximately $35,000,000) for a cultural educational program.

The British Government in 1934 established the British Council, whose budget is several million dollars a year. The British Council in spite of the war continues to award fellowships to Brazilian, Argentine, and other students for study in England. British cultural institutes are maintained in the important cities of South America.

It should be clearly understood that this activity has for its purpose the establishment of Western Hemisphere solidarity and to preserve peace in the world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Going back to this Rockefeller activity, did I understand the gentleman to say that this activity is not being carried on any more?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman did not; I hope he did not. I said that a large portion of that activity had been transferred to this activity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And included in this appropriation.

Mr. KERR. And I think the reason that the Budget recommends the sum of $6,000,000 is in order to take care of that part of the Rockefeller work that was being transferred.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Can the gentleman tell us how much we are also going to spend for the Rockefeller work?

Mr. KERR. No; I cannot, because that does not come directly under our consideration. In conclusion, let me make this observation: As human beings, as men of intelligence, we know very well that in order to have a good neighbor we must cultivate our neighbor. Two men or two families can live on opposite sides of the same street, and if they fail to cultivate each other they finally come to hate each other. It is characteristic of human life; it is characteristic of national life. For 200 years we have neglected to cultivate these people, and this is the first program that has ever been inaugurated looking toward that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana and Mr. STEFAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the House for whom I have greater respect than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who just preceded me in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from California [Mr. CARTER]. This is not a proposition to defeat the program of cultural relations or cooperation with the South American republics. It is a matter of endeavoring to save money and use

a little common sense. The total amount in this bill for the Department of State is over $33,000,000. We feel it is our duty in these times of stress to recommend wherever possible a saving of money. The appropriation for this one item has jumped from a little over a million dollars to over four and a half millions.

From what has been said by my distinguished colleague you may have secured the impression that the Rockefeller organization is idle. Last year they had $18,000,000 for the purpose discussed. They have transferred only a little of their work to the State Department.

The minority members of your subcommittee believe in doing everything we possibly can in bringing closer together the people of the entire Western Hemisphere. We are trying to do that. We do not believe we will cripple the program if some items are eliminated.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I know my colleague wants to be fair about this.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly I do.

Mr. RABAUT. Of the increase I would beg my colleague to remember that there are two items of the same size—one is for $1,211,000, the other is for $1,294,000. Most of the $1,294,000 is for the Coordinator's office and the $1,211,000 is for the civilian pilot training program. There is a total of $2,505,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The Coordinator spent approximately $18,000,000 last year and I have no information that he is not going to have sufficient funds this year. We believe in continuing the weather information service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the aviation, the complementary crops program, and a lot of other things that we know we must have from Central and South America.

We also believe we are trying to continue a program of better friendship and better understanding, but there are some things that go beyond our comprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not, may I call attention to the fact that I am hopeful we will get through with the general debate on the legislative appropriation bill today? I am sure that the members of the subcommittee will appreciate the situation that confronts us. I am very anxious that a week from next Saturday we may have that recess.

Mr. STEFAN. The distinguished leader will realize I am trying to cooperate with him in every way I possibly can, but this is a very important item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, when this bill came to us with the various things they wanted in South America, even the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee was so confused that he said:

> We better send this back to the State Department and have them tell us what this is all about. We better tell them to give us a first priority on the things which they consider most important.

This came at a time when I had word from my Indian reservations in the district I represent that they wanted more police protection, and some more assistance. When the information came back from the State Department they put on as the first priority a handbook for the South American Indians. For years and years the Indians of our country have been begging us for a handbook on American Indians. Our committee in other bills always was opposed to a handbook on South American Indians until we were a little better off financially.

Another item that came back as one of high priority, an item which your committee has thrown out of the bill before the war, called for the stocking of waters in South America with fish. People in my own district have been asking us for a few minnows to stock the streams of Nebraska. We thought we ought to look after our own fishing before we launched on such a program in foreign countries.

Then there was another one involving information about labor conditions, a labor program for South America. Another had to do with the delinquency of children down there.

There are many things here that are good, but some do not make common sense. It will not make the South American or Central American people mad at us if we eliminate some of these things. They will be grateful to us for scrutinizing the items which they themselves probably would not approve.

The program of cooperation with the American republics as reflected in this appropriation and its effects on every department of our own Government should attract the attention and interest of every Member in the House.

Twelve departments of our Government have been asked to contribute their services in many of the countries south of the Rio Grande, and requests for funds for each of these departments are in this bill. The far-reaching effects of the program are shown by the original requests that the following departments embark upon the following activities in these foreign countries:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Development of complementary products.
Development of rubber production.
Intern training in agricultural economics.
Intern training in agricultural chemistry and engineering.
Intern training in agricultural extension.
Intern training in soil conservation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Development of vital statistics in the Americas.
Civilian pilot training.
Tidal investigations.
Magnetic observations.
Seismological observations.
Geodetic surveys and intern training.
Intern training in map and chart reproduction.
Printing of hydrographic manual.
Intern training in hydrographic surveying and assignment of experts.
Publication of Spanish Edition of Manual of Tide Observations.
Gravity surveys.
Intern training in foreign trade statistics.
Maintenance and operation of radiosonde stations in Mexico.
Intern training in meteorological science.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Intern training in the field of radio communications.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Exchange of fellows and professors.
Assistance in connection with teacher-exchange and travel-grant program.
Intern training for school teachers.
Studies of Latin-American education and evaluation of credentials.
Exchange of materials on education.
Promotion of pan-American clubs.
Promotion of language teaching.
Assignment of medical and scientific personnel.
Public health fellowships.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fishery mission to Mexico.
Fishery exploratory projects.
Fish-stocking projects.
Fishery survey of the Amazon Basin.
Fellowships in fishery science.
Cooperative investigations of strategic minerals.
Assignment of technical advisers in the field of minerals.
Materials relating to national parks and monuments.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Printing of Our Constitution and Government in Spanish and Portuguese.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Protection of childhood.
Care of dependent and delinquent children.
Maternal and child-health services.
Child welfare consultant service in agricultural investigations and extension stations.
Internships.
Intern training in the welfare of employed women.
Assignment of representatives to other American republics.
Internships.
Intern training in the administration of laws relating to labor standards.
Cooperation in connection with labor standards.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Duplication of collections for exchange with institutions in the American republics.

Assistance in the field of library science.

Archive of Hispanic culture.

Preparation and exchange of albums of recordings of American music.

Recording folk music in other American republics.

Surveys of collections and preparation of bibliographies of Latin-American music.

Guide to the official publications of Latin America.

Law guide and center of Latin-American legal studies.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Preparation of a handbook of South American Indians.

Cooperation with scientific institutions.

Cooperation in the field of social anthropology.

Mailing the International Exchanges to Argentina and Brazil.

Conservation of animal and plant life.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Intern training in the field of tariff administration, import statistics, and customs procedures.

Printing and binding.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Publication and distribution of an Inter-American Treasury Bulletin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Translations.

Printing and binding.

Preparation of an American boundary document.

Travel of advisory committees.

Travel grants to leaders.

Professorial missions.

Travel and maintenance grants to students.

Convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations.

Training and education of vocational teachers and leaders.

Art and music exchanges.

Exchanges of books and other cultural materials.

Grants for American cultural institutes, libraries, and schools in the other American republics.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it looks like I am back on the red network this afternoon.

In support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California, I may start off by saying that in 1942 for this same proposition the State Department received $700,300. For 1943 the State Department received $1,685,000 and for 1944 the State Department requests $6,000,000.

In my statement yesterday I said that the committee had cut that to $4,500,000. The pending amendment seeks to cut it down to $3,000,000. Personally, I think it should be cut further than $3,000,000.

I heard a lot of emphasis yesterday and today put on the fact that Germany spent from 1933 until the outbreak of the war with the United States the sum of $6,000,000 for education. Well, that argument alone condemns the State Department because in 1942 the State Department asked for only $700,000, and that is all it received. What were they doing while Germany was spending $6,000,000 from 1933 until about 1941, the time of the outbreak of the war? By their own argument they convict themselves.

Today they say they are waking up, but it is like trying to close the barn door after the mare has gone. It is too late. No matter how much money you want to give or to spend on these matters that have been set forth by the State Department, and many of them are ridiculous, you will not build up any goodwill that has not already been built up and that does not already exist. I heard one distinguished gentleman get up here, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], and say that a few million dollars such as we have been talking about is chicken feed. Well, it may be chicken feed to him, but down there in the district where I come from in Louisiana four and a half or six million dollars is a lot of money. That money comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. And may I say right here that some of these bureaucrats can think up ways for spending money faster than the taxpayers can rake up the money to pay for them with. You talk about chicken feed. Dollars make millions, millions make billions, and the taxpayers pay the whole load.

I ran into one Congressman yesterday who said, after I had finished my talk, "Jimmie, I do not agree with you." I asked him why and he said, "I do not believe in sending these men from South America to a school here in the United States at the taxpayers' expense, with the exception of one." I asked him, "Who is that?" He said, "The one to go to Harvard to study epilepsy and alcoholism." I said, "Why not keep him down in South America?" He said, "Oh, no; let him go to Harvard and when he finishes there, let him be assigned to the State Department."

The United States has stopped sending students down to South America. Why on the other hand should we pay out millions of dollars to bring their students up here?

Mr. Chairman, we are at war. Central America and South America are just as much at war as we are. We should take every available dollar, these millions, these so-called chicken-feed items, as one distinguished gentleman the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] called them yesterday, and use them to win this war. We should use that money for the war effort, and use none for these nonessential things.

As a matter of fact, South America and Central America are getting millions and billions of dollars through other departments and other branches. How can we ask for money for the Red Cross, how can we ask our people here in the United States to buy bonds when this money is being spent like this in the ways it is, for anthropology, $116,000 in South America; for fisheries and fishhooks the sum of $125,000; to make a handbook on the South American Indians, $10,000; and for distributing periodicals, over $100,000.

In conclusion, may I say that if we do not have the goodwill of South America yet, if we do not have the goodwill of Central America, no matter how much money we spend on these nonessentials, whether it is $1,000,000, $5,000,000, $10,000,000, or $100,000,000, we will never get it at this time.

The amount was $700,000 in 1942, $1,650,000 in 1943, and now for 1944 I say $3,000,000 is ample.

You will be doing a favor for your constituents, for those soldier boys up there in the gallery, for every man in the armed forces, and for the taxpayers, and you will be doing your duty if you support this amendment to cut that appropriation to $3,000,000, which is many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday that probably there are some items in this bill that on their face would appear to be objectionable. It has been pointed out that 2 years ago the State Department asked for $900,000 and last year $1,000,000. May I say that 3 years ago the State Department did not ask for anything to be used in South America, nor did it ask for anything 4 years ago.

Up until 3 years ago this country appeared to have no interest in South America. The only country in which we appeared to be interested was North America, until we saw the war clouds gathering on the horizon in Europe and in the Orient in 1940. Then we began to look around and take stock of our ability to face the situation. We looked into South America and we found that Japan, Germany, and Italy had become quite favorably identified there simply because they had cultivated cultural and business relations with the people of South America.

Then we realized the situation we would be in if we had to fight a war and our enemies obtained a foothold in South America. The State Department suggested we might make a few investments down there in order to find out definitely what was going on and see if it were possible to cultivate the good will of those people and have them take sides with us in what was considered to be an approaching conflict. That is the reason the State Department asked for this money.

Personally and selfishly, and let me emphasize the word "selfishly," if I looked at this from a selfish standpoint I would certainly not be in favor of some of the items carried in the bill.

It has been suggested that because we are appropriating $33,000,000 for the State Department, the items for cultural relations should be eliminated. The advocate did not take into consideration that this is probably the greatest department of the Government, certainly one which has functions to perform equal to or superior to those of any executive department of the Government. Yet you will come in a few minutes to a provision in this bill carrying an appropriation of $35,000,000 for one bureau in the Department of Justice, yet some complain because we are appropriating $33,000,000 for the great State Department, about $4,000,000 of which will be used or spent in South America.

Like my friend, the gentleman from California, I do not agree with some of the purposes for which they are to be spent, I do not think some of them will amount to much. However, I am not prepared to say that my judgment is better than that of the representatives of the State Department. They have asked for this money and said that it will be well spent and a valuable contribution to our war effort. I am, therefore, willing to take a chance on it, just as we are taking a chance on a number of other things in our war program.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr CARTER. The gentleman was making a very strong point of how much money Germany and Italy and some other countries had spent in South America.

Mr. HARE. No; the gentleman is mistaken. I did not mention money.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman spoke of how much attention they had given South America in the past.

Mr. HARE. Yes; that is correct, and the evidence is they spent a lot of money in their program.

Mr. CARTER. The State Department has told us how much they spent there. My understanding is that all South American countries except one have broken diplomatic relations and declared war against Germany. Does not that demonstrate to the gentleman how fruitless it is for us to go down there and spend money to gain their friendship?

Mr. HARE. No; it demonstrates to me the fruit of the expenditures of the State Department 2 years ago and the fruit of the expenditures of the State Department last year. That is what it clearly demonstrates to me. I think the gentleman had his ideas right, but he had his words wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to follow the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]. He paid great tribute to the State Department. I wonder where the State Department was during the last 10 years, when all of these things that have culminated in the last few years were developing. What is the attitude of our State Department to the Falange broadcasts to South America? Has our State Department made any protest to the Spanish Government on this matter? It will be recalled time and again that the State Department permitted our doing business with Japan and Germany.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. HARE. While the State Department was permitting us to do business with Japan and with Germany and Italy and the Governments of those countries the gentleman will recall that the Congress of the United States by its action and some of its laws was doing very little business with South America.

Mr. BENDER. We have had representatives in South America for many years; official representatives of our Government, and charitable and philanthropic organizations also represented us; as a matter of fact, medical missionaries from my own church were in South America carrying on a good work. Frankly, I believe that this amendment is a desirable one. It will save us considerable money. I cannot conceive of our raising this appropriation for another boondoggle and at the same time having this subcommittee recommend a decrease of $800,000 in the appropriation for the F. B. I. I do not know whether the gentleman desires to comment on that or not, but I think we might well increase the appropriation for the F. B. I., or leave it as requested by the Budget and not increase this item, which seems to me to be out of line with good government. J. Edgar Hoover is doing a magnificent job and should have every dime he asks for.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will read the report, he will find it explicitly stated why we made the reductions. There is no question at all with the State Department. It is the manpower situation and the difficulty to fill the job that made that comparative amount in proportion to the amount of the other appropriations. It is on pages 24 and 25.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman, but I am not convinced. I am for giving the F. B. I. the $800,000, and I am for the Carter amendment to decrease the amount of money for the South American boondoggle. I only have another minute or two. Here are a few questions my constituents are asking that I wish someone from the State Department would answer:

Has our State Department requested the Spanish Government to withdraw its concentration of troops from the border of Spanish Morocco?

What is the attitude of the State Department to Eduard Benes?

What is the attitude of the State Department to the Polish Government in exile? Specifically, to Sikorsky?

Did our State Department agree that General De Gaulle should not go to north Africa at this time?

How many political prisoners remain in jail in north Africa at this time?

How much food and oil is being shipped to Spain each month?

Several weeks ago I introduced a resolution for an investigation of our State Department appeasers and bureaucrats. Today I want to urge that the resolution be adopted, and quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman frem New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for 4 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have heard arguments put forth here about saving money. I think we are overlooking the main point in this discussion. We have established a program that embraces considerable and extensive work in South America of a vital, far-reaching account. Much opposition has been directed to certain items upon the basis that they are frivolous items. I do not believe that is so. I do believe that it is possible to modify some of the items in the bill, but when you establish a program it is important to follow it up. Some of these items may not be possible of completion during the coming year, but we know that such funds as are not expended revert to the Treasury. Certainly the State Department is not going to seek out ways to use these funds just for the amusement of spending the taxpayers' money. I think when we treat this matter in a frivolous manner we are doing an injustice to the State Department, to ourselves as representatives of the people, and we are placing our officials at a great disadvantage. We all know what Germany, Italy, and Japan have been doing for years in Latin America. We recognize the inroads they have made there, and we should realize that we will have to do twice as much work in order to counteract their insidious influence. We have been told that our enemies have been down there for 25 years, and not only have they set up extensive business interests and schools but they have also intermarried. We know when ties, however to our disadvantage, are that close, we are not going to counteract them merely by spending a few million dollars in a hurry, in good old get-rich-quick-Wallingford style, by saying, "Here is money; we are your friends." That is not the point. I think our Latin-American program is based on solid substantial ground.

It is important for us to bring students to our universities so that we may have an exchange of cultures. I am in favor of this program being extended over a period of years, and I am convinced it will take years before we attain our proper place in the sun of South America. If we do not fully support the program of the State Department, and support it now, we will slip back to our former unworthy place, and all of the scanty progress that we have made will

be lost. Our failures will be magnified because these folks will regard our program as merely theoretical. I do not know why they declared war or did not declare war upon our common enemies; I do not know whether it was from a selfish or a patriotic motive, but I prefer to believe that the motive was patriotic.

I do not believe we ought to tie the hands of our State Department in any way. When the success of a broad constructive program is at stake, a program which is an essential part of the larger program of winning the war and the peace, I repeat, this is no time to indulge the luxury of ignorance and prejudice in ill-advised frivolity or penny-pinching frugality. It behooves us to be more generous than we ordinarily would be. I know it imposes a penalty upon our people, but we are in a war that is affecting every single home. I would rather spend millions of dollars than lose the life of one American boy because of something that we should have done and failed to do.

I hope that this amendment will not be adopted. After all, if the money is not expended it will simply go back into the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to cut the amount carried in this portion of the bill from $4,500,000 to $3,000,000. In other words, it proposes to save the American taxpayer $1,500,000. Of course, in supporting this amendment I do not for a minute wish to be understood as decrying the effort to solidify and render permanent the good will that exists now between this Nation and virtually all of the Central and South American republics, but we cannot buy victory. We have been liberal with every country in the world to the degree of prodigality. In considering this effort to save this sum of money for the American taxpayers, let us just have in mind a few facts. A few days ago we raised the debt limit of this country to $210,000,000,000. That means that before this war is over this Nation shall have spent in the war on its own behalf and that of its allies all of the accumulated wealth of this Republic.

Just what degree of care should a public official exercise in the discharge of a public duty on behalf of the people he represents? The law sets the standard for an official in the discharge of his official duties. It says he must use a degree of diligence which exceeds that of a prudent man in the discharge of his own private affairs. There ought to be some limit. When war comes in the door, economy, good judgment, and a lot of other good things go out the window.

Of course, we are going to win this war, but I am not convinced for 1 minute that any victory will come to us by the expenditure of this $1,500,000 in South America. We have done a lot of good down there and we are getting a lot of good things that we need. We are getting tin. We are getting copper, we are getting quinine, we are getting bauxite, and if necessary we can get other things; but that is a business proposition. We have gone into the social phase of this thing. I am not going to say that we ought not do that. They say that when a man is in wine he will tell the truth, and that a banquet is sometimes a feast of reason and a flow of soul, and that one way to a man's intellect and his judgment is through his stomach. We have made liberal allowance for all of that, but we do not want to leave the impression on the minds of those people that we do not have any sense; that we are just a Nation spendthrift; that we are throwing away our wealth like a drunken sailor. All over the world we are pouring out the wealth of this Nation like sand, and the blood of its boys like water. Let us stop short of absolute bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. We all realize that friendship is the cement that binds peoples together. We realize that this four and a half million dollars is for the purpose of purchasing that friendship. Nations are like men, because they are groups of men. As a man, I have never known an individual whose friendship I have had to purchase whose friendship has been of any value. I think that this would apply also to South America.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I am for the old-line agencies, as I said yesterday. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], cutting $1,500,000 from this item, is a good amendment and will not harm the State Department or its integrity in any way. I am for it. I think this amendment will leave in the cultural relations program all that is necessary for the State Department to weld its share of the friendship between the United States and the South American countries.

I hope the amendment will be adopted almost unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, you cannot do what is being proposed here without disrupting the good-neighbor policy. If you vote for this amendment, you are doing an offensive act to the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere. You are not going abroad to do it. You are doing it right here in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I want to know whether or not the good-neighbor policy has already been offended by reason of the fact that the subcommittee cut the amount down to $4,500,000 from $6,000,000?

Mr. RABAUT. No. This proposition is brought to the official body of Congress. Congress is the representative body of the people. If you desire to convey the idea that we are now embarking on a wartime honeymoon, you are certainly playing into the hands of those who have sought to sell and have succeeded in selling the Axis proposition south of the Rio Grande. That is No. 1.

No. 2: No one questions the statesmanship of Cordell Hull or the African front, and the same great leader of the Department of State carries this message to you that is contained in this bill.

There has been much ridicule about the handbook on the American Indians. Scientists throughout the Americas, including teachers from 200 different universities, have earnestly sought the compilation of this data on the American Indian. The handbook is now in its third year of preparation. Sixty percent of the manuscript, maps, photographs, and drawings are in the editor's hands. The remainder is so near completion that the entire work could be assembled in a little more than a year. Thirty thousand dollars has already been spent on the project, and now it is contemplated to disregard the investment and the work that has been done by cutting down the $12,000 that would be allowed.

Moreover, there have been 90 contributions to this one book, and I ask the gentleman from New York particularly to listen: 47 in the American republics in Central and South America, and 43 in the United States.

These contributors went at the job so promptly and enthusiastically on the invitation extended that they are well in advance of the program and have really cut down the time for the work as originally anticipated by over a year. I could go on and tell you how the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese have been active in South America, but it is really difficult to appraise the great inroads that have been made there. I am surprised that the gentleman from California of all people should make the request that this fund be cut, for my distinguished and personal friend accompanied me on a recent trip to 17 of those countries.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 78.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. CARTER. The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were ayes 113 and noes 86. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, War Division: For all salaries and expenses in the District of

Columbia and elsewhere necessary for the enforcement of acts relating to the national security and war effort and in connection with the registration and control of alien enemies, including the employment of experts; supplies and equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; stenographic reporting services by contract or otherwise; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers (not exceeding $4,000), $800,000, of which not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for personal services without regard to the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the language on page 36 beginning with the word "of" in line 13 and extending to the end of line 15 and ask the gentleman from Michigan why it is proposed to exempt $100,000 from the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. RABAUT That is for an emergency in the Attorney General's office.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I should like to know what it is, to see whether it is justified or not. I have not been able to find anything in the hearings about it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HARE. It is my understanding that it is for the employment of special counsel in special cases by the Department of Justice in the war program. It is an appropriation that has been carried heretofore.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have not been able to find anything about it in the hearings.

Mr. HARE. It has been carried from year to year in the same language.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have no objection whatever to an item exempting only the classification law, but I see no necessity for exemption from the civil-service law, especially when we are now operating under the War Service Regulations.

Mr. RABAUT. This item has been carried for several years. If my colleague wishes to press his point of order that is his privilege, of course.

Mr. ROWE. Do special counsel fall under the jurisdiction of the civil service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, yes; all employees now come under civil service procedure. Attorneys were just recently put under civil service.

Unless there is some real emergent reason for it I am not disposed to pass it by.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language referred to is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of buildings and facilities: For construction, remodeling, and equipping buildings and facilities for penal and correctional institutions and for all necessary expenses incident thereto, including the acquisition of a site, there is hereby authorized to be transferred to this appropriation such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Attorney General and the head of any department, agency, or corporation of the United States as reimbursement for the National Training School for Boys or for any other penal and correctional facilities appropriated for under this heading, transferred to any other Government department, agency, or corporation, to continue available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 50 in lines 12 to 23 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is very bad practice to provide an indefinite appropriation without knowing what it is to be used for or anything about it. It is entirely illegal and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. No; we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal services (not to exceed $1,354,480) and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law; newspapers (not exceeding $1,500), periodicals, and books of reference; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of witnesses, and other contingent expenses in the District of Columbia, $1,409,000: *Provided*, That expenses, except printing and binding and traveling expenses, of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 68, line 13, after the word "appropriated", insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation in this paragraph shall be used for inquiries or investigations relating to dairy products, or for promotional activities, inquiries, or investigations in connection with oleomargarine, 'filled milk,' 'filled' cheese, and other pretended substitutes for dairy products."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would not ask for the additional time. We have another bill coming up, and the hour is late.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I had a tentative understanding with the gentleman from California that I would have 10 minutes today instead of taking the time yesterday.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman there is not a thing in the bill about this matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request temporarily.

Mr. RABAUT. Has the gentleman an amendment pending?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which I have just proposed, may I say that I believe that there is a definite conspiracy on within the administration to permanently injure and sabotage the dairy industry of this country? In 1940, the consumers counsel in the Department of Agriculture staged a Nation-wide radio broadcast urging people to eat oleomargarine, leaving the inference that oleo was just as good as butter. This was followed by a ruling of Paul V. McNutt, in charge of the Pure Food and Drug Division, which provided a new formula for oleo to make this product, as nearly as possible, have the same nutritive value, taste, and smell as butter. And, now, we have the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce putting on a promotional campaign, at the expense of the taxpayers, urging the use of oleo, filled milk, and filled cheese, and attempting to discredit butter and other genuine dairy products. Mr. E. E. McCleish is the Chief of the Marketing Laws Unit in this Bureau. I will have something to say about him and his predecessor, Mr. Paul T. Truitt, who resigned a few months ago to take on, as I have heard, a $40,000 a year job as the head of the Oleomargarine Institute.

These officials in the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce, and their associates, under the direction of Mr. Truitt, now the head of the Oleomargarine Institute, undertook to make an investigation which sought to discredit dairy products and to boost the use of oleomargarine, and other products like filled cheese and filled milk, both of which are now being sold contrary to law.

I have before me the results of the investigation, which consist of one publication of 308 pages and another of 55 pages boosting the merits of oleo and filled milk and cheese, and attempting to tear down genuine dairy products. These publications have been mailed out over the country by the Bureau and by Mr. Truitt, former chief, and now the high-priced executive of the Oleo Institute. All of this at the expense of the taxpayers.

In my opinion, Mr. Truitt did such a splendid job, as chief of the Bureau, in advertising oleo, that he was offered and did accept the high salaried position as head of the Oleo Institute. I estimate that he gave the industry at least $10,000,000 worth of free advertising—all at the expense of American taxpayers. After he resigned to take on his new job, Mr. McCleish took over, and it appears to me that Mr. Truitt still has considerable to say about the running of the Bureau when it comes to the products covered by my amendment.

There is no reason why the taxpayers should be called upon to pay for promotional work or advertising for any product or commodity. I have therefore offered this amendment to prohibit the use of any money appropriated by this section for inquiries and investigations of dairy products, and also to stop all promotional activities, inquiries, and investigations with reference to oleomar-

garine, filled milk, filled cheese, or any other pretended substitute for dairy products.

There will be a shortage of butter in the United States this year. Last year the production for civilian use was approximately 1,800,000,000 pounds. The Army and other governmental agencies will take around 30 percent of that butter, which leaves approximately 1,200,000,000 pounds for domestic consumption. When you deduct the amount that four or five million farmers will produce when they churn butter due to the rationing of butter, you will find approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter left for civilian use as against 1,800,000,000 last year. I can see good reasons why the few who are engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine want to have the Government promote their product, and I have no objection to people eating oleo. I do not want to be misunderstood in that respect.

You can buy and eat all the oleomargarine that you want. If the people know what it is, they may buy it, but we do not want it sold for butter, and we think it is wrong for any governmental money to be used for advertising or for any agency of the Government to promote its sale.

The sale of oleomargarine has gone up by leaps and bounds during the last 2 years or ever since the departments undertook this campaign to promote the sale of it. I have the figures here from the Department showing the sales of oleo to be around 72,000,000 pounds in January. At that rate, if it continues for the rest of the year, and we expect it will because of the butter shortage, you can realize that the total will be close to 1,000,000,000 pounds in 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman says that oleomargarine is sold as a substitute. Is that not a legitimate way to present the subject?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We want it sold for what it is. Let the people know what it is. If it is oleomargarine, and the people know it, I have no objection. But the people should not be deceived and made to believe that it is butter or just as good as butter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that that report on oleomargarine was started by the W. P. A. and finished by the Department of Commerce. Am I correct in that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentlewoman called that to my attention. It says in this 308-page booklet that the study of the food industry was initiated by Mr. Paul T. Truitt, recently resigned Chief of the Marketing Laws Division of the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce. He is the man who did such a good job in advertising these synthetic substitutes that he was given a job at $40,000 a year as the head of the Margarine Institute.

A legal research was conducted by Miss Edith N. Cook, chief attorney and labor analyst for the unit, and her associate counsel, Mr. Burt W. Roper, and Mr. John H. McLean. The Los Angeles staff of the Market Laws Survey contributed importantly in checking and charting the statutory restrictions. The economic section was conducted by Dr. Richard H. Rush, head of the economic staff of the unit, and his associate, John E. Kane. They do not give any credit to the W. P. A., although I know the W. P. A. assisted in this investigation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They started it, I think.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Bureau takes full and complete credit for having compiled this publication and for undertaking the program to advertise oleo and to bring about its increased sale to the people.

I was saying here that the sale of oleo has increased by leaps and bounds. Seventy-two million pounds were sold in January of this year. If it goes along at the same rate, the manufacture and sale of oleo will run close to 1,000,000,000 pounds for 1943, which will be about the same as the sale of butter available for consumption by the people in this country.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In this very book about trade barriers that the gentleman holds in his hand and which deals with the subject of——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield for a speech. The gentleman can bring that out in his own time.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman wants to be fair in his statement?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be fair.

Mr. RABAUT. There was no increase whatever in the consumption of butter when they put the tax on oleo. This is right in the findings in this book.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The tax has been on oleo for many years, but, in addition, this bureau has undertaken to make 10 or 15 recommendations, which appear in the back part of their book, recommending what should be done in Congress to change the laws and what should be done to secure the repeal of laws in the respective States. They are setting themselves up as supermen to dictate to us what shall be done in this country. We want no traffic with that kind of synthetic dictatorship.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much money belonging to the people of this country has this set of bureaucrats used in order to destroy the dairy industry of this Nation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have no idea how much money they have used, but I can tell the gentleman from Tennessee that if the objective of these officials is achieved, and they are trying to get the American people on a permanent oleo diet, that will drive the people away from butter. The O. P. A. has helped out on it. They require only 5 points to get a pound of oleo, whereas they require 8 points to get a pound of butter.

Mr. JENNINGS. What was the reward of the man who thus sabotaged the dairy industry of this country at the hands of the oleo interests?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The reward for Mr. Truitt, the chief of that division, was that he got this job as the head of the Oleomargarine Institute at around $40,000 a year. In other words, he gave them $10,000,000 worth of advertising at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How many copies of this book were delivered to the Oleo Trust for distribution at Government expense?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know how many copies they got, but I tried to get two copies and had to raise particular Ned even to get these and a few extras from Mr. MacLeish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In conclusion let me ask your support of my amendment so that we may stop this iniquitous practice of spending the taxpayers' money for the promotion of any product, and forever prevent a bureau chief from feathering his own nest at the expense of the people.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me the book to which the gentleman has been referring, Trade Barriers in the Food Industry. There is nothing in this bill, for the Department of Commerce for the particular matter that is being suggested under the pending amendment, so it is all water over the dam and we are just talking about it. It is all finished.

Besides this book that was referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota, I have here letters from different war agencies commending this study. It was originally started in the W. P. A. and then inherited by the Department of Commerce. These letters of commendation that I have are from Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, of the War Department; Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; and Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation. There are several others, and I could go on naming them. All these letters praise the activity that has been undertaken.

The gentleman from Tennessee just now said that the dairy industry is being

ruined. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because it is unable to fill its orders. Of course, people must have something in the form of substitutes for food. Naturally they are using these other products. If the orders can be filled, I know of no one who does not prefer butter and milk, if he can get it. But if these products are unobtainable, it is the most natural thing in the world for such a study to be made.

Under a study, started in the W. P. A., this matter came to light. Now it is completed. It is water over the dam, and I see no reason for having a continuing discussion about it, especially at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this subject close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean on this amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, during yesterday's debate on this bill the Chair gave me permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD full information, not only on this particular book known as Trade Barriers for Food Industry, but also approximately 25 other books, which were printed as a result of research done by a committee from various departments of the Government. I wish to advise my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] that I have been told that the gentleman who did some of the work on this particular book was employed in the Department of Commerce and since that time I understand, also, he has been employed by the oleo people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He was the Chief of the Division.

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct. He has since left the Department of Commerce.

I agree entirely with my colleague from Minnesota that we who come from butter-producing States are not so much concerned about the substitutes as we are about presenting to the public an inferior material, to be labeled as butter. We do not want the people fooled. We want them to know when they are eating butter and when they are eating substitutes.

I suggest that Members read the RECORD of yesterday. That gives a full, unbiased report of the publication of the various books in question. Here are about 25 of them, and practically every one was paid for with W. P. A. funds. To give the gentleman from Michigan some information about the history of the books, which the producers of milk, cream, and butter object to, they were paid for by W. P. A. funds.

The Department of Commerce spent no money in the preparation of them except a small amount on one book on trade barriers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this amendment comes to us strictly as a proposition to destroy any information that the public might get in regard to the value of oleomargarine as human food. The amendment is not here for the purpose of saving money. The gentleman who has just preceded me, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], talks about the improper publication of books. He did not tell you that the books relate to a great number of subjects, not simply oleomargarine.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not say "improper publication of books."

Mr. POAGE. Then I will simply say the publication of books. The books about which he complains relate to the whole question of interstate barriers. The amendment relates to getting information about oleomargarine, and the gentlemen who have discussed the subject have referred to what they call the oleomargarine monopoly. Oleomargarine is made all over the Cotton Belt, all over the Soybean Belt, and all over large sections of the United States. It is not produced by a monopoly. At least there is sufficient competition to keep the price far below the price of butter. It is not made altogether out of one product. It is made out of cottonseed, out of soybean oil, out of many crops grown in the great agricultural regions of this Nation, and it is being consumed by all the people of America who can get it. Even if the public wanted butter they cannot get it and the very gentlemen who are unable to furnish the people of America with the butter which they tell us the people want are unwilling for the people to have any substitute. They say they do not want to deny the people a good spread, they say they simply want the people to know the difference. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made a fine argument. He said all he wanted was that the people might know whether they were buying oleomargarine or butter. I want them to know also, and the very proceedings against which they now inveigh convey that information to the public. When the housewife goes to a store and pays five ration points for oleomargarine as against eight for butter, you can be mighty sure that she knows whether she is getting butter or oleomargarine. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] think that oleomargarine is so superior to butter that it should require more ration points? If he really believes that butter is so much better than oleomargarine then surely he would want butter to command a higher point value. If those people who do not want the people of America to have a cheap spread for their bread are sincere in saying they want the people to know the difference between oleomargarine and butter, they have never had an opportunity better than they have today for more clearly understanding the difference between oleomargarine and butter in what the O. P. A. is doing at this moment.

Why, then, continue your complaint about agencies of the Government doing the very thing you say you want them to do? Oh, the gentleman from Tennessee talked about the oleomargarine monopoly. Who has got a monopoly in this country? Who wants to keep the people from knowing what the product is that they are buying? Those of us who want the people of America to buy any food that is wholesome and pure that the American farmer can produce, whether he belongs to a favored group or whether he belongs to the great masses of farmers who produce general crops throughout this Nation, those of us who want the poorest as well as the most wealthy of this country to be able to buy a bread spread, are glad to see an agency of the Government show the housewife whether she is buying oleomargarine or whether she is buying butter. The people of America have long known the difference. Let them buy what they want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, personally I had been hopeful that we would not have this battle of oleo and butter during the present war; but that we could have that afterward. It seems, though, that when there is a war on, many groups, many people think that is the opportune time to sell their particular brand of medicine oil. The Commerce Department seems to be anxious to add fuel to the controversy. We should stop it.

For many years I have followed what has been done on these substitutes. If the substitute people want to promote any product let them use their own money instead of the public's.

The question is not whether oleo is as good as butter; the question is why we should be spending time and money during the war or any other time for this purpose. We do not want the Commerce Department spending time and money on this proposition. We have the Department of Agriculture; we have agricultural colleges and land-grant colleges scattered all over the United States. That is the place to study foods. We should not be trying to run it through the Department of Commerce. Since the Agriculture Department can carry on this experimental work and it is equipped to do so, we should let them do it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I might say that my amendment does not in any way interfere with the sale of oleomargarine or butter. All it does is to simply stop the expenditure by the Department of Commerce of any of the money appropriated in this bill to carry on promotional processes or investigations with reference to either dairy products, oleomargarine, or filled milk or filled cheese.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. We should support the

motion of the gentleman from Minnesota. We should discontinue the appropriation, as the program is absolutely without merit.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, when you patronize the time-honored institution of the cow that gives milk, to take care of the cottonseed of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who has just spoken so eloquently and so feelingly about that, you can put the cottonseed through the cow and get milk as against putting the cottonseed through a machine and get oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But that does not solve the problem before us. The question for us to decide is whether we want to continue an agency to promote dairy substitutes. I hope you will support the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is poor practice for any public official on the public pay roll to use his efforts in trying to promote the sale of any kind of product so that he can get a job as head of the institution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think we all agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] said you put this cottonseed through the cows and get butter and if you put it through a machine you get oleomargarine. When you put it through the machine and get oleomargarine you do not get tuberculosis, anthrax, and all these other infectious and contagious diseases that some of these cows carry.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can qualify as an expert on this subject or not. I happen to have two or three milch cows at my home, and I also happen to grow cotton. I get butter, milk, and clabber cheese from the cows. I guess I get oleomargarine from the cottonseed. So I think I can approach this from an unbiased standpoint. But I do want to make this observation.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. In just a minute, because I may not get an opportunity to make this observation. I have had a number of complaints recently about an O. P. A. order. Down in my country where other farms are about the size of mine, it has been customary for these farmers to keep a cow or two and sell their butter every week throughout the year. That is where the farmer gets his spending money. He has not been able to get rich at it, but he has been able to keep things going. O. P. A. orders have recently been issued to the effect that such a farmer cannot take his butter up to the little village and sell it where he has been accustomed to sell it for 10 or 20 years without getting some kind of a ticket or coupon. Consequently he does not sell it. What I want to know is this: Are the dairy people responsible for that order or is it the oleomargarine people? Whenever I find out who is responsible for it, then I will be ready to start cussing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that the O. P. A. intellectuals, key policy makers, are the ones who are responsible for it, and the butter and dairy industry regret it just as much as the gentleman does. We are trying to get it changed.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate that, but I say to the gentleman that I did not hear anything about it in his speech. I am serious about this because I imagine the custom prevails in practically every farming section of the country. It interferes not only with the operations of the small farmer, but it also interferes with a lot of people living in small towns and even the larger cities who have developed a taste for cow butter and, therefore patronize these small farmers. They know the difference between cow butter and butter substitutes. They like butter and they like to buy it from these farmers, but since they cannot get it they are disappointed and dissatisfied and both the farmer and the customers are kicking like "old Harry," and I cannot blame them. I get letters of protest nearly every day and I want to find out whether it is the oleomargarine people or the dairy people influencing the actions of the O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 85.

So, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 68, line 3, after the word "exceed", strike out "$1,354,580" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,260,000"; and on page 68, line 10, strike out "$1,409,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,309,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to take out of the bill money that was spent by the crowd that pulled off this performance last year. Just to show you the kind of job they thought they were doing I call attention to some of their performances. Thousands of copies of these documents, like this one entitled "Trade Barriers in Food" and this other smaller one on oleomargarine, were printed at Government expense and turned over to the Oleo Trust for distribution. To me it is the height of ridiculousness for any Government agency to go out and try to destroy one industry or build up another. I believe that people who indulge in this sort of thing very evidently for their own profit ought to be put in their proper place, and that is off the Government pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to save the $100,000 that was spent in this way. They were so ashamed of the documents they had put out that they tried to prevent the dairy industry from getting copies of them and refused to furnish copies to representatives of the dairy industry when the representatives asked for them after they had turned over to the Oleo Trust thousands of copies of free distribution.

Is it not about time we put them where they belonged and cut out this $100,000 which is unnecessary because they say according to the chairman that they are not doing that job right now?

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 101, noes 95.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 96.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 68, after line 13, insert the following paragraph:

"Field Office Service, for salaries (not to exceed $397,000) and all other expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions including foreign and domestic newspapers (not exceeding 300), periodicals, and books of reference and the transference of householding goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 194[illegible] and regulations promulgated thereunder, $430,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Commerce bill for last year carried the amount included in this amendment, namely $430,000 for the maintenance of 30 field offices. These offices have existed for 30 years, they are maintained, manned, and operated by trained commercial personnel. Virtually all of this money is for salaries for the maintenance of those offices. There is one such office in each Federal Reserve city and 18 additional offices scattered over the country in 22 States of the Union.

When this bill came from the Budget Bureau that item was deleted. This amendment proposes to restore that item as contained in last year's bill and I certainly hope it will commend itself to the best thinking of this body.

There is some short-sighted economy and I think this is an example. What virtue is there in setting up these offices

under the Board of Economic Warfare at some later date because you do not save any money as you simply disrupt and destroy trained personnel. Every day restrictions are going on commerce—block exchange, blacklists, fund control, block money, everything to make things difficult for the business and industrial men of the country. After all, how are we going to pay this enormous war debt? We could repudiate, we can devalue, but there is one and only one way in which it must be paid and that is by the sweat of everyone's labor and by the exchange of goods and services. That is the way we shall pay the war debt. If that is the case, then why not help industry, why not help the businessman of the country first to assemble information which goes into the Department of Commerce and, secondly, to make information available to all the businessmen of the country?

The hearings will show that in the year 1942 these offices received 434,000 calls for consultations from businessmen on problems that have developed as a result of the war, as a result of restrictions, as a result of the enactments of this very Congress. Now, we propose to delete that item and make the job of the businessman infinitely more difficult. With all this control, exchange blocking, international difficulties, how are we going to promote the flow of international commerce unless we offer some help to these people?

The other day, to be exact on the 26th of March, the preliminary estimate for the Office of Censorship came to the Appropriations Committee. Do you know what it asked for? It asks for an appropriation of $29,000,000 with which to put 13,852 people on the pay roll. If we have money enough to maintain a censorship office and keep 13,000 people on the pay roll, surely we have $430,000 in the Federal exchequer for the development of our trade and commerce, the interchange of goods and services, wherein lies the one and only hope of ever meeting the enormous debt that will be piled up as a result of this war and that will take this country out of the valley of the shadow. This item ought to be restored and I respectfully submit you should support this amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. Chairman, I am just as solicitous of the welfare of the small businessman and for business generally as the gentleman who preceded me here or any other member of the committee. I believe that they should be given help, aid, and assistance, but I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget took this item out of the bill. This subcommittee called the representative of the Budget who handled this appropriation before the subcommittee and asked him if he had any personal knowledge in regard to it. He said he had. He had made a personal investigation of a number of these offices. We asked him in regard to that investigation. He said he had visited the offices, he had checked on their work, and he was firmly convinced that this expenditure for this purpose should not be made at the present time.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Was the gentleman satisfied with that statement? Did you not put your own investigators on this to determine whether or not it was necessary?

Mr. CARTER. I may say to the gentleman that we did put our own investigators on this, but they have not yet reported.

Mr. RIVERS. The Bureau of the Budget statement has not been satisfactory to your committee up to this time?

Mr. CARTER. No; that was not the reason why we put the investigators on. We were satisfied that at this time these officers should not receive the appropriation. We want to know whether or not they should ever be continued again and the result of the special investigating committee that was appointed under House Resolution No. 69 will determine that. I may say to my good friend from Illinois who offered the amendment and for whom I have a profound respect, that he was the one largely instrumental in providing a corps of special investigators for the Appropriations Committee. Now, we are using the machinery that he advocated, and I say that in the meantime the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the recommendations of this subcommittee should stand.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it not true that the administration is attempting to substitute the Board of Economic Warfare for the activities of the Commerce Department in foreign affairs as well as the State Department?

Mr. CARTER. I do not believe that is true, so far as these officers are concerned, because the Board of Economic Warfare does not have offices established around over the country at the present time. I understand that at one time they did have some offices, but they have been closed, and I may say in passing, too, that we called a representative of the Board of Economic Warfare before this committee and asked him if that Board used these offices. He said, "Yes; we use them some." When we suggested, or asked, "How about transferring a part of your appropriation for maintaining these offices?" he said, "No; we would not want to do that."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell us what these branch offices do? I understand they give advice at about $1 per advice—400,000 pieces of advice to businessmen. What else do they do and what is the nature of their advice?

Mr. CARTER. They aid and assist and I think they do render some assistance to business.

Much has been said about the small businessman. I have one of these offices in the region in which I live, and I have received numerous telegrams requesting me to vote to put these offices back into the appropriation. I have no doubt but that many of you have.

Here is a real test now as to whether or not we are for economy. It is a test with me as to whether or not I am for economy. I am going to stand for economy notwithstanding the fact that one of these offices is in my vicinity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late. I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment on the desk which intended to do the same thing as the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. However, Mr. DIRKSEN'S amendment has precedence over mine since he is a member of the Appropriations Committee. Mr. DIRKSEN'S and my amendment have the same objective in view, that is, restore the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has so aptly said: There are 30 regional offices and a number of local offices throughout the Nation. These offices give a great deal of information to business, wherever they be. In my home town of Charleston there is a great deal of activity for the Army and the Navy. The intelligence offices of both of these branches of the service utilize this office with a great deal of regularity and a great deal of success, as they have attested by copies of letters in my possession.

These offices give the small businessmen a wealth of information. The other day I was in Charleston and numbers of these small businessmen who had heard of the prospective closing of this office at the end of the fiscal year were very much disturbed. They said:

> The Congress has set up a Smaller War Plants Corporation. Every day something appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about keeping small business alive. If you close up our local office of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, our local men will have no place to turn to get this information which is so vital to them.

Our people cannot get priorities for traveling on the railroad. They cannot get priorities for coming up here in their cars. They can ill afford to come to Washington at such great expense to get information when these local offices are furnishing them with such a wealth of information so satisfactorily.

I should like to read you some of the things which the services have written me in this regard. They have sent me copies of letters which they in turn have sent to the regional offices about the services of the Domestic and Foreign

Commerce offices throughout the country.

First, I quote one from the Naval Intelligence, and one from the Military Intelligence second:

1. The writer wishes to express his appreciation and that of the district intelligence officer, Sixth Naval District, for your efforts and the efforts of the district managers in the offices of your department in the Sixth Naval District, in furnishing the lists of those persons speaking or reading foreign languages who may act as translators or interpreters for Naval Intelligence. The writer fully realizes that the compilation of such a list required a great deal of time and effort on the part of all concerned and such will be of great value to Naval Intelligence.

The writer is enclosing herewith copies of this letter for each district manager and will greatly appreciate your forwarding it to them.

2. In compliance with the request of the military intelligence director, Headquarters Fourth Service Command, Atlanta, Ga., you have maintained liaison with the writer and supplied him with periodic reports of the conditions and changes therein of the port of Charleston, with reference to congestion of railroads leading into the port and other facilities.

The writer has found the confidential information furnished by your office to be accurate and complete in every detail. Both for himself and his superior officer, he wishes to express appreciation.

It is requested that you continue to maintain this liaison with the writer in connection with periodic reports, reference to subject letter.

In closing I would like to quote the testimony of Mr. Wayne C. Taylor before the Appropriations Committee on this subject:

Our whole approach toward the field office set-up is in terms of the best service that a Government department can render to the business community and particularly to the small business community. Our experience has proven in every way possible that unless you can be where business is, particularly where small business is, you cannot be effective. Therefore, in reorganizing the department, particularly this field service, 2 years ago, and anticipating a great many of the things which have taken place in the years in connection with the war itself, and in connection with the impact of the war on small business, we based our plans on improving the structure which existed, namely, the field-office structure.

I cannot say too strongly that, in my opinion, the Bureau of the Budget has made a fundamental mistake in eliminating those offices, because you must have a place where a businessman can go, without coming down to Washington; the small businessman, for example, cannot afford to come here. He cannot come down here under the conditions which you know he has to face.

I hope this amendment prevails, because it is a good amendment for the small businessmen of this country, at least.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have sat through 5 hours of this debate and several hours of general debate yesterday so that I could be here when this particular section of the Department of Commerce bill was reached. Much of the discussion this afternoon was certainly not relevant to this particular appropriation bill. Now, late in the day, and at the final sections of the bill, the Chairman moves to cut off debate and deny us the opportunity to present a matter to the House that is of vital importance to a large number of citizens in a great many congressional districts.

I do not like to object to a unanimous-consent request for an extension of 10 or 15 minutes of time, made by Members of this House, but after this experience today, I can see no other way to protect the interests of my constituents than to object to all requests for additional time on appropriation bills in which I have a particular interest.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] just a few minutes ago asked the question as to just how much service these regional offices extended. In the few minutes available, I will try to answer his question. Recently I asked the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut to tell me just how helpful these regional offices were to them. This association advised me that in the last 6 months of 1942, the Department of Commerce, through the office of the manufacturers association, sent out each week to 465 companies a complete recapitulation of all information pertaining to export and import procedure. This information included regulations of the Customs Division of the Treasury Department; the regulations under Executive Order 8389 relative to the freezing of foreign funds; complete information on the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals; information relative to the Office of Export Control; the Import Control M-63 Order; the W. P. B. M-148 Order; the Controlled Materials Plan as it affects exporting; information on foreign visitors to this country; foreign tariff regulations, and foreign financial news.

Other than the survey, 100 copies of the Comprehensive Export Control Schedule, and 100 copies of each of the Current Export Control Bulletins are sent to manufacturers throughout the State as they are released.

In addition to this, the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut inform me they were able to answer approximately 460 written inquiries as well as approximately 870 telephone inquiries, and many thousands of required forms were distributed by the office. They also obtained sales information report on 25 foreign agents and political information pertaining to pro-Nazi activities on 15 agents.

We all know that when this war comes to an end, thousands of manufacturers, both large and small, are going to try to find a market for their product. Many of them will naturally turn toward South America. There is a widespread opinion that our cash exports have fallen off greatly since the war started. As a matter of fact, according to official figures issued by the Department of Commerce, our cash exports handled through private channels in this country amounted to $3,158,000,000 in 1942. This is slightly larger than the average for the pre-war years of 1936-38. This large export business is subject to a great many regulations with which the exporter must be familiar if he is to do his business efficiently and profitably.

When in the slightest doubt, he naturally turns to the nearest field office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, where he has been going for help for a great many years. He knows that these regional offices are fully informed and anxious to help.

Just why these offices should now be closed, in spite of the record of rendering efficient service over a period of 30 years, is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, sometime ago when the Doughton so-called pay-as-you-go bill was up for consideration, I made a statement with reference to loan sharks. This is a good opportunity for you to find out something about this loan-shark racket, because on page 121 of the hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation bill you will find that Mr. Comer, representing the Attorney General's office, testified as follows:

What we need to do is to get over the country and bring this chart up to date and see the degree of overlapping in the ownership of local companies.

He was referring to loan companies.

This may become one of the biggest anti-trust suits we ever had, because there is $500,000,000 lent at 30 and 36 percent annually, and roughly $100,000,000 lent at 120 and 240 percent. Loan sharks are especially troublesome around the war plants. They cluster around those gates like flies to lend their money at these ruinous rates.

The war agencies have complained. Some have said that they have either got to stop making more airplanes or get rid of the loan sharks around the plants.

To show you how important it is to have a current pay-as-you-earn collection system, our estimated Federal tax load for 1944 is $33,081,000,000, which, with State and local taxes of $10,000,000,000 and $16,000,000,000 of new taxes that we shall have to raise, means that the people will have to carry a load of taxes amounting to $60,000,000,000, or half the national income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, these old-line offices of the Department of Commerce have done good work in promoting the freest sort of flow of commerce in the past. They are definitely aiding in the transportation of military supplies and civilian needs as well as expediting the exchanges of raw materials.

They should be kept in shape for the vital work of reestablishing the freest kind of flow of commerce after the war ends.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, no matter what is said about the Department of Commerce, it must be admitted that it has been and it is now a very important source of information that is sought by nearly every department of our Government. Whatever is done with the legislation now under consideration, we must be careful to guard against possibility that some other agency or some other bureau does not

offices, he had checked on their work, | to business.

set up another bureau or agency which would duplicate the work already done and work being done by the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce is an old-established Department. It has been the target of considerable criticism. Some of it, in my opinion, unjust. Some of it may have been justified. The charges of duplication of work have considerable merit. There has been and, in my opinion, there is now duplication. That is costing the taxpayers considerable money. Let me give you a few instances of these duplications. Duplications which cannot be charged to the Department of Commerce.

After our entry into the war there arose a need for expert advice on industrial facilities and products of foreign countries. The Coordinator of Information sent representatives into the field to obtain from trade associations and others the names of Americans with specialized knowledge of foreign countries. The Board of Economic Warfare required similar information. The Department of Commerce was suggested as the logical source, and it was learned that the Department already had much of the desired information, but also had the contacts and facilities to supplement it on a Nation-wide basis. The Department, through its field offices, developed information on 6,000 persons able to supply specific data on foreign countries. This basic file is now available to and is being utilized by a number of war agencies.

In connection with the operation of the proclaimed list of certain blocked nationals—black list—numerous cases have arisen where the Department of Commerce, through its field offices, has assisted manufacturers and exporters to replace undesirable foreign connections. These companies were later approached by compliance officers of other agencies only to find that the matter had already been satisfactorily adjusted through the efforts of the Commerce representatives. One case involved a manufacturer of hand lanterns in connection with its representation in Ecuador. Another involved an American exporter of wearing apparel, whose representative in Peru had already been dispensed with, and a new distributor found for him by the Department of Commerce. An additional example is a Wisconsin firm who had been approached by the compliance officer to explain his relationship with a Mexican firm, details of which were already in the possession of the Department of Commerce. A special representative of another agency went to a midwestern city to ascertain the attitude of a manufacturer toward compliance with existing regulations. Interviews previously conducted by the Department of Commerce and reported to Washington contained all of the information needed to determine the attitude of the firm.

The field offices of the Department of Commerce have carried on a number of surveys for the Board of Economic Warfare on economic conditions and industries in European and Far Eastern countries. Similar assignments have been given to the field representatives of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission. In a number of cases such representatives have found it necessary to call upon the field offices of the Department of Commerce to obtain the names of persons able to contribute information. Familiarity with the subject matter and the training of the Commerce field men have equipped them to carry out assignments of this character with precision and dispatch. Their facilities for this type of work are unequaled in any other agency.

The Department of Justice and the Treasury Department instituted a systematic interviewing of New York exporters to obtain information on the character of goods exported by specific American firms, how long established, names of officers, principal markets, and the names of foreign agents and distributors. Thousands of firms had already registered with the Department of Commerce furnishing information on the first four points, and on the fifth the Department had a few months before completed a survey to obtain this information in connection with the replacement of undesirable connections. The interviews very largely duplicated information already in possession of the Department of Commerce.

The Office of Price Administration has a special section of the Division of Research dealing in foreign experience in price control. Price-control policies in foreign countries have engaged the attention of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for a number of years and several reports have been published on the subject. Some of the studies of the O. P. A. have been based on data originally collected by the Bureau. For example, the Bureau published a 12-page report on Price Control in Germany—Policy and Technique, in April 1941, and in October 1942 the O. P. A. published a Chronology of Price Control in Germany, based very largely on material furnished by Commerce.

Within the past 2 months two representatives of war agencies in Washington were sent to South America to make a study of the hide situation and to develop information on the supply available, where stored, and why shipments were not forthcoming to the United States. Much of the required information was readily obtainable through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. What up-to-the-minute details were needed could have been obtained from the American Foreign Service through the Bureau, whose regular function is to supply such data to Government and business.

The Department has 30 field offices. My information is that they started back in 1913. In spite of what is said about the lack of business in these offices, I find that there have been 534,243 inquiries in these offices during 1942, as compared to 509,103 in 1941. That shows businessmen used these offices more throughout last year. In 1941, 106,000 businessmen made personal calls on these offices. These calls jumped to 114,000 in 1942. Since last January 1, the Department has received 69 directives from the Board of Economic Warfare alone.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the House to the various departments in the Government chiefly that use these field offices. If you eliminate them, you are simply going to re-create offices of this type in these other departments. There is the Board of Economic Warfare, which uses them; the Office of Price Administration uses these offices; War Production Board; Postal Censorship; Cable Censorship; Radio Censorship; and the distinguished gentleman has spoken of the military and naval agencies. All of these departments are vital in the conduct of the war. They all use these offices constantly. Various divisions of the Treasury Department use them; for instance, Foreign Funds Control, Internal Revenue, War Shipping Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission. Practically all field agencies of Washington use these field offices of the Department of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and I earnestly hope that the advantage to small business will not be destroyed and that the item will be restored. It is like cutting off the right arm of small business. I refer you to the able plea of the gentleman from Ohio for continuing existing department offices and not duplicating or creating new offices in other Government agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made special reference to the duplication of these services. I think there is little economy in the destruction of these old line established offices, which the Bureau of the Budget admits have contributed much to the war effort, but which it intends to destroy and supplant with other agencies. The same amount of money will be expended through other sources. One of the original purposes of the establishment of the Board of Economic Warfare was to bypass the State Department and the Department of Commerce in its foreign relations division. I see where we gain little economy in having the puppet show put on by the Bureau of the Budget in their attempt to destroy these offices.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am against this amendment because there has been no showing on the record that the Department of Commerce field offices are worth the amount of money it is necessary to keep them going for another year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just came into the Chamber. A Democrat over here said that the Republicans were increasing the number of bureaucrats. I want to find out about that before I vote.

Mr. JONES. It certainly is not true of any member of the subcommittee that reported the bill. We heard the request of the Department of Commerce and we were open-minded. We were absolutely unprejudiced in coming to a conclusion,

and we are doing now the very best that can be hoped for. What could be fairer than to send out our investigators to see if there is any necessity for continuing these field offices? We went further. We called before our committee Mr. Milo Perkins. It was charged by the Department of Commerce that they were doing work for the B. E. W. and for the State Department. Milo Perkins, Administrator of B. E. W., said that they had given to the field offices $50,000 for everything the field offices had done for B. E. W. We asked Mr. Perkins whether he would be willing to go further than the $50,000 next year, if we cut out the field offices and he said that he intended to give them no more money. He told us that he would go no further than $50,000. The amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of the downright sincerity of the House. Nobody is more favorable to the Department than the members of our committee. We have been very lenient with the Department in the past. We are very favorable to the Department now and want to be fair with the Department at all times. But if the Members will look on page 61 and page 263 of the hearings they will obtain all the information needed on this subject.

The following questions were asked of representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare:

If these offices are discontinued would you establish offices in their place?

The answer was—

No, sir; we would not do that.

On the next page Mr. Carter asked the question:

You could get the information otherwise; could you not?

And he said—

I would say that we could.

Now, the committee wishing to go even further, has placed in the report the following language, and to be fair will be guided by the findings of the investigators:

The reduction in the appropriation for 1943 of $444,000, as reflected in the Budget estimates, is accounted for by a decrease of $14,000 recommended for the Washington office, and the elimination of the Bureau's domestic field offices, which carried an appropriation of $430,000 in fiscal year 1943. With respect to the latter item, the committee has allowed the Bureau of the Budget recommendation to stand temporarily without prejudice to the status of the offices as to permanent continuance or discontinuance. The committee has, under authority of House Resolution 69, instituted an inquiry of its own with the view of securing complete factual data for a subsequent determination as to their disposition. If the report on this examination is not available to the committee while the bill is in the amendment stage, and if favorable action is later recommended, it can be incorporated in a supplemental or deficiency bill in order that any funds which may be determined for this purpose may become available by July 1, 1943.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would like to say that I am glad to see the gentleman fighting for economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut) there were—ayes 72, noes 135.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Carter amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Andresen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 29, line 13, strike out "$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were ayes 120 and noes 110.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 169, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—163

Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Mruk
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Griffiths	Norman
Arends	Gwynne	O'Hara
Arnold	Hale	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Barrett	Halleck	Ploeser
Beall	Hancock	Poulson
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Pracht
Bishop	Heidinger	Ramey
Blackney	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rizley
Buffett	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Burdick	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Busbey	Horan	Rohrbough
Butler	Hull	Rolph
Canfield	Jeffrey	Rowe
Carlson, Kans.	Jenkins	Sauthoff
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Schiffler
Carter	Jensen	Schwabe
Case	Johnson, Anton J.	Shafer
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calvin D.	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Johnson, Ward	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jonkman	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Springer
Crawford	Kilburn	Stanley
Cunningham	Kinzer	Stefan
Curtis	Kunkel	Stockman
Day	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Dirksen	LeCompte	Sundstrom
Ditter	LeFevre	Taber
Dondero	Lemke	Talbot
Dworshak	Lewis, Ohio	Talle
Ellis	McCowen	Taylor
Ellsworth	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Elmer	McLean	Tibbott
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Towe
Englebright	Martin, Iowa	Troutman
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Van Zandt
Fenton	Merrow	Vorys, Ohio
Fish	Michener	Vursell
Gamble	Miller, Mo.	Weichel, Ohio
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Wheichel, Ga.
Gerlach	Miller, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Gifford	Monkiewicz	Willey
Gilchrist	Morrison, La.	Wolcott
Gillette		Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—169

Abernethy	Eberharter	Johnson, Luther A.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Andrews	Fay	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Judd
Beckworth	Fernandez	Kean
Bland	Fisher	Kefauver
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Kelley
Bradley, Pa.	Flannagan	Kennedy
Brown, Ga.	Folger	Keogh
Bryson	Forand	Kerr
Buckley	Ford	Kilday
Bulwinkle	Fulbright	King
Burchill, N. Y.	Fulmer	Kirwan
Burgin	Furlong	Klein
Camp	Gale	Lane
Cannon, Mo.	Gathings	Lanham
Chapman	Gore	Lesinski
Cochran	Gossett	Ludlow
Coffee	Granger	Lynch
Compton	Grant, Ala.	McCord
Cooley	Green	McCormack
Cooper	Gregory	McGranery
Costello	Hagen	McMillan
Courtney	Hare	McMurray
Cravens	Harless, Ariz.	Madden
Creal	Harris, Ark.	Magnuson
Crosser	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Curley	Hart	Maloney
D'Alesandro	Hays	Manasco
Davis	Heffernan	Mansfield, Mont.
Delaney	Hendricks	Marcantonio
Dickstein	Hinshaw	May
Dies	Hobbs	Merritt
Dilweg	Hoch	Miller, Conn.
Drewry	Holifield	
Durham	Jackson	
	Jarman	

given to the field representatives of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission. In a num-

Board of Economic Warfare alone.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the

of the Department of Commerce and we were open-minded. We were absolutely unprejudiced in coming to a conclusion,

Mills	Priest	Stearns, N. H.
Monroney	Rabaut	Stewart
Mundt	Ramspeck	Sullivan
Murdock	Rankin	Tarver
Murphy	Rivers	Thomas, Tex.
Murray, Tenn.	Robertson	Vincent, Ky.
Myers	Rogers, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
Newsome	Russell	Walter
Norrell	Sadowski	Ward
Norton	Sasscer	Wasielewski
O'Brien, Mich.	Satterfield	Weiss
O'Connor	Scanlon	Wene
O'Leary	Schuetz	White
O'Neal	Sheridan	Whitten
Pace	Slaughter	Whittington
Patman	Smith, W. Va.	Wickersham
Patton	Snyder	Winstead
Peterson, Fla.	Somers, N. Y.	Worley
Philbin	Sparkman	Wright
Poage	Spence	Zimmerman
Price	Steagall	

NOT VOTING—102

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	O'Toole
Allen, La.	Gavagan	Outland
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Gibson	Pfeifer
Barry	Gordon	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Randolph
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Richards
Bell	Gross	Robinson, Utah
Bennett, Mo.	Guyer	Robsion, Ky.
Bonner	Hébert	Rogers, Calif.
Boren	Holmes, Mass.	Rowan
Boykin	Howell	Sabath
Brooks	Izac	Scott
Burch, Va.	Johnson,	Sheppard
Byrne	J. Leroy	Sikes
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Smith, Maine
Capozzoli	Kee	Smith, Va.
Celler	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Clark	Knutson	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	LaFollette	Sumners, Tex.
Colmer	Lambertson	Thomason
Cox	Larcade	Tolan
Culkin	Lea	Treadway
Cullen	Lewis, Colo.	Vinson, Ga.
Dawson	Luce	Wadsworth
Dewey	McGehee	Weaver
Dingell	McKenzie	Welch
Disney	Maas	West
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Tex.	Wheat
Doughton	Mason	Wilson
Douglas	Morrison, N. C.	Winter
Eaton	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Elliott	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Engel	O'Brien, Ill.	
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Doughton against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Gorski against.

Mr. Monkiewicz for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Outland against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Boren against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Barnes against.

Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Starnes of Alabama against.

Mr. Guyer for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Lewis of Colorado against.

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. Wheat for, with Mr. Gavagan against.

Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Rowan against.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Elliott against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. West with Mr. Scott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 68, line 13, after the word "appropriated", insert *"Provided further,* That no part of the appropriation in this paragraph shall be used for inquiries or investigations relating to dairy products or for promotional activities, inquiries, or investigations in connection with oleomargarine, filled milk, filled cheese, and other pretended substitutes for dairy products."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 158, noes 137.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 147, not voting 110, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—177

Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Kinzer
Andresen, August H.	Fish	Kunkel
Angell	Gale	Landis
Arends	Gamble	LeCompte
Arnold	Gavin	LeFevre
Auchincloss	Geriach	Lemke
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	Lewis, Ohio
Barrett	Gilchrist	McCowen
Beall	Gillette	McGregor
Bender	Gillie	McLean
Bennett, Mich.	Goodwin	McWilliams
Bishop	Granger	Mansfield, Mont.
Blackney	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Bolton	Griffiths	Martin, Mass.
Bradley, Mich.	Gwynne	Merrow
Brehm	Hagen	Michener
Brown, Ohio	Hale	Miller, Conn.
Buffett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Mo.
Burdick	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Busbey	Hancock	Miller, Pa.
Butler	Harness, Ind.	Monkiewicz
Canfield	Hartley	Morrison, La.
Cannon, Mo.	Heidinger	Mruk
Carlson, Kans.	Herter	Mundt
Carson, Ohio	Hess	Murray, Wis.
Carter	Hill	Norman
Case	Hinshaw	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Hoeven	O'Connor
Chiperfield	Hoffman	O'Hara
Church	Holmes, Wash.	O'Konski
Clason	Hope	Phillips
Clevenger	Horan	Pittenger
Cole, Mo.	Hull	Ploeser
Compton	Jeffrey	Poulson
Crawford	Jenkins	Powers
Cunningham	Jennings	Pracht
Curtis	Jensen	Ramey
Dilweg	Johnson, Anton J.	Reece, Tenn.
Dirksen	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reed, Ill.
Ditter	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Johnson, Ward	Rees, Kans.
Dworshak	Jones	Rizley
Ellis	Jonkman	Rockwell
Ellsworth	Judd	Rodgers, Pa.
Elmer	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Elston, Ohio	Keefe	Rohrbough
Englebright	Kilburn	Rolph
Fellows	Kilday	Rowe
		Sauthoff
Schiffler	Stefan	Van Zandt
Schwabe	Stockman	Vorys, Ohio
Shafer	Sundstrom	Vursell
Short	Taber	Wasielewski
Simpson, Ill.	Talbot	Weichel, Ohio
Simpson, Pa.	Talle	White
Smith, Ohio	Taylor	Wigglesworth
Smith, Wis.	Thomas, N. J.	Willey
Springer	Tibbott	Wolcott
Stanley	Towe	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stearns, N. H.	Troutman	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—147

Abernethy	Green	Norrell
Allen, La.	Gregory	Norton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
	Harless, Ariz.	O'Leary
Beckworth	Harris, Ark.	O'Neal
Bland	Harris, Va.	Pace
Bloom	Hart	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Patton
Brooks	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Philbin
Bryson	Hoch	Poage
Buckley	Holifield	Price
Bulwinkle	Jarman	Priest
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rabaut
Burgin		Ramspeck
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rankin
Capozzoli		Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Cochran	Kefauver	Russell
Cooley	Kelley	Sadowski
Cooper	Kennedy	Sasscer
Costello	Keogh	Satterfield
Courtney	Kilday	Scanlon
Cravens	King	Schuetz
Creal	Kirwan	Sheridan
Crosser	Klein	Slaughter
Curley	Lane	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Snyder
Davis	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Lesinski	Sparkman
Dickstein	Ludlow	Spence
Dies	Lynch	Steagall
Drewry	McCormack	Stewart
Durham	McGranery	Sullivan
Ellison, Md.	McMillan	Tarver
Fay	McMurray	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Madden	Vincent, Ky.
Fernandez	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Fisher	Mahon	Walter
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Ward
Flannagan	Manasco	Weiss
Folger	Marcantonio	Wene
Forand	May	Wheichel, Ga.
Ford	Merritt	Whitten
Fulbright	Mills	Whittington
Fulmer	Monroney	Wickersham
Furlong	Murphy	Winstead
Gathings	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
Gossett	Myers	Wright
Grant, Ala.	Newsome	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—110

Allen, Ill.	Gavagan	Nichols
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Gibson	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Outland
Barden	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Gorski	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Graham	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Randolph
Bell	Guyer	Richards
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Robinson, Utah
Bonner		Robsion, Ky.
Boren	Hays	Rogers, Calif.
Boykin	Hébert	Rowan
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Sabath
Byrne	Howell	Scott
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Sheppard
Celler	Jackson	Sikes
Clark	Johnson, J. Leroy	Smith, Maine
Coffee		Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Starnes, Ala.
Colmer	Kee	Stevenson
Cox	Kerr	Sumner, Ill.
Culkin	Kleberg	Sumners, Tex.
Cullen	Knutson	Thomason
Dawson	LaFollette	Tolan
Day	Lambertson	Treadway
Dewey	Larcade	Vinson, Ga.
Dingell	Lewis, Colo.	Wadsworth
Disney	Luce	Weaver
Domengeaux	McCord	Welch
Doughton	McGehee	West
Douglas	McKenzie	Wheat
Eaton	Maas	Wilson
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Winter
Elliott	Mason	Wolverton, N. J.
Engel	Morrison, N. C.	Woodrum, Va.
Fogarty	Mott	
Gallagher	Murdock	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Doughton against.
Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Boren for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Dingell against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Outland with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Rowan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.
Mr. Barry with Mr Plumley.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Culkin.
Mr Boykin with Mr Mason.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey
Mr Kleberg with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. West with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Welch.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING AND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader tell us what the program is for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the legislative appropriations bill and the Hobbs bill.

I understand that general debate on the legislative appropriations bill will be 2 hours. After the legislative bill is disposed of we will take up the Hobbs bill.

I may say in further amplification of the program that between now and a week from Saturday we have a great deal of business to take care of, but I hope we shall be able to dispose of it. I hope we can at least finish general debate on the Hobbs bill tomorrow. That would be very helpful.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it intended to vote on the Hobbs bill tomorrow if we get through with debate on it, or will the vote go over until Friday or Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; we are going to sit Friday and Saturday, and it is very important that Members be here. As a matter of fact, a bill from the Committee on Immigration is on the calendar for the latter part of the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Which bill, may I ask?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A bill to restore citizenship to deserting soldiers who have been taken back into the Army. Under present law, upon court martial such soldiers lose their citizenship. The bill was reported out unanimously and it has the approval of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a supplemental report on the bill, H. R. 653, to amend the Antiracketeering Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

PASSAGE OF TAX BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers are beginning to burn with indignation over the threatened delay now being voiced by administration leaders—or some of them—in devising a tax bill which will embrace current payment features.

There is no question in anybody's mind, at least those who have studied the situation, that we will have to devise a current-payment tax plan so the American people can pay as they earn. Unless this is done, the Government will find itself confronted with an impossible tax-collection situation, and the individual citizens will find themselves confronted with an impossible tax-payment situation. There was no excuse, no valid reason whatsoever, for the administration to make the Carlson tax plan a political football as they did.

Figures have been presented from time to time showing that the amount of income in 1942, based on a 1940 dollar, was about $18,000,000,000 for those above the income level of $10,000 per year; that the income for the group between $1,700 and $10,000 a year amounted to about $73,000,000,000; and that the income of the group below $1,700 a year was about $9,000,000,000. Any effort to trace down figures like these through governmental departments usually results in complete frustration, for in spite of all the thousands upon thousands of statisticians, census takers, enumerators, evaluators, research economists, and so forth, and in spite of all the billions of dollars being spent in reams of research and other reams of propaganda, whenever a Member of Congress or an ordinary citizen wants to get a definite figure on income, he is shifted from one department to another, and from one bureau to another bureau, until finally, worn out with fruitless telephone calls, he gives up in disgust. An attempt to check the figures given here through the Treasury, through the Department of Commerce, and then through O. P. A., resulted in exactly nothing except that nobody knew, or was willing to attempt to say, what the national income is by brackets, where the

inflationary dangers lie, or who could say positively that any figure is correct.

Apparently the figures quoted in these comments are about as nearly correct as it is possible for general figures to be. It does seem quite clear that instead of a pay-as-you-go plan being a rich man's device, its beneficial effects would fall most markedly upon that class of people earning from $1,700 up to $10,000 a year, with by far the greatest class being within the income bracket between $1,700 and $5,000 a year.

All talk about the deferment of 1942 income taxes being a rich man's device is based upon a few isolated cases in which windfalls might be temporarily received by a very few individuals until the windfall amendment incorporated in the Carlson bill, the gift, income, and estate taxes, caught up with them. If millions of taxpayers with an income of $73,000,000,000 must be penalized in our tax laws because a pay-as-you-earn plan might give such a temporary windfall to 20 or 30 individuals in the United States, then we have indeed reached a sad condition of government and our traditional American system is well on the way to extinction.

It is preposterous and outrageous to legislate a tax bill for millions of people with $73,000,000,000 of income on a basis of punitive motives against a small number of citizens.

The American people are now fully aware of the dangers which lie in the immediate future for them. Next year's taxes are going to be higher than this year's taxes. This year's are, of course, to be higher than 1942 taxes. We are thus going on compounding our problem, while, at the same time, the tax bill and the tax plan are made the political football of politicians who consider it more important, apparently, to keep class prejudice aroused and flaming than they do to secure a sound tax measure which will guarantee the Government the greatest revenue return, while, at the same time, putting the American people on a basis which every informed person knows must be adopted for future taxation.

There is a tendency on the part of some to dismiss the present attitude of the majority and of the Ways and Means Committee chairman with the comforting thought that if a new tax plan is not evolved and adopted taxes will go right on pouring in under the old system. The fact is, times have changed. Our situation is unparalleled in our history. The inconceivable national debt before we went into this war, and the inconceivable debt which is now being piled on top of the pre-war debt, make it imperative that we adopt a new pay-as-you-earn tax basis if we want to avoid economic chaos in this country after the war. Those willing to defeat a current-payment tax plan because of their utter hostility to a few individuals of large incomes are, whether they realize it or not, simply taking the position that they are willing to risk economic chaos and ruin for America rather than risk a decidedly temporary windfall for a few individuals whose incomes can be fully dealt with under present laws, together with the proposed windfall tax provision.

We simply must keep at it, and the people of this country simply must continue to demand of their Representatives in Congress that a current-payment tax plan be worked out, and that we get on the kind of a tax basis the new conditions created by our stupendous national debt and the war make inescapable for us if we are to survive and keep our American economy from toppling into the abyss of planned economic chaos.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fitchburg Sentinel, of Fitchburg, Mass., and also a recent article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have obtained permission to extend my remarks in several instances, but due to the pressure of work I have not been able to use them. The time is about to expire, and I therefore renew the requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes today after the other special orders for the day have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request because I do not think we ought to run any later.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. You already have one special order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is on an important matter.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think we ought to run any later.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DEVELOPMENT OF LIGNITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on three former occasions I have attempted to draw the attention of the Congress and the country to the strategic value of lignite coal in our war effort. I made the first speech on August 17, 1942, and the second on August 20, 1942. In those speeches I showed that in North Dakota alone, not including Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, and Texas, we have 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal and that Germany, in brown coal—lignite—including all the countries she has overrun, has about 60,000,000,000 tons or one-tenth of what North Dakota alone has.

Germany is getting 75 percent of its electric power for war industries, fully 80 percent of its sulfuric acid, coal-tar distillates, and sundry chemicals for the manufacture of explosives, and upward of 80 percent of its synthetic gasoline and its Diesel oil, as well as materials for synthetic rubber for mechanized war machinery—all from the brown coal which it controls.

In all these essential properties the German brown coal is inferior to our lignite coal. Lignite coal in North Dakota per hundred tons of mined coal will average 32 tons of oil. Dry coal will average 49 tons of oil per 100 tons of coal. The Velva mine in North Dakota runs much higher, samples of dry coal running 60 to 65 percent oil. In tar acids used in the manufacture of explosives, the German brown coal is vastly inferior to our lignite.

The only advantage Germany has over us is that Germany is using her coal and we refuse to have anything to do with ours.

In January 1943 I again called the attention of Congress to this subject. In this speech I not only showed the extent of Germany's coal and our coal, but gave the record of what our enemies are doing with their brown coal. Germany is increasing her processing of coal by

leaps and bounds because without the oil and materials for explosives derived from this coal, Germany would soon find herself driven back beyond her own borders and would finally be crushed.

If you will look at the war map of Europe, you will note one most peculiar situation of that map. Just to the west of the Donets Basin you will find a city called Orel, pronounced precisely as our Oriole bird name is pronounced. It is spelled O-r-e-l. On this war map of Europe you will note that the tide of advance and retreat has affected the whole Russian battle front except this one place, Orel. There is a line which has remained permanent since its first occupation by the German armies.

The Donets Basin contains the great brown coal deposits of Russia, and from this coal the Germans expect to get their oil, explosives, and rubber. Orel is the great manufacturing and railroad center servicing the basin. If the Russians succeed in driving the Germans out of the Donets Basin and in capturing Orel, you may expect the collapse of the German offensive in Russia. One time this winter the Russians came near to accomplishing this important feat, but you will observe that the Germans put no extra pressure on the Russian line anywhere except in the Donets Basin. There they have again driven the Russians out and as long as they hold this area, we may expect the Germans to remain an advancing force.

With our own shortage of oil and rubber and ingredients for war purposes you would think this Government would make some move to use what we have in abundance.

Some 21 years ago some enterprising men made tests of coal from every corner of the globe and from these tests it was determined that the lignite field of North Dakota offered the greatest opportunity to process coal and obtain the most valuable derivatives for war and commercial purposes. No one asked them to build their plant at Minot, N. Dak., a point accessible to the best coal beds as a railroad center. These people came to Minot solely because of their scientific investigations and in 1941 began the erection of a plant for the purpose of processing lignite coal, especially having in view the production of chemicals and gas. In this enterprise these men and their friends invested over $400,000, but before they could complete their plant priorities went into effect, and it was not until October 16, 1942, that this company was able to secure permission to buy the materials needed in completing their plant. During all these months business was at a standstill.

In the meantime Congress had set up an organization known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation with a loan fund of $150,000,000 to make loans to smaller plants engaged in or about to be engaged in the production of war materials. Loan application was made to this concern for a loan of $300,000 to be used for the following purposes:

First. To complete facilities.

Second. Operating capital.

The next question that arose was this: Was such a plant about to manufacture essential war materials? The matter was fully presented to the Navy Department and they certified that cresylic acid was an essential war material and in their judgment this concern, operating, could supply the material. The concern filed their application for a loan, agreeing among other things to permit Government engineers to supervise the production, and agreed to permit a disbursing agent of the Government to handle the loan money to make sure that the loan would be disposed of as outlined in the application.

This loan was rejected and it took 12 weeks to find out why. In desperation these people came to me in the hope that I could do something to hurry up this loan so they could go to work. After this lapse of time the reasons were assigned, the principal one being that unless the Navy Department would guarantee half of the loan, it would not be made. These people asked me if they should go back to the Navy Department and ask this guaranty and I told them flatly, "No." I told them the Navy was fighting battles and was not in the loaning business. This nettled the operators and managers of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and these people, the Western Carbon & Chemical, Inc., were plainly made to understand that it was bad taste for them to go to the Hill for assistance. You can see that when we create one of these agencies and start it out on its express business, they forget all about who created them and forget the purposes for which they were created and damn their creator.

The reasons they give for turning down this loan are pathetic. Here they are:

First. Over 80 percent of the loan was to be used for plant facilities.

Second. The need for cresylic acid was not so great as had been anticipated by the Bureau of Ships.

Third. The Navy Department saw no reason why they should guarantee the Smaller War Plants Corporation in any loan without reference to the authority given them under Public Law 603.

Fourth. Investigation disclosed that oil leaseholds above referred to in net worth figure of K. C. Moody were subject to judgment notes in the State of Pennsylvania to the extent of $98,000 and therefore the value of the proposed endorsement was questionable.

Fifth. The Navy Department would not guarantee that there was no past experience with actual production of cresylic acid; nor any actual indication other than a survey by the Navy as to the quantity of lignite coal to be used in making cresylic acid nor any appraisal available on the leaseholds or fixed assets. It was assumed at that time that if such a shortage of cresylic acid existed that it could be made available by the installation of plants in other lignite coal areas which would not entail the expense anticipated and apparent in this case.

Sixth. The company is heavily encumbered by judgments and although the principals have made a large investment in order to install the proposed plant in this area, their outside financial responsibility is questionable.

What difference does it make whether the president of this concern is worth $750,000 or 75 cents? One-half million, nearly, has been put into this plant and these people offer to turn the management of it over to the Government while they produce a material which the Navy say they must have.

They say this material can be produced more cheaply elsewhere when it is a fact beyond all dispute that no place on this globe outside of the strip-mined lignite coal in the West can it be produced for $1.15 per ton. Add to this that these people have the process formula, and no one else, and you can see that this reason is no reason at all, but merely an excuse.

They still insist that the Navy shall go into the loan business. One other reason bears examination. They say this plant did not start out as a plant to produce chemicals but was a briquetting plant. They know this is absolutely false. This concern never at any time was connected with briquetting. They bought out the property of an abandoned briquetting plant and used what material they could salvage in erecting their present plant. If this is not an excuse instead of a reason, I never saw an excuse.

I do not know anything about the background of the men in control of this Corporation, but they look to me like a bunch of bankers who want to obtain a positively secure loan, instead of contributing to the war effort. They appear to be more concerned with having bankable paper than they are in stopping Hitler, who if not stopped would render valueless all paper—bankable and otherwise.

Why all these excuses and not one single reason? Are there any interests in the country opposed to the processing of lignite? Are there any interests in America opposed to the production of rubber and gasoline from coal? Are there any foreign interests opposed to our production of rubber after the war? Are the men who operate this corporation subject to the influence of any interest outside of the defense of their own country?

The only possible reason I am able to assign for this flat refusal to aid this concern—as was intended by Congress—is that if this one plant is set up in the lignite fields of this country, and the value of this coal is once demonstrated in the production of oil, rubber, and the countless number of derivatives, it will revolutionize business in oil, rubber, and explosives.

If this demonstration is once set up the idea of shipping rubber from the Orient will be a lost business so far as consumption of rubber in the United States is concerned. Wildcat oil wells will be a thing of the past because every plant set up will be a sure-shot oil producer, running in coal as mined 30 to 50 percent and in dry coal 60 to 65 percent. Just think of it, 650 tons of oil out of every 1,000 tons processed.

From the lignite fields of North Dakota we can increase our gasoline consumption 50 percent in the Army, Navy, and in the air, and also supply every civilian need with 50 percent more fuel than that required today, and continue the war for 78 years. This lignite field offers such gigantic opportunities that I am convinced the large business interests of this country are afraid to actually see a demonstration.

Here the Government has an opportunity to start this business by matching $300,000 with the $400,000 already contributed by private capital and use the entire output, under Government management, for our war efforts. But this board does not think the loan is bankable.

They insist upon the officers of this concern guaranteeing the loan to be used for our war effort, and when the officers show a willingness to do as requested they stop short in the process of the loan to find that the property statements of the officers are too optimistic, and finally ask of the fighting forces of this country, the Navy Department, to quit shooting and go into the loan business.

There is a screw loose somewhere in the direction of the war effort. There should be unanimity of action among administrators at least.

Donald Nelson is responsible for the appointment of the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This bunch of directors refuse to make a loan to a concern which can make essential war materials. The Bureau of Ships in the Navy Department approved the project, yet this board set up by Donald Nelson says that the Bureau of Ships is wrong.

Donald Nelson, in his testimony before the Senate Small Business Committee on April 1, said:

> That facilities necessary to produce materials needed in the war effort should not be measured by dollar values.

Yet his board controlling the Smaller War Plants Corporation say they cannot make this loan because the president of the Western Carbon and Chemical Co. is not worth as much as he says he is; they cannot make the loan unless the Navy guarantees the loan. How can the Navy? What money has the Navy got? Such money as Congress assigned to it. The people's money. Whose money does the Smaller War Plants Corporation control? The people's money—the $150,000,000 voted by Congress. In either case it is all the people's money, so what?

Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, testified before the Senate Small Business Committee on April 1 and said:

> In the early stages of our preparedness, the Government was willing to assume financial risks in order to insure an increased output of raw materials and fighting weapons. We will continue to assume such risks, if we are to succeed in our task as quickly as possible. But we must take a chance on the little fellow also. In fact, we will be committing a folly if we fail to resort to and accept each and every contribution that will lead to an aggregation of the materials we need. We are furthermore under a moral obligation to sustain small enterprise if we wish to rebuild and retain the America that we have known, with its concepts of individual freedom and opportunity.

The majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation also take issue with the Navy and say, "The need for cresylic acid was not so great as has been anticipated by the Bureau of Ships."

The majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation disagree with Donald Nelson and they disagree with Secretary Ickes.

Then this majority board of directors go off on an entirely new tangent and say "It was assumed at that time that if such a shortage of cresylic acid existed that it could be made available in other lignite areas which would not entail the expense anticipated and apparent in this case." Did you ever hear of such rot? Other lignite fields when this concern is located in the heart of a deposit of lignite of 600,000,000,000 tons. Did you ever hear of such rot, when this board speaks of "cheaper cost"? Here is the case. The private individuals have their plant 80 percent completed. Did you ever hear of such rot when these directors know that this concern has the formula for this production?

This board takes the officers to task in the loan rejection because they did not go back to the Navy Department and secure a guaranty. The board says: "He said he would contact the Navy. It appears that he never carried out his expressed intention, but diverted his efforts to other channels."

I voted to establish this concern, but I serve notice now that I have voted "yes" for the last time in setting up any more agencies to assist in the war effort. The idea was good but when operators of these agencies are picked out, we seem to invariably get a bunch of men who seem to set up their own narrow standards of business rather than to carry out the will of the people as expressed by Congress. They become totally unaware that a terrific war is in progress and must have this loan bankable.

The Corporation is empowered—

> To make loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as it may determine, to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with capital, to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war or essential civilian purposes; and such loans or advances may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

The refusal of the majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to make this loan, does not only concern North Dakota but it affects the destiny of 130,000,000 people. Here is a concern that knows how to do it; here is a concern 80 percent completed; here is a concern that can turn out in 3 months essential war material; here is a concern that is willing to let the Government engineer its business scientifically and financially; but this Board says "no" in a set of reasons that are childish and positively inane. Here is a Board that does not have the slightest conception of what this war is, and bury their heads in the sand looking for gilt-edge security when the Hitler submarines are running rampant through every ocean on the surface of the globe. These chemicals will prevent sinkings but this Board is looking for bankable paper, and they say, "Gentlemen, let the war proceed if you can't furnish guaranties that will satisfy our critical banking eye."

Time is an essential factor in this war. Here is a concern 80 percent completed which can in 90 days turn out an essential war material; yet it has taken 90 days already to find out why this loan was rejected. If this Board had acted when it should have acted these materials would be coming to the Navy.

This situation should be called to the attention of the country. I presume it would be in order to submit a resolution to investigate this matter, but yet that will not save any time. By the time a committee could investigate and listen to all the conflicts existing in the management of the war effort several months would go past, and this vital material would remain unproduced. I prefer to rely on public opinion and the response that all administrators must finally make to that opinion. It may be that the President is busily engaged at this very moment in bringing about a clear conception of what must be done in directing this war effort. Surely departments and agencies of the Government must see eye to eye if we are to have any clean-cut program of fighting this war. I think we will win the war no matter how we bungle things up with confused administrators, but we could bring about the end much sooner if there were some unity of effort.

Let me further call your attention to the facilities we already have in North Dakota to move the products and by-products of plants such as are planned by the Western Carbon & Chemical Co. The coastal line of the Great Northern Railroad and the Northern Pacific Railroad go directly through this field; add to that the Soo Line and the Milwaukee and you have four major railroads tapping this immense deposit of lignite. This plant was erected at Minot, N. Dak., the intersecting point of the Great Northern and the Soo Line. The Northern Pacific taps the coal fields of Beulah, and the entire length of the Kildeer Line, and also Dickinson and points west. The Milwaukee taps the great coal deposits in southwestern North Dakota. From the standpoint of railroad facilities no expense is needed, because those roads are already there. Is there any other point in the lignite fields where we already have these necessary facilities which can be used without Government money to operate them? Yet the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation say a plant could be erected at less expense elsewhere in the lignite field, after knowing full well that this plant is already 80 percent completed without any Government assistance.

With these well-developed and actively operating railroads, the products of this company can be shipped to plants at the west coast or east to the head of the Lakes, or by direct railroad routes to the eastern seaboard. The char which will be so badly needed by the iron mines of northern Minnesota in processing sponge iron can be landed by direct line from Minot to the mines. And the Bureau of Mines has already approved this program.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How many million tons of lignite coal does the gentleman estimate there are in North Dakota?

Mr. BURDICK. In my State alone we have 600,000,000,000 tons.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman give us the B. t. u. content of this lignite coal?

Mr. BURDICK. I may say to the gentleman that on August 20, 1942, I made a speech on the floor of this House and put in my remarks the entire content of the lignite coal and showed that the contents of distillation from lignite were superior to those from the brown coal of Europe. The figures to which the gentleman refers are in that speech. I cannot recall them offhand, but I could refer to them.

Mr. RANKIN. The best bituminous coal is 14,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound. The lignite coal in Texas is about 8,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound. The reason I ask this is so that I may be able to figure out just what this coal would amount to when it came to the generation of heat, power, and so forth.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think we had testimony about that before our Committee on Mines and Mining last year when we went into these various German processes, and I think the western lignites run about 11,000 B. t. u.'s, if I am not mistaken. I think they have a rather superior grade in that section.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to the gentleman from North Dakota that I am very much interested in his remarks. Nearly the whole State of Wyoming is underlaid with large deposits of coal. In fact, it has been estimated that Wyoming has more than 250,000,000,000 tons of coal deposits. Near Gillette, in my State, an open-pit mine has been operating for some time, which has a continuous vein of from 60 to 90 feet of lignite coal, with no dirt or rock seams. This coal can be recovered by removing about 20 feet of top soil, and it has been estimated that the supply will last for many years. A movement has been started in Wyoming to utilize this great deposit of lignite coal in the war effort. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Bureau of Mines is constructing, at this time, an experimental sponge-iron plant at the University of Wyoming. The purpose of this plant will be to carry on research work in which the iron ore will be pulverized and also various types of coal will be pulverized and mixed in a mortar kiln, brought to a sufficient heat to produce the sponge iron. Wyoming also has one of the largest iron deposits at Sunrise, and we are very hopeful that the research studies made by the Bureau of Mines at the University of Wyoming in connection with this experiment plant will combine our coal deposits and our iron deposits and enable us to produce vast quantities of sponge iron, not only for immediate purposes in connection with the war effort, but also for commercial purposes after the war.

This is the most progressive measure provided for the development of the West in years and I trust that additional funds will be forthcoming by the Congress to increase the splendid work of the plant.

I know of no better time than now to develop the strategic minerals of Wyoming and the West.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. We had this question up before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and it was testified to there that Texas has 37 billion tons of lignite coal that had about 8,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound, and that was sufficient to produce the present amount of electricity used in Texas for the next 20,000 years. What I am trying to figure is this. The gentleman said there were 600 million tons of coal in his State.

Mr. BURDICK. Six hundred billion tons.

Mr. RANKIN. With that amount of coal in North Dakota, that is a tremendous asset. I doubt if the average Member can grasp what it is.

Mr. BURDICK. If you can visualize a cubic block 6 miles each way, you will have it in mind. Here is one thing that I want to call to your attention. The war map of Europe changes almost every day in Russia as between Russia and Germany, but you will find one town that does not change. That town remains stationary, and that is the city of Orel. When the Germans took that they held on to it, and the reason why they are holding on to it and fighting there today to drive the Russians out of the entire basin is because this town of Orel is the processing and railroad center that services the Donets Basin of Russia. The Donets Basin of Russia is the only available coal Hitler has in sight to run his war machine, and if the Germans lose that basin, then they lose the war, and they came mighty near losing it sometime ago, but they have turned around in the last three weeks, and have driven the Russians back.

Mr. RANKIN. What can this coal be produced at in North Dakota at the mine mouth.

Mr. BURDICK. $1.15 a ton, strip mining. In England it costs from $8 to $10 a ton. The Germans are mining it at $2.40 per ton.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman will put this analysis in his speech to show the B. t. u. per pound.

Mr. BURDICK. My experience is that no one will read a speech even if it is marked and you take it to them. They are very polite and say they will.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not asking this question just to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. BURDICK. I have set forth all these reasons. Mr. Ickes is for it. Donald Nelson is for it, and yet the board that he himself appointed is not for it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a distinguished former Member of this House, Hon. John O'Connor, addressed to Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"BY YOUR ACTIONS SHALL YE BE JUDGED"

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a former very distinguished Jeffersonian Democratic Member of this House, a very loyal outstanding American, whose patriotism can never be successfully challenged, the Honorable John J. O'Connor, apparently read with appreciation and also with some degree of approval my remarks delivered on this floor last Thursday afternoon. This afternoon in my mail I received from Mr. O'Connor a copy of a letter addressed by him on yesterday to the Reverend Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of Catholic University, of Washington, D. C. With that interesting letter there was a note from Mr. O'Connor suggesting that this letter might prove interesting to the membership and therefore suggested that I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After calling him long distance this afternoon at his New York office to verify the authenticity of the letter and the suggestion, I decided to take the floor even this late in the evenihg after such a long day because I felt this letter should appear in the body of the RECORD where all the Members may read it the more carefully tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, you know it is a funny thing, but there are those among us who thought that perhaps I was unduly alarmed, perhaps even unto the point of crying "wolf," when I warned this House last Thursday against the potential possibilities of the political use of the great patriotic Office of Civilian Defense organization and especially its unpatriotic block plan. This block plan is but little different in its set-up from the famous cell plan of the Communists, remember that. It can be a very potent weapon in the hands of the Dave Niles-Hardtack Harry Hopkins team of managers behind the scenes for the fourth term. And there is a powerful element in this country who step right in line behind those men in being satisfied in their own minds that a fourth term is essential to the post-war inclusion of these United

States into some form of a world-wide collectivist state. Last Thursday I pointed out how these master political minds might conceivably operate.

The first thing they need is money. The old blank check takes care of that little matter. And there are plenty of sheckels hidden away in these tremendous war appropriations. Secondly, they need patronage. There is plenty of that; too much of it under the war effort. And what a marvelous set-up of patronage is immediately provided by the minions hired to merely distribute the various tools, gas masks, arm bands, helmets, whistles, and so forth, that go with the O. C. D. outfits, which, in his recent letter to me, Dean Landis said it was their function to distribute under lease from the Government. Of course, there are a few record clerks, a few administrators, and so forth. And then, lastly, they—Hopkins, Niles & Co.—must have a centralized organization through which they can work. They must have a nucleus through which they can blanket the country. I charged the O. C. D. was potentially that nucleus. There may be those who doubt it. I hope it is not permitted to be brought about. But we sometimes unwittingly let ourselves in for something when our patriotism is appealed to. And so, let us go back a bit into not too-distant political history to see just how Neyhus, Hopkins & Co., can, did, does, and probably will operate in the 1944 fourth-term campaign. Remember the three ingredients—money, patronage, organization — theoretically nonpolitical in character, of course. And so, Mr. Speaker, let me read you this letter from our former colleague, a great American, a great Jeffersonian Democrat, a victim of the purge of 1938 by Niles and Hopkins.

NEW YORK, *April 6, 1943.*

Rev. Msgr. FULTON J. SHEEN,
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR: You may recall me as a former Member of Congress and chairman of the Rules Committee.

The high plane of your Sunday afternoon addresses, especially on Christian justice, so inspires me that I beg leave to address you concerning the following:

There is a man in New York named Edwin P. Banta, residing at 215 East Seventeenth Street, New York City, in the congressional district which I represented for over 15 years. He has just written to me asking that I intercede with you, to ask you to acknowledge, if you will, his several registered letters to you of recent date, and return to him the papers he sent you, including certain photostats which he enclosed.

Although you may have labeled Banta as a "crackpot," I feel sure that if you really understood his background and service you would at least tolerate him, as I have done for years—and ought. In addition, I have helped him financially all I could, because I have felt he got a very raw deal at the hands of the Communist adherents of the administration for what he did while in fact serving our religion and our country.

Because it is stranger than fiction, I make bold to write you part of the story.

In 1938, when I was being "purged" by the President, with aid from many sources, the most effective of which was the Communists, Mr. Banta served my cause.

At what turned out to be at the risk of his life, he duly joined the Communist Party in Manhattan and reported in full to me the proceedings of the meetings of the Communists in reference to my candidacy for reelection to Congress.

For instance, he reported the agenda, calling in thousands of young men and women Communists throughout the entire city to canvass the district against me, especially those members who looked least like "the type." The order was to conceal their communistic adherence. It worked. Those enthusiastic, fanatical atheists outsmart any other political solicitors.

Again, for instance, Mr. Banta reported to me that at one meeting, at which Mr. Earl Browder spoke, he (Browder) told how he had just talked to President Roosevelt, who stated to him that "O'Connor must be licked at any cost." Browder's entree to the White House then was well known. In the preceding June I had been placed No. 1 on the Communist blacklist, at their national convention at Madison Square Garden, because of Nation-wide radio talks I had made against communism.

What support I got during such efforts, or in the election, from certain prelates is still another story now being written for another day.

Suspicion began to fall on Banta in the Communist meetings. The Daily Worker, chief supporter of my opponent, FAY, Roosevelt's candidate, finally caught up with Banta and exposed him as "my man." He was followed, and his life was threatened to such an extent that I arranged bodyguards for him. You may not believe it, but the Commies do get tough sometimes, in packs, in alleys, late at night.

Banta was working on Work Projects Administration. Hopkins got word of his secret activities in my behalf and after an investigation, at which I was also questioned, by Hopkins' first assistant, Banta was thrown off the Work Projects Administration, and all relief rolls, although he was in dire distress and had a sick wife. One of Hopkins' handy men in the purge was Davey Neyhus, alias Niles, now one of the President's secretaries and field marshal for the fourth term. Did you ever get a look at him? If you did, you could just picture him in that Communist strike riot in Lawrence, Mass., some years ago. He spent a good deal of time in traveling between Washington and New York, directing the purge and carrying the sinews—$25,000 from J. L. Lewis, $65,000 from the White House. "Tommy" Corcoran and "Ed" Flynn helped, too. They "persuaded" Ben Smith, the Bear of Wall Street, to give up $50,000 on a promise to be made Ambassador to Russia. He's still waiting.

Meetings of the supervisors of Work Projects Administration—hundreds of them—were held at which they were ordered to go out and work in the campaign against me.

But the particular $65,000 sent from the White House had dehydrated to $50,000 by the time it reached FAY's manager, Major Walsh, in the Municipal Building in New York City, where the major, an appointee of Mayor LaGuardia, was conducting the campaign.

The major, now director of the draft in New York City, was so provoked at the shriveling that he personally went to the White House to have a show-down.

Gerald V. Cruise, about to expire as a member of the New York Power Commission (a job which I obtained for him) and who acted as liaison man for Corcoran in the purge, was questioned in respect to the funds transmitted from Washington to New York. Of course, there was no accounting in Washington or New York for the upward of $200,000 so spent in the New York purge.

I only review the foregoing, narrated in the writings of Dr. Stanley High, because in all this conspiracy, Banta became a victim.

I was instrumental in having Banta testify before the Dies Committee, which I helped create and of which act I am very proud. He gave very valuable information to the committee about communistic, subversive, un-American activities. That made Banta's plight all the worse, because the Dies committee was taboo with the administration.

All that only led to increased hounding of Banta by all the Federal forces in New York, under the lieutenancy of Hopkins, Niles, and Browder. He was a marked man—from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to Union Square. How he ever lived through it, I often wonder.

Despite any annoyance from his prolific letter writing, I have helped him through all the 7 years, as best I could, and I feel deeply that I could not do more. He is such a better American than many people you run into these days.

Through the proper pen, his story could well be a saga of what has happened to our country in the last decade.

Most respectfully yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

So, Mr. Speaker, by your actions shall ye be judged. There is now no more W. P. A. But there is an O. C. D. The blank checks are here, in astronomical amounts. The patronage—well, read your daily newspapers. Wake up, America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. OUTLAND, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. WILSON (at the request of Mr. LANHAM), indefinitely, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;

H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Expedition's east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2079. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section I, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8 and postponed until April 15 have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

307. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

309. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. Supplemental report to part 2 to accompany H. R. 653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934 (Rept. No. 66). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 189. Resolution authorizing printing of a revised edition of a digest of State laws affecting the hard of hearing and the deaf; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 349. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 700. An act suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2417 (by request). A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2418. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "Assistant Clerk"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2420. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from aiding in the production of rice outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2421. A bill to provide for reduced fares for the transportation by railroads and busses during the present war of members of the land and naval forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2422. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2423. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2424. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2425. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2426. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2427. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2428. A bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2429. A bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to suspend the provisions of the laws relating to compulsory retirement for age of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider legislation as soon as possible granting unto the people of Alaska the right to elect their own Governor; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Morton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2431. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Otis Hall; to the Committee on Claims

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

436. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Ida Steiner and 60 other citizens of Wells and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Mrs. Phebe H. Benton, Mrs. R. I. Bonney, and Mrs. V. W. Peck, of Manistee County Pomona Grange No. 21, urging Congress to give consideration to the issuance of honor certificates to all boys who are "frozen" to farm work and who are thereby prevented from serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

438. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of George Dilboy Post, No. 529, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Somerville, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for mandatory war-risk insurance for enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

439. Also, vote of the Department of Public Utilities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts opposing Federal legislation interfering with the power of that department to regulate rates for air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. By Mr. BARRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the applications of petitioners of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and trustworthy, notwithstanding a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

441. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Resolution No. 18 of the State of California, adopted March 29, 1943, relative to the construction of a multiple-purpose dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River to restrain the usual recurring excess flow of water of said river and to utilize the water so impounded for the generation of electric power, for irrigation, for domestic water supply, and for other useful and beneficial purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

442. Also, resolution No. A-55 of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, opposing House bill No. 1012 and Senate bill No. 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of many citizens of Connersville, East Chicago, Scottsburg, LaGrange, Wolcottville, Auburn, Corunna, Howe, Peru, Wabash, Monroeville, Akron, Rochester, and Silver Lake, Ind., urging the adoption of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. By Mr. BURCHILL of New York: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, that the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

445. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Casper Le Compte and others of the White Horse Community, requesting that certain changes be made in present Indian laws and regulations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

446. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the Nevada Legislature, memorializing Congress to grant relief to the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

447. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Rev. Russell Weller and 46 other residents of Decatur and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate adoption of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. Also, petition of Mrs. R. B. Click and 33 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the California Legislature, relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

450. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Flatbush Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing a permanent commission to study and define the peace aims of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thy glory the heavens are telling and the earth showeth Thy handiwork. Across the star-strewn spaces, in all the order and majesty of the universe we catch an assuring glimpse of Thy garments vast and white with a hem that we can recognize. Behind all the tangled threads of human affairs we are conscious that hands not our hands are working out the bright pattern of an eternal purpose.

In the heat and burden of our swiftly ebbing day may we be the agents of Thy beneficent will for mankind, with honor unsullied, playing our part in the life of our times. With full purpose of heart, wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour, may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man.

"Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to make men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bone	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal

Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"STATE OF NEW YORK,
"IN SENATE,
"*Albany, March 2, 1943.*

"Whereas the Pharmacy Corps bill, S. 216 (H. R. 997) is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

"Whereas in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick or injured the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential, and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

"Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

"Whereas such public policy is vital and necessary to the safety, health, and life of its people; and

"Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance for the safety of the Nation; and

"Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States, and especially those of them who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people, and especially to furnish proficient and skillful graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

"Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill, intimate knowledge, and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of New York (jointly), That the Legislature of this State unanimously endorse the Pharmacy Corps bill, S. 216 (H. R. 997), and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the New York State Members of Congress."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF PUERTO RICO,
"*San Juan, Puerto Rico.*

"At the session held by this legislative body on February 19, 1943 (third regular session of the fifteenth legislature), the following resolution was adopted:

" 'Whereas certain political leaders and certain economic forces wage an organized campaign in Washington against the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Rexford G. Tugwell;

" 'Whereas this campaign is being waged in Washington on the grounds that Governor Tugwell is forcing his own personal ideas upon the people of Puerto Rico;

" 'Whereas on the basis of such an assertion a part of the public opinion of the United States might be brought to believe that Governor Tugwell is acting contrary to the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico;

" 'Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico, as sole power democratically representative of the people of Puerto Rico, is in duty bound to make public its views and its will in order to give expression to the democratic reality of Puerto Rico and disabuse the minds of our fellow citizens of the United States of America as regards the true significance of the attacks against Governor Tugwell and his administration: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:*

" '1. To declare, as it hereby declares, that Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell has the support of the majority of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

" '2. To make it a matter of record that the fundamental legislation for the improvement of the living conditions of the Puerto Rican people was discussed directly with the people during the election period, received the votes of the people, and was passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico before Mr. Tugwell was appointed Governor of Puerto Rico or had come to have any official contact with our country.

" '3. To declare, as it hereby declares, that all the legislation approved was part of the political platform on which the majority of this legislature, and also the greater part of the minority of this legislature, were elected.

" '4. To transcribe in evidence of the foregoing the following excerpts from the platforms of the various parties represented in this legislature which took part in the last election held in Puerto Rico:

" ' 'PLATFORM OF THE POPULAR DEMOCRATIC PARTY

" ' 'The Popular Democratic Party will supply executive branch of the government with all the means to insure the enforcement of the 500-acre law. Its legislature will make regulations therefor, to the end that corporations may not scoff at the rights of the people, and will base such regulations on policies that will benefit directly the greatest number of families consistent with the efficiency and production of the lands made a subject of distribution as a result of the enforcement of this law. We will strive to the end that the land subject to the provisions of this law be recovered for the benefit of laborers, of small farmers, and of cooperatives of farmers and workers.

" ' 'Legislation to insure that sugarcane growers receive the full amount they are entitled to receive from the product of their effort and their land. If necessary, the grinding of sugarcane and its processing into sugar will be declared a public-service industry, and its duty toward the farmer, the workman, and the sugar consumers of the island will be regulated in order to establish a fair distribution of the profits derived from such activity, guaranteeing the permanent operation thereof for the benefit of the Puerto Rican community on the basis of reasonable profits for the owners of the sugarcane-grinding industry, and abolishing all existing monopolies in the matter.

" ' 'Effective steps toward the reformation of the banking system in order to establish the Banco de Puerto Rico, liberalize credit to farmers, businessmen, manufacturers, and workers of the island, and facilitate the development and improvement of Puerto Rican economy.

" ' 'An ample program will be submitted with all the necessary requirements for the development and utilization of water resources.

" ' 'Legislation will be enacted so that all aggregados may acquire without cost to themselves a piece of land that will serve to guarantee their individual freedom and be the source of their civic awareness.

" ' 'Measures for the protection of our industries so that they may develop and prosper."

" ' 'PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF PUERTO RICO

" ' 'The Socialist Party of Puerto Rico declares that the natural wealth and the riches produced in Puerto Rico by labor in its manifold and varied manifestations, are monopolized by resident and nonresident natural and artificial persons; that the vast latifundia, inventions, and the prodigious applications of machinery to sugar production and other industries, are monopolized by absentee capital.

" ' 'That the industrial and social wealth which is the product of the effort and labor of all the citizens who in the past and the present have applied and are applying their intelligence and muscle to produce it is not only not enjoyed by those citizens but is also sent out of the country in the form of incomes, dividends, and profits, thereby compelling the producing community of Puerto Rico to suffer dire and painful consequences; and for these reasons:

" ' 'The Socialist Party of Puerto Rico, upon making this declaration of redeeming and humane doctrine, resolves to declare before the public conscience of Puerto Rico and of the United States, that the industrial economic system which predominates in this island is directed and controlled by selfish and baneful monopolies of absentee and resident capital, and that it does not fulfill the civilizing purpose and the design of human justice that our country demands.

" ' 'Measures for economic, social, and human advancement: To increase the powers of the Legislature of Puerto Rico to adopt solutions of the problems of the centralization of lands and absenteeism.

" ' 'Technical organization of industry: The Socialist Party, well aware of the need for the technical organization of industries, considers that the promulgation of legislation has become necessary, and to that end will strive to obtain the establishment of credit institutions in harmony with the requirements and development of industries.

" ' 'Public ownership of public utilities: A part of the natural resources of the people of Puerto Rico is in the hands of public utilities. The capital represented is nonresidente. If

Puerto Rico were able to connect public utilities with the administration of the government, the majority of the economic and social ills from which it is suffering would be suppressed.

"'"The services rendered by these public utilities represent, for the community in general, an annual outlay of a considerable sum of money, amounting to millions of dollars, which not only is not reinvested but which migrates, serving to pay dividends, interest, and compensation to persons, while the industrialization of our island, the telephone and telegraph, steam and electric railroads, and other resources, continue undeveloped in Puerto Rico.

"'"These resources in the possession of the state would be an invaluable source of advancement and of general comfort and welfare.

"'"The Socialist Party advocates that the state, through well-planned and carefully considered enactments of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, take over the utilization of the natural resources of the island, including land and maritime communications, piers and warehouses all along our coast line, operation of water resources—considering this is the white coal that we can produce for steam and electric industrialization—and the other resources that so far remain unexploited in Puerto Rico."

"'"PLATFORM OF THE COALITION OF THE UNION-REPUBLICAN AND SOCIALIST PARTIES

"'"Examination and survey of all the natural resources and other factors, as a foundation for the possible establishment, promotion, and development of industries capable of producing successfully for export.

"'"Continuation of the agricultural policy initiated by the coalition (of the Union-Republican and Socialist Parties)

"'"Establishment of business cooperatives, of the barter of products for consumption, and of agencies for the creation abroad of markets for our agricultural and industrial production.

"'"Continuance of our program of extension and development of subsistence farms, furnishing them with agricultural implements, seeds, livestock, and homes, and providing the necessary means for the enforcement of homestead laws.

"'"To promote and contract a loan of not less than $1,500,000 to be applied to the construction of homes for laborers and to the improvement of those already in existence, and to the purchase of land and the creation of farms to be supplied with all the required agricultural implements, animal power, seeds, fertilizers, and everything else needed.

"'"The natural resources of the land, such as waterfalls (water resources), forests, mines, fisheries, etc., should be conserved and developed under the direction of the state.

"'"PLATFORM OF THE PUERTO RICAN TRIPARTITE UNIFICACION, NOW THE PUERTO RICAN LIBERAL PARTY

"'"Extension of the farm and homestead program.

"'"Amplification of the system of subsistence farms.

"'"Industrial promotion, not only by means of protective legislation, but also by means of such financial assistance as may be required.

"'"Establishment of credit facilities for agriculture and industry for the purpose of affording them cheaper credit by the creation of the necessary organizations.

"'"Establishment of such relations between the colono and the central, and between the laborers and employers in sugarcane and other agricultural products, as will guarantee to each the enjoyment of that share of profits to which each of them may be entitled from the standpoint of a fair conception of contribution to production.

"'"Maintenance and enactment of such laws concerning land tenure as consolidate and strengthen the foundations of our general economy.

"'"Establishment of a water resources administration that will assist our agriculture and furnish the people cheap irrigation and electric energy in the rural and the urban districts. This policy does not imply the elimination, or a merger with the general system, of those public systems which, as in the case of the Guayama irrigation system, are operating in a solvent and efficient manner."

"'5. To declare that, as is very well shown by the platform hereinabove transcribed, Governor Tugwell, far from arbitrarily forcing ideas upon the people of Puerto Rico, is carrying out, as behooves an executive under the democratic system defended in this war, a program of reforms known to and ardently desired by the people of Puerto Rico, which was discussed with the people when their votes were solicited during the election campaign, which was sanctioned directly by the people, and which the Legislature of Puerto Rico enacted in democratic compliance with the mandate of the people.

"'6. To declare further that such program, far from being anything new, aims at securing for the people of Puerto Rico the enjoyment of measures enacted either for Puerto Rico or the United States or numerous States a good many years ago, and which are opposed only by a certain group in Puerto Rico because of the habitual belief of this group that our people can be deprived of rights won long ago by the people of the United States and by the civilized peoples of the world in general.

"'7. To declare that for all the foregoing reasons Governor Tugwell, as a democratic executive, and until such time as the people of Puerto Rico elect their own executive, represents the democratic forces of Puerto Rico and the democratic principles the defense of which is involved in this war.

"'8. And to request from the President of the United States as a democratic expression, as it is hereby requested, that the Honorable Rexford G. Tugwell remain in the governorship of Puerto Rico until our people have the opportunity of electing their own chief executive, this latter being the only democratic alternative to the permanence in Puerto Rico of a Governor who effectuates the program of the people and of the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

"'9. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, and to the American press.'"

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by the pastor and members of the Methodist Church at Oswego, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens and church organizations, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter embodying a resolution adopted by the Frederick (Md.) Branch of the American Association of University Women, favoring the enactment of the so-called Thomas-Hill bill, being the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—LIST OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the localities from which 11,602 petitions have come to me asking favorable consideration of Senate bill 860.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arkansas: Monte Ne	1
California:	
Chowchilla	1
Covina	1
Garden Grove	1
Huntington Park	1
Los Angeles	4
San Diego	2
Yarba Linda	2
Colorado: Manzanola	2
Connecticut: Madison	1
District of Columbia: Washington	2
Florida:	
Gainesville	1
Green Cove Springs	7
Georgia: Jesup	1
Illinois:	
Chicago	1
Lansing	1
Indiana:	
Akron	1
Bluffton	1
Muncie	1
Richmond	1
Iowa:	
Des Moines	1
South English	2
Kansas: Delphos	27
Kentucky: High Splint	1
Maine: Presque	1
Missouri:	
Clarksville	31
Columbia	1
Dexter	1
Kansas City	124
Neosho	1
Palmyra	53
Rolla	39
Tipton	98
University City	20
Versailles	62
Nebraska:	
Blue Springs	4
Crookston	1
Omaha	1
New Mexico: Roswell	1
New York:	
Binghamton	23
Hamburg	51
Hyde Park	3
North Carolina: Swannanoa	12
North Dakota: Foxhohn	1
Ohio:	
Cambridge	64
New Philadelphia	2
Warren	1
Wilmington	1
Pennsylvania:	
Aliquippa	1
Philadelphia	1
Wilkinsburg	1
Oklahoma:	
Ada	1
Coyle	2
Medford	1
Perkins	1
Roland	2

South Carolina: Latta	1
South Dakota: Yankton	1
Tennessee:	
Maryville	1
Rives	1
Texas:	
Anahuac	1
Austin	1
Beeville	137
Big Springs	1
Brownfield	1
Cameron	1
Camp Wallace	11
Cleburne	1
Corpus Christi	102
Dallas	148
Edinburg	3
El Paso	61
Gainesville	1
Grand Saline	1
Houston	2
Itaska	1
Jacksonville	4
Lampasas	2
Lexington	45
Lometa	2
Lubbock	36
Maud	1
McLean	1
Mount Vernon	150
Orange	1
Pecos	1
Perryton	1
Port Neches	40
Post	2
Raymondsville	10,000
Riviera	20
San Antonio	1
Santo	56
Terrell	1
Texarkana	1
Waco	2
Virginia: Norfolk	60
Washington:	
Custer	23
Seattle	1
Wisconsin:	
Ashland	2
Wonewoc	1
Wyoming: Laramie	1
Total	11,602

REPORTS OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 367. A bill for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace; without amendment (Rept. No. 158).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren; without amendment (Rept. No. 159); and

H. R. 1857. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 160).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 7, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable;

S. 856. An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 979. A bill granting a pension to Ralph L. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 980. A bill to provide for placing the name of Lloyd Weeks Benedict upon the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. BONE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 981. A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 982. A bill to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, New York, may be paid into the general funds of such city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING FROM FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BARBOUR to the bill (S. 920) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, last Friday I inserted in the RECORD a statement setting out indications of bias in the abstracts from publications dealing with post-war programs, issued by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress. The Director of the Bureau, Mr. Griffith, in a personal interview denied any intentional bias in that work, and I offered to submit for inclusion in the RECORD any statement he might wish to make in regard to the matter.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Griffith in a letter he wrote me under date of April 6. The statement by the Director, however, is not a conclusive answer to the chief point raised in my statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, April 6, 1943.

The Honorable RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have been good enough to call my attention to the extension of your remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1943, and to ask me for any comments or additional facts bearing upon the subject. However, before proceeding to the main topic, I do want to thank you sincerely for your very kind remarks concerning the Legislative Reference Service. We try to give the Members the assistance which they desire, and recognize that impartiality and the absence of any suggestions of propaganda are absolutely essential to our operations.

It is for this reason that I welcome the opportunity to clarify the relationship of the State Department to the abstracts which we prepare of publications relating to post-war problems. Some misunderstanding must account for the statement that the selection of materials to abstract is determined "in every instance * * * by agents of the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management." The selection is made by and in the Library, and the only stipulation which the State Department makes is that the articles, books, and documents selected for abstracting shall contain within them some significant contribution toward the analysis or solution of post-war problems. In furtherance of this instruction, our staff members strive to examine all the material in print (except newspapers) which comes into the Library every day. In what is currently available in published form, during the few months in which this project has been operating, there have been only a few items hostile to the administration's stated policies in the fields of international trade and peace aims. The complete absence on the part of the Legislative Reference Service of any bias one way or the other can be best indicated by the inclusion in the abstracts of a very considerable number of articles which are antiadministration in some of the other fields.

I must assume personal responsibility for the particular six samples which were circulated to the Members of Congress. Attempt was made to include a crosssection of material as it was being received, so that the Members might know what to expect if they wished to receive copies of the abstracts. The

most careful rereading of them does not suggest to me that they have a bias in any one direction. Certainly none was intended, nor were any of our workers conscious of bias.

You quite properly raise the question as to why we abstract the State Department's own publications. The reason is quite a simple one. So many of the Federal agencies are, at the present time, giving attention to the problems of demobilization, the unscrambling of wartime controls, and probable conditions in the international field, that the abstracts are used, not by the State Department alone, but by a number of other research bureaus within the Government. To these other bureaus, an abstract of a State Department publication is a quick and convenient way of learning its contents. The project as originally conceived and as now carried out is intended to avoid serious duplication and to make it unnecessary for several agencies themselves to try to discover and analyze what is appearing in print of interest to their special assignments. The Library of Congress seems to be the most appropriate agency to examine virtually the entire flow of printed materials for this purpose.

Once more let me thank you for your courtesy in the matter and for your words of appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

FUEL OIL SITUATION IN THE EASTERN TERRITORY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD a very interesting and encouraging letter which I received today from Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads. It is a short letter, and I shall read it. It is as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: You will recall that I appeared before the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages on January 27 and outlined to the committee what had been accomplished by the railroads up to that time in moving oil into the eastern territory and what we hoped to accomplish in the future.

In this connection you will, I am sure, be interested in knowing that for the week ended April 3 the railroads handled into the eastern territory an average of 933,966 barrels per day. The daily average in tank cars for that week was 912,919 barrels and handled in drums moving in boxcars 21,047 barrels.

This is the peak record up to date in the movement of oil by rail into the eastern territory, the previous peak being for the week ended September 19, 1942, when the daily average was 856,710 barrels. You may be assured the railroads will do everything that can be done not only to continue this record but to better it in the months that lie ahead.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PELLEY.

Mr. President, I should like to add that, in view of this very encouraging letter, plus the fact that the so-called 20-inch pipeline to the east coast has been approved and that the larger pipeline, the so-called big inch line, will be completed this year, the oil situation in the distressed area, not taking into consideration the needs of the military forces, looks much more encouraging than it has.

STATUS OF NEGROES AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS IN ARMED SERVICES AND WOMEN'S AFFILIATED AUXILIARY MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof, to consist of five members, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the status of the Negro and other minority groups in the armed services and in attached or affiliated auxiliary military organizations for women, with a view to ascertaining (a) the extent of compliance by the armed services and the Selective Service System with the requirement of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, that the selection and training of men be accomplished without racial discrimination, (b) the nature and extent of any practices in the organization and placement of personnel which accomplish the exclusion of persons because of race or color from the assignment to any type of unit or any type of service on land, at sea, or in the air, (c) the extent to which opportunities for training, appointment, or advancement in the commissioned grades are restricted on the basis of race or color, (d) the extent to which considerations of race or color are impeding the full utilization and development of professional and technical skills, and (e) the relation of the system of segregated units to the effective utilization and appropriate placement of persons on the basis of individual competency and merit. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

WINNING THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Winning the Peace," delivered by Senator WAGNER on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANISM VERSUS INTERNATIONALISM IN THE POST-WAR PICTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Americanism versus Internationalism in the Post-war Picture," delivered by him on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of post-war problems, delivered by Senator TAFT on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE EAU CLAIRE (WIS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Small Business Must Not Be an Unnecessary War Casualty," delivered by him before the Eau Claire (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on March 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ADDITIONAL WEAPON FOR JAPAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him, entitled "An Additional Weapon for Japan," publish in the Progressive for Monday, April 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POETIC TRIBUTE TO FATHER DUFFY

[Mr. MCNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Father Duffy," composed by Martin M. Clifford, past State chairman of the Knights of Columbus of Jersey City, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE A PLACE OF REFUGE FOR THE JEWS—ARTICLE BY JAMES G. MCDONALD

[Mr WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by James G. McDonald entitled "The Time for Discussion Is Past," published in the March 9, 1943, issue of the New Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PRODUCTION AND LABOR—ADDRESS BY L. METCALFE WALLING

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of current war production and labor, delivered by L. Metcalfe Walling, Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, United States Department of Labor, at Springfield, Mass., March 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PHONEY WAR ON INFLATION—ARTICLE BY MERLO PUSEY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Merlo Pusey, entitled "Phoney War on Inflation," published in the Washington Post, of April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Will P. Kennedy dealing with the activities of the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, in connection with the celebration of the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY AND BUREAUCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM "AMERICA"

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Bureaucracy" published in "America," which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF HENRYK EHRLICH AND VICTOR ALTER—REMARKS BY DAVID DUBINSKY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, remarks made by David Dubinsky at a meeting of protest against the execution of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, which appear in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial

entitled "Give It a Hearing," from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, of March 30, 1943, and an editorial entitled "The Senate Answers the Challenge" from the Norwalk (Ohio) Experiment, of April 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute. If any amendment is to be proposed to the committee amendment, it should be offered before a vote is had on the committee amendment.

NORWAY'S DAY OF SORROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be the 9th of April, a day which looms large in the history of this country and looms large in the history of a little country across the water. That country is Norway.

The destiny of the free people of Norway has been forever joined to the destiny of the free people of the United States by the inexorable hand of God.

Norway and the United States have the same allies—the United Nations.

The United States and Norway have a common foe—the Axis.

We even share the same day of sorrow, April 9.

On April 9, 1940, Hitler's forces, with the aid of Quisling's Judases, violated the shores of neutral Norway.

On April 9, 1942, the United States War Department announced the fall of Bataan in the Philippines after 3 months of heroic resistance.

April 9, 1943, Bataan and Norway are still in the grasp of our barbarian enemies. But today the growing might of American production and American arms is striking at the Axis; its supreme goal the liberation of all Axis-subjugated peoples all over the world.

Norwegians are doing their part to win this victory. Norwegians are serving in the air, on the sea, and on the land under the banners of Norway and of other United Nations. Norwegian ships and Norwegian sailors carry American war materials to every fighting front. And in Norway itself resistance is going on—and it will go on until the last vestige of Axis oppression is destroyed for all time.

When the enemy launched his sneak attack on the Norwegian coast on the night before April 9, 1940, he lost between one-fourth and one-third of his then existing fleet, a fact not generally known. From that moment forward, the people of Norway have never neglected an opportunity to attack the invader.

Quisling was immediately put in power by the Nazi, but his short-lived cabinet was never able to assemble, and 6 days later the initial Quisling government was forced to resign. King Haakon was the constitutional monarch of Norway. He continues to be the constitutional monarch of that nation. The pretense at government which the Nazi-Quislings set up is, in the eyes of the world, as it is in the minds of the Norwegian people, unconstitutional and illegal, commanding neither obedience nor respect.

In this connection, I should like to read an open letter to Vidkun Quisling, whose name has displaced even that of Judas as the very symbol of betrayal, from Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States. The letter is contained in an official publication of the Royal Norwegian Government under date of April 9. I now quote the letter, which is addressed to Vidkun Quisling:

When for the love of power, a man attempts to sell the dignity of his own people, Vidkun Quisling, he sells nothing but his own soul.

For a brief moment he wields the sword; but it is a lonely, meaningless gesture, Vidkun Quisling, and the command meets only the silence of a contemptuous world.

Borrowed armor is a deadly thing, Vidkun Quisling. It is no firmer than the source from which it came. It falls apart and leaves him who has worn it against his own people, naked, alone, unready for the wrath of men whose freedom and dignity are beyond price.

The source from which you borrowed strength is waning, Vidkun Quisling. Already there are cracks in the armor and the contempt of the world, the wrath of men is unabated.

You are ruling, Vidkun Quisling, past the hour. You are living, Vidkun Quisling, on borrowed time. You have spent, Vidkun Quisling, the last of the 30 pieces of silver.

If this is the contempt of the Attorney General of the United States, how much more terrible must be the surging hatred of the Norwegians themselves.

No loyal Norwegian has cooperated with Quisling or with his master, Hitler. Every loyal Norwegian has struck back at the traitor and the barbarians he represents with all the vigor that characterized the Vikings of old—the Vikings who discovered America, the Vikings who, in 1066, invaded England, after having lived for a generation in France, the Vikings who in 750 settled in Dublin and in Cork.

Quisling tried to appease the nearly 300,000 members of the National Athletic Association by means ranging from bribery to threats of death, or prison camps. Since 1940, not one athletic contest has taken place in Norway in which the contestants were Norwegians.

When he was foiled in his attempt to gain control of the membership of the National Labor Federation, which had a membership of approximately 350,000, the puppet traitor brought about the reduction of wages and an arbitrary raising of living costs. But, he could not break the undying spirit of the Norwegian workingman. Norwegian workers, today, are the spearhead of the living movement of resistance which will eventually bury the Quisling movement.

Wounded by his failure to enslave mature Norwegians, Quisling aimed a Herod's blow at Norwegian children. He decreed that the children between the ages of 10 and 18 years, should become members of the Ungdomsfykling, a youth organization patterned after the Nazi Jugend. He decreed that teachers must join the Nazi-controlled Norges Larersamband—Norway's teachers organization. As a protest, 12,000 of Norway's 14,000 teachers resigned, and more than 700 teachers were sent to the concentration camp near Lillehammer. After weeks of torture, those who remained alive of the 700 were shipped off to a work camp near the Finnish border. Yet, the teachers who were not imprisoned or killed resisted and continued to resist.

Quisling tried to force his master's new order upon the Norwegian Church. He suspended the pledge of silence which Norwegian law required of all clergymen concerning facts confided in them by their parishioners. As a consequence of this move, 7 bishops and 1,100 pastors resigned. The Norwegian Church is a church of God and of free men, not of idols and of slaves who cringe before them. The world knew that. Vidkun Quisling has learned to his sorrow that from the blood of a single martyr there spring a thousand true believers.

Every action of the slave betrayer has been met with stubborn disobedience. Five political parties, representing 92 percent of the voters of Norway, united to oppose him. He disbanded this united organization. The disbanded group still continued to checkmate him at every turn.

He attempted to intervene in local and district governments, only to encounter mass resignations of governors and mayors.

Norway's national legislative body, the Riksting, has confounded Quisling by suspending its operations indefinitely.

Since December 12, 1940 Norway's Supreme Court has refused to meet.

Quisling cannot control organizations and groups which have, voluntarily, and as an attack upon him and the evil which he represents, gone out of existence.

I know the immeasurable strength of the Norwegian character—as certain, as powerful as the sea that breaks against the bounds of their native fjords. I know that strength because both my parents were born in Norway.

The people of the State of Wisconsin, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, appreciate the deep-rooted democracy of the Norwegian people. The many thousands of American citizens of Norwegian ancestry who live in my home State have made lasting contributions to its progress and its greatness.

And the people of the United States, in common with all right-thinking people everywhere, are well aware of the manner in which Norwegian resistance has aided the cause of the United Nations.

When the Axis is crushed, defeated by triumphant United Nations, Norwegians can attend a pure church, send their children to the instruction of loyal teachers, resume honest work and honest recreation, and live under a government which has denied the right of invaders to defile it.

Norway will see that day of restoration and liberation.

The United States, with men and machines, will hasten the coming of that day.

Norway and the United States have shared the day of sorrow—April 9.

Through trial and torture and punishment and pain, our two nations will fight side by side, together, until we and all United Nations share another day, the day of victory.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain at once that I am shocked by the War Department order of recent date that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty." I can understand the necessity for discouraging ordinary political activities on the part of members of the armed forces. But this order nullifies the fundamental rights of American citizenship. It inhibits, furthermore, the rights of our whole people to turn to the military establishment for high leadership in civilian places of high authority if civilian judgment wants to turn in that direction. I deny the right of the War Department to militarize the processes of American democracy. I deny the right of the War Department thus indirectly to control American elections. I think I can understand the purpose. But I, for one, repudiate it. If the American people ever desire to draft a member of the military forces for high American responsibility, it will take more than the petty dictum of the War Department to deny them this high privilege. We are not yet totally at the mercy of our self-serving overlords. If a great American emerges, for example, as the next, most eligible President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him just because he happens to be a member of the military forces on active duty, and it will make a blunder, as ineffectual as it will be transparent, if it tries.

THE FARMER AND INFLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting statement by the Northeastern Dairy Conference just received by me. In this statement I find four questions asked, as follows:

1. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when they are selling their farms to go to work in factories?

2. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when dairy herds are being sold because of insufficient returns to pay bills and hired labor?

3. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when the farm has been stripped and is continuing to be stripped of hired labor by the attractiveness of factory jobs?

4. How long would the protected industrial worker stand it if he worked 80 hours per week instead of 48; if he worked for approximately one-half of what he is now getting and then was called insulting names?

Mr. President, to some it may seem that the picture here given is very much overdrawn, but those acquainted with the farm situation at present realize that many farmers see it just about that way.

All efforts to find a "class goat" for inflation are unfair and in the long run will fail. We have inflation for a very simple reason. The Federal Government is paying out money now at the rate of $100,000,000,000 a year instead of approximately $10,000,000,000 a year.

National income payments to individuals have gone up from $76,000,000,000 to approximately $115,000,000,000 in 2 years. National income payments to individuals this year promises to go to $130,000,000,000 and, perhaps, to $140,000,000,000.

At the same time the amount of goods and services for which these tremendous sums in purchasing power can be exchanged has dropped by one-third; by the end of this year perhaps it will be cut by almost one-half.

Price controls and wage controls, applied simultaneously and reasonably, if made in time, can retard the progress of inflation. So can taxation, if the taxation is applied where the increases in income are the largest. The Government has, so far, done none of these things.

A year ago price controls on commodities were initiated. But wage controls were not attempted, and then only half-heartedly, until months later. Of course, wage increases, especially in total volume of wages paid, increased production costs as well as purchasing power. Prices beat against ceilings, naturally. As this process continues, prices and wages will continue to advance alternately but steadily.

The remedy is not to attach the blame to the farmer, nor to any one group, but to try to prevent the spread between supply and purchasing power from increasing still further.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending legislation deals with one of the most critical aspects of the manpower problem. It undertakes to supply funds and to provide some machinery to assist in securing sufficient farm labor for the production and the harvesting of essential agricultural crops.

It is unnecessary for me to discuss the importance of increased agricultural production in the present very unusual period of our national history. The fact that the available labor on the farms of the Nation has been seriously depleted both by reason of the more attractive wages offered in industry as well as by having workers drawn into the armed forces is a matter of common knowledge. Various surveys indicate that there is a shortage of from 700,000 to 1,000,000 in the manpower necessary to be had on the farms of the country in order to reach the production goals which have been set by the Department of Agriculture.

The hearings before the committee demonstrated that the farmers are preparing large areas for planting. With good luck, a slight increase in the amount of machinery, and an increase in the labor supply, despite all the difficulties which confront the farmers it is not at all impossible that they will reach the high goals which have been fixed for this year's production.

Some months ago the responsibility for the recruitment and placement of farm labor was transferred from the Manpower Commission to the Department of Agriculture. A few weeks ago the Honorable Chester C. Davis was appointed the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, and was charged with the responsibility of assisting the farmers of the country to secure adequate labor for the production and harvesting of their crops.

The pending measure appropriates funds to assist in that movement. The original Budget estimates which were sent to the House requested an appropriation of $65,000,000. The measure as it passed the House carried an appropriation of $26,100,000. After very careful consideration, the Senate committee recommends to the Senate an appropriation of $40,000,000, which is more than the amount carried in the joint resolution as it passed the House, but is a considerable amount below the Budget request and the estimate of the sum necessary to be had in order to do the work.

The Senate will observe that the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee is really in two parts. The first part relates to the recruitment and placement of farm labor within the several States and within the counties of the several States. The committee was of the opinion that the county extension agents and the State extension services would be better informed as to the available supplies of labor, as well as to where the labor was most needed, than would any other agency. We have, therefore, made available to the State extension services not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 of the funds that are appropriated. It is estimated that from 85 to 90 percent of the labor which will be secured will be obtained within the several States. Most of it will of necessity be recruited locally.

We had before us a number of the directors of the extension services of the States. Many of the States have already formulated programs and have made considerable progress. The boys and girls in the high schools have been enrolled in a corps of farm workers. Several of the States have passed local laws which permit the children in the schools to be absent for as long as 30 days at one time, provided they are engaged in agricultural labor under the specified supervision. Some of the States, notably New York and California, have not only passed laws but have provided appropriations for the maintenance of local committees that are attempting to grapple with this very serious problem of the shortage of labor.

Now, we are very hopeful that with the plans which have been formulated and with the work which has been done, the county agents will, from the schools and from among the people with farm experience who are living in small towns, be able to secure large labor resources.

The other program relates to the activities of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the first section, will he yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has indicated that he thought that, speaking generally, from 80 to 90 percent of the labor would be obtained in the local areas involved. Is there to be an importation from outside the country of the balance of the necessary labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was just approaching that subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Agreements have already been entered into with the Republic of Mexico whereby it is hoped to secure at least 50,000 Mexican laborers for the crops raised principally in the Southwest and in the sugar-beet areas. An agreement has been entered into with the colonial government of the Bahama Islands whereby 5,000 experienced farm workers from those islands will be brought into this country. I understand that the first load of them is now on the way, and it is proposed that they shall start work on the vegetable crops in Florida, and will work their way up the entire Atlantic seaboard, working on the crops as they mature in different periods, and perhaps going as far north as the State of New York and other States in that locality.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. However, there is nothing in the measure to prevent the importation of workers from any country; is there? In other words, if the Administrator desired to send to Europe and to bring into this country citizens or persons living in Europe, there is nothing in the measure which would prevent him from doing so; is there?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is nothing in it which would prevent him from bringing in anyone who is not an alien enemy. No citizen of a country with which the United States is at war can be brought in under this measure; but I may say that as a practical matter it would be almost impossible today to transport labor from Europe to this country, in view of the fact that every country in Europe has a much greater manpower problem than does the United States. They need all available labor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the refugees from Europe who seek entry here?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that there is nothing in the joint resolution as I now recall, which would prevent the importation under a temporary entry permit of any foreigner who is not a national of a country with which we are now at war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me ask whether the joint resolution would suspend in any degree the immigration laws?

Mr. RUSSELL. It only suspends the immigration laws to the extent that it would waive the head tax on the persons brought in for this purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it would not suspend the quota system, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it would not suspend the quota system. I appreciate that suggestion from the Senator from Michigan.

I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that, of course, no number of aliens could be brought in in excess of the number allowed under the quota for the country from which they derive their nationality.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean that there is a limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. There is nothing in the measure which would suspend any of the quota laws. The quotas do not apply to Mexico or to the Central American republics; but there is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas which were established by the basic immigration act of 1924 or which would increase the number who could come in under the quota system. There is that limitation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator feel that the immigration laws would not be suspended by implication if we should give the Administrator power to bring in persons from other countries as they may be needed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not believe that the joint resolution would suspend by implication the Immigration Act of 1924 as to quotas. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend or in any wise affect the quota system. The Senator is well aware that there is no quota in the case of Mexico and the other American Republics. The quotas apply only to Europe, and there is a provision against the importation of Asiatics. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas even if, as a practical matter, it were possible to bring in aliens from Europe.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not a fact that the contract which has been entered into with the Republic of Mexico provides for the return of the laborers when they are no longer needed in the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. All the contracts provide for the return of the laborers to the country of their origin, whether it be Mexico or the Bahama Islands. Not only do the contracts so provide, but the Administrator has placed the imported agricultural laborers under the direction of a United States Army officer, with the idea that he will see that they are kept together and properly provided for, and that after they have performed their services in this country they will be returned to the country of their origin.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that as a practical matter it is not contemplated that laborers will be brought from Europe. In addition, it would be practically impossible to get them out of Europe, because all the countries of Europe have a very acute manpower problem. The powers proposed to be granted by the joint resolution would exist only during the remainder of this calendar year. All the powers proposed to be created by the joint resolution would expire on the 31st of December 1943.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator made the statement that it would be impossible to get laborers from Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not make the statement that it would be impossible. I said that as a practical matter it would be very difficult if not impossible to get them out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I accept the correction. Has there not been quite a clamor for returning transports to bring persons from Europe to America?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard of any such clamor; but, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be very happy to accept any amendment to the joint resolution which would prevent the importation of persons from Europe. I think it should be so worded that we would not be denied the opportunity of utilizing the labor of prisoners of war from Europe who might be brought into this country. In the hearings before the committee it was developed that the British were relying very largely on Italian prisoners of war in England at the present time for the production of farm crops, and that they had proved to be the most efficient laborers they could find. However, with the exception of prisoners of war, I should have no objection to an amendment to prohibit the importation of any person of European origin.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask a further question. With whom was the contract with respect to Mexican citizens entered into?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original contract was entered into in behalf of what might be called a commission, which consisted of representatives of the State Department and of the Department of Agriculture who signed on behalf of the American Government, and the Secretary of Labor, or the equivalent officer, of the Mexican Republic who signed on behalf of the Mexican Republic. The entire agreement is set forth in the House hearings.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator says that the contract provides for the return of those persons to Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But if another contract should be made there is nothing in the joint resolution which would provide for their return.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the joint resolution, but there is ample provision in the immigration laws. The moment they cease their duties here they are subject to deportation. The committee had before it the Assistant Director of the immigration and Naturalization Service, who stated that if any of them undertook to stay in this country the Immigration and Naturalization Service would endeavor to see that they were deported under the ordinary deportation procedure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it be possible under the terms of the joint resolution to import agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would certainly be possible.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely possible, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any plan to use the funds proposed to be appropriated for importing agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. No such plan was brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. We found from 100,000 to 150,000 men unemployed in Puerto Rico, many of whom, I am sure, would be physically capable of coming here. I wish to suggest that some effort be made to do something along that line. We were told that 15,000 Puerto Ricans actually signed up for mechanical work, and stated their willingness to put up $100 of their own money in each case to come to the United States, and that nothing had been done about it. Apparently no effort whatever has been made to recruit agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico, and it seems very strange to me that no such effort should be made when we there have a vast supply of American citizens who are out of work and who are capable of performing agricultural labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. No reason was assigned before the committee for not importing Puerto Ricans. However, it occurs to me that one reason might be that in ordinary times in this country we have a surplus of agricultural laborers. Only in a period of great emergency is there any dearth of farm labor in the United States. If labor is imported from the Bahamas or Mexico, we can force the laborers to return when the period of the emergency has passed. Puerto Ricans, being citizens of the United States, there is no way to compel them to return to Puerto Rico. That is the reason which occurs to me; but I do not know why Puerto Ricans have not been imported.

Mr. TAFT. I feel confident that they would be perfectly willing to return to Puerto Rico, and would desire to do so in most cases. Puerto Rico is somewhat farther away than the Bahamas, but it is no farther away than Jamaica; and I do not know of any reason why we should not avail ourselves of the supply of American citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. For the information of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], let me say that as a practical matter I think there is no chance for the importation of any agricultural workers from Europe. If he fears such a result, I must differ with him.

In California we would welcome any efficient farm operators, because otherwise we may be in a very desperate condition. I was informed that in the Azores there were several thousand very fine Portuguese who were very proficient in the dairy business as milkers and in taking care of herds. Our need for such dairy workers was so great that I immediately discussed with the State Department, the Army, and the Navy the possibility of securing workers from those islands, and I was informed by all the governmental agencies that there would be no chance of our bringing in any agricultural workers from Europe or from Asia.

For more than a year I have been concerned over the problem of importing Mexican workers. In the West, at least, where we have had wide experience with workers from Mexico, and some from Puerto Rico, we have found that the Mexican workers are thoroughly acceptable to our people. They are congenial and are liked by our people. They do very fine agricultural work. On the other hand, it was the opinion of almost all our farm leaders that the Puerto Ricans would not be satisfactory, and that once they were brought into this country there would be very great difficulty in returning them.

Mr RUSSELL. We could not return them unless they should desire to return.

Mr. DOWNEY. Every method is being employed to safeguard the return of the workers from Mexico when their services are no longer needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to make a brief observation with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Of course, we are all sympathetic toward the effort to obtain agricultural laborers in the United States during the present critical times. We wish to obtain cotton pickers, vegetable pickers, and other farm workers. However, in justice to ourselves and in justice to the boys who are doing the fighting, our own citizens should have the opportunity of working on our farms. They should be given the opportunity to pick citrus fruits and vegetables in Florida, and cotton in the Southwest. I am most sympathetic toward the effort to obtain farm labor, but why neglect our own people? In Puerto Rico there are more than 250,000 unemployed. We complain because we have spent millions of dollars in Puerto Rico; but when there is an opportunity for Puerto Ricans to come here and work, we pay more attention to foreign groups than we do to our own citizens.

I think it is the duty of the Congress to insist that Puerto Rican citizens be given an opportunity to come into the continental United States. I know the excuse which is given. The Senator from Georgia was correct in his statement. There is a fear that the Puerto Ricans will not go back to Puerto Rico. Can any Senator stand on this floor and justify such an objection? I am sure the Puerto Ricans would go back of their own volition. But for groups of people in this country at a time we are fighting a war for democracy to say that we cannot allow our own citizens to come here and work because of a fear that they will not return to the place where they came from, is an untenable position to assume.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. As I read the pending joint resolution rather hurriedly, I saw in it no discrimination against the importation of Puerto Ricans.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the measure which would prevent them from coming into the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no; there is nothing in the joint resolution which would prevent that.

Mr. BONE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; there is nothing of that character in the joint resolution. What I am complaining about is this: About 2 weeks ago I read in the newspaper that some Bahamans were being imported to the State of Florida. On instructions of the Senate committee was sent to Puerto Rico. During its investigation it found poverty, starvation; but many of the Puerto Ricans are good laborers. I inquired why there was a preference on the part of Florida, or any other State, for Bahaman rather than Puerto Rican labor. I inquired of officials of various departments as to what efforts were being made to utilize Puerto Rican labor in this country, and I found that some of the officials are just as scared as some Members of Congress apparently are. I was told that such a procedure would tend to reduce the wage standards of labor in this country. I do not think it would. Puerto Ricans also like to receive good wages, but they will work according to the circumstances at the time; they will work for the prevailing wage.

Mr. President, we talk about a Puerto Rican problem; it is an American problem. We created it. So I shall continue to insist that the departments of the Government, either under the pending joint resolution, or under the law as it now exists, give opportunity to Puerto Rican citizens. One of the generals on Guadalcanal was a Puerto Rican. His poor relatives in Puerto Rico—if he has any poor relatives, as I am sure he has—are not now being given an opportunity to work within the continental United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is any provision in the pending measure which would prohibit those coming from foreign countries from accepting work other than that of an agricultural nature.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the pending measure which would prevent that, but as I recall in the contract between the United States and Mexico, there is contained language to the effect that Mexican nationals shall accept no employment other than agricultural employment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There is nothing whatever in the proposed legislation which would restrict the employment of labor to the agricultural field?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing except the fact that if they do not engage in agricultural labor they are sent back to the country from whence they came.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Is that provided for in the pending measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is not. It is not spelled out in the joint resolution, but it is in accordance with the terms of the contract, with Mexico, as I recall. At least it was testified before the committee that that is the method by which the situation had been handled up to then.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does it not appear to the Senator from Georgia that after arriving in the continental United States from other countries to engage in agricultural work, such persons might be tempted by higher wages afforded by industrial work and accept employment in those lines? If nothing prevented them from doing so it would not serve to help agriculture very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is something which would prevent them from doing so because if they should engage in other than agricultural labor they would be immediately deported. If they should undertake to engage in industrial labor they would be deported. If they should refuse to work on agricultural labor wherever it is available, they would be immediately deported.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If that is the situation, I should think it could be construed as a prohibition against them accepting other employment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me if it was spelled out in the measure, and I say that it is not, but it is in the agreements, or contracts, to which I have referred, and has been a part of the policy pursued up until the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I believe he has stated an issue, so far as I am concerned, with respect to the pending bill. I believe he stated he would welcome foreign labor to California. I wish to take the position fundamentally in this time of war, that I do not welcome foreign labor into this country. When young farmers of the country are fighting on foreign soil, and upon the high seas, I do not wish to see such a situation created in America, that the farms and industries of the country will be operated by men from other lands.

A short time ago the Senate passed the Bankhead bill for the deferment of farm labor. It is now in the other House, where it seems to have been slowed down. A chilling hand seems to have touched it. If that bill were passed and should become a law, I submit to the Senate that there would be no occasion for us to talk about importing foreign labor. I think it is very fundamental at this time, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] said a while ago, to think first of our own citizens and not to send them into the battle lines, and use men from other lands to fill their places of employment.

Mr. President, I make these comments in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that the Senator from California was expressing his own views and not expressing the views of the committee if he stated that he was in favor of importing foreign labor. I am sure the committee would be opposed to the importation of a considerable number of foreign farm laborers from Europe. There might be difficulties involved in returning such laborers to the land of their origin.

I want to say to the Senator, who referred to the young men in uniform, that all our hearts are with them, and the purpose of the pending measure is to furnish a sufficient supply of labor to insure that our men in uniform shall be fed. The total number of foreign laborers affected by this joint resolution is less than 6 percent of the total labor need and of those whom we hope to employ in order to assure that men at the front, as well as civilians at home, shall not suffer for the lack of food.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have a request to make, if the Senator from Georgia can comply with it, and that is that he insert in the RECORD as a part of this debate a copy of the Mexican contract which has been referred to and which I presume is typical of the average contract under this sort of operation.

May I ask also at this point if men have been brought into the United States and are working under that contract, and if so, what is the authority for the execution of the contract?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I do not believe there is any specific statutory authority for the execution of the contract. There may be, but the contract was entered into, nevertheless, by the Department of Agriculture with the Government of Mexico.

Mr. BONE. Are Mexicans now permitted freely to enter this country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; they are not permitted freely to enter the country, but if anyone thinks that the country will be overrun with Mexicans he is deceiving himself. The fact is that the Mexican Government does not want its nationals to come into this country. They have a border patrol. The committee had evidence to show that at that time Mexicans were rushing to the border in large numbers and were endeavoring to get into this country, but the Mexican Government stopped them at the border and sent them back to their homes, refusing to let them come in. The trouble has been to get a sufficient number of Mexicans to labor on our farms, not that we have been swamped with Mexicans. We have had difficulty in getting a sufficient number to take care of the long staple cotton in Arizona and New Mexico and to save the vegetable crop in California. We are not being swamped with Mexican labor, but the Department has been trying to get a sufficient number to take care of the present farm-labor problem.

Mr. BONE. I fear the Senator misunderstood the purport of my question. I understood the statement made on the floor was to the effect that there was no quota in operation as affecting Mexico, and I was merely inquiring about the status of the Mexican who attempted to immigrate to this country, and I was wondering, if there is no quota system, what arrangement exists between the two governments?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona is present, and I ask him to clear up that question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, no alien can come from any country in the Western Hemisphere unless he has a passport visaed by an American consul, and to obtain such a visa he must pass an educational test; he must show that if he comes to the United States he will not become a public charge, and he must show that he is in good health.

Mr. BONE. Are those the only restrictions? If there is no quota, suppose a million men from Guatemala or Honduras or Mexico desired to come into the United States, and met the qualifications, could the 1,000,000 come under this arrangement?

Mr. HAYDEN. They could come just as a million Canadians could come.

Mr. BONE. I am merely seeking information, I am not making an argument; but I should like to know if that is the case?

Mr. RUSSELL. They could not come in under this arrangement, they could come under existing law. This measure would not increase the number.

Mr. HAYDEN. The quota applies to European immigration only; it limits the number that may come from Germany, France, Spain, and other European countries in proportion to the number of people of the particular race who are in this country. There is an absolute prohibition of oriental immigration. It does not, however, apply to the Western Hemisphere, to anyone from Mexico or South America, for instance, so that such immigration is actually regulated by the visa system. We protect our country by providing that no one can come in from Canada, from Mexico, from Guatemala, from Brazil, or any

other country unless he can satisfy our immigration standards. He has got to pass a literacy test, show that he will not become a public charge, and that he is not suffering from any disease. When we have had difficult times in this country it has been practically impossible for any farmer to obtain such labor, and the practical effect of this measure will be to relieve, to some extent, that situation.

Mr. BONE. I raised the question merely in order to clarify this immigration picture. I am frank to say that I did not realize that the barriers were down to quite the extent which has been suggested, and that the only restriction was one the individual may find imposed on himself by lack of financial responsibility and education. Assuming that there is financial responsibility and education in the individual himself, and he could secure the visa from a diplomatic representative of this Government in the countries whence he desires to come, he would have no trouble in getting into the United States, would he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that it is not quite so easy as it sounds, for, as a matter of present practice, these countries will not let their nationals come into the United States. They endeavor to restrain them in every way they can. They have border patrols, and the agreement with Mexico make it plain Mexico does not want any great number of her citizens to come to the United States, for fear it will disturb the economy of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly respond to a few inquiries I should like to make?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator can do so. I invite the Senator's attention to section 2 on page 6. I understand from that section that the payments are to be made to the States in a sum not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 and that the sums so apportioned are to be available for expenditure by the Agricultural Extension Service of the States. Let me ask the Senator first, please, whether or not the agricultural extension services referred to are State services or Federal services at the present time?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reference is to State services, because there is no such thing as a field service for the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, inviting the Senator's attention to lines 20 to 22, inclusive, it follows, does it not, that the Agricultural Extension Service at the present time, the State services within the States, are to be subjected to supervision and approval by the Administrator, at least, in respect of the sum to be apportioned to the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true at the present time. The Senator is well aware that under the Morreel Act, under the Smith-Lever Act, and all other extension appropriations an allocation is made on a formula provided by Congress, and none of the funds is to be paid until an arrangement satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture shall have been entered into between the Federal Government and the State agencies. This is merely a continuation of that. The Secretary of Agriculture now has the right to withhold Federal funds from any State unless the State extension service submits an agreement for the expenditure of the funds in a way satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture. This does not give to the Agriculture Department any new power over the State extension services.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Insofar as we would authorize the recruitment and placement and training of workers, we would not authorize the taking of any worker against his consent; would we?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing on earth in the joint resolution that requires any involuntary labor of any kind.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, will the Senator turn to page 10, lines 18 to 24, where we find the proviso stated in the limitation set forth. The proviso says that should the county extension agent refuse to give his consent in any case to the removal of a worker from County A to County B, let us say—I now quote:

> Any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

First, let me ask the Senator, who is the interested or affected person who may appeal to the Administrator?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was afraid someone was going to ask that question. In my opinion, that would give an appeal to the man who wished to employ the laborer, the laborer himself, the laborer's wife, or the laborer's child, or any representative of the United States Government who is engaged in the recruitment and placement of these laborers. That is my construction of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator another question: Is there any control over any such agricultural worker by the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. DANAHER. Under the system of job priority being set up in the United States Employment Service, no worker may work except in a given industry until and unless he has a certain type of certificate from the United States Employment Service. I, therefore, ask whether or not the United States Employment Service in any respect known to the Senator will have jurisdiction in any way over these agricultural workers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will be utilized to locate the workers and to notify the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, as well as the county agents, as to where the labor is located; but unless the United States Employment Service is given direct authority over these laborers, I do not know any power they would have at all.

Mr. DANAHER. Would not the United States Employment Service or its representatives be such an "interested or affected person" as to be able to move a man from County A and County B?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would have an appeal to the Administrator, undoubtedly.

Mr. DANAHER. Conversely, they would have the power to deny unemployment certificates within the county in which Mr. A is a resident unless he consented to go to County B.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true, but I do not think this measure impinges on the authority of the employment service in the slightest degree.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator, under the language on page 9, lines 15 to 24, and following, is it the Senator's understanding that this measure will supplement or supersede in any respect the work of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I think this joint resolution transfers all the power for the transportation interstate of migratory farm labor from the Farm Security Administration to the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production. However, there is nothing in the measure that prohibits the Administrator from utilizing the facilities of the Farm Security Administration. It is contemplated that, so far as existing camps are concerned, that he will utilize the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's answer coincides exactly with my own understanding, and I wish to thank him.

Calling his attention to page 12, beginning in line 14, there is reference to the Farm Security Administration, and I assume that the reference deals with recoupment by that agency for the use of facilities which now are chargeable to the Farm Security account. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of subdivision (d) on page 12 is to provide for covering into the Treasury any funds received for the account of any of the farm placement centers, including the camps which are under the operation of the Farm Security Administration. Heretofore, the Farm Security Administration has collected a certain amount from people who were in the migratory labor camps, which has been placed in a revolving fund. This measure provides that all such receipts, whether from the Farm Security Administration, or the Federal Extension Service, or any other agency, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand that there is a limitation of some 2 percent on the total fund appropriated for administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Is that 2 percent limited to the difference between $20,000,000

and $40,000,000, or is it on the entire appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies to the entire $40,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask the Senator to clarify section 4. I call the attention of the Senators from Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arizona, where sugar beets are raised, to this particular section. We in the Northwest rely on migratory labor, we have migratory laborers coming into our section by the hundreds of thousands. Employment of such labor is the only way by which we can possibly harvest our crops, as I think the Senators from the Northwest who are present will agree.

In section 4 we find the following language:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

I can easily envisage a situation in which thousands of folks in one of the States of the South would be through picking cotton. During the preceding year they had moved North. They move with the seasons. Am I to understand that before such workers could come to the Northwest to help us with our threshing and our harvesting every one of them, some of whom cannot read or write, some of whom do not know their rights, would have to go to a county agent? Would they have to go to a county agent and get permission to come, for example, from the State of Georgia to the State of North Dakota, or the State of Montana, or the State of Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand the measure has that effect at all. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would impose the slightest restraint on labor. Any private contractor from the Senator's State could go into any other State of the Union, whether it be Georgia, Wyoming, Washington, or any other State, recruit all the labor he pleased, and move them wherever he pleased, and no one would have to sign, and no one would have to approve. This provision is to prevent the use of Federal funds to impose upon the very class of labor to which the Senator refers, as well as to keep an equalized supply of labor in the country.

A number of instances were brought to the attention of the subcommittee, and doubtless to the attention of the other House, instances of the United States Employment Service and other agencies of the Government using some outrageous methods in forcing laborers to move from one section of the country to another by intimidation and threats.

If the Senator will turn to the hearings, he will find there one very significant letter. The United States Employment Service sent out this letter to a large number of farm laborers and farm tenants:

> UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
> *Rome, Ga.*
>
> Your selective-service occupational questionnaire shows you have a farm background. Please see Mr. Ernest Farmer in the United States Employment Service Office at 522 Broad Street, Rome, Ga., by Monday, January 25, 1943.
>
> M. A. N. PATTON,
> *Manager.*

There is evidence in the RECORD that when some farm tenants and sharecroppers who were under contract, and did not wish to leave their contracts, who were satisfied with their housing conditions, who were satisfied with their contractual relations with their landlords, presented themselves to the United States employment officer, he told them that they had registered as farmers, and that they would either go to Florida to gather vegetables or would be inducted immediately into the Army.

There is an instance of a responsible citizen writing in to his Representative in Congress to ascertain whether the United States Employment Service had the power to put a man in the Army if he did not leave his farm and go to Florida to gather vegetables. There should be a brake somewhere to prevent that kind of thing occurring. Therefore we provide that before any such practice as that can be carried on, the county extension agent has to approve the man leaving.

There were other illustrations, such as that of the authorities going into one county and, by intensive recruitment, moving as much as 50 or 60 percent of the local labor in the county, and such as that of people in one county going over to another county and engaging in competitive bidding for labor, so that the crops in one area would fail absolutely for lack of gathering, because all the labor had been drawn off to crops that could afford to pay a slightly higher wage.

Section 4 is an effort to stabilize the use of labor so that it will be employed most effectively. Any person affected by it can write a letter to Mr. Davis, if he feels he is entitled to transportation at Government expense, and Mr. Davis has a right to say, "You have a right to go at Government expense"; but no person can restrain him.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe an impartial reading of section 4 will indicate that, taking an extreme case, although there might be four or five thousand workers who were not at all needed in a given county farther south, the county agent, by refusing to sign up and permit them to go north, could freeze them in that county. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not true at all, as I see it. The Senator may construe it in that way, but I do not so construe it, because the Administrator has absolute power in the matter. If the Senator will read the succeeding section, he will find that the Administrator has absolute power to nullify anything the county agent might do.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make an observation in reply to the question of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OVERTON. The situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers is not at all affected by the pending measure. Any laborer may move from any county to any other county, or from any State to another State, at his own will. There is no effort on the part of Congress, through the enactment of the pending measure, to produce a situation of involuntary servitude, because constitutionally we could not do it. We are merely creating a new agency to help in the present labor situation, and we are supplying the agency with funds. So far as the funds of the Government are concerned, they may be employed solely under the restrictions set forth in section 4.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator to do so.

Mr. LANGER. Assume that a large farmer in the State of Montana wishes to hire 500 men who are in Georgia. How would he proceed, under section 4?

Mr. OVERTON. He could go to Georgia and get the 500 men, if they wished to go, but he could not take advantage of the funds appropriated by the pending measure to transport them.

Mr. LANGER. If Congress is to appropriate $40,000,000, why should not the farmers in Montana or North Dakota or Wyoming have the benefit of that fund?

Mr. OVERTON. Because, on the other hand, Government funds can be used to deplete a county or a State of labor which the county or the State absolutely needs. Why should the Government funds be used for that purpose?

Mr. LANGER. There may be an excess amount of labor in a county, and the laboring men may want to go north to work but do not have the funds necessary to make the move.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there is a county agent in the United States, whether it be in Georgia or North Dakota, who, if there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers in his county, would interpose objection to their being moved. If there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers and he would not permit them to move, he would not keep his job very long.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia will agree with me that under section 4 the county agent

has the power to block the movement of labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he does not have such power.

Mr. LANGER. A man affected may appeal, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It is so simple that a man can write a letter, and it will be considered to be an appeal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has raised this question. It was raised in the committee. Perhaps it may be well to call attention to the language of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad if the Senator will do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If Senators will turn to page 4 of the bill, beginning in line 7, they will find the language which was written in on the floor of the House dealing with this subject matter. It reads:

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

It was perfectly obvious upon the reading of that language that Congress was providing a large appropriation to make migratory labor accessible and available to agricultural employers throughout the United States. But at the same time it was saying, "This purpose, this objective of Congress, may be defeated utterly and completely by any county agent in a county in which there is a surplus supply, or by any agricultural commissioner in any county where there is a surplus supply, upon his own motion, in his own discretion, for reasons which are satisfactory to him, and without giving any reason to anyone at all."

The criticism in the committee, I think, was practically universal that no such broad power should be delegated by Congress in making a labor appropriation to county and State officials.

As one member of the committee, I sought to have the whole matter stricken. The committee took the other view and adopted the language to which attention has now been directed by the Senator from North Dakota.

To me the language is still open to objection. The argument which the Senator from Georgia has made is, to my mind, no argument at all. He quotes from a communication which was written by a citizen of Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; by an employee of the United States Employment Service who was sent to Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is quite right. But the incident, I think, happened there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The situation which is there described is simply this: An employee of the United States Employment Service exercised or attempted to exercise a power he did not possess. He had no right to say to any worker, "You go to Florida or else you will go into the Army." It was altogether outside his jurisdiction. And now, because, forsooth, an employee of the United States Employment Service in a State somewhere is willing to attempt to exercise power he does not possess, and to compel workers to go where he wants them to go or else go into the Army, we are asked to say in a law that the county agent shall have such power. We are now proposing to say in connection with an appropriation designed to provide labor for all agricultural employers throughout the United States that a county agent may veto the act of Congress.

The power was taken away from the State agricultural commissioner in this provision which the committee has adopted. And then this provision, to which the Senator from Georgia draws attention, was written:

Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

In fairness to the committee and to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who has had a particularly onerous task in working out this bill, I may say that the purpose of that language was to prevent the sort of thing which I criticized in the committee and which I have criticized on the floor. My thought is that it will not be effective, because the migratory workers for whom we are trying to provide employment in this bill are persons who are not likely to make such an appeal. We are creating an obstruction. My feeling was, in the committee, and still is, that this provision ought to be stricken from the bill. In that event, when the matter goes to conference the conferees will have a perfectly free hand in writing a provision. They cannot write a more liberal provision than that which is contained in this section.

My feeling is that even though we are appropriating money, and that this provision applies only to those who derive the benefit of the money, and does not in any way prevent a worker traveling on his own funds or on the funds of someone else, it is nevertheless a restriction upon the free movement of labor, which should not be written into a law of Congress at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this provision is not intended as any restriction on the movement of labor anywhere. Its purpose is to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds to dislocate the supply of labor and to hire labor from counties or from areas where the labor is needed.

To hear the distinguished Senators speak one would think that Congress was undertaking to pass a law which would forbid a farm laborer leaving the county of his residence. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill does not undertake in any wise to place any restrictions whatever on any farm laborer anywhere in the United States. It merely says that these funds shall not be used to drain off labor from one county or one section where it is needed, for the benefit of another county or of another section. It will operate between counties as well as between the State of Georgia and the State of Wyoming, as illustrated by the Senator from Wyoming.

Senators talk about the measure interfering with the movement of migratory labor. This provision does not affect migratory labor. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] overlooks the language which provides that if the worker has not resided in the county for a period of 1 year, and been engaged in agriculture during that year, there is no restriction whatever upon his movements. It does not affect the migratory laborer in the ordinary sense of the word who moves from one crop to another crop, and from one State to another State, because unless the man has been living in the county for the full period of a year and been engaged in agriculture during that year the funds may be expended to remove him from that county.

The whole theory of the joint resolution, let me say very frankly, is to give the largest possible measure of control to the States and to the State agencies. The joint resolution decentralizes the program. As to whether or not it will work, I do not know.

The joint resolution as it came to the House from the Budget Bureau vested all the power in the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. As the measure came to the Senate from the House, it undertook to put all the authority in the county extension agents and in the Federal Employment Service.

We have revised the joint resolution so as to give the county agents absolute control of the local recruitment of labor, with the Federal agency to have the power to move labor into a State and to handle such farm labor as might be imported.

There is nothing in the joint resolution which is inconsistent with the whole theory of doing such work or of handling such labor. Certainly, no agency should reach into Georgia or Wyoming or any other State at the behest of anyone in Georgia or Wyoming or any other State and interfere with contractual arrangements already entered into between farmers and laborers, and use Federal funds to lure laborers away by offering higher wages for Federal employment. Nothing in the joint resolution is consistent with any aspect of peonage. The whole theory of the measure is that the county extension agent knows more about the farm labor within his county than does anyone else, and that he should have some control over all parts of the program as it applies to his county.

It might be said that we are wrecking the program because we require the Administrator, whether he wishes to do so

or not, to allocate at least $13,500,000 to the county agents and the State extension services. It might be said that under section 2 of the joint resolution there might be a program which would result in recruiting laborers from one county, and then having someone go into another county and offer the workers in that county a little more money, and move them out, under Federal funds, although it is true that in the joint resolution funds are provided for moving laborers into some county or counties.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it has always been my understanding that the agricultural extension services and agricultural county agents of a State carry on work which is primarily educational. I am wondering why it is that the committee has written into the joint resolution a mandatory provision, as appears on page 6, that the Administrator shall apportion a specific amount to the State extension services for the purpose of handling transient labor. As the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia stated a while ago, the entire program is under the supervision of the Administrator; and, as I further understood the Senator to say, the Administrator is to be permitted to select any agency he desires in order to carry on the work. Should that be the case, why make it mandatory that the Administrator must employ the State agricultural extension services in order to carry on the work?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that in the subcommittee I held exactly the same view as that which the Senator from Louisiana has expressed, but I happened to be the only member of the subcommittee to entertain that view.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. As soon as I finish discussing this point I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The evidence showed that the State extension services had already set up their programs, and already had people out mobilizing the high-school boys and girls and undertaking to locate in the small towns laborers with a farm background. Therefore, an overwhelming majority of the committee felt that, insofar as the mobilization and placement of farm labor within the counties and within the States was concerned, it should be made mandatory that the Administrator should utilize the services of the county agents and of the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the Administrator were to find that that plan does not work. Would he not run short of funds? In other words, he could not use the money for any other purpose, could he?

It strikes me that the joint resolution should be amended so as not to make it obligatory on the Administrator to spend not less than $13,500,000 or more than $20,000,000 in that way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must say that, although in the committee I agreed with the Senator's view, I do not think he has correctly interpreted the language. The joint resolution requires that the Administrator shall apportion the money, but he is not required to spend it. The requirement is that he shall apportion at least $13,500,000 of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If he did not apportion it, he could not use it for any other purpose; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, he could not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind. The joint resolution is specific in that respect; on page 6, line 15, provision is made that—

> The Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I agree with the statement the Senator has just made. But a few minutes ago the Senator stated that the Administrator would have to spend the money through the State extension services. I was pointing out that he would not have to spend it. He would not have to spend it at all. He must apportion it to them; but if he were not satisfied with the administration of it, he would not have to pay it to the extension services. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would force the Administrator to pay the money to the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any language in the resolution which would enable the Administrator to utilize the facilities of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will take quite a large part in the program. For example, the State of New York has already passed a State law under which the United States Employment Service and the county agents and representatives of various farm groups have set up a committee which will receive some of the funds.

The Senator will see that local areas are to be permitted to enter into agreements with any private or public agency to perform any part of the work; and it is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will receive a certain amount of the funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that a certain amount of money is apportioned to the State of Maine. Could any of the money be used to transport laborers from Maine into New Hampshire?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could be; yes. However, a State extension service is not going to do anything like that, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 7, line 2, I notice that the extension service can pay, among other things, for the—

> transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property.

That language does not indicate that the labor must be within their own States; the funds could be used to send labor outside of their jurisdiction or vice versa. There is no limitation as to what can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should simply like to remark that I cannot imagine any State director of extension spending his money to ship his labor outside of his State, to some other State. He might do it, but I cannot imagine it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not attempting to argue that point. I am trying to find out how the money may be spent. During this emergency I can imagine many cases where the extension service of one State would find it advantageous to enter into an agreement with the extension service of another State to exchange labor services in saving the crops of their respective States. All crops do not mature at the same time. I desired to make it certain that it was the intention of Congress to permit the use of the funds to transport labor out as well as in a State. Under the measure as now written the funds could be used in such a manner, could they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if there were such a revolution in the ordinary processes of human nature, he could do it, but I do not think any one other than a person in some institution would be likely to do such a thing.

It is contemplated that a State extension service director could bring persons from some other State into his State. Of course, we give the State extension service director of any given State every power that we give to the directors of State extension services of other States. They all have the same power.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us suppose that the State director for Maine desired to have some labor come from Massachusetts to Maine. Under the measure as now written, could he pay all the expenses incidental to bringing that labor from Massachusetts to Maine?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he could do so, so far as transportation and subsistence expenses were concerned. He could pay all the expenses of bringing the labor from Massachusetts into his State; and it is contemplated that the directors will do so.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I promised first to yield to the Senator from Arizona, and then will yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the issue raised by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The matter of the difficulty of bringing in labor was pointed out. I should like to make the point that the difficulty has been, not that the Department of Agriculture or the Manpower Commission have been too ready to admit laborers from other countries, they have not been quick enough to admit them.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to the fact that my State responded to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture to plant American-Egyptian cotton or long-staple cotton. At the request of the Department, my State increased the acreage of long-staple cotton from 65,000 acres in 1940 to 127,000 acres in 1942. There was an implied promise that aid would be given by the Government to pick that long-staple cotton. There was an implied promise that aid would be given to the people of California and

other States to help them when they responded to the request of the Department of Agriculture to plant the crops which are needed in the war program.

I submit, Mr. President, that long-staple cotton is needed in the war program today, and needed badly. Because we responded to the appeal which was made, there was a shortage of workers in Arizona. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and I went to Arizona and California and conducted a hearing in the month of November last year. We found that the people of the State of Arizona and the people of the State of California were desperate in their attempt to get laborers to harvest their crops and pick the long-staple cotton needed by the War Department.

That is the situation which we found, not only in regard to long-staple cotton, but in regard to the dairy and other products of our State. Dairymen were compelled to sell cows for beef purposes because they could not get laborers. They could not get laborers to save their feed. That was the general situation, without going into detail, which we found in the State of Arizona and in the State of California. There was a general farm-labor shortage.

About the first of March of this year I went back to the State of Arizona to find out just what had happened to that program. In March, which is the planting season for long-staple cotton, I saw with my own eyes, fields where not a lock of the previous crop had been picked. The ground was as white as the stalks. That cotton is needed in the war program.

In the month of October I had called upon the Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Agency and asked about the importation of Mexican labor to pick the long-staple cotton. They responded that we had plenty of domestic labor. They were going to import labor from other States to pick the cotton, but it was not done. I asked, "Where is the labor about which you are talking?" The answer which I finally received was that some professor in Oklahoma had testified that on October 1 there would be 100,000 workers available to send to the western area; but on October 1 they did not come, and they never came.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that if there is a surplus of farm labor in West Virginia or in any other State, we will welcome it with open arms in Arizona. I hope that he will not vote against this bill and thereby prevent the Government of the United States from getting long-staple cotton picked after it has been planted, because it is proposed to import labor from another country.

Mr. President, this is a serious problem. The farmer is facing a serious manpower shortage, and has faced it throughout the past year. The people of my State have suffered. We hear much talk about how much money the farmers are making. Some of them have made money; but I can point to farmers in the State of Arizona who have lost money in the year 1942.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What has become of the farm labor in the Senator's State which makes it necessary to import so much farm labor?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will gladly answer that question. In the first place, our farm laborers have responded to the call of their country and have gone into the military service. In the second place, they have responded to the call of industry. They have gone to work in the construction of large training bases, Japanese relocation camps, and war industries. We cannot get them back, because they are making more money elsewhere. They responded because they were offered more money elsewhere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What will become of the laborers whom it is proposed to import?

Mr. McFARLAND. The machinery proposed to be established by the joint resolution would keep them there as long as their services were needed. As I understand, if we go to the expense of importing them, they will be kept there until their job is finished, or for the length of time they agree to stay.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked why it is proposed to give this job to the Extension Service. One of the reasons is the dissatisfaction with the Farm Security Administration. They did not get the desired results last year. That is stating it frankly and honestly. The farmers lost money because those agencies did not do the job. While some good was accomplished, they did not handle the situation satisfactorily to the farmers.

Mr McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr McNARY. I appreciate the kind consideration of the able Senator in charge of the joint resolution. I have not had much time to study the Senate committee amendment to the measure as it passed the House, but it occurs to me that complete control of the funds and the program would be placed in the hands of the Food Administrator, who is Mr. Davis To that extent I assume it would be taken away from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, or the remaining part of the Department which he controls. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my understanding. The Executive order of March 26, 1943, confers on Mr. Davis all the powers which the Secretary of Agriculture has heretofore had in dealing with this problem. It also places under his direct supervision the operations of certain bureaus in the Department, including the Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Under the Executive order, the Extension Service goes to Mr. Davis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It is no longer under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Executive order undoubtedly transfers from the Secretary of Agriculture the powers which he has heretofore exercised over the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not the opinion of the very able Senator that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senate committee would centralize the power in the Administrator, as against the House version, which would lodge the authority largely in the extension service in the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, that is what the committee undertook to do.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I thought. A few moments ago distinguished Senators thought that this was a decentralization measure. I think the effect of it would be a high degree of centralization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was referring to the operations of the Administrator within the States. I invite the attention of the Senator to section 2. The able Senator has undoubtedly read it. No Senator has a quicker grasp of legislation than has the Senator from Oregon. He will see that the State extension service would have almost unlimited control over the funds allocated to the States for the recruitment and placement of labor within the States.

Mr. McNARY. I recall the work which was done in the States last year. Parenthetically, let me say that I favor State supervision, whenever possible, as opposed to Federal supervision. The Extension Service, in cooperation with the United States Employment Service, worked very satisfactorily, and this year a great many of the States favored the joint cooperative effort of those two agencies rather than a centralization in the office of the Food Administrator. Did the committee give thought and consideration to that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee did; and the committee sought to effectuate that very idea in section 2. The committee so worded the amendment that $20,000,000 of this money, if spent at all, must be spent through the State extension services and such agencies as they desire to enlist to assist them.

Mr. McNARY. "Such agencies", which omits specifically the Federal agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; if the Senator will read the language——

Mr. McNARY. I am not as familiar with the language as is the able Senator; but is it not true that it is proposed to work entirely with the extension services in the States through the Food Administrator, omitting, so far as possible, the activities and cooperation of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The hearings on the bill, which were exceedingly interesting, showed that the several States had different systems. The State of New York, for example, was represented before the committee. The State extension director appeared and outlined in some detail the plan which had been adopted in the State of New York for cooperation between the State extension forces and the United States Employment Service. It is contemplated that the State extension services will work in the closest harmony with the United States Employment Service. They are given power, as the Senator will see on line 14, page 7

of the joint resolution. The following language appears:

Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

So far as it was brought to the attention of the committee—and we heard, directly or indirectly, from nearly all the State extension services—I believe that without exception they plan to work in close harmony with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. McNARY. If the joint resolution should become an act, I hope that may prove to be the fact.

I observe that the increase is from $26,000,000 to $40,000,000. Will the Senator tell me why the Senate committee saw fit to alter and modify in many respects the House provisions by the insertion of the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be frank and say to the Senator from Oregon that some of the members of the committee, including the Senator from Georgia, had a great deal of difficulty in determining exactly what the joint resolution, as passed by the House, meant.

Mr. McNARY. Did the Senator experience that difficulty with respect to the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, as the Senator well knows, anyone who has any connection with the writing of a law knows what he has in mind, and he thinks it is covered by his bill, whether it is written into the bill or not. The Senator is aware of that. Apparently the author of the House joint resolution knew exactly what it was designed to do. But from my reading of it, it appeared there was considerable conflict in its language. There were a number of limitations, such as that read by the Senator from Wyoming, whereby the commissioner of agriculture in any State would have the right to forbid the movement of any labor without a State. There was language which provided that in this interstate movement of labor the Extension Service should work with the United States Employment Service, and it said that this work should be done under general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal office of the Extension Service of the United States Employment Service.

It occurred to me that while one bureau in the Department of Labor had just as much authority to write rules and regulations as a bureau in the Department of Agriculture, they might have some difficulty in ever agreeing on rules and regulations for the interstate movement of labor.

There were a number of other provisions in the joint resolution as passed by the House which were just as confusing to me, because I thought that someone somewhere should have final authority. It is said that the United States Extension Service and the United States Employment Service should write rules and regulations, without saying who should have the right to reconcile any differences between the agencies. My observation convinces me that under such circumstances we would not be likely to have any rules and regulations.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator knows my profound objection to an appropriation bill containing a legislative provision. The objection is as acute in this instance as when legislative amendments are proposed to regular annual current appropriation bills. I believe this is in violation of the rules of the Senate, to the extent that it is an attempt to write legislation into an appropriation bill, though not one of the annual appropriation bills. Of course, I am not going to raise the point, but, as the Senator knows, it is a practice which I deplore most profoundly.

I merely wish to add this inquiry at this time: How many witnesses appeared before the committee, and how general were the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings were very extensive. They embraced 283 printed pages. We had before us representatives of all the farm organizations, including some I had never before heard of. Of course, the committee was a deficiency subcommittee, as the Senator is aware. We had farm organizations which appeared before the committee who never found their way before the committee on agricultural appropriations.

There appeared before the committee the newly appointed Administrator, and the directors of the extension services of four or five States. We had before us the Secretary of Agriculture, in addition to a representative of the Federal Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, and other farm organizations, as well as individuals who represented States and groups. We had a very wide variety of witnesses. In fact, it was one of the most thorough hearings I have seen.

Mr. McNARY. Did the farm organizations to which the Senator has referred approve of the Senate committee's amendment, or did they not express their preference for the House provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. We may as well be frank about it——

Mr. McNARY. We always are.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Bureau Federation endorsed the House joint resolution as written. When some of the complications of the House joint resolution were pointed out to them, they came in with a great many separate amendments which they proposed to the measure as it passed the House. The committee then undertook to write a complete substitute. Mr. Goss, of the Grange, and representatives of other farm organizations, expressed some doubts as to the workability of the House joint resolution.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon that as far as the farm organizations are concerned, and particularly the Farm Bureau Federation, the pending joint resolution embraces more of their ideas than mine, because I opposed very vigorously some of my colleagues on the committee who supported the views of the Farm Bureau, and I lost in committee. I would say, therefore, it is more of a Farm Bureau measure than anything else. Some of the members of the subcommittee were very anxious to have the ideas of the Farm Bureau written into the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee have before it a representative of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think there was a representative of the United States Employment Service before the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to be provincial at any time, but in this instance I may state that I think this work was carried on splendidly in my own State last year under the United States Employment Service, and I was rather hopeful that the same service would be rendered this year, and continued under the same administration. I was curious to know if the committee requested a representative of this very reputable and competent Service to come before it and have him express the views of the Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I did not invite them.

Mr. McNARY. The pending joint resolution is really the Food Administrator's measure, with the Extension Service assigned to him to administer it, and somewhat sanctioned by the farm organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that it certainly is not a measure of the Food Administrator. The Food Administrator wrote a letter to the committee very vigorously protesting against several provisions in the joint resolution, and earnestly insisting that they be stricken from the measure. I am not certain whether he approves any substantial part of the joint resolution or not, but the Senator has stated that it is his measure. To make his position clear, he wrote me a letter which very vigorously protested against a number of provisions in the joint resolution and earnestly urged the committee to strike them out, or change several of the provisions.

Mr. McNARY. Was the joint resolution reported unanimously from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. No opposition to the joint resolution was expressed in the committee. As I recall, the junior Senator from Massachusetts—though he is in the Chamber and can make his own statement—stated that he had no desire to oppose reporting the joint resolution, but he reserved the right to oppose any portion of it when it got to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Maine also indicated his opposition to some features of the measure, as I did.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, the Senator from Maine was opposed to the idea of legislating and appropriating in the same bill. He expressed the same dissent to that expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not like the idea of legislating in the Appropriations Committee; but what was the committee to do? A measure came to the Senate from the House of Representatives; it contained legislative provisions and appropriations, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and we were compelled to handle it. There is

nothing new in such procedure. Year after year we have taken up bills containing provisions which are legislative, and also appropriation items to carry on the agencies of the Government. There never has been any basic legislation affecting the N. Y. A. before any standing committee of the Senate. It has always been handled on a year-to-year basis by the Committee on Appropriations. For the W. P. A., which was in existence for some years, there never was any basic act, and no standing committee of the Senate ever saw a bill relating to the powers and functions of the W. P. A. It was handled on a year-to-year basis by the Appropriations Committee. While I think it is much better to have a legislative provision providing for appropriations rather than to write a bill and the appropriation all in the same measure, certainly the committee could not refuse to have anything to do with this very important problem of attempting to supplement the decreasing farm labor in this country, merely to take the time to decide what committee should have handled the bill and how it should have been handled. It came to us from the House of Representatives, and we have done the best we could with it, both in respect to the legislative and appropriation features.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it may be appropriate to say that in my service on the Appropriations Committee I do not remember an occasion when more full and complete study was given to a proposal than was given to this measure. I think the Senator from Georgia should be complimented on the manner in which he conducted the hearings and the executive sessions of the committee at which the text of the joint resolution was discussed. The problem presented to us was, without question, one of the most difficult which has been presented to the Appropriations Committee for some time. We had this great national need for agricultural labor; we had a joint resolution which came to the Senate from the House, written partly upon the floor and partly in the committee, which raised many questions of emotional disagreement as well as a factual disagreement. The Senator from Georgia was instrumental in having legislative draftsmen present. When the Food Administrator was appointed the committee adjourned in order to give him an opportunity to come to Washington to present his point of view to the committee. After that was done, the Food Administrator was asked to suggest to the committee language which he felt might serve the purpose for which the Food administrator had been selected. He did that, and, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that suggestion was not accepted by the subcommittee. We had before us the measure as it passed the other House, a tentative draft which was prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia by the legislative draftsman, another draft which was prepared by the legislative experts of the Department of Agriculture at the suggestion of the new Food Administrator, and a draft which was again prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia. The full committee worked all over these drafts and produced the result which is now before the Senate.

As I said a moment ago, I think the Senator from Georgia is to be complimented on what he did. I did not agree with it in its entirety, and I made a motion in the committee to strike out section 4 (a). I intend to make such a motion again, so that the Senate may pass upon it, but, by and large, I think this measure has been given careful and constructive consideration by the committee.

Now, Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? I ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then a perfecting amendment is now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the committee amendment is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make one more brief statement; I have not yet yielded the floor. Naturally, I would not want to interrupt the Senator from Wyoming, because he was kind enough to say some very nice things about me. Handling the joint resolution was the most thankless job I ever had to perform, and, in a few moments, I shall be glad to have the Senate take it over and do as it sees fit.

Mr. BYRD and Mr. HOLMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia has made a very able and complete statement concerning the pending measure. There are several questions I should like to ask him. Did I understand him to say, in response to a question by the Senator from Oregon, that this measure removes the Agricultural Extension Service entirely from the control of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The joint resolution does not affect that at all. The President, by Executive order, transferred the Extension Service and placed it under the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. The joint resolution does not affect that. It was moved, as I understand, by Executive order of the President.

Mr. BYRD. There are two items to the joint resolution, one an appropriation not exceeding $20,000,000 to be expended through the State agricultural extension services, and then another $20,000,000 to be expended by the Food Administrator. Would it not be possible to coordinate the activities of these two agencies, as they would be doing the same work? The first, as I understand, will do the work within the States, moving the workers within the borders of the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Largely recruiting them and transporting any necessary to move.

Mr. BYRD. And the second will move them from State to State? Will not these two organizations conflict with each other by doing the same work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they can. I may say to the Senator that I endeavored in the hearings on the joint resolution to make sure they would not.

Mr. BYRD. Both of them have the same powers and authority—the power to recruit and transport, and so forth, and so on. I do not see how the two can operate without some conflict and duplication of effort, because they have exactly the same powers, whether the laborers are moved within a State by the agency of the Agricultural Extension Service or are moved without a State by the other agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there can be any conflict even though there is a spelling out of powers. Both agencies are effective, the State extension service as well as the other for interstate and international movements, because all are under the supervision of the Administrator.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the purpose of the Food Administrator, as the Senator understands, to designate some agency of the Government to operate under section 3?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, he is going to use the extension agencies of the Government to operate under section 3. He is going to use the Federal Extension Service, and he intends to use the United States Employment Service. He will, undoubtedly, use some features of the Farm Security program camps which are already in existence.

Mr. BYRD. What features will he use, so far as the Senator is aware, of the Farm Security program?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Administrator intends to see that the camps which the Farm Security Administration has already established for migratory labor will be operated under the provisions of this measure under his direction. He may use some facilities of the Farm Security Administration. I want to point out to the Senator from Virginia that all the drafts of the joint resolution had given both the Extension Service and the Administration the power to construct additional farm-labor camps, but, on my motion, the committee struck out that authority and there is now no power to construct any new or additional migratory labor camps.

Mr. BYRD. The joint resolution gives authority over "transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property." Would not that give the power to construct camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because of the language in clause 3, 2 (a). If the Senator will look at that clause—I tried to point it out to the Senator, but evidently he did not understand me—he will note that the word "construction" was omitted. It was the first word, and the clause read "construction, lease, repair,

alteration, and operation of labor supply centers." The word "construction" was stricken out. The Administrator only has power to lease, repair, alter, and operate labor supply centers.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not think, then, since the joint resolution provides for shelter, that it would authorize the Administrator to build camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Mr. BYRD. I do not see how the workers could be sheltered unless some houses or equipment were provided.

Mr. RUSSELL. This refers to the furnishing of loans or grants for shelters. It means that he could rent a house for workers or he could give them two or three dollars when they first land and before they have obtained jobs to enable them to stay in a boarding house a day or so, but it certainly does not relate to any construction. The word "construction," giving power to construct, was expressly stricken from the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator any information as to whether the Farm Security will have power over these workers? They have had in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I have some information on that, because that was practically the sole subject of discussion before the subcommittee for some 3 or 4 days. As nearly as I can understand the situation, the Farm Security Administration is to have absolutely no policy-making power to deal with any feature of this program.

Mr. BYRD. From whom did the Senator obtain that assurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. From the Secretary of Agriculture, from the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production, and from the extension services, which will handle the matter within the States; and they are the only people who have any power to control the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says he obtained the assurance from the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. Did he obtain directly from Mr. Davis the assurance that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not, because I think it would be very foolish if he did not utilize some of those connected with the Farm Security Administration. There are agents of that organization in nearly every county in the United States, and if the authorities can use those agents in the program without the necessity of hiring new men, I think it would be very desirable to do so. I said that it was stated that no one in the Farm Security Administration would have any power to make any policies in the program.

Mr. BYRD. They would only use the camps and such other facilities as the Farm Security Administration now has?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. In the past millions of dollars have been spent on those camps.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Farm Security Administration operate the camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Administrator could let them operate them if he wished to, but if I understood Mr. Davis' statement—and I am not quoting him verbatim—I took his position to be that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration to formulate policies. My view is that Mr. Davis would utilize an employee of the Farm Security Administration who is already employed in the field, rather than employ a new one. He would be very foolish not to do that. Such employees are not going to be discharged between now and the 1st of July, and if he can avail himself of their services, I think he should do so.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator convinced in his own mind that Mr. Davis will not use the Farm Security Administration to the extent of it having equal influence?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am absolutely convinced of that, and I think every other member of the subcommittee who attended the hearings will give expression to the same opinion.

Mr. BYRD. There is one other question I should like to ask the Senator. At the bottom of page 6 the word "recruiting" is used. Who would fix the price of labor when the labor is recruited to go to another county or another State?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will turn to the provision on page 10, commencing in line 25, he will find a feature of the bill as it passed the House which caused us more difficulty than practically any other section. The language came to us from the House as follows:

> That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor.

And so forth. It occurred to some of the members of the committee that if that language meant anything at all, it meant that it was not permissible even to go from one county to another and tell a man what wage he would receive if he were to move to another county to work. We undertook to amend it, particularly with respect to the agreement already entered into with the Mexican Government, by adding the following language:

> Except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

We then added the following proviso:

> *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

In other words, under the language as it was construed by at least some members of the committee, it would not be possible to go to a worker in the State of Kentucky and say, "If you go up into Virginia and pick apples, we will give you so much a box," or "If you go to the Eastern Shore of Maryland and gather beans, we will pay you so much a crate." We did amend it so that they could be assured that they would get the going wage, whatever it was, whether it was for picking cotton, or whatever the work was.

Mr. BYRD. I presume that process would be followed so that if a group in a certain section of the country wanted labor, they would notify the workers what they would pay?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. And the price would not be determined by either one of the organizations concerned in the pending measure, as I understand?

Mr. RUSSELL. The man who wanted the labor would tell the people he was asking to supply the labor what those who wanted labor were willing to pay, and if the laborers were willing to work for that amount, he could get them.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I request that the Members of the Senate turn to page 11 and observe, in lines 8 and 9, the words "workers imported into the United States from a foreign country."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to make an explanation for the RECORD, for the benefit of those who, like me, are jealous of breaking down the restrictions on immigration from foreign lands, so far as they relate to permanent residence.

I have two points in mind: First, that the language of the pending measure is ample to provide for the return of all workers permitted to enter the country under the joint resolution. The second point is that no language in the joint resolution would permit an influx of immigrants from all over the world in violation of existing immigration laws.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon was a member of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings, and I am sure that all the members of the subcommittee will bear testimony that the Senator from Oregon was most diligent in undertaking to establish that no person, alien-born, should be permitted to enter this country and take up permanent residence by virtue of any of the powers granted under the pending measure which might be exercised by any agency. The Senator was responsible for the inquiries being directed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as well as to the officials who would administer the proposed law, to make certain that all due precautions would be taken to see that such immigrants were returned to the countries of their origin as soon as they had concluded their contracts. That is certainly the intention of the committee, and I hope no person will be permitted to take up permanent residence in this country by

virtue of admission under the terms of the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was well aware of that interpretation and that of the committee, but I wanted the record made. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in lines 15 and 16 on page 11 appears the language "and that shelter shall be provided for such workers." The Senator comes from a part of the country distant from where I have my residence. I am quite familiar with farming conditions throughout the Middle West, and I do not believe there is any place in the Middle West, in what are called the Prairie States, where it is necessary to construct shelters and housing for farm laborers. I am wondering whether that fact was taken into consideration by the committee when it raised the appropriation from $26,000,000 to $40,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that fact was taken into consideration. Not a dime of the money is to be used for the construction of shelters. If the Senator will refer to the language in lines 15 and 16 he will see that it merely means that before a laborer can be transported from one State to another it is permissible to tell the laborer that he will have some kind of shelter when he gets to where he is to perform his work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then the agency would not undertake to force upon the producer or the farmer the necessity of constructing new shelters?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. The word "shelter" was used merely to avoid the confusion which has resulted from the efforts of the Farm Security Administration to fix a certain standard of housing throughout the country. That is the reason the word "shelter" was employed in drafting the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the hearing had before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on the subject of food supply of the United States. That hearing has been going on most of the winter. I recall very definitely the testimony of Mr. Chandler, of Florida, who represented the vegetable and fruit growers of Florida. He stated in his testimony, which appears in the record of the hearings, that he asked the Department of Agriculture for additional laborers, and the Department undertook to provide them, but when the laborers were sent there the agent in charge of the contingent of laborers rejected Mr. Chandler's housing, or the cabins which he had provided, which he had used for 20 years, and to which no one had ever previously objected. So the agent moved his crowd of workers into an adjacent open field, and housed them in tents, and told Mr. Chandler that he could not have those laborers because they were not provided the proper kind of housing.

I wish to supplement what the Senator from Arizona said concerning the situation in Arizona. Very interesting testimony concerning that subject was taken during the hearings to which I have referred. Mr. Abbott, representing the cotton growers of three or four States, said that at the solicitation of the Department of Agriculture they increased their acreage by 60 percent. He said those cotton farmers had to have 20,000 or 21,000 additional laborers.

The Department said the laborers would be furnished to them. All the Department ever did furnish was approximately 1,900 laborers, and the Department undertook to set up a standard contract of labor and wages by the hour, instead of by the pound, as cotton is picked. The thing is in a mess; and, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona said, that long-staple cotton still lies in the fields, practically a total loss. The cotton growers of Arizona alone lost ten million or eleven million dollars by the failure of the laborers the Department sent there.

I should like to read what the Graham County farmers' organization said about the laborers which were sent to them, as being of interest in connection with the present discussion:

> We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of TB, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases, and that if they could get out there they might effect a cure, even if they couldn't work; that they would be given free medical care and attention and otherwise be taken care of. There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who, by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age, and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old, worn-out prostitutes.

That is the type of laborers the Farm Security Administration furnished the State of Arizona.

I read what Mr. Abbott said in his testimony about this kind of an appropriation, and with this I conclude my remarks in connection with the question:

> Now, on coming back here, I find that they have asked this same group who blocked us last year, asked for sixty-five or seventy million dollars. I guess that is to do the same thing to other people that they did to us.
>
> I want to register before this committee a very definite protest on the part of my people, and also myself as an American citizen and a farmer, against this Congress appropriating $17,000,000 for the construction of camps which are not needed. Every farmer has room for labor, and in only a few instances will it be found necessary to establish small, rolling, gathering camps for the harvesting of berries.

Of course, the distinguished Senator says the matter of construction of camps has been eliminated from the bill, but I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony which came before our subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we received testimony practically to the same effect as that mentioned by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. There is, however, a difference in the several areas of the country, particularly in some of the vegetable and fruit areas, and if some kind of camps are not provided it is very difficult indeed to handle the labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a word in addition to what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has stated regarding the testimony of Mr. Chandler from Florida. Mr. Chandler did come before us and say that his buildings had been condemned, and that the labor that was secured through Farm Security Administration was unsatisfactory. However, at a later date—and I am not sure the Senator from South Dakota was present—Mr. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, came before the committee and stated that they had not condemned any of Mr. Chandler's buildings; that they had furnished him with 20 hands, 2 of whom had been returned as unsatisfactory, but he quite emphatically denied that they had condemned the buildings.

We also had, as the Senator from South Dakota said, the testimony from Mr. Abbott, of Arizona. I have heard no word from the Farm Security Administration or from anyone else contradicting his testimony. So possibly there is more basis for that complaint than there is for the one from Florida, which was denied by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in a colloquy had a few moments ago with the able Senator in charge of the bill, I asked him the question what the attitude of the farm representatives was with respect to the House bill and the Senate amendments, and he answered, as always, with clarity and frankness. Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, a short while ago sent me a letter regarding that organization's attitude, which at this time I ask unanimous consent to have read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

APRIL 8, 1943.

Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNARY: In order that there may be no misunderstanding of the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to House Joint Resolution 96, I wish to advise that we believe the provisions of this bill as passed by the House, together with the amendments which we submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee, constitute a more workable and effective program than the bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Our board gave this whole matter extended consideration during its recent meeting in Washington and, after careful study, strongly recommended that the Extension Service be given this responsibility with authority to utilize the facilities of the Employment Service or other agencies through cooperative agreements.

Under the plan which we have recommended, and which is embodied in the House bill, the Food Administrator has ample authority to supervise the administration of this program, since he must approve all programs and projects and the expenditure of all funds under the terms of existing cooperative agreements of the Extension Service with the Department of Agriculture and under the terms of the President's Executive order creating the Food Administration.

Very truly yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always very happy when I can be in agreement with the distinguished head of the Farm Bureau Federation on any legislative matter, but, of course, I realize that I have a responsibility to the people over and beyond any responsibility to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wish to say again that, in my judgment, the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation asked the committee to support and report was absolutely unworkable and that it could not have functioned at all, because it undertook to apply the rules of a matching provision in the Smith-Lever Act to this bill, in connection with which all the funds are Federal funds. While I should like to be in agreement with Mr. O'Neal, I want to say again that I think he is as far wrong as he could possibly be and that, if we were to pass the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation wrote for the House and succeeded in inducing the House to pass, we might as well throw the $26,100,000 out the window, because we would not be able to get one laborer from anywhere and make him available to any farmer in the country.

There is one other provision of the joint resolution which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, and then I shall be through. I wish to point out that I have not utilized all the time which has passed while I have been on my feet. I desire particularly to call the attention of the Senate to subsection (f) on page 13, because it is a provision which affects other legislation, and I think the Senate should be fully apprised of the provisions of the subsection.

It was brought to the attention of the subcommittee that there was in the country a large reservoir of labor of both men and women past 65 years of age who now, on account of rules in various States, are receiving sums by way of old-age assistance. A great many such persons have a farm background; and, while they do not have the physical strength of the younger farm workers, they have the experience and the knowledge which are so vitally needed today on the farms, where high-school boys and girls are attempting to do work which is somewhat technical in nature. There is a rule or provision of law, or it may be a regulation of the Social Security Board—I am not quite clear which it is—which provides that if any person earns any money while receiving old-age assistance, that fact shall be taken into consideration in determining whether such person is in need. In many of the States the old people who have undertaken to relieve the farm labor shortage by doing a little work found that they would be taken off the old-age assistance rolls and would be denied the amounts they were receiving by way of old-age assistance. Naturally, as soon as word of that got around, the others were very slow to accept employment on the farms.

The subsection does say that hereafter, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, there shall not be a Federal rule that the funds received for performing agricultural labor shall be considered in determining old-age assistance need. That is a matter affecting laws which have not been under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, and I thought I should call the matter especially to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me say that the joint resolution falls far short of being perfect. There are in it a great many provisions of which I do not approve. However, it represents approximately 2 or 3 weeks of very earnest effort on the part of the subcommittee. We believe it will work. We believe that the county agents and State extension services will be able to mobilize sufficient high-school boys and girls and other resources of labor within the States, in conjunction with labor which is to be brought in from outside the States, to enable us to harvest this year's crops. We are not going to have adequate farm labor, and that which we do have will suffer for lack of actual experience in the very highly technical business of farming; but by the full utilization of the labor which is available, with the slight back-to-the-farm movement which has been noted lately as those who have rushed off to employment in industry have seen that "all that glistens is not gold" and have encountered the difficulties of rationing and have in their mind's eye gone back to the good old days on the farm when they could have all the butter and all the meat they wished, together with the forces which will be mobilized under the pending joint resolution, the committee believes we should be able to harvest this year's crops, and, with favorable conditions, we can virtually succeed in reaching the goals which have been fixed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With reference to the statement just made with respect to subsection (f), I offered the amendment in the subcommittee, and the subcommittee accepted the amendment. Later it was redrafted by our drafting service, and was approved by the full committee. Since the committee reported the bill and submitted a report on it, the Social Security authorities have considered the amendment; and the meaning of the amendment is not exactly clear in the minds of some of those who must administer the act.

It is the fear of the Administrator of the Social Security Service—I refer to Governor McNutt—that if the amendment should be adopted in its present form it might provide for an addition to the old-age pension rolls of a substantial number of persons. That was not the intent of the amendment. In order that the intent of the amendment may be made as clear, I desire to offer for the RECORD the interpretation of the committee with respect to the amendment. I ask that the interpretation be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the interpretation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 5 (f) provides that compensation earned for agricultural labor shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of individuals for old-age assistance under title 1 of the Social Security Act. That title now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. The purpose of this subsection is to permit recipients of old-age assistance to work as agricultural workers during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may proceed for just another moment, let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to permit persons on the old-age pension rolls to accept employment at agricultural labor and to accept remuneration for such labor without in any way altering or changing their status as recipients of old-age assistance.

In order that the amendment may be clarified, I propose the proviso which I send to the desk and ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 22, strike out the period, and add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this subsection (f) shall not be construed to alter or amend any provision of existing law save that during the time mentioned any person receiving old-age assistance shall be entitled to receive remuneration for agricultural labor performed without in any way whatever altering, changing, or modifying his or her status as recipients of old-age assistance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think that this clarification proviso covers the point which has been raised by Governor McNutt. Let me say that if the proviso is adopted, along with the statement of intent made by the committee, then if it goes to conference, no doubt Governor McNutt will be called into conference; and if in conference any further change is made in the section or in the clarifying amendment, it will be agreeable so far as I am concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill and, therefore, I feel it

incumbent upon me to make a statement with regard to it. Unfortunately, as so often occurs in the Senate, there was a conflict of duties, and on several occasions I had to be absent from meetings of the subcommittee. Consequently I am not as fully conversant with all the proceedings as I otherwise would be.

For that reason, in the committee I took the position of reserving my right to study the joint resolution further when it came to the floor, and at that time to take any action which I might deem appropriate.

I attended a sufficient number of the meetings of the committee to enable me to bear witness to the splendid work which was done there by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to say a word of praise for his industry and intelligence, and to express my own belief that no other Member of this body could grasp a problem of this kind better than could he. Whether or not the measure becomes law, certainly the contribution which the Senator from Georgia has made to the subject is noteworthy, and deserves our gratitude.

Of course, the joint resolution also has a tremendously worthy aim which must be approved by every Member of the Senate—the aim of taking practical steps to meet the farm-labor shortage. The aim of trying to move people from areas where there is a surplus of manpower into areas where there is a shortage of manpower is a profoundly appealing objective; but none of those considerations, appealing as they are, mitigate the fact that the joint resolution is full of moot questions of very far-reaching import, involving grave considerations of national policy. I am prepared to concede that the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the subcommittee considered all these questions with the utmost care, and that they conducted the hearings in the most orderly way. However, at the same time, questions of policy and questions of opinion, which are not secondary questions at all, are involved in the joint resolution.

The joint resolution clearly impinges on the question of immigration. I accept the statements which have been made that it would not change the quota system. I do not believe it would; but I am not at all clear in my mind as to the effect which the joint resolution would have on the laws regarding the head tax or what effect it would have on the question of immigrants becoming public charges. I do not know. I do not think anyone knows.

I notice the provision that the gentleman who is to administer the act shall cooperate with the Secretary of State. That brings to mind a picture of both of them working together. Of course, the question of immigration involves a great deal more than the Secretary of State. It involves other departments. It is my understanding that the proposed legislation has never been cleared by the State Department. It certainly brings up the question of treaties and foreign relations.

Another thing which I do not like in the joint resolution is that the money proposed to be appropriated may be distributed without precept, directive, formula, or yardstick of any kind. I realize that the members of the subcommittee have thought about this, and that they believe that the situation is such that no formula or amendment could be drafted which would meet the needs. However, it is an important consideration with some of us on the committee that there should be such a precept.

I am in doubt as to the effect which the impact of this measure would have on our contract-labor law. I do not say that it would have any. I do not know. However, the more one reads some of these measures the more he wonders.

So while I heartily approve the stated purpose of the joint resolution, and while I pay tribute to the sincerity and intelligence of the Senators who drafted it and worked on it, I believe the proper course to take now would be to refer the joint resolution to a committee, preferably the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is my motion now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, which is a preferential motion.

Mr. LODGE. I move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the motion debatable?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to be heard for a few moments on the motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked the Senator to yield in order to ascertain what he hopes would be accomplished by referring the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of immigration which he raises. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of foreign affairs which he raises. Why did he select that committee? None of his objections has anything to do with the functions performed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE. So far as that is concerned, the Appropriations Committee has nothing to do with those questions, either.

Mr. HAYDEN. We understand that; and that has been explained many times to the Senate, with respect to the W. P. A., the National Youth Administration, and other agencies, as well as in this instance. However, when the House passes a measure which contains both an appropriation and legislation, it must go to the Appropriations Committee. We did not seek it. The joint resolution was handed to us. I am trying to find out why the Senator from Massachusetts selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to meet the objections which he raises, which have nothing to do with the functions of that committee.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that the prime purpose of the joint resolution is to relieve the agricultural situation. I know that I should be very much more severely criticized than I am now being criticized if I were to seek to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Immigration or the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can imagine what some Senators might say to me then.

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case our answer would be that neither of those committees would have any occasion to act upon the joint resolution, because it does not affect the immigration laws, and does not affect our foreign relations, as everyone must know who is familiar with the way in which the proposed legislation would operate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator cannot correctly say that it does not affect our foreign relations because he knows very well that it has to do with the importation of foreign labor and that the joint resolution has not been cleared by the State Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had witnesses from the State Department before the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator point to anything in writing from the State Department indicating that the Department approves it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It was not necessary to obtain a report. All the joint resolution does is, in effect, to provide that the existing agreement made with Mexico by the State Department shall be carried out unless it is hereafter modified.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that there is nothing in the joint resolution which would limit such agreements to Mexico. Such agreements might be made with Venezuela, San Domingo, or any other country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The State Department has approved the two existing agreements. One is with Mexico and the other with the Government of the Bahama Islands. Those agreements stand unless it is desirable to renegotiate them, in which case Mr. Davis is directed to cooperate with the State Department.

I cannot conceive of any purpose the Senator can have in mind in making the motion except to delay relief which the farmers of the Nation need in obtaining labor to take care of crops which are now being put in the ground. Why kill time?

Mr. LODGE. What motive could I have for doing so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Knowing the Senator as I do I cannot understand what his motive could be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is unworthy of the Senator from Arizona to make such a statement; and I believe that when he thinks about it a little more he will realize that he did not mean it. He knows perfectly well that no Senator is more desirous than I am of solving this problem. I made it very plain when I

began that I heartily endorse the purpose of the joint resolution, but I am not sure that it would achieve the announced purpose. It does neither the Senator from Arizona nor anyone else any credit to say that I wish to delay bringing relief to the farmer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the Senator's attention to subdivision (3) on page 10. The Senator spoke of what the State Department thought about the measure. Subdivision (3) on page 10 provides that the Administrator shall cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States. That refers to the second half of the joint resolution. Instead of leaving the State Department out of it, it merely enforces the agreement which the State Department has already made and provides for cooperation with the State Department in making any future agreements. Under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, with the necessity for importing workers from other countries, it seems to me that that is the logical, most effective, and most expeditious way of dealing with the subject. The joint resolution does not exclude the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, but provides for cooperation.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not allege, does he, that that rather peculiar language "to cooperate with the Secretary of State" has been approved by the State Department?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that it has the entire approval of the State Department. I do not think there was any evidence to that effect. There is none in the hearings; but we were assured that it is entirely satisfactory to the State Department. That is the reason why that particular provision was included.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. My recollection of what was said about this matter in the Committee on Appropriations is that the State Department had not cleared the proposed legislation in any respect. If I may say a word further, reference has been made to an agreement with Mexico. The provision just referred to by the Senator from Tennessee not only relates to existing agreements with Mexico or with any other nation, but gives authority of a dubious character with respect to all negotiations which may hereafter be carried on, or agreements which may hereafter be negotiated.

I do not know what the joint resolution means when it says that the Administrator is authorized to cooperate. My impression is that that is a dilution of the authority of the Secretary of State, and makes the Administrator, to some degree at least, a partner with the Secretary of State in the negotiation and renegotiation of such agreements. I agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said about this particular provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. It applies solely to the importation of farm workers and that is why reference is made to it. It does not give the Administrator any authority to deal with other agreements, but merely to cooperate with the State Department, and it is perfectly natural and proper that it should.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because of the fact that the State Department has been brought into the discussion of the pending measure, I should like to point out that in the very unusual efforts made to work out the proposed legislation a joint meeting was held between the members of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee and six or eight Members of the House who were interested and members of the Senate committee. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee invited the Secretary of State to attend the meeting. The Secretary of State sent representatives who stated to the joint conference—it does not appear in the hearings because I did not have the proceedings reported due to the fact it was a combined meeting of the two committees—that they had no interest in the measure other than to work with the agency in which the power should finally be delegated in an effort to negotiate these treaties and that they would gladly work with any agency on which power was conferred by Congress to attempt to obtain agricultural labor.

As a matter of fact, the agreements made prior to that time had been negotiated under the auspices of the State Department and were signed by representatives of the Department, attesting to the fact that the Department had had full knowledge of all agreements made, and had participated in making them. There has been no effort made to short-circuit the State Department. The State Department has been consulted, and it has no objections whatever to the pending joint resolution. It went further and stated that it would be happy to work with whatever agency the Congress saw fit to designate in placing responsibility for securing the labor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to some of the provisions in the joint resolution not being as plain as he would like them to be. What the Senator has said may be true. There may be provisions in the joint resolution which are not as plain as they should be, but there is one thing, Mr. President, which is plain. It is plain to Congress, it is plain to the President, and it is plain to the people of the United States that this Nation needs food. It is plain that our Army needs food, and it is plain that it is time to plant the crops. The farmers of the Nation are entitled to know whether they shall have labor with which to plant their crops and whether they shall have labor to harvest the crops if they shall be planted.

I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the thoroughness with which he has handled the pending measure, and for the study he has given to it. Mr. President, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has come before this session of Congress, because it involves food for our people and food for our Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the statements made by distinguished Senators all along the line. I am very glad the Senator from Georgia brought this joint resolution up today because I think the sooner it is enacted into law the better it will be for the crop situation in America.

I was detained in the Appropriations Committee on another matter, and as I came into the Chamber a few moments ago I heard a letter being read from my good friend O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He is one of the finest men in the world. He and I have been devoted friends for many years. He and I were born in the same section of Alabama. In general, we have had much the same views with respect to the farmers of the country. I did not understand that Mr. O'Neal had the slightest objection to the first section of the joint resolution. Indeed, from the standpoint of Mr. O'Neal and my own standpoint, I think it is superior to the section in the measure passed by the other House. It will be remembered that the House section provided that $13,500,000 could be expended by the Extension Services.

The section under discussion provides that not less than $13,500,000 shall be available for the agricultural extension services, and not more than $20,000,000 may be expended in that way. From the standpoint of expenditures by local authorities, such as the agricultural extension service of each State, it is, to my mind, a much better provision than the one originally contained in the House joint resolution. I think the greatest benefit which would probably result from this measure would be the benefit coming from the activities of the agricultural extension services.

From talking to Mr. O'Neal since the joint resolution was reported, I am quite sure that he is in full and hearty sympathy with the first half of it dealing with the extension services.

With regard to the expenditure of further funds, the amount has been increased to $20,000,000. Western States, such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Idaho, are greatly interested in obtaining labor principally from Mexico. Our country has an agreement with Mexico by which that may be done. Section 2 of the joint resolution largely carries out that agreement. It is true that its administration has been put into the charge of Mr. Davis, who is the new head of the agricultural section dealing with this matter. That is entirely proper. I do not see how we could do otherwise. Under the joint resolution as passed by the House, the administration of the provision to which reference has been made was placed in the

land-grant colleges of the country. I doubt the wisdom of that. I think Mr. Davis ought to be put in charge of it.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had charge of the joint resolution. I was chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with it, but was ill at the time and could not take charge. I desire to say that I think the measure is better than anything I could have prepared. I think the Senator from Georgia has done a very fine piece of work in both these matters. I am not so sure that he agreed with everything that the subcommittee put into the measure so far as the first section is concerned; but being a careful and prudent legislator, he gave and took, and therefore he agreed to the first section as it was written. So far as the extension services of the various States are concerned, the joint resolution could not possibly have been improved upon by anyone.

The second part of the joint resolution is considerably more difficult because we had to deal with the situation as it existed in foreign countries. A number of States such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Idaho, and other western States—even the splendid State of the distinguished Senator from Michigan—depend on these outside agencies for the furnishing of labor. It is a very important matter to the Senator from Michigan, as well as to his State, because they have to depend on labor obtained from outside sources, particularly in the growing and harvesting of sugar beets. I believe the same condition applies to the State of New York, and perhaps in a lesser degree to other States. But the principal northern States to which this section applies are Michigan first, then New York, and then to other States in a lesser degree. I think the provision with respect to the second $20,000,000 is certainly agreeable to those States. It certainly ought to be agreeable to them under any circumstances.

To deal with such a subject, manifestly, was very difficult. I do not think our subcommittee ever passed upon a measure that has been more carefully and more painstakingly prepared than this one was prepared by the subcommitteee. It was almost unanimously agreed to by the full committee. With the exception of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—I do not recall any other Senators—who reserved the right after examining the joint resolution to vote for it or against it, it received the unanimous approval of both the full committee and the subcommittee. I think the Senator from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago that he felt then, as he feels now, that he did not know whether it would work as it has been arranged.

I think the provision which was written into the bill through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] under which old men who receive benefit payments from the Government are allowed to work on a farm and not lose such benefits, is an admirable provision at this time of our great stress, and I think we may depend upon those men to do excellent work on the farm or, at least, most of them. It seems to me that is an excellent provision.

If Senators will look at the limitations provided on pages 10 and 11 and the "miscellaneous provisions" of the joint resolution I think he will realize that the subcommittee and the full committee undertook in every way they could to hedge it about in such a way as to bring the greatest benefit to the farmers of the country and, at the same time, do as little harm as possible. For that reason, I sincerely hope that the motion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not be agreed to, for I believe that if the joint resolution were sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it could not be improved.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. DAVIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from West Virginia rose first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator please look at line 25 on page 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The joint resolution appropriates $40,000,000 and provides that—

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor—

That is very clear, but this language follows—

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

I ask the Senator does that mean that the moneys appropriated under this joint resolution may be used directly or indirectly to fix or regulate union membership and to enforce collective-bargaining with respect to persons imported from other countries to labor in the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not exactly that. I wish to say to the Senator—and I am glad he has asked the question—that, while I was not present when that provision was placed in the joint resolution, I was present when it was subsequently discussed.

The reason for it was that under the agreement now existing between the United States and Mexico—I do not know whether there is an agreement with any other country or not; I have forgotten; perhaps there may be one with the Bahama Islands—but under the agreement with Mexico it is provided that there shall be a minimum wage paid those coming from Mexico. I am familiar with that. That is the reason for making the exception to which the Senator refers which reads:

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country, and then only—

I call the attention of the Senator to these words:

and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the governments of such foreign country.

I have not the agreement before me, but there is such an agreement, and the Senator from Georgia, who is not for the moment in the Chamber, is familiar with it. The Senator from Arizona who has taken a very great interest in the matter, and whose State is greatly interested in this proposed legislation, is also familiar with it. That agreement provides that there shall be a minimum wage, and, perhaps shelter, provided to workers who are imported from Mexico. Of course we are obliged, in carrying out that agreement with a foreign country, to write in the measure such language as will effectuate it. That is the reason for it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask another question, if I may address it to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why, then, if the agreement provides for shelter and for minimum hours or wages, has there been written into this measure that with respect to the workers brought in from foreign countries the money appropriated may be used to enforce collective bargaining and union membership?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee permits me at this point, let me say that there is nothing in the Mexican agreement that has anything to do with union membership or collective bargaining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, why is such a provision in the joint resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a prohibition against a practice which grew up in the United States, as alleged by some persons, at least, and is designed to meet objections of that kind. The House put in the measure a provision which made it unworkable. If the Senator will read the words as they appear prior to the word "except," in line 7, he will find that is the text of the House bill. If we said that none of the money appropriated by this measure could be used for any of the purposes mentioned, and the Mexican agreement provides for any one of those things, then none of this money could be used to bring workers from Mexico. One of the provisions in the agreement with Mexico is for a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour, and there is a provision that there shall be suitable housing. None of the other provisions are in the Mexican agreement. Therefore, the Senate committee simply provided that the prohibition as written by the other House should apply except to the extent that the Mexican agreement might modify it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there any other agreement except the Mexican agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is one relating to the importation of some 5,000 persons from the Bahama Islands. Those are the only two I know of at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Bahama agreement include any other provisions

than those for minimum pay and for housing?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all as I understand. The Bahama agreement is very similar to the Mexican agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am practically through. I desire to add to what I have already said that I am opposed to the joint resolution being referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to any other committee, because the House committee dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and the House dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and, necessarily, it went to the Appropriations Committee and, necessarily, it should not go to any other committee. All these matters no doubt will be very accurately worked out in conference, and in conference we may have to have a give and take process, such as we all know frequently happens.

Time is of the essence in the situation. Today is the 8th of April. In the section of the country from which I come, when I was a boy we were planting crops at this time of the year. We are considering a condition affecting the southern tier of States, and we should act at the very earliest possible moment.

I had very little to do with working out the joint resolution. I returned to the Senate, after being ill, the last day or two of its consideration, but the other members of the committee have worked out what I think is a most admirable measure, which I believe will result in the production of additional crops to a greater degree than under any other measure which could be suggested.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Pennsylvania asked me to yield, and I yield to him first.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand, there are now two countries which have agreements with the United States regarding labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understand.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the measure now pending could the Secretary of State enter into agreements with other countries, and bring in workers from countries other than the two which have been named?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, some mention has been made in the press of the fact that there might be some importations of labor from the island of Jamaica. That is the only other country mentioned, so far as I know. That, I believe, is due to the fact that because of the shortage of shipping, the agricultural crops from Jamaica could not be exported, and it was thought some of the workers might be brought to this country to help on a basis similar to that under which laborers are being brought from Mexico and the Bahamas.

Mr. DAVIS. Have the agreements already entered into been made a part of the RECORD, are they set forth in the hearings?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not been on the floor during every minute of the discussion, and it may be that the question I wish to ask has already been answered, but it runs in my mind that some weeks ago, possibly some months ago, certainly rather recently, at any rate, the Secretary of Agriculture spent some time in Mexico, with assistants, working out a plan whereby the labor question between the United States and Mexico would be very well handled. I wondered whether it was necessary to have further legislation of this kind at the moment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am familiar with the matter, and if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. No legislation is contemplated which would make any provision with respect to the Mexican agreement, except to allow it to operate. In the form in which the pending joint resolution passed the House, it required a renegotiation of the agreement with Mexico within 30 days. If there were no new agreement with Mexico within 30 days, we would not obtain any labor from that country at all.

The testimony before the committee was that while the agreement with Mexico is not entirely satisfactory, and perhaps we might get a better one sometime, it is the only one we now have. It provides a limitation that not more than 50,000 Mexicans may enter the United States under the agreement, and up to now less than 10,000 have come in. As a matter of fact, we have spent much time, in the committee and in the Senate, discussing the very smallest degree of help the farmers will get. The great bulk of the money carried in the second part of the joint resolution is not to be spent to bring in foreigners, it is to be expended in taking labor from one part of the United States to another. Customarily there has been a migration, up to half a million people, from one part of the country to another. Those people cannot travel now because they cannot get gasoline and tires; so it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide them with some form of transportation, and the money proposed to be appropriated will provide for it.

The major portion of the money carried in the second part of the measure will be expended, not to transport foreigners but to move people from one State to another, as the crops require.

Mr. BUTLER. The other question I have in mind is prompted by what happened this morning in the Committee on Banking and Currency when Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, testified to the great unemployment which exists in the State of New York, which was mentioned by the Senator a moment ago. I wanted to be sure that we were going first to take care of the unemployment there is within our own country before we become too much concerned about bringing people in from foreign countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's remark is entirely accurate, and I agree with him. What he seeks is provided for in the joint resolution. There is an additional provision allowing those who are receiving small payments from the Government to work without losing such payments.

I hope the pending motion will be voted down, and that the very excellent joint resolution now pending will be passed and allowed to go to conference this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee knows my great admiration and respect for him and the pleasure it always gives me to follow him. There is one thing which bothers me about the pending joint resolution. Section 2 creates an organization to recruit and to do several other things within the States. That refers to the Agricultural Extension Service. It is made mandatory; that organization must be used.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator agrees with that section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That applies to one-half of it.

Mr. BYRD. The part with which I do not agree is section 3, because it sets up a duplicate organization to do the same work.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. BYRD. To recruit, and place, and do all the other things which section 2 provides for, so far as labor sent out of a State is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that provides that this department shall have jurisdiction to do that work, but no provision is made for setting up any new bureau.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say a new bureau; I said another organization. One is made mandatory for the labor within the State. That is fixed, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is fixed.

Mr. BYRD. Section 3 provides for another organization, which would not use the organization set up by section 2. It may be the United States Employment Service, it may be the Farm Security Administration, it may be any other agency of the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Senator will agree that a State extension service cannot go into another State, or across the United States to recruit labor, and set up an organization to do it.

Mr. BYRD. The recruiting is done within the State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us understand the picture in some proportion. From 85 to 90 percent of the labor that is to be moved in order to handle crops is going to move inside the State. Everyone knows that. So 10 percent of the labor has to be found somewhere else. That which is to be inside the State is to be in the hands of the State extension service, and that is where the great benefit will come from the joint resolution. As to the 10 percent to be obtained from outside the State, it is not possible to send a county agent or a State extension director into another State.

Mr. BYRD. There is a county agent in every county in the United States. It is not necessary to send a county agent from one State to another. There is an

administrator who is in charge of all county agents. There are three thousand-odd counties, and every one has a county agent. It is not necessary to send an agent from Virginia to Tennessee. We can send requisitions to the Administrator here for the labor, and he can then distribute it to the respective States. That does not mean that a county administrator or agent would come to my State of Virginia, because there is a central agency in Washington to handle the matter. I cannot understand why there is a desire to create two organizations to do the same work.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not proposed to create two organizations to do the same work. One is to recruit labor in the State.

Mr. BYRD. It is recruiting labor.

Mr HAYDEN. Yes; but it is not the same labor.

Mr. BYRD. There is only a certain amount of labor to recruit. If there are two agencies recruiting the labor, we add to the confusion, and they compete with each other.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has a total misconception of how the measure would operate. We appropriate money for these purposes—one function to be inside the State and one outside the State. The only way to handle anything outside a State is to perform it as a Federal function. That is what is provided for.

Mr BYRD. It is all performed as a Federal function because the Food Administrator has the right to direct and to veto everything a county agent may do. It is not a local function, anyway.

Mr. HAYDEN. How would the Senator correct it? If he objects, how would he correct it?

Mr BYRD. I would use the Agricultural Extension Service to do the recruiting, for example.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is, the Senator would send the county agents from Arizona to Virginia to recruit laborers and take them to a different place?

Mr. BYRD. No. If the Senator from Arizona will permit, I should like to make clear what I mean. Let us say there are 100 unemployed persons in my county of Clarke in Virginia. Those persons are available for labor. Why should two agencies be able to recruit that labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the pending measure two agencies would not recruit that labor.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides for it. It provides—

> The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, the recruiting, placement * * * and training of such workers; * * * transportation, supervision—

And a long list of things they may do. The same authority and the same activity is exactly duplicated under section 3 for some other agency of the Government. If that is not a duplication I simply cannot read the English language.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a duplication, because it applies to a different set of persons.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that, but the recruiting of labor is one activity, is it not, whether the labor is used in the State or outside the State?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but the recruiting must be done by a Federal agent outside the State to move the labor inside the State.

Mr. BYRD. Even a farm agent cannot prevent a laborer being taken from his county if an appeal is taken to the Food Administrator and the Food Administrator sustains the appeal.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator objects to the Food Administrator doing it, who does he want to do it?

Mr. BYRD. I do not object to the Food Administrator doing it. I object to two agencies doing it. What I object to is a duplication of effort. I wish to do something in a simple economical way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows I agree with him very heartily on the subject of duplication of effort. He and I have been working for about a year and a half to try to accomplish something along the line of prevention of duplication of effort.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee has rendered a most valuable service in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have looked into this matter most carefully, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government appropriates all the money I am utterly unable to see why it is not entirely proper to place a Federal bureau in charge of the work. We have been assured that no additional help will be requested; that no additional agencies will be set up, but that the work will be done within the bureau, under the direction of the head of the bureau, who is, I think, a satisfactory person to have charge of it. He is so much better than some who might be chosen that I am almost willing to leave it to him. I am quite sure that this money will be spent to the very best advantage to the farmers who are affected by the measure, and that it will be the best possible way to get an increase of food for the coming year.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to the Senator's statement insofar as the need of some organization is concerned, but what I am objecting to is that this provision creates two organizations; it creates one within the State to be conducted by the Agricultural Extension Service which is under the control of the National Administrator. This is all a national function. Every dollar of the money to be used is being appropriated by the Federal Government. It sets up another organization which is not described in the bill. It may be the Farm Credit Administration. There is no definite guaranty made to Members of the Senate that the Farm Credit Administration, an organization to which there is great objection in Congress, will not be the agency which will undertake the activities under section 3, and which will thereby duplicate and compete with the efforts of the Agricultural Extension Service in the recruitment of labor and the other activities provided for in the measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suppose there is no other State which more imperatively needs the assistance provided by some such measure as this than the State of California. I wish to make a statement concerning what I understand to be the actual working of the joint resolution. We in California first must be able to move around our own labor within the State in order to meet the changing needs of our farmers. In addition, after Mexican workers are brought into the State we will then have to have some agency within the State which will be able to move such Mexican workers around. Insofar as the handling of the transient farm workers in California, who are there now, or after they are brought in, the farm extension service will be admirably adapted to do that, and will be empowered by this joint resolution to do it. But I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, whose courage and intellect I so very much admire, that I do not see how any farm extension agency in the State of California would have the power or the personnel or the authority to go down into Mexico and recruit Mexican workers. I feel that we must have some superior Federal agency which can recruit workers from Mexico or some other foreign country and transport them into the State.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Agricultural Extension Service is a large organization. The personnel of that organization could be used to go to Mexico or to go to any other country under the direction of the Food Administrator. All this, it will be remembered, is under the direction of the Food Administrator. Section 2 provides for administration by the Agricultural Extension Service, which is under the Food Administrator, and so does section 3. If labor from Mexico is needed, there is now existing in the Agricultural Extension Service a personnel which could be sent to Mexico to recruit the labor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Virginia to this situation: Probably there are 5 or 10 or 15 States, principally in the West and the Southwest, which, we hope, will have workers from Mexico assisting farmers in those States. Manifestly, farm extension workers in Arizona could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for Arizona. California farm extension workers could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for California. The same thing is true with respect to farm extension workers in Montana, Wyoming, and other States. So it seems to me that some bureau or agency must be set up by the Federal Government which would have the personnel necessary to go into Mexico to recruit workers.

Mr. BYRD. The Agricultural Extension Service, as the Senator from California knows, is not confined to farm agents. If it were necessary to add to that organization, it would not be a diffi-

cult thing to do. Personnel could be added to that organization if additional personnel were needed. What I object to is that two organizations are set up under this bill to do practically the same work, insofar as recruiting labor is concerned. There is no guaranty whatever to anyone that the Farm Security Administration, to which an overwhelming majority of the Senate and of the House are bitterly opposed, will not be designated as the agency under section 3 to perform this work.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as I recall the testimony of Mr. Chester Davis, who appeared before the committee only a few days after he was appointed Food Administrator, he testified that he was not able at that time to go into the detail of this matter, but he would like to speak about the over-all picture.

I believe this measure is quite largely the result of the understanding of the committee of the problems presented by Mr. Davis, plus the House bill which came to the Senate and which was undoubtedly directed toward eliminating the Farm Security Administration from handling this particular feature of the farm-labor problem. So determined was the House to eliminate the Farm Security Administration from handling the matter that a number of Representatives came and testified before our committee. One of them specifically pointed out that he did not want to see men leave the Farm Security Administration, as that organization had been eliminated in the House joint resolution, put on different hats and come in and do the same work under some other organization. When Mr. Davis came before our committee, I pointed out to him that that was the definite view of the House, as I understood it, and Mr Davis said he had the same understanding. I told him that was also my view, and, so far as I could judge the temper of several members of the committee, that it was also their view. But Mr. Davis pointed out to us that we are late at this hour in getting at this problem of recruiting the farm labor.

Mr. President, the sad part of the situation is, as I see it now, that in laying the strategy of our war effort, food has not been properly represented at the council table. It has been testified before our committee that to meet the requirements of this Nation and its commitments at the present time, and to provide for emergencies which are foreseeable, we will be required to produce at least 8 percent more food than we did last year. But the best information we can get from the county agents throughout the Nation is that we will fall short anywhere from 1 percent to 30 percent of the production we had last year. If we fall short even 15 percent of last year's production, and if we fail to obtain the 8-percent increase which we are told we must have, as the whole strategy of America's participation in the war is based upon at least a 25-percent shortage in food production in the coming year, anything which now retards that production is dangerous.

That was why Mr. Davis said to the committee that, although he did not want to create another bureau, he felt he should have a rather free hand in moving as rapidly as he could move to meet this problem. Since he is to be the one to direct the effort to meet it, I am basing my judgment upon his testimony, because he said he felt that the extension services were the proper ones to ascertain the need within the counties, to accept the labor which came to the counties, and to place it within the counties, but that he might have to use any number of other agencies, and he did not wish to exclude entirely even Farm Security, which I would have been willing to exclude permanently but for the lateness of this hour. Food is going to be the bottleneck of this war, and it will be the breaking point of the war unless we do everything we can to produce it now.

For that reason I believe we should give Mr. Davis the opportunity to move forward, using his knowledge that it is the will of Congress—and certainly he knows from the discussion had today in the Senate, from the House bill, and from our discussion with him in the committee that it is the will of Congress—that he do not put the Farm Security back in command in any real degree of this problem.

Again I say that because food has not been properly represented at the council table in the consideration of the overall problem of America's participation in this global war, we should give Mr. Davis a chance at this late hour to move as quickly as he can move. I think the whole situation was changed when Mr. Davis came in. He came in late, but I think we should afford him the opportunity to proceed, and then hold him responsible, he having been told what the will of Congress is in the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, yesterday nearly every State was represented by its director of the Selective Service System at a meeting held in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. Other officers of the Selective Service System were present; so the gathering included approximately 75 persons. The unanimous evidence relating to the particular subject now under discussion was that there has been a marked migration of men between the ages of 18 and 38 from nonessential occupations to the farms, whether they were in one or another classification of deferment, all of them being within the class of those who, under the existing orders of the Selective Service System and under the possible law, might be called into service.

That proves two things. First, it proves that the need is being to some extent relieved; secondly, it proves the all-significant fact that it was the compulsion of liability which caused this movement of marked proportions during the last 30 days, and especially marked during the last 10 days. The opportunity to learn these facts came to us yesterday by chance.

Mr. President, in order for men between the ages of 18 and 38 to come under the protecting shield of occupational deferment, there is no need for those of them who are engaged in occupations essential to the war effort to go back to the farms. They can remain where they are, and can serve their country in skilled activities, even though they are skilled farmers, too; and at the same time they can draw much higher wages than those they could receive on the farms, and can enjoy a much more glamorous life.

So there is no exodus from essential occupations back to the farms. Why is that so? Because there is no compulsion or liability which causes them to go back to the farms.

Mr. President, I beg of you not to consider me as being cynical about this matter. I am trying to present some cold facts for the consideration of the Senate at this moment.

Aside from considering the experience as to the group of men between the ages of 18 and 38 as to whom exists the liability for service at the front, where there is danger of being shot, let us consider what has been the experience with the other groups, as shown by the evidence which, since October 1942, has been in process of being taken. We can talk all we please about "recruiting," but that is the wrong word. We cannot recruit those men. The proper word is "shifting."

Even under the work-or-fight order under which a certain degree of sanction or coercion exists, to be applied indirectly, how does the measure attempt to shift work? Mr. President, the first area which was organized was the Baltimore area. There is where the longest experience has been had. The evidence shows the following with respect to the shifting; and if this is not striking evidence of the fact that men do not move by being requested to move, then I do not know what evidence is:

> The record of the attempts of the United States Employment Service to get these men—

That is, men who were in nonessential occupations—

> to take vital jobs was poor. The United States Employment Service took 96,938 talent questionnaires from the Army in July, but its staff was too small to analyze that number. It analyzed about 20,000 cases. Of these, 2,734 of the best qualified were called in for interview and selection. The best 1,123 were then offered the 1,123 jobs then available. Acceptance was voluntary and depended on the amount of interest shown both by employer and by candidate. If the man did not like the looks of the job, that ended it. Only 49 of the 1,123 men, about 1 in 25, were sufficiently interested to go to see the employer. Of these 49, 4 failed to report, and 4 more refused the employer's offer. This left only 41, some of whom dropped out later. There were only 26 verified placements.
>
> The country needed 1,123 workers in vital war jobs from Baltimore just then and could get only 26, or about 2 percent of the qualified 1,123.

Mr. President, that survey was made by Market Analysis, Inc. The statistical data and other detailed information found in the pamphlet have been obtained from the following sources:

The War Manpower Commission and the various agencies included in the Baltimore office of the Commission.

The United States Employment Service.

The War Production Board.

The Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

The local State and city departments of education and welfare.

The Urban League.

The Fair Rent Commission of Baltimore.

It was edited by Sanford Griffith, who is probably well known to many of us.

Mr. President, I make this point because it seems to me that great as is the need of agriculture, and imminent as it is, the problem cannot be solved by merely appropriating money and declaring that it may be used for the purpose of recruiting and moving labor, paying for its transportation, and providing this and that, to shift men from New York City to some other place.

The effort to shift men, without any statutory liability on their part to go, was an abominable failure in the last war. Armed guards had to be put on the trains to keep from leaving men who had originally agreed to go, and who, while on their journey, became determined to get off the train at intermediate stations because they were sick of the idea of being transported so far. Without general liability to work, and without any way to mobilize the workers, I believe it would be utterly futile to appropriate great sums of money with the objective of inducing them to go.

Mr. President, let me make one further comment. I am not making a "plug" for Senate bill 666. What I have to say has to do with reference to the pending joint resolution. An attempt has been made in the latter part of the debate to shift the emphasis from the importation of foreign labor to the other element of the joint resolution, namely, the transfer of domestic labor. After only a brief study of the joint resolution and only this opportunity of hearing my colleagues talk about it, yet having listened with great care and study, it seems to me that the one element which calls for speed and requires immediate action is the element of immigration. If it be true, Mr. President, that the need for labor is in sowing the crops, then we probably cannot wait until we shall have handled the manpower question in a general way. It is probably true that we would have to import labor for that purpose at this time. Let me ask Senators who have been advocating this measure whether men are really needed to plant the crops, or whether the need is for confidence on the part of the farmer that when his crop grows he will have the labor to harvest it. Is not that the only question? If it is, there is no need to enact such a futile law as this would be, for, by that time, we can provide domestic labor for the job of harvesting.

The evidence already taken shows that we have the labor in this country. The difficulty is that it is in pools here and there. There are critical areas of shortage of manpower in various places, and there are other areas where there is a surplus, where men are idle. Under existing law, even with the power of an order of the Chief Executive to work or fight, we cannot mobilize those men, because they will not go. They will not be moved. They do not recognize any liability resting on them to volunteer to go; and until the Congress declares a liability, which is supposed to be equal upon all mobile persons in this country, and makes all citizens equally liable to contribute to the war effort, this condition will continue and we shall have bill after bill presented to the Congress to try to solve it piecemeal, a little bit here and a little bit there, without any satisfactory result.

Mr. President, I hope that the joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to ascertain the fundamental facts. Is there need for men to plant the crops, or is this a problem of having men ready to harvest the crops, or of enacting legislation which will give the farmer confidence that if he increases the amount of his plantings which will be harvested in the fall he will then have the labor to harvest the crops? If the Committee on Agriculture finds that to be the condition, then let us not pass this kind of piecemeal legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on the joint resolution immediately, I hope we may proceed to vote upon it. Before the Senate adjourns I desire very briefly to make some observations concerning the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but I do not wish to interfere with the consideration of the joint resolution if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on it immediately. Why can we not vote on it now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to refer the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I note the absence of the sponsor of the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. LODGE]. I am very sorry that action was taken on the motion before he could reach the Chamber.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator from Massachusetts left the Chamber he told me that he had an imperative engagement with General Marshall, and would be called away. He asked me to register him in favor of his motion. Beyond that, I have no instructions from him.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber for a few minutes. I knew that the Senator from Massachusetts had an appointment, but I thought he had canceled it. I did not want to have action taken in the way in which it was taken if the Senator from Massachusetts could reach the Chamber in a short time. Because of the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, I was about to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected; but in view of the statement of the Senator from Michigan I have nothing further to say.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the joint resolution been read the third time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution has been read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] advised me that he desired to move to strike out section 4. I notice that he is absent from the Chamber. In order to protect his rights, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Senator from Oregon refer to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming told me that he was compelled to go to the War Department to keep an appointment there. He said that he hoped to be able to return before the joint resolution was finally acted upon, but that if he did not, he necessarily could not offer his amendment, being at the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, again the matter has been explained away.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon insist on his point of no quorum?

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia I do not insist on it. I merely wish to protect the rights of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] left the Chamber he stated to me that he desired to offer an amendment, and that if he did not return in time, he wished me to offer it in his behalf.

On behalf of the Senator from Wyoming I move to amend the joint resolution by striking out all of section 4, beginning with line 10, on page 10, and extending through line 16 on page 11.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution having been read the third time, is it not too late to offer an amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. The amendment could be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the rule should be observed. I object to the consideration of amendments after the third reading of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 635.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 635) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking up Senate bill 635. Earlier in the day I spoke with the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD,] and I believe it was agreed that if we reached this period in the afternoon the request might be made, but the bill would then go over until the first of next week. I do not desire to object to the consideration of the bill today. I believe also that the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. BARKLEY] would like to have the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, it had been my hope to dispose of the bill today and then adjourn until Monday; but if we cannot dispose of it today, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, it will be entirely agreeable to me to make it the unfinished business and let it go over until Monday.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to have the bill go over until Monday, except that I am informed that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. DOWNEY] will be out of the city on an important committee assignment on Monday. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who has had a great deal to do with the formation of the bill, will likewise be out of the city on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suppose that under the circumstances the Senate will have to accommodate itself to the convenience of absent Senators instead of transacting business here where we were sent to transact it. I suppose we should recess from time to time until all Senators return to Washington so that business can then be transacted by the Senate. I do not say that in any critical spirit with respect to the two Senators who have been mentioned; but during this session Senators have been absent on one mission or another all over the United States, if not all over the world. They are everywhere except in the Senate, where they were chosen to serve.

I hope that we can transact the business of the Senate without having to adjourn from day to day because Senators desire to be absent. It is immaterial to me whether the bill is taken up tomorrow. I am perfectly willing to move a recess and have a session of the Senate tomorrow if we can dispose of the bill. Otherwise, let it go over until Monday. If we are to adjourn from today until Monday next, we must have some business to transact on Monday. It is not convenient to meet on Tuesday, because it is planned to hold a ceremony dedicating the Jefferson Memorial in Potomac Park. For that reason we are not contemplating a meeting on Tuesday next, so I hope that Senators will be able to accommodate their individual situations to the necessities of the Senate.

There is a great deal of criticism throughout the country because of absenteeism in factories and war plants. The first thing we know criticism will be centered on the Senate; and it may not be inappropriate when it comes.

I notice that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is looking at me intently. The situation is becoming such that I cannot look at a Senator when I speak without being charged with implying something about him. The Senator from Michigan is almost as handsome as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] who yesterday thought, because I looked at him, that I was implying something with regard to him. If Senators object to my looking at them when I speak, I will shut my eyes, although it would be to my great disadvantage if I were not permitted to look into the handsome and beaming countenances of my friends in the Chamber. [Laughter.]

I hope that we can take the bill up on Monday if not tomorrow. Would tomorrow be convenient?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Tomorrow would be convenient.

Mr. President, it was rather understood that we would adjourn from today until Monday. With that thought in mind, I did not want to split consideration of the bill by jumping from today until Monday, but I am willing to start now and meet tomorrow to conclude consideration of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances I think that would be the best thing to do. There was a general understanding that if we could finish these two measures today we would adjourn until Monday; but the joint resolution which we just passed took much more time than I expected it to take.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to adjourning until Monday. That is perfectly satisfactory. I merely wish to avoid a hiatus.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator. I do not want a hiatus any more than he does. We might be able to finish with the bill today. It is now only 4 o'clock.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I doubt whether it will take very long. I should like to proceed for a little while today. If we can finish very well. If we cannot, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] had so much to do with forming the bill, I should like to have it disposed of while he is present. If we could proceed for a while today we might possibly dispose of it without another session.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely agreeable to me. I said a moment ago that I was compelled to make a few remarks because earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] criticized an order issued by the War Department, which I think should be explained so that there can be no misunderstanding about it. The Senator from Michigan is as anxious to know the facts as I am to present them.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1860, and when the bill shall have been taken up, I shall move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute in lieu thereof the language of Senate bill 635 as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Civil Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the language of Senate bill S. 635, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Civil Service.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

That this act shall apply to all civilian officers and employees (including officers and employees whose wages are fixed on a monthly or yearly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, except those in or under the Government Printing Office or the Tennessee Valley Authority) in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that this act shall

not apply to (a) elected officials; (b) judges; (c) heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies; (d) officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; (e) employees whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose; (f) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed; (g) officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; and (h) individuals to whom the provisions of section 1 (a) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes", approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law —, 78th Cong.), are applicable.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation computed on the same basis as the overtime compensation which was authorized to be paid under Public Law No. 821, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid only on the portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation not in excess of $2,900 per annum: *And provided further*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid on such portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation notwithstanding the fact that such payment will cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of 48 hours in any administrative workweek, the heads of departments, establishments, and agencies may in their discretion grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c), officers and employees to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are intermittent or irregular, officers and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches (except those in the Library of Congress, or the Botanic Garden, and per annum employees in or under the office of the Architect of the Capitol who are regularly required to work not less than 48 hours per week) to whom this act applies, and, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, officers and employees whose hours of work are governed by those of private establishments which they serve and for whom on this account overtime work schedules are not feasible, shall be paid, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized under section 2 of this act, additional compensation at a rate of $300 per annum.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any officer or employee to whom this act applies, and who is entitled to no additional compensation under subsection (a), shall be paid for any pay period, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of $300 per annum, unless his overtime compensation under section 2 for such pay period is at least equal to such additional compensation.

(c) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are less than full time shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation at a rate of 12½ cents per hour for the hours which such officer or employee is required to work: *Provided*, That officers and employees to whom this act applies and whose compensation is based upon other than a time period basis shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation for any pay period as is not in excess of a rate of $3,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the House and Senate restaurants shall be paid, lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation amounting to 20 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall apply to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees; and the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be applicable to any such official reporter or any such employee upon application therefor duly made to the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 5. The act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law No. 450, 77th Cong.), and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law No. 46, 77th Cong.), as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this act is in effect.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not operate to prevent payment for overtime services in accordance with any of the following statutes: Act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 261 and 267); act of July 24, 1919 (41 Stat. 241; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 394); act of June 17, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450, 1451, and 1452); act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1467; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 109a and 109b); act of May 27, 1936, as amended (52 Stat. 345; U. S. C., title 46, sec. 382b); act of March 23, 1941 (Public Law No. 20, 77th Cong.): *Provided*, That the overtime services covered by such payment shall not also form a basis for overtime compensation under this act.

SEC. 8. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find that within the same Government organization and at the same location gross inequities exist, to such extent as to interfere with the prosecution of the war, between basic per annum rates of pay fixed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for storemen, stockmen, or inspectors in or under the Navy Department, or storekeepers, stockkeepers, inspectors, truck drivers, or elevator operators in or under the War Department, and the compensation of employees whose basic rates of pay are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, the Commission is hereby empowered, in order to correct or reduce such inequities, to establish as the minimum rate of pay for such class of positions any rate within the range of pay fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the grade to which such class of positions is allocated under such act.

SEC. 9. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of coordinating and supervising the administration of the provisions of the foregoing sections of this act insofar as such provisions affect employees in or under the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 10. The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this act, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress such information as the Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the first day of each quarter, require for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the thirtieth day after the beginning of each quarter, determine the number of employees so required, and any personnel of any such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released at such times as the Director shall order. Such determination shall be reported to the Congress each quarter. Sections 2 and 3 of this act shall cease to be applicable to the employees of such department or agency unless the head thereof shall certify within 30 days from the effective date so prescribed by the Director that the number of employees of his agency does not exceed the number determined by the Director to be required for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions. Any determinations and directions made by the Director under the authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, are hereby continued in effect until modified by him. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments and agencies any employees released pursuant to this section whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies, and the services of these employees are to be utilized by the departments and agencies before additional employees are recruited.

SEC. 11. Amounts received as overtime compensation or additional compensation under this act shall not be considered in determining the amount of a person's annual income or annual rate of compensation for the purposes of paragraph II (a) of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or section 212 of title II of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes", approved June 30, 1932, as amended.

SEC. 12. This act shall not apply to civilian employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States or to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and such employees may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

SEC. 13. This act shall take effect on May 1, 1943, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe; except that the termination date contained in this section shall not be applicable to so much of section 4 as relates to the applicability of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "War Overtime Pay Act of 1943."

SEC. 15. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not be applicable to any person who is a member of any local union (the members of which are employed in any governmental agency) which discriminates against, or denies membership to, any person because of race, color, or creed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If it will not interrupt the Senator's explanation of the bill, I shall be grateful if in the early part of his explanation he will inform the Senate whether or not the bill has the approval of the Budget Bureau, and whether or not the administration has taken any position upon it, either pro or con.

Mr. MEAD. In answer to my distinguished colleague I will say that early in my consideration of the matter I consulted a representative of the Civil Service Commission, a representative of the

Bureau of the Budget, the personnel representative of the White House, a representative of the Classification Board, and a number of others. They not only agreed on a bill but agreed on one the cost of which would be considerably in excess of the cost of the pending bill. I will say that our committee in the consideration of the bill reduced the cost from the original estimate by approximately $200,000,000.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not like to ask the Senator from New York to interrupt his discussion, and that is why I am asking him to yield to me now because of the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Michigan, which I think ought not to be passed over. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, I shall not take long.

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] commented upon the iniquity, as he conceived it to be, of an order issued on the 25th day of February prohibiting political activity on the part of men on active duty in the armed forces of the United States. The Senator's remarks are brief, and, in order that there may be proper connection between them and what I have to say, I shall read them. They are as follows:

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF ARMY OFFICERS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain at once that I am shocked by the War Department order of recent date that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept—

With the word "accept" underscored—

election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty." I can understand the necessity for discouraging ordinary political activities on the part of members of the armed forces. But this order nullifies the fundamental rights of American citizenship. It inhibits, furthermore, the rights of our whole people to turn to the Military Establishment for high leadership in civilian places of high authority if civilian judgment wants to turn in that direction. I deny the right of the War Department to militarize the processes of American democracy.

I deny the right of the War Department thus to control indirectly American elections. I think I can understand the purpose. But I, for one, repudiate it. If the American people ever desire to draft a "member of the military forces" for high American responsibility, it will take more than the petty dictum of the War Department to deny them this high privilege.

We are not yet totally at the mercy of our self-serving overlords. If a great American emerges, for example, as the next most eligible President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him just because he happens to be a "member of the military forces on active duty"—and it will make a blunder, as ineffectual as it will be transparent, if it tries.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan in his prepared statement said that he was shocked at the order issued on the 25th of February last upon the subject of political activity among those in the active military service. A similar order was issued before the 25th of February, and, as a matter of fact, in effect this order has been in force since 1925. I do not suppose that in 1925 anybody could contend that there was any design on the part of those who issued the order to keep some person from being elected or aspiring to the office of President of the United States; and yet, in face of the fact that, in effect, this order has been in force for nearly 2 decades, the effort is now being made to create the impression that it was designedly issued by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Staff in order to make it impossible for somebody to be elected or to be a candidate for or to accept the office of President of the United States.

Today the Secretary of War, who is not a Democrat, as everyone knows, and who would be the last man, in my judgment, to stoop to such a subterfuge as to issue a military order in order to keep anyone from aspiring to high political office in this country, answered this question at a press conference in response to an inquiry made of him by a member of the press. I shall read the statement of the Secretary of War:

In response to a question asked by the press concerning a revision of Army Regulations issued February 25, 1943, the Secretary of War at his press conference, April 8, 1943—

That is today—

made the following answer:

As far back as 1925, Army Regulations (AR 600–10, June 30, 1925) prohibited persons on active duty from taking active part in political management of political campaigns. As far back as 1937, Army Regulations (change 3 to AR 600–10, July 15, 1937) prohibited persons on active duty from participating in nonmilitary activities or interests which would tend to interfere with or hamper in any degree the full and proper discharge of their military duties, or would normally give rise to suspicion that such participation would have that effect. The above prohibitions were continued in effect at all times after they had first been promulgated. They were republished in the revision of AR 600–10 of September 6, 1938, which was the last revision of AR 600–10 before the current one of June 2, 1942.

In September 1941 the country being still at peace, the War Department relaxed the above rule as to elective office to the extent of allowing members of the Reserve components, who had been called to extended active duty and who were on leave status from public offices held by them, to run for election, on the condition that their election to and occupancy of such office would not interfere with their military duties (AG 000.1 (7–23–41) MB–A–M, September 26, 1941).

After Pearl Harbor, the country being then at war, it became essential to assure that all military personnel on active duty would devote their entire time and energy exclusively to the discharge of their military obligations. By War Department Circular No. 243, dated July 24, 1942, it was provided that "no individual on active duty will hereafter seek election or reelection to public office, or take an active part in political management or political campaigns."

Cases arose, however, in which this absolute prohibition worked unnecessary hardships, where members of Reserve components who were on leave status from public offices held by them were threatened with loss of substantial pension and retirement and other benefits, theretofore earned by them, if they could not stand for reelection. In consequence, the rule was relaxed by War Department Circular No. 413, dated December 18, 1942, so as to allow, in proper cases, individuals on active duty to become candidates for and accept reelection to public office held by them when they entered upon active duty, on condition that neither their candidacy for such office nor their occupancy thereof would interfere with their military duties.

The change, dated February 25, 1943, to AR 600–10, did not alter or modify anything in the foregoing. It merely consolidated the various outstanding directives, which were scattered in different places, and put them into one place, in the appropriate Army Regulations.

The War Department considers that the existing policy is not only wise and necessary from the point of view of the effective functioning of the Military Establishment in time of war, but, also, that it is the only policy which is compatible with democratic principles and procedures. Nothing could more directly expose a political system to the improper intrusions of the military, than to allow men to exercise military and civil (and, more especially, legislative) office simultaneously. The existing War Department policy, which prohibits officeholders from exercising the functions of office while on active military duty, is essential for the maintenance of the traditional American separation between the military and the civilian branches of government.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on July 24, 1942, the following order was issued by the War Department:

III. Political activities of military personnel on active duty: 1. Letter from The Adjutant General (A. G. 000.1 (7–23–41) MB–A–M), September 26, 1941, subject, Political activities of military personnel on active duty, is rescinded.

2. Paragraph 4c, AR 600–10, is applicable to all persons in the active military service, and no individual on active duty will hereafter seek election or reelection to public office, or take an active part in political management or political campaigns. Individuals who, prior to July 24, 1942, have obtained permission of the War Department to seek election to public office, may continue their candidacy and complete any leave therefor already granted. No additional leave will be authorized for this purpose.

Following that, on December 18, 1942, an order was issued which, so far as it was comprehensive, was a codification of the orders which had been theretofore issued regarding political activities on the part of men in the active military service of the United States. Under the heading "Political activities of military personnel on active duty," in the order dated December 18, we find the following:

No individual on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept—

In view of the emphasis placed on the word "accept" in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, I am emphasizing the fact that last December the exact language used in the order of February 25 was used:

b. No individual on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept reelection to public office held by him when he entered upon active duty, without prior approval of the War Department, and such approval will be granted only in cases of material hardship and if, in the opinion of the commanding officer, such individual's candidacy for reelection to and occupancy of such office will not interfere with his military duties; and no leave will be authorized for

any purpose of campaigning for such reelection or of promoting or furthering same.

c. No individual on active duty will hereafter take an active part in political management or political campaigns.

d. Individuals who, prior to July 24, 1942, have obtained permission of the War Department to seek election to public office, may continue their candidacy and complete any leave therefor already granted, but no additional leave will be authorized for this purpose.

Following that, on the 25th day of February, a new order, which the Secretary of War described as a codification of orders which were lying around loose in the Department and which appeared in various documents, was issued. It seems that it was not discovered, or certainly there was no furor made over it, until the last few days, when it seems to have been interpreted as a deliberate effort on the part of the War Department to keep someone from running for some office. This is paragraph No. 1 of the order, still a part of Army Regulation 600–610:

No person in the military service will use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof.

There is some more to it, then another paragraph, and we come to paragraph No. 3, as follows:

3. No member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept reelection to public office held by him when he entered upon active duty, without prior approval of the War Department, and such approval will be granted only in cases of material hardship and if, in the opinion of the commanding officer, such individual's candidacy for reelection to and occupancy of such office will not interfere with his military duties; and no leave will be authorized for any purpose of campaigning for such reelection or of promoting or furthering same.

4. No member of the military forces on active duty, whether on a duty status or on leave of absence or furlough, will act in his official capacity as the holder of any public office, or perform any of the duties thereof.

5. A member of the military service on active duty may be honorably discharged therefrom for the convenience of the Government upon his request in a proper case, for the purpose of performing the duties of a public office as specified in section 5 (c) (1) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Requests for such discharges will be submitted to the War Department through military channels.

Mr. President, I call attention to this because some effort seems to have been made to create the impression that this is a diabolical order, that it was made for the deliberate purpose of denying some American citizen the right to run for office, or to accept office if he should be chosen.

I take it for granted that no one will dispute the soundness of the proposition and the theory that a man cannot well hold a military office, be charged with military duty, and be on active military duty, during the existence of a war, and at the same time hold a civilian office, and attempt to perform the duties of the civilian office. In my judgment, there would be nothing more subversive of the sound theories of democracy than to allow men in the military service to take advantage of their service in order that they might appeal for election to civilian office, and that is all this order affects.

There is nothing new about it. It has been in existence and effect for some time. The only change made was as to the word "accept," and that change was made last December and not in February of this year. While it shocked the Senator from Michigan in April 1943 to see that new word in the order of February 25, the order was made in the same language last December, without any similar shock on the part of the able, eloquent, and sincere friend of mine from the State of Michigan.

I think the Senator from Michigan did not know, or, if he did, he probably had forgotten, that in the order issued last fall the same language was used; and there is no material difference in the effect of prohibiting a man in military uniform or on active duty from being a candidate for public office and from accepting a public office.

As a matter of fact, paragraph 5 of the order issued in February permits a man to resign from the Army if he wants to became a candidate. I dare say that in any case in which a military officer, or a private in uniform, on active duty, desired to resign in order that he might run for reelection to some office which he held, or in order that he might accept an office to which he might be elected, without any effort on his part so far as political management or political activities are concerned, he would be allowed to resign from the Army, but certainly he could not hold his place in the Army and hold his civilian job at the same time and try to be on duty in both places.

Mr. President, I think it is regrettable that this effort has been made, not only on the part of the Senator from Michigan, who is only reechoing statements which have been made outside the Senate Chamber, but I noticed that yesterday a statement was made by a distinguished Member of another body, in which he charged that this order was issued in order to deny to a famous American general the right to run for President, and in order to guarantee that the President of the United States should have a fourth term. Any such statement as that is the quintessence of stupidity and quadrupled assininity. That designation of it is not altogether unwarranted in view of the source from which the statement emanated. It was not a Member of this body, I will say, who made the statement.

I dare say that the President of the United States never saw this order. It was issued in line with other orders which had been issued from 1925 until now. It was a recodification of these orders which had been issued from time to time. It was done by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States.

Mr. President, whatever anyone may say about the political machinations of the President of the United States—and the mere fact that I am looking at the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] does not imply that I think he entertains any such views, and again I repeat that I have to look at somebody, and I might as well look at the Senator from Michigan—regardless of anything that anyone may think about the political machinations of the President of the United States, I do not believe that any Senator on this floor, or anyone in America who knows Gen. George C. Marshall, or who knows the outstanding record of the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, would assert or even entertain the idea that they would connive, in secret or even in public, in order to issue an order for the petty, pusillanimous, and contemptuous purpose of trying to keep some particular person from running for any office within the gift of the American people.

That is all I wish to say about the subject. I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, written by Mr. John O'Donnell. I sometimes find myself in disagreement with Mr. O'Donnell, but he has written a very enlightening article about this situation, calling attention to the fact that back in 1920 Gen. Leonard Wood wanted to run for President of the United States. He was a candidate. He went to the Chief of Staff of the Army, who was at that time General March, and told him he wanted to run for President, and that he wanted to run for that office in his uniform, he wanted to run while he was still a major general, and General March said that he, of course, would not think of undertaking to deny General Wood the right to run for President of the United States, but that he thought General Wood ought to have a leave of absence from the Army. General March took the matter up with Newton D. Baker, who was then Secretary of War, who took it up with President Wilson, against whom General Wood was desirous of being a candidate, and they gave General Wood 4 months' leave of absence from the Army of the United States in order that he might run for President, although, as Mr. O'Donnell says in his article, General Wood made the mistake of going to Chicago and appearing at the convention in his uniform of a major general of the United States Army.

I ask that that article be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, functioning in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed forces in World War No. 2, has broken sharply from the political principle laid down by his Democratic predecessor, Woodrow Wilson, Commander in Chief in World War No. 1.

The same problem confronted both. What should be done about the military hero who seeks high elective office challenging for power the administration ruling the Nation from the White House?

As a footnote to American history, this reporter can place on the record what happened when Woodrow Wilson, sitting in the White House, was told by his Chief of Staff, Gen. Peyton C. March, that Maj. Gen. Leonard

Wood, then on active duty as a major general, purposed to become a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1920.

The Democratic President then faced the political problem that the future might pose to President Roosevelt, if and when the political supporters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur might decide to toss the name of the American commander in the southwest Pacific into the 1944 Presidential race. Tuesday the War Department revealed that an order had been issued which neatly stymied any MacArthur political ambitions—"No member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for, seek, or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered on active duty."

Note significantly that this White House-War Department decree applies only to the Army. It does not apply to the Navy, into which the Willkie-intimate, internationalist Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, enrolls himself within the next few days and from which his friends confidently expect he will emerge as a White House possibility in 1948—after Franklin Delano Roosevelt's fourth term.

This is what happened a generation ago when General Wood, then on active duty, decided that he would become an active candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Wood was uncertain about the proper procedure, worried about any infraction of military etiquette, but determined that he would make his fight for the White House.

This is what happened; and for the first time it's being told.

General Wood went to World War No. 1's Chief of Staff—the post now held by Gen. George C. Marshall—and in the gloomy office of the antiquated State, War, and Navy Building put his cards on the table.

Said General Wood to Chief of Staff March:

"I am a major general in the United States Army on active duty under your command.

"I have decided that I shall actively campaign for the nomination for the Presidency of the United States.

"What do you wish me to do so far as my Army command is concerned?"

To this Chief of Staff General March replied:

"This is a free country and a democracy, and you have the right, General, to make a campaign for the Presidency. But as Chief of Staff I cannot permit you to campaign in opposition to the Commander in Chief while you are on active duty as a major general in the Army."

Replied General Wood:

"I am planning to do what I have told you in my rank as an Army officer on active duty."

The two generals talked over this impasse. Suggested the Chief of Staff:

"I have decided that I shall give you a 4 months' leave for this political effort of yours. But before reaching a decision let us take it up with the Secretary of War and the President."

Two hours later, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War, Newton Baker, was sitting behind his desk listening to the suggestion of Chief of Staff March and the political intentions of his subordinate Wood—intentions which were frankly designed to strike at the heart of the Wilson administration and the Democratic Party.

Said Baker:

"General Wood has every right to seek the nomination for the Presidency. I approve of the suggestion of the Chief of Staff to give him a 4 months' leave to conduct his political campaign. General Wood still remains on the rolls of the Army, of course, and later can be recalled to active duty."

Then came a brief dramatic meeting with Woodrow Wilson. The World War No. 1 President approved the arrangement and 4 months' leave was granted to Wood to muster political strength in an effort to destroy the party of which Wilson was the head.

General Wood made a big mistake.

He appeared at the convention in uniform and with his ribbons.

And privately, down at the War Department yesterday, the guardhouse lawyers, even those with stars on their shoulders, will whisper that Franklin D. Roosevelt's order ruling out Army officers from political campaigns, is strictly illegal, unconstitutional, immaterial, irrelevant, incompetent, and not binding on any defendant Army officer who wants to run for mayor, Governor, House, Senate, or White House.

All of which is high-priced legal language.

But none of them feels like challenging the official order just for the fun of a legal fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that in the midst of the great crisis in which our country is engaged, no one will undertake to divide us and create suspicion on the part of the American people against the men who are charged with the duty of conducting this war, by alleging any such petty, picayunish, dishonorable purpose as that which is implied in the criticism that this order was issued in order to keep somebody in particular from running for any office within the gift of the American people.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad the able Senator from Kentucky has presented the complete record. I should like substantially to confine myself to the record as the Senator has presented it. I rather think the able Senator from Kentucky would be among the first to acquit me of any purpose or intention or effort at any time to divide the American people upon any phase of the war effort, and I do not take personally to myself at all any of the remarks the Senator made in that aspect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is wholly justified in that assertion. I would be the first to acquit the Senator from Michigan of any such motive or purpose. But it is true that outside this Chamber efforts have been made to create the impression that the order was issued for a particular purpose, and I do not want that impression to go uncorrected. I again acquit the Senator from Michigan of any such purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. I quite agree with the able Senator that it is very easy to stir up a synthetic prejudice out of some of these tender and difficult and delicate situations, for which there may be in fact no justification whatever. For example, there are those who have been willing to intimate that there is something sinister about the fact that somewhere in this Government within the last 10 days an order was issued canceling a Government program to provide for a Nation-wide recognition of Bataan Day tomorrow for inadequately explained reasons. I am just indicating how easy it is for a text to be used prejudicially. I am not using it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I understand the Senator is not using it. He is just throwing it in here, but he is not using it. I had not heard that any such thing had been done. That may be eloquent testimony to my ignorance, but I had not heard that any such order had been issued. Perhaps it has.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I acquit the Senator of responsibility for ignorance on that score. He is in the same fix in respect to that that I was in respect to these prior Army orders which he tells me originated this utterly indefensible War Department rule, from my point of view, 2 or 3 months ago.

Let us now see about this rule. The rule, as I understand the Senator from Kentucky, has only recently been amended to include a prohibition against the acceptance—I emphasize the word "acceptance"—of public office by men in the active armed service of the country. That is the sinister word to which I apply my total indictment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator believe it to be a wise military policy to permit any man in the active service of the United States military forces to accept an office and still continue in the military service?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. I will make it very plain exactly what I am talking about. I agree completely that the military and the political services should be totally, absolutely, unequivocally, unreservedly, effectively separated, and any man who accepts a designation for public office automatically should cease at that moment to have any relationship whatever to the military service. I agree completely. The Senator cannot charge me with having the slightest interest in permitting any sort of political activity within military units. But, Mr. President, I repeat what I said this noon, without any dilution or apology whatever. The acceptance of high public office, independent of any personal pursuit of it, is a totally different matter. If the time comes when a great representative convention of this country, speaking for millions of our people, no matter whether it be a Democratic or a Republican convention, concludes to draft a great military leader for the supreme command, not only of our war efforts but of our civil activities, I deny that there is any justification whatsoever in a War Department order which would even assume to try to restrict him at that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBURG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I interpret this order there would be no interference with any such procedure. If any convention should nominate any great military hero, or even a private, for any office, he could accept, but he could not accept while on active duty. The order itself permits him to resign. He would be in the same situation Mr. Justice Hughes was in when he was nominated for President of the United States while a member of the Supreme Court. There was no law preventing it, but there was a code of political ethics which prevented him from taking an active part in his

own nomination. He resigned immediately, and then accepted the nomination, not while on active duty as a Justice of the Supreme Court. Any man on active duty in the United States Army could do the same thing. He would not be accepting while on active duty, provided he separated himself from active duty prior to his acceptance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, Mr. President, between us the Senator from Kentucky and I will sooner or later have the record clear. I do not think it is clear at all that the right of resignation is automatic under these circumstances. On the contrary, I conceive it to be the fact that the right of resignation is a very narrowly guarded right.

Mr. President, I want to demonstrate just how completely absurd the rule is, referring now to the word "accept" without in any sense justifying any sort of actual political activity by a man in uniform. Mr. President, no one would say, technically speaking, that when the President of the United States becomes Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy he is a member of our military forces on active duty; but, Mr. President, if there is any person under the flag who is in fact a member of our military forces on active duty it is the Commander in Chief, and he would be the first one in this country to insist that he was. Will anyone say that there would be any justification for a rule which would say that the Commander in Chief should be prohibited by a War Department order from seeking a fourth term in the White House? Now, Mr. President, that is not an objective about which I am overly enthusiastic; but I assert that if there is to be any restraint or restriction upon that right with respect to the Commander in Chief, it is a restriction which can be applied only by the people of the United States themselves. And yet the spirit of this order certainly should apply to the President in his role of Commander in Chief if it is to apply to anybody in the military service.

I insist that the order of the War Department, insofar as it undertakes in any fashion to circumscribe or discourage the acceptance of civil designation by a military leader who at the moment separates himself from the military service, is an order circumscribing the elective function and privilege and prerogative of the American people themselves.

There is no reason why we should quarrel about why this particular order has been issued and reissued and issued again—I think it has been issued three times—in the last 90 days. They certainly seem very anxious to be sure the order is out. To whom it may apply I shall not even undertake to say. But that it should apply to anyone in the armed service of the country, in respect to his right to accept a high political designation after it has been voluntarily given to him, I deny that there is any fundamental Americanism in any such attitude; and that will continue to be my opinion. I conclude by saying that no such order, whatever its intent, will ever foreclose the American people from choosing a great general of the Army as President of the United States, if such be their electoral desire.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may submit an amendment?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I offer the amendment which has been printed and lies on the table, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York as a substitute for the House bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, of the committee amendment, after the words "per annum", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

And provided further, That no officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation under this section amounting to more than 25 percent of his earned basic compensation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on the part of the committee, I should like to accept the amendment and take it to conference. I think the amendment is a very worthy one.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to make a short statement in support of the amendment, in order that the conferees may have the benefit of my views upon the subject and my reasons for offering the amendment.

The amendment does not affect the purpose of the bill in increasing the compensation of those to whom the bill is applicable and to whom it is intended to be applicable. The purpose of the amendment is merely to take care of a situation involving certain employees who are receiving a very small compensation in the way of a token payment. Some of them get as little as $5 a month; so if $300 per annum were added to their salary, the addition would be entirely out of line.

Therefore, the amendment simply would restrict the provisions of the bill so that it would not be applicable to cases in which the compensation would be increased in excess of 25 percent of the basic salary.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I accept the amendment, and on behalf of the committee I shall be glad to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me inquire whether there are any further amendments to be offered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has an amendment which now lies on the table. He is ill, and has asked me to offer the amendment in his behalf. Therefore, I offer the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation for work in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek at a rate of one and one-half times their basic rates of compensation: *Provided*, That in computing the overtime compensation of per annum officers and employees, the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one two-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries, and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of base pay so computed for 1 day: *Provided*.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the issue presented by this amendment was considered at great length by the Senate Civil Service Committee. As a matter of fact, that was the major issue considered by the members of the committee. It was voted upon, and a substantial majority of the committee was opposed to the major portion of the amendment which has just been read.

I am not speaking as chairman of the committee in favor of the 260-day formula. I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr LANGER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] voted for it. However there was a heavy majority against it, and, of course, the amendment cannot be accepted by the chairman of the committee or by the Senator from New York and taken to conference.

Mr. BYRD rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator from Virginia speaks, I should like to call his attention to the fact that in addition to the major portion of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah there is another part of his amendment which would do away with our amendment, which would allow the head of an agency to grant compensatory time in lieu of overtime. Speaking as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, and looking back upon it, I do not believe that we sufficiently considered that particular phase of our amendment, nor were we fully advised. I am now restricting my remarks merely to that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah striking out of our amendment the right of the head of an agency to grant compensatory time, in lieu of money, for time in excess of 48 hours.

I ask that the conference committee be allowed to take that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah to conference.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to ask the Senator from California what the chief objection was to the 260-day formula.

Mr. DOWNEY. I prefer to let the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] answer that question.

Mr. BONE. I am rather curious to know what the chief objection was to that proposal.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it would provide what might be called bona fide time and a half for overtime, and would cost approximately $200,000,000 in addition to the cost of the pending bill. I assume that the total cost of the amendment was the principal objection to it.

Mr. BONE. I know that there has been a great desire to have that particular provision adopted. There has been much correspondence on the subject.

Mr. MEAD. That is the yardstick by which all other Government employees who are on a time-and-a-half basis are paid. It is the same yardstick as is used in private enterprise. However, the committee decided to use the 1/360 formula, which reduces the cost of the bill by $200,000,000 below what might be termed the Budget estimate.

Mr. BONE. Because of that particular principle, and in view of the fact that that formula has been employed by private companies, I wondered why the committee abandoned it.

Mr. MEAD. We provide straight time for overtime.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The committee has never abandoned the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula for civil-service employees, because Congress has never adopted it. The overtime computation is based upon one three-hundred-and-sixtieth.

Mr. BONE. I understand.

Mr. BYRD. If we should adopt the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula, we would put the civil-service employees who are employed on an annual basis on a straight 40-hour week, with overtime at time and a half above 40 hours. That would cost $219,310,000 in addition to the other very substantial increases which have been given to civil-service employees. I think it was the judgment of members of the committee who voted against the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula that the civil-service employees should not be considered on an hourly basis, as provided by the wage-and-hour law. Although the wage-and-hour law has been in operation for a number of years, there has been no effort whatever to put the civilian clerical employees who are under civil service on the 40-hour-week basis. The 40-hour basis applies to Government workers in navy yards and arsenals, and those doing mechanical work.

One of the reasons which actuated me in opposing it was the fact that the civil-service employees of the Government have 26 days' leave or vacation each year, which they can accumulate up to 90 days. I know of no private enterprise which gives its employees 26 days' vacation with pay, with the privilege of accumulating leave up to 90 days. Civil-service employees also have 15 days' sick leave a year, which, likewise, is cumulative up to a total of 90 days. They also receive automatic increases in pay upon the completion of 18 months' service, or 30 months, according to grade, and they are frequently classified at higher salaries. They obtain benefits from a very liberal retirement fund, on the basis of 75 percent of the cost being paid by the Government and 25 percent by the employee.

So the committee, after very careful consideration, and by a very substantial majority, decided that we should continue the present plan of overtime payment, which is based on the 1/360 formula, and not the 1/260 formula, the difference being, as I have stated, about $219,000,000. Employees of the Government under civil service cannot be classified as hourly employees, as would be the case if they were put under the wage-and-hour law. As the Senator knows, the wage-and-hour law provides that supervisory employees, such as foremen and others, shall be paid monthly compensation and not hourly compensation.

This amendment would place all the officials of the Government, including the heads of bureaus, but excluding the heads of departments, on an hourly basis, with time and a half for overtime above 40 hours. The committee very carefully considered the amendment and rejected it by a substantial vote. In passing the bill a day or so ago the House likewise rejected the 1/260 formula, and adopted the 1/360 formula which is contained in this bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I should like to add a word of further explanation on that same point, and in opposition to the Thomas amendment.

In this bill we are dealing with an attempt to provide something to make up for the increased cost of living of civil-service employees during the war. In the last war every civil-service employee was given $240. There were some minor details in addition. In substance, this bill would give $300 to every civil-service employee, exclusive of overtime. Then it deals with overtime, and fixes a minimum of $300, but says, "If you will work overtime you can earn more than $300 extra."

The question then arises as to how to compute overtime when an employee receives an annual rate of pay. The provision in the bill as we have it from the committee, and in the law as it now is, is that overtime shall be computed by dividing the annual pay by 360, on the theory that there are about 360 working days in the year, exclusive of holidays. Then if we divide 1 day's pay by 8, we have the hourly rate, and time and a half is computed on that basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was any change made in the annual leave?

Mr. BURTON. No change was made in the annual leave.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much annual leave does a civil-service employee have now if he is in the classification covered by the bill?

Mr. BURTON. I think it is a month.

Mr. BYRD. Twenty-six days.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much sick leave with pay does a Federal employee receive?

Mr. BYRD. Fifteen days.

Mr. TYDINGS. That means that a Federal employee could get 41 days leave with pay, assuming that he was sick for 15 days. He would receive his regular pay.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, those privileges are not to be taken away. He is to have 41 days off if he is sick and on leave, and receive his pay just the same.

Mr. BURTON. Precisely so. This is an attempt to help him meet the cost of living. We must have a formula in order to reach a conclusion. Under the present law the time-and-a-half computation does not relate to his whole salary. It relates only to the first $2,900 of his salary. On that basis, if he works 8 hours a week overtime, he could earn a maximum of $628.

If he works more than 48 hours a week he might receive more than $628. It is to that matter that the discussion recently related, as well as possibly to the allowance in some cases of compensatory time in lieu of money. But he could receive more than $628. If he should work about 20 percent more time than he has been working under the 39 or 40-hour rule which has been in effect, he would be entitled to some additional compensation for the extra work. The formula which is now in effect works out so that he receives about 21.6 percent extra pay for his approximately 20-percent overtime. If we should adopt the Thomas amendment, which was in the bill as originally introduced, but not in the bill reported by the committee, instead of 21.6 percent the employee would be entitled to receive 8.30 percent, or a maximum of $870 instead of $628. That would entail a cost to the Government of $219,000,000 to put the extra increase into effect, over and above what we have been paying since the 1st of December last.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator tell me in what way the proposed legislation would affect the compensation of a civil-service employee who is receiving an annual salary of $4,000?

Mr. BURTON. If he worked 8 hours overtime, he would receive his time and a half based on $2,900, and also $628 in extra pay.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest that the Senator means time and a quarter.

Mr. BURTON. The figures I have given are based on the formula we have worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Ohio repeat what he has just stated?

Mr. BURTON. If the employee is receiving $4,000, his added compensation relates only to the first $2,900. Divide that amount by 360, and then divide 360 by 8. He is allowed time and a half on that basis which results in his receiving

21.6 percent of his $2,900, or $628. It does not make any difference whether his salary is $3,000, or $4,000, or $5,000, he still receives his $628.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would he still have a month's leave with pay?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. His month's leave of absence would not be affected at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. So he would work 11 months and 4 days, or really 11 months, because 26 days and the Sundays make a month.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that to be so.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, under the bill, he would work 11 months, he would be paid for 1 month which he did not work, and would receive about $600 in additional pay.

Mr. BURTON. Yes, but he works 11 months now and receives 12 months' pay, and he would continue to do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not a member of the committee, and I am not as familiar with the bill as are the members of the committee, but my own thought concerning the bill is that the employees who are away down in the lower brackets, for instance those receiving $1,440 and perhaps $1,620, might have a pretty hard time to survive with the cost of living as it is in Washington. Without knowing the factors, I believe that a very strong case might be made out for those two categories. But, knowing that all the money which would be disbursed under the pending bill would come out of borrowed money, out of War bond sales, and out of money needed for the war effort, and without reflecting at all on the services of the $4,000 or $5,000 employees who would become beneficiaries under the pending measure, it seems to me that the position taken by the President a few days ago with reference to inflation would apply to some extent, particularly to those who are not now below what may be called the subsistence level.

I suppose the committee had good reasons for what it did, but to allow a man working for the Government to have a month off, allow him 15 days' sick leave with pay, and then give him $600 more a year when he is already receiving $4,000, appears to me to be somewhat inflationary.

Mr. BURTON. It was the purpose of the committee to study particularly what might be the influence of the proposed legislation on the person receiving a small amount of pay. It seemed clear that the cost of living had gone up for that person as well as others, and it was believed that there should be some adjustment made in the light of that situation, particularly in view of the fact that there had been increases in pay provided for other employees in the governmental service and in comparable services throughout the country.

In the case of the civil-service employee who does not work overtime, in contrast with the bill passed by the House a few days ago the pending amendment would allow a $300 flat payment to each employee whether he is receiving $1,440 or $1,620 a year. If he should work overtime, he would then receive a minimum of $300.

I do not think the bill can be regarded as inflationary, and therefore subject to criticism, because it would increase the present rate of pay for all substantial purposes throughout the Government service since the 1st of last December. It will be remembered that the increase granted at that time was only an approximate adjustment to the extent that all Federal employees were below the level to which it was proposed to raise them, and the increase did not put them above that level whatever.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the Little Steel formula in its application to industry, we are told that the increases which the industrial workers are receiving are only those which represent the margin between what they had formerly received and the subsistence level, and that in the higher-paid brackets generally the formula does not apply. How does the bill compare with the operations we are told the War Labor Board is engaged in as applied to industrial workers?

Mr. BURTON. I would say that it is more conservative, particularly as we do not apply the rates of overtime above the first $2,900 of pay.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that many industrial workers receive $2,900 a year.

Mr. BURTON. The industrial worker receives $1.50 on the basis of $1. It really amounts to what he calls only $1.25 and is a conservative rather than an exaggerated comparison between the two.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, as I have said, I can see where a very good case could be made out for those in the lower brackets, for instance, those receiving $1,440 and $1,620, and others in the lower-bracket category. But if everyone is going up in the whole scale all over the country because the cost of living is going up, and there is to be no sacrifice, and the whole increase is to be paid for out of borrowed money, it appears to me as though we are abandoning the men who need the increase in order to survive. I suppose I have more Government war workers in my State than has any other Member of the Senate, because a great many of them live in Maryland. I should like to see some of those in the lower brackets receive some help. I am more than disappointed that the efforts of the committee have not been more devoted to that group, and not to those who are receiving higher salaries, which range up to a pretty high figure. It seems to me in this respect we have departed from the treatment normally applied to industrial workers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I think the statement made by my able colleague from Maryland is a little unfair to the committee, and perhaps if I should explain the facts, the committees' action would be better understood.

We did not even begin to approach the Little Steel formula, because that formula increases basic wage rates. We do not touch the basic wage rate. The Bacon-Davis law, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act, which were passed by Congress and supported by many of us here, imposed on private enterprise an actually effective time and a half for overtime, while the pending bill would allow straight time for overtime.

In a word, we ask them to work 20 percent more time than they were working under the existing law, and we give them approximately 21 percent more money for doing so. So we have not raised basic rates, we have not given them time and a half. We have merely permitted them to work approximately 20 percent more than they have been working in the past, for which we give them about 20 percent more in money.

With respect to the 15 percent of the employees of the Federal Government engaged in arsenals, navy yards, and repair depots, men and women who have the right to take sick leave, vacation pay, and whatever else the Senator from Maryland mentioned, we give to them at regular intervals increases in their basic pay in keeping with the increases granted to private enterprise, and, in addition to that, if they earn a dollar an hour and work overtime, we give them $1.50 an hour, whereas in the case of the employees we are now discussing, if they earn a dollar an hour and we work them overtime, we give them a dollar for working overtime. So this bill is insignificant in comparison with the "Little Steel formula." It is not to be matched with what we do for 60 percent of the Government employees, whose wages are set by wage boards and other set-ups of that type.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, however, those in industrial employment do not get a month off every year with pay.

Mr. MEAD. But those in the Government service whose wages are fixed by wage boards, who represent 60 percent of the employees, do get a month off, under a law passed by Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that, but the Government employees are enjoying a counter benefit, which the industrial workers do not get.

Mr. MEAD. But in comparison with the Federal worker whose wages are fixed by wage boards, in comparison with the industrial worker who is the beneficiary of the provisions of the Walsh-Healey, the Bacon-Davis, and the Fair Labor Standards Acts, for which we voted, the employees for whom we are now legislating are not treated nearly so well. In my judgment, they are poorly treated in comparison with what the Congress insisted private enterprise do with its employees, or what the Congress insisted we should do with employees who work for the Government in navy yards, arsenals and repair depots, and in other similar occupations.

The committee went over this bill very thoroughly; they gave it an abundance of time and attention; they reduced the cost from the original bill supported by

the Budget and Civil Service Commission by approximately $200,000,000. I personally believe that if it were not that I am representing the committee I should be here on the floor fighting for an amendment; but, in view of the fact that the bill has been given to me by the committee and it is my responsibility to defend it, I assert that the committee as a whole accomplished a good job, and that they should be permitted to take the bill to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there any class of employees affected by the bill who would have an increase in salary over and above that granted by the temporary legislation now in effect?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I should say those in the lower categories would. For instance, an employee receiving $1,200 per annum, who would be given an overtime wage for working 48 hours, would probably find that his wage, with the overtime, might amount to approximately $1,380 a year. That employee will be raised to a minimum of $1,500. That is what we do with the employee in the lower category, and to that extent I believe we raise the wages over and above those provided in the present law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not very familiar with the present law in that regard, but I was under the impression that the present law provided an increase of $300.

Mr. MEAD. No; the measure we enacted does not provide a $300 bonus. It provides only time and a half for overtime, based on a 360-day year.

Mr. RUSSELL. What evidence or what theory prompted the committee to provide for extending the proposed legislation to June 30, 1945?

Mr. MEAD. Or an earlier date, if a concurrent resolution shall be passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that, but it would be more difficult to get Congress to terminate it than to extend it.

Mr. MEAD. That was the termination date in the bill raising the wages for postal employees, and I believe a similar provision was contained in the bill which affected policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia, though I am not sure about that. This bill provides the same termination date that was contained in the bill affecting postal employees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall being present when that bill was passed, but it seems to me, that in a matter involving such considerable expense to the Government, we should not enact a law and provide that it would require action by a majority of the Congress to terminate it. Issues might alter considerably between now and 1945, and whereas it would require a majority of all the Members of the Congress to extend the provisions of the act, it would also require a majority, under the bill, to terminate it.

Mr. MEAD. The postal pay bill contained other language, but the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] at that time suggested that the same provision we have here be written into the postal pay bill, and I think he offered some very substantial reasons why it should be done. I should like to have him join in explaining the reasons to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the postal pay bill been finally enacted into law?

Mr. MEAD. It is at the White House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the President signed it?

Mr. MEAD. No.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there is much merit in the point made by the Senator from Georgia. The point he raises had not occurred to me. The only intent of the Senator from Virginia was to have the two acts uniform.

Mr. RUSSELL. The additional expenditure of the Government might amount to six or seven hundred million dollars, and under the provision of the pending bill it would take a majority to terminate the law.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Georgia will offer the amendment he has in mind, I shall support it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I propose to offer an amendment to change the termination date to June 30, 1944.

Mr. MEAD. I have no objection to the Senator offering the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is now past 5 o'clock, and it is apparent we cannot conclude consideration of the bill today. Is the Senator from New York willing that the Senate shall take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. MEAD. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the motion be withheld until we can dispose of one matter. I must leave Washington tonight, and the members of the committee to whom I have been able to speak are willing to have go to conference that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] dealing with compensatory time. If there is no objection, I should like to have that matter acted on.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, we have substituted the Senate committee bill for the House bill?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, the provision to which the Senator from California refers, being in the Senate commitee bill and not in the House bill, will go to conference, anyway.

Mr. MEAD. No; it is not in the Senate committee bill. We want it inserted in the Senate committee bill so that it will go to conference. We are considering the Senate committee bill now.

Mr. BURTON. But in order to be clear on that the Senator from California referred to a portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah which would strike out a portion of the Senate committee bill. Is that true?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, if it is not stricken out, it will be in the Senate committee bill. It is not in the House text.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I shall not delay the adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from California want us to finish with the pending amendment or let it go over?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let it go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have action on the amendment on line 2, page 13. I might have some difficulty being present at the next session, and inasmuch as the Senator in charge of the bill has agreed to the amendment, would there be any objection to taking action on it at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have none, but it would be necessary to lay aside temporarily the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the pending amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand that had been offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment may be laid aside temporarily, in order that the amendment to the committee amendment may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I object if it will result in continuing the Senate in session much longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] in behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer the amendment to the committee amendment on page 13, line 2, to change the date "1945" to "1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations under the War Manpower Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are on the executive calendar the nominations of one postmaster, and of two Army officers to be brigadier generals. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations on the executive calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and

without objection, the nominations on the executive calendar are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Edmund J. O'Boyle, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant in the Division of Manning Tables, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Agnes S. Cronin, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the western Long Island area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph G. Dellert, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be principal manpower utilization analyst, at $5,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Walter Lee McDonald, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Toledo area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Thomas L. Gaukel, from the State of Missouri, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the St. Louis area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Orville W. Erringer, from the State of Texas, to be area director at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Fay William Hunter, from the State of North Dakota, to be head employment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, in the Agricultural Division in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Arthur Ringland Harris
Claude Mitchell Adams

POSTMASTER

MISSOURI

John L. Thomas, Bevier.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, as we lift our eyes to Thee in prayer, we catch the impulse from above: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto Me." We pray that we may descend into the valley of service and of sacrificial giving, not in condescension, but in loving humility; thus we shall see the right trail leading up to spiritual heights where we may find the self we should be.

O God, free us all from personal vanity, from love of applause and position. Allow not ambition, nor jealousy, nor prejudice, nor any desire of advancement keep us away from Thee, but rather bend our wills to the cross where we may learn its undying lesson. Heavenly Father, there are those with spiritual windows darkened in the midst of loneliness and desolation, and the heart has become embittered; Thou knowest that there are long stretches which weary us. As the spring sun shines out of an empty sky to warm and vitalize the barren earth that it may blossom and give forth, so may the sad, the troubled, and the tempted lift up their souls and know that our great Companion is near. He lives and shall forever live. The Lord is my Shepherd. I shall not want. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of New Jersey and a resolution from the board of freeholders of my home county in opposition to the proposed ship canal across the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the public service of Hon. HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator from California, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PLAN

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] called attention to what he described as the secret plan of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau to establish an international stabilization fund.

The plan is so secret that three committees of the House—Foreign Affairs, Banking and Currency, and Coinage, Weights, and Measures—were all invited to meet Secretary Morgenthau and offer any suggestions that might occur to them.

The plan is so secret that it has been published Nation-wide and commented on both by radio commentators and editorial writers. In spite of this fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] asks, "Why all the secrecy?"

The answer is very simple: What secrecy?

The fact that the meeting with the Secretary was an executive meeting, a meeting which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] attended, the only secrecy about it was that the Secretary asked that his answers to any questions be off the record, the reason being one of courtesy because the plan had not as yet been published.

The distinguished gentleman assures us that he will do all in his power to inform his people of the peril that is involved in this secret New Deal scheme.

Well, since the United States, Great Britain, and France have had a tripartite agreement of this sort for some years, and the result of the peril involved has been a $30,000,000 profit to the Treasury of the United States, I may be pardoned if I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that his effort to inform comes rather late.

The plan, which has a worthy and, I might add, a vital objective, the stabilization of international currencies, is merely a plan to apply to the world the mechanism used in our tripartite stabilization plan, and thus avoid the chaos that would be inevitable, in the absence of some plan, in the post-war world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the Pilot of April 3.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. William Green.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Oakwood (Ohio) Press, which I believe so well evaluates present conditions as to be worthy of reading and study by every Member of Congress and by our Government officials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include several resolution passed by the New York State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the hope has been held forth that there may be an Easter recess. I can appreciate the value of a short respite. The House has worked hard and a rest would be helpful to the health of the Members. I believe also it would be a good thing for the Members to go back home and find out about what the people are thinking. It would help in our decisions here. But before taking this recess my advice would be to make certain we pass a pay-as-you-earn tax bill. If you do this you can go down Main Street when you go back home and be greeted with smiles. If you fail to act you will be greeted with demands for action, and I am afraid the home visit will not be too pleasant. This is not a partisan measure. Members on both sides of the aisle, a majority of the House wants action, and they should get it.

Before we adjourn the Ways and Means Committee should bring out a tax measure—a pay-as-you-earn bill; we can have 2 hours of general debate and 2 hours of debate under the 5-minute rule and then let us pass a bill. The House, I am sure, now is ready to act. Forty-four million taxpayers want legislation that will make them current; 44,000,000 voters cannot be wrong; let us give the people what they want; let us stop fiddling and pass a progressive tax bill which the country is demanding. Then we can enjoy our recess.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOLGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12B AND 19 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us briefly what this bill does?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, as he well understands, the purpose of this bill is to suspend for the duration of the war and for 6 months following the cessation of hostilities assessments levied against banks participating in the Deposit Insurance Corporation as to Government deposits resulting from the sale of Government bonds under the Second Liberty Loan Act. The amount lost to the Corporation would be so small as not in any way to endanger the operation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and its protection of depositors. The average of such deposits is shown to be not more than three or four billion dollars and the insurance assessments to be surrendered amount to only about two and one-half millions. The original capital of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was $289,000,000, $150,000,000 of which was subscribed by the Treasury and $139,000,000 paid in by the Federal Reserve banks, representing the earnings of the Federal Reserve banks not paid out to member banks. In addition to the original capital, the law provided for an additional fund of $250,000,000 to be supplied by the Treasury, and provided for loans of $250,000,000 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Corporation was also authorized to borrow from the public. The capital of the Corporation at this time amounts to $625,000,000. The income during the present fiscal year is expected to amount to approximately $70,000,000, which will make the capital about $700,000,000. It will be seen that the Corporation has large resources which it is thought are amply sufficient to fully afford the protection for which the Corporation was established.

The record shows that the deposits that have been made good by the Corporation down to this time amount in round figures to $474,000,000. The amount paid out in its operations for the protection of its depositors is approximately $250,000,000. The actual losses that have been sustained by the Corporation amount to $48,000,000. The number of depositors protected down to this time amounts to 99⅘ percent of the total. The amount of deposits that have been made are a little above 98 percent of the total deposits.

The record is extremely gratifying and it demonstrates beyond question the success of the law and the able and remarkable manner in which the Corporation has been administered under Mr. Leo T. Crowley and his associates.

The second provision of the bill would suspend for a similar period the reserve requirements of banks as to deposits of Government accounts resulting from the sale of bonds under the Second Liberty Loan Act. It is thought that this will facilitate the financing of the $13,000,000,000 program that now confronts us by making these investments more attractive to banks that participate in the loan program and that a greater number of banks will find it desirable to participate in the program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And these two provisions are approved by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve banks?

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill has been approved by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, by the Federal Reserve Board, and by the Treasury. All of them regard the bill as an essential measure in the promotion of the bond program immediately at hand.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Unofficially there has been no objection to the bill from the standpoint of the American Bankers Association or the Independent Bankers Association?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have heard of no objection from anywhere. The bill passed the Senate without objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. A similar bill with reference to provisions covering reserve requirements was passed shortly after the declaration of the last war?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. On April 24, 1917, the Congress passed the following:

> The provisions of sections 143 and 462 of this title, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite correct and that is stated in the report on this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. And that remained in effect until August 31, 1935, when it was repealed. Now it is reenacted for the same purpose?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct. Attention is called to that fact in the report on this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman whether this change in reserve requirements would mean that when a bank purchases Government bonds it would not have to have any reserves to back the deposits which they give the Government under those circumstances?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct. It means that the bank will not be required to carry reserves against the Government's account, arising from the sale of bonds. That account is not large on the average. It is a checking account, as the gentleman understands.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know that. Would that not mean that the bonds which are purchased could be easily used as a means of establishing additional reserve in the banks for other lending purposes?

Mr. STEAGALL. Maybe so.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. Is it not a fact that the account that is set up by the Government in that bank is insured 100 percent by reason of the fact that they put up securities in similar amount?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes; that is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (h) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (h) (1)), as amended, is hereby further amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*And provided further*, That until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress any balance payable to the United States by any insured bank, whether represented by a deposit account or otherwise, arising solely as a result of subscriptions made by or through such insured bank fo United States Government securities issued under authority of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, shall be excluded from the definition of 'deposit' for the purpose of determining the assessment base."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462a-1) be amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: "*Provided*, That until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress no deposit payable to the United States by any member bank arising solely as the result of subscriptions made by or through such member bank for United States Government securities issued under authority of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, shall be subject to the reserve requirements of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and to include certain documents and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

PRESS PERMITTED TO BE PRESENT AT FOOD CONFERENCE TO BE HELD ON APRIL 27

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to note in the morning paper that Elmer Davis has decided to allow the press to be present at the food conference that is to be held on April 27. Original reports were to the contrary.

This conference will discuss matters of great interest and importance to the American people. They should be made cognizant with its proceedings through the newspapers of the country as well as over the radio. Certainly they will not have access to these proceedings unless newspaper reporters are admitted to the sessions.

This will be one of the most momentous gatherings the Nation has ever seen. I maintain that the public should be allowed to participate through the presence of the newspaper reporters. It is my understanding that someone at the White House recently told the reporters to lay off the delegates when they came. I insist that this smacks of star-chamber tactics. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the public were denied knowledge of what is going on at the series of conferences that we know will be held in connection with post-war planning after victory has been won. The coming food conference would set an all-time precedent if the press should be banned from its meetings. I am glad that Uncle Elmer changed his mind.

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVESTOCK

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the following resolution, unanimously passed by the Joint Livestock Committee at a meeting held at Chicago, Ill., on the evening of April 2, 1943:

Whereas we recognize that many features of the meat-industry program for solving wartime meat problems as submitted to us today by the American Meat Institute are similar to the program already submitted by our group to the proper officials in Washington, and which are now partially in effect, and which tend in some particulars to make our previous program more effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the representatives of the 93 organizations here assembled, representing the producing, feeding, and marketing interests of the livestock industry, unanimously endorse the fundamental principles of the meat-industry program with the exception of that part which proposes the imposition of price ceilings on live hogs. We stand unalterably opposed to the establishment of price ceilings on livestock; we consider them unworkable, unenforceable, and tending toward the curtailment of production, as well as stimulating the development of black markets.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short-wave broadcast to the Netherlands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOHN BOETTIGER

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this little news item may have escaped the attention of some Members of the House. I give it to you without comment. An Associated Press story released from Seattle states that John Boettiger, son-in-law of the President, has been given a leave of absence from his duties as publisher of the Post-Intelligencer to join the United States Army as a captain.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed for 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 2409, with Mr. MCGRANERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the legislative and judiciary appropriation bill. This is the entire amount of money required to run the legislative and the judicial branches of the Government. It is the housekeeping bill of this body and the Senate, and is the entire amount of money needed to carry on the operations on the Hill.

I am very proud of the fact that this committee and the House and the legislative branch of the Government have tried to live as economically as is practical in these days of wild spending.

The committee has had the judiciary part of the bill only this year. Heretofore it was under the committee presided over by the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Several new members are on our committee this year, but we have worked harmoniously and there has not been a man on the committee who has not been interested in the strictest economy in our own affairs. I think the bill justifies that statement. We were fortunate in having placed on this committee the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and on the Republican side the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] was sitting with another committee and could not be in attendance at our sessions, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] substituted for him and furnished a great deal to the committee in its close examination of these items.

Mr. Harvey, the clerk of the committee, furnished the same type of careful study, interest, and ability as has been given to this committee before by Mr. Sheild.

I should like to tell you the story of this bill as briefly as I can. I cannot touch on all the items, and there is much in it that should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

The Budget estimate for 1944 was $41,804,000, and the appropriations for 1943 were $43,826,000. This bill for 1944 is $40,659,000, so this bill is $3,166,000 less than the 1943 appropriation and $1,145,000 less than the Budget estimate. On an appropriation running around $41,000,000, we feel that is a very sizable cut, especially when the bill had been trimmed in the past very carefully just as it has been this year.

In other words, we are operating on the Hill on a simple maintenance and operation basis, where no great changes are made, no great new costs for this or that improvement. We have even cut down a great many items of small amounts, which grow to a large total, such items as painting the dome of the Capitol. We have tried to be careful in our economy on every item of that kind.

I would like to explain to the House, just for the information of its Members, and particularly the new Members, that the Budget exercises no control over any of these items. The legislative appropriations go to the Budget, and they are sent immediately to us, without comment. The judiciary items go through the same process, and they may advise as to those items, except as to the Supreme Court. So that we are our own budgeting officers and our own appropriation committee. Under title I of this bill the legislative branch, the entire appropriation for what we have, that is, the legislative branch as distinguished from the legislative plus the judiciary, is $28,257,000. That is $3,000,000 under the 1943 appropriation and $478,512 under the Budget estimates. It is very interesting, with all of the spending that is going on in the United States to see what we are spending here on the Hill. The entire cost for the operation of Congress proper is only $19,757,000 to the taxpayers of America. In addition to that, there is the cost of franked mail, which is less than $1,000,000, and adding that to what this bill provides for the operation of the legislative branch, it shows that less than $21,000,000 of the taxpayers' money takes care of all the expenses of the Congress, and every item that the taxpayer has to put out for the legislative branch of the Government. That includes the salaries of Members, the salaries of clerks, and every item honestly chargeable to the legislative branch, which is one of the three branches of the Government and it is operated for less than $21,000,000 annually. Certainly this indicates that Congress is sincere in its desire to economize as to itself. I feel that this should be something of an inspiration to some of the bureaus when they find that all we spend up here on ourselves, including salaries, is less than $21,000,000.

In the House of Representatives, as distinguished from the entire Congress, we appropriate $22,000 more than in 1943 appropriations. One item of telephone and telegraph increases amounts by $35,000, and except for that one item, we would have cut even that which we authorized last year. This year I thought we brought it to an irreducible minimum when we made the amount $111,000 less than the Budget. There are no expensive additions to any item. Some increase comes through in this bill because of in-grade promotions and reclassifications, and matters of that kind. So far as the business of Congress is concerned, I am trying to make not only a report of the Appropriations Subcommittee, but something of a family report to you, to know what is going on up on the Hill. We have a very competent disbursing clerk under the Clerk of the House, Mr. Shanks, and if you will turn to the hearings, you may see how carefully he has itemized every expense that we are making. And I think you will appreciate the fact that it is well managed and in good hands, and that is exemplified by the intelligent report of Mr. Shanks. There are about 1,900 employees, counting our congressional clerks on the Hill.

If Members have copies of the bill, I call their attention to the fact that the Senate items are first in the bill. The common practice has been that the Senate items are not touched by the House committee, except that we start every item from the 1943 figure or the Budget estimates, whichever is the lower. The Senate then goes into those items, and does what it chooses with them, and the bill comes back to the House, and we accept their action in that respect. There is reciprocity in that. The Senate does exactly the same insofar as the House items are concerned. We do not attempt to govern their appropriations and they do not attempt to govern ours.

The complete list of all salaries, the number of clerks, the number of employees, may be found in the bill. I shall not attempt to go into that because the bill speaks for itself, and you gentlemen can see what clerks are assigned to committees, and what the pay roll is; how much it costs. There is nothing there that does not speak for itself. I shall not attempt to go into that. We allowed one more official reporter of debates, simply because the volume is getting to be so heavy that we thought we must have another. That is one small item of increase. Under the contingent expenses of the House you will note they are set out in the bill very carefully. You will find in the hearings, which I shall not attempt to go into now, a full discussion of the dining room that is operated here in the Capitol, and the cafeteria in the House Office Building. Those are things that everyone is interested in. There is no secrecy about them. It is all in the hearings. I wish we could discuss it, because it is a real problem as all must recognize, and it is a difficult problem to consider on the floor of the House.

We allow $5,000 for the Joint Committee on Revenue Taxation. This is not exactly as a reward for them, but I think that they need a little more tax assistance—I started to say advice, but I do not mean that, because I think they are highly competent. I am sure that this will help with the entire problem of taxation methods.

Under the head of Capitol Police we have a little change, which I think you ought to know. You will hear it discussed. Undoubtedly the Capitol Police have been a little underpaid and I would like to tell you how raises and changes are made in their case and that of other employees of Congress. The Appropriations Committee has not been in the past nor is it now inclined to make any increases or create any jobs other than as authorized by direct action of this House.

We have been importuned from many places to increase salaries, and many of them are out of adjustment; to make new positions—and possibly some are needed—but we have taken the position that the Committee on Accounts is the legislative committee for the legislative appropriations subcommittee. That committee must pass a resolution to bring it to the floor of the House before we will embody it in our bill. There are many changes that are needed. I think in the press and radio galleries some of the salaries are out of balance and should be adjusted, but it should be done upon the recommendation of the Committee on Accounts, and after a resolution has passed through the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have felt that the pay of the waiters in the dining room was small. There is a great shortage of waiters. I think many people coming from the outside feel that the Government pays the men adequately and do not fee the waiters.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is a difference of opinion about that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It would mean we would have more service.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is a difference of opinion about that. I have tried to find out what the waiters make and in most cases it has been a very satisfactory return. We find the positions are really desired by the men who are working there, which is an indication that the return must be reasonably satisfactory.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, there is a shortage.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course, there is a terrible shortage. The shortage is due not only to that, but there are many other factors. It seems to me that much of the absenteeism comes from prosperity. Like the fellow who was asked if he wanted to make a quarter and he said, "No; I have a quarter." I think it is due to the fact that a lot of the men are doing very well and they will just miss a day here and there.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad our chairman has made plain to the House that we on this subcommittee did not at any time take unto ourselves the power that we felt belonged to the Committee on Accounts, the proper legislative committee that has to do with the

allocation of personnel for the legislative establishment.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am glad the gentleman approves of that.

I would like to state that we have possibly a little legislation in this appropriation bill which is needed. I would like to read a little comment from the report on this bill as to the Metropolitan Police who are loaned to the Congress. Those men are sent here upon our request. They are a picked crowd and they are doing a splendid piece of work. They seem to have forfeited, or at least the District of Columbia police authorities look upon them as having forfeited, some of the rights they had before they came up here in the Hill. We are placing a provision in this bill which will correct that situation.

Reading from the report:

> They are loaned to Congress and their cost reimbursed so the District may temporarily replace them for the duration. The men sent to the Capitol were very carefully selected, are seasoned officers, and were chosen because of their splendid records and years of experience. Such men should not be penalized by having their careers placed in jeopardy on account of being selected for a very important wartime work. In order that there may be no question as to their status in the Metropolitan Police upon termination of their detail to the Capitol, the committee has included a provision requiring that they shall have the same status with respect to rank, pay, allowances, privileges, and benefits during the detail and at the termination thereof as though such detail had never been made.

We feel that relief is only just to the men sent here, and we trust that provision will remain in the bill so that those men will not forfeit any of the rights that any other policemen on the force may have.

Under the head of "Architect of the Capitol," I think it would be interesting if you would read, on page 59, the duties of the Architect. You do not realize, unless you scan the hearings, that he has a tremendous job, not only the job on the Hill but in other parts of Washington, and I am sure he is performing those duties in a most satisfactory way.

I would now like to call your attention to the items for the Library of Congress. In my opinion, we have a very excellent, competent, and interested Librarian. It has been somewhat popular here to criticize the Librarian, but I believe the gentleman we have there is a scholar, a man of tremendous energy, foresight, and vision. In my opinion, we have the greatest Library in the world. This gentleman appreciates that fact, and I believe that if we will support him, within reason, in that which he has requested, this Library will continue to serve even a more useful purpose. I am sure that the vision and ability of Mr. MacLeish will accomplish much for the Congressional Library.

Now, I would like to call your attention to some of the work of the Library. I think this House should know more of it. In the first place, on page 110, in Dr. MacLeish's statement, he says:

> A government library exists to render a service—an essential service—a service without which a modern government cannot operate effectively in peace, or, even more, in war. But a library is also a collection of books and other materials representing an investment of value.

Of course, this is primarily a Congressional Library. It was started for that purpose, for our use, in order to write better legislation. We have an excellent Legislative Reference Service over there which they are very hopeful the membership will continue to use, in order to make even a more thorough study of legislation.

As to the actual physical value of this Library, it might be worth while to note that even from a dollars-and-cents standpoint you have an investment there of great importance. For instance, the Gutenberg Bible sold for $250,000, which the Library owns, just to give you an idea of a tangible estimate of some of the things the Library possesses. It has been estimated that the actual dollar value would be over $300,000,000, but I think this is a ridiculously low price to put on the possessions over there. The Library is doing fine war work. One does not realize how much it is used by the Army, the Navy, and the other departments engaged in war activity. It is sending its maps out by the hundred, and today an institution that is looked upon by most people as a place where one may retire for quiet, peace, and pleasure, is actually an important part of the war effort and is making a very valuable contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another great business that has been provided for out of the money in this bill, the Government Printing Office. I hope some day all of you will go to the Government Printing Office and see a business the like of which is not to be found anywhere else in America. In 1940 the Government Printing Office did $20,000,000 worth of business; in 1941, it did $28,000,000; in 1942 it did $47,000,000; and in 1943 it is estimated it will do $65,000,000 worth of business. They have 7,800 employees down there. The total number of employees in the Capitol is 1,900.

A great deal has been said about the spreading of Government printing business. Mr. Giegengack, a very splendid executive, has had this matter much in mind, and of the business which they did in 1941 they let out to commercial printers $2,100,000 worth; in 1942, $6,300,000; and in the first 8 months of 1943, $18,400,000. This business was let out to 981 private printers in 41 States of the Union in a total of 8,800 different contracts.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Before the gentleman completes his statement I think it only fair to rise and compliment both him and his entire committee on the splendid work they have done in scrutinizing each of the items in this legislative bill. Certainly if every department of the Government followed the custom of the gentleman and his committee, I am sure the Budget would be a great deal more presentable to the people.

Mr. O'NEAL. The compliment is very much appreciated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I echo the sentiments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. I should like to ask how many of the personnel in the Congressional Library are now under civil service?

Mr. O'NEAL. They are classified but not under civil service; they have a classification in line with civil service, but they are not actually under civil service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. None of them are under civil service?

Mr. O'NEAL. I am not sure. Some who are paid from other funds may be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They were not blanketed in?

Mr. O'NEAL. They are paid in accordance with the Classification Act.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachuetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEAL. The amount of business done by the Government Printing Office is simply amazing; nothing like it was ever done before by a printing house. For instance, the rationing program and the stamp books. No such paper was made by any mill in America; they had to have a special paper designed, and they have printed 60,000,000,000 rationing stamps. Such a figure one cannot understand. They printed 190,000,000 copies of War Ration Book No. 1, and 150,000,000 copies of No. 2. That work had to be done rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, I wish there were time to go into many more items concerning the Library and the work of the Public Printer. Let me say in passing that all is not expense, it is not all outgo, there are returns from sales of Government publications by the Superintendent of Documents. This amounted to $1,712,000 in 1942.

For the next 3 or 4 minutes I should like to speak about the judiciary items. The judiciary is living just as economically, I think, as the legislative department, and this bill appropriates for salaries and for the maintenance and work of the entire judicial system of this country, the judges and all the clerks. We had a group come before us requesting help with reference to the underpaid clerks of the courts. I shall not have time to tell you exactly how we worked it out but we did give, I think, quite a bit of relief to all the courts in this country as far as the clerks are concerned. They also requested help for the clerks to the judges and their employees. We met with the Committee of the Federal Judiciary, went into the matter carefully and suggested that they come back next year with their problem carefully studied and their recommendations agreed upon by all of them. There was some disagreement among even the judges. Next year we probably will bring to this House a much more complete report on the needs of the judiciary, but we did help them with the clerks in the courts and we did

help them with clerks for the judges. That is itemized and carefully explained in the report which you have before you and I think it will give it to you in detail.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. On page 55 I notice that in providing for the salaries of clerks of courts and the usual entourage, the committee has made it illegal to provide clerks and deputies in places that are designated as places for holding court.

Mr. O'NEAL. I was just coming to that.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman feel it is within the province of his committee to write that type of legislation—and I ask the question because the Judiciary Committee has been studying this very thing for quite a while. We expect to report in the usual orderly way a bill to eliminate the holding of court in certain places.

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman that quite a few of these small places were abolished in this manner. The statutes required that they be continued. The administrative officer of the judicial system stated that he did not need those offices and that they should be abolished.

Mr. WALTER. That is the thing certain members of the Judiciary Committee are afraid of, that the administrative officer could prevail upon an appropriations committee to do something that the legislative committee did not think ought to be done.

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that these places are appropriated for by the legislative committee. The Council of Circuit Judges has an administrative director, Mr. Chandler, who stated that they had practically no business in these various places. They can still carry on court there, but he said we are still required by law to keep these places open where we do not need them. Why should the committee appropriate for such places?

Mr. WALTER. That is his opinion, but he is not basing it on anything except the report from a judge. It is entirely possible that some judges dislike going to certain places and they could very well represent to Mr. Chandler that they do not need to hold court in that place, and then you would follow Mr. Chandler's recommendations, despite the fact that there might be a very decided need for sessions of court at a particular time, and that section would be eliminated.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will turn to the hearings, he will find those places are listed and it will show how often they sat during the previous year, very few of them as much as 10 days, most of them 1 or 2 days, yet we have to pay for them the entire year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. This paragraph brings out just one of the things that was feared when another bureau was created and an administrator of justice set up in his present luxurious quarters with a large personnel in the new Supreme Court Building. If the gentleman will permit, the very idea of that administrator coming before a subcommittee on appropriations, not familiar at all with the needs of the court, and inducing that subcommittee to introduce a provision in a bill such as this is ridiculous.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman does not state the facts correctly. The gentleman is stating it in a prejudiced way. That is not correct at all.

Mr. MICHENER. I will illuminate my prejudice, then. Let us get the facts.

Mr. O'NEAL. All right.

Mr. MICHENER. The bill says that "the provisions of law requiring offices of clerks of court" in enumerated places throughout the United States—and a large number is listed—"are hereby repealed." Now, that is clearly subject to a point of order. It seems to me that the Representatives in Congress should have the right to go before the legislative committee if a court is to be discontinued in that Representative's district. A hearing should be held, which hearings are open, and the Members of Congress know about it rather than a bureaucrat functioning entirely as a legislative committee of the Congress.

Mr. O'NEAL. In the first place, under the Holman rule, this is perfectly in order and it is done many times on all forms of appropriation bills by way of retrenchment. The gentleman states that the gentleman from Kentucky knows this is not legal, but that is not the fact, because it is permissible under the Holman rule.

Now, to whom may we look as an administrative proposition with reference to the items under this bill for the judiciary? We look to the duly constituted authorities. There is the Judicial Council, composed of the senior circuit judges of all the circuits. They have worked with Mr. Chandler as the administrative director appointed by the Supreme Court. He is the man who knows the situation with reference to the judicial work of this country from an administrative standpoint.

Upon interrogation, not by voluntary information, and it is wrong to accuse Mr. Chandler of that, he told us, in reply to our question, "What about a lot of these places?" that they were not needed. The members of our own committee knew of places where they had to keep an office open. Being an honest man, Mr. Chandler told us the truth. He said, "This one is an office with 3 days of court a year, this one 10 days. They serve no necessary purpose, but we have to keep them open by law." Consequently, in the interest of economy and not to preserve something that somebody may want in his district just because it is a nice thing to have, the committee saw fit to cut down the items, and I do not see why anyone should complain.

Mr. MICHENER. I think I know much about Mr. Chandler's agency. I had much to do with setting it up and creating it.

Mr. O'NEAL. Are the facts which I have stated correct?

Mr. MICHENER. They are correct to this extent: The Congress set up this agency and now another bureaucrat is taking over functions that were never intended.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have heard bureaucrats mentioned. What is a bureaucrat? We jump on some little fellow down here in office doing the best job he can. He jumps on the underling in the office, the newspaper jumps on us, somebody jumps on the newspaper. The word "bureaucrat" to me is a difficult word to define, because it depends upon whose ox is being gored. I have some sympathy for the man who is trying to do his job, and must stand the criticism, more often unjustified than justified, by those who are not so well informed as to his problems and job as he is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it was a pleasure to serve on this subcommittee with the able chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. I regret that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] could not be with us on account of being engaged in another hearing.

All members of the subcommittee took an active interest in the hearings. Mr. Harvey, the committee clerk, rendered excellent service.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time explaining this bill. The chairman has very well explained it in detail. I do not believe I could enlighten the House much more than what the chairman has said and what can be gained from reading the hearings and the report.

The bill is $3,166,817 below the 1943 appropriation and $1,145,077 below the Budget estimate. We have tried to write a bill using a degree of considered economy and still write a bill that would not hinder any function of government. I believe it would be well if the same rule of economy in appropriations were applied to the various governmental departments and agencies. I think it could be done without lessening their effectiveness and most certainly it would save the taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars.

The chairman is very profuse in his praise of the administration of the Library of Congress. There are many things he believes in that connection in which I cannot join him, but I do not believe anything can be accomplished by discussing it here. Rather I think it should be taken up in the regular way in the committee. If I remain on this committee, I think that when the next bill comes up I shall go into that matter very carefully, and I am very hopeful of getting some good results.

This bill, taken as a whole, is not a particularly good bill, but it is not nearly as bad as it might be. In making appropriations we are working under a

most peculiar system. Those requesting the money are the only ones who come before the committee attempting to justify the amounts they ask. They know the facts. Those on the committee are more or less forced to be governed by the opinions expressed by those coming before the committee to justify the appropriations. I believe that if we could get a real study made, even this bill could be very greatly reduced. I am very hopeful that in the coming months the investigators we have been authorized to employ will be put to work and will go through not only the agencies covered in this appropriation bill but those covered in all appropriation bills, to the end that we may establish order and efficiency in all Government operations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I am looking at page 8 of the bill, and wonder if a mistake has been made. In line 3 there is an item for 96 additional clerks at $1,800 per annum each, and in line 5 there is an item for 96 additional clerks at $1,800 per annum each. That would make 192 additional clerks at $1,800 per annum each. Is there a mistake there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I think that was in the previous appropriation. It refers to the Senate.

Mr. STEFAN. Would that make 192 additional clerks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Not this year. I may say that the committee, following the precedent that I understand has been heretofore set, did not have hearings in any manner upon the items affecting the Senate. We wrote the bill as it was We took whatever was the lesser figure—that in the previous bill or the Budget estimate—and inserted that. When this bill goes to the Senate, I presume, or I hope, at least, they will go through the bill as it affects them as we did on this side as it affects us.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought this referred to the House, but the gentleman tells me he does not know anything at all about this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. No; it refers to the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleague to an article under date of March 30, 1943, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor. The title of it is "The Swollen White House Budget." It quotes a statement by Senator HARRY F. BYRD appearing in the New York World-Telegram to the effect that the White House executive staff pay roll under President Roosevelt, as of September 1, 1942, entailed a monthly outlay of $2,999,460 for the employment of 726 persons in the District of Columbia and 180 persons outside. This does not include any of the emergency agencies set up under Executive authority, such as the Office for Emergency Management.

By contrast, the White House pay roll under President Woodrow Wilson, in July 1917, during the last war, contained the names of 48 persons and involved a monthly outlay of $164,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding may I take this opportunity to thank my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] for his courtesy in permitting me to address the House at this time to present a very important matter.

Mr. Chairman, on March 4, upon my return to Congress following a serious illness, I introduced House Resolution 148. The resolution is available to Members and, in effect, directs the Committee on Labor to make a full and complete survey of all labor conditions and labor-employer practices which affect or may affect the war-production program. The resolution was referred to the Rules Committee. I appeared before the Rules Committee by direction of the Committee on Labor to ask for a rule to bring the resolution before the House. Up to this date the Rules Committee has not acted upon our request.

Pending the authorization of the resolution by the House to conduct a complete survey, your Committee on Labor decided to immediately start hearings on the much-discussed problem of absenteeism. Many witnesses from important industries, representatives of labor, and representatives of Government were invited to appear before the committee to give us the benefit of their knowledge and experience in dealing with this problem and assist us in our attempt to appraise the causes of absenteeism and whether or not legislation would solve the problem.

Following almost 3 weeks of interesting hearings and much information, your committee has requested me to present a summary of our findings to the House. The full report will be printed and available, we hope, within a week or two.

INVESTIGATION OF ABSENTEEISM IN WAR INDUSTRIES BY THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE

The committee held public hearings from March 12 to 30, 1943. The witnesses who testified represented a variety of interests, industries, and localities. The witnesses who spoke for management came from some of the most outstanding war plants in the country. The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations were represented by witnesses from their affiliated unions in major war industries. The Government witnesses came from agencies primarily concerned with war labor and procurement problems.

The industries represented included aircraft, radio and electrical equipment, nonferrous metals, automotive, textiles, and shipbuilding.

Witnesses came from every part of the country, from southern California to Washington, from New England to North Carolina, from Illinois to Alabama.

Without exception these witnesses unanimously agreed that the most successful solution to the problem of absenteeism will come from management and labor, with assistance from government and community cooperation.

The solution, of course, must be based on a complete understanding of the problem. Current discussion has created the false impression that there is a large amount of willful absenteeism. Witnesses who spoke for management and those who spoke for labor unanimously agreed that willful absenteeism is negligible. Their testimony shows that the typical American worker is not the deliberate truant but the fellow who gets up early, shares his car with fellow workers, drives oftentimes from 10 to 50 miles to work in all kinds of weather, puts in a long day of work in an overcrowded workshop and gets home late at night, frequently to face additional responsibilities. The woman worker, who must carry her household responsibilities along with her job, deserves even greater credit. Many workers do not even have the elementary comforts of a home after work. They live in one-room shacks or trailers or sleep by shifts in "hot beds."

An attitude which blames "irresponsible workers" for production delays causes a natural resentment among the vast majority who are giving their best to war work. People close to war-production problems know that to date material shortages, not absenteeism, have been one of the most important factors in retarding output. Mr. Wendell Lund, Director of the Labor Division, War Production Board, inserted in the record this memorandum recently issued by the West Coast Council of Aircraft Manufacturers:

> The conclusion of the Los Angeles area companies is that aircraft production has not been retarded in any important and widespread degree by absenteeism in our plants. There has been absenteeism representing a substantial number of man-hours, but it has not been a limiting factor. Materials shortages and imbalances has been the limiting factors. The Los Angeles area companies can find no facts to support the conclusion that had our absentee rate been lower than it was we would have built appreciably more airplanes than we did in 1942. This conclusion does not countenance unexcused absenteeism with its consequences of waste, but is an effort to define the problem precisely for aircraft-production purposes.

Mr. Randall Irwin, personnel director of the Lockheed-Vega Corporation, reiterated this statement of fact, as did spokesmen for other industries. To create the impression that American workers are slackers when actually they are working hard under difficult conditions is not going to make it easy for labor, management, and Government to join in solving this problem. We need to offset this impression for the sake of unity in this country, and to keep the way open for voluntary cooperation to meet this problem as we have met so successfully many of our others.

Testimony indicated that in normal times absenteeism averages from 2 to 3 percent in most industries. The only accurate overall figures on the subject today are those developed by the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Sta-

tistics, which are limited to the shipbuilding and airplane industry. Witnesses, however, pointed out that absentee rates are bound to increase in wartime. The average absentee rate in England now is 10 percent, while a study of absenteeism in shipbuilding during the last war, in this country, revealed an average rate of 18 percent. Even so, spokesmen for some industries told the committee that some plants today have absenteeism so well under control that it presents little or no problem. In other words, preventive measures can be developed in plants locally.

Witnesses brought out that the greatest percentage of absenteeism occurs among workers previously not employed in industry. As our young men from 21 to 38, in the prime of physical health, enter the services, they are replaced in industry by people often physically under par, even handicapped workers, and by women with domestic responsibilities, which they must meet along with their jobs. As this group increases in the coming months, absenteeism will inevitably increase, unless remedies are applied. The size of the problem is indicated in part by Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates presented to the committee by the Secretary of Labor: two and three-quarter million woman not now in the labor force will be in industry by the end of this year.

Consequently, we have no time for false starts nor can we delay in meeting this problem. In developing corrective measures, management and labor need a yardstick to measure the success of their efforts. Any given plant should know its own absentee rates. Individual plants also need average figures for the industry as a whole to view their problems in perspective.

From all the testimony it has taken, the committee concludes that figures available today are not adequate. There is a wide difference in the definition of absenteeism on which records are based in different establishments, and therefore absentee rates in one plant are usually not comparable with those in another, even within the same industry and will vary in different sections of the country.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures for shipbuilding show a variation in rates from 2 percent all the way up to 20 percent. This variation indicates that causes of absenteeism vary widely from shipyard to shipyard, and management and labor in one shipyard has been more successful in solving them than in other shipyards.

No national figures are available. Very few industries are keeping absentee records. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has made studies on the only two industries to furnish information—shipbuilding and airplanes. The shipyard study covers April through October 1942. The absentee rate averaged between 7 and 8 percent. I quote from the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

> Absenteeism is more prevalent in Atlantic and Gulf coasts than in other shipbuilding zones. Yards in the Great Lakes area reported the lowest rate of 3.1 percent in August and 4.2 percent in April. The Atlantic coast rates were the highest, averaging around 8 percent.
>
> The range among the individual yards was very large. One-quarter of the yards accounted for more than half the absenteeism.
>
> A study of absenteeism in 90 shipbuilding companies in the last World War showed that the rate at that time averages 17.8 percent over a 9-month period. That is more than twice as high as the rate of absenteeism today.
>
> Airplane study just being completed for January 1943 shows that absenteeism averages 6.4 percent. It was highest on the Pacific coast with an average of 7.1 percent and was lowest in the midwestern district—Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas—where the average was 4.1.

Testimony of witnesses from other industries indicates the same situation. Causes and success in remedying them vary, but there are certain general principles which are important in working out a solution through the voluntary action of management and labor, with Government assistance.

For example, poor scheduling and planning of production and labor hoarding were cited frequently by witnesses as among the most important causes of absenteeism. The worker who is told by management to slow down or lay off because parts or material that should have been available are not yet ready can hardly understand why he should maintain a good attendance record. And yet his time off may come just when he is suddenly most needed. The Government in awarding contracts and assigning production quotas should do all within its power to prevent such situations. It is also apparent that more effective planning on the part of management is vital to a reduction in absenteeism.

It was evident from the testimony that plants with good industrial relations had a head start in approaching the problem of absenteeism. Good industrial relations cannot be developed overnight or applied from the top by Government but must grow up in the plant through the responsible efforts of labor and management. Plants where union and management have developed good working relations have already had a great deal of success in reducing absenteeism through the joint efforts of these two groups. Unfortunately real union management cooperation exists in comparatively few plants. Consequently any program to control absenteeism must go beyond the relatively small number of plants where sound industrial relations exist.

Witnesses repeatedly emphasized that the first step in reducing absenteeism is to discover, through record keeping, the underlying causes in a particular plant and then attack the causes, through local action in the plant. They emphasized that absenteeism is a human problem and must be dealt with by special attention to the human factor in production.

Here are some of the causes most frequently cited by the various witnesses:

Illness and industrial accidents cause the overwhelming majority of absences—from 50 to 75 percent, most witnesses agreed. These causes increase as more women, older workers, the less physically fit, the inexperienced, and the handicapped are employed.

Transportation problems result in another significant percentage of absences. Many workers travel from 10 to 50 miles to work in the morning and back in the evening. They have to depend on car pools. Cars break down and weather conditions make driving almost impossible.

Fatigue, arising out of long hours, increases accidents and illness. Workers who cannot stand the pace finally must take a day off to rest up.

Responsibilities outside the plant result in absences. Especially when hours of work are long, workers take time off to do their shopping, visit the doctor and the dentist, pay bills in cash, cash their checks, do household chores. Women are usually called upon to carry out the major part of their domestic duties even though they are working full time in a war plant. Lack of child-care facilities results in many absences. Because the number of existing nurseries where mothers while employed can leave their children is totally inadequate, these women usually have to resort to makeshift arrangements for care of their children, leaving them with a neighbor or relative or even free to roam the streets. Under such unsatisfactory conditions these women are bound to stay home from time to time, especially when children become ill, as is likely when they receive little care.

Poor housing conditions are important causes of absenteeism. Many of the so-called Monday-morning absences represent the extra time workers must take to spend a week end at home when they cannot secure housing facilities for their families near the plant. Often workers have to take time off to look for housing accommodations. Where families are living under unsanitary conditions in shacks and trailers, they frequently become ill.

Absence, resulting from these causes, is obviously beyond the workers' control, none the less such absences delay production, and every effort must be made to remedy the causes. Where the cause cannot be eliminated, management in some cases has authorized time off for workers, to prevent unscheduled absence and permit better planning in production. In England, for example, women are allowed time off for essential household chores and even to visit family members on furlough from the armed services. Many of the causes of absenteeism, however, can be eliminated by local action in the plant and community cooperation.

For instance, many plants have reduced industrial accidents and disease by applying well-known prevention methods. They have lessened fatigue by special attention to working conditions. They have secured community cooperation in adjusting store hours, or even bringing shopping facilities into the plant. They have assisted workers in solving transportation problems. Communities have a very definite responsibility in helping to eliminate causes of absenteeism. The record of committee hearings contains a wealth of detail on methods of eliminating the causes of absenteeism. The real need is to make the experience of plants that

have dealt successfully with these problems available to plants still trying to solve them.

There is still another group of absences which may be described as willful, where a worker stays away from his job for no valid reason. This type of absenteeism represents a negligible proportion of the whole and is most reprehensible. In peacetime such workers would be discharged. But with the present manpower shortages, every effort should be made to awaken these people to their responsibilities, to bring them up to steady performance, before taking them out of production. Witnesses testified on various techniques which have been used successfully in dealing with this group, and these techniques placed very little emphasis on punitive methods.

In the first place, these people must be made aware of the importance of their jobs to the entire war effort. Often workers feel that the product on which they are working is unrelated to the war effort. Many companies have helped to solve this problem by illustrating in posters, lectures, and company publications just how the material manufactured fits into the total picture of war production.

The worker must be made to realize that his absence is noticed by the company and should be required to report the reason for his absence. A good foreman or shop steward can impress upon the worker the need for steady performance. Many unions have been extremely helpful in dealing with this group of workers. Telephone check-ups and even home visits have been used successfully by many firms.

Disapproval of truancy must be emphasized by recognition of the steady attendance record achieved by the majority. Some companies have issued badges or buttons to workers who score perfect attendance or have devised other ways of showing them that their good work is appreciated.

The committee has no evidence that there are many truants in the group who have secured occupational deferments. The responsibility for securing deferment rests with management. Management would not be likely to request deferment for the chronic absentee. Highly skilled workers—the only group who can secure occupational deferments today—are usually among the most responsible in the labor force. In any case, deferment is now subject to periodic review, and it is presumed that local draft boards consider the attendance records of such workers in granting extension of deferments.

The most serious aspects of the absentee problem arise, not among the men eligible for selective service, but in the group replacing them—the women, persons less physically fit, handicapped workers, and many others not accustomed to industrial life.

This country is only just beginning to realize the seriousness of the absentee problem, one that will grow in importance with the changes in the labor force in the coming months. The information that we have on the subject at present is for the most part inadequate. Consequently any legislation that we might draft at present to apply to all workers in war industries probably would not solve the problem. In attempting to reach the small group of willful absentees, it was the opinion of a number of well-informed witnesses before the committee that legislation might be interpreted as a personal affront by the vast majority of workers who are loyal to their country and devoting their utmost energies to war production. The committee condemns the small group of willful absentees. Your committee makes the following recommendations, recognizing that only by getting at the facts and dealing with the basic causes of absenteeism can management, labor, and Government solve the problem:

First. Industry should keep such records of absenteeism as may be necessary to enable the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, to determine the extent and causes of absenteeisin. Undoubtedly the necessary figures can be secured through the voluntary cooperation of industry, just as the Bureau of Labor Statistics has already secured such figures for shipbuilding and the airplane industry.

Second. The Department of Labor should be directed to act as a clearing-house on ways and means of reducing absenteeism. On the basis of this information and material gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department should be authorized to recommend to management and labor representatives practical methods to reduce absenteeism in plants that have high absentee rates. The funds necessary to carry out these activities should be appropriated to the Department of Labor.

Third. The appropriate Government agencies should use every means possible for securing immediate action to correct causes of absenteeism arising in certain communities, such as bad housing, inadequate transportation, and lack of child care facilities.

Fourth. The Department of Labor, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, and the Office of War Information should lay before the public the real problems involved in absenteeism, to clear up false impressions now current that American workers are slackers. In this country we believe in giving credit where credit is due, and therefore we should recognize the contribution that American workers are making to war production.

Your committee proposes to investigate further the major causes of absenteeism, beginning with illness and industrial accidents, in an attempt to formulate more effective programs for dealing with these problems and upon completion of its studies will make its recommendations to the House.

We earnestly hope you will cooperate with us and vote for House Resolution 148 when it is presented to the House in order that your Committee on Labor may have full information on all of the problems confronting labor and industry concerned with war production.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this informative talk which the gentlewoman from New Jersey is making, and from one point of view particularly, namely, from the standpoint of the average worker, who, after all, has been instrumental in giving us the greatest production in the history of mankind for this past year, and past months, and I do think it is most important that the Congress is considering fundamentally some of his own problems, as well as what the gentlewoman pointed out, some of the shortcomings of a few.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, it cannot be gainsaid that there exists among the people of this Nation a profound distrust in the competence and even in the sincerity of a large portion of the bureaucracy of Washington in the pursuit of the war effort.

There is a deep-seated belief that, with a fanatical zeal, many officials of this beehive of bureaucracy place the victory over our enemy in a minor place in comparison with their ambition for control and power and the promotion of ideological objectives, both of which hinder rather than help the prosecution of the war.

This view is shared by many patriotic Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle as well as by the Republican minority.

A few glaring instances of subordination of victory to vanity by bureaucrats have already been exposed. But much that goes on in Washington is cloaked in secrecy, hidden in star-chamber proceedings, and too frequently one of the "four freedoms" for which we are supposed to be fighting—freedom of the press—is but a bitter, muffled ghost haunting the press rooms of O. W. I. and the press conferences of the Executive department.

Unless and until our Federal Government buckles down to the job of winning the war and calls a halt to its campaign against free enterprise, this cancerous condition of distrust will thrive and grow.

Only today an astounding example of bureaucratic sabotage which is the basis of a lack of confidence in the national administration has come to my attention.

The matter concerns the Federal Power Commission, in patent collusion and collaboration with the Bonneville Power Administration, to force, under emergency war powers, an extension of Federal public ownership despite losses to the Federal Treasury.

The money and the amount of electric power involved in this case is small. But the abuse of power raises an issue that is fundamental and far reaching. It is entirely possible that the issue was raised in a matter involving so small an encroachment upon private enterprise—in terms of money—that the Commission hoped to establish a precedent by default.

The case in question arises out of a Presidential letter of September 26, 1942,

to all war agencies requiring them to make their purchases of power from public or private sources at the "cheapest" rate consistent with "the fullest and most rapid progress." With this laudable objective the taxpaying public was in full accord, especially in view of the extraordinary wastes that have occurred in many other fields of the war effort.

The order was singular only in that electric power is the one vital war production commodity which has not been rationed, in which there has not been a shortage, and which has actually decreased in price to the consumer since the war began. This, despite the fact that on as many as 11 different occasions, the Federal Power Commission erroneously surveyed power resources of the Nation and erroneously predicted shortages which failed to appear.

On the basis of the President's letter of September 26, a Presidential directive was issued on October 22 empowering the Federal Power Commission to renegotiate any power contracts which appeared to be unreasonable and to order the delivery of power to war plants from the cheapest available source of generation, public or private, over such transmission and transformer facilities as were available, whether public or private.

Pursuant to this directive, the Federal Power Commission on February 15, 1943, ordered the Washington Water Power Co. to make available to the Bonneville Administration transmission and transformer facilities to service a Government hospital in the city of Spokane, with a load of 700 kilowatts, and to supply also facilities for the delivery of Bonneville power to Fort Wright, an Army camp, in the suburbs of Spokane, for a water pumping station requiring 500 kilowatts of power.

It is a matter of record that the Federal Power Commission had previously established as a reasonable minimum for renegotiation, loads in excess of 1,000 kilowatts. It is further established that the Federal Power Commission action to which I am referring was based on a request by the Bonneville Administration, although the latter agency then had a contract with the Washington Water Power Co. for exchange of power, by which Bonneville agreed to take war-production loads higher than 750 kilowatts, leaving the loads smaller than 750 kilowatts to the private company. These facts show the Federal Power Commission was willing to violate its own rules and to vitiate the contract already entered into by the parties.

It is entirely possible that the Federal Power Commission sought out a picayune case on which to test its strength and establish a precedent in a matter, which a less public-spirited company would not have gone to the expense of challenging.

It so happens that the Washington Water Power Co., however, felt that the case was a legal milestone and demanded an open hearing here in Washington, a hearing which could not be legally denied under our Constitution.

The Federal Power Commission order of February 15 was predicated on emergency war powers granted to the Federal Power Commission under the Federal Water Power Act in section 202 (c). In view of the fact that the F. P. C. order made no contention that there is a shortage of electrical energy or facilities, and predicated their whole case on the so-called public interest, this section of the Water Power Act is worthy of study. Here is a typical instance of administrative interpretation and a twisting of the clear intent of Congress to further ideological aims far removed from the purpose of the legislation. The section of the act to which I refer reads as follows:

(c) During the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged, or whenever the Commission determines that an emergency exists by reason of a sudden increase in the demand for electric energy, or a shortage of electric energy or of facilities for the generation or transmission of electric energy, or of fuel or water for generating facilities, or other causes, the Commission shall have authority, either upon its own motion or upon complaint, with or without notice, hearing, or report, to require by order such temporary connections of facilities and such generation, delivery, interchange, or transmission of electric energy as in its judgment will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest. If the parties affected by such order fail to agree upon the terms of any arrangement between them in carrying out such order, the Commission, after hearing held either before or after such order takes effect, may prescribe by supplemental order such terms as it finds to be just and reasonable, including the compensation or reimbursement which should be paid to or by any such party.

Meeting the emergency and serving the public interest are the declared objectives of the above statute.

In the present instance it was the uncontested contention of the company that there was no emergency, that the connections for service were already installed, that power was available by the simple manipulation of a power switch. The Federal Power Commission's justification invoking this cause, therefore rests solely upon the public interest objective.

The demand of the company for the hearing was reluctantly granted by the Commission. The reasons for this reluctance are obvious to anyone who has read the transcript of the hearing. The conduct of the chief trial examiner and the attitude of counsel for the Commission are reminiscent of the famed Nazi trials before their so-called people's court.

The hearing was begun April 5 to determine whether the Federal Power Commission had made a mistake, acted too hastily, and was guilty of official incompetence in making its order of February 15. The judge was an employee of the Federal Power Commission itself, subservient to and controlled by the very officers whose conduct he was reviewing. The defending attorney was the counsel for the Commission. Here was a case where the Federal Power Commission went to trial before itself. It was in the happy position of being its own judge and jury. Does anyone here believe that the Federal Power Commission would return a verdict of guilty against itself? The bar of public opinion, however, is another matter.

It brings to the light matters which bureaucrats would prefer to have hidden.

The trial examiner apparently was apprehensive of the possible repercussions from this case from the outset.

At the beginning, he requested interested parties to consent to a closed hearing with public and press barred. His reason was, believe it or not, that military secrecy demanded the cloak of silence on the actions of the Federal Power Commission.

Now the truth of the matter is that Grand Coulee, Bonneville Dam, and the gigantic network of Government-built transmission lines are about as much a military secret as the Washington Monument.

The plans and programs, the system of streams and their normal volume of flow are readily available in public documents printed by the United States Congress. Elaborate photographs and maps have been submitted from time to time to Congress and are public documents. If the military intelligence of Japan and Germany is so underrated by Federal bureaucracy that they presume that such information has not long since found its way into the archives of enemy espionage systems, our Federal officials are guilty of an alarming naïveté.

It appears obvious that the alleged military secrecy was a ruse to suppress the facts and to gag the press.

As such, it was a cheap and cunning connivance to take advantage of wartime conditions to suppress the facts about an ambitious and dictatorial bureaucratic usurpation of power.

As to the hearing, I shall confine my remarks to two points. The first is the obviously discriminatory nature of the order and the second concerns itself with the theories of the Federal Power Commission as to what constitutes the cheapest electric power.

While the Federal Power Commission, pursuant to the President's order, is obligated to see to it that war projects be supplied with power from the cheapest possible source, the hearing brought out that the Commission has been winking at a number of flagrant violations of this order.

For example, the Commission dismissed at the hearing as irrelevant and immaterial to the case, the facts about the Clark County, Wash., public utility district.

Here is an astounding case of a political parasite sucking at the lifeblood of our war effort with the collusive knowledge of at least three Federal bureaus: the Bonneville Administration, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Housing Administration. Inasmuch as the President's directive of October 22 is intended to prevent such abuses, the Federal Power Commission must accept full responsibility for its continuance.

Here are the facts—and they went unchallenged by the Federal Power Commission:

The Clark County Public Utility District is located at Vancouver, Wash. It is a political dummy just like dummy corporations. Its physical assets consist of a little office furniture and exactly two—I

said two—electric power meters worth not more than a few hundred dollars.

Located in Vancouver is a huge Federal Housing Administration project.

Bonneville Power Administration has run a high-tension power line along the north bank of the Columbia River from Bonneville Dam, 40 miles upstream, directly to and through the city of Vancouver where the power line crosses over to the city of Portland in Oregon. This dummy political corporation, the Clark County P. U. D., has a wholesale contract with the Bonneville Power Administration and a resale contract to the Federal Housing Administration to supply power to this F. H. A. project. It sits in between, arbitrarily, as a middleman rendering absolutely no service, and collects the difference between the wholesale and the resale price, a matter of some $50,000 annually, which is diverted into its coffers. Who gets what from this kitty might make juicy reading. Suffice it to say that the army of lobbyists representing such public-utility districts here in Washington last summer appeared to have a pecuniary interest at stake.

Nor is this a single instance. The Umatilla County Rural Electric Cooperative buys power from Bonneville at wholesale rates, provides no service, and, as a middleman, collects the difference between wholesale and resale rates in the transfer of power from Bonneville to the United States Army Ordnance Dump at Hermiston, Oreg. At the hearing the Commission dismissed this fact as irrelevant.

It seems to me that there must be at least one committee of the House with power and authority to investigate these scandals, to find out what political proteges of the New Deal are secretly hooked on to the gravy train of this totally unnecessary war expenditure.

Inasmuch as the Federal Power Commission has outstandingly failed to use the instrumentality of the President's directive except as a weapon to destroy private enterprise, it is apparent that the people must look to Congress for relief from hocus-pocus deals like the Clark County P. U. D. and the Umatilla R. E. A.

When scandals like this can come out in an open hearing, can there be any doubt as to the true motive behind the anguished efforts to gag the press by urging closed hearings on the grounds of so-called military secrecy?

I turn now to the second point to which I direct your attention in connection with the proceedings in the Federal Power Commission offices on Monday of this week.

You will recall that the February 15 order claimed no emergency as to power supply or power facilities in the invocation of Section 202 (c) and that the order is predicated specifically on the alleged "public interest" phase of the section in question. The whole basis of the order, according to the Federal Power Commission's order of February 15, is the claim that Bonneville power rates are—and I quote—"cheaper" than those of the Washington Water Power Co.

Counsel for the company presented evidence to show that 42 percent of its gross revenue from any contract from these two war projects would revert to the Federal Government as the normal corporate income surtax. He urged that in making a comparison of the sale of power by a Federal agency to another Federal agency, as against the sale of power from a private agency to a Federal agency, the factor of a return to the Federal Government in the form of taxation was a relevant and material fact in evaluating the ultimate cost to the Federal taxpayer and the Federal Treasury. The logic of such a position is inescapable. It cannot be dodged or evaded. "Cheaper" is a comparative term. Federal taxes must be taken into account if a just and fair and equitable comparison is to be made.

But listen to the Federal Power Commission through the words of its Chief Himmler as he sustains the objection by Commission counsel to the consideration of taxes as a part of costs when counsel for the company sought to introduce this evidence:

> The tax laws of the country are necessarily very complex and there might be other considerations in the tax field that ought to be taken into consideration if we are going into that matter at all.
>
> This Commission has no particular duty with respect to the levying and collection of taxes, certainly not as to the income tax. But the tax situation is very complicated. There are many kinds of taxes that all citizens and corporations necessarily have to pay in this day, and it we undertook to explore the ultimate effect of whatever we may do, within the scope of our jurisdiction, if we undertook to explore in each case the ultimate case of this action or that action upon the tax receipts of the Treasury, we would get entirely out of our own province, complicate our adjudications in an appalling and confusing sort of way, and perhaps even then fail to take into consideration all the ramifications and involvements that might adhere to the statement of a proposition as to the amount of taxes you have to pay or the amount of taxes that might be saved if a certain course were taken by this Commission in the exercise of that jurisdiction which it does possess.
>
> The presiding officer's view about that matter is that the Commission will stay within its own field and not wander out in remote and far explorations of what the consequences in the field of Government taxes may be of any action which it may take.
>
> I have no authority to speak for the Commission, but, so far as this presiding officer is concerned, he deems it proper that we stay within our own field, and only that is relevant and admissible in evidence which goes to the determination of the question which is before us, by the standards that lie within that field where we have our jurisdiction.
>
> I will give you an exception. I thought I knew your theory that you had in mind, and what you have said shows that I was correct about that. I do not say that your argument does not have some force, but I think that the best judgment about the matter—at least the best judgment that this presiding officer is competent to give in the matter—is against going into that matter which is outside of our field. We will have to take matters as they are now and make our determinations from the facts that lie within the field where Congress has delegated authority to the Commission. We can't follow it out and beyond and find out what the remote and ultimate fact may be in other respects.

Only in the obscure precincts of a Federal commission dedicated to rule by men and not by law could such a Federal officer commit such a weasel-worded evasion of inescapable truths.

In effect, this people's court trial examiner obediently followed the New Deal party line. Any jack-legged sophistry to justify New Deal objectives, whether they be right or wrong. Forty-two percent of the private enterprise contract would be returned to the Federal Treasury in taxes. But, in passing upon the question of which rate would be cheaper, tax-free Bonneville power was decided upon as the cheaper without any consideration whatever of the tax factor.

By this ruling, the Commission serves notice on private enterprise that the tax laws of the country are too complex for it to take into account in reaching a decision. It arrogantly announces that a comparison of costs can be made—that a fair and just and equitable conclusion can be reached without giving any consideration to an item representing 42 percent of the gross revenue of one of the parties before it. The private company's revenue is depleted by more than two-fifths as a result of Federal taxation, and yet this quasi judicial body refuses to permit the introduction of evidence to prove the fact. Can such conduct be conducive to a confidence on the part of our people that personal rights and private property still enjoy the protection of the law?

By this ruling, the Commission takes the position that the subject of Federal taxation—what a private company may pay to the Federal Government—is, to use the words of the Commission, outside of its field. Why, I ask, make a hollow mockery—a sham—a masquerade of a public hearing by a ruling such as this? The Commission is to hear the facts—all the relevant and material facts to an issue—and yet it rules that what becomes of 42 percent of the revenue of one of the parties to that issue is so remote that the Commission cannot follow it, I submit, this is authority running riot.

I shall not detain the House with additional pertinent points which would add even greater emphasis to the case against the Federal Power Commission.

It is sufficient to say that the Federal Power Commission, by the record of its own hearing, did three things:

First. It tried to gag the hearing;

Second. It has winked at open and scandalous violations of the President's directive of October 22; while

Third. At the same time it has persecuted a private utility in forcing it to accept a contractual violation of its written agreements with the Bonneville Administration by a double talk refusal to take cognizance of the very vital element of Federal taxation in considering the cheapness of a power rate.

If, as, and when the Federal Power Commission and other Federal agencies discover that winning the war is more important than socializing America in the guise of national defense, this administration will find the same wholehearted support for its domestic policies from the people that it has found in the people's support of its bona fide military activities.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I might very easily be able to take the time allotted to me to pay my deep and abiding respect to the very efficient and genial chairman of this subcommittee and his colleagues on that committee. My brevity at this point should not be interpreted as any lack of appreciation. I appear before you at the direction of and with the authority of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. At its direction I submitted a request for an item to permit of the substantive revision of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code, titles dealing with the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure and the Judicial Code and the Judiciary. The need for that substantive revision is conceded by the Appropriation Committee in its report. The history of the development of those two titles of our Code will also, I think, justify our coming before this committee in an effort to continue the work that the Committee on Revision of the Laws has been doing for the last several years. The first attempt to revise the statutes of this country took place in 1874, and there was no further attempt between that time and 1911, when the Judicial Code was revised by a temporary commission. The Committee on Revision of the Laws has been trying during the past 5 years conscientiously to preserve the structure of the United States Code, upon the theory that in that way, and in that way alone, will the people of this country, will the bench and the bar of this country have any way of determining the extent and scope of the acts enacted by the Congress. That committee is inadequately staffed to do the job. We must appeal to you to give us the means to discharge a responsibility that has been ours since the creation of the committee in 1864. We must begin now to carry to its ultimate conclusion the slogan which our committee has adopted for its work, namely, "Making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws." If we are permitted the opportunity to proceed with the work we started in 1939, we should be doing a service to this body and to the country that will live as long as the country lives. We are a standing committee of this House. Here is our duty. We see that duty, we recognize the need, and we ask you for your cooperation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. In a moment. There have been sporadic, temporary attempts to revise the laws of this Nation. There have been temporary commissions set up from time to time. The very bill we are considering today carries two items, one for the Office of the Legislative Counsel in the sum of $83,000 and one for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the sum of $65,000. This latter item deals with only one of 50 titles in the United States Code. Quite obviously no one committee can have a comprehensive view of the code structure itself, and unless you afford our committee an opportunity to do the work that has long been recognized by the Judiciary of this country, by the American Bar and other State bar associations, and by the Judiciary Committee of this House, you will be continually adding confusion to the present state of our laws. I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to reinstate the item that we have requested. I hope between now and then the members of this committee will be good enough to look at the hearings on this bill. I have inserted a statement setting forth in detail the scope of the work that we propose to do. This work will be the first step in the establishment of a permanent framework of legislation within and around which all new and amendatory legislation may be intelligently coordinated, integrated, and interrelated. We ask you for your serious consideration. We approach this problem very philosophically. We have been given this job to do by the House under its rules. Al we ask you for is the means to discharge that responsibility. I am confident that the committee will agree with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much disturbed by the failure of a lot of the bureaucrats to support the war effort. By the way, they are doing everything they can to waste the substance of the United States of America on frivolities and on things that should not be done.

I have previously called attention to many of the propaganda activities of the O. W. I., including the "Tarzan" life of Roosevelt. Today I am going to call attention to another one of the activities of the O. W. I. which does not even rise to the height of propaganda but sinks to the low level of the worst type of waste of public funds.

I have here a nice picture book. It is called John's Book. It has blue crayon and red crayon. Inside it says:

> This book was thought up by a boy named John. He lives right in the middle of the United States of America, on a farm where wheat grows as far as he can see. John loves all the American planes, because they are big and fast and powerful. He loves the ships of the Navy, too, big ships and little ships.

Over here are the stars that you always see on the publications that are gotten up by writers who are of a communistic trend, all ready for the red crayon to go on it.

That, Mr. Chairman, was sent to the soldier boys in Hawaii in place of mail from home. I suppose that the gang of bureaucrats who are wasting the people's money thought that the soldier boys would like "this nice picture book," of a type that might be appreciated by a 3-year-old, better than they would to get letters from home.

Now, is it not about time these bureaucrats stopped betraying the trust that has been placed in them? Is it not about time they stopped wasting the money that has been entrusted to them to spend, and use that money for the war effort and for the victory that we hope will come? Such a performance as this not only destroys confidence in the Government on the part of the soldier boys who receive such things but it is a disgrace that the Congress has appropriated funds for such wasteful and ridiculous performances. It is a waste of paper that is said to be in great need. It is a waste of crayon. It is a waste of plane space and ship space that is required to transport such things.

I hope that when we come to write appropriation bills for these bureaucrats in the days to come this House will remember how some of them have been wasting it and will cut out the money for these things so that they cannot do it any more. Let the Congress keep faith with the people, even if the bureaucrats are betraying them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do you not think they might have a kindergarten over in Hawaii?

Mr. TABER. I suppose that is the kind of people they are catering to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries about $8,450,000 for the Government Printing Office.

Some time ago, while at home, representations were made to me by members of the Boston Allied Printing Trades Council in reference to conditions connected with Government printing and the Government Printing Office, which were characterized as deplorable.

I was advised that the workers at the Government Printing Office had received no increase in wages for many years.

I was advised that these workers had been denied the right to collective bargaining under existing law.

I was advised that money appropriated for printing and binding for the Department of Justice was in fact being used under waiver to undermine labor and wage standards built up in the printing industry.

I was advised that printing let under waiver to private firms outside of the Government was being let to a favored few regardless of the ability of others to do first-class work at a real saving to the Government.

What possible justification can there be for a hypocritical policy on behalf of the Federal Government which purports to seek improved labor standards from private industry while refusing to measure up to those standards itself? What possible justification can there be for a policy by the Federal Government which denies its workers rights guaranteed by law and which discriminates against one specific group of workers?

There can be no justification.

Earlier in the week, the House passed legislation granting increases in wages

in view of the increased cost in living to almost all Government workers. Workers at the Government Printing Office were not included in this legislation.

Way back in 1924, the so-called Kiess Act, approved June 7, 1924, provided for the determination of wage rates by what amounted to collective bargaining. I am advised that while it is true that the Public Printer has held conferences with a committee representing these workers over a considerable period of time, these conferences were arbitrarily terminated by the Public Printer, all attempts of the workers to reopen the conferences or to bargain collectively having been ignored.

Some time ago I brought to the attention of the Attorney General the fact that the cost of printing for the Department of Justice was some 37 percent less than it would have been had the printing been done in the Government Printing Office, together with the protest of workers in the printing industry to the effect that the funds appropriated for printing for the Department of Justice were being used to undermine the labor and wage standards built up in the printing industry. Particular emphasis was laid on alleged deplorable conditions in connection with printing for the Department of Justice by a contractor in New York City. The facts appear to be admitted. The Attorney General simply says he can do nothing about it under existing law and that he has no suggestion to offer in the matter.

Such inquiry as I have been able to make tends to confirm the charge that printing let to private concerns under waiver has been let to a favored few concerns even though substantial savings could be realized to the Government by letting to others equipped to do a first-class job.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that the Joint Committee on Printing or some other appropriate committee of this House examine into all these and related matters in connection with Government printing and the Government Printing Office at the earliest possible moment. I urge it in the name of economy and in the name of justice to the workers at the Government Printing Office and throughout the printing industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be critical of the O. P. A. at all times, but occasionally there comes to my desk a letter from a constituent that is expressive of sentiment that I believe is to be found throughout the country and which should be called to the attention of the Congress and the country. People are looking to this Congress for some relief.

This particular situation I intend to discuss is very, very interesting to me, and I know there are a few others in this House to whom it ought to be of some interest. The O. P. A. is not only regulating almost everything under the sun that we eat and wear and use, including profits, but they have now issued an order, limitation order L-64, providing regulatory sizes for burial receptacles—for caskets. Thus, it appears that the long arm of bureaucracy is reaching out to regulate and control the grave. I read that order with some apprehension, not that it would make any difference to me after I had passed on, but because I am presently a little bit worried about my mortician and about the difficulties that may confront my family. The O. P. A. has issued an order limiting the size of caskets, the inside dimensions, to 6 feet 3 inches. Now, Mr. Chairman, I stand 6 feet 4 inches. I know a few others here who stand more than that. I do not know what they propose to do to my remains in order to get me into one of these O. P. A. coffins. I suppose they will have to cut off my feet. That is the only way I can figure it out. Is that not a bright future that we overlength fellows face?

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Perhaps it is part of that program, "from the cradle to the grave."

Mr. KEEFE. Well, it no doubt is. They may be determined to even cut down the size of cradles—at this time, however, I am thinking of some other Members of this House I happen to know, some of large girth, some of great height, who should also view this recent order with alarm.

Think of the other dimensions and then look over some of your friends. The inside dimensions under this order are 22 inches in width, 17 in height, and 6 feet 3 inches in length. Now, I know a considerable number of people in this House, as well as many around the country, who are oversize, and I am wondering just how they are going to push them into that kind of casket. I wonder how they are going to get the lid closed if they do succeed in squeezing them in there. I am looking at one Member right now. They could get him in for length but I do not know how they are going to take care of the width. They might be able to squeeze him in, but if they squeeze him in one way the lid would pop off the other. And here we have a bunch of O. P. A. people issuing such a regulatory order under the guise and theory that they are going to save lumber—going to save lumber by cutting down the size of burial receptacles. Oh, yes! Now, to be perfectly fair to them, permit me to say that the order does allow the casket manufacturers to make 10 percent of their products in larger sizes in any one calendar quarter. Suppose, however, that I happened to die toward the end of the quarter when the large-sized caskets had all been used up; they would have to preserve me some way and keep my remains until the next quarter. Of course, they could get me in a casket by cutting my feet off, perhaps.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana. I will say to the gentleman that he was on my mind.

Mr. LUDLOW. I just wanted to say I am 6 feet 3. I wonder where I come in under this.

Mr. KEEFE. When I came across this order, having great solicitude for the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, I am frank to say I was very much worried.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. This may seem a little facetious and funny, and it would be if it were not so serious. I wonder if these fellows down at the O. P. A. understand that trees grow and that loggers go out and cut trees down and that millers saw them up into lumber and that the lumber goes to these concerns, and that then they cut that lumber to size to make caskets. They may have a little clipping off the end that may be 3 or 4 inches long, but what difference does it make, it just goes into the scrap or into the fires and is burned in these mills. They are not saving anything; they are not saving a thing.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I believe the O. P. A. is going to dehydrate the 6-footers.

Mr. KEEFE. They may dehydrate us but that will not have very much to do with length, and it is the length I am worried about. I may be perfectly dehydrated and they may be able to get me insofar as width is concerned, but I am worried about that length. That, however, does not seem to be a thing they are worried about; they think they may save a little lumber and thus upset and disturb the casket industry but add further torments to the people of the Nation. I think it is one of the most ridiculous and ill-advised orders ever to be issued by this bureau.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Some one over the radio last Sunday night made the observation or the suggestion that they change the name of the O. P. A. to "O Pee-U."

Mr. KEEFE. May I just read a couple of paragraphs from a letter received this morning from one of the finest, most progressive, and liberal-minded manufacturers in my district? He says:

> Wage-and-hour laws, labor-relations laws, social-security laws, confiscatory-tax laws, and the matter of completing myriads of governmental forms, reports and requisitions—many of them duplications during a time when office and clerical help cannot be secured—are all things a conservative American in business can stomach. The latest however, causes me to spout. War Production Board Order L-64 dated March 3, 1943, is an example of substituting totalitarian methods instead of American methods. Order L-64 is a new method of providing a regulatory size of burial receptacles without taking into consideration the size of the human body, both male and female, and the geographical, physical, and climatic conditions which control their size. Casket sizes are reduced by this order from practical di-

mensions to impractical dimensions. Regulations regarding extra or larger sizes are injected which are nonsensical. Provisions are made that 10 percent of our product may be made in larger sizes in any one calendar year quarter. If that 10 percent limitation were reached at the end of February, any full-sized adult dying in March would have to wait until April for a casket. Under this order, you and some of the members of your family, as I remember them, would require extra size caskets, the regulated inside dimensions being limited by this order to 22 inches in width, 17 inches in height, and 6 feet 3 inches in length.

Reducing casket sizes will not contribute in any way toward winning an unwelcome war. Saw mills cut lumber according to the length of the logs, the result of the natural growth of trees. We buy the lumber the saw mills cut and recut it to the size for our product. If the cuttings are one, two, or three inches smaller, no saving of lumber is entailed; instead we have one, two, or three inches more to burn in our boilers.

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do about this situation? The gentleman from New York has just told you. I have stated it repeatedly on the floor of this House: We must as a Congress do something about it besides just talking, and finding fault. I believe the distinguished gentleman from New York has again properly sounded the alarm. He is a member of the deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He again says that we must see to it that the people's money is not appropriated and spent for the carrying out of such orders as this. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with this sentiment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I had on my mind using a little more time, but I will use this 5 minutes to bring to your attention something that has not been talked about.

I understand the Military Government School at Charlottesville was set up by Executive order, and supervised by a board appointed by the President. It has come to my attention, as I indicated this morning, that the President's son-in-law was given a captaincy and sent down there to be trained for the overseas service, which he indicates he wants to go to hurriedly, trained to rule over conquered countries. That is the purpose of the school. It is all alarm to me. Possibly it is all right, maybe in matters of foreign affairs, that the Committee on Military Affairs can work this out, and perhaps the rest of us are all too stupid to question some of these things, but it all dovetails into the recent effort to make a brigadier general out of our former colleague from New York, Mr. LaGuardia, and send him overseas to rule conquered countries in some way.

It is all kind of funny. Here is a school down there created by Executive order, to train men to rule conquered countries. The son-in-law goes down there as a captain. In 3 months he will be a lieutenant colonel and he will be going overseas. That is very personal. LaGuardia was very personal.

It worries me that anyone thought of all of this so far ahead, in our fight for defense.

You will forgive me if I make a reference to something that was terrible. Admiral Kimmel was advanced over 49 line officers to the top command in the Pacific in January, 1941. It is terrible to think of it. But that is the personal government. Whose representatives are they going to be? Are they going to be the representatives of the United States, or are they going to be the representatives of the President of the United States, from in the family, or from the inner circle, like the mayor of New York has been all along? Those things alarm me, and that is what I wanted to say in this short time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope that the gentleman is not reflecting on the patriotism of Mr. John Boettiger in getting into the United States Army?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I do not reflect on him at all, not a bit more than I did the four boys when I talked about their preferential treatment. God knows they did not give it to themselves, and John Boettiger did not give it to himself. He did not get his captaincy from private life himself. A lot of men have misunderstood me when I talked about preferential treatment. It is not the boys themselves or the son-in-law that gives it. Somebody gives it to them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman does not think for one moment that a man of the stature of John Boettiger, leaving the position he left and having the place in the public mind that he did and in private life in my city, is getting much more than is due him when he is given a captaincy in the Army? I can take the gentleman down to the Pentagon Building and show him clerks in the Department with lieutenant colonel insignia on their shoulders.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. How many of your constituents have they made captains? Every captain should have been a lieutenant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All kinds of them, and many of them with nowhere the ability of John Boettiger.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And that is the thing that is helping to ruin the military service and the public morale. There are hundreds of Regular Army career officers, with medals awarded to some, with from 10 to 30 years' service, under 60 years old and physically fit, drawing 75 percent of their pay and not even permitted to serve, through some unexplainable policy of the War Department, yet captains are continued to be made from private life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I want to use this time to commend the members in the majority of the subcommittee as well as my colleagues in the minority for the splendid fashion in which this committee has conducted its hearings and for the splendid progress which they have made in reducing the appropriation of over a year ago.

We have succeeded in reducing the appropriation more than $3,000,000 under that of a year ago and we have succeeded in reducing the appropriation below the so-called Budget estimate by over $1,000,000. The subcommittee unfortunately did not have the services of the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. LANE POWERS, at this particular time because of his arduous duties as a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee investigating the Dies committee charges.

I want to particularly compliment the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. NOBLE JOHNSON, who served as our ranking member for the minority and the distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. EMMET O'NEAL, who led the committee in its expeditious work.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, clerical assistance to Senators, $1,156,800.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since we are considering the legislative appropriation bill, I wish to bring up a matter that I believe is vital to Congress.

Within a short time the representatives of more than 30 nations will meet here in Washington to consider an international monetary proposal. I happen to be on the Committee on Coinage, where we have something to say about $22,600,000,000 worth of United States gold. A few days ago our committee and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Banking and Currency met with Secretary Morgenthau, at which time he outlined the American plan for setting up an international bank. Mr. Morgenthau said it was his desire that Congress should pass upon this question. He felt that it was necessary to have additional legislative authority. He very frankly told us that he wanted to keep Congress informed as to what was being done.

There is a difference of viewpoint among financial experts in the world on the international monetary problem. It appears that certain countries want to get control over this new financial group, and we have our ideas here in the United States as to who should have

control. In view of the fact that Congress will be called upon to approve legislation to perfect this organization, or to consider the matter, it seems to me it would be highly advisable for the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee of at least 10 or 12 members from the committees which I have named so that this congressional committee could sit in on all monetary conferences that are held when the experts meet in Washington. I believe we are entitled to have the benefit of all discussions taking place within the group, and I therefore expect to offer a resolution within the course of the next day or two calling for the appointment of a House committee to sit in on the conference.

One of the main reasons why I think we should have full and complete information is that the United States will be called upon to make the largest contribution to the proposed international financial organization. We are dealing with the people's money, and as their Representatives it is our duty to see that the money is properly safeguarded in every respect. We shall not be able to legislate intelligently unless we have all the facts before us. That is why I feel we should have a group from Congress sitting in on the international conference, not necessarily to take part in the deliberations, but to get the viewpoint and knowledge of secret agreements that are often made in such conferences.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman agree with me in the thought that there must necessarily follow the legislation which covers the stabilization agreement providing for the stabilization of foreign currency; additional legislation providing for the creation of what we might term a Western Hemisphere bank or an all-over international bank with branches for the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia, so that that bank may proceed to furnish the necessary credit to maintain the internal economy of the respective countries, and through the maintenance of that internal economy prevent the breaking down of the currency stabilization plan attempted to be carried on by the stabilization fund?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman. If we are to pursue the course outlined in the Atlantic Charter, in the "four freedoms" arrangement, in the master lend-lease agreement, and are called upon to do the principal part of the financing for rehabilitation of the world, I think we should be fully informed on all matters relating to the understanding between the leaders of the different participating nations. We should not act without such information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time chiefly to say that I agree very heartily with what the gentleman from Minnesota has said. We had an opportunity to hear Mr. Morgenthau. What I expect to say will have reference to his public statement given to the press subsequently.

It will be recalled that the Secretary of the Treasury in discussing his plan mentioned that no nation would have a vote greater than 25 percent, but that the United States would be expected to contribute to the total fund for stabilization purposes a figure which will be 40 or 50 percent of the total amount required for that purpose.

We are going to put in most of the gold. We are going to stabilize the business dealings of the world after the war, if we can. I think some sort of stabilization is necessary. I am glad it is brought forward at this time. I think we ought to support it as far as we can. But I think that one thing this House ought to bear particularly in mind, and one thing we ought to follow most closely is that provision that 80 percent of the total voting power of the member nations will be necessary in order to adopt certain features of the plan, or to make certain undisclosed changes in it. We are not told as yet to what features the veto power refers. I think what the gentleman from Minnesota has said is very cogent and quite pertinent, because we need some committee from this House for the purpose of determining that the United States shall have a veto power wherever necessary to protect its contribution and its gold which will be required if this stabilization fund is going to work.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think it would be out of order for a committee from Congress to ask to sit in on these conferences?

Mr. SCOTT. In my opinion, it would not. I think such a committee ought to be given an opportunity to sit in. We ought not merely to be invited to send an observer, a single person. I think such a committee is most important and most desirable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman if his mind is running along with mine in this respect? If I understand the general approach, this is for the purpose of stabilizing international currency in order to facilitate the transfer of goods between the nationals of the countries involved.

Mr. SCOTT. So that the nations of the world may be able to do business according to some well-recognized rules after the war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That has to do with the stabilizing of international currencies for international trading purposes.

This is what I want to ask the gentleman. Has the gentleman had time to think through this proposition sufficiently to reach a conclusion in his own mind as to whether or not such a stabilizing plan can be made effective if any country involved fails to stabilize its own currency internally? Do I make myself clear?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the gentleman does. I would not undertake to be an expert or to answer that question upon any such assumption, but I can say that is one of the very reasons why such a committee should be formed from the Congress to sit in on these conferences. I make the further observation there that if any nation through internal revolution should depreciate its own currency, the fat would be in the fire.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that factor lends the greatest support to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Minnesota have recommended in connection with a committee from this body.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Some of the international banking plans proposed contemplate that this international banking group shall have the power to devalue the money in any country. The gentleman may read such power into the plan proposed by Secretary Morgenthau.

Mr. SCOTT. I prefer that this country shall have control of the value of its own currency, and that that veto power shall be very clear.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We could not very well surrender power over our own money to some international group without first having the Constitution amended?

Mr. SCOTT. No. The founding fathers provided wisely in putting control over the Nation's currency in the hands of the people's representatives, and we could not give that power away, even if we would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Revision of laws: For preparation and editing of the laws as authorized by the Act approved May 29, 1928 (1 U. S. C. 59), $8,000, to be expended under the direction of the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Because in a short time we are going to vote on this bill (H. R. 2409), which provides expenses for the payment of our salaries, I think it might be well to bring to the attention of the House a bill that has been introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Representative SUMNERS, H. R. 1198, which would move up the day of general election 1 month. I wish to have you consider this bill because the newspapers are carrying stories about an abbreviated campaign as one of numerous news stories in connection with the coming election. By the time of the election we will have more than eleven or twelve million men in uniform, spread all over the world, and it will be necessary to make some provision to give those men an opportunity to be heard in the coming elections. Such a provision would be the advancing of the date of election. We all know that the brevity of the campaign has nothing to do with the time necessary to count the votes. Unless we abbreviate the campaign, I am afraid that we will be disfranchising several millions of men. Certainly if there

ever was a time in the history of this country when all of us, and especially men in uniform, should submit ourselves to the electorate, this is the time. We have passed the legislation that put them there. We ought to give them an opportunity to express their views as to candidates for public office, and unless we make this provision I am afraid that unintentionally we will be shutting out the voices of 11,000,000 men, vital voices who have an active interest in what this Government is going to do, especially in view of post-war planning, that vital planning that contemplates a security for mankind from the cradle to the grave. I believe that we ought to give serious thought to this bill, and if we do I am sure we will join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] in bringing about its passage.

I have talked with a great many men in the armed forces. During the past election I talked with many men and women who did not have the opportunity to vote. I am convinced that we will have stained the record if we come to find some congressional district having as few as 50,000 or 60,000 votes cast, at a time when many thousands of men from that same district are in uniform. These men of the United States armed forces are not getting a proper chance. They represent a substantial force of our adult population; they are very important men and women in this country, and we should do everything in our power to extend to them the privilege of suffrage, which belongs to them. Remember, this is nothing that we are giving to them. We should assure them a right and opportunity to vote at the coming election. I am not talking about the candidates one side or the other. Those issues will settle down and be voted upon by the people, but I think it is up to us to adjust the election machinery so that the men in our armed forces will have a chance to vote.

While we are voting salaries for ourselves, we might as well prepare ourselves for a complete examination at the hands of the voters. Some of us may find that after the next election we will be returned to private life, but be that as it may, let us be men enough to take this step today, to bring about suffrage for every single man and woman in uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Revision of laws: For preparation and editing of the laws as authorized by the act approved May 29, 1928 (1 U. S. C. 59), $8,000, to be expended under the direction of the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEOGH: On page 26, after line 17, insert:

"Revision of the laws: For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code, including the correction of errors as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1541), fiscal year 1944, $100,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Revision of the Laws."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to carry into effect the unanimous action of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, about which I spoke during the course of the general debate. The primary purpose of this immediate request is to permit of the substantive revision and recodification of titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code, comprising those titles of the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure and the Judicial Code, and the Judiciary. I should like to point out that the last time the Judicial Code of this country was revised was in 1911, and it was done under the direction of a temporary commission, at a cost of approximately $230,000. That temporary commission ceased to function upon the completion of its work, and since then there has been no attempt to correlate any subsequent acts of this Congress nor any of the decisions of the courts affecting existing law. The Rules of Civil Procedure, which were promulgated under the direction of a committee appointed by the Supreme Court, cost approximately $135,000. The Rules of Criminal Procedure, which are presently being prepared, will cost approximately $80,000 on completion. Your standing Committee on Revision of the Laws is asking you now to give to it the means whereby it may properly discharge the responsibility that is this House's and the Congress'; a responsibility running to the country and to the bench and bar generally. We are ready to do the work, we are prepared to do it, and come to you experienced in this particular work. In 1940 we supervised the preparation of the edition of the District of Columbia Code and of the United States Code.

The District of Columbia Code was prepared for the first time in the history of this country as a completely annotated edition of the code. Your committee did that work at a cost of only $32,500. Unless this legislative body begins now to integrate the work of all standing committees in a manner that the people of this country may more easily and more quickly know the purport and extent and scope of our laws, we will simply be adding continually to the confusion that now exists. We are ready to do the job and we hope for and ask for your support in performing that very necessary task, a task that has been recognized as most necessary by all leading jurists, by the outstanding bar associations of this country, and by the American Bar Association as well. By vesting in us the authority to do this work you will be giving to the preparation of your laws continuing control, not with respect to the substance but rather with respect to the form. We shall not invade the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House, but we will simply make more understandable the laws that are enacted. We say to you in all seriousness that making these laws understandable is just as important as making the laws themselves.

I ask and I certainly hope that this amendment will prevail. The Appropriations Committee has recognized the need for this work in its report. I ask you if you will be good enough to refer to the report on this bill as well as the hearings. I am sure you will be able to convince yourself that this job must be done and must be done now. Our committee can and will do it for you in the manner in which I know you want it done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON How much is the gentleman asking for?

Mr. KEOGH The hearings support a request for $110,000. My amendment calls for $100,000, of which approximately $85,000, it is estimated, will go for the bulk of the editorial work that is necessary. The remainder will be reserved for the necessary supervision by our committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman tell the committee whether or not he has an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on this item?

Mr. KEOGH. Being an item in the legislative appropriation bill, the gentleman from Missouri knows better than I do that the Bureau of the Budget makes no recommendation with respect to any such items.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Bureau of the Budget makes a recommendation when asked to do so.

Mr. KEOGH. We have complied with the regular procedure, but the gentleman knows that the Bureau of the Budget makes no comment with respect to the legislative establishment nor to appropriations therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is my purpose to explain the action of the committee. Frankly, although I am going to vote against the amendment, I would like to submit to this House whether or not they want to engage in this work.

The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, is a highly respected Member of this House. He is extremely interested in the work of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. He made an excellent presentation of his cause to our committee. The committee recognized that it was probably, some day, a worthwhile job to be done, and possibly it is needed right now, but the committee did not take action on it, first, because when the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] was proposed it was subject to a point of order, in the opinion of the committee. It has been changed in such manner now that it is probably not subject to a point of order. The committee questioned whether or not even such an important work as this might not better be deferred until a little later, possibly until the war emergency is over. Rightly or wrongly, the committee questioned whether directives and practices on the part of various executive agencies, affecting the law

during the period of the emergency, would change the legal situation in many places. Certainly, as I say, they were much influenced by what the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has said.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. I should like to remind the gentleman of a fact which I am sure he knows, that all this temporary legislation which we are now passing to meet the present emergency, being temporary legislation, is not a part of the code and, therefore, would not affect the objectives of our committee.

Mr. O'NEAL. It seemed to the committee that directives that affect the law during this period might have some place in some new preparation of codified law, showing that it does not have any particular importance or bearing upon the permanent legal situation.

The committee heard the gentleman. They recognized the need for the work. They did not want to spend $100,000 or $110,000 for it. They questioned the desirability of hiring some private concern to do it, where later, by publishing an annotated code, they might get the benefit of it, but recognized that the job should some day be done. Knowing the ability and the competency and the integrity of the Committee on Revision of Laws, the committee decided to submit it to you whether or not you wanted to authorize this additional expenditure of $100,000 at this time. Therefore we submitted it in this way.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am a member of that subcommittee. As I recall, we did not vote on this matter in the subcommittee, or we did not turn it down on the merits of the cause, but at the time, as I recall, we discussed the question as to whether it was authorized by law. At that time we did not feel it was authorized by law, but since the amendment has been drawn differently I believe the chairman will agree with me, we felt it was in order. I just wanted to make it clear that the committee did not vote on the merits of the amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. The committee did discuss the various phases of it, both as to whether or not it was admissible, and other matters.

We bring it to you. We are not willing, as a committee, to put it in this bill. I think perhaps the committee members will vote against it, but we believe the work is highly important. It cost $100,000, and we wanted this Committee of the Whole to decide whether or not we would go ahead with this expenditure at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure the gentleman is not unmindful of the fact that yesterday this House voted to spend four and one-half million dollars on South America, which I think is very worthy.

An amendment was adopted in the Committee of the Whole reducing it a million and a half, but when we went back in the House the million and a half was reinstated. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that work of this sort right at home for this small amount of money may certainly be as important as the million and a half that we added on yesterday?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Kentucky thinks we ought to save wherever we can save.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully point out to the House as a sample of the type of work this splendid committee on the revision of the laws performs, the codification of the laws of the District of Columbia. All of the Members have probably seen this work and I trust they have all examined it. If they have I am sure they will agree with me that no finer or more thorough job of the sort has ever been done.

Now as to the amount of $100,000, while we are always guilty of plugging up these little leaks around the spigot, I suggest that we could find $100,000 very quickly by dispensing with the services of say 20 of these $5,000 a year members of the bar of which there are so many in the employ of the Government today. You will note that I described them as "members of the bar" because I would not dignify them by calling them lawyers.

This work must be done at some time. Not since 1911 have these titles of the codes been revised or properly codified. I know of nothing more unsatisfactory than to look at the code and thereafter wonder whether or not the law one read was the law of the land at the time one looked at it.

By adopting this amendment you will be rendering a great service, not only to Members of Congress but to the judiciary and the lawyers throughout the Nation who are certainly entitled to know what the last pronouncement is.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that, as a lawyer, I am in complete accord with the statements he has made and with the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. I believe this amendment should pass, and I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that it will meet a long-felt need and what has become an absolute necessity for the legal profession of this country and the judiciary.

Mr. WALTER. After all, the lawbooks are a lawyer's tools, and today our tools are very rusty and in many instances have broken handles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter was most ably presented to the committee by the gentleman from New York and the committee gave it serious thought and I will say serious discussion. I believe we can agree there is some need for work of this kind. I believe, however, that it should not be undertaken at this time for several reasons. One of them is that all the money we have in this country that is available ought to be expended upon the war effort and not for work of this kind that we have been getting along without, and can continue to get along without. In the second place, we are ruled today largely by rules and regulations issued by the departments and by Presidential directives, and I want to know how in the world anybody who is attempting to recodify laws can keep their work up and checked so as to be on time with the various changes in the rules, regulations, and Presidential directives, and what would this work be worth after the war is over, which we hope will not be long, after these temporary laws, these rules, these regulations, and these directives have been set aside, are no longer enforced, and Congress begins to legislate and we go back to a government of laws instead of a government of men and rules? I think the work ought to be undertaken when this emergency is over—when the job can be done right.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that rules, regulations, and directives, never find their place in a code of law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If they do not they will be of no value because of the fact that the rules, regulations, and Presidential directives are taking precedence and are largely governing the people today. That is the reason why we should wait for the appropriate time to do this work.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Am I in error or am I correct in the idea that in the full committee the statement was made there was no prejudice against this on the part of the committee but they thought they would let the House decide the matter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If there was any such understanding I do not know.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not mean understanding; I said those words were used when this matter was taken up. That is my recollection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I do not know. I do not remember any such words. It was brought up and we did not put it in the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The chairman of the subcommittee made that expression, as I remember it, in the committee and he just made it again on the floor of the House. There was no such position taken either by the whole Committee on Appropriations or the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is my understanding.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Should there not be some possible comfort for the lawyers in having it remain a confused code because so often certainly they are able to better protect their clients by confusion? That seems to be very often their best weapon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Perhaps that is the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the balance to be divided between the three gentlemen standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] has been seeking recognition for 5 minutes before this request was made, and the gentleman from Minnesota has been substituted. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] is entitled to 5 minutes as well as the Member of the legislative committee who favors this amendment on the minority side.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. KUNKEL. Three minutes is all I need.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I give a little illustration of a happening in the full Committee on Appropriations the other day to illustrate my viewpoint as to why we should not, with all deference to the gentleman from New York, accept his amendment? We are in a war for survival. It is needless for me to tell you that. You all know it. Is this spending of $100,000 at this time essential to our war effort? I say, "No."

I am not attempting to tell the profound legal fraternity of this House whether or not this recodification is necessary. I am inclined to agree with the learned lawyers who support this amendment that this work will be necessary to perform. But is it necessary today? Is it vital enough now to use manpower so badly needed elsewhere? Mr. Chairman, this work and expenditure of $100,000, I feel can help to fill up the reservoir of jobs we must provide for our returning soldiers after this most horrible of all wars is over. Also, the woods will be full of members of the legal profession seeking new positions after having been turned loose from the soft berths in governmental agencies. Let us keep jobs such as this as a cushion for unemployment, following the war.

Just the other day in our Committee on Appropriations there came before us an amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] seeking to reprint 400 1942 yearbooks for distribution by each Member of the House. As a farmer I would very much like to have 400 new yearbooks, and by the way, the 1942 yearbook is a very superior work, but I took the same position that day as today and voted against and helped to defeat that amendment in committee. Those yearbooks are not necessary today. They are not essential to the winning of this war. Those yearbooks represented to me a bomber which we could better send across the seas. They represented to me something just like this proposed recodification. We would like to have them, but now is neither the time nor the place for such expenditure of our taxpayers' money. The cost of printing and labor has skyrocketed. Newsprint is hard to obtain. To me, every man employed on any such project represents one less who should and could be on a farm helping to produce the food so much needed today.

Our subcommittee has worked long tedious hours so as to cut this bill down $3,000,000 below the last year's appropriation. Will you not aid us in preserving these savings and stand up and vote down the pending amendment, which seeks to add $100,000 to the total of the bill? One hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money back in Minnesota. Here, dealing in billions, we are apt to lose our perspective.

I again repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment has much merit but it cannot pass the acid test which should be applied to all appropriation bills in this dark hour of war: Is it necessary and will it help toward achieving victory?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, this proposition admittedly has been very necessary for the country for years and years and years. There has not been any codification made since 1911, as the distinguished gentleman from New York will confirm.

Mr. KEOGH. That is correct.

Mr. KUNKEL. During that whole period it has been generally admitted by members of the bar and everybody else who has studied the subject that it is essential that this be done. It has been postponed and postponed and postponed. If we are ever going to start, we should start right now.

We are starting in a very modest manner under this proposal. We are only trying to codify two of the codes, the one on the Judiciary and the Criminal Code. If those two codifications work out satisfactorily, as the members of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws feel sure they will, then, of course, the Congress can decide whether it wishes the other codifications made.

I also want to stress very strongly that the Committee on Revision of Laws, as I get the history of it, has favored this for many years back. At this particular time it is the unanimous opinion of both the majority and the minority members of that committee that the work should be started and undertaken at once. I feel that this is a job, if we want to start upon it, which will result in performing a service that will last for generations and ages. Of course, future revisions will have to be made, but we will have laid the groundwork for something that will be of permanent and lasting value to this Nation for all time to come.

With that in mind I urge the members of this committee to follow the counsel and advice of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and vote for this minor appropriation of $100,000 so that the work can be started and undertaken immediately.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that most lawyers now use the United States Code annotated rather than the Government code?

Mr. KUNKEL. Yes; but that is relatively imperfect.

Mr. KEOGH. Does not the gentleman realize that the body of any code must conform with and follow the body of the official United States Code?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is true, but the U. S. C. A. has a very good, complete index.

Mr. KEOGH. The Official United States Code has precisely the same index.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in listening to the splendid addresses delivered by several of the distinguished Members of this House, all of whom are lawyers. The thing that flashed through my mind, although the amount involved in this amendment is rather small, was whether or not this might have something to do with inflation. If you even mention the word "farmer" on the floor of this House, you hear over the radio and see in the press, especially the large commercial papers of the country, "Oh, that will bring about inflation. You are destroying the consumers of the country." But when you get an item up here, small or large, in which these distinguished lawyers are interested, and they constitute a great majority of the Members of the House, it does not make any difference about how many billions we have to spend to win this war, it does not mean anything about bringing about inflation.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, there are many things that should have been done in the past and that we should do in the future. There is many a program we have had in the past because of the serious situation of the country, involving unemployment, and the condition of the farmers, who have not had during the past year a square deal because they are not organized and are helpless in having to accept whatever they are offered for their products and on the other hand have to pay monopolistic fixed prices for practically everything they buy. I warn that we had better cut out some of these programs and some of these appropriations and put your minds on the winning

of this war, the greatest struggle ever in the history of this country. If not, we may regret spending money when that spending can be delayed to some other time, perhaps after this war when, no doubt, we will be called upon to spend millions to give employment to millions of unemployed people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, if we still have a democracy, then let us reason rationally together. This amendment does not affect the legal profession. It affects 130,000,000 men, women, and children. It saves millions of dollars and useless appeals not only to the circuit court of appeals but even to the Supreme Court of the United States because lawyers are not able to find the law as they would be able to, if the laws were properly revised and codified.

I speak with some authority on this matter because I have had some experience. I took a vacation for 2 years and I tried some cases. I know that both the legal profession and the judiciary half of the time cannot find the law under which a case is being brought or tried because they do not have time to go through the various parts of the Code, in which you find the laws scattered all over, not codified but arranged in an imperfect and illogical condition.

Therefore, let us not talk about inflation. I shall join my friend from South Carolina some day on that subject. He is absolutely right. We talk about everything else but the subject under discussion. We have here an amendment dealing with $100,000. Why worry, $1,000,000,000 is only a molehill to us. It is about time that we do something constructive, and this is one of the constructive measures. After that we will go one step further and do something constructive for agriculture and give it 100 percent parity. Then we will be doing what we ought to do.

Something was said about rules and directives. Rules and directives are based upon the laws we pass. If we have been silly enough and foolish enough to pass these laws under which the rules and directives are made, do not take it out on the people who are trying to get justice in the courts. That was not their mistake, it was our mistake. Again, I shall help you to correct those mistakes if you will get busy and do it.

The revision of our laws will also help the farmers. Most of the litigation in which I took part during the last 2 years related to farmers in distress, farmers whom the Government forgot. They took their property without consulting them and then demanded that they take what the Government offered them or take nothing.

It is about time that the courts have an opportunity to know where to find the law and how to find it and what the law is, which they cannot do when they have to search all through the code for it.

In conclusion, I say let us reason together. This is not a party issue, this is an American issue. Every lawyer on that committee, Republican and Democrat, saw the need for this revision. The excuse originally given by the committee that we did not have authority is wrong. Anyway, it has been amended so that there is no room for objection. I congratulate the able members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on leaving this an open question so that the House can decide for itself what it wants and what it does not want.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman was speaking about $1,000,000,000 meaning nothing, and saying that we should not have any concern about that. I think it is about time we begin to think about these $100,000 items if we are going to keep this Nation of ours from going bankrupt.

Mr. LEMKE. It is about time you think more about the billions you are and have been giving to foreign countries, and be more willing to protect the American people in their property, in their lives, and in their liberty, especially if it takes only a measly little $100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Without objection, the Clerk will again read the Keogh amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Keogh amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 103, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries of clerks of courts: For salaries of clerks of United States circuit courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, $2,542,900: *Provided*, That the positions of deputy clerk of the United States district court at Springfield, Mass.; Cumberland, Md.; Statesville, N. C.; Big Stone Gap, Va.; Charlottesville, Va.; Key West, Fla.; Victoria, Tex.; Del Rio, Tex.; La Crosse, Wis.; Batesville, Ark.; Harrison, Ark.; Creston, Iowa; Ottumwa, Iowa; Chadron, Nebr.; Grand Island, Nebr.; Hastings, Nebr.; McCook, Nebr.; Norfolk, Nebr.; Minot, N. Dak.; Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Jamestown, N. Dak.; Moscow, Idaho; Bellingham, Wash.; and Pueblo, Colo., are hereby abolished and such provisions of law as require offices of clerks of courts to be maintained at such places are hereby repealed, but this proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent the detail during sessions of court of such employees as may be necessary from other offices to the offices named herein.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to call attention of the Committee to page 55 of the bill. This is the item which in general debate was discussed, relative to the abolition of certain positions in the Federal judiciary system. The testimony before our committee was to the effect that practically no business was being done where clerks were hired at certain places and where offices were maintained. That was the position, not voluntarily given, but after the committee questioned the administrative officer of the court. He stated there was practically no business being done there, and we could see no reason in the world why we should not abolish clerkships where there was no business being done. If gentlemen will turn to pages 29 and 30 of the hearings, they will find the testimony about this matter.

The paragraph beginning on line 17, page 55, is a provision that is clearly authorized by the Holman rule, and I think we can sustain it against any point of order. As to the positions beginning on line 12, page 56, the paragraph beginning with the words "The provisions of law" the testimony was that these offices are not needed yet could be filled. We put this provision in which we think is subject to the point of order. I am moving to strike out the last word at this time to announce that when we reach the paragraph beginning on line 12, page 56, I shall ask unanimous consent to strike that provision from the bill, and then I shall offer an amendment which is clearly within the Holman rule, which merely provides that no money appropriated in this bill shall be used for the purpose of maintaining those offices. As I stated, they are not being maintained now. There is nothing to be gained by letting them go on. We think it would be well to strike that out, and in offering this unanimous consent request, we remove language which could have been ruled out on a point of order. Therefore, I ask permission to strike from the bill the paragraph on page 56 beginning on line 12 and ending on line 25.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I think that the gentleman cannot make that request until the paragraph has been read, and I was listening very intently to the Clerk and I do not think it has yet been read.

Mr. O'NEAL. Then I announce to the committee that at the right time I shall ask unanimous consent to strike from the bill the paragraph beginning on page 56, line 12, and ending on line 25. If that consent is given, then I shall offer an amendment which will accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. That is the section to which we had the colloquy on the floor?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct, but I say to the gentleman that we had a colloquy with reference to two sections. I misunderstood the gentleman. I thought he referred to the section preceding this, but he was referring to the section now under discussion.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. To what point has the Clerk read?

The CHAIRMAN. Down to line 11, on page 56.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the material contained in line 20, page 55, down to the end of the paragraph on page 56, line 11, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there was no reservation made when this bill was introduced with reference to points of order, and the RECORD will bear me out. Therefore a point of order against anything in the bill now is not in order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure the Chair well knows, there is no rule of the House requiring reservation of all points of order before the House goes into Committee of the Whole for the consideration on any bill. In fact, possibly as far back as 1882 a custom was established—a sort of textbook custom, a precedent custom, not supported by a rule—whereby the Committee on Appropriations reserves points of order against appropriation bills before the House goes into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill. That was the custom when I came here, and that has been followed down through the years. Once in a great while the custom is not observed. I have in mind one occasion where I know personally the custom was not followed for a purpose, because there was in the bill matter which was subject to a point of order, which fact was known to the Committee on Appropriations; but the average Member of the House, paying no attention to the reserving of points of order, did not take advantage, and, as a result, when the improper part of the bill was reached, as is the case today, the point was raised that because that same custom—not a rule—was not followed, the person making the point of order was precluded from making it. That is where we are today. I am not saying today that there was any trickery, but I am saying that in the other case there was. I am not saying that there was any intention to force anything through here by means of a technicality, but I am saying that the result is the same. I am saying that the Chair may rule, of course, following the precedents to which I have referred, points raised on several occasions, but a long time ago those original precedents were established when the conditions in the House were entirely different from what they are today. In those days the Legislative Committee on Rivers and Harbors appropriated for rivers and harbors.

The Military Affairs Committee appropriated for military necessities, the Naval Affairs Committee appropriated for naval affairs, and so on down through. In other words, there was little distinction between the legislative committee and the appropriating committee, because the legislative committee in those instances performed both functions.

When the Budget system was set up in 1921, I think it was, the entire situation was changed, and the appropriating power was all lodged in one great supercommittee. The membership of that committee was increased to 35, and the committee was divided into subcommittees. So that today, for instance, we have the Military Affairs Committee passing on military appropriations. Then we have the check of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Military Affairs determining whether it is advisable to spend the money and to do the things authorized. If the Appropriations Committee is permitted to become a supercommittee and by technicalities usurp the powers of the legislative committees, the time is not far distant when there will be no need for the legislative committees.

Now, let us take the question involved here. A couple of years ago the House Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill setting up and establishing a new agency, another bureau in the Government. It was for the administration of justice.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman, in charging this against the Appropriations Committee, be kind enough to state what the Holman rule is?

Mr. MICHENER. I am not discussing the Holman rule at all. That is an entirely different question and I am sure the presiding Chairman appreciates the fact. I am discussing the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

To resume where I left off, the Committee on the Judiciary brought in a bill setting up another agency, another bureau, the purpose of which bureau is to supervise the general conduct of the judiciary of the United States. They were given specific duties and powers. Now, the administrator of that bureau, who is a bureaucrat—the chairman of the subcommittee said awhile ago he did not know what a bureaucrat was. Well, here is one. I helped to establish his agency but I did not have any idea he was going to go before a secret hearing of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and there, in secret, advise the subcommittee that certain courts in the land were not needed or that certain functionaries in those courts, like clerks, were not needed, and that they should be abolished and the law creating them repealed. The Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee. The rest of the Members, including the Speaker, other than the Committee on Appropriations, had no knowledge that there was any such purpose or intent on the part of the bureau or on the part of the subcommittee or on the part of the Appropriations Committee. The hearings were held in secret. The transcript was printed. The printed hearings were kept away from other Members of the Congress until the bill was brought on the floor for consideration. Then and then only were those hearings released. I did not know about it. The Members representing the districts in which these clerks of the courts are to be abolished had no knowledge of it. They knew nothing about it. The secret was entirely within the heart of the bureaucrat and the subcommittee, and they were mighty careful to see to it that no one knew about it. Then we come to the floor, and for some reason no points of order were reserved, and we find ourselves in the position now where the only thing we can do is to accept that situation, provided the Chair follows those old precedents.

I know it is quite difficult to get away from precedent. Sometimes I think we would be better off, especially with an old decision and a wrong decision if we did not follow precedents. I know that the court is expected to follow decisions, but it has always been my philosophy that if a court away back yonder, when conditions were entirely different, rendered a decision which is clearly out of tune today, which does not meet present-day conditions, which is not just, which is not equitable, and which is not right, the court should find a way and state the facts that will meet the conditions of today.

The rules of the House are for but one purpose, and that is to permit the House to carry out its will according to a laid-down formula. Now, if there was a rule, then I would not be speaking. I am asking a great deal of the Chairman. I know he is a courageous man, and I do hope he will take the bit in his teeth and decide this matter as it should be decided and write a rule that meets conditions today.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call the gentleman's attention to rule 21, paragraph 2, and the decisions of his distinguished friend from Illinois, Mr. Chindblom, on the subject.

Mr. MICHENER. I am familiar with those rules. I do not think the Chair will cite them as authority for what the gentleman contends. Possibly Chairman Chindblom, who was a Member of the House, and with whom I served, might have decided back there in Committee of the Whole—I presume he did if the gentleman says so, although I have not seen the decisions at all but I presume he sustained the old 1896 decision, which I say is archaic, and which I hope will be done away with. To hold as I advocate will not violate the rules of the House, and will give modern interpretation to Chairman-made precedents.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to state that the chairman of the subcommittee has no desire whatsoever to rely upon any technicality. I am perfectly certain that what has been done in this bill, as I mentioned a moment ago, is clearly within the rights of the committee, but the parliamentary question is this, due to the fact that reservation of points of order was not made, is the Chair in a position now to hear a point of order argued? If the Chair would rule that he can entertain a point of order, we

would know better how to proceed. I would like to be heard on the point of order if the Chair is going to entertain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGRANERY). The Chair is always in a position to entertain a point of order and arguments on it. In this particular matter the Chair is prepared now to rule.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules I would like to be heard briefly.

Mr. O'NEAL. I, too, Mr. Chairman, desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it might seem that I would like to have the Appropriations Committee have all the power that might be found for it by application of the precedent cited by the gentleman from Missouri, but I feel it would be distinctly unfortunate for the procedure of the House if that precedent should receive any additional prestige by being followed in this case.

As the gentleman from Michigan has very aptly pointed out, those old decisions were not based upon a rule of the House but simply upon a practice. I invite the attention of the Chair to the citations in volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, page 956, and following, where, in a decision of March 31, 1882, Mr. Speaker Keifer definitely referred to the situation as merely a practice that had grown up in the House.

If this precedent or practice is further observed it will mean that every legislative committee of the House must be on guard when an appropriation bill is reported to the House lest the ranking minority Member or some other Member should fail to reserve points of order. Any appropriations subcommittee of the House could bring in legislation repealing acts under the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. Legislative committees would be powerless to protect themselves against repealers. They do not get to see the appropriation bills until they have been reported.

Moreover, the application of such a precedent seems decidedly unfair because under rule 21 the Committee on Appropriations or Members of the House can make points of order against appropriations in legislative bills at any time and without reserving the point of order when the bills are reported to the House. Turn-about is fair play. The rule should work both ways. I call the Chair's attention to this sentence in paragraph 4 under rule 21:

> A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto, may be raised at any time.

So it is not necessary to reserve points of order against appropriations when legislative bills are involved. Should a legislative committee bring in a bill reporting an appropriation, any member of the Committee on Appropriations, or any other Member of the House, may make a point of order against that appropriation or against the reporting of that part of the bill. But here in this instance, for some reason—probably through inadvertence—the ranking minority member failed to reserve points of order, so the gentleman from Missouri is in position to call up this old practice and object to any point of order being made against any legislative item in this appropriation bill.

It seems to me it would be decidedly unfortunate because if this precedent should be recognized in this House, then every legislative committee must guard against such a situation as this.

As the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, the situation today is entirely different from what it was at the time this practice grew up. At that time a legislative committee had jurisdiction over reporting appropriations also in its field and so the legislative committee was on notice, so to speak, that a bill was coming up involving appropriations that might also carry legislative riders, but today legislative committees cannot be on notice that an appropriation committee may be bringing in some section repealing statutory law. They know nothing of the hearings until the day before and they do not see the bill until it has been reported.

How can every or any chairman of a legislative committee know that he must reserve points of order when an appropriation bill is reported? He will not even know when it is to be reported, much less what is in the bill If an appropriations subcommittee agrees for any reason not to reserve points of order, legislative committees will find their rights lost, as the Judiciary Committee finds itself threatened today.

It seems to me it would be decidedly unfortunate if this Congress should recognize that old practice and give any further standing thereto.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I should like to make this matter clear to the House so there may not be any misunderstanding. The gentleman from Kentucky and other members of the committee are well aware that no reservation of all points of order was made at the time the bill was ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. To make it accurate, did the gentleman give notice to the minority members of his subcommittee that he was going to present the bill at the time he did?

Mr. O'NEAL. They were present at the meeting of the full committee, and it is common practice that as soon as the full committee approves the bill whoever is in charge of the bill comes to the floor and reports the bill. Now, let me proceed. I think there is a lot of excitement about this unnecessarily. This committee has no desire or thought of pushing any kind of procedure against any point of order being made to a portion of the bill; we had no thought of doing that. Just before the point of order was made the chairman of this subcommittee went to the Well of the House and made a statement that he thought a point of order would lie against the second paragraph. The chairman knew at that time that no point of order could be made against it. I knew that, but I stated that I thought it would lie against it properly and therefore I was going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw that paragraph and offer another amendment which would be perfectly in order. I did that with a desire that this point would not be brought up and with the hope that it would not be presented to the Chair. As chairman of this committee I stated publicly that I was willing to recognize the fact that it would be subject to a point of order, although I knew it would not lie, because no reservation had been made. So this committee was acting in perfect good faith in not trying to put over something sharp on the Committee of the Whole. We were endeavoring to cure it by unanimous consent and I want the House to know there was no effort to take advantage of the situation.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest to the gentleman that if unanimous consent is not given, a motion would be in order to strike out the language that some of these people have criticized, and then a motion might be in order to substitute new language that would be in order.

Mr. O'NEAL. May I say to the gentleman that if we could follow the procedure that the chairman of the subcommittee suggested, namely, that unanimous consent be given to strike the language in the second paragraph, I would then offer an amendment to the bill which would be in order that will cure the entire situation. But, as I understand it, so long as a point of order is made by the gentleman from Missouri, he is well within his rights and no points of order would lie, in my opinion, and I think the Chair would so rule.

Mr. TABER. But the thing could be covered so that the House would be in the same position that it would have been if reservations had been made by striking out the offending language on amendment and then permitting language that would be in order to be offered, if that could be done.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, the amendment to be offered by the committee would strike out the language which would have been subject to a point of order, and this new language in the opinion of the committee would not be subject to a point of order. That is the way we attempted to cure it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a point of order to the paragraph which had been read. The paragraph the gentleman refers to, as I understand it, has not yet been read. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania made the point of order against the paragraph I made the further point of order that his point of order was not in order

because no reservation had been made when the bill was reported. So, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to withdraw his point of order, I will withdraw mine.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the Chair in the position at this moment of having to rule on the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCGRANERY). The Chair will have to rule unless the point of order is withdrawn. In that case the Chair would not be required to rule.

The Chair is prepared to rule, if there is no withdrawal of the points of order.

In this connection the Chair feels that there is a duty upon all Members to read the rules, which are published. This is not just mere custom, as the Chair sees it.

The Journal discloses that there were no points of order reserved on the pending bill when it was reported to the House on April 6, 1943.

The Chair has been very deeply impressed with the decisions on this question which run back to 1837, particularly an opinion expressed by Chairman Albert J. Hopkins, of Illinois, on March 31, 1896—Hinds' Precedents, volume V, section 6923—in which it was stated:

> In determining this question the Chair thinks it is important to take into consideration the organization and power of the Committee of the Whole, which is simply to transact such business as is referred to it by the House. Now, the House referred the bill under consideration to this Committee as an entirety, with directions to consider it. The objection raised by the gentleman from North Dakota would, in effect, cause the Chair to take from the Committee the consideration of part of this bill, which has been committed to it by the House. The Committee has the power to change or modify this bill as the Members, in their wisdom, may deem wise and proper; but it is not for the Chairman, where no points of order were reserved in the House against the bill. * * * The effect would be, should the Chair sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from North Dakota, to take from the consideration of the Committee of the Whole a part of this bill which has been committed to it by the House without reservation of this right to the Chairman.

Hopkins then held that he had no authority to sustain a point of order against an item in the bill.

The present occupant of the chair feels constrained to follow the precedents heretofore established and sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. For the sake of clarity and for the future, and may I say I have great respect for the Chairman's ruling, will the Chair differentiate between an appropriation bill in his final decision as written, that is, differentiate between the Hopkins decision which applies for all logical reasons to all legislative committees the same as it does to the Appropriations Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks if the gentleman will read clause 2 of rule XXI he will find that that provision applies merely to appropriation bills, while clause 4 of rule XXI applies to legislative bills coming from committees not having appropriating powers.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the decision.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. As I understood the Chairman, the point of order was overruled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair held that in the Chair's opinion he cannot pass upon the question raised by the gentleman. The Chair feels this bill was given to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in its entirety and that the Chair cannot under the present circumstances sustain a point of order against an item.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that, but does the Chair mean that the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri is sustained?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri and overruled the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the Chair if the ruling affects page 56, line 12, down to line 25, the part of the bill which had not been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not read that part of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Then it has no effect upon the language appearing on page 56, lines 1 to 11?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's decision just now given will affect every item in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. In the entire bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I note in reading the precedent to which the Chair has referred, volume 5, Hinds Precedents, page 957, that the Chairman at that time recognized that this was a very close question. The Chair raised this question: "The very most that could be done would be to report the point of order back to the House for its decision."

In other words, in taking the point of view that since the House had referred the bill to the Committee, no such question rose, the Chair might refer it back to the House for further instruction, which would be within the ruling that the Chair cited.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair read the particular case, that was the suggestion made by the Chairman, but there is nothing in the decision to show that that was actually done.

Mr. CASE. I was hopeful that the Chairman would make this the first time and take advantage of that suggestion.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. I have had an amendment on the desk for some time. I am wondering whether or not this is the time to offer the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I am a member of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is a member of the committee, so the Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Nebraska on his amendment.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follo 's:

> Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 55, line 20 to the end of the paragraph, strike out all of the proviso.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer would restore and keep open a number of Federal court offices, five of which are located in my State—Nebraska. It may seem, according to the hearings that little work is done in these offices and that they should be closed. It is true the court holds few sessions at these points. But in recent years I am told the work of the clerk has been heavy. That is due to the large amount of work on citizenship matters, immigration and naturalization matters, bankruptcy, and other matters in which our citizens are so much concerned now. I have just talked to Gen. Guy Heninger, who is in charge of our Selective Service in Nebraska. He agrees with me that these offices are busy now. He agrees with me that citizenship cases are very important at this time. I have also talked to numerous lawyers in my State. They are interested in these offices. If we abolish them now I am fearful that hundreds of Nebraska people and many of our lawyers would be forced to travel long distances to transact court business. With the tire- and gasoline-rationing program and the serious transportation problem I believe we had better leave these offices open. There is no one more anxious to eliminate useless expense than I am. I am sure the membership of this House knows that, especially in view of my efforts on yesterday to reduce millions of dollars of expenditures made for activities in Central and South America. In that item there was money on laws in South America and kindred matters. Matters on which we spend American taxpayers' money in foreign countries. Here is an item affecting our own people. Matters which are vitally important to them. I hope that the membership will vote for my amendment.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say this. I think the fair thing under the circumstances is to strike out this proviso, which would manifestly be subject to a point of order if points of order had been reserved, and then if the subcommittee has an amendment to offer that is in order, let it offer

it. I think to keep faith with the House we ought to adopt this amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is very much occasion for anyone's being terribly disturbed about this matter. I think anyone who is familiar with parliamentary law and the rulings of the House will agree that the paragraph that has been read—and I call this particularly to the attention of the gentleman from New York—is certainly within the Holman rule, and is right and proper. All we do is attempt to save a little money. There is no question about that part.

If the gentleman from New York, however, will turn to the paragraph which has yet to be read, on page 56, that, in my opinion, I state again as chairman of the subcommittee, is subject to a point of order. In order that the gentlemen may have just what they are entitled to on the minority side, we are perfectly willing without a point of order being made, and without having to go through a discussion such as we are now going through, to take it out. I wanted to do that from the start, as the gentleman from Indiana will tell you. We are perfectly willing to strike that from the bill by unanimous consent, at which time I will offer an amendment which is plainly within the Holman rule. That will cure the whole thing. Nobody will be deprived of any rights, and you will incidentally be doing the right thing by saving a little money.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman state what the amendment will be that the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. O'NEAL. It provides that no part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the cost of maintaining an office of a clerk of the United States courts at the places described here. In other words, that is purely cutting down the money involved. Incidentally, as to the paragraph we are discussing, there is not an office today in one of the places named. It seems to me that should satisfy the gentleman from New York and everybody on the minority side. We are not trying to take advantage of any technicality.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The part of the language that I doubt very much is in order—in fact, I am sure it is not—is that part beginning on line 7 with the word "and" and continuing "such provisions of law as require offices of clerks of courts to be maintained at such places are hereby repealed," and then on for the remainder of the paragraph. The first part of it is clearly in order.

Mr. O'NEAL. We can argue that point, but I may say that I have gone into that very thoroughly. I think the gentleman will find it is perfectly in order under the Holman rule up to line 12 on page 56. We have attempted to cure this difficulty, and at the proper time I shall ask unanimous consent to strike out lines 12 through 25. But let me urge you again to remember, if you are interested in economy, what we are trying to prevent. There are a lot of offices where there is no work going on other than perhaps 1 day a year, and we are attempting to stop the payment for these clerks.

In the second place, why should you maintain an office that has never been filled? Why should you leave it open?

In the third place, this slight economy, this slight cut, is the recommendation of the administrative officer of the court.

I think we are engaging in a lot of discussion that is hardly worth while.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. There are two distinct paragraphs here. I read the hearings, and I find the section of the hearings to which the gentleman has referred on pages 29 and 30, relating to the offices that are covered in the first paragraph, but I have been unable to find any testimony anywhere with reference to the offices covered in the second paragraph.

Mr. O'NEAL. There are no offices there now, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. But there is no testimony in the hearings to that effect.

Mr. O'NEAL. Do you need testimony that they are not needed when they do not have any such offices and never have had any?

Mr. CASE. There is nothing in the hearings to show that that is the fact. The offices are authorized by law.

Mr. O'NEAL. I assure the gentleman that was the statement made to us. There are no offices there and there is no use in carrying on offices where somebody may want to send a friend and put him to work.

Mr. CASE. Where was the statement made that there are no offices and no need for them?

Mr. O'NEAL. The statement is by the administrative officer. I cannot lay my hands on it.

Mr. CASE. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. O'NEAL. He addressed us both on the record and off the record. That was the statement. I assure the gentleman that statement was made.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman has a section in the bill, then, abolishing at a number of places offices that are authorized by law, but about which there is nothing in the printed hearings.

Mr. O'NEAL. Common sense says you shall not appropriate for a little office which you never use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is more involved in this matter than anybody has mentioned up to this moment. It is a question of whether or not we are going to permit the Committee on Appropriations to amend and repeal laws written by duly constituted legislative committees. There is no question in my mind, and I have given some thought to this particular matter, that there are many places in the United States where the terms of court ought not to be held, where there ought to be no clerks, where there ought to be no marshals, but bear this in mind, that in every single district in the United States, the courts that are now in existence, and authorized to sit, have been authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, after full and complete hearing has been held, and after it has been demonstrated to that committee that there is need for holding court at that particular place.

Mr. CRAVENS. And is it not also true that the Committee on the Judiciary has leaned over backward against holding courts and establishing clerks' offices until it clearly and positively demonstrated that they are necessary?

Mr. WALTER. I agree with that, and I will say that we have not created a judgeship that has been permanent, with the idea of saving whatever money we can in conducting the courts of the land, but in this particular case the administrative officer of the courts who occupies a very important and influential position has decided to short-cut the usually orderly way of having matters of this kind disposed of, and instead of coming before the Committee on the Judiciary and suggesting legislation, he has gone to the Committee on Appropriations and sought to have the law repealed through the simple expedient of withholding appropriations. Whether or not there has been any testimony in justification of what it is proposed to do I do not know. I do know this, that the record is silent as to this entire matter. It seems to me that the thing to do is to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and strike this section out and permit the Committee on the Judiciary in an orderly way to send for Members of Congress who are interested, and others, and there are a number of Congressmen interested in every section of this paragraph, and let them make their own recommendations, and then we will be happy to permit the administrative officer of the court to advise us as to what in his judgment ought to be done, but I do not think we ought to accept that man's judgment without supporting evidence.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. For some several years we have not had in these places as much as 1 day a year of court, and the clerk was paid for the entire year. Look on page 30. They have not held court, in places that we are trying to get rid of, over 15 days.

Mr. WALTER. I decline to yield further. Nobody disputes what the gentleman from Kentucky is saying. I am quite sure that what is proposed to be done here will be done through the unanimous action of the Committee on the

Judiciary, but let us do it in the regular way.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. To point out that a number of these places are today in States where the distance to be traveled is great, and by abolishing these offices, we are moving the Federal courts farther away from the people, and the fact that no trials have been held is immaterial. It is the right to go into court conveniently that is worth something to the people. Furthermore, these clerks are carrying on important functions with reference to immigration and naturalization, bankruptcy, and other matters at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it appears that Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and the Canadian Government should answer some pertinent questions regarding the recently announced leasing of the palatial Welles residence and stables in Washington at a reported rent of $37,000 a year for the housing of 135 members of the Canadian Women's Army Corps.

When the Canadian Women's Corps moves into these quarters on June 1, the American Women's Voluntary Service, which has occupied the stables since December 1941, will be ejected.

From highly reliable sources it is reported that the United States Navy sought to rent the property from Mr. Welles several months ago as a headquarters for the Navy's own auxiliary women's division, the WAVES. The Under Secretary of State is said to have refused to negotiate with the Navy so that this American women's military unit might have a place to live.

Now, according to the press, this great Massachusetts Avenue mansion, which Mr. Welles would not open to American women, is to be turned over to Canadian women in uniform. Moreover, another American women's military organization is to be evicted from the Welles stables because the Canadian Government insists it needs all the buildings upon the estate.

The question naturally arises whether the Canadian Government is going to pay the $37,000 annual rent to our Under Secretary of State out of lease-lend funds provided Canada. This House ought to have a statement from the Canadian Government on that proposition.

In addition, Congress should be informed by Mr. Welles why this huge dwelling, which has lain vacant for several years despite the desperate housing shortage in the Capital, should now be leased to the Canadian women's outfit, known as the CWACS, whereas it was barred to American women in uniform. Could it be that the Canadian Government, aided by lease-lend funds supplied by American taxpayers, was able to outbid our own Navy?

The AWVS, which will be made homeless under this arrangement, has 5,819 members in Washington whose voluntary services cover 63 details which supplement the Government's war activities. They have occupied the Welles stables without paying rent, but they paid the heating and electricity bills from December 1941 to January 1943. At that time, apparently in anticipation of the Canadian deal, Mrs. Welles offered to pay the heating and electricity charges thereafter, thus removing all legal and moral claims which the AWVS might have put forward in a petition to remain on the premises.

In view of the numerous activities of the AWVS, which include confidential work for the Army, motor corps work for Army and Navy, emergency feeding and housing for the armed services, rescue-squad work, selling War stamps and a host of other duties, it would be interesting to know just what 135 members of the Canadian women's organization are doing in Washington that they should have a priority on housing accommodations.

The Welles home and stables are spacious enough to accommodate 300 or 400 persons, it is reported, and our Navy wanted to put that number of WAVES into the place. It has been reserved, however, for 135 Canadian women in uniform who insist they must have the stables, as well as the residence, for their accommodation.

Centainly we want our Canadian guests to be as comfortable as possible, but it is permitted to wonder if a high-ranking Canadian official would oust a women's military organization of his own country from its quarters to make room for an American women's organization.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. STEFAN]. I can readily understand his position, because there are a number of these offices in his State. I also find one in Florida and I would have been concerned myself if I did not know exactly what is being done in these offices. When we had the matter before the committee I pointed out myself that these offices were established by statute and in order to do away with the offices, we should repeal the statute. But there is another way to do it, a way in which we have always done it, or at least have used many times, and that is to deny the appropriations to carry them on. Take the list on page 30 of the hearings and you will find a summary of the cases held during the years 1941 and 1942, both criminal and civil. I don't remember exactly how many but I ask the chairman of the subcommittee how many of these offices are we denying appropriations for?

Mr. O'NEAL. Twenty-four.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Twenty-four, and we pay to each one of these clerks on an average $1,000 a year. This is the way we have established at times in doing away with some of these useless offices. We do it by denying the appropriations. I submit that the statute should be repealed, where these offices are not necessary. As I said there are 24 of these offices, and if you gentlemen will notice the summary there of where the courts were held they will notice that 5 cases were filed in 1 year and in another 68 and in another 52, and in another 20, another 19, and so on down the list. The highest number filed was 68, including civil and criminal cases during 1941. I think the highest number of days in which court was held was 12 days in 1941, and that was for 2 years.

So you are paying a clerk in 24 courts on an average of $1,000 a year to file these few cases and to hold court for 6 to 12 days. This does not deny the court the right or opportunity to hold court in these particular places. The court can still sit as a court and carry a clerk with him, or whatever help is necessary.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the gentleman understands my purpose in offering this motion. I am sure he is not charging me with any ulterior motive because five of these offices in my State would be closed. My interest in it would be the interest of the people who go to those offices to get information about immigration, naturalization, and citizenship. I have particularly found in the office in my home town which is mentioned there, where people have come long distances for that information. By closing the office I fear they would have to be forced to go to Omaha or Lincoln, 100 or 120 miles away.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would be the last to accuse the gentleman from Nebraska of doing anything improper. I know he is trying to do what he thinks is for the best interest of his people, but I want to say to the gentleman that I believe if he will go to Mr. Chandler, who is administrator of the Federal courts, he will find that Mr. Chandler can give him the information that these offices are absolutely not necessary, and when he gets that information he will agree.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, I worked on this legislative bill and I know Mr. Chandler, and I have great faith in him.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to what Mr. Chandler said at this hearing. He said:

> I should be going beyond my authority to recommend abolition of specific branch offices of district courts without consulting the judges.

You are going away beyond anything that was recommended by Mr. Chandler, through this provision in the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I know Mr. Chandler said that, because he is the administrative officer and he cannot recommend that we abolish these offices when they were created by statutory authority. But I simply say that Mr. Chandler has given us the facts, and we found that these offices are not justified. The only way to stop the expenditure of this money when it is not necessary, is to cut out the appropriation. That is the way it should be done. I know exactly what Mr. Chandler said, because I questioned him on the subject.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to what he himself said:

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think we missed something there. He is speaking of abolishing these offices. These offices are created by statute; are they not?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; they are created by statute.

Mr. HENDRICKS. And the statute would have to be repealed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I assume that that is true.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will admit that, but never did I say we should not deny the appropriation. That is one way of stopping unnecessary expenditures. I am sure I said that because I was there when I said it. Never did I say we should not deny the appropriation. I want to point out that this office in Florida is included. I say this is a useless expenditure and can easily be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the argument which was just made in regard to the abolition of the clerks' offices, I think we ought to point out the fact that many cases are not entered in the place where the clerk or the deputy clerk is located. For instance, you will note there were no cases filed, on page 30, at Springfield, Mass. Yet days of court held were 15 in 1942 at Springfield. The reason of course is that the district attorney for the State of Massachusetts is located at Boston. The Government files its cases in Boston. They are tried outside of Boston, at Springfield. That is a long distance away. It would be a real hardship upon the people of western Massachusetts if there was not some place in a city of 175,000 to which they could go to learn about their cases and to find out what is going on. For instance, Westover Field is taken over by the Federal Government. There are a great many land cases to be tried. They have not been completed yet. They are tried in Springfield. They are not tried in Boston.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman realize, when he is speaking for the preservation of Springfield, that they have not had a civil case filed in either 1941 or 1942, and they only met 3 days in 1941?

Mr. CLASON. I believe the gentleman has not been listening to what I said, because they have tried 15 days in 1942. The cases were filed in 1941 and 1942 at Boston. But they were tried in Springfield. The reason for it is that the place where the land is located is in western Massachusetts.

Further than that, the clerk's office is open every day in the year. People go there and do business. If you will look at the earnings of the clerk's office, you will find that the clerks have been earning far in excess of their expenditure. There is nothing in this testimony to indicate that, if those offices are closed, the Government would not lose money. I certainly feel that on naturalization proceedings, on visa proceedings, and with reference to witnesses and various other matters it is only fair that there be more than one clerk's office in each State dealing with four or five million people.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it that the gentleman feels that before this court in his particular district is abolished, he should at least be permitted to know that such a thing was contemplated and that he might be furnished a forum in the Congress where he might present the claims of his constituents?

Mr. CLASON. I certainly do feel that way.

I want to say further, I think the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska should be agreed to. Then we get down to the point where there is no question of legislation before the House, and, if the gentleman in charge of this bill feels that legislation should be passed, after giving the Members of Congress a chance to be heard, he can bring forward the motion he has suggested, and we can vote on it at that time. But, first of all, I think the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska, which is now pending, ought to be passed unanimously.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It will mean in my State if certain of these offices are abolished that citizens will have to go from two to seven hundred miles to get to the clerk of a Federal court in reference to naturalization papers and other matters at a time when travel is curtailed.

Mr. CLASON. I have no doubt it would be a hardship upon millions of people. There are at least 750,000 people who depend upon the clerk's office in Springfield, Mass., for service. To ask these 750,000 people to do their business through Boston, 100 or more miles away, seems to me a little unfair and that the $1,000 in salary saved would be lost in additional fees, and furthermore it ought to be expended in any instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 100, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The provisions of law requiring offices of clerks of courts to be maintained at Anniston, Ala.; Florence, Ala.; Jasper, Ala.; Gadsden, Ala.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Montrose, Colo.; Durango, Colo.; Sterling, Colo.; Newnan, Ga.; Benton, Ill.; Salina, Kans.; Chillicothe, Mo.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Bryson City, N. C.; Shelby, N. C.; Ardmore, Okla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Deadwood, S. Dak.; Ogden, Utah; Casper, Wyo.; Evanston, Wyo.; or Lander, Wyo.; are hereby repealed, but this paragraph shall not be so construed as to prevent the detail during sessions of court of such employees as may be necessary from other offices to the offices named herein.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, but first I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the paragraph beginning on page 56, line 12, and running through line 25, and substitute therefor the amendment which I have just sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to understand the gentleman. The gentleman's request is limited to the striking of the language beginning in line 12 on page 56 and running through line 25.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let me ask the gentleman from Kentucky this question: I notice in lines 17 and 18 Bryson City, N. C., and Shelby, N. C. Shelby is in my district. To my information there never has been a clerk there. There has always been one detailed there, but here you are taking away from them a clerk when no clerk has been there. I want to know something about it.

Mr. O'NEAL. I remind the gentleman that when I made the reservation of the point of order I made the statement that the offices provided in lines 12 to 25 had not been filled and that we wanted to make sure that they would not send somebody down there to open up those offices and put that burden on the Government. To do that we put this provision in here so that it could not be done in the future. The chairman of the committee has said many times that these have not been filled.

The ones in the paragraph which we have just voted on in which the House was unwilling to economize, are filled and courts are held, sometimes as little as 1 day only during the full year. That is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Still further reserving the right to object, I know court is being held at this place.

Mr. O'NEAL. They can still hold court there but they cannot maintain a clerk there.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But they do not maintain one there anyway.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is all I can say to the gentleman. It does not seem to some of us to be good judgment to maintain a man in a place for a whole year to do just 1 day's work.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But they do not keep that man there.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the gentleman has asked unani-

mous consent to do two things: First to withdraw all of page 56 beginning with line 12 and concluding with line 25. That is the section which is clearly and admittedly out of order.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. The one to which I have been objecting. The second thing the gentleman asks that he be permitted to do is to put back in a parliamentary way the very things he has stricken out.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is in error.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: On page 56, after line 12, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the cost of maintaining an office of clerk of the United States district court at Anniston, Ala.; Florence, Ala.; Jasper, Ala.; Gadsden, Ala.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Montrose, Colo.; Durango, Colo.; Sterling, Colo.; Newnan, Ga.; Benton, Ill.; Salina, Kans.; Chillicothe, Mo.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Bryson City, N. C.; Shelby, N. C.; Ardmore, Okla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Deadwood, S. Dak.; Ogden, Utah; Casper, Wyo.; Evanston, Wyo.; and Lander, Wyo.; but this paragraph shall not be so construed as to prevent the detail during sessions of court of such employees as may be necessary from other offices to the offices named herein."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. The amendment, as I understood it read, proposes to offer a new paragraph at line 12 or after line 12 without striking any language. That cannot be done.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I presumed the Republicans were going to allow the unanimous-consent request to be acted upon; therefore my amendment which I am offering asks for the insertion of these words as a new paragraph following line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment to read, "Beginning with line 25," instead of line 12. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: On page 56, beginning in line 12, strike out all of the language down through line 25.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be frank with the House. The only reason I made the unanimous-consent request which has been objected to by the gentleman on my left was to obviate the necessity of bringing up the question of whether they had reserved their rights when this bill was offered on the floor. I did not care to take advantage of a technicality where my friends were involved, because no point of order would have lain against any part of this bill if we had insisted upon that procedure; therefore, I came here to ask unanimous consent so that would never be brought up in the House. The very gentlemen I am trying to defend are the ones who object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The trouble is, the unanimous-consent request was not the same thing as this amendment and that is the reason the objection was made.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, we have talked economy here for months. We get up here and holler about economy, and what is happening as to what the committee has done in this bill? The executive officer of the judicial circuit representing the chief judges and all the judges comes before our committee and says: "Gentlemen, we have a lot of places here where there is no work going on to speak of, and certainly not enough to justify a clerk. We should not provide money for those positions." And he furnishes us a list showing that some of them have not had a case filed in 2 years, others maybe 1 day in the year, and no business at some of these places. If you will take the number of cases filed in the average court as compared to one, two, or five, it would be five hundred to a thousand times the number these little places handle. Because some man has one in his district, is that a justification for keeping the amount in the bill to pay for unnecessary service?

The second paragraph before us and about which I am speaking now, contains places where they do not even maintain an office, they have never maintained one, and all we are asking today is that no money shall be paid out of this appropriation to open up one of these places. But, because it mentions the congressional district of some Members, they are going to protest anything being done that will in any way affect the personnel or the expenditure that might take place for those offices. If you vote to knock this item out, what are you doing? You are saying that we are wrong to put in there that no money shall be used for opening up these offices, we do want such a prohibition and we want to make it possible that offices that have never been opened up may be opened up with money provided in this bill.

What a ridiculous position for those who are interested in economy. That is all there is to it. They are not open now and they have not been for a long time and we say, "You shall not open them during the next year out of the money appropriated in this bill." If you want to sustain the motion to strike this out so that somebody in some congressional district may put someone in there and help the situation a little bit, that is your privilege, but you are not acting in the cause of economy.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman would not yield to me. The gentleman made his explanation and would not yield. But I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman were familiar with the administration of the courts, he would know that the administrator, Mr. Chandler, would be the person who would have to approve of the opening of these offices which the Chairman of the subcommittee says are not open. The whole discretion would be lodged with him, so that answers completely the argument the chairman of the subcommittee is making. It simply shows he is not familiar with the situation.

Mr. O'NEAL. The discretion lies with the Congress. If you want to appropriate money to open offices that are doing no business that is your responsibility, but I do not intend to vote for a dime that is not justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strikes out the language that would be subject to a point of order. After the amendment has been adopted, if the gentleman from Kentucky is really interested in economy and has the evidence to make out a case, I shall support an amendment myself which would eliminate any unnecessary offices, or eliminate the money for any unnecessary offices.

The membership of the House should act according to their best judgment as to what is the right thing to do. The reason I objected to the unanimous consent request was that I understood from what the gentleman from Kentucky said that there was coupled with his unanimous consent request the proposition not only to strike out this language but to substitute some other language in its place. I think that is what the RECORD will show.

I hope the pending amendment will be adopted so that we may keep faith with the House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here all afternoon listening to a lot of wrangling that apparently had very little point, at most times, that tended to confuse the members of the committee at other times, and that at very few moments expressed the definite intention of the subcommittee.

I think I can conscientiously speak for the entire subcommittee when I say that there was never any intention on the part of the majority or the minority to withhold from this House that it intended to abolish an appropriation for these unused or little-used offices of clerks of the various courts. For anyone on either side to try to twist the intention of the subcommittee is to present a false issue before this Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Not at this point.

Let us admit that that paragraph of the bill as brought on the floor is out of order. Let us further admit that there was a

failure to make a reservation of points of order at the beginning of the sitting of the Committee of the Whole House. That still does not excuse anyone for trying to twist the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee, who was sincerely trying to eliminate that section of the bill which many of you contend is out of order and to substitute for it a provision which would prohibit the use of any appropriation for those offices, without repealing any law.

It makes no sense whatever when a Member of this House gets on the floor and says that the office has never been in use, so why put in a prohibition against the use of funds for it in the future. Neither does it make any sense whatever for any Member of this House to attempt to convey the thought that the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky is the identical language which appeared in the original bill. Obviously such a statement is not true.

The fact is simply this: The original bill came in here and attempted to legislate on an appropriation bill. Everyone is satisfied to eliminate that portion of the bill. Whether you do it by point of order, whether you do it by unanimous consent, or whether you do it by simple majority vote of this Committee on the proposal of an amendment matters little as long as the Committee on the Judiciary is satisfied that we are not repealing any section of the law, and certainly you should be satisfied with the amendment which is before the Committee now. I support that amendment and ask you to support it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. No; I do not yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman know what the amendment is about which he is talking?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; I know, and so does the gentleman from Pennsylvania. What we are trying to do is explain it so that other Members will know, too. I have listened to this debate all afternoon; I have asked no one to yield to me; and I do not intend to yield.

The committee, in all its sincerity, led by its chairman, is trying to do this thing in the parliamentary fashion, which you distinguished lawyers want and are now getting. There is no excuse for any further wrangling over the matter. We intend purely and simply to prohibit the use of any part of this appropriation for sustaining or paying the salaries in these offices which are not functioning, and we want to write it into this bill so that this office, for example, in North Carolina, will not bloom needlessly during the next few months.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am enthusiastically for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman understands that when the unanimous-consent request was objected to by the gentleman from New York, the parliamentarian made the suggestion that the gentleman from Kentucky offer an amendment to strike the paragraph beginning at line 11 and extending through line 25, and that is the amendment now before the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; and that is what I am supporting.

Mr. O'NEAL. If that is done, I intend to offer the amendment which I discussed.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. It seems to me that the quickest way for us to dispose of a very nasty situation is by agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky. I was hopeful when he offered that amendment that he did not intend to offer a further amendment, because it seemed to me it was a manifestation of his intention to maintain the dignity of the Committee on the Judiciary and not insist on assuming its prerogatives.

The gentleman who spoke just before me said that it does not make sense to refuse to appropriate money for offices where clerks are not now paid. That may be true, but it does not make sense to say that the adoption of this language will bring about economy when no money has been expended heretofore.

The thing of which I am fearful is just this. In every one of these places where courts are being held and where clerks are not maintained, clerks are assigned to travel throughout the circuit. Through the adoption of this language, conceivably the Comptroller General would rule that it would be illegal to pay a clerk while he was employed in one of the towns mentioned in this section.

Mr. Chairman, this all goes back to the original proposition. Are you going to permit the Committee on Appropriations to write the laws in the House? Today it is the Committee on the Judiciary that is affected. Tomorrow it will be the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. There is no end to it. It seems to me the thing for us to do is to adopt this amendment and not consider the one the chairman says will follow this one.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that I speak with trepidation when I do so before the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], who claims all the ability and all the sense that anyone should have in respect to this bill. For the life of me, unless there is something more to it, I cannot see the sense in providing in a bill that you should not have anything but a detailed clerk at a particular office, when that has been in effect for some time, and unless the Comptroller General holds that no part of the appropriation shall be spent for a detailed clerk, then I cannot see the reason why the gentleman from Missouri wants to press this. There is something else, gentlemen. You might as well say that because, forsooth, a rural carrier goes a quarter of a mile out of his way to a man who does not put in sufficient mail in the way of receipts to pay expenses of that rural carrier that, therefore, that route should be eliminated. The courts should be near the people, and I do not care what the gentleman from Missouri or anyone else says as to the sense of it. It is good sense to put the courts within easy reach of the people at all times.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that the clerk provided for the division of court in my home town of Newnan has his office 39 miles away in Atlanta, because the courthouse has not been built there yet. It is one of the biggest divisions in the State, and here they strike out the provision for the clerk, when he is only doing business in another town temporarily. It simply shows that they have not investigated the case. They added another clerk at Atlanta until such time as the quarters could be provided for the one at Newnan, Ga., and this bill strikes out the legislation creating that clerkship. I just think that the House should have this information and explanation.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. I have the same situation in my district.

Mr. CAMP. That matter has been thrashed out before the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary approved and this House passed a bill creating that clerkship at Newnan, Ga., and to strike it out now, here, I do not believe is in accordance with the correct rule of legislative procedure, that is, to strike it out in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman had known that this was contemplated, he could have gone before the committee and explained the matter, and surely this intelligent committee would not have reported a thing like this if they had heard the gentleman.

Mr. CAMP. Certainly, and the first I knew of it was when it was called to my attention here on the floor of the House this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I briefly call the attention of the Committee to a certain implication in the report accompanying this bill leaving the impression that the Administrator of Courts had recommended the abandonment of the court-clerk offices named in this bill. Referring to Mr. Chandler, the report says that he is willing to abolish some of the outlying offices. I quote from the report:

> The Director was asked in the course of the hearings, page 29, whether he would recommend the closing of any such offices, and

in reply made the following statement: "I would certainly abolish a number of those outlying offices." He was then requested to furnish the committee with a list of offices which in his opinion could be closed without impairing the work of the courts, and inserted in the record, at page 30 of the hearings, a list of 24 such offices.

That would leave the impression on the part of anyone reading that statement that the Administrator of Courts had gone before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and recommended that the offices named in this bill be abandoned. The Administrator of Courts, however, made no such recommendation. Here are the hearings, and all of the testimony that the Administrator gave before the subcommittee, and the Administrator expressly declined to make that recommendation.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. Just 1 minute. On page 29 of the hearings concerning this bill he says that he would not have any authority to make such recommendation and declined to make it, and yet we have the implication left by this report that the Administrator of courts made such a recommendation, when the Administrator himself says that he had no authority to do so and expressly declined to make any recommendation with reference to the matter.

Mr. O'NEAL. I refer the gentleman to his statement on page 29:

I would certainly abolish a number of those outlying offices.

Mr. CRAVENS. And then the gentleman asked him to furnish a list and he said he would not have any authority to furnish that list and implied that he would not have the information on which to base a recommendation without consulting with the various judges throughout the whole country, which is just as much as to say that he himself did not know whether such offices should be abandoned or not. And yet the gentleman is trying to leave the impression that the administrator of courts recommended the abandonment of the particular offices named in this bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. We did not say that he had authority to abolish it. He said that if he had authority he would abolish them.

Mr. CRAVENS. I have the record here in my hand, and if the gentleman will point out to me where Mr. Chandler, the Administrator, recommended abolishing any particular office in the United States, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. I can tell the gentleman.

Mr. CRAVENS. Where did he name any office that is named in this bill?

Mr. O'NEAL. Right in these places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: On page 56, after line 11, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the cost of maintaining an office of the Clerk of the United States District Court at Anniston, Ala.; Florence, Ala.; Jasper, Ala.; Gadsden, Ala.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Montrose, Colo.; Durango, Colo.; Sterling, Colo.; Newnan, Ga.; Benton, Ill.; Salina, Kans.; Chillicothe, Mo.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Bryson City, N. C.; Shelby, N. C.; Ardmore, Okla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Deadwood, S. Dak.; Ogden, Utah; Casper, Wyo.; Evanston, Wyo.; or Lander, Wyo.; but this paragraph shall not be so construed as to prevent the detail during sessions of court of such employees as may be necessary from other offices to the offices named herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment provides is simply a limitation on the use of these funds for opening the offices which are not now open, and which have no business in prospect. The amendment further provides of course that nothing in the amendment shall stop anyone from holding court there or carrying on business should any business develop.

We have had a great deal of heat about this whole thing, but the committee did not realize that an effort to stop a little useless expenditure such as was set up by these various offices, would create so much furore. This amendment is very simple. I think it will hurt no one. It has a tendency to prevent useless expenditures.

The other part of the bill which was stricken out I think would have saved a little more. But if it is of such vital importance to the membership of this House to retain the last little item of that sort, the committee has no particular feeling about it.

I trust that on this amendment, where there is a chance of saving a little money, the membership will support the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WALTER. Would the gentleman tell us how much would be saved if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. O'NEAL. No court would be held.

Mr. WALTER. So that nothing would be saved.

Mr. O'NEAL. I told the gentleman it would prevent; not save.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman mean that no courts are being held at the points named?

Mr. O'NEAL. They are not keeping them open. The money to open those offices is provided, but it keeps them from maintaining and opening an office and causing expenditures for that purpose.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there provision otherwise in the bill for paying the traveling expense of opening these offices?

Mr. O'NEAL. Certainly. It specifically says in this amendment that they may still go there and hold court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

All time on this paragraph and all amendments thereto has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit a parliamentary inquiry——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Is this not a new paragraph that has been offered and the debate has not been closed upon it?

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request applied to the paragraph and all amendments that might be offered on this same subject.

Mr. MICHENER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the subcommittee, accomplishes exactly the same result as the part that was stricken from the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is quite a stickler for order. I think that parliamentary inquiry is not quite up to the high standards the gentleman has been contending for.

Mr. CASE. As I recall the unanimous-consent request made by the chairman of the subcommittee a while back, was that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 15 minutes. That time has expired. That paragraph was disposed of by the adoption of an amendment striking it out. As I understand it, the amendment now before us is a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request applied to the subject matter involved in the paragraph.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 102 and noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses (other than salaries): For such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized or approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for the United States courts and their officers, including rent of rooms for United States courts and judicial officers; supplies and equipment, including the exchange of typewriting and adding machines, for the United States courts and judicial officers, including firearms and ammunition therefor; stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, provided that the rates of payment shall not exceed those fixed by the district court pursuant to rule 80 (b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, in the jurisdiction of which the services are rendered; purchase of lawbooks, including the exchange thereof, for United States judges, and other judicial officers, including the libraries of the United States circuit courts of appeals, and the Federal Reporter and continuations thereto as issued, $390,000: *Provided*, That such books

shall in all cases be transmitted to their successors in office; all books purchased hereunder to be marked plainly, "The property of the United States": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2 per volume shall be paid for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and that the reports of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more than $6.50 per volume.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subject has been worn threadbare this afternoon, but I think we should not let the record go without challenging a statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. If I understood him correctly, at one point he said that court was not being held at any of the places covered in his amendment last adopted. That simply is not the situation, and if the gentleman were given that information in the hearings before the committee he was given misinformation.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Kentucky did not mean to give any such impression, and specifically in the amendment it is provided that court may be held there. The gentleman from Kentucky said that they did not maintain offices there and that is what they attempted to prohibit. Of course, they can hold court, and the amendment specifically states it.

Mr. CASE. Then, for the purpose of having the legislative history clear as to the construction of that provision, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee his opinion if such a situation as this occurred: Court is held at Deadwood, S. Dak., and held there regularly. It is over 400 miles across the State to the home of the district court in the city of Sioux Falls. Assume a session of court is about to be held at Deadwood. The clerk must come in advance and make certain arrangements. Following the session of court it is often necessary for somebody to remain there to take care of the details of commitments and the arranging of bail and other things of that sort. Under the language in the latter part of the gentleman's amendment, would it be permissible for the judge of the district court to assign a clerk to be at Deadwood in advance of the session and to continue there, following the holding of court, to take care of the details and clean up the business of that session of the court?

Mr. O'NEAL. It certainly would. There is nothing in the amendment that would in any way interfere with that.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate that statement, because I want the legislative intent to be clear. The latter part of the O'Neal amendment means, then, that the office of clerk may be opened in advance of a session and continued afterward as may be necessary to the holding of a session of court at the places named. That is, although the court itself may have adjourned, it would be possible for the clerk to stay there and clean up the business; take care of bail, commitments, receive papers, and handle other things connected with a session of the court.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Have we passed the proviso on page 57 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That has been read.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Where is the Clerk about to read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is prepared to begin reading at line 6, page 60.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Would it be in order to move to strike out the proviso to which I referred?

The CHAIRMAN. That could be done only by unanimous consent to return to the paragraph.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to that paragraph for the purpose of getting some information.

Mr. O'NEAL. If all the gentleman wants is information he can move to strike out the last word and get the floor for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It seems to me that this proviso constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. I am not sure of the status of the present provision, but it makes these probation officers subject to control of the Department of Justice.

Mr. TABER. I reserve the right to object, but I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to explain this particular question.

Mr. O'NEAL. This proviso, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, has been in the bill for many years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Keogh amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEOGH: On page 26, line 17, insert "Revision of the law: For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code, including the correction of errors as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1929, Revised Statutes 1541, fiscal year 1944, $100,000 to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 92, noes 72.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and ten Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 177, nays 184, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—177

Andresen, August H.	Forand	Lea
Barden	Gale	LeFevre
Barry	Gallagher	Lemke
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Lesinski
Bennett, Mo.	Gathings	Lynch
Bishop	Gavagan	McCord
Bloom	Gossett	McCowen
Brown, Ga.	Graham	McMurray
Buckley	Green	Madden
Bulwinkle	Gregory	Magnuson
Burchill, N. Y.	Gross	Maloney
Butler	Hagen	Manasco
Camp	Hale	Mansfield, Mont.
Capozzoli	Hall, Leonard W.	Marcantonio
Celler	Hancock	Merritt
Chenoweth	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Conn.
Chiperfield	Hart	Miller, Pa.
Church	Hébert	Monroney
Clason	Heffernan	Morrison, N. C.
Clevenger	Heidinger	Murdock
Coffee	Hendricks	Murphy
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Murray, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Myers
Compton	Hinshaw	Newsome
Cooley	Hobbs	Norton
Cooper	Hoch	O'Brien, Mich.
Costello	Holifield	O'Connor
Courtney	Holmes, Wash.	O'Hara
Cravens	Horan	O'Leary
Culkin	Hull	Peterson, Fla.
Curley	Jeffrey	Peterson, Ga.
Curtis	Jensen	Philbin
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pittenger
Davis	Judd	Poage
Day	Kearney	Price
Delaney	Keefe	Priest
Dickstein	Kefauver	Rabaut
Dilweg	Kelley	Ramey
Disney	Keogh	Rankin
Domengeaux	Kilday	Reed, Ill.
Doughton	King	Rivers
Douglas	Kirwan	Robertson
Drewry	Kleberg	Robsion, Ky.
Eberharter	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Fay	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Fellows	LaFollette	Rolph
Fenton	Lane	Rowan
Fernandez	Lanham	Sadowski
Fitzpatrick		Sasscer

Satterfield	Stewart	Weiss
Schuetz	Sullivan	Wene
Scott	Sumners, Tex.	West
Shafer	Talle	Whelchel, Ga.
Sheppard	Tolan	Whitten
Sheridan	Troutman	Wickersham
Short	Vincent, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sikes	Voorhis, Calif.	Wright
Slaughter	Wadsworth	Zimmerman
Stanley	Walter	
Steagall	Wasielewski	

NAYS—184

Abernethy	Gifford	Monkiewicz
Allen, La.	Gilchrist	Mruk
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Mundt
	Gillie	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Goodwin	Norman
Arends	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arnold	Grant, Ala.	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	O'Neal
Baldwin, Md.	Griffiths	Pace
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gwynne	Patton
Barrett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Beckworth		Ploeser
Bender	Halleck	Poulson
Blackney	Hare	Ramspeck
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Randolph
Bolton	Harris, Ark.	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Harris, Va.	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Hays	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Rizley
Brehm	Hoeven	Rockwell
Brooks	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Bryson	Howell	Rowe
Buffett	Jackson	Russell
Burch, Va.	Jarman	Sauthoff
Burdick	Jenkins	Schiffler
Burgin	Jennings	Schwabe
Busbey	Johnson, Anton J.	Simpson, Ill.
Canfield		Smith, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Smith, W. Va.
Carlson, Kans.		Smith, Wis.
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Sparkman
Carter	Johnson, J. Leroy	Springer
Case		Stearns, N. H.
Chapman	Johnson, Luther A.	Stefan
Cochran		Stockman
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Johnson, Ward	Sundstrom
Creal	Jones	Taber
Crosser	Jonkman	Talbot
Cunningham	Kean	Tarver
Dewey	Kilburn	Taylor
Dirksen	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	Lambertson	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	Landis	Tibbott
Durham	LeCompte	Towe
Dworshak	Lewis, Ohio	Van Zandt
Ellis	Ludlow	Vinson, Ga.
Ellison, Md.	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	McGregor	Vursell
Elmer	McLean	Ward
Elston, Ohio	McMillan	Welchel, Ohio
Engel	McWilliams	Welch
Englebright	Mahon	Wheat
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	White
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Flannagan	Mason	Willey
Folger	May	Winstead
Fulbright	Merrow	Wolcott
Fulmer	Michener	Woodrum, Va.
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	Worley
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	
Gerlach	Mills	

NOT VOTING—73

Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Patman
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Pfeifer
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gorski	Plumley
	Guyer	Powers
Andrews	Hartley	Pracht
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Beall	Kee	Sabath
Bell	Kennedy	Scanlon
Boykin	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Byrne	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	Lewis, Colo.	Snyder
Clark	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Cox	McCormack	Spence
Cullen	McGranery	Starnes, Ala.
Dawson	McKenzie	Stevenson
Dies	Maas	Thomason
Dingell	Morrison, La.	Treadway
Eaton	Mott	Weaver
Elliott	Nichols	Wilson
Fogarty	Norrell	Winter
Ford	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Furlong	O'Toole	Woodruff, Mich.
Gibson	Outland	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Outland with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Gorski with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Cox with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Mott.

Mr. GREEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Catholic Weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the city council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two resolutions adopted by the legislature of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I announce to the House that it is the intention to proceed with consideration of the rule making in order the Hobbs bill for 30 or 40 minutes, but not to complete consideration of the rule this evening. The House will proceed with general debate after the preliminary matters are disposed of tomorrow.

AMENDING THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 154, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 653) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934. That after debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of

the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, we shall proceed with the Hobbs bill, of course, tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When that is out of the way, what else will be considered?

Mr. McCORMACK. The nationality bill, and then, following that, will be a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules that was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and retain 30 minutes for myself.

I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that any explanation of this proposed legislation could be made in 5 minutes, but I do want to call the attention of the House in this limited time by way of explanation to some of the things the legislation seeks to do. This bill simply seeks to make extortion and robbery in interstate commerce unlawful. It does nothing else.

This legislation, reported almost unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary, I understand, would seek to stop racketeering in interstate commerce. It will be recalled that legislation was enacted some years ago that sought to do that very thing, and that the Supreme Court in a recent decision involving a case that arose in New York, rendered a decision through Mr. Justice Byrnes which held that that legislation did not cover the type of racketeering this legislation seeks to curb.

A condition something like this exists in this country: A man who drives a truck into one of certain of our large cities, and who does not belong to a union, is stopped at the entrance to the city and required to do one of two things, either to employ a union man to drive his truck to his destination, or to pay the equivalent of a day's wages of a union worker. It makes no difference what type of truck it was, who owned the truck, or anything of that nature; it is just a question of whether or not a truck could drive into one of these cities, such as New York, Chicago, Richmond, and others, where that practice became common without having a union man drive it. A farmer could not deliver his produce into these cities without a union driver. That was the situation, briefly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The case to which I refer resulted from an indictment against a local teamsters' union in New York City. The case went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court rendered the decision to which I referred.

This measure is an attempt to remedy that situation, or to stop the loophole, or whatever you want to term it. That was a very serious situation, a situation comparable to the condition that existed in this country in the early days of the Colonies, when a farmer could not travel from one State to another with his produce, which created an intolerable situation.

You may say, "Who condones such things? Does the union stand for that?" My answer is that the unions do not. They say they do not. They say they do not approve of it.

This bill provides that it shall be a felony against the United States Government to engage in extortion or robbery in interstate commerce. That is all. It covers a thing that you and I were taught at our mother's knee is wrong.

When this matter was before the Committe on Rules some of the labor leaders wanted to be heard. As you know, the Committee on Rules is not a legislative committee, and we do not hear anyone except Members of Congress. However, I suggested that that rule be deviated from in that instance and that these gentleman be allowed to present their claims, and they were given that privilege. They professed to see in this measure something of a bugaboo whereby labor could be crucified, as somebody put it. I do not think that is involved. Remember, these leaders say they do not condone this thing. The teamsters' union in New York said that they do not condone it. Yet they took the position before the legislative committee and before the Committee on Rules that they do not want anybody else to do anything about it. That is a bad situation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. The fact of the matter is that this committee report was not unanimous. Also, in the committee it was indicated by those who favor this legislation that the legislation is too drastic, that the $10,000 fine and 20 years in jail is too drastic. They think a modified bill might be more in consonance with present-day thinking.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman refers to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. DELANEY. Exactly.

Mr. COLMER. Yes. I said that I understood it was reported practically unanimously from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Was the testimony of the labor leaders before the Committee on Rules reported?

Mr. COLMER. No; it was not made public. That is not customary.

In deference to all that can be said about this, it gets down to the question of whether or not a great country like this is going to permit any organization, whether it be a labor union, a religious organization, a patriotic organization, so-called, or anything else, to interfere with the orderly transfer of commodities in interstate commerce. I do not think anybody should put honest, God-fearing, patriotic, hard-working, laboring men in the position of condoning extortion and robbery. I think that the average laboring man is just as honest and patriotic as anybody in any other class of our citizenry. He is a good citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes. I do not think it is fair to organized labor to put them in that position, but I am happy to be able to say now that I understand that as a result—and I say I understand advisedly—of a committee amendment which will be offered, a lot, if not all, of the opposition from labor leaders will be withdrawn from this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not think that statement is quite correct.

Mr. COLMER. Very well. I say that I understood that. I am sorry that it is not true, because I do not think labor ought to be put in that position of upholding extortion or robbery, be it in whatever form. There are some of us in this Congress and some others in this country who are interested in labor, and we do not want to see labor crucified. Personally I have always been sympathetic with the cause of labor. Up until the last few months and until we got in this war I have been considered by these labor leaders themselves as friendly to labor. I do not want to see labor, which is dependent upon public opinion just as you and I are dependent upon public opinion, crucified by some people who are advising them wrongly, and I am just as interested in them as anybody else is. Some amendments will be offered to this bill. I hope and pray in the interest of labor itself that they can agree upon those amendments, one of which, at least, I wish I had the time to discuss, but in the final analysis it is a question of whether the Congress of the United States is going to be big enough and strong enough to meet this situation, and I say to you in conclusion that if you cannot pass this bill, then you cannot pass any legislation to which the labor leaders object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. It is now 10 minutes after 5 o'clock. Some of us have been on the floor constantly since 11 o'clock

this morning. We are all tired. It is the wrong time to bring up a matter so serious and so controversial as this is. However, the rule is up for consideration. I shall not at this time attempt to discuss the bill. I shall do that which I conceive to be the function of the members of the Rules Committee and discuss the rule by which the bill comes before the House, and then in a general way, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I shall state the procedure that will be followed in the committee. The committee will have 2 hours under the rule at its disposal for general debate. It is hoped that every man and woman in the House who wants to express himself or herself will be given an opportunity to do that. It is an open rule. After 2 hours of general debate, then the membership will be permitted to offer all amendments to the bill which are permissible under the general rules of the House. There has been much discussion about the bill, much of which has its basis in misinformation. The bill finds its inception and motivation in the fact that the Supreme Court rendered a decision a few months ago interpreting the antiracketeering act passed by this Congress in 1934. The soundness of that decision is, in the considered opinion of many, most questionable. It was the purpose of that act to prevent robbery, extortion, and racketeering. It was not aimed at organized labor in any way, and in an endeavor to make that sure there was included within the law a provision which attempted to guarantee that thing. By what I deem, and many, especially among labor leaders, today deem to be a most unfortunate decision by the Supreme Court, this bill has been introduced. It was introduced at the invitation of the Supreme Court, as expressed in the majority opinion. In other words, if it was the view of the Congress that the antiracketeering law should apply to one engaged in robbery or extortion or racketeering who happened, perchance, at the time, to have in his pocket a union card, that law should not exempt him. No labor organization justifies the act to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has referred and which brought the case to the Supreme Court.

Now when the Congress passed the act in 1934 the Congress never intended to exempt anybody from the law who was committing robbery or extortion. It was never intended that membership in a union would give immunity under the law. The Department of Justice at that time, in 1934, took that view, and it approved that law. The President of the United States took that view and he approved that law. Then over in New York there was extortion, robbery, and racketeering committed by men who it developed later were members of a labor union. That same Department of Justice prosecuted those men for racketeering under that law. Those racketeers were convicted in their own bailiwick, in the city of New York, as racketeers, by a jury of their peers. They then appealed to the circuit court of appeals upon the ground largely that the judge had committed error in his charge to the jury, and that as members of a labor union they were attempting to carry out the proper and legal purposes of the labor union, and that they were exempt from law regardless of what they did, so long as they had in their own mind the thought that they were furthering a legitimate activity of a labor union. The circuit court of appeals reversed the conviction. The case then came to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States sustained the circuit court of appeals and indicated to the Congress that if the Congress intended to include this kind of act on the part of members of labor unions it should make it clear and amend the law. That is the purpose of this law. If you have not read it, please get the report of the committee and read majority and minority opinions overnight. That is, especially if one is a lawyer, and especially if he has at heart the interest of organized labor.

I feel that this bill should be rightfully entitled a bill for the relief of organized labor from racketeers and persons of that type, who have bored from within, and who are discrediting the labor union today. Organized labor can render a splendid service to its members and to the country and should not be destroyed by unscrupulous members and racketeers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I would rather not just for the time being because my time is so short. Before we get through debate tomorrow I shall be glad to yield to my good friend from New York.

For a moment may I call your attention to the bill? The bill H. R. 653 consists of two titles. The first title deals with robbery and extortion. The second title was prepared and introduced at the suggestion of the Director of Transportation, Mr. Eastman. The first section on page 2, line 18, contains a provision exempting certain activities of organized labor and certain acts from the operation of this act. That is the general meaning of it. That is title 2. There was some question about that title, as to whether or not it would interfere with the legitimate activities of labor unions. The labor unions took this matter under consideration. They undoubtedly gave it much attention and there was submitted a proposal in the form of an amendment which, as I understand, has the approval of the American Federation of Labor, and as I have been informed, and as the weekly publication of that organization states, if this amendment were adopted, then the objection of the American Federation of Labor would be removed.

There has been a lot of talk around the House, this buttonholing of Members, and saying, "Now we are trying to do something for organized labor, and we have got an amendment that will take care of this thing."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The only amendment that the committee knows anything about is the amendment suggested by the American Federation of Labor, and, as I understand, was prepared by Mr. Padway, attorney for the American Federation of Labor. The committee had a confidential committee print of the bill under date of March 18, 1943. It embodied in that confidential print the suggestion of the American Federation of Labor which found expression in the amendment of Mr. Padway. After careful consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary it was felt that the proviso on page 4 of the bill, title 2, was in substance and in fact the same thing as embodied in the Padway amendment.

As one member of the Committee on the Judiciary—and I can speak for myself, and I do not speak for anyone else—I voted to substitute the Padway amendment in lieu of the proviso in the House bill. There is no difference except that amendment in the bill refers to the section and not the act. I voted to change the word "section" to "act" and make it apply to the entire bill.

If that is done then it would seem that there should be no objection, at least on the part of the American Federation of Labor. It is just a question as to the wording.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. There was a substitute amendment offered and I think that substitute amendment is one that the American Federation of Labor and Mr. Padway wish to have adopted, and which labor generally wishes to have adopted. It is quite different from the so-called committee amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. I may be in error. I want to be fair. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is one of the two members of the committee who filed a minority report against the bill, and he made a very intelligent fight in the committee for the principles for which he stood and the changes which he thought should be made.

My understanding was that he did not object to the amendment which was included in the committee print as the A. F. of L. amendment. If I am in error, I am sure the gentleman will correct me, and I always want to be corrected if I am wrong.

Now, to get down to the necessity for this legislation, that is a long story. We all know about racketeering. We all know that if a truck driver, for instance, from my town or your town or Washington were to go to New York with produce he would feel that he should be permitted to drive into the market place so long as he was obeying the law and complying with lawful regulations, and unload and sell his produce. He does not feel that he should be waylaid on the highway as he enters the city and compelled to pay tribute amounting to a day's work to any man who stops him at the point of a bludgeon or a threat to take from him a given number of dollars for the privilege of driving his own truck,

loaded with potatoes or chickens, from the farm down to the market place. I regret that my time has expired, and I hope to continue the debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think a great deal of the debate will turn on the question of the so-called amendments. At the outset, I want to say that there is a big difference between the committee amendment, which will be offered, and the amendment which I will offer as a substitute amendment.

The committee amendment, in brief, states that nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify four different acts, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the antitrust laws, and the Railway Labor Act.

My amendment, in brief, provides that no acts, conduct, or activities which are lawful under these four different acts shall constitute a violation of this act—the so-called Hobbs Act.

I have written out carefully the distinction between the two, so that overnight the Members of the House can mull over the distinctions.

I emphasize there is a vast difference between the committee amendment and the Celler amendment. The committee amendment simply says nothing in this act shall repeal, modify, or affect the antitrust laws, th Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Railway Labor Act, and the National Labor Relations Act. That is not equivalent to saying that the exceptions or conduct made lawful in those acts are incorporated in the Hobbs Act. It is one thing to say that the Hobbs bill does not repeal certain laws. It is quite another thing to say that the substantive provisions of these laws are to be included or considered included in the Hobbs bill. The committee amendment is wholly in the negative; the Celler amendment is in the affirmative. The practical effect is vastly different.

The committee amendment may just as well say nothing in the Hobbs bill shall repeal or modify the White Slavery Act, the Tariff Act, the Income Tax Act. The Celler amendment says that conduct, acts, and activities that are lawful under the four statutes mentioned shall not constitute a violation of the Hobbs Act, but in my wording of my amendment, I actually embrace within the Hobbs Act and make part of it the substantive provisions of these four statutes.

This is the way the saving clause embodied in the committee amendment will work out. When a prosecution is had under the Hobbs Act with the committee amendment that amendment will have no effect at all. If a worker is charged with a violation of the Hobbs Act and he attempts to justify his conduct by asserting that what he did was lawful under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, or the Clayton Act, or the Railway Labor Act, or the National Labor Relations Act, the court will probably state, "This is not a prosecution under any of those statutes; this is a prosecution under the Hobbs Act. If you are guilty of violating the Hobbs Act, you must be punished, as there are no exceptions provided for you in the Hobbs Act, since the exceptions appearing in these other acts have not been included or incorporated in the Hobbs Act."

However, when a prosecution is brought under the antitrust and other laws mentioned in the proviso, and the prosecutor should attempt to deprive a defendant of the exemptions under the antitrust laws, claiming that the Hobbs bill has wiped them out, then in such prosecutions under the antitrust laws, and so forth, the defense can assert that his exemptions are not wiped out because the Hobbs bill specifically says that the antitrust and other laws are not repealed. In other words, permissible statutory construction does not allow for incorporation of exemptions contained in other laws under a specific law which merely says that such other laws are not repealed. To obtain the benefits of the exemptions in the antitrust laws when a prosecution is had under the Hobbs bill, it will be necessary to show by affirmative recital in the Hobbs bill that the exemptions, and so forth, are to be considered affirmatively incorporated therein.

With reference to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], for whom we all have the highest regard, said concerning Mr. Padway and the American Federation of Labor, I draw the attention of the House to the release of the American Federation of Labor of March 15, 1943, where it announces that it would accept the Hobbs bill if it contains the so-called Celler amendment, which I intend to offer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the pending resolution be suspended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I shall not claim my time this afternoon, but will ask for it at a later date.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE, for Friday and Saturday, Monday and Tuesday, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 2 days on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 9, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8 and postponed until April 15 have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Monday, April 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 687, at which public hearings will be had.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 2370. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1531) granting a pension to Martha Lumley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1634) granting a pension to Martha E. Lumley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2192) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Brownson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 2433. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2434. A bill to provide that retired Regular Army officers called to active duty shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the highest temporary grade attained by them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2435. A bill to provide for the establishment of uniform freight rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr BOREN:

H. R. 2436. A bill to establish uniform freight rates throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2437. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr GALE:

H. R. 2441. A bill to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2442. A bill to provide for the temporary promotion of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law House bill 997 or Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to keep Governor Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico until the people of Puerto Rico have the opportunity of electing their own chief executive; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Bernadine Salmons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2439. A bill for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

451. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Walter L. Roberts, H. R. Stewart, and B. T. Delahay, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 2195; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

452. By Mr. TREADWAY: Vote of the Department of Public Utilities, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing Federal legislation interfering with the power of the State to regulate rates for the transportation of passengers and freight by aircraft within the State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

453. By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas: Petition of W. M. Slopansky, president, and Lee L. Hawley, secretary, and about 100 other citizens of Belleville, Kans., concerning House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

454. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of many citizens of Indiana and especially from Marion, Kokomo, Huntington, Connersville, Princeton, Owensville, Wabash, Columbus, Warren, Kendallville, and Pendleton, Ind., who urge Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

455 By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Memorial from the Montana State Senate to the President, requesting that steps be taken to increase the price of strategic metals; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

456. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature memorializing Congress to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

457. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, requesting transfer of that part of Federal reservation known as Beaver Creek Park for use as a State park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

458. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, favoring appropriation to utilize irrigation and power possibilities of the Fort Peck project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

459. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, to return to the farmer such prices as will assure a reasonable profit over his cost of production, including all cost of labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

460. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, requesting that the so-called cost-plus plan of letting governmental contracts be discontinued; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

461. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, relating to the disassociation of the several divisions of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

462. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, relating to the scarcity of fiber, foods, and drugs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

463. Also, memorial of the Montana State Legislature, to the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, to construct a road from the Boulder River to the head of Bobcat Basin; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

464. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, requesting enactment of legislation directing the annual payment of grants by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the several counties of Montana in lieu of taxes on lands owned by the United States Government in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

465. Also, memorial of the Montana Legislature, requesting that appropriate action be immediately taken for declaring the highway leading south from Edmonton, Alberta, to Great Falls, Mont., and the connections thereto as the Alaskan Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

466. Also, memorial of the Montana State Senate, requesting legislation and administrative regulation fixing the allotment of acreage for sugar beets on the basis of 1942 and years previous, as a minimum, removing any and all penalties for seeding or planting less than 90 percent of the war crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

467. Also, memorial of the Montana State Senate, requesting an extension of time to negotiate and approve the Yellowstone River compact; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

468. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: House Resolution No. 139 of the California Legislature, regarding ceiling prices on poultry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

469. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 28 of the California Legislature relating to destruction of crops by ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

470. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34 of the California Legislature relative to memorializing the President and Congress to enact legislation to secure to all employees of the Post Office Department an increase in wages commensurate with increase in living expenses; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

471. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the State Senate of California, relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

472. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, requesting Congress to remove unnecessary restrictions interfering with travel of persons and movements of products between the United States and Canada to the end that an efficient and victorious prosecution of the war may be promoted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of the Civilian Pilots' Association of Wertz Field, Charleston, W. Va., objecting strenuously to War Production Board Order L-262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

474. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Senator Young in the Senate of the State of New York, favoring a revision on our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, efficient, and victorious prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

475. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Jefferson, N. Y., favoring an amendment to section 500 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act requiring a person in the armed forces claiming a deferment from real property tax sale by local taxing authorities to give notice in writing of such claim and making the right to such deferment dependent upon the giving of such notice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

476. Also, petition of Mr. Twomey in the Senate of the State of New York, favoring the Pharmacy Corps bill (S. 216 and H. R. 997); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

477. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, requesting the Members of Congress to enact the Pharmacy Corps bill (H. R. 997 and S. 216) into a law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou seeking shepherd of our souls, from the arid wastes of our own foolish and perverse ways lead us in green pastures and beside still waters. Deepen the wells from which our spiritual strength is drawn. Incline our hearts to keep Thy law, and in that law may we meditate day and night. May that meditation of the heart be mirrored in wise legislation for the Nation.

In all the perplexities of these confused days may we not lose our perspective. May we be worthy of the high trusteeship of power and of opportunity which Thou hast committed to us. May this Nation under God be purged of its own failures to practice genuine democracy. Keep us in the homeland from all that is narrow and selfish and petty by the solemn remembrance that every day her embattled sons are bravely dying for her preservation.

Make a chastened and disciplined America the pioneer of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples, a world of justice and righteousness, of security and freedom and with living room for the development of personality. May our starry banner be ever the symbol of the beatitude of patriotism pure and undefiled: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on April 8, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 886) relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] be designated in my place as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of McCune, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—INTERNATIONAL ORDER AND JUSTICE UNDER LAW

Mr. TRUMAN presented resolutions of the American Bar Association, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That the American Bar Association endorses, as one of the primary war and peace objectives of the United Nations, agreement among such nations for the complete establishment and maintenance at the earliest possible moment of an effective international order among all nations based on law and the orderly administration of justice.

2. *Resolved*, That the House of Delegates directs the Section of International and Comparative Law to study and report to this House an adequate post-war judicial system of permanent international courts which will provide for an accessible and continuous administration of justice.

3. *Resolved*, That the House of Delegates directs the Section of International and Comparative Law to study and report to this House the fundamental principles, including a bill of rights, which are constitutional in character and which should be generally acceptable as a minimum for the preservation of international order and justice under law.

3-A. *Resolved*, That a copy of the three foregoing resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, and to all bar associations affiliated with the American Bar Association.

RESOLUTION OF ATLANTIC AND GULF CANALS ASSOCIATION—DEPTH OF 8 FEET FOR STUART-FORT MYERS CANAL, FLA.

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution adopted at a public meeting of the Atlantic and Gulf Canals Association, Inc., at Clewiston, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, the United States adopted as a navigation project the Caloosahatchee River-Lake Okeechobee Drainage Area, Florida; and

Whereas in accordance with that authority the United States has expended the sum of $20,000,000 on this project which has resulted in a navigation channel connecting the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico by way of the St. Lucie River and Canal, Lake Okeechobee, and the Caloosahatchee Canal and River, with an official navigable depth of 6 feet; and

Whereas the present war emergency has made the internal transportation system one of the greatest factors in success or failure requiring that maximum use be made of all transportation facilities in the United States; and

Whereas it has been repeatedly stated by officials of the Federal Government that a navigable depth of more than 6 feet is desirable for the most efficient movement of oil by barge; and

Whereas the War Department has heretofore recommended that this waterway be deepened to a minimum navigable depth of 8 feet and the Congress has heretofore approved such recommendation; and

Whereas such deepening can be accomplished within a period of 6 months at small cost and without interfering with other war activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. The Florida delegation in Congress be requested to use every effort to have the Stuart-Fort Myers Canal deepened to 8 feet immediately in accordance with the previous recommendations and approval of the War Department and Congress in order that full use may be made of this waterway in aiding in the transportation problems of the State and Nation.

2. Copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Florida delegation in Congress as expressing the sense of this meeting and the desires of the citizens there represented.

Upon motion duly made and seconded and unanimously passed the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the members of the Atlantic and Gulf Canals Association, a nonprofit corporation, at meeting held at Clewiston, Fla., Wednesday, March 31, 1943.

A. D. H. FOSSEY, *President.*

Attest:

F. W. GREENE, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.—WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION SEWING PROJECT

Mr. PEPPER also presented a resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Work Projects Administration has heretofore and now operates a sewing-room project in Duval County, Fla., where some 168 women are employed; and

Whereas most of the women employed in the sewing-room project are past 50 years of age, and upon cessation of Work Projects Administration activities on April 30 next they will be without means of making a livelihood; and

Whereas the usefulness of this project has heretofore been well demonstrated, and every effort should be made to maintain and continue its operation, not only for affording employment for needy women but to continue the supply of needed garments supplied by the sewing room: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Duval County, Fla.:

That the sewing-room project operated and maintained by the Work Projects Administration of Duval County, Fla., should be maintained in order that the women now employed in said project may be afforded means of making a livelihood and to continue the flow of garments supplied by the project.

That Senators CHARLES O. ANDREWS and CLAUDE PEPPER and Representatives LEX GREEN and EMORY H. PRICE be, and they are hereby, urged to lend their offices and best efforts to continue in operation this sewing-room project, which has served a most useful purpose, and will, if permitted to so do, continue to serve a most useful purpose in this county and community; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the following: Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Hon. LEX GREEN, and Hon. EMORY H. PRICE.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 693. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 161).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Freddie Sanders; with amendments (Rept. No. 162).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 351. A bill for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Corporation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 163).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 807. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 164);

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of Douglas R. Mulher; without amendment (Rept. No. 165);

H. R. 1522. A bill for the relief of Morton Fiedler; without amendment (Rept. No. 166); and

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 167).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Viola Dale; with an amendment (Rept. No. 168); and

S. 514. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; without amendment (Rept. No. 174).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 410 A bill for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters; with an amendment (Rept. No. 169);

S. 625 A bill for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 170); and

H. R. 1667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; with amendments (Rept. No. 175).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Blake; with amendments (Rept. No. 171);

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; with an amendment (Rept. No. 172); and

H. R. 401. A bill for the relief of James W. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 173).

By Mr RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2238. A bill to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 176);

H. R. 2281. A bill to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; with amendments (Rept. No. 177); and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages; without amendment (Rept. No. 178).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Several citizens and a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 983. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 984. A bill providing for the payment of compensation to the estates of Federal employees having accrued annual leave at the time of death; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 985. A bill to restrict the establishment of branch offices by financial institutions chartered or insured under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 986. A bill to eliminate certain assessments payable by insured banks on deposits secured by obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 987. A bill to amend the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, approved June 3, 1924, as amended, authorizing the Secretary of War to extend the services and operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation to Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEECH BY ANTHONY EDEN IN HOUSE OF COMMONS (S. DOC. NO. 27)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the recent visit of Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden to the United States, a visit in which we were all interested, and in view of the fact that in the House of Commons yesterday he made what might be regarded as a report to the House of Commons upon his trip to the United States, I ask that his speech to the House of Commons be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I request that it also be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAGE AND PRICE ORDER AND STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obained leave to have printed in the RECORD the wage and price order issued by the President on April 8, 1943, together with the statement by the President relating to the order, which appear in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ARTICLE BY C. P. IVES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Trade Agreements—Their Necessity for Post-war Trade Revival," written by C. P. Ives and published in the Baltimore Sun of today's issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. WALLGREN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Army Day address delivered over the radio on April 6, 1943, by Senator TUNNELL under the auspices of Jewish War Veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS — STATEMENT BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio statement made at the town meeting of the air by Senator BALL at Chapel Hill, N. C., on April 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HARRY SLATTERY, OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION — EDITORIALS FROM EMPORIA (KANS.) GAZETTE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, relative to the record of Harry Slattery as head of the Rural Electrification Administration, which appear in the Appendix.]

PLANNED PARENTHOOD AND NATIONAL BIRTH RATE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Planned Parenthood," written by Nathaniel W. Hicks and published in America on April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFFAIRS IN THAILAND—VIEWS OF DR. HUGH GRANT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Former Minister to Thailand Not Surprised at Recent Developments," published in the Savannah Morning News, of February 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLEGE WAR-TRAINING AND WORK PROGRAM

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the proposal of the National College Work Council of the National Youth Administration to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission on the college war training and work program for 1943–44, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD OF TOMORROW—STATEMENT BY R. S. REYNOLDS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The World of Tomorrow," by R. S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metals Co. of Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials relating to Senate Resolution 114, one entitled "Let's Tell the World Now," from the Raleigh News and Observer of March 28, 1943, and the other entitled "For Unified Action," from the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of March 28, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR HUMANITY—EDITORIAL FROM PRAIRIE FARMER

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Food for Humanity" published in a recent issue of the Prairie Farmer, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial "Post-War Plans Now," published in The Trades Unionist of April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLEGED LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF UNITED STATES HISTORY (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on the 6th of April the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] put into the RECORD a copy of a survey made by the New York Times involving the question of instruction in American schools and colleges. I thought it was a very important document, and I have had many requests for copies of the RECORD from those who want a copy of the report. I find that the RECORD for the date when the report was printed costs 15 cents. I have requests for at least 10,000 copies. I ask unanimous consent that the report, or survey, be printed as a Senate document, because the Joint Committee on Printing informs me that after the first thousand it can be printed for nine-tenths of a cent a copy. The first thousand will cost $63 a thousand, and each thousand thereafter will cost $9.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF WAGE INCREASES FROM NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 130, calling for certain information from the National War Labor Board. I should like to have the clerk read the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. I object to that until after we dispose of the bill which is pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution will take but a second, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I am sure the resolution will be acted upon quickly, and I have to leave the Chamber, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 130) submitted by Mr. BYRD on April 7, 1943, as follows:

Resolved, That the National War Labor Board is authorized and directed to submit to the Senate as soon as practicable (1) an analysis of the effect of its decisions and orders since January 12, 1942, which have directed, authorized, or approved wage increases and reclassifications of employees, with the total cost of all such wage increases, together with a statement of the changes (expressed in percentages and amounts) in the basic hourly rates of wages and the average weekly earnings which have resulted from such decisions and orders in the case of each employer or industry affected thereby; (2) a statement with respect to any action taken by the Board since January 12, 1942, for the purposes of increasing substandard wages and correcting inequalities in wages, together with illustrative examples of situations in which, in the opinion of the Board, substandard wages and inequalities in wages exist and which in effect constitute a definition of such substandard wages and inequalities; and (3) a statement with respect to all cases in which wage increases have been authorized or approved by the Board which constitute a departure from the so-called Little Steel formula; (4) the first report shall be made not later than May 1, 1943, and thereafter the War Labor Board is directed to furnish a report on the 1st day of each month to the Senate containing this information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out the word "first" and insert the word "tenth."

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that it be "not later than the tenth."

Mr. BYRD. Very well. I move to strike out the word "first" and insert the words "not later than the tenth." The purpose of that is to give the War Labor Board adequate time to prepare the information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

USE OF NITROGEN FERTILIZER

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of a letter written by the dean of the Wisconsin College of Agriculture, Dean Chris L. Christensen, to Mr. Chester C. Davis, Federal Food Administrator. I have Dean Christensen's permission to read the letter, and, in view of the fact that it has what seems to me to be an important bearing upon the policy of the Government in relation to the increased production of both dairy and meat products, I desire to take the time of the Senate to read the letter and to read briefly from the enclosure. The letter is as follows:

APRIL 3, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Federal Food Administrator,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: On December 29, 1942, we transmitted to Secretary Wickard a brief which explained Wisconsin's need for chemical nitrogen fertilizer. Following this appeal, additional allocations of fertilizer nitrogen were made to Wisconsin. However, subsequent to this appeal, Order FPO-5 was put into effect, one provision of which restricts the use of chemical fertilizer nitrogen on field corn in Wisconsin to farmers who have previously made such use.

In other words, the effect of FPO-5 is to "freeze" the utilization of nitrogen in the State of Wisconsin to farmers who have previously used it. This is in the face of the fact that it has been demonstrated that the use of nitrogen fertilizer can tremendously increase the productiton of corn, which, in turn, means, so far as Wisconsin is concerned, an increased production of dairy and meat products. It is also in the face of the further fact that there has been a sharp increase in previous years, a rising curve, in the utilization of nitrogen fertilizer by the farmers of Wisconsin.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator says the letter referred to Wisconsin. I presume it has a general application?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is applicable to the entire country, in reality, and I think it should be of interest to every Senator and every Representative coming from a State where the farmers can utilize nitrogen fertilizer to increase the production of meat and dairy products. The letter continues:

This provision will seriously handicap increased production of dairy products and meat in Wisconsin, and is therefore contrary to the best interests of the country as a whole.

I wish to emphasize that, Mr. President, at the very time when the Federal Government, through all the agencies that can be utilized to communicate with the farmers of Wisconsin and other agricultural States, is urging upon the farmers increased production, yet by the restriction imposed by this order it is helping to increase the handicaps which the farmers face today in their effort to meet the increased demands of the Government for food. The letter continues:

The application of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen to field corn has been strongly recommended by the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station for over 20 years, and each year more farmers have adopted the practice, so that at the present time about one-half of the Wisconsin farmers are following it. Because of the demonstrated highly beneficial effects produced by this practice and the desire of farmers to produce more food, possibly 25,000 farmers in Wisconsin would like to follow this practice for the first time the coming season, but are now prevented from doing so by one of the provisions of FPO 5.

Mark this, Senators:

In Wisconsin, corn "spells" dairy products and meat, and certainly dairy products and meat should come under the preferred list of products as regards provisions for their production.

The peculiar and singular position of Wisconsin as regards marked benefits obtainable from the application to corn of a small amount of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen is fully explained in the detailed statement enclosed.

Listen to this:

It is shown that the use of 1 pound of chemical nitrogen in this manner, costing normally about 10 cents, may result in the production of 5 additional bushels of corn.

When the silage represented by these 5 bushels of corn is fed to dairy cows, its contribution in the production of milk may be expressed by approximately 15 pounds of butter; and when the 5 bushels of corn are fed to hogs, its contribution in the production of pork may be represented by about 60 pounds of pork (live weight).

In other words, Mr. President, if this restriction were not to be found in FPO 5, if the farmers in Wisconsin who want to use this chemical nitrogen in the form of fertilizer could get it and use it for this purpose, it would result in Wisconsin producing 150,000,000 more pounds of butter this year, or 600,000,000 more pounds of live pork.

I continue reading from Dean Christensen's letter:

What is very important in this connection right now is the fact that this increased production through the use of fertilizer can be obtained with little or no increased outlay for labor, machinery, and seed.

All of which, as every Senator knows, are very scarce. In other words, with the amount of available labor, with the amount of available machinery, and with the amount of available seed, if this fertilizer were put into the hands of farmers, this increased production would result; and what is true of Wisconsin is true of other States which are similarly situated.

To continue:

Because of the peculiar conditions in Wisconsin, explained in the enclosed statement, it is doubtful that a similar small amount of fertilizer nitrogen will produce as much increase in food production in any other region as in Wisconsin. That the whole situation surrounding the permissible use and the allocation of chemical nitrogen fertilizer is not fully appreciated or understood by those in charge of these matters is evidenced by the following:

1. Order FPO 5 allows the use of chemical nitrogen fertilizer on soybeans and peanuts, although this practice is not supported by agricultural experiment station results.

2. Order FPO 5 allows the use of large amounts of chemical nitrogen fertilizer on short-staple cotton, although a large surplus of this type of cotton exists.

3. Order FPO 5 greatly restricts the use of chemical fertilizer nitrogen on field corn in Wisconsin, although positive proof exists that repeal of this restriction would materially increase the production of dairy products and meat, all of which are scarce and being rationed.

4. The greatly restricted allocation of chemical nitrogen fertilizer for use in Wisconsin appears irrational on the basis of the following quotations:

From a recent letter by a prominent agricultural authority in an Eastern State: "As you probably know there seems to be a considerable supply of nitrogen available now. Our fertilizer mixers here in the East have received supplies of uramon, which no one expected would be available 2 or 3 months ago. In fact, there seems to be adequate nitrogen to take care of all our needs even for an increased acreage of potatoes."

I wish Senators would listen to this:

From a recent letter by a manufacturer of chemical nitrogen fertilizer to a mixer or processor and wholesaler of fertilizer goods serving Wisconsin: "Referring to your letter of March 12, it will be April before your sulfate moves." (Sulfate refers to ammonium sulfate, a nitrogen fertilizer.)

Listen to this:

"This is because every available pound of sulfate was practically commandeered by the Bureau of Economic Warfare for export to"—

I have stricken out the name of the country—

"on boats leaving the —— city on —— date."

I have stricken out the name of the city and the date, because I do not know whether they have been made public.

To get this sulfate, the United States Commercial Company, which is a branch of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had to take material from as far away as Duluth, Minn. So you can see the urgency that they place upon the material. Naturally we do not like to see this material going out of the country and at the height of the domestic fertilizer season, but it is just one of those things that Washington required done, and domestic buyers are the sufferers.

I add that the domestic consumers are the sufferers because it will result in the failure in Wisconsin or other States to produce corn which would be turned into dairy products and an increased supply of meat products.

It was also announced recently that 25,000 tons of ammonium sulfate (5,000 tons of chemical nitrogen) were shipped to Spain. The total export of chemical nitrogen to Spain is possibly four or five times that being requested for Wisconsin.

Thus it appears clear that considerable amounts of nitrogen fertilizer are being shipped right from the region where the use of a small amount would give maximum benefits, but such use is denied by people who apparently do not understand the situation. One wonders why food production in Spain should be given priority over such production in Wisconsin.

On March 2 an appeal was made by the writer and enclosed brief sent to the Director of Food Administration (now M. Clifford Townsend) requesting as follows:

"In order to promote production of dairy and meat products in Wisconsin, it is asked that:

"1. Use of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for corn be not restricted to farmers who have previously made such use.

"2. Date of April 1, when delivery of second half of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for field corn may be made, be changed to March 15.

"3. In order to take care of Wisconsin's urgent need of fertilizer nitrogen for field corn, 1,000 additional tons of chemical fertilizer nitrogen be allocated for this purpose."

Copies were also sent to Mr. William F. Watkins, Chief, Fertilizer Section, Chemicals Division, Food Production Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; and M. H. H. Meqers, Chief, Nitrogen Unit, Chemicals Division, Inorganics Section, War Production Board, Washington, D. C.

The dean was spreading his requests around in the different places in the hope, I suppose, that those addressed might get together and do something about it.

Recently a reply was received from Watkins indicating that favorable action in regard to point 1 above would not be given.

Point 1 is the request of our commissioner that the use of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for corn be not restricted to farmers who have previously made such use of it.

However, a substantial reason for the unfavorable action is not presented. It is firmly believed that this unfavorable action is adverse to the best interests of the Nation as a whole and justifies vigorous counter efforts.

In justice to the farmers of Wisconsin, who are making an all-out effort to produce food, and as a matter of furthering the Nation's production of critical war foods, it is suggested that you contact the authorities in charge and urge relief to Wisconsin farmers, particularly as regards point No. 1 above. (This point comes under matters in control of Townsend and Watkins.) Point 2 above is already outdated, and nothing can be done about it except prevention of making the situation worse by advancing the date of April 1 to April 15, which it is understood is being considered. Point 3 needs to be strongly urged in order that point 1 may be made workable. (This point comes under matters largely in the hands of H. H. Meyers.)

To summarize, of the Nation's total Wisconsin produces 50 percent of the cheese, 18 percent of all processed dairy products, more canned vegetables than any other State, and notable amounts of meat and other critical war foods, and is now being asked to increase these amounts to a notable extent and in addition produce a considerable acreage of hemp for which chemical nitrogen fertilizer is indispensable. In order to make this increased production possible, Wisconsin is asking for considerably less than 1 percent of the Nation's available fertilizer nitrogen. To date the small amount requested has been only partially satisfied and its method of use greatly restricted, notwithstanding the fact that chemical nitrogen fertilizer is supplied to other regions for crops that do not need it, or for crops of which there exists a surplus, and is apparently being shipped right across Wisconsin for export abroad.

Right now the fertilizer companies serving Wisconsin are reporting that their shipments are being drastically held up because the available nitrogen supplies are going South, much of it presumably for short-staple cotton, of which a great surplus exists. Any action to be effective must be prompt, because planting of hemp will start in 30 days and corn in 40 days, and 1 month is a short time for the manufacturer to mix and deliver the goods.

Very truly yours,

CHRIS L. CHRISTENSEN,
Dean and Director.

Mr. President, there is attached to this letter a statement by Professor Emil Truog of the findings of various agricultural experiment stations as to the use of chemical nitrogen fertilizer for various crops. I shall ask that it may be printed as a part of my remarks, but I desire to read the summary for the information of the Senate.

1. To give preference as FPO 5 does to soybeans, peanuts, and possibly some other legumes over field corn in Wisconsin for chemical fertilizer nitrogen is not, on the basis of the extensive experimental data available, in the best interests of food production. To do so is to say that legumes which can utilize atmospheric nitrogen need nitrogen fertilization more than corn, which cannot make such use, and that soybeans and peanuts are more critical products than are dairy products.

2. The use of a small amount of chemical nitrogen for fertilization of field corn in Wisconsin will promote early growth, facilitate cultivation, insure maturity before frost, and by making possible the more effective use of a large natural supply of manure and legume nitrogen, markedly increase quality and yield; these benefits will be reflected directly in increased production of dairy products to the extent in many cases of over 100 pounds for each pound of chemical nitrogen used.

3. To limit in Wisconsin the fertilization of field corn with fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen to only those farmers who have previously practiced such fertilization is to deny to possibly 25,000 farmers in 1943

a practice which has been advocated by the Wisconsin experiment station for 20 years or more, and is now especially desirable as a measure for promoting dairy production in Wisconsin.

4. The withholding of delivery until April 1 of chemical nitrogen for fertilization of field corn and limitation of sale to that date of only one-half of previous use will greatly delay the farmer's plans, further complicate the manufacturers' labor problems, and by dividing shipments increase shipping costs and difficulties. This date of April 1 should be changed to March 15—

Of course, this suggestion is now obsolete, but the dean is urging that the date be not advanced from April 1 to April 15, as it is now rumored that it may be—

so that delivery of all fertilizer for any one farmer may be combined in one shipment.

5. The present fertilizer rationing plan, based largely on a historical basis of previous use, strikes Wisconsin right at the stage when her need and consumption are rising at a phenomenal rate. Her consumption in 1942 rose 57 percent over that in 1941. Normally, without rationing, a similar tonnage increase would follow in 1943. Other comparable States have some time since reached a saturation or near saturation historical base. This fact should be taken into consideration in applying FPO 5 to Wisconsin.

6. To supply possibly 25,000 Wisconsin farmers who will want to apply chemical nitrogen to field corn for the first time, 1,000 tons of additional chemical nitrogen should be made available immediately for this purpose to the fertilizer manufacturers serving Wisconsin. If reports received are true, this could easily be done by utilizing stocks now accumulating and not needed by the munitions industry.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I think this is a matter which should have the earnest and early consideration of Mr. Chester Davis, and of those in the War Production Board who are responsible for this order.

I ask that the statement to which I have referred, prepared by Professor Truog, the summary of which I have read, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FERTILIZER CONTAINING CHEMICAL NITROGEN IS URGENTLY NEEDED FOR FIELD CORN IN WISCONSIN

(Statement prepared by Prof. Emil Truog, chairman, department of soils, University of Wisconsin)

In order for Wisconsin to meet the food-production goals which have been set, particularly as regards dairy products, it is urgent and necessary that more fertilizer than now appears forthcoming be supplied. The provision of FPO 5, relating to the fertilization of field corn with fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen, will seriously handicap milk- and meat-production goals in Wisconsin because FPO 5 provides that—

1. Fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen may not be used on field corn by farmers who have not previously made such use.

2. Date of delivery to farmers eligible for such use is restricted to one-half before April 1, and the balance, if then available, after April 1.

It is believed these restrictions, as they apply to Wisconsin, are contrary to the best interests of the Nation because in Wisconsin field corn "spells" dairy products, and Wisconsin normally produces 18 percent of the Nation's processed dairy products. As far as Wisconsin is concerned, field corn should be placed in the group A crops.

NEED OF FIELD CORN IN WISCONSIN FOR FERTILIZER CONTAINING CHEMICAL NITROGEN IS FAR GREATER THAN IS THIS NEED BY SOYBEANS AND PEANUTS IN OTHER REGIONS

To give preference, as regards chemical fertilizer nitrogen, as FPO 5 does to soybeans and peanuts grown in various States over field corn in Wisconsin is not in accord, for the most part, with either experimental results or recommendations of experiment stations.

Little or no evidence exists that soybeans need fertilizer nitrogen

The soybean, being a legume, is able to obtain all the nitrogen it needs from the air, when properly inoculated. Experiment stations in the principal soybean-growing States do not recommend fertilization of this crop with nitrogen because little substantial evidence exists that such fertilization is beneficial. For example:

In the recent Ohio Extension Bulletin 207 is stated: "Soybeans respond very little to direct application of commercial fertilizer."

In Illinois Extension Circular 527 (1942) it is stated: "Soybeans respond less to fertilizers with possible exception of potash than most other crops."

In Indiana Extension Bulletin 231 (1938), page 4, the following data appear:

Preceding crops	Average yield in bushels per acre 1922-36 of corn and soybeans following preceding crops	
	Corn	Soybeans
Clover	57.9	24.0
Soybeans	50.4	22.7
Corn	48.4	23.8
Oats	49.4	24.0
Wheat	48.6	22.6
Timothy	49.4	22.9

These data show that the yield of soybeans following clover, which supplies nitrogen to the following crop, was not significantly greater than the yield of the beans when they followed a non legume which removes rather than supplies nitrogen. In fact, the soybean yields following clover and oats are precisely the same, while the corn yield following clover is strikingly higher, showing its great need for nitrogen fertilization. These data support the common statement that soybeans, when properly inoculated, will derive at least two-thirds of their needed nitrogen from the air, and are not materially benefited by nitrogen fertilization. In none of the great soybean-growing States is it recommended that the beans be fertilized with nitrogen. In fact, direct fertilization with even phosphate and potash is of questionable profit in most cases in these States.

Evidence shows peanuts in most cases do not need fertilizer nitrogen

Likewise the peanut, being also a legume, is, when properly supplied with minerals, benefited little, if any, by nitrogen fertilization. In a comprehensive bulletin, Peanut Production, Bulletin 366 (1942), Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station, statements as follows appear:

Page 14: "Experiment station results indicate that the greatest fertilizer needs of the peanut are phosphorus, lime, and potash."

Page 18: "The peanut, being a legume, draws most of the nitrogen from the air, but draws upon the soil for phosphoric acid, potash, and lime."

Page 19: "It is believed that when other crops in the rotation receive applications of fertilizer it is necessary to apply only phosphorus to the peanut crop. Our experimental results show that large quantities of nitrogen used on a fairly fertile soil always produce a poor quality of peanuts. At the same time, the yield is not materially increased. The use of this element causes the vines to grow too rapidly and consequently the axils where the flowers are formed, are too far apart. It also causes a profuse growth of vine and a corresponding lateness of maturity. When the vines are killed by frost there are always a number of immature nuts or 'saps' which are of a dark color and require much longer to dry than fully matured nuts. These results are not applicable under all conditions, however. On light, sandy soils, which are deficient in organic matter, an application of nitrogen often pays, especially when used in connection with phosphoric acid."

In a late bulletin, Culture and Fertilizer Studies with Peanuts, Bulletin 209 (1941), Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station—results of numerous fertilizer tests with peanuts are given and from these results those pertaining to the question at issue (tables 3, 6, and 8) are quoted in the tabulation that follows:

Place in Georgia of test, year, and variety	Yield per acre of nuts	
	Fertilizer without nitrogen	Fertilizer with nitrogen
Dawson (1937) Spanish variety	1,308	1,261
Dawson (1937) Carolina Runner variety	1,482	1,452
Hawkinsville and Cuthbert (1938-39), 2-year test at both places, Spanish variety, average 4 tests	633	1,040
Hawkinsville and Bronwood (1940) Spanish variety, average yield both places	815	676

In this bulletin, page 16, a statement as follows appears:

"Nitrogen is the chief element in peanut fertilizers which increases grass growth. Owing to the slow growth of the peanut plant in early stages, peanuts compete poorly with crab grass and yields are poor unless the grass is cleaned out. Putting 24 pounds nitrogen under peanuts increases the amount of hand hoeing required."

On page 17 of this bulletin, it is indicated that in a rotation in which the other crops have received average fertilization, it is doubtful that fertilization of peanuts even with minerals will usually pay

On the basis of the evidence found in these bulletins, one is impelled to conclude that even if there was no nitrogen shortage, fertilization of peanuts with nitrogen would be inadvisable, excepting possibly when grown on the very poor soils.

Fertilization of canning peas (a legume) has been under careful investigation in Wisconsin for the past 5 or 6 years and the results give further evidence regarding fertilization of legumes in general. These results show conclusively that when the peas are properly inoculated and fertilized with minerals, addition of nitrogen fertilizer is inadvisable and unprofitable except in the case of early peas grown on soils low in organic matter. The recommendations of the Wisconsin station are in accord with these findings (see attached mimeographed directions regarding fertilization of peas).

Field corn in Wisconsin responds markedly to starter nitrogen

On the other hand, for the past 20 years or more, the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, on the basis of hundreds of tests and observations, has recommended hill fertilization of field corn with 75 to 125

pounds per acre of fertilizer containing 2 to 4 percent of starter nitrogen. About 25 years ago the Wisconsin Station started extensive investigations of corn fertilization, involving kinds of fertilizers and methods of application. These investigations showed that the hill application of 75 to 125 pounds per acre of mixed fertilizer containing chemical starter nitrogen produces benefits as follows:

1. This fertilizer, being concentrated right near the seed, fertilizes the corn and not the weeds, and thus gives the corn a quick start so it may be cultivated early to advantage, thus saving much labor in later cultivations.

2. The early and vigorous growth promoted by this fertilization often hastens maturity by 1 to 2 weeks and greatly lessens frost injury, especially of the later, high-yielding varieties.

3. This fertilization, by insuring full maturity, favors high quality and feeding value either as silage or grain corn.

4. Because of the vigorous early growth produced, the corn is enabled to feed on the natural supply of nutrients in the soil so that the final yield is generally increased by 25% or more.

Is it necessary to put nitrogen in the fertilizer that is applied in the hill? Here is one result (a sample) obtained in 1923 that bears on this point:

	Bushels corn per acre
No fertilizer	21.7
120 pounds per acre of 0–12–2 (phosphate and potash)	23.1
120 pounds per acre of 2–12–12 (nitrogen, phosphate, and potash)	33.9

Although these are low yields, the influence of the nitrogen is striking.

How much is early growth stimulated? Here is one illustration of hundreds of similar cases noted:

(Picture not printed)

(Legend: An application of 100 pounds per acre of fertilizer in the hill, costing only $1.75, made the difference. Commercial fertilizer applied with an attachment on planter gets corn off to a vigorous start, permits early cultivation and effective weed control, advances maturity, and increases yield.)

The above result was obtained in 1942 in central Wisconsin. The picture was taken July 6; at this time corn should be knee high which it is on the fertilized portion where the yield was increased 16 bushels per acre. Note the slow growth of corn on the unfertilized portion; this greatly hinders effective cultivation. This slow growth occurs over most parts of Wisconsin whether the land is manured or not.

Why should a small amount of fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen do so much in Wisconsin where so much manure and legume nitrogen are added? There are several reasons for this: First, the large amounts of nitrogen supplied in Wisconsin by legumes and manure are not available to the small corn, either positionally or chemically; it being plowed under, it is some distance from the young plant; it being in organic form, it must be changed by bacterial activity to ammonia and nitrate before the corn can use it; in Wisconsin, because of the cool spring weather, this change does not go on rapidly until about June 15. This has been definitely determined by experiment.

It should also be noted that the presence of a large supply of manure and legume nitrogen without starter or chemical nitrogen may actually be detrimental to corn in a cool short season as frequently occurs in Wisconsin, because by producing excessive late growth without an early start it may delay maturity and thus cause undue frost damage. Thus, the addition of large amounts of manure and legume nitrogen in Wisconsin increases Wisconsin's need of starter nitrogen for corn over that of Michigan's need for this purpose, since Michigan does not apply nearly as much manure. Because of Wisconsin's cool spring climate, this need of starter nitrogen is also much greater in Wisconsin than farther south in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

In the fall of 1942, an early frost in September injured a lot of corn in Wisconsin to the extent that much poor silage was produced and this is now reflected in the milk flow. Without fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen, the hazard of serious frost injury to the field corn in Wisconsin is greatly increased, and the yield is materially reduced.

Because of the favorable results obtained, about one-half of the farmers in Wisconsin are now practicing hill fertilization of corn with fertilizer containing starter nitrogen. Restriction of use of fertilizer for corn containing chemical nitrogen to those farmers who have previously made such use means that possibly 25,000 farmers in Wisconsin who will want to make this use for the first time will be denied doing so, even though the Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service are strongly recommending the practice as an effective measure for promoting increased production of dairy products. This is creating an incompatible situation.

PRESENT RATIONING PLAN FOR FERTILIZER NITROGEN ON AN HISTORICAL BASIS STRIKES WISCONSIN AT STAGE WHEN HER NORMAL CONSUMPTION IS RISING AT PHENOMENAL RATE

In this connection it should be realized that only about one-half of the farmers in Wisconsin have ever used fertilizers, and that just now the use of fertilizer in the State is increasing at a phenomenal rate. This fact is well illustrated by the figure that follows:

(Graph not printed)

(Legend: Figure showing fertilizer consumption in Wisconsin (1938–43). Note phenomenal rate of increase right now.)

The use of fertilizer in the State in 1942 increased 57 percent over the use in 1941, and if the fertilizer were available for purchase, a similar tonnage increase would normally follow the coming season. In other words, the present fertilizer rationing plan based on past use strikes Wisconsin right at the very stage when her base of past use is undergoing a phenomenal increase. States in the South and to the East and even nearby States like Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio have long since reached a much more near saturation point on which their allocation of fertilizer is now based. Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota, because of their better soils and other factors, have as yet not reached the stage of rapid increase in fertilizer use. For the reasons given, the present rationing plan imposes a most serious handicap to Wisconsin's food-production effort.

The total amount of chemical nitrogen needed to supply Wisconsin's need for all fertilizer purposes is relatively small, being only slightly more than one-half of 1 percent of the Nation's total consumption and about one-half of what Michigan uses and is being allocated. On the basis of amounts and kinds of critical war foods produced in Wisconsin and Michigan, it does not appear to be in the best interests of the Nation that Wisconsin be given only one-half as much chemical fertilizer nitrogen as Michigan.

REVISION OF FPO 5 SO AS TO RELEASE IMMEDIATELY MORE NITROGEN FOR FIELD CORN IN WISCONSIN IS URGENT

The greatest single need for chemical nitrogen in Wisconsin is for fertilization of field corn used to produce milk. The present provisions of FPO 5 restricting use of chemical nitrogen on corn to previous users will prevent possibly 25,000 milk producers in Wisconsin from using chemical nitrogen to produce milk. Furthermore, the date of April 1, when past users of chemical nitrogen for corn may get consideration for their final allotment, is too late in the season. This date should be advanced to March 15, because farmers must complete their plans before April 1, and shipments to the country towns should be made in full carloads, consisting of a variety of fertilizers, some of which may be used on small grain by April 1. Transportation, manufacturing, and shipping facilities by the manufacturer will be greatly handicapped by withholding portions of orders until a date as late as April 1. This will mean in many cases that orders will be split so that much less than carload and truckload lots will have to be transported.

Reports are being received that the nitrogen needs for munitions manufacture are now being supplied by Government-built synthetic nitrogen plants to the extent that chemical nitrogen is piling up as a surplus at other places of private production, but is not being released for agriculture. This matter should be investigated immediately, and any surplus found should be released immediately to the fertilizer industry so the farmer will get it in time. It certainly will be gross negligence if all available supplies of chemical fertilizer nitrogen are not released in time for use this spring.

It appears that the fertilizer industry serving the Middle West is in a position to make up and ship fertilizers in excess of that delivered last year if the nitrogen materials are released in time. Information from Darling & Co., Chicago, is to the effect that they can increase their delivery at least 25 percent over last year providing proper releases of material are made immediately.

It is also being reported over the radio that recently 25,000 tons of ammonium sulfate (5,000 tons of elemental nitrogen) were delivered to Spain for fertilizer purposes. This is more than twice as much fertilizer nitrogen as Wisconsin is being supplied. The writer has not had opportunity to check this report of shipment to Spain and doubts its truth. Nevertheless, our farmers get these reports over the radio and wonder why they cannot get the small amount of nitrogen needed to facilitate their effort in producing dairy and other much needed food products. When the Wisconsin farmer is urged to increase food production and then is given only one-half of 1 percent or less of the Nation's fertilizer nitrogen, resulting in many farmers getting no nitrogen at all, might it not be said that many of these farmers are being asked to fight the battle of food production pretty much with their bare fists?

PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging and heartening things in connection with the Puerto Rican problem is contained in an Associated Press dispatch today from San Juan, P. R., which I will read:

SAN JUAN, P. R.—A campaign to win enthusiasm for Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS' independence bill opened today in earnest as the newspaper El Imparcia gave prominence to a "Patriotic Manifesto" calling for a mass meeting to support independence.

The conservative paper El Mundo broke a week-long silence on the Maryland Senator's measure and editorialized for its approval.

El Mundo declared that proponents of both statehood and independence should appear before the Tydings committee to claim for the people their right to resolve their status by "free determination."

Besides printing the manifesto signed by more than 60 lawyers, writers, and doctors, El Imparcial criticized the proposed elective governor bill as merely a temporary gain

which would in fact extend the colonial regime.

The manifesto called on Puerto Ricans to unite for the historic moment when "Twenty sister republics in solidarity with the United States look to Puerto Rico to bridge the fraternal union with the Americas."

Mr. President, the bill which has been introduced to achieve independence for Puerto Rico is not a perfect bill. It will undoubtedly have to be amended in view of testimony and facts which will be adduced at the hearings. I believe its approach is a fair one. I believe that in essence it is very fair to the people of Puerto Rico and provides them with an opportunity to achieve independence with a minimum of hardship. Therefore it is gratifying to me to know that the bill has been received in Puerto Rico in the spirit in which it was introduced.

The newspaper El Mundo and the newspaper El Imparcial are the two leading newspapers of Puerto Rico. They have very great influence among the population in the island. Therefore to have gained their cooperation toward the achievement of this mutually beneficial status for Puerto Rico in the years to come is something for which I, as an individual, am very grateful, and I believe it will conduce to a fair understanding and a fair solution of the Puerto Rican problem.

The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs will in the not-far-distant future begin hearings on the bill. We shall have members of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force before us. We shall have a report from the Tariff Commission. We shall have a report from the State Department, from the Commerce Department, from the Interior Department, and from other governmental agencies directly or indirectly concerned with the provisions of the bill.

I feel confident that if the people of Puerto Rico want independence a solution can be reached in the form of a bill which will give them a real opportunity not only to get it but to keep it successfully. I likewise believe, from my meager knowledge of Puerto Rican conditions, that in the long run the best interests of Puerto Rico and its people will be served if an appropriate independence bill shall be passed by Congress and submitted to them for their approval.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I saw the article to which the Senator from Maryland refers, and I know that the people of Puerto Rico received the introduction of the bill by the Senator from Maryland in the spirit in which it was meant. However, the information which I get from Puerto Ricans is that the reasons why they are in favor of independence are not the reasons which the Senator from Maryland would attribute to them. My understanding is that the people of Puerto Rico are enthusiastic now for the Senator's bill—or at least some of them are—because they feel they have been neglected completely by the Government of the United States. They feel that if they had independence some gesture of some kind would be made to try to cooperate with them. But they become completely disgusted, as citizens of this country, when they see American ships go to Puerto Rico, which produces sugar, and then go in ballast to Cuba, and pick up Cuban sugar. They think that if they were independent they would be able to sell their sugar. They feel that if they were independent possibly they would be able to make with our Government some kind of a contract by which the citizens of the island could get work in the United States. They feel that if they were independent, possibly they could develop the small industries which they have without encountering the handicaps which they have met in dealing with continental manufacturers. For instance, take cement: In the city of Ponce there is a small cement industry which has been a success; but, nevertheless, now, even though we are so short of shipping space that we are unable to send foodstuffs to Puerto Rico, cement—instead of foodstuffs—goes from continental United States to Puerto Rico. That is why there appears to be in certain quarters some enthusiasm for the bill of the Senator from Maryland.

I feel differently. I feel that down in their hearts and in their consciences the majority of the people of Puerto Rico want to solve their problems in an American way. I have been trying to be open-minded about the bill which the Senator from Maryland introduced, and I am. No one is more liberal than am I. I actually feel for freedom and for liberty. But because I consider the Puerto Rican problem an American problem, I shall not make up my mind until we find out what we are going to do with our children. To my mind, the problem is that of parent and child. Would the average parent turn his children loose before he knew that they could take care of themselves? I do not think he would. I do not think any of us would.

I know that the Puerto Rican problem is a hard one to solve, but I have faith that the American people, with the cooperation of the people of Puerto Rico, can solve it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with what the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico says, but I should like to have his reaction to the following question: In the Senator's judgment, would Puerto Rico be better off as a State of the United States, rather than having its own independence?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to answer that question for the Senator now; but, as he knows, a committee of this body went to Puerto Rico some time ago, and we should prefer not to make any personal comments until the committee shall have taken some action on the information which we have heretofore received.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows that I introduced a bill to that effect some time ago; does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I believe that until the Puerto Ricans get independence or until they get statehood, under the present system it would be better for Puerto Rico and for this country if they had as Governor one of their own people. I do not say that because I am against any particular person who might have been Governor of Puerto Rico, but if we want to carry out the idea we have in this country, the idea we love and revere under the system of appointment by the President of the United States, let us get a first-class, law-abiding, intelligent citizen of the island to be its Governor. I think that would help Puerto Rico.

SENATOR WHEELER AND LT. EDWARD COOPER—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on March 12, while I was in Arizona, there appeared in the Washington Post in the Drew Pearson column, an article headed "WHEELER'S Problem." It is stated there that—

Montana sugar-beet farmers, desperately hard up for labor, doubtless will be interested in the way one of their two Senators, BURTON K. WHEELER, solved a manpower problem with the help of the United States Navy.

Senator WHEELER is chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, which sponsored the bill to merge the Western Union and Postal Telegraph Cos.

Early last year an investigator for this committee, Edward Cooper, obtained a commission as a lieutenant in the Navy's Communications Section. Now Senator WHEELER has got Lieutenant Cooper assigned back to the Interstate Commerce Committee.

WHEELER went right to the top to swing this little deal. He urged Navy Secretary Knox to permit Cooper to return to his old job until the telegraph merger bill passed Congress. WHEELER explained that Cooper's services were sorely needed because he had given a great deal of time and study to the legislation.

Knox referred the request to Navy personnel officials, with the result that Lieutenant Cooper was given an indefinite leave to assist WHEELER as long as needed. He has been occupying an office close to WHEELER'S in the Senate Office Building since February 1.

Just what his duties are remains a mystery. All studies relative to the merger bill were completed last year, and the bill was sent to the President for his signature February 25, yet Cooper, at last report, was still occupying an office on Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, in fairness to the Senator from Montana, to Secretary Knox, and to Lieutenant Cooper, I feel that I should make a brief statement in regard to this article.

Had Mr. Pearson been correctly informed as to the facts, I am sure that the article would not have appeared. Edward Cooper was secretary to the special committee to investigate telegraph merger legislation. He was also secretary to the subcommittee which studied the bill after it was introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from Arizona. He helped us upon that bill up to the time he went into the Navy.

The so-called telegraph merger bill passed the Senate before Ed Cooper was assigned back to assist us. After it passed the Senate and the House a conference committee was appointed, of which the Senator from Arizona was chairman. There was much work to be done in the joint conference committee.

The Senator from Montana asked Secretary Knox to loan Lieutenant Cooper to serve the committee during the conference.

Lieutenant Cooper rendered most valuable and efficient service to the conference committee. If there is any criticism for the few days that he worked for the conference committee, it should be directed at myself and the other members of the conference committee, rather than at the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I feel that the criticism is unfair to the Secretary of the Navy and to the Senator from Montana.

Lieutenant Cooper was here only during the conference consideration of the bill. Immediately upon our agreement he went back to the service of the Navy. I tried to have him remain a few days longer to answer some of the many questions which were coming to the conference committee in regard to the bill, but he told me that his services were demanded by the Navy, and that he had to return.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As a member of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Arizona was chairman, which subcommittee considered the bill and acted as conferees on the part of the Senate, I wish to join with the Senator from Arizona in his statement, emphasizing that Mr. Cooper was here for only a very few days away from his naval duties—only the few days the bill was under consideration by the conferees.

He had an intimate knowledge of the bill. He had played a great part in the original drafting of the bill, and we felt that Mr. Cooper's services would be invaluable to the conferees. That is why we asked the Senator from Montana to request Secretary Knox to let us have the benefit of Mr. Cooper's services while we were in conference considering and working out the final form of the bill. Mr. Cooper knew so much about the bill, and had it so much at his finger tips, that the truth is that the conferees—certainly the Senate conferees—would have been at a great disadvantage if we had not had Mr. Cooper's advice while we were working on the bill in conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO LT. COL. G. B. GREENE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a citation issued by General MacArthur for a Distinguished Service Cross for Lt. Col. G. B. Greene, who is a lieutenant colonel in the Air Corps. He is the son of Judge and Mrs. George Benjamin Greene, of Anderson, S. C. Judge Greene is a member of the Supreme Court of South Carolina. His wife, Jane Drake Greene, is the daughter of Brig. Gen. Charles C. Drake, a prisoner of the Japanese from Corregidor. Mrs. Charles C. Drake is a cousin of Mrs. Truman. Colonel Greene returned to this country March 14 after 14 months in New Guinea. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross on April 2 by General MacArthur for extraordinary heroism, displayed over New Guinea on April 30, 1942. The citation from General MacArthur reads as follows:

Greene was honored for his achievements over Lae last April 30 and the other 5 for their work over Salamaua the same day. The 5 who had just arrived in the combat zone and their squadron were ordered into action for the first time. Greene was not required to participate but he voluntarily went on the mission over unfamiliar terrain. The mission approached Lae from the sea, took the enemy by surprise, destroyed or damaged 15 heavy bombers and several fighters, then proceeded to Salamaua where the flyers machine gunned ground installations and personnel and destroyed 3 seaplanes. When a superior number of enemy fighters attacked at low altitude, Greene shot down 1 fighter and damaged several others.

Mrs. Greene has been living with her mother, Mrs. Charles C. Drake, and her sister, Mrs. D. E. Williams, wife of Colonel Williams, of the Army Air Corps, who is also out of the country, at 2742 Woodley Place NW.

VETO OF AGRICULTURAL PARITY BILL

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial appearing recently in the Daily Oklahoman, a newspaper which has been in existence for many years and which ranks as the equal of any newspaper in the great Southwest in soundness of editorial policy. It deals with the subjects embraced within the Bankhead bill and other measures recently considered and discussed in the Senate.

This editorial does not bear out the statement that all the newspapers in the country condemn the principle set out in the Bankhead bill. It deals also with the veto by the President. It states with some degree of accuracy, I think, that the farm income constitutes about one-tenth of the national income. The President's veto would seem to indicate that this bill would result in an increase in prices of about 10 percent. If we assume that to be correct, that would mean that possibly the farmers' income would be increased about $1,000,000,000, and that figure in itself is solemnly declared to be calamitous in starting the spiral of inflation which would engulf this country in economic chaos.

It has been stated by some of my colleagues that this bill is a bill to do away with subsidies. In the bill we have sought to prohibit benefits and subsidies from being considered in arriving at parity for farm prices. I think the editorial is somewhat persuasive that the President, in his veto message on the bill, exaggerates the calamity that its enactment would produce. I most definitely agree with the sentiments expressed by my colleagues to the effect that subsidies and benefits to farmers should be repealed.

Mr. President, I invite special attention to the significance of the title of this editorial, "First To Be Denied." That, of course, refers to the farmers. The farmers are to some extent organized, of course; but because of the very nature of the wide diversity of farms, they are not susceptible to complete organization. The farmers have been asked to make a greater sacrifice than other elements are making. The editorial proves that benefits now denied to farmers are enjoyed by other classes; it proves convincingly that under an administration which is completely responsible to the proletariat and the big-city influence, the farmers are the stepchildren of the Government. Their prayers for what they honestly consider equal justice are the last to be heard and the first to be denied.

Personally, I feel that yesterday I witnessed the most humiliating experience it has ever been my lot to feel. I refer to the passage by a voice vote of an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the creation of another bureau further to centralize in Washington the activities of the citizens. Legislation of such far-reaching and portentous implications on appropriation bills is extremely alarming. We have harangued the people about the curtailment of bureaus and bureaucratic infiltration among the confusion of frustrated people, and yet from time to time we are increasing and expanding this plague of democracy. The remedy claimed to be effected by the bill passed will operate to revive what we thought were dormant bureaus, and add additional politicians to the long list. In my candid opinion, this will not be of any practical benefit, but will add to the perplexity of the farmers. The implications contained in the bill will, after the war is over, have repercussions which will be embarrassing and annoying.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman]

FIRST TO BE DENIED

Fairly recent figures estimated the approximate income of the American people for the past year at $90,000,000,000. The estimated income of American agriculture was $10,000,000,000, or one-ninth of the whole. Those figures were not absolutely accurate when they were first published, and they probably are even more inaccurate today, but it is unlikely that there has been any material change in the proportion of the total that the farmers of the country receive.

But the President has vetoed an agricultural parity bill on the ground that it would increase the farmer's income about 10 percent and thereby vastly augment the perils of inflation.

It is rather difficult to see how the addition of a billion dollars to a total national income of $90,000,000,000 could plunge the country into the troubled seas of inflation. It is likewise difficult to see the justice of denying this billion-dollar increase to agriculture after many billions have been added to the income of business and labor. And it is downright bewildering to see the administration blocking a billion-dollar increase to a $10,000,000,000 budget after it has helped and repeatedly helped to add billions to an $80,000,000,000 budget.

Theoretically, if not positively, the President is right when he says that no special interest should be permitted, or even seek, to make a special profit from the exigencies of total war. No one of patriotic impulse can

quarrel with such a postulate as that. Practically though, other special interests have already reaped immense profits from the war program, and some of them have been favored by administration acquiescence and even by the administration's positive help. It is only when the farmers ask for what business and labor have been given freely that the dangers of inflation begin to stir the misgivings of the Government.

In the veto message of the President are sharp intimations that there will be no more increases in prices and wages. There is the fairly clear implication that the present national income is going to be frozen exactly where it is and kept stationary for the duration. If that is necessary to prevent the ravages of inflation, there will be little opposition to the freezing. And if the farmers of the country believe that it is necessary for them to make a special sacrifice in order to serve the general welfare, they will make that sacrifice with reasonable cheerfulness.

But the record proves quite clearly that the farmers have been asked to make a greater sacrifice than other elements are making. It proves that the benefits now denied to the farmers are enjoyed by other classes. It proves convincingly that under an administration that is completely responsive to proletarian and big city influences the farmers of America are the stepchildren of the Government. Their prayer for what they honestly consider equal justice is the last to be heard and the first to be denied.

EFFECT OF WAR ON SMALL BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was quite interested in the remarks made a few moments ago by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]. I should like to make one additional suggestion concerning a class of people who, as well as farmers, have not been taken into consideration in the attempts which have been made of late to reorganize our economic affairs.

The pending bill, which is in charge of the Senator from New York and which the Senate will soon proceed to consider, has caused me considerable concern. All of us desire to pay what is fair to those who work for the Government, if we are in position to pay it. I do not think there is any exception to that. But there must come a time when we shall have to give consideration to our ability to pay.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from a former Governor of the State of Nebraska which refers to a group of people about whom we have heard considerable of late. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY THE WAY RANCH,
Lincoln, Nebr., April 6, 1943.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUGH: The thing uppermost in the towns and cities now is how we are going to be able to continue our businesses. Government reports and rationing have multiplied the work our executives and clerical force formerly had to do. On the other hand, many of our experienced employees have been taken in the draft or have gone to what they thought were more fruitful fields. We, like everyone else, are very short of experienced and capable help. Now it is proposed to take men from 38 to 45. That would include our manager and the heads of three or four other departments. I do not see how we could possibly operate if that were done.

Thi is cited as affecting not only our organization but thousands of other small businesses. I talked with the owner of a cleaning establishment this morning. For months they have been making deliveries every 3 days where they used to make it every day. Now it is 4 days. This manager told me that in the last 6 months they have had a turn-over of 70 employees, which is more than they had in 38 years prior. He said he did not see how they could continue in business. He thought that he and his partner might try to do enough of the work themselves to secure income for paying taxes and continue in business, but he doubted that they would be able to do even that. Every institution has its own story, and they all tend toward the same result; namely, the internal economy is being gradually wrecked beyond the point that it can recover after the war is over. Maybe that is the price that will have to be paid for winning the war, but before we resign ourselves to it I believe it is vital to canvass the need for the size military organization now proposed. More vital still, it is unthinkable that this Nation should be on a 40-hour week or the equivalent so far as the wage level is concerned, while thousands upon thousands of businesses are being wrecked through a manpower shortage.

I quote from the April issue of Reader's Digest:

"On the authority of the New York Times the war this year will cost the United States more than all the other belligerent nations put together. According to these estimates, it will cost the United States roughly $100,000,000,000; Germany, $34,400,000,000; Great Britain, $21,330,000,000; Russia, $15,000,000,000; Italy, $8,670,000,000; and Japan, $7,000,000,000.

"Although the United States budget tops the war expenditures of allies and enemies combined, the United States will not maintain larger armies and navies than all these other nations put together. It does not mean the United States will produce more munitions and supplies than all of them. It means that, through unprecedentedly high wages, through overtime due to the 40-hour week, through an unwieldy bureaucracy, we are paying far more for far less, proportionately, than any other nation. Such prodigality is a serious threat to our country's economic future."

We may be able to win a war that way. What will be left after it is over? Unless Congress saves the situation it will not be saved.

Cordially yours,

SAM R. MCKELVIE.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to mention the group referred to in the letter. It consists of small businessmen who are gradually and rather at an increased rate disappearing from the scene. Their employees are being taken from them. Their businesses are being closed. Their number is not small; they comprise hundreds of thousands the Nation over. So I cannot refrain from suggesting that now is a good time to call a halt and consider for a moment whether at this time we should attempt to make life easier for those who are working for the Government. I should like to be able to do it, as I am sure all other Senators would. War is a grim business, to say the least. It is a time when we should make sacrifices and every group should be willing to sacrifice to the limit.

In the Reader's Digest of recent date there appeared an article quoting the New York Times to the effect that our Government will spend during this year more than $100,000,000,000 which is a greater amount than will be spent by the other contestants in the war on both sides. I think it is time to call a halt, and that each and every person should make a personal sacrifice toward winning the war.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to state the pending question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment, striking out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, on page 6 of the substitute and inserting in lieu thereof certain other language.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate may we have read the language which is to be stricken out?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the language to be stricken out.

Mr. MCNARY. I am informed that if the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] were present it would not be his intention to insist on the amendment. He is now absent from the city.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that he offered two amendments, and that he asked for the consideration of one and not the other. If the one he wishes consideration of is the one I have in mind, the situation will be clarified by having it read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 8, it is proposed to amend by substituting a period for the colon, and striking out everything after the colon down to and including line 12.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I may explain that the proposed amendment has only to do with overtime being compensated for by compensatory time off. It has nothing to do with the overtime basis. The Senator from California asked us to consider that proposal. He said he had discussed it with a number of persons. Personally, I do not believe it is vital because it is not contained in the House bill, and we could take it up in conference.

Mr. MCNARY. What effect, may I ask, would the amendment have on the bill?

Mr. MEAD. It would merely have the effect of preventing the heads of departments and agencies compensating workers who work more than 48 hours a week, by giving them time off instead of paying them for the time they work. It would have little or no effect on the main purposes of the bill.

Mr. MCNARY. Would it add to the outlay?

Mr. MEAD. No; two methods are provided for compensating the worker who works more than 48 hours; either by paying him practically straight time, or giving him some additional time off to compensate him for the extra work. That is all it does. It will not cost anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean that if an employee works overtime he will be given time off from his regular employment equal to the time he works overtime?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. It merely prescribes either that method, or the method of paying the employee for the overtime worked.

Mr. BARKLEY. What good would it do to give him compensation for overtime if there shall be deducted from his regular salary an equal amount?

Mr. MEAD. He can work for 48 hours which is, we will say, a stated week established by the head of the agency. But in a crisis the agency may wish to work a certain employee 50 or 52 hours. For the time over 48 hours the agency may give the employee compensatory time off during the following week. It would probably save bookkeeping. It might be helpful and it might not be helpful. It will have very little to do with the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is this a part of the Thomas amendment which was presented?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; it is the latter part of the amendment not the first part.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. BURTON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask the Senator from New York this general question: Since the Senate recessed last night the President issued a general order relating to compensation, and has put rather drastic ceilings—I think very appropriately—in many directions. Is there anything in this proposed legislation which would collide with the new formula announced by the President in respect to the wage question?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is my opinion that it in no way does violence to the President's message, first of all, because we are not raising the basic pay; we are lengthening the workweek about 20 percent but are giving the employee about 20 percent additional pay to compensate him for the extra time he works. We are actually paying him straight time for overtime. So we are doing nothing which would be at variance with the philosophy of the President's order, and the President, I understand, has just signed the postal-pay bill which is somewhat similar to the pending bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How about the proposed Thomas amendment which changes the overtime base?

Mr. MEAD. The Thomas amendment would insert in the bill the overtime yardstick which is used generally in private industry, the yardstick which the Congress inserted in the wage-and-hour law, the Bacon-Davis law, and the Walsh-Healey law, a yardstick prescribed by the Government for 60 percent of all Government workers who are engaged in the arsenals, repair depots, navy yards, and so forth.

I will say to my distinguished colleague from Michigan that the committee considered that, and, by a substantial vote, as was brought out in the Senate yesterday, changed the yardstick from one two-hundred-and-sixtieth to one three-hundred-and-sixtieth so that, in reality, instead of giving them time and a half by that yardstick, it gives them just a little over straight time. I presume the vote taken in the committee, which was a substantial one, should, at least, guide me in explaining what happened in the committee to that amendment, for, after all, the committee has authorized me to speak for it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand, the amendment to which the Senator now refers, which was rejected by the committee, is to be offered on the floor?

Mr. MEAD. No; it is not to be offered at the present time at least. The amendment is merely a compensatory time amendment, but not the Thomas amendment. I have no information that the Thomas amendment will be offered.

Mr. BYRD. I think it was offered yesterday by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Thomas amendment is the pending question before the Senate at this time.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, that is the observation I was making a moment ago, and I am informed reliably that the amendment was not intended to be pursued or pressed for consideration this morning. The Senator from California, who is not now present, I understand, thought we might well abandon that amendment.

Mr. MEAD. The situation can be simplified by separating the amendment, as it was my understanding that the Senator from California asked for action only on the second portion of the amendment. It seems to me that is what he discussed on the floor of the Senate, but, if that was not his idea, we can vote on the amendment divided, on the first section now and the second section a little later.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are two amendments in the Downey proposal.

Mr. MEAD. Then, Mr. President, which one of the two proposals is now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], to strike out lines 21 and 25, on page 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof certain other language. That is the first Thomas amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what would that do? Is that the one which simply provides for compensatory time for any overtime, or is that one which increases the monetary total of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the clerk read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6 it is proposed to strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation for work in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek at a rate of one and one-half times their basic rates of compensation: *Provided*, That in computing the overtime compensation of per annum officers and employees, the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one two-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries, and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of base pay so computed for 1 day.

Mr. MCNARY. That is the one I had in mind when I stated that it was the intention of the Senator from California to abandon it. I think we should dispose of that amendment before we dispose of the other.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has just been stated, offered by the Senator from California on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from California on behalf of the Senator from Utah.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7 it is proposed to substitute a period for the colon in line 8, and strike out all after such colon down to and including line 12.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. I ask the Senator from New York to yield to me because I discussed this particular matter at the close of the session yesterday with the Senator from California, and I believe I can clarify the situation. I believe that this amendment also should be rejected in order to carry out the intent of the proponent of the amendment. As the bill now stands, it includes the Senate committee's proviso. This provides that an employee who works more than 48 hours at least with the consent of the head of his department or agency, and in the discretion of the head of that department, or agency, may receive compensation in the form of time off instead of in additional dollars. That will meet some special situations where it will work out to the better advantage of both the Government and the employee to handle it in this way.

The Senator from California would like to have discussed in conference the question whether or not the proviso should be in the bill.

The proviso, however, is not in the bill as it passed the House. Therefore, if this motion to strike the proviso from this bill should prevail, the proviso

would not be in conference, as it would not appear in either the House or the Senate bill, and would not be a proper subject for consideration by the conference committee. I understood from the Senator from California, when he left last night, that he agreed that if the Senate rejected this amendment, thus leaving the proviso in the bill, the proviso would then be in conference, because it is in the Senate bill now, and not in the House bill. This would accomplish what he wishes. The proviso then could be considered in conference, where there can be further evidence presented to show the full effect of the proviso. Therefore, I believe this amendment should be voted down.

Mr. MEAD. I agree with my colleague from Ohio, that the amendment should be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the second amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from New York is open to further amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, are we about ready to vote on the final disposition of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, before we reach that stage.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. I have spoken to the Senator from New York about the amendment, and I should like to know whether he will accept it. It reads as follows:

On page 13, line 12, after the word "applicable", to insert "nor shall any overtime be payable under the act of March 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 522, title 5, sec. 673)."

That simply refers to the wage-and-hour law in United States navy yards.

Mr. MEAD. That would take the place of section 15. I discussed it with my colleague from North Dakota, and, so far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. LANGER At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a short statement which I have prepared, and in connection with it several newspaper comments and articles.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I feel that "it is the duty of every government to give protection to its citizens of whatever class, color, or condition."

These are the prophetic words of President Abraham Lincoln.

Is it not just and proper for the United States Senate to protect loyal American workers against union discrimination in the Goverment navy yards and the United States Treasury Bureau of Engraving?

Section 15 of the pending bill (S. 635), the so-called Langer antidiscrimination amendment, simply denies the benefits of this legislation and overtime pay to Government employees, who are members of unions, such as District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, which maintains a closed shop in the navy yards of the United States, while at the same time barring qualified, experienced, necessary, and available colored civil-service employees from membership to this same union. It would, likewise, stop a similar abuse and practice in the Bureau of Engraving, Department of the United States Treasury, as well as other Government agencies.

There is pending before the Senate a resolution for an international police force to guarantee the "four freedoms" to the people of the world. Should not the Members embrace within their charity and generosity the opportunity to assure through this action against discrimination equal justice and freedom from prejudice to these patriotic and native Americans? On the home front assure them their constitutional rights in building battleships, submarines, airplane carriers, and transports, and to promotions in the Government service, for the all-out total effort to beat the Japs and Nazis, as well as supply our own fighting men on the far-flung battle lines in this global struggle for actual existence.

Mr. N. P. Alifas, president, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, when questioned before the House Civil Service Committee as to the continued discrimination of the union in denying membership to Negroes, said he preferred not to answer the question. He had no hesitancy in making further demands for overtime and pay-increase benefits under this legislation. Of course, this question, as usual, was off the record.

Edgar G. Brown, director, National Negro Council, and president, United Government Employees, outlined before the Senate Civil Service Committee that more than 20,000 excellently trained and experienced colored skilled civil-service workers in the United States navy yards are being lost to the vital ship-building program of the Nation because of this continued discrimination of the machinists and metal-trades unions, which maintain closed-shop agreements in these Government shops.

"We are fighting for the right of men to live together as members of one family rather than as masters and slaves. We are fighting that the spirit of brotherhood which we prize in this country may be practiced here and by freemen everywhere." President Roosevelt recently transmitted this challenging declaration of the cause for which 10,000,000 young and old American soldiers, including 450,000 colored servicemen, are fighting, bleeding, and dying in an official message to the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

A telephone call from one of these 20,000 patriotic and loyal colored employees with 23 years' service in the United States Navy Yard of Washington, D. C., that he was questioned only yesterday and reminded of the utter senselessness of what he rightly thought was his right, to complain of the continued refusal to utilize his proven competency as an electrician and to deny to him promotion and recognition, not on the basis of race or membership in the union but highly developed skills and long experience.

This is the verbatim reply of the authorized Federal official to the plea of this injured civil-service employee.

I quote: "Mr. B, we must remind you that you are a colored man."

How would you feel, Senators, if you were forced for 23 years, and in the face of World War No. 2 for democracy, to be subjected to the same humiliating and discriminatory experience of this faithful colored Federal employee, who is also a taxpayer, War-bond purchaser, and the father of three sons fighting, bleeding, and dying to preserve our way of life—the American way? But a cruel and heartless and tragic spectacle it is for this unfortunate colored Government employee.

There are 20,000 like this sad and perplexed colored American citizen and Federal employee in the United States navy yards covered by this Senate bill 635. My amendment is designed to immediately correct this terrifying situation. It will do no harm to any other civil-service employee and bring about a square deal for these wrongfully treated and deserving Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, as first set forth by Thomas Jefferson in the Constitution of the United States, which every Member of Congress has taken a solemn pledge to uphold.

Yesterday we appropriated $40,000,000 to secure farm workers to plant and harvest the 1943 crops so absolutely necessary. We are going to bring in thousands of foreign workers. Still, right at home we have those who would deny to those who are willing and begging to work and do their full share in the war effort membership in a union with a closed-shop agreement with the United States navy yards, the United States Treasury (the printers' union at the Bureau of Engraving), and thereby prohibit from employment these civil-service workers because they are Negroes. This is tragically unjust.

These colored workers in the United States navy yards work today and have labored side by side of their fello.· American workers for many years as apprentices and have acquired valuable skills, which are most vital to the war effort, but the union bars them from membership and insists on its closed shop as usual. The President and the Fair Employment Practices Committee set up by him have failed to correct this gross injustice. Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox refused to discuss this matter with the representatives of the National Negro Council. In a mass meeting in Colonel Knox's home city of Chicago only 2 weeks ago 2,000 citizens in protest called upon the President in unanimous resolution to demand the resignation of this Cabinet member as refusing to consider immediate steps to stop discrimination against colored workers in the United States navy yards and thereby expedite the war shipbuilding program, as well as to protect the constitutional rights of the 13,000,000 colored citizens, one-tenth of the total manpower of the Nation, so essential today.

It is the duty of the Congress to act now and quickly.

Let me remind the Senate of a recent happening.

The American public learned in 1941, through the then uncensored press, that an unnamed Negro mess attendant became the first hero of the treacherous Jap attack at Pearl Harbor by manning a machine gun—he had never been taught by the Navy to shoot—and bringing down four enemy planes above the battleship *Arizona* after members of the gun crew had been put out of action. He was so accredited officially by the Navy only last week. Belatedly the Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox revealed his name as Dorie Miller. Later he wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee recommending against the award of the Congressional Medal, as proposed in a Senate and House joint resolution by the distinguished junior Senator from New York and Congressman DINGELL. The very next day after this unfavorable action of the Secretary the President awarded this same colored hero the Naval Cross. Let me quote further from the Navy's own comment. In addition, "Miller swam to shore and helped in a flying-field operation, after having removed the dying captain to a more sheltered place beneath one of the big antiaircraft guns." The Afro-American newspaper makes this

further comment: "This is the first official account that actually credits Miller with bringing down any planes. All previous accounts have referred only to his carrying his wounded captain to a place of safety and his manning the gun. For this heroism Miller received only promotion from second-class mess attendant to first-class and an increase in pay from $60 to $66 a month."

There appears to be ample reasons for the belief, that the presently suppressed and inhibited skills of these colored workers will never be made the true assets, they should properly be at this time, unless Congress insists by such antidiscriminatory action as here recommended by the full Senate Civil Service Committee in section 15 of Senate bill 635.

The Nation's peril can only be further endangered by our failure to legislate this evil thing out of the Government itself. The golden opportunity to make justice work here and now for all those, who take an oath to uphold the laws and the Constitution in our democracy rests squarely with the members of the United States Senate. It seems inconceivable that there could be one Senator who could stand before the American people and the peoples of the world and cast a vote, which would deny equal rights to the fathers, sons, and brothers of th 450,000 colored soldiers fighting, bleeding, and dying along with the millions of other brave Americans, whose battle cry around the globe is "freedom."

Let the Senate ponder well the full implications of this vicious practice of discrimination against Americans, because of race.

I first call your attention to the comment of one of the best-known columnists of the Negro press, George Schuyler, in the Pittsburgh Courier. It is as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier]

"THE WORLD TODAY

"By George S. Schuyler

"SAYS HE HAS NO COUNTRY

"Robert Moses, Newark Negro draft dodger who with five other colored men drew 3 years in Federal prison last week told the judge, 'I have no country.' What Moses said, many Negroes could be thinking, and it is up to American white people to make them think otherwise. Jailing them will not change their minds, but democracy, fair play, citizenship rights, and equality of opportunity will.

"One wonders do people who give lip service to the concept of national unity realize how widespread is the feeling among one-tenth of the population of not 'belonging,' and how justified it is. You cannot bar a man from voting, bar him from public places, coop him in a ghetto, subject him to economic discrimination, and otherwise make him feel like an alien, and expect him to feel like a full-fledged citizen.

"This war is primarily a struggle of ideas and ideals. The side which first loses the support of its people for its ideas and ideals will be defeated. Nor will machine guns and jails take the place of honesty and sincerity. Ignoramuses and martyrs will blurt out that they have no country. We lock them up but cannot help but wonder how many others are silently thinking the same thing.

"You cannot imagine an American white man saying what black Robert Moses said to the judge, because no American white man feels like that. He has been taught that he is 'free, white, and 21,' and that anything he wants is within his reach if he is willing to study, plan, work, and make sacrifices for it. On the day that this becomes true for black men, there will be not one to say, like Robert Moses, 'I have no country.'

"Mahatma Gandhi has much the same grievance as Robert Moses; Gandhi, jailed by fighters for democracy because he wants democracy for India, has started another long fast in protest against the unwillingness of the British administration to turn the government of India over to Indians. He calls his ordeal 'an appeal to the highest tribunal for justice.' Perhaps he means the Indian people. He couldn't mean the British."

[From the Chicago Defender of March 27, 1943]

"SHIPYARDS DISCRIMINATE IN SAVANNAH, GA.

"Negroes constitute 46 percent of Savannah's population. White children have three modern high schools and one junior college. Recently a Federal grant for education was secured from which immediately another school for white children was built.

"Negro children have but one high school—ancient and inadequately equipped and unaccredited. One Negro public school used to be pointed out by Negroes as a famous landmark because it is one of the innumerable houses of which it is said 'George Washington slept here.' Washington visited Savannah in 1791—152 years ago—so little imagination is needed to judge the suitability of such a building as a schoolhouse in 1943. There is a deep differential between salaries paid white and Negro teachers but no colored teacher has yet stepped forward as a plaintiff despite the unbroken series of successful suits all over the South against differentials which have added nearly $3,000,000 to the pay checks of Negro teachers.

"NEW DAY COMING

"All these and other familiar patterns of James Crow afflict Savannah. Older residents used to boast that 'race relations are better here than in any other town in Georgia.' Neither they nor the younger newcomers are so naive today. They know that in part the absence of sense of conflict in the local scene is due to the fact that Negroes haven't asked for much so the white folks feel kindly toward them.

"But a new day and a new spirit have come. It isn't immediately perceptible. Deep-throated, unrestrained Negro laughter still fills the colored part of West Broad Street like that I heard a few minutes ago from a superbly built ebon woman dressed in a billiard-table green sateen-visored cap, sky-blue sateen slacks, and grey-green sweater.

"But mirth is less mirthful as Savannah Negroes see the accentuated difference in pay and opportunity at war plants and shipyards and training schools for whites and those provided—when they are provided—for Negroes. Passive, hopeless acceptance of these conditions is passing. Negroes are determinedly, intelligently organizing to do something instead of merely bemoaning their plight.

"I have just talked with as alert, intelligent and courageous a group of shipyard workers as could be found anywhere in the United States. They gave me a terse, accurate picture of how they and other Negroes are being cheated and discriminated against by employers and American Federation of Labor unions.

"One of them is an acetylene cutter with 10 years experience who receives 80 cents an hour as a 'helper' to green country whites he himself taught and who get $1.75 an hour.

"Another who worked 6 years as a rigger and stationary engine fireman was allowed to fill out an application blank only as a common laborer as were all the Negroes at the Southeastern Shipyards which is operated by the Maritime Commission.

"A third who is an expert anglesmith works at his skill but is paid as a helper.

"LABOR FIGURES IN FIGHT

"All whites at the yards are hired as skilled, though many of them are dumb farm hands right out of the Georgia and Florida backwoods. They receive 62 cents an hour while being trained and are paid skilled wages as soon as the free course is completed.

"The American Federation of Labor has closed-shop contracts with the two Savannah shipyards which the Congress of Industrial Organizations charges are collusive. Negroes are segregated in the hodcarriers' and boilermakers' unions, which the Negroes assert does nothing for them except collect dues and issue work cards. A fat racket is firing Negroes when they have finished paying the initiation fee of $15—plus monthly dues of $1.50—and then inducting a new lot to pay the joining fee. Another racket is to certify white workers fresh from the canebrakes to draft boards as skilled and irreplaceable, while skilled Negroes are drafted.

"But tough and disheartening as the situation is, Negroes are not taking it lying down. The Congress of Industrial Organizations is working to secure National Labor Relations Board elections in the shipyards to determine whether it or the American Federation of Labor shall represent the workers. Negroes have flocked to the Congress of Industrial Organizations, justly cynical about the resolutions passed by the American Federation of Labor Southern Conference recently held at Atlanta to offset Congress of Industrial Organizations gains in the South, which proclaimed the end of racial discrimination in the American Federation of Labor. Negroes see no change in American Federation of Labor practice."

Mr. LANGER. In the all-out total war effort, no single contribution will do more to expedite the victory of the United Nations than the construction of more ships. The supply lines to the 7,000,000-man Army on the far-flung battlefields of the world must be kept intact. Nothing impedes more definitely this important objective than the insistence of the United States navy yards of a closed shop maintained by the metal-trades union of the American Federation of Labor, barring Negro workers from employment.

It is unbelievable that at this very hour approximately 40,000 eligible experienced Negro civil-service employees of the United States navy yards are now barred from the use of essential skills because of closed-shop agreements. Negroes are denied membership in the metal-trades unions of the American Federation of Labor at these navy yards. In Senate bill 635 to provide overtime pay increases for all Federal Government employees including several hundred thousand in the navy yards, it is provided that the benefits of this legislation shall be denied any member of such union which discriminates in its membership on account of race, creed, or color. This prohibition against racial discrimination is a fundamental provision of the United States Constitution. It is likewise prohibited in the civil-service statutes. Still in these closed-shop agreements, the American Federation of Labor machinists, electricians, and metal-trades unions at the United States navy yards continue to practice prejudice as usual.

More than 450,000 Negro servicemen are now fighting and dying for democracy all over the world. It recalls to mind the oft-practiced missionary proposition of carrying brotherhood, christianity, justice and humanity to all sections of the world, while the people in your own community at home are overlooked and forgotten. There is nothing more paramount at the moment than for organized labor to forego its prejudices. The long pent-up capabilities and patriotism of Negro workers in the Government and in industrial war plants denied membership and employment by the unions should be utilized now in the struggle for survival and the preservation of democratic institutions.

Negro leaders of the 13,000,000 colored citizens of the United States are demanding support of this non-discrimination proposal and propose to back it up with every ounce

of their moral and political force in all States of the Union. This measure will advance the welfare of the American worker, regardless of race, creed, or color to make certain of equal benefits, employment, and democracy on the home front.

We favor international amity, but we are firm in our belief that there can be no world peace under the auspices of the United Nations before there is adherence to the ways of constitutional democracy and equal rights for all the people in the United States. The task of patriotic Americans everywhere who are giving their sons, too, who in turn fight and die to defeat those who would enslave us, is to assure the country of the militant and devoted support of the Negro in the cause of security for all regardless of race, creed, or color at home, as well as abroad.

The representatives of the African Methodist Episcopal Church have voiced their protest, as evidenced by an article which I present for the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

"AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL PRELATES GIVE VOICE TO RACE AIMS—LEADERS GIVE RÉSUMÉ OF HISTORIC ROLE RELIGION AND THE CHURCH HAS PLAYED IN RACIAL LIFE

"NASHVILLE, TENN., March 4.—The African Methodist Episcopal Church was born in the midst of a war waged for liberty and free self-government. Our church had its beginning at a time when the spirit of the Declaration of Independence filled the air. Its founders upheld the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, that at the altar of our common faith all men are equal. To uphold this truth, Richard Allen and his group established the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The principles Washington and the colonists fought to establish in political government, Richard Allen and his followers with equal zeal strove to establish in the church.

"It is a strange revelation of the ways of Providence that every turning point in the advancement and freedom of the Negro on American soil has been forged in the fires of war and established by the decision of the battlefield.

"Now that our country, our church, and our race are caught in the meshes of the greatest global war that ever encircled the world, we, the chosen leaders of our church, send you a brief message which we believe represents the spirit of Christ and the verdict of history.

"Wherever human society exists, there must be some form of government, a government conceived and administered by human agencies. But such ideas as liberty, freedom, justice, neighborliness, righteousness, must be drawn from a source that represents the Absolute One. We in America find these qualities residing in God. The fundamental principles of American democracy are based upon the teachings of Jesus. That is why human slavery was destroyed. It has been the inspiration of laws for justice to labor, equal political rights for women, old-age pensions, and our entire program of social legislation. We cannot join in making a fetish out of democracy, or conform to the pattern of the 'American way of life' when it conflicts with the express teachings of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Our first and highest loyalty belongs to Him.

"We advise that it is our duty to resist all forms of oppression and destroy the power of oppressors. It is our duty to defend our country against the ruthless might of those who would force upon us ideologies repugnant to our Christian tradition and our ideals of democratic freedom. But our high duties by no means end here. Our bewildered people are asking, What shall we do when our Government asks us to fulfill these duties at the expense of our honor as freemen and the debasement of the dignity and honor that belong to all American citizens? Shall we offer our lives and our money on the altar of national defense in the face of exclusion and denial of participation on terms of equality in every phase of the war effort? Our answer is, "Yes" and "No." Social economic, and political attitudes in our country are such, as relate to the Negro, that we must uphold as our watchword 'Our church, our country, and our race.' It is neither unpatriotic nor disloyal to vigorously protest by using every legal weapon at our command to fight exclusion from any branch of the armed service or the war effort on the ground of race or color, while giving the full measure of our strength for the success of our war effort against our foes.

"We are cautioned that protest against our exclusion and denial makes for disunity and division in the face of our common enemy; that we should suffer in silence until our arms are victorious. If at a time when all of us are engaged in self-denial and sacrifice, even unto death, our country will not grant us opportunity to freely participate on every front—domestic, civil, social, and military—then we prove ourselves unworthy of that liberty, freedom, and opportunity whichwe proclaim we are fighting to preserve for ourselves and to bestow upon the conquered and oppressed freedom-loving people of the earth.

"In the face of this we remind you that the people called Negroes have here in America during the past 300 years, coming from the mire of the degrading depths of slavery achieved more substantial development and progress than any other group of this people upon the face of the earth.

"We urge our people to falter not, neither give way to discouragement nor fear. The history of the past is our guaranty that the borders of equality, freedom, and justice shall be immensely widened at home while we sacrifice and die to bestow them upon people across the seven seas in every part of the globe.

"Ignorant, helpless, and defenseless, but with unwavering faith in God, we have come thus far on our journey. He has removed mountains from our pathway of progress and divided the seas to make for us a way of escape. There is not a single page of American history to show that, as a group, we have left any footprints turning backward. In this, one of the most fateful and decisive hours in history, let us arise and come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

"The Reverend Henry McNeal Turner, a minister in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, was commissioned a chaplain by President Lincoln when Negro soldiers were inducted into the Army during the Civil War. Reverend Turner (later bishop) thus became the first Negro chaplain to be commissioned. Today scores of educated and trained young ministers from our church and sister denominations are carrying the services of the church to our men in the armed forces. Through the chaplains, the church is marching alongside the armies to the farthest places of the world.

"Thousands of our men are away from home serving the armed forces. They shall have bitter experiences there which may harden the hearts of some against the Spirit of God. We should keep in close touch with the men, pray for them, write to them, let them know our hearts follow them.

"Hundreds of our girls have joined the WAAC's. The daughter of one of our general officers has been promoted to the rank of captain. The country is watching to see how the WAAC's will carry on. They present to the church a challenging opportunity.

"In the last 2 years thousands of our people have pulled away from the church when breaking home ties and going off among strangers. We Christians who stay at home must seek the strangers moving into our community, befriend them, and help them to find places in our congregations.

"Our foreign mission fields have been disturbed by the war as never before. Our bishops have not been able to be on the spot and give personal supervision. Our missionaries have been hampered for lack of funds. We must prepare now to give generously in 1943 to the appeal of our department of missions for the support of our mission fields in Africa and the islands of the sea.

"At the close of the present war, many of our soldiers shall return from strange lands where they have been among strange people of strange language and customs, worshipping strange gods under strange stars. They shall have lost touch with their old and familiar surroundings. They shall have to be integrated anew into the paths of peace as they relate to our social, industrial, political, and economic life.

"We shall do all in our power to give the spiritual influence of the church full cooperation with the Government and other agencies and organizations."

"AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPALS SUPPLIED MORE THAN HALF QUOTA OF CHAPLAINS TO ARMY

"NASHVILLE, TENN., March 4.—According to Bishop R. R. Wright, the African Methodist Episcopal Church has supplied 51 chaplains to the Army. The quota is 96, the bishop said.

"He also stated that two of the highest-ranking chaplains in the Army are graduates of Payne Theological Seminary of Wilberforce University."

Mr. LANGER. The Catholic Council considered, in a panel discussion, the barriers against Negro workers, as shown by an article which I also present for the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of March 6, 1943]

"CATHOLIC COUNCIL DISCUSSES NEGRO AND LABOR—INTERRACIAL LEADERS MEET IN NEW YORK—CHURCH GOVERNMENT, LABOR, AND RACIAL LEADERS IN PANEL DISCUSSION ON THE NEGRO AND LABOR

"NEW YORK, March 4.—Catholic labor leaders and employers were urged to 'make every effort' to remove existing barriers to the admission of Negro workers to labor unions in a resolution adopted by the Catholic Interracial Council of New York at a meeting last Sunday marking the eighth anniversary of the organization. Adoption of the resolution followed a panel discussion on The Negro and Labor, presided over by the Reverend John P. Delaney, S. J., director of the Institute of Social Order, and featured addresses by Joseph P. Keenan, Associate Director of Labor Relations, War Production Board, and Frank R. Crosswaith, chairman of the Negro labor committee.

"Geared to the theme that education, rather than legislation, was needed to combat discrimination against Negro workers, the meeting of 200 Negro and white Catholics heard also Harold A. Stevens, president of the Council; George Streater, of the Labor Relations Department of the War Production Board; and the Reverend Charles Keenan, S. J., chaplain of the council.

"Father Delaney opened the discussion by defining the traditional teaching of the church concerning the equality of all races and the right of all men to share equal opportunity. He praised the increasing number of Catholic leaders who are espousing the Negro's cause and declared that although progress was slow, there was every reason for satisfaction over that which has been accomplished.

"Declaring that the American Federation of Labor is committed to the organization of all workers, Mr. Keenan added that the

'American Federation of Labor pledges itself to work for the use of much-needed manpower without regard to race, class, or national origin.' He warned, however, that the problems of racial and religious prejudice are deep-seated and a great deal had yet to be done before the 13,000,000 Negroes and other minority groups would be brought into full participation in the war effort.

"Mr. Streater complained that Negro intellectuals are not taking sufficient responsibility in organizing the Negro, and that discussion of the labor movement is being promoted by persons not sufficiently familiar with it.

"Joseph T. Ryan, president of the Irish-American Committee for Interracial Justice, presented the resolution calling upon 'every labor organization and each and every local as well as Catholic employers to render complete justice to Negro workers, both in the interest of the war effort and to insure the efficacy, inclusiveness, and unity of labor.'

"In the course of the year the council succeeded in having introduced at the Fordham School of Catholic Action a summer course on race relations, and again a course of 15 lectures at the Fordham University school of social service in the past semester; cooperated with the Reverend Raymond J. Campion here in the latter's efforts to get Negro baseball players into the major leagues; worked with the National Conference of Christians and Jews; assisted in the organization of the Irish-American Committee for Interracial Justice, and aided the establishment of an interracial council in Detroit."

Mr. LANGER. I present for the RECORD an article which shows the position of a noted industrialist, Hon. Joseph N. Pew, on this question.

The article is as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of February 20, 1943]

"'AMERICAN NEGROES MUST TAKE LEAD AT PEACE TABLE,' PEW—TALKS TO LEADERS AT SCOTT BANQUET—NOTED SHIPBUILDER REVEALS MORE THAN 10,000 ON SUN PAY ROLL—OTHER NOTABLES ON PROGRAM

"PHILADELPHIA, February 18, 1943.—American Negroes must prepare to accept the challenge for leadership of the 150,000,000 other black men in the post-war world, Joseph N. Pew, chairman of the board of directors of the Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., declared at the seventieth birthday banquet to Dr. Emmett J. Scott at the Broadwood hotel here Saturday night.

"For the first time, Mr. Pew put himself on record in regard to the employment of more than 10,000 Negroes by his company and particularly in respect to the No. 4 yard destined to be manned exclusively by Negroes. Dr. Scott is the personnel manager for this yard.

"The great shipbuilder explained that he had a legitimate personal interest in the welfare of the Negro because he came from an abolitionist family in western Pennsylvania which had played a significant role in the operation of the 'underground railroad' which aided Negroes to escape from slavery.

"PAYS TRIBUTE TO MR. VANN

"No. 4 yard at the Sun Shipbuilding Co. had been set up, he said, to give Negroes the fullest opportunity to develop their talent and skill as shipbuilders.

"'They have made an astonishing success so far,' he asserted.

"In the course of his speech, Mr. Pew paid high personal tributes to Dr. Scott and to the late Robert Vann.

"More than 200 persons from separated sections of the East, South, and Middle West attended the banquet. Dr. Scott was overwhelmed with praise for the significant achievements of his long career."

Mr. LANGER. According to an article in the Pittsburgh Courier, the Committee on Racial Discrimination of the Congress of Industrial Organizations has also taken a position on this question. I present the article for the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From The Pittsburgh Courier of January 16, 1943]

"CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS ANTI-DISCRIMINATION GROUP ISSUES REPORT—CONTENDS JOB BANS DEFINITE HELP TO AXIS

"WASHINGTON, January 14.—The existence of discrimination against Negroes and other minorities is not only a continuing blot on American democracy, but even more seriously a drag on the total mobilization of all our people needed to win the war against Axis slavery,' according to the Congress of Industrial Organizations Committee on Racial Discrimination, the membership of which includes Willard S. Townsend, secretary, who is president of the United Transport Service Employees of America.

"'Every war industry and plant in the country is crying for more manpower, desperately needed to keep the weapons of war rolling out to the offensive fighting fronts of our armed forces and our Allies,' the committee report reads.

"EAGER TO DO PART

"'Negro Americans are as anxious as any to work for victory, just as they are fighting for victory in the Army and the Navy. To allow employers or any other agencies to bar them from jobs is worse than unjust—it is an active help to Hitler.

"'The Congress of Industrial Organizations, in setting up the Committee on Racial Discrimination at its November convention, moved to implement in industry and government the policy it has already held to in its own ranks—of absolute opposition to discrimination in any form, and of complete equality of opportunity for all.

"NATIONAL POLICY

"'This policy has been made national in the Executive Order of the President No. 8802, and in the setting up of the Fair Employment Practices Committee. The Congress of Industrial Organizations concurs fully in these steps, as it concurs in every move to promote national unity for winning the war.

"'At the same time, we must point out that the job of wiping out racial discrimination is far from complete, and at the present rate of progress will scarcely be completed in time to make full answer to the needs of all-out war, or to the needs of a people's peace.

"'Too often mere lip-service is given to the principle of equal opportunity. Too often an employer or a whole industry, ordered to stop discriminating against Negro workers, has evaded the order by offering token employment to a handful in place of opening jobs to all who are qualified. Or again, Negro workers are confined to the lowest paid, least skilled or even the menial jobs, regardless of their experience or training.

"BIG EXCEPTION

"'Of course, there are notable exceptions to these disruptive practices. The exceptions, however, could easily become the rule if the national policy were made completely effective. This cannot be done as long as the Fair Employment Practices Committee lacks sufficient funds and sufficient personnel to do the needed job.

"'At the present time, the Fair Employment Practices Committee lacks funds and personnel to do the necessary following-up on each of its orders. Trained, paid investigators are needed to patrol every section of industry where discrimination is suspected or found. More co-operation from other government agencies responsible for war production is needed.

"DETERMINED PURPOSE

"'The Congress of Industrial Organizations Committee on Racial Discrimination is determined to press for these and all other measures to end this gross injustice and criminal waste of needed manpower. We intend to press for more funds and more authority for the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

"'Victory requires the full effort of every person in this country and in the United Nations. Many millions of people among our allies are looking to our country to end inequalities that hold back a speedy United Nations victory.'"

Mr. LANGER. I present another article, according to which a former Negro aide to the Secretary of War says Negroes are practically barred from the United States Army Air Corps.

The article is as follows:

"ONLY ONE BRANCH IS OPEN TO US

"(Editor's Note.—In the following statement, William H. Hastie, who recently resigned as civilian aide to the Secretary of War in protest against the shortcomings of the military aviation program as it affects Negroes, discusses some additional aspects of racial discrimination and segregation in the Army Air Forces.)

"(By William H. Hastie)

"WASHINGTON, February 18.—It was not until March 1941 that the Army Air Corps began accepting applications from Negroes for aviation cadet training. The actual instruction of Negroes to be flying officers did not begin until several months later. But even then, and to this day, there was and is only one type of combat aviation, namely, pursuit flying—for which the Air Command will train a Negro.

"MOST DIFFICULT AIR COURSE

"How did it happen that the training of Negro aviators was started in the field of pursuit flying? It is common knowledge that grave doubts were expressed from the beginning as to whether the Negro was capable of making good as a combat aviator. The Air Command described, and still describes, the training of the Negro in aviation as an 'experiment.' Yet, in face of this expressed skepticism, the Air Command saw fit to begin with the training of Negroes for pursuit flying, the most difficult type of combat aviation.

"The single pilot in his pursuit ship has the most exacting of air tasks, handling his fast plane, maneuvering it at terrific speed in actual combat, mastering the technique of accurate and properly directed fire in aerial dog fights, and exercising split-second judgment in unexpected situations and emergencies. Why was the Negro, whose ability was in doubt, not started off with observation flying or in bombardment where copilots and other crew members assist each other and share and divide responsibility?

"Only the men who made the decision know the answer. They may have reasoned that through pursuit flying Negroes would demonstrate their ability to perform any air-combat task. Fortunately, it seems to be working out that way. They may also have reasoned that Negroes were less likely to succeed in pursuit flying than in somewhat less exacting work. Yet, in all fairness, it should be said that the best of facilities and thoroughly competent instructors were provided for the segregated training program for Negro pilots. And the men in the field who started this training did so with enthusiasm and determination to make it a success.

"OTHER COURSES OPEN TO WHITES

"Statistics already released by the Air Command show that during the first year of Negro pursuit-pilot training 42 percent of the Negro trainees successfully completed their courses and earned their wings as pilots. During the same period 59 percent of white aviation cadets who entered training qualified as flying officers. Of course, the number of Negroes was small, and the statistics are therefore not conclusive. More important is the fact that Negro candidates have no opportunity at any stage of training to be assigned to some other branch of combat flying if they seem not to be well adapted to pursuit work.

"The Negro cadet must become a pursuit pilot or nothing. White cadets are sorted out and placed according to their apparent aptitudes. Under these circumstances, the fact that 42 percent of the Negroes who had the physical and educational qualifications for aviation made the grade in the most difficult assignment is a significant accomplishment.

"Beyond the fact that the Negro must have the ability for pursuit flying, or else not fly at all, he must meet the special physical specifications of the pursuit pilot. If he is too tall or too heavy for pursuit flying, he cannot be an Army flyer, however competent he may be for some flying job other than pursuit work.

"In wasted manpower it is difficult to say how much is being lost by imposing such restrictions upon the Negro. It seems probable that some 200 Negro pursuit pilots will earn their wings in 1943. But the Air Command has never undertaken a campaign of publicity or promotion designed to get young Negro men with superior training into flying training.

"NO NEGROES FOR COLLEGE RESERVE

"When the air forces set up their college-reserve program, no Negroes were wanted. The small 'Negro quota' was already filled for a year in advance. So, while the ground forces were welcoming Negro college men into their college reserve, the air forces refused to accept them. Even earlier, the Air Corps had undertaken the recruiting of groups of men from the individual college campus who would go into training as a unit with the group spirit and enthusiasm developed through their association at college. The Negro was excluded from this also. Thus, only the Negro who went forward on his own initiative, determined despite hell and high water to be a combat flyer, ever became an aviation cadet. Even then, he was accepted only within limited quota restrictions and for one type of training.

"Within the past 2 months, restrictions upon the acceptance of volunteers in the Army have been extended to aviation cadets. Apparently, aviation cadets will be chosen almost exclusively from men already in the Army. A new problem faces the Negro. He must apply for aviation cadet training through his commander and his papers must survive a journey through military channels. It remains to be seen whether his application will be encouraged and facilitated to the same extent as the application of the white soldier.

"In this connection, one recent experience is disturbing. For more than a year, the Air Command has been selecting young soldiers, high school graduates, to be taken from the ranks and trained to become enlisted pilots. They become master, staff, and technical sergeants with flying rating. So far as I have been able to discover, Negro enlisted men have not been accepted in this program. How different will the situation be now that both prospective flying officers and prospective enlisted pilots will be enlisted from the ranks of the Army?

"Two hundred Negro pursuit pilots a year is something more than token representation. Certainly, 200 pilots can make a big difference in almost any of the present theaters of war. Yet the failure of the Air Command to encourage or even permit the full participation of the Negro in flying training and service prevents the number of Negro pilots from being several times 200 per year. If the Air Command should decide to use Negro flying officers and enlisted men without racial restrictions, 1,000 pilots would be a conservative estimate of annual production.

"Of course, there would be serious practical difficulties in developing segregated training fields and segregated organizations of many various types in such an expansion. From a military point of view, all of this new segregated set-up probably would not be worth the time, expense, and diversion of personnel."

"WHY CAN'T THEY SERVE AS PILOTS?

'Last week William H. Hastie, resigned Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War, charged the Army Air Force with refusal to use the services of capable and experienced colored aviators. Here is the list:

"James L. H. Peck, veteran civilian and military flier, writer and authority on aviation, fighter pilot in the Spanish Civil War, volunteer for the United States Air Corps. Still on the waiting list.

"Fred H. Hutcherson, American pilot, who was in command of a white crew ferrying United States bombers from Canada to England. Applied for a commission in the Army Air Corps last spring but landed as a victim of red tape and run-around. Returned to Canada as an instructor and ferry command pilot with the rank of captain.

"Gilbert Cargill and Robert Ashe, civilian pilots, received telegrams from the Army Air Forces to report to Maxwell Field for service pilot training. On reporting were told bluntly no provisions were made for training Negroes.

"Robert Terry, commercial pilot, rejected by the air command as an Army service pilot."

Mr. LANGER. There were 450,000 Negroes in the United States Army in 1943, 60,000 overseas. That is shown by another article which I present.

The article is as follows:

[From the Chicago Defender]

"SIXTY THOUSAND RACE TROOPS NOW IN OVERSEAS WAR ZONES

"WASHINGTON—'Dispersal of Negro personnel of the Army is in accordance with War Department policy. That policy calls for utilization of Negro troops wherever they can further the war effort.

" 'Negro soldiers are being trained as fighting men, and it is the considered judgment of the War Department that they will acquit themselves on the battlefields of this war with the same courage, distinction, and valor that their forefathers displayed in all the wars in which this country has engaged.'

"This was the War Department's answer this week to Congressman HAMILTON FISH in reply to his request for a statement of policy on the use of Negro troops in combat zones. The policy was made public in the form of a general news release the day following the answer sent Congressman FISH.

"FISH, however, did not fail to note, as he told the Defender, that this expressed policy did not seem to be borne out in practice.

"SIXTY THOUSAND OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

"According to an announcement of Secretary Stimson last week, over 1,500,000 American troops have been successfully convoyed by the Navy to foreign shores. The answer to Representative FISH's letter and the news release point out there are only 60,000 Negro troops serving outside the continental United States. The total number of Negro troops is announced as 'in excess of 450,000.'

"According to the War Department's statement, 25,000 Negro soldiers are on duty in the far Pacific, and approximately 10,000 are stationed in north Africa.

" 'In addition to completely organized and well-trained Army Air Force pursuit squadron composed of Negro personnel will be committed to combat soon.'

"The balance of the release, containing similar information given to Representative FISH states:

" 'Negro officers now on duty with troops number nearly 2,000. This number is being augmented from time to time as additional Negroes graduate from the various officer candidate schools.

" 'Distribution of these Negro troops covers the Army Ground Forces, Services of Supply, the Army Air Forces, and defense commands. They are in all arms and services, including Infantry, the Quartermaster Corps, the Corps of Engineers, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, the Ordnance Department, the Signal Corps, the Cavalry. The 25,000 Negro soldiers stationed in the far Pacific comprise combat as well as service units, including Infantry and Artillery organizations.'

"No mention of such combat units in north Africa is made.

" 'More than 70,000 Negroes are in the Infantry. There are two Negro infantry divisions. Activation of a Negro cavalry division having among its elements the famous Ninth and Tenth Cavalry Regiments, was recently announced. There are also more than 40,000 Negroes in Field and Coast Artillery units. In addition, many air base security battalions—mobile, hard-hitting combat units—have been and are being activated in the Army Air Forces with Negro personnel.'

"Representative FISH has written a further letter to the War Department in which he has asked for an additional break-down showing the number of Negroes stationed in north Africa and the far Pacific in each of the various branches of service as the Infantry, Artillery armored units, and the Air Corps.

"The release of this information to the public followed closely upon the question asked concerning it and Representative FISH's letter in Secretary Stimson's press conference by the Defender's correspondent. At that time, Stimson irritatedly replied that he had not heard of the letter—though it was written on February 13, and the question was asked on February 25. The answer was mailed to Representative FISH on February 26, and the information was made public on February 27."

Mr. LANGER. I further bring to the Senate's attention that in 1770 Crispus Attucks, a Negro, was the first American patriot and hero.

I present an article on that subject.

The article is as follows:

[From the People's Voice of March 6, 1943]

"SOAPBOX

"(By Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.)

"Crispus Attucks was a tough guy. Make no mistake about it. The first martyr of the American Revolution was no sissy. He stood about 6 foot 3 and weighed 215 pounds. From the time he purchased his freedom until the Redcoats killed him, he lived a joyous, bubbling-over life. He was thoroughly American in every sense of the word as it was then used. He loved nothing better than a good tavern brawl with no holds barred and the knuckles bared. Before he rang history's bell and retired from the scene his favorite occupation was heaving paving blocks at British soldiers.

"On the afternoon of March 5, 1770, the citizens of Boston sensed that they were treading on a volcano. There had been many disorders and street riots all during that week. Crispus Attucks and some of his friends had made up their minds that they were not going

to stomach any longer the arrogance of the British imperialistic troops. A strange company was gathered together that afternoon: Irish, Scots, English—all led by the former slave, Crispus Attucks. As they emerged and walked down King Street they met a detachment of the hated Redcoats. Crispus Attucks yelled, 'This is the nest! Strike at the root!' and the paving blocks began to fly.

"A British soldier named Montgomery leveled his flint musket and fired the shot that started the War of Independence that resulted on July 4, 1776, with 'One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.' Crispus Attucks fell mortally wounded, first martyr of the American Revolution.

"It is altogether fitting and proper that this martyr too long ignored, and the incident of the Boston Massacre, now be taught to democracy's children.

"In response to a resolution of mine the council of the city of New York unanimously set aside Friday, March 5, as Crispus Attucks Day. On that night a community celebration will take place. It is altogether fitting that groups—white and colored—everywhere so observe that evening. It marks the first time that the city of New York has named a day after a Negro. The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History should be congratulated for initiating this project. It comes at a very fitting time. Democracy's children are passing through a crisis from which will emerge real democracy or true American fascism. One of the signs of the times was the acceptance by the New York City chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution of the invitation to attend the special Crispus Attucks services.

"Democracy is marching on. Setbacks are only temporary. Defeats cannot last. Crispus Attucks set in motion a wheel in a wheel that can be slowed up, now and then, but can never be stopped until 'here is ful' democracy for all people."

Mr. LANGER. J. A. Rogers says that the United States is the only Nation which discriminates against its own native citizens. I present his article for the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

"UNITED STATES ONLY COUNTRY WITH LAWS AGAINST ITS OWN CITIZENS BECAUSE OF COLOR

"(By J. A. Rogers)

"I have been hearing and reading much comment on Negroes and the War, an illustrated booklet got out by the Office of War Information, and edited by Chandler Owen, Chicago newspaperman. Some of this comment, mostly from Negroes, is unfavorable, while others do not know what to think of it. However, in all fairness, I do think it is an effort in the right direction, especially if circulated among white people. This typical cross-section of Negroes from all walks of life—leaders, scientists, artists, writers, mechanics, dancers, businessmen, laborers, farmers, college professors—cannot help but correct, in my opinion, much of the woeful ignorance about Negroes in things constructive. The pictures, especially, are lifelike and were sympathetically handled.

"Of course, most of the matter is on the bright and optimistic side although the reverse is not altogether omitted. With this, also, I do not find too much fault. Looking on the bright side never hurts. Also some little known Negroes who have done as much or more than most of those named in the booklet—I could name a score of the latter off-hand—have been left out; but here, again it may be said, that doing full justice to the subject would take several volumes and not a booklet. All in all, I think the Office of War Information deserves praise, even considerable praise, for this work.

"Chandler Owen, in the foreword, has given a short but able summary of the progress of the Negro since emancipation. He also predicts what the Negro would lose under Hitler by citing what the latter has said about them. He tells how badly Hitler has treated not only Jews, but his own so-called Aryan brethren who opposed him, and adds logically and truthfully. 'There, men and women of color, is your social security under Hitler.'

"MUST DEFEAT HITLER MENACE

"But as one looks on the seamy side, too, I don't think Owen went far enough. Whether he would have been permitted to I don't know. Of course, Negroes must oppose Hitler, not because of what he might do to them if he came here, but because he is a menace to all humanity. An attack on humanity anywhere is, I feel, an attack on humanity everywhere. 'The world is but one country,' said Abdul Baha, "and mankind is its citizens.'

"We all, regardless of color, must learn to have the same horror of the Hitlers, Mussolinis and Tojos, as we have of the monsters of history such as Nero, Caligula, Ivan the Terrible, and Henry VIII. Such must be given no quarter. The Japanese massacre the Chinese, a yellow people, and if it suits their purpose, they will as readily massacre white and black people. We want no dictators, white, black, or yellow.

"FEAR AMERICA'S OWN HITLERS

"However, truth to tell, I'm not half so scared about the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Tojos, thousands of miles across the sea, as I am of the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Tojos, right here at home. What the latter are actually doing to Negroes now is so much more concrete, so much more felt, that trying to scare Negroes with Hitler is like trying to frighten a man in Texas, who is being chewed up by a bulldog, by telling him that way up in Maine a great lion is coming after him. It simply doesn't work. And as for what Hitler has said about Negroes, I could quote you worse, and in far greater volume, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Would Negroes suffer more than white Americans if Hitler came here? Don't believe that for a moment. To begin with, the whites have more wealth to be taken by Hitler. Also, more accustomed to freedom, they would be more resisting, and forever plotting, which would make their lives a hell on earth. As for the Japanese, if they came here, the lot of the whites would even be worse yet. But the Negroes would not escape. Their lives are too inextricably bound with that of their white fellow-citizens. All Americans would suffer. But just you try and let our American Hitlers see that. You'll find them as deaf as the German Hitler.

"LITTLE KNOWN FACTS IN HISTORY

"As for comment on 'Negroes and the War,' in the white press, it was uniformly commendable. Especially good, I thought, was that by the noted writer, William Philip Simms, in the New York World-Telegram, February 9, 1943. However, I find myself differing with Mr. Simms on one point where he says, 'In no country on earth has a racial minority made such progress as have the 13,000,000 Negroes in the United States."

"There was a time when I used to repeat this cliche myself, but then I was ignorant in Negro history. Today all of that is so much hooey to me. For instance, starting with Mexico and all the way to Argentina one can name Negro presidents in almost every country. Brazil's three emperors were all of European Negro ancestry. The founder of the Brazilian Republic and its first president was a mulatto. As for other Brazilians in high public life they could be named galore. Argentina's first president, her Alexander Hamilton so to speak, was a dark mulatto, Bernardino Rivadavia. Mexico's chief liberator and her second president, Vincente Guerrero, also was a Negro.

"CITIZENS SUFFER FROM OWN LAWS

"When it comes to possession of this world's goods as well as in education, the Aframerican tops the Negroes of the Rio Grande. But this is only because the United States is better off economically. The difference is like that between the cat that lives in a butcher shop and one in a notions store; or the rich man's dog and the poor man's dog. The former cannot help but be fatter.

"Any progress to be real must be made in manhood and citizenship rights. In this you'll find the Aframerican far behind. The United States is the only country in the New World with laws on its statute books against its own citizens because of color. With the exception of parts of British Africa it is the only land on earth with enforced color segregation.

"PROGRESS TALK A LOT OF DRIVEL

"No, talk about the Negro's progress is but so much optimistic drivel. I'll begin to believe it when I see even one Negro justice of the Supreme Court, or one cabinet minister, or one admiral. And please don't remind me of that old one about the Negro's being just out of slavery. Whites were slaves in this country, too, but as soon as they were freed they were eligible for jobs like other whites. As for the white immigrant who comes to this country, sometimes even more illiterate, more debased than a Dixie peon, he has been able to go, and has gone, to every high position except that of President."

Mr. LANGER. Finally, I present a story by a North Dakota man, Lt. Francis E. Nuessle, son of a former chief justice of the North Dakota Supreme Court, recounting a Negro's bravery, as published in the Washington Star.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 18, 1943]

"HONOR OF NEGRO RACE IN WAR IS REPORTED UPHELD BY MANY—FIGHTING HOLDEN FAMILY OF NINE CITED AS EXAMPLE OF SERVICE TO NATION

"(By John A. Moroso 3d)

"WITH THE ATLANTIC FLEET, March 18.—The hail of Japanese bombs and torpedoes that destroyed the 32,600-ton battleship *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor also killed five brothers of the fighting Holden family—an orphaned group of nine colored boys.

"On September 14, 1942, Warren Holden, 18, of New York City, enlisted in the Navy as an apprentice seaman.

"'I'd like to get on a gun crew and get over there to get a few Japs for my brothers who didn't have a chance to defend themselves last December,' he told recruiting officers.

"Young Holden has three brothers in the Army. His father served in the Navy in the last war. Aunts and uncles helped raise the Holden boys after their parents died.

"These youngsters, like many other colored persons, have been upholding the honor of the Negro race in American armed forces in this war. Several have been decorated. I have heard many stories of their bravery in my travels with the fleet.

"STORY OF TRACY MARCUS

"There was Tracy Marcus, 18, of Mullins, S. C., a messman aboard the 840-ton seaplane tender *Gannet*. The *Gannet* was plowing along in the Atlantic off Bermuda last summer when a torpedo struck her amidship. She went down in 4 minutes, but 50 seamen managed to get over the side and onto life rafts.

"'Lord have mercy on us, on our souls. Save us from the sea,' said a voice in the pitch-black darkness.

"Lt. Francis E. Nuessle, skipper of the *Gannet*, knew that it was Tracy Marcus praying, and he knew that young Marcus could sing spirituals. He commanded the lad to

sing and the air soon rang with such songs as 'Just Beyond the River Jordan,' 'Everybody That's a-Living Got to Die,' and 'I Got Shoes.'

"The singing was infectious. Lieutenant Nuessle joined in and pretty soon everybody pitched in. They still were singing hours later when planes and rescue ships hove into sight.

"The destroyer *Gregory* was converted into an auxiliary transport and sent to Guadalcanal. Two Jap cruisers and three destroyers cornered her last summer and sent her to the bottom with shellfire. Survivors plunged into the water—a shark-infested area.

"A colored lad named Fred French, 20, son of Mrs. Millie French, of Newark, N. J., was aboard one of the overcrowded life rafts. When he realized that the raft was drifting away from shore, he tied a line around his waist and dived into the water with these words:

"'I'm going to tow this old crate in.'

"FRENCH WAS STILL SWIMMING

"Six hours later a barge picked up the men on the raft. Young French, exhausted, was still swimming.

"When the *Arizona* was sunk at Pearl Harbor a 213-pound colored messman, Dorie Miller, 22, of Waco, Tex., manned a machine gun although he had never had any formal training with the weapon. He fired at Jap planes until his ammunition was exhausted. He was trying to reload the gun when officers ordered him to abandon ship.

"Navy Secretary Frank Knox commended Messman Miller 'for his distinguished devotion to duty, extraordinary courage, and disregard for his own personal safety during the attack.'

"'While at the side of his captain on the bridge,' the commendation read, 'Miller, despite enemy strafing and bombing, and in the face of a serious fire, assisted in moving his captain, who had been mortally wounded, to a place of greater safety, and later manned and operated a machine gun until ordered to leave the bridge.' Young Miller is the son of sharecroppers operating a 28-acre farm near Waco.

"I had a good chance to observe colored boys in the Navy during the invasion of North Africa. I found them courageous and conscientious. It was the job of our messmen to pass the ammunition. They were assigned to the magazine, deep in the bowels of a ship—a hazardous place to be during a torpedo strike. These boys sweated down there for almost 8 hours and when our battle was over they came topside and served us food, although they were exhausted and covered with sweat.

"'Were you scared?' I asked one of them.

"'Yes, sir,' he replied.

"'What did you do about it?' I asked.

"TOO BUSY TO THINK

"'I was too busy to think much about it,' he said.

"Up until last April the Navy used colored persons only as messmen. They cooked and prepared the meals and served them piping hot. On April 8 the Navy opened up all ratings to them and made plans to train them as electricians and carpenters' mates, ship fitters, metalsmiths, machinists' mates, and aviation and motor machinists' mates.

"Camp Robert Smalls was constructed at Great Lakes, Ill., and a 16-week course was laid out. Colored boys were enrolled and started courses on how to be quartermasters, radiomen, signalmen, yeomen, bakers, cooks, and gunners' mates.

"The camp was named after a colored pilot who took the Confederate transport *Planter* out of Charleston Harbor during the Civil War and delivered it to the Yankee forces. Pilot Smalls later was made skipper of the craft and he served with distinction.

"Last September a colored man, Capt. Hugh N. Mulzac, of Brooklyn, N. Y., was named skipper of the 10,500-ton Liberty ship *Booker T. Washington*. Captain Mulzac, who started his sea career abroad a Norwegian whaler, already has made several voyages to England.

"He recently described his crew as a 'checkerboard,' for he has Englishmen, Danes, Turks, Norwegians, Belgians, Irishmen, Americans, and Filipinos under his command.

"Exact figures are not available, but the Navy says 'several thousand' colored persons joined up before enlistments were discontinued and that 'several hundred' more have been assigned to the Navy by draft boards.

"The Coast Guard has assigned hundreds of colored recruits to active duty, and the Marine Corps is training a combat battalion of 900 men at New River, N. C.

"Many have joined up as musicians.

"Two former track stars, Eulace Peacock, of Temple, and Jim Walker, of Iowa, are teaching boxing in the Coast Guard.

"The Navy hasn't enlisted colored girls for the WAVES and SPARS. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is pressing a campaign in that direction now."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 12, after the word "applicable", it is proposed to insert:

Nor shall any overtime be payable under the act of March 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 522, title 5, sec. 673).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, was any explanation made of the amendment? I should like to know its purport.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it was testified before the committee that there is discrimination in one of the navy yards in which certain persons are denied admission to an organization or union, and by denying such admission they are denied the privilege which Congress provides in this proposed legislation. This amendment merely prescribes that there shall be no discrimination so far as color, creed, or race are concerned in admission to organizations or unions which operate in Government agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean to imply that we have a closed shop in Government navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. No; they are not exactly closed shops, but a report was presented to the committee indicating that certain people are discriminated against and denied membership, and therefore they are denied advancement when they are entitled to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If there is no closed shop, and the Government has not entered into a contract with the union on the basis of a closed shop, I do not see how there would be any discrimination against any individual.

Mr. MEAD. A man may become an apprentice or a helper and he may advance and become eligible for appointment as a journeyman, but to be a journeyman I understand he has to become associated with a union, and to that extent there is a closed shop. He cannot become associated with the union; it may be that he is denied membership by some surreptitious method; but, nevertheless, he is denied membership, and therefore he does not advance to the position of a mechanic to which his years of service would entitle him to advance.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the statement of the Senator from New York is correct, we have a closed shop now in the navy yard, because, without a closed shop, it would be impossible to deny anyone any advancement if his skill would entitle him to it.

Mr. MEAD. In a way there is not a closed shop, because a mechanic may file an application and secure an appointment in the navy yard and not be a member of the organization until after he is an employee of the navy yard. In other words, the mechanics are not hired through the union or through a hiring hall. There is a difference. There is a charge of discrimination.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand there may be a charge of discrimination, but I was trying to elicit the facts. Does the Senator take the position that there is any rule or any contract of collective bargaining in these yards which would deny promotion to a person who is not a member of a union?

Mr. MEAD. No; I do not know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me it is merely a charge, then, that is not sustained.

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes; it was sustained, according to the information presented to the committee, and the provision was adopted by the committee by a majority vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. How did the information convey to the committee the fact, if it is a fact, that a person has to be a member of a union in order to get any promotion?

Mr. MEAD. It is not really a promotion. If a man is a helper, he remains a helper, because he cannot become a bona fide member of a certain union, which evidently represents all the men who work in the particular place, who are listed as journeymen, and, therefore, in view of the fact that he is not associated with the union, he does not advance but stays where he is.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may be very slow to grasp this subject, Mr. President, but it seems to me that if there is no such thing as a contract with the union, the charge which the Senator makes, or says was made to the committee, would be absolutely impossible, because certainly unless there is a closed shop, or a contract with the union, the fact of membership could not affect promotion, unless there were some kind of collusion between the union and officers in charge of the navy yard.

Mr. MEAD. There may be some understanding, but there is not what might be called, in the broad sense, a closed shop. The evidence before the committee, however, was that there was considerable discrimination. That might be the result of collusion, it might be the result of custom, but it is there. The able Senator who sponsored the amendment

knows more about it than I do; he presented it, and he can probably answer the question in greater detail.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator call before the committee any of the officers in charge of the navy yards and give them an opportunity to explain the situation, or to absolve themselves from the charge of collusion made against them in the committee?

Mr. MEAD. They were right there when the charges were made, and they had opportunity afforded them to answer the charges.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator from New York ask them about the charge, with respect to it, or interrogate them?

Mr. MEAD. There were four or five witnesses from various sections of the country who discussed the question, and it was generally understood that in this particular locality, and in this particular union, certain people were denied membership. The committee realized that the charge was more or less accurate, and a representative of the union was there, and he did not challenge it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee, then, had only the testimony of those who were making the charge?

Mr. MEAD. Plus the presence of any number of others, some of whom were given the floor, and others refused to take the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it seems to me this section goes rather a long way. I am very reluctant to say anything about it, due to the fact that someone might question my motives on account of the fact that everyone from the South seems to be suspected when such questions are involved.

Mr. MEAD. It merely asks the union to live up to the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not so sure about that. I am not so sure this provision is constitutional. It says that if a man happens to be a member of a union, and the union does not adopt certain rules which the Senator says are laid down by the Constitution, then he will be denied the benefit of the proposed pay increase. I suppose a man might be a member of the union and refuse to support the rule. At what time would the man have to resign, or dissociate himself from the union, in order to be able to collect the pay? The Constitution guarantees certain civil rights which may be enforced in the courts, but this provision seeks to impose certain rules upon a private local union which has no connection with the Government.

Mr. MEAD. Let us look over the broad picture. Here is a Government agency, operating very close to the Government. Certainly such an agency should carry out not only the spirit and letter of the Constitution, but it should be as accurate and as diligent about it as it possibly can be. If, in that agency, someone is discriminated against because of his color or his race or his religion—and that was testified to, and we all agreed that it was being done—that is unconstitutional, and we should not tolerate that in any agency of the Government, no matter what the creed or the race or the religion or the color or anything else of the applicant may be. So the committee by a majority vote determined that the amendment should go in the bill, because they believed that certain people working for the Government of the United States were denied membership in a certain union.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is one thing to have discrimination against an individual by the Government, and another thing for Congress to legislate rules and regulations, regulations which will force private organizations, which are not recognized by the Constitution, which have absolutely no standing except as in the case of all other private local groups, to accept any person into membership.

Mr. MEAD. It was not a discrimination against an individual, it was a discrimination against an entire group.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could see that if the local union were recognized for bargaining, this practice might be used as a means of discrimination, but if the local union is not recognized for collective bargaining purposes by the authorities of the navy yard, I utterly fail to see how membership in the union could result in discrimination against any group, whether it be a group that is designated by religion, or by race, or by creed.

I did not know heretofore that there was such a thing as a closed shop in any of the Government departments. If there is, I am very much opposed to it, and I think something should be written into the pending bill which would eliminate it, because I do not believe in a closed shop in any branch of the Government of the United States. All Government employees have a right, of course, to organize, but certainly there should not be any closed shop in any Government bureau or department. I wish to say to the Senator that in my judgment it is certainly violative of the spirit of the Constitution if there is anything that is the equivalent of a closed shop in any Government yard or in any Government agency.

Mr. MEAD. Whether there is a closed shop, or whether there is or is not any discrimination, it occurs to me that restating the policy contained in the Constitution will do no harm.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no provision in the Constitution with which I am familiar which requires any private group not to discriminate against any individual in social contact on account of his race or color or creed. We could not legally adopt a legislative provision which would force any church to accept members it did not desire to accept.

Mr. MEAD. We are not dealing with a church.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are dealing with a local labor union which is not recognized for collective bargaining purposes. If we have the power to control their membership we have the right to control the membership of any private club or church or say whom a man must receive in his home.

Mr. MEAD. We are dealing with a situation which arises in a navy yard, which comes directly under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. If a man is eligible to fight and die for this country in Libya, or Tunisia, or Guadalcanal, that man should be protected in his work and in his right in the navy yards where ships are built to do the fighting in those remote places.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will not dispute that with the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think my question would exactly entitle the Senator to wrap the flag around him and declaim in that manner. The Senator is here proposing to legislate against a local union—to say who shall be members of a local club or group that has no official connection with the Government—and I am trying to get the facts as to why the committee saw fit to do that. The Senator is not dealing here with the right of employees in the navy yard, he is not dealing here with the right of promotion in the navy yard; he is saying that this local union, which is not recognized as a collective bargaining agent, cannot have any rules of membership which discriminate against any person on account of religion or race or color. I think we are going a pretty long way in the Senate when we attempt to do any such thing. The members of any club or local union have some inherent and fundamental rights as well as those who are seeking membership.

Mr. MEAD. The provision would operate only with respect to the navy yard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Section 15, as I read it, does not refer to any navy yard.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct, but that is the only place, so far as the committee is informed, where this discrimination exists, and we prescribe that it shall not exist in an agency within the framework of the Government of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt very seriously that we can go so far. We may have the right to say that the Government employees cannot organize a union, but certainly I do not think we ought to go so far as to undertake to legislate as to what rules and regulations a local union may have, when that union is not recognized as the sole collective-bargaining agency by any department of government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to say that I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia that this amendment should not be in the bill. It is inconsistent with the remainder of it. As I understand the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota, it would prohibit a member of a union from obtaining overtime pay because the union allegedly practices discrimination. Why should an individual member be penalized?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the very point I was making.

Mr. BYRD. Why should an individual member be penalized because the union did something with which the member may not agree? The particular member

may not agree to the discrimination practiced, but the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would result in penalizing that member, who may not agree with the union practices, by denying him overtime pay. That is going pretty far, when the unions are not under Governmen control, and there is no way by which the Government can compel them to do one thing or another. The proposal would result in penalizing individual members.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is not clear under the amendment as drawn that a man can withdraw from the union and thereby avail himself of the pay increase as provided. It could be construed that if he were a member of the union at the time the measure is passed, and if there had been any discrimination in the past against any person by reason of denying him admission in the union due to his race, color, or creed, that the member of the union would be debarred from receiving the increase in compensation provided for by this measure.

It is all very well, Mr. President, to oppose discrimination before the law, but it is an entirely different thing to have the Congress of the United States undertake to write a law which applies to any private group; to provide that no person shall be entitled to this increase who is a member of a union which discriminates against any person on account of race, color, or creed. If we have the right to do that we can go further and say that if an employee of the Government is a member of the Kiwanis Club, and if that Kiwanis Club discriminates against any person on account of race, color, or creed, that that member of the Kiwanis Club shall be penalized by being denied the benefit of any law the Congress may enact. If we have the right and power to adopt this provision as to local unions we can apply similar penalties to any club, church, or private organization in the country. Such a law is more clearly unconstitutional than the alleged discrimination it seeks to remove. The right to choose one's own associates is, in my opinion, as fundamental as any right guaranteed by the Constitution.

Mr. President, I know that coming from the section of the country I do I perhaps am not the proper person to raise this issue, but this is a much more far-reaching proposal than it would appear to be at first blush, and Senators from all sections of the country should give pause before proceeding to legislate as to private organizations in any such manner as this. I think the entire section ought to be stricken out of the bill. If we adopt it, it will arise to plague all of you in the future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the amendment of the Senator from New York in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Dakota to explain his amendment? Perhaps he has done so in my absence.

Mr. LANGER. Under section 15 of the measure we included 40 percent of the Federal employees. All my amendment does is to include the remaining 60 percent, those who come under the wages-and-hours law, and who work in the United States navy yards. It seemed to me that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] explained the amendment quite fully and completely.

Mr. WALSH. Unfortunately the amendment refers to statutes and to previous acts. The language of the amendment is not very informative.

Mr. MEAD. Let me explain the amendment very briefly.

Mr. WALSH. The language of the first part of section 15 reads:

> The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not be applicable to any person—

And so forth. The Senator from North Dakota proposes to add language after the word "applicable" which would make the language of section 15 read:

> The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not be applicable nor shall any overtime be payable under the act of March 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 522, U. S. C., title V, sec. 673).

What is the act of March 28, 1934?

Mr. MEAD. The Langer amendment extends the provisions of the committee amendment applicable to the employees who come under the Classification Act to the employees who come under the wages-and-hours law, and to employees of the navy yard and arsenal. It extends the provisions to persons who are not included in the committee amendment but who come under the laws quoted in that section, and whose pay is adjusted from time to time by local wage boards.

Mr. WALSH. Is the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota acceptable to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is a member?

Mr. MEAD. No; I cannot say that. I said it was acceptable to me, and that I should be very glad to take it to conference. I am authorized by the majority of the committee to speak for a definite section 15 which is in the bill, but the committee did not consider the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. WALSH. How many employees does the proposal embrace?

Mr. MEAD. Sixty percent of all the employees of the Federal Government, while the committee amendment covers 40 percent of all the employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. WALSH. Would the proposal increase the cost of the proposed legislation or decrease it?

Mr. MEAD. I do not believe it would increase it. It simply has to do with the question of discrimination. It would not add or subtract from the cost.

Mr. WALSH. At best I have not received much information with respect to the proposal.

Mr. MEAD. That is true. I doubt very much, however, if it would increase the cost of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from New York personally thinks that the amendment should be adopted, but can he express the opinion of the other members of the committee who considered the proposed legislation?

Mr. MEAD. No; I cannot. The majority of the committee approved only the language which is in the bill, and which is known as section 15.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] an opinion on this amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will say as a member of the committee that I voted against inclusion in the original committee amendment of section 15, and I am even more opposed to the amendment to the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. I think it is entirely outside the province of the Government to penalize an individual member of a union as the Senator from North Dakota attempts to do, by denying him his overtime pay by reason of the fact that the union does something in regard to racial discrimination, or even is alleged to do so. Who is going to determine whether there has been discrimination? There is no machinery provided for that purpose. If the Senator from North Dakota wants to put the labor unions under Government control, and make them Government agencies, that is an entirely different matter. But they are not Government agencies; they are not under Government control; they are private agencies. The Senator's amendment is absolutely unworkable. It is inconsistent with the bill, and has nothing to do with the purpose of the bill, which is to readjust the wage scales of the civil-service employee.

Mr. President, I wish to be recorded as in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has asked me to record him similarly. He, unfortunately, is temporarily absent from the Chamber. In the committee both of us opposed it, as did the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me present a hypothetical case to the Senator from New York. Suppose there is a local union, 40 percent of the members of which are opposed to any discrimination on account of race, color, or religion. Am I to understand that under the provisions of the amendment the minority of 40 percent, a large minority, would not be able to receive any overtime compensation or any additional compensation under this bill because they are affiliated with a union the majority of which takes such action?

Mr. MEAD. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. If any question of a discrimination prohibited by the Constitution is involved, would not that be a discrimination against the individual, if an individual employee of the Government is discriminated against because he belongs to a union with the theories of which he is not in sympathy, but as to which the majority of the union have announced a certain policy?

Mr. MEAD. I think my able colleague is correct. We went into that question

very briefly, not adequately. It was assumed that if there were a penalty for group discrimination, the minority of which the Senator speaks would become the majority.

The Senator can see how unfair it would be if an organization set up in any shop or factory decided that it would take in as members only persons of the Christian faith. The Congress would not tolerate such a thing. It might be that if there were legislation which would penalize a practice of that kind, the practice would be completely wiped out as a result of the discipline resulting from the legislation.

But in the present instance we find existing in the shadow of the Capitol the practice of men being denied membership in a union because of their color. The committee felt that if some notice were taken of that situation, the union would without hesitation eliminate the discrimination. After all, the only discrimination existing today before we act is the discrimination against a man because of his color.

Mr. OVERTON. Then the position of the able junior Senator from New York is that Congress will enforce its views upon a union, and will do so by saying to its members, "You are not going to get any of this additional money unless you subscribe to our viewpoint on this question. It does not make any difference whether as many as 49 percent of the members of your union are against that theory or policy; those 49 percent are not going to get the benefit of this act—none of you are going to get the benefit of this overtime-pay legislation—because you do not adopt our views as to the policy for your organization."

Mr. MEAD. As I said, the committee considered that problem.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. In discussing the effect of having Congress impose its will on unions, let me say that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota goes only to one union within a Government navy yard, which is wholly financed by the Government and is engaged exclusively in making things for the Government. All the amendment would do would be to say that such union cannot exist on Government money and on Government property, where munitions for the Nation are being made, if it continues to discriminate against any citizen. That is the nub of the situation; is it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is stating the position taken by the majority of the committee.

Mr. BROOKS. As a member of the committee, I supported that position; and I may say for the majority of the committee, that the majority supported that position.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, why was not the amendment included in the bill when it was reported?

Mr. MEAD. It is in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand there is no objection to that.

We are debating the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, which makes some change in the bill.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What has been the committee's attitude on it?

Mr. MEAD. The committee took no position at all on the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I am speaking for the amendment adopted by the committee—the amendment contained in section 15 of the bill. So far as I am concerned, I said I was willing to take the proposed amendment to conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the amendment of the Senator from New York in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barkley	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is in favor of the passage of this bill, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 12, after the word "applicable", it is proposed to insert "nor shall any overtime be payable under the act of March 28, 1934, as amended, 48 Statute, 522, title 5, section 673."

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I have the amendment restated?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The amendment was again stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as amended, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out section 15 of the substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it.

Mr. MEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for a division.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All in favor of the amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Chair has already announced the result.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the able Senator from North Dakota is within his rights. He was addressing the Chair when the question was put.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Dakota demands a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as amended, in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 1860, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 635 be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 635 will be indefinitely postponed.

DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 157, House bill 2076.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the calendar number?

The CHIEF CLERK. Calendar No. 157, H. R. 2076.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] very courteously spoke to me about the bill. I wish he would make a brief statement regarding the general purposes of the bill before the motion is acted upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill proposes to amend section 20 of the Emigration Act of 1917, as amended, so as to enable the Government of the United States at a time when the country is at war to deport to countries allied with the United States certain aliens who are citizens or subjects of our allies who for any reason cannot be deported to the country of their origin.

Mr. President, the following situation confronts us: At the present time under the law it is impossible to deport from the United States any citizen of any nation with which we are allied which has been overrun by any of the Axis Powers. The Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization was proceeding in a normal manner with the deportation of aliens to a country which is the seat of the governments in exile of these various powers. Under an opinion by the United States district court it was determined that such procedure was not legal, and the bill would merely permit the deportation of such aliens to the country wherein is located the governments in exile.

The bill has particular reference, Mr. President, to the deportation of alien seamen, although it would be applicable to any alien. It is approved by the Department of State; it is approved by the Department of Justice; it has the wholehearted and unqualified endorsement of the War Shipping Administration. It will also permit the deportation of any alien, be he seaman or otherwise, to the country whence he last shipped, if it is impossible to deport him to the country of his origin or the government of the nation of which he is a national is not in exile.

It is a very important bill, Mr. President, due to the shipping situation. I have heard of absolutely no opposition to it from any source. It passed the House of Representatives almost unanimously.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not anticipate that the Senator from Georgia intended to have the bill considered today or I should have sent to him a request for at least a temporary deferment of its consideration. I say that because I have received advice that the Chinese Ambassador has protested to the State Department against the passage of this bill. I was hoping that it might be possible for a little deferment of the bill to occur, to take it, at least, into next week. I understood that there were some negotiations under consideration which might lead, perhaps, to the removal of the objection I had in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the able Senator from Georgia if it might be possible that the bill be carried over until the following week, at least, or until the next call of the calendar, so that possibly some progress might be made in the matter of which I speak.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I always like to defer to any suggestion which may be made by the distinguished Senator from Florida; but this bill is of extreme importance, and it should be enacted at the earliest moment. Evidence has been submitted that at one time, as a result of this defect in the immigration laws, as many as 45 ships have been tied up in one harbor in this country. The War Shipping Administration is most insistent that the measure be considered as early as possible; the State Department has approved it and urged that early action be taken on the bill.

The committee canvassed the situation to which the Senator from Florida refers. Efforts were made to work out some amendments which had been suggested to the bill, but I was advised this morning that those amendments did not meet with the approval of the Department of Justice or of the State Department or of the War Shipping Administration. I rather doubt that any good purpose would be served, and I hope that the Senator from Florida will not insist that the bill go over, because, as Admiral Land says in one of the letters I have on my desk, shipping is the lifeline of this country today; we should do all within our power to see that there is no delay occasioned in the transportation of goods to those who are overseas.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is there any authority in the bill, which I have not had an opportunity to read, for this country to deport citizens of one country to another country, for example?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is.

Mr. PEPPER. Why? For example, suppose some Chinese sailors were in this country and became subject to deportation, would such Chinese sailors be deported to any country other than China? If so, what would be the advantage gained?

Mr. RUSSELL. The advantage would be in carrying out the general policy of the immigration law. If there should be a Chinese sailor in this country who had deserted his ship, he could be deported "to the country wherein is located the recognized government in exile of the country of registry of the vessel on which he entered the United States, if such country will permit the alien to enter its territory."

I read that from the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Take the case of China, the government of which is in China itself; as I understand, then, it would not be possible, for example, to deport a Chinese sailor to England?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be if the Chinese sailor had deserted a ship under English registry.

Mr. PEPPER. If he had deserted a ship under some other registry, could he be deported to that country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, he could, if he deserted a ship under any other registry, provided that country was allied with us in the war.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think that would be true only if conditions made it impossible to deport the alien seaman to his native country. If circumstances connected with the war made that impossible, then, he could be deported to the nation under whose flag the vessel on which he sailed was registered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the correction; he has made a correct statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the present immigration law provides that, under certain circumstances and under the circumstances suggested, an alien may be deported to the country from which he came, but, because of the war situation and the fact that many countries are now dominated by the enemy, it is impossible to deport them to the countries from which they may have come, and, therefore, it is the purpose of this bill to enable this Government to deport aliens who are employed in shipping yards or on ships who desert or decline to work to the country——

Mr. RUSSELL. To the country where their government is exiled.

Mr. BARKLEY. To the country where that government has representation and where it has an entity.

Mr. PEPPER. That would not cover the case of China.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not cover the case of China.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it would not. I wish to say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, that for the first 12 months of the war there was absolutely no difficulty; there were practically no desertions from the ships be-

cause we were deporting them to the country where the government in exile was located. It developed before the committee that most of the governments in exile have maritime courts set up in England today where deserting seamen can be tried under their own laws. But a habeas corpus proceeding was brought in one of the United States district courts, and the court held that a seaman could not be deported unless he went to the country of his national origin. Manifestly, in the case of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and other countries it is impossible to return him to the country of his origin.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, it is impossible to deport them to the country of their origin, and this bill is intended to remedy that situation by enabling this country to deport them under these circumstances to another country which is represented by a government in existence but in exile.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The evidence before the committee showed that after the decision of the district court became known to seamen who came to this country and they found that they could not be deported, desertions increased 500 or 600 percent. The evidence further disclosed that many of these men were undertaking to marry American women and to stay in this country permanently, and were undertaking to become citizens of this country in order to avoid being sent back to the country of their origin. Not only was that violative of the spirit and intent of our own immigration laws and our regulations relating to deportation but it was unfair to the countries with which we were allied to have them denied the services of their men and their nationals in this time when each and every one of them is fighting for its national existence.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it seems to me that this is an important measure affecting not only the construction of ships and the manning of ships but also the morale of our own country, and I hope the Senator from Florida will not insist upon an objection to the bill being taken up. I do not think it at all affects the situation which he has in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. Information has been communicated to me that some countries associated with us dislike the idea of having their nationals deported to some country other than their own. We have done so little, so very little, for China, for example, who has done so much for the rest of us, that I should not like to aggravate their irritations in any unnecessary way. I wish there were some way by which there might be discretion lodged in the United States authority which is responsible for these deportations, so that any legitimate complaint which any country might have could be heard by the officer exercising such discretion.

As the bill reads, if a Chinese sailor, for example, should be subject to deportation and must be deported by this country, he is not sent back to China or retained in this country, but he is sent back to the country of the registry of the vessel on which he is engaged. In substance, that practically means the British Isles, the British Government. Those sailors may not want to be deported to the British Isles, for all I know. Evidently some of them do not want to be so deported. Since both China and the British Empire are allies, I do not see why we should take the nationals of an allied nation and deport them to the territory of another allied nation, if perhaps they do not want to go, and if the sovereign whose nationality they have does not want them to go there.

I think it might be appropriate to provide at least that if there is involved a national of a country with which we are allied, the deportation to another allied country should not occur until the first nation might give its approval of the deportation.

The British probably would not want us to take a British sailor who deserted and send him to China because he happened to be on a Chinese vessel, and I suspect that we would hear something about it if we started to do it. I do not want Chinese sailors to be transferred back to Britain, for example, unless the Chinese Government perhaps had agreed to it. It seems to me only fair that we would not want to choose between our allies in a matter of this sort.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, under the bill, if it were impossible to deport the British sailors to England—and I might say we are deporting British seamen almost daily, and sending them back to England—if they were sailing in a Chinese ship and we could reach China, we would deport the British sailors to China.

I am just as jealous of maintaining good relations with the Government of China as is the Senator from Florida, or anyone else. I have just as high an appreciation of the magnificent sacrifices the Chinese have made in the common cause of all the Allied Nations. For that reason I took the bill up specifically with the State Department, to ascertain the views of the Department with regard to the provision regarding Chinese citizens. I had hoped this matter would not arise on the floor of the Senate, because I doubt that it serves any useful purpose to discuss it, but since the Senator from Florida has raised the question, I wish to read a paragraph in answer to a question I propounded in which I asked the Department to examine the bill with particular reference to the citizens of China. I read from the reply of the Department:

> In the opinion of the State Department the passage of this amendment to the immigration law appears to be of importance to the prosecution of the war effort. In effect, it removes a discrimination which has existed in practice in favor of Chinese seamen, and in the long run it can only work to the benefit of the Chinese Government and people.

That letter is signed by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State, and is under date of March 10, 1943.

We have to depend upon the State Department to carry on our negotiations with our allies in the war, and the State Department, upon the very question raised by the Senator from Florida, says this bill removes a discrimination in favor of Chinese seamen and that the enactment of the bill will be of great benefit to the Chinese Government and the Chinese people.

Mr. PEPPER. In what way has there been a discrimination in favor of the Chinese?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because of the fact that Chinese seamen, knowing they cannot be returned to China, have deserted in large numbers. There were several hundred in New York at one time, and we were compelled to keep them and feed them at Ellis Island, and some ships were tied up because the Chinese seamen could not be deported to England or to any other country, and it stood in the way of shipments abroad where goods were desired in order to carry on the battle against the common foe.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is the first instance of any discrimination in favor of China of which I have ever heard. The general observation I have made is that most actions and most policies of the Allied and United Nations have been discriminatory against China, and if a few hundred Chinese sailors may in some measure atone for the discrimination against China thus far in this war, for one I rejoice in that measure of justice which they have received. Usually it is too little and too late.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the pending bill treats only of those who are in our country illegally.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think it is about time that our immigration laws were written and enforced for the welfare and protection of the American people, and not in the interest of aliens who are in this country illegally.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2076.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE ORDER STABILIZING WAGES AND PRICES (S. DOC. NO. 25)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier today I had printed in the RECORD the statement of the President of the United States and the Executive order issued yesterday by him on the stabilization of wages and prices. So many requests will be made for the order, which cannot be filled by merely sending copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I ask unanimous consent that the statement and order be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EFFICIENCY OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT—LETTER FROM ROBERT H. McNEILL AND ARTICLE FROM ARMY LIFE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Robert H. McNeill, attorney at law, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. The letter is entitled "Efficiency in Government," and it pays a very high compliment to the War Department.

In connection with the letter I submit for publication in the RECORD a table relating to activities of the War Department.

Mr. President, I wish to read at this time an article from the February 1943 issue of Army Life. It speaks in high terms of Col. Harold N. Gilbert, who was selected to be head of the Office of Dependency Benefits.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter, together with the accompanying table, and the magazine article, be printed in the RECORD, for the reason that very rarely do we receive fine letters of commendation from citizens in regard to governmental activities; but, on the contrary, as a rule we receive criticisms. For that reason, as I have stated, I should like to have these matters published in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee, United States Senate, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In view of the general belief of some people, that there is much inefficiency in governmental activities, I feel it my duty as a citizen to bring to your attention as chairman of the great committee over which you preside, and through your committee to the attention of the general public, as striking an illustration of efficiency in Government as I have ever seen throughout a long period of years of residence in Washington, where I have been an acute observer of governmental methods.

Recently my professional engagements required me to visit the city of Newark, N. J. As you know, the War Department transferred to Newark that branch of its service which administered allotment payments to the dependents of the members of our great new Army. Col. Harold N. Gilbert was placed in charge of this great assignment and found available for use a new office building, that of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and secured possession of it and began to add to and build up a force of lawyers, auditors, stenographers, typists and other clerical and mechanical employees sufficient to handle the stupendous task of sending out over 2,000,000 checks per month to all parts of the Nation and its dependencies. This force now consists of about 9,600 men and women, operating in 2 shifts of 8 hours each.

My sole object in bringing this matter to your attention is to commend this War Department activity upon which so many dependents of soldiers throughout the country rely for their monthly support, and to pay slight tribute to Colonel Gilbert for such a magnificent accomplishment.

R. H. McNEILL.

Report on work received and work accomplished in administration of family allowances, dependency allotments, and Class E allotments—weekly period Mar. 27, 4:45 p. m. to Apr. 2, 4:45 p. m., 1943

(a) Reference	(b) Item	(c) Cumulative total, end of preceding week since: July 31, 1942, for family allowance; Aug. 1, 1942, for dependency allotments; Nov. 2, 1942, for class E	(d) Current week	(e) Grand total, end of the current week
1	Work received:			
2	Total work received	$9,578,096	$369,876	$9,947,972
3	Family allowance applications	2,381,174	73,570	2,454,744
4	Class E allotment authorizations	511,592	27,879	539,471
5	Dependency allotment applications	55,653	1,902	57,555
6	Correspondence (pieces), changes of status, and documentary evidence	6,629,677	266,525	6,896,202
7	Cases acted upon and returned to file:			
8	Total cases acted upon	6,675,350	564,346	7,239,096
9	Family allowances (including changes in status)	3,348,098	269,327	3,617,425
10	Class E allotments	1,874,606	200,088	2,074,694
11	Dependency allotments	32,088	2,058	34,146
12	Correspondence (pieces)	1,420,558	92,873	1,513,431
13	Checks disbursed:			
14	Total number of checks disbursed	9,983,286	2,389,091	12,372,377
15	Total amount disbursed	$632,009,273	[1]$124,978,073	[1]$756,987,346
16	Family allowances	$447,339,041	$73,967,190	[1]$521,306,231
17	Class E allotments	$184,670,232	$51,010,883	[1]$235,681,115
18	Mail:			
19	Incoming (pieces)	9,578,096	369,876	9,947,972
20	Outgoing (pieces exclusive of checks)	10,661,229	468,761	11,129,990
21	Family-allowance applications:			
22	Total applications duplicated	46,735	2,306	49,041
23	Total temporarily disallowed, incomplete, or insufficient evidence	142,866	5,992	148,858
24	Total disapproved	17,093	854	17,947
25	Total approved	2,126,452	63,100	2,189,552
26	Total applications in progress	48,026	1,320	49,346
27	Total remaining in effect after changes in status	1,964,584	52,624	2,017,208
28	Total class E allotments in effect	1,085,992	18,671	1,104,663
29	Cases in progress:			
30	Total cases in progress	140,853	31,030	171,883
31	Family allowances (includes item 26)	85,236	29,881	115,117
32	Dependency allotments	374	−168	206
33	Class E allotments	55,243	1,317	56,560

[1] Preliminary figures; amounts will be adjusted in succeeding report.

[From Army Life and U. S. Army Recruiting News for February 1943]

"GETTING 'EM PAID"—OFFICE OF DEPENDENCY BENEFITS SPEEDS FINANCIAL AID TO SOLDIERS' FAMILIES

(By North Callahan)

Bulwark of our Government's system of taking care of its soldiers' families is the War Department, Office of Dependency Benefits, at Newark, N. J.

This new agency, which ministers hourly to the needs of the dependents of United States Army men, through issuance of allowance and allotment checks, has become such a huge enterprise that it is now one of the largest business organizations in the United States. In many ways, it is the most important one.

Housed in an imposing 16-story new building at 213 Washington Street in Newark, the physical appearance of the Office of Dependency Benefits is almost as impressive as the scope of the far-flung work it performs. Since the agency recently moved from Washington, D. C., the name of the street on which it is located is most appropriate.

Col. Harold N. Gilbert, a distinguished officer of the Regular Army, is the director of the Office of Dependency Benefits, as it is called, and under his expert guidance, hundreds of officers and thousands of civilian employees ply their utmost financial skill day and night to meet the heavy requirements which our growing Army has placed upon those responsible for paying allotments to soldiers' families.

A full description of the Office of Dependency Benefits and its manifold functions would fill a book; as it is, we will report the results of a recent visit to the tremendous institution and set forth the high lights. An idea of the immensity of the work performed may be gained from a few figures: 1,519,055 family allowance applications were handled by the Office of Dependency Benefits through December 31, 1942; 3,500,000 pieces of incoming mail have been received and over 5,000,000 pieces sent out; and now the incoming mail averages 62,449 pieces daily and the outgoing mail, 63,422 pieces. Just since January 1, of this year, $89,000,000 in allowance and allotment checks has been mailed out by the Office of Dependency Benefits.

The first impression one gets from a visit to the Office of Dependency Benefits is the perfect order in which every detail of work seems to fit—and move. The modern brick structure is even more up-to-date inside, and the absence of smoking by any of the personnel lends a freshness to the atmosphere that is refreshing. In company with Maj. Anson D. Clark, genial public-relations officer, we started at the bottom of the whole thing and systematically went right through

to the top. When one reaches the highest floor of the building, and has completed observation of the final process of the intricate operations, he feels that he is not only high up in financial circles; he is literally at the apex of a great enterprise that keeps our family circles together.

The Office of Dependency Benefits administers, under public law, the payments to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Army, of family allowances, emergency class E (dependency) allotments, and voluntary class E allotments.

The family allowance consists of a soldier's contribution from his pay, supplemented by one from the Government; the emergency class E allotment is made by the Secretary of War for the benefit of dependents of Army personnel who are missing in action, interned, beleagured, besieged, in the hands of the enemy, and under other conditions; the ordinary class E allotment is a voluntary allotment that any officer or soldier may authorize from his own pay and which he may terminate or change at his option.

Here is how the Office of Dependency Benefits operates. It will be well for every wife, mother, or other dependent of an American soldier to bear this procedure in mind the next time they receive allotment money. For there is a lot more to it than just the simple filling in of a blank check by Uncle Sam.

The Office of Dependency Benefits operates on a production line system with each of its thousands of workers performing a single operation, but there is this difference: On most production lines each worker knows just his own operation. On the Office of Dependency Benefits production line he is taught the entire operation of producing the product involved, which is in this case the allowance or allotment. Each Office of Dependency Benefits employee learns all these steps in a basic training course, and when he has finished he has a good general idea of the entire process of authorizing and paying these benefits.

This system was worked out by Colonel Gilbert, the director, and has been found to increase efficiency and instill employee interest in the whole job.

Applications for family allowances and allotments are received in the mail branch of the Office of Dependency Benefits, where they are time stamped and sorted. These applications are then sorted alphabetically, according to the soldier's last name, into 10 categories for 10 production lines. The application is then sent to the appropriate production line of the Case Recording and Record Searching Branch, where the application and its documentary evidence are placed, with a work sheet, inside a case folder. Then it is checked with the soldier's record card to verify his service and eligibility. The application is next given a number and a post card is prepared advising the applicant of its receipt.

Next the family allowance application goes to the Determinations Branch where it is checked for dependency relationship and other factors of eligibility, these processes usually taking only a few hours.

However, if the determinations branch finds evidence requiring a legal decision, the application goes to the legal branch for an opinion and then a decision by the Director. Also, if some piece of evidence or information is lacking, the case folder may be sent to the correspondence branch, where a letter is written asking for the information, which having been received, the application goes back to the determinations branch.

The next major step in the main production line for a normal family allowance is the authorization branch, where all actions of previous branches are finally checked, and if found correct and complete, as required under the provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, the family allowance is authorized for payment. If authorized, the allowance is authenticated with the signature of Colonel Gilbert.

When the family allowance is authorized, it is transmitted to the Finance Division of the Office of Dependency Benefits for payment. Here the allowance becomes 1 of a lot of 100 authorizations and is reviewed and examined, the amount computed and verified, and accounting control established, a master card on this application is punched, a stencil card cut from which the check is to be written and the check drawn.

Each mechanical process involved in this series is verified by a machine and also by groups of clerks. Voucher registers are prepared on a machine which translates the information from the master punch cards onto large sheets of the register. This machine can type 100 recordings a minute.

The family allowance check which has now been written goes to the Disbursing Branch, where it is signed and sent on its way to the soldier's family. This Disbursing Branch is the one into which the benefit checks issued by the Office of Dependency Benefits are funneled from the various production lines. The signature of Lt. C [illegible] W. L. Johnson, finance officer, is affixed by the check-writing machine, which also dates the check. Then the check goes on to another machine, the inserter, with a stack of others, a button is pressed, and the machine stuffs the check into the familiar brown envelope, licks the flap, seals the envelope, and deposits it with the others in a neat pile where it is counted.

Finally, the family allowance check, ready for mailing, is at last taken by a human hand and tossed with a bundle of others into a mail bag whence it goes to the Post Office Department and into some serviceman's home.

The class E allotments and dependency allotments are handled in much the same way.

So now it can be seen that the simple-looking check which a soldier's wife or other relative receives through the mail is the concentrated result of a tremendous, intricate, and painstaking production process.

In other words, check and double check.

When the Office of Dependency Benefits was formed a few months ago, a man of the highest caliber and most valuable experience was needed to head it. For these reasons Col. Harold N. Gilbert was selected as the Director.

Colonel Gilbert was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in France during the First World War and later, being wounded, was decorated with the Purple Heart Medal. Soon after the present conflict began, the War Department selected Colonel Gilbert, then Chief of the United States Army Recruiting Service, to head the gigantic recruiting campaign to build up our Army. He responded with enthusiasm and a sensational publicity campaign, and in so doing made the popular slogan, "Keep 'em Flying," a national byword. As a result of obtaining the hundreds of thousands of men in this campaign, Colonel Gilbert was decorated with the Distinguished Service Medal by Secretary of War Stimson, with an accompanying citation which explained that it was awarded "for his unusual foresight and resourcefulness in planning and conducting with conspicuous success the largest peacetime recruiting program in the history of the Army."

Executive officer of the Office of Dependency Benefits is Col. T. D. Joiner, a well-known Regular Army officer who has been on duty at the United States Military Academy, and from 1934 to 1937 helped to develop the war plan used by the American-Philippine forces under Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Among other well-known officers of the Office of Dependency Benefits is Col. F. Granville Munson, officer in charge of the Service Division. His long record of achievement includes a degree from Harvard and being editor of the Military Laws of the United States. An outstanding legal figure of the Army, Colonel Munson was the senior military assistant to the Judge Advocate General in the recent trial of the eight Nazi saboteurs in Washington.

The Office of Dependency Benefits has a slogan. It is "Get 'em paid," originated, of course, by the Director.

Summing up the accomplishments to date of the Office of Dependency Benefits, Colonel Gilberts stated: "In addition to building a completely new organization, training and equipping it, being thrown into operation 2 months ahead of the original scheduled time, making the largest and fastest decentralization move from Washington to date, getting reestablished in a new location, and again having to procure and train over 4,000 new employees, the War Department Office of Dependency Benefits has achieved a record comparable to nothing in the Army or civilian lifetime under similar conditions in such a brief time. Despite the handicaps and magnitude of the task, the main job of 'getting 'em paid' is being accomplished. We are working day and night. The skies look clear ahead."

VISION OF THE UNSEEN—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a poem entitled "Vision of the Unseen," by the poet of the Senate, Horace C. Carlisle. It was read in one of the Washington churches several days ago. It is thoroughly inspirational, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISION OF THE UNSEEN

O dear God, Thy word is hidden
In the framework of the world—
On the sky it is recorded,
Where the night-stars shine, impearled—
And we, fashioned in Thine image,
From the dusts of yesterday,
Hear the voice which thru life's changes
Guides our footsteps all the way.

In this hushed and sacred moment,
We would very humble be,
For in Thine eternal presence
Every heart is known to Thee—
May the fretful fears that blind us
Be transformed, O God, we pray,
Into faith and hope and courage
That will drive these fears away.

Give to us that inner vision
Of the Giver of all good,
That we may both preach and practice
Sacrificial brotherhood—
Guide us thru this night of shadows,
Till the earth, saved from despair,
Shall have rolled out of the darkness,
Into daybreak everywhere.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no Executive Calendar; therefore, it is not necessary for the Senate to go into executive session. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fred W. Jandrey, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

William Embry Wrather, of Texas, to be Director of the Geological Survey, vice Walter C. Mendenhall, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, which art in Heaven, who art closer than breathing and nearer than hands and feet, hallowed be Thy name. Lead us to steady our tempers and strengthen our characters. We pray that over the eager, vehement, restless spirit of man may brood that peace which passeth understanding. Grant that those who have grown weary in the journey, bruised and tarrying by the way, may be cheered by the invisible Saviour whose crown of thorns mocks the diadems of mortal monarchs and whose scepter shall sway the nations to a perfect liberty.

We sincerely pray Thee to discipline us that our defects and excesses shall yield a more complete manhood. In this day of fatalities, with its distresses of veiled hearthstones, encircled by the whirlwind of war, O do Thou enfold them with the mantle of Thy holy presence; so abide with them that fear and evil shall be of no avail. Let us not linger on the well-worn levels, retracing familiar steps, rather boldly and confidently mount to happier and wiser ways which lead to the goal of peace and contentment. Beset by many problems and difficulties, give more than human wisdom to our President; with broad vision and with minds alert bless our Speaker and the Congress. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

MAKING INELIGIBLE FOR EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills. One of them makes ineligible for employment by the Government of the United States a person who affiliates himself or associates with any organization which our committee, the Interdepartmental Committee, or the Attorney General has found or will find to be subversive.

The second bill provides for the forfeiture of the citizenship of any person who affiliates himself in the future with any organization subject to foreign control which engages in a political activity.

I shall ask for early hearings on these bills and I hope they may be brought to the floor of the House without delay.

I also want to report, Mr. Speaker, that our committee has heard 18 Government employees and we will within another week have heard all of the 38 Government employees. The testimony of all of these employees is being promptly sent to the Appropriations Subcommittee considering the matter.

TAX BILL

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, compromise seems to be in the air, and I hope it will not turn out to be some balloon which will burst over our heads. As everyone in this House knows, I was one of the 15, may I say enlightened Democrats who supported the Carlson bill.

On last night I addressed a letter to every one of the Democrats who supported that bill asking them to get behind the movement of our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], to bring some sort of compromise plan to this House.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Not at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. Where does the gentleman get that word "majority" when he speaks about that bill?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] saw the light the next day after the debacle of last week and has been moving very hard to get this bill before us. Yesterday I was glad to see the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], take the floor and ask to get considered some sort of pay-as-you-go plan before recess.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I have been every minute asking for this plan.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, we all know that to be a fact, and I am glad to see the gentleman still fighting so hard for a pay-as-you-earn plan. We had better get a pay-as-you-go plan or we had better not go back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NEWSOME addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COMPTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DEWEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TAX BILL

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a day or so after the Carlson amendment was defeated last week the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachu-

setts [Mr. McCORMACK], issued a statement that has been well received by the press, the businessmen, and the wage earners of this country. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], speaking for the majority charged with the responsibility of enacting a workable tax-collection bill, took the position that a tax bill should be introduced providing for the collection of taxes at the source, and almost without exception all classes of people are in agreement on this proposition.

The minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], yesterday made the suggestion that some brief, concise, and workable bill be reported to the House before the adjournment on April 17. These expressions from both sides of the aisle show very clearly that there is no insurmountable obstacle in the way of the adoption of an orderly, efficient tax-collection system that will put an end to the present uncertainty.

What the country is demanding, in my judgment, is a tax bill that will get results, and get them now. It could well go into effect after the second quarterly payment on June 15, and whatever forgiveness of taxes might be involved would be a good investment in the bringing of our tax collections to a current basis. Unless we are prepared to sacrifice billions in revenue from persons who are receiving extraordinarily high incomes, we must go on a current basis, and we cannot go on such a basis without forgiving some taxes—at least, to some degree. Those who fear that war millionaires will be created overnight can banish their fears; for, in the first place, a bill which would become effective for the last half of the year would materially cut the amount of taxes which would be abated; and, furthermore, the able members of the Ways and Means Committee can easily and quickly frame a bill that will take care of this objection.

In view of the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], as well as the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday, it is to be hoped that a practical, workable bill can be reported and passed before we leave Washington on April 17.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include copy of the President's Executive order of last night in regard to stabilization of prices and wages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PACE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REMEMBER BATAAN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by the Reverend Father Edmund Walsh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FULMER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUSBEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE HOBBS BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the procession of converts to some sort of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan which has been hitting the sawdust trail down here to the Well of the House would be encouraging to any evangelist. What I am wondering is whether when some sort of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan comes up for consideration those who favor it will be told from the floor of the House that if they vote for such a scheme they are scoundrels or fools.

The little zephyr of public condemnation that has hit this House because of its refusal to adopt some such plan is going to be nothing compared to the tornado of public indignation that will hit us if we try to fool the people with a Hobbs bill that does not reach the evil the people want corrected. I mean the end of violence, union raiding, extortion, and forced payment of dues and initiation fees. When the Hobbs bill comes on for consideration, you watch it, because some labor leaders and some others who want to compromise so as to permit racketeering are going to threaten us with political execution if we pass a bill which will give union men, as well as the public, real protection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some statistics and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics; in one, to include a couple of memorials adopted by the Washington State Legislature, and in the other, to include a set of tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief statement by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

A DANGEROUS ATTACK ON ONE OF OUR ALLIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking and dangerous statements I have ever seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that of the speech of David Dubinsky, which was inserted by permission of the Senate on yesterday at page A1705 of the Appendix, attacking the Russian Government for executing the two Jewish revolutionists, Ehrlich and Alter, in December 1942.

In my speech of April 7 I inserted a letter from the Russian Ambassador showing why these men were executed. According to that statement they were attempting to stir a revolution in Russia at the very moment when Russia was fighting for her life and holding the bulk of the German Army off the American and British forces in north Africa.

This speech of Dubinsky's was delivered to a mass meeting in Mecca Temple in New York City on March 30. It was

inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday, and today it is no doubt being broadcast over the German radio for the purpose of trying to show friction between the United States and Russia, and it is undoubtedly being read with disappointment by the leaders of the Russian Government.

How would we feel if a vast mass meeting was held in Moscow, or in London, and speeches were made denouncing the United States Government for executing the German spies who came here to blow up our factories a few months ago—especially if those speeches were published at the expense of the Russian or the British Government and sent broadcast over the land.

These men were Trotskyites. They belonged to that revolutionary group that has been trying to spread communism over this country, and according to the Russian Government, they were attempting to stir a revolution, and were circulating poisonous subversive literature among the soldiers in the Russian Army during the darkest hours of the siege of Stalingrad.

Think what a calamity would have been if they had succeeded and forced Russia out of the war.

Besides, this is Russia's affair, and it is none of our business how she handles it.

The fact that this mass meeting was held, and this revolutionary speech was made, denouncing these executions as a "black crime," and the fact that it was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the greatest deliberative body in the world, is likely to do the cause of the Allies more harm in this critical hour than adding 100,000 or probably 500,000 men to the strength of our enemies on the various fighting fronts.

As I said the other day, whether you like Stalin or not, whether you like Russia or not, we must all remember that Russia is our ally in this war, and that every time she engages the Germans on the Russian front she is moving one step closer to victory and saving the lives of thousands of American and British soldiers.

I hope the Senate will strike this speech from the RECORD, in order to reassure the Russian Government and the Russian people, as well as all the rest of our allies, that the Congress of the United States is not aiding, abetting, or condoning these attacks on one of our leading allies in this terrible struggle.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker I cannot refrain from replying to what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] just said. David Dubinsky is not a Communist. He has been one of the most earnest and effective opponents of communism in the whole American labor movement for years and years and years. Personally I think that discussion in the House of what happens in Russia as to the execution of these two men is not going to gain anything but in the interest of fairness I myself inserted the speech of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, delivered at that same meeting. I do not see how anyone can take exception to the temperate remarks which Mr. Green made in which he protested the execution of these two men who for years he says have been known as earnest leaders of the labor movement in Poland, who were not Communists in any sense or definition of that term, but whose public record for a long period of time has been a record in vigorous opposition to nazi-ism and Hitlerism, and all that those things stand for. These men were Poles, they were labor leaders, they were Jews. They were sought and pursued by the Gestapo. That they could have been guilty of trying to aid Hitler's cause appears to me utterly inconceivable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. [During count.] Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I make it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Pfeifer
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Horan	Pracht
Bell	Izac	Richards
Boykin	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Calvin D.	Rohrbough
Burdick	Kee	Sabath
Byrne	Keefe	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Kerr	Schiffler
Carson, Ohio	Knutson	Short
Cooley	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cox	Luce	Smith, Va.
Culkin	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	McKenzie	Sparkman
Dawson	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Dickstein	Mansfield, Tex.	Stevenson
Dingell	Mason	Thomason
Elliott	Monkiewicz	Tolan
Fogarty	Morrison, La.	Treadway
Gibson	Morrison, N. C.	Wadsworth
Gordon	Mott	Weaver
Gore	Nichols	Wilson
Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.	Winter
Guyer	O'Hara	
Hagen	O'Toole	
Hall,	Outland	
Leonard W.	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings, under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TARVER, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DITTER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations known as the Kerr committee, may have permission to sit during the session of the House today until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House today until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the committee considering?

Mr. MAY. We are considering a batch of bills relating to manpower and several other problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in The Tablet, a Catholic weekly of Brooklyn, N. Y., Saturday, April 3, 1943, entitled "Freedom for All."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of House Resolution 154.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield some time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I suggest that while I am very happy to have such a fine crowd in attendance, I had nothing to do with bringing Members over here.

There were some good speeches made late yesterday evening explaining the background and the purposes of this bill.

Many Members undoubtedly were not here at that time, and I shall try in a few words to give them some idea of what I think this is about.

In 1934 Congress enacted a so-called Anti-Racketeering Act. It was designed to bring about Federal prosecution of people obtaining money or property by violence and threats of violence in connection with the movement of goods in interstate commerce. An exception was written into the law which provided it should not apply to a situation where there existed a bona fide relationship of employer and employee.

The celebrated 807 case in New York came on for decision by the Supreme Court. The case involved the conduct of individuals who stopped trucks going into the city of New York and in effect hijacked the drivers out of $8 or $9 per truck. The Supreme Court held that under the exception heretofore referred to by me, relative to the relationship of employer and employee, the prosecution would not lie in that case. I know a lot of good lawyers who violently disagree with that decision, and personally I disagree with it although I may be taking a lot on myself by undertaking to challenge a decision of the Supreme Court.

This bill seeks to supply the deficiency created by that decision. In a word, what this bill seeks to do is to superimpose Federal jurisdiction or Federal prosecution for robbery and extortion committed in connection with the movement of goods in interstate commerce. I say that is the objective, and as far as I have ever heard that is the sole objective of the bill. It is to stop the so-called hijacking and racketeering that has prevailed. That is why I am supporting the bill.

When the bill came on for consideration both before the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules, representatives of labor assailed the bill. There is no reference to labor in the bill, but they assumed it was directed at them. They said the language in the bill was so broad as to reach the legitimate operations of organized labor. Personally I do not think the language was so broad, but I was one of those who joined with many others in taking this position. We said to those representatives of organized labor, "You say you are against hijacking and racketeering. We are all against hijacking and racketeering. If you thing this language is too broad, and since the proponents of this legislation, and I am one of them, are not trying to reach the legitimate operations of organized labor, but rather the racketeering, the robbery and extortion, why do you not draft and submit some language that will do the thing we all want to do, which is to stop racketeering, and at the same time will protect legitimate and lawful acts which you say you want to protect and that all of us want to protect."

At one time I had the view that if we just took the regular robbery and extortion statutes that prevail in the codes throughout the States and wrote them into this bill without adding any words, that might do the job and remove any uncertainty of interpretation. There did not seem to be much support for that sort of proposition, however.

I think that it was largely as the result of this insistence that labor ought to suggest something if they really wanted to prevent racketeering and also protest legitimate rights that they came forward with an amendment. Personally I think the amendment is all right. No one can challenge me as having failed at any time or under any circumstances to vote for measures that seemed to me to be necessary to curb labor excesses, to deal with racketeering, or to bring about equitable and fair relationships between employer and employee.

I think that perhaps on its side labor has seen some ghosts under the bed with respect to this measure, but assuming that, I do not also want to be seeing ghosts under the bed and oppose something which I think, after careful examination is fair and reasonable. I shall not oppose a fair and reasonable suggestion just because it has been advanced by organized labor.

We say in this bill that robbery and extortion shall be punished by Federal prosecution. That I am for, but certain labor people want to add a proviso which will say simply this: That conduct which is made legal by the specific acts of Congress, known as the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Railway Mediation Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, shall not be considered as having been made illegal by the Hobbs bill.

Now, I take the position that there is nothing in any one of those four acts that any reasonable judge or lawyer could contend as legalizing robbery and extortion committed in one of these hijacking operations. Now, that being true, what is the effect of the amendment? The amendment simply preserves the objectives of the bill, which are to punish for robbery and extortion, and then excepts conduct that is specifically made legal by the Congress of the United States in those four acts. While I have stood for amendment of some of these acts, everyone admits that we are not trying in this bill to repeal or amend those acts of the Congress and we are not trying to make illegal conduct that is made legal under those acts.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I must yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman. To sum this up, there are two amendments before the committee, or there will be before the House: One is the Celler amendment, for which the gentleman from Indiana is speaking, and the other is a committee amendment, which was advocated by Mr. Eastman. It is the contention of some of us that there is the difference between tweedledum and tweedle-dee. Either one accomplishes the purpose for which the gentleman from Indiana is speaking.

Mr. HALLECK. If I may proceed, I was about to come to that, and I will, if my time does not expire. I think the gentleman is correct.

I have checked my judgment with the judgments of some good legal minds. When you finally get down to it many of those who contend against putting in this proviso can only say, "Well, now, we cannot be too certain about what the Supreme Court will do when you add words."

My view of that is that we must legislate on the theory that the Court is going to interpret an act the way we write it and the way we intend that it be interpreted and applied.

If any court or any judge cannot see in these proceedings—cannot get a complete idea from what is going on here in the passage of this bill—that we intend that hijacking, extortion, and robbery in connection with movement of goods in interstate commerce be stopped, then I do not know what you can depend upon in the way of judicial interpretation.

Another thing: It has been suggested that the four acts named authorize violence, but I do not so understand. For instance, take the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It specifically provides that conduct of labor organizations is legalized only when it is peaceful, nonviolent, and free from fraud.

So I think that in the final analysis this amendment is clarifying. It does not, as some might say, rip the heart out of the bill. The objectives are still there. Some have suggested that the amendment is superfluous, and if the language is not broader than I think it is in the original Hobbs bill possibly it might be said that it is superfluous, but assuming that it is, if there are great bodies of people who feel that this language is necessary to protect their legitimate rights and their legitimate objects, then I say why object to putting the language in the bill? As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] pointed out, there is what has been referred to as a committee amendment. This same sort of proviso, in substance and of same effect, was put on the second title of the bill, which has to do principally with rail transportation or with carrier operations.

On the so-called labor proposal as against the committee proposal the committee as I understand it by a close vote decided to make the proviso which was originally applicable only to title II also applicable to title I; that is, applying it to the whole act rather than to the second section.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. I may not use it. I just want to say in conclusion that as between the committee amendment and the so-called labor amendment, I think there is no substantial difference. My own view of it is that both amendments seek to exempt from the purview of the Hobbs Act the legitimate operations of the labor organizations as protected and provided for in the four acts to which I

have referred. On this basis I might say: "Let us take the committee amendment;" but again I say there are many people, most of whom are cooperating loyally in the war effort, who probably if their original views were followed, would not have wanted any of this legislation, but who have said that if we will put this amendment in—which I personally think is a clarifying amendment only, which does not interfere at all with the real objectives of the act—that they would go along. I think that is what we should do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 4 minutes.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a supplemental report on the bill, H. R. 1730, to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us has for its purpose, according to its title to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation. No American citizen should object to such a proposal. There can be no real argument about legislating against robbery and extortion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill—the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill—should not be opposed by Members of Congress, because it merely applies to labor what is already applied to all other groups among the American people. Its purpose is to do away with extortion, robbery, and practices that should be unlawful that have been used in the past by some union organizations in New York City extorting or attempting to extort fees from helpless farmers before permitting them to drive their produce truck to market. I rise, however, to support the American Federation of Labor amendment. The labor organizations are fearful that there is something written into this bill that by inference or otherwise may take away some of their legislative rights and benefits, those hard-won rights that labor has secured during the last 30 years. I am confident there is no such provision or intent in the bill. If, however, a great organization with more than 4,000,000 members want an amendment of that kind why should we haggle between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], between the amendment offered by the committee and the amendment suggested by the American Federation of Labor?

I should like to see the committee withdraw its amendment as they admit it is practically identical. If the American Federation of Labor amendment satisfies labor, why should we not adopt it? I feel some responsibility because as a member of the Rules Committee I repeatedly asked: "What is the objection of labor to this antiracketeering bill? Why do you not present an amendment that will safeguard your legal rights? And if you do I will be glad to support it and I believe Congress will also." That is what the American Federation of Labor has done in submitting their clarifying amendment. I hope the House will adopt the American Federation of Labor amendment by an overwhelming vote. It can do no harm, it is almost the same as the committee amendment, but it will satisfy that great, loyal, American labor organization, and for this reason I hope that when the House reaches it it will adopt the amendment proposed in good faith by the American Federation of Labor.

I want to refer likewise to some of the excessive penalties. The penalties in this bill in my opinion are too severe—20 years and $10,000 fine. When we reach this section of the bill there should be very careful consideration given to reducing both the extent of the imprisonment and fines. Let me refer also to title II, which reads:

> SEC. 201. Any person or persons who shall, during the war in which the United States is now engaged knowingly and willfully, by physical force or intimidation by threats of physical force, obstruct or retard, or aid in obstructing or retarding, or attempt to obstruct or retard, the orderly transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce * * *.

Why should such a provision be carried in the bill when there has been no such attempt in the last 20 years? It is a reflection on the loyal railroad brotherhood employees, and many of them object to it. When we reach this section I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the language "or aid in obstructing or retarding, or attempt to obstruct or retard," which is not necessary or warranted. The main issue is as to whether we shall adopt the committee amendment or the American Federation of Labor amendment; and I hope the House in its sound judgment will vote for the latter and thereby take away from the greatest American labor organization any suspicion that this bill may be used to deprive American wage earners of the legal rights and benefits that they have obtained over the years for collective bargaining, to strike, to peaceful picketing, and others of importance to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon's Star carried a story which is inaccurate and which so far as my mind, my heart, and my statements are concerned is not in accordance with the facts. I know that reporters going around and gaining bits of information here and there, when they sit down to their typewriters to write their stories sometimes put words into the mouths of those they are ostensibly quoting that were not uttered. I am not saying that the gentleman who wrote this article did anything of that kind intentionally, but I am saying that nothing could be further from the truth so far as I am concerned and so far as I believe the facts to be. The article states, for instance:

> The legislation was originally slated for a vote yesterday, but priority was given by House leaders to two appropriation bills.

That is not so, exactly. The consideration of the Hobbs bill was tentatively slated for yesterday, but its place on the agenda was always fixed and understood to be subordinate to the two appropriation bills.

It has always been told me, and I think, told the House, that the order in which these bills were to be brought up was that after disposition of the two appropriation bills this bill would be called up for consideration, and that is exactly what has been done.

May I say that so far as the leadership of this House on both sides is concerned, and so far as the membership of the House is concerned, there has been no disposition so far as I can learn to do anything but to live up to the promises or statements that were made as to the agenda.

To quote me as saying that there was an apparent inclination to delay the bringing of this bill to the floor is not so in the slightest degree. Suggestions or questions have been made, but I never shared those views.

Then it says I made a remark about Mr. Tobin of the Teamsters Union to the effect that he cautioned against haste in labor legislation. If so, I never knew it. I think Mr. Tobin is a high-class American gentleman. I do not believe that he made any such remark with reference to this bill. I do not know that he did, except from what I see in this paper. If he did, I do not believe he had any reference to this bill. I believe the leadership of the House has been absolutely fair with me and everybody else and that the program of the House is in accord with the previous statements of the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not see the news item referred to. The gentleman made some reference to it outside a few minutes ago. Of course, mistakes are made. Reporters are human beings like all of us. May I suggest to the gentleman that he not give it any more consideration because even if I had read it I would understand thoroughly that a mistake was made. The gentleman himself in no way even intimated anything which would justify such a news item.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman has been exceedingly fair, kind, and helpful in trying to bring this bill to the floor. I am grateful. The same thing applies to

the whole leadership and membership of the House.

The last two speakers who have spoken in aid of the Celler amendment are sincere, honest men; but I respectfully submit that issue will come up in due and orderly course at the time that the amendments are considered. I do not believe that their consideration has any place in the debate on the rule, and this is said without any criticism at all of the distinguished gentleman who made such speeches. I am simply saying that, to explain why I do not answer at this time. There is a perfectly good and sufficient answer.

There is no material difference apparent at a first reading between the committee amendment and the A. F. of L. amendment, but if you want to emasculate this bill there is no surer way to do it than to adopt the Celler amendment, and I will address myself very pointedly to that proposition and pull the mask off of this tricky amendment when it is offered.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that an honest interpretation of this act if it becomes the law of the land is not to be expected?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. I said that these two amendments seem on their faces to be without material difference.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I was going to explain why I am not going into that point at this time. I did not say that we might expect an interpretation which would be other than honest. But I differ with the gentleman in regard to the Supreme Court. I am not talking about what may happen in the future. I am talking about what has already happened and the decision of the Supreme Court in the Local 807 case, which the gentleman made reference to, has already decided that no matter how much violence a union man might use in seeking employment, he could not be punished under the 1934 Anti-Racketeering Act. If he commits murder, or if he commits assault with a weapon, it is all right under the antiracketeering law. In accordance with the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, which is the law of the land today, whether you agree with it or not, that is stare decisis.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact that question has been brought up by the gentleman, is it not true that that decision of the Supreme Court in the 807 case hinged upon the exception written into the act in reference to the bona fide relationship of employer with employee, and is it not also true that if this act becomes the law those words will be repealed, which will mean that the words upon which that decision depended will no longer be in the law?

Mr. HOBBS. No. I do not so construe the opinion and I do not think that is the fact. If I read that opinion correctly, and I have read it a hundred times, so have you, I guess, the opinion is based on both of the exceptions. If you will read the opinion it says what the test that should be applied to all conduct of this kind must be and it includes both of the exceptions, the latter one of which is substantially in blanket form what is detailed in the committee amendment and what is also detailed in the A. F. of L. amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman but may I say I cannot yield any further because I want to get to a factual presentation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to know how the gentleman can argue that both of these amendments are substantially the same, then say in the next breath that the Celler amendment emasculates the act and at least infer that the other one does not.

Mr. HOBBS. I never said that. I said they seemed so at first reading. I submit that there is within the essence of the Celler amendment a phrase which seems to be in accord with our wishes as to stamping out the racket, but which does not result in that. It permits robbery or extortion because it does not deal truly with the status. It says that no acts, conduct, or activity which are lawful under the four laws therein cited should constitute guilt under this law. And it implies that this is to be taken as true, no matter how unlawfully any of those lawful acts may be done. The four laws cited in the Celler amendment require the lawful acts in them enumerated to be done in a peaceful, lawful way. The Celler amendment, quite cleverly, omits any such requirement.

It gets away from the laws and does not give that safeguard, and in the light of the majority opinion in the 807 case implies that no matter how these lawful acts are done—they may be done ever so unlawfully in a given instance, such as robbery—the perpetrator would still be innocent under this act.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the acts are not peaceful, if they are not lawful, I cannot quite follow the gentleman's reasoning.

Mr. HOBBS. That is all right. As I say, I want to discuss that when the amendment is offered. But I am telling you that it does not make a bit of difference how unlawfully lawful acts are done, the perpetrator would be acquitted if the law contained the Celler amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman explain how one can do an act lawfully and at the same time do it unlawfully?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, the question as framed contains a contradiction in terms. No one can do an act lawfully and unlawfully at the same time. But no such case is presented by the Celler amendment or its underlying meaning. There we have a lawful act done unlawfully. Let me illustrate. Suppose one is engaged in the perfectly lawful practice of striking. On strike for months. But for that fact he would have been at work. But he is at home and sees a young girl coming into his home looking for his absent wife, and he rapes her. Of course, that is reductio ad absurdum. I do not mean to say that that is not farfetched. But I am saying that is the effect of the construction put upon robbery committed while engaged in otherwise lawful conduct by the Supreme Court decision. No matter how much force is used, robbery is a perfectly innocent pastime, as Chief Justice Stone said, if the perpetrator be a labor-union member seeking employment.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 181, noes 2.

The resolution was agreed to.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds of his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in Walter Winchell's column, On Broadway, which appeared in an issue of the New York Sunday Mirror under the heading of "Notes of an innocent bystander," the following statement was made:

> The Story Tellers. * * * Look takes off the wraps and calls people by name in its article on "Hitler's American stooges." Two of the alleged stooges are mentioned.
>
> I shall name only one, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan.

That charge calls in question the loyalty, the patriotism, and the integrity of the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan and reflects upon him in his official, representative capacity, and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman states a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the best defense against a false charge is always a driving, direct inquiry into what is back of it. There are two things that are back of this charge. A similar charge has been made against many Members of Congress. That is the only reason the question is raised here.

Mr. RANKIN. What charge? The House could not understand what the gentleman read.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The charge that I am a stooge of Hitler. The gentleman was listed in another publication as being the same thing, as were 96 Members of Congress, so let not anyone think he is not interested in this thing. You may not be now, but you will be when the 1944 campaign comes on and this smear-purge movement gets going again.

One group that gives currency to this sort of a charge is that which believes that we ought to substitute for our Declaration of Independence a declaration of interdependence; that we ought to give away everything we have, no matter if it leaves us in a condition where we cannot help any nation or any people. Give it away, anyway. That seems

to be the plan. That same group advocates the hauling down of the American flag and the substitution of an international flag. I shall say little about that group.

The other day on the floor of the House when the gentleman from Louisiana was speaking a Member from Connecticut arose, and she said:

Is it the gentleman's contention that now, having isolated ourselves from the rest of the world, we should proceed to isolate ourselves from South America and to have no contact with the hemisphere culturally, economically, or spiritually?

There is a false premise in that statement. We have not isolated ourselves from the rest of the world. If that Member from Connecticut believes we have, I should like to have her go out in my country some day; I should like to have her stand on the hillside, and, as the lights in the valley go out and the farmhouses become dark, I should like to have her go into that home and see what the farmer and his wife are doing. They are down on their knees—doing what? They are down on their knees by the side of their beds praying for the boy who is gone, who may or may not be alive. They are asking God's mercy for the one who has gone, for the one who is to go. In the morning when the farmer goes out to the fields and the housewife goes about her duties, what are they doing? They are thinking of the empty chair that was there at the breakfast table in the morning. Yet the Member from Connecticut would say that we have isolated ourselves. Our blood, our flesh, our hearts, our minds are all over the world with the boys who are doing the fighting, giving their lives.

The future of our boys, the sons and the brothers—yes, and in some instances, the fathers—all are being offered on the sacrificial altar. It may be that under the stress and the strain, the famine and the pestilence that follow a war as all-embracing as this one, the light of civilization itself will go out and the world again endure the trials and the tribulations of the dark ages.

We are giving billions of dollars' worth of food, of munitions of war of all kinds. We are sending farm machinery needed by our own people to foreign lands. We are dismantling factories and sending them to South America and to Russia, and just the other day we were advised by Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, that we should give to an international bank $2,000,000,000 in gold.

It is not only possible, it is probable, that under the New Deal planning, all that gold in the hills of Kentucky will be used for a like purpose.

If the Member from Connecticut, and those who believe as does she, think that we have isolated ourselves from all the world, then she knows not the minds nor the thoughts of our people. There is an old saying that where your treasure is, there shall your heart be also. The thing that is dearest to us and all the world is the welfare, the future, of those who go to fight.

There is one group that charges those who did not want war, who realized the magnitude of this war, and what it is going to cost, not in treasure, not in property, but in American youth, to be gone forever—a million or more of them, when the war is over—that is one group I say that charges us who realized what was coming to this country, and what is happening now, with being Hitler stooges.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if that is the same man who is haranguing all of the time, denouncing the Russian Government for executing those two spies, and in that way stirring trouble between us and the Russian Government at a time when the Russian Army is keeping the German Army off our boys in North Africa?

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is another group which makes the same charges. They were busy during all the last campaign, and they will be busy again when another election rolls around. That group went out into the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan and circulated—and they violated two State laws when they put them out—pamphlets which they put in every home in some of those counties. One was a circular of 12 pages, illustrated, and the sum and substance of it was that one Republican for the nomination in that Fourth District was a Hitler stooge, and was not a loyal citizen. In addition to that, and before the general election, they put out in that district, as they did in many other districts throughout the United States, a 6-page circular, characterizing the Members of Congress who did not favor going into this war before we were prepared for it as "Congressmen Agin It." I say that was put out not only in Michigan, but it was put out in other States, and let me read you some of it:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of sly little pats on the back that Congressman "Agin It" gave to Hitler.

They were writing about Members of Congress other than, as well as, the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. Hundreds of thousands of those circulars were put out in the various States of the Union.

The C. I. O. during the campaign advocated the publication and circulation of similar false statements charging candidates for Congress with disloyalty. Listen to this statement from the six-page circular:

Congressman "Agin It" couldn't have done more harm to America if he had been on the Axis pay roll.

Here is another:

Congressman "Agin It" boasted that America is not a united people but a divided Nation.

Another:

Mostly Congressman "Agin It" is a Republican, but Michigan has a couple of Democrats who fit the shroud. They thought they could cater to more votes by lining up with the back stabbers.

Let me read again:

In justice to Congressman "Agin It" the record shows he wasn't always against everything. No, sir. He favored pensions for Congressmen until the people applied the heat and then he weaseled out of that mistake. And he was strong for Congressman MARTIN DIES, the big bust from Texas, whose record for mistakes has made even the arch conservatives toss him overboard.

Here is another:

He—

Congressman "Agin It"—

had nightmares about the departments of Government being honeycombed with Communists.

On the last page of that circular are these statements:

For our own survival, it is time that we voters of Michigan send Congressman "Agin It" back to private life.

You would know what to do if you got a cablegram like this from Berlin:

"AMERICAN VOTER,
"Michigan, United States of America:
"It is my command that you vote for Congressman 'Agin It.' He has helped the Fatherland by keeping America weak. This is my order.
"ADOLPH HITLER."

Hitler would send that wire if he could get it delivered, and you know how he would vote.

If you are not on Hitler's side, then make sure Congressman "Agin It" has cast his last "no" vote against you, your family, and your home by retiring him to private life.

C. I. O., 803 Hofmann Building,
Detroit, Mich.

Just why was the C. I. O. which time and time again by slowdowns, by work stoppages, and by strikes has held up the production of essential war material—needed by the Army and by the Navy—campaigning against Congressmen? The reason is not far to seek. Those Congressmen it opposed, or the majority of them, were against the racketeering carried on by a few labor racketeers and Communists who had sought refuge and found a harbor in the C. I. O. organization.

The rank and file of the C. I. O. never had—they have not now and they never will have—any use for their subversive racketeering leaders. That fact was demonstrated at the last national election when the rank and file of labor, recognizing their real friends, sent back to Congress many a candidate opposed by their own leaders.

Trying to whip their members into line, the C. I. O. endeavored to make its members believe that the candidates they opposed were against labor. Note this statement from the pamphlet from which other excerpts have just been read:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of sly little pats on the back that Congressman "Agin It" gave to Hitler. "There was a fellow who got things done," Congressman "Agin It" said. Over in Germany they showed the people what was what. No fooling around with 40-hour workweeks. No monkey business about free enterprise for farmers. No, sir. Probably worked the slaves twice that long and they had to like it.

The group to which I refer is the second group—the labor racketeers, the labor politicians, who place self-interest above the interests of the union members, and the would-be racketeers.

When this bill comes on for amendment and for a vote you may find some

here in Congress, honest and conscientious, who are against the Hobbs bill because they have been led to believe that it might, by some wrongful construction, injuriously affect proper union activities. It may be there are others who wish to compromise and so fail to do the things which we know the people want us to do.

The people want us to put an end to racketeering, to union raiding, to jurisdictional strikes, to secondary boycotts, to sympathetic strikes; and they will never be satisfied, nor will union men be satisfied, until labor has cleaned house or Congress has cleaned house for it.

This Congress has had two experiences with an outraged public opinion in recent years. Congress passed a so-called pension for Congressmen bill, and inside of 30 days we had to eat it, and we ate it cheerfully, and many tried to get down in the Well of the House and be the first to take a bite out of it. Then along came this so-called pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn plan, and we turned it down, and ever since the leadership on both sides has been trying to rectify that error that was made when the House refused to do anything.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement so far as I am concerned is absolutely without foundation, and the gentleman should not make statements that are inconsistent with the facts. When the gentleman says that I have changed my position and tries to carry out that impression——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, do not be so long about it. I will withdraw anything the gentleman does not like.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not a question of what I do not like.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. I refuse to yield any more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is all right, and that is usually the refuge of the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Go on and talk all the gentleman desires. At no time in the Well of this House, on the floor of this House, or outside of the Congress have I ever challenged the ability, the judgment, or the integrity of any Member of the House. I never did that and I never will. I claim it is my right to express my opinion anywhere on any subject, and naturally I concede to every other Member of the House the same privilege, the same prerogative.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. If I remember what I said to the gentleman, I did not say anything about him personally, but I spoke about the leadership. What I said, if I recall it correctly was this, that since we voted on the tax bill, the membership on both sides has been trying to get out another tax bill and rectify the error we made. That is what I intended to say, and what I think I did say, and if I am wrong and if I misunderstood the gentleman from Massachusetts and he is not in favor of bringing out tax legislation now, that is, some sort of a pay-as-you-go plan, I stand corrected.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's latter statement is all right. I have no objection to that, but the gentleman's first statement was based on an incorrect premise.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well. What was there incorrect about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can read the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. We will read the record and read the stenographer's minutes. When you read them as printed in the RECORD you will learn I correctly stated the gentleman's position.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke about the C. I. O. attacking Members of Congress and accusing them of voting against the draft. I was one of the men who voted for the draft, and I was one of the men who stayed here and voted when it passed by only one vote because I saw the danger. If I understand it, that is the same C. I. O. of which this man David Dubinsky is one of the leaders——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield any further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Who a few nights ago in New York denounced Russia for doing to some revolutionists just what the United States had done to some traitors we have caught here.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield on that tax-bill question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You heard the gentleman from Alabama this morning speak about this bill. You heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] talk on the same measure. Now, it seems we want to stop racketeering. We want to stop extortion and robbery. Those are the two things named in the Hobbs bill. Why is it necessary for the House to take any action? It is necessary, as the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Indiana said, because the Supreme Court not long ago decided that the antiracketeering statute we passed in 1934 did not reach union activities. Read the Hobbs bill. I propose to show, if I have time, that it does not prevent practices that the people want legislation against. This is the reason: In the last paragraph of the Hobbs bill you will find a provision that that bill does not modify, repeal, or affect four statutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I submit the gentleman is not speaking on a question of personal privilege when he is discussing a measure which is to come before the House for consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to be heard on that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Michigan to proceed in order, and under the rule he must limit himself to a discussion of the charges made in his question for personal privilege. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand the rule. You will recall I said there were two groups back of this charge. One was the international warmongers and the other the labor unions. I am proceeding to show why—not labor unions, not members of the American labor unions, but the leadership, the politicians in the unions, try to smear those who oppose their unlawful actions with the charge of being Hitler stooges. Just as Willkie does not represent the Republicans, so some of these fellows do not represent the workers. There is no doubt about that. The last election demonstrated that fact. I am now just trying to show you one of the backgrounds of this charge—why it is made.

There will be offered to the Hobbs bill a new title 3, providing that nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect four other acts. One is the N. L. R. A., another is the Norris-LaGuardia; another is the so-called Railway Act, and the fourth is the Anti-Trust Act.

By adopting that amendment, we will afford to the lawyers who defend some of those who later may be charged with a violation of the Hobbs Act, the argument that, by this proviso exempting those four laws, we condoned, we approved of certain union activities which are by many citizens regarded as unlawful, but which by the courts have been construed as not being prohibited by the acts just named.

It is a cardinal principle of the law, that a law when adopted in another State, or when being construed, if it be a State law, by a Federal court, carries with it all reasonable constructions placed upon it by the courts of the State of its origin. Likewise, when we exempt from the operation of this law, all those who proceed under any one of the four acts just named, it will be argued that we also approved of the construction which has been placed on those acts by the courts.

Let me show you how union raiding, a practice which deprives union men of their right to choose an agent for collective bargaining is legalized by the N. L. R. A. Prior to 1938, out on the west coast, the American Federation of Labor had many unions. Under the Wagner Act the C. I. O. went there and called for an election. Their petition was granted. They had a vote, the election district extending from the Canadian border down to Mexico. The C. I. O. won, and it was held, and the Supreme Court upheld the finding, that the A. F. of L. men must get out of their unions and go over to the C. I. O.

On January 2, 1940, the United States Supreme Court handed down that decision—308 United States Reports, page 531—in which, among other things, it was said:

> The effect of the certification, as petitioner alleges is the inclusion in a single unit, for bargaining purposes, of all of the longshore employees of the members of the employer associations doing business at the west coast ports of the United States, and to designate the Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate as their bargaining representative so

that in the case of some particular employers, their workers who are not organized or represented by the Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate have been deprived of opportunity to secure bargaining representatives of their own choice.

In the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which was handed down on February 27, 1939 (103 Fed. (2d) 933) and which was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court, as just stated, the court said:

Petitioner's grievance grows out of the fact that in ascertaining the appropriate representative of the men the Board ignored the identity of separate employers or of separate ports and extended the employer unit to include the entire Pacific coast, with the result that the rival union was designated and certified as the sole representative—in consequence of which its own union was "put out of business" and its members obliged to become members of its rival and deal with the employer either exclusively through it or not at all. In short, that by reason of the Board's decision to enlarge the unit to embrace about 25 separate ports and the acceptance of its decision by the employers, a situation has arisen as the result of which a so-called closed-shop contract may be entered into which will require petitioner's members, even where they predominate in a particular locality or business, to join the other union or possibly be displaced from their employment by members of that union.

The lower court further said:

Petitioner had no control of the employer, and here the petition shows that the employer, acting within the spirit as well as the letter of the act, promptly obeyed the Board's decision and entered into a contract in accordance with its terms. So that what happened was precisely what in a proper case the act designed should happen, but, as we have seen, with the result that petitioner, in the localities in which its members constituted a majority, was—if the Board's decision as to the representative unit is valid—deprived of the very thing which petitioner insists it was the purpose of Congress to secure and protect.

In affirming this case, the United States Supreme Court said that, under the law, that is, the N. L. R. A., the A. F. of L. must address its plea for justice to the Congress.

Today, by writing into this law the committee amendment that it shall in no way repeal, modify, or affect the N. L. R. A., we sanction and approve of the trouble-breeding situation and actions referred to in the two decisions just cited.

Last week, over before the Truman committee, as you may remember, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray testified. Things have switched. The shoe is now on the other foot. Sixty A. F. of L. men had obtained a union contract for a closed shop. The C. I. O. insisted that 20,000 men who became employees later should be given a chance to join the C. I. O. and select their own bargaining agent.

Here is testimony given before the Truman committee on the 24th day of March last—Mr. Green speaking:

But another form of jurisdictional dispute has become intensely aggravated in recent months. This is what we call union raiding. There is the term. Halt it. I have used the term "must" in here. It ought to be. There is no question of wages there, of the right to belong to a union, to join a union, or the recognition of a union by the management. There is no issue of that kind, but it is because one union is in and another union wants to put it out and get in. That is the reason why.

Senator BALL. Isn't the real issue in that, Mr. Green, how the union got in in the first place? Wasn't that contract for a yard which generally actually employs 40,000 people signed when you only had some sixty-odd employees?

Mr. GREEN. My dear sir, that union contract was negotiated just the same as all other union contracts are negotiated by the American Federation of Labor. It is nothing new. It is the same way. When a plant begins operations the management wants to avoid strikes, and it doesn't want any trouble. So, it enters into a contract with a union. That is entered into at a fixed scale.

Senator BALL. Do you think that is justice to the 20,000 men who are going to be employed? They weren't members of the A. F. of L. They weren't asked about the contract. Do you think it is justice to them to tie them up to a hard and fast union contract when they only had 60 there at the beginning?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; because when they accept employment at that plant they do so with the clear understanding that there is a union there, that there is a closed shop there. They can decide whether they will accept employment or whether they will not. They are not forced to go there. They are not forced to work. They decide of their own free will that they will go in and join the union.

Then there is a form of what some would call extortion. When Mr. Green was testifying Senator BREWSTER said:

You just listen to me for a minute. I am taking the floor now. We went into Camp Blanding and we found a little carpenters' union with 250 members. Everybody employed on the Camp Blanding job had to join the union. As you are saying, they could pay the $50 fee in 10 installments. They could do that after they joined. We even found that there was provision by the Government that the business agent stood right beside the pay counter so that as the man got his weekly wages he paid his installments there. If he didn't, he was fired on the spot. We further found the interesting fact that in 5 months of work there were 18,000 different people employed, although there were only five to six thousand working at any time. In other words, within 1 or 2 or 3 weeks of the time that the man completed his $50 payment at $10 a week, he got fired and somebody else came in and took the job. That is the kind of thing which has very seriously aroused questioning in the minds of people of this country about what advantages were being taken of this crisis not for organization but for the unfortunate profits of some individuals or organizations employed.

Mr. GREEN. I don't know the case that you refer to.

Senator BREWSTER. In your position you ought to know it, Mr. Green, and you assured us after it was over that you would see that it didn't recur. I don't know whether it has or not.

Mr. GREEN. I say I don't know why that is done because that is not in accordance with the policy of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator BREWSTER. I can multiply that many times.

So union leadership, union politicians, want in all of these laws a proviso preventing the application of the law to them. They want to continue that raiding, although they have agreed that it is not right, and some of them continue to practice extortion.

This bill does not reach that practice because it provides that it shall in no way modify the N. L. R. A., under which it is carried on. The Court may say that we not only left the N. L. R. A. but the Court decisions construing it.

Down here in Washington a case was decided on December 27, 1939, the Zirkin case. There were 11 union workers. Nine of them wanted to belong to one union and the 2 others belonged to another. So the 2 and their friends picketed the place of business. That was a union activity that will be sanctioned under the Hobbs Act.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think not.

Here is what the Supreme Court said. Keep this in mind, because that is one of the groups that says I am a stooge. Why? Because I oppose the things they have been doing.

Here is the decision of the Court in the Zirkin case:

It is clear further that in such a situation there is no remedy for the employer under the National Labor Relations Act. That act makes no provision for invocation of the election and certification powers of the Board by an employer. The result is an inequality before the law as between an employer and employees in this particular, namely, that while the employer has a substantive right to carry on his business, he lacks a legal remedy for protecting the same against injury through the struggle of competing unions, even though he be indifferent as to the choice of his employees between them.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, which is exempted from any provision of this antiracketeering bill, you can go on and destroy here in the city of Washington or anywhere else an employer's business. You can also force union men out of one union and into another and compel them to pay the second union. Is that extortion? One step further, and here is a case from the United States Supreme Court, the Negro Alliance against Grocers' Association. Here was a group of Negroes in the city of Washington, and they wanted some grocer to employ more of their race as clerks. There was no contract relation between the Alliance and the grocer. No members of the Alliance were employees of the grocer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I submit the gentleman is not confining his remarks to a question of personal privilege when he is discussing a case decided by the United States Supreme Court. If the gentleman wants to filibuster against having labor legislation come before the House, he should continue in the manner he is, but I submit he should adhere to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan must observe the rules of the House and limit himself to a discussion of the charges made against him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I am trying to do. I hold here in my hand two pamphlets, one with 12 pages and the other with 6, put out by these labor unions. It is a strange situation if I cannot defend myself against charges made by these organizations or their political leaders, and, if I cannot back up my statements by United States Supreme

Court decisions, you will have to take my word for it. I want to state the original authority. I want to show to you that sometimes the views I express are in line with Supreme Court decisions.

Now, what happened here was that this Negro organization insisted that this grocer give employment to more Negroes. They picketed the place of business and the United States Supreme Court said they could do it because there was what? A labor dispute under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which is another act referred to as not being modified in any way by this Hobbs bill.

Here is the point: When you pass a law, the courts afterward in construing that law always go back to any previous decisions which have been decided in another State which has the same law in effect. If the Federal court passes upon a State statute they take into consideration the decisions of the State courts; and so here the court in passing upon acts which may hereafter occur will beyond question take into consideration the decisions of the Federal courts in construing those laws under which the acts are charged to be an offense. The Federal courts having held up to this time that the things to which I have referred, for instance, raiding, and picketing, and destroying the business of a private citizen are all legal insofar as any provision of any of these three acts, the Clayton or Antitrust Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the National Labor Relations Act are concerned, that therefore, they are not precluded by this act. That is not all.

Here is another one. The case of the milk drivers over in Chicago. Let me read you something that they did over there and show you that it is legal insofar as any Federal legislation goes. I am reading from the opinion of the circuit court of appeals:

> It also appears from the evidence before the master that certain of the cut-rate milk stores that handled the products of the plaintiff dairies were picketed by members of the defendant union; that such picketing was usually indulged in for a number of days, during which time said pickets sought to induce the offending storekeepers to discontinue the purchase of such milk from the plaintiff dairies; that in several instances where their efforts were unsuccessful said pickets were withdrawn and within a few days thereafter, usually during the night, the store of the storekeeper (some of whom were poor women struggling to make a living) was either bombed or bricks were thrown through the plate-glass windows of such stores, or other acts of violence were committed. To request the master to conclude and find, in the absence of proof of the identity of the guilty culprits, that there was no connection between such acts of violence and the defendant union, or some of its members, is to overtax the credulity of the master.
>
> The master cannot condone or too severely condemn the resort to such malicious and cowardly conduct in support of any cause. Such lawless conduct has no place under our form of government and the few lawless, radical union leaders or members who resort thereto are not only a blight upon the righteous cause of honest labor but reflect discredit upon our country and upon our American civilization as well.

The purpose of those acts was to extort money from the milk dealers and their employees.

That case went to the United States Supreme Court. The circuit court of appeals ordered an injunction, said that kind of conduct was not lawful. The United States Court, the Supreme Court of the United States, in November 1940—311 U. S. 91—said that so far as Federal statutes went it was all right; it was all right. Why? Because under the Norris-LaGuardia Act there was a labor dispute. And the plaintiff had not shown that the Chicago police would not give protection, and the violence and threats had been continuing for weeks. Do you see the point? Now where do you get a labor dispute? Must there be one? I mean under the Norris-LaGuardia Act between an employer and an employee? Not at all. You do not even know me. But I insist that you employ A. You do not know him. I, with my friends, picket your place of business. Under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which this bill says shall not be modified, there is a labor dispute.

Here is the beauty-parlor case from Illinois. That went up; the same question was involved. The same result reached. I go one step further; here is the Maggie O'Neal case, a widow out on the west coast. She owned a couple of apartment buildings; she had no employees; her children did the work. Along came the union and said that Maggie, an employer—now think of it—not an employee, an employer, must join the union and her children must join the union and pay fees. Maggie did not want to join. Her children did not wish to join. Yet Maggie must join and pay or submit to picketing. Was that extortion?

March 24, before the Truman committee, William Green, upon the stand, said that they had 6,000,000 members who paid a dollar a month—$6,000,000 a month; and Phil Murray claimed 5,000,000 members—6 and 5 give $11,000,000 a month—$132,000,000 a year. Those who are working on the tax bill might look at this source of income—look at that income if they want to collect more revenue. And how many of the 11,000,000 were forced by fear of violence to join and continue to be members? How much of the $132,000,000 a year is extorted from union members? But the committee amendment says that the law and decisions which sanction that practice must not be modified.

And so the courts have held under the Norris-LaGuardia Act as it stands that a citizen who has no paid employees can be forced to join a union, that the children who want to help a mother in caring for the apartment out of which she makes a living can be forced into the union along with the mother. Do you want to sanction that kind of legislation? Do you want to do anything to stop activities such as are shown in the papers here just a few days ago: "Strikers tie up food for Army and Navy." Do you want to stop it? Are you a stooge of Hitler because you insist that the food should get to our soldiers in the camps, to the men who are going across; that the food should be shipped across? Are you a stooge because you insist that citizens should be permitted to work without being required to stand and deliver?

The last part of the last section of this bill states that nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect any of those four acts, and under those four acts you have extortion, you have robbery, you have violence of all kinds, you have the destruction of a citizen's business.

Now, take the last case, the one referred to by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Indiana. This Congress in 1934 passed an act which Congress thought prohibited racketeering.

Section 2 of that act, among other things, provided:

> Any person who, in connection with or in relation to any act in any way or in any degree affecting trade or commerce or any article or commodity moving or about to move in trade or commerce—
>
> (a) Obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion, the payment of money or other valuable considerations, or the purchase or rental of property or protective services, not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

But the Supreme Court, on March 2, 1942, held that because of the words "not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee," the practice of extortion by union teamsters against truck drivers seeking to enter the city of New York was not racketeering.

The Court reached that conclusion as to the intent of Congress by reading a report written by Senator Copeland in which he said that the act was 1 of 11 which had been enacted "to close gaps in existing Federal laws and to render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types."

In the opinion, it is further said:

> We have expressed our belief that Congress intended to leave unaffected the ordinary activities of labor unions. The proviso in section 6 safeguarding the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, although obscure indeed, strengthens us somewhat in that opinion. The test must, therefore, be whether the particular activity was among or is akin to labor-union activities with which Congress must be taken to have been familiar when this measure was enacted. Accepting payments even where services are refused is such an activity. The circuit court has referred to the "stand-by" orchestra device by which a union local requires that its members be substituted for visiting musicians or, if the producer or conductor insists upon using his own musicians, that the members of the local be paid the sums which they would have earned had they performed. That similar devices are employed in other trades is well known. It is admitted here that the stand-by musician has a job, even though he renders no actual service. There can be no question that he demands the payment of money regardless of the management's willingness to accept his labor. If, as it is agreed, the musician would

escape punishment under this act even though he obtained his "stand-by job" by force or threats, it is certainly difficult to see how a teamster could be punished for engaging in the same practice. It is not our province either to approve or disapprove such tactics. But we do believe that they are not the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types at which the act was aimed and that, on the contrary, they are among those practices of labor unions which were intended to remain beyond its ban.

The Court then continued:

This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control.

They are not, and the Hobbs bill may reach them. But the Hobbs bill will not—because the committee amendment says that these other four statutes shall not be modified—reach the unlawful acts committed under them and sanctioned by Federal court decisions. They can continue those activities even though we pass the Hobbs bill. I say to the committee, I say to the chairman, I say to the Republican members of that committee, if you want to end that kind of practice, as you say you do when you bring this bill before the House, then why not follow the simple method of striking out the 17 words of the exception and section 6 of the Anti-Racketeering Act of June 18, 1934, and let it go at that? When the Hobbs bill comes up, why not do that, even though you may be accused of being a Hitler stooge just because you try to end racketeering and bring out a bill that will accomplish the things our folks want, our people back home desire, the thing they are going to have some day, either through this Congress or some other Congress. If you want to get the good will of the union men themselves, many of whom and whose wives have appealed to me, "Get us out from under these fellows who are making us come across all the time, who are telling us when and where we can work and how much we must pay in each month," pass a real bill. I repeat, if you want to follow and execute the will of the people and give them the things they want, if you want to give organized labor, the rank and file of organized labor, the things they want, then you ought to pass a bill that will not only protect the citizens against racketeers but we ought to bring in a bill that will protect the union men themselves against the racketeer politicians in their own organization.

I am going to offer some amendments to the bill, even though I will be characterized as a stooge of Hitler. However, I will not be the stooge of any labor politician or labor official. I will stand by the American worker and the union man but I will not submit to the will of the union boss who is a bloodsucker on the body of union workers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the gentleman can help me out. The first part of this bill recites illegitimate acts. Then we seem to be writing in something to the effect that if these illegitimate acts are found to be legitimate under certain other acts they must not do anything about it. You simply assume that you have to look over the other acts and that probably there is not anything in those acts that would be affected by this; and it is perfectly fair to assume, is it not, that by putting in that reservation they can use those acts wherever they can do something that is pretty nearly legitimate, but use it as a lever so as to refute any charge that the acts were illegitimate? I am trying to see where you declare certain acts illegitimate, then you try to make them legitimate under a reservation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you put into this act the committee amendment that it shall in no way repeal, modify, or affect these other four acts, then you accept the other four acts, and with the four acts as written you accept the construction put on those acts by the courts of last resort which have said that certain things that we know are illegal if performed by any other citizen are legal when performed by union men.

I shall vote for the Hobbs bill even though it is not amended, because it is the only thing I can vote for that looks as though it had something in it which might stop one form of extortion. But I do not want my people in the old Fourth Congressional District of Michigan to think for one moment that I do not realize that that act does not cure the evils of which they now complain, even though I am told by the Judiciary Committee and all the lawyers in the House that the amendment will not rob it of its intended purpose. In my own mind I am convinced that if we let that act go through with that amendment, in the days to come, when these activities which have been condemned time and time again by the people, come again before the courts for characterization, we will be told they are not punishable under any Federal law. The argument then will be: Congress said, "Oh, well, you are legalizing all the things that can be done under those acts," you legalized all those acts. Remember the case here in Washington when there was a combination down here of teamsters hauling bread. The Supreme Court said a conspiracy charge would lie, but they could not be indicted because they belonged to a labor union, and the Antitrust Act did not reach unions. So they conspired and held up the delivery of bread to the hungry citizens of Washington. The law which the committee says shall not be modified does not reach them.

You pass this act the way it is and upon the shoulders of the chairman of the committee, upon the committee, rests the responsibility. I do not want anyone to think that if we pass this bill all the evils brought on by racketeers operating within unions will be cured.

AMENDING THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 653) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 653, with Mr. WOODRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] will each be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill unamended would drive a deep wedge between capital and labor and would make for discord and disunion at a time when peace and harmony are essential and when peace and harmony are all the more needed between employer and employee during these "times that try men's souls," as Tom Paine said.

Labor is striving to do all in its power in the interest of the war effort. It is entitled to commensurate rewards for its titanic striving. It is not entitled to a deprecatory measure like the instant bill, if unamended. If this bill is adopted unamended, or if the committee amendment is adopted, I am firmly of the conviction that the bill will put a manacle on labor. Its traditional, lawful, fair, and equitable union activities will be unduly interfered with. While the bill ostensibly is aimed at racketeering, and we are all in favor of anything that would stamp out racketeering, it goes beyond the purpose of stamping out racketeering.

Among other purposes, those behind the bill seek to strike a blow at labor which is quite unjustifiable. The bill stems from the activities of the so-called Teamsters' Union, Local 807. None of us approve of the activities of that local teamsters' union. On the contrary, as I said in the minority report, it is my belief that these activities are in the long run disadvantageous to those comparatively few locals who engage in them and to the organized labor movement in general. But this bill seeks to visit the sins of the few upon the many.

It is interesting to note that Daniel Tobin, general president of the Teamsters' Union, not only disavowed the practices of that local and similar practices of other local unions but actually issued an order prohibiting in the future such outrageous conduct on the part of the unions under his jurisdiction.

I believe that this is a most inopportune time to bring up a bill of this character. Labor is doing all in its power on the assembly lines to effect a torrential flow of tanks, planes, guns, and ships. For that reason, labor deems this a blow below the belt.

I have here a letter the Under Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, wrote to William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which gives

you some idea of the splendid war contribution made by labor. He states:

DEAR MR. GREEN: I hope you will present my greetings to the members of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, and my best wishes for a successful meeting.

Through you, the Army congratulates the millions of members of the federation on the important contribution they are making to the cause of a United Nations victory.

The planes, weapons, radio equipment, and other manufactured products American Federation of Labor workers are building are performing splendidly in battle. The machine tools and parts which you produce for the factory front are no less invaluable.

The Army is especially grateful to those members of the federation who helped us to rush to completion the barracks, hangars, arsenals, and factories without which we could not have trained our troops and made our munitions. In a like manner, your members who are engaged in transportation and warehousing have helped us to speed supplies to the fronts and to our allies.

No history of the present conflict could be written without adequate mention of labor's importance in tipping the scales of military power. From every front come reports every day of the fighting achievements of weapons made by members of the American Federation of Labor.

According to a dispatch from Guadalcanal, enemy bombing on our positions always ceases after the arrival of your P-38 Lightning planes. "It was evident," the dispatch said, "that enemy aircraft avoided, as much as possible, actual combat with the P-38's." The federation has reason to be proud of the splendid record being made by the Lightnings, the Flying Fortresses, the Liberators, and all the other planes which are made by members of your organization.

With the equipment you have furnished us, we have come a long way on the road to building an adequate offensive arsenal. We are counting on free labor to continue supplying us with the weapons to keep America free.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Similar commendatory messages have been written to the heads of the C. I. O. complimenting them on the tremendous contribution made by the members of that organization in the war effort. Such worthy service is entitled to more than is embodied in this bill, more of that which is generous and rewarding, and more of that which is beneficent. I believe and am firmly of the conviction that we do wrong to labor and we do wrong to the Nation in attempting to pass this bill. It will discourage honest workers, disillusion them, and make them bitter and fearsome. The "hewers of stone and drawers of water" are entitled to encouragement and incentive, to greater striving, not to the disparagement and humiliation connotated by this bill.

Let me call your attention to one or two items in the bill which meet with my disfavor. For example, the bill provides for a punishment of 20 years and/or a fine of $10,000. Examine the antitrust statutes and you will find that malefactors under those statutes do not have to face a 20-year sentence. Violations of the antitrust laws are equally detrimental to the body politic and are as much a crime as extortion or robbery as contemplated by the instant bill. If the extortion or robbery is of such magnitude that it ought to be prosecuted as a felony instead of a misdemeanor, then the prosecution should be under State law. Insofar as the instant bill is concerned, it does not intend to punish extortion or robbery as such, since that would be a usurpation of States' functions. It intends to punish activities which interfere with interstate commerce. In that respect it parallels the antitrust laws, punishment for violations of which are likewise based on interference with interstate commerce. But in the one case, where capital is involved, you have the penalty of 1 year, and in the other case, where labor is involved, you have the penalty of 20 years.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask my distinguished colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary if it is not a fact that under the provisions of this bill the question of penalty is left entirely discretionary with the court trying the case? Under the provisions of this bill a person could be penalized to the extent of 1 year or less than 1 year or up to 20 years, all in the discretion of the court.

Mr. CELLER. Or his sentence might be suspended. I agree with the gentleman. But why do we single out labor and impose even a possible penalty of 20 years? Psychologically, that is abhorrent, to my way of thinking, especially since innocent labor acts, lawful acts, might be interdicted, especially if my amendment shall not prevail. That will be seized upon by everyone who has any opposition to the bill and will be exaggerated all out of its importance.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman is basing his entire argument on the false premise that this bill is aimed at labor. This is a bill of general application. It covers the most heinous crimes the criminal statute book contemplates. It had its origin in the activities of the Dillinger gang. All this bill does is abolish the double standard which Justice Byrnes established and makes labor responsible for crimes just as well as those who are not laborers. That is all it does.

Mr. CELLER. I wish the gentleman's interpretation were correct, but I fear that he is woefully in error. This bill is primarily aimed at labor. It has a label of racketeering, it has a label of extortion, it has a label of robbery, but it is an antilabor bill. Let us not delude ourselves, because were it not for the so-called Teamsters' Local decision by Mr. Justice Byrnes, a labor decision, we would not have had this bill. That decision arose from the activities of the so-called local unions. For that reason, it conconcerned labor, and this bill is directed at labor. We would be short-sighted otherwise. Let us not delude ourselves.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is not the gentleman insulting labor when he calls an antiracketeering bill an antilabor bill? I call it an insult to labor.

Mr. CELLER. The bill is not properly called an antiracketeering bill. Those opposing the bill, unamended, and labor opposing the bill cannot and should not be said to be in favor of racketeering. We disfavor any bill that interfers with legitimate labor acts under the guise of preventing racketeering. The language is broad and sweeping and is as broad as a barn door and may permit simple assaults to be converted into felonies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, back in 1934 this Congress passed the Copeland antiracketeering statute. It provided a penalty for any person who would obtain property from another person by means of violence or by threats of violence. The law had in it what later turned out to be a very important exception. It provided that it should not apply to "wages paid by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee."

In 1941 that statute came before the Supreme Court in the case of the Government against Local 807. The facts, putting them very briefly, were in substance as follows:

Local 807 is a large labor union in New York City operating principally in the Washington Market, which is the largest market in America engaged in the handling of vegetables. It was the practice of the members of that union to stop nonunion trucks coming into the city and insist on the driver of the truck employing a union driver, or a union man to unload the vegetables. That is, they insisted on the employment of these men of the union or the pay of a day's wages, judged by the union scale. The contention of the Government was, that under those circumstances the exception in the statute did not apply, that this money was paid to these hijackers for protection, and not by way of wages. The Court overruled the contention of the Government and held that the exception applied, and that is why we are here, trying to amend this law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Not for a moment. Putting it briefly, what this bill does is to rewrite the law and leave out that exception on which the Supreme Court's decision is based. So the net result would be that the same set of facts which existed in the case of the Government against Local 807 would result in a conviction and punishment. That is title I.

Title II is similar to a bill we had in the last war. It is broader than title I in some respects, except that it will be in force only for the duration of the war. It makes it a crime for anyone by the use of physical force or intimidation to interfere with the orderly transfer of

goods in interstate commerce, or with the transportation of troops, munitions of war or mail, even though not in interstate commerce. Later on there will be some discussion about some proposed amendments.

I believe it was not the intent of the committee in writing this bill to in any way interfere with the rights of labor, guaranteed under the statutes that are enumerated in these amendments. I think no amendment is necessary. There are those people who disagree, and, in order to make it abundantly clear that we do not propose to interfere with the rights of labor under these statutes, some kind of an amendment will be offered, and the choice then will be between the so-called Celler amendment, and the committee amendment. I prefer the committee amendment, and I may say a few words about that later on. However, I am frank to say that I do not see much real difference between those two proposed amendments. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentleman to say the purpose of this action, title I, is to strike out that exception contained in the 1934 act.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is the purpose, why do we not adopt an amendment striking out those words? That case was decided on March 2, 1942, and on the 6th of March I introduced in the House a bill to strike out that exception, which, if adopted, would take all that class of racketeering out from under the Byrnes decision.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is substantially what we have here, except we do this. We take the different acts and proceed on that basis. But we do substantially what the gentleman says.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is one other question. Is it not true that when we adopt a statute or when a Federal court, for example, construes a State statute, that it takes into consideration the decision of the State courts?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is the usual practice, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All four—and I leave out the railway act—but the other three laws, which will not be modified by this act, have been passed on by the Supreme Court.

Mr. GWYNNE. There is nothing in any of those statutes which authorizes the use of force and violence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right, but as construed by the Supreme Court in the beauty parlor case and in the others, the Court said it did not carry anything which would provoke those acts. Yet they smashed the windows, and bombed the house.

Mr. GWYNNE. There are many decisions of the courts with which I do not agree, but it seems to me very clear that the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Government against Local 807 did not turn on any statutes except this one that we passed in 1934.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. GWYNNE. I do not think any amendment is necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman; if we write a bill without the amendment, then we will have a law.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment out of abundance of caution, because some people think it is necessary.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain for the benefit of the House the difference between the committee amendment and the Celler amendment, if there is any difference?

Mr. GWYNNE. I do not see any real difference. The gentleman has probably heard the statement made by a distinguished English judge about a brother judge. He said that so-and-so is a distinguished judge, but "he has an unfortunate predelection for scholastic logic." I think that explains some of the arguments about these amendments. I prefer the committee amendment for the reason that it follows the usual language that we have adopted in the past in that type of legislation. There are people who say that the Celler language is capable of some different construction. It probably is. If I were construing it, if I were the court, I would say that the two amendments are identical. It is entirely possible that some court, wanting to arrive at a certain decision, might more easily arrive at it under the Celler amendment than under the committee amendment. That is the reason that I am for the committee amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that the vital difference between the bill now before us and the Antiracketeering Act of 1934 is that this bill excludes two provisions which were inserted in the Antiracketeering Act of 1934 for the purpose of protecting labor, when it is engaged in a militant labor activity, and those provisions, excluded from this bill, distinguished between a militant labor activity and a racketeering activity? With those provisions out, a militant labor activity such as a clash between strikers and scabs during a strike would be considered a violation of the provisions of this bill if it were enacted into law.

Mr. GWYNNE. No. I cannot agree with the gentleman. This statute leaves out three provisions that were in the 1934 statute, and words the remainder in a little different language.

Now, here is the disagreement. I think the intent of Congress in the 1934 statute was to protect the lawful activities of organized labor. The construction put upon it by the Supreme Court would authorize unlawful acts—certainly never intended by this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the reason for a law is the soul of the law. I think that at the outset we might examine what is admittedly the reason for our being here today considering this legislation. I am about to read from the opinion of Mr. Justice Byrnes, that unfortunate decision that necessitates this legislation, with the feeling that this probably is as honest a statement of what the facts that formed the basis of the prosecution in the Local 807 case were:

> There was sufficient evidence to warrant a finding that the defendants conspired to use and did use violence and threats to obtain from the owners of these "over the road" trucks $9.42 for each large truck and $8.41 for each small truck entering the city. These amounts were the regular union rates for a day's work of driving and unloading. There was proof that in some cases the out-of-State driver was compelled to drive the truck to a point close to the city limits and there to turn it over to one or more of the defendants. These defendants would then drive the truck to its destination, do the unloading, pick up the merchandise for the return trip and surrender the truck to the out-of-State driver at the point where they had taken it over. In other cases, according to the testimony, the money was demanded and obtained, but the owners or drivers rejected the offers of the defendants to do or help with the driving or unloading. And in several cases the jury could have found that the defendants either failed to offer to work, or refused to work for the money when asked to do so.

Now, if the above-stated facts do not constitute racketeering, certainly the Congress, when it enacted this Antiracketeering Act, chose improper language. In my judgment, the decision was a bad one, and I ask you at some time to read the entire minority decision and you will have a pretty good idea of what Congress intended to do.

Now, with the hope that my voice can be heard across the park, I want to state that it is the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to enact legislation for one purpose, and one purpose alone, namely, to correct the unfortunate decision in the Local 807 case. It was never within the mind of any member of the Judiciary Committee to take from labor any of those things that it has won. It seems to me that both amendments make that very, very clear. Both amendments, excepting from the operation of this act those things that are guaranteed to labor under the National Labor Relations Act, under the Railroad Mediation Act, under the Clayton Act, and under the Norris-La Guardia Act. As plain as we could select English, those exceptions are provided for.

But there is something about this law that strikes me as being very significant. Bear in mind that we are amending the act of 1934 and nothing else. We are amending the Antiracketeering Act. Under section 420 (c) of the act that we are amending there is this language:

> Prosecutions under 420 (a) through 420 (e) of this bill shall be commenced only upon the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States—

Language that is not found in any other criminal statute. Why? Bear in mind that the original Antiracketeering

Act was written by Senator Copeland of New York. Senator Copeland was determined not to do anything to injure labor, and with that in mind and realizing full well that a tremendous weapon would be placed in the hands of people who were antilabor, through the ability to bring prosecutions and indictments, was written that provision. So that the arguments about a dangerous weapon being available to those people who would crush labor is without any foundation because the prosecution brought was first submitted to the Attorney General of the United States, and he concluded, and properly so, that members of Local 807 had violated the law.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. COX. Has the committee written that provision into the pending bill?

Mr. WALTER. No; that provision was not written in the pending bill. We are amending the act of 1934 because the Supreme Court has, through the most tortuous decision that ever came from the pen of a justice, found something that the Congress never intended to be in the act of 1934.

I do not know why labor is not willing to assist in putting its own house in order. I am always very much provoked when labor leaders take the position that labor, like the king, can do no wrong. It certainly seems to me that in this particular instance labor ought to be requesting that we take steps that will take from their doorsteps the criticism that has come there, and with justification, as a result of the things that have been done in New York City. Farmer after farmer in the eastern part of Pennsylvania has been stopped at the entrance to the Holland Tunnel, compelled to get off his truck and give to some man $9.40 to deliver that truck to a point where that farmer had been delivering his produce for a great many years; or he has been compelled to employ a pilot to show him where the market is; where he and his father and his grandfather have delivered their produce for a great many years.

Even the representatives of organized labor who testified before the Committee on the Judiciary—and much testimony was taken on this proposal—testified that they frowned upon the practice sought to be curbed through this legislation. No one can justify it. There was even inserted in the hearings an editorial written by Daniel Tobin, in which he said that his union was very much opposed to the practice sought to be outlawed through the bill under consideration, but, Mr. Chairman, according to letters I have received during the last week, the opposition of Mr. Tobin and other members of his organization to this practice has availed nothing, because those slimy racketeers are engaged in the same shake-down that they were working when the case was brought to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Why does not labor stop, wake up, and realize that they are following the same path that business followed up to 1934? There was a time when business resisted every effort to enact any kind of decent regulation, and they have paid a bitter price for that resistance. Today labor is doing the same thing, and those of us who are real friends of labor, those of us who believe that the labor movement can be made to mean something worth while in our body economic are fearful that, if labor continues to follow along the path they have been following in the past, labor will find itself ultimately where business did a few years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, it is rather fortunate that I am permitted to speak following the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. Perhaps I misunderstand this bill, but I do not believe I do. I think that one of the weaknesses in the present bill is the absence of the very section to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred; in other words, I object to the bill because I do not think there is a uniform treatment of labor and aggregations of capital in the question of who shall institute prosecutions. In the Federal Power Act, in the Communications Act, in the Packers and Stockyards Act, in the Investment Company Act, the Anti-Trust Act, and in the Securities and Exchange Act, there is a provision that prosecution cannot be begun until approved by the Attorney General.

I think this is an all-inclusive amendment; I am unable to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that section 4 of the old act is still effective if this bill is passed. Section 4 reads:

> Prosecutions under this act shall be commenced only upon the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

I do not find it in this bill. It is true there is a reference in the preamble of the bill——

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. That section is clearly left out, intentionally so. This bill omits the section referred to.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. To that extent, then, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was mistaken when he said a few minutes ago that that section was still in the bill.

Mr. HANCOCK. I did not understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make that statement.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I thought he did.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that with reference to the prosecution in the Federal courts for a violation of any Federal criminal statute the prosecution is wholly under the control of the Department of Justice and a person interested in the prosecution of such an offense cannot be represented by private counsel? Those cases are always handled by United States district attorneys who in turn are under control of the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there are innumerable prosecutions which may be brought by district attorneys without reference to the Attorney General. If that were not true why do we find this language in the five acts to which I have referred?

Mr. JENNINGS. But my point is that no Federal prosecution can be instituted or followed up and presented to a trial jury except by a United States district attorney or his assistant or some special officer.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I admit that.

Mr. JENNINGS. No outside attorney is ever permitted to file any such case.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I admit that. What I am trying to say is that if you say that certain combinations of capital shall not have a suit brought against them without approval of the Attorney General, then I say the same standard should be applied to this act and no prosecution brought without the approval of the Attorney General rather than to permit any district attorney, under any pressure of any kind in any State in the Union, to begin and institute an action under this bill. I say that language should be in the bill, and I am quite sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania was in error when he said it was still in it. I think it was taken out, and because of the broad language, particularly of the robbery section of this act, if I were a laboring man I would very definitely feel that I would be much safer if this section, which was section 4 of the old act, were put in; and if I do not get tangled up in parliamentary procedure I intend to try to get an amendment in the bill which will restore to this bill that which I think has been taken out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one-half minute.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few minutes to urge to the best of my ability the passage of this bill and the retention in it of the committee amendment, and the defeat of the Celler amendment which will be offered. Let me explain my reasons for taking this position. The Maryland delegation, including the two Senators, had a meeting with about 200 representatives of the C. I. O. of Maryland some 2 weeks ago. This bill came up for consideration. They were opposed to its passage except upon inclusion of the Celler amendment.

Upon being questioned about the amendment, they admitted that it nullified the bill completely, and they were satisfied with it, because the bill meant nothing with the Celler amendment in it. That is the statement made by the C. I. O. leaders of Maryland, and I am sure they got pretty good legal advice when they proposed this amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I cannot yield. That was their statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am here only in the interest of decent government in this country. I am a friend of labor, and my voice will always be raised on the floor of this House against any measure which tends to exploit labor, but I say to the men who are labor leaders that they should be the most ardent sponsors of this measure in order to protect labor from the general public reaction which some of their own members bring upon themselves by their own acts.

I have not read the hearings before the committee. I do not have to. I know too much of what has been done by some men, possibly not with the sanction of labor generally, I may say in fairness, in my own State. I could stand here for a half-hour and tell you of instances of farmers' trucks hauling into Baltimore which have been stopped and made to pay exorbitant fees.

I will give you one illustration of a milk transportation company in my county. It had 5 truck drivers who were farm boys. They tried to force them to belong to the union, but they refused. They oiled a curve on a sharp downgrade on the road, and ran one of their trucks in a ditch and wrecked it. Then 1 week after that, while unloading at the Western Maryland Dairy in Baltimore City, the driver was blackjacked, and knocked unconscious, his helper's throat was cut from ear to ear, and 22 stiches were required.

Mr. Chairman, those things are disgusting, not only to everybody in this country, but to the decent, honest, law-abiding laboring people in this country. The main issue in this, in view of the generally acknowledged fact that this has happened all over this country, is this: Are we in Congress going to let that condition exist in this country because of a Supreme Court decision? We have one duty by this bill, and that is to tell the American people that by this act we are going to restore their respect and their confidence in the strength and the dignity of this Government.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of what I want to say in connection with this bill, may I bring to the attention of the Members the fact that a careful check of the biographies of the 435 Members of this House shows that 230 Members are members of the bar, leaving 205 Members who are laymen. As a consequence, I think those of us who are attorneys too frequently assume that the nonlegal Members of this body understand legal phraseology, understand exactly how acts are constructed, and what the interpretations of courts have been on specific acts, with the consequence that many, many persons who receive from propaganda groups, pressure groups, and the like literature and interpretations written by some special writer in behalf of the particular group, that these nonlegal Members are frequently confused and are unable to discern the fine legal distinctions that enter into the writing of an act, its phraseology and its manner and method of enactment.

With that in mind, as a lawyer of 26 years' experience as a public prosecutor, 12 years as State district attorney, 4 years as State deputy attorney general, 3 years as chief legal adviser of a prohibition district, 4 years as United States attorney, and 3 years as special assistant to the Attorney General, I want to talk just as if I were speaking to a group of laymen.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Who was Attorney General when the gentleman was United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Honorable Homer Cummings. I had originally been appointed by President Hoover and was later appointed by Attorney General Cummings to be a special assistant in connection with the prosecution of a number of cases in the city of Pittsburgh.

First of all, let us realize just what we are dealing with here. We are dealing first with the interpretation of an act which was drawn in 1934. One of my colleagues who preceded me here stated that in his judgment a specific clause should be retained in this proposed bill, if enacted into law, requiring that the special attention of the Attorney General be given and that his permission be given before prosecutions are entered. I do not think I am in error when I say that this same biographical check shows that I am the only former United States attorney in this House. Several men have been assistants, several men have been special assistants to the Attorney General, but I believe I am correct in stating that I am the only former United States attorney in the House.

Prior to the year 1933 or 1934, or in that neighborhood, such sections were rarely known in the law, but with the incoming of the new administration a habit grew up and has been followed through a number of recent enactments, requiring that the permission of the Attorney General be granted before prosecution be entered. This is entirely contrary to the practice that existed for over 140 years. It is almost always left to the discretion of the United States attorney.

In view of the fact, as I said before, that many of you have not been United States attorneys, may I say that the method is this. Before the convening of the grand jury the facts are assembled. They are prepared in every instance by very carefully selected men, men of the F. B. I., of the Secret Service, of the Alcohol Unit of the Treasury Department, of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and of all these various sections. These reports are submitted and a copy of these reports goes to the Attorney General in Washington as well as to the head of the particular bureau. As a consequence, when the United States attorney receives his report it is usually one of four reports, one being retained in the local unit, one being given to the Attorney General, one being given to the head of the particular bureau, and the other to the United States attorney. Thus there is a fourfold check on the proposed indictments.

After the convening of the grand jury and the submission of the testimony and the finding of the bill, of course, the indictment has already been prepared. An indictment calls for certain counts. In this particular case the first count was violation of the provisions of the Sherman Act. That was not pressed before the Supreme Court. The second indictment carried four counts of conspiracy to violate the provisions of this act.

I have carefully read the opinion of Judge Learned Hand, circuit court judge of the second circuit, that of Judge Clark, concurring in part, and the dissenting opinion of Judge Augustus Hand in this case, showing that these judges split wide apart in their interpretation of this act and the law applicable to the facts.

I now want to refer for a moment to another part of the decision that was quoted a moment ago by my colleague from Pennsylvania. I am using the language of Justice Byrnes in this opinion. After he has recited these facts, he says this:

> This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control, nor does it mean that they need go unpunished.

In other words, even Justice Byrnes says to the Congress of the United States—

> You should now enact legislation which will meet the exact situation that we find has not been covered in our majority opinion in handing down the opinion in this case.

There is a direct mandate, if you wish to call it that, from the Supreme Court of the United States that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation.

I now want to turn for a moment to the dissenting opinion of Justice Stone, the Chief Justice.

If you will pardon a digression for a moment, this makes me think of a thing I once heard while waiting to argue a case before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. An attorney was arguing with some vigor and the chief justice of the court said, "Mr. Blank, you are arguing from a dissenting opinion. That is not the law." Unabashed, the attorney said, "Well, if it isn't, it ought to be." That is my comment in this case. If Justice Stone's opinion is not the law, in my judgment, it ought to be.

This is what Justice Stone has said on the interpretation placed on the provisions of this act and the exceptions by the majority members of the Court. I have noticed carefully what he said:

> It is no answer to say that the guilt of a defendant is personal and cannot be made to depend upon the acts and intention of another. Such an answer if valid would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime.

There are many ways of getting a case out of court. You can laugh it out of court, but this is too serious a matter to be laughed out of court.

What happens? One of the former speakers referred to the fact that the

definition of robbery was loosely drawn. I do not know how many thousands of indictments I have drawn, but many, many thousands. I went to the books to see whether the definition of robbery as written in this act did coincide with the common-law definition of robbery. As you know, we in Pennsylvania follow the old English common-law procedure, with such codification of law as has come up since. This is the common-law definition of robbery. If you will take the trouble to compare this with the definition used in this act, you will see that it has been followed almost word for word.

The common-law definition of robbery is that it consists in feloniously taking the personal property of another from his person or in his presence against his will by violence to his person or by putting such person in fear of immediate injury to his person.

As you compare that with the language in this bill, has this section of the bill been loosely drawn, as stated here on the floor?

This is the definition of extortion:

> The ordinary meaning of the word "extortion" is a taking or obtaining of anything from another by means of illegal compulsion or offensive action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I purposely cited those two definitions to meet the charge that the phraseology and language used in the preparation of this bill has been loosely drawn and loosely prepared, when as a matter of fact it reveals that the language used is in complete conformity with the common-law definition of the various crimes.

One of our colleagues, I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], referred to the fact that he was appalled—I think that was the language he used—at the penalty that was imposed under the provisions of this bill. Let me read you for a moment a brief definition of robbery under the Criminal Code. I am quoting from the Criminal Code, chapter 11, section 463:

> Robbery: Whoever, by force and violence, or by putting in fear, shall feloniously take from the person or presence of another anything of value, shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years.

That has been the law of the United States for I do not know how long, probably 125 years; yet all of a sudden Members become appalled. As stated in the committee by the author of this bill, he made a compilation of the penalties for robbery in the 48 States of the Union, and by averaging those found that they averaged 20 years. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOBBS. They averaged 20 years.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Justice Byrnes in his decision stated there was no attempt on the part of Congress to interfere with the traditional activities of labor unions. We put in the Copeland Act a specific provision which favored the traditional activities of labor unions. Therefore, the original act as well as this bill is aimed at labor. It seeks to do away with the excesses and racketeering of the Dillinger type. That being the case, should not we have been more careful in providing penalties rather than put a 20-year penalty in this bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. My answer to my colleague is this: The four sheet anchors of labor in Federal legislation are, first, the provisions of the Clayton Act, which applies to the issue of injunctions in labor disputes. The second is the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which also protects labor, and, returning for a moment to the first act cited, the Clayton Act, it is stated that labor is not a commodity, and no higher recognition of labor has ever been given than in the enactment of that act. The third sheet anchor is the Railway Labor Act, and that in my judgment is one of the finest acts ever passed by the Congress of the United States. The complete machinery and the mechanism is set forth, and a whole agenda has been laid down by which its processes may be followed out. Men have the right to strike. Of course, they have. They have the right of collective bargaining, of course, and no one disputes that. They have the right to peaceful picketing, and no one disputes that; and they have the right to organize for better working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute more to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the fourth sheet anchor is the National Labor Relations Act, and in that act every safeguard has been thrown around labor. What do we propose to do in this act? We propose to preserve and save intact for labor every one of those sheet anchors, and as a consequence we are determined that first of all there shall be upon the statute books of America accurately drawn laws that will take care of situations that arise, that racketeering will stop and as a consequence honest, decent people who are law-abiding will have no fear of the law. Finally, this is not an intricate act. I counted up the lines, and if we add the committee amendment, this will have only 78 lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleagues will believe me when I say that, on the whole, I have stood by the rights of organized labor about as much as any Member of Congress, particularly from my section of the country. I feel that organized labor has a definite and an important place in the economy of this Nation, and I am for organized labor, and for the purposes it seeks to accomplish. But, after all, if any movement or any group, not excluding organized labor, is going to be successful, it must have public opinion with it. Organized labor suffered a great deal by virtue of things that took place in New York out of which the 807 case grew. A very few people were responsible for this condition and yet all of organized labor had to withstand the wrath of public opinion because a few men did wrong. This wrong, mind you, was even against the orders of their leaders.

There can be no justification for what took place up there. These farmers, or men driving farm trucks came in, and as has been explained, they were shaken down for $8 or $9. It might not have been so bad if they had been given an opportunity to join the union, but as was said by Mr. Padway on page 188 of the hearings, they were not invited to join the union, they could not join the union, they were not eligible for membership. So they were confronted with a situation in trying to market their produce of paying a sum for the privilege of driving over the streets which they owned as much as anybody else. Down in Richmond, Va., a policy grew up where the apple farmers in bringing apples into the market could get within 100 or 200 feet of the place where they were going to deliver them, and then they had to employ a union truck, or a truck with a union driver, and take the apple boxes out of the farm truck, and put them into the union truck, in order to unload them at the station. A picture of the transfer is on page 21 of the hearings. Mr. Chairman, no one contends this is right. Union leaders themselves condemn it. I have a very definite feeling that the leaders of organized labor down in their hearts would welcome well-intended assistance in dealing with these problems.

Mr. Padway said in the hearings:

> I maintain that any man who is guilty of highway robbery whether he has a union card or not, should be prosecuted under the highway-robbery statute, and sent to prison.

He is right about that. He further says:

> I simply say that in an organization that is so large, you will find men that do the things that some of these leaders were convicted of doing some months ago, but you will find that in banks, and in the legal fraternity and in the medical fraternity, as for instance, we find abortionists in the medical profession.

His statement is true and wrongs should be corrected regardless of who commits them.

I can favor this bill because it is not intended to take away any rights of labor. An amendment will be offered to guarantee that none of these rights which I want labor to have are taken away. I assume the amendment will be adopted. If it is I understand the A. F. of L. has no serious objections to the bill. I believe that with the amendment, which will exclude from the act all lawful acts of any person which are protected under the four laws passed for the benefit of labor, the law will be wholesome and actually in the interest of organized labor if you take a long-range view of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Hobbs bill. The Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 is printed on pages 10 and 11 of the committee report. This act is entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation."

In substance this act provides that if any person—

(a) Obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion, the payment of money or other valuable considerations, * * * or

(b) Obtains the property of another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of force or fear, or under color of official right; or

(c) Commits or threatens to commit an act of physical violence or physical injury to a person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to violate section (a) or (b); or

(d) Conspires or acts concertedly with any other person or persons to commit any of the foregoing acts, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony

This statute, however, contains an exception in section (a), as follows:

not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

This exception is further found under section 3, in paragraph (b) wherein it is said the terms "property," "money," or "valuable considerations" shall not be deemed to include wages paid by a bona fide employer.

In considering the proposed amendment to this original act of 1934, one must keep in mind this exception found in the original act.

In 1941 certain persons were indicted under this original statute for conspiring to violate its provisions. After a 6 weeks' trial the respondents, who were members of a labor union, were convicted.

The jury required 2 days—

Opinion of the court, page 6 of the committee report—

in which to reach a verdict.

And twice during that period, it sought further instructions from the court, particularly with reference to the law relating to labor activity. After conviction, the circuit court of appeals found reversible error in the charge of the presiding judge. From this finding, the case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and in a majority opinion, delivered by Mr. Justice Byrnes, the circuit court of appeals was sustained—U. S. against Local 807, March 2, 1942.

Mr. Chief Justice Stone dissented.

In this dissenting opinion will be found a statement of what the respondents did which gave rise to the indictment. I will quote it—page 7 of the committee report:

Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Anti-Racketeering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service.

What does anybody think of such conduct in a country that is fighting for freedom from fear and freedom from want?

Well, Mr. Justice Byrnes said, in his majority opinion—page 6 of the committee's report:

This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control—

And, further—

The use of violence disclosed by this record is plainly subject to the ordinary criminal law.

It is evident what he thinks of it.

Mr. Justice Stone, in his opinion—page 8 of the committee report—said:

It is no answer to say that the guilt of a defendant is personal and cannot be made to depend upon the acts and intention of another. Such an answer if valid would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime.

It is evident what he thinks of such conduct.

I turn now to the committee minority report, found on page 13 of the committee report, and quote from the third paragraph:

It is interesting to note that Daniel Tobin, general president of the Teamsters' Union, not only disavowed the practices of the local teamsters' union involved in the Local 807 case and the similar practices of the other locals, but actually issued an order prohibiting in the future—

Note these words following—

such outrageous conduct on the part of unions under his jurisdiction.

That is what Mr. Tobin thinks of such practice on the part of union members that brought about the indictment of these men who practiced these activities.

We seem to be agreed, therefore, that these outrageous practices call for some correction. And the correction, we believe, is offered in this so-called Hobbs amendment to the original act of 1934. This amendment provides that if anybody, whether he is a member of a union or not, regardless of his race, color, or creed, commits robbery or extortion, he shall be punished.

Can anybody object to such a statute?

It is designed to make robbery and extortion anything but a wholesome, innocent pastime when such acts interfere with interstate commerce, which inevitably involves vitally our war effort and the feeding of our civilian population.

The opinion of the Supreme Court revolves around the exception in the original Antiracketeering Act, which excepted from its provisions the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

The Supreme Court found error in the charge of the trial judge. Because he believed Congress did not intend to except from the operation of this original statute men who were guilty of holding up truck drivers and beating them or threatening to beat them for $9.42, in his charge to the jury used these words—page 7 of the committee report:

If the jury finds that the sums of money paid by the truck operators were not wages so paid in return for services performed by such defendants, but were payments made by the operators in order to induce the defendants to refrain from interfering unlawfully with the operation of their trucks, then the sums in question may not be regarded as wages paid by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

Mr. Justice Byrnes, in commenting on this charge—page 7, second paragraph of the committee report—said this:

These instructions embody the rule for which the Government contends, and which we think is erroneous for the reasons we have given. Under them the jury was free to return a verdict of guilty if it found that the motive of the owners in making the payments was to prevent further damage and injury rather than to secure the services of the defendants. Whether or not the defendants were guilty of conspiracy thus became contingent upon the purposes of others and not upon their own aims and objectives. Moreover, the charge failed correctly to explain the legal consequences of proof that the owners had rejected bona fide offers by the defendants to perform the services. As we have said, the jury was bound to acquit the defendants if it found that their objective and purpose was to obtain by the use of threat of violence the chance to work for the money but to accept the money if the employers refused to permit them to work.

Bear in mind, if you will, that the words of the exception in the original statute are:

Not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

It is now late to discuss the question of legislative intent with reference to this original act of 1934, containing the exception above stated, because the Supreme Court has spoken, and that is the law of the land. It is interesting, however, to note what the Chief Justice had to say about this legislative intent—page 8 of the committee report:

When the Antiracketeering Act was under consideration by Congress, no Member of Congress and no labor leader had the temerity to suggest that such payments, made only to secure immunity from violence and intentionally compelled by assault and battery, could be regarded as the payment of wages by a bona fide employer or that the compulsion of such payments is a legitimate object of a labor union, or was ever made so by any statute of the United States. I am unable to concur in that suggestion now.

In this conduct of the defendants' described in the minority report as "outrageous," the Court pictured a relationship of contract—a meeting of minds—a voluntary agreement to employ and be employed in good faith! A man, with his truck, taking food into the city of New York, is set upon by two or more men, who beat or threaten him with serious bodily harm and thereby compel the payment to them of a day's wage. It is admitted that in some of the instances these stick-up men disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service. The man pays the money to save himself and his property. He does not feel that his assailants are fit men to be trusted with the driving of his truck with its load of food, and rejects their offer of service. It is not clear to me how anybody could find in these facts and circumstances an honest relationship of employer and employee, voluntarily entered into between the assailant and the assailed.

Conspiracy was the charge and, in accordance with the interpretation placed upon this excepting clause by this majority opinion of the Supreme Court, the offer of service must be made in good faith. In the foregoing recital of facts where can anybody find these assailants were tendering their services in good faith? If good faith resides in this set of circumstances, it finds itself in strange companionship.

The judge who presided at the trial believed that no such relationship could exist under these circumstances, and in effect so charged the jury. In this charge, among others, was found reversible error.

Certainly this situation calls for correction.

It is said that we are fighting for the "four freedoms" everywhere in the world. of which two are freedom from fear and freedom from want. This statute proposed is of universal application. It is designed to make these "four freedoms" applicable not only to Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea, but everywhere in the world, including the Holland Tunnel.

This so-called Hobbs bill should be passed.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the bill and upon the record of the hearings which were had before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I would say that the situation which confronts the House today is that each Member of the House is a member of a jury that is passing on a question of serious moment. I think some of the membership of the House may approach this in different ways, and I am indebted to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] for a little rhyme which he gave the hearings, and which may illustrate the viewpoint of some of the Members of the House with reference to this legislation.

> I do not like thee, Dr. Fell,
> The reasons why I cannot tell,
> But this I know and know full well,
> I do not like you, Dr. Fell.

It seems to me it is a significant situation that there are some who feel that this legislation is bad legislation; yet when you read the hearings, whether it be a farmer hauling beef to market in Minnesota, whether it was a Pennsylvania farmer hauling potatoes to the great Washington Market in New York, or whether it is a Virginia farmer hauling apples, or whether it was a Maryland farmer hauling peaches, from each of them was exacted a toll before he could use the public streets approaching the market place, not only in the great city of New York—and, by the way, the Washington Market is the greatest market in the world—but you had it happen in Pennsylvania, you had it happen in California, you had it happen in Idaho, you had it happen in a number of States of the Union. I do not know of any greater weapon that could be given to any group than to have them unrestrictedly, unlicensed, control the market place of the world. And that is what is happening in some of these instances as are reported here.

We had before our committee Mr. Padway and Mr. Tuttle. I would say they are two of the ablest lawyers in this country. They appeared in behalf of the brotherhoods of organized labor; and yet there is not a single witness, whether it was Mr. Padway or Mr. Tuttle or any other labor representative who had one word of commendation or one word of support for this hijacking and this racketeering; but they just felt that it did not need legislation.

I certainly am one of those who feels that we must have organized labor, but I think it would be the healthiest thing in the world if organized labor at some time in some of this legislation would say to the Members of Congress, "Gentlemen, we think there should be legislation." I think it would be a healthy thing for labor, because something has to be written on the statute books in view of the Supreme Court decision, and that decision in the case of United States against Local 807 is the only reason we need this law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Could the gentleman give me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to say in respect to the United States against Local 807 case, I have never been able to see that the relationship of employer and employee existed when a man got on the running board of a truck and told the driver of that truck, "You have got to pay me $9.40 and I will drive your truck a couple of blocks." That is what the decision, in my opinion, holds. I have never been able to imagine an employer-employee relationship in such a circumstance. So I say this legislation is necessary by reasen of the opinion in the Local 807 case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of representing the great industrial east side of the city of Detroit, that part of Detroit that has produced and established probably the most marvelous record of production in the whole United States of America. I must disagree with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] when he attacks labor and labor leaders. First of all, I know that no man could get up here with bitterness and hatred in his heart for unions and union leaders and then argue intelligently about this legislation. I am not going to get too excited about what was said by the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan about labor leaders, but let me say to this House that we in Detroit are mighty proud of R. J. Thomas, George Addes, and other U. A. W. labor leaders and for the wonderful job they have done. We have been producing. Our industry has produced. It was not just management alone that can take credit for the work that has been done there. These labor leaders deserve credit because they have held down strikes and they have seen that production has been turned out. It is very unfair to come here day after day and attack those men when they are producing and have done such splendid work in our war effort. We are proud of the fact that strikes and lock-outs have been reduced to five one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-hours worked. That means that since Pearl Harbor industrial production has been 99.95 percent continuous.

The many antilabor bills being introduced in this Congress would be of no service to the war effort; on the contrary they could, if passed, be seriously detrimental to the production effort of our Nation.

A concerted effort is being made by some people in and out of Congress to attack the labor movement. These attacks do not arise on the basis of facts; rather they represent an attempt by antilabor and anti-Roosevelt elements to whip up public hysteria against our working people based on distortions, falsehoods, and appeals to prejudice.

The most highly publicized antilabor bill now before Congress is the Hobbs bill. The sponsors of this bill call it an Antiracketeering Act. We all agree that racketeering should be ended and that the punishments for racketeering should be severe. However, there is already an antiracketeering statute in Federal law which is called the Antiracketeering Act of 1934.

The trouble with the Hobbs bill is that it can be construed by the courts to prohibit and punish most of the legitimate activities of organized labor. Under its provisions a man who voted for a strike

or walked the picket line would run the risk of being sentenced to a maximum of 20 years in prison or to be fined $10,000, or both. Whatever the proponents of the proposed measure may say, the language of the Hobbs bill is so broad that it constitutes a serious menace to all that organized labor has struggled for, bled for, and even died for through many decades.

The original Antiracketeering Act of 1934 contains all the powers necessary to ferret out and adequately punish racketeers. In that original act, sections were included to protect organized labor in the lawful pursuit of its legitimate objectives. What the Hobbs bill would do is to delete and to remove those sections which protect the organizations of working people in their hard-won right to bargain collectively with management.

The provision of the original Antiracketeering Act of 1934 which the Hobbs bill would eliminate says that "no court shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such a manner as to impair, diminish or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objectives thereof as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States." Also in the original act is a section specifically prohibiting any attempt to direct its application against situations involving simply "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee." These two provisions were inserted as a result of representation by the Department of Justice which has the duty of enforcing the legislation. Thus, all that the Hobbs bill would do is to delete from the present law the two provisions inserted to prevent any distorted application of the law to destroy the lawful rights of labor.

The Hobbs bill is a bad bill. It is a vicious bill. If passed, it would pave the way for the destruction of organized American labor. Let us not fool ourselves. Success of bills like the Hobbs measure will pave the way for fascism in America in exactly the same way Hitler fastened the bloody tentacles of fascism upon the unhappy people of Europe.

We all know that Hitler's first act in his own country and in the unoccupied countries, once he had the power, was to destroy the unions of the working people. Hitler knows that fascism cannot succeed where a strong, democratic labor movement flourishes. Therefore, the labor movement of the United States is against the Hobbs bill. I am also against it, and many of my colleagues are against it.

There are a number of other antilabor bills which have reached one stage or another in this Congress, but this Hobbs bill appears to me to be the most dangerous because of the misleading language in which it is phrased. Let us contrast these efforts of the antilabor group with the record established by our unions so far in this war. In my congressional district the leading union is the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This union is now the largest in the Nation, if not in the world. Its members have already purchased around $200,000,000 in War bonds and given $2,000,000 in Detroit alone for American and Allied war relief. More than 150,000 of its members are in the armed forces of the Nation. Furthermore, most of its members at home have brothers, sons, husbands, and friends in uniform.

In addition, the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has made an enviable record in the production field, which is, of course, its chief function. At least 75 plants, many of them huge in size and in productive capacity, under contract with the U. A. W.-C. I. O. have already been awarded the Army-Navy E for productive efficiency.

Let me name just a few: The aircraft division of the Briggs Manufacturing Co., Detroit; the Conners Avenue plant of the Briggs Manufacturing Co., Detroit; the Ford Motor Co.'s River Rouge, Mich., plant, the largest factory in the world; 8 plants of the Chrysler Corporation, 6 of them in the Detroit area; Continental Motors, in Detroit; 14 plants of the General Motors Corporation, 3 of them in Detroit and 9 of them in Michigan; the aircraft division of the Hudson Motor Co., Detroit; 4 plants of the Kelsey Hayes Wheel Co., 2 of them in Detroit, and all 4 of them in Michigan; the marine-engine division of the Packard Motor Car Co., Detroit; the Timken-Detroit Axle Co.'s plant in Detroit. Many other plants in Detroit and other sections of the country under contract with the U. A. W.-C. I. O. have been awarded the Army-Navy E. This is not all.

Some 40 war workers in Detroit U. A. W.-C. I. O. plants have received highly prized honor awards from the War Production Board for valuable suggestions for improving the quality and quantity of production.

In all plants organized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O. the union has either succeeded in having a labor management committee established or is doing all in its power to have one set up. The efforts of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. and the cooperation that has been established in many plants between the union and management has resulted in great gains to war production and therefore has been of invaluable aid in helping to win the war against the Nazis and the Japs.

If I dwell almost exclusively on the U. A. W.-C. I. O. it is because I am from Detroit and because this union is the largest in the country and probably the most aggressive in its will to do its part in winning the war. Other C. I. O. unions, the A. F. of L., and the Railway Brotherhoods have also established fine records in production and in buying War bonds, and in contributing to the armed services. Labor as a whole can be proud of the fact that strikes and lock-outs have been reduced to less than five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the man-hours worked. This means that since Pearl Harbor industrial production in this country has been almost ninety-nine and ninety-five one-hundredths percent continuous.

This illustrates very clearly that the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. meant what they said when they pledged that they would abandon their hard-earned right to strike, which is overwhelmingly their chief economic weapon.

Let it also be said that it takes two to make a quarrel. In those relatively few instances where stoppages have occurred, we must not forget that labor is just one party to the dispute. Whatever the opponents of organized labor may say cannot obscure the fact that whenever there is a dispute, management is at least as much at fault as labor in most instances and frequently the chief cause of the trouble.

I think it can be reasonably said that the wisest course for this Congress to pursue in such matters is to promote good labor relations in our mills, our mines, and our factories by all means within its power. I am sure that it is along such a path that Congress could do most to aid in our national effort to improve and increase productive capacity so that we can win the war as quickly as possible. Such measures as the Hobbs bill can only hurt the war effort, and in addition reactionary legislation of this type, if adopted, can only mean the loss of our hopes to win the peace.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] 1 minute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would not detract from the pride which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] feels for the workers in the Detroit area, but I would like to read a dispatch that appears in today's paper:

> A dispute that started when plant-protection men broke up a dice game in a lavatory halted production on armored war vehicles today at the Ford Motor Co.'s Highland Park plant, a company spokesman said.
>
> There was no immediate comment from spokesmen for the workers. The company spokesman said more than 500 men stopped work at 2:45 a. m. after the plant-protection men took the badges of the crap shooters and told them to report to the labor relations office.
>
> When the day shift came on duty at 6:30 a. m., an additional 2,700 men refused to go to work, he added. By 9 a. m. an additional 1,000 men in another unit of the plant had joined the stoppage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] in his remarks stated that any member of organized labor voting in favor of a strike or engaging in peaceful picketing could under the Hobbs bill be subject to a fine of $10,000 or 20 years in the penitentiary. Upon the answer to the question, Is this correct? depends the way I will vote.

I want to know if that is a true statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot imagine any rubber material that could stretch as far as the imagination of mankind would have to stretch to reach such an erroneous construction. I say to the gentleman that it absolutely will not and it absolutely does not.

Mr. BREHM. That is all I wanted to know. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be a peculiar human being, and I might say a heartless wretch, who would want to fight labor. I cannot conceive a heart beating in the breast of a human being who would fight labor.

Mr. Chairman, when I say that, I mean honest labor. When we look about and see the dignities of labor and see what has been accomplished as the result of labor, every red-blooded American citizen naturally has to take his hat off to honest labor and to the dignities of labor.

The question involved in this act is whether the Celler amendment or the committee amendment shall be adopted. May I say, if you want some legislation and not a piece of paper, vote down the Celler amendment because it has been said, and cannot be successfully contradicted, that with the Celler amendment in here it leaves you right where it picked you up. You will only have a piece of paper with some writing on it without any force or effect.

Justice Byrnes says as much in his opinion when he gives the reasoning for holding as he did and that clause was read a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Michigan who stretches his imagination so extremely far. It is identical in substance and effect the same thing as the Celler amendment. If you want to do something by legislation at this time that will amount to something and accomplish results leave the Celler amendment out of it because I know just what it will do. If we are to consider the clause read a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan which Justice Byrnes says was the authority for his holding and in the final analysis he did so hold in that case, you will find it puts us right back where we were.

Let us see if labor is in line with this or if this is against labor. Labor has said this is wrong. Every one of them who testified before the committee said such acts as we are seeking to legislate against were wrong. They said they had instructed their unions to desist from such actions, that it was wrong, and in so doing they plead a confession, then come along with the avoidance and say, "Well, we have stopped these things and it is not necessary now." That is the avoidance. "We have stopped it now and it is not necessary," they say.

May I say if you put the Celler amendment in this act you are going to find yourselves in the same boat you were in before this legislation was enacted because upon substantially the same provision in the act of 1934 Justice Byrnes held that members of a labor union were exempt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer. I am one of those 205 as against the 230. It seems to devolve upon us to interpret for the lawyers at the present moment. How they differ today. It is necessary for us to take the usual role as jury after listening to attorneys on both sides of the question. Your farmers could not get into New York without paying tribute. My fishermen could not get in either. I should also make an appeal in their behalf.

Undoubtedly this bill will be passed. I have listened carefully and I must make up my mind whether the bill would be emasculated by the Celler amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] says that the committee amendment is not affirmative, and that when action is brought under the Hobbs bill they could not plead that the other acts were persuasive in a defense. I can hardly believe that, and you lawyers do greatly confuse us. It is hard to understand the effect of some of the provisions that are written by the lawyers in this bill and if it had not been for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] I would still be more uncertain. He has resolved some of my doubts. Of course a defense can be made by relying on the enumerated act. Surely it could be sufficient defense, to be carried to the Supreme Court. I am particularly interested in this bill inasmuch as my city last week had an important election. It seemed generally agreed that the A. F. of L. would win, but the C. I. O. won. Now, they will be at loggerheads with each other and I sincerely hope that there will be no acts of violence. The provisions in this act may provide a basis of defense for such acts. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wants an affirmative declaration to provide for absolute exemptions. From these 230 lawyers, how easily one could get their own favorable interpretation.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The section to which the gentleman refers provides that the act must be lawful under those four specific acts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; lawful. The Supreme Court has declared that plainly unlawful acts may be considered lawful. It is not convincing.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] spoke about that great patriotic organization, the A. F. of L. I am inclined to believe that it is a great patriotic organization, but still there comes to me the memory of the $75 fee that my neighbors had to pay to work for a few weeks on defense undertakings. I cannot think they are so very patriotic at times. Seventy-five dollars as a fee to work on a defense project for 6 weeks. Patriotic? Maybe. Still that rankles within me and I wonder if they are really intensely patriotic. Let us hope that on the whole perhaps they are.

Why do you lawyers insist on this "Provided, however"? If we wish to stop racketeering, why do we not do it without providing loopholes? I like to follow the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. He says he has thought this over carefully and that he cannot find anything harmful in these provisions. Perhaps I should rely on his judgment. However, I do not want a delaying defense provided when prompt action is desired. Would it not be sufficient to simply define racketeering? Do you not think that that $75 fee was extortion and robbery? However, there seems to be no redress even under this bill. Again, beware of these lawyers who desire to complicate and provide too many defense provisions that they may make profitable cases for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, there are a good many people who have been active in organized labor who feel that this bill is designed to injure their legitimate interests. Many Members of the House who have always defended the rights of organized labor deny this. I believe that if we want to be sincere we should adopt the Celler amendment. I do not think it emasculates the bill. The only thing it takes out of the purview of the act is the legitimate activities of union labor.

I think that if we want to be sincere and prove that we do not want to hurt the cause of organized labor we should in addition restore that other guaranty that this bill will not be used for persecution, we should restore to the bill the provision that prosecutions must be instituted by the Attorney General. That has been removed. I disagree with my colleague from Pennsylvania, although I always pay a good bit of tribute to his legal ability. I do not believe it is in the act presently before us. I agree with the gentleman from the minority who spoke here just a few moments ago who stated that it is not in the Hobbs bill. I do not believe sufficient attention has been paid to that provision. If it was in the act before, and if it has been said that the only reason we are passing this bill today is so we can bring the unauthorized acts of organized labor within the purview of this statute, why do we have to take away this guaranty that prosecutions must be instituted by the Attorney General? If we want to be sincere and want to pass a bill that will do good and not be misinterpreted and used as a club over decent hard-working people, let us amend the bill in the particulars I have suggested, and I think you will find, in spite of the representations from back home from labor organizations against it, that a good many of the Members who are very zealous about the rights of organized labor will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the turn the debate has recently taken indicates what the issue in this discussion really is. It involves the relative merits of the so-called Celler amendment and the committee amendment.

Let me call your attention to what the committee amendment does. We all know that when we pass a new statute which is at variance with an old one the new statute supersedes and repeals the old one to the extent of the difference. So that we will be absolutely certain not to repeal or interfere with any of the rights labor has under the various statutes specified in the committee amendment, we specifically state that this act shall not repeal, modify, or affect any of the provisions in the laws mentioned, which together constitute labor's bill of rights. Labor's lawyers should ask no more than that. The amendment reaffirms and preserves the rights which the law has given to labor.

On the other hand, the Celler amendment is adroit and tricky. There is more to it than meets the eye. It provides that no act which is lawful under the various labor statutes which are specified shall constitute a violation of this act. Everyone concedes it is lawful to seek jobs. Under the Byrnes decision it is lawful to use any amount of violence necessary to obtain employment, and by using force to obtain employment a man may establish a bona fide relationship of employer and employee. If the Celler amendment is adopted, it can be argued that Congress intends to exempt the very offenses we all know this amendment is designed to reach.

I suspect that nearly all the Members have received in the past few weeks a great many letters, telegrams, and postal cards protesting against the passage of the Hobbs Antiracketeering Act on the ground that it is hostile to labor. These communications come from men who never read the bill and have been misinformed as to its contents and its purposes. I have not the slightest doubt they are good law-abiding citizens who would favor the bill if they understood it.

The bill is not aimed at labor. It is directed against robbery and extortion when used to obstruct the free flow of goods in interstate commerce, no matter who the offenders may be.

Such a law is already on the statute books—the Antiracketeering Act of 1934, which was sponsored by the late Senator Copeland. But that law has been partially nullified by what I regard as the labored reasoning of Mr. Justice Byrnes in the recent case of U. S. against Local 807. Five of his New Deal associates on the Court—Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, and Murphy concurred. Chief Justice Stone dissented in a strong, and to me, a convincing opinion. Justices Roberts and Jackson did not sit in the case.

That decision makes this amendment to the Antiracketeering Act of 1934 necessary, unless we are willing to allow the Byrnes opinion to stand as the permanent law of the land in cases where the circumstances are similar.

In recent years, under the benign influence of the New Deal, a few labor czars have become avaricious, arrogant, and defiant. They have prayed on their own membership, on members of rival unions, on nonunion workers, and on the public. They have cast discredit on organized labor and have embarrassed the millions of decent working men. Among the worst offenders have been certain locals of the Teamsters Union in New York City.

In that city, Local 807 asserted that its members had the sole and exclusive right to drive trucks of farm produce through the streets of New York to the Washington Market. Farmers driving their own trucks, carrying their own produce for delivery to their own customers, were waylaid on the outskirts of the city and compelled by physical violence to hire, or, at least, to pay a day's wages to members of Local 807 before they could proceed to market. Sometimes a member of the union would actually drive the farmer's truck through the city, but more often the farmer rejected his services or the teamster refused to perform any services for his so-called wages. The tribute thus exacted frequently amounted to all or a substantial part of the profit the farmer hoped to make on the sale of fruits and vegetables which he had raised by the sweat of his brow and which he had driven many long miles to deliver.

For these outrages a number of teamsters belonging to Local 807 were indicted for conspiracy to violate the act of 1934. They were tried and convicted by a jury in United States District Court. Eventually the case reached the Supreme Court on appeal and the Supreme Court reversed the conviction in the decision I have mentioned.

There is no dispute about the proven facts in the case. They are clearly and succinctly set forth in the opinion written by Chief Justice Holmes:

> Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Antiracketeering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service.

The defendants were indicted under a provision of the 1934 act, and the conspiracy provision relating thereto, reading as follows:

> SEC. 2. Any person who, in connection with or in relation to any act in any way or in any degree affecting trade or commerce or any article or commodity moving or about to move in trade or commerce—
>
> (a) Obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion, the payment of money or other valuable considerations, or the purchase or rental of property or protective services, not including, however, the payment of wages, by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee; * * * shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by imprisonment from 1 to 10 years or by a fine of $10,000 or both.

Justice Byrnes held that when Congress used the language "not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee," we gave legislative sanction to the acts complained of in the indictment. He held that because of this language we intended to recognize a bona fide relationship of employer and employee when a member of a union obtains money or property from another no matter what degree of violence is used, provided the ostensible purpose is to obtain wages. According to that decision any thug belonging to a teamster's union may climb on a farmer's truck, beat him over the head with a club and extort a day's pay as a truck driver whether he performs any services or not, and Congress so intended when the Act of 1934 was passed.

If that construction of the law is allowed to stand, a gang of teamsters can hold up every car and truck crossing the bridge into Virginia, and compel the owner or the driver to hire one of them at his own terms to drive the car through the State.

Here is the reasoning of the learned Justice Byrnes:

> The mischief of a contrary theory is nowhere better illustrated than in industrial controversies. For example, the members of a labor union may decide that they are entitled to the jobs in their trade in a particular area. They may agree to attempt to obtain contracts to do the work at the union wage scale. They may obtain the contracts, do the work, and receive the money. Certainly Congress intended that these activities should be excepted from the prohibitions of this particular act, even though the agreement may have contemplated the use of violence. But it is always an open question whether the employers' capitulation to the demands of the union is prompted by a desire to obtain services or to avoid further injury or both. To make a fine or prison sentence for the union and its members contingent upon a finding by the jury that one motive or the other dominated the employers' decision would be a distortion of the legislative purpose.
>
> As we have said, the jury was bound to acquit the defendants if it found that their objective and purpose was to obtain by the use or threat of violence the chance to work for the money but to accept the money even if the employers refused to permit them to work.

The views of the Chief Justice are summed up in this brief quotation from his opinion:

> There is abundant evidence in the record from which the jury could have concluded that respondents, or some of them, conspired to compel by force and violence the truck drivers or their employers to pay the sums of money to respondents or some of them; that the payments were made by the drivers of truck owners to purchase immunity from the violence of respondents and for no other reason; and that this was the end knowingly sought by respondents.

I can only conclude that such conduct accompanied by such a purpose constitutes a violation of the statute.

Thank Heaven, not all of the "nine old men" have left the Supreme Court of the United States.

You cannot find many laboring men who defend the acts described in the Local 807 case. In the minority report accompanying this bill, it is pointed out that Mr. Daniel Tobin, president of the teamsters' union, disavows the practices of the union involved in the Local 807 case and has issued orders prohibiting such outrages in the future.

The minority report and the opponents of this bill claim that it is an attack on labor. Such a charge is wholly false. They urge that the bill should not be passed because of the tremendous contribution labor is making in our war effort. Perhaps these gentlemen feel that this type of argument will ingratiate them with workingmen. They insult labor by overlooking the fact that workingmen are as law abiding as any other group in this country and that no one is more eager to get rid of the thugs and gangsters among them than they are.

I do not need any lecture from the opponents of this bill to know that the rank and file of labor is patriotic. Their sons and brothers are fighting beside yours and mine. We are the same sort of people, with the same hopes, aspirations, emotions, and loyalties, no matter what our jobs are, despite the efforts of the radical groups among us to line up Americans into antagonistic classes. It will not work, so long as we have free schools, free speech and a free press.

The opponents of the bill say it is not necessary. I say it is. Under the act of 1934, as construed by the Supreme Court, robbery and extortion, as described in the Local 807 case, are lawful acts. This is the law of the land today. We must not allow it to stand. This bill eliminates the language on which that amazing decision was based and with the committee amendment preserves all the rights of honest labor.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to correct the condition brought about by the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of those convicted for robbing and beating up farmers and truckers from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other States who brought their produce from their farms to New York City for sale. That opinion casts a reflection upon the Congress of the United States and upon the law-abiding union labor of the Nation. It holds expressly that Congress, by the language used in the act of 1934, meant to legalize robbery by the use of force, by beating men, by holding them up when they are engaged in interstate commerce. It holds that such acts are habitual and customary acts on the part of labor unions.

I deny both of those assertions. It is not a customary practice of the labor unions of this country to indulge in that sort of conduct. It was not the purpose of the Congress, and I do not think it is the purpose of this Congress now to legalize that sort of conduct. I have had one letter from one man in my district protesting the passage of this bill. In my district today there are more than 50,000 loyal, patriotic, law-abiding men and women and boys and girls engaged in vital defense industries. Not one of them will ever commit any of the acts made unlawful by this bill now before us for consideration. They are not interested in the racketeers of the State of New York. They are giving their all to win this war.

I can tell you how every citizen, every man, woman, and child in this country, can avoid the penalties of this act and that is to refrain from interference with interstate commerce through acts of violence and illegal conduct such as are denounced by this bill. This measure will not suspend, impair, or destroy any of the protection thrown around labor by the laws passed by Congress. It so provides in no uncertain terms.

The bill provides that it shall be unlawful to interfere with the movement of our armed forces and with the necessary transportation of the implements of war. Who is it that will say that ought not to be the law?

If I wanted to hurt labor, if I wanted to bring it under the condemnation of the public opinion of this country, I would line up for and support the Celler amendment. I shall support the committee amendment. And in so doing I will render a greater service to the working people of this country than are those who are opposing this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to impose myself on the Committee during the consideration of this important measure for the discussion of a matter not related thereto, but a recent novel regulation has been promulgated down at the W. P. B. offices by a self-styled important gentleman, which I think would be of interest to the Members of the House.

LATEST REQUIREMENT TO SECURE W. P. B. PRIORITY—CRYING

There are some who delight in coming down into the Well of this House to make a general blast against the bureaucrats. I do not approve of this practice unless the charge be made against the specific person responsible for the action complained of. That I shall now do. The person will be named. I shall be specific. I have a just complaint.

On last Saturday afternoon one of my constituents, a small businessman, called me over long distance, soliciting my aid in expediting an application which he had filed with the War Production Board for a priority on certain equipment. He talked to me for about 20 minutes over 1,000 miles of long-distance lines, which entailed no little expense. His need was urgent. The call so indicated.

After working through a mass of telephones in the War Production Board, they finally located this file, which had been handled by one Mr. Joe Miller in the office of the Rubber Director. On presenting, in a respectful manner, my constituent's urgent and seemingly most worthy case, the said Mr. Miller, attaching much importance to his bureaucratic self, without even a slight display of sympathetic consideration for this small businessman, gruffly and promptly solved the problem with a retort that there were several thousand others "crying just as your constituent is," using his exact words. He proceeded to say that one "cry" was not sufficient and that my constituent would have to "cry twice, or even three or more times, before the case"—again using his exact words—would receive further consideration from him. He suggested that I wait a while with patience, that my constituent would undoubtedly be calling him over long distance not later than the Monday following, and then he, the important Mr. Miller, might condescend to give consideration to the case.

Naturally, I was astounded, and so expressed myself. Mr. Miller then arbitrarily replied that the case, so far as he was concerned, was closed several days ago; that it would remain there, irrespective of my request, and would not be reopened unless and until I petitioned a reopening through Mr. W. J. Hays, W. P. B. legislative liaison officer. And may I here add that Mr. Hays has been helpful and very courteous.

In other words, a Member of Congress is not privileged to discuss matters with Mr. Miller. A Member of Congress, who is the elected representative of the people, cannot petition his Government through the bureau-appointed Mr. Miller. Why, Mr. Miller is too important to be taking up his time with a Member of Congress. Mr. Miller insists that you go the long red-tape route to reach him. Mr. Miller has no sympathy, no regard, no consideration for the tax-paying businessman back home, who is struggling to keep a little business going. Mr. Miller puts no faith in the first petition of your constituent. Mr. Miller insists that your constituent petition, or "cry" as he puts it, at least three times. Mr. Miller forgets that he is a public servant. His consideration for the average sacrificing American citizen is cold and arbitrary. His attitude, on the occasion in question, was a downright contemptible, outrageous, pusillanimous insult to the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Miller needs another job. He ought to be fired. And Mr. Donald M. Nelson will please take notice.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an amendment to the antiracketeering law of 1934, but the only material change which the adoption of this amendment would make in the existing antiracketeering law is the elimination of the clause which protects trade unions, engaged in their legitimate functions, against persecution under it.

I believe that every fair-minded person must recognize today that organized labor stands in the forefront of the successful prosecution of the war effort. The passage of this amendment would be an attack upon labor and would destroy much of the unity that now exists between employers and labor.

The amendment is particularly dangerous because it seems reasonable enough that labor should not be permitted to racketeer, and to persons who do not know the facts, that seems all that this amendment would do, but the wording of the antiracketeering law is so wide that demands for increased wages could be considered racketeering.

Racketeering in my opinion is a fraudulent scheme or unlawful method to gain money or other transferable materials. If you know these things exist, we have plenty of laws to take care of such cases without any new laws enacted or amendments to present laws.

I think if our present laws were enforced where it is necessary, we could clear this whole thing up in short order. It is an admittance when we say there is racketeering, as racketeering is unlawful any time and any place, and our antiracketeering law has been enacted to take care of this crime.

My objection to this bill lies in its wholly unwarranted reflection on the working men and women of our country. I think it very unfair to place them in the class of racketeers and enact a law to protect the country from their so-called crimes. Criminal antilabor legislation is not a suitable award for the loyalty and splendid cooperation of our laboring people. It seems to me that this bill, under the guise of protecting the American people against racketeering, has no other purpose than the persecution of organized labor.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this measure which is now before the House comes as the result of an unfortunate decision made and entered by our highest court. This is a bill by which we are attempting to correct a situation which has resulted from that decision, and this bill will do two things: First, it will prevent interference with interstate commerce by robbery and extortion. In the second place, it will prevent interference during the war with the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, and of mail, and that relates to either interstate or foreign commerce. Returning for a little while to the case of the United States against Local 807, I mentioned awhile ago that this was an unfortunate decision. I think it is a most unfortunate decision. Under the old law of 1934 this case proceeded under sections 2 (a), 2 (b), 2 (c) of that act, and those particular provisions I read now so that the membership may know just what they were. Section 2 (a) reads as follows in part:

> Any person who in connection with or in relation to any act in any way or in any degree affecting trade or commerce or any article or commodity moving or about to move in trade or commerce, obtains or attempts to obtain by the use of, or attempts to use or threat to use, force, violence, or coercion—

And so forth. Those are the strong charging words of that particular subsection.

> Subsection (b). * * * obtains the property of another with his consent, induced by wrongful use of force or fear, or under color of official right.
>
> Subsection (c). * * * commits or threatens to commit an act of physical violence or physical injury to a person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to violate sections (a) or (b).

Those are the subsections that I read and which are just preceding. In that case there was evidence introduced, and I wish to call your attention to a few of the statements of that evidence which was introduced on the trial of that case. I think this evidence is highly important. This is what the Court said in deciding the case:

> There was sufficient evidence to warrant a finding that the defendant conspired to use, and did use, violence and threats to obtain from the owners of these over-road trucks $9.42 for each large and $8.41 for each small truck entering the city. These amounts were the regular union rates for a day's work—

Not an hour's work, not 2 hours' work, but those were the union rates for a full day's work.

> There was proof that in some cases the out-of-State drivers were compelled to drive the truck to a point close to the city limits and there to turn it over to one or more of the defendants. These defendants would then drive the truck to its destination, do the unloading, pick up the merchandise for the return trip, and surrender the truck to the out-of-State driver at the point where they had taken it over.

That was when he turned it back to the farmer, or to the laboring man himself, who was in charge of the truck and contents; and I know of a case where the laboring man was attempting to take some of his own produce into one of these large cities, and some of these racketeers held him up, and this particular man belonged to their union. The racketeers made him pay tribute.

I now continue to quote from the judge in his decision:

> In other cases, according to the testimony, the money was demanded and obtained, but the owners or drivers rejected the offers of the defendants to aid or help with the driving or unloading, and in several cases the jury found, and could have found, that the defendants either failed to offer to work, or refused to work, for the money when asked to do so.

Mr. Chairman, this is the evidence upon which the judge who delivered the opinion of the court based that decision. The opinion quotes the above statement as a part of the evidence in the case—and no one can question the evidence which was given during the trial of the case, and no one can question that evidence when the judge quotes the same in his opinion in the case. That was done here.

That, the judge found, was a fact in this case. The court found that as a fact. That is a part of the decision. That is a part of the court's opinion. It is a part of the very facts upon which the judge stood and rendered his decision in this case. Mark you this: These were American citizens who drove to that city, men of every walk of life; honest, poor, but thrifty Americans, striving and struggling to earn a livelihood in a free country, and then to have taken away from them their truck, or the mode of transportation they were using, together with their property, and they were compelled in many cases to pay tribute which amounted to all their profit on all the produce they had, all they were attempting to deliver. So, in part, those are the facts in this case. I stated a while ago it is a most unfortunate decision. Further, I want to read some of the language which has been written into the decision and which is a part of it.

Mr. Chairman, the decision contains a discussion on the question of whether the money which was exacted from the drivers was paid "as wages for labor, or whether it was paid for protection." This question is discussed at length in the decision. I wish I had the time in which to go into the details of this anomolous decision, as it would be enlightening to the Members of the House to fully understand its import. Suffice it to say, that there has never been a decision comparable to this one, and I am convinced we will never have another decision in this country which approaches this decision in the length to which it has gone in destroying the right to contract and employ men, and to have the right to own, hold, and possess property in this country.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that in the district which I represent we do not look upon this measure as a labor bill. This is a bill which applies to everyone alike. This bill applies to every American citizen, and it is intended to prevent robbery and extortion in matters of interstate commerce, and under title II of the bill it is intended that all interference will be prevented during war with the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, in either interstate or foreign commerce. In the district I represent, and in the State of Indiana, we do not have any laboring men who would indulge in robbery or extortion, in matters where interstate commerce is conducted.

Our laboring men are patriotic, they are loyal to our country, they are bending their backs with every other American to aid in winning this war. They do not subscribe to any policy whereby any man, or men, who hold membership in a labor union go forth and engage in hijacking and hold-ups and extort money and property from other Americans. Our laboring men in Indiana observe the law—and they want to continue to obey the law—and they look

with disfavor upon any American who indulges in such unlawful acts and practices. The honest and upright laboring men, such as we have in Indiana, do not fear any law of this character, because it will not bring them within its folds; they will not violate its provisions. They want the people protected from racketeering and hijacking, and they want to be protected from those unlawful acts themselves.

Concluding, Mr. Chairman, may I commend to the Members of the House this legislation. We are engaged in a frightful war. We must deliver gasoline, sugar, coffee, meats, and foods and every needed commodity in the channels of interstate commerce; we must send our troops—the boys of our community who are now in the armed forces of our country—and we must send war munitions and war supplies and the mail, and all of these must be protected by the strong arm of the law. This is war. We must make secure our property, our boys in the service, and the United States mail. There is no American who could object to that procedure, nor who could register a worth-while protest against the provisions of this bill when it is fully understood.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allowed to me I want to discuss subsection (b), the robbery section, and direct your attention to the fact that in the amendment which it is proposed to offer, the four acts to which reference has been made, are specifically not repealed; and in addition to that, this word is to be found in the first sentence of that subsection:

> The term "robbery" means the "unlawful" taking.

So when the Government comes to make out its case it would have to prove, even without the exception of these acts, that the term "robbery" means the "unlawful" taking; not only the taking in the method detailed in this act, but if the defendant could find anywhere not only in those four acts, but anywhere in the criminal law, privilege or permission to take this money by the method resorted to, he would be entitled to a verdict of "not guilty."

In the face of that fact, my friends who have the responsibility of being statesmen in the movement of organized labor, at a time when everybody who understands the situation knows that that movement is moving rapidly away from the support of public opinion, just as business did a few years ago, and faces the supreme crisis of its existence in America at this minute, I say in a situation like that, my friends who hold high duty to be statesmen in the ranks of organized labor are insisting upon the defeat of this legislation. It does not mention organized labor, it is true, but organized labor is being placed in the attitude of wanting to be excused and excepted from this general language which denounces the taking of property from another by robbery and extortion. Another's property. Do you get that? The property that belongs to another person. Taking it from him. Against his will, by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person, and so forth. Now, think of that and think of Members of this Congress, friends of labor—and many of you are—putting organized labor in such a position at a time when everybody knows that its position insofar as its hold on public opinion is concerned, is the most shaky it has been since organized labor began in America. It does not make sense.

If ever on this earth organized labor needed to clean its ranks, it is now. I have people, fine people, who belong to organized labor, high-class citizens. I do not make any claim to be a representative of organized labor. I represent the people of my district. This bunch of racketeers and hijackers are a disgrace to every decent American citizen who belongs to organized labor. We are a democratic people in Texas. There are no lines of cleavage among my people. Many of my people are not far removed from the farms and ranches. They would be incapable of crawling on the wagon of a farmer coming to town to sell the fruits of his toil, threatening him, beating him up if he did not submit to being hijacked and then claiming protection in the name of organized labor. It is just such people as that and such actions as that which is losing for the labor movement the support of public opinion not only on the outside but within the ranks of labor itself. To stop this high-handed brutal treatment by a lot of city thugs of peaceable citizens trying to earn an honest living, working people themselves, is the sole objective of this particular item of legislation. It does not touch any other interest or problem of what is known as the labor question or the controversies with reference to organized labor as it is practiced. Just the one thing. I am not speaking of the transportation title.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the undivided attention of the membership, while I close this debate. The first point I want to make briefly is that this is not an anti-labor bill, no matter who says it is. I introduce in evidence in support of that contention, first, that this bill comes from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives which was criticized by no less authorities than Judge Howard Smith and Judge Eugene Cox before the Rules Committee the other day as being "the graveyard of labor bills." Therefore, when a committee like that, which has a reputation and is characterized as being the graveyard of anti-labor bills, brings you a bill, it is pretty good evidence that it is a fair measure.

The next point I want to make in support of that contention is that you are pretty near the middle of the road when neither of the extremes agree with you. We have the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the distinguished columnist, Westbrook Pegler, inveighing against this bill because it is a rope of sand or a drink of water. We have Mr. Padway and Mr. Tuttle inveighing against it because it means the crucifixion of organized labor. Of course, neither of those extreme views affects us. We have solemnly considered this matter for more than a year and we bring you a bill that is sound. The real reason of the opposition from the labor lawyers, it is not from the rank and file, is because it will do the job and the single job that it sets out to do.

I want to call your attention to just one thing, if I may. I want everyone of you to listen to this, because it is my solemn pledge. If any man, woman, or child in the world will show me how any honest law-abiding member of organized labor can be affected by this bill, I will either offer an amendment correcting that threat, or I will vote against my own bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I only have 2 minutes for this.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but the gentleman has just asked a question which I would like to answer.

Mr. HOBBS. I want it shown.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right. In connection with a strike, if an incident occurs which involves——

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman need go no further. This bill does not cover strikes or any question relating to strikes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman put a provision in the bill stating so?

Mr. HOBBS. We do not have to, because a strike is perfectly lawful and has been so described by the Supreme Court and by the statutes we have passed. This bill takes off from the springboard that the act must be unlawful to come within the purview of this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That does not answer my point. My point is that an incident such as a simple assault which takes place in a strike could happen. Am I correct?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That then could become an extortion under the gentleman's bill, and that striker as well as his union officials could be charged with violation of sections in this bill.

Mr. HOBBS. I disagree with that and deny it in toto.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then, let us put in a provision providing against such an interpretation.

Mr. HOBBS. To put in a provision covering every suggestion anybody can make on the floor after the committee has studied the bill probably a year is perfectly ridiculous. The gentleman, good lawyer that he is, knows that all that is needed and all that we are trying

to do today is to pass a law without leaving loopholes through which the guilty may escape.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make an orderly presentation of the case for H. R. 653.

Some years ago a New Jersey truck farmer made the mistake of thinking that this was a free country. He and his wife and sons had worked from planting time to harvest and had produced and gathered a crop of cauliflower. They contracted to deliver a truckload of cauliflower to the shipside at a New York pier ever so often. The first time they left home long before day. Upon arriving in New York City in the darkness before dawn they were stopped by goons who patiently explained to them that their idea of freedom was a myth; that Local 202 had exclusive jurisdiction of all deliveries of perishable products in New York City and that they would have to pay tribute to an escort before that truckload of cauliflower could be delivered to the shipside. The farmer and his two sons were not persuaded. They were free-born Americans and clung obstinately to their preconceived prejudice that the highways and streets were free to all. There being three of them and only four goons, they fought them off and drove on to the shipside. Upon arrival there, there were more than four to show them the error of their way. They still remonstrated and began to unload the hampers containing the cauliflower, so their truck, its load, and the farmer and his two sons were all thrown into the river. Police officers deserved and were given full credit for helping to save the father from drowning. No arrests were made. No prosecution followed.

Since this case the pattern has become more clearly delineated and standardized. All over the Nation this pattern has become manifest.

Farmer Brown is driving his own truck, properly licensed, and loaded with produce he had raised on his own farm. He is going to the Washington Market in New York City to deliver his farm products toward the sustenance of the teeming millions of that metropolis who are dependent upon him and thousands of other farmers for their daily food. As he emerges from Holland Tunnel, four "gentlemen" jump on his running boards. They demand $9.42. They have their answer ready for his resentful question "For what?" They explain to him patiently, and with the pained expression of a teacher talking to a stupid child, that no one but a member of Local 202 of the teamsters' union can deliver farm products in New York City. Farmer Brown may argue if he pleases; he may even drive to the Washington Market, but sooner or later he will find that he had better pay, and he does.

Had Farmer Brown driven his truck to Scranton, Pa., he would have been stopped on the bridge. The tribute levied would not have been quite so much—but then Scranton is a smaller city.

The Virginia variation of the racket was that his truck would have been stopped within a block of destination and the load transferred to a union truck which would then haul the load two or three hundred feet and make delivery to the consignee for a small consideration of $7.50.

Had Farmer Brown sent his load to market on the truck of one of his neighbors who owned a truck and hauled the produce of the neighborhood, he would have been stopped just the same; and, of course, if Farmer Brown's load moved to market on an over-the-road or commercial truck, the stoppage would have been even more gleeful.

Had Farmer Brown taken the precaution to employ a member of the teamsters' union to drive his truck to New York, it would have made no difference whatsoever for his membership would have been in some local in Pennsylvania or New Jersey and the jurisdiction over New York City is in Local 202.

Farmer Brown's name is legion. He is typical of the farmers all over the Nation. Whether his load be lemons, oranges, or asparagus from California, "Delicious" apples from the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington, Idaho potatoes, Minnesota beef cattle, miscellaneous fresh fruits and vegetables, or milk from the farms of Pennsylvania or New Jersey, the story is the same.

This story, in its essential details, was abundantly verified by the testimony of witnesses in the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary last year.

Please do not gain the impression that farmers are the only victims of racketeering.

Realizing as I do how busy each and every one of you ladies and gentlemen of the House are, I am afraid that many of you have not had the time to read the 429 pages of the hearings Subcommittee No. III of your Committee on the Judiciary held on the precursors of the pending bill, simultaneously with two other bills, a year ago. I sincerely wish that each of you had read the printed booklet in which those hearings are set forth. I wish that I had time now to read them to you. But this is just as impossible as for you to find time from your pressing and manifold duties to read them for yourselves. So I will read a few excerpts from the testimony of Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, beginning on page 365:

Now, these things are going on. Let me read a letter which I took from the files of the section of law enforcement of the Bureau of Motor Carriers. This is a copy of a letter which was written by the Sanitary Co. of America to the Department of Justice, and it is rather interesting.

The letter referred to is as follows:

"APRIL 2, 1942.

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"Washington, D. C.

"GENTLEMEN: On March 31, we made a delivery of 893 lengths of pipe to pier 8, East River, New York City. This material was for export to the War Department, and carried a priority of A–1–C.

"When the trucks arrived at the pier, they were stopped by union men, and advised that they could not unload the trucks on the pier unless union men were placed on the trucks.

"To do the unloading they asked $17.35 for each truck, and since there were two trucks, the total cost would have been $34.70. However, after considerable argument, the owner of the trucks, Mr. Edgar Nettles, Limerick, Pa., persuaded them to unload the two trucks at a total cost of $17.35, for which amount he received the following receipt:

"'MARCH 31, 1942.

"'Received for driver and helper, $17.35 for one truck at pier 8, East River.

"'Driver ---------- $10.27
"'Helper ---------- 7.09

"'H. HYMAN.

"'Local 807—105–127894—Ledger 4899.
"'C. Romano—112058080—7361—Ledger.'

"Our carriers have been stopped repeatedly, especially at the piers in New York City, and have been forced to pay various amounts to have their trucks unloaded.

"These union men will recognize men of no other union, nor will they allow any drivers to join their local union in New York City.

"They are seemingly interested in nothing except a collection of various amounts from truckers from out-of-State points making deliveries in New York City.

"In one instance, the driver of the truck was a member of an American Federation of Labor drivers' union; when he arrived at the docks, he was also forced to pay, because they would not recognize his union.

"As this condition is making the cost of transportation to New York City prohibitive, and since the carriers are operating under rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we feel that this is nothing more than a hold-up, and is absolutely wrong in every respect.

"These hold-up men in New York City state that the Government has recognized their union, and that they have a perfect right to make these charges. We do not doubt that the Government has recognized their union the same as any other union, but we doubt very much whether the Government would sanction the assessment of such charges for the unloading of a truckload of material.

"We are, therefore, asking to have an opinion from you, as to what can be done to do away with these additional charges. If this thing continues, it will be absolutely impossible for our company to make any deliveries to New York City, as our company works under the ceiling price as established by the Office of Price Administration, and cannot afford to pay these charges, nor can the trucking company.

"We, therefore, anxiously await your reply.

"Very truly yours,
"SANITARY COMPANY OF AMERICA,
"H. D. RITTER, *President*.

"CC: Interstate Commerce Commission,
"Senator Davis,
"War Production Board,
"Office of Price Administration.

That is an illustration of complaints which, during the past several years, have been brought to the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As I have said, during the past several years literally hundreds of such complaints have been made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, arising in such places as New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, and several others.

While no one has had the temerity to attempt to justify such practices, a few have contended that these practices have ceased. So let me give you a few instances which occurred in 1943:

A citizen of New Jersey was moving into the city of New York. One truckload of furniture had to be moved from New Jersey to New York. The citizen and owner of the furniture thought he was wise. A neighbor who owned a truck but who was not a member of the teamsters' union would have hauled the load and

delivered the furniture for half the amount a union trucker, the owner and driver of which was a member of the teamsters' union in New Jersey, required. The union man fixed his price at $30. But the citizen, who had heard of the hold-ups at the New York mouth of Holland Tunnel, decided that it would be best to employ the union man, driving the union truck, to haul his furniture. He paid the $30. But at the New York mouth of Holland Tunnel, this union truck was stopped by four goons who represented themselves to be members of Local 807—the local union having exclusive jurisdiction in New York City over nonperishable loads. The union owner and driver pulled out his union card and showed them that he was a member of the same national union to which the hold-up men claimed to belong. But the goons explained that he was a member of a local in New Jersey and had no authority to invade their exclusive province, since he was not also a member of Local 807. He remonstrated. He begged. He explained that it would hurt his business as a union man, getting more pay than "scabs" received. The only good accomplished was that a compromise was reached and he was allowed to proceed for a payment of $7 instead of the usual "take."

Information is to the effect that all railway-freight deliveries in New York City are covered by the same pattern of racketeering. The Chelsea Piers in New York City are also reputedly under the ban. It is further said that all deliveries to steamship and railway piers in New York City are paying tribute.

One of them reports that his truck driver on one trip got as far as the dock and was unloading when the goon squad caught him. They demanded their usual $9.42 exaction. The driver appealed to a policeman who was there and had heard the demand and seen the "hold-up." The police officer's reply was significant, and speaks volume: "You heard what he said." So, under police supervision and approval, the extortion was consummated!

Hundreds of truck growers in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, seeking to deliver their fresh fruits and vegetables in New York City in February and March, were victims of the same racket.

In February a critical piece of war equipment, consigned for delivery in New York City, was so important and so complex that the manufacturers thought it necessary to send with the truck an expert crew of riggers to unload and to erect the machine. All of these riggers were labor union members. This shipment was destined for delivery to the United States Navy. All this was explained to the goons, who held up this truck and demanded the usual money payment. In vain did the union riggers protest that unskilled men could not safely unload this equipment. They contended that it must be done by those who were familiar with the manufacture of this machinery and that that was why they had been sent to do the job. They were not allowed to proceed. The argument proceeded, nothing else did. During the argument, one of the men on the truck slipped away to a telephone and called the Navy. Immediately a truckload of armed Navy guards came to the scene, rescued the truck and escorted it to destination. No money was paid to the goons.

A load of steel bars from a factory in Pennsylvania was dispatched with instructions to stop at Newark, N. J., deliver two of the bars there, and then proceed to New York for delivery of the remainder of the load. The novel feature of this case is that this load was stopped both at Newark and at the New York end of Holland Tunnel and a regular payment exacted at each place.

In all of these cases, fear compelled the informants to stipulate that their names and addresses be not disclosed. But Hon. John G. Cooper, of Youngstown, Ohio, writes a letter which he authorizes me to use. I quote:

Recently I read in the papers that a bill which you are sponsoring, relative to the movement of trucks engaged in interstate commerce, has been favorably reported out of the House Judiciary Committee.

I have not read the bill, therefore I am not informed as to the exact provisions of same. I do, however, trust the members of your committee and the House will carefully consider the question of interstate truck traffic being stopped and delayed at city and State lines until another driver is taken on, or a certain amount of money is paid before the truck can proceed to its unloading point and return to the city or State line.

I, with thousands of other citizens, consider this action of delaying interstate truck traffic a low-down racket. Let us keep in mind that almost 100 percent of the regular drivers of these interstate trucks are members of the Truckdrivers' Union, so it is not a question of placing a union driver on the truck, for there is one there.

I am aware that the Supreme Court has passed on this question. I do hope, however, that when the measure is considered by the House you will try to find some way to wipe out the racket I mention. It is un-American and has no right to exist in our country.

As you may know, I was a Member of the House for 22 consecutive years, retiring (not voluntarily) in January, 1937. I have always been a friend and supporter of organized labor, and can see the necessity for labor to organize and unite to improve working conditions and wages. For 17 years I was in the employ of the Pennsylvania Railroad as locomotive engineer. In the year 1914 I stepped from the locomotive cab into Congress and was proud of my membership in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. During my service in the House I fought many a hard battle in behalf of labor, as may be verified by some of the older Members of the House who were there during my service.

For 20 years I was assigned a place on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I assisted in reporting and passing the bill in 1934 which provided that interstate truck and bus traffic should be under the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For the past 6 years I have been assigned to a position as a member of the claims board, Ohio Industrial Commission, which passes on industrial injury claims. Recently this board had before it for consideration an injury claim filed by an employee (truck driver) of an Akron, Ohio, transportation company operating under a permit issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission to engage in interstate traffic. The driver in question was operating a truck from Akron to New York City. He stopped at the New York City line to take on a driver, which he was compelled to do, in order to drive his load to its destination. A New York member of the teamsters' union boarded the truck in an intoxicated condition, or, in plain words, he was drunk. The Ohio driver protested against this man taking the truck into the city. According to the record on file there was quite an argument between the regular driver and the drunk, who wanted to operate the truck. Finally he was taken off the truck by some of his fellow workmen and another driver was put on to take the truck to the unloading point and return it to the city line on the way back to Ohio. As he arrived at the city line the drunken driver who was put off the truck when going in waited for the Akron driver to return and made a vicious assault on him to the extent that the claimant required prompt medical and hospital attention, and he was unable to work for some time after.

Our Board allowed this claim as a compensable injury, sustained during the course of and arising out of claimant's employment, but that is not all. The Akron employer, through his premium which he paid to the State fund, had to pay medical, hospital bills, and compensation for lost time.

This statement I make is a matter of record with the Ohio Industrial Commission. This assault case is not by itself. In Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and other States similar assaults and rackets are being carried on by a vicious element of racketeers under the guise of organized labor. It is this condition which is arousing the law-abiding people of our country and they are demanding that Congress take action to stop it.

Knowing that the majority of the American working men and women affiliated with organized labor are honest, loyal, and patriotic, they want to clean out the scum and criminals who have slithered their slimy forms into their ranks.

Laborers, organized workers, businessmen and employees, and other citizens are looking to Congress to drive out the racketeers who, under the guise of organized labor, are a menace to our country and the decent, law-abiding working classes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. COOPER.
Youngstown, Ohio.

FEBRUARY 1, 1943.

So much for the types of racketeering covered by title I.

Title II covers a somewhat different field. Its life is limited to the duration of the war. It is in substance a reenactment of the law passed for World War No. 1, that expired with the armistice in 1918. The coverage of title II is broader than the former act because Congress has expanded the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1918. During World War No. 1 the Commission had jurisdiction over railways alone. Now it has jurisdiction over highways, waterways, and airways as well. To keep all streams of interstate commerce flowing freely and uninterruptedly during the war is essential to our war effort. Therefore, the coverage of title II has been extended to include interstate and foreign commerce by highway, waterway, and air as well as by rail.

The great railway brotherhoods contend that the enactment of title II is utterly unnecessary because the loyalty and devotion of their members and the splendid transportation record of service they have rendered so demonstrates.

With all of these premises from which they argue we are in hearty accord. The

Railway Brotherhoods are made up of men of character, loyalty, and devotion who have rendered outstanding and splendid service in this the greatest crisis the Nation has ever known. But this does not mean that title II is unnecessary. The overwhelming majority of members of Railway Brotherhoods are as good citizens as this or any other country has. But there is said to be at least one black sheep in every flock. The ninety and nine law-abiding, patriotic citizens in their membership certainly have nothing to fear from this or any other criminal law. These ninety and nine do not wish the hundredth to go unpunished if he should commit a crime, and his guilt is proven beyond all reasonable doubt as the law requires. Title II of this bill gives the Railway Brotherhoods infinitely less cause for complaint than did the World War No. 1 Act. That act covered the railways alone, whereas title II of this act covers also transportation by air, water, and highway. There was no complaint of unfair administration or enforcement of the World War No. 1 Act, nor do the Railway Brotherhoods contend that they were cramped or hampered thereby; neither will they be by anything in this law.

One illustration is sufficient to demonstrate one of the pressing needs for the enactment of title II. The Office of Defense Transportation was created—

To assure maximum utilization of the domestic transportation facilities of the Nation for the successful prosecution of the war.

In pursuance of this purpose the O. D. T. knew full well that tires and trucks must be conserved and that to do so there must be no overloading of trucks so that tires might be injured. O. D. T. engineers conferred with engineers of the manufacturers of tires and trucks. They found that a truck of rated or registered capacity could safely be loaded—in accordance with the conservation ideal—greatly beyond its rated or registered capacity. They found that the reason underlying the low-capacity rating was that the manufacturers wished to have an abundant margin of safety for their products and as the public was paying the bills, they made this margin of safety large. So the O. D. T. prescribed the load tonnage which would not overburden the tires or the truck and yet would with safety assure maximum utilization of the domestic transportation facilities of the Nation for the successful prosecution of the war insofar as trucks were concerned. Their figures were in substantial accord with the load limits fixed by the laws of the several States. But nine local unions, covering a substantial portion of New England, banded themselves together in the creation of a Fair Trade Practice Board and promulgated an order of their own, limiting loads to the registered capacity of any truck. These local unions, located at New Bedford, Worcester, Providence, Springfield, Bridgeport, and New Haven, Fall River, Brockton, Hartford, and Waterbury, proclaimed the most patriotic purpose:

To conserve rubber tires, gasoline, and truck equipment and to aid the war effort and not to obstruct it.

They limited speed to 35 miles per hour anywhere, or less where local limits so prescribed. There was and is no law authorizing any such action by these or any other local unions. No vestige of legal authority existed or exists for them to enforce compliance with their regulations nor to sit in judgment on alleged violators, nor to fine or assess anyone. But this lack of legal authority did not and does not prevent them from usurping so much of the jurisdiction of the courts of the land as would enable them to try, convict, and fine the owners of trucks loaded above the limit prescribed by these local unions, although well below the limits fixed by State law and by the order of O. D. T.

Let me read you a letter from the Fair Trade Practice Board under date of March 24, 1943:

291 SOUTH MAIN STREET,
SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., *March 24, 1943.*
HARTFORD TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.,
1 Wawarne Avenue, Hartford, Conn.
Re: Fair Trade Practice Board, No. 394, Hartford Local 671 versus Hartford Transportation Co., Inc.

GENTLEMEN: The board at yesterday's meeting took up for disposition the above-entitled case, heard on November 24, 1942, which involves Local 671's charges against you for overloading 8,670 pounds, 6,540 pounds, and 1,680 pounds, as described in our summons of November 18, 1942, to you.

The board has found your company guilty as charged on all three counts and has assessed damages in the amounts of $49, $43, and $28 on the respective counts to nullify any and all advantages gained through the violations and to serve as a deterrent against any further violations.

The board has further ruled that these assessments, bill for which is enclosed, be paid within 10 days and hereby advised you that should you fail to comply within the time specified, all rights and benefits due your company under the contract will be automatically withdrawn.

Yours very truly,
FAIR TRADE PRACTICE BOARD,
CHESTER G. FITZPATRICK,
Secretary.
By LUCY A. ROBERTS,
Executive Secretary.
Enclose copy to Local 671.

Here follows the bill they enclosed:

291 SOUTH MAIN STREET,
SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., *March 24, 1943.*
HARTFORD TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.,
1 Wawarne Avenue, Hartford, Conn.:

Assessments for overloading

8,670	pounds	$49
6,540	pounds	43
1,680	pounds	28
		120

(FTPB No. 394.)

Next let me read you a letter from the Hartford Transportation Co., Inc.:

HARTFORD TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.
REFRIGERATED SERVICE OVERNIGHT
Telephone 208086
HARTFORD, CONN., *November 20, 1942.*
Mr. JOHN ROGERS,
Division of Motor Transport,
Office of Defense Transportation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer has read your letter dated October 31 which had reference to bulletin No. 34 issued on October 5, 1942, by the fair trade practice board of the trucking industry of New England.

Under date of November 12 I wrote to Mr. John F. Maerz, supervisor of the Hartford district of the Office of Defense Transportation, copy of which I am hereto attaching. I have communicated with him today, and he advised me to forward directly to your attention a copy of a letter received from the fair trade practice board which, I believe, is self-explanatory.

As you will notice from the enclosed document, we are summoned to appear before the Board on Tuesday, November 24. I might call your attention to the fact that article No. 1 designated in their letter showing an overload of 8,670 pounds was a unit which consisted of a load of rifles destined to the New York pier for export, which boat was leaving the morning that this truck was ordered out. Article No. 3, showing an overload of 1,680 pounds, was a vehicle with scrap material which had been collected in the area and which was being sent to a smelting refinery in New Jersey. Article No. 2, which had an overload of 6,540 pounds, had a load of paper destined to a defense plant on a subcontract.

Under the circumstances, in our opinion, we feel we were not in violation of the Office of Defense Transportation orders but apparently had violated article VI of the union contract.

I am sending this directly to your attention for the sole purpose of determining what reaction, if any, the Office of Defense Transportation will take in this matter. No doubt, as a result of past hearings at the Board, the decision will be unanimously in favor of the local union, and we will be assessed exorbitant fines for overloading.

It would be greatly appreciated if a representative of the Office of Defense Transportation could be present at the Board hearing, which, no doubt, will involve other truckmen in the area, to give you complete further details of what will transpire.

Very truly yours,
HARTFORD TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.,
WM. E. O'NEIL, *Vice President.*

Next, please listen to this letter from the Fair Trade Practice Board to Wooster Express, Inc.:

FAIR TRADE PRACTICE BOARD
OF THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY,
291 South Main Street, P. O. Box 384,
SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., *March 24, 1943.*
WOOSTER EXPRESS, INC.,
Hartford, Conn.
Re: Fair Trade Practice Board No. 395, Hartford Local 671 versus Wooster Express, Inc.

GENTLEMEN. The board at yesterday's meeting took up for disposition the above-entitled case, heard on November 24, 1942, which involves Local 671's charges against you for overloading two trucks in the amounts of 1,680 pounds and 1,210 pounds, as described in our summons of November 18, 1942.

The board has found your company guilty as charged on both counts and has assessed damages of $28 on each count to nullify any and all advantages gained through the violations and to serve as a deterrent against any further violations.

The board has further ruled that these assessments, bill for which is enclosed, be paid within 10 days and hereby advises you that should you fail to comply with the above order within the time specified all rights and benefits due your company under the contract will be automatically withdrawn.

Yours very truly,
FAIR TRADE PRACTICE BOARD,
CHESTER G. FITZPATRICK, *Secretary.*
By LUCY A. ROBERTS,
Executive Secretary.
Enclose copy to Local 671.

Copy of telegram sent to Washington on November 4, 1942:

THE LAUBE-INTERSTATE CORPORATION,
Waterbury, Conn.

JOHN L. ROGERS,
Division of Motor Transport,
Office of Defense Transportation,
Washington, D. C.:

Rudolph Tata, business agent of Waterbury Union, today stopped all our trucks in transit loaded with antiaircraft gun barrels, other Army, and Navy freight on orders of Fair Trade Practice Board. We were forced to pay him $137 in cash, no check, to have him order drivers to proceed. They claimed two trucks some weeks ago were loaded over their limit, but far under your orders. They assessed fines and so-called dues. Can this racket be stopped? We do not know whose orders to follow.

WM. LAUBE, Jr.

From these it will be seen that no matter how important to the successful prosecution of the war the loads carried by the arrested trucks may have been—whether rifles, antiaircraft gun barrels, or what not—interstate and foreign commerce were stopped and the owners of the trucks, who had violated no law of any State and no regulation of the O. D. T., and no other law, were compelled to pay the Fair Trade Practice Board fines or assessments because they had been adjudged guilty by a kangaroo court, set up by these local unions, of these local unions, and for these local unions, utterly without authority of law. Note also that the payments were required to be made under threat that the constituent local unions would breach their contracts with the truck owners and "all rights and benefits due your company under the contract will be automatically withdrawn."

This New England variation of wartime racketeering certainly seems outrageous and to cry to high heaven for immediate remedy.

This bill, if and when it becomes law, will take the place of the Antiracketeering Act of 1934, which the Supreme Court held in the Local 807 case did not cover highway robbery when committed by members of labor unions claiming to seek employment.

This bill is grounded on the bedrock principle that crime is crime, no matter who commits it; and that robbery is robbery and extortion extortion, whether or not the perpetrator has a union card. It covers whoever in any way or degree interferes with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion.

The facts of the Local 807 case are clear. Local 807, of International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers of America, and 26 of its members, were indicted, tried, and convicted in a district court of the United States in New York City for conspiring to violate the 1934 Federal Antiracketeering Act. They appealed to the circuit court of appeals. That court reversed the conviction, and the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that decision, on the ground that Congress had written into the 1934 Antiracketeering Act provisions excepting from punishment any person who—

obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion, * * * the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

The Supreme Court further wrote:

We have expressed our belief that Congress intended to leave unaffected the ordinary activities of labor unions. The proviso in section 6 safeguarding the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, although obscure indeed, strengthens us somewhat in that opinion. The test must therefore be whether the particular activity was among or is akin to labor-union activities with which Congress must be taken to have been familiar when this measure was enacted. Accepting payments even where services are refused is such an activity.

The majority opinion of the Supreme Court also says:

There was sufficient evidence to warrant a finding that the defendants conspired to use and did use violence and threats to obtain from the owners of these over-the-road trucks $9.42 for each large truck and $3.41 for each small truck entering the city.

But Chief Justice Stone, in his dissenting opinion, wrote:

Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Antirackteering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and, by beating or threats of beating the drivers, procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $3.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid, without rendering or offering to render any service.

Chief Justice Stone continues:

Unless the language of the statute is to be disregarded, one who has rejected the proffered service and pays money only in order to purchase immunity from violence is not a bona fide employer and is not paying the extorted money as wages. The character of what the drivers or owners did and intended to do—pay money to avoid a beating—was not altered by the willingness of the payee to accept as wages for services rendered what he in fact intentionally exacted from the driver or owner as the purchase price of immunity from assault, and what he intended so to exact whether the proffered services were accepted or not. It is no answer to say that the guilt of a defendant is personal and cannot be made to depend upon the acts and intention of another. Such an answer, if valid, would render common law robbery an innocent pastime. For there can be no robbery unless the purpose of the victim in handing over the money is to avoid force.

This bill is drawn in response to the challenge of the following quotation from the majority opinion:

This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control. Nor does it mean that they need go unpunished.

But do some say that the Local 807 case involved only one local union and 26 of its members and that the Nation should therefore ignore it?

The answer is that while that case was only one case and did relate to the hold-up of only a comparatively few trucks, there are literally hundreds of trucks that have been held up in New York City in one night; and New York is only one of many points where such racketeering flourishes. How can we hope to encourage honest men to work a full day for $9.42 if others get that as the fruit of a 10-minute robbery within the law? But even if the rank and file of Americans are too honest to be tempted by such easy money, and even if such cases were few, instead of many, what right has Uncle Sam to fail to do his duty, enjoined by the Constitution, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce? Are we to admit that our Nation is too weak or too fearful or too indifferent to make our highways free for lawful commerce? Is there any class above the law?

Wholly aside from these considerations, however, there is another of national importance. How are the teeming millions of our metropolitan areas to get food at reasonable prices—or in sufficient quantities—except through the unimpeded channels of interstate commerce? Milk does not grow in bottles. It comes from cows on farms. The markets and stores of every great city must be supplied not only with milk but also with fresh fruits and vegetables, meat, poultry, fish, butter, eggs, sugar, and salt.

Can a soldier shoot ammunition that is not passed through interstate or foreign commerce? Can he eat food that rots because of racketeering stoppages?

Title I is to be permanent legislation, operating both in war and in peace. Title II is to be effective only during the present war. Title I condemns only interference with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion. But during World War I Congress passed an act, approved by President Wilson, outlawing the willful interference, by physical force or intimidation by threats of physical force, with the orderly transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, or the orderly make-up, movement, or disposition of any train, locomotive, car, or other vehicle on any railroad or elsewhere in the United States in interstate or foreign commerce. This old law, which expired with the armistice in 1918, is proposed to be reenacted for the period of the present war, with its coverage extended to include the other forms of transportation by highway vehicles, airplanes, and vessels, in accordance with the expanded jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, suggested that this be done, and submitted a draft of such additional provisions. He cited a number of cases evidencing the need for such legislation. His suggestion was adopted, and his draft is now title II of the pending bill.

STATES' RIGHTS

The specious argument used against this bill that its enactment would invade the province of the rights of the States is absurd. The sole and single purpose of this bill is to keep the stream of interstate and foreign commerce flowing free. No State has had the right to protect or regulate interstate or foreign commerce, since that right was granted by the States

to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States adopted in 1787.

It has been, therefore, the exclusive right and concomitant duty of Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce ever since 1787. No State has any right in this field. The fact that the interference with interstate or foreign commerce condemned by this bill is only such interference as is perpetrated by robbery or extortion, which crimes, per se, are condemned and punishable by State law, does not render the pending bill in any sense a duplication. The crimes of robbery and extortion are condemned and punishable by State law. The crime of interfering with interstate or foreign commerce is condemned and punishable by the pending bill, and it is stipulated that such interference, to be punishable under this bill, must be of so heinous a character as to come within the definitions of robbery or extortion. So the States' rights argument is just another smoke screen.

PUNISHMENT

Another opposition argument frequently employed is that the punishment prescribed in this bill is too severe. The answer is that the crimes of robbery and extortion are not trivial. They are major felonies, heinous offenses. Only when the interference with interstate commerce, condemned by this bill, is accomplished by means so criminal as to be within the definitions of robbery and extortion is any punishment stipulated. But the argument that the punishment prescribed is too severe ignores the fact that it is only the maximum. Any punishment less than this maximum may be imposed by the court. A fine of 1 cent or a sentence of 1 minute in jail is just as much a punishment under the provisions of this bill as is the maximum. This bill simply enables the court that heard the evidence and knows the details of each case to make the punishment fit the crime. It is interesting to note, however, that a number of States have fixed the maximum punishment for robbery at death. The maximum fixed in this bill is about the average. Take New York, for instance. The definition of robbery contained in this bill is substantially copied from the New York statute. Yet New York has fixed the minimum punishment for first-degree robbery at 10 years and the maximum punishment at 30 years. This bill contains no minimum punishment and fixes the maximum midway between the two New York limits.

ANTILABOR

Many of the enemies of this bill claim that they are fighting it not because of its provisions but because the provisions might be misconstrued by a biased court, so as to punish legitimate activities of organized labor. Last year when the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary was holding hearings on the precursor of this bill that argument was made so often and so earnestly that the question was asked if the then bill should be amended so as to outlaw only interference with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion, if that would meet this objection. The answer was an emphatic "yes." The pending bill, H. R. 653, is that amendment. It does limit the field of its condemnation to interference with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion. But still the opposition on this alleged ground persists.

It is also urged that the author of the bill is a labor hater. But, unfortunately for those who make this charge, the record of the author makes this accusation absurd. As a practicing attorney, he never represented any public utility corporation. For the more than 20 years of his practice of his profession he always represented the other side, including labor unions. Since he has been in Congress he has supported many prolabor bills, such as the Wagner National Labor Relations Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. In truth and in fact, he and the vast majority of the supporters of this bill are real friends of labor and believe sincerely that they are rendering a valuable service to the people of the United States, including the members of organized labor, in pressing for the passage of this bill.

Let me read you a letter from a fine, honest Alabaman who had wired me a protest against this bill:

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS, LOCAL UNION NO. 1371,
Gadsden, Ala., March 23, 1943.

Hon. SAM HOBBS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOBBS: Thank you for your letter and the copy of your amendment, H. R. 653.

A number of the men in our local requested me to write you in regard to your amendment and protest against its passage. Since reading your amendment I can only say that I am heartily in favor of it and feel sure our members will take this same stand. They are too ready to jump to conclusions and condemn something which, in reality, they know nothing about.

I have voted in your district for a number of years and supported your campaign for Congress. You have always been honest, fair toward labor in general, and believed in the square deal to everyone. For this reason, it was hard for me to understand how you could do anything openly to hurt labor. Thank you for clearing up this matter and let me assure you I am for your bill and hope it is passed immediately.

Sincerely yours,

OSMOND E. STEWART,
Business Agent, Carpenters' Local No. 1371.

In conclusion, please let me reiterate as positively as possible that I resent the implication that robbery and extortion are legitimate bona fide activities of labor unions. They are not. And may I also reiterate the question I have so often put to labor leaders fighting this bill, If members of organized labor are not guilty how can this bill hurt them? Echo answers: "How?"

Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

This is the sole question at issue today. If we are determined that the highways and city streets of the United States must be freed and kept free of racketeers, we will pass this bill. If we have wishbones where backbones should be, we will shrug our shoulders and say: "Let George do it."

But no attempt to pass the buck can relieve us of our duty under the Constitution to protect interstate and foreign commerce from unlawful interference.

Like Elijah on Mount Carmel, I solemnly adjure and challenge you:

How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired, all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An Act to Protect Trade and Commerce Against Interference by Violence, Threats, Coercion, or Intimidation," approved June 18, 1934 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 420a–420e), be, and it is hereby amended to read as follows:

TITLE I

"SEC. 1. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'commerce' means (1) commerce between any point in a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and any point outside thereof, or between points within the same State, Territory, or the District of Columbia but through any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory, and (3) all other commerce over which the United States has jurisdiction; and the term 'Territory' means any Territory or possession of the United States.

"(b) The term 'robbery' means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

"(c) The term 'extortion' means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

"SEC. 2. Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the preparation of any article or commodity for commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 3. Whoever conspires with another or with others, or acts in concert with another or with others to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 4. Whoever attempts or participates in an attempt to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 5. Whoever commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 6. Whoever violates any section of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 20 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. Any person or persons who shall, during the war in which the United States is now engaged, knowingly and willfully, by physical force or intimidation by threats of physical force, obstruct or retard, or aid in obstructing or retarding, or attempt to obstruct or retard, the orderly transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, or the orderly make-up, movement, or disposition of any train, railway or highway vehicle,

airplane, or vessel, on any railroad, street, highway, airway, or waterway, or elsewhere in the United States, which is engaged in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both such fine and imprisonment; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment the public interest requires, to employ the armed forces of the United States to prevent or remove any such obstruction to or retardation of the passage of the mail, or the orderly transportation or movement of interstate or foreign commerce, or the transportation of troops, munitions, or war supplies in any part of the United States whether by air, motor, rail, express, water, or otherwise: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect either section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, or an act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932, or an act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or an act entitled 'An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1935. For the purpose of this paragraph the United States shall be deemed to include all Territories and possessions of the United States."

With the following committee amendment in the bill:

On page 2, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "or the preparation of any article or commodity for commerce."

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BALDWIN of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. This motion is offered in deep sincerity.

I am opposed to this bill for several reasons, none of them technical. I appreciate and understand the convictions of many of the Members that we must stop robbery and extortion and permit the free movement of interstate and foreign commerce. Anybody who would here argue to the contrary would be out of his mind, in my opinion. I do not, however, believe that we are correcting anything that was wrong in the existing law passed in 1934. It is my personal opinion that the opinion of Mr. Justice Byrnes and the majority of the Supreme Court, rendered in the case against Local 807, which occurred in my own city and State, was a political opinion and that you are not going to change political opinions from the Supreme Court when you change the law. The only thing you will accomplish, in my opinion, will be to put upon labor that is not doing these extraordinary things an onus and a sense of guilt that should not be put there these days. Member after Member who has spoken in favor of this bill has pointed out that decent labor does not want robbery and extortion.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Certainly.

Mr. WALTER. If the Supreme Court renders a decision that in the judgment of Congress is erroneous, how can the decision be corrected if not by legislation?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The Supreme Court can reverse its decision; cases can be brought again. I am going to come in a moment to what I consider to be the real purpose of this bill, which is to stop robbery and extortion. After all, as far as I know, in every State of this Union, and certainly in my State, there are local laws that will take care of robbery and extortion.

Unfortunately and in perfectly good faith, the parties concerned in this particular case brought the action under the Federal law which they thought would cover it and which, in my opinion, did cover it. The Supreme Court decided otherwise in a political decision.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. They told us in the hearings before the subcommittee that they had complained and complained to the local authorities, but that nothing was done and that was why they went to the Federal law.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, we do not always have the same government of the city of New York.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Certainly.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman will testify that they elected their present Governor of New York because of his fight against racketeering in that State and because he put a lot of racketeers out of business.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Certainly, Mr. Chairman; and I will further testify that I am convinced that the present Governor of New York will not permit racketeering in interstate commerce, robbery, or extortion wherever it affects the State of New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. But the Governor of the State of New York could have prevented this when these cases arose, but he did not do it.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get into a political discussion; I do not think any of us want to; we have our own opinions on these things.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman feel that Congress is under any obligation to protect interstate commerce?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Certainly I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman over on the other side who spoke about the district attorney in New York remembers recent history, he will recall that when Governor Lehman went out and Lieutenant Governor Poletti became Governor, he turned those racketeers that Dewey had sent to prison out. Has he forgotten that?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I think the gentleman from Michigan is correct, but I do not want to get into a political discussion.

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, this law seeks to do three things: One, correct a misconception by the Supreme Court, and I do not think it will do that because the Supreme Court will continue to write political opinions. That is my personal conviction. Two, it tries to stop robbery and extortion, and that can be stopped legally in every State that I know of. If there are some that do not have laws on robbery and extortion I should think they would get them. And three, it talks about the protection of troops and trucks of the Army and mails and so forth. Everybody here knows that the Executive has the power to protect the movement of troops and mail or military supply trucks. This bill, whether amended or not, does only one thing. It unjustly points the finger of congressional suspicion at American organized labor, a group in our country which has within itself corrected the evils complained of, and which in my opinion has contributed as much as any other group in the community to the successful prosecution of the war. I earnestly hope this bill will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN]?

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a committee amendment pending which the Clerk will again report, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 22, after the word "commerce", strike out the remainder of the line and the words "or commodity for commerce" in line 23.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, which is merely a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: On page 1, line 5, after the first parenthesis and before "U. S. C." insert "48 Stat. 979;".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 4, beginning in line 15, after the word "otherwise", strike out the colon and all after the proviso down through and

including "1935" on page 5, line 4, and insert after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect either section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, or an act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932, or an act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or an act entitled 'An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1935."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Is it in order now to offer the so-called Celler substitute at this juncture?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER, of New York, as a substitute to committee amendment: On page 4, line 15, after the word "otherwise", strike out the colon and all of the proviso down through and including "1935" on page 5, in line 4, and insert after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III

"That no acts, conduct, or activities which are lawful under section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, or under an act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932, or under an act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or under an act entitled 'An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1935, shall constitute a violation of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. Gladly.

Mr. MICHENER. The amendment just read is what is known as the Celler amendment. Is it exactly the same amendment as was before the Judiciary Committee and included in the committee print?

Mr. CELLER. It is.

Mr. MICHENER. I ask this question because last night in our colloquy there was some misunderstanding. I want to be sure that I understood correctly.

Mr. CELLER. I understand you asked whether or not words had been eliminated from the committee print, or stricken out. My amendment was added to the so-called committee print in italics.

The difference between my amendment and the committee amendment is this: The committee amendment simply states that the so-called Hobbs bill in its entirety shall not modify or repeal the so-called Railway Labor Act, the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, or the National Labor Relations Act. You might as well just say that the Hobbs bill does not affect or repeal the National Tariff Act, or it does not affect or repeal the White Slave Act or the Income Tax Act.

My amendment embraces within the purview of the Hobbs bill all lawful acts and activities and conduct of tradeunions that have been made lawful under these four enumerated acts. It would preserve all legitimate labor activities. It would not place any approval upon racketeering or robbery or extortion or any conduct that the local teamsters' union was guilty of in New York City.

Fear was expressed that what was done by the teamsters in New York, which was made lawful by the Justice Byrnes decision, would be made lawful by my amendment. That is not true. If you examine carefully the Justice Byrnes decision, you will see that it turns primarily on the significant words which are contained in section 3 (b) of the old Copeland Antiracketeering Act:

The terms "property," "money," or "valuable considerations" used herein shall not be deemed to include wages paid by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

Justice Byrnes erroneously decreed that the payment of money, which to my mind was protection money, was in that case a legitimate and sanctioned activity under the Copeland Antiracketeering Act and set up a relationship between employer and employee in a bona fide manner. My amendment, since it does not contain such language, and since the Hobbs bill now contains no such language, would not by any wildest stretch of the imagination permit a recurrence of that which happened by virtue of the activities of the Teamsters Union. Nay, more such activity would be banned and branded unlawful as it rightfully should.

What would happen if you did not accept my amendment and instead accepted the committee amendment? Let us say a man is indicted under the Hobbs bill as amended by the committee amendment. He might plead, "What I did was excepted and made legal by a number of Supreme Court decisions, under, say, the Clayton Act, for example." The judge might reply, "No; you are indicted under the Hobbs Act, which does not embrace within its purview the Clayton Act and the exceptions under the Clayton Act as defined by judicial interpretations. Therefore, I cannot accept your plea." The striker, or worker picketing or boycotting, would be held guilty. The exceptions under the Clayton Act as enunciated by these long lines of Supreme Court decisions are not part of the Hobbs Act, the judge would say. "You are indicted under the Hobbs Act. If you were indicted under the Clayton Act, your contention would be sound."

For that reason, I say to the members of this Committee that you must accept my amendment if you want to protect labor in its honest endeavors, in its lawful, traditional activities such as collective bargaining, strike, picket, or boycott.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, almost any crime may be committed while the perpetrator is engaged in otherwise lawful acts, conduct or activities.

To snatch a child from the path of an onrushing automobile is not only lawful, but praiseworthy in the highest degree. But suppose that, while so engaged, the rescuer recognizes the child as one that he had planned to kidnap, and then does so. Would he be innocent of kidnaping?

Because a man is engaged in the perfectly lawful conduct of striking, is he guiltless if he commits rape?

Picketing is lawful. But does that mean that a picket cannot be punished for stealing?

The right of collective bargaining is guaranteed by law. Does that give collective bargainers the right to murder?

These questions answer themselves.

Therein is the trick or joker in the Celler amendment.

Honestly and peaceably seeking employment is not only lawful, but commendable. However, it is equally lawful for the one from whom employment is sought to refuse it. Does any sane and reasonable man contend that the lawful right honestly and peaceably to seek employment gives the seeker the right to force employment or to beat the refuser?

The Celler amendment says "No acts, conduct, or activities which are lawful under" the four major labor relations laws—Clayton Antitrust Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act, Railway Labor Act, and National Labor Relations Act—"shall constitute a violation of this act." It wholly omits to require, as do these acts to which it refers, that the "acts, conduct, or activities which are lawful" must be done lawfully and peacefully, and that no crime be committed while doing otherwise lawful acts.

The committee amendment refers to the same four major labor relations laws and guarantees, as does the bill without the amendment, every right granted in them; but it does not grant the right to do a lawful act in an unlawful way, nor the right to commit crime under color of legality.

In vain in the sight of the bird, is the snare of the fowler displayed.

Organized labor was born and has grown great, strong, rich, and almost omnipotent under State and Federal laws condemning robbery, extortion, murder, manslaughter, assaults, rape, larceny, and arson, with never a claim until 1934 that any right of labor was impinged or jeopardized by any one of them.

Why does labor now seek to make itself above the law that applies to all others? Is there any reason why labor should be granted immunity from the penalties of the criminal law? Unless crime be committed, no one can be hurt by any criminal law. "The guilty flee when no man pursueth." If labor is innocent, how can this bill hurt them? If guilty, why should they be the only class seeking immunity?

The answer to these questions is clear. The vast majority of the men of labor are as good citizens as America boasts. They ask no unfair favors or advantages. They are law abiding and have nothing to fear. But clients of lawyers sometimes commit crime. A few good men are misled into following bad advice.

I submit that for these reasons the Celler amendment is dangerous, especially in view of the decision in the Local 807 case, which held that no matter how much violence might accompany a request for employment it was all right and you are perfectly innocent under the antiracketeering law. The same thing is true here. No matter what may be said about the Celler amendment, it still does not require, as do the acts to which it points, that lawful acts, conduct, or activities must be done in a lawful and peaceful way. Without that or something like that the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Celler amendment. I shall try to take up where I stopped when I talked in general debate upon the bill. About that time I stated that if the Celler amendment was adopted it would have the effect of destroying the bill, and we would be legislating just a piece of paper that would not amount to anything. In other words, we go up the hill and come down the hill. As we boys from the country used to say when our means of conveyance was a horse and saddle or a horse and buggy, we would give the horse a bundle of oats but would tie it so high that he could not reach it. If the Celler amendment is adopted, it would place racketeering in the same position it was in prior to the decision of the Supreme Court. All lawyers know that when the highest court in the land passes on the legal question and writes a decision upon it, that that decision becomes a part of the law. It is what is known as case law. The Supreme Court has written an opinion exempting members of labor unions on the authority of paragraph 6 of the act of 1934, which reads substantially in effect as the Celler amendment. It reads:

Provided, That no court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States.

Now, if you adopt the Celler amendment you not only adopt that construction of existing laws at that time but you are going further, and you are adopting the construction placed upon that act by the Supreme Court of the United States. You are tying the hands of the court in the future in passing on this question, because if you do that, they may say that the opinion of Mr. Justice Byrnes was ill-advised and, although we believe that Mr. Justice Byrnes in that decision was in error and it is wrong, yet it is substantiated now by the legislative sanction of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it will place us in a much worse position than we were before. In other words, it will turn those racketeers loose who have been condemned by the union themselves, and they have said that they have stopped it, and there is no need for the law. Then, why did they stop it? As I said, it is a plea of confession and avoidance. "If it is wrong, but we have stopped it," and "we do not need legislation which will prevent the wrong hereafter." It will be a club to fight law and order with if the Celler amendment is adopted. There is no doubt about that. Ask any lawyer and he will tell you so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Celler amendment. The author of the amendment is opposed to the bill. He filed minority views. Unable to defeat the bill, he would nullify it.

LEGAL RIGHTS

I recall that in December, following Pearl Harbor, representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations assembled in Washington. They announced to the American people that they had agreed there would be no strikes for the duration. Some time thereafter there was a strike out on the Pacific coast in the Kaiser shipyards. One hundred thousand employees and $3,000,000 in annual dues were involved. It was a contest between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. The public was surprised. There was a jurisdictional strike. An appeal was made to the National Labor Relations Board. It was asserted that rights of collective bargaining guaranteed by the Wagner Act were involved. That strike brought to light something that had not been announced by those two labor organizations in December. They had said there would be no more strikes. They said they had entered into an agreement that in the event they were not able to settle jurisdictional disputes they would refer matters to arbitration. They were unable to settle this dispute in the Kaiser shipyards. They resorted to the Wagner Act. Then came to light a clause in the contract in which they had agreed to arbitrate, of which the public was not advised at the time the statement or promise was made that there would be no more strikes for the duration. In that agreement there was a clause to the effect substantially: "Provided, nothing herein shall interfere with the rights of labor." Their rights are guaranteed under the Wagner Act. The proposed Celler amendment might as well say: "Provided, nothing herein shall interfere with the rights of gangsters and racketeering robbers." The least that the House of Representatives can do in the face of continued absenteeism, in the face of jurisdictional strikes, in the face of continued delays in production and in face of repeated labor racketeering is to pass the pending measure, as a gesture to correct labor abuses and especially to correct a mistake in the law, which Congress was invited by the Supreme Court of the United States in the New York teamster case to correct, and to correct the statute under which those escaping punishment under alleged defective statutes whose acts have never been condoned or approved by a single Member on the floor of this House during this debate or by any citizen of the United States, can be convicted and punished. Among the rights of labor in the National Labor Relations Act is that any union can raise a question of collective bargaining and a question of jurisdiction. While announcing to the country there would be no strikes, by this secret clause the policy of no strikes was nullified. The passage of the Celler amendment, I repeat, would nullify the pending bill to punish racketeering and gangsterism by labor unions. The Celler amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

THE PURPOSE

I extend to say that the primary purpose of this bill is to prevent interference with interstate commerce by robbery or coercion as defined in the bill. It is an amendment of the existing Antiracketeering Act passed in 1934. This act was passed to eliminate racketeering in relation to Interstate Commerce. It is of interest to the Nation as a whole. The act came under the examination of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent case of The United States against Local No. 807. The opinion in this case was rendered by Mr. Justice Byrnes. There was a dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Stone. For my part I agree with Chief Justice Stone. The real purpose of the bill is to remove any doubt about the interpretation of the act by the Chief Justice being correct. The case involved members of a local union who were convicted of violating the Anti-Racketeering Act.

There can be no question that under the Constitution, Congress has the exclusive regulation of interstate commerce. It is the duty of Congress to protect interstate commerce in the interest of all the people. At the same time it is the duty of Congress to see that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States. The bill would outlaw criminal interference with interstate commerce. Title II of the bill has to do with the obstruction of transportation during the war. It is recommended by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, Joseph B. Eastman.

ORGANIZED LABOR

It is maintained that the Hobbs bill is an attack on organized labor. There is no ground for such contention. It was

not intended that labor unions would engage in the practices of gangsters or terroristic activities, but in the New York case union teamsters did engage in such practices. The purpose of the bill is to prevent a repetition of the criminal terroristic activities of racketeers, whether they are members of unions or not. They are not to be relieved because they are members of unions. They cannot hide behind the cloak of organized labor if they engage in gangster methods.

I favor the rights of organized labor. I advocate collective bargaining, but I oppose racketeering by labor whether organized or unorganized. The purpose of unions should be to promote better relations between employers and employees.

There are some unfair employers. There are some unfair employees. There are industrial racketeers and there are labor racketeers. I oppose both. I advocate the punishment of both. It is time for plain speaking. It is time to call a spade a spade. I know that some employers are unfair with workers. I know that workers are sometimes unfair with employers. The need is mutual understanding. The need is not coercion but cooperation.

LEGISLATION

Personally I regret that the pending bill does not go further. It is imperative that the National Labor Relations Act be amended. That act was intended to diminish the causes of labor disputes. It has multiplied them. Sections 7 and 8 of that act provide for coercion. There is no opportunity for conference between employer and employee. It is unfair for the employer to interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization. The act was intended to bring peace. It has resulted in turmoil. Racketeers and chiselers have taken advantage of the act. It places the employers and employees in a position of disharmony. It does not provide for the determination of labor disputes. It burdens and it obstructs interstate commerce. It promotes strikes, both jurisdictional and otherwise.

The amount of human hours lost since Pearl Harbor on account of unnecessary strikes is beyond tabulation. What kind of people put profits beyond the lives of the men in the armed services? I have referred to two sections and provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. There are others.

I believe that the large majority of workers are honest, just as I believe that the large majority of employers are honest. But the public demands that the National Labor Relations Act be amended and improved and that its provisions which promote turmoil and which are unfair both to the employer and the employee be repealed.

I opposed the Fair Labor Standards Act, and I have advocated liberalizing amendments. I have insisted from the invasion of Poland in September 1939, and especially since Pearl Harbor, that the United States cannot win the war on a 40-hour week, which I always opposed. I have insisted that the 40-hour week be repealed at least for the duration.

HOW LONG?

Which is the bigger, Uncle Sam or John L. Lewis? There was recently a costly coal strike. There is now a demand by miners, under the leadership of John L. Lewis, for a wage increase of $2 a day. If labor unions are going to permit the drawing out of the war and cause the needless sacrifice of lives of many American fighting men, the country ought to understand that the burden rests primarily upon Congress, and secondarily upon the striking workers.

It is time for action. We have tried cooperation. We have tried voluntary methods. Strikes continue. Labor racketeering abounds. The people are awake. States are passing laws. Absenteeism is being punished, but statutes against absenteeism are not enough. Excessive fees must be prohibited. Sit-down strikes must be stopped. Jurisdictional disputes must be eliminated. Absenteeism must be penalized, but the penalization of absenteeism is not enough, I repeat. We must all work or fight. Racketeers in labor and racketeers in industry must be eliminated.

Congress can appropriate all the billions of dollars that the President recommends for the Army and the Navy, but Congress cannot appropriate 60 minutes of time, and 60 minutes of time at Pearl Harbor might have saved a half billion dollars and 3,000 lives.

There can be no feather beds, slowdowns, or strikes in all-out war efforts. We cannot win the war by working 40 hours a week out of 168. It is time for cooperation between industry and labor. It is time for the elimination of racketeering whether in industry or in labor, whenever and wherever it is found.

CONCLUSION

The pending bill is necessary because of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Out-of-State truck drivers were required to turn over their trucks to teamsters on entering the City of New York. Under threats of violence and coercions the drivers were required to pay from $8.41 to $9.42, according to the size of the truck. This has been a common practice for years. Violence was conceded. The purpose of the bill is to clarify the existing antiracketeering statute and to prevent the necessity for interstate trucks paying a fee to labor unions for entering the City of New York, or for that matter, any other city, or from passing from one State to another in the United States, and to punish and prevent similar racketeering practices whether by labor unions or others.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this substitute amendment and on the committee amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I object.

Mr. HOBBS. Then I move that all debate upon the substitute amendment close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, it has been the accepted jurisprudence since the law of Moses, the common law of England, and our own courts, that there are certain natural laws that it would be wrong to violate were there no written laws—no statutory laws; and we should not condone such discrimination against a citizen who is not a member of a labor union in favor of a citizen who is a member. If this opinion is the law, Congress did nothing short of repealing a natural law by a statutory law in the act of 1934. When I speak of natural laws, those are laws which it was wrong to violate before the existence of the written word, those which have been the wisdom of the ages, those which were drawn without the action of a legislative body.

I never knew until the opinion in the case of the United States of America against Local 807 of the Teamsters Union in the United States Supreme Court was handed down that it was wrong for me to attack you and then you would be justified in attacking me for the same offense because you might be clothed with membership in an organized union, which would exempt you from the penalty of a natural law. How can it be? But it is.

Let us right this wrong that is ringing in the ears of every red-blooded American citizen throughout the United States. People are alarmed. Somebody said, "The woods are on fire," and, "believe me you, they are on fire." It is up to us to act. When you read the opinion in this case, you do not have to talk with anybody or study to know that there is discrimination between two classes of citizenship who might commit a crime. The rights of organized labor I do not condemn, but I believe in the rights of unorganized labor also. I believe in the rights of everyone; equality before the law. Let us assert ourselves. Vote down the Celler amendment. You heard the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN], when he said he and his colleagues and their Senators met with a delegation of 200 members of the C. I. O., wherein they stated that the Celler amendment would give them a free excursion from violation of the penal laws of the Antiracketeering Act of June 18, 1934. In my opinion, the adoption of the Celler amendment leaves us exactly where we are.

Organized labor should sponsor this bill and seek the support of friendly Congressmen. Greed breeds distinction. Every citizen should stand on equal footing with every other citizen, and such is not the case today.

The people of America are not given over to too much loud palaver today, but they are thinking as they never thought before of our future welfare.

In my opinion, this bill will pass without this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this Hobbs bill in its entirety. This bill in any form will put regular and legitimate union activity under constant attack on charges trumped up by hostile employers and labor baiters out to cripple labor.

Labor of all types looks upon this bill as the beginning, the forerunner of the establishment of slave labor in America by the House of Representatives. If this bill H. R. 653, known as the Hobbs bill, is passed it will cause three definite disastrous effects throughout our land.

First. It will cause chaotic conditions of misunderstanding and confusion between labor and management.

Second. It will demoralize all those workers who have been giving their all-out for victory, and will lower their morale.

Third. It will thus break down the second lines of offense and defense in this great World War, the production line, and for a surety, if the second line goes down, the first line which depends upon the second line will very soon follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to even start to discuss a bill as far reaching as the Hobbs bill in the 3 minutes available to me this afternoon. Rather than attempt a discussion of either the Hobbs bill or the Celler amendment, I will simply comment on a situation that becomes more apparent with each passing day of this session of Congress. Why the rush? Why should debate be cut off or limited to 20 minutes on this important amendment—an amendment proposed by the A. F. of L.—the adoption of which would remove a great deal of objection to the bill?

Most of the time during general debate was used by members of the committee reporting the bill. I asked for time during the general debate but was informed that it was all assigned and I could get plenty of time under the 5-minute rule. I realize that an effort is being made to clear the calendar so that Congress can take an Easter vacation. Personally, I would appreciate a 2 weeks' recess, and I know that many of the older Members of the House, the Chairman and ranking members of committees, need the vacation more than I do. Many of these men have been steadily on the job for more than 5 years. However, I would rather stay here for evening sessions or pass up a recess all together than to see legislation ill-considered and rushed through the House. And, at this point, I may as well add that I will oppose any recess until after the House has passed the pay-as-you-earn tax bill that will be acceptable to the majority of our 44,000,000 income taxpayers.

The Hobbs bill is not the only bill on which fair debate has been cut off. The same thing was done by the farm bloc when the Pace and Bankhead bills were under consideration. What happened to these two bills after they were passed in the House? The Bankhead bill was vetoed by the President for the very reasons advanced, in the limited time, by those opposed to the bill. The Pace bill is stalled in a committee of the Senate for fear it will meet the fate of the Bankhead bill, namely, Presidential veto. We rushed the salary-limitation bill through the House with such speed that the Wolcott amendment was not even explained to the House. We accepted the Disney amendment, but when the bill reached the Senate, that body adopted the language of the Wolcott amendment, and we later approved it as a conference report. Yesterday, very little time was allowed for discussion on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to continue the operation of the regional offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. I dare predict that next week the Senate will write the Dirksen amendment into the Department of Commerce appropriation bill and that we will later accept it.

Now, to get back to the Hobbs bill for a moment. I have more than 70,000 men in my district who carry union cards. It does not seem unreasonable to me that I should have 5 minutes of the time of this House in which to discuss some of the fears of these 70,000 against the Hobbs bill. And, at this point I wish to make it plain that I owe nothing to the C. I. O. leaders—they spent their money and did everything possible to defeat me last November. Nothing I do or say on the floor of this House is going to change the minds of the C. I. O. leaders in Connecticut. The activities of these leaders, however, do not justify my voting for this bill, even though it might well be some of these same leaders who later may fall victims to the unreasonable provisions. The passage of the Hobbs bill is not going to help labor relations during this period of war, when we need production as never before. I will not vote for legislation that gives organized labor privileges not given to others, nor will I knowingly vote for legislation that invokes penalties on members of a labor organization that cannot be invoked against a citizen who is not a member of organized labor.

An effort is being made to make us believe that robbery and extortion and other crimes cannot be adequately punished under existing laws if the person who commits the crime carries a union card and is out on strike. I am one of the 205 Members earlier referred to who is not a lawyer, but I know that such a claim is not true. The sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who a few moments ago moved to cut off debate with 14 Members indicating a desire to be heard on this amendment, told the House an hour ago that if a union member, at home, due to the fact that he was out on strike, committed a certain felony, he could not be prosecuted. How absurd. I know he could be, and would be, convicted in the State I represent, not under the Hobbs Act, to be sure, but under adequate laws adopted in Connecticut many years ago. The same is true in New York State. The present Governor of New York, while serving as district attorney for New York City, was certainly successful in prosecuting racketeers of all kinds, including labor racketeers. And, may I say at this point that I would like to see every labor racketeer sent to prison or, if guilty of retarding production on any phase of the war effort, shot at sunrise.

The Hobbs bill is simply another example of the effort being made to more and more control every aspect of our daily lives from Washington, D. C. The sponsors of this legislation contend that our States cannot or will not punish labor racketeers, but, when it is suggested that the Federal Government attempt to wipe out lynching, they cry to the high heavens that the States should be permitted to deal with the crime of lynching. This same is true on the poll-tax law.

Can anyone justify sending a union member to prison for 20 years for committing a misdemeanor during a labor dispute when a nonunion member, guilty of the same offense under different circumstances, would receive a fine of possibly $25?

In the past I have voted for legislation opposed by the C. I. O. and, by the same token, voted against legislation favored by the C. I. O., and will doubtless do so again. During this war there can be no favored classes or individuals. All must sacrifice alike. With few exceptions, labor has produced as never before, and we have shown the world that here, under our representative form of government, capital and labor can work together peacefully, toward the common goal of all of us—defeat of the Axis Powers and victory for the United Nations, which, in time, will make a better world for all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to add my observations for a minute or two on the tangent which the House has got off on in regard to this bill. I do not think there is a person in this House today on either side of the aisle who is not for the purposes of the Hobbs bill. I think the only disagreement and the only difference of opinion here today is the so-called legal interpretation of the Hobbs bill. There are some of us who happen to feel, sincerely and deeply, that the legal interpretation of the Hobbs bill will not exactly create what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] says it will create. Therefore we propose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I do not think we are entitled to be berated or labor is to be berated on the floor of this House about strikes or production or anything else in the discussion of this bill. You Members in this House know the record of American labor production in this war is one of the finest in the world. Yes; and if you

want to go a little bit further, I wonder where we would have been today in our production schedules on this war if labor had not been organized to meet the emergency.

All this bill does in theory is to try to correct something we are all against, and I want to go along with my friend from Connecticut. I listened to the author of this bill and he left that impression on me. "Why," he said "if you were out on strike and you saw some girl you wanted to kidnap because you were on strike you could not be prosecuted." I know of no State in the Union that would not prosecute that man. In my State they would hang him for kidnaping. We ought to look at this thing coldly and legally; it is the legal interpretation of this bill that we should watch in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill until my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] made his statement.

I agree with the gentleman from Washington. I do not want to hear labor berated either, and I represent some labor down in my district. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] just said that all organized labor is against the Hobbs bill. They are not in my country. Organized labor in my district are red-blooded American citizens. Organized labor in my district are against extortion and robbery, and I am tired of having the laboring men I represent charged with being against a bill the principle of which is to write on the Federal statute books a law against extortion and robbery.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Do they have a police force in the various cities of Oklahoma?

Mr. NICHOLS. They sure do.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Are they not capable of taking care of robbery?

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, they are. But they have a police department and policemen in the great State of New York where the high-jacking complained of took place that caused this bill to be brought to the floor, but they did not do anything about it.

Who is the man who would say that simply because there is a State law there should not be a Federal law against the same thing to protect men and goods that move in interstate commerce? That is no argument; no.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; I cannot yield.

I do not want the laboring men of my district berated any more. Organized labor in my district is against extortion and robbery, and is for the Hobbs bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I notice this bill refers specifically to robbery and extortion. Why leave out all the other crimes and misdemeanors? Let us have an all-inclusive bill and put them all in—or do you want to except all the other offenses and confine the operation of the act merely to robbery and extortion?

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I suggest the gentleman read title II.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] have risen in support of the bill and against the Celler amendment. I am in favor of the Celler amendment. I should like to ask these gentlemen, inasmuch as there are State laws on the matters to which this bill refers, is it because they do not trust the State governments that they want this bill enacted? If that is the case, and I assume it must be, then why not let us pass the antilynching bill? If we do not trust the State governments then why not pass the anti-poll-tax bill? Let us get down to brass tacks. If we are to override State governments, all right; let us go ahead and do it all along the line. I see no reason for picking out organized labor as the villain and enact this law in order to hold a threat and a club over their heads and be able constantly to persecute them, if they do not do what their opponents want them to do, and make them behave.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I cannot yield; I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That may be, and I am liable to mention it again.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to these gentlemen that if they have the courage of their convictions and are opposed to State governments and State control then let them come out openly for the antilynching and the anti-poll-tax bill and let us make a clean sweep.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to answer the gentleman. This is a law against interstate commerce.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about that; and there is another answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that is for 67 days Harold Christoffel, a Communist, with a wife holding a Government job, held up production in a plant—the Allis-Chalmers—over near Milwaukee which was engaged in making turbines for a powder plant down in Virginia and nothing was done in Wisconsin about it. Oh, yes; something was done. The strikers upset the Governor's automobile. Sixty-seven days' war production was held up. It is about time that somebody stepped in and took cognizance of that kind of a situation.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I just cannot to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Every argument, however, that was made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] against the Celler amendment, every single argument he made—and I hope you will read it in the RECORD tomorrow—applies to the amendment offered by the committee. Do you recall that not long ago here in this debate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] said that he could not see a particle of difference between the committee amendment and the Celler amendment—tweedledee and tweedledum? Then you get back to the proposition I made awhile ago, if you want to stop the racketeering which is permissible under the Supreme Court decision, which has so often today been called to your attention, then why not strike out the foundation, the proviso in that law upon which the Supreme Court rested its decision? Then you would hit that kind of racketeering and you would not hit anything else, and you would not be taking the chance, when this thing comes up before some court in the future, of lending your approval to some of the illegal activities—I say "illegal," except they are made legal by court decisions—which are practiced under the National Labor Relations Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and under the Antitrust Act, which do not apply to unions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my colleague from Washington, I think there is no one in this House who by voting for this bill has any reason or any thought of doing anything in the slightest against labor. We realize their rights and we recognize them, we recognize their prosperity as being important from a civic and from an economic standpoint in this country, but I want to rise in opposition to the Celler amendment. For the information of some of you gentleman who were not present awhile back I will make the statement that the Maryland delegation had a meeting with the Maryland C. I. O. leaders, about 200 of them, 2 or 3 weeks ago. This Hobbs bill came up for discussion. They were opposed to it unless the Celler amendment was accepted and when asked directly why they would accept it with the Celler amendment, they very frankly said because it nullified the bill and the bill with that amendment meant nothing. They probably had very good legal advice on that question.

There is another thing I want to bring to the attention of this House. Organized labor and organized-labor leaders have received fair consideration from this House for the last 10 years and will

get it in the future. I have here copy of a bulletin sent out by Ford local 600 of the C. I. O. to the thousands of Ford employees, and here is what the C. I. O. says about the Hobbs antiracketeer bill:

A vicious antiunion bill is being pushed through in Congress. It is known as the Hobbs bill—H. R. 653—and it was prepared to suit the interests of the National Association of Manufacturers.

This Fascist piece of legislation would put the unions under the control of politicians and would:

1. Make unions subject to court action and lawsuits for wild-cat strikes or damage to property or persons.

2. Would make the unions liable to court action and lawsuits for loss of production.

3. Any violations of the law by the union or by individual members during wartime would make the penalty double.

Actually this would be the first attack against unions. Under this kind of law any individual could be fired or prosecuted at will.

Get a post card from your committeeman and send it to the following Michigan Congressmen.

Here are the same people who come in here and ask for fair treatment from Congress misrepresenting the intent of Congress on this bill and completely misrepresenting the intent of the Congress to the membership of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 115, noes 140.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CELLER and Mr. HOBBS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 126, noes 167.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Amend title I, section 1 (b) by removing the entire paragraph contained on page 2, lines 9 to 16, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The term 'robbery' means the felonious and forcible taking from the person of another, goods or money in any value, by violence or putting him in fear."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 653 embraces title I and title II. Title I deals with robbery and extortion. Title II deals with the willful obstruction of interstate commerce by force, violence, and intimidation.

TITLE I. ROBBERY, EXTORTION

Title I defines robbery and extortion as follows:

(b) The term "robbery" means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

(c) The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

It is urged this legislation is necessary because of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States involving Local Teamsters' Union 807, of New York City. An indictment was returned in the district court of the United States charging a number of members of that local teamsters' union with violation of the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. A great many trucks of farmers, and others, carrying their farm produce and other commodities from the States surrounding and near New York, were stopped about the time they entered the corporate limits of New York City, and some member of this local union would board these trucks and insist upon driving the trucks to the warehouses and markets of New York City. For the smaller trucks they demanded $8 plus and for the larger trucks $9 plus. In some cases where the truck drivers refused to submit to these threats and pay the sum demanded, they were assaulted and beaten, and in some cases, after these persons collected the money, they immediately abandoned the trucks. This clearly was a racket, and similar rackets were carried on in and near other large cities of the country.

Several of these persons were indicted by the grand jury in one of the Federal district courts of New York. They were convicted by a jury. This case, under the heading of "Deal against United States," reached the Supreme Court of the United States, and in a written opinion, the Supreme Court decided a conviction could not be sustained on the ground defendants were carrying on a legitimate labor activity. Chief Justice Stone wrote a strong dissenting opinion.

Mr. Daniel Tobin, head of the International Teamsters' Union, according to press reports, repudiated the conduct and action of these members of Local 807 and members of other locals. I have not yet heard of any responsible labor leader approve their conduct. I am sure the leaders of labor were as much surprised over this decision of the Supreme Court as lawyers generally were. I cannot understand how the majority arrived at its decision. The facts were clear and the law plain. But for that decision this bill would not be before us.

When these men met these trucks and by threats of force and violence took possession of the trucks and collected these sums they certainly did not create the relationship of employer and employee, and they violated the Antiracketeering Act. It was nothing more nor less than robbery or extortion. This kind of conduct could not be approved in peacetime and much less so when we are at war, when food and feed were being taken into these great centers to be transferred to the people and to our fighting men on land, sea, and in the air throughout the world. A handful of men at these great centers would effectively prevent a lot of this food and feed from flowing into interstate commerce and providing food for our armed forces, and as a loyal friend of labor it is most gratifying to me that the leaders generally throughout the country of organized labor have placed their stamp of disapproval on this conduct. They do not look upon robbery or extortion as legitimate activities of the labor movement. They know and we know that conduct of this kind is a disservice to organized labor, and if persisted in will do more to discredit organized labor in the eyes of the American people than any other one thing. This is certainly no time for rackets or racketeering. Robbery and extortion are among the heinous crimes that have been known to the law for centuries. Robbery and extortion cannot be justified in the name of any group. No man ought to be permitted to rob or extort money or property even though he be clothed with the sanctity of the church.

Many conscientious leaders of labor fear this legislation may be used to oppress and harass labor. As I understand they do not object to any legislation that may be necessary to prevent robbery or extortion and prevent a repetition of the conduct indulged in as was by the members of Local Teamsters' Union 807. They do not want their members, under the cloak of unionism, to engage in robbery or extortion, but they do not want labor tried for other alleged offenses under the guise of robbery and extortion. Many of us in the House and out feel the definition of robbery, as set forth in the bill, is too loosely drawn and does not conform with the accepted definition of robbery, and I therefore am submitting an amendment which I claim correctly defines robbery.

Persons tried under this proposed legislation, if it becomes law, will be tried in the Federal courts. The Supreme Court in the case of *Deal* v. *United States* (274 U. S. Repts., p. 277), correctly defines robbery as follows:

The term "robbery" means the felonious and forcible taking from the person of another goods or money of any value by violence or putting in fear.

This definition of robbery is given in Bouvier's Law Dictionary and the same language was used in the case of Jolly versus United States (170 U. S., p. 402).

The highest courts of many States have approved this same definition. I refer to *Hammond* v. *Commonwealth* (198 Ky., p. 453), and *Douglass* v. *State of Alabama* (App., p. 299). This is the State of the author of this bill. I shall not take the time to point out the definition announced by the highest courts of many other States of the Union.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Will the gentleman tell me what this language on page 2, lines 11 and 12, means:

By means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury.

Whose fear of injury is referred to? What does that mean?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In my opinion, that definition is very loosely drawn, and for that reason I am offering my amendment.

The Criminal Code of the United States defines robbery substantially as set forth in the case of Deal against the United States. If this clear and unequivocal definition of robbery, as set forth in my amendment, should be adopted, it would eliminate much of the opposition to this bill. Since the Supreme Court in the Deal case and other cases, and with the highest courts of many of the States approving this definition, why should it not be accepted and placed in the bill? The author of the bill claims he is seeking to try and convict persons guilty of robbery and extortion. I cannot see why he should object to a correct definition being written into the statute for robbery and extortion. There seems to be no serious objection to the definition in the bill as to extortion.

There is some objection to the penalties prescribed in this bill for robbery and extortion. It has gone forth to the country that the penalty is 20 years. That is not a correct statement. The penalties range from 1 hour up to 20 years, according to the offense, and fines of $1 to $10,000. In other words, the 20 years and the $10,000 fine are the maximum. The court can fix any length of time of imprisonment up to 20 years or any fine up to $10,000, or both. The court might fix the penalty at 1 hour in jail and then in an aggravated case it might fix the penalty at 20 years. It could fix a 1-cent fine or in an aggravated case a $10,000 fine. The judge can impose a fine or imprisonment or both according to the evidence.

In Kentucky a person may be sentenced to life imprisonment or put to death for robbery and for extortion in certain cases. The average maximum imprisonment for all the States is about 20 years.

I am not much worried over the penalties imposed on anyone who actually commits robbery or extortion, in taking money or property or other thing of value from another person by force or violence or by putting him in fear. No individual or group should be permitted to engage in robbery or extortion in this free land of ours, even a church or association of ministers.

Legitimate and lawful activities of labor should and must be protected. The Judiciary Committee wrote an amendment into the bill, which is as follows:

> That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect either section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, or an act entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, or an act entitled "An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or an act entitled "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1935.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a member of the Judiciary Committee, has offered a substitute amendment. It is agreed by the author of the bill and others that in substance there is no difference between the committee's amendment to the bill and the Celler amendment.

In view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against Local Teamsters' Union, Local 807, we ought to set out definitely and clearly the intention of the Congress in this legislation. Since it is urged by the author of the bill and others there is no difference in substance and effect between the committee amendment and the Celler amendment, and feeling the Celler amendment is more clear and definite, it is my purpose to vote for the Celler amendment when it comes up.

TITLE II

Title II deals specifically with the willful obstruction of the orderly transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, such as the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, and so forth, on railway, State highway, air or water, which is accompanied by physical force or intimidation by threats of physical force. This title only applies while the United States is at war.

It is needless to say in time of war no one should be permitted to retard or obstruct knowingly and willfully by physical force or intimidation by threat of physical force the transportation of our troops, munitions, war supplies, mail, or other persons or property. There must be a free flow of our interstate and foreign commerce, by rail, air, waterway, and highway if we are to prosecute successfully our great war effort.

So far as I have been able to learn there has been no opposition expressed to title II of this bill. My amendment defining robbery and the Celler amendment making more definite and clear the protection for lawful activities of labor, if adopted, should remove all objections to the bill, and at the same time accomplish fully the objectives of the bill to protect the people against robbery, extortion, rackets and racketeers, and protect the movement of our troops, munitions, war supplies, mail, and so forth, in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, the Supreme Court deals with the cases that are before it. When common-law robbery is involved, they give the common-law definition of robbery. That is all that decision amounts to, and the gentleman might have read a dozen others.

I will tell you why robbery is defined as it is in this bill. The testimony before our committee in the 429 pages of hearings we took last year showed that about 80 percent of the holdups in the United States occur in New York City; that more than 100 trucks a night carrying fresh fruits and vegetables from the farms of New Jersey are held up and robbed there every night. Pennsylvania contributes about a hundred. There are many others, running into the thousands a week. Therefore, in looking for the definition of robbery to be put in this bill, going on the old-fashioned principle that the hair of the dog is good for the bite, I copied the definition of robbery that is in this bill from the statute of New York, substantially. There are one or two words added which do not change the significance of it at all. Substantially it is the same.

Of course, I had to cover the obtaining, because sometimes the driver of the truck does not have the $9.42 in his pocket and has to give an order on or get it from the consignee. But aside from that, there is little or no difference.

The gentleman from North Carolina asks what "threat of violence" means?

Mr. FOLGER. No; will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I do not understand this. The bill reads "by means of actual or threatened force or violence."

If you put in there also "or engendering fear of injury" I could understand it, but you say, "or fear of injury."

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. FOLGER. That fear would be the fear of the man who had the goods?

Mr. HOBBS. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that the appellate court of New York has defined their robbery statute and every word in it a hundred times.

Mr. FOLGER. If you had in there the words "engendering fear of injury" I would understand it, but I do not understand it the way it is.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, I cannot illustrate without fear of injury what actual violence means, but the gentleman would understand if I put this fist in this manner on his nose [striking his left hand violently with his right fist]. Threatened violence would mean that I was drawing back to do that thing. Violence would be if I were wielding a blackjack over the gentleman, or a pistol with which I threatened to beat him into a pulp, as they did a man from Akron, Ohio, there the other night. This is one of the most significant things that has ever come to my attention in connection with this whole racketeering question.

A man from Akron, Ohio, licensed to drive a truck in interstate commerce, drove a truck to New York. He went there and they held him up. He paid his fine. He paid what the racketeers wanted, $9.42. They put a drunk in there, a man who was absolutely so drunk he was dangerous. This man said, "I do not mind paying you the $9.42, I knew I was going to have to pay that to get through the Holland Tunnel into New York, but this man is too drunk to drive anybody through the streets." So they took off the drunk and took a man who was not drunk out of the goon squad and he got up on the truck and drove on into Washington Market. Then the Ohio man came back, and the drunk was waiting. He beat him into a pulp. He had to go to the hospital and stay there I do not know how long.

The complaint came to me from the Honorable John G. Cooper, of Ohio, who is on the Compensation Commission of Ohio. His complaint is that the Compensation Commission of Ohio had to pay the doctor and hospital bills and the man's time off from work because of that beating that he got at the mouth of Holland Tunnel. That is what we are talking about, and that is why the New York statute is quoted in this bill. We are not talking about common-law robbery, we are talking about New York robbery, in the main.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The opinion that I read was an indictment on a statute, not common law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am for a bill that is going to stop everyone, whether a member of a labor union or not, from committing robbery and extortion to interfere with interstate commerce in wartime. I feel, however, that this definition of robbery which is taken from the New York statute, and which combines three degrees of robbery all together here, adding a few other words, is going too far afield on something that is not vital to our purpose. Under this definition, which you find before you in the House bill, it would be possible that taking property by causing fear of future injury to the property of someone in somebody else's company at the time of the taking would constitute a crime. When it comes to beating up people, that comes clearly under the common-law definition of robbery. When it comes to what is the real heart of racketeering—and that is extortion—I certainly approve of the words the committee has used to define what we mean by extortion.

Let us remember that we are not attempting to forbid all kinds of violence. We are trying to make a legal definition of racketeering. Both robbery and extortion have to do with the securing of property by vicious, criminal means. Rather than have some definition which has never yet appeared in any lawbook, or in any court decision—that is the one now in the House bill—which is an assembly of parts of New York law, with some additional suggestions by the committee, why not do what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] has suggested, and for "robbery" use the words that have been defined by our Supreme Court, which constitutes an obvious definition of common-law robbery, and then leave in the definition for extortion, so that we will have it clearly defined that we mean what we say when we say we are voting to prevent the use of robbery and extortion to obstruct interstate commerce in wartime?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HOBBS. Would not the gentleman include the New York statute in his remarks at the proper point? There are two definitions set forth in the bill, both of which are based on the New York law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have the New York statute before me here and I have the bill before me, and while the bill follows the New York statute closely I find nothing in the New York statute about "obtaining" rather than the taking of property, and I find nothing about "actual or threatened" force or violence. I find nothing about property in a person's "custody or possession," although I believe this is a wise addition to the definition. I am not sure that this definition would not parse out, but when we are trying to make clear what we mean, when we are dealing with a controversial matter, it seems to me it would be far wiser to stick to a definition of robbery that has had repeated construction by the courts, rather than a combination of words, which has not yet been before a court, and which might have an effect we do not intend. One thing we want to prevent is the common law idea of taking property or money from a man either by fear or threat or force or by violence, and that is what the gentleman from Kentucky has suggested in his amendment. The committee's definition of racketeering is much better than the vague terms of the law which is being repealed, but I believe we could improve on it by adopting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky) there were—ayes 42, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: After the word "felony", on page 3, line 10, and before the words and figures "Sec. 6" on line 11, page 3, insert a new paragraph designated Sec. 6, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Prosecutions under this act shall be commenced only upon the expressed direction of the Attorney General of the United States."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would rather not be required to yield during these 5 minutes. I discussed this morning my reason for offering this amendment. Perhaps there may be people here now who did not hear me, but I yielded fully at that time, and I would like now to be permitted to proceed without interruption.

The amendment that I am offering is found in the original act of 1934. It is not found in the present bill, and there is no question by anyone on the committee who has studied the question that it has been left out, and, as I understand it, purposely left out. The reasons for the committee leaving it out are not my concern, but we are repeatedly told that we are simply leaving the old act and making it applicable to labor and nothing else, but I find that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] this morning made a passionate plea for the adoption of this legislation and largely based it on the fact, apparently, that he was under the misapprehension that the amendment that I offer is already in the bill. He very definitely stated that it was put in the bill in order to keep labor from being affected by district attorneys all over the country.

There are five acts dealing with wrongful acts in interstate commerce, with reference to capital, that I can think of now; namely, the Federal Power Act, the Communications Act, the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Investment Company Act, and the Antitrust Act, all of which have similar language. In other words, this Congress has said to capital, "We are going to have uniform prosecution of this law throughout the United States, and therefore district attorneys must go to the Attorney General before they institute prosecutions." If you are going to say that, let us be fair. This affects interstate commerce, we say. It does not have anything to do with State rights. We say we need it because the State laws are not effective. If that is true, if you want to say that you are doing nothing but amending this act, then put this amendment which I am proposing back into the bill and leave this law the way it was when you passed it in 1934.

As far as I am concerned, if this amendment in the old act was necessary to protect Dillinger and Capone, I think it is necessary in this bill to protect the legitimate activities of labor from district attorneys who might be subject to local pressure in various districts throughout the United States.

I think in good faith this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Under the procedure in the appointment of United States attorneys, the appointment is made by the Attorney General of the United States after investigation conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The name is then submitted to the Senate by the President for confirmation. The United States attorney is confirmed by the Senate. As a consequence, the men selected are usually men of high character and ability. They take upon themselves the duty of the office, and in their respective districts handle all reports submitted to them by the various agencies of Government, the F. B. I., the Secret Service, the Alcohol Tax Unit, the Internal Revenue, or whatever board of

investigation submits the evidence to them. As a consequence, I think discretion is allowed the United States attorney.

Speaking personally—and I trust the House will pardon this personal allusion—many, many times while United States attorney I consulted the Attorney General in Washington with reference to procedure and the course of action. Almost invariably it was left to our discretion. They informed us we were in possession of all the facts and circumstances and knew what we were to do.

So much for the procedure then. I assume it is the same today, although I have not been a United States attorney for 10 years. But over and above every consideration is this fundamental fact, that if you place in the hands of the Attorney General alone the sole power to decide this, you have placed the fate of all organizations in the country that may come under this law in the hands and at the will and caprice of one man. That is what we are driving against, that no one man shall exercise any capricious action, and override some 85 United States attorneys.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Pardon me. The gentleman refused to yield. I do not mean to be discourteous, but I cannot yield.

The United States attorney is not subject to local pressure at all. He is appointed for 4 years. He is not like a local district attorney. He is always under investigation. His office is regularly examined every year. An examiner comes into his office and passes upon his conduct. Every month he must make reports. It seems to me that while I was a district attorney my chief duty for about 4 days at the end of each month was making reports.

I fear that the gentleman who has just preceded me is not familiar with United States court work, procedure, and practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6 of the Antiracketeering Act of June 18, 1934, the same being section 420 (d) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 980), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the colon after the word 'conspirator', inserting a period, and striking out the remainder of said section, beginning with the word '*Provided.*'

"SEC. 2. That section 2 (a) of the Antiracketeering Act of June 18, 1934, being section 420 (a) of title 18, United States Code (48 Stat. 479), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out therefrom the comma after the word 'services', inserting a semicolon, and striking out therefrom, following said semicolon, the words, 'Not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when William Green was before a Senate committee it developed that when Camp Blanding was constructed a carpenters' union of 250 members were required to pay a fee of $50. Thereafter the union business agent stood right beside the pay counter. Additional men were called on the job. In 5 months they had 18,000 different employees on that pay roll, although only five or six thousand worked at any one time. The union collected $900,000 in 5 months. Now, I ask you if you put in the committee amendment do you not legalize that sort of procedure, and will not the court say that that is an activity that comes under the Wagner Act? Was the collection of $50 each from those men—as the price of a job—extortion? Was it?

Here is another one: In this milk driver's case to which I referred a while ago windows were smashed and the places of business were bombed over a period of weeks. When that case came before the circuit court of appeals the court said that that was an unlawful activity the purpose of which was to collect money. That was attempted extortion, attempted extortion through violence. The United States Supreme Court, in reversing that decision of the circuit court of appeals, which held that conduct unlawful, had this to say:

The court of appeals concluded that the defendant's picketing activities constituted a secondary picketing in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and for this reason regardless of the Norris-LaGuardia Act the district court had jurisdiction to grant an injunction even though the case arose out of or involved a labor dispute. In this the court was in error.

What they held was that those unions could go ahead, as far as Federal law was concerned, and dynamite and smash windows over a period of weeks, and yet under the Norris-LaGuardia Act and under the National Labor Relations Act they were protected from injunction unless it could be shown that the local authorities failed to give protection. The committee amendment provides that nothing in this bill which is supposed to stop racketeering shall repeal, modify, or affect any one of those four acts under which the kind of procedure to which reference has been made is declared by the Court, mind you, not by the statute, by the courts, to be lawful.

The amendment offered is simple. If you had a chair out here that was standing on one leg and you wanted to knock the chair over, what would you do? You would knock the leg out from under it. The Supreme Court decision which brings this Hobbs bill here rests upon one thing, and one thing only, less than 20 words in the Anti-Racketeering Act. Never mind these amendments. My proposition to the committee is that if you want to remedy, if you want to override the decision of Judge Byrnes in that case, just knock that one prop out from under it, for it is the only thing that supports it, and then you will not be attacking any of these labor unions, because it is admitted that no one favors robbery or extortion. Strike out the 17 words of the exception upon which the Court's decision is based and you have overruled or reversed the effect of it.

Why not take the simple way? Destroy the foundation of the decision and the whole thing falls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAY: On page 2, line 19, after the word "fear", strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to time on this amendment? I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the committee is not guilty of some inadvertence in their definition of the word "extortion" on page 2, section (c). I ask the author of the bill to follow me closely. I read:

The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear—

Up to that point it would amount to duress, it is clear intimidation or extortion. Then it states:

or under color of official right.

I want to ask this, and if you do not mean this in the bill, then so state in the interest of clarification of the future enforcement of this act and for the benefit of the House. Inasmuch as the first section of this bill carries a penalty of 20 years and a fine of $10,000, it is not wartime legislation, but is permanent legislation, and an amendment of the act of June 18, 1934.

When you say that by extortion you mean getting money or property from a man with his consent or under color of official right, it would apply to an initiation fee in a labor union.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not. "Color of official right" means absence of right but pretended assertion of right.

Mr. DAY. I know; but what do the words "official right" mean?

Mr. HOBBS. The same thing.

Mr. DAY. It has not got to be by some authority?

Mr. HOBBS. In other words, you pretend to be a police officer, you pretend to be a deputy sheriff, but you are not.

Mr. DAY. I think the change should be made that I have mentioned.

Mr. HOBBS. It could not possibly apply if there was any bona fide right; it applies only to pretended right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. With reference to what the gentleman from Illinois said about union dues, suppose somebody should say that he paid union dues only because of fear or violence. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. DAY. That is just the point. A union official might be indicted and face a 20-year sentence in a Federal penitentiary or $10,000 fine. Not only that, but there might be great hardship to himself and his family if there should be some careless construction of this language. I think this is very important.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to my friend that if he will examine the language carefully I believe he will conclude that it means money acquired by some person who claims to be an officer of the law who is trying to take his money.

Mr. DAY. You say that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is the language.

Mr. DAY. It is subject to the construction I have given it or I could not have arrived at it. This is a penal statute. Why do you not make it clear?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We believe we have. "Officially" means an officer of the Government.

Mr. DAY. The gentleman knows there is a quibble in there or he would not be debating it. You are writing a statute here.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Would the gentleman accept the statement by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that reported the bill that the language means money acquired by somebody claiming to be a public officer?

Mr. DAY. You say that but why do you not say "by some public official"?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is it.

Mr. DAY. An officer of a union is a private official, not a public official.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No.

Mr. DAY. Why leave any doubt about it? Let us write these laws in clear language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER: Page 4, line 16, after the word "this", strike out the word "section" and insert the word "at."

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. That is the committee amendment that has already been adopted.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. For the purpose of informing the gentleman who has offered the amendment, may I say it is a good amendment, it has already been recognized as such, and the committee has made the change?

Mr. FOLGER. It has been adopted?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FOLGER. That is all right then.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 3, line 13, after the word "than", strike out "twenty" and insert "ten."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I will only require a minute to speak on this amendment. When the bill was before the Rules Committee it seemed to me at that time that these penalties were excessive. Twenty years is just about as bad as a life sentence, and I want to give the House the opportunity to reduce it by cutting it in half. This applies to threats. A man may be sent to jail for 20 years merely for threatening extortion. Such a drastic and severe penalty takes you back to the dark ages, and is not warranted or in line with the offense.

I have another amendment at the desk which affects title II on page 3, line 19, after the word "retard", strike out "or aid in obstructing or retarding, or attempt to obstruct or retard." There is no sound reason for such language in connection with transportation by rail. It is not needed and only reflects on the loyalty of railroad men. It might be used with the drastic penalty attached against minor infractions involving delays by railroad employees. There is no more loyal or patriotic group of Americans than members of the Railroad Brotherhoods in peace and in war. Day and night, winter and summer, in storm and bad weather they are rendering an important war service in keeping the wheels turning in carrying troops and munitions and food for the American people. I would like a vote on this amendment, also.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Chairman, the punishment fixed in this bill is a maximum, and any punishment imposed by a judge of 1 cent or 1 hour in jail would be covered by this maximum penalty just the same. May I point out to the House again that this bill was copied substantially from the New York statute which punishes first-degree robbery by a minimum punishment of 10 years and a maximum of 30 years. We took the average of 20 as the maximum, with no minimum. I think the gentleman is amply protected in his desire for the penalty to be reasonable and all we are doing is giving the court the right to make the punishment fit the crime.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that title 2 of the act applies to the most heinous offense conceivable, namely, interference with troop trains in time of war, and conceivably the punishment would not be adequate if there would be a violation of that title of the act.

Mr. FISH. That is title 2. My amendment applies to title 1.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does not the definition also cover third-degree robbery, which, under the New York law, carries a maximum penalty of 10 years?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not so understand it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is in the New York law. Does not the present law have a maximum of 10 years?

Mr. HOBBS. I may say to the gentleman that in other sections of New York law that is true, but not in the section I substantially quoted.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The purpose of the maximum penalty in the bill, as I understand it, would be to allow room for aggravated cases?

Mr. HOBBS. To enable the judge, who tried the case and heard the evidence, make the punishment fit the crime.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 653) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, pursuant to House Resolution 154, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAFOLLETTE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 270, nays 107, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—270

Abernethy	Courtney	Gossett
Andersen, H. Carl	Cox	Graham
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cravens	Grant, Ala.
Andresen, August H.	Crawford	Grant, Ind.
Andrews	Creal	Gregory
Angell	Culkin	Griffiths
Arends	Cunningham	Gross
Arnold	Curtis	Gwynne
Auchincloss	Davis	Hagen
Baldwin, Md.	Dewey	Hale
Barden	Dies	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Barrett	Dirksen	Hall, Leonard W.
Beall	Disney	Halleck
Beckworth	Ditter	Hancock
Benrett, Mo.	Domengeaux	Hare
Blackney	Dondero	Harless, Ariz.
Bland	Doughton	Harness, Ind.
Bonner	Douglas	Harris, Ark.
Boren	Drewry	Harris, Va.
Bradley, Mich.	Durham	Hays
Brehm	Dworshak	Hébert
Brown, Ga.	Eaton	Hendricks
Brown, Ohio	Ellis	Herter
Bryson	Ellsworth	Hess
Buffett	Elmer	Hill
Bulwinkle	Elston, Ohio	Hinshaw
Burch, Va.	Engel	Hobbs
Burgin	Fellows	Hoeven
Busbey	Fenton	Hoffman
Camp	Fernandez	Holmes, Wash.
Canfield	Fish	Hope
Carlson, Kans.	Fisher	Horan
Case	Flannagan	Howell
Chapman	Folger	Jarman
Chenoweth	Fulbright	Jeffrey
Chiperfield	Fulmer	Jennings
Church	Gale	Jensen
Clark	Gallagher	Johnson, Anton J.
Clason	Gamble	Johnson, Luther A.
Clevenger	Gathings	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Cole, N. Y.	Gavin	Johnson, Okla.
Colmer	Gearhart	Johnson, Ward
Compton	Gerlach	Jones
Cooley	Gifford	Jonkman
Cooper	Gilchrist	Kean
Costello	Gillette	Kearney
Courtney	Gillie	Keefe
Cox	Goodwin	Kefauver
Cravens	Gore	Kerr
Crawford	Graham	Kilburn
Creal	Grant, Ala.	Kilday
Culkin	Grant, Ind.	Kinzer
Cunningham	Gregory	Kleberg
Curtis	Griffiths	Kunkel
Davis	Gross	Lambertson
Dewey	Gwynne	Lanham
Dies	Hagen	Lea
Dirksen	Hale	LeCompte
Disney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	LeFevre
Ditter	Hall, Leonard W.	McCormack
Domengeaux	Halleck	McGehee
Dondero	Hancock	McLean
Doughton	Hare	McMillan
Douglas	Harless, Ariz.	McWilliams
Drewry	Harness, Ind.	Mahon
Durham	Harris, Ark.	Manasco
Dworshak	Harris, Va.	Mansfield, Tex.
Eaton	Hays	Martin, Iowa
Ellis	Hébert	Martin, Mass.
Ellsworth	Hendricks	Mason
Elmer	Herter	May
Elston, Ohio	Hess	Merrow
Engel	Hill	Michener
Fellows	Hinshaw	Miller, Nebr.
Fenton	Hobbs	Miller, Pa.
Fernandez	Hoeven	Mills
Fish	Hoffman	Monroney
Fisher	Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, N. C.
Flannagan	Hope	Mruk
Folger	Horan	Mundt
Fulbright	Howell	Murdock
Fulmer	Jarman	Murray, Tenn.
Gale	Jeffrey	Murray, Wis.
Gallagher	Jennings	Newsome
Gamble	Jensen	Nichols
Gathings	Johnson, Anton J.	Norrell
Gavin	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Gearhart	Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Hara
Gerlach	Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal
Gifford	Johnson, Ward	Pace
Gilchrist	Jones	Patman
Gillette	Jonkman	Patton
Gillie	Kean	Peterson, Ga.
Goodwin	Kearney	Philbin
Gore	Keefe	Phillips
Gossett	Kefauver	Poage
Graham	Kerr	Poulson
Grant, Ala.	Kilburn	Price
Grant, Ind.	Kilday	Priest
Gregory	Kinzer	Ramspeck
Griffiths	Kleberg	Randolph
Gross	Kunkel	Rankin
Gwynne	Lambertson	Reece, Tenn.
Hagen	Lanham	Reed, Ill.
Hale	Lea	Reed, N. Y.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	LeCompte	Rees, Kans.
Hall, Leonard W.	LeFevre	Rivers
Halleck	McCormack	Rizley
Hancock	McGehee	Robertson
Hare	McLean	Robsion, Ky.
Harless, Ariz.	McMillan	Rockwell
Harness, Ind.	McWilliams	Rodgers, Pa.
Harris, Ark.	Mahon	Rogers, Mass.
Harris, Va.	Manasco	Rohrbough
Hays	Mansfield, Tex.	Russell
Hébert	Martin, Iowa	Sasscer
Hendricks	Martin, Mass.	Satterfield
Herter	Mason	Schwabe
Hess	May	Scott
Hill	Merrow	Shafer
Hinshaw	Michener	Short
Hobbs	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Ill.
Hoeven	Miller, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Hoffman	Mills	Slaughter
Holmes, Wash.	Monroney	Smith, Ohio
Hope	Morrison, N. C.	Smith, Wis.
Horan	Mruk	Springer
Howell	Mundt	Stanley
Jarman	Murdock	Steagall
Jeffrey	Murray, Tenn.	Stearns, N. H.
Jennings	Murray, Wis.	Stefan
Jensen	Newsome	Stewart
Johnson, Anton J.	Nichols	Stockman
Johnson, Luther A.	Norrell	Sullivan
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Ward	O'Neal	Sundstrom
Jones	Pace	Taber
Jonkman	Patman	Talbot
Kean	Patton	Talle
Kearney	Peterson, Ga.	Tarver
Keefe	Philbin	Taylor
Kefauver	Phillips	Thomas, N. J.
Kerr	Poage	Thomas, Tex.
Kilburn	Poulson	Tibbott
Kilday	Price	Tolan
Kinzer	Priest	Towe
Kleberg	Ramspeck	Treadway
Kunkel	Randolph	Troutman
Lambertson	Rankin	Van Zandt
Lanham	Reece, Tenn.	Vincent, Ky.
Lea	Reed, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
LeCompte	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
LeFevre	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
McCormack	Rivers	Wadsworth
McGehee	Rizley	Walter
McLean	Robertson	Ward
McMillan	Robsion, Ky.	Welchel, Ohio
McWilliams	Rockwell	West
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Wheat
Manasco	Rogers, Mass.	Whelchel, Ga.
Mansfield, Tex.	Rohrbough	White
Martin, Iowa	Russell	Whitten
Martin, Mass.	Sasscer	Whittington
Mason	Satterfield	Wickersham
May	Schwabe	Wigglesworth
Merrow	Scott	Willey
Michener	Shafer	Winstead
Miller, Nebr.	Short	Wolcott
Miller, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mills	Simpson, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Monroney	Slaughter	Woodrum, Va.
Morrison, N. C.	Smith, Ohio	Worley
Mruk	Smith, Wis.	Zimmerman
Mundt	Springer	
Murdock	Stanley	
Murray, Tenn.	Steagall	
Murray, Wis.	Stearns, N. H.	
Newsome	Stefan	
Nichols	Stewart	
Norrell	Stockman	
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sullivan	
O'Hara	Sumner, Ill.	
O'Neal	Sumners, Tex.	
Pace	Sundstrom	
Patman	Taber	
Patton	Talbot	
Peterson, Ga.	Talle	
Philbin	Tarver	
Phillips	Taylor	
Poage	Thomas, N. J.	
Poulson	Thomas, Tex.	
Price	Tibbott	
Priest	Tolan	
Ramspeck	Towe	
Randolph	Treadway	
Rankin	Troutman	
Reece, Tenn.	Van Zandt	
Reed, Ill.	Vincent, Ky.	
Reed, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.	
Rees, Kans.	Vorys, Ohio	
Rivers	Vursell	
Rizley	Wadsworth	
Robertson	Walter	
Robsion, Ky.	Ward	
Rockwell	Welchel, Ohio	
Rodgers, Pa.	West	
Rogers, Mass.	Wheat	
Rohrbough	Whelchel, Ga.	
Russell	White	
Sasscer	Whitten	
Satterfield	Whittington	
Schwabe	Wickersham	
Scott	Wigglesworth	
Shafer	Willey	
Short	Winstead	
Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott	
Simpson, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.	
Slaughter	Woodruff, Mich.	
Smith, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.	
Smith, Wis.	Worley	
Springer	Zimmerman	
Stanley		
Steagall		
Stearns, N. H.		
Stefan		
Stewart		

NAYS—107

Baldwin, N. Y.	Hart	Miller, Conn.
Barry	Heffernan	Miller, Mo.
Bender	Hoch	Murphy
Bennett, Mich.	Holifield	Myers
Bishop	Hull	Norman
Bloom	Jackson	Norton
Bolton	Jenkins	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Johnson, Calvin D.	O'Connor
Buckley	Johnson, Ind.	O'Konski
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Leary
Burdick	Kelley	Peterson, Fla.
Butler	Keogh	Pittenger
Capozzoli	King	Ploeser
Celler	Kirwan	Powers
Cochran	Klein	Rabaut
Coffee	LaFollette	Ramey
Cole, Mo.	Landis	Rogers, Calif.
Crosser	Lane	Rolph
Curley	Larcade	Rowan
D'Alesandro	Lemke	Rowe
Day	Lesinski	Sadowski
Delaney	Lewis, Ohio	Sauthoff
Dickstein	Ludlow	Scanlon
Dilweg	Lynch	Schiffler
Eberharter	McCowen	Schuetz
Ellison, Md.	McGranery	Sheridan
Englebright	McGregor	Sikes
Fay	McMurray	Smith, W. Va.
Feighan	Madden	Snyder
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Spence
Forand	Maloney	Wasielewski
Ford	Mansfield, Mont.	Weiss
Furlong	Marcantonio	Welch
Gavagan	Merritt	Wene
Gorski	Miller, Conn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Granger	Miller, Mo.	Wright
Green	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—57

Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Monkiewicz
Allen, La.	Gibson	Morrison, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Mott
Bates, Ky.	Guyer	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Hartley	O'Toole
Bell	Heidinger	Outland
Boykin	Holmes, Mass.	Pfeifer
Brooks	Izac	Plumley
Byrne	Judd	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Richards
Cannon, Mo.	Kennedy	Robinson, Utah
Carson, Ohio	Knutson	Sabath
Carter	Lewis, Colo.	Sheppard
Cullen	Luce	Smith, Maine
Dawson	McCord	Smith, Va.
Dingell	McKenzie	Somers, N. Y.
Elliott	Maas	Sparkman
Starnes, Ala.	Thomason	Wilson
Stevenson	Weaver	Winter

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. McCord for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mrs. Luce against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Stevenson against.

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Monkiewicz against.

General pairs:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Outland with Mr. Carson of Ohio.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Harter.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Maas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain letters and quotations from the hearings and from Supreme Court decisions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE WISDOM OF JEFFERSON

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, April 13, the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson will be observed throughout the Nation. Here in the Nation's Capital a most impressive and beautiful memorial structure of white marble will be dedicated. The ceremonies will be conducted by exponents of the New Deal, headed by Associate Justice Felix I. Frankfurter. They will, I predict, extol the virtues of that great Virginia statesman and may even try to convince the American people that they are the apostles of Jefferson's creed.

With fervid oratory they will, no doubt, name him as the patron saint of their new order and seek by other means to make political capital of the magic contained in his name.

To the people of America this will seem strange and inconsistent. They will most certainly not accept graciously any attempt to associate the philosophy of the present administration with that of the Sage of Monticello.

Every teen-age school boy and girl knows that the philosophies of this administration are in direct conflict and stand for everything Jefferson abhorred, and any effort to deceive the people in that respect cannot fail to bring a measure of resentment from them.

One need only insert a table knife into a volume of Jefferson's letters and speeches—as the Puritans used to do with the Bible to obtain names for their numerous progeny—open it and come upon a warm denunciation of some common New Deal practice.

Briefly what were some of Jefferson's principles? He believed in as simple a government as possible. We are all familiar with his famous observation that that government is best which governs least. He had something further to say on this subject, and I quote him:

> I think, myself, that we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious. I think it might be much simplified to the relief of those who maintain it.

More machinery of government in the early part of the eighteenth century? What would he think of this Federal colossus of today and on administration that has added more than 60 bureaus, boards, and commissions to the Federal structure of Government within a single decade?

Thomas Jefferson was a strong upholder of States' rights and the greatest protagonist of that principle. Listen to his words:

> The support of State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican principles.

I see with the deepest affliction—

He said—

> the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing toward the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation of itself of all powers, domestic and foreign; and that, too, by constructions which, if legitimate, leave no limits to their power.

Where does the present administration stand with respect to that statement? We have today more disregard of States' rights, more centralization of government in Washington than at any time in the entire history of the United States.

It is perhaps embarrassing that Jefferson's birthday comes at the moment when, from the portico of the Executive Mansion, a fourth-term movement for President Roosevelt has just been launched by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Walker, that chairman, no doubt will find repetition of the words of his adopted patron saint in that respect a bit unpleasant, and I am equally sure that Associate Justice Frankfurter will refrain from quoting them in his dedicatory address next Tuesday.

It will be recalled that Jefferson bitterly opposed a Presidential third term and that he declined even to stand for reelection after completing a second term. His feelings on that subject were strong and he expressed them in language that cannot be misunderstood. Hear him speak:

> If the principle of rotation be a sound one, as I conscientiously believe it to be with respect to this office, no pretext should ever be permitted to dispense with it, because there will never be a time when real difficulties will not exist and furnish a plausible pretext for dispensation.

The pretext, my colleagues, for the continuation in office of our present Chief Executive is that this Nation is in dire danger; that he is the only person out of a population of 132,000,000 people who can win the war and the peace. But let me remind you that in the early 1800's our infant ship of state was also in great danger. They were some of the most dangerous and uncertain days in our history. Many difficult international and domestic questions were unsolved, and a large part of the world seriously doubted that we could endure as an independent nation.

Jefferson, too, was told that he alone could successfully guide our ship of state safely, but he adhered to his principles and resisted all temptation, stating emphatically—

> That should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views.

The great Virginian did not regard himself as a superman. Even though our Republic in his time was a frail and feeble plant, he never faltered in his belief in the supreme capacity of men to govern themselves.

> We both consider the people as our children—

He wrote to du Pont de Nemours—

> but you love them as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses, and I as adults whom I freely leave to self-government.

Largely because of this administration's policies, our country is now faced with a serious shortage of food according to reports from many sources. Regimentation of the farmer was one of the first goals of the present administration. We all remember when crops were plowed under, little pigs were slaughtered, and when bureaucracy moved in on the farms and still refuses to relax its grip. We also remember the words of R. M. Evans, A. A. A. Administrator, who assured us in December 1941 when the United States entered the war—

When the war situation hit—

He said—

> we were prepared to handle the food problem due to our previous planning. Farmers have been canvassed and know what they are expected to produce. There is no reason to believe that the people of the United States and other countries cannot expect all the food that is necessary. There is no reason why there should be any rationing here or that prices should go very far above the present level.

But rationing is here and prices have soared far above the level in 1941. Food shortag is our portion and the day of want is present.

If only those regimenters had heeded the warning of Jefferson, uttered over a century ago:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

He said.

That warning was most prophetic.

If only we had today that strong and independent agriculture, free from governmental interference, he visualized, threats of a steadily decreasing food supply would not be front-page newspaper material.

The father of the Declaration of Independence believed in economy and frugality in government.

> The principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale.

He wrote John Taylor in 1816.

Again he said:

> If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy * * *. We must make our selection between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

In the face of a spendthrift administration with a record unequaled in all our history, further comment becomes unnecessary.

During the entire reign of the present administration to date we have witnessed an era of executive interference with the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. The effort to pack the Supreme Court will never be erased from the pages of our history. All too frequently the executive branch has usurped the function of the legislative branch, and a glaring example of such interference was the threat of the President to stabilize wages by edict unless Congress acted before a specified date.

Jefferson was particularly emphatic on that point. When he was Secretary

of State he wrote George Washington as follows:

When I embarked in the Government it was with a determination to intermeddle not at all with the Legislature. * * * As I never had the desire to influence the Members (of Congress), so neither had I any other means than my friendships, which I value too highly to risk by usurpation on their freedom of judgment, and the conscientious pursuit of their own sense of duty.

And reporting the result of a later interview with Washington, Jefferson said:

I said that if the equilibrium of the three great bodies—legislative, executive, and judicial—could be kept independent, I should never fear the result of such a government; but that I could not but be uneasy when I saw the executive had swallowed up the legislative branch. * * * The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people and every blessing of society depend so much on an upright and skillful administration of justice that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislative and executive and independent from both so that it may be a check upon both as both should be checks upon that. The judges * * * should not be dependent upon any one man or body of men. * * * Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction.

Thomas Jefferson, of course, espoused many other policies.

His political philosophy may be briefly summed up by quoting a passage from his first inaugural address:

What more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens, a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and employment and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned. * * * Equal and exact justice to all men. * * * Economy in public expense that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and the sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture and of commerce, its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press. * * * These principles formed the bright constellation which has gone before us. * * * They should be the creed of our political faith; the text of civil instruction; the touchstone by which to try the service of those we trust.

Those words, Mr. Speaker, were spoken by the father of the Declaration of Independence, the third President of the United States, and the great liberal of his time—words which are today incorporated in the bible of our Republic. Is there one among us here who would claim that the New Deal follows the principles or is the rightful heir of Thomas Jefferson?

The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if Jefferson were alive today, new dealers would not be glorifying him in marble and speech. Instead they would be smearing him for the certain opposition he would voice to the growth of the great Federal bureaucracy and the fourth term ambitions of President Roosevelt. He would be branded as a reactionary and a tory.

Yes; on Tuesday many of our self-called liberals will pay lip service to the memory and ideals of that truly great American. But those of us who subscribe to his sound philosophy will sincerely do him honor in word and thought, for he, more than any other man, provided the blueprint for our Republic.

WORLD PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGRANERY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in one of the Washington papers today attracted my attention, and in my judgment it is worthy of directing it to the attention of the Members of the House. It is as follows:

MACARTHUR PRAYS FOR BATAAN RETURN

SOMEWHERE IN AUSTRALIA, Friday, April 9.—In a statement commemorating the first anniversary of the surrender of American and Filipino forces on Bataan Peninsula, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said today:

"A year ago today the dimming light of Bataan's forlorn hope fluttered and died. Its prayers by that time—and it prayed as well as fought—were reduced to a simple formula rendered by hungry men through cracked and parching lips: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' The light failed. Bataan was starved into collapse.

"Our flag lies crumpled, its proud pinions spat upon in the gutter; the wrecks of what were once our men and women groan and sweat in prison toil; our faithful Filipino wards, 16,000,000 souls, gasp in the slavery of a conquering soldiery devoid of those ideals of chivalry which have so dignified many armies.

THREE HEROIC MONTHS

"I was the leader of that lost cause, and from the bottom of a seared and stricken heart I pray that a merciful God may not delay too long their redemption; that the day of salvation be not so far removed that they perish; that it be not again too late."

It is a wonderful spiritual message, and it conveys a volume of thought to every forward-looking American. I am wondering if we have the courage in America to stand by the Atlantic Charter. I am wondering if we have the stamina among the representatives of the United Nations to stand together not only in this war but at the conclusion of the war for the establishment of a permanent peace.

More than 19 centuries have passed since Christ came on earth and gave to mankind the panacea for peace. It was a simple message that a weary world which had been torn with wars for thousands of years appeared eager to receive. In simple language, it outlined a program through which a brotherhood of man and a fatherhood of God, with peace and happiness, might be the lot and heritage of all mankind.

It was known as the Lord's Prayer, which for 19 centuries has been accepted by millions but not by the world as a whole. The child at his mother's knee lisps it, and in its recital a large number of our armed forces, either on the field of battle or upon a bed of pain, find in it a solace which nothing else in the world can give.

To the theorists and war lords seeking a solution for the ills that afflict humanity, I commend it—the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil. Amen.

Nineteen centuries have passed since they crucified Christ for his preachment of love and brotherhood, and during that period rulers have come and gone, nations once great and powerful have become but a memory, while the message still survives.

The religious organization founded upon the preachment of Christ recognizes neither race nor color and through the centuries has been accepted as the fountainhead of Christian morality. Yet today but scant consideration is accorded this source of sound philosophy and spiritual guidance, without which victories become empty achievements and enduring peace is impossible. The recent message of Pope Pius XII presents an outline which represents the concentrated thought of centuries upon the part of men who have followed the teachings of the Divine Master and which modern theorists and greedy rulers disregard.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in an address at Christmas last, presented a five-point program for world peace which, if adopted, would mark an end of wars:

FIVE POINTS

1. Dignity and rights of the human person

He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society should cooperate for his part in giving back to the human person the dignity given to it by God from the very beginnings; should oppose the excessive herding of men, as if they were a mass without a soul; their economic, social, political, intellectual, and moral inconsistency; their dearth of solid principles and strong convictions; their surfeit of instinctive sensible excitement and their fickleness.

He should favor, by every lawful means, in every sphere of life, social institutions in which a full personal responsibility is assured and guaranteed both in the earthly and the eternal order of things.

He should uphold respect for and the practical realization of the following fundamental personal rights: The right to maintain and develop one's corporal, intellectual, and moral life, and especially the right to religious formation and education; the right to worship God in private and public and to carry on religious works of charity; the right to marry and to achieve the aim of married life; the right to conjugal and domestic society; the right to work as the indispensable means toward the maintenance of family life; the right to free choice of a state of life, and hence, too, of the priesthood or religious life; the right to the use of material goods, in keeping with his duties and social limitations.

2. Defense of social unity, and especially of the family in principle

He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society should reject every form of materialism which sees in the people only a herd of individuals who, divided and without any internal cohesion, are considered as a mass to be lorded over and treated arbitrarily; he should strive to understand society

as an intrinsic unity, which has grown up and matured under the guidance of Providence, a unity which, within the bounds assigned to it and according to its own peculiar gifts, tends, with the collaboration of the various classes and professions, toward the eternal and ever-new aims of culture and religion.

He should defend the indissolubility of matrimony; he should give to the family—that unique cell of the people—space, light, and air so that it may attend to its mission of perpetuating new life, and of educating children in a spirit corresponding to its own true religious convictions, and that it may preserve, fortify, and reconstitute, according to its powers, its proper economic, spiritual, moral, and juridic unity.

He should take care that the material and spiritual advantages of the family be shared by the domestic servants; he should strive to secure for every family a dwelling where a materially and morally healthy family life may be seen in all its vigor and worth; he should take care that the place of work be not so separated from the home as to make the head of the family and educator of the children a virtual stranger to his own household; he should take care above all that the bond of trust and mutual help should be reestablished between the family and the public school, that bond which in other times gave such happy results, but which now has been replaced by mistrust where the school, influenced and controlled by the spirit of materialism, corrupts and destroys what the parents have instilled into the minds of the children.

3. Dignity and prerogatives of labor

He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society should give to work the place assigned to it by God from the beginning.

As an indispensable means toward gaining over the world that mastery which God wishes, for His glory, all work has an inherent dignity and at the same time a close connection with the perfection of the person; this is the noble dignity and privilege of work which is not in any way cheapened by the fatigue and the burden, which have to be borne as the effect of original sin, in obedience and submission to the will of God.

Those who are familiar with the great encyclicals of our predecessors and our own previous messages know well that the church does not hesitate to draw the practical conclusions which are derived from the moral nobility of work, and to give them all the support of her authority; these exigencies include, besides a just wage which covers the needs of the worker and his family, the conservation and perfection of a social order which will make possible an assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of society, which will promote higher education for the children of the working class who are especially endowed with intelligence and good will, will promote the care and the practice of the social spirit in one's immediate neighborhood, in the district, the province, the people, and the nation, a spirit which, by smoothing over friction arising from privileges or class interests, removes from the workers the sense of isolation through the assuring experience of a genuinely human, and fraternally Christian, solidarity.

The progress and the extent of urgent social reforms depend on the economic possibilities of single nations. It is only through an intelligent and generous sharing of forces between the strong and the weak that it will be possible to effect a universal pacification in such wise as not to leave behind centers of conflagration and infection from which new disasters may come. There are evident signs which go to show that, in the ferment of all the prejudice and feelings of hate, those inevitable but lamentable offspring of the war psychosis, there is still aflame in the peoples the consciousness of their intimate mutual dependence for good or for evil, nay, that this consciousness is more alive and active.

Is it not true that deep thinkers see ever more clearly in the renunciation of egoism and national isolation, the way to general salvation, ready as they are to demand of their peoples a heavy participation in the sacrifices necessary for social well-being in other peoples?

May this Christmas message of ours, addressed to all those who are animated by a good will and a generous heart, encourage and increase the legions of these social crusades in every nation. And may God deign to give to their peaceful cause the victory of which their noble enterprise is worthy.

4. The rehabilitation of juridic order

He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over social life should collaborate toward a complete rehabilitation of the juridical order.

The juridic sense of today is often altered and overturned by the profession and the practice of a positivism and a utilitarianism which are subjected and bound to the service of determined groups, classes, and movements, whose programs direct and determine the course of legislation and the practices of the courts.

The cure for this situation becomes feasible when we awaken again the consciousness of a juridical order resting on the supreme dominion of God, and safeguarded from all human whims; a consciousness of an order which stretches forth its arm, in protection or punishment, over the unforgettable rights of man and protects them against the attacks of every human power.

From the juridic order, as willed by God, flows man's inalienable right to juridical security, and by this very fact to a definite sphere of rights, immune from all arbitrary attack.

The relations of man to man, of the individual to society, to authority, to civil duties; the relations of society and of authority to the individual, should be placed on a firm juridic footing and be guarded, when the need arises, by the authority of the courts.

This supposes (A) a tribunal and a judge who take their directions from a clearly formulated and defined right; (B) clear juridical norms which may not be overturned by unwarranted appeals to a supposed popular sentiment or by merely utilitarian considerations; (C) the recognition of the principle that even the state and the functionaries and organizations dependent on it are obliged to repair and to withdraw measures which are harmful to the liberty, property, honor, and progress of health of the individuals.

5. The conception of the state according to the Christian spirit

He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over human society should cooperate toward the setting up of a state conception and practice founded on reasonable discipline, exalted kindliness and a responsible Christian spirit.

He should help to restore the state and its power to the service of human society, to the full recognition of the respect due to the human person and his efforts to attain his eternal destiny.

He should apply and devote himself to dispelling the errors which aim at causing the state and its authority to deviate from the path of morality, at severing them from the eminently ethical bond which links them to individual and social life, and at making them deny or in practice ignore their essential dependence on the will of the Creator. He should work for the recognition and diffusion of the truth which teaches, even in matters of this world, that the deepest meaning, the ultimate moral basis and the universal validity of "reigning" lies in "serving."

Mr. Speaker, today, after the lapse of nearly 20 centuries since the coming of Christ, we find the world engaged in the most cruel and destructive war ever known. Despite the lessons of history, namely, that resort to arms as a means of settling international disputes has proven a failure for thousands of years, the chief panaceas for peace all advocate the shedding of blood.

I have three boys in the service of the Nation, in the Navy of the United States, and my blood runs cold every time I pick up a newspaper and I read about our boys policing the world when the war is ended. I would like to see my boys home when the war is won by the Allied Nations, and I believe I express the wish uppermost in the heart of every American when I give expression to that sentiment. For 10,000 years before the coming of Christ, international disputes have been settled by resort to arms and the shedding of blood. A new feature has been introduced in this war of not permitting the shedding of blood to be confined to the representatives of the armies and navies of the nations engaged. The entire population of a country are the targets for attack. Women and children are not immune. It is a new phase and a dangerous phase, and I am wondering if we have reached that point in the life of the world when we are willing to change our policy, change our system, change our custom.

I had occasion within the last week to visit the Chief of the Ordnance Division of the War Department, General Campbell. There was an inscription on the wall that focused my attention. It was an old Persian proverb, and it read:

I had no shoes and complained, until I met a man who had no feet.

I am wondering how much longer this old world of ours is going to give thought to that problem. The end of this war means hundreds of thousands of men without feet. It means millions of men and women and children without heads, and here we are, the United Nations, controlling the food supply of the world at the end of the war if they stand together, controlling the wealth of the world if they stand together, and controlling the industrial establishments of the world in which are made the munitions for the carrying on of war. If we can stand together and live up to the Atlantic Charter and bring a little spiritual atmosphere into the question of peace, it should be possible by economic pressure to do that which for 12,000 years has been impossible by recourse to arms and to be able to say to any nation that wants to make war: "Make war if you will, but you get no food, you get no money, you get no munitions. We consider you an outlaw now that the war is over and refuse to trade with you." I venture the suggestion that it is worthy

of our thought, worthy of our consideration, and, God willing, may we adopt that program.

THE CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC-UTILITIES DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NORMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a speech on the floor of the House Thursday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made an unwarranted attack on the public-utility district of Clark County in the State of Washington.

Clark County is one of nine counties which I have the honor to represent. In his remarks yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to Clark County's public-utility district as a "political parasite," and as a "political dummy," and broadly intimates that there may be a question as to whether the officials of this district have handled its money properly.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I will not let such remarks about the people of my district go unchallenged. They reflect on the integrity of the officials of the Clark County public-utility district. They reflect on the intelligence, and even the rights, of the voters of Clark County.

The State of Washington, by legislative act, set up the public-utility-district system 10 years ago. The Clark County public-utility district was created by majority vote of the people of that county some years ago, and the three commissioners which head the district have been elected, and reelected, by vote of the people. I do not think it is within the province of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to question whether these people should have a public-utility district if they want one; or to question whether the officials of the district merit the confidence of the voters, after the voters already have demonstrated and redemonstrated their confidence in these officials. They live with them and they know them.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania hinted at "collusion" between the Clark County public-utility district and certain Federal agencies. The people created this district and they elected its officials. Therefore whoever cries "collusion" must be prepared to indict the voters of the whole of Clark County, and such an indictment is manifestly ridiculous.

Bonneville is a wholesaler of electric power. It wholesales this power to both public and private distributors. Among many others, it sells wholesale power to the Clark County public-utility district, which retails the energy to consumers. Bonneville also wholesales power to other public-utility districts in my district, which, in turn, retail it to the consumers. Bonneville wholesales this power to some private companies, which, in turn, retail it to consumers. There is nothing wrong in all this and there certainly is nothing wrong with the fact that both the public and the private power retailers make profits. They show these profits through intelligent, efficient, and, I might add, publicly approved operations.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania no doubt fears that the Federal agencies, in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere, have too much control over the States and their peoples. I thoroughly agree with him in that; I am just as alarmed over this growth of Federal bureaucracy as he, or anyone else. And I solicit his support for my "home rule" public power bill, H. R. 1899, under which the States of Washington and Oregon could acquire Grand Coulee and Bonneville for a fair price. I believe my bill may merit the gentleman's approval, since it would help curtail the all-powerful control by Federal bureaucrats to which he so rightly objects.

But I must disagree strongly with the gentleman when he says, as he did yesterday, that "Who gets what from this kitty"—referring to operations of the Clark County Public Utility District—"Might make juicy reading." He makes thereby a veiled insinuation that is grossly unfair to the officials of Clark County P. U. D., and one which reflects on the intelligence of the voters of Clark County. I want to point out that the accounts of this P. U. D., and all others in my State, are kept and audited according to strict State regulations. I say to the gentleman that it would have been much better if he had investigated the bookkeeping and financial practices of this public utility district before he made any such unfair comment.

He has reflected upon certain officials and certain voters of my congressional district. I want this House to know that I not only believe in the integrity of these officials and the intelligence of these voters, but that I strongly resent such unjustified attacks upon them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Atlanta Journal of April 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 700. An act suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, April 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Monday, April 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 687 at which public hearings will be had.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 13, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8 and postponed until April 15 have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

310. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation "Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers," contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 152), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Supplemental report to part 3 to accompany H. R. 1730. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (Rept. No. 146). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to Marjorie Scott, widow of the late Rear Admiral Norman Scott, United States Navy; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1629) granting a pension to James William Westerfield; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 2443. A bill to provide for the payment currently of individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 2444. A bill to provide for the payment currently of individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 2445. A bill to provide for the issuance of a medal in recognition of services of war correspondents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 2446. A bill to provide for the forfeiture and cancelation of citizenship of any person who knowingly affiliates with any organization subject to foreign control and engaged in political activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2447. A bill to make ineligible employment of any person by the United States Government who affiliates with any subversive organization; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2448. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2449. A bill to suspend until termination of hostilities the compulsory retirement age of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 2450. A bill providing for cancelation of penalties for farm marketing excess of wheat for the years 1941 and 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 2451. A bill to incorporate the national association, Rainbow Division Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 204. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to attend the international monetary conference to be held in 1943; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

478. By Mr. CARTER: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34 of the State of California, memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to increase post-office employees' pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

479. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 28 of the State of California, memorializing Congress to create a fund to reimburse rice and other grain farmers in California for damage to crops by wild fowl; to the Committee on Agriculture.

480. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of J. J. Hubbard and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 1111; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

481. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Mrs. C. F. Utter and 23 other residents of Schenectady, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, contending by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

482. Also, petition of Addie Pitcher and 40 other residents of Broadalbin, N. Y., appealing for enactment of House bill 2082, contending by its enactment that untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

483. Also, petition of Emma Allen and 26 other residents of Sprakers, N. Y., appealing for passage of House bill 2082, contending by its enactment that untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

484. Also, memorial of the New York State Legislature, unanimously endorsing the pharmacy corps bill, (S. 216, H. R. 997), and requesting the Members of Congress to enact same into law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

485. Also, memorial of the New York State Legislature, respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movements of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient, and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

486. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. E. Burlingame and other residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. By Mr. HULL: Petition of 22 citizens of Eau Claire, Wis., supporting House bill 997 and Senate bill 216, a bill proposing the establishment of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the author of our being, to Thee we offer up our prayer of thanksgiving and praise. As we walk the shores of life's Galilee and vision the gloom of its Gethsemane, we pray that our souls may catch the glory of the unfailing secret of our Lord. In spirit and in might enable us to stand with the saints and martyrs, with prophets and sages who have gone before into the rest of eternal peace.

O Thou who stooped from the stainless heights of glory, help us to raise to the highest power wisdom, humility, and the spirit of forgiveness. Be with those who are bleak in their sorrow and human misery; nourish them in that earthly vineyard where groweth the tree of life. Give them an awakening comfort in the midst of confusion and let a heavenly joy break in their hearts as they onward go. We pray that Thy children of every creed may avail themselves of the divine instinct of prayer and learn the lesson of Thy will, continuing to enlarge the spheres of their devotion to Thy holy purpose. We bless Thee that Thou dost bring forgiveness for every sin, hope for every starved soul, and a fadeless light for every darkened pathway. O soothe the wounds of every sorrow and give grace and patience to ease every troubled breast. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

MEMORIAL TO GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, down in Alabama, the first State in the Union alphabetically and in almost every other way, there has been organized a George Washington Carver Memorial Foundation. It is unique in that it is not asking any contribution from the Federal Government. The people of Alabama are raising a foundation fund with which to perpetuate his work.

We heartily favor the memorial at his birthplace, but we wish that his memory should ever be as "the shadow of a rock in a weary land" where the people of the Nation who looked to him for leadership may find at the home of his choice and in the institution wherein his genius attained world recognition, his lengthened shadow perpetuated and his work as well as his soul marching on.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the plaintive cries of the American people and in order to relieve a suffering, shivering, frozen East, the Seventy-seventh Congress authorized a pipe line from Mississippi to Charleston, S. C. A more foolproof pipe line could not be conceived by the mind of man. There is no tenable argument against the wisdom of Congress in authorizing this vitally needed project.

At a great expense of time and money the city of Charleston, S. C., has prepared a very comprehensive brief justifying the immediate construction of this pipe line. In order to give the American people the complete story on this matter and in order to give them facts they may not know, I ask unanimous consent to insert this brief in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Because of the many vital factors treated by this document it necessarily will take up more than two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Public Printer estimates that this brief will make six pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $270.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and include therein this fine piece of work on this most important subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial from the Braddock Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

O. W. I. GETS IN STEP

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, regardless of party affiliation, are very much in sympathy with the trend within O. W. I., made public in the press today, by which the Government itself joins the program to save paper through curtailing the publication of queer pamphlets and booklets and using the customary channels of newspapers, magazines, and radio to give information to the people.

There is some satisfaction in having this dispute within O. W. I. brought into the open, because many of us have felt that taxpayers' money, manpower, and printing paper have been wasted on an attempt to win the war by pamphleteers. If, as the press today states, a clique within O. W. I. has resigned because it is dissatisfied with this change in policy, their departures from the Government pay roll will be quite in keeping with the desires of members of the Appropriations Committee and the House generally. The fact that those resigning are holdovers from the Mellett regime in O. W. I. makes it that much more satisfactory to the Congress in my opinion.

With W. P. B. ordering curtailment in the use of printing papers by newspapers, magazines, and commercial printers, it was high time for those responsible for the use of paper by the Government to get in step. If Gardner Cowles, Jr., Deputy Director of O. W. I., is bringing this about, he is to be commended and sustained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLEVENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, several Members on this side of the aisle, including myself, have, on a number of occasions, called attention to the vast amount of duplication and red tape within the various departments of our Government, which is pretty well known and understood. Only recently our attention was called to the fact that about 25 different agencies of our Government are giving attention and study to the question of post-war planning. Certainly, we must win this war first; we realize that is most important now. Nevertheless, post-war planning is also important and entitled to careful and comprehensive study.

Mr. Speaker, in place of having 25 different agencies of the Government working on the same general subject matter, it would be in the interest of efficiency, economy, and saving of manpower to have the services of these various agencies coordinated and then eliminate about two-thirds of them. Why there should be more than 2 dozen agencies of our Government, with their big staffs of employees studying the same problem, remains unexplained. I think the administration, after plenty of pressure, will proceed to follow this suggestion. It ought to be done now. To follow the suggestion I have just made will be for the best interest of the people of this country and will result in a better approach to the problem of post-war planning.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, April 13, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NO EXCUSE FOR DELAYING TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on the day after the defeat of the Ruml-Carlson amendment, I said in this House and in this place that I did not believe the Committee on Ways and Means ought to compromise the principle of pay-as-you-go. Time ticks on. Money is being spent in streams throughout the country which might otherwise find its way into the Treasury. Every day that passes makes this question more urgent. I think we ought to have a bill. I think that bill ought to include the pay-as-you-go principle. I am still for the Ruml plan. I think we ought also to have a withholding tax. Let us be courageous and let us be prompt.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made here to some obstinate men. History is replete with instances when some obstinate men did their country some good. Let us see who is so obstinate here.

We disagreed on the Ruml plan to abate $10,000,000,000. We disagreed on the other phases of the forgiveness feature of the tax bill, such as the Forand plan to forgive $7,600,000,000. We are agreed, apparently, on withholding at the source, taking the taxes from the pay check of the salaried man and the wage-earner.

The Carlson bill was copied from the committee bill in that respect, so now on that we do not need any compromise or any reconciliation of differences. We are agreed on that. In ordinary circumstances, men in busi-

ness affairs can agree to fight out their differences at the proper time and put into execution the things upon which they have agreed. That is what can be done here and now if in good faith we determine to pass a collection-at-the-source plan. That could be done with reasonable promptness. But not a soul in this House believes that we can bring a withholding plan in here if the leadership on both sides will not lend their efforts to passing that, and that alone, because opening the bill up for amendment would precipitate the same dogfight over the Ruml plan, the Robertson plan, the Forand plan, the Luce plan, the Compton plan, and the Newsome plan—we would have them all in here—that we had the last time that question was on the floor. Who talks about doing that in 1 day or 1 week?

Next Monday the reciprocal trade agreements are set for hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. It is necessary to pass the Bituminous Coal Act. If you really want to get the money that the gentleman from Pennsylvania talked about, we can pass a withholding tax and the committee can bring that in. But what on earth is the use of bringing it in if we are going to have a week's dog fight over the Ruml plan or these half dozen other plans?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think a majority of this House should have the type of bill it wishes?

Mr. DISNEY. Of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then why not bring it in and let the majority of the House determine what it wishes?

Mr. DISNEY. Did not the gentleman or someone for him offer the motion to recommit that sent back to the committee the withholding tax, on which we are all agreed? Was not that the gentleman's motion?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was because we did not want to forego the right to get some type of pay-as-you-earn bill.

Mr. DISNEY. You sent the thing back for political reasons. You will have a political dog fight. That is what you are fighting for, and you know it. Every day you are giving out statements, for that reason and none other.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman himself was the first one to inject politics in the tax fight.

Mr. DISNEY. You apparently have not given a thought to the welfare of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a resolution passed by the Washington State Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there has never been one moment since I came into this body, when I have governed my actions by party consideration. I trust that no one who listens to me now will interpret my remarks as partisan. It is my intention at this time to throw a little light upon a part of the so-called Ruml tax plan that has been misunderstood by many. I have here the opinion of a very able tax man who has this to say. I quote:

> I would like to put forward a thought that I have on this subject, which is that any year's income is simply the yardstick or measure for determining the tax payable. There is nothing sacred about this yardstick. When we look at the matter in this way, we see that the Ruml plan or the Carlson plan or any similar proposal is not seeking to take money from the Government that is due to it but is simply exercising the usual right to change the measure of the tax, which practically every revenue measure does to some extent.

I would suggest that all of us look at the whole tax matter from the standpoint of the need of the people of the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Capt. J. D. Carter, chairman of the North Carolina legislative committee of the Order of Railroad Conductors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUGAR

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years it has been my custom about this time of year to look up the statistics available on stocks of sugar for the forthcoming several months. As I study the picture today it causes me to suggest to all Members of this body that they proceed to take whatever steps they can to provide for the necessary amount of sugar for their household keepers, to use in canning the fruits and vegetables that are to be grown this year. Personally, I do not see where the required supplies will be available, and I think it is a matter we can well give attention to by reason of the scarcity of foodstuffs at the present time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the Office of Price Administration just made an agreement with Cuba for the purchase of 200,000 tons of additional sugar for the purpose of canning.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Two hundred thousand tons of sugar would probably supply the city of Pittsburgh, with its greater area and trade center, for probably a week or 10 days, with sugar moving at a fast clip for canning and manufacturing. I am speaking about the 133,000,000 people in the United States and their sugar needs for canning goods, and consisting of vegetables and fruits. A tonnage of 200,000 is a very small sum compared to some 7,000,000 tons or a substantial annual requirement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would can all of the fruits and vegetables raised in my district, anyway.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It might take care of that, and in a rather satisfactory manner, if permitted to be so used.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial on the subject That Congress Shall Have Power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain editorial with reference to the trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Senate of the State of New York and one from the State assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include some short resolutions from our State general assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORN FOR DAIRY HERDS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to read an appeal that I am making to Mr. Prentiss Brown, of the Office of Price Administration, in behalf of the farmers of my district:

> DEAR MR. BROWN: I take this occasion to make a very special appeal for the dairymen and poultry raisers of my district.
>
> Thousands of farmers in the counties of Broome, Delaware, Chenango, and Otsego are engaged in producing dairy products in the food for victory program. Figures show that they have stepped up their production a considerable percentage over all previous attempts and are now using more feed corn than ever before.
>
> As you are aware, this corn comes largely from the Midwestern States and my farmers have always been dependent upon the Corn Belt for at least partial substance.
>
> This year, unless something is done immediately, the dairy herds and poultry flocks of up-State New York must be liquidated; unless the Office of Price Administration does something about the existing ceiling prices that have been clamped upon the corn growers

of Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, and the rest. The existing ceiling is now $1 per bushel. It has been suggested that if this were raised to as much as $1.20 per bushel, the middle western farmers would be willing to dispose of their corn so that New York State farmers will not have to dispose of their dairies and poultry.

Therefore, I appeal to you for positive action in this regard. It is my hope you will adjust the ceiling you have placed on corn in such a way as to make it possible for my farmers to buy sufficient feed to last them the remainder of the year. Only by doing this will you be able to save the producers of the country's largest dairying and poultry interest, which is the small family-size farm of the East, now faced with the prospect of extermination after their 3 weeks' supply of feed corn has been exhausted.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO IS A TAX MUST

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] charges the minority with playing politics with the tax bill, especially since 60 members of his own party have petitioned for some kind of a pay-as-you-go plan. I believe they, along with the Republicans, are interested in some form of forgiveness, possibly a modified Ruml plan. An overwhelming majority of our people want a tax bill of the kind discussed during recent weeks, and all the charges of partisanship or wisecracks will not kill off public sentiment for a pay-as-you-go forgiveness tax measure. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] that a tax plan will be adopted by this House whether he likes it or not. The defeat of the Ruml plan to "forgive" taxes for 1942 and place the collection of all income taxes on a pay-as-you-go annual tax basis is only the opening phase of a campaign which will inevitably result in a modification of our entire income-tax collection system. When the Federal income-tax program went into effect in 1913, it reached back into the 1912 earnings of every taxpayer and has remained 1 year behind ever since. Today, with literally millions of new taxpayers required to pay income taxes for the first time, the opportunity to place collections on an up-to-date current basis presents itself most definitely.

It is increasingly evident that the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has evolved no constructive idea for the treatment of income taxation in keeping with the needs of the day. The striking lack of originality in the program offered by the Ways and Means Committee, coupled with their proposal to allow a 6-percent discount to those people able to pay both 1942 and 1943 taxes by June 15, 1943, points to their absolute abandonment of any claim to leadership in the formulation of a wartime fiscal policy.

THE CARLSON-RUML TAX PLAN

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, if the Treasury and the administration were as much interested in helping the poor and the middle class as they are in wrecking the rich, they would have agreed to the Carlson-Ruml tax plan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. KILBURN.

RIGHT BACK OF RICKENBACKER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial from the Railroad Workers Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Journal-American of New York, of April 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 199, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule making in order the bill H. R. 2207, which is a bill unanimously reported from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and which has had the closest scrutiny by many of the Members of this House who are so zealous in guarding the rights and privileges of this country on the question of immigration.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], a member of the Rules Committee, reported this rule and is favorably inclined to the bill.

The bill, in brief, provides that when these boys, many of whom are of tender age, go over to the fighting fronts and on a sudden impulse desert the armed forces temporarily, they may be reinstated or prevented from losing their citizenship which they would ordinarily lose under the previous statute.

The War Department has asked for this bill. It has received favorable consideration and the commendation of those who have considered it.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a war measure and it affects the manpower problem before the country. I am in entire sympathy with the proposal in this bill. In fact, I go further than the proposal in the bill, particularly in a war such as we are now engaged in, when we need everybody we can possibly reach, in our armed forces.

I am in favor of permitting men who have been in jail, or who are now in jail, serving in our armed forces. Naturally I am in favor of those who have temporarily deserted, through homesickness or have left the Army through some reaction and then want to come back and serve in our armed forces during the greatest war in our history.

I would like to be advised by some of the students of the Constitution of the United States in the House just exactly what power the Army has to take away the citizenship of a native-born American, an American born in this country. Under the category of treason, in the Constitution, I understand you lose your citizenship once you have been found guilty of treason, but I did not know that the War Department could take away the citizenship of any American. That raises a very important issue in this bill, and before we vote on it I would like to have it discussed and the facts presented to the Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this bill apply to native-born Americans?

Mr. FISH. Yes; it applies to native-born Americans and to naturalized Americans—to all categories of citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this applies to men who have been convicted by a military court, but I remember in reading the history of this country, which I

understand is not being taught today, we learned that a great many men in the War between the States were marked up on both sides as deserters, and later on showed up in the prison camps of the opposition. But I do not suppose that would have any effect in this case, because it applies only to ones who have been convicted by a court martial. But I do not see where it affects the native-born Americans.

Mr. FISH. It does affect the native-born. But I am interested in the constitutional angle. I am for the bill. I want to restore citizenship if it has been taken away. I doubt the constitutional right to take citizenship away, but if it has been, because someone has deserted from the Army and then voluntarily comes back to the Army, I certainly want to restore it. But it seems to me we should be very careful about depriving any American-born citizen of his nationality, and I want to find out what the constitutional rights of the men in our armed forces are. I am sure there must be some constitutional lawyers in the House who are familiar with all the details of the Constitution and who can answer this question. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for an answer to the question.

Mr. MASON. I am not a constitutional lawyer, nor a lawyer of any kind, but I do understand that the Constitution provides that a person may lose his citizenship if he performs certain acts, and one that I definitely remember is treason. Under our Naturalization Act that has been passed by this Congress, and no one questioned the constitutionality of it, we said that desertion in time of war, when followed by a court martial and conviction under the court martial, that person, whether he was a native-born citizen or a naturalized citizen, should lose his citizenship automatically. All this bill does is to say that that person who deserted in time of war and who was court-martialed and who did automatically lose his citizenship, may automatically regain that citizenship, provided he performs military service during the war. The Army officers told us that quite often, after court martial, they did not dismiss the person from the ranks but put him right in again, and he performed service. The officer told us that there were hundreds now serving in Africa and Guadalcanal who had deserted temporarily, who had not been dismissed, and who are now serving and not citizens, and they are losing their lives today for the country of which they are not citizens.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Illinois has made a very able explanation of the bill. As I said before, I am very much in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but it does not answer the constitutional question. Has the War Department any right or any power under the Constitution to take away the citizenship of any American except for treason? That is described specifically in the Constitution, and I doubt that the War Department has any such power unless by an act of Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I unfortunately do not have before me a copy of the Constitution, but this may throw some light upon the matter: The Congress in 1940 passed an amendment to the Nationality Act that provided that a person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization should lose his nationality by doing certain things, and among them is deserting the military or naval service of the United States in time of war, provided he is convicted by a court martial.

Mr. FISH. Is that the law of the land or is that a regulation of the War Department?

Mr. COLMER. That is a law of the land passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FISH. Then, by act of Congress we have amended the Constitution and added another definition in regard to treason.

Mr. COLMER. I do not know about that.

Mr. FISH. Just as we attempted to do the other day under the sabotage bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. By act of Congress we have instructed the War Department to carry out that act and if there has been any violation of the Constitution the violation came through the act of this Congress in passing that law.

Mr. FISH. That is exactly the situation; the War Department is carrying out the law which the Congress passed defining treason to apply to deserters.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If the Congress did pass an unconstitutional law and it is on the statute books it is the law of the land until the Supreme Court says it is not constitutional. This bill recognizes the law about which the gentleman is talking as constitutional. All this talk about constitutionality does not amount to anything because it is immaterial whether that law is constitutional or not, for we are negativing what has been done under that law. So we are just wasting time and energy as to the constitutional question.

Mr. FISH. There is no question about the law of the land being constitutional until it is held otherwise, and the War Department is acting under the law. Congress very unfortunately has the habit of adding these clauses to and amending the Constitution sometimes very hastily and loosely and in defiance to the regular procedure provided for constitutional amendments.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know whether this will add anything to the discussion, but I do think a law is constitutional until it has been held otherwise. It must be presumed to be constitutional. But if a law is unconstitutional, it is bad in the beginning because it is without the power of the law-making body.

Mr. FISH. Yes; but it is presumed to be constitutional when it passes the Congress; it is presumed to be constitutional until it is held otherwise, and we cannot proceed under any other theory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was interested in the gentleman's observation with respect to the use of prison labor in the war effort. If the gentleman will yield to me for that purpose, I should like to place in the record a letter from the Secretary of War, and also a letter from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission directly on that point in response to an inquiry I addressed to them.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman want to put them in the record at this time without making a speech about them?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD, a letter from the Secretary of War and a letter from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission on the subject of the use of prison labor in the war effort; in reply to an inquiry on that subject by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. My letter to the Secretary of War, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just received a letter from a man who is in prison, who is a good machinist, who should be making a contribution to the war effort instead of killing time.

His case suggests to me that there must be thousands like him in the prisons of the country. If they were released on parole, they could build a lot of tanks or farm a lot of crops and many of them would make first-class soldiers.

This man got into temporary financial difficulties, wrote a few checks beyond his bank account, and wound up in the Iowa penitentiary. His record, he tells me, is absolutely clear since he has been in prison, and he has been given different jobs of trust there.

There must be thousands like him who would welcome an opportunity to prove their worth to society.

What consideration has been given to making their manpower available?

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Member of Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

An identical letter was addressed to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. The replies follow:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 1, and I thank you for your interesting and pertinent comments relating to the use in the

war effort of certain men who are confined to prisons.

The general use of such men for military purposes is a question involving many angles, not the least of which is the release of such men from prison by those having authority over their conviction and punishment, as well as the willingness of the respective armed services to make use of them. In respect to the latter, it has heretofore been a rather well-established policy of both the War and Navy Departments to retain the right to determine who may be acceptable to them for military service.

With the increased need for men of all kinds both for military purposes and to supply the labor necessary for production, it is possible that further study will be made of the use of available manpower everywhere, including certain individuals in the prisons of the country.

Incidentally, there is no law or regulation which excludes persons with prison records, or persons on parole, from war-production employment. While the Civil Service Commission has had a regulation that it would not hire persons for government work until 2 years after they have completed their sentence or parole, even that regulation is not entirely rigid. An employer willing to employ those with prison records will not violate his contractual obligations to the United States Government in giving employment to such people.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In reply to your inquiry of March 1, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, relative to making use of the manpower in the prisons in furtherance of the war effort, the War Department, in collaboration with the Selective Service System and the Department of Justice, has given careful consideration to the induction of men with prison records into the Army.

The policy of the War Department is to accept for induction those registrants who have not displayed criminal tendencies or traits of character which render them unfit or undesirable associates of enlisted men following parole, conditional release, or discharge from a prison. As an essential prerequisite to acceptance for induction of men in this category, the selective service officials and the Army must have satisfactory evidence that the individual is regarded by the prison or parole authorities as fit for life in a civilian community, and that regardless of acceptability to the Army they are willing that he shall be paroled, conditionally released, or discharged, contingent only upon development of adequate means of livelihood.

In certain meritorious cases the commanding general of the Service Command concerned may, upon the recommendation of selective service officials and the appropriate parole authorities, waive the period of probation during which the individual will be observed in his home community, and accept the registrant for induction immediately following his release from prison.

It is estimated that approximately 15,000 registrants with prison records have been inducted into the Army since the inauguration of the present policy in November 1942.

The determination as to the proper use of men in prison otherwise than by their use in the armed forces is for the War Manpower Commission rather than the War Department to determine, and I am therefore taking the liberty of forwarding your letter to that agency for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. My criticism of this bill is that it seems to me we are getting rather hasty in restoring a man's citizenship and other civil rights not after he voluntarily returns but after he is caught and convicted.

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman misinterprets the bill. A man to whom this applies is a deserter who has been convicted.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. FISH. He deserts, is convicted, then he goes home, gets over that homesickness and wants to go back and fight for his country.

Mr. RANKIN. No; he does not get over his homesickness.

Mr. FISH. On his return to the Army, he serves 30 days in the guardhouse let us say and then proceeds with his military training and ends up in the front lines in Tunisia, where he serves gallantly. Would the gentleman not restore his citizenship, his civil rights, and his Americanism?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York is going entirely too fast. He has not gone home and remained 30 days, but he has got a jail sentence or the firing squad facing him and he decides that he will be better off to get back in the Army than to take his penalty. So it seems to me that it is a little out of the ordinary to take up the time of the Congress for a whole day here to rush in in advance and restore citizenship to a man who has been convicted of desertion when all it does is to give him a chance to go back in the Army and escape the just punishment the court martial has imposed.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows a great many of these young boys 18, 19, and 20 years old who have never been away from home become homesick in the Army; it is overwhelming, and they desert for a little while. The gentleman also knows there is a much bigger issue, which is the question of manpower necessary to win the war. I am in favor of taking all of these young boys back and giving them another chance. I even go further and am in favor of taking them out of the jails. I am also in favor of not giving any deferments at all to any unmarried men under 38 or married without dependents holding down jobs in the departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government. I would not give a single deferment. If we need these unmarried men under 38, take them all. If any of them are badly needed as experts or technicians, or chemists or designers, I would put them in uniform and send them back to the departments where they are needed.

In the meantime let us pass this bill and any other bills that will stop deferments of men in the Government service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Selective Service occupational deferment of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government the following Members of the House: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. ANDREWS.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2207, with Mr. ZIMMERMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the Members of the House that the War Department has asked for this legislation by letter dated March 6, 1923, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and states that there is enclosed draft of a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940. Section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940—54 Statute 1168–1169; United States Code 8–801—now provides that a person who is a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by "deserting the military or naval service of the United States in time of war provided he is convicted thereof by a court martial."

This is a long letter and I will not read all of it at this time. I am going to read now part of the hearings before the committee and the statement of Col. James E. Morrisette, Chief, Military Justice Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army:

Colonel MORRISETTE. The law as it stands today provides that a member of the military or naval service shall lose his nationality by deserting the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war provided he is convicted thereof by court martial.

Speaking for the Army alone, when a soldier is convicted of desertion by a court martial, he may or may not be dishonorably discharged from the service upon conviction. Usually he is sentenced to dishonorable discharge. In rare cases, however, where there exist extenuating circumstances, the sentence does not include dishonorable discharge.

In the majority of cases where dishonorable discharge is included, the dishonorable

discharge is suspended, with the result that the individual remains a member of the military forces.

We have hundreds of them now who have been convicted of desertion and sentenced to dishonorable discharge, but the execution of the dishonorable discharge has been suspended. Many of those men are in north Africa and Guadalcanal fighting for their country, which under the present law disowns them.

It is that situation which the War Department desires to correct. A soldier is tried for desertion. He is guilty of desertion. He has been gone for 3 months. He is working in a civilian job in civilian clothes and under an assumed name. We know he deserted. We get him. We try him. We convict him of desertion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if his authority that he intends to cite on this question which he has been presenting is the Manual of Courts Martial?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes, the statement of James E. Morrisette.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not from any decided authority by any of the courts, but is merely a statement from the Manual of Courts Martial?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been presented to the committee by both the Navy and the Army, and the Coast Guard, all of which are interested in this legislation and they have asked the committee to report a bill which was reported unanimously. There has been no objection in the committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the first point I want to make in the discussion of this bill is that although the name of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is on the bill it is not his bill. It is not a bill even from the committee. It is a bill that was presented to the committee by the War Department and the Navy Department with the request that we pass it. The only part the committee has had in preparing the bill is to amend the bill as presented in the first place by inserting the four words "in time of war" in two places so that this reenlistment or this service after court martial and automatic loss of citizenship must be done in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, one of the finest orators I ever knew in my life admitted to me that every time before he got up to speak he had trouble, he had a knot in his stomach, he was frightened, he was nervous; but the minute he got up to speak and got started he got over it. I confess that in my early days I had the same sensations. That might be called speaker buck fever. I am not a hunter, but I understand those who go out hunting for big game get buck fever sometimes when they first go out, but they get over it and become great hunters.

The fact of the matter is that these 17- and 18-year-old boys who are now in the Army and Navy get buck fever sometimes and are temporarily, shall we say, unbalanced, and they desert. They are returned to the Army or Navy, court-martialed, and continued in the service in 80 or 90 percent of the cases. They have lost their citizenship automatically. All this bill does is to provide that if they serve their country in time of war either by reenlistment or otherwise they shall automatically have their citizenship restored.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there may be some reason sometimes for getting buck fever in the case of a youngster in the battle front or other places. But after they get over it, they make excellent material, the Army officers testify, and are now fighting and dying at the front, although they are not citizens. This bill simply permits the restoration of citizenship providing they serve their country while in time of war. That is all there is to the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me how many of these cases it is estimated there are?

Mr. MASON. No. The testimony was that there are hundreds of these men at the front today. That is the only testimony we have.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The paragraph you seek to amend is paragraph (g). That naturally implies that there is an (a), (b), (c), and on down to (g) preceding.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. What do those other paragraphs, (a), (b), (c), (d), and so on, deal with?

Mr. MASON. I do not know.

Mr. JENKINS. There must be some language in them with reference to desertion.

Mr. MASON. Under our present law, if a person deserts and is court-martialed he automatically loses his citizenship regardless of the disposal of his case after court martial.

Mr. JENKINS. That is what it evidently means. These other sections must mean that anybody who does the things that are referred to in (a), (b), (c), (d), and so forth will lose his citizenship.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Then you come down to (g). You say that anyone who deserts the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war, provided he is convicted thereof by court martial, loses his citizenship.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Then you have added to it:

And as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the service of such military or naval forces.

If he deserted, he would be out, of course, but you add that. I suppose you put that in so you would be sure to get the right kind of man.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, you are not going to grant this consideration to just anybody.

Mr. MASON. No, it is all left to the discretion of the commanding officer.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry I did not hear the gentleman's discussion from the beginning. You have here a proviso. What does this proviso mean?—

Provided, That notwithstanding loss of nationality or citizenship or civil or political rights—

I have read this through 2 or 3 times. That is a sentence about 10 lines long. What does it mean?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman is looking at the report?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. That shows the corrected bill and the present bill.

Mr. MASON. That is plain English.

Provided, That notwithstanding loss of nationality or citizenship or civil or political rights under the terms of this or previous acts by reason of desertion committed in time of war, restoration to active duty with such military or naval forces in time of war or the reenlistment or induction of such a person in time of war with permission of competent military or naval authority, prior or subsequent to the effective date of this act, shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship and all civil and political rights heretofore or hereafter so lost and of removing all civil and political disabilities resulting therefrom.

Mr. JENKINS. There is the proposition. I wonder if you need all that long sentence.

Mr. MASON. That sentence is not in the law. It is simply in the report as an explanation of the purpose of the law.

Mr. JENKINS. But that is what is going in your bill, certainly?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the language you are putting in the law.

Mr. MASON. Certainly, and that is why I am reading it.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sure the gentleman has prepared himself adequately, but the fact that the War Department and the Navy Department come up and ask you to put something in the law does not mean a whole lot. It has not been more than 2 months since we had this situation before the Committee on Ways and Means. The Army and the Navy and others asked for the extension of a third grant of power to the President. When we went into it, it just faded away like frost before the sun, and they have never had the temerity to bring it up again any place.

Mr. MASON. Let me ask the gentleman from Ohio this simple question. If a boy who has been in the Army deserts in time of war and is court martialed and automatically loses his citizenship, does the gentleman from Ohio believe that if that boy returns or is brought back forcibly and does serve his country well in time of war, he should have those rights restored?

Mr. JENKINS. Absolutely.

Mr. MASON. That is all this bill does.

Mr. JENKINS Let us see if it is. Just wait a minute. The bill says "with permission of competent military or naval authority, prior or subsequent to the effective date of this act, shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship."

Why do you not stop there?

Mr. MASON. Because he may have lost other rights than his nationality and citizenship.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has asked me a question and I will ask him a question. I say, if you go that far, and stop there, I will go with you, but I do not know what other things are meant by "and all civil and political rights, heretofore or hereafter lost."

How can you pass a law today to say that anything a man might lose hereafter will be restored now?

Mr. MASON. If you apply it to the case in hand. There are two cases. One is a boy who has deserted, and who has been brought back and who has been court-martialed, and who is now serving his country in time of war. That applies to him. The other is a boy who next year, or 40 years from now, may desert in time of war, and is brought back and court-martialed, and then that is hereafter.

Mr. JENKINS. I just resume the question. I am not going to object to this, because if the committee has passed on it that is all right with me. The language is "shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship."

That is what you want and what everybody wants.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Then let us take the next. There is no comma after the word "citizenship" and then comes the language "and all civil and political rights heretofore."

If you stopped there with "heretofore," I would go with you, but you say "then or hereafter."

Mr. MASON. It does say "heretofore or hereafter."

Mr. JENKINS. And I ask the gentleman as a teacher and a scholar, especially a grammarian, how are you going to pass a law today that is going to take care of a right that a man does not have now and that he hereafter loses?

Mr. MASON. It seems to me that is as plain as the nose on the gentleman's face. If he lost his rights hereafter, his right to citizenship, and did anything by virtue of the fact of desertion in time of war, then this bill covers the automatic restoration of those rights even if 20 or 30 years from now.

Mr. JENKINS. Let us exhaust this and see where we are. I am perfectly willing to go along and give this fellow everything that he has lost. He has come back, and he is a good boy.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Give him everything that he has lost.

Mr. MASON. Or that he may have lost 30 years from now.

Mr. JENKINS. But if he goes out and kills 14 men——

Mr. MASON. Oh, this has nothing to do with the killing of 14 men. This is simple desertion in time of war, followed by court martial. Stick to the scope of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Let us take it that way. Suppose this boy, after I forgive him all these things, deserts again. Then what are you going to do with him?

Mr. MASON. Then under the bill the military authorities have the right to adjudge him. If it is a second or third offense, that would be a different thing. They do not have to do that.

Mr. JENKINS. You start out your bill with a man who has done a wrong, and you want to correct that. That is all right, I am for that, but I do not want you to do that every time that man deserts again. Under your language it makes no difference what he does, even if he kills a man or commits some other felony.

Mr. MASON. That does not apply.

Mr. JENKINS. That is all right with me, if that is your language. I do not want to be captious about it.

Mr. MASON. That covers a boy in service now or who may be in service 30 years from now, and you have to put in heretofore and hereafter.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. This bill applies merely to soldiers who are in service at this time.

Mr. MASON. That is right, and the soldiers who may hereafter be in the service.

Mr. GRANGER. And the gentleman is sure that this bill would not have the effect of bringing deserters back into the Army, except that they were heard by the military authorities.

Mr. MASON. That is right. They have to have the approval of the military authorities.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the bill as it stands is meritorious, but the thing that I am fearful about is this. Would this have a tendency to encourage desertions in the Army?

Mr. MASON. I would say no; definitely no.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I think that is a very pertinent question, because I have a feeling that this gives a soldier encouragement, that if he deserts and gets tried by court martial, then he is given an opportunity to reenlist, and if he reenlists, he has his rights restored.

Mr. MASON. Only after a period of service in time of war.

Mr. HARE. Take the case of a boy who wants to get a furlough for 30 days or 60 days. The Army says no. Nevertheless he goes off, and he says that he will desert, and he is court-martialed, and after he is court-martialed under this, he would have a right to go back and reenlist, and all of these disabilities would be restored to him.

Mr. MASON. Oh, no. He is penalized under the military rules for desertion.

Mr. HARE. That is right. If he is put in jail for 30 days——

Mr. MASON. Or any longer time the military commanders want to put him in.

Mr. HARE. Suppose it is 5 years. Then he says, "I will reenlist."

Mr. MASON. Yes; in time of war.

Mr. HARE. In time of war. This war will probably be going on for a long time. I think that is a very pertinent question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can clear that up.

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Has the gentleman read this bill carefully?

Mr. HARE. I have read it a half dozen times.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think you will notice there is a clause that he is not restored except by permission of the authorities.

Mr. HARE. That is right. You are encouraging the authorities to restore him by taking away the penalties that would be inflicted upon him.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no. The authorities would have the right to punish him.

Mr. MASON. In other words, you do not trust the authorities to apply the proper penalty for any kind of desertion that you describe?

Mr. HARE. But if you were in authority and had this law and a man had been discharged and court-martialed, this law standing before a general or a colonel or an Army officer, seeing that his nationality or citizenship would be restored if he reenlists, would that not be an invitation to him to say, "You ought to let him reenlist"?

Mr. MASON. He has not been dismissed. A court martial does not mean dismissal. In 90 percent of the cases we were told they were still in the service.

Mr. HARE. But it says here "after dishonorable discharge."

Mr. MASON. Yes; in some cases.

Mr. HARE. I think it would encourage desertion myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to supplement some of the things that have already been said and call to the attention of the House one tragic situation which this bill seeks to cure.

You will recall that following the last World War, after the Armistice on November 11, there was almost wholesale desertion from the American Army of boys who were anxious to go home. That and other situations brought about a general amnesty proclamation, issued by the President some time later. Of course, a general amnesty proclamation could take care of boys who had lost their citizenship through court martial or otherwise in the course of this war, except that some of these boys are going to be killed. Now, let us assume that a boy has been court-martialed, and under existing law has lost his citizenship. Somewhere on the battlefront he is killed

in action. He dies for a country of which he is not then a citizen. In other words, this bill simply cures a hiatus in the present law and gives the military authorities the right to restore citizenship to those boys who are entitled to have it.

I might say to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] that we had up in the committee the question of whether or not this bill, if it became law, would encourage desertion. The officers from the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps all expressed the opinion that it would not. They still have within their jurisdiction the penalties for desertion and would exercise their discretion in those matters.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Suppose we have a case of this character—I am very much interested in this particular point—suppose a man is in the military forces of the United States and he commits some crime, let us say a felony, and the military authorities then permit the surrender of this soldier to the civil authorities for trial in the civil courts. Upon his trial in the civil courts he is punished and disfranchised. Will this bill which is now before the House tend to remove the disfranchisement the same as it would the onus of a trial by court martial?

Mr. GOSSETT. If that individual is subsequently admitted into the armed services and serves honorably, he should be reenfranchised, but I do not think this bill goes to that situation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, he is already in the armed services. He has never been thrown out of the military forces, as far as the trial is concerned. The military forces permit the civil authorities to try him.

Mr. GOSSETT. The military forces take cognizance of proceedings in civil courts and any conviction of a civil offense.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is not this bill limited only to one offense of desertion?

Mr. GOSSETT. In time of war, yes. Desertion followed by court martial. Of course, a man might be court-martialed for something other than desertion.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would it involve a civil offense?

Mr. GOSSETT. No, it would not involve a civil offense, except as a court martial might follow upon a civil conviction.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The point I raise is whether or not this bill would remove the onus of the disfranchisement which is imposed by a civil court.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. When he is turned over to the civil authorities he is dismissed from the Army and the Army has no further jurisdiction.

Mr. GOSSETT. I may say I have not studied that particular situation. I am confident it would be worked out equitably under the rules and regulations.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is the gentleman's conviction that the disfranchisement which is imposed by a civil court would be entirely eliminated by this procedure?

Mr. GOSSETT. Not by this legislation. But if the man served honorably in the armed forces after disfranchisement, I believe we have other laws under which he may be reenfranchised.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I suppose in the case of a court martial, where a man was perhaps guilty of stealing blankets, and so forth, or stealing other things, then, of course, he does not get a dishonorable discharge when he is convicted.

Mr. GOSSETT. What would be done to him in such case?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I suppose they could keep him in the Army. He would lose his citizenship. I have known cases like that and that is the reason I ask.

Mr. GOSSETT. If he continues to serve in the Army honorably after such conviction his citizenship should be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid there is a little too much confusion over the bill. This bill comes to the House as a request from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps. Representatives of these branches were united. The only difference any of them entertained at all when the bill first came to us was that the phrase "in time of war" was not in the original bill. At the suggestion of the Navy Department and the Marine Corps this phrase was placed in the bill, and the War Department concurred in it. One who deserts must return in time of war to claim the benefits of this bill. The departments concerned insisted on that and it seemed like a wise provision to the committee. It is designed to discourage desertions in the first place and to encourage those who do desert to return in time of war and do their full job.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Can the gentleman state what the penalties under the Articles of War are for desertion in time of war?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The penalty I should think lies to a great extent with the court martial.

Mr. HALE. Is it not a fact that the death penalty may be prescribed by the court martial?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is up to the court martial, as I understand it; but this bill, as has been said over and over again, provides one thing and one thing only: It gives these men who have deserted in time of war a chance to come back in time of war and regain their citizenship. I cannot see why anyone should oppose the bill. If one under sudden impulse deserts and later repents and wants to come back and fight, let him do it. The question of constitutionality is farfetched. Congress passed the 1940 Nationality Act specifying ways in which one might lose his citizenship. Under the law one who deserts the military or naval forces in time of war and is convicted by court martial loses his citizenship. But many, of these men so convicted want to fight. The War and Navy Departments feel that if they are willing to fight and die for this country, they ought to have that citizenship restored. The military and naval authorities want to give these men that chance to return in time of war.

In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] a few minutes ago about encouraging desertions, it was our belief and it was the belief of the departments represented before our committee that instead of encouraging desertions it would discourage them. That may be wrong, but that was the opinion expressed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that all this bill does is to grant to the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps permission to restore citizenship in meritorious cases?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is all it does.

Mr. CURTIS. Many of these desertions may be caused by some nervous disorder, and later when the war came closer those boys and their buddies want to get back in the fight. If they do, and if they should be killed, then under present law they would be killed as noncitizens and would remain as noncitizens. This bill is to take care of those cases where the War and Navy Departments think the restoration of citizenship is merited.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is all it does. The testimony was to the effect that there are in Africa and other places right now hundreds of men who have lost their citizenship. They have lost their American rights, yet they are dying. Now, that is not fair; it is indefensible; no man can defend it. We have got to give the War Department officials and the Navy Department officials a chance to restore those men to their rights.

I hope the bill passes; it ought to pass unanimously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Probably the gentleman or some other Member has already done so, but can the gentleman tell us the number of men involved, or approximately the number?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No, I doubt anyone knows that. The representatives of the departments told us there were hundreds of men now fighting who had lost their citizenship and that also

there were I believe 2,000 incarcerated in one place in this country for various offenses.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Take the instance of a man who has lost his citizenship through the commission of a civil crime and then gets into the service, realizing that he can desert, come back, and serve meritoriously and that his citizenship would be restored to him if he does so. Would this act have the effect of restoring citizenship that was denied to a person because of the commission of a civil offense?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am not certain. It might, but if it does it would be within the discretion of the military and naval authorities and I am willing to trust the military and naval authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things that I think should be cleared up.

The gentleman from New York suggested there might be violation of a provision of the Constitution by reason of passing an act that would take away a man's citizenship because he deserted the armed forces. The Nationality Act of 1940 contains several provisions on how a person may lose his citizenship. This is just one of them.

There are about eight or nine in all. For instance, a man might take an oath or an affirmation making a formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state. Under those circumstances he would lose his citizenship. He could perform the duties of an office of a foreign state and lose his citizenship. He could vote in some foreign election and lose his citizenship. He could make a formal renunciation of his country and lose his citizenship. And then among them is this one:

> Deserting the military or naval service of the United States in time of war provided he is convicted thereof by court martial.

It just simply says that if the armed forces see fit to take him back into the service, and permit him to serve in the Army or Navy or Marine Corps, then he does not lose his citizenship. They take the boys back now; they have taken them back—hundreds of them who deserted rather temporarily—yet they are in there and not citizens of the United States. They may be killed, as has been suggested—perhaps some have been killed—yet because of this court martial on account of desertion, temporarily, perhaps, they are not citizens.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Reference has been made to the commission of felonies and trial by court martial. Is it not true that under this bill the only trial by court martial affected deals with the crime of desertion?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Any other military offense for which a man could be court-martialed and lose his citizenship is not covered.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct. This deals with the section that reads:

> Deserting the military or naval service of the United States in time of war provided he is convicted thereof by court martial.

That is the only thing this bill affects.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The same answer would apply to the question raised about some soldier stealing blankets?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That problem is not affected by this particular bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this suggestion might be a desirable amendment. I know he is the author of the citizenship code, and I would like to have his opinion with reference to inserting, in line 5, page 2, after the word "authority", the words "advised of the fact of such desertion." What I have in mind is that if the competent military or naval authority was not advised of the desertion, it having been concealed by fraudulent deletion, or otherwise, the judgment of the authority upon the induction would be worthless as a criterion, but would still result in restoration of citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to know the point the gentleman is making by offering the suggested amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. I have not offered the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am asking the gentleman what he has in mind.

Mr. HOBBS. I might be a draftee or I might be a volunteer, and I might conceal, fraudulently and by perjury, the fact I had ever been a deserter in wartime, still I would almost automatically regain my citizenship if my own fraud succeeded in obtaining for me acceptance into the Army in wartime.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You mean at some prior time, for example, thereto you may have been a deserter?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; say in World War No. 1.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then you enlisted in the armed forces, and the armed forces saw fit to accept you, and you go into the fighting forces?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think there is a possibility of such person obtaining citizenship under this act.

Mr. HOBBS. If I concealed the fact of a former desertion by stealing or falsifying my record, and by perjury, and they did not know what they were doing when they said it is all right for me to come in?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you concealed the fact and you were approved by the Army as provided by the terms of this act, under those conditions you might become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. HOBBS. I know I would, but I do not think I should.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not too sure. That is a matter I would have to give some consideration to. A man who goes into the fighting forces and fights for his country should be given a lot of consideration. This particular bill deals only with the question of desertion, and where those in authority see fit to permit such person to go back into the services of his country. This legislation does not deal with any other crime. Mr. Chairman, this may seem to be repetition, but it should be clearly understood that this measure does not take into consideration the commission of other crimes such as stealing of blankets, and other more serious infractions of the law. A man may be court-martialed and be dishonorably discharged, and lose his citizenship. It is possible in such cases that the authorities may see fit to permit such person to continue in the service and later have an honorable discharge.

This measure, before us today, deals with a mandatory law that says in substance, that if a man has been convicted of desertion he thereby loses his citizenship, regardless of the fact that he may go back in the forces, upon approval of the proper officers, and serves honorably thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1169; U. S. C. 8, 801g), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(g) Deserting the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war, provided he is convicted thereof by court martial and as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the service of such military or naval forces: *Provided*, That notwithstanding loss of nationality or citizenship or civil or political rights under the terms of this or previous acts by reason of desertion committed in time of war, restoration to active duty with such military or naval forces or the reenlistment or induction of such a person with permission of competent military or naval authority, prior or subsequent to the effective date of this act, shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship and all civil and political rights heretofore or hereafter so lost and of removing all civil and political disabilities resulting therefrom; or."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "forces", insert "in time of war."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "person", insert "in time of war."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER,

having assumed the chair, Mr. ZIMMERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, pursuant to House Resolution 199, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF CONTEMPLATED REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO LABELING, PRODUCTION, MARKETING, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES AND COMMODITIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 98.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining—

(1) Whether the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, or any other agency or officer in the executive branch of the Government, is formulating plans with a view to putting into effect (a) requirements with respect to Federal grade labeling of articles or commodities, and the discarding of private brand names of articles or commodities, and (b) any other requirements intended to bring about simplification and standardization of production, marketing, and distribution of articles or commodities, as well as concentration of industry or production; and

(2) Whether, and to what extent, the formulation and carrying out of such plans are necessary in connection with the war effort; and

(3) The extent to which any such plans may represent an attempt to change our domestic economy along lines not authorized by Congress.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "Government", insert "has formulated or."

Line 11, strike out "and (b) any" and insert "(b) requirements which would have the effect of curtailing the production or consumption of newsprint or book papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges, or (c) any."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and pending that yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], one of the ablest Members of this House, has sponsored. This is the first time since I have been a member of the Committee on Rules that a resolution has been reported by a member on the minority side, which I think is a distinct, well-merited, and well-justified tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the author of the resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared quite a lengthy address, but I am not going to take the time of the House this afternoon to go into this matter at any great length except as questions shall be asked.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Before the gentleman starts on his talk, I should like to make this inquiry and observation. If it is contemplated that there is to be a standardization with reference to goods and the labeling of goods which would eliminate trade-marks, which are a very natural and normal part of our commercial processes, it seems to me that by all means a situation of that kind should be investigated. There will be created great confusion and lack of confidence on the part of the public if goods are simply to be standardized according to one pattern regardless of their origin in point of manufacture.

Personally, I offer my commendation to the gentleman for trying to preserve the normal trade relationships, especially in dealings with the public, in order that they may be informed with reference to what they are buying. I see no particular objection to grades being posted on a label under a trade-mark, because that would further inform the public, but to do away with trade names and to do away with trade-marks would to me seem unconscionable. I commend the gentleman for undertaking this important work.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and suggest to him in reply to what he has said that already out of the O. P. A. have come several standardization orders dealing with such everyday commodities as heavy underwear, hosiery, and men's and boys' shirts. I understand there is presently under consideration standardization in respect to men's work clothes.

I shall cover that in my prepared address, but at this point let me suggest that those standardizations are on such specifications and price levels that when the quality manufacturer who has been producing an advertised line, a quality garment, brings his specifications and prices down to the standards that are being fixed in various of these orders, he would be required to make a product that he just would not put his name on and could not put his name on. That is the thing. It is not only the grade labeling but the end result which threatens trade-marks and brand names.

As the gentleman suggests, you might put a grade label according to Government specifications on a given article of consumer goods and at the same time maintain your quality and retain your brand name on it. We have that sort of a situation at present under the so-called Wool Labeling Act, where brand names are still continuing.

These programs do threaten the very thing about which the gentleman is talking. It seems to me highly important, and it seems to me that it is the responsibility of the Congress, answerable to the people, to determine which of those programs are essential in the war effort and which of them may be devised for some other reason that is wholly outside the intent and the purpose of congressional action.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Has the gentleman heard from any source whatever why this particular program has been indulged in by these people down in these various departments of the Government?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is contended by some that you cannot have a price-fixing arrangement unless you standardize. I do not subscribe to that view. I do not think you have to put every underwear manufacturer in just a given groove in order to fix prices. Prices have been fixed upon the prior existing prices of the particular product in many cases, and fairly effective jobs have been done in that direction, all of which leads me to believe that the purpose in many of these programs is not price control alone. The gentleman will recall that in the Price Control Act we specifically provided that that act should not be used to change the manner or method of doing business.

I might cite this too. The O. P. A. in the hosiery standardization order very brazenly says that this is not only to fix prices but to let the consumer know more about what he is paying his money for. I could talk at considerable length about just how much they are letting the consumer know about it. The hosiery manufacturers say that when they get down

to those standard specifications many of them will have to curtail greatly the quality of their product.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I have given some thought to the situation the gentleman has been discussing. I have often wondered whether or not this was a part of a program to make it awfully embarrassing—I use a very mild term in expressing my thought of that—for legitimate business in this country. Will not the program that is now being followed do much really to tear down the business that has been built up by the varinous fine manufacturing concerns of this country?

Mr. HALLECK. I shall discuss that at some length. Of course manufacturers are disturbed. The heavy underwear industry the other day put out a statement explaining their position. They say that the effect of the standardization order is to cut down their production. It is not only the manufacturer who is disturbed but the distributors are also, and as a matter of fact, you could not deal a quicker death blow to small independent business than to drive trademarked and branded goods off the market. The consumers are disturbed about it. For years I bought suits of clothes that had a given manufacturer's name on them. I do not want to promote his business since they are still making them and so I shall not mention the brand. I did not know much about the texture of cloth or the tailoring in cloth, but I found from experience that that manufacturer was building quality into his product and I relied upon that I bought the garment that he sold me and was consistently satisfied with it. It is that sort of manufacturing integrity that has been the very cornerstone and bedrock of the system of private enterprise in America.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Briefly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think what the gentleman intends to do in this investigation is to discriminate between these restrictions which are made necessary because of war limitations on supplies, and those which are arbitrary and capricious, to effect a new system of merchandising.

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct, and is specified in the resolution. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to which this matter will go is a committee that is not bent on doing anything to injure the war effort, but rather is a committee I am confident the House can depend upon to do the job fairly and rightly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Right there, suppose an order be given out to simplify 300 or 400 different styles of shoes in order to make it possible for the small retailer to have an adequate supply of shoes for sale. It would not be the attitude of the committee that that order, in view of the limited supply of leather, would be arbitrary and capricious.

Mr. HALLECK. Absolutely not. Simplification of lines today, to take out the frills and to cut out unnecessary lines, is something that industry, the retailer, and the consumers have all gone along together on. There is no dispute about that. As a matter of fact, industry has been down here right straight along cooperating in that very direction, but some of them have been a little disillusioned when the orders finally came out. Some hosiery people have been to see me. They agreed on a program of simplification, but they said to me plainly that when they finally saw the order, it set up requirements that they could not comply with. They thought it represented a complete socialization of their industry. Those are things that may come up, and of necessity any congressional committee would have to exercise judgment in considering them.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not true that the food production may be hazarded by a system unless we have some definite understanding? I understand that in the canning industry the canners have not ordered the production of certain vegetables from the farmers because they are fearful as to whether or not they will be able to dispose of it properly and are waiting some definite steps to be taken with regard to labels.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, the House Committee on Agriculture has started on that phase of it, and has done a good job on that special matter. Of course, this is an over-all problem, that involves many different things and ties in with many problems, and in different lines; but the canners stated that those requirements sought to be imposed on them would probably reduce their production 25 percent.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Briefly.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. The so-called Smith committee is investigating executive agencies and has before it now matters as to certain instances where the party making the complaint feels that the O. P. A. is overstepping its powers under the law. The Smith committee is now in process of holding hearings under those complaints. I am wondering if it is the thought of the gentleman to investigate that same realm of activities that the Smith committee is investigating, or whether his activities are going to be along a different line.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman that I helped the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, with his resolution and opened the debate for it on our side, as he knows. I had some little part in helping to draft the resolution. The gentleman will recall that it is very specifically provided in that resolution that only those orders and activities outside the scope or the authority of the statute should be subject to the investigation of that committee. This resolution deals with the further proposition of reasonableness, and a determination as to whether or not the program not alone is outside the law, because I suspect many of them are inside the law, but whether or not, in truth and in fact and in good judgment and reason, they can be logically supported as being necessary in the prosecution of the war, as distinguished from some effort to make over the economy of the country. So I do not think there is any conflict at all. If I though there was, if I thought that the Smith committee had complete jurisdiction to do this job, I would not be here urging the adoption of this resolution. But I have an abiding conviction that this is one of the most important things before the country today. I believe the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives is the proper committee to handle it. This is not a partisan matter, and I want to say to the membership that I certainly thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the splendid things he said about me, which were not at all deserved, I am sure.

I appreciate the fairness and cooperation of my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Rules and of the membership of the whole House. This matter will be in the hands of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is dominated in numbers by the majority side, and of course they will be in control. I cannot refrain from suggesting since he is right here that our very able and fair majority leader has been very helpful in making it possible for this resolution to be considered.

Apart from the labeling and standardization program that is sought to be investigated here, there is a amendment that was contained in a separate resolution introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] to inquire into the necessity for the curtailment of newsprint and paper used by magazines. That is to be incorporated as a part of this resolution. As a matter of fact, when I first introduced the resolution I thought the authority was there, but there was some question about it. I might suggest that in that particular matter when there was talk downtown of a 30 or 40 percent additional cut in newsprint over the 10 percent originally made, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was asked to intervene and did intervene. Subsequently at an informal meeting of certain Members of the House who wanted to attend, certain members of the WPB and other agencies downtown came up here and talked about that proposed curtailment. Following that there apparently was some sudden change of opinion on the part of the Canadians as to how much wood and pulp they had. But be that as it may, the curtailment order that had then been promulgated of an additional 10 percent, was rescinded. While no one knows what the requirements in the future may be, certainly there is not one of us but who would want to be sure that before this great industry of ours, the press of the Nation, which is doing such a valuable work in the actual carrying on of the war effort, were curtailed in its operations, a very clear and

definite showing should be made of the necessity for such action.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Referring to grade labeling let me say to the gentleman that our Committee on Agriculture has conducted lengthy hearings on grade labeling of canned products, and we were unanimous that there should not be any compulsory grade labeling requirements for the 1943 pack.

Mr. HALLECK. As I said, I think the Committee on Agriculture did a splendid job and they are to be commended for it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If this resolution is adopted, will the House understand that you intend to go into the question of whether or not the Government itself is curtailing the use of newsprint?

Mr. HALLECK. I think that is a proper subject for inquiry, if I may say it. Certainly it would strike me that if the time comes when the private press of the Nation is to be required to seriously curtail its supply of paper, the Government might well set a good example by cutting down a little on some of its uses, that I am quite sure all of us will agree could be eliminated without any serious detriment to the war effort.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the gentleman happen to notice this morning an announcement that there were some changes being made in the O. W I., pointing to a trend to abolish the use of so many pamphlets, and relying more upon the press of the Nation to carry their various messages?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I observed that, and I commend the gentleman in O. W. I. who was responsible for the action.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It might be interesting to inquire how much paper has been used by the State Department in sending out great packages of speeches relating to the trade agreements, clear down to the Y. W. C. A.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that many of those things could properly be inquired into.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have introduced a resolution asking that a committee be appointed by the Speaker of this House to go into that very question about which I have asked the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I know of your resolution and it is commendable. However, I think this resolution will cover the whole field and such as may be necessary to be done can be done under this authority.

It should be noted that this resolution does not set up a new committee or a special committee. It goes to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am confident that reasonably expeditious action will be had.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, if this resolution is adopted, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will welcome the assistance and aid of the gentleman from Michigan and other men who are interested in this problem.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I might say in that case I would like to present the committee with a large envelope which one small newspaper sent me, containing the Government releases which it received in a single week.

Mr. HALLECK. This resolution which was introduced by me comes from the Rules Committee without objection on the part of any member of that committee. It is entirely nonpartisan. It is the result of a tremendous concern among manufacturers, distributors, and consumers caused by various orders promulgated and proposed by the O. P. A. and certain other war agencies. These orders, under the guise of simplification and pricing to aid the war effort, are going so far as to require grade labeling and standardization of such type as to threaten the elimination of brand names and trade-marks and put out of business manufacturers and distributors who have spent years developing a quality product and promoting its mass production and sale through advertising. The resolution as amended also provides for an inquiry into the curtailment of newsprint and paper.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is directed to examine into these various orders and programs and to determine whether they are necessary in the war effort or whether they are designed to change our domestic economy along lines not authorized by Congress. There is an overwhelming demand for such an investigation, and I am happy to report that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce desires to undertake it. That committee is the proper committee. Its jurisdiction and experience is definitely in the field which this resolution covers.

For instance, there is currently raging a controversy about grade labeling of canned goods. Canners say it is unworkable, impractical, and, what is more to the point, that it will cut down production. They say the O. P. A. theorists are gambling with the food and clothing necessities of every American community, and I agree with them. But what is more to the point, this whole matter of compulsory grade labeling was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a few years ago when we rewrote the Food and Drugs Act. It was turned down then by Congress as unnecessary, unworkable, and impractical. And yet it is being promoted today by the same people in Government who urged it before.

We are in a war and everyone wants to win that war. Our people will make any necessary sacrifice. But they do not like to see anyone use the necessities of war to subject them to economic experimentation which has nothing to do with winning the war. If they are asked to give up long-standing traditions and practices rooted in our system of free enterprise, they are at least entitled to know the cause therefor.

When we wrote the Price Control Act, we were afraid of some of these bureaucratic innovations. So we specifically provided that—

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

That should be clear enough to anybody but the Henderson clique in O. P. A., now busy trying to gang up on their new boss, Prentiss Brown, are insisting on going ahead with their grade-labeling program. These self-appointed legislators in O. P. A. seem to proceed on the theory that the entire canning industry, and the food distribution system of this Nation, are seeking to evade the law.

Many Members have undoubtedly heard the complaints of hosiery manufacturers against O. P. A. order MPR–339. After months of honest effort to cooperate, these producers tell me that this order goes clear beyond any reasonable necessity and points directly toward complete socialization of their industry. And the most brazen part of it all is that, in its press release on this order, the O. P. A. flies right in the face of the positive mandate of Congress that our act was to be used to control prices and not make over our way of doing business. In that release, they say:

> Office of Price Administration took these steps not only to control prices, but also to let consumers know more about what they get for each dollar spent.

That is the sort of stuff I think the committee should investigate. That order of the O. P. A. will not help the consumers. It will hurt them. Quality manufacturers of hosiery, attempting to meet these specifications, and the price fixed for them, must go out of business or cheapen their product to where they will be ashamed to own it.

But grade labeling is only the beginning of the story. Conceivably, a manufacturer could continue to use his brand name or trade-mark, keep up his quality, and add a marking covering Government specifications. But now, for instance, it is reliably reported that Dr. Galbraith, of the O. P. A., is getting up an order to standardize all work clothes. That means no more Sweet-Orr, Oshkosh Bi-Gosh, or Levi Strauss overalls. You ask why? Just because the standardized type is inferior to their product and it is priced less. They cannot make their overalls to their quality specifications and stay in business. That means their brand name is gone. The thing they spent years to build is valueless.

And they have nothing left to advertise. The war model has taken over. And for what good end? Only to satisfy the long-standing social and economic theories of those whose proposals would never stand the light of day. We cannot stand by and let a scheme like that of Tugwell for Puerto Rico be put into effect in this country without convincing proof that it is necessary in the war effort.

The same thing is true of heavy underwear. Orders for standardization threaten the whole industry and have paralyzed production. The same may be said of many other kinds of consumer goods.

Some of us happen to believe that extremists sponsor this program with the hope of acquiring greater control over many industries. There has been a lot of behind-the-scenes jockeying on this question, and an investigation by the Congress will help put the bureaucrats in their places and permit more experienced and practical men to chart the course.

Men in industry have not hesitated to cooperate in plans to simplify lines, cut out unnecessary frills, and curtail the use of material. Such action aids the war effort. But they cannot go along with these extreme plans which would do away with identity, eliminate brand names and individual quality, and seek to put all manufacturers in one groove.

Mr. Nelson has been extremely wise in selecting Howard Coonley, well-known industrialist with extensive experience in standardization efforts in his own industry, to head up W. P. B.'s Division on Conservation and Simplification. My desire is to see our committee strengthen the hand of men like Howard Coonley in W. P. B.

But we may well look into a scheme which says that an overall manufacturer, whose trade-mark has been respected for perhaps 50 years or more, will no longer be allowed to make the kind of overalls his customers have been buying and wearing. Shall we say that, like a school child, this experienced overall maker will be told that the law requires him to make overalls in just such a way, and the overall wearer will wear whatever O. P. A. decides is right, or do without. Like so many of the blueprints made by these dream-world economists, this O. P. A. price-fixing standardization scheme has no solid basis of practical experience. At best, it can only be termed a "crack-brained experiment." At worst, it may turn out to be deliberately subversive of American institutions.

Production to meet consumer needs cannot be turned on and off like a water tap. Food and clothing supplies for months ahead will be either short or adequate according to the plans and decisions which producers and manufacturers must make now. Recent O. P. A. orders for knit underwear, women's hosiery, men's and boys' work and sport shirts, have thrown these industries into confusion, according to reliable reports. With every additional day of delay and evasion by O. P. A. officials who have the professorial dislike of admitting error, production of badly needed civilian supplies is further reduced. Is this the sort of price control that is supposed to help win the war? Are those O. P. A. theorists more interested in breaking down free enterprise at home than in beating the Axis abroad?

As one of my correspondents puts it:

> Grade labeling is the opening gun of as sinister a move as could well be figured by the bureaucrats, to despoil our internal economy for the benefit of the Socialist system of production for use and not for profit.
>
> Grade labeling the 1943 pea crop is only the beginning. Brought down to its logical end product, through the inevitability of gradualness, step by step, would come the disappearance of advertising and hence of a free radio and a free press; mass unemployment, in the absence of competition; degrading of product, without brand guarantee; and monopoly cartelizing, destroying the independent merchant. Yes; it goes even further than these immediate probable results, for it would put the eggs all in one basket for the take-over by the totalitarian state.
>
> This reform by bureaucratic decree, without the shade of congressional sanction, is abhorrent to every thinking person. This lurking evil should be resisted at all costs.

Coming to the newsprint situation, there is the greatest need to have the true facts brought to light by congressional investigation. Originally this part of the resolution was a separate resolution introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] but was combined with my resolution by the Committee on Rules.

Here are a few facts about the newsprint situation. Threats of curtailment of consumption of paper have been made from time to time by O. P. A. and W. P. B. for the past 2 years. No conclusive proof of the necessity for such action has ever been made public. At the first of the year, W. P. B. issued orders curtailing the use of printing papers about 10 percent. Newspapers were required to go back to the paper required for their net paid circulation in 1941, while magazines were allowed to use 90 percent of their 1942 consumption. There were vague hints at greater reduction. Just a day or two after the Congress started to give this matter attention, W. P. B. announced another reduction of about 10 percent to apply after April 1, 1943.

It developed that the Civilian Supply Section of W. P. B. was suggesting that the use of paper by newspapers and magazines be cut 30 to 40 percent and the people in W. P. B. thought they were doing very well to hold the second cut to 10 percent. No one has let it be known just what actually happened in the next few days, but it seems that Canadian authorities made a remarkably quick resurvey of the situation as to wood and wood-pulp production, and W. P. B. reversed itself and abandoned the proposed second cut. But in newspaper, magazine, and paper production circles the grapevine has it that this postponed second cut may fall on newspapers and magazines any day.

A few days ago Members in the House from Texas and others, whose names have been identified with this question in Congress, have received copies of a letter written to W. P. B. Chairman, Donald M. Nelson, by the Texas Newspaper Publishing Association, asking him to thoroughly investigate all phases of a rumored further cut in newsprint use July 1 and declaring that newspaper publishers have been kept in a state of confusion because of the continuous flow of statements on the subject emanating from W. P. B. According to the Texas publishers, these developments "have raised the question as to whether the statements and rumors of newsprint shortages emanating from the Pulp and Paper Branch of W. P. B. are activated by the price angle."

Spokesmen for W. P. B. and other agencies have told us about the problems of wood production in Canada which seem to control the whole situation. First they said there was a great falling off in production. Then the Canadians corrected them and said production was much greater than expected. Now we are starting to hear reports that the outlook is bad again. All these conflicting reports have come out within a few weeks.

I have here a clipping from the New York Times of April 2 giving a Canadian Press dispatch from Toronto dated April 1, on the annual convention of the Ontario Pulp and Paper Makers Safety Association. President A. T. Whealy reported to members of the association that employment in woods operations in Ontario increased 26.5 percent in 1942 above 1941, and was 68 percent above the average for the preceding 10 years. That looks like something official from one of the two big paper-producing provinces in Canada and certainly does not verify reports of any falling off in wood production.

The other big producer is the Province of Quebec. Last week the former premier of Quebec, Maurice Duplessis, who headed the provincial government from 1936 to 1939, told the legislative assembly that the curtailment of paper production is causing much unnecessary unemployment, that it is entirely unnecessary and that there is absolutely no truth in the claim that curtailment is necessary to divert electric power to more essential needs. He declared Canada has more electric power than they know what to do with and urged that Canadian producers seek the market in the United States formerly held by Scandinavian producers.

Perhaps the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when this resolution is passed, could look into the rumor that some master minds in the executive branch are keying post-war international trade schemes into the curtailment of newsprint. I would like to know if someone is restraining Canadian and American producers from filling the market in this country so that the need of imports of pulp and paper from Scandinavian countries will be here after the war. I want to know if the willingness of the American newspaper and magazine publishers to make any sacrifice to help win the war is being imposed upon.

I want to know if the American people are being imposed upon.

This proposed investigation is the answer. Newsprint production is a Canadian—not a United States problem. Seventy-five to eighty or more percent of all the newsprint used in the United States comes from Canada. The committee will have no difficulty in securing complete and official information from Canadian authorities, for I am sure the Canadians want all this confusion cleared up and the importance of a committee of Congress assigned to this question will be recognized by them. No group is more anxious than this Congress to see continued the very fine and friendly relations now existing between Canadian producing interests and the consumers of newsprint in the United States. Many of our American producing companies are big operators in Canada. They know the situation on both sides of the line and can bring us real facts. If newspaper and magazine publishers have information for us, they will be heard. If anyone is trying to slip something over, the curtain will be pulled back.

If I were charged with the responsibility of running the pulp and paper or the printing and publishing sections of W. P. B., I would want a committee of Congress at work on this problem. If I were in Donald M. Nelson's shoes, I would welcome the support of this congressional committee, and I am sure Mr. Nelson will welcome it. Such a committee will be clothed with adequate authority to find out what savings can be effected in the use of paper by the Government itself and in this direction can probably do a better job than officials of W. P. B., or the Bureau of the Budget can do. And such a committee can bring its findings to the Committee on Appropriations, where definite results can be secured.

There is no sense hiding the fact that many of the "smart boys" who were loaded onto the temporary war agencies are more concerned with inaugurating their pet reforms than they are about working in harmony with the business leaders in the war agencies and the seasoned, trained executives in the permanent branches of our Government. When we pass this resolution and the committee gets underway with its work, the forces standing for sane, intelligent administration in these war agencies will be strengthened and sustained.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete sympathy with the gentleman from Indiana insofar as labeling and trade-marking is concerned, so long as they do not violate the False Advertising Act.

What I want to address myself to for the moment is the creation of special and select committees. If you will reflect for a moment you cannot but agree that there are more select and special committees in the House and Senate today than ever before in the history of this Congress.

Before long the people will be referring to the Congress as the investigation branch of the Government rather than the legislative branch.

It was extremely unfortunate that at the outset we did not provide for joint committees of the House and Senate to make the investigations. Keymen of this Government can be found more before committees of the House and Senate than at their desks.

That includes General Marshall, that includes Admiral King, that includes Admiral Land, General Somervell, Admiral Moreell, and other men charged with the prosecution of this war. If the House and Senate committees do not stop requiring these men to come before them, one day before the Senate and the next day before the House on the same subject, you will be required to have alternates for all of them to carry on the business of prosecuting the war.

In my opinion, the Smith committee has full jurisdiction over the subject contained in this resolution. That committee is created, it is functioning, and I am confident if this question were placed before the committee it would be investigated. I say also that the Smith committee should investigate the matter that you have charged to the Cooley committee and likewise to the Cox committee. There is no reason why we should have all these special committees.

The one good feature of this resolution is that it provides that a standing committee of this House shall make the investigation. I hope in the future that more care will be given by the Rules Committee to resolutions of this character. I know what the cost of this is going to be because I happen to handle the accounts. We have appropriated more money in the legislative appropriation bill this year than we ever did for the select and special committees, yet it is only a drop in the bucket compared to what you are going to appropriate in the future if the special committees are going to carry on as they do today; so I express the hope that if investigations are to be made some committee that is already created and that has jurisdiction over the subject will do the investigating and not a new committee.

I realize investigations are beneficial. They serve notice on those administering the laws, especially the expenditures. They are being checked, but our big job today is to win this war. Waste and extravagance we will always have, but like you I want it held to the minimum. I also agree if there was a disposition on some in authority to discharge those who are not properly doing their duty there would be less complaint. I know some of our committees have done a great job and saved the Government untold amounts, but they should remember the keymen have work to do and cannot do it and at the same time spend their time before investigating committees.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to second what the gentleman from Missouri has just said to the effect that he is glad this resolution does not set up a new special committee but utilizes one of the standing committees to do this work. In the second place I want to emphasize that, as has already been pointed out, the Committee on Agriculture has gone rather deeply into this question of grade labeling as far as food products are concerned.

I should also like to point out that the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture introduced a resolution to empower that committee to make an investigation of the spread between the price which the consumer pays for agricultural commodities and the price the farmer receives. Such an investigation will, in my judgment, inevitably involve the question of the proper labeling of the foods on the retail shelves of the Nation.

The main thing I want to say, though, is to make my own position very plain about some of these matters. I think it altogether important that in the work of the War Production Board and the OPA, or any other Governmental agency, every effort be made to preserve normal methods of doing business, and I do not think that trade-marks, or trade names, or the reputation of a business should be interfered with. I furthermore believe that in attempting to bring about standards, in attempting to bring about a savings of goods and materials, or what not, the retailers ought to be consulted much more than they have been in the past, because, after all, they are the fellows who have got to dispose of these goods in the last analysis, and they will be left with them after the war ends. So I think they are entitled to consideration and I am sure they will receive it under the terms of this resolution.

I want to say this with all the vigor at my command: I do not see how in the world you can impose fair and just prices or price ceilings unless you have some method of determining and unless the consumer has some method of knowing what the quality of a product is. I agree with the other members of the Committee on Agriculture that at this time it is probably impractical to require grade labeling on canned goods as to the 1943 pack. I think that might cause delay and that there is some doubt whether O. P. A. has power to require Government grade labeling, but I want to say with all emphasis that in any situation where fair prices are desired it becomes necessary to have some method whereby the consumer knows for what quality of goods he is paying that price. It seems to me in this connection that at least one thing that might be considered now is the simple requirement that the information carried on the invoice be given not only to the wholesaler and to the retailer but also to the purchaser. I am confident such a requirement would be not beyond the scope of the powers granted to O. P. A. That information might simply be passed on to the consumer in some proper way as it is now passed on to the wholesaler and the retailer. As to the pack for 1943, the all-important thing, of course, is to get going and to achieve the

maximum production, and I am not going to split hairs over requirements as to that. But as to general governmental policy, which I think should be decided by the Congress, before the 1944 season comes around, it is my position that grade labeling is proper and necessary so that the consumer may know what the quality thereof is.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman believe that this is the sort of legislation that should come from Washington, or should it not come from the State legislatures?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that legislation could appropriately be passed by the Congress. I do not like to see it handled by a governmental agency unless the Congress gives it definite authority so to do. I think the whole question should come before the Congress for its consideration and determination.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in the adoption of this resolution, because, among other things, it will enable the Congress to determine the extent to which a conspiracy exists to destroy the freedom of the press in America.

This resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], contains an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] which I assisted in writing. I take the floor at this time to emphasize the importance of this amendment.

For a considerable length of time many of us have been disturbed at what we believe to be a persistent, determined, and concerted effort by Government agencies and officials to interfere with and curtail the full freedom of the press as guaranteed to the people of America under the Constitution.

These efforts seemed to have reached their climax in the filing of what I term "the spite suit" against the Associated Press last August, a suit which alleges that the Associated Press is a monopoly and that it has operated in violation of the antitrust laws.

It mas my thought at the time that this suit, which clearly revealed the spleen and animus of the enemies of a free press, was to be the final, as it was in fact the most dangerous, move in the game that was being played and the objective of which was to deprive the American people of their constitutional right to be told what was going on by an untrammeled press.

In order that this House, and the people, may be fully informed as to the hidden motives of the suit and other machinations which were in train, I introduced a resolution last January 21, authorizing the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the entire matter of the rumored conspiracy to bring the Nation's press into governmental subjection.

I do not know whether it was the result of my resolution or not, but the Department of Justice began moving with what seemed to me to be indecent haste to speed up the prosecution of the suit. It demanded and obtained an order expediting trial of the suit. It appointed additional and special counsel to prosecute it. Fortunately, that case has not yet come to trial.

My resolution was referred by the Speaker to the Rules Committee when it was introduced January 21. On February 4 I wrote to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], pointing out the importance of the contemplated investigation and urging early consideration of the measure. I regret to report that I have yet to receive an acknowledgment of my letter.

Now, I am not unmindful of the press of business before the Rules Committee, but I know of nothing more fundamental than this question of the freedom of the press, and it seems to me that some action could have been taken on my resolution, or on the resolution subsequently introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] which was similar in objective but which would authorize a select committee to make the inquiry. But, neither of these resolutions have been acted upon by the committee.

Now, I hope I will not be misunderstood. I am not criticizing the Rules Committee for failing to act upon either one or both of these resolutions. Rather, it is my purpose to commend the committee for providing this House with an opportunity to approach the matter from another angle under the pending resolution.

As I stated before, it seemed to us Members who are concerned with safeguarding the freedom of the press that the enemies of that freedom would rest in dependence upon the prosecution of the suit against the Associated Press to accomplish their purpose. And it was our further thought that an inquiry into the background of the suit would defeat this tricky maneuver.

We were in error. Instead of placing their dependence on the suit, those striking at the freedom of the press executed an oblique maneuver while the suit was pending.

Having set in train the movement by which they hoped to place under Government subjection that gathering and distribution of news—now carried on by three principal and independent news agencies, which in itself is prima facie evidence that the Associated Press is not a monopoly—the anti-free-press agitators in Government positions moved to curb, curtail, and restrict the paper on which the news might be printed. This, in my opinion, was to give them what is commonly known as an ace-in-the-hole in event the Associated Press move failed.

The newspapers of the country accepted without complaint—as a part of the war effort—a governmental directive cutting their supply of newsprint 10 percent under the amount consumed in 1940. To newspaper owners that cut did not seem unreasonable. But, lo and behold, we awoke one morning to find that an additional cut of 40 percent was being contemplated.

That proposed cut was so absurd and so ridiculously unnecessary from the standpoint of supply and availability of newsprint that it immediately cast light on the real motive, which was most assuredly not to aid in the prosecution of the war by eliminating pulp waste and paper.

Originated by Joseph L. Weiner, of the Office of Civilian Defense, the same fellow who cut the production of farm machinery 67 percent and who wrote the ridiculous report on the Nation's bedrock requirements, the movement could not be stomached by his associates in the War Production Board. They fought him on it, but because of his association of ideology with many who are highly placed in government, those who opposed his fantastic scheme were powerless to sway him.

Loyal executives of government joined with a group of us Members of Congress in fighting Mr. Weiner's disruptive order, which would have put hundreds of newspapers out of business.

To make a long story short, we were, fortunately, able to expose the fanatical scheme and the Weiner proposal for an excessive cut in the consumption of newsprint was defeated. Weiner was forced to agree to a modified order for an additional cut of a maximum of 10 percent.

But—and weigh this carefully—when adequate investigation was made and full light thrown on the question of supply and production of pulp and newsprint, it was found that even this additional cut of a maximum of 10 percent could not be justified. It is now being held in abeyance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even if there were nothing sinister in the move for a 40-percent cut, consider the ridiculousness of a man in high authority who could make such a miscalculation of fairly simple figures. That man, Mr. Speaker, is still in office. Local newspapers recently stated that Mr. Donald Nelson, of W. P. B., was seeking a successor, but Mr. Weiner still holds onto his job. I have said before, in my opinion, he is one of the most dangerous men in Washington today, and no time should be lost in giving him a one-way ticket out of town.

It is the brazenness of this maneuver, Mr. Speaker, which is going to give the Members of this House the opportunity to go into this entire subject of the freedom of the press and ascertain the enemies of that freedom.

The resolution before us with the approval of the Rules Committee gives to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the authority to go into every phase of this subject. It is my hope that the resolution will be unanimously adopted. It does not go as far as I would have it go, but it opens the door.

And, Mr. Speaker, when that door is open the American people should be assured that Congress will move in to preserve the freedom of the press, which is the freedom of the people and not

merely the freedom of those who happen to be editors and publishers of newspapers.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this resolution meets with my complete approval; it is timely; it is overdue. For months chaos has reigned in the land because of uncertainty of what the O. P. A. or other agencies might do toward the further strangulation of America: initiative, and free enterprise, and our traditional American institutions of business and industry. Where is there any truly American merchant today who has the faintest knowledge of whether he will be in business tomorrow or not? He is not afraid of his competitors; he knows what they will do, under the American way of life; but he is afraid of what his competitors may do under the New Deal way of life, this new-fangled stuff of operating under the aegis and orders of the learned "professors" of the O. P. A.—those birds who have all the answers at the ends of their fingertips. Those birds who—called upon or not—still rush to the immediate aid of those "front men" of the O. P. A. when they are called before congressional committees to give honest, straightforward testimony. Those figureheads, those men who are set up as puppets in order that their names may carry weight with the industry for whom they have been carefully selected as the "front", and yet those very same men, men who admittedly know their industry, in the final answer have no more actual authority in the actual issuance of these hairbrained regulations than has my little spaniel dog. Where is there a merchant in America today who knows where he is going or whether he will be in business tomorrow? And the worst part about it is that these boys behind the scenes, these professors who have all the answers, openly confess that they do not give a damn. They seek a "new order."

For instance, recently a hearing was held in lower Michigan, at which one of my colleagues was present. It was a hearing promoted by a coal dealers' association to protest against a certain regulation and to seek higher wages for their employees in order that they might remain in business. Imagine the astonishment of my colleague when the Government agent blandly and with colorless face told the dealers that the Government did not care how many of them were able to stay in business because there were too many of them. "After all, here are 26 coal dealers supplying a town of 60,000. That is absurd, 2 are enough." Thus speaks the New Deal Uncle Sam. But he is not like the Uncle Sam I used to know. And the point is, Who is going to select the 2 who are to stay in business? Listen, Mr. Speaker, our boys are not going to like that sort of stuff when they find out about it. And you do not like, and I am damned if I do. What are we coming to?

Oh, yes; this insane regimentation under the guise of war necessity has overstepped all reasonable bounds. These long-haired boys are drunk with too much power. It is time to call a halt. I hope that complete authority will be freely given to my old friend, albeit my political opposite, Prentiss Brown, to put an end to this silly stuff and let us get on with this business of winning the war. And I am disturbed by recent newspaper accounts to the effect that while Prentiss has made a good start at cleaning house, nevertheless in the same issues are statements to the effect that Prentiss may himself be on the way out. How come? Is it in spite of the fact he is and will continue to try to do a good job—as is his type—or because of that fact? Wake up America. Let us not lose what we are fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution because of the fact that it may well be said that I had a hand in its drafting. I think it is most vitally important to the Nation today that a thorough investigation be made into all phases of the newsprint and print paper situation, as well as to any possible attempts to throttle the press. I have been leading a fight against threatened further reductions of newsprint paper allotments to the free press of this Nation while Government agencies continued to treble, quadruple and sextuple their own demands—without restraint, or without any possible control being exercised by our own Government agencies charged with or at least assuming authority over curtailment of the free press. To inquire into such activities, I introduced a resolution calling for an inquiry into that situation. Rather than cause to be treated two overlapping committees, I suggested to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that our resolutions be combined. They have been and I am grateful to him. This investigation in all its phases is most important. It should be gotten under way at once and we should be able to report progress very very soon—not become stagnant—as have some of our other well conceived investigating committees. If the gentleman from Indiana is made chairman, or at least ranking minority Member of this committee, we will get something of benefit to this Nation, of benefit to the merchants of this Nation, of benefit to the free press of this Nation, and get it mighty, mighty quick, or I miss my guess, and I think I have a safe bet this time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of House Resolution 98, and I want to compliment my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as the author of this resolution.

The condition which confronts the industries affected by this resolution likewise affects every person in the United States. The complaint is constantly heard as to the disastrous effects of some of the rulings and directives which have been formulated by the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board. Many of these industries are finding it increasingly difficult to continue operations without the handicap of unreasonable and unnecessary regulations. That some of these rules and regulations have been highly disruptive is inescapable; that some of these rules and regulations are either made without full appreciation of their effect or they are made deliberately, following a scheme or plan, should be investigated.

I shall not only support this resolution but I shall join in urging that such investigation be carried out at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

NO TAX BILL, NO VACATION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House is meeting today, Saturday, to consider this important legislation. I shall vote for this bill. Other important legislation should be considered before we recess.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the House taking a recess over Easter unless in the meantime we call up and dispose of a pay-as-you-earn personal income-tax bill. I appreciate that the membership of the House has been working early and late from the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress and is entitled to some relief from these strenuous activities. In fact, this proposed vacation would, in my judgment, materially help in solving the problems that are coming before us in the program for an early victory in the war.

Notwithstanding this, however, 44,000,000 people are directly interested in having the Congress adopt a personal income-tax program which will lessen the burden they are carrying in helping to finance our war program. Their interests should come ahead of the welfare of the 435 Members of the House.

There is no reason why the House cannot, with the sincere cooperation of the Ways and Means Committee, bring up and pass a pay-as-you-earn tax program within the coming week. The committee has held long hearings, all testimony has been taken and reported, all interested groups have been heard and their proposals carefully considered by the committee, and the House itself, after the open debate already had, is well informed on the issues involved. Two days at the outset would be ample to give full consideration to this most important legislative proposal.

The American public have made it clear that they who pay the taxes want the Congress to adopt now a pay-as-you-go program. As disclosed by the report of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, a tax bill along the lines of the Carlson proposal would increase the receipts of the Treasury by at least $3,000,000,000 this fiscal year, and with the provisions against windfalls would protect the Treasury from any loss from this source. On the other hand 44,000,000 taxpayers would be made current and would be relieved from the burden of a year-old tax bill always staring them in the face. The Government would collect at the source from the millions of these taxpayers who will

be unable to pay in many cases if payment is postponed for a year, which must be done under the existing law. Should the war end abruptly and the millions of war workers thrown out of employment the Federal Government would lose billions in taxes which will be saved if we adopt this proposal.

I include as a part of my remarks a letter I received today from a constituent in my district who is engaged in a large enterprise where he is brought directly in contact with thousands of employees. The letter to which I refer reads as follows:

We hope you will bend every effort and use every influence you have with your fellow Congressmen to get them to consider immediately some form of the pay-as-you-go plan for Federal income taxes.

We are simply astounded at the inability of the members of the Ways and Means Committee to realize that their constituents are ready to do anything to win the war and to pay the tax which the war requires. What the voters cannot understand is that a plan which will get the most money in the least time and produce the fewest squawks on the part of the taxpayers should fail to pass.

It is the only common-sense method that has been proposed, and all of the verbal camouflage to the effect that we "forgive" one year's taxes, that the rich escape, that the 1942 windfalls will go untaxed, that the Treasury will lose billions of dollars, that it is a scheme put forth by Wall Street, and all of the rest of the drivel, fools nobody but the Congressmen who gave utterance to these untruths.

The fact of the business is, the jails are not going to be big enough to house the poor folks who will not pay their 1942 taxes during 1943 simply because they haven't the money at hand with which to pay them. I am not interested in the rich people, because all of them must pay their taxes, but I am interested in seeing that the tax base be made as broad as possible so the Nation can carry the war load with the least shock to our economy.

Everybody knows this is an all-out war, and everybody wants at heart to have a share in America. We hope Congress will give us a chance to contribute by making the pay-as-you-go plan available before June 15. This is a first and should come ahead of everything else. I urge you again to lend every effort possible to the promotion of this legislation.

The views of my correspondent are similar to those of 80 to 90 percent of the American taxpayers who must carry the load, and having to carry this load they are entitled to our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely urge that we forego a much needed and deserved recess until we bring up and dispose of this tax legislation. Let us meet this most serious problem facing us honestly and immediately, and let us all urge the Ways and Means Committee to present to the House for consideration this coming week the tax legislation under an open rule where amendments may be made and the matter disposed of without further delay.

The issue is now clear that we should adopt immediately a bill providing for the current payment of all personal income taxes; for the collection at the source of all of these taxes that are payable periodically; that there be no doubling up of tax payments; that suitable provisions be made to prevent any windfalls or the escaping from taxation of any large incomes; that under no circumstances we permit a new crop of war millionaires from unconscionable war profits.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will help in the war effort. I wish to express my favor for its adoption and to state that immediate action is needed if the small, independent stores of the country are to be saved from extermination. Recent orders by the Office of Price Administration impose upon them burdens they cannot meet.

I do not refer to the matter of rationing as such, nor the principle of price ceilings. I refer to the page after page of regulations which they must observe, the blanks they must fill out and the records they must keep. I refer to the provisions in ration order No. 13, for example, 19 pages of fine print, 3 columns to the page, which simply staggers the crossroads or country store trying to carry on with 2 or 3 clerks in the face of the wartime conditions. I refer to the nonsense in the order which advertises and requires the small stores to advertise prices higher than competitive stores in the larger retail centers, regardless of the store's price needs. In some instances, prices may need to be higher, but that is not always true.

The net effect of these orders is to place all stores in a strait jacket of regimentation that destroys incentive and reward and places an unnecessary and uneconomic load of record keeping and inventories upon the smaller stores of the country. If it is desired to keep the price of living down, these wasteful regulations should be modified for the country stores, doing only a small business in dollar volume, but doing an important business in serving farmers and ranchers at the crossroads.

I sincerely hope that the investigation contemplated by the resolution will contribute toward that end. It will help people to carry on. Let us get on with the war.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

VALUE OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I agree that we should keep down expenses just as much as possible, but let us not overlook the necessity and the value of many of these investigations.

One of the greatest powers that the Congress possesses is the power to investigate. We cannot compel the selection of certain personnel to administer or execute the laws that we cause to be enacted. So one of the greatest powers we have is the power to check up and see whether or not those laws are administered in the way and manner that Congress contemplated.

COST OF CONGRESS 20 CENTS PER YEAR PER CAPITA

The cost of this Congress, including the whole legislative branch of our Government, House and Senate and all incidental legislative expenses, I may say to the gentleman from Missouri, and including the amount that he stated in his speech has been added this year, will reach the enormous sum of 20 cents per person for an entire year, about 1½ cents per month for each person in the United States. So we are certainly not profiteering or wasteful when we spend no more than approximately 1½ cents a month per person per year for the entire cost of the legislative branch of our Government.

DEMOCRATIC PEARL HARBOR

Last fall we had in this country a Democratic Pearl Harbor. We just as well admit it, we did have it. Many of us wondered why that Pearl Harbor on the Democrats, but we had a check-up by a congressional committee I happened to be on and we soon found out why we had that Democratic Pearl Harbor. The people were resentful of the arbitrary, autocratic way that many of the laws that we had passed were being administered. By making that careful check and by investigation some changes were made. I think Congress can be blamed for not checking up more than it has in the past. I think the Congress is to blame in many ways. So the only way for us to be in the clear and cease to be vulnerable is to often and carefully check up on the way these laws are administered.

Only yesterday the Administrator of the Office of Price Control admitted before our committee that a law that Congress passed has been violated for 8 long months. Now, that is a serious admission. Imagine a clear, unmistakable mandate passed by the Congress being openly, flagrantly, and deliberately violated for the past 8 months, which has caused dozens and dozens of small independent packers to go out of business and which, if continued, will cause all independent packers, slaughterers, and nonslaughterers to go out of business in the next few weeks. There must be a change and a change quickly, otherwise we will have four big packers in this country, which system will be harmful to the producers of livestock, it will be harmful to the consumers, it will be harmful to everyone concerned, it will be harmful to our country.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is undoubtedly stating a truth, especially about these big packing houses. May I say, an investigation will not help because it takes too long. The power rests in the Executive to remedy that situation through one of these agencies caus-

ing the difficulty. The whole thing could be settled just that quick if the executive agency will act.

Mr. PATMAN. Why, certainly, no one disputes that.

Mr. MICHENER. Why wait for months and months to check up?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no dispute among us about that, but, remember, the executive agency does not always want to correct these mistakes. The Executive, the President, is running a war right now and cannot give personal attention to all matters, especially details that are brought out in the execution and administration of our laws. So the only way that Congress can protect itself is to check up, investigate, make disclosures, and demand changes, and we usually get changes made when Congress makes the demand.

Mr. MICHENER. What I am objecting to is the continuous checking up and the continuous talking by the Congress and no attention paid at all.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. We have gotten things done and we already see evidence of results. I am inserting herewith a report which the Committee on Small Business of the House adopted this morning.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ON THE MEAT PACKING INDUSTRY, APRIL 10, 1943

The Committee on Small Business of the House has for many weeks considered the plight of the independent and small packers and slaughterers as well as the other segments of distribution in the meat business. Our conclusions are:

1. Something must be done quickly in order to prevent the bankruptcy or the closing down of all the independent packers, slaughterers, and nonslaughterers, in the meat business. If the present situation with reference to price continues there will only be remaining in a short time in business to serve the public and the Government the four big packers, as they are the only ones who can possibly survive the present deplorable situation for any length of time. If something is not done the producer will be harmed because the normal channel of distribution will be broken down for livestock; the Government will be harmed because the enormous quantities of meats will not be available for our armed forces; and the consumers will be harmed for the same reasons. Therefore, it is imperative that these small concerns of the country be saved.

2. We do insist that the Emergency Price Control Act, which provides for a fair and equitable margin for slaughterers, packers, processors, and retail and wholesale distributors, be carried out. If this law is carried out the situation will be remedied.

3. It is the judgment of our committee that the Office of Price Administration has for many months flagrantly violated the clear and unmistakable mandate of the Congress which in effect says that normal channels and functions of distribution must be maintained and that nothing shall be done to prevent their survival; and further, the clear and unmistakable mandate of the Congress has been violated by the Office of Price Administration for several months by reason of its failure to allow a fair and equitable margin to small concerns, dealers, and distributors which would permit them to survive.

4. Regardless of the method of approach to correct the mistakes of the past, in order to protect and allow to live the groups herein mentioned, arrangements should be made to remove the slaughtering quotas in order to prevent, or at least diminish the chances of, black markets in meats. Unless some arrangements are make to take the quotas off slaughtering, we are apprehensive that black markets will continue.

This statement is being furnished to the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the Price Control Act, and the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, with the request that it be given consideration at the earliest possible time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I believe the adoption of this resolution should serve a useful purpose. In saying that I do not prejudge the activities to be investigated. We all know that the agencies concerned are dealing with problems that are of great interest and importance to the American people. If the regulatory power in the hands of these agencies in reference to the paper problem and in reference to grade labeling is exercised improvidently, it may harass the producer and processors and cause a great deal of needless injury or inconvenience to the American people. We have had many examples of the improvident use of the powers given to such administrative agencies. I make no blanket indictment. Such agencies are necessary in wartime. There are many capable men serving in them.

I was here in World War No. 1. Then as now we had examples of improvident and foolish administration of regulatory laws. It is inevitable that we have such results under war conditions. These organizations are hastily assembled, with large personnels, many of them inexperienced people and frequently unqualified for the responsibilities assigned them. Lacking the wisdom, experience, and training necessary to fill responsible positions they hold, their regulations may impose great hardship upon producers and consumers alike. Congress may be able to protect the public against improvident action by such agencies. I am sure that an investigation such as is proposed here can be useful.

From experience we have had with such investigations we must recognize that many of them are more or less futile and others are very useful. There are two conditions under which a real investigation may be useful and ordinarily is valuable, that is, if it is conducted fairly and thoroughly. It cannot help but be valuable in cases like these if the work is done fairly and thoroughly. It will develop the facts; properly appraise the activities of the agencies in charge and place Congress in position to exert its powers to remedy any abuses which may be shown.

Grade labeling, if carried to extremes of refinement might reduce production, increase cost, waste manpower, and greatly interfere with production if improvidently injected into the difficulties of war production.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In that connection, is the committee looking into the labeling that is being required, the advertising that is being required, whereby small independent stores are being required to advertise that they must sell at higher prices than the chain stores, even though that may not be the fact, even though they may be competitive with the chain stores?

Mr. LEA. The committee is not doing that at the present time, but I take it that such an inquiry might properly be within the purview of this investigation.

Mr. CASE. I should like to refer to the gentleman's committee some evidence on that part. It seems to me that recent orders on that point have been decidedly discriminatory against the small independent merchants.

Mr. LEA. I am sure our committee would welcome such information from the gentleman from South Dakota. If we get this investigation, it will be our purpose, I think I can assure the House, to conduct it constructively, to perform a useful service. It will not be our purpose to make it a mere scalp-hunting expedition. We shall conduct the investigation with the purpose of affording a legitimate solution to the American people if the facts show a remedy is needed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says it will not be the purpose to go on a scalp-hunting expedition. I take issue with the gentleman. I think it is the duty and will be the duty of this committee to go on a scalp-hunting expedition to get the scalps of those people in the departments and agencies who are flagrantly disregarding the plain intent of the Congress in administering these laws. If we are going to be any more effective in Congress than a crossroads debating society we must go after some of the scalps of those who absolutely and knowingly defy the Congress and the intentions of the Congress in administering these laws.

Mr. LEA. I trust the gentleman will not place such an interpretation on my meaning when I used the words "scalp hunting." I recognize it might be our duty to bring in some scalps, but the mere getting of scalps should properly not be the motive. In many instances the proper remedy for these abuses of administration is the removal and elimination of those responsible for the misuse or abuse of their powers. The first and best remedy may be to get rid of them.

Mr. MICHENER. I possibly did not differentiate between witch hunting and scalp hunting.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. He is one of the ablest and most efficient Members of the House. We are all glad that he is back here with us again, because when he speaks he generally contributes to the

debate through his experience and knowledge of the subject.

I do not, however, agree with him that the House of Representatives should not have special committees to investigate and use the standing committees or the subcommittees of the standing committees to investigate the different departments and agencies and bureaus of the Government. I am in favor of more and larger and greater investigations until we know what is going on in the bureaucratic agencies of the Government in Washington and whether they are carrying out the laws as we pass them in the Congress. Our legislative duty is not complete under the Constitution by simply voting on legislation.

We should know or find out how the laws are being carried out. It is likewise our duty and responsibility to turn the searchlight of pitiless investigation upon these bureaus and departments, which often ignore the intent of Congress and if they are not carrying out the laws as written, then it is the duty of the Congress to rewrite them or hold those responsible for failure to abide by the law. The only way to restore representative and constitutional government is for Congress to provide a searching investigation of all governmental bureaus that seek by directives or regulations to usurp the legislative powers of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but I have an amendment here that is of great importance to 130,000,000 Americans, which has to do with honest labeling, that may affect the very destiny of America, and possibly of the world. Therefore, I want all Members on both sides to scrutinize carefully the proposed amendment which I am about to read.

The resolution before us provides that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall investigate for the purpose of determining whether any agency or officer of the executive branch of the Government has formulated or is formulating plans with a view to putting into effect requirements with respect to Federal grade labeling of articles or commodities and the discarding of private brand names of articles or commodities. So I offer the following amendment, and I hope of course it will be germane to the resolution in respect to honest labeling. I am sure that it would have the unanimous approval of the public and I hope of all the Members of the House. The amendment I propose is—

That the Republican Party shall thereafter be known as the Liberal-Conservative-American-Constitutional Party, and that the New Deal Party shall henceforth be known as the Bureaucratic-Totalitarian-Radical-Socialist Party.

This is an important proposal as the American people are entitled to know and get what they vote for.

I want honest labeling of our parties in the future so that the voters will know exactly what they might expect when they go to the polls in 1944.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows that his amendment would not lie to this resolution.

Mr. FISH. Of course, I am hopeful that it will be adopted unanimously. It is certainly germane to honest labeling for the protection of the American public.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIED].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. After some years of merchandising experience, I realize that price ceilings can only be effective if they are connected with quality grades of the product offered. An 11-ounce can of peas, of course, can differ in quality by several cents, while the same number of points under the point rationing system that would be required from the housewife for every grade of that particular size of can of peas would be the same. The same is true of a broadcloth shirt or any other article, and we know after some experience that in many cases fraudulent practices are indulged in by manufacturers, canners, and others under the no-grade labeling system, and, therefore, I think the grades should be placed or stamped on these different articles in order that the housewife may know what she is buying. I do not think that any particular brand that a merchandizing company has built up should be taken away from the company, and I do not think that the legitimate manufacturer or canner will object to putting grades on his product. As a rule those who operate on the border line of legitimate business usually insist on selling a poorer article and getting as much for it as the manufacturer who has built up a good name on a particular brand. On further investigation by this committee I am sure these facts will be substantiated and the policy of quality grade labeling will be justified.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at the opportunity to speak on behalf of House Resolution 98, submitted by our distinguished friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], a most timely resolution which should be given the unanimous support of this membership.

This proposed new setup of grade labeling and standardization and simplification is the beginning of a real planned economy. It gives signs at this stage of causing business men to regard the New Deal as a picnic by comparison. The New Deal was an effort to cushion the shock caused by what looked like too much of everything. The present situation is an effort to solve the problems caused by what looks like too little of almost anything, and the bureaucratic planners, it becomes increasingly evident, are certainly playing havoc with the economic life and the American system of business in their futile efforts to solve the problems.

As a Member of this distinguished body I might say that one of the objectives of this Congress should be the preservation of our American business system. I come from the great State of Pennsylvania with its eleven millions of people teeming with industry and this industry must be maintained so that the men in the armed forces of the United States will be able to find a gainful occupation upon their return. It may interest you to know that almost a million men have gone into the armed forces of the United States from the great industrial State of Pennsylvania.

Today the Keystone State is producing 30 percent of all war materials, farm products, coal, oil, steel, ships, submarines, tanks, planes, and machinery and other mechanized equipment. Now this great industrial empire is dependent on and for its future progress and prosperity what is known as the American business system.

Now, this great American business system is strictly an American-made product, designed to meet the needs of 135,000,000 people. It has stood the test of 150 years of trial and experiment under changing conditions, and, my friends, let me tell you that during this time it has created more wealth and distributed it more widely, wisely, and equitably than any other system in the world. It has made America the land of opportunity, because the American system gives everybody a chance. It is a ladder on which anyone may climb to success if he has the ability and energy and willingness and resourcefulness to use it. There are no barriers in America, unless the Goverment becomes one, to stop anyone who is ambitious to succeed. This American system is not blueprinted by any authorities or decrees. Anyone in America can strike out in any field of effort he chooses, and the reward comes to him as his efforts earn it, so my remarks today are for the preservation of a system that I am determined shall be retained.

We have all heard about planned economy; we have all heard of planned scarcity, and over the past 10 years these creators and conceivers of new ideas have been concocting more formulas than the American business system can digest, with the result that confusion, confliction, and chaos exist today due to Government regulations, restrictions, and strangulations—a condition that has brought the farmers, the merchants, and the American business system to a point of utter exhaustion, and so today the people of America are lifting their voices to the Congress to eliminate that element from the various departments of our Federal Government who are sabotaging this American system and small business of the country—men who have built America to such a strength that we have become the envy and the leader of all the world.

I have reviewed for you the work of my great State of Pennsylvania with those 11,000,000 of people and the contribution that we are making in this all-out effort to win the war; no one can challenge this record that the business interests of my State with the other States of the Nation are leaving nothing undone in this great all-out effort to bring this war to a rapid and early conclusion.

When our backs were up against the wall after Pearl Harbor, who did we turn to, to do a job that had to be done if we

were to exist? We did not turn to the planning bureaucrats. We turned to the American businessmen. They took off their coats and secured unbelievable results—results that have earned for them the recognition and thanks of the people of the world. They turned out the foodstuffs, ships, tanks, guns, planes, and mechanized equipment that gave the world a new inspiration to carry on. Several months ago we were sick and disheartened, worried over what might happen. Now, today, we know we are going to win the war, and it is just a question of time, so now the social-reform boys are reasserting themselves and attempting to take over the American system and operate it as they feel it should be operated.

However, we, too, are thinking for the future. And if this country of ours is to remain a democracy and not degenerate into a socialized bureaucracy, we, then, must maintain at all costs the American business system that built America, and let us not be driven out by the power-drunk bureaucrats who are introducing under the guise of a wartime contribution socialistic reforms for the regimentation of the farmer, the laborer, the merchant, and the business people of America.

This is a far more serious situation than the Members of this body seem to recognize.

A group of professors recently called on the Honorable Prentiss Brown and served notice on the Office of Price Administration that they insisted and demanded that one of their social reforms, grade labeling, be adopted. These economists and visionaries have for years been teaching in schools to a lot of kiddies who, no doubt, sit mystified by the theories, charts, graphs, and plans they advance.

Now the professors are accustomed to having the pupil accept their philosophy without argument and that's that—but when he runs into a practical group of businessmen and they scorn his crackpot stuff he becomes indignant, enraged, and demands action, issues orders and directives that must be complied with. Well, thank God, this is still a free country. He decrees that these half-baked ideas of grade labeling, standardization, and simplification, and so forth, be accepted although there are no laws on the books compelling anyone to accept any of these plans, and they should be rejected as these planners have overstepped their authority. However, they still insist that the American business system accept them, but the American business system decides that it is impossible to accept them because it would destroy that which they represent and therefore, they refuse to accept them. So the professors by directive orders endeavor to push these measures through and in many instances have gotten away with it. However, the mandate delivered by the people on November 3, 1942, insists that the planning bureaucrats who are stifling initiative, eliminating competition, and destroying trade be no longer permitted to ride herd on the American businessman and the American people.

Now under the American system you are permitted to buy your favorite cola, your favorite oil, whether it was Blue Sunoco, Pennzoil, Texaco, or Quaker State or any other oil you wanted to buy; if you wanted Giant peas, Doles Hawaiian pineapple, Chesterfield cigarettes, Pet milk, Quaker Oats, Baker's or Hershey's chocolate, or any other item or brand that you so desire, for which your stomach and taste has a particular appetite, you get it.

Now the American people decide whether any particular manufacturer or retailer stays in business or passes out. Whether some particular style that we like or some particular corporation, some brand, or product we enjoy is to be continued or changed. All these corporations with branded products are under Government supervision, regulation, and observation and they are paying the taxes that keep on the pay roll the bureaucrats who are trying to cut their throats.

In the food business we are protected by the pure food laws and, with this system, the American people have the power to throw into bankruptcy overnight by withholding their purchases on any particular product that does not come up to standard.

We do not have to put them out of business by going to the polls and casting our ballot. We pass judgment every minute of the day by putting our money on the counter and buying this, and rejecting that. If we want Heinz catsup, we buy that, if we want Snyder's, we are permitted to buy whichever brand we favor. If we want Ivory soap, we buy Ivory soap. If not, we reject it. If we have some other particular brand we like better, we buy that, and any time any brand doesn't come up to the quality it supposedly represents, the public stops buying and they automatically go out of business.

In this democratic way we determine what is best to meet our needs and shall discontinue what fails to meet our appetites or desires. No merchant sells foodstuffs, oil, or automobiles, or any other goods on the market without our approval, expressed by the purchase of the goods. Every year we vote out of business in your country and my country and throughout the Nation thousands of retailers. During the past 30 years, we voted out 200 makes of automobiles. One may say this is drastic. Yes, but that way progress lies, and there is no political interference and these losses are not taxpayer losses. There is no attempt to put any corporation out of business by directives, limitation orders, or any kind of Executive decrees. It is our American way. It is typically American.

However, my friends, I think this past few years have been boom years for the professional bureaucrats. For years they have been playing around with books, and now a generous Government comes along and gives them the money and the opportunity they have dreamed of—but never hoped to realize—and that is to experiment with their ideas and plans and charts on 130,000,000 of American guinea pigs, so they try a little of this and a little of that, and sit back and gloat and glee over the results obtained. If the results are bad and they cost the American taxpayer many millions of dollars, and they fail, they laugh it off and shrug their shoulders and say, "Oh, well, they have at least tried what we have been dreaming of for years and years and it did not work, so we will try something else." That is one reason why they are particularly anxious to institute what they call grade labeling. Grade labeling is just a start on a very definite objective. After they get grade labeling across they will immediately institute what will be called a national brand, even though they despise great corporations with branded names that have been 50 to 75 years establishing trade names, whether it is for oil or catsup or canned milk. After they have established grade labeling to A, B, C, then it will be national brand A, B, C, and whether you want a chocolate bar or macaroni it will be national A, national B, and national C. Now, I am of the opinion that this group has this country of ours blueprinted and charted with a very definite program. After grade labeling, and they have branded their grades, they will introduce and they are now introducing standardizations and simplification of packages. Standardization and simplification of packages will revolutionize the container industry. No matter what type container is on the market today, all must go by the boards, and we must accept from the learned professors and their cooperatives, the dollar-a-year men, what they have determined is the correct type of package.

In the glass business alone, where millions of dollars are invested in molds, certain types of steel necessary to make these molds, which only special die makers can make, must be discarded and all the various types of containers must be destroyed and a new set-up of containers brought into the picture, of a certain type of container as will be known as the victory container, standardized and simplified so on down the line for crates, boxes, barrels, steel containers, paper boxes, bags, and all types of containers will be changed. All of this in the midst of an all-out effort to win the war, these social reforms must have attention under the guise of conserving materials to win the war. Limitation orders just issued state definitely project must be complied with by July 4, 1943. Why do they not let business alone?

For your information, it is estimated that total steel production for this country in 1943 will amount to approximately 100,000,000 tons. It is furthermore estimated that in order to insure an adequate food supply to the civilian population of this country, as well as to our armed forces and the countries which we may occupy, a total over-all production of somewhere between one and three-fourths million and two million tons of steel in the form of tin plate would adequately take care of our needs up to the limit of our capacity to produce

canned fruits and vegetables. Less than 3 percent of our steel production is not too great a price to pay for the assurance of a food supply adequate to take care of our requirements. I believe the American public would agree that this small percentage of steel production is not too great a price to pay to assure the civilian population, as well as our armed forces, that they will not go hungry from the standpoint of being able to eat fruits and vegetables consistent with good diet practice.

Last year they stopped all packing of pork and beans and other essential food products, and it is just being recognized by the professors that so little black iron would have been required to pack all these foodstuffs hundreds of thousands of cases could have been packed, and now we wake up with a food shortage. The professors just guessed wrong, but it is too late to do anything about it and somebody is going hungry.

After they get through their standardization and simplification program, I presume the next step will be "blue eagle" government-owned cooperatives, which will sell nothing but "blue eagle" brand products, packed in "blue eagle" brand packages, and distributed through "blue eagle" Government agencies, and it becomes increasingly clear and evident that the technique of a regimented order is being eased on to the American people all to the destruction of the American business system, which has been built on team-play cooperation and good will, and not on directive orders and mandates. This American system of management, labor, consumer, and individual, pull together because they know that it is the best way to get ahead. The American system does not need any political economic czar to crack the whip over them or drive them. This American system has permitted everyone to open wide, new fields of enterprise, build new industries, provide more employment.

I believe that the method, technique, and planning now being considered in grade labeling, standardization, and simplification program will tend to destroy the demand for labor after this war is over, and will create a condition which will eliminate thousands and thousands of men from the productive field of enterprise because of the elimination of competition between branded products of kinds, classes, and description, from oil to canned milk.

Under this American system we have proven that the American businessman has blazed more new industrial trails, developed more new enterprise than any other system in any other country in the world. Our workers today receive a higher wage, and they can buy more for their money than in any other country, and under our American system the thrifty and provident have been able to build up insurance to protect them and their dependents which is larger than all the systems of the other countries altogether. You will have to admit, my friends, that there is no system better than the one in existence here today. You will have to admit there has been less waste and less energy devoted under the American system of private enterprise than there has been under regimented bureaucracy, such as the wasteful distribution of foodstuff through the Surplus Food Commodities Corporation. We are crying food, more food, and more food, and yet one branch of the Government is distributing food all over America through our schools, the greater portion of which, I understand, has been wasted. The newspapers here in Washington recently carried a story telling how this food was being thrown into the garbage cans in the alleys of Washington. You would not find this wasteful method if handled by the small merchants of America who are being put out of business. So now the professors are going to revolutionize this American system, kill off the remaining small merchants we have left.

Do not misunderstand me; I admit, of course, that the Government is necessary. The Government should regulate and not destroy. The Government should preserve our freedom of initiative and freedom of effort and not be harassing, haunting, and destroying with restricting regulations. The more Government interference, the more production is slowed down; evidence this canners' and food-packing situation here in Washington. They have for 2 years been trying to secure a program, and yet no program has been secured so far.

Now, I appeal to the Congress to pass this House Resolution 98 because you are a part of the American system. You either stand with democracy or you stand with bureaucracy, and you either are going to stand or fall, one or the other. There is not room enough in America for both. This great country has given you what you have. The American business system has opened the door of opportunity for all of us and we want that same opportunity to go over to the generation of tomorrow, the opportunity of freedom of thought, freedom of operation, the liberty to create and do things that build for a great America. We are today here as representatives of the people to protect that American system so let us have faith in this system, which has done so much to make our country great.

Our fathers fought for this freedom—for this opportunity. We fought for it in World War No. 1. We are fighting for it today, in World War No. 2, and as our fathers passed this freedom on to us I sincerely hope that we will have the courage of our convictions to carry on this fight against this element who seek to regiment the peoples of America through some bureaucratic-controlled and operated form of government. Our compensation for our work will be the satisfaction of passing on this heritage to our boys and girls of tomorrow having played our part to protect the American way of life.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course the gentleman knows that I do not quite agree with him on political philosophy. I am, however, very happy to agree with him that the State of Pennsylvania is one of the greatest States in the Union, and that it is producing about 30 percent of the production needed for the prosecution of the war. I assume that the gentleman is not in favor of doing away with trade-marks by the adoption of a plan of grade labeling exclusively, and I am happy to be in accord with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania on that question also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has my hearty support. A week or two ago I called the attention of the House to a five-point program which has been under consideration by those who wish to make over and gain control of our Government for a long time. This five-point program is:

First. Point system of rationing.
Second. Centralization of plants.
Third. Regionalization of business.
Fourth. Inventory and sales control.
Fifth. Victory labels and grade labeling.

It does not require a great deal of imagination to convince the average person that if the administration bureaus can gain sufficient control to establish this program, they will have destroyed private enterprise and be in control of our national economy.

While it is their claim that this is a process having for its objective the elimination of duplication and overlapping in industry and commerce, and that it will streamline and simplify production for the war effort, it has nevertheless the earmarks of a bid for Government control of business.

If the bureaucrats had implemented this program with any reasonable attempt to sustain or increase production, the claim that it is being inaugurated only for the war effort would have at least some substance and it would make a certain contribution to the war effort. On the other hand, if the plan is not implemented with a substantial attempt at sustained or increased production, then it is reasonably clear that it has no relation to the war effort and that the failure to give the necessary attention to production will create that very scarcity which is necessary to put the above-named five-point program into reality for the destruction of private enterprise and the securing of control of all business and industry by the bureaucrats.

In other words, the administration has concerned itself first and foremost with the regimentation of our production with consistent interference and hampering of that production, and has given the matter of facilitating that production only secondary consideration, if any whatsoever. The attention the Gov-

ernment agencies have given to production during the past year has not been a substantial fraction of the avidity with which they have applied themselves to regimentation and control.

This movement for grade labeling and victory labels is perhaps one of the most destructive influences that could be applied to the canning and many other industries. Most of these have built up their business through trade names and labels which through years of effort have come to have the meaning of quality and superiority of production to the consumer. The result of destroying these would be inevitably followed by the destruction of the business itself.

I believe that an investigation of this plan is one of the most urgent needs before the Congress and I heartily approve of the proposed work of the committee in this respect.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. There is no one, no group of people in the country, so well aware of the problems that are meeting us on every side, due to the fact that we do not have grade labeling at the moment, as the housewife, and I speak very definitely in her behalf I do not pretend to know the intricacies of trying to put such a system into effect immediately, but I do know the great problems with which every woman is familiar who goes to the store to buy the food that she must prepare for her family, to give them an adequate diet on a ration system. I know these problems intimately, for they are my problems.

Serious studies of the quality of canned foods have been made by the women of the country in various places. They have given themselves to the buying of various brands of canned goods experimentally, taking them home and putting them through a process of careful checking under the standards of the Food Administration, and so forth. They have found that the markings "excellent," "good," and so on, do not in any way contribute to their understanding of what is inside that can. They have convinced themselves that the only way they can be protected against inferior grades is by a system of labeling that would clearly state whether the contents of the can be grade 1, 2, or 3.

The housewife who knows she cannot afford first quality will get second. If she cannot afford that she will buy the third, but she will do it with her eyes open. She will not be short-changed, so to speak. This matter of quality labeling is one of the very important things before us, especially because of the tremendous buying being done by the Army, combined with the great dearth of canned foods, and with the even more serious problem we are facing of constantly increasing food shortages. If we do not know the kind of food we are buying how can we ever give you men the kind of pies that mother used to make?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that the United States purchasing department always buys all of its products on grade specifications and not on brand names?

Mrs. BOLTON. I understand so, and the housewife would like the same opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to say I am very much in favor of this resolution. From a committee standpoint it seems to me there are three committees of the House vitally interested in the procedure and the outcome of the resolution—namely, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the resolution is in the hands of a fine committee.

If one will wade through the 2,300 pages of testimony taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with the original O. P. A. Act, I believe they will find that there was determined a proper base for this investigation. I was thoroughly convinced by the testimony offered by Mr. Leon Henderson when he was before the committee, that a situation would develop which would demand this very kind of an investigation.

Personally, I do not see how the independent retail grocery stores of this country will be able to continue in business with any degree of profit whatsoever if certain rules and regulations now in operation and others which are under contemplation are put into operation and then administered. The only way those independent grocery men can survive against the three or four big chains is through purchasing and marketing grades and staples and trade-marked products which they have developed and which they carry through their channels of distribution. The consumer is vitally interested in all this. The so-called independent industry is interested in it. The big chains are interested, whether it applies to foodstuffs, shoes, clothing, drugs, or what not. To me it is one of the most vital factors which could possibly relate to American industry as it has developed in this country over the past 150 years.

I believe this committee will do a good job on this problem and thus help the O. P. A. work out a future as best it can in this day of rationing, scarcity of goods, taxation, price fixing, and wage and salary ceilings in which we are involved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution and I told my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, several weeks ago that I did. But what I regret to see is the injection of politics into this. I do not fear investigations. I think they are all right. But I am rather surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just stated that the New Deal was tired of having everything investigated; that that was one source of the trouble. Does the gentleman forget the 12 years that the Republicans were in power? Does the gentleman forget the Hoover panic that we had for 4 years? If the gentleman or any other gentleman wants some labeling I am ready and willing to put those labels where they belong, and the people of this country know that what I will say is the truth about it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to say to the gentleman that he and I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years. The gentleman was there much earlier than I. I never have known that committee to divide on political lines, and I am confident there will be no politics in this investigation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I realize that, but I want to let the membership on your side of the House know that it is not going to be a partisan investigation. There is not going to be any of this sniping carried on just for the purpose of embarrassing the administration which is now engaged in war. It is time to quit that kind of stuff. These times are too serious for men to constantly stand on the floor and snipe at something all the time. There is too much at stake. You are Americans like we are. Mistakes will be made under any administration in an emergency like this.

I would have you read carefully that entire Civil War period when Mr. Lincoln suffered—suffered more than any man could suffer on account of the sniping that went on in both the House and the Senate. Think of those things. You may think you can gain some political advantage by some of this from time to time, but I tell you the American people are doing their part in this, and they realize full well the responsibility which is upon the President of the United States and the administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has made some investigation along the lines of this resolution as it relates to the grade labeling of canned goods. There were a number of witnesses before the committee and I think I should at this time, for the sake of the record, repeat to the House the statement of one of the witnesses before the committee. The witness was Mr. Carson, who represents the great "co-op" organization in the Nation. He stated that his organization had recently purchased a cannery in the State of Missouri. That after taking over the cannery, they made an analysis of the operation of the cannery during the year 1942 and they found that during the

year 1942 this cannery had paid for empty cans $36,000 more than the farmers were paid for all the farm commodities that went into the cans. Let me repeat that: The empty cans cost $36,000 more than all the farmers received for the products that went into the cans. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who seem to take delight in charging that all of the increased cost of living today was brought on by those who toil in the fields, from daylight to dark, and to whom we must look for our food.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Was action taken on the committee amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The amendment was adopted before the debate began.

HOUR OF MEETING, TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 13, 1943, at 2:30 o'clock p. m. The reason for making this request is the dedication to take place that day of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 12

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] tell us as far as he can what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; on Monday District business will be in order, and I am informed by the chairman of the District Committee that while some matters may be called up, nothing controversial will be taken up.

The Kilday bill will come up on Monday also.

Tuesday: On Tuesday the Panama treaty bill will come up, and I understand that certain opposition we feared might develop will not because the misunderstanding has been straightened out. I have a letter from the American Federation of Labor saying there will be no opposition from that source to the passage of the bill or with regard to the amendment which they at one time insisted should be offered to the bill.

Bituminous Coal Act: If the Ways and Means Committee report the joint resolution extending for a short time, I think probably around 120 days, the Bituminous Coal Act, I want to bring that up as soon as possible, probably Tuesday or Wednesday.

Agricultural appropriation bill: Starting Wednesday, after the matters I have mentioned are disposed of, the agricultural appropriation bill will come up.

District of Columbia appropriation bill: After disposition of the agricultural appropriation bill, the District bill will come up.

Pay bill conference report: If the conferees agree on the pay bill any time during the week, that will come up.

That is the program for next week, so far as I am presently advised. Some matters may arise of which I am not perfectly advised, but I will notify the leadership on the other side as soon as they come to my attention and give the House as much advance notice as possible.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it contemplated that the Guffey coal bill will be brought in under a rule? One of the members of the committee has asked me that question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer, because that naturally would have to be decided first by the members of the committee. I should assume it would come up under the rule, for otherwise it could only come up by unanimous consent. I should, therefore, say it would be necessary to obtain a rule, but I make that statement with reservations.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Before the gentleman can make any specific plans with reference to the Guffey coal bill, it would have to come out of the Ways and Means Committee. It has not even been considered yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the reservation I made in my statement. I said that if it was reported out it would be considered next week.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman for his very lucid explanation and only hope there are some things in the back of his head that will work out which he does not want to discuss today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate my friend's state of mind and I am somewhat in sympathy with it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROOKS for 3 days, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Dr. D. M. Yap, at Averett College, Danville, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE AND RUBBER FOR RACKETEERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from a Port Huron newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, up in Port Huron, Mich., there are drivers of trucks who have been engaged in delivering milk to the citizens of Port Huron. They are satisfied with their wages, with their working conditions, and those who employ them are satisfied with their work, and the customers who receive the milk are satisfied.

But down in Detroit there is a group of men, some of them with criminal records, who are not satisfied with the situation at Port Huron. They decided some time ago that Port Huron offered a fertile field for the collection of a little revenue. So, in three or four big cars up to Port Huron they went, using rationed tires and gas with the avowed purpose of organizing, whether they wanted to be organized or not, the milk drivers of Port Huron. Intimidation and threat of violence were among their weapons.

Morris W. Coleman was the chief organizer for the Teamsters Union. James M. Clift, Jr., of Detroit, assisted Coleman. There were others bent upon depriving the Port Huron drivers of their opportunity to work unless those citizens of Port Huron kicked in to the A. F. of L. treasury.

So the C. I. O. organizers demanded of the employers of some of these drivers that they force their men to become members of the A. F. of L. The employers had no right to follow that course. In fact, had they done so they would have been guilty of a violation of the law, of an unfair labor practice under the N. L. R. A. The employers were threatened but the drivers still refused to sign on the dotted line and to pay into the union the amount demanded by those organizers.

Then the organizers went around to some of the customers who were receiving milk and tried to intimidate them. They tried to induce employees of restaurants and other places of business not to serve the milk and they tried to convince patrons of those eating places not to use it. Still they were not successful. But they created a lot of trouble, and eventually, to call attention to the situation, the milk drivers of Port Huron went on strike. Then, the facts appearing, legal protection could no longer be denied them, and they went back to work.

It developed that some of these organizers were driving back and forth daily between Detroit and Port Huron, and naturally the Port Huron Times-

Herald became interested. It sought to learn how those residents of Detroit, seeking to compel Port Huron drivers of milk trucks to stand and deliver, could get gasoline under C cards sufficient to carry them about. Among other things that that inquiring paper learned was that there was not one, but many, gentlemen getting a large amount of gasoline, whose business, among other things, seemed to be the forcing of honest citizens to stand and deliver. In brief, they were practicing extortion.

One result of the questions of the Port Huron Times-Herald was to call the O. P. A. in Detroit to make an investigation into the granting of these rationing books and the allocation of the mileage to the various individuals. That hearing is scheduled for Monday next, and Coleman, who was given a card entitling him to 2,300 miles a month, will be asked to explain how come.

Clift, who is allowed gasoline sufficient to carry him 2,310 miles a month, will also be requested for an explanation.

Thomas Briglia will be asked how it was that he was granted a card entitling him to travel 3,000 miles a month.

Now, it just happens that Briglia is chairman of War Rationing Board No. 82–6, of Detroit, and he is also a representative of the union.

Isaac Litwak, who has a book entitling him to drive 1,350 miles a month, is a member of the War Rationing Board No. 82–8, while James Langley, with an 1,800-mile book, is a member of No. 82–10. Five other members besides Briglia, Litwak, and Langley are among those under investigation.

Farmers and others out-State hard put to it to obtain gasoline for necessary work will certainly be interested in learning just why it is that union organizers, who use gasoline to drive from Port Huron to Detroit and then follow trucks delivering milk through the city around on their respective routes, get these books. Yes; we would like to know. Is gas and rubber to be furnished extortioners by the Government?

Does the joining of a union, which is a political ally of the administration, entitle a man to unlimited gasoline and tires?

From the Port Huron Times-Herald I take the following editorial. Read it. It is interesting:

IT TAKES A HELL OF A LOT

Now, as a result of the revelations made by the investigators of the Office of Price Administration, following the Times-Herald's repeated exposé of the use of C cards in this city by Detroit racketeers and gangsters, we must rush to the defense of our little pal, Morris Coleman, that great "champeen" of "the American way."

Yes, sir; now we've got to make them quit kickin' Morris around.

Why, it just doesn't make sense; that's all.

The Office of Price Administration says Coleman's gasoline allowance was 2,300 miles—yes; that's right; 2,300 miles—a month. That's 27,600 miles a year.

We submit it isn't enough.

How can a racketeer like Morris be expected to follow honest men around in his big Buick car, annoying them and cursing at them, on gasoline for only a measly 2,300 miles a month?

How can a racketeer like Coleman work his racket of trailing hard-working, decent milkmen over their routes, warning their customers that they will be boycotted if they don't stop buying milk from them, if the Government is going to limit Coleman's gasoline supply to that of any other good American citizen?

How can he get a lot of goons and burglars and safecrackers and felonious assaulters to come up here from Detroit to accompany him if they can't get the gas?

It just doesn't make sense; does it?

It can't be done; that's all.

How could Coleman, for example, follow poor Shamaly's drivers through the city, flashing lights in their faces, cursing at them, blocking their way, and threatening them, if the great United States Government, through its rationing boards, refused to supply the gas?

Of course, heroes like Lt. Dek Burley, "Ted" Neal, and many others home on a furlough to rest their shattered nerves—see letter to Mrs. Phillips in the Times-Herald yesterday—can't get a pint of extra gas, after going through hell and high water to save our country and our freedom, but Coleman and the goons and burglars can.

Great stuff, isn't it, fellow citizens?

But that isn't all, by any means.

It takes a lot of gas to go from one businessman to another, telling them to "get your men organized or else"—just those words—and "we don't give a damn for these truck drivers, they're just a lot of ignorant people, we're after the dough"—just those words.

The fact that this is strictly against the law and the Wagner Act doesn't even make a slight dent on Coleman and his kind.

What's the law to them?

Look over the police records of the Detroit boys and see what they have done down there and got away with it.

But even that isn't all.

How can they throw picket lines around places of business, bringing in their gangsters to do it, if they don't get gas?

It just isn't in the cards, we tell you.

Why, if the Office of Price Administration stops this sort of thing the racket will be off and Coleman may really have to go to work or into the Army or something.

And wouldn't that be terrible?

Of course, our sons are away in the armed forces, having given up their good jobs, having left their families and wives and children in many instances because they want America to remain free.

They didn't know, when they left, that a lot of criminals and ex-convicts would invade their home town, to take milk from their babies and to destroy the very freedom for which they are fighting on foreign battlefields and on the seven seas.

But that's what has happened and will continue to happen, unless men of courage and patriotism assert their rights and stop these racketeering destroyers of our glorious Nation.

Just think, 2,300 miles a month, more than 27,000 miles a year, just for one filthy racketeer, while you, Mr. Workingman and Mr. Citizen, can barely get enough to get you to your place of employment and business and back again.

Yes, they've got to quit pickin' on Coleman or increase his gasoline allowance.

It takes a lot of fuel, a hell of a lot, to get away with the rotten stuff he's been pulling off in this community.

The big gas users

	Monthly mileage allotment
Dora E. Milloy, 152 West Nevada	1,810
Orville Matheney, 4070 Larchmont	2,500
Isaac Litwak, 4027 Richton	1,350
James Langley, 9205 Grandmont	1,800
Charlotte M. Kenny, 7011 Maxwell Van Dyke	630
William Hopkins, 4524 Vermont	1,200
James Gardiner, 12694 Northlawn	2,400
Edward F. Garland, 2000 Elmhurst	2,100
Brunson Gilbert, 4855 Maplewood	1,500
Martin Haggerty, 1573 Dragoon	1,430
Alvin Ogilvie, 3409 E. Vernor	2,000
George Wilson, 8082 Carlin	1,430
Fred Willis, 17327 Fenelon	2,260
Alfred Squires, 8543 Inkster Road, Gardencity	1,430
Solomon Sniderman, 2290 Gladstone	900
Frank L. Singer, 11676 Sussex	1,500
John H. Roffey, 1457 Field	2,000
Herbert L. Robertson, 1876 Russell, Lincoln Park	2,000
Joseph S. Prebenda, 7626 Bingham, Dearborn	470
Mike E. Nicoletti, 3900 Berkshire, Van Dyke	2,290
Claus E. Johnson, 11702 Whithorn	2,000
Aloyse V. Herzog, 7227 Maxwell, Van Dyke	1,200
James M. Clift, Jr., 17532 Russell	2,310
Thomas J. Briglia, 7763 Whipple	3,000
Owen B. Brennan, 18600 Asbury Park	2,450
Raphael Bennett, 32845 Eureka Road, Romulus	3,210
William P. Broe, 2690 Sturtevant	470
James F. Cassidy, 12551 Longview	2,070
Frank Collins, 9639 Mark Twain	470
John Leslie Emmert, 946 Frank	1,200
Frank E. Fitzsimmons, 5651 Wabash	1,500
Harry Ames, 16140 Robson	3,000
James R. Hoffa, 16154 Robson	3,000
Robert Holmes, 17172 Lesure	1,590
Otto E. Wendel, Jr., 16190 Littlefield	2,060
George A. Lethem, 12026 Broadstreet	1,430
Samuel L. Hurst, 3938 Helen	1,500
Dorothy M. Foulger, 11 Farrand Park, Highland Park	470
Thomas E. Burke, Wolverine Hotel	2,560
Morris W. Coleman, 2667 Tyler	2,300
Frank S. Ford, 19467 Cheyenne	1,200
William Mair, 5298 Merwin	770
David E. Johnson, 2095 Russell, Lincoln Park	2,070
Eileen Kaplan, 2025 W. Euclid	470

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the Hobbs bill, punishing extortion, which we passed yesterday, will provide a remedy for those citizens who do not want to become the victims of the racketeers and criminals who have taken shelter within union organizations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a member of the United Improvement Association in reference to the very great suffering that has resulted on account of the shortage of fuel in Massachusetts this past winter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the privilege granted me yesterday of extending my own remarks in the RECORD I may include certain excerpts

and communications in connection with the bill that was passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Monday, April 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 687 at which public hearings will be had.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads (full committee) on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2437. Public hearings will be had.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 13, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1172.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

311. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense of the Office for Enfergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $5,949,550 (H. Doc. No. 153); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

312. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to limit the provisions of certain laws relating to the pay and promotion on the retired lists of the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, of commended officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

313. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to require a witness seeking immunity from prosecution under certain acts to claim his privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

315. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period February 1, 1943, to March 31, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 2460. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to permit the local boards to have access to Federal income-tax returns of registrants claiming deferment on grounds of dependency; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Res. 205. Resolution to investigate the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2452. A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Margaret J. Pow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2454. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jud Hendry and her daughter, Gladys Hendry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

488. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of D. J. Mauk of the First National Bank of Franklin, Tex., favoring incentive war-crop payments instead of price supports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

489. Also, petition of D. J. Mauk of the First National Bank of Franklin, Tex., favoring incentive war-crop payments instead of price supports; to the Committee on Appropriations.

490. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the passage of pharmacy corps bills (H. R. 997 and S. 216); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

491. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation changes in laws and regulations affecting the border between United States and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and hat travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, efficient, and victorious prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

492. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of various citizens from the State of Indiana, and especially from Vincennes, Rochester, Hudson, Carmel, Albany, Rossville, New Salisbury, Russiaville, Howe, Sharpsville, Noblesville, Westfield, Mulberry, Carlos, Winchester, Lynn, Marion, Hope, Windfall, Kokomo, Middleton, Auburn, Garrett, Scottsburg, Plymouth, and Seymour, Ind., expressing their wish that House bill 2082 may be passed, the same having been introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

493. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Women's Democratic Organization, First Aldermanic District, Queens County, N. Y., that the proposed amendment to the Constitution, known as the equal rights amendment, is neither necessary nor beneficial and the Women's Democratic Organization of the First Assembly District, Queens County, New York, oppcses such a proposed amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

494. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to unemployment in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, gratefully we remember the days of old. We meditate on the wonders Thou hast wrought. In hours of crisis and sore need Thou hast raised up for us great-souled and high-minded leaders who were the mouthpieces of Thy emancipating truth that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. Especially today do we offer our thanksgiving for Thy servant, Thomas Jefferson, as two centuries after his birth, in remembrance of him an embattled Nation lifts its white symbol of liberty against the black shame of thraldom.

As his towering figure is set up within the encircling classic columns through which blow the free breezes of heaven may there be set up anew at the heart of the Republic's life his lofty passion for pure democracy.

We give Thee thanks for this servant of Thine and of the people to whom principles and persons were more than pedestals; who, in a time of mental fetters proclaimed freedom, in a day of religious bigotry championed tolerance, in a day of dense ignorance fathered universal learning, in a day of artificial sham and show loved sincerity and simplicity, and who in a day of lax morals himself wore ever the white flower of a blameless life. Our grateful hearts rejoice that this founding father was the faithful servant of ideas whose hour had come. May we count as the beads of a holy rosary the triple creed which even in death he bequeathed to posterity: political independence, religious freedom, popular education. As his heroic sculptured form is unveiled to the gaze of a torn and tortured world may the wise and reverent counsel he gave in the flesh fall like a benediction upon the Nation and upon the nations.

Hear us as we prayerfully lift up his words:

"Adore God. Love your neighbor as yourself and your country more than life. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of Providence, and the life which you are now living will be the passage to one of eternal and ineffable bliss."

We ask it in the name of Jesus, whose words were to him, as they are to us, spirit and life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CIVILIAN APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, and branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service for the period February 1 to March 31, 1943, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 1, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

SANITARY INSPECTION OF PLANTS AND PLANT PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR EXPORT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COOPERATIVE ACTION AGAINST PLANT AND ANIMAL DISEASES, NOXIOUS INSECTS, AND PESTS AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects, and other pests affecting agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPRESENTATIVE OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TO ASSIST AND ACCOMPANY SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

A letter from the chairman of the War Production Board, stating that, pursuant to Senate Resolution 113, requesting certain governmental departments and agencies to assign representatives to accompany the Military Affairs Committee in its investigation of labor shortages in certain Western States (agreed to April 7, 1943) he had designated Gustav Peck as the War Production Board representative to accompany the Senate Military Affairs subcommittee to assist in studying the subject referred to; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War, Navy (3), and Commerce, and the Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of John Henry Smith, of Longview, Texas, praying that the Government accept his free offer of the Smith Fuelless Engine to use forever; to the Committee on Patents.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution relative to the making of payments by the Federal Government to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax receipts on account of the use of certain lands by the United States

"Whereas there are many thousands of acres of tax-free lands owned by the Federal Government and held in national forests, national parks, national wildlife refuges, national grazing-land acquisition projects, military and naval reservations, Indian reservations, and Indian trust lands; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of such tax-free lands are located in counties of California; and

"Whereas the remaining acres of these counties are overburdened with taxation to meet the educational, police protection, and other costs of county government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation similar to Senate bill 1201 introduced by Senator MCNARY on March 24, 1941, which provided for annual payments to the State for apportionment among counties of 2 percent of the fair value of Federal-owned tax-free land situated in the State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such legislation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Resolution 424

"Senate resolution asking Congress to prevent the sending through the United States mails of magazines and newspapers containing advertisements of intoxicating liquors

"Whereas it is contrary to the public interest to encourage the use of intoxicating liquors: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to take such action as may be adequate to prevent the sending of magazines and newspapers through the mails and other channels of interstate commerce which contain any advertising of intoxicating liquors.

"2. That copies of this resolution be furnished to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Members thereof from the State of South Carolina."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Resolution 30

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
"*Albany, March 1, 1943.*

"Whereas our country is now engaged at war, and pledged to decisively and speedily defeat the forces of aggression and tyranny; and

"Whereas to achieve victory over the enemy all the available man and woman power of our country at home must be mobilized in a production effort to furnish and supply our glorious armed forces and our gallant and courageous allies with supplies, equipment, and war materials; and

"Whereas certain employers engaged in businesses, industries, and occupations, and engaged in the production of supplies, equipment, and war matériels are not fully contributing to the limits of their ability and capacity, the reason, among others, therefor being that even at this late date and advanced stage of our production efforts for victory, they are still practicing discrimination, by refusing to engage, employ, and hire certain of our people because of race, color, creed, or national origin, which discriminatory practices are imperiling and endangering the unity, morale, and social welfare of our people; and

"Whereas the vital effects of this practice and situation have been recognized by the New York State War Council and accordingly

a committee on discrimination was established, vested with full power and authorization, under our State laws, to investigate, prosecute, and penalize employers engaged in discriminatory practices; and

"Whereas this vital situation was recognized by the President of the United States and the Congress and in June 1941 the fair employment practice committee was created; and

"Whereas the committee on discrimination of the New York State War Council has been doing effective work and achieving favorable results, but, however, many employers remain out of its jurisdictional sphere; and

"Whereas the fair employment practice committee in attempting to do effective work and achieve favorable results finds it has limited power, scope, and authority, and it is otherwise handicapped: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact suitable legislation vesting the fair employment practice committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution, and enforcement, together with adequate funds to operate; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to use their best efforts to accomplish the purposes of this resolution with all convenient speed."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"STATE OF NEW YORK,
"*In Assembly, Albany.*

"Whereas 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are presently deprived of their right of free suffrage by poll-tax laws in eight States which impose upon the exercise of the elective franchise limitations neither contemplated nor condoned by the Constitution of the United States: and

"Whereas taking advantage of the inability of these 10,000,000 citizens, both Negro and white, to express themselves politically by participating in the choice of their representatives in government, both State and Federal, the forces of disunity and reaction have entrenched themselves in power and, thus protected, struggle ceaselessly against the consummation of the domestic and foreign policies of our Government and seek to disrupt the mobilization of all our forces for the successful prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas at a time when the morale and strength of the people of this Nation are needed increasingly if it is to survive, it is a dangerous inconsistency to continue to deprive any section of them of the democratic rights, to preserve which this war is being fought, but rather is it necessary to draw all men and women, no matter what their race, creed, color, or economic position, into full participation in the struggle for victory; and

"Whereas the abolition of the poll tax will enable these 10,000,000 citizens to enter fully into their rights and duties as American citizens and will, at the same time, weaken those forces who place petty self-interest and personal power above the need for complete mobilization for victory as it will defeat those elements of reaction who depend upon the poll tax for their power, while it will strengthen national unity and morale: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact H. R. 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government, and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
"*Albany, March 22, 1943.*

"Whereas the Saratoga National Historical Park embraces a section of New York State highly significant in this Nation's early struggles for independence; and

"Whereas it would be entirely fitting and appropriate to convert a portion of this hallowed ground as the final resting place for veterans of the several wars in which this Nation has or may become engaged: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State."

A resolution by judges and members of the Franklin County (Ky.) Fiscal Court; to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the United States Government has now been engaged in a war with the German, Japanese, and Italian Governments for about 15 months, during which time it has suffered several defeats; and

"Whereas the Franklin County (Ky.) Fiscal Court is the duly elected representative of the people of Franklin County; and

"Whereas our democratic form of government in the United States grants us the power to petition our representatives in our various representative bodies in the United States; and

"Whereas the members of the Franklin County Fiscal Court feel that there must be an all-out effort on the part of every citizen in the United States if we are to win this struggle for the freedom of the world; and

"Whereas the press and radio commentators continue to give us news of absentee workers from war plants and stoppage of work by strikes, all of which greatly impedes our war effort: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, as representatives of the people of Franklin County, Ky., call upon the Members of our House of Representatives and United States Senate at Washington to speedily pass some legislation to correct this condition at once. We feel that the time for the use of persuasion to curb this situation is passed and that the people are entitled to some immediate legislation to correct this condition. Therefore, we call on our Representatives to lay aside all else for the present and concentrate all their powers in an effort to pass some legislation that would speedily terminate this war; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we call upon the county court clerk of Franklin County to send a copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the clerk of the United States Senate at Washington to be read upon the floors of their respective Houses.

"This March 23, 1943.

"Judge L. BOONE HAMILTON.
"O. L. SUTER.
"NORMAN QUIRE.
"RUDOLPH MOORE.
"ERNEST GRAHAM.
"FRED MONTGOMERY."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition numerously signed by sundry citizens of Atwood, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"STATE OF ARIZONA,
"SENATE, SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE.

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial requesting Congress and the United States Land Office to clear the title to certain school lands granted the State

"*To the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"By numerous acts of Congress, sections 16 and 36 in each township were reserved and set aside for the benefit of the public-school systems of the Territories of the public-lands area of the West and of the States thereafter to be created out of such Territories.

"By the acts approved September 9, 1850, and July 22, 1854, following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gadsden Treaty, respectively, the same course was pursued with respect to New Mexico, of which Arizona was at that time a part.

"The act of July 22, 1854 (10 U. S. Stat. 309), provides: 'That when the lands in the said Territory shall be surveyed * * * sections Nos. 16 and 36 * * * shall be, and the same are hereby, reserved for the purpose of being applied to schools in said Territory, and in the States and Territories hereafter to be created out of the same.'

"By authority of the act of Congress of March 26, 1896 (29 U. S. Stat. 90), authorizing the Territory of Arizona to lease 'all of the school land in the Territory of Arizona for school purposes, the Territory of Arizona, under the act of the Territorial legislature effective September 1, 1901, assumed the administration, through the boards of supervisors of the several counties, of all school lands which had been surveyed and the plats thereof approved, and continued to administer them until statehood, for the benefit of the public schools.'

"The Arizona Enabling Act, approved June 20, 1910, recognized and confirmed the reservation of sections Nos. 16 and 36, and granted two additional sections in each township.

"Following the State's admission into the Union, the Arizona State land department assumed the administration of these school lands, and in conformity with the terms of the Enabling Act, the State constitution, and the State land code sold and leased the same.

"Among the lands sold were numerous tracts of school land comprising all or parts of certain sections Nos. 16 and 36, located chiefly in the Salt River Valley, the irrigated and irrigable areas near Yuma, and at other points adjacent to the Colorado River, which, in most cases, have been brought under a high state of development and large investments made thereon.

"It now appears that the United States Land Office denies that title to these lands has ever vested in the State of Arizona, basing its denial upon the withdrawal of the lands

from entry under the terms of the Reclamation Act of 1902, prior to the granting of statehood to Arizona, while ignoring the fact that they were reserved for school purposes by the act of July 22, 1854, and that the lands were surveyed and the plats approved long prior to the passage of the Reclamation Act, and were administered by the Territory by authority of an act of Congress of 1896.

"Thus the State of Arizona, which administered in good faith the grant in favor of the common schools, and in all respects complied with the laws of the United States, is placed in the position of a defrauder, a seller of property to which it had no title, and of taking under false pretenses the money received for these lands. The innocent purchasers are in the position of having bought and paid for the lands, made large investment and extensive improvements thereon, and having for their money, their enterprise and their labors a title repudiated and denied by the United States.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the United States Land Office, upon application of the State Land Department of Arizona, issue patents to all such sections 16 and 36 which have been sold and deeded by the State, together with all other school sections granted the State of Arizona where the plats of survey have been regularly filed and approved, failing which, that the Congress by legislation validate the title of the State of Arizona to such lands.

"Approved by the Governor March 19, 1943."

RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE LEGISLATURE—AMENDMENT RELATING TO SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

Concurrent resolution in respect to a proposed amendment to the Federal social-security laws

Whereas at the present time the employees of the State of Delaware and of the various departments and agencies of our State government do not and cannot come under the provisions of the Federal social-security laws and, by consequence, are not entitled to participate in any of the privileges accorded to employees under such laws; and

Whereas it is the belief of the One Hundred and Ninth General Assembly of the State of Delaware that it would be to the best interests of the State and beneficial to the State employees if the Federal social-security laws should be amended so as to permit any State to obtain for its employees these benefits by voluntarily accepting coverage under these laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the one hundred and ninth general assembly (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the representatives of the State of Delaware in the Congress of the United States of America, the Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL, the Honorable C. DOUGLASS BUCK, and the Honorable EARLE D. WILLEY, be and they hereby are asked, on behalf of the State of Delaware, to propose measures in the Congress of the United States which would permit any State voluntarily to accept coverage under the social-security laws of the State of Delaware to the end that the employees of such State would be entitled to participate in the benefits now obtainable by the employees of private industries; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL, senior Senator from Delaware, the Honorable C. DOUGLASS BUCK, junior Senator from Delaware, and the Honorable EARLE D. WILLEY, Representative from the State of Delaware in the Congress of the United States.

Approved March 26, 1943.

WALTER W. BACON, *Governor.*

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY—PRICE CEILINGS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. DANAHER] and for myself I present and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from the clerk of the Senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, and with it a resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products. I ask that the letter and resolution may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter, with an accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Senate, April 9, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: Enclosed please find copy of house joint resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products, which was passed by this general assembly.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE P. BALDWIN,
Clerk of the Senate.
SEARLS DEARINGTON,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session A. D. 1943.

Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the food situation grows more acute daily, this being particularly true of the milk supply necessary to meet the requirements of our greatly increased population; and

Whereas dairy farmers are going out of business at an alarming rate owing to the shortage of skilled farm labor, feed, fertilizer and farm machinery and to inadequate prices to meet the increased cost of production; and

Whereas some immediate action must be taken to remedy this situation and give encouragement to our remaining dairy farmers to carry on in this grave national food crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut General Assembly respectfully requests Secretary Wickard, the Office of Price Administration, and all other governmental agencies involved in the production and distribution of food to take immediate action to eliminate the existing shortage of milk by establishing price ceilings that will make it possible for Connecticut dairy farmers to meet production costs and to continue in business; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, Price Administrator Brown, and each of the Connecticut Members in Congress.

CREATION OF AN IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it has long been one of the chief aspirations of the State of Washington to develop in that State an iron and steel industry. The State has many heavily mineralized belts and ore resources which would justify the creation of such an industry. In the session of the Washington State Legislature just concluded the State senate adopted a resolution urging governmental agencies to give serious consideration to the establishment by the Federal Government of an iron and steel industry in that State.

In the resolution it is directed that it be brought to the attention of various committees and officials of the Government, including the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I think it is proper that the resolution be printed in the RECORD under the rule and referred to that special committee. Therefore, I send it to the desk and ask that it be so referred to the committee, and I bespeak for it full consideration by the committee and by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Washington for the reference of the resolution suggested by him? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington was referred to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
TWENTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION.

Whereas the State of Washington, richly endowed with the ores, coals, and other raw materials essential to the establishment and maintenance of an iron and steel industry and presently handicapped by lack of development of these resources, should take steps at this time to bring these resources to bear in the war effort and should provide for its post-war development and prosperity through the establishment of such an industry on a sound basis; and

Whereas the Senate of the State of Washington recognizes that at many times in the past efforts have been made to establish such an industry in the State and that these efforts have been thwarted and blocked in the interest of industries already existing in other sections of the country; and

Whereas it is the declared conviction of the senate that the time is now ripe to add to the industrial resources of our State an iron and steel industry which will be able to contribute to our general industrial growth in the future and to make an important contribution to the winning of the war in which our country is now engaged; and

Whereas the senate recognizes the fact that Washington industries, basing their operations upon the use of iron and steel, are now and have been in the past at all times in an unfair competitive position because of the so-called Pittsburgh-plus basis upon which steel and iron are sold in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we hereby urge the Governor of the State of Washington, the Members of the Washington delegation in the Congress of

the United States, and the agencies of the Federal Government concerned with war production to support and to give favorable consideration to any feasible proposal for the establishment of such an industry in the State of Washington at this time; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Governor of the State of Washington, and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington, and that copies shall be sent to Mr. Donald Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, to the Steel Investigation Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, and to the United States Senate Committe for the Investigation of the War Effort.

RESOLUTION OF INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION, WICHITA, KANS.—INCREASED PRICE FOR CRUDE OIL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask consent to present and have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission at its quarterly meeting held in Wichita, Kans., April 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is grave and deep concern among us that there is imminent a serious shortage of current producible oil in this country.

We are consuming this most vital war material at least twice as fast as we are discovering new fields.

The oil producer is faced with shortage of funds, manpower and materials. The price of oil has been fixed at a very low level while drilling and operation costs have constantly risen.

Many independent oil producers are thus being forced out of business. The independent has in the past discovered most of the new oil fields. He will do it again if the Government will permit the price to advance to cover costs and provide a proper incentive. This method has always worked in an economy of free enterprise. It is reasonable to assume that it will now again provide the oil. There should be no further delay in applying the known historic American method of finding oil: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Oil Compact Commission request the President and the Congress, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission to immediately permit an adequate increase in the price of crude oil with appropriate products price adjustment in order that new life be put into prospecting for oil, that abandonment of stripper wells be thereby retarded, that secondary methods of recovery may be made financially possible in many oil fields, and resolved further that immediate steps be taken to relieve the critical material and manpower shortages.

We feel the need so urgent and so vital that a copy of this resolution should be sent to each Member of the Congress, and that our chairman be requested to present a copy to the President of the United States.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S 650. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak."; with an amendment (Rept. No. 179).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 8, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 988. A bill to provide relief for victims of the flood of September 17, 1942, in and near the village of Spring Valley, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 989. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 990. A bill for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WAGNER. I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. It is the so-called stabilization fund bill relating to that fund and also to the gold dollar. Let me say that hearings upon the bill will be held next Friday before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 991. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 992. A bill to change certain exemptions relating to the renegotiation of contracts with the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the Maritime Commission, and subcontracts thereunder, and to require in certain cases the filing of financial statements for each expired fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation; ordered to lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. KILBURN were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TARVER, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DITTER, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 653. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation", approved June 18, 1934; and

H. R. 2207. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 653. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2207. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, and re-

questing a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. In the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MEAD, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. LANGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas by House Joint Resolution 263, approved and signed by President Wilson, May 8, 1914, the second Sunday in May of each year has been designated as Mother's Day for the expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of our country; and

Whereas there are thoroughout our own and other war-stricken lands today an unprecedentedly large number of once prosperous but now impoverished mothers who have been bombed from their homes, whose husbands have been killed and whose children are homeless, undernourished, and millions of them literally starving: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon our citizens to express, on Mother's Day this year, our love and reverence for our mothers—

(a) By the customary display of the United States flag on all Government buildings, homes, and other suitable places;

(b) By the usual tokens and messages of affection to our mothers; and

(c) By making contributions, in honor of our mothers, through our churches or other fraternal and welfare and war-relief agencies of the donor's choice, for the relief and welfare of the many millions of mothers and dependent children less fortunate who are today suffering for lack of the sheer necessities of life.

ADMINISTRATION OF JACKSON HOLE AND OTHER NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND PARKS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 134), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the methods and purposes of, and the administration of the laws relating to, the establishment of and the fixing or alteration of the boundaries of, national monuments, national forests, Indian reservations, and national parks. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation and study, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman, and shall be subject to the limit on expenditures contained in and be deemed to be a part of the expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 11, Seventy-eighth Congress (authorizing such committee to sit and hold hearings during the 78th Cong.).

MEMBERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS—IMPLEMENTATION OF ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution pertaining to the foreign relations of this country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and referred in accordance with the request of the Senator from Florida.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate (two-thirds of the Senators concurring) advise the President to inform the several United Nations that the United States is ready to enter into a solemn pledge that it will, within 6 months after the conclusion of the war in Europe, become a full participating member of an acceptable form of United Nations in order to implement the Atlantic Charter, safeguard it in peace, and promote its welfare by cooperating with other free peoples of the world.

Further, That the President invite the several members of the United Nations immediately to join the United States in executing such solemn covenant and pact.

Further, That the President invite the several United Nations to join the United States in initiating immediately a study and exchange of ideas and suggestions as to what should be the specific form and detail of the United Nations to be formed.

DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—RECONSIDERATION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I submit a motion that the Senate reconsider the vote whereby the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States, was passed by the Senate on Friday last.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, in the last hour of the session of the Senate on April 9, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] called up for consideration a bill having to do with the deportation of Chinese sailors. I was not aware that the bill would be called up. It was passed at that time. I regret very much that no way could be found to prevent taking such action, because I am informed that the Chinese Government found the action repugnant. China has done so much and has received so little that, as a matter of grace, I think it would have been a nice gesture if some way could have been found to comply with her wishes in such a matter. I am glad the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] made the remarks he did make in regard to it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield, let me advise him that at an earlier time today, when he was absent from the Chamber, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] had a motion entered that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed on Friday. So the matter now is before the Senate for further and studied disposition.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator.

A MECHANISM FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject A Mechanism for Peace, delivered by him on Saturday, April 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL ON ANNIVERSARY OF OCCUPATION OF NORWAY

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Carnegie Hall, New York, on April 10, 1943, on the third anniversary of the occupation of Norway, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him for translation into Spanish and Portuguese and for distribution to Latin America in connection with the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO AGRICULTURE—ARTICLE BY DR. JAMES E. WARD

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Thomas Jefferson's Contributions to Agriculture," prepared by Dr. James E. Ward, chairman of the department of economics and government at Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES W. GERARD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address regarding post-war problems, delivered by Hon. James W. Gerard on Sunday, April 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS IS MY AMERICA—BY LT. COL. WILLIAM A. BREWER

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an apostrophe to America, entitled "This Is My America," by Lt. Col. William A. Brewer, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY HON. HUMPHREY MITCHELL

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding the development of the 1943 farm labor program, delivered in the House of Commons of Canada by Hon. Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO FOOD ADMINISTRATOR CHESTER CHARLES DAVIS BY ROBERT ST. JOHN

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a description of the personality and attributes of Hon. Chester C. Davis by Robert St. John on March 31, 1943, in a talk broadcast over the radio, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHEESE MAKERS—ARTICLE FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject Cheese Makers, published in the Wall Street Journal of April 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMINISTRATION OF JACKSON HOLE AND OTHER NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND PARKS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by the Secretary of the Interior and a statement of policy concerning the administration of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., and other national reservations, which appear in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may want to change the order later, but, for the time being, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the first Republican President of the United States cannot be made the prerogative of any one political party. As our national history rolls on, Thomas Jefferson grows in stature, in the love and respect of the American people, in their recognition of his majestic intellectual conception of his country as a representative republic, in which the people are masters and the officials their servants. I cannot refrain from rising today to speak in praise of that American who said—

> That I have acted through life on those principles of sincere republicanism I feel in every fiber of my constitution. And when men who feel like myself, bear witness in my favor, my satisfaction is complete.

I do so bear witness and every Republican will give allegiance to the republicanism of Thomas Jefferson.

Nowhere has Jefferson stated his fundamental philosophy—a way of life that should be today, but unfortunately is not, binding upon every American in whose heart beats eternal adoration of his country and his country's hopes—nowhere has Jefferson stated his philosophy better than in his first inaugural address. When he penned those lines, the sage of Monticello must have reviewed his own life and thought in panoramic retrospect. He had early in life established a belief in republican principles. He believed in the rights of man, and had fought for them in his native Virginia. He had led his State valiantly in the cause of human liberty. He it was who prepared the Declaration of Independence, that call to freemen to remain free, to live in liberty, to die, if necessary, that tyranny should not live. He had served in the Continental Congress; he had succeeded Patrick Henry as Governor of Virginia; he had negotiated the peace with Great Britain, and had been George Washington's Secretary of State—the first of a long line of honorable and faithful servants of the people in that office.

But he had witnessed an appalling concentration of power and authority in the central government, an attempt on the part of the Federalists to perpetuate themselves at the expense of the ideal of a representative republic. Jefferson could not compromise on principle. He was determined that his country should be a republic and that the American people should prosper and thrive and live in freedom under the republican form of government.

And now he himself had become President of the United States, successor to George Washington and John Adams. The time had come when he could speak from the vantage of the White House. He could strengthen the authority of the administration in Washington, or he could strengthen the will of the people and their right to control their own decisions and their own Government. Sitting in the White House he could betray his principles as so many do when they attain the highest of public positions, or he could be true to his Heaven-inspired ideals. It was at such a moment that Jefferson said:

> But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

History did record the answer, for we survived a free people, unfearful of government and its minions, unhampered in our exercise of republican principles for fully 132 years after Jefferson wrote those words. Alas, we have more recently lost our way and his direction. We have wandered far from his guidance. We have permitted government to expand until it has ceased to be a beloved jewel in the people's diadem and has become a burdensome and oppressive weight upon our shoulders.

Again, in the same address, Jefferson counseled Americans of all generations as to the sound course to pursue, but we in our generation have despised his counsel. Some men who, calling themselves Democrats, and New Dealers, and such names as would have sounded odd and unaccustomed to his precise ears, often prate in his name and separate an isolated phrase from its context to prove a distant and unrelated analogy, have wandered furthest from his principles and ideals, for mark what he said:

> Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one-quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens: A wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

Thomas Jefferson had no illusions as to the difficulties which this country of ours faced. He realized the dangers which beset a nation that sought a way of life which was neither dominated by a single powerful individual and a self-perpetuating aristocracy nor dominated by a wild and reckless mob. In a letter to Isaac H. Tiffany, dated August 26, 1816, he wrote:

> Aristotle and the people of his time had just ideas of the value of personal liberty, but none at all of the structure of government best calculated to preserve it. They knew no medium between a democracy (the only pure republic, but impracticable beyond the limits of a town) and an abandonment of themselves to an aristocracy, or a tyranny independent of the people. It seems not to have occurred that where the citizens cannot meet to transact their business in person, they alone have the right to choose the agents who shall transact it; and that in this way a republican, or popular, government of the second grade of purity, may be exercised over any extent of country. The full experiment of a government democratical, but representative, was and is still reserved for us.

He almost foretold our current dangers of concentration of authority in a letter to Joseph C. Cabell in the same year:

> Let the National Government be entrusted with the defense of the Nation, and its foreign and Federal relations; the State governments with the civil rights, laws, police, and the administration of what concerns the State generally; the counties with the local concerns of the counties; and each ward direct the interests within itself. It is by

dividing and subdividing these republics from the great national one down through all its subordinations, until it ends in the administration of every man's farm by himself; by placing under everyone what his own eye may superintend, that all will be done for the best. The elementary republics of the wards, the county republics, the State republics, and the Republic of the Union, would form a gradation of authorities, standing each on the basis of law, holding everyone its delegated share of powers, and constituting truly a system of fundamental balances and checks for the Government.

Surely we have departed from that wise doctrine of a cooperative, unbossed society, in which the wards and counties and districts and States all function in their proper spheres without the mastery of a vast, irreverent, and offensive bureaucracy that determines at a distance and without regard to propriety or justice what a citizen shall sow and what he may reap, what he shall eat and how he shall rear his children. Jefferson realized the dire consequences of a tyranny of officialdom. He said:

But a short review of facts * * * will show, that the contests of that day were contests of principle, between the advocates of republican, and those of kingly government, and that had not the former made the efforts they did, our Government would have been, even at this early day, a very different thing from what the successful issues of those efforts have made it.

Even earlier, in a letter to James Sullivan, he wrote what could today be read and employed with profit:

Where a constitution, like ours, wears a mixed aspect of monarchy and republicanism, its citizens will naturally divide into two classes of sentiment, according as their tone of body or mind, their habits, connections and callings, induce them to wish to strengthen either the monarchical or the republican features of the Constitution. Some will consider it as an elective monarchy, which had better be made hereditary, and therefore endeavor to lead toward that all the forms and principles of its administration. Others will view it as an energetic republic, turning in all its points on the pivot of free and frequent elections. The great body of our native citizens are unquestionably of the republican sentiment.

Yes, Jefferson clearly understood his country and his country's needs. To Edward Livingston, he wrote:

The people, through all the States, are for republican forms, republican principles, simplicity, economy, religious and civil freedom.

I have quoted but a few expressions out of a vast literature on the inherent republicanism of Thomas Jefferson and his faith in the American people rather than in an officialdom—perhaps permanent and hereditary. I could, with profit, continue such quotations until their length would fill volumes which could with advantage be given to our children who are so wanting in knowledge of the history of their own country. I deny myself that privilege today.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson has from its very inception been the guiding genius of the political party of which I am a member. That party was organized by simple, humble, religiously inspired men and women who were moved by the republican ideal of national unity without the suppression of individual liberty; yea, even the liberty of difference of opinion. That party was conceived not as a political machine seeking power, but as a liberal movement out of the hearts of the American people for the preservation of our republican form of government which at the moment was in peril. Gathering at Philadelphia on June 17, 1856, the delegates wrote the first platform of the Republican Party, the very first resolution of which stated:

Resolved, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States must be preserved.

But it was in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson that that resolution was passed, for, mind you, Mr. President, those first Republicans, the founders of the party to whose principles I adhere, stated in the opening sentences of the resolution that the delegates were assembled for the objective of "restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson." In 1856, the Republican Party recognized the principles of Thomas Jefferson as guiding, as fundamental in Americanism. From that day until this, no American, except perhaps the kindly Lincoln, who through his martyrdom has been beatified into an eternal saintliness, plays so significant an intellectual role in the Republican Party as Thomas Jefferson.

I think of tomorrow. Millions of Americans will then review the career and life of Thomas Jefferson. A monument erected in his honor by the whole American people will be the scene of a national celebration. That monument knows no partisanship. That monument frowns upon private politics and unlimited personal ambition. That monument casts the shadow of shame upon any American who even within the secrecy of his own heart substitutes self-glorification for the simplicities of a representative republic. That monument reminds us that Jefferson, like Washington, might have served for more terms in the Presidency than two, were he not ever mindful that prolonged tenure in office of an individual, no matter how upright his intentions, increases his powers and his sense of authority beyond the bounds of benefit to a people living under the blessings of republicanism. That monument to Thomas Jefferson will ever be a reminder to the American people that when his principles of governmental simplicity, frugality, even humility were cast aside and their place usurped by power and pride and haughtiness, when the republics of ward and county and State were forgotten and in their place an overweening bureaucracy appeared, the American people for the first time in all their history were suffering from a scarcity of food in a land upon whose soil smiles the bounty and abundance of God.

Would that we were again led by a Thomas Jefferson, by an American whose eye never faltered from the single conception of republicanism. Would that among us there were one man whose courage, whose honesty, whose fervor in the right, could lead our people forward again to the noble ideals which strengthened our forebears in Jefferson's day to build a civilization upon this continent which in little more than a century has become the envy of all the other peoples of the world—their envy and their benefactor. Yes; Thomas Jefferson, were he alive today, would no doubt say to us as he wrote to Robert R. Livingston:

The public mind is recovering from the delirium into which it had been thrown, and we may still believe with security that the great body of the American people must for ages yet be substantially republican.

DANIEL C. ROPER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise at this time to pay a very brief tribute to an outstanding American who died last night in the city of Washington. I think Daniel C. Roper was one of the most typical Americans it has been my privilege and pleasure to know since I have beer a Member of the Congress of the United States. If there ever was a man who deserved to be described as a Christian statesman Secretary Roper was that man.

Mr. Roper came to Washington as a young man back in 1893 or 1894 as a clerk of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate. By his diligence and industry and fidelity to duty he rose from one position to another. I think at one time he was connected with the Ways and Means Committee. He was a member of the Tariff Commission. He was First Assistant Postmaster General during the Wilson administration, or a part of it. He was appointed Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and completely reorganized the internal-revenue service of the United States by the consolidation of collectors' offices and bureaus and divisions within the Bureau of Internal Revenue, until he had placed it upon the most efficient basis it had ever occupied in its history.

At the begining of the Roosevelt administration he was appointed Secretary of Commerce. Later he became Minister to Canada. His long public life, from the humblest position of clerk of a Senate committee to member of the President's Cabinet, was typified and in a sense integrated in and by his high character as a man and as a citizen.

He was a deeply religious man, and all his life devoted himself to the cause of the church of which he was an honorable and shining and eminent member and officer. There was never the slightest whisper against or tarnish upon his official escutcheon or upon his private character or life. I am sure I have spoken the sentiment of all who knew Mr. Roper when I have uttered these few words in honor of his memory and have paid this feeble tribute to an outstanding American whose life was an example to the younger generation. I desire to impress upon America, and in particular the younger generation, the desirability of Christian ideals in public life and in

public advocacy of any cause in which they may be interested.

I wish through these feeble words also to express our profound sympathy to the family of Mr. Roper. All his boys are now in the service of the United States, I believe, wearing the uniform of their country in this great crisis. Let me say, Peace to his ashes, and may the memory of his life become brighter and brighter as the years pass by.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a Repesentative of the people of South Carolina, I wish to express their sadness at the loss of one of their most devoted and beloved citizens, the Honorable Daniel C. Roper.

Mr. Roper was born in Marlboro County, S. C., and was educated at Wofford College. While still in his youth, he was elected to the South Carolina Legislature, and from that service of the State he came to Washington. The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has portrayed his career and the advancements which came to him in Washington. On behalf of the people of South Carolina I wish to say that Daniel Roper was beloved and his memory will be cherished by them. He was a magnificent Christian American and a great South Carolinian.

USE OF NITROGEN FERTILIZER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the brief of the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, which my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] inserted in the RECORD on April 9, 1943, I should like to state that I received a similar communication early last week, and subsequently telegraphed Dean Christensen of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin, indicating my endorsement of his urgent request for consideration of the fertilizer program.

On April 8, 1943, I received in reply to my telegram a telegram from Dean Christensen in which he indicated that he sincerely believed that the increased use of fertilizer offers a large promise of increasing crop yields and, hence, food supplies. In his telegraphic reply to me, the dean indicated particularly the necessity for securing governmental approval of an increase in the amount of nitrogen fertilizer available for Wisconsin farmers this year. The dean also requested support for a plan of greatly expanded manufacture of fertilizer for distribution next year.

Under date of April 8, 1943, I wrote directly to Mr. Chester C. Davis, Federal Food Administrator, with reference to this problem, and urged immediate action.

In supplementing the comments made by my colleague, I should like to stress particularly that any action taken on this problem, if it is to be effective at all, must be exceedingly prompt. The planting of hemp will start within the next 30 days, and the planting of corn will start within the next 40 days; and, of course, as Dean Christensen has pointed out in his memorandum, 1 month is an exceedingly short time for the manufacturer to mix and deliver the goods.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of my letter of April 8, 1943, addressed to Mr. Chester C. Davis, Federal Food Administrator.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 8, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator, Food Distribution Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: Under date of April 3, 1943, Dean Chris L. Christensen, of the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture Experimental Station, wrote you with respect to Wisconsin's need for chemical nitrogen fertilizer.

I have read Dean Christensen's memorandum and enclosures respecting this matter with great interest, and I urge your consideration for Dean Christensen's views.

I will appreciate being advised as to any action you may take with respect to his memorandum.

I share Dean Christensen's active interest in anything which will increase our crop yields and, consequently, our food supplies. Accordingly, I am concerned with increased use of fertilizer, the governmental approval of an increase in the amount of nitrogen fertilizer available for Wisconsin farmers this year, and a plan of greatly expanded fertilizer manufacture for distribution next year.

I request immediate consideration for this matter because, as Dean Christensen points out, any action, if it is to be effective in this connection, must be prompt.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES ON SECOND-, THIRD-, AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I addressed to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, in which I voiced in advance a protest against House bill 1989 or any similar measure designed to increase the postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I realize that H. R. 1989 is not before the Senate committee at this time, but I wish to voice a protest in advance against this or any similar measure designed to increase the postal rates on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter.

We have witnessed, Senator, during the past few years, and more especially since we became an active participant in the war, the gradual tightening of restrictions, both directly and indirectly, upon the activities of the press of America. We have heard with ever-increasing frequency the cry, "Maintain the freedom of the press." I realize that that phrase has been overworked by being raised each time something occurred which affected the fourth estate; however, I do think that it should be stressed once more in view of the more recent happenings and especially in the light of this proposed legislation.

The press has been, since its inception, the source of news and opinion for the average man. It has done more to mold public opinion, suppress corruption, arouse public sentiment, and bring about social betterment than any other similar instrument. True, there are those who will contend that the press has been supplanted to a large extent by the radio as an instrument or medium of news dissemination, as well as advertising medium. However, the press remains as the only pictorial advertising method, the largest medium of complete news coverage as demonstrated by the ever-increasing circulation figures.

The press is still, and will continue to be, the largest and most complete source of news for the reader—will present the best editorial opinion and feature material.

The American press, as a patriotic duty, has plunged headlong into the war effort and has donated hundreds of thousands of lines of advertising to various war programs. They have gone all-out in their efforts to surpass quotas in the sale of War bonds, War Savings stamps, war charity drives, scrap drives, and the like. In addition they have, as a public service, contributed thousands of additional lines of space to the printing of ration-book applications, explanations of rationing programs, and have attempted to put into readable and understandable language other bureaucratic programs.

On the other hand, they have had to endure a censorship of war news; they have had to abide by self-imposed censorship on a large quantity of domestic news; have had to rely on Government hand-outs in the form of news releases which have had to be rehashed in an attempt to create a readable article.

The present administration has hindered the press at every turn. Press photographers have been forced to lay aside their cameras and accept official photos of domestic events, photos which in a great number of instances were never printed because of their inferior quality, and which in the recent case of an Office of War Information photographer resulted in no picture at all, since the photographer forgot to take the cap off his lens.

The attempts of the administration have culminated in the recent ruling that the press will not be allowed to attend the greater portion of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Va., May 18.

In addition to the restrictions placed upon news coverage and dissemination, the press has had to submit to curtailment of their newsprint, shortage of mechanical repairs, loss of manpower, and in one instance to legal proceedings charging monopoly.

The publishers of the Nation were forced to alter publication plans and programs to meet a newsprint cut of 10 percent. In the face of an additional cut of 40 percent investigations were held which proved the lack of necessity and this additional cut was limited to 10 percent which itself was removed shortly thereafter under pressure of additional findings. The press has lost operators, reporters, and executives to the draft as has every other business concern. They have faced the loss of advertising contracts in the shrinking of their advertising fields.

However, I wish to direct my next few statements to the so-called country press of America. Although some of them have been forced to suspend publication for reasons varying from the draft to actual shortage of paper, the large majority of them have managed to survive although faced with the problems above mentioned, especially with the withdrawal of advertising from their local communities.

The local country paper serves a great purpose. Among rural people it is usually the only paper which enters the home. These papers, of which I write, are the small-town dailies, semi-weeklies, and weekly publications, dependent upon mail subscriptions for the maintenance of their circulation, and whose publication is in large part supported by the job work done in the same plant.

Now, in addition to everything else, they have to face the prospect of increased postage

rates which a good many of them cannot under present conditions meet and remain solvent.

The low rates were in the first instance granted to them as an acknowledgment of their place as a public service. Has their position changed? If so, why? Personally, I believe the country newspaper is today just as much a public service as it ever was. It stands just as high as a necessity as it ever did. True, it may not be what at times it has been. It may find its news a little more stale. It may find its advertising running to Government cost-free spreads. It may have fewer feature items and articles than it has had. It may depend upon departmental release hand-outs for certain news items. But the country press still remains the great organ of news dissemination that it always has been. Now is no time to further encroach upon the press in an attempt to curtail its activities, as would result from an increase in the postal rates if H. R. 1989 or a similar measure were enacted into law.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

EASTERN FUEL-OIL AND GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I rise today as a spokesman for thousands—in fact, millions—of people in my own New England and elsewhere in the East who suffer a type of discrimination which sets in reverse the basic principles upon which this country was founded more than a century and a half ago.

These hard-working, industrious, thrifty people have long accepted rationing, restrictions, and reductions of all sorts as a necessary part of personal sacrifice in a land where democracy must prevail if we are to survive.

These very people, with sons and daughters at the front, are giving their best in homes and factories and on the farms to bring to a successful conclusion this terrific struggle for liberty and justice.

All they ask is to receive the same consideration, the same treatment of their problems, as that given to problems elsewhere in this great Nation of ours. Surely it is unfair, unwise, un-American to entertain any idea that the people in New Hampshire, the people in New England, the people who live along the Atlantic coastline, should be treated differently.

I refer to the "district discrimination" handed out to the people in the eastern part of these United States by the bungling of Washington New Deal bureaucracy in various agencies having a complexing degree of authority.

Fuel oil and gasoline are almost as essential to the livelihood of New England as are air and water. People died this past winter because of the lack of fuel. Those people froze to death because there was too much red tape and not enough action to properly relieve the fuel situation.

We must act now so that never again will there be too little, too late. Every available means of transportation, every railroad tank car, every carrier—whatever the means may be—should be commandeered tomorrow, not next October, for the long haul from oil fields and refineries to the New England States.

Every possible storage tank should be filled now, and kept filled. New facilities should be provided to hold excess fuel oil as a backlog so that there will never be a recurrence of last winter's predicament.

Mr. President, I realize our first consideration has been, is, and will continue to be the armed forces. I have every confidence that high-ranking Army and Navy officials are able to handle their own particular situations as far as oil, gasoline, and transportation matters are concerned.

However, unless things have changed greatly in recent weeks, there is enough fuel for the armed forces and for civilian use.

The American people are well aware a war is being fought; and, aside from the war branches, no one wants or expects large quantities of critical materials. This is particularly true of the common people.

New Englanders have for 300 years been able to get along by making a little go a long way, but there is a limit even to conservation.

Gasoline and fuel oil are of general importance to New England and to all the rest of the east coast. Last winter some people were frozen for lack of fuel. Unless effective remedial measures are taken now, there will be a freeze-out of much private business this summer for lack of gasoline.

This latest cut in the allotment of motor fuel is certain to have a serious effect upon the morale of the people and upon the small businesses, as well as upon the entire physical set-up in our New England and Eastern States. Then, too, without a reasonable solution to the gasoline problem there can be no answer to the complex fuel-oil situation; for they go more or less hand in hand in war as well as in peace.

Mr. President, let me first refer to gasoline.

Extending the value of the gasoline A coupon over a longer period is in the final analysis reducing the amount from 3 gallons, the basic form of restricted allotment in New England, to a new low of less than 1½ gallons a week.

This shifting about of gasoline values has been a mess from start to finish. There are now available to any automobile owner who registers his car A coupons that permit him the use of 6 gallons of gasoline a month for the next 8 months—a little less than 1½ gallons a week, which, under ordinary driving, permit approximately 22 miles of travel. Up to the time of the change on March 22, practically two-thirds of the people were "getting by" with the A book.

Thousands of the people in the eastern area are now faced with new problems. Many of them live miles from a ration board. In New Hampshire, I know of people who are 15 miles from a ration board. If they are to use their cars at all, they must apply for and receive occupational supplements, B or C books, or keep their cars at home. But most of those people admittedly have no claim for occupational use. What then?

Many of those people got along on the 3-gallon "no pleasure" gasoline. They drove to country villages once a week for necessary purchasing, or to the doctor, or dentist, or used the vehicle for some emergency trip which definitely was not pleasure.

Then, too, prior to March 22, many of those people had no reason to ask for supplemental gasoline. They really did not need it. Their status has not changed. But their gasoline allotment has. One thing is certain: If 3 gallons a week on an A book satisfied their needs, permitted them to get into town occasionally, they are not now going to be able to do the same thing on less than half as much.

If there is a shortage, if it is necessary to save gasoline, if it is necessary to conserve fuel oil and other transportation facilities, then every gasoline ration book should be tailored—not just those for the people in New England and the East.

I, therefore, request from those responsible for the gasoline cut a complete report, one that can be read and understood by the general public, as to why New England and the eastern area should be forced to suffer this discrimination, while the rest of the country goes along on its former allotment basis.

By every law of nature, warmer weather should mean an increase in the flow of gasoline to New England. I know someone will "pipe up" with the argument that it is necessary to drop the flow of gasoline to speed up the flow of fuel oil. That argument is based on a general condition which also prevails in other parts of the Nation. It is predicated more on a defeatist attitude than on an actual fact.

It is now high time to stop playing politics, matching one section of the country against another. We are all in this war up to our necks. We all know it. We Americans want to win it the quickest way possible, to bring back the boys from foreign soil, to restore this Nation to normalcy again.

You cannot break faith with the people, on one hand, and, on the other, expect them to keep on having this type of discrimination medicine poured down their throats.

I firmly protest this type of governmental thinking which leaves New England continually "holding the bag."

Just because a farmer or defense worker lives 2,000 miles from an oil well is no reason why he should get less than one-third as much fuel as the fellow living 20 miles away from the well—certainly not, in view of what this country has to offer.

In a Nation-wide over-all reason for this gasoline ration, the O. P. A. indicated that it is because of a rubber shortage and a combined effort to conserve the present supply.

Therefore, that being the case, any discrimination against New England on this score can be quickly discounted, for a tire does not wear out any faster in New Hampshire than it does in Texas.

A product shortage is one thing; transportation another. If it is a question of transportation, then it is time the men responsible for the job either do that job or get out and let someone else do it.

Americans everyhere, from Maine to California, are buying bonds, paying taxes, and giving their sons, daughters, fathers, and brothers to the services. In wartime it is the American way to share and share alike. So should it be with gasoline.

Mr. President, I demand that New Hampshire and other States currently affected by the gasoline allotment decrease be given more consideration, and that the proper authorities be so advised as to restore the old standard of at least 3 gallons a week, and 4 as soon as circumstances permit.

I ask that this discrimination against New England stop, and that good will and fair play be the future policy when the eastern seaboard is counted into the plan of things.

The present A gasoline allotment is insufficient to care for daily needs, let alone any form of minor business. Driving 15 or more miles to a ration board to increase one's allotment rating is not a sensible way to save gasoline. Even a moron should be able to understand that.

When the coupon value jumps around no one knows just what to do. Consequently much efficiency is lost. It is bound to be that way.

It is my firm suggestion, and one which I request be considered by the Petroleum Administrator for War and the Office of Price Administration, that the New England and eastern area gasoline allotment be increased; that the coupon value of 3 gallons be restored to its previous basis; and that as soon as possible the 3 gallons be increased to a 4-gallon allotment if circumstances permit; so that New Englanders may be permitted to travel and use their cars just as much as the people living in Texas or California.

There are 6 months of comparatively warm weather ahead when fuel oil demands will be at their lowest ebb. Now is the time to start moving gasoline and fuel oil to assure New England of an adequate supply.

The whole program of gasoline has been tossed around from pillar to post long enough. Is it little wonder that people become confused as to what they can and cannot do, when the rules and regulations are altered nearly every new moon? Let us look at the amazing record.

Oil companies were asked to curtail deliveries to service stations by at least 20 percent. That was the beginning, on March 19, 1942. Many changes, curtailments, and restrictions were invoked and enforced in the months to follow.

Curtailments came to 33⅓ percent on April 15, later to 50 percent, and card rationing was put into effect on March 15. On July 22 came coupon rationing, and a moratorium was declared on gasoline sales from noon December 18 to midnight December 20.

A cut in coupon values was made effective November 22. This reduced the value for A book holders from 4 to 3 gallons. A similar reduction followed on December 21 for B and C coupon holders.

Beginning early this year, the O. P. A. again started to work on the people of the 16 Eastern States. On January 7 an order was issued clamping down on all pleasure driving, with enforcement sanctions. On March 3 an honor system was announced to take the place of the enforcement ruling.

Despite the fact that on March 2 the Petroleum Industry War Council reported that we were over the hump insofar as petroleum shortage in the East was concerned, an announcement came that the pleasure-driving ban would end on March 22, to be succeeded by drastically devalued A coupons.

In concluding my remarks on gasoline I wish to leave with the Senate the thought that creeps forth as a paramount issue too frequently these days. Too many persons in responsible positions continue with an attitude of complacency. They fail to take the firm measures necessary to increase supplies, going on the assumption that the whole problem is impossible, without trying their best to solve it.

I know, as do my colleagues, that there are enough smart men in this country to find ways of getting fuel to New England if the problem is one of transportation. Let us not give up with a shrug of the shoulders, saying, "Oh, we cannot help you; it is too far to New Hampshire." Let us work a little harder to find some way. It is not the American way to give up without trying. American history was not made that way.

It was a long way from Fort Ticonderoga to Boston; but New Englanders found a way to haul 200 cannon by ox team through heavy snows of a hard winter to defend Boston and win the independence which we are now privileged to enjoy and which we are fighting to preserve.

General Miller, a subordinate officer at Lundy's Lane, said, "I'll try, sir," and led his men against the enemy. What we need is someone who will say, "I'll try, sir," and then go out and do the job.

Mr. President, fuel oil is another consideration.

Suffering among thousands of New England families last winter was intense. There were deaths in fuelless, heatless homes. It is one thing that civilians shall suffer and die as an inescapable consequence of war. It is something else when suffering and death are unnecessary, avoidable, or add nothing to the war effort.

Much of the privation which these people have undergone, the hardship and suffering they have experienced, and the grief occasioned by the deaths attributable directly and indirectly to the lack of sufficient heat were in many instances wholly unnecessary. A reasonable degree of foresight, just a touch of common sense, would have greatly alleviated this condition of affairs.

I ask today what Washington officials, who have the lives and financial welfare of these people in their hands, propose to do about the fuel situation.

I express the general New England viewpoint and warn the Congress and the many agencies of the administrative branches which have anything to do with the fuel situation that our people do not intend to put up placidly with another winter without proper fuel. They will not accept quietly next winter a continuation of the conditions which lack of wisdom, foresight, sound judgment, even of common honesty, thrust upon them this year.

Whenever and wherever the welfare of our fighting men is endangered; whenever gasoline and fuel oil stand between victory and defeat, then the people will endure suffering and grief without complaint.

That part of the burden they will bear without protest; but many persons are convinced that a large percentage of the privations and suffering which the bureaucrats at Washington inflicted upon them the past winter contributed in no degree to the safety or comfort of our soldiers and sailors, or to the efficiency of the war effort.

The people are convinced that pleas and excuses to that effect were used as a cover to hide the absurdities of incompetent bureaucracy, swollen to the point of recklessness with the authority it has assumed.

When our people in New England were freezing the past winter, and their sufferings became so intense that complaints were brought to the attention of Washington, some brilliant bureaucrat remarked, "Oh, the people of New England are only suffering mental anguish."

I do not know how many of my colleagues have lived in areas where the temperature frequently goes far below zero. Last winter in my State it went to 50 below and even lower. Let me assure the Senate that in such temperatures the anguish one suffers is both physical and mental.

When one wakes up in a subzero temperature in an unheated home he knows it is cold. When he cannot obtain heat he suffers from acute physical pain. If he continues without adequate heat he shall die. That is exactly what happened to some of our New England people during the past winter.

Now is the right time for us to take steps to prevent a recurrence of the conditions which prevailed in the 3 severe months of 1943. Let us act to eliminate some of the duplication and bickering among the various agencies which are exercising complicated lines of control in the fuel situation. Let us compel these agencies to cooperate among themselves and to untangle, if possible, the intricate jig-saw puzzle—the alphabetical nightmare.

It requires no expert ability or learning to know that the greatest storage space for fuel oil in the country is in tanks of the individual consumer of such oil.

Every effort must be made during the summer months to fill the home tanks. In this way people will obtain fuel oil in the necessary amounts without building up an impossible transportation load when the snows of another winter shall be upon us. A definite order should be issued ordering all private oil storage tanks to be filled to capacity before next fall.

We already know many people have converted from oil to some other form of fuel. This factor of itself should cut the load by a sizable amount.

It is not necessary to force American people into doing things they wish to do anyway. Too many of the regulations are uncalled for and are completely out of line with our regular form of government. Give the people able leadership, and figure out a reasonable answer to the gasoline and fuel-oil problem. Be sure it works before new rules and regulations are made. After it is once in order, if it is left alone, much of the worry and confusion which has developed between the Government and civilians will have been remedied.

Mr. President, I have a 10-point program which I believe will aid materially in bringing about a more equitable distribution of fuel oil and gasoline in New England, and if it shall be successfully carried out it will result in greater coordination of all existing governmental agencies connected with the war effort. These points are:

First. The Office of Defense Transportation should set up a division, or place some individual in charge of expediting the routing and travel of tank cars from oil wells and refineries to New England and return.

Second. Greater oil shipments for our armed forces should be made from the Gulf ports, the Indies, and directly from Venezuela, thus saving the expense and inefficiency of bringing oil to eastern ports and reshipping it to our forces when other ports are nearer to the scene of operations.

Third. The 24-inch pipe line now being constructed to carry crude oil from Texas to Illinois, and from Illinois to the east coast, should be rushed to completion at once for its immediate use at full capacity.

Fourth. The Government should now construct a second pipe line of 20-inch pipe from Texas to Illinois, and from Illinois to the east coast, to transport finished oil products, such as gasoline and fuel oil.

Fifth. A pipe line from Bayonne, N. J., or wherever the western pipe line hits the eastern coast, should be constructed, and extended to a central point in New England. In keeping with this suggestion I further add that steel for this construction should be made available by the W. P. B. without hesitation or bickering, so that all possible relief can be brought to a region which honestly and actually needs it.

Sixth. An order should be issued from the P. A. W. and O. P. A. ordering that during the summer months all house, factory, and storage tanks shall be filled with fuel oil, thereby eliminating much of the confusion which accompanied the first cold weather in 1943.

Seventh. In complete fairness to those who have so patriotically converted their homes and business establishments from oil to coal or coke, some very definite assurance should be given them that coal shall flow freely, and that there shall be no shortage because of strikes, transportation, and other problems which would tend to hamper the industry.

Eighth. One person should be designated by the President as a fuel coordinator to have complete authority to coordinate the various fuel branches and force complete cooperation between the alphabetical agencies such as the O. P. A., P. A. W., O. D. T., and as many more as may follow in the long list now available, or others which I have not been able to obtain.

Ninth. Some special gasoline ration should be provided for those who plan to travel from their usual places of abode to a summer home or camp, or from one section of the country to another for rest or for health purposes. In these busy days of war work, men and women who are weighed down by the burdens of terrific pressure are entitled to a form of healthful rest. It is my recommendation that they be permitted to visit the country, that sufficient gasoline be allowed them for the purpose of travel, and that upon reaching their destination they be rationed according to the system in operation in that area.

Tenth. In an effort to better facilitate the moving of fuel into New England, and to aid the transportation agencies already established, I recommend the completion of all coastal waterways, including the Florida Barge Canal.

I hope very sincerely that the Federal Government will take the problems of fuel and gasoline in hand and really solve them. I know they can be solved.

It may be necessary for the people of New England and the northeast, regardless of political party, to get together to see that their interests are protected, and to prevent their being discriminated against. If such discrimination continues, it may be necessary for me to join with others from New England and the northeast in taking the leadership to bring such discrimination to an end.

I do not approve of blocs. I wish they did not exist. I do not approve of pressure groups putting forth their selfish objectives, but today Washington is full of blocs and pressure groups. In self-defense it may be necessary to band together to protect ourselves because, when faced with desperate necessity, self-preservation is the first law of nature.

We, in New England, want nothing more than fair treatment and equitable consideration. That, my colleagues, is as it should be. Just so long as I have the strength to stand in this Senate Chamber I shall fight for that right.

This is still a free country, and we are going to devote every last ounce of endeavor to keep it that way. Freedom and democracy were born in New England. The people who came to its rock-ribbed shores were not afraid to fight for liberty and rise up against persecution.

Time has not quelled this desire for honest living and equal rights. New Englanders want no more of this discrimination. They want equality and fair dealings from their Government. The people of the East have been, in my opinion, the tail of the dog long enough. I think that from now on they should be considered as being a more important part of the animal than they have been considered heretofore. I hope we may obtain some definite action from the many bureaus in Washington, as well as some coordination of their activities, to the end that we along the eastern seaboard may be accorded more equal consideration with the other sections of the country, may not be subjected to persecution, discrimination, or the bungling of bureaucrats in the city of Washington.

JOHN T. VANCE, LATE LAW LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself, I announce, with profound sorrow, the death in Lexington, Ky., last night of Hon. John T. Vance, Law Librarian of Congress.

Mr. Vance was born in Lexington, Ky., on the 24th of August 1884. He graduated from Transylvania College in 1905 with the degree of bachelor of arts, received his bachelor of laws degree from the University of Michigan in 1909, and was subsequently accorded honorary degrees of master of laws by the University of Michigan, doctor of juridical science by the Catholic University of America, and doctor of laws by Transylvania College. I may add that Transylvania College is the oldest institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains.

Mr. Vance was a close personal friend of mine. His father, who was affectionately called Daddy Vance, was treasurer for Transylvania College for nearly half a century. His brother, Dr. Charley Vance, is one of the leading physicians and surgeons of Lexington, Ky.

I sincerely regret the untimely passing of John T. Vance, and I know other Senators will join me in this brief expression of sorrow. Mr. Vance was a loyal, faithful public servant of the people of the United States. I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and his children who survive him.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a brief sketch of the life and career of Mr. Vance.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Vance, John Thomas. Born Lexington, Ky., August 24, 1884. A. B., Transylvania College, 1905; L.L. B., University of Michigan, 1909; special courses in law at the University of Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 1920–21; Honorary L.L. M. from the University of Michigan, 1933; S. J. D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., 1937; LL. D., Transylvania University, 1940. Admitted to Kentucky bar, 1909, and practiced at Lexington, 1909–13. Also member of bars of Michigan, District of Columbia, and Supreme Court of the United States. Appointed by President Wilson as deputy-general receiver of Dominican customs, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 1913–19. Member of the

law firm of Lippitt & Vance, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 1920–21, Washington, D. C., since 1922. Law Librarian of Congress, 1924 to date. Delegate to semi-centennial meeting of British Library Association, Edinburgh, 1927. Headed delegation of representatives of American Library Association to Second Congress of Librarians, Mexico, 1928. A delegate of American Library Association to First World Congress on Libraries and Bibliography, Rome, and Venice, 1929 (contributed paper on legal bibliography). Member of Hoover Conference on Child Health and Protection, 1930 (contributed study on Laws of Foreign Countries Concerning Physical Culture and Recreation). Member of Attorney General's Conference on Crime, 1934. Appointed a delegate to the Second World Congress on Libraries and Bibliography, Madrid, 1935 (contributed paper on Juridical Questions of the International Interlibrary Loan Service). Member of American Association of Law Libraries (served as president, 1933). Member of Second Pan American Congress of History and Geography, Washington, D. C., 1935. President of the District of Columbia Library Association, 1935–37. President of Instituto de las Españas (Washington, D. C., chapter 1937–39). Secretary of the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, 1936–40, chairman of the section, 1940–41, and chairman, Committee on Cooperation with Inter-American Bar Association, 1943– ; member of the council of the section, 1941–43. Delegate of American Bar Association to Second World Congress of International and Comparative Law, The Hague, 1937 (contributed paper on International Legal Documentation). Delegate to the Eighth American Scientific Congress in Washington, D. C., May 1940. Delegate to First Meeting of Inter-American Bar Association, Habana, Cuba, March 1941 (conducted round table on Inter-American Legal Documentation and contributed paper on same subject). Member of Council of Inter-American Bar Association. Member of Joint Anglo-American Committee on Literature of Librarianship in Translation, American Library Association; Representative of Library of Congress in Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation with the American Republics. Member of the District of Columbia Bar Association and chairman of the Committee on International and Comparative Law. A member of the American Society of International Law, American Foreign Law Association, The Societe de Legislation Comparée, Riccobone Seminar of Roman Law, Bibliographical Society of America. Spent the winter 1923–24 in Mexico in quest of books and documents for the Library of Congress and traveled extensively in Europe on a similar mission. He also made two trips in 1941–43 to Mexico, Central and South America, visiting law schools and libraries for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the Library of Congress. He was contributor to the various legal periodicals and library journals. Author of Bibliography of Las Siete Partidas (Chicago 1931) and a thesis Background of Hispanic American Law (Washington, D. C., 1937), of which the commercial edition is now in press.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in expressing deep regret over the untimely death of John T. Vance. I do not use the word "untimely" in any idle sense. Mr. Vance was an outstanding scholar. He was a historian; he was versed in literature of all kinds, and he was an accomplished lawyer, familiar with the philosophy and the history of the law. Because of these qualifications, he made an outstanding law librarian for the Congress of the United States. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word, courteous, dignified, sincere, loyal in his friendships, and in his devotion to the welfare of his country. I was shocked only a few moments ago to learn of his death in Lexington last night as the result of an operation.

Of course, no man can ever be said to be indispensable anywhere in any position, but it will be difficult to find a man with all the qualifications John T. Vance possessed for the responsible position which he held in connection with our legislative processes. I wish to express my profound sympathy for his family and all his friends.

APPOINTMENT OF FEMALE PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS IN THE ARMY AND NAVY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to move, at the proper time, that the Senate proceed with the consideration of Calendar No. 161, House bill 1857. I inquire if it is now in order to make such a motion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator the motion is in order at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1857, which is a bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1857) to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I may say in behalf of this measure that there is no objection on the part of anyone. The War Department has been consulted, and has given its approval; the Navy likewise has given its approval, and the Senate has been advised that the Bureau of the Budget does not object. As a matter of fact, the Navy says it needs women physicians, and certainly there is a great need for them in the Army at the present time.

Through the fault of no one but because of a lack of legislation on the subject, there exists a discrimination against women physicians despite the fact that they have spent much time learning their profession and engaging in research work. Women with much less preparation for a career and with much less scientific knowledge can get into the Army and Navy as nurses; and as we all know, many women who have had very little training as compared to that undergone by women physicians have become WAVES and WAACS and members of other organizations in connection with our armed forces.

I am told that Canada and Great Britain and Russia, to their great advantage, take women physicians into their services; indeed, I am informed that Dr. Barbara Stimson, who was an outstanding American surgeon and a relative of the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, was not accepted by our own armed forces but now holds the rank of a major in the Royal Army Medical Corps and is stationed at London. Of course, such a condition does not reflect much credit upon the United States and our attitude toward women physicians. I am also advised that many women physicians are anesthesia experts, and are more deft than men along that line and that the Army and the Navy badly need them in their hospitals.

The bill provides that the Secretary of War and the Navy shall have complete control, and that women physicians shall be taken into the medical services only as they justify being taken in by their record and by record of their training.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. May I assume that, performing equal services, the women will have commissions comparable to those granted male physicians?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. The purpose and objective of the bill is to provide that when women are taken into the Army they shall be given ranks comparable with those of men surgeons and physicians in the Army, and that they shall be entitled to all the benefits our country extends to men physicians in the way of compensation, insurance, and other things of that nature.

Mr. McNARY. We have all heard from time to time of the shortage of members of the medical profession in civil life. I am very much in favor of the objective of the bill before the Senate, and I was wondering why this action had not been taken earlier. I myself favor the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement. Everyone who has considered the measure is in complete agreement with the Senator in that regard.

At this time I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD two letters addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to this matter, one from Secretary of War Stimson, and one from Secretary of the Navy Knox. Secretary Knox, in his letter, referred to House bill 1364 instead of House bill 1857. The House considered both measures, but passed H. R. 1857, so that really the Secretary's letter applies to the pending measure, as well as to the measure specifically referred to in his letter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
March 10, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department has no objection to the enactment of S. 720, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to pro-

vide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the appointment of licensed female physicians and surgeons in commissioned grades in the Army of the United States or the Naval Reserve. The numbers, qualifications, duties, and assignments would be in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. The bill authorizes the same pay and allowances, rights, privileges, and benefits as are provided for members of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army and the Naval Reserve of the Navy with the same grade and length of service. The bill limits persons appointed under its provisions to assignments in hospitals or other stations where female nurses are employed.

The War Manpower Commission has prescribed a limit upon the number of physicians and surgeons to be procured by the Army during 1943. Therefore, enactment of this bill will neither increase the number of physicians and surgeons available to the armed forces nor will it increase expenditures of the War Department. As the military service may secure only a limited number of medical officers, any female physician or surgeon so employed means one less male physician or surgeon withdrawn by the armed forces from civilian communities.

Attention is invited to the fact that S. 495, a bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, passed by the Senate on February 15, 1943, will authorize the commissioning of female physicians and surgeons in the Army of the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, March 23, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill S. 720 "to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy" was referred to the Navy Department with request for views concerning the proposed legislation.

The purpose of the bill S. 720 is as stated in the title thereof.

In view of the limited number of physicians and surgeons in the United States not now members of the military services who are within the age limits for such service, the Navy Department estimates that it will be necessary to utilize the services of approximately 600 women doctors to obtain the minimum of medical officers required for the Navy. Authorization has already been given to recruit 60 women physicians in the Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve.

At present the limitation on the number of officers in the grades of lieutenant commander and lieutenant in the Women's Reserve restricts the recruitment of women physicians. The enactment, however, of the bill H. R. 1364 "to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 as amended," which provides for removing the limitation on numbers and grades of officers in the Women's Reserve and for removing the restriction against the performance of duty without the continental limits of the United States for all members of the Women's Reserve, has been recommended by the Navy Department with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

If the bill H. R. 1364 is enacted into law, the purpose of the bill S. 720 will have been accomplished insofar as the Navy Department is concerned. In view of the anticipated passage of H. R. 1364, the Navy Department recommends that S. 720 be amended so as to omit any application to the Navy.

If either bill is enacted into law, the estimated cost to the Navy Department per year for pay and allowances of appointing 200 women physicians in each of the three grades of lieutenant (junior grade), lieutenant, and lieutenant commander would be $2,173,100.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should also like permission to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement given to me by Henry Sage Dunning, a noted physician of this country, with respect to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN DOCTORS' BILL

(Henry Sage Dunning, B. S., M. D., D. D. S., F. A. C. S. Overseas 2 years with the American Expeditionary Forces. Professor of Oral Surgery, Columbia. Attending oral surgery: Presbyterian; Sloane; Babies; Vanderbilt Clinic; Manhattan Eye, Ear, and Throat. Consulting oral surgeon: Knickerbocker; Nassau; Roosevelt; St. Vincent's; Ruptured and Crippled; St. Luke's; Jamaica; Meadowbrook; Mary Immaculate; New York Foundling: National Speech Hospital; State Reconstruction; United Hospitals, Port Chester; North Hudson; Stamford; Hackensack General; Greenwich and Norwalk Hospitals. Member of American Medical Association; American Laryngology, Rhinology, and Otolaryngology; American Oral and Plastic Surgeon; American Board of Plastic Surgery; American Board of Otolaryngology; New York Academy of Medicine; Fellow of American College of Surgeons; New York County Medical Society.)

I have been interested in the question of women doctors being commissioned in the Army for a long while. We are told on good authority that the armed forces need at least 10,000 more doctors during the next year. Although the doctors have responded very well to the call to the colors, it now is becoming more difficult each day to enroll medical men in the Army and Navy. On account of this shortage of trained medical personnel nearly all the medical schools of the country have adopted accelerated courses and are now graduating doctors in 3 years instead of 4 years. This speeding up of the medical course will, of course, supply many more young men, some of whom may be given time to obtain a short internship and others may enter the Army without too much training. At this time of emergency, it seems only logical to use some of our highly trained women doctors in the armed forces.

We are fighting a total war to the finish. We are glad to accept military aid wherever we can find it, I should think that we would be glad to accept all the medical aid that we can obtain from our own countrywomen.

It seems unfair and un-American to discriminate against our highly educated professional women at any time, but particularly in time of war. Why should nurses, WAACS, WAVES, and other women with fair education, be given rank and the accompanying privileges, and the women doctors be given nothing but a contract surgeon's job that carries no rank, no authority, no insurance, no pension or disability compensation? Can we in 1943 just say that we do not want highly educated women doctors in the Army any more than we can say we do not want them in our hospitals, our boards of health and other public institutions?

Great Britain, Canada, China, Norway, Russia, and other countries are glad to honor well-trained women doctors by giving them suitable rank in their armed forces. Why should we be so old fashioned as not to utilize trained women who can do so much in alleviating suffering of our wounded men? We are sending theatrical women, canteen women, aides, and many partially trained women abroad to buck up the morale of our soldiers for we know what the American women mean to our fighting boys, especially when they are injured and far from home. Some of these brave women have lost their lives in planes and ship disasters. We say, however, to our highly trained women doctors, "Army work is too dangerous for you, also you may get in the way. You stay home and do the chores until our boys come home. Your place is on the home front." Have we a right to tell the women doctors that they cannot wear a uniform and perform their professional duties as their patriotism and love of country dictates? We have not denied any other class of women the honor to serve their country in uniform of the armed forces. Why pick on our most highly trained professional women, the women doctors? I have been a professor at Columbia University and attending surgeon at the Presbyterian Hospital, New York, for over 25 years, and have had the honor to work with women pathologists, women neurologists, women anesthetists, women physicians, and women surgeons, and I can say from personal experience they are splendid persons to work with, real persons, even if they are not legally supposed to be persons. They are just as good as men in most cases, and in some cases a little better than mere man. I do not have to tell you of the attainments and the high character of the American women doctors. The public knows full well what they have accomplished against great odds, and they need no build-up from anybody.

Many women doctors hold responsible positions at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York. This center is attracting some of the best medical talent in the country. I have had the pleasure of working for many years with Dr. Barbara Stimson, a relative of Secretary Stimson, who was not accepted in the Medical Corps of our Army, but who at this time holds the rank of major in the Royal Army Medical Corps and is now doing major surgery in London. Dr. Stimson is one of our outstanding surgeons, being an expert in fracture surgery which is so badly needed at this time. Our anesthesia department is under the direction of Dr. Virginia Apgar who has done more for anesthesia than most men have in this field. Anesthesia is most important in badly injured cases that do not breathe very well. Great skill must be exercised in anesthetizing a wounded man who has had his jaw and possibly part of his throat shot away or sustains chest injuries. She is of military age, but has not been accepted by the Medical Corps of the Army. I am sure that she alone could save many lives in the skillful administration of anesthetics in advanced zones. There are many other skilled women doctors who are anxious to serve their country.

All they need is a chance to carry on their professional work in a patriotic manner, the same as her medical brother and her sister, the medical nurse, well protected with rank and all the prerogatives that go with it. I had the privilege of being a captain in the United States Army Medical Corps, and was overseas for 2 years in the last war. I believe I visited, or was stationed in every type of hospital from a field dressing station to a base hospital. I never saw a place that the nurses could go that the woman doctor could not negotiate. Some of our nurses attached to mobile hospitals and advance units were

wounded and killed in the World War. Some Red Cross and Salvation Army girls were also hurt, and a lot more women are going to be injured in this war. This is more of a people's war than the last one. Women are doing all sorts of tough jobs, even ferrying airships across the ocean, a fairly dangerous job. Mentally and physically they seem to be equal to any job.

The old cry is again heard that there are no proper quarters for women in many of the advanced hospitals. This may be so in many cases, but if nurses can go to Australia and north Africa and other places, why cannot women doctors? There is another cry that women doctors would have to treat any kind of disease, even serving in the venereal wards of the Army. My answer to this protest is that the Army has been trying for a long while to fit their doctors into the jobs they are best suited for. The old idea in the Army Medical Corps was that any man with an M. D. degree could do anything, but now I am sure that the medical staff of the Army is trying very hard to place specially trained men in positions that they are best qualified to fill. One instance of this movement is the special courses that the Army Medical Corps is giving its medical officers in many medical centers throughout the country. We are at present giving a course in plastic and maxillo-facial surgery at Columbia University, and I am quite sure that an effort will be made to place these officers in positions where they can do the most good. There are many women doctors who are specially trained in surgery, in anesthesia, in radiology, in pathology, in blood-bank work, in bacteriology, in neurology, and general medicine who can help our desperately wounded boys in advanced hospitals and who should be enlisted in the services of their country as soon as possible. Early and highly skilled treatment will save many lives of our wounded. I have seen a life saved by giving the proper first-aid treatment, also by the proper surgical interference at the right moment. I have seen a life lost by a bungling anesthetist. I have seen many lives saved by patient, conscientious, skillful treatment over a period of months. There are about 8,000 qualified women doctors in this great country of ours. Possibly 1,000 of these women could qualify for medical services in the armed forces. Many of these women are outstanding in their special fields and compare very favorably with their male confreres. Many more doctors are needed in the armed forces. Is there anyone so unwise who can say that we can write off 1,000 well-trained, patriotic women doctors who are willing to risk their all for their wounded brothers? If these women could save only a few lives, I am sure that it would be worth while to give them their commissions in the Medical Corps of the Army, which they richly deserve.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill, H. R. 1857, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIMITATION OF SALARIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I read this morning that the President had permitted the bill nullifying the $67,200 limit on salaries to become a law without his signature.

Mr. President, I was elected United States Senator by non-partisan votes. I came here feeling it my duty to back the President when he was right and to vote against him when he was wrong.

If ever the President was right it was when he issued his order limiting salaries during the war to $67,200, and, as I see it, the statement he issued today in connection with the $67,200 limitation, and which appeared in the press this morning, protects the wealthy.

The president said in his statement:

> If the circumstances were otherwise, I should veto the bill. Even so, I cannot permit this legislation to become effective without registering my protest against the attachment to this bill of an irrelevant and unwarranted rider.

The proof that his statement favors the rich lies in the fact that on the 25th day of February the Senate passed the Bankhead bill by a majority of 78 to 2, and on March 23 the Senate passed, by a vote of 74 to 3, the measure nullifying the $67,200 limit. Thus we see these measures, to both of which the President said he was opposed, come to him at about the same time. The Bankhead bill he vetoed on the 2d day of April, but the $67,200 limitation measure he permitted to slumber upon his desk and to become law because he failed to veto it.

Where was the brave fighter of 1933 who said he was going to chase the money changers out of the temple? Where was the fighter of bygone days who demanded social security for all except the farmer and domestic help? Where was the scrapper of old who in his campaign speeches said he would be the master of the enemies of the people? Certainly I feel he has had bad advice, possibly listening to the advice of Harry Hopkins of alleged sewer basement fame at the Chicago Democratic convention, and whom the people so dislike that when Hopkins moves out of the White House many of the people of America will want us to declare that day a national holiday.

So, Mr. President, I say openly upon the floor of the Senate that I agree with the distinguished columnist and warm friend of the President, Raymond Clapper, who said recently that the first two terms of the President's administration had been an outstanding success, but that so far the third term had been a failure. I agree that it has been a ghastly failure, and this ghastly failure of the President's which commenced almost immediately after he started to serve his third term, makes all the more important the vigilance of the people as to what is happening in this country politically. Unless the President radically changes his attitude, then at the next election the average citizen who loves America first above other countries will have nothing to choose between the Democratic and Republican candidates. On March 25 I called that tragic situation to the attention of the people of America. I do so again today. The President has now officially guaranteed that in spite of the Democratic and Republican platforms adopted right after the last World War which announced that incomes and salaries should be limited in time of war, the rich man drawing $67,200 or more a year in salary can keep on drawing it, but a soldier, no matter what he was receiving before, not only shall risk his life, and shall wreck his business, but he shall not receive more than $600 a year while serving his country. The soldier sacrifices his salary; so why not the rich man?

The promises made by the Democratic and Republican politicians in their platforms have been repudiated. The common people can no longer believe either one of them. The rich monopolist has the country by the throat, and every one of us living here in Washington knows that the poor man is paying for this war, and that the rich man is getting richer. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] only last week showed by official reports of the Department of Agriculture that many farmers are still making less than $150 a year, less than 50 cents a day, with which to support themselves and their families.

In this connection, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to some remarks I made upon the floor of the Senate on March 25 last under the headline "A call to action." I ask unanimous consent that what I said at that time be made a part of what I say today. Those remarks I started as follows:

> Mr. President, because I was twice attorney general and twice Governor of North Dakota before I was elected Senator by the people of my State over the unscrupulous opposition of both the old gang predatory Republican and Democratic machines, I feel it my bounden duty, in these most perilous hours in the Nation's history, to call the people to action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL TO ACTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, because I was twice attorney general and twice Governor of North Dakota before I was elected Senator by the people of my State over the unscrupulous opposition of both the old gang predatory Republican and Democratic machines, I feel it my bounden duty, in these most perilous hours in the Nation's history, to call the people to action.

If you millions of plain, everyday folks were in one vast auditorium, ready to embark on a fight to protect your own and your children's interests, I would speak to you thus:

PEOPLE OF AMERICA

People of America: We are facing a national election. On the one side are your political enemies, those who believe in vast aggregations of wealth, in having a few men at the top run the country, in a continuation of the old system where the farmer and laboring man get just enough to exist, and the small businessman is almost no more; and on the other side are you, the miner, the factory worker, the farmer, and the laborer whom these autocratic powerful monopolists wish to keep on controlling. These predatory sinister interests are again already busily engaged with some of their newspapers in trying to array the farmers against the laborers, the laborers against the farmers, and dividing both the farmers and laborers into organizations where they even fight each other; in arousing the passions of one class against the other, in the continuation of prejudice against American citizens because of race, color, or creed.

SIXTY-SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS VERSUS SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS

These monopolists, who divided the business of the world before the war and were responsible for the depression, the low wages, the starvation farm prices, and farm foreclosures, are already carrying out their plans to again dominate the world when this war is over. The international banker, the members of infamous cartels, the millionaires, and their friends who have been fighting the limitation of $67,200 a year salaries which would leave the rich man a net of $25,000, while the soldier's wife and children have gone hungry, struggling to keep alive on $50 a month, or $600 a year, while praying for the life which the soldier is daily offering upon the altar of democracy.

NEW CROP OF MILLIONAIRES

These enemies of yours who have fought and are fighting the establishment of synthetic-rubber plants, and who have fought the manufacture of synthetic rubber out of our grain and the fruit that has rotted on the ground, these disciples of greed and avarice, are determined, by electing the next President of the United States, to gain a deadly strangle hold upon the lives of the people. Through a pliant tool in the White House whom they hope to elect while your minds are occupied by the war, they plan to rule you after the war, and unless you wake up you will find yourselves helpless when you greet those millions of soldier boys and girls who trusted you to preserve democracy at home, while hundreds upon thousands lost their lives or came back blind, insane, or maimed. Shall we look to the new crop of millionaries created by World War No. 2 to rehabilitate them or shall we do this job ourselves? Remember, Congress has voted in favor of the $67,200 patriot; but my measure to pay our soldiers at least $100 per month still sleeps in the committee.

My friends, our enemies are organized. They know neither race, color, nor creed. They are interested in money and profits and in ruling you. To them the word "democracy" is a joke. To them a Republican or a Democrat or a Socialist is all right if he plays their game. They know neither East, West, North, nor South, except to array one against the others.

There is only one solution, and that is to fight fire with fire. They have proven that party affiliations mean nothing to them. You, by voting for nonpartisan candidates for school boards, township officers, mayors, and Governors, have proven that you have the power now to go one step further and vote men into the offices of President and Vice President on a nonpartisan basis.

ORGANIZE YOUR VOTING PRECINCT

It is to rally you to that kind of fight that I address you. Alone, one of you suffering from injustice can do little. United, you can rule America as God Almighty intended the people should rule. The way to do that is by the organization of yourselves. Adopt the slogan, "Every man a politician," and organize your voting precinct. The method which two other friends of you folks and I have decided upon and which I suggest that you adopt is as follows:

THIS IS HOW

On a day chosen by us we will ask you leaders in every precinct in America to call a meeting of the people at your home. There delegates will be chosen who will meet a week later at the county or parish courthouse. There delegates will be chosen to meet at a State convention, and there delegates will be chosen to meet at a national convention. In no other way can the people, whom our political enemies are attempting to divide and array one against the other, better work out their problems, adopt their own platform, select their own candidates, and emerge unitedly pledged to fight for that platform and for those candidates.

If but a few of you Americans in every precinct pledged yourselves to enter this fight, we would start with a nucleus of over 2,000,000 American votes. By secret vote at the national convention of the people your elected delegates may select Mr. Roosevelt, or Wendell Willkie, or Norman Thomas, or, in their deliberations, they may choose some great labor or farm leader, or some farmer, laboring man, or businessman who today has not even been mentioned, but when they choose one man for President and another for Vice President, you can definitely depend upon the fact that it is your convention, made up of your friends, who are selecting these candidates whom you are pledged to support, and not the parasites who have grown fat and wealthy and powerful through the selection of their creatures to office.

ENLIST! ENLIST!

This fight can be successful only if enough of the people enlist in it. This fight will not even get started unless enough of you show that you are determined to take control and organize for your own government. If not enough of you do it, then my talk to you today might as well be forgotten. If enough of you respond by signing the pledge herein contained, we will go on to a glorious victory. You are not organizing a new party—and yet that may result.

You are simply calling a convention in an endeavor to have the people take control of the parties now existing. But if you find that Wall Street and the politicians are controlling the Republican, the Democratic, and the Socialist Parties, and that you cannot nominate a liberal friend of the people in one of these conventions, then the national convention, made up, as I have before said, of your own delegates, representing you, will decide the course to take, or which of the parties to support, or whether to create a new party relying upon the pledge we are asking you to sign.

EXPLOITATION OF THE MANY

If you will take up this battle, America at last will have one political group fighting for America first. You who gave your sons and daughters in this World War, and not the politicians, will say whether this world is going to continue to be a place of exploitation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, you and not the politicians will say whether there is to be a continuation of discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

ILL-CLAD, ILL-HOUSED, ILL-NOURISHED

Already, although the war is not yet won, we see an attempt to tie this country into a new league of nations, an attempt to have your boys part of a great force to police the world. We see this although one-third of our own people are still undernourished and ill-clad. We have seen our Government for decades making a ghastly failure at ruling little Puerto Rico, and yet some wish to have us help rule the world. I say that you, and not groups of internationally minded, controlling large newspapers, should decode.

YOU WILL DECIDE

You, and not the politicians, will decide whether lovers of America shall run this country, or whether it shall be governed by a horde of bureaucrats, none of whom you elected, and most of whom are seemingly more interested in how much of the taxpayers' money and property they can give away to other countries rather than in America. You will never sell America short. To you America will always be first. You, and not the politicians, will be the political force that will unite the farmer, the laborer, the returned soldier, the small businessman, the miner, the factory worker, and all other patriots into a relentless battle against monopoly, greed, cunning, wicked, cruel, avarice, and un-Christian prejudice.

YOUR PLEDGE

The pledge we ask you to sign is as follows:

"PLEDGE

"I do hereby promise at a date to be selected by the national committee to call together at my home on the day specified, patriotic men and women who, regardless of race, color, and creed, will pledge themselves to fight the battle of the people.

"Name----------

"Address ----------"

MAIL TO SENATOR LANGER TODAY

Sign this pledge and mail it to me, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Washington, D. C., as temporary chairman, and if enough of you will do this you will begin one of the finest, grandest battles for the common man ever begun in any nation on this earth. You, you, if you believe in America's future sign this pledge that you will organize your precinct immediately, and mail it to me today.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not speak for and have no authority to speak for the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota. The suggestion I have made has no connection with that organization.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY MILITARY FORCES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago when bills on the calendar were under consideration, there was called Calendar No. 144, Senate bill 899 to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] at that time asked that the bill go over. He has since looked into the matter, as I am advised by him, and has suggested an amendment to a Senate committee amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the bill does is to increase the amount of claims from $1,000 to $5,000 which may be settled by commissions in foreign countries for damage occasioned by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States. It is necessary to do this in order to avoid injustices in many cases, especially in cases of personal injury and death. With the amendment which the Senator from West Virginia has himself suggested I think there will be no further objection, but I will let the Senator from West Virginia speak for himself.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when the bill was reached on the call of the calendar I asked that it go over so that it might be examined into, to see that damages were limited to injuries which happened not in combat, and I believe that the language of my amendment, which I may say has been agreed to, will serve that purpose, and result in attaining that end, namely to protect us from the payment of damage to property or persons growing out of actual combat. I hope action on my amendment may be taken at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the first two committee amendments were agreed to on April 2 this year. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The pending committee amendment is on page 3, line 5, after the word "presented", to strike out "within 1 year after the occurrence of such accident or incident" and to insert "at any time prior to May 1, 1944."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 21, after the word "allowed", it is proposed to inser' *"Provided further,* That no claim of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of any ally of such enemy country, except as the Commission or the local military commander shall determine that the claimant is friendly to the United States, and no claim resulting directly from action by the enemy or by our armed forces directly engaged in combat, shall be allowed under this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the language just read is that which I propose to amend at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, in lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out the word "directly", and in line 2, following the word "or", to insert "resulting directly or indirectly from any act."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia include striking out the word "directly" where it appears in lines 1 and 2?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the language as amended be read in its entirety, commencing at the end of line 21 on page 3 down to and including line 3 on page 4.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That no claim of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of any ally of such enemy country, except as the Commission or the local military commander shall determine that the claimant is friendly to the United States, and no claim resulting from action by the enemy or resulting directly or indirectly from any act by our armed forces engaged in combat, shall be allowed under this act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 899) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d) be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and such other officer or officers as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to appoint a Claims Commission or Commissions, each composed of one or more officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims, including claims of insured but excluding claims of subrogees, on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public property both real and personal, or on account of damage to or loss or destruction of private property both real and personal or personal injury or death of inhabitants of a foreign country, including places located therein which are under the temporary or permanent jurisdiction of the United States, arising in such foreign country, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, when such damage, loss, destruction, or injury is caused by Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces, or individual members thereof, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of such forces, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided,* That no claim shall be considered by such Commissions unless presented within 1 year after the occurrence of the accident or incident out of which such claim arises except that claims arising out of accidents or incidents occurring after December 6, 1941, but prior to May 1, 1943, may be presented at any time prior to May 1, 1944: *Provided further,* That any such settlements made by such Commissions shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe and may, in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, be subject to the approval of such commanding or other officer of Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces, as the case may be, as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe; and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall have authority, if he deems any claim in excess of $5,000 to be meritorious, to certify such amount as may be found to be just and reasonable thereon to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided further,* That no claim of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of any ally of such enemy country, except as the Commission or the local military commander shall determine that the claimant is friendly to the United States, and no claim resulting from action by the enemy or resulting directly or indirectly from any act by our armed forces engaged in combat, shall be allowed under this act: *Provided further,* That any such settlements made by such Commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"SEC. 2. All payments in settlement of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made out of the appropriation, current at the time of settlement, for 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel,' as to claims settled by Commissions composed of officers of the Navy or Marine Corps, and out of the appropriation, current at the time of settlement, for 'Finance Service, Army,' as to claims settled by Commissions composed of officers of the Army.

"SEC. 3. This act shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, ascertainment, adjustment, determination, or payment of claims by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

"SEC. 4. This act shall be applicable to claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after May 27, 1941: *Provided,* That as to any claim in excess of $1,000 this act shall be applicable for the purpose of payment thereof, or the purpose of the certification thereof to Congress for payment only if the accident or incident out of which such claim arises has occurred, or shall occur, subsequent to December 6, 1941.

"SEC. 5. The act of April 18, 1918 (40 Stat. 532), relating to indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. Claims of the type described in section 1 hereof on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property both real and personal, or personal injury or death of any person, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to activities of such forces, arising at any time while the Coast Guard shall be operating as a part of the Navy may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the manner in this act provided for the settlement of Navy and Marine Corps claims, except that in such cases one or more officers of the Coast Guard may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to a Claims Commission or Commissions or as officers to approve settlements of claims made by such Commission or Commissions, and all payments in settlement of such claims shall be made out of the appropriation 'General expenses, Coast Guard': *Provided,* That no claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property, or personal injury or death, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members thereof, or otherwise incident to the activities of such forces, shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, or paid under the provisions of this act at any time when the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department.

"SEC. 7. In time of war, any claims, whether Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, which may be settled under this act may, at the request of the service concerned, be settled by any Commission or Commissions appointed under this act even though not composed of officers of the service concerned, subject to reimbursement by the service for whom the claims were settled pursuant to the provisions of this act."

R. S. HOWARD CO. AND OTHER CLAIMANTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the calendar was called on April 2 three bills were passed over at the request of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Mc-

KELLAR]. I am informed that since the call of the calendar the Senator from Tennessee has examined each of the three measures and has no further objection to their passage. I may state for the benefit of the Senate that all three bills arise out of the commandeering by the United States Government of large and valuable space occupied by the claimants during the First World War. All these claims were considered by the Court of Claims. The amounts requested by the claimants have been passed upon by the Court of Claims.

Mr. McNARY. The Court of Claims having adjudicated these claims, they become an obligation of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Louisiana speaks of three bills. To what bills does he refer?

Mr. ELLENDER. The first one is Calendar No. 31, Senate bill 355, for the relief of R. S. Howard Co. The House passed a similar bill, H. R. 1787. It is my intention to ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill. The two bills involve the same facts and the same amount and are similar in every respect.

Mr. McNARY. What are the other two bills?

Mr. ELLENDER. The second bill is House bill 1786, Calendar No. 69, for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. The third bill is Calendar No. 127, House bill 1785, for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., of Chicago.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask further whether the adjudications have been favorable to the claimants in all these instances?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear clearly the Senator's question.

Mr. McNARY. Has the Court of Claims, having jurisdiction, decreed favorably to these claimants?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McNARY. There has, of course, been no modification of the amounts which the court allowed?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, sir; none at all. If the Senator from Oregon will examine the report to accompany Senate bill 355, for the relief of R. S. Howard Co., he will notice at the top of page 3 the following language:

> Special findings of fact and decision of Court of Claims.
>
> * * * * *
>
> II. Moving costs and other expenses incident to the Government's commandeer order—$57,216.54.

That is the amount requested by the Howard Co. in the pending bill. In like manner certain amounts have been found to be due by the Court of Claims in connection with the other two bills.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that when the calendar was called the last time some Member of the Senate objected to these bills. I do not recall which Senator it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McNARY. Has the Senator from Louisiana conferred with the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am informed by Mr. Biffle that the Senator from Tennessee has no further objection to the passage of these three bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1787.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1787) for the relief of R. S. Howard Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill, Senate bill 355, be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 355 will be indefinitely postponed.

FAIRBANKS, MORSE & CO.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1786.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1786) for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM WRIGLEY, JR., CO.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1785.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1785) for the relief of William Wrigley, Jr., Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LETTER WRITTEN BY THOMAS JEFFERSON TO SAMUEL KERCHEVAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are tomorrow celebrating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a letter, which I will not read in full, written by Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval in 1816, with reference to changes in the Constitution and laws. I am sure it will be interesting to all Members of the Senate and to all Americans to read the letter, because it shows the reflections of Jefferson after a long and full life spent in public enterprises as well as private contemplation and experience. There are two or three sentences from the letter which I should like to read now, and then have the entire letter printed in the RECORD.

> Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them, like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well; I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present; and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading; and this they would say themselves, were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know, also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Their monarchs, instead of wisely yielding to the gradual change of circumstances, of favoring progressive accommodation to progressive improvement, have clung to old abuses, entrenched themselves behind steady habits, and obliged their subjects to seek through blood and violence rash and ruinous innovations, which, had they been referred to the peaceful deliberations and collected wisdom of the nation, would have been put into acceptable and salutary forms. Let us follow no such examples, nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself, and of ordering its own affairs. Let us, as our sister states have done, avail ourselves of our reason and experience, to correct the crude essays of our first and unexperienced, although wise, virtuous, and well-meaning councils. And lastly, let us provide in our Constitution for its revision at stated periods. What these periods should be, nature herself indicates. By the European tables of mortality, of the adults living at any one moment of time, a majority will be dead in about 19 years. At the end of that period, then, a new majority is come into place; or, in other words, a new generation. Each generation is as independent as the one preceding, as that was of all which had gone before. It has then, like them, a right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness; consequently, to accommodate to the circumstances in which it finds itself, that received from its predecessors; and it is for the peace and good of mankind that a solemn opportunity of doing this every 19 or 20 years should be provided by the Constitution; so that it may be handed on, with periodical repairs, from generation to generation, to the end of time, if anything human can so long endure—

And so forth. I shall not read any more of the letter.

Mr. President, I read that part of the letter to show that in 1816 Jefferson believed, and later on he said, that no living generation should be bound by a dead generation; and he advocated a change in constitutions every few years—every 19 or 20 years, he said. I myself would not go so far as to provide that automatically the Constitution should be changed at any stated period; but I adhere to the Jeffersonian opinion, as expressed in the letter, that the constitutions and laws must be changed in the light of changes which transpire in the history of the human family, so that governments, laws, and institutions may go hand in hand with the development of modern thought and the necessity for modern activity.

I ask that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter in full was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> MONTICELLO, *July 12, 1816.*
>
> SIR: I duly received your favor of June 13, with the copy of the letters on the calling of a convention, on which you are pleased to ask my opinion. I have not been

in the habit of mysterious reserve on any subject, nor of buttoning up my opinions within my own doublet. On the contrary, while in public service especially, I thought the public entitled to frankness, and intimately to know whom they employed. But I am now retired. I resign myself, as a passenger, with confidence to those at present at the helm, and ask but for rest, peace, and good will. The question you propose, on equal representation, has become a party one, in which I wish to take no public share. Yet, if it be asked for your own satisfaction only, and not to be quoted before the public, I have no motive to withhold it, and the less from you, as it coincides with your own. At the birth of our Republic, I committed that opinion to the world, in the draft of a constitution annexed to the Notes on Virginia, in which a provision was inserted for a representation permanently equal. The infancy of the subject at that moment, and our inexperience of self-government, occasioned gross departures in that draft from genuine republican canons. In truth, the abuses of monarchy had so much filled all the space of political contemplation, that we imagined everything republican which was not monarchy. We had not yet penetrated to the mother principle, that "governments are republican only in proportion as they embody the will of their people, and execute it." Hence, our first constitutions had really no leading principles in them. But experience and reflection have but more and more confirmed me in the particular importance of the equal representation then proposed. On that point, then, I am entirely in sentiment with your letters; and only lament that a copyright of your pamphlet prevents their appearance in the newspapers, where alone they would be generally read, and produce general effect. The present vacancy too, of other matter, would give them place in every paper, and bring the question home to every man's conscience.

But inequality of representation in both houses of our legislature is not the only republican heresy in this first essay of our revolutionary patriots at forming a constitution. For let it be agreed that a government is republican in proportion as every member composing it has his equal voice in the direction of its concerns (not indeed in person, which would be impracticable beyond the limits of a city, or small township, but) by representatives chosen by himself and responsible to him at short periods, and let us bring to the test of this canon every branch of our constitution.

In the legislature, the house of representatives is chosen by less than half the people, and not at all in proportion to those who do choose. The senate is still more disproportionate, and for long terms of irresponsibility. In the executive, the Governor is entirely independent of the choice of the people, and of their control; his council equally so, and at best but a fifth wheel to a wagon. In the judiciary, the judges of the highest courts are dependent on none but themselves. In England, where judges were named and removable at the will of an hereditary executive, from which branch most misrule was feared, and has flowed, it was a great point gained, by fixing them for life, to make them independent of that executive. But in a government founded on the public will, this principle operates in an opposite direction and against that will. There, too, they were still removable on a concurrence of the executive and legislative branches. But we have made them independent of the Nation itself. They are irremovable, but by their own body, for any depravities of conduct, and even by their own body for the imbecilities of dotage. The justices of the inferior courts are self-chosen, are for life, and perpetuate their own body in succession forever, so that a faction once possessing themselves of the bench of a county can never be broken up, but hold their county in chains, forever indissoluble. Yet these justices are the real executive as well as judiciary, in all our minor and most ordinary concerns. They tax us at will; fill the office of sheriff, the most important of all the executive offices of the county; name nearly all our military leaders, which leaders, once named, are removable but by themselves. The juries, our judges of all fact, and of law when they choose it, are not selected by the people, nor amenable to them. They are chosen by an officer named by the court and executive. Chosen, did I say? Picked up by the sheriff from the loungings of the courtyard, after everything respectable has retired from it. Where then is our republicanism to be found? Not in our Constitution certainly, but merely in the spirit of our people. That would oblige even a despot to govern us republicanly. Owing to this spirit, and to nothing in the form of our Constitution, all things have gone well. But this fact, so triumphantly misquoted by the enemies of reformation, is not the fruit of our Constitution, but has prevailed in spite of it. Our functionaries have done well, because generally they were honest men. If any were not so, they feared to show it.

But it will be said, it is easier to find faults than to amend them. I do not think their amendment so difficult as is pretended. Only lay down true principles, and adhere to them inflexibly. Do not be frightened into their surrender by the alarms of the timid, or the croakings of wealth against the ascendancy of the people. If experience be called for, appeal to that of our 15 or 20 governments for 40 years, and show me where the people have done half the mischief in these 40 years, that a single despot would have done in a single year; or show half the riots and rebellions, the crimes and the punishments which have taken place in any single nation, under kingly government, during the same period. The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen, in his person and property, and in their management. Try by this, as a tally, every provision of our Constitution, and see if it hangs directly on the will of the people. Reduce your legislature to a convenient number for full, but orderly discussion. Let every man who fights or pays, exercise his just and equal right in their election. Submit them to approbation or rejection at short intervals. Let the executive be chosen in the same way, and for the same term, by those whose agent he is to be; and leave no screen of a council behind which to skulk from responsibility. It has been thought that the people are not competent electors of judges learned in the law. But I do not know that this is true, and, if doubtful, we should follow principle. In this, as in many other elections, they would be guided by reputation, which would not err oftener, perhaps, than the present mode of appointment. In one State of the Union, at least, it has long been tried, and with the most satisfactory success. The judges of Connecticut have been chosen by the people every 6 months, for nearly 2 centuries, and I believe there has hardly ever been an instance of change; so powerful is the curb of incessant responsibility. If prejudice, however, derived from a monarchical institution, is still to prevail against the vital elective principle of our own, and if the existing example among ourselves of periodical election of judges by the people be still mistrusted, let us at least not adopt the evil, and reject the good, of the English precedent; let us retain amovability on the concurrence of the executive and legislative branches, and nomination by the Executive alone. Nomination to office is an Executive function. To give it to the legislature, as we do, is a violation of the principle of the separation of powers. It swerves the members from correctness, by temptations to intrigue for office themselves, and to a corrupt barter of votes; and destroys responsibility by dividing it among a multitude. By leaving nomination in its proper place, among executive functions, the principle of the distribution of power is preserved, and responsibility weighs with its heaviest force on a single head.

The organization of our county administrations may be thought more difficult. But follow principle, and the knot unties itself. Divide the counties into wards of such size as that every citizen can attend, when called on, and act in person. Ascribe to them the government of their wards in all things relating to themselves exclusively. A justice, chosen by themselves, in each; a constable; a military company; a patrol; a school; the care of their own poor; their own portion of the public roads; the choice of one or more jurors to serve in some court; and the delivery within their own wards of their own votes for all elective officers of higher sphere will relieve the county administration of nearly all its business; will have it better done; and by making every citizen an acting member of the government, and in the offices nearest and most interesting to him, will attach him by his strongest feelings to the independence of his country and its republican constitution. The justices thus chosen by every ward would constitute the county court, would do its judiciary business, direct roads and bridges, levy county and poor rates, and administer all the matters of common interest to the whole country. These wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principle of their governments and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and for its preservation. We should thus marshal our government into: (1) The general Federal Republic, for all concerns foreign and Federal; (2) that of the State, for what relates to our own citizens exclusively; (3) the county republics, for the duties and concerns of the county; and (4) the ward republics, for the small and yet numerous and interesting concerns of the neighborhood; and in government, as well as is every other business of life, it is by division and subdivision of duties alone that all matters, great and small, can be managed to perfection. And the whole is cemented by giving to every cititzen, personally, a part in the administration of the public affairs.

The sum of these amendments is, (1) general suffrage, (2) equal representation in the legislature, (3) an Executive chosen by the people, (4) judges elective or amovable, (5) justices, jurors, and sheriffs elective, (6) ward divisions, and (7) periodical amendments of the Constitution.

I have thrown out these as loose heads of amendment, for consideration and correction; and their object is to secure self-government by the republicanism of our Constitution, as well as by the spirit of the people; and to nourish and perpetuate that spirit. I am not among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom. And to preserve their independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor 16 hours in the 24, give the earnings of 15 of these to the Government for their debts and daily expenses; and the 16th being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes; have no time to think, no means of calling

the mismanagers to account; but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers. Our landholders, too, like theirs, retaining indeed the title and stewardship of estates called theirs, but held really in trust for the Treasury, must wander, like theirs, in foreign countries, and be contented with penury, obscurity, exile, and the glory of the Nation. This example reads to us the salutary lesson, that private fortunes are destroyed by public as well as by private extravagance. And this is the tendency of all human governments. A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; that second for a third; and so on, till the bulk of the society is reduced to be mere automatons of misery, and to have no sensibilities left but for sinning and suffering. Then begins, indeed, the bellum omnium in omnia, which some philosophers observing to be so general in this world, have mistaken it for the natural, instead of the abusive state of man. And the fore horse of this frightful tear is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its train wretchedness and oppression.

Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well; I belonged to it, and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present; and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading; and this they would say themselves, were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Their monarchs, instead of wisely yielding to the gradual change of circumstances, of favoring progressive accommodation to progressive improvement, have clung to old abuses, entrenched themselves behind steady habits, and obliged their subjects to seek through blood and violence rash and ruinous innovations, which, had they been referred to the peaceful deliberations and collected wisdom of the Nation, would have been put into acceptable and salutary forms. Let us follow no such examples, nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself, and of ordering its own affairs. Let us, as our sister States have done, avail ourselves of our reason and experience, to correct the crude essays of our first and unexperienced, although wise, virtuous, and well-meaning councils. And lastly, let us provide in our Constitution for its revision at stated periods. What these periods should be, nature herself indicates. By the European tables of mortality, of the adults living at any one moment of time, a majority will be dead in about 19 years. At the end of that period, then, a new majority is come into place; or, in other words, a new generation. Each generation is as independent as the one preceding, as that was of all which had gone before. It has then, like them, a right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness; consequently, to accommodate to the circumstances in which it finds itself, that received from its predecessors; and it is for the peace and good of mankind that a solemn opportunity of doing this every 19 or 20 years, should be provided by the Constitution; so that it may be handed on, with periodical repairs, from generation to generation, to the end of time, if anything human can so long endure.

It is now 40 years since the Constitution of Virginia was formed. The same tables inform us, that, within that period, two-thirds of the adults then living are now dead. Have then the remaining third, even if they had the wish, the right to hold in obedience to their will, and to laws heretofore made by them, the other two-thirds, who, with themselves, compose the present mass of adults?

If they have not, who has? The dead? But the dead have no rights. They are nothing; and nothing cannot own something. Where there is no substance, there can be no accident. This corporeal globe, and everything upon it, belong to its present corporeal inhabitants, during their generation. They alone have a right to direct what is the concern of themselves alone, and to declare the law of that direction; and this declaration can only be made by their majority That majority, then, has a right to depute representatives to a convention, and to make the constitution what they think will be the best for themselves. But how collect their voice? This is the real difficulty. If invited by private authority, or county or district meetings, these divisions are so large that few will attend; and their voice will be imperfectly, or falsely pronounced. Here, then, would be one of the advantages of the ward divisions I have proposed. The mayor of every ward, on a question like the present, would call his ward together, take the simple yea or nay of its members, convey these to the county court, who would hand on those of all its wards to the proper general authority; and the voice of the whole people would be thus fairly, fully, and peaceably expressed, discussed, and decided by the common reason of the society. If this avenue be shut to the call of suffrance, it will make itself heard through that of force, and we shall go on, as other nations are doing, in the endless circle of oppression, rebellion, reformation; and oppression, rebellion, reformation, again; and so on forever.

These, sir, are my opinions of the governments we see among men, and of the principles by which alone we may prevent our own from falling into the same dreadful track. I have given them at greater length than your letter called for. But I cannot say things by halves; and I confide them to your honor, so to use them as to preserve me from the gridiron of the public papers. If you shall approve and enforce them, as you have done that of equal representation, they may do some good. If not, keep them to yourself as the effusions of withered age and useless time. I shall, with not the less truth, assure you of my great respect and consideration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of class I, to act as minister resident and consul general to Ethiopia.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Dozier A. DeVane, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida, vice Curtis L. Waller, elevated to another office.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray J. O. Brien, of Hawaii, to be judge of the third circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice James Wesley Thompson, term expired; and

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Carrick H. Buck, transferred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is appropriate and desirable that Members of the Senate be afforded opportunity to attend the ceremonies, which will be held tomorrow, incident to the dedication of the monument in honor of Thomas Jefferson and to participate in the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth. Therefore, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12, 1943:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Charles E. Kemper of Columbus, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Everett Clifton Hayden, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Charles Burnham Milliken, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. William Edward Sievers, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Robert Gardner Baker, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1937.

TO INFANTRY

Second Lt. George Rayens Grant, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. John Porter Kidwell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Joseph George Focht, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM MARCH 30, 1943

Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Clifford, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Oscar Otto Kuentz, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 12, 1943:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

William G. Winters, Jr.
George Wolly
John R. Napton, Jr.
Francis J. O'Connor, Jr.
Kenneth H. Sayre
George W. King

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

John E. Harrington, North Chelmsford.
Helen R. Erikson, Pembroke.

SAMOA

David J. McMullin, Pago Pago.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before whom the generations come and go, Thy power hangs in the light of every star and Thy mercy on the breast of every sea. Do Thou hasten the time when the suffering and abandoned shall become triumphant in the Lord, for Thy love shall never fail to overtake its own.

Heavenly Father, the stress is great and the problems are many; do Thou give us directive counsel that we may place all emphasis on the mandates of the needs of our country. Make the hearts of all citizens aware of the world's fires and its sharper fires of persecution. Let us give proof to these tragic times that life's inspirational dreams and endeavors are not in vain. Dear Lord, Thou art standing at the loom of this tragic world and art weaving together its broken and tangled threads into a design of peace and fraternity. We believe that its soul is destined to beat a pathway through the tides of scorn and hate and sound again the notes of a world redeemed from the tragedy of discord. We rejoice that Thou art the light universal and the lamp of hope can never be extinguished. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 10, 1943, was read and approved.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

APRIL 9, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

Respectfully yours,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE LATE JOHN T. VANCE

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and further to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some biographical data with reference to the late John T. Vance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with difficulty that I speak of the passing of my friend John T. Vance, law librarian of Congress for 19 years. His attainments are a matter of public record, and I shall not emphasize them. No words can portray his character. I doubt that any intentional act of his ever brought sadness to anyone. His life gave happiness, comfort, and inspiration to his family and friends. Although a profound student, he enjoyed to the utmost the simple joys of life. His friendships were unlimited, his companionship was a delightful privilege, and his life a blessing to all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, on April 12 addressed the following letter to the staff of the Library of Congress:

I have the sad duty of announcing the death last evening of John Vance, the law librarian of Congress. The Library of Congress has suffered an irremediable loss. Not only the law library but the whole Library of Congress was enriched by John Vance's long years of devoted and loyal service. His place in the history of this Library is secure. I know that I speak for many members of the staff when I say that his loss is not only the loss of an honored and valued colleague but a personal loss deeply felt. He was not only a distinguished public servant: he was a man who inspired the loyalties and the affection of those with whom he worked.

To have completed 20 years of public service with the honor, the admiration, and the affection of all with whom, and for whom, he served is an achievement of which any man might well be proud. John Vance was not given to personal pride, but we who had the privilege of serving with him in this Library cannot help but feel, with the sorrow which moves us today, an earnest pride on his behalf. We have lost one of the ablest and most respected public servants of our time. We have learned through his loss what the public service of this Government at its best can be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial and a letter that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of Friday, April 9, 1943, on the subject of income-tax collections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address I delivered over the N. B. C. network on April 9, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two occasions and include in each a resolution from the State Legislature of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am not a prophet, but I would almost be willing to stake every dollar I have or can raise that there will be no adjournment of Congress next Saturday unless meanwhile a pay-as-you-go tax bill has passed this House of Representatives. The people of the country are sick and tired of the tax muddle in Congress. Rightly or wrongly, they believe the tax problem is being unreasonably delayed and mishandled and they are demanding that the bungling shall cease and there is iron in the voices of the people on this subject. The rising pressure will before long get too hot for comfort and that is going to happen real soon, in my opinion, if Congress shows further signs of procrastination. If arrangements are to be made for a withholding tax by July 1 no time can be lost. In this House there is a substantial majority that approves the Robertson-Forand bill as the best measure that has been offered and if that majority sentiment can be crystallized into action the problem will be solved. Why not forget all differences and do what the people want done? The sensible thing to do is to get together and report out and pass this reasonable compromise bill early this week. Then we can adjourn Saturday and go home with a feeling that we have earned the benedictions of our people. On the first day of the week let us approach this vital matter in the spirit of compromise, to the end that before the week closes we may be able to see our duty and do it.

INCOME-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I received a letter signed by several Democratic Members of the House, urging me as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means not to delay action on income-tax legislation. Nothing could be further from my purpose than to unnecessarily delay consideration of any matter or measure concerning which I have responsibility.

The recent action of the House on the committee tax bill, and the Carlson-Ruml substitute is well known to the Congress and the country. Both bills contain identical provisions as to a withholding tax, which seems to be what the country is most concerned with at this time. The highly controversial question of tax forgiveness will necessarily result in further lengthy discussion, consideration, and delay. If the leadership of both parties will agree to support a program for the enactment of a simple withholding measure, I will promptly introduce such a bill and use my best efforts to obtain its early and favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means and the House, leaving known controversial tax matters for consideration in connection with the general tax bill which we expect to reach and consider when we dispose of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act and the Bituminous Coal Act, both of which expire in the near future and both of which we have agreed and arranged to give and should give prompt consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as I understand it, wants to simply pass that part of the legislation which he is in favor of, and leave the rest of the legislation which the country is demanding. I think we should proceed to do both jobs at the same time, because otherwise we would be put in the position where 20 percent will be taken out of the wage-earner's salary and there will be no chance to pass legislation which will bring the taxpayer current without doubling up on his taxes. I think we should bring all bills before the House, and let the House determine what it wants done. If this is done—and I hope that the gentleman from North Carolina wishes to cooperate, as well as the rest of the House—the majority then will have an opportunity to function.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does not the gentleman know that we made a determined effort to do that in the recent consideration of tax legislation, and that we were unable to do it, and does he not further know that if we take up controversial matters now there is not enough time to dispose of it, if we do pass the reciprocal trade agreement legislation? The gentleman knows that we cannot deal with these controversial matters now, but if we take what was identical in both bills, we can do that, and it will then be but a short time when we would take up general tax legislation when these other matters are disposed of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman knows that every piece of tax legislation is going to be more or less controversial. I believe in the light of what has happened in the last 10 days that this House understands the situation a little more clearly than it did when the bill was before the House the last time. The Members have heard from home, and they know the people are demanding a pay-as-you-earn tax bill now, and we should pass the measure before we have any recess.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And the gentleman from North Carolina and other gentlemen here have also heard from home, and the people there are more determined against the Ruml plan than ever.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We can dispose of the legislation in 1 day, if the gentleman will give us the opportunity, and I know that my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, will be glad to have this done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, of course, everyone knows my position, which I have stated publicly, but let us brush aside for a moment some of the disturbing implications, such as the Ruml plan on the one hand, and partial forgiveness on the other. My viewpoint has always been that whatever forgiveness there is should only be from the Government's angle, and to the extent that it might be necessary as a governmental policy to go, and no further, in order to put into operation on a sound basis any new method of taxation that is controversial. Everybody agrees on the pay-as-you-go proposition. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] refers to it as a withholding tax, and the gentleman from Massachusetts as a pay-as-you-go tax. The pay-as-you-go tax, of course, is the withholding of 20 percent at the source. There is no such thing as a complete pay-as-you-go policy that can be written into law. All we can do is to apply it to those who get wages or salaries. Nobody is in controversy about that. It seems to me that the sound legislative thing to do would be, recognizing the importance of getting the pay-as-you-go plan into operation by July 1, not only from the governmental angle, but from the angle of controlling inflation, to get the noncontroversial question out of the way, and then the controversial matters, whether the Ruml plan or any other plan, would be in order when the next tax bill comes before the House. It is important to get into operation by July 1 the pay-as-you-go plan, and that can be done. We are all agreed on that on both sides of the aisle. I have my own personal views about the Ruml plan, and in the interest of action, and in the interest of our people, and in order that we may give leadership on the part of the House to the country, I am willing to forego some of my own personal views in order to put through as quickly as possible the one thing that is noncontroversial. I hope this matter will be thought over, and that in the next few days something will develop along the lines outlined by the gentleman from North Carolina. I respect thoroughly the position of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], but what I suggest will put into operation the things that we are all agreed upon, and if we cannot adjust the controversial differences, we will enact into law the pay-as-you-go plan, which is so important to our country.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute on the tax question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is a terrific demand on the part of the country that we enact a pay-as-you-go current tax bill.

I want the RECORD to be kept perfectly straight. When the Ways and Means Committee met this morning to consider the trade-agreement program I offered this motion:

> I move that the committee, upon the conclusion of the testimony of the Secretary of State, defer further hearings on the extension of the Trade Agreement Act until it has first reported to the House a bill providing for a current pay-as-you-earn tax-collection system.

The committee tabled the motion by a record vote of 16 to 9, the majority side and 1 Republican voting to table the motion and 9 Republicans voting against tabling the motion.

I think it is regrettable, when there is such a universal demand on the part of the country from all phases of life to get on a current pay-as-you-go basis in time of a great war, that there should be the slightest delay on something that we all understand and upon which we could get action within a very short time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the suggestions made by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] are sound. As he stated, his views are known. He has definite, fixed ideas on the subject of tax forgiveness. But this matter of withholding at the source is imminent. In Mr. CARLSON'S bill, he copied the committee amendment verbatim on withholding. So we are not disagreed on that phase of the tax matter—taking the tax from the salary checks, with no doubling of taxes. The Treasury advises that they must print 200,000,000 blanks, and it has to get those blanks to the employers. It needs to know what the law is on withholding in order to do that. Mr. Helvering thought that about the 1st of May was the very limit of time necessary to get that done by July 1. We can realize what a job that is to get those 200,000,000 blanks to the employers and educate the employers as to what to do with the blanks. That is the problem of the Treasury, and the quicker we get the withholding feature passed, the better off the country will be, in my judgment, eliminating the controversial matters until the regular tax bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to impress this fact upon my colleagues. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] stated a few minutes ago that all parties interested in the tax bills had been in agreement on the subject of withholding at the source. That is a very unfortunate statement to make, because it does not set forth the actual facts. Simply because each and every one of the bills presented to or discussed before the House contained a provision for withholding at the source, it does not indicate that everybody interested would be for withholding at the source, regardless of whether it was or was not accompanied by some provisions.

We want to leave with the membership this impression which has been our position all the time, that we will not favor withholding at the source on a certain group of people, just on certain individuals, unless it has general application and unless it carries with it some relief so that those against whom the withholding has been enacted can carry the load. In other words, we do not favor withholding at the source if it only applies to the working people of the country and if it carries with it compulsory payment of 2 years' taxes. We want a withholding at the source if it applies to all alike and if provision is made to relieve the taxpayer of back payments so that he may become current. What the gentleman from North Carolina proposes will be worse than the proposal as contained in the bill which the House rejected by a tremendous vote a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

THE LATE MR. JOHN T. VANCE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the death, following a surgical operation in his home city, Lexington, Ky., of a devoted and loyal native son of the bluegrass region of Kentucky, who for the past 19 years has been the capable, diligent, erudite scholarly, faithful, ever-courteous and accommodating law librarian of Congress, my dear and valued friend, Mr. John T. Vance.

As a young lawyer at Lexington in 1912, then and to the last hour of his life an ardent Democrat, John T. Vance was one of the enthusiastic admirers and early supporters of the Presidential candidacy of Governor Woodrow Wilson. Early in the administration of President Wilson, Mr. Vance was appointed by him to an important Federal position at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, in which he served with honor and distinction.

A graduate of historic Transylvania College, at Lexington, Ky., the oldest institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains, and of the University of Michigan, he also held honorary degrees from both schools and from Catholic University of America. He was an assiduous student, learned in the law, well versed in the history and deeply grounded in the principles of jurisprudence. Mr. Vance was successful in the practice of his profession and, after accepting the important position of Law Librarian of Congress, soon became known, admired, and respected by the membership of this and the other body, and the object of the genuine affection of those who came to know him well and fully to appreciate his splendid qualities of mind and heart.

John Vance was a loveable character and had a generous nature. A few years ago when a vacancy existed in the office of Librarian of Congress, he had very substantial and powerful support for that position, to which his brilliant attainments justified him in aspiring. The day after Mr. Archibald MacLeish was appointed, I met my old friend and expressed my own keen disappointment, to which John Vance, with a benevolent smile on his face, made the characteristic reply: "Mr. MacLeish's selection was the best that could have been made." From that day until yesterday, Mr. MacLeish had no more loyal member of his staff than John T. Vance.

His death occurred at Lexington, where I am sure he would have chosen to spend his last hours. Wherever he roamed, wherever he was engaged in public service during the past 30 years, he was always the typical Kentucky gentlemen. His footsteps never turned toward the bluegrass section of his native land that his heart did not beat faster as from it welled the sentiments of My Old Kentucky Home.

In his life was exemplified as fully as in that of any man I ever knew the sentiment expressed years ago by Henry Watterson in welcoming homecomers to Kentucky when he began his address with the oft-quoted expression, "Once a Kentuckian, always a Kentuckian."

John Vance often told me, sometimes in the cloakroom and in this Chamber, that he had seen to it that, wherever public missions called him, when his children were to be born they were born at Lexington, in Fayette County, in the heart of the fairest land beneath the skies, the bluegrass of old Kentucky. There he will be buried. A more devoted spirit never passed from the land he loved. All that is mortal of John T. Vance will sleep beneath the bluegrass sod in the homeland of his fathers, the land he loved better than any other place in the world.

INCREASED CORN PRICE AND ITS RELATION TO INFLATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, if the Bankhead bill had become a law the ceiling price on corn would have been increased 6 cents per bushel. On Saturday it was

announced that the corn ceiling had been increased 5 cents per bushel. This raises an interesting question. The President said in his veto message that if the Bankhead bill became a law it would call forth a demand for higher prices for hogs, livestock, poultry, eggs, milk and other dairy products. He went on to say that the Bankhead bill would deprive the Government of the power to prevent these price increases, "increases which might swell the cost of living more than 5 percent, add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' food budget and several hundred million dollars to the cost of feeding the armed forces and of supplying our allies." The President also painted a picture of resulting wage increases, the breaking of the Little Steel formula and an inevitable inflationary spiral. The O. P. A. brief on which the President based his alarming figures said a 6-cent increase in corn prices would result in an "increase in cost to Government and consumers amounting to $1,600,000,000. This increase in costs is apportioned 25 percent to lend-lease and the armed forces, and 75 percent to civilian consumers."

If a 6-cent increase in corn prices would do all these terrible things just how much less damage would a 5-cent increase do? Has some other adviser convinced the President that the figures given him by the O. P. A. economists were all wet or was he just kidding when he used those figures in the first place?

If the President still believes in those figures does this mean that the Little Steel formula will now be broken and that the coal miners will be given a substantial increase? I confess I am stumped. I wish some expert who knows about such things would enlighten me.

SALARIES AND WAGES

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is lamentable that the President has taken the attitude he has expressed in the statement he gave to the press when he allowed the debt-limitation bill to become law. I cannot but feel that the President has been misinformed in respect to the law. If he has not been misinformed, he is guilty of the reprehensible practice of demagoging on a very important fundamental question.

The law, nothing to the contrary withstanding, including the President's own statement, does not freeze wages at any level. The President by his own directive has set up the machinery whereby wages may be increased by his War Labor Board upon application. So the statement made by the President that Congress froze wages but took the ceiling off salaries is not based upon the facts or the law.

It is the President's duty, if the Congress has failed in any respect, to call its attention to that failure and recommend to the Congress that it remedy and correct any deficiency in the law. It was the President's duty, if he did not want to abide by the clear mandate of Congress expressed in the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that the act was inflationary in its tendency and allow the Congress to correct it. If he did not say so then, he has been remiss in his duty. The President has no constitutional or statutory power to amend or modify an act of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

ALBERT H. FIEBACH—IMPERIAL SHRINE POTENTATE GUEST OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, an illustrious fellow townsman of mine, from Cleveland, is the guest of Washington today. He is Albert H. Fiebach, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America. I am happy to say that he is with us in the Capitol at the present time, and I am sure all of us are very happy to welcome him here.

SPECIAL COTTON REPORT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Members of the House to a disparity in the distribution of cotton bales. We now have a report of 265 pages which has been issued by the Census Department as a result of the efforts and studies of the authorities of the Census Department, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the Farm Security Administration. The title of the report is "Special Cotton Report." I have previously stated that I do not believe it is fair for approximately 50 percent of the cotton income to go to seven-eighths of the cotton farmers and the other 50 percent to go to one-eighth of the cotton farmers. Often it has been contended that very frequently on large farms this income is distributed among several people. I want to read one sentence from the report which, in my opinion, does not bear out this contention.

> When a landowner has one or more tenants, renters, croppers, or managers, the land operated by each is considered a farm. Thus, on a plantation, the land operated by each cropper, renter, or tenant should be reported as a separate farm, and the land operated by the owner or manager by means of wage hands should likewise be reported as a separate farm.

Again I say, I want all of the Members who are interested in giving to the small family-size cotton farmer a fair deal to study carefully these 265 pages because the figures presented are startling in their revelations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement on the dangers of the foot-and-mouth disease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAPOZZOLI]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CAPOZZOLI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ALARMING DEPLETION OF CRUDE OIL RESERVES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the regular order of business has been concluded and after any special orders heretofore entered; and I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that our country is facing a situation that is extremely serious in connection with the depletion of crude-oil reserves. This matter was also called to the attention of the House by the distinguished Member from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] some days ago.

The demand for oil and oil products is getting higher and higher, more and more, while the supply is getting less and less, largely because the Office of Price Administration does not yet provide a reasonable increase in the price of crude oil. There is to be a meeting within the next day or two before what is known as the Small Business Committee of the House where this problem will be discussed thoroughly. I trust those of you who are interested in this problem, and we all should be interested in it, will appear before that committee and express your views. The matter is a most important one. I have spent considerable time and effort on this problem. The situation, in my opinion, is likely to become critical unless something is done very soon to correct it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech by Mr. T. M. Martin, vice president and general manager of the Lion Oil Refining Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION GETTING ECONOMY MINDED

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Office of War Information is proud that 42,317,000 copies of informational publications and press releases have been eliminated to save manpower, printing, and mail facilities. The reduction is around 20 percent under 1940.

The O. W. I. reports that this is good, and having done so well the O. W. I. perhaps should not be chided for falling 50 or 60 percent short of perfection. I merely point out that another 50,000,000 copies or its equivalent, including reduction in size, could easily and profitably be eliminated. The mails still are swamped with nonessential publications which the recipients must pay porters to cart away unread. Why not give this paper to the press where it will be of real benefit to the people?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, and to include letters.)

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a resolution from the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McWILLIAMS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Post-War Blueprint."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Charles W. McLawhorn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, first on the subject of the equal-rights amendment, and, second, on the subject of the office of the O. P. A. in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE FERGUSON FAMILY, OF PALISADE, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1943, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] called our attention to a family in his State who has seven sons in the armed service. That family is justly entitled to due recognition and honor, and I join with other Americans in commending them.

However, out in the First District of Nebraska we never allow others to outdo us if it is humanly possible to avoid it. I, therefore, call attention of this Congress and of the Nation to the fine outstanding record of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C. Ferguson, of Palisade, Nebr., who not only have given seven sons to the armed forces but the father is an employee at the Army air base at McCook, Nebr.

The succession of Ferguson enlistments began in May 1934 when Irvin, age 28, and Cleo, 27, enlisted in the Navy. Both now bear ratings of boatswain's mates, second class. Irvin is at a naval air station near Corpus Christi, Tex., and Cleo is attached to a receiving ship in New York.

Next in age comes Pvt. (1st cl.) Carroll Ferguson, 25, who entered the Army in November 1941. He is attached to an Infantry regiment, and his New York Army post-office address would indicate that he is out of the United States.

The others are:

Merle Ferguson, age 24, now an aviation mechanic, second class, at a naval air station in Puerto Rico. He enlisted in May 1941.

Dale Ferguson, 22, also an aviation mechanic, second class, but located in the British West Indies. He enlisted with Merle.

Pvt. Dean Ferguson, 20, entered the Army in November 1942. His California Army post-office address indicates he is out of the United States.

Donall Ferguson, 18, entered the Navy in May 1942 and is now in service on one of the Navy's swift PT boats operating along the Florida coast.

If any other congressional district has a record greater than this, I hope that they will come forth and make it known. We will then again look around in the First Nebraska District, because we do not propose to be outdone if we can help it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article I prepared for the May issue of the magazine Flying.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means this morning commenced hearings on the bill to continue the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The genial Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, has just concluded an eloquent and very moving outline of the high idealism which has inspired his administration of the program. But, Mr. Speaker, the dollars-and-cents, tons-and-pounds problems of foreign trade cannot be disposed of with pious platitudes and lofty expressions.

Foreign trade is business, and businessmen must keep their eyes on the books if bankruptcy is to be avoided. What do the books show? How do they balance? As the Bard of Avon once rose to remark, "That is the question."

This, Mr. Speaker, is what the record shows:

Under the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, agricultural imports from all countries have increased 57 percent since 1934. During the same period exports of agricultural products have decreased to a minus 30 percent.

This is the 9-year answer to the New Deal promise that their brand of reciprocal trading would expand foreign markets for the products of the United States.

The test of the pudding is in the tasting thereof.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GIFFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I deny the assertion, repeatedly made on this floor, and reiterated the other day by the distinguished minority leader, that 95 percent of the American people want the Ruml plan.

If the American people had not been deliberately misinformed by the press and the radio—led to believe that the Ruml plan was a pay-as-you-go plan and that the taxes to be forgiven were negligible—I am very certain that even Mr. Gallup's misleading question would not have gotten the response it did.

Personally I am unalterably opposed to forgiving or canceling any part of last year's or this year's or any other year's taxes.

We are in a war to the death for freedom. We voted to declare that war and send the flower of the Nation's manhood into it.

If we are willing that these brave men—most of them mere boys—who are willing to fight till they die, we ought to be willing at least to pay till it hurts.

I, of course, realize that in forgiving a full year's taxes, or any part of a year's taxes, we would please a lot of people and incidentally create a colossal potential political campaign fund.

Well there is just one fund I want to build up, that is the fund in the Treasury which is being used to fight the campaigns—in the jungles of New Guinea and the Solomons, on the sub-infested seas of the world; on the deserts of Africa; the steppes of Russia, the fog-bound, windswept, icy Aleutians, to say nothing of those heroes of the air.

I totally disagree with Mr. Ruml's philosophy. In that connection I might ask, "If the Treasury will profit by the forgiving of 1 year's taxes, why not forgive 2 years or 10 years?"

I sincerely hope that my countrymen, or those of them that are not willing to pay taxes, just pause and consider this bit of reasoning: "If a nation values anything more than freedom it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is money or comfort that it values more it will lose that, too."

In conclusion let me make this general observation; namely, that the minority leaders' threat to block an Easter vacation, unless the Ruml plan is reconsidered, is in keeping with the minority leadership's philosophy—namely, trade a 2 weeks' vacation for a $10,000,000,000 bonus to its friends.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent address I made over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Bronson Trevor with reference to stabilization of currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WASTE OF FOOD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, so far today not one word has been mentioned about the thing that more housewives are thinking about than any one other thing, and perhaps the most important thing aside from the war, and that is the food problem. I am glad to know that the United Nations Food Conference that has so long been delayed is now going to be held the latter part of this month. I am glad to know that the people are getting more waste conscious, and that more people are daily licking their platters clean. I cannot understand the attitude of the President, in his wanting to bar the public from this world food conference. I wonder if it is simply a case of the President's stubbornness, and whether he has gotten to like a closed meeting since Casablanca. That is the problem that many of us are debating. At any rate, I think with this most important problem being handled in this food conference the latter part of this month, the President ought to throw wide open the gates, and we ought to know the facts, and if the Government is going to continue to purchase food through this year, just as last year, then we are in a desperate situation.

On the other hand, if the Government has vast quantities of food on hand, as many people think, and are going to withdraw from the market, then the situation is not so desperate. This is something about which the public certainly ought to know.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia on public health may sit during the afternoon, during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, commemorative exercises for our third President of the United States are being held in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation this week. I call the attention of the membership to the gentle and modest spirit of Thomas Jefferson as expressed in this revealing character story. When Benjamin Franklin returned to this country, having been our Ambassador to France, Mr. Jefferson was selected to take his place. Talleyrand, the French diplomat and master of sarcasm, is said to have greeted Mr. Jefferson, when he arrived at his post abroad, in these words:

Mr. Jefferson, you come to take the place of Mr. Franklin.

Jefferson is said to have replied:

I do not come to take the place of Mr. Franklin. No man could do that. I come simply to succeed him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include short extracts from two speeches of two young men who won the national finals in the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Oratory Contest in New York last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald on Ickes against the Barge Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RUML PLAN

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from the president of a large organization outside the State of Arizona saying in effect, "I notice by the RECORD that you voted against the pay-as-you-go tax measure."

I dictated a brief reply saying, in effect, "You misread the RECORD; I did not vote against the pay-as-you-go tax measure, I voted to defeat the Ruml proposal, and then not to recommit the bill, which was a pay-as-you-go measure. What I voted against, as you will find by rereading the RECORD, is the Ruml proposal, to forgive all income taxes for 1942 and pass that additional burden on in a bonded indebtedness for posterity to pay." As I stated on January 24, 1943, in a Nation-wide radio hook-up, so I feel now, that it is desirable to get income taxpayers, with incomes consisting of wages and salaries, on a current basis as soon as possible—even with considerable doubling up if necessary.

I think the public sentiment for their pay-as-you-go plan claimed by Rumlites—mostly Republicans in this Chamber—is largely manufactured and greatly exaggerated. What the majority of Democrats thwarted recently here—and about which there has been an awful howl—was a Republican effort to shirk $10,000,000,000 of patriotic, legal obligation in order to pass that burden on to other taxpayers, many of whom are now paying their just share of the cost of war on many foreign battlefields.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article in the current issue of the magazine News Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RUML PLAN

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress and the House to respond to the demand of this country to bring in a pay-as-you-go tax bill. My position is not changed, and I shall support the committee amendment. I am opposed to the Ruml plan or any forgiveness of taxes.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

JEWISH BOND RALLY

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I attended the Jewish bond and rally roll call last night. I think the best speech that was made was delivered in about 2 minutes by a fine soldier who had seen service in North Africa.

In reference to the bond-buying rally he said this:

I hope there will be no let-down in this great program. We soldiers have no one to appeal to for the materials of war except to you—

Addressing himself to the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1860) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MEAD, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting Vice President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission).

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 192, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1730) to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the Chair whether or not part 2 of the report accompanying the bill H. R. 1730 complies with the Ramseyer rule? On reading the report it is obvious that an attempt has been made to comply with the rule by printing in parallel columns the existing law and the proposed legislation, but on examination of it it appears that it does not show compliance with that portion of the Ramseyer rule which provides that that part to be stricken out shall be shown with stricken-through type and the new part in italics. Yet a comparison of the two columns shows there is great similarity in the text.

The SPEAKER. Reading from the Ramseyer rule:

Whenever a committee reports a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document.

The Chair would think that the accompanying document is part 2 of the report of the committee.

Mr. CASE. I was not objecting to part 2 as an accompanying document, but asked whether or not it, as the accompanying document, complied, in a satisfactory way, with subsection 2 of the rule which the Chair has just cited.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman the original report of the committee or has he the supplementary report?

Mr. MICHENER. If the Chair will permit, I think the real point is this, that under the Ramseyer rule the committee reporting the bill is presumed to give a picture, visual insofar as possible, of the proposed changes, by including within brackets the parts stricken out and in italics the additions, so that one may look at the report and get a picture of the changes to be made. It is true, as the Chair well stated, that when the Ramseyer rule was adopted cases were suggested, like internal-revenue bills, where it might be necessary just to copy the present and the proposed law in parallel columns. When the Ramseyer rule was adopted it was contemplated that would be done, but where the bill can be pictured as the rule contemplates that certainly should be done. There is a practice growing up among the committees here where it is much easier, no matter how much space it requires, to copy in one column the old law and in another column the new law, without any reference or consideration at all being given to the terms of the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read from clause 2a of rule XIII:

A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

The Chair thinks that the supplemental report substantially complies with the above quoted rule inasmuch as the existing law and the proposed changes in that law are set forth in parallel columns. For that reason the Chair would hold that the Ramseyer rule has been complied with.

Mr. MICHENER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, because this decision which the Chair is now making is most important. The rule might be so interpreted so that all that is necessary is to abandon everything in the Ramseyer rule except to publish in parallel columns the old law and the proposed law, and forget the brackets and italics. Such was never intended when the rule was adopted. The Chair will remember when we debated the Ramseyer rule there was much discussion in committee and elsewhere about that very thing. The original rule, as offered by Mr. Ramseyer, did not permit the printing in parallel columns because that procedure would be of little aid in most cases. The parallel column provision was finally accepted as a part of the rule, on the theory that the brackets and italics would be used in every case where it was possible to use them.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the Chair was one of the complainers before the adoption of the Ramseyer rule. We could not know the terms of the act we were proposing to repeal or amend without resort to the printed statutes. The Chair thinks that the purpose of the rule was to make readily available and easily understandable in the reports on bills repealing or amending existing law the changes proposed in such bills. Perhaps it would have been clearer had the report used brackets and italics to show the proposed changes in the existing law but the Chair must hold that technically the report does comply with the provisions of the rule which the Chair read.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair would permit a further word, I do not quarrel with the decision of the Chair. I think the Chair is holding in accordance with the rules as far as that is concerned, but it seems to me that the difficulty that arose which resulted in the printing of the report on this bill in three separate parts illustrates the value of the Ramseyer rule and of careful compliance with it. The confusion that arose in the mind of the Secretary of War would have been avoided had the rule been complied with in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. It was to bring out the value of the rule that I raised the question. It seems to me it would be good parliamentary practice if the committees would follow that portion of the rule which requires the use of italics for new matter and brackets and stricken-through type for other changes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would express the hope that committees in reporting bills would bring them in in the most understandable fashion so that it would be easier for the Members of the House to understand them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As long as we are trying to learn something about the rules, the gentleman from Michigan when he arose, said, "Mr. Chairman," and then proceeded to discuss this matter without the Chair's having recognized him. Was that proper? Or should a Member wait until the Speaker, if he is in the chair, recognizes the Member?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota had the floor and the Chair understood that he yielded to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not hear any request by anybody for the gentleman to yield, but the gentleman from Michigan started right in saying, "Mr. Chairman," and making his statement. I want to obey the rules of the House as interpreted by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] the other day. I have been striving earnestly in this direction and do not want to go wrong on this thing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be very much pleased if all the suggestions made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] were followed at all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my difficulty.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair would, in some instances, find himself in the embarrassing situation of putting a Member in an embarrassing position by being called down by the Chair. The Chair does not like to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mind furnishing the example if the Speaker does not find it embarrassing; I would be glad for the education and edification of the Members to be made an example.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will correct the gentleman from Michigan some time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and later on will yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point of order that was raised by the gentleman from South Dakota to the effect that the Ramseyer rule had not been fully complied with in all technicalities. Perhaps he might have had justification for calling attention to that, but I feel that the Speaker has ruled correctly, that the spirit of the Ramseyer rule has been complied with.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules misunderstood. I did not make a point of order. I recognized that the situation was as the Chair stated. I hoped, however, by raising the parliamentary inquiry that I might call attention to the rule and that it would be complied with in better fashion in the future for the benefit of the Members of the House.

Mr. SABATH. It has been the desire of the Committee on Rules to insist, request, and demand of committees reporting bills that they do comply with the Ramseyer rule. Unfortunately, sometimes the Committee on Rules has not the report before it when the application for a rule is made and we are obliged to act upon the statement of the chairman of the committee, and invariably, as in this case, the minority member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order what is known as the Kilday bill. It is an open rule, it provides for 2 hours of general debate, and will give the Members the right and privilege of offering amendments under the 5-minute rule if they desire. Personally, I felt originally that this legislation was not necessary, but, in view of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill and urged a special rule, the rule was finally granted, notwithstanding the fact that the War Department believed the legislation would create conditions that might be hard for the Department to administer.

I received a lengthy letter from the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, which was read at the first hearing before the Committee on Rules, in which were pointed out certain provisions that the Department could not approve. For the information of the House, I am inserting at this point the letter of the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1943.

Hon. ADOLPH J SABATH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SABATH: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of H. R. 1730, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

This bill, if enacted, would establish a system of classification and order of induction of registrants under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, who are not deferred from training and service by reason of employment in essential occupations, and would require the assignment of such registrants to categories subject to induction on the basis of their relationship to persons dependent upon them for support. It would further provide that no person assigned to such categories shall be called for induction prior to the call for induction of all persons within the same State who have been placed in categories made subject to earlier induction than the category in which such person has been placed.

H. R. 1730 as originally introduced provided that no person assigned to any of such categories should be inducted before the induction of all persons within the same State who had been placed in categories made subject to earlier induction than the one in which such person had been placed. The bill, as amended by the Committee on Military Affairs, now prescribes that "no person assigned to any of said categories shall be called for induction prior to the call for induction of all persons with the same State who have been placed in categories herein made subject to induction prior to the category in which such person has been placed." This provision of the bill as amended might be construed to mean that persons placed in categories made subject to later induction could be called for induction and, in fact, inducted if all persons within categories subject to prior induction had been issued a call for induction prior to such time by the Selective Service System. However, in view of the statements contained in the report by the Committee on Military Affairs (H. Rept. No.

146, 78th Cong.), the purpose and the effect of H. R. 1730 are not clear to the War Department. It is there stated that "* * * the bill as presented, does not, in any way, bar the induction of heads of families, but does provide that based on the degree of dependency, single men without dependents, and single men with collateral dependents, as well as married men without children, shall be inducted into the service under proper rules and regulations prior to the induction of heads of families with one or more dependents." If this is the effect of the proposed legislation, the chief objection of the War Department to the enactment of the bill, as stated by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, Brig. Gen. M. G. White, in his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs on February 17, 1943, is reaffirmed. Under this construction of H. R. 1730, the proposed system presents an administrative impossibility. No selective service local board would ever be able to ascertain at any given time that every selectee subject to prior induction in that State had, in fact, reported and been duly inducted, which must have been accomplished before a call for induction of members of a later category could be issued. Shifts of population, changes of individual circumstances, and other similar factors make such a determination impossible. Accordingly, the administration of the Selective Service System would completely break down and the Army would be unable to continue to receive the steady flow of manpower which is essential.

If, on the other hand, the proposed legislation could be interpreted and administered as merely establishing a uniformity of procedure within the States so that unmarried men and men without dependents would be called for induction when possible before married men and men with dependents, without precluding the actual induction of the latter so long as any of the former had not been inducted, the War Department would have no objection to the bill. If, however, this is the proper interpretation of the bill, it is submitted that its language requires substantial clarification. It is further to be noted that upon this interpretation of the bill its enactment is unnecessary as the Selective Service System is now accomplishing the same result.

At the hearings referred to, the War Department further expressed concern with the fact that the bill might require the Army to accept illiterates and otherwise undesirable registrants coming in a category made subject to earlier induction, before any men in succeeding categories could be inducted. It has been explained, however, that this is not the intent of the bill and that such a result is deemed to be avoided by the provision as to each category that it shall contain only registrants who are otherwise qualified. Here again, clarification of the language of the bill would be helpful and necessary so as to avoid possible misinterpretation if the bill is to be favorably considered.

Inasmuch as the committee has requested that this report be expedited, the Bureau of the Budget has authorized its submission without a determination by the Bureau as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the letter was submitted to the Committee on Rules during the course of its first hearing and at a later hearing the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the proponents of the bill assured our committee that they would take up with the Department some of the questions which were raised and would endeavor to adjust them so that the objections would be eliminated.

I fully appreciate the task imposed on General Hershey in the administration of the Selective Training and Service Act, but notwithstanding that fact I feel that this measure will clarify and make positive the intent of Congress and bring about the elimination of many contradictory statements appearing in the press as to the operation and administration of the act which, unfortunately, have been elaborated upon and charged to the President. It will also tend to eliminate the uncertainties in the minds of the people as to the categories in which men in various classes will be called for service.

There has been some criticism against some of the draft boards but this criticism unfortunately was heaped upon the President and the administration notwithstanding the fact that the draft boards were appointed by the Governors of the respective States—in my State they are composed of Republicans—and the President had nothing to do with their appointment and cannot be and should not be held responsible for any sins of commission or omission on the part of these boards.

I recommended to the general a year ago that he should endeavor to bring into the service the thousands and thousands of gentlemen who roam our highways and byways and also many of those who roll around in the barrel houses. I think they are unmarried or surely do not live with their wives, nor do they support their families, and I know of no reason why this element should not be corralled and forced into service, service that they can and should be able to perform, and especially in view of the great hue and cry that there is such a shortage of farm labor. Surely these men are capable of doing some work on the farm and thereby to some extent may be useful in relieving the shortage of farm labor.

The bill itself will be thoroughly explained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who made a very clear and intelligent presentation of the matter befor the Committee on Rules. Though I felt that this legislation was unnecessary, and though the War Department and the Secretary of War were not in favor of it, may I say that the gentleman has made such a strong plea, and shown himself so thoroughly posted and so well informed, that I cannot help but congratulate him now upon the ability with which he presented this bill before the Rules Committee and I know he will do likewise on the floor of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thought I saw something in the paper a day or two ago to the effect that the War Department had withdrawn its objection.

Mr. SABATH. As I stated, I have every confidence in any statement that the gentleman from Texas makes, and we have been led to believe that he will sit down with those gentlemen in the War Department and adjust the verbiage which that Department complains of which might lead to misinterpretations.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABBATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that when I appeared before the Rules Committee the gentleman furnished me with a copy of a letter written him by the Secretary of War. At that time I called the attention of the Rules Committee to the fact that the letter of the Secretary raised objection to a construction on the bill which was contained in the original committee report and at the direction of the Rules Committee a supplemental report was filed, now available, part 3 of the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which it is pointed out that the construction which the War Department said it had no objection to is the correct construction and that the original construction in the committee report was inaccurate. So the statement that the War Department had withdrawn its objection is a statement contained in a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee at the time the bill was pending before that committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation which makes it clear that the Committee on Rules endeavors to be careful before voting out rules for the special consideration of bills by the House. This is evidenced in this instance as the Committee on Military Affairs filed an original report, followed by a supplemental report and, acting upon the suggestions of the Committee on Rules, filed a still further, or third report, which clarified the controversial or questionable provisions in the bill, affording expeditious consideration of the bill by the House.

I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half of that time, 5 minutes, out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is being presented by the rule was considered by the Rules Committee and reported practically unanimously to the House. It provides for certain categories in regard to the deferment of those who are eligible for service in our armed forces.

It establishes certain categories beginning with the unmarried man under 38 years of age; next, the unmarried man with collateral dependents; then the married man without dependents and, finally, in the last category, the married man with dependents. In other words, it puts at the very end, and I believe properly so, the married man with dependents. To that extent I am in favor of the bill.

I am also in favor of that part of the bill which makes these categories Statewide, which, in my opinion, should have been done long ago.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it the purpose to keep the married men with children and dependents to the last or is it proposed to exempt a man who has no children and keep him in the same category as you would put men with children?

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. The men who are married with dependent children and wives will be called last. It is simply a question of dependency and marriage.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How about single men?

Mr. FISH. They head the list. I do not think the rich man with children and a wife should be let off on the grounds of dependency. In fact they all ought to be in the service by now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What category does the gentleman place a married man who has been divorced and who has dependent children, though not living with those children? Where is he placed?

Mr. FISH. That is a specialized case and the gentleman will have to ask a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I refer him to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I assume, if the children are dependent on him, it would be a matter of dependency. That is the main question. If these children are dependent on him, I suppose he is in the same category as any other bona fide married man, though I would prefer that the gentleman ask that question of the author of the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. One other question. The gentleman says that this bill takes it away from the local quota system and makes it State-wide. Will the gentleman explain what he means by "State-wide"?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows the Selective Service System established certain quotas, and when the draft boards run out of the local quotas they can, under the proposed bill, now reach out and get them from all over the State. There is much more equity in it, otherwise they will go down the list and take them all. They have even defied the laws of Congress and have taken farmers because the quota was exhausted. I believe the Selective Service System has also ignored some of the laws that we passed and adopted new regulations in their place that have violated the intent of Congress.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then under this bill the local unit is disregarded and the selection is made from all over the State?

Mr. FISH. That is one of the amendments in the bill, if it passes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman says he approves this on a State-wide basis?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I do.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I think that is an improvement, but why could we not have a bill on a Nation-wide basis? We know that in Montana they have been taking married men and men with families for over a year while here in the District of Columbia they are just beginning to take married men and there are large centers of the East where the same situation prevails.

Mr. FISH. I think the answer to that is the difficulty of handling it on a Nation-wide basis. It just covers too much ground and is too extensive.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. They handle the O. P. A. that way.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has a distinguished war record. In the first World War he rendered great and outstanding service. He is a close student of this whole question. I am wondering, however, if in the gentleman's mind it would not be a mistake for us to take this bill in its entirety and grant exemptions to all married men?

In other words, the purpose is to build the best Army that can be made up. The best men are not all unmarried men. Why should this favoritism, this immunity, be shown married men simply because they are married, when the purpose is to select the best material that is obtainable?

Mr. FISH. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. He has brought up the cruz of the bill and has asked a very fair question. Why should a distinction be made between unmarried men and the married men in drafting them to risk their lives in defense of their country? There is a distinction and, I believe, a very definite one. When you take the married man you break up the home. When you take him away from his wife and his family you break up that home, at least temporarily. I am in favor of taking the married men if we have to take them. If we were about to be invaded, I would take all the married men right up to 45, overnight. When you know how many men you need, it is simply a matter of taking those you can take with the least effect upon the home and upon war industries.

I go further than this bill, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend. I propose to offer an amendment to the bill, if it is in order, to take every physically fit unmarried man in the Government service under 38 years of age, to take him away from these bombproofs in Washington and elsewhere and put him into our armed forces. I see no reason for a single unmarried man being in the Federal service in our departments, agencies, and bureaus in the midst of the greatest war in our history. Every one of these men is needed. Draftsmen, inventors, chemists, engineers, and so on, I would put in uniform and then send them back if they are badly needed in the Government service, but I would take them all without exception.

I realize the difficulty under which the gentleman is laboring. He has raised the crux of the whole question, whether there is any distinction between risking the lives of the married men and the unmarried men. I say yes, there is, because, if you do not have to break up the homes and take from those homes the married men with dependents, you should not do it. There is a hardship there and a moral issue involved.

Mr. COX. The gentleman very properly expresses great concern in the preservation of home life, but is there not greater disruption in home life by the taking of a widow's only son, upon whom she is entirely dependent, than in the taking of a married man whose family is well circumstanced?

Mr. FISH. The taking of an only son whose mother was dependent on him might involve a hardship case, and then he would be excluded as a hardship case. But if it is just a widow, and not dependent I see no reason why that single man should not be taken in the first category.

Mr. COX. Is it not just as heartrending and just as disturbing for the mother to give her first-born to the country as a soldier as it is for a well-circumstanced wife to suffer a temporary separation from her well-conditioned husband?

Mr. FISH. If a married man is well to do he then would have no dependents. It is all heartrending. If you take the only son of any family, of course that is probably even more heartrending, whether he is single or married, than if there are a number of sons in the family. It is all a question of degree. But I assure the gentlemen there is a great distinction between the single man and the married man with dependents.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under the present regulations, which would be called first, the worker in an essential war industry or the married man with a dependent wife and children?

Mr. FISH. The way the Selective Service System is working it now, the men in essential industry who are under 38 years of age, single or married, particularly the single ones, are supposed to get replacements in the next 6 months so as not to endanger the progress of that war industry, and they will be taken just as soon as they can be replaced. They are taking those men as fast as they can find replacements for them.

The question of deferment is also involved in the Tydings amendment that provides that farm help should be deferred until January 1, 1944. Then deferment is also given in essential war industries.

The answer the selective-service officers give me is that they are trying to take the men as fast as they can out of essential industry who are under 38 and unmarried, and next if necessary the married men, but the married men come at the end of the list so they may not be reached, if they are in an essential industry, and have dependent children and wives.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But suppose such a man is in an essential industry?

Mr. FISH. If he is unmarried a replacement will be found. I wish you

gentlemen would not ask me all these questions as I do not want to take up so much time under the rule. I wish you would defer—I think that is the word—these questions until you get into the consideration of the bill itself. I am not the author of the bill. There are some things about the bill that I like, and I am merely expressing my views. I should like to see an amendment adopted to bring into our armed forces all the unmarried men under 38 now in the Government service, every single one of them, from the State Department, War and Navy, O. W. I. and O. P. A., and all the rest. There is not one man whose job cannot be filled by an older man or by someone who is physically disabled or by a woman. If these men are indispensable and absolutely needed after we get them into the armed forces, we can send them back in uniform to their old jobs but there will not be many. Of course, that is a matter for the House to decide, but I intend to offer my amendment, and the House can vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I merely want to state some figures I have here which would in a way reach the question raised by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FISH. Could not the gentleman defer that until he has the floor? I do not want to consume too much time on the rule, and I should like to have 5 minutes to speak out of order.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I was interested in what the gentleman said about taking young men out of the Government offices. My recollection is that according to figures that have been presented about 550,000 single men are employed in industry. Can they be replaced by other people within a reasonable time?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service told me today that that is what they propose to do, and are doing it as rapidly as possible, and getting replacements in these essential industries; but there are a good many in the Federal service, and my goodness, the way I look at it, we declared the war, the Congress of the United States, and yet you find a lot of these single men still holding jobs in the Government service, after we have been in the war for 16 months.

Mr. DONDERO. I am very much impressed with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Cannot these draft dodgers——

Mr. FISH. Yes, these bombproofers.

Mr. COX. That are in the Government service, and we know they are there——

Mr. FISH. Lots of them.

Mr. COX. Could not they be reached by some proviso other than the adoption of a law which will exempt married men until all unmarried men may be inducted into the service?

Mr. FISH. This does not exempt them. It defers them to the bottom of the list, and if we are to take them, if the Army and the Navy is to exceed ten million, then we will probably take them also.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to speak out of order on the rule, but there is not much request for time today, and I do so because I want to take this occasion, as I could not do it adequately in a 1-minute speech, to reply, if I may, to the statement of the President of the United States on the Public Debt Act, as it appeared in the newspapers this morning. I feel that there is a part of that statement that reflects directly upon all Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats as well—because it infers that the Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, have let off the rich men in the country in the existing income-tax law, which is the law of the land today, that we have for some reason or other let the rich men, who have salaries or incomes of over $67,200, off easily and that we have soaked everybody else but the big fellows who receive the largest incomes and that they do not have to pay their full share of the heavy burden of taxes. Let me quote what the President said as it appears in the newspapers of today:

> Some two or three thousands persons who on September 1942, were receiving salaries in excess of $67,200, may continue to receive them; about 750 persons will be able to receive salaries in excess of $100,000; about 30 persons with salaries in excess of $250,000, and some 3 or 4 persons with salaries in excess of $500,000.

Mr. Speaker, most of those, at least half of them, I believe, come from the State of New York. Very generally when these rich men make a lot of money, they migrate to the State of New York, and of course we welcome them if they spend their money there. I think it is safe to say that at least 50 percent of them live in the State of New York.

I want to impress on the Congress of the United States exactly what these rich men, who receive over $67,200 salary, pay back to the Government, whether you call it a salary, or whether you call it an income—those over $67,200 and up to $500,000. There is scarcely one of them under the present law who can net more than $30,000 a year, and yet the President asked Congress to impose a special war supertax on net incomes from whatever source derived, which, after the payment of all taxes, exceeds $25,000, which is equivalent to a salary or income of $67,200. This proposal, in view of the existing taxes on higher brackets of 88 percent and a 5 percent Victory tax, is political buncombe, deception, and demagogy.

If they receive a $500,000 salary, or a $500,000 income, or $1,000,000, both combined, they would not have a net salary under the present law of over $30,000, because we take 88 percent, and then there is the 5 percent Victory tax, and a 7 percent additional tax in the State of New York. This State tax may be written off the following year on Federal incomes. I believe at least 50 percent of the richest men in the Nation live in New York State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And is it not a fact that the President of the United States signed the very law that he now lays on the shoulders of the Congress?

Mr. FISH. Of course, he signed it; and that law could not go further to soak the rich; and in spite of the fact that that is the law, the President evidently did not know what is in the tax law which he signed when he made that statement, to be read by millions of people. I say again that either he was ignorant of the law or what he said was sheer demagogery. You can take your choice, but those are the facts which I am presenting to you. I am fearful that such loose and inaccurate statements are made for political purposes to pit class against class as part of the fourth-term ideology. The only way to soak the rich any further is through abolishing tax-exempt securities, and that would be unconstitutional. None of these big taxpayers under the present tax law, and not the proposed law or Ruml-Carlson bill, would receive a net of over $30,000. The statement of the President is either demagogery or he does not know anything about the tax law that has been written by the Congress affecting these high brackets. I repeat, virtually none of these men will receive more than $30,000 net, and when the President makes the kind of a statement he did today, and the public is led to believe that Congress is in cahoots with a few rich men and not taxing them to the limit, he is deceiving the American people and promoting class hatred and playing into the hands of the radicals and Communists. We have soaked the rich until they are dry, and have bled them white. Such an attack as made by President Roosevelt today reflects on Congress, is not based upon the facts, and is a disservice to the Nation in time of war, and might very easily undermine the morale of the American people which he so glibly referred to in his statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Could the gentleman take some more time?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take the 5 minutes because I simply want to call attention to a bill which I have pending and which I propose to offer as an amendment to this bill. I am in favor of the Kilday bill. I think it is a good thing to have this declaration on the part of the Congress so as to advise and instruct the draft boards.

In regard to the matter of dependency and deferment because of claim for dependency, I shall offer this bill, which is H. R. 2460, as an amendment, for this reason: It grants to draft boards and to any special committee of Congress investigating deferments on the ground of dependency, access to Federal income-tax reports, in order to find out whether such claim is true or not. I do this for a very simple reason. Several outstanding cases of evasion have arisen. One that was called to my attention involved a deferment on the ground that the selectee claimed his mother was dependent upon him. In my State income-tax reports are public. You can see them without getting the permission of anybody; but that is not true of Federal income-tax reports. In this specific instance it was found that the mother of this boy, who was granted a deferment, owned two large apartment buildings from which she was receiving a very substantial income.

Of course, it must be apparent to everyone that not many cases will have to be investigated. As to those of small income it is readily apparent that their claims can be ascertained without reference to the income-tax report. But if you check back to 1940 when this act was passed, you can pick up much valuable information in regard to these deferments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does this authority to examine income-tax reports go further than giving the authority to draft boards; or can anyone do it?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. No; because this is a part of the Selective Training and Service Act. It is an amendment to that act. So it only grants the power to the boards themselves or to special committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I greatly deplore that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used language in criticism of the President, which, saying the least, is most regrettable. He states the President must be ignorant of the facts or guilty of demagoguery. Of course, I think it is safe to assume that most of the Members, regardless of their political faith, resent such reckless and embittered statements. It is a habit of the gentleman from New York to make from time to time such rash and vitriolic remarks about the President. The President himself is indeed always exceedingly well informed on the war situation and world conditions and is careful and accurate in his statements and makes no misrepresentations. The expressions we have heard here today make the headlines in the unfriendly, biased, and antagonistic newspapers and the gentlemen who make them disregard the fact that their inaccurate, unwarranted, and unwise criticisms are propaganda food for the Hitler Nazis and treacherous Japanese war lords and tend to weaken the country's position in the eyes of the world; and lower the morale of the men and women in our armed forces whom the Congress was instrumental in sending to every section of the globe to fight for the preservation of our freedom and liberty, which, coincidentally, were made possible for us in the first instance by the man in whose honor we will dedicate tomorrow here in Washington the handsomest memorial of its kind in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be possible that any man or any group of men could be so devoid of the patriotism and the sense of duty, which we all owe to our country, as to permit their personal hatred to cause them to expostulate the extremes of caustic criticism against the President, who, notwithstanding attacks on the part of some irresponsibles, has endeavored by the grace of every action to refrain from injecting politics in our war effort. These remarks will not set well with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not object to sincere and honest criticism. It is frequently wholesome and is bound to be productive of much good; but I hope we will be able to refrain from a repetition of the use of such inaccurate and harsh expressions or comment on the President of the kind that I am calling attention to today. It is no time for personal or political hatreds. It is high time that the enemies of the President forego their hatreds and instead of assailing and harassing him and making more difficult the performance of his tremendous responsibilities, we must use our intelligence and influence to the utmost to achieve perfect unity and cooperation everywhere. We owe that not only to our Commander in Chief, but we also owe it to our allies, who have already given thousands upon thousands of lives to the preservation of freedom and liberty. I cherish the hope, Mr. Speaker, that if we cannot have this perfect unity we shall at least have a minimum of discord to avoid retarding the early winning of the war.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York also severely criticizes and takes the President to task for his statement with respect to the limiting of the wealthy to an income of $67,000 yearly, bemoaning that under the present tax law they will have only $30,000 left after the deduction of taxes. In this the gentleman is in error because these poor unfortunates, besides receiving salaries, also draw bonuses, dividends, and profits, and I, therefore, suggest to my colleague that he not become unduly worried about his wealthy constituents.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend the remarks I made heretofore as well as these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1730) to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1730, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the pending measure, but desire to speak generally on the situation and what has brought about the condition that makes necessary this legislation.

Of course, the membership understands that the Selective Training and Service Act has already been amended in several particulars. This committee recalls that when the Committee on Military Affairs of the House reported what is known as the pay and allotment bill during the last Congress, we set forth a principle that had prompted the committee to pass such legislation in title II of that bill. That principle, as stated in the report of the committee at that time, hinges around the perpetuity of the American home as an institution. I think I said at that time that I regarded the American home as the basic institution of our civilization, and I have not changed my views on that subject in the slightest. That was brought about very largely on the recommendation of the Selective Service Bureau, because I recall that when we reported the bill and while it was pending there was a request from the Selective Service Bureau that we include title II of that bill, which contained the statement that is now contained and repeated in this report on H. R. 1730.

We have repeated that in this report because we believed in it and we thought that if we must take men who have families that they ought to be taken only when all other sources of manpower have been exhausted, that is all other reasonable sources. I am not going to take time to read what we reported in this report, but I am going to say that when the House passed the Selective Service and Training Act with that report before them they knew the basic principle to which we were adhering, and that constitutes approval by the Congress, especially since it was written into law.

This bill does three things, and there are some things it does not do. It does not provide that married men shall not be inducted into the service. First the bill sets up categories, lists them. Second, it provides that men shall be called in accordance and in line with these categories, and it places married men at the end of the list of categories, as I understand it, to be called if, and when, the other categories are exhausted.

The third thing the bill does is to place the calling up of men on a State-wide

basis rather than on the basis of local communities or local board jurisdictions. Our committee heard exhaustive testimony on this particular subject, and this you will find in the hearings. As a result of the hearings we found that many abuses existed in the method of calling men to service under the Selective Service Act, not because of anybody's desire to do anything wrong nor because of anybody's desire to discriminate or show favoritism to any particular group but because of many misunderstandings that were brought about by change of attitude on the part of the Selective Service Bureau and by many changes in regulations which I do not have time now to discuss.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that confusion throughout the country continues to disturb the minds and mar the efforts of local draft boards, not especially because of regulations by the Federal Selective Service Bureau but because other agencies of Government have injected themselves into the situation and as a result directives and executive rulings come thick and fast and no two of them look alike, much less read alike. That is the reason we make this legislation mandatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes or so much thereof as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me until recently that there was entirely too much loose talk throughout the country. I mean statements, articles, and expressions relating to our military program, most of which have not been based upon fact and without knowledge of the actual plans of our military leaders. I refer to published views by all sorts of civic and patriotic organizations, some self-inspired articles by columnists, and a number of speeches in both Houses of Congress on various phases of our military situation. In these times, no doubt, this is to be expected, for we as a people and Nation are a group of individuals, very prone at times, in the vernacular, to running the ball team from the bleachers, the grandstand, or even from the front office.

For example, there were the demands last year for a second front, while one was being planned, and then the criticism following, of how our leaders in north Africa were handling this situation, some of this from the very persons who had howled loudest for a second front. Then the cry of Why not more help to Russia? and recent testimony has revealed that in 1 month Russia received more assistance from us than did England. Lately it has been: Help now for China; bomb Japan out; open the Burma Road; blot out Berlin; or how to win the war. Most of these suggestions, it would seem, came from those who wished to qualify for the I-told-you-so group. There were those who bemoaned the fact that Stalin and the Generalissimo, Kai-shek, were not present at Casablanca; but do any of those who made such utterances know why? Or are they sure that China and Russia are not in accord with what is being done and the momentous decisions arrived at on that occasion? The question has been raised in the Senate of what we will do if Stalin stops at the Russian border. If any in this country know, would you have them answer to the world now, when our course is laid and we are in it to the finish anyway? I hope that before long we, as a people, and we, their Representatives in the Congress, will realize that this war, to be won, must of necessity be one of secret planning—planning which must also include great deception. A true course of secrecy and deception makes hard rations in news for the American people, the Congress, the press, and radio, upon which the American people have become so dependent.

There were those who would have published on Main Street at once the name of every American ship sunk, where it sank, and when. And to some extent this same feeling still persists. In this connection, have you every heard of the launching of a Japanese battleship when in this country we gave for a time full publicity with particulars on all our launchings?

We are all too prone to say something, and most of our comments on military matters get headlines, with the result that by such statements we risk embarrassing our military leaders, to whom we have entrusted the responsibility of prosecuting our war.

For the past 8 years I have served as the ranking minority member of the Military Committee and, as such, have beer associated with three great chiefs of staff, General MacArthur, General Craig, and now General Marshall; and right here let me say that if we, their representatives, and the people of the country had followed their recommendations in turn, we would be a lot better off today. I do not think that any member of the Military Committee has ever received one word or intimation from General Marshall as to any strategic plan of the American Army, and properly so, for were it otherwise it would weaken the great confidence we all have in General Marshall and the General Staff. Therefore, I urge that we all refrain from loose comment on our military operations. It is dangerous, and in many ways, of which we cannot possibly be aware, such action may involve us in difficulties with our allies, to say nothing of comfort to our enemies.

I am glad to say that this general point of view, which I have outlined is being more and more understood by great numbers of the people. The facts are that with some initial military successes they have come to have confidence in the direction of our present military policy.

We must respect this great confidence, which we rightfully have in our military leaders, because of their accomplishments to date—and this brings me to my point in connection with the proposed further amendment of the Selective Servive Act and to which amendment I am opposed. When the original bill was enacted in 1940 it was for training and service only during a period of peacetime. To be sure there were many who hoped that it might not have to be extended. Fortunately for the country, however, it was extended and not long before Pearl Harbor. Then the age limits were lowered—first, to 20 and finally, last fall, to 18 years of age. Of course, being in the war has, from time to time, changed our ideas and estimates and those of the General Staff on liability for service and experience once more has been a great teacher. Moreover, I do not say that the War Department and the selective service organization have not made mistakes. Of course they have; so have we in our votes in the Congress. But we are now, more so than ever, up against the most serious threat and test which this country has experienced in its history and considering a measure which would make it mandatory to send single men into service before fathers or fathers with dependents. Do we want to send single young men, 18, 19, or 20 years old, in each State into the Army, the Navy, or Marine Corps before fathers or fathers with dependents? Is this America? Does this represent the spirit of the men who built up this country, defended it and fought for it in every war we have experienced? I wonder what Colin Kelly would say? What thousands of fine American fathers in the fox-holes say and what the mothers of young 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old sons think today?

Summarizing General Hershey's recent testimony: There are approximately 22,000,000 men between 18 and 38 years of age in this country and this figure includes those already in the armed services. Of that total number about 9,000,000 would be or have been physically disqualified for military service on the basis of a rejection rate of 40 percent. This leaves a balance of 13,000,000 men. From this we must deduct about a million and a half physically qualified farmers, who would be deferred by the end of this year under the amendment of last fall. That is the Tydings amendment; and in addition there are more who would be deferred under recent Executive orders.

This leaves a net pool of eleven and a half million. Remember—that this figure includes approximately 8,000,000 men now in the Army, the Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, and from this remainder of three and a half million we must deduct physically qualified men of such ages required as necessary men for essential civilian industrial war effort work. Furthermore, at the present time we are discharging from the service for psychoneurosis, real and fancied duodenal ulcers and other reasons at the rate of 400,000 annually. Beyond that we must anticipate battle casualties in killed and wounded—and which in all probability may equal nonbattle casualty discharges. These figures clearly indicate that to attain an armed force of the size contemplated by the Chiefs of Staff, it will be necessary to induct by the end of this year a very large percentage of all physically qualified men between the ages of 18 and 38, and including those with wives and children. It follows, therefore, that any bill, not intended to interfere with these plans and recommendations with respect to ultimate requirements of

the armed forces cannot postpone the induction of fathers for any appreciable length of time. There is a general misunderstanding in this regard now existing on the part of Members of the Congress and their constituents. This must be clarified without further delay. The facts must be made plain so that citizens will not be misled. We must not contribute to such confusion. The element of time—the demands of the armed services and the necessity for a continuing operation and thorough training without further change of policy make this proposal unwise.

The facts are that with or without the proposed measure—we are down to hardpan or bedrock, whichever you may call it.

To use the baseball vernacular again, "The American League season is over." It ended on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor. We are now in the "world's series" and I can understand for the first time why that famous sports writer, Ring Lardner, always referred to the world's series as the world's serious. As a matter of fact we lost the first game in the Pacific almost by a shut-out and we are now in the opening innings of the second game. Yes; the Yanks are in the world's serious again and it is not being played in a stadium in New York City. Small wonder that Joe DiMaggio will not be in center field this year and the same goes for Barney Ross, Bob Feller, Bobby Jones, Frankie Sinkwich, Don Budge, good old Hank Gowdy, and many others. They will all be in the stadium again, but when the final game is played, it will be in the world stadium somewhere overseas and that is where every able-bodied young man, single or married, not required for or necessary to the war effort at home should be, if we are going to win the odd game and the series.

It is not all conquered by the Reds on the Russian front. There is a reason for the German retreat. There is a reason, also, for Rommel's retreat in North Africa. There is a real second front. It has been the terrific night after night and day after day pounding by the R. A. F. and American bombers over Europe and Germany—and our own daring expedition to Africa and its amalgamation with the gallant British Army.

If I may be privileged to do some guessing on my own—there is going to be a new line or it may be called a Hitler defensive European ring—stronger and longer than the Hindenburg line of the last war. This, with our allies, we must be prepared to break through before long. To break it, moreover, will require everything we have both over there and back here at home. And, hard as it will be for us, there must come real privation and sorrow in hundreds of thousands of American families. Things are going to be a lot worse before we see them really better. We are down to hardpan or bedrock now.

We will have to get along without much gasoline, meat, fuel, and hundreds of things and possibly even fewer ball games if they must be played by young men fit for and to the exclusion of either military or war effort service at home. On this latter subject—we hear a good deal of this or that for morale and they point to what England does in this connection. But England has not won the war yet and neither have we.

I say to you, forget this proposed legislation and let us get down to hardpan. You know what we were elected for last fall—to win the war, of course—but chiefly to see to it that our war effort, particularly at home, is properly and efficiently administered. Cut out nonessentials and let us get down to business.

Right here may I also say something of a proposed visit to Africa by members of the Truman committee or the Senate or House Committee on Military Affairs. This is no time for such an expedition by any of us.

For some time Senate groups have argued or talked of unified command. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Senate leadership itself cannot decide which of its groups would be entitled to go to Africa and are obliged to ask the General Staff to settle their dispute—I hope General Eisenhower will send word that he wants no one over there now. Aside from a few millions cut from appropriation measures totaling billions and the question of lend-lease, we, the Congress, have as yet scarcely scratched the surface. What about a sound tax bill, the vital question of really solving our manpower problem, the labor situation and strikes, the question of food and proper rationing of many essential items—waste and inefficiency in bureaucratic administration? These are some of the really pressing problems, which should command our immediate attention. We know things must be improved.

So far as our military situation is concerned, however, let us all have faith in our military leaders. I refer to the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and his able assistants, Judge Patterson, McCloy, and Lovett, the four civilian heads of the War Department, all four of them soldiers in their own right, with previous military experience in the last war.

But chiefly, I refer to General Marshall, General McArthur, General Eisenhower, General Arnold, and Generals Somervell, McNair, Clark, Eichelberger, Andrews, Stillwell, Patton, Harmon, Kenney, Spaatz, Weaver, Doolittle, and many more.

Look back only 2 or 3 years and you must realize what magnificent headway, sometimes against our own opposition and at great odds, these men, civilians and professionals alike, have made. We must follow their suggestions and back them to the limit, and unless the provisions of this bill are changed so that they are eminently satisfactory to the War Department and the Selective Service I am opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 1 minute.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I say to the gentleman from New York that there is not a member of the House Military Affairs Committee who feels that by supporting this legislation he is in any wise blocking or interfering with or even criticizing the war effort, or the management of our military effort by the military leadership. On the contrary, I desire the committee to know that regardless of what you hear or what you see in the papers, there has never been a recommendation by the Secretary of War, by the Chief of Staff, or by any of the high military authorities, to your House Military Affairs Committee that there were any plans for an army beyond 7,500,000 men. On the contrary, when we had under consideration the drafting of the 18-year-old boys, Secretary Stimson, as Secretary of War, stated to the committee definitely and positively that the war plans provided only for that number and we have had no other plans submitted to us since then.

On the subject of proposed or supposed or anticipated junkets of any kind to north Africa or anywhere else, without reference to the membership of the body at the other end of the Capitol, no member of my committee as an investigating committee, or otherwise, will go to north Africa on a voucher signed by me for any expenses for that purpose. Neither will I propose such a thing to the Chief of Staff or the Secretary of War. Furthermore, I find I have more work than I can do here in Washington, and I am not going to junket all the way to north Africa, or elsewhere, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, supporting this legislation with the hope that every possible and consistent consideration may be given to fathers. The home is the foundation of our civilization. The presence there of the father better insures its sanctity and security. My main purpose, however, in speaking today for 5 minutes is to try to be helpful to the war effort in general.

I was deeply impressed by the splendid and able statements recently made by the gentleman from New York. He indicates his expectation that we may have ultimately a line to cross which will surpass in its strength and fighting possibilities the Hindenberg line. It indicates that the gentleman has given broad and comprehensive thought and study to the various ramifications of this war and our place in it. In that connection, and this is the purpose of my little statement, may I say that I received a few days ago a communication in the form of a short letter from a former West Point man, a high officer in the last World War, a man who has no more interest in Florida or New York than he has in any place else in our Nation, a man who has offered his services again to the armed forces of our country and who probably will be called.

He stated very much what the gentleman from New York has just said and he

went further and stated that the demand for oil and gasoline on our ultimate fighting front, probably in Europe, would be many times perhaps as great as it is today. He said on this oil supply and fuel supply being made available to that offensive rested the fact whether or not that offensive would be successful or perhaps collapse. He said that the only hope for that supply to reach this offensive in its climax and to be effective was to have the supply of fuel on the Atlantic coast in time to get it there. Furthermore, he said that under our existing methods of transportation and transportation possibilities to the east coast of the United States he gravely doubted that the supply could be had.

He recommended that the Congress lay aside any differences that it may have, forget controversies which it may have, and that those who had leanings to the fleshpots should come out of the fleshpots and give an appropriation for a barge canal connecting the intercoastal waterways of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. I did not intend to inject this into the debate, but I just feel it my duty to state this view held by one who is eminent in the mastery of all war strategy and technique, who has no interest whatsoever in the matter except the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am anxious to know what the gentleman's position is on the pending bill?

Mr. GREEN. I said in the very beginning that I favored the bill, and favored every possible and consistent consideration for fathers and their homes.

The following letter is from Mr. James H. C. Hill, of Tampa, Fla., and addressed to Hon. Hansel Leavengood, publisher of the Ocala Evening Star, Ocala, Fla., as follows:

TAMPA, FLA., *April 3, 1943.*

Mr. HANSEL LEAVENGOOD,
Publisher, Ocala Evening Star,
Ocala, Fla.

DEAR HANSEL: You are a close friend of LEX GREEN, so I request you submit him the following idea for use in his great fight for the barge canal, that is, if you think it has merit.

The idea is for securing the support of Members of Congress who formerly have been indifferent to the canal. These Congressmen should be shown that:

Several times last year, emergency war demands practically drained dry the Atlantic seaboard's supply of oil and gasoline. Although our oil and gasoline supplies have been moderately increased since then, our overseas army has been tremendously increased—in much greater proportion than our east coast gasoline supplies.

New emergency demands this year from our enlarged forces probably will be for quantities larger than before, possibly for larger quantities even than we can assemble on the Atlantic seaboard with present modestly enlarged facilities, that is, and keep the civilian war effort functioning too. This is not all.

Our leaders admit it will be a long war, a war that will not be won until we invade Europe. We are straining every effort to build an overseas invasion force of enormous size. Physical limitations prohibit us from assembling in Africa or England the proper sized invasion armies in less than 12 or 15 months. When such an invasion does start, anything can happen.

If the enemy is successful in destroying our gasoline supplies our Army is helpless. Our airplanes, tanks, gun carriers, and trucks are all useless until we can rush gasoline across the Atlantic. To meet such emergency demands, adequate supplies should be stored at the nearest place, which is the Atlantic seaboard. The quantities of gasoline and oil demanded in the emergencies arising from an all-out invasion of Europe will be tremendous and colossal, vastly in excess of our present facilities, and we should do something about it.

We have the time (12 to 15 months) before the all-out invasion can get started. We can build our barge canal to furnish sufficient oil and gasoline in the allotted time, and meet the colossal emergency requirements as they may arise at the beginning of the invasion, and continue to arise until the war is won.

Members of Congress appropriate millions of dollars for cruisers and aircraft carriers which cannot be completed under 2 or 3 years. They should be equally willing to promote the war effort by appropriating for a canal to be built in 12 months if they can be shown its true military supply value. It will guarantee the adequate and available supply of the most vital military necessity of all—gasoline for our overseas forces.

You may send the Honorable LEX GREEN this letter if you want. I still remember him most favorably.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. C. HILL.

This communication coming from a West Point man and former officer with our armed forces, I know is of interest to all of you who are so conscientiously trying to aid the war effort in every way possible. I present it to you in no thought of controversy or partiality and with the sole motive of trying to be helpful. I feel a grave responsibility in the present oil and fuel shortage on the east Atlantic coast of our country. As this shortage intensifies, more keenly do I and will you feel the responsibility and the dereliction in duty of the Congress in failing to provide every possible avenue of transportation of oil and other war essential products from the central and western portion of our country to the eastern manufacturing and distribution seaboard centers of our country.

Long ago should we, the Congress, have appropriated the required $44,000,000 to dredge this missing link in the barge canal reaching from the oil and sulfur fields of Mississippi and Louisiana to upper New Jersey on the east coast. Hundreds and millions of dollars have been expended by the Government in the construction of the existing land-locked coastal waterways now in existence. There remains in this waterway a missing link across the upper part of the peninsula of Florida. The matter was not so forcefully brought to our minds prior to the war crisis but with the impending war crisis, it is a responsibility now which the Congress cannot longer dodge.

I speak, I hope, not particularly as a representative of any specific area of the United States but speak as an American citizen, interested in providing every possible avenue of aid to the war effort which is growing real in intensity and magnitude. With all of the railroad facilities, with all of the pipe-line facilities possibly obtainable, and with this barge canal, we will not be able to get to the east Atlantic seaboard any more oil and petroleum products than will be needed. Without the construction of this barge canal, it is definite and obvious that, regardless of the supremacy of our effort, we will be unable to get to the Atlantic coastal shipping points adequate fuel supply for the ultimate and definite climax of our supreme war effort in Europe. You gentlemen, I know, realize this, and I feel that you will now place behind you any petty differences, as I have already done, and rise to the occasion and perform your duty. Arguments and rumblings in the past are as a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. We are faced with actualities and emergency. The emergency will grow more and more grave. Our final and supreme offensive in the European invasion campaign which we know will come sooner or later will collapse unless adequate fuel is there for the use of our war machines and equipment.

I shall not at this time go into the present and ever-increasing fuel shortage and acuteness in the east coast States because, while I know it is of great seriousness and will next winter and the following winter, perhaps reach far more drastic proportions, it is, after all, secondary to the prosecution of the war in actual line of battle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I endorse thoroughly the statements made by the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, to the effect that the prosecution of the war is and must be in the hands of those leaders who have been chosen to carry it on. I have consistently as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs insisted that all matters of strategy involved in the war be left to military commanders without any hindrance from Congress or anyone else.

On the other hand, in time of war as in time of peace we as the Congress have a very definite duty and obligation to perform. In each instance when legislation is proposed I feel that we should examine it carefully to determine whether the question involved be one of strategy or one of legislative policy. In the past we have too frequently relied upon the executive branch of the Government in determining whether or not legislation should be enacted.

I feel that in connection with the war effort we have made some very serious mistakes in following the lead of the executive departments on matters which related to legislative policy and civilian economy rather than to questions of strategy.

I think anyone acquainted with the subject will agree that we made a very serious mistake last fall when we lowered the draft age to 18, and then agreed to a conference report which eliminated my amendment permitting those boys in school to complete their academic year. In one fell swoop we disrupted and abolished our educational system. We did it without any planning, without a program prepared for the utilization of those

men. We took them out of the schools before the Army itself was ready to utilize their services.

In this instance we are dealing with a matter that has no connection, no relationship to the strategic prosecution of the war. We are dealing here with a matter that relates to legislative policy and to our civilian economy. We are dealing here with a civilian question and not a military question.

I want to make definitely clear the position the War Department has taken on this bill. Brig. Gen. M. G. White appeared before the committee in his capacity as G–1, the Chief of Personnel of the General Staff, and stated opposition to the bill. After the bill was pending before the Committee on Rules, the chairman of that committee asked the War Department to state its position on the bill to the Committee on Rules. In a letter signed by Secretary Stimson and dated March 16 of this year, the War Department gave its views on the bill. The portion of the letter relating to the views of the Department on the bill has been incorporated in part III, the supplemental report on the bill, and I ask particularly that the Members read the letter and note the position taken by the Secretary of War. I think you will find that the supplemental report contains an accurate statement when it states that the opposition expressed by the Secretary of War was to the construction of the bill as carried in the original report and not to the bill as reported by the committee.

I think you will see that the original statement in the report was inaccurate and that inaccuracy has been cured by the supplemental report. I call your attention to the fact that the Secretary has said:

> If, on the other hand, the proposed legislation could be interpreted and administered as merely establishing a uniformity of procedure within the States so that unmarried men and men without dependents would be called for induction when possible before married men and men with dependents, without precluding the actual induction of the latter so long as any of the former had not been inducted, the War Department would have no objection to the bill.

I refer you now to the correct construction of the bill as contained in that supplemental report and ask your consideration of it in connection with the quoted statement from the Secretary of War.

Mr. Chairman, this bill accomplishes three objectives.

First. It provides that men who have not been deferred because of occupational reasons shall be divided into four categories with references to persons dependent upon them for support.

Second. It requires that men assigned to those various categories be called for induction in the order in which the categories are listed in the bill.

Third. It provides that those in lower categories shall not be called for induction prior to the call for induction of all persons placed in higher categories within the State in which the registrant lives. In other words, it places the quotas on a State-wide basis rather than the local board basis as at present.

I want to make it clear that nowhere in this bill is it provided that men with families shall be deferred. This bill provides an orderly procedure under which every man registered under the terms of the Selective Service Act and within the age bracket liable for service may be called under the provisions of my bill. It goes this far, however. It says that every individual case shall be settled according to the facts of that particular case. It says that with reference to persons dependent upon the registrant for support he shall be assigned to one or the other of these four categories.

In all frankness and all candor, the bill does not say to heads of families, "You will be exempt from service." It simply says that so long as there are those without dependents, those without families, the family will be preserved. But it goes on, too, to say just as strongly that if we need every married man and every family man in the United States in order to win this war we will take them under the terms of this bill. That is the effect of it.

Frankly, the practical reason it was offered was to prevent the use of the Selective Service Act to fill the office of a national service act. For some reason or other, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, who by Executive order has been designated as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, now sees fit to fail to recommend the passage of a national service act. It is true that before a congressional committee some months back and prior to the time that he individually was clothed with power by Executive order to handle the manpower situation, he recommended the adoption of a national service act.

We are practical men, and we realize that there are powerful influences and organizations in the country which oppose the adoption of the National Service Act. I take it that it has been determined that it would be easier to attempt to use the machinery of the Selective Service System for that purpose than to face the opposition which will come against the National Service Act.

This law was never designed to serve the purposes of a national service act. It is impossible to adapt it to the purposes of a national service act. All the directives you have seen recently and their conflicting provisions arise from an attempt to use this law for a purpose for which it is not adaptable.

I hold in my hand clippings from newspapers with reference to the local board releases of the Selective Service System. I have them here only from February 2 of this year, the date of the work-or-fight order, as to 29 occupations. It is correct to say that here are eight separate directives from the War Manpower Commission as to the proper classification of men in nonessential industries and men with dependents. None of them are alike. All of them are conflicting. In today's paper we have a brand new one which has none of the elements of any of these eight which have preceded it since the 2d day of February.

I say to you there is not a man in the United States between 18 and 45 years of age who can tell from day to day where he stands with reference to his registration under the Selective Service Act. I say to you that the families throughout the country are kept in constant turmoil and uncertainty by these conflicting rulings. I say it is high time for us to discharge our legislative function and to place the question of deferment upon an orderly and a sound basis such as is provided in my bill.

The gentleman from New York raises the question as to the propriety of arranging the categories on the basis of family dependency.

May I say to you, first, that we were sold the Selective Service Act back in 1940 on some very powerful representations made to us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the author of the bill, was most persuasive, and General Hershey, then a major on the General Staff, appeared constantly for weeks while we were considering the bill. General Shedd, then G–1 of the Army, appeared. I refer you back to the hearings on this bill in 1940, and you will find that the committee and the Congress were sold selective service on the unequivocal statement that dependency would always constitute an element in considering the question of deferment. I say to you in two wars it has been the estabilshed policy of this Government to consider the question of dependency in passing upon deferments. I say that the congressional intent in the original act, and in the amendments that have been adopted since its original adoption, has always been clearly and unmistakably that you shall take into consideration questions of dependency in passing on deferment. I say it is an attempt to repeal our legislative enactments by administrative decrees when an attempt is made to use this law now for a purpose for which it was not intended, contrary to the purpose and intent of the Congress, as clearly expressed in these various pieces of legislation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, also, that the same consideration was given to the matter of family relationship, and that, as a matter of fact, when our committee insisted on writing an amendment to make dependency the primary ground for deferment, rather than family relationship, in the case of married men, where the wife was not dependent upon the husband financially, that the Selective Service insisted that that be removed, and insisted that the family relationship ought to be one of the grounds for deferment.

Mr. KILDAY. And may I say to the gentleman from Alabama that that question was definitely involved in title 2 of the allotment and allowance bill in which we amended the Selective Service Act, and imported into it at that time the entire question of family relationship within the home, and provided that the allowance to be paid would not be the only feature in determining it, and that there should be taken into consideration the sanctity of the American home in passing on any question of deferment, and that is the fixed policy of law, and these new

directives are in direct contravention of it.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. My colleague has made reference to the legislative intent. Frankly I think there has been considerable confusion about the construction and interpretation by people of my colleague's bill. In fact, I have had some confusion about it. However, that has been clarified somewhat by the letter of the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Rules Committee dated March 16, to which my colleague has referred. To make sure of the legislative intent I would like to ask the gentleman, since he is the author of the bill, whether he concurs in the statement made by the Secretary that this bill, if it becomes law, is to be interpreted and administered so that both unmarried men, and men without dependents would be called for induction when possible, before married men and men with dependents, without precluding actual induction of the latter, so long as any of the former have not been inducted?

Mr. KILDAY. And I say to my colleague that is exactly correct, and it comes about in this way. As I originally drafted the bill on page 3, line 9, I had provided that—

> No person assigned to any of said categories shall be inducted prior to the induction of all persons within the same State who have been placed in categories herein made subject to induction prior to the category in which such person has been placed.

In committee, because of objection raised by the Assistant Chief of Staff, General White, I offered the amendment, which struck out the word "inducted" and inserted the words "called for induction." Here is the point. Induction is the physical act of taking the oath of the soldier. It is accomplished by the Army and not the Selective Service System. It is accomplished by the Army at its induction center. In other words, selective service sends a man to the induction center, and from then on he is a part of the Army, because he is sworn in. Had the original language remained in the bill, the induction officer could never have administered the oath, because he had no means of telling whether a man who was sent there was in a category which is subject to induction, within his State, so that when we changed the language to "called for induction" that makes it a function exclusively of the Selective Service System, and when that system sends a man to an induction center, he is subject to be sworn in and becomes a soldier, so that there would not be a determination of whether anybody had been inducted, but whether they had been called for induction.

Mr. THOMASON. I thank my colleague, the author of the bill, for this construction that he, as the author, puts upon it and if that is the legislative intent, then I am in accord with the purpose the gentleman seeks to achieve with this bill, and that fact, by the process of elimination, brings the question down to this, and I quote the concluding sentence from the Secretary of War's letter, which I think justifies some qualification:

> It is further to be noted that upon this interpretation of the bill its enactment is unnecessary as the Selective Service System is now accomplishing the same result.

Mr. KILDAY. I challenge anybody to tell what the Selective Service System is accomplishing by the 8 or 10 releases they have issued within the last 45 days.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not taking issue with the gentleman on that. I think on the whole they have done a fine job, but I do think that in determining legislative intent and also just how the law is to be administered, it is worthy of comment by the gentleman as to why his bill is necessary in view of the existing statute.

Mr KILDAY. The statement in the letter of the Secretary is not entirely accurate, because it refers to the instruction issued to State directors of Selective Service, that they should consider the advisability of creating pools of single men and to exhaust them within their States before they would resort to men in other categories as to dependency. In some of the States they have carried that out. In others they have not, because it is not mandatory on them. They would do it if they wanted to, or they would not do it if they did not want to. The result is a great deal of uncertainty and lack of uniformity in the various States on that question.

The question arises as to the attempt to use this bill for coercive purposes and holding a threat over men that you are going to have to go into this necessary industry or that necessary industry or you will be subject to draft. Never should a man in uniform be under the odium that that is why he is in the service. It is a grave responsibility, but it is a high honor for a citizen to serve in the armed forces of the Nation, and he should not be subjected to the odium that there is some other reason why he is in the uniform.

Mr. THOMASON. I heartily agree with my colleague on that, but is that not largely the fault of the local boards and their lack of uniformity?

Mr. KILDAY. No. I am sorry to say it is due entirely and exclusively to the action of Mr. Paul V. McNutt in stating the 29 industries that would not be entitled to dependency deferments. His order of the second day of February in which he said that in those 29 industries, no matter whether a man was married, with a totally dependent wife and babies, he is not going to be given deferment unless he is in an essential industry. It may be that a man is living 500 miles from the nearest essential industry. Then he is going to have to move to that town, I take it, in order to take such a position in an essential industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. After he gets there he does not know whether he is going to be permitted to take the job or not, because it may be a closed shop and he may not belong to that union. He may not qualify under their bylaws. They may not accept him. It may be that the initiation fee is more than he is able to pay. But still under the order of Paul V. McNutt he is going to have to go over there and try to get into that essential industry. I say to you that a man who is not in an essential industry should be placed in an essential industry. That is correct. But we should do it positively and directly, and we should not take a law that is designed for the purpose of producing fighting men and use it for that purpose, because the compulsion then is only on that age bracket subject to military service. Then you are going to have all of your essential industry handled by those who are also liable for fighting service in the Army.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with that, but is that not up to the local boards? They have the power and discretion to act if they want to exercise it.

Mr. KILDAY. Not under the present policy of the War Manpower Commission. That is not correct. That was correct in the days when General Hershey had complete charge of Selective Service. I agree with you that Selective Service on the whole has done an excellent job. I say particularly that those volunteers out in the country who have served on these draft boards, and as appeal agents and advisers, are entitled to a great deal of credit and praise from this Congress. But it functioned much better when it was not under the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I want to say to the gentleman that I am in hearty accord with every statement he has made. I would ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that it was the opinion of most of the members on the Military Affairs Committee that the order issued by Mr. McNutt on February 2 last, his so-called work or fight order, was absolutely without authority?

Mr. KILDAY. There can be no doubt about it. That was entirely beyond his authority in the administration of that law.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further I would like to ask if the amendment which is included in the last paragraph of the gentleman's bill, providing, "nor shall individuals be called for induction for such training and service, or be inducted, because of their occupations or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institution," does not completely nullify the unlawful and unwarranted order of Mr. McNutt and places the administration of the Selective Service Act where it belongs, namely, in the hands of the draft boards?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. I was glad to support this language, which was offered as an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. I think the gentleman's amendment makes it much clearer and carries out what should have been the construction of the original act, because we provided in that act that men should

not be deferred by occupational groups or otherwise, and would be deferred as to the facts in each individual case. I say the logical conclusion would have been to go to the converse of it, that they should not be inducted by occupational groups, and I think that is the proper construction. But your language makes it safe and does prevent the present efforts to use this law for something that it is not adapted to and which is losing confidence in the Selective Service System every day this policy continues.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] speaking with reference to the induction of married men stated they should not be deferred because of marital status or dependents. I have referred to the fact that in two wars it has been our policy to take those facts into consideration in passing upon deferment. The thing goes much deeper than that. The second question is the question of cost. The cost of maintaining a single man with the armed forces is approximately half the cost of maintaining a married man because you have to pay to the family of the married man the allotments and allowances that are theirs under the law. In addition to this he may be injured or killed while serving in the Army which would make the cost immeasurably more if they have dependents or a family. There are other reasons too, but the family life of this Nation is of far more importance than the directives of Mr. Paul V. McNutt. There is not a community in the United States in which juvenile delinquency has not already risen because of the dislocations in society which have taken place incident to the war. When husband and father leave the home to go off into the armed services and we send the mother out of that home to work in a factory or some other place this deprives the children of the guidance, protection, and discipline of both parents. This is something which means so much to the life of America that if there were no other reasons for the adoption of this bill, if it did not accomplish anything more than to hold the family together for a few days or a few weeks it would be worth every effort that is put forth here.

I am for winning the war with all that it takes, but I say to you that it is not possible for an administrative agency to take arbitrary positions with reference to the most sacred relationships in life. You are not going to be able to maintain here a nation and a society under all of the dislocations of war and permit this sort of thing to go on. This bill will be a definite promotion of the war effort. There is not a man who has studied this bill carefully and without a prejudiced mind who will say to you that it could in any way hamper the Selective Service System. Many of the local boards realize it will really be a promotion of the effectiveness of the Selective Service System. I submit, Mr. Chairman, this bill should be adopted.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this House some time ago passed a bill which included the substance of the gentleman's bill which is before us today?

Mr. KILDAY. It passed here practically unanimously, I may say to the gentleman, in connection with the draft of the 18- and 19-year-olds. It was much simpler in form at that time because now the categories established by Selective Service System regulations are carried into my bill. If the gentleman will read the language of the bill he will find that it is the language of the Selective Service System regulations as they were placed into effect after title II of the allotment and allowances bill was enacted providing for the creation of categories. They created these categories; and in the 18- and 19-year-old draft act we had a provision for State-wide selection which I have placed in this bill. There was a provision in there that a man assigned to a lower category should not be called until those in higher categories within his State had been exhausted. Unfortunately that went out in conference.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman further if it is not a fact that even though that went out in conference that went out because the language finally adopted was considered to be sufficient? I will ask the gentleman whether or not in the conference report this language did not appear:

> The effect of these amendments is to make it clear that under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 it will be possible to carry out the policy expressed in the report of the House committee on H. R. 7119, to the effect that established families should be preserved insofar as is practicable and should not be indiscriminately uprooted. To this end, these amendments authorize the deferment of men with wives and children until after the available single men have been inducted.

Mr. KILDAY. That was our declaration at the time. That statement is carried into the report on this bill, that portion the gentleman has just read.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAY. I have heard it discussed on the floor that this bill would probably defer by groups those engaged in essential industries in the country and the production of war materials. I should like to have the gentleman emphasize the provision of the bill which relates to that particular subject.

Mr. KILDAY. If you will look at page 1, line 6, you will find the provision which reads as follows:

> (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

That is exactly the language of existing law readopted here, and it contains all of the law that there is now for occupational deferments, and it carries forward exactly the same condition of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SASSCER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand the application of the regulations of the selective service, after a certain date marriages contracted and children born are not in the same category.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. This bill carries the existing regulations of the Selective Service System with reference to marriage into its provisions.

Mr. SASSCER. That is what I want to ask the gentleman. As I read the act there is apparently no differentiation made in the act between persons who were fathers prior to either Pearl Harbor or selective service and persons who have become fathers since then?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. Under the act they would all be in the same category.

Mr. SASSCER. They would all be in the same category?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. SASSCER. But the provision as to marriage is retained as it was in selective service?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. It had to be before December 8, 1941, and at a time when induction was not imminent.

Mr. SASSCER. What was the reason, or was there a reason for any differentiation between children of parents where the birth took place before and after that date?

Mr. KILDAY. It makes no difference to society, the way I view the matter, when the child was born. We have not reached the degree of perfection where we are going to be able to determine the reasons for the birth of a child. I realize that there are some in the administrative agencies who have assumed that obligation unto themselves. I say to you that I have great admiration for these supermen.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I call the gentleman's attention to the committee amendment on page 3, lines 9 and 10, to which the gentleman has already referred and ask for a little information about it? It provides now that no person assigned to any State categories—those are the categories mentioned on page 2, in the order of their obligation to meet the induction order—shall be called for induction prior to the calling of those senior categories, if I may use that term, until all the members of the senior category have been called for induction. Am I wrong in getting this picture of it: We will say that in a given State there are 10,000 single men still left uncalled for induction. No married man may be called for induction until all 10,000 single men have been called; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What would be the practical effect in the orderly recruitment of the Army and Navy in such a situation? We will take a State the size of Illinois or New York where the law would say to all the draft boards of the State: None of you shall call a married man for induction until the last single man in the State is called for induction. Would it not have the effect of dwindling and tapering down the increment of recruits coming into the service?

Mr. KILDAY. By no means. It could not possibly have that effect. If a call went to my State for 2,000 men and there are only a thousand single men left, I say that the call will be filled with a thousand single men and a thousand married men in the next order of priority of these categories. The point is when you say, "Called for induction" you prevent the situation which might arise because within the State there would always be some men called for induction who have their cases on appeal, so, having been called then you would still be in a position to go to the next category, even though he had not actually been inducted. That is the change we effected in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Texas in his argument in support of the pending legislation. I want to join with him in condemning these bureaucratic directives that try to put men into the armed forces of this country by threats and coercion.

I believe that every red-blooded American considers it a privilege and an honor to wear the uniform of his country, and resents any orders or directives that threaten induction into the military forces as punishment. The act should be administered as was intended by Congress in an orderly manner, calling registrants on the basis of their relationship to persons dependent upon them. This bill, if enacted, will force that procedure. If there is doubt in the mind of anyone here that draft boards throughout the country are calling married men with children, I hope you will indulge me for just a minute while I read two recent letters that came to me from my district, one of them as recently as the first day of April, this year. This constituent writes me in part as follows:

> Received my physical exam directive this morning. Three kids evidently are no longer a bar to service. I will be a poor bargain, I am afraid, at $100 or thereabouts per month as a private, but we shall see.

Of couse, he was referring to the $100 that his wife and children would receive under the Allotment and Allowance Act.

Another constituent writes me from a small town in my district, on April 9, 1943, as follows:

> I am writing to you as the last resort to obtain, in my opinion, fairness and just action in the case of my husband.
>
> He is at present time working at Allison G. M. C. in Indianapolis and has been since October 4, 1940, as a gear shaper. We have a small daughter born October 4, 1941, prior to Pearl Harbor.
>
> My husband was classified III–B, but only last month he received a card to appear for a preliminary examination April 8 at a local physician's office, which he did. He then went to the draft board and was informed that induction at Fort Harrison would be about June 1.
>
> The whole idea of this letter is to say that at present the supply of married men without children is not exhausted, not to mention the countless cases of married men with children born since Pearl Harbor. Now, I do not want him to try to get out of going to the Army, for I believe that is certainly a privilege, but should not these other cases come first? I believe first should come first in all cases. We are not trying to be un-American. At present we are doing everything we can to further the war effort.
>
> I wish you would answer this and tell me what is what.

The War Department has furnished to the special committee of the Committee on Military Affairs investigating draft deferments a preliminary report dated February 28, 1943, giving the number of civilian employees in the War Department at various establishments.

Let us take the Sacramento air depot in California. This report shows that there are 1,652 single men and 1,132 married men without children, all between the ages of 18 and 38, employed at this station, and that the War Department has asked for the deferment of only 593 of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let us consider Patterson Field, Ohio. Out of a total male employment there of 17,357 there are 3,583 single men between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive. There are 1,867 married men without children, although the War Department has asked for the deferment of only 156 of these employees. We expect a break-down of these figures within a few days. However, it is reasonable to assume that many of these 3,583 single men are classified as I–A but have not yet been called by their draft boards because they happen to live in a section of the country where the supply of single men has not been exhausted.

Is it carrying out the intention of Congress to go into my district and your district and draft married men with children while there are 3,500 single men working for the Government at this one station?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with what the gentleman has said but, after all, does not that go back to your local draft boards?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Not at all.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it their fault that they are deferring these men? They do not have to do it if they do not want to.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Not at all does it go back to the local boards.

Mr. THOMASON. They have power and authority to draft everyone of those men the gentleman mentions.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This is the best argument for the Kilday bill that has been made, in my opinion, because if you put the quotas on a State basis this could not happen. The more populous areas of the country, where they have not yet exhausted the supply of single men, are not being called upon to furnish the rest of those single men before other boards are forced to draft married men.

Mr. THOMASON. The heart of this bill, however, is to draft every single man before any married man is drafted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Exactly.

Mr. THOMASON. In view of the construction the author of the bill now puts upon his bill, I am very happy to give it my support, but at the same time does not the gentleman know of many cases where a married man with no dependents has a rich wife or an employed wife, and that man probably ought to be drafted before some single man? Does not the gentleman know many cases like that?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not know that I do.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not up to the local draft boards to determine under all the facts and circumstances whether they should take that man?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under this bill married men will be inducted into the service when all single men have been taken. It certainly does not prohibit a married man who has a rich wife from volunteering to his draft board for service.

Mr. THOMASON. It does this, as my colleague from Texas said in answer to a question propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. If you have 10,000 single men in the State of Indiana, you cannot under this bill—you might just as well be frank about it—draft a single married man until every last one of those single men has been inducted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; that is not true.

Mr. THOMASON. That is the way I understood the author of the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This is what would happen. If you have 10,000 single men in the State of Indiana and all of them have not been called—I do not mean inducted; I mean called—they could not call a married man until all the single men are called, but when they call all of the 10,000 single men, which they should do before they start in on the married men, then they would get all the men they needed to fill their quota, both single and married, and they could even go into the category of married men with children.

Mr. THOMASON. I know some sorry married men with no dependents who probably ought to be drafted before a lot of fine, deserving young single men.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There may be some of them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. This bill would prevent this situation, of one local draft board being placed in the position of having no other single men to call, while another draft board just across the street in the same town, perhaps, has several hundred of them yet to call.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I call the attention of the gentleman in contravention of the condition that has been outlined where there are a lot of single men available, to the fact that there are counties in my district where for almost a year they have been drafting every available physically able man, whether he is married, with children, or without children.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is true in many other sections of the country, too.

Let me refer to one more establishment of the War Department, the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot at Philadelphia, Pa. At that establishment the War Department has adopted a policy of asking for the deferment of none of their employees. In other words, they say that the men employed in that establishment are not essential in their jobs, and they will not ask for their deferment. Yet we find they have 1,167 single men of draft age and 817 married men without children on the pay roll. Is there any good reason why these single men should escape service while draft boards in Minnesota, Indiana, and other States are calling married men with children? If you pass this bill, it will correct that inequality, and force, by law, selective service to carry out the intent of Congress by calling registrants in the order of preference which the bill establishes, and which was intended when the original act was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the passage of this bill is imperative, and I believe that the need for this legislation has been brought about largely by the Director of Manpower, Mr. McNutt. I talked the other day with the chairman of a draft board in my district. He pointed out to me that while they had worked long hours as members of the board and had enjoyed the work up until the last few weeks, he felt that the confusion, brought about by the directives recently issued, had taken all the pleasure out of the work. As one example I was told that in one factory in my district, an airplane-engine factory, since the recent directive by Mr. McNutt, they were losing more than 200 men each week, men leaving that industry and going back to the farms from which they came.

I do not want to reflect upon the patriotism of anyone going back to the farm, but it seems to be the feeling that they were more secure from military service if they went back to the farm. I do not know whether the amendment that I have in mind would be germane, and I am not sure even that it would be desirable, but I do feel that there is a situation which should be corrected. In areas such as Hartford County, Conn., where we have seen a terrific expanse of defense industries—one factory going from 3,000 to 35,000, and another from 2,500 to 18,000 employees—it is only natural they have attracted young men from all over the country, some having been sent into that region by the N. Y. A. and other training organizations. I was rather surprised at the last time we had a registration—I believe young men between 18 and 20—to find young man after young man coming in, and when I asked the question as to where he wanted his card sent, whether to a board in that community, or back to his home State, almost without exception they all said send it back to their home State. I asked some of them why they wanted to send it back to the home State, and pointed out that it meant a great deal of correspondence back and forth with the local boards all over the country—Nebraska, California, and other places—everyone I asked gave me the same answer. They said in effect, "If I send my card back there, I will be deferred. They don't know the game out there quite so well as they do here, and they feel that everybody who works in an essential war factory should be deferred, and I will be deferred. The boards here are too wise." The result is that you go into Hartford Conn., almost any evening and you are surprised at the number of young men between 18 and 25 and 30 that are walking the streets in civilian clothes, because they are working in these industries.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON or Ohio. I want to say to the gentleman, that is true. The Costello committee, which is inquiring into draft requirements, found that situation exists so far as the city of Washington is concerned. A great many young men in Washington do not want to be classified by the Washington draft boards, but prefer to be handled back home, because when they appear at the board at home and say that they are working for the Government, automatically they get deferment, in almost every instance.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It seems so. I do not know whether this is the best way to attack the problem, but there is a problem and a serious one. I propose an amendment, on page 4, line 20, after the word "board", to provide as follows—and I would like to have the opinion of the chairman of the committee, and I shall be guided by his advice. I propose to add the following:

That all registrants requesting deferment because of occupation shall make their application for such deferment to the selective service board in the State where they are employed and in the community where they reside at the time application for deferment is submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee would care to make snap judgment as to whether that would be a proper amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. One of the things that our committee is going into is to try to avoid any registrant asking for his own deferment, and we have in view a program of replacement schedule which will in effect provide that no one shall be deferred classification unless the proper department head shall have asked for it, on an official form approved by the Government, and no one in industry shall be given deferment, unless a proper officer of the corporation shall request the draft board to grant that occupational deferment, and when that is done under this replacement schedule program, I think it will prevent registrants from requesting deferment from their home board.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. On the strength of the statement of the gentleman from California, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call attention to the fact that last week this House passed a bill which authorized the Speaker to make application for deferments so as to relieve the employees of the Congress from that obligation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That will cover private industry as well?

Mr. MAY. No; not private industry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. With reference to those men who sent their applications back home for deferment, were those deferments granted pursuant to the rules and regulations sent out by the Selective Service, Washington headquarters to those boards, or in violation of them? My observation has been that the boards in my State have been thorough and conscientious in their work.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, I do not know, but they are being granted in large numbers.

Mr. CURTIS. Without their employers' request?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Apparently without the employers' request.

Mr. CURTIS. I am surprised and somewhat shocked and I dare say that the local boards must not have had all the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate today with a great deal of interest, and I heard one of the distinguished gentlemen from New York make the statement that this country had just about reached rock bottom insofar as its manpower is concerned. I wish to disagree with that gentleman and tell him that we have not by any means reached rock bottom as yet. We have a great many factories in this country that are overmanned. We note at the present time great migration from those factories back to the farms. We have something like 250,000 illiterates who have been rejected for the Army who could be used, who could be educated to the proper level for such purposes, the fourth grade. We have a great many people who are diseased in various ways who at the present time are being utilized by cures. We have men in the penitentiaries throughout the country who could be used and should be used in the defense of this United States.

Insofar as the Selective Service Act is concerned, nobody in this country knows what it stands for. Every day you read a different directive from the Selective Service people. No one can make any plans. No one can look into the future.

As far as the Kilday bill is concerned, I am going to vote for it, but I wish it was on a national scale rather than on a State-wide scale.

Insofar as statements made today are concerned, that most of the draft boards throughout the country have done a very good job, that is true, but they are only human. They have to follow orders. Consequently many States have been drained of their single men long before others. For instance, the State of Montana, from which I come, I think was the first State to draft married men. That has been going on there for over a year. Here in Washington they are just beginning to draft married men. Some boards in this city have not yet begun to do so. Many of our large metropolitan centers have not yet begun to draft married men, and they should be made to conform with what the rest of the country has had to do.

This bill brings about equality and not exemption. We must remember that the family is the foundation of American life. If we do not try to preserve it as long as we possibly can, we are going to break down some of the foundations which we have considered necessary in the makeup of this country.

We should realize also that we do not have the manpower to spread all over the world. We will have to conserve some of our manpower here at home for the jobs that will be necessary to do.

I urge you all, therefore, if you can possibly see your way to do so, to support the Kilday bill, which is a step in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe registrants shall be assigned to categories with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, in the following order:

Category 1: Registrants otherwise qualified who do not have dependents entitling them to be placed in category two and who do not maintain a family relationship entitling them to be placed in category 3 or 4.

Category 2: Registrants otherwise qualified who do not maintain a family relationship entitling them to be placed in category 3 or 4 but who have persons financially dependent upon them who qualify as dependents under the Selective Service regulations.

"Category 3: Registrants otherwise qualified who do not have children but who do have wives with whom they maintain a bona fide relationship in their homes provided marriage took place prior to December 8, 1941, and at a time when selection was not imminent, or when they were beycnd the maximum age then liable for selection under the law or regulations of the President.

"Category 4: Registrants otherwise qualified who with their wives and children, or with their children alone, maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes provided marriage took place prior to December 8, 1941, and at a time when selection was not imminent, or when they were beyond the maximum age then liable for selection under the law or regulations of the President."

Persons assigned to such categories shall be subject to induction in the foregoing order of such categories. No person assigned to any of said categories shall be inducted prior to the induction of all persons within the same State who have been placed in categories herein made subject to induction prior to the category in which such person has been placed.

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective.

For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents.

No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those men who have been classified by such local board.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "registrants", insert "not deferred under the foregoing paragraph."

Page 3, line 9, strike out the word "inducted" and insert "called for induction."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "the", insert "call for."

Page 4, line 12, after the word "institution", insert "nor shall individuals be called for induction for such training and service, or be inducted, because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institution."

Page 4, line 20, at the end of the bill insert ": *Provided,* That nothing herein shall be construed as repealing, changing, or in any way modifying section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended by the act approved November 13, 1942."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 4, line 20, after the word "board", strike out all that follows in lines 20 to 24 inclusive, and insert, in lieu thereof, the following: "*Provided, however,* That every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective service local board from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided,* That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out the last four lines in the Kilday bill which provide that nothing in the bill is intended to do that which or should

be construed to carry out the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had a similar amendment before the House on previous occasions which was considered not germane to the bill being considered at that time. I believe that every Member on the floor of this House definitely understands the serious situation in connection with the production of even a normal crop this year let alone the increased production which is so necessary not only to furnish food for 130,000,000 Americans, including our boys in the service, but the tons and tons we ought to have to take care of our allies and those who are starving in countries abroad.

I do not believe a single Member here will deny that under the operation of the Selective Servi e Act, especially under the rules and regulations written by those administering the selective act, that they are still taking them down to the last man on the farms.

Just a few days ago, in the city of New York, according to the press, all the dressed poultry in the New York markets was seized for the Army. Why? Because they could not buy these products; there was a scarcity; and you know and I know that the War Department is going to have plenty and the very best the country has. They are going to take it even if they have to do as they did in New York at this crucial moment. If they are going into seizing food products under a strict rationing program what is going to happen a little later on?

POULTRY SUPPLIES SEIZED IN NEW YORK FOR ARMY

Agents of the Food Distribution Administration, armed with requisitions, seized all the dressed poultry supplies of at least four New York firms yesterday for use by the Army.

The agents exercised emergency powers for the first time in the New York area, and Robert A. Henson, State F. D. A. director, indicated the practice may continue if that method is necessary to obtain Army supplies.

The F. D. A. has an Army order for approximately 2,000,000 pounds which must be bought in the New York market in the next few days. An F. D. A. official said the agency had been having a difficult time filling Army orders because of the shrinkage of available civilian supplies both in storage and fresh receipts.

Although Mr. Henson would not divulge further details of the seizures it was learned from other sources that 30,000 pounds of dressed poultry of 2½ pounds and up and 8,000 pounds of turkey were netted by the agents.

The requisitions presented to the dealers called for 50,000 pounds from each and will remain in effect on further receipts until the order is filled.

Let me refer to my own State. We are not a dairying State. We are improving and I hope we shall be able to take care of our own people some of these days instead of having to have so much dairy products sent in. Just the other day people I know, a man and his wife, his son and his wife, had 50 cows and 1 or 2 laborers. They lost all their labor. These two men and their wives were left to carry on. Now this son has been drafted. It will be just a few days and these cows will go on the market. I want to refer to another case. A man from Wisconsin came to my State, buying a farm near my home city, Orangeburg. He found a wonderful opportunity to go into the dairy business. He did and had one of the best dairies in Orangeburg County with a herd of 100 of the finest cows; listen to this item clipped from the county paper:

FAIRLEE ACRES TO SELL ENTIRE HERD AT AUCTION MAY 25

W. E. Perry, owner of Fairlee Acres in Orangeburg, is dispersing his entire herd of 75 Guernseys and 25 Holsteins due to labor conditions, George B. Salley, sales manager, said. The auction will take place on his farm at 10 o'clock Tuesday, May 25th, and Ward Snarr, of Washington, one of the country's foremost auctioneers, will officiate.

Mr. Perry was formerly in the plywood business in Wisconsin.

You know and I know that this is going on all over the country; and you know and I know that nothing is going to be done about it except beautiful statements carried in the press from week to week that changes are being made, that they are going to do this, that, and the other. Why, just this morning it was stated in the press that they were going to do exactly what the Kilday bill proposes to do in the hope that Congress would not do anything about it. They say in effect: "You Members of Congress keep quiet and we will run things." Believe me, unless Congress asserts itself by passing definite legislation to do that which Congress intended in the passage of the Selective Service Act it is going to be too late when you wake up and find hungry people all over the country, because you cannot grow food overnight. My amendment is the provision carried in the Bankhead bill which passed the Senate some days ago. The amendment also provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may take into further consideration other crops that may be designated as essential so that the draft officials may consider the manpower problem as related to those essential crops.

I cannot for the life of me understand why this amendment is not germane and if not why the chairman of the committee now in charge of the bill will not accept same. Under this bill we are amending the Selective Service Act for one group of people, and we have set forth just what rules and regulations shall govern these various categories. My amendment simply takes in another group and I strike out the last proviso in the bill which should make my amendment in order. I am hoping my amendment will be held germane and that it will be passed so that the Congress may say to those in authority that they should do that which was intended under the original Selective Service Act. If I had time I could quote a provision in the original that if properly administered we would not need my amendment.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and added to the Kilday bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina on the ground that it is not germane because it provides the deferment by occupational groups, that is an agricultural group; whereas the pending bill to which it is offered is based on the question of dependency.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is slightly different from the amendment submitted to the Parliamentarian, but generally in this amendment we are dealing with a special group. It amends the Selective Service Act, as does the pending bill. The amendment sets forth the various categories. We propose also to amend the Selective Service Act under section 3 instead of the section referred to in the original bill. It would appear to me that the amendment clearly is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill establishes the categories of registrants on the basis of dependents. Certainly an agriculturist or a worker in agriculture should not come within that category.

Further, on page 4 of the bill it is provided expressly that no deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups. The Chair feels that farmers come very clearly within the provisions of that language and therefore holds that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Line 3, page 1, strike out "(e)" after "5" and insert "(c)" and after the enacting clause insert the following: "(3) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and the accepted American tradition, that no person who may be a member of the military forces of the United States, whether on active or inactive duty, may be prohibited from becoming a candidate for or seek or accept election to any Federal public office to which he might aspire, whether or not he has previously held such office before entering upon active duty, by Executive order, directive, or Army regulation. Any such Executive order, directive, or Army regulation heretofore issued with such intent is hereby declared to be null and void."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve it if the gentleman desires to discuss his amendment. It is so apparently not germane on its face that it is needless hardly to argue it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I will take only about 2 minutes to discuss it, then I will abide by the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sure that this is not germane to the

Selective Service bill, because it applies to an order that was issued in connection with the Selective Service System, therefore, if we are discussing the Selective Service, I am inclined to think this might be germane; but, of course, I shall abide by the decision of the Chair and will rely on his good judgment.

Mr. Chairman, if my amendment is not germane, I hope that it will be brought up in some other way. It merely says that the recent Army regulation providing that nobody in the armed forces may be a candidate or accept an elective position is null and void.

Now, my proposal only affects Federal elective offices. I have just written the amendment and, although I have not made a very thorough study of the categories that it would cover, it seems to me it would only include the President of the United States, the Vice President, and Members of the House and Senate. I do not recollect any other elective Federal offices. This does not apply to State or county offices, such as sheriffs or constables or any other office except that of Members of the House and Senate, and President and Vice President.

It seems to me also that it is in entire accord with the traditions of our country from the very beginning. I know that one of my predecessors, Hon. John Henry Ketcham, held office from my district for 42 years in Congress and was first elected while he was a colonel in the Union Army. The same principle and practice applied to the Spanish-American War and to World War No. 1. I do not know why we should make any change in this war as far as Federal elective offices are concerned.

If my amendment is held not germane, I hope it will be brought up in some other way so that we may get an expression of the House itself and of the Congress of the United States, whether in these days when we are fighting for democracy and for the "four freedoms" all over the world, it can be said to those in our Army, "you cannot aspire to or accept office if elected to the Congress or as President of the United States."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that every American citizen, regardless of what his line of activity might happen to be, ought to be encouraged to participate in government and be eligible for an elective office?

Mr. FISH. I am in entire accord with the gentleman. I do not want to go further than the Federal elective offices in my proposal because if we did I can see a great deal of difficulty. Someone in the Army might aspire to be a constable. He might want to get out of the Army to seek the office of constable. On the other hand my amendment deals only with Federal elective offices and applies merely to Members of Congress, and to the Presidency. It is very limited in its aspects and we could well afford, without impairing the efficiency of the armed forces or the war effort to pass this legislation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the gentleman a question. I believe you will agree with me that we should not restrict it to the armed services, but include even civilian employees of the Government itself who ought to be able to participate to some extent and not be denied that right as they are by the Hatch Act which the gentleman supported.

Mr. FISH. Of course, I supported it, but it is not being carried out by the New Deal. That is what I complain about, and I do not think it will be carried out as long as the New Deal is in power.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any precedent in all our history for such an order as that which was recently issued by the Secretary of War?

Mr. FISH. No; none whatever. Among those who have served in our armed forces in all our wars have been candidates for Congress and the Presidency, the highest office in the gift of the American people.

Mr. DONDERO. Has there been any obstruction offered when that condition existed?

Mr. FISH. Why, Theodore Roosevelt came back from the Spanish-American War and while he was in the Army he was nominated for Governor in New York State. I believe General McClellan was nominated for President on the Democratic ticket during the Civil War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we all sympathize deeply with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] who complains of this Republican officeholder whom the President has appointed Secretary of War issuing an order prohibiting men in uniform running for office.

When that order first came out I thought of taking the floor and expressing my views, which are very pronounced on this subject. I think the order is a terrible mistake. If he can prohibit men in the service running for office, the next thing he can tell them whether or not they can vote.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this order of Secretary Stimson is his order or somebody else's order? Is it a case of the voice of Jacob and the hand of Esau?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know which one it is, but I do know whom it affects. It affects every man in the armed forces.

Let me give you the condition at home. This is our election year for State and county offices. The best paying offices in Mississippi are the county offices, chancery clerk, circuit clerk, sheriff, tax assessor, county superintendent, and so forth. Some men now in the service are running for those offices—that is, they have filed their names for that purpose. They do not have to come home to campaign, but they have a right to run.

With the exception of the sheriff's office, there is almost an unwritten law in Mississippi that if a man is elected to a county office and behaves himself, which he usually does, he is given a second term of 4 years. But now many of these offices are becoming vacant, the occupants are not running for reelection, so these men in the service—and I speak advisedly because I have some of them in mind—are running for these county offices. They know that if they are elected it will probably mean 8 years in office for them. We certainly hope this war will not last that long, but if this order stands, the door will be shut in the faces of those boys, you might say, until 1952, or 9 years from now. If they are elected to office, they have a right to appoint a deputy, if the war is still going on, and the deputy can carry on the work for them.

I submit that it is a bad practice for the Secretary of War to arrogate to himself the prerogative of saying to the men in the armed forces, "You cannot even put your name on the ballot at home and let your people elect you to office."

He also provides in that order that a man who already holds an office may run for reelection provided he has the permission of the War Department. Suppose the War Department decides it does not want a man to even put his name on the ticket. Then he must withdraw.

I submit that this order ought to be revoked or else Congress ought to pass a law setting it aside and give these boys to understand that we are not going to outlaw them just because they are in uniform, fighting for their country.

How long do you suppose this war will last? Even after hostilities cease, these men may be in uniform for years and years. I submit they have a right to put their names on the ticket and then, if they are elected and the war is still going on, they do not have to leave the service, they may appoint a deputy or they may decline the office and let somebody else take it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman says that under this Executive order our public officers could be chosen by the War Department rather than be elected by the citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. No, I did not say they could be chosen, I said the War Department has a right if the War Department assumes the prerogative to say to a man, "You cannot run for office," it can in the next breath say, "You cannot vote in an election." I say that is going entirely too far. If it were necessary to do this in order to win this war, I would not complain, but I do not think it contributes one iota to the war effort but

may have a depressing effect on many men now in the service.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has made a grave mistake. He says that the best officers in the State of Mississippi are the county officers. I submit that one of the most resourceful men on this floor is the gentleman from Mississippi who now is in the Well of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. But I said best-paying offices in the State.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not a fact that under Army regulations the rule about which the gentleman is now talking and about which the gentleman from New York talked, the so-called order of Secretary Stimson, existed 2 years ago, and is not a recent thing?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not care when it was issued. It ought not to have been issued at all. It certainly was not in effect in California last year.

I hope the Secretary of war revokes this order, and if he does not do it, I hope Congress will set it aside.

Let us deal justly with our men in the armed forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, that order was dated February 25, 1943. It was issued by the War Department at Washington, signed by the Chief of Staff, George C. Marshall, by the Under Secretary of War. It also is included in section 5 (c) (1) of the Selective Training and Service Act, the very thing we are discussing.

Mr. MURPHY. I received a telegram 2 years ago from the War Department to that effect, advising me in connection with a county office, before MacArthur and before Bataan.

Mr. FISH. All I can say to the gentleman is that I am not a mind reader. All I can say is that the War Department issued this order on this particular date.

Mr. MAY. What is the argument on the point of order?

Mr. FISH. The argument is that this is included in the draft act, section 5 (c) (1) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is speaking about this order being in effect 2 years ago. It evidently did not apply to California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has to do with the qualifications of men in the service to seek public office. It clearly does not come within the three principles set forth in the bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 4, line 7, after the period, insert the following paragraph:

"For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, the local board having jurisdiction, and any committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives authorized to investigate deferments, shall have access to, and be entitled to inspect, the Federal income-tax returns of such registrant covering the period or periods in question."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I spoke about when we were discussing the rule. The amendment in no wise affects the provisions of the bill. It merely seeks to give another instrument to draft boards and to special committees of Congress investigating cases of deferment based on dependency. That is simple enough. That kind of an amendment giving authority to draft boards and to the Costello committee would give them an opportunity to inspect the Federal income-tax returns of every registrant who claimed dependency, and to check on whether or not he tells the truth. It would be an instrument to take away from the registrant as far as we possibly can fraud and deceit in his claim for dependency. I feel that the Costello committee ought to be given this assistance because right here in Washington is one of the worst abuses of deferment in any place in the United States. The committee is digging up some very valuable information, and I feel that the amendment, being of assistance to the committee and to draft boards ought to be accepted by the Committee without debate, because it is a help on the bill, and not a hindrance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division, the Chair being in doubt, there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 20, after the word "board", add the following: "No deferment from selective training and service shall be made in the case of any unmarried individual between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive, who is holding an appointive position in any department, bureau, or agency of the Federal Government, unless physically disqualified."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be found to be germane. It is certainly introduced in absolute good faith, and if we cannot get a vote on an issue of this kind in discussing the selective service, how are we going ever to get a vote on it? We have an amendment to the Selective Service Act before us to defer certain categories. This amendment is to take out of the deferment every unmarried man in the Federal Government service, including the State Department, the Army, the Navy, and all the bureaus and all the agencies—to take them out of the bombproofs, and put them into the Army or Navy where they belong. We are in an all-out war, and it calls for all-out service, and all-out sacrifice, and we still have a lot of draft dodgers, unmarried, between the ages of 18 and 38, physically fit who are in the Federal Government service and on the Federal pay roll. I submit in absolute good faith that it is the duty of Congress to drive them out of their political bombproofs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Let me finish the sentence. These unmarried men under 38 ought to be in the service anyway, but if we have to force them in, let us enact adequate legislation immediately. We in Congress declared war, and it is our responsibility. We could fill the jobs of every one of them with older men or with women. There is not one place that we could not fill without harming the war effort. If there is anyone who is needed, such as a technician, or a chemist, or an engineer, or a designer of airplanes, then put a uniform on him, pay him $50 a month, or if necessary make him a technical sergeant, and pay him $150 a month, and then send him back into his old position in the Government service. That could not impair either the Government or war service at all. I am opposed to giving any deferments to this category, and I want to go on record on that, and would like the House to vote upon it. I would like the House to vote not to give any deferment to any unmarried man between 18 and 37 on the public pay roll except for physical disqualifications.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now you are getting in politics, because if you do that, you will ruin the New Deal.

Mr. FISH. And I do not want the gentleman from Michigan to defeat my amendment by making a statement of that kind. I want his cooperation, not a kiss of death.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a fact.

Mr. FISH. The truth is a most disagreeable thing. I do not want the gentleman to get up and by telling the truth throw a monkey wrench into my proposed amendment. I am trying to put something over in the interest of the country, and in the interest of the war effort.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. Would the gentleman accept an amendment, to make his

amendment apply to other organizations and institutions? I think the gentleman has a point to this effect, that there are organizations and institutions where men who might serve in the Army are now employed.

The Federal Government may be one of those organizations. There are others.

Would the gentleman accept a revision of his amendment to include private corporations and other institutions?

Mr. FISH. Of course, I will make it as broad as I can to get the unmarried men into the service without impairing the war effort. It would be up to the House to amend my amendment, as I am making it apply only to the Federal Government service. If it went beyond that I would be glad to support it. I am not objecting in any possible way. I want these unmarried men in our armed forces whether in the Government service or outside of it, except for honest dirt farmers who are needed to produce the food necessary to win the war.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I think you are right.

Mr. FISH. I know I am right.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not think there should be any exception here in Washington. They seem to be flagrant violators. Back in our own communities there is no exemption made such as is made right here in Washington.

Mr. FISH. It goes beyond that. We have a responsibility in Congress. We voted for this war. We are letting those young fellows off who are on the Federal pay roll and we ought to set an example at Washington to the rest of the Nation.

Mr. GAVIN. The local draft boards should bring them in.

Mr. FISH. I hope my amendment will be germane, Mr. Chairman, because if it is I believe it will be adopted by a large vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is clearly in violation of the express language contained on page 4, line 11, as it applies to occupational groups. The Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment is not germane and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIFFORD: On page 1, line 10, after the word "agriculture", insert "fisheries."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need to be debated. I ask the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment. It is so simple that everyone understands it. Everyone must acknowledge that it is fair.

Mr. MAY. I would agree to it readily in order to accommodate the gentleman, but I am afraid it is "fishy." So, I cannot accept it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Think of a farmer being more important to our economy than a fisherman! Just because there are fewer fisherman here to represent them, we are forced to sue for their rights. There is no one here who does not know perfectly well that fishermen are engaged solely in furnishing food for the Nation. Unquestionably they should be placed on an equality with farmers. They have been heretofore consistently recognized by the Congress. They are allowed loans such as those made to the farmers. They were recognized in the Price Control Act as on a par with the farmers. Clearly, this amendment is in order. I might be ashamed to face my constituents if I were unable to prove that they were no less important in production of food than farmers. There are plenty of gentlemen farmers and the "farmers" they employ will be taken care of in the bill. But think of the risk that the fishermen take and the sort of toil they have to endure. I will not indulge in oratorical praise of them. I could do so, and with good reason. I think all I need depend upon is common sense, and you Members have that. The fishermen should certainly receive equality of treatment under this bill. If there is anybody who could possibly argue sensibly against it, I would like to hear him. Of course, you could talk against it, but could not advance a real, sensible argument.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Do you not agree with me that the present provision in the bill would cover fisheries?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; like many other activities.

Mr. KILDAY. The words "employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupation."

Mr. GIFFORD. You have named three things. I want fisheries named after agriculture. That is in order. The bill does authorize the President to do this if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. KILDAY. In any industry he finds to be essential to the national effort.

Mr. GIFFORD. At the moment I am not willing to depend on that. I want this body to find that fishermen are just as essential as farmers. You know they are. I should not need to argue the matter.

Mr. KILDAY. Do you want to put "fishing industry" after agriculture?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have used the word "fisheries" after agriculture. It is in proper form, I feel sure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the gentleman given any consideration to including hunters and trappers?

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not, but I will now. Hunters and trappers used to furnish some food. Now they are largely fellows who do this for sport; I am not appealing for sportsmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Evidently some gentlemen do not realize that there are tons and tons of fish produced for food.

Mr. GIFFORD. Many do not know much about the fishing industry. Anybody who votes against my amendment probably is not fully aware of its importance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that many of the men who fish go down in their ships? It is also very dangerous?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have just reminded the House that it is a dangerous occupation. Shall I draw a picture of fishermen, arising at 4 o'clock in the morning, bucking the cold, the winds, and the storms, and taking their lives in their hands? Some of you may smile if you want to, but I expect you to vote right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were ayes 98 and noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 3, following the word "President" in line 6, add the following category: Category five: Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in Local Board Release No. 164, of the Selective Service System, as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective service local board from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That should any such deferred registrant cease to be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with such production or harvesting, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving his work on the farm he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determine, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage or be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided further*, that the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill. I base my point of order on the further ground that with the exception of possibly one word this amendment has already been rejected by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FULMER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the following language be-

ginning in line 6 of the first page of the bill.

(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The next paragraph directs the order in which registrants shall be assigned to categories. Then follow four categories. My amendment merely adds a fifth category, those engaged in the occupation of agriculture. This would appear to be clearly in line with the purpose of the bill, and I believe the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not feel that the change in language in the amendment just offered has in any way affected the amendment offered originally. As far as the language in the first paragraph is concerned, it is merely a repetition of existing law.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina very clearly has as its purpose the exception from the operation of the act of occupational groups, which is forbidden under the statute under consideration.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1730) to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 192, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS) there were—ayes 143, noes 7.

So the bill (H. R. 1730) was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a poem written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, an announcement was mailed to the Members of the House who have sons or daughters in the service. Some Members may not have received this announcement. I believe there is to be a meeting at 4:30 this afternoon on the first floor of the Capitol Building in the main corridor of the House wing in the House Appropriations Committee room. I hope very much that those who have children in the service will attend this meeting.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes today after the other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from today's Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SCHEME TO SET UP AN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POWER

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to discuss the scheme of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, and Prof. John Maynard Keynes, adviser to the exchequer, and a governor in the Bank of England, to set up an international monetary power, the ostensible purpose of which is, in part, to provide an international currency, and to stabilize, as it is termed by the advocates of this scheme, the exchange values of all the currencies of the countries that join in the plan. Any discussion of this subject must at present be limited. I have not seen any draft of the British plan, so must confine my discussion of it to reports as given in the newspapers.

The proposals are so novel, many of their provisions are so vague and involved, and the scheme as a whole is based so completely on inexperience, as to make any detailed or complete interpretation of it impossible. One can, however, gather from the material relating to these proposals that is now at hand, sufficient information to permit of some idea as to the effects this scheme would have upon our Nation. I shall confine my discussion principally to a consideration of the provisions relating to so-called stabilization of currency and foreign exchange.

First. I wish to again call the attention of the House and the country to the secrecy with which our Treasury officials carried on their work in aiding the promotion of this international monetary power scheme, and the grave injustice they did to the Congress and our people by withholding this plan from this body and our country, giving it to the rest of the world, and leaving it to the rest of the world to tell the Congress and our people about it.

According to a news item in the Washington Times-Herald April 6, 1943, Mr. Morgenthau expressed himself as being embarrassed because London had informed our country of his interest in the international monetary power plan before he got around to tell us about it. This paper quoted him as saying:

The whole purpose of our keeping our plans secret was so that we could acquaint Congress first and then the people. We took great pains to do this. Then I was scooped.

By saying he was scooped he meant, of course, that having confided his secret to London that city broadcasted it to our whole Nation while he was still carrying it around in his pocket smugly believing he had something important to tell the Congress and the country.

No wonder Mr. Morgenthau felt himself embarrassed and thought he had been scooped.

I think this act deserves severe condemnation. It appears to me this scheme involves our very national existence. For Mr. Morgenthau to confide so vital a matter as this scheme to a foreign country and keep it secret from those who employ him as their fiscal agent is, in my opinion, nothing short of a breach of public trust.

We are apt to be led to believe from the newspaper, radio, and other reports that this scheme emanates from a few individuals. Mr. Harry D. White, special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, is being credited as the prime mover of the United States' contribution to the

plan. Prof. Maynard Keynes is being credited as the prime mover of the British contribution to this plan. Now, of course, we would be naive indeed if we were to believe the officials of our Treasury had undertaken this task on their own initiative, or that Professor Keynes and perhaps a few of his associates had inaugurated their part of the scheme on their own accord. We may rest assured that back of this move are the most powerful international monied interests and financiers of the world. Furthermore, we may be certain that world power politics are playing a prominent role in promoting this movement.

Let us also not be deceived into believing that our Treasury officials and Professor Keynes worked independently of each other in promoting this set-up. Of course Mr. Morgenthau and Professor Keynes may not have had much direct personal contact with each other during the time of the formulation of this plan, but we may be pretty certain that the same forces were back of both of these gentlemen and were somehow directing their action toward a common end. Or did both plans emanate from London?

Upon first sight the Keynes plan and that of Mr. Morgenthau may appear to some to be quite different from each other. It should not be surprising if this impression has been received by many from reading the brief news dispatches describing the two proposals. One is even apt to get the impression from some of the news reports that the two plans oppose each other. The fact is, however, that the two proposals are fundamentally alike and such differences as exist between them are of relatively small importance.

Both drafts embrace the idea of a completely politically managed international currency.

Both contemplate the surrender by the individual countries to the international monetary power of a large part, if not all, of the very heart of national sovereignty, that is, mastership over monetary and credit resources. Thus the international monetary power would embrace the most far-reaching control of the domestic economies of the individual nations.

This much is clear from a reading of the Morgenthau draft of his plan, and also from what can be gathered from the newspapers pertaining to the Keynes plan.

The following is taken from the New York Times of March 29, 1943:

> Mr. Keynes' plan, which entails in some measure the surrender of the sovereignty of individual states over their domestic economic policy, has implications far beyond mere finance and international banking. * * * It is easy to see how the union might become a mechanism for enforcing national policies in addition to the financial arrangements that would be its primary purpose.

What is said here about the Keynes proposal applies equally to that of Mr. Morgenthau, as a reading of the draft of the plan of the latter shows.

Being completely under political control, and politics being what it is, everywhere corrupt to the core, lustful for permanent and unlimited power to absorb all social functions and reduce the peoples to the status of servants of the state, the international monetary power scheme would, of necessity, partake of all these evils. There would be political favoritism to the money interests on a world-wide scale instead of being limited mostly to nations as now is the case. Instead of having a political pork barrel for congressional districts and States, we would, under the international monetary power, have this evil extended so as to embrace all the nations of the earth.

Indeed, when we examine this subject do we not find that the New Deal has already inaugurated programs along this line, so far as the United States is concerned? Look at the gold-purchase scheme. Has not this administration made a gift to other nations, mostly gold-producing countries, of many billions of dollars in premiums on gold it acquired from them? Are we asked to believe the honest debts of some of the nations south of the Rio Grande were canceled by our Government without there having been involved any political motive whatsoever? Then, too, there was already before the war the program of the Export-Import Bank of withdrawing much-needed credit from our own economy and pouring it by the hundreds of millions of dollars into Mexico and South America for constructing all sorts of projects.

Also, there is the big program of give-away under lend-lease which the New Deal bureaucratic planners say must be continued after the war and made a permanent policy.

Has not this administration already gone far in giving the United States away?

Think of the grand opportunity this international monetary power could provide to the New Deal for scattering to the four corners of the earth the remainder of the wealth of our country and for playing world-power politics.

The scheme proposes in part the setting up of an international monetary power, with a capitalization, according to the Morgenthau plan, of $5,000,000,000; to provide an international monetary unit; to stabilize the currencies and foreign exchange of the nations that join the union.

The Morgenthau draft of his plan does not say how much of this capital would be contributed by the United States. However, the likelihood would be that we would contribute no less than the amount of our $2,000,000,000 gold stabilization fund. Other nations, according to the plan, could put political paper promises to pay in as their contribution to the fund.

Though we would contribute no less than 40 percent of the amount of the fund, and all gold at that, we would have no more than 25 percent of the voting power, while the other nations would contribute no more than 60 percent of the capitalization, which would be in the form of paper promises and some gold, but would have 75 percent of the voting power.

The scheme would virtually involve complete control by the international monetary power of domestic currencies with power to alter their value or purchasing power. This will probably be denied by those favoring the plan.

The plan is to be modeled in part along the line of our own $2,000,000,000 so-called stabilization fund, but nobody but Mr. Morgenthau and the President yet knows just how our stabilization fund has actually worked, or just how it has been used. No detailed or comprehensive report has ever been made of its operations because the law provides in specific terms that the Secretary of the Treasury is required to make a report only to the President, and that the President shall not at any time be required to make any report to the Congress or the Nation on the use of the fund.

The Secretary of the Treasury has made several reports to the Congress on the operation of the fund, in the form of balance sheets, which, of course, give no idea of the inner workings of the fund. They are, therefore, of no value to the Congress.

In looking through the ostensible objectives of this scheme into the real ones, we might profitably start out by inquiring into the origin of the present $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, which as stated, we understand the Treasury is thinking of using as our part of the contribution to the $5,000,000,000 international stabilization fund. From whence did this $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund come? On January 31, 1934, the New Deal clipped the gold coins of the United States by more than 40 percent. The clippings amounted to roundly $2,800,000,000 and were called profit. Two billions of this spurious profit were taken by the Treasury and designated as the stabilization fund.

Down through the ages since coins were first struck more than 2,500 years ago, up until well into the twentieth century, the clipping of coins by kings and rulers of nations was universally regarded as an act of oppression and tyranny. It was looked upon as state robbery of the property and the fruits of men's labor. There is nothing in the nature of our own $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund that justifies its being classified in any other category than the one involved in the clipping of the coins in past ages. This fund represents just $2,000,000,000 worth of the property, sweat, and toil that our Government expropriated from all classes of workers, from the lowest-paid day laborer to the highest-salaried executive.

Would you think the spurious origin of these $2,000,000,000 would bode well or ill if used as an international fund for the purposes as outlined by the Morgenthau-Keynes plan?

Furthermore, perhaps no single deliberate monetary act that has ever been performed by any state has caused more instability of currency, not only in our Nation, but throughout the world, than the clipping of our gold coin and all that was thereby made possible. Without the clipping of our gold coins there could have been no gold-purchase program, which has brought such great disequilibrium of this metal among the nations of the world. Through clipping of the gold dollar an enormous volume of inflationary deposits in our banks was created,

the effects of which we now see manifesting themselves in regimentation, rationing, price control, and other bureaucratic restrictions and regulations. Our Nation will long be haunted by the specter of this deed.

Now let us examine the word "stabilization" as this term has been used in the operation of the so-called stabilization fund and as it is expected to be used in the operation of the international stabilization fund.

According to Webster's New International Dictionary, the word "stability" is defined as the:

State or quality of being stable, or firm; strength to stand or endure without alteration of position or material change; steadiness; firmness; as, the stability of a structure, of a government, of customs or habits. Steadfastness or firmness of character, resolution, or purpose; constancy; steadfastness. State of being in stable equilibrium.

And the word "stabilize" is defined as:

To make stable; steadfast, or firm. To make or hold steady; to prevent fluctuations; as to stabilize prices.

These definitions need no elucidation. They stand exactly for what they say.

With reference to prices they are considered to be stable as long as they remain the same, and they are regarded as being unstable when they, for one reason or another, become altered. Currency, for example, a dollar bill, is considered to be stable in its capacity to purchase goods as long as its buying quality remains the same. When it, for any reason loses part of its capacity to purchase goods, then it is considered to be unstable.

Here, let us make clear an important point. So-called stabilization funds, insofar as they are ostensibly used for currency stabilization purposes, in the final analysis can have to do only with unstable paper currencies, such as have lost a part of their value or purchasing quality, as compared with their value at some previous time. To be specific, these funds are used only in an attempt to prop up falling values of paper promises to pay.

Before representative money, that is, paper currency, came into use, men never thought of such a thing as stabilizing currency in the sense this term is now used. From the advent of coinage to the time paper currency made its first appearance, all countries had more or less trouble keeping up the value of their coins. The history of coinage shows that the process of clipping coins by rulers of nations was very frequently resorted to as a means of raising revenue, and sometimes this device was used by private persons as a means of enrichment. In fact, the history of coinage is largely a history of its debasement. The point here is that when hard money alone was in use, the term "stabilization of money" could, as a rule, have had no other meaning than the prevention of further debasement of the coins. This is simple and can be understood by all.

It was only after banks, nearly always with the connivance of governments, and governments themselves, learned the art of creating representative money, paper currency, that there began to develop the idea of stabilizing currency in the sense this term is now used.

As a matter of truth, there never has been but one real and dependable stabilizer of the value of paper currency since this device was first invented, namely, gold and silver coins and bullion in free circulation wholly unhindered by laws, decrees, or political action of any sort. Always, no matter how much paper currency banks and governments printed, if ruthlessly and continuously exposed to the operations of hard money in open and free markets, though often straying more or less from the standard, such paper currency would nevertheless in due time become fully stabilized.

Since the introduction of paper currency into the monetary system whenever and wherever gold and silver coins and bullion were in use, unhampered by political action, these pieces of metal performed the peculiar function of measuring the true value or buying quality of the paper currency; of determining how much genuineness it contained and how much falseness or counterfeit it contained.

In the great process of civilization, exchange, there have always been some people, possibly not so many, who understood the nature of paper currency, knew it needed careful watching lest it multiply spuriously as well as legitimately; who, therefore, always examined its parentage to see what part of it was created out of honest toil and Nature's gifts, and how much of it was just the product of cunning and the desire to make a living without honest toil.

Always those who have understood money have watched to see what part of paper currency was created out of production of life's necessaries and what part of it was not so created. But above all, they watched to see whether paper currency was demanding a greater amount of commodities in the market than the amount of commodities required to bring it into existence.

Now, to all men of monetary integrity, everywhere and at all times, the term "stabilization" as it relates to paper currency and bank credit, meant that these devices should never exchange for a greater value in goods than the value of the goods that was required to bring them into existence. There has never been but one exact and reliable test to determine this point, namely, the free and politically unhindered use of gold and silver coins and bullion in free circulation. Moreover, the free use of the precious metals in these forms always has been the only sure protection against over-issues of paper currency. Only by the process of free interchange with and convertibility of paper currency into coins and bullion has it ever been possible to provide a reasonably safe guarantee that such paper would not command in the market more value than the value required to produce it.

Always it depended on the few knowing to see to it that paper passed at its true value by demanding gold for it. And as long as gold remained in free circulation they could be depended on to perform this precious social service in a reasonably satisfactory manner.

But we have, along with the rest of the peoples of the world, lost our natural protection against over-issues of paper currency. Our gold has all been taken from us and locked in the hands of political authorities. This is one of the most awful facts that ever confronted civilization.

Now, let us see just how the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme could stabilize paper currency. Presumably, of course, it would be dealing with unstable paper currency. Since there is only one cause of unstable paper currency, over-issues, would the scheme aim to correct the inherent evil in the redundancy, the passing of it for an amount of goods greater in value than the value of the amount of goods that was required to create it? But the world monetary power could do this only by somehow inducing the nations to burn their paper currency redundancies, which would not require any stabilization fund, but only persuasion or force. It might be all right to stabilize currencies by consigning the redundancies to the flames, but what of our own over-issues? Horrors. Surely the Secretary of our Treasury would not entertain any such thought as that, would he?

No; the Keynes-Morgenthau international monetary power scheme would not be used to really stabilize paper currencies, to reduce their volume so as to make them pass for an amount of goods equal in value to the amount of goods of the same value that was required to bring them into existence, as gold and silver coins and bullion were wont to do.

Quite the contrary. The scheme would take all the inflation balls which the different countries all over the globe have been keeping in the air, fuse them into a giant balloon, and send them up into the stratosphere. By the biggest political hocus-pocus the world has ever known, it would prolong the despotic power that inheres in irredeemable paper currency—forcing the people to give up the fruits of their toil for pieces of paper that required no more to bring them into existence than a Government printing press. Central politicalized banking all over the world, not only having failed utterly in preserving monetary integrity but having itself been the principal cause of the global inflation, there is to be one more throw. All the central banks are to be brought together under a single head—the Morgenthau-Keynes international monetary power. This international political machinery would somehow transmute the great mountains of currency and credit inflation throughout the world into gold value.

Mr. Morgenthau, in his release explaining his plan, said:

I have been anxious to discuss this matter with you and keep you informed of developments. * * * However, I did want you to know what we are doing and I do want to feel free to come back from time to time and discuss the subject with you and obtain your advice.

Mr. Morgenthau said further:

> In each country acceptance of a definitive plan can follow only upon legislative or executive action.

Note particularly, the words "or executive action," and keep them thoroughly in mind.

Is it possible that Mr. Morgenthau thinks no more may be needed than congressional action to give legal sanction to the scheme he is promoting? Has he never read section 8 of the Constitution? Or does he propose by devious means to circumvent the basic law of the land in order to attain his end?

Section 8 of the Constitution provides that:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin * * *.

Nothing in the Constitution is more definitive, or more important than this clause.

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune of April 7, 1943, points out the unconstitutionality of this scheme.

It requires no more than a superficial examination of this proposal to show that it would involve the power to take from the Congress the function of coining money and the regulation of its value. Once the international monetary power had control over this function it would, of course, use it.

The clause in the Morgenthau draft which provides that "all countries agree that all of the local currency holdings shall be free from any restrictions as to their use" clearly indicates that the intention of the framers of this scheme is to hand over to the international monetary power the function given to Congress by the Constitution "to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Whatever possible control would be left us over our currency would involve no more than its use. The international monetary power could tell us what kind of money we had to use, whether gold, or silver, or shinplasters.

If Mr. Morgenthau and the forces back of him should be able to get around this provision of the Constitution, then the last vestige of our great charter of liberty will have disappeared. All hope of restoring it would be gone, and the totalitarian state would be completed.

No, I cannot believe the American people have as yet been beaten into such abject submission that they will allow this to happen.

It is not Congress alone that Mr. Morgenthau should consult. To conform to the Constitution he would be obliged to go before the whole country and seek the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution which alone could give legal sanction to the scheme he is helping to promote.

Now let us refer back for a moment to the words "or executive action," which I stated we should keep in mind.

Any contemplated executive action to set up this plan without further legal authority would most certainly involve the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund that is already in existence. It has even been intimated by certain high governmental authorities that there exists legal opinion in Government circles to the effect that no further legal authority would be required by the President to completely involve the United States in this international monetary power scheme. This is something serious to think about when the Congress comes to considering the extension of the life of the stabilization fund. The authority for this fund expires this coming June.

It was stated, at the outset, no attempt would be made in this discussion to consider all of the provisions of the Keynes-Morgenthau plan. An effort has been made to touch only the high points. Enough, however, should be evident from this discussion to fully arouse the American people to a realization of the grave dangers that are inherent in this scheme to the sovereignty and well-being of our country.

Because of the war situation, one cannot discuss this question with complete freedom. However, some matters are of public record, which, it is presumed, we are allowed to mention.

Moreover, as citizens of the United States, we not only have the right, but it is our duty, in time of war no less than in time of peace, to protect the interests of our country. As a Representative in Congress, I feel it to be my bounden duty to vigilantly look after my country's interests.

In the New York Times of March 29, 1943, in describing the Keynes' plan, we read:

> Mr. Keynes' plan recognized that it would be unreasonable to ask the United States to demonetize its gold as a governing factor, but not to dispense with it. International bank money would be defined, therefore, in terms of a weight of gold.

Can it be that Professor Keynes would even be thinking of asking our country to undertake such a revolutionary act as the demonitization of our gold, if there had been no serious discussions between fiscal and monetary officials of the two governments of a nature to put this idea into his head?

Moreover, there is supporting evidence to the effect that British financial interests are seriously thinking of making an attempt to do something that would amount to about the same thing.

The New York Herald Tribune recently carried an article by Geoffrey Parsons, London correspondent of that paper, in which it is stated that there has been considerable discussion in British financial circles in the last few weeks about the current relative value of the pound sterling and the American dollar, with some fairly strong suggestions that the dollar is due for a radical revaluation. Mr. Parsons shows some of the calculations which are being used in London to show that the pound sterling is worth $8 to $16.

What! Is this a scheme to knock down the value of our gold and induce us to sell it for a song?

Is it possible we are being asked to contribute $2,000,000,000 to the international monetary power and receive credit for only one billion, or possibly only half a billion?

And then would we be induced to sell our gold hoard to the international monetary power for half or possibly no more than a fourth of what we value it at?

Would we be required to contribute the bulk of the gold that went into the formation of the $5,000,000,000 capital structure of the international monetary power?

Would the other nations contribute their share mostly in the form of political promises to pay?

The total amount of monetary gold in the world is in the neighborhood of $32,000,000,000. The United States holds roundly $22,500,000,000 of this. The rest of the nations hold the remainder, about $9,500,000,000.

If the United States should enter this scheme would the gold liability be our total supply of more than $22,000,000,000, and what would be the gold liability of the rest of the nations?

How would the operation of the scheme affect us if our gold liability should be the total amount of our gold holdings, which is something short of 75 percent of the total gold supply in the world, but as stockholders in the international monetary power corporation, we had only 25 percent of the votes?

Who would be on our side, and who would be against us?

Professor Keynes is credited with being the real father of the New Deal policy of deficit spending. It is generally understood that he exercises strong influence in the councils of the administration. He makes visits to this country and is welcomed to the chambers of our high officials. It is reasonable to assume that he is now exercising strong influence over the administration in the formulating of the international monetary power.

In One Man's Opinion, by the late Hugh S. Johnson, the following appeared:

> God save us from any more suggestions of Mr. John Maynard Keynes. God help us to run our own serious business with due regard to our own serious problem. (Washington Daily News, Monday, May 12, 1941.)

Yes, let us have international cooperation, but by all means let us have international cooperation based on enlightened self-interest.

The American people should be reminded now of something of which George Washington warned us in his Farewell Address. In speaking of the mischiefs of the spirit of party, he said:

> It—
>
> That is the spirit of party—
>
> opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passion. Thus the policy and will of one country becomes the policy and will of another.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has made a very pro-

found study of this international financing situation. May I say that my understanding of international finances is not very deep, but I do know that after the last war there was a great deal of money lost in this country due to the speculation and fluctuation of the exchange. Does not the gentleman think that a proposition of this kind would be very helpful in preventing a similar situation from developing after the present war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It would multiply it many times instead of helping it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DEPLETION IN SUPPLY OF CRUDE-OIL RESERVES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our country is facing a most serious situation because of the depletion in the supply of crude-oil reserves. If the present condition concerning our oil production is allowed to continue, this country will face a problem that will be another case of too little and very late.

Last year our oil reserves were reduced approximately 60,000,000 barrels, and if we continue as we have started during the first 3 months of this year, our reserves will be reduced a great deal more than that amount during this year.

In 1942 we used 1,395,000,000 barrels of oil and during the same year we produced about 1,385,000,000 barrels. Let me put it another way. In 1935 we discovered 1,900,000,000 barrels of reserve oil. In 1940 we discovered 945,000,000 barrels. Then in 1942 the discovery was 317,000,000 barrels, only one-third of the amount for 1940. Let me call your attention to some additional figures. Productive wells drilled in 1941 amounted to 20,080. In 1942 we drilled only 10,900, just about half as many. The average daily production of crude petroleum, based on Government figures, during the last 3 months of 1941 and including January 1942, was 4,114,000 barrels per day. The production of crude petroleum during the year beginning February 1942 was 3,776,000 barrels per day, being a drop of about 330,000 barrels per day; and during the first 3 months of 1943 the reduction has been still more.

I think these figures should be sufficiently indicative to show that the situation is not only serious but likely to become an alarming one.

Now let us look at the question of prices for crude oil. During World War No. 1 there was an agreement on the price of crude oil of $2.25 per barrel. That price went up to about $3.50 per barrel. In 1920 the price was about $3.07 per barrel. The price went down during depression years, along with other price fluctuations, but even in January 1937, 36-gravity crude brought about $1.20 or $1.22 per barrel. During the month of March 1943, with all the increase of price of other commodities, the same crude oil sold for about $1.17 per barrel.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the simple thing to do is to increase the price of crude oil to a place where producers can afford to drill wells for the discovery of additional oil supplies. Drilling activity in Kansas and other places has declined because of the inadequate price of crude oil. You talk about parity prices—the price of crude oil is less than 60 percent of parity. Another thing, an increase of 50 cents per barrel on the price of crude oil would increase the price of high-octane gas but very little.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that I believe we have a most critical situation facing us in the oil industry. We have on the one hand a depletion and decrease in the amount of our oil reserves, and on the other hand an increased demand for oil products. We do not know, of course, the approximate demand for gasoline and other products that are to be made by our Government for the use of our armed forces. That must remain more or less of a military secret. But we do know that because of the increase in the production of planes and bombers and tanks and all kinds of equipment that must have gasoline and gasoline products that the increase will be almost more than we can comprehend. It will certainly be most unfortunate if we should find within the next 12 months a critical shortage of one of the most important materials required for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time there is a ceiling on crude oil?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. What effect would that ceiling have upon the new oil areas? Would it retard or help their development?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman understood me, it would continue to retard the bringing in of new oil fields and oil production. It holds down new discoveries of oil and thereby depletes the reserve supply we have on hand. As I said a moment ago, last year we depleted our reserve about 60,000,000 gallons, and from the way we started this year, for the first 3 months, it is possible that we may double that amount.

Mr. CURTIS. When we need production in wartime, does not the gentleman agree that the great powers of the Office of Price Administration should be used to encourage production, whether it is crude oil, beef, pork, or what not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the thing I have been trying to do, to convince the Office of Price Administration and other agencies that it ought to increase the price of crude oil at least a sufficient amount to encourage producers to go ahead and discover new fields and produce more oil.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. If the price of crude oil is increased, will that retard the consumption and market of crude oil?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly not, because an increase in the price of crude oil of as much as 50 cents a barrel should not increase the price of gasoline more than 1 cent a gallon, as near as I can figure it out.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Kansas represents an oil-producing State and a great agricultural State. The statement that he has just made corroborates the splendid article written by Secretary Ickes which appeared sometime ago in which he stated that we are fast facing a depletion of oil deposits in this country. For that reason, does not the gentleman feel that we should certainly use farm products in the production of synthetic rubber?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's views but the thing to which I am directing particular attention now is the fact that with the depletion of our oil production and with the cutting down of our reserves we are going to face a most critical situation, one more critical than we realize, because of the need for gasoline and gasoline products in the prosecution of our war effort.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am honored to yield to my distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. The subject that the gentleman is talking about is one that interests me and has interested me for many months. I feel that unless we can get a reasonable increase in the price of crude oil our little independent oil producers are going out of business. The independent oil producer has only one way on earth to make money and that is by the sale of crude oil. That is all he produces.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. The major oil company has four definite ways of making money. First, it has crude oil that it can sell, if it desires. It transports oil through its own pipe line, and it also transports other people's oil and has an opportunity to make money in that way. If it refines oil, it has an opportunity to make money by that process and it distributes the refined products and it has the opportunity to make money in that way. May I say in this connection that there is little or no oil produced in the district I represent, but I do represent a great oil-producing State, and I am interested in keeping the small businessman in business. I would hate to think that when this war is over a few giant concerns will control the money and business of the United States of America. There is only one class of people who can buy the independents out. A bank, or anybody who has money, does not want an oil field.

An insurance company that has money to invest does not want to go into the oil business. When these little fellows go out of business, there is only one place for them to go, and that is into the hands of the major companies.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think this is vitally important to the oil industry because these little fellows are the pioneers. They are the ones that discover new fields. The Government this year has asked for 4,500 new wells. Unless these independents, who are the pioneers, and the so-called wildcatters, get a little encouragement in the way of an increase in the price of oil, I doubt very seriously that we shall bore half of 4,500 wells this year. I think it is vitally important that those who have the last say about the price of crude oil allow a reasonable increase in that price. I think those who manufacture and transport and distribute oil can absorb a reasonable increase in the price of crude oil and not raise the price of the finished product.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the splendid statement of our distinguished Speaker. His views on this very important matter are greatly appreciated. The big oil companies would do well to cooperate with the independent operators, who may be counted among the small businessman, as our Speaker has just suggested. The only group that can or would buy out these operators if they had to sell out are the big operators. Otherwise these small concerns will go out of business. They must have help and they must have it now, because we are not going to get the new production unless we can have a little more encouragement for them than we have had in the past. The way we can encourage them is mainly just to give them a fair price for their crude oil, because the amount that would be added to the price of the gasoline or the refined product is infinitesimal as compared with the results that would follow. Increased production is necessary right now, otherwise we may be heading for a critical shortage later on.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman from Kansas has made a very able statement. We have an identical situation in the State of Indiana. A shortage of crude oil is sure to come unless there is immediate relief to the crude-oil producers.

There has been a general decline in our present production and also a decline in the drilling of new wells or wildcat wells which are necessary to maintain production levels to have crude oil for effective prosecution of the war.

If this shortage of oil becomes acute the responsibility shall rest with Congress. We should do something about this, now, before it is too late. At the present time the price ceiling on crude oil is set at a level of 1941. Since that time there has been an increased cost in labor, material, and increased cost of drilling new wells. At the present average price of $1.20 per barrel in Indiana it is impossible to drill new wells. In some localities labor costs have increased 50 percent. To drill a new well, the drilling cost has risen in some areas from $1.75 per foot in 1940 and the early part of 1941, to $3 per foot in 1943.

The present fields and the production is not sufficient to maintain the war effort, and it is necessary that new wells be drilled. In 1942 the replacement cost per barrel of oil was approximately $1.26 per barrel, and with the trend of increased cost, our placement of the same barrel of crude oil in 1943 will be approximately $1.50 per barrel.

It is essential and necessary, in order to have new wells drilled, that the producers of oil should receive at least a 50-cent over-all increase in the price of crude oil at the well.

The small independent oil producers, numbering approximately 18,000 to 20,000 men, produce about 50 percent of the oil. These small producers are being put out of business because the price for crude oil at the well is not sufficient to permit them to drill additional wells.

I hope we can get some immediate action from Congress and the Small Business Committee of the House on this important subject.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PERMITTING RECIPIENTS OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO ENGAGE IN ESSENTIAL WAR SERVICE UNDER CERTAIN LIMITATIONS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call your particular attention to a joint resolution recently passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin has long been recognized as a forward-looking State. It maintains its leadership by the interest it displays in all the groups of our society.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 29

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in essential war service under certain limitations

Whereas the manpower shortage has accentuated the dislocation of necessary food production and aggravated the lack of coordination and delivery of essential war materials that will seriously hamper and retard the effective utilization of the resources of the allied nations; and

Whereas such labor shortage may be alleviated by economizing and utilizing our available labor in permitting the recipients of old-age assistance to be gainfully employed to the extent of permissible physical ability; and thereby extend to these aged people the opportunity to labor for victory and democracy; and

Whereas it would appear to be unwise and foolhardy to permit the continued impairment of the ability of our farmers and manufacturers to produce the necessary supplies and material necessary for both winning the war and the peace; and

Whereas the rapid acceleration in the cost of living with the limitations imposed by a pension budget has produced want and privation to our own citizens who have been most modest and meager in their needs; and

Whereas the pensioner has been handicapped greatly not only by the increased cost of living but in the limitations imposed upon him to obtain gainful employment to supplement the pension so as to provide the minimum necessities of life; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable to alleviate such manpower shortage and the distress of such pensioners by enacting legislation for the emergency period of the war that will provide that the earnings of any applicant for, or a recipient of, old-age assistance, received for labor required for the armed forces or for the production of war goods, agriculture or essential goods or services shall not be considered as income under such pension budget, so as to reduce such pension payment if the earnings are $50 per month or less, but 65 percent of the income in excess of $50 per month shall be considered income for the purpose of the reduction of the pension; and

Whereas such proposed legislation will enable thousands of loyal citizens to assume fully their obligations and duties of patriotic endeavor in the complete mobilization of all our manpower to work or fight to keep democracy safe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to speedily enact suitable legislation that will restore the effective productiveness of our old-age pensioners without loss of pension and alleviate in part both the increased living costs of such pensioners and our critical manpower shortage for the emergency period of the war; be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

CONRAD SHEARER,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ARTHUR F. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The resolution indicates the need of making provisions for the elderly people of our country. We are appropriating millions of dollars to bring in people from other lands like Mexico and Bermuda for farm work. We should be more interested in the contribution these elderly people want to make in our war effort. The manpower that can be obtained by letting these elderly people make their contribution should be very apparent. We should provide ways for these elderly people to make their service to the manpower needs of our country.

We have seen the civil-service bill pass where Government employees receiving over $4,000 per year are going to get a bonus or wage increase of over $600 per year. Should we expect these elderly people to live on less than the bonus given Government employees? If we give this one group extra pay whether they ask for it or not, and whether thousands of them have been on the pay roll a year or not, we surely should grant these elderly people this request and not deny the elderly people an opportunity to earn additional needed funds.

Our colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HEIDINGER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], here realized the plight of our elderly people and have each introduced legislation this session for their benefit.

I realize that these are all members of the minority party and how difficult it is to get their legislation on the floor of the House for consideration. However, I expect to continue to cooperate with them. I took this question up with Mr. McNutt as long ago as last October. It is time for action.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for calling our attention so often to the needs of the elderly people of our country. I realize full well how difficult it is to get consideration for this group. I have had a bill, H. R. 775, in this Congress, and, in fact, I had one bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress that would have provided for these elderly people. They most assuredly should be allowed to work and make their contribution to the war effort, especially in face of the manpower problem that exists today.

In addition I would like to call to your attention and to the attention of the other Members of the House the wage inequalities that exist for other groups.

WAGE INEQUALITIES

There are millions of underpaid workers in America today. About 7,000,000 workers receive high wages, while millions of others are having a hard time trying to make both ends meet. This is due, of course, to the high cost of living in the past 2 years. The high prices today are among other factors due to New Deal bungling of the food program. The bureaucrats and economic planners are getting a rebound from their scarcity program. Black markets have entered the picture and they must be removed. The American farmers did their part in food production in 1942. They are only getting a small portion of the increase in food prices.

There has been some work done by the Labor Department in regard to the inequalities in the wage rates of the Nation. The parachute workers in my district were increased from 37½ cents an hour to 47½ cents an hour. These workers are appreciative of that small increase, but they are having a hard time trying to survive on this small wage. However, in a similar industry, in a nearby defense plant, which is under civil service, the workers are receiving a minimum of 60 cents an hour.

Civil-service employees received a 21.6-percent raise and legislative and judicial clerks received a 10-percent raise effective until April 30, 1943. Under pending legislation all legislative and judicial clerks may receive a 15-percent increase and the civil-service employees will continue to receive a 21.6-percent increase.

Efforts have been made to remedy the inequalities of wages by the Little Steel formula. This formula would give wage earners an increase of 15 percent because the cost of living has advanced this much or more. There has been much confusion as to how much the cost of living has really advanced. Estimates run all the way from 15 to 50 percent. Some industrial workers have received an increase of 15 percent and others have received more. According to the testimony given by Mr. S. M. DeBrul, director of labor economic section of General Motors Corporation, before the House Labor Committee, the workers at General Motors have received a 30-percent increase on the basis of weekly earnings. They have received a 20-percent increase based on a straight-time hourly rate.

COAL-MINING INDUSTRY

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the coal-mining industry. As a former member of the Indiana mine rescue team, a top worker, and one who has weighed coal in the mine tipple, I believe I know the conditions of the coal miners of America. I represent the bituminous coal fields of Indiana. During the last 40 years I have watched the development of the coal industry. Before labor laws and unions developed, men worked for $1.70 per day and young boys worked for $1 per day. In those days there were many fights and wildcat strikes in the coal fields. Today, we have very little trouble in the Indiana mines. A few years ago, there were no company wash houses, and the men were required to wash at home. Today, due to legislation, we have company wash houses. Many miners have to drive several miles to the mines and then travel from 1 to 10 miles underground to get to their location to start the day's work. They should receive pay for the time spent in traveling to their work underground and returning to the surface at night. It is my understanding that this portal-to-portal pay is now given to miners in the metal mines and other industries; therefore, it is no more than right to expect the same consideration for the coal miner. Many miners have to work in 3½ or 4 feet of coal, making it necessary for them to stoop at all times and sometimes crawl through muck and water.

The coal-mining industry has been marked with a great loss of life because of hazardous working conditions. Miners work far below the ground in water and dangerous gases. One thousand four hundred and twenty miners lost their lives, and 45,000 were injured in 1940. Most of the mine accidents were caused by the fall of rock and the explosion of gas.

The basic wage scale of $7 per day is not all clear money, because miners have to buy tools, fuse, powder, lights, helmets, and pay for tool repairing. Considering the danger involved and the miners' expenses, the mining industry is the poorest paid of all industries. The miners' pay is based on the days the miners work. They will average about 5 days a week in the winter months but will do well to average 2 days a week during the summer months. In the earlier days miners were called underground savages by some people, but let me tell you it takes skill to work in the coal mines.

The miners are just like all other Americans; they want to educate their children, have security, and be allowed to enjoy the necessities and luxuries of life. They are patriotic citizens, giving their sons and daughters for the battle fronts while they produce the coal on the home front. They have been and hope to be able to continue to buy their share of War bonds and stamps. In order to produce the coal to win the war, these miners must have the proper food to give them strength to do the job. Let us not forget that coal mining is the basic industry on which all war industries are based.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his contribution. I have noted that the gentleman never pits one group against another. He is interested in every group, including the businessman, the laboring man, the farmer, the elderly people, and other groups of our citizens.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman kindly yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely.

Mr. LANDIS. As to the farmer many of them are suffering from inequalities. This is shown wherein some farmers receive much below parity for their products, while other favored ones obtain up to 148 percent of parity. This disturbs me and should not exist. It is apparently due to the bungling of O. P. A., and O. P. A.'s lack of understanding of practical agriculture. I hope these inequalities will be removed at an early date. For example, melons are a food, a good, desirable food, and should be recognized as such.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I was pleased to note that the gentleman from Indiana has been selected as chairman of the committee to study fresh and processed fruits and vegetables. The canners of our country should benefit from the work done by this committee under your leadership.

THE VALIANT TWENTY-SIXTH

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are daily watching with pride the steady advance of our fighting men in Africa, as our divisions meet the German enemy in direct and all-out combat. And the steady resistance, the courageous daring and the confident assurance of victory which our Army is demonstrating is a true indication that the Americans are in the fight again.

This year celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Twenty-sixth Division, the first division to be fully organized under the American flag. That great Yankee division went into the firing line on the Chemin des Dames on the 6th of February, 1918. It is the sons of these saviors of Paris who will soon be the saviors of France, for they are fighting with the same intrepidity, devotion to duty, and promise of victory that their fathers demonstrated before them.

The following poem was written by one of my constituents in honor of the Yankee Division, and gives testimony to the pride of achievement which marks every member of that famous fighting unit. Only the courageous attack against harsh opposition, mixed with common suffering and occasional setback, climaxed by common pride in a

victory hard won, could have preserved for 25 years the spirit that is set forth in this poem and is representative of the spirit of the valiant Twenty-sixth. The poem is as follows:

THE VALIANT TWENTY-SIXTH

Ye veterans of the Twenty-sixth,
Who fought so well in France;
A quarter of a century
Gives you predominance!
Among the Nation's fighting men
Your immortality
Was earned the way you met the foe,
And swept to victory.

Ye sons of Edwards, man of men,
Who led you to the front
Of Toul, La Reine, Chemin des Dames,
Schiesprey and Apremont.
Then on to Belleau Wood and Vaux,
Givry, Etrepilly;
You fought the Battle of the Marne
At Chateau Thierry.

Ye soldiers of the old YD,
There's glory in your name;
You stormed the plateau of St. Mihiel
To gain a lasting fame.
And when the Argonne claimed your dead
With tears you lifted sod,
To lay them in a resting place,
Safe in the hands of God.

Ye veterans of the Twenty-sixth
Are slowly growing gray;
But in your heart a fervent flame
Is burning to this day.
You rightly have the pride of men
Who beam with ecstasy;
To know you did it for the flag
And France's fleur-de-lis.

—*Stephen M. Walsh, Jr.*

LYNN, MASS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. GAMBLE), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MAGNUSON (by Mr. JACKSON), indefinitely, on account of the death of his mother.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 13, 1943, at 2:30 o'clock p. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads (full committee) on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2437. Public hearings will be had.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 13, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1172.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, April 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 687. Public hearings will be had.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

317. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $247,000 (H. Doc. No. 155); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

318. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

319. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

320. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Twenty-ninth Annual Report, prepared by direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1900. A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Donald J. Munson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2462. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2463. A bill to restrain pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2464 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2465 (by request). A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2466. A bill to expedite the payment of compensation to persons having any right, title, or interest in property taken by the United States for naval uses during the existing national emergency; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2467. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of a building for, and for the operation of, the petroleum experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Laramie, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H.R. 2468. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2475. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to

promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2476. A bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2477. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 2478. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2479. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2480. A bill directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of his services and contributions to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res 206. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1900; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to remove unnecessary restriction interfering with travel of persons and movements of products between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent the sending through the United States mails of magazines and newspapers containing advertisements of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Anna Charack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of J. G. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Hristos Paulos Divitaris, alias Christ D. Paul; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of Jonas Mullens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harold Weil; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

495. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation vesting the Fair Employment Practice Committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution, and enforcement, together with adequate funds to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on Appropriations.

497. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, requesting Congress to enact House bill 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

498. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of G. Clarke LaCelle and other residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

499. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging Congress to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on Appropriations.

500 Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging speedy enactment of legislation which would effectively abolish the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. By Mr. BURCHILL of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, efficient and victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

502. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, unanimously endorsing House bill 997 and Senate bill 216, providing for the establishment of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

503. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, that the Congress be memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on Appropriations.

504. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting Congress to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on Appropriations.

505. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully requesting the Congress to speedily enact House bill 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

506. By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of the New York State Legislature, that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact suitable legislation vesting the Fair Employment Practice Committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution, and enforcement, together with adequate funds to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. Also, memorial of New York State Legislature, that the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on Appropriations.

508. Also, memorial of New York State Legislature, respectfully petitioning the Congress of the United States to speedily enact House bill 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

509. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of various citizens from the State of Indiana, and especially from Howe, Anderson, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute, Plainfield, Marion, Middletown, Stroh, Urbana, Wabash, Portland, Hartsville, and Lagrange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

511. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 51 residents of Pine Bush, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, and stating that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

512. Also, petition of 15 residents of Pine Bush, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, contending that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

513. Also, petition of 18 residents of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, and stating that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

514. Also, petition of 50 residents of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 and stating that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

515. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to enact legislation vesting the Fair

Employment Committee with additional power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

516. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Steele and 625 other residents of Jasper County, Mo., petitioning passage of Senate bill 860 or similar legislation as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 to give to the young men of 1943 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

517. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the city of Portland, Maine, in the city council, urging the completion of drydock facilities at South Portland, Maine; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

518. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of Queens division of the Community Councils of New York, that every means possible be used to prevent the waste of public funds, cutting out unnecessary expenses and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

519. By Mr. BARRY: Resolution of the Legislature of New York, urging the passage of pharmacy corps bills (H. R. 997 and S. 216); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

520. Also, resolution of the Legislature of New York, urging legislation to bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in laws and regulations affecting the border between United States and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

521. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Calif., relative to establishing cafeterias in defense plants so that proper food can be furnished to workers and to avoid absenteeism; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

522. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 15, of the State of California, adopted April 2, 1943, relative to the making of payments by the Federal Government to counties to reimburse them for loss of tax receipts on account of the use of certain lands by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

523. Also, resolution of the Retail Department Stores Employees Union, San Francisco, relative to amending the National Security Act, so as to include all cemetery employees within the benefits and provisions of this act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

524. Also, Senate Resolution No. 94 of the State of California, relative to the foot-and-mouth disease in imported cattle; to the Committee on Agriculture.

525. Also, resolution of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the induction of married men with children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1943

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give ear, O Lord, unto the voice of our supplication; in the bounty of Thy love and mercy, vouchsafe Thy continued blessing unto us. As wisdom is before the face of him who hath understanding, we pray for the faithfulness which finds rich satisfaction in working out Thy purpose in the needful things of every common day. Deliver us from the idols of the natural man; instill in us the steadiness of mind and rest of heart which spring from the ultimate realities as exemplified in our divine Lord.

We praise Thee that the might of great men and the purity of good women ennoble the world and their ministry makes a contribution to the onward progress of civilization. They lived and thought, planned and toiled, and spent their new-found strength for the blessing of mankind.

Heavenly Father, we are grateful today that yonder monument, most worthily and most fittingly crowned, proclaims to our Nation all which makes a people great and enduring. It tells of our passion for religious and political freedom beyond temporal gain; it symbolizes the worth and dignity of a true life and pleads for that nationalism which is the heritage of a free and enlightened democracy. We rejoice that it announces to all the world that the great Virginian, beyond our peerless institutions, glorified the rights of the individual. Almighty God, may he ever live in the evolution of right and national honor as the master architect of the new world. Through Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 31, 1943:

H. R. 2068. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution extending the time within which certain acts under the Internal Revenue Code are required to be performed.

On April 8, 1943:

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been; and

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes.

On April 9, 1943:

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1366. An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2070. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institution so named.

On April 10, 1943:

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts; and

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast.

On April 12, 1943:

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James; and

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler.

The message also informed the House that the act (H. R. 1780) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes, having been presented to the President of the United States on March 30, 1943, for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, has become a law without his approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 899. An act to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill H. R. 2481 (Rept. No. 354) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas reserves all points of order.

COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 203) from the Committee on Foreign Affairs for present consideration, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to transmit to the House information, so fully as possible, from the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, showing the actual status of the functions, duties, operation, and administration of cultural relations thereof of and in relation to the State Department; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to transmit to the House information, so fully as possible, defining and distinguishing the information-service duties of the following agencies: Office of War Information, Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease Administration, and Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. No, I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, though I shall not do so, because the information is coming from heads of the various departments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the resolution lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek at the Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif., April 4, 1943. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that this will make two and one-third pages, at a cost of $105, and I ask that the matter be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS BY ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled, "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain what this is?

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, Senate 899 is substantially the same as H. R. 2283, on the Union Calendar, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Claims of the House. The Senate amended the bill by striking out the word "directly" in lines 24 and 25 on page 3, and inserting in lieu thereof after the word "enemy" the words "or, resulting directly or indirectly from any act." H. R. 2283 was considered by the Claims Committee and passed unanimously, and as I stated a moment ago is now on the Union Calendar. The Senate considered S. 899 yesterday, which is the same bill, with the just-mentioned amendment, and which came over from the Senate a few moments ago. Some of the officers were in my office this morning and they asked that this bill be rushed through as quickly as possible, because the leadership in our foreign countries are asking that they be given this relief. Under the present act of January 2, 1942, they have the right to settle all claims up to $1,000 and this merely raises the amount that they can settle for up to $5,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is only for the duration of the war?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and such other officer or officers as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to appoint a claims commission or commissions, each composed of one or more officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims, including claims of insured but excluding claims of subrogees, on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public property both real and personal, or on account of damage to or loss or destruction of private property both real and personal or personal injury or death of inhabitants of a foreign country, including places located therein which are under the temporary or permanent jurisdiction of the United States, arising in such foreign country, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, when such damage, loss, destruction, or injury is caused by Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces, or individual members thereof, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of such forces, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by such commissions unless presented within 1 year after the occurrence of the accident or incident out of which such claim arises except that claims arising out of accidents or incidents occurring after December 6, 1941, but prior to May 1, 1943, may be presented at any time prior to May 1, 1944: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe and may, in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, be subject to the approval of such commanding or other officer of Army, Navy, or Marine Corps forces, as the case may be, as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe; and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall have authority, if he deems any claim in excess of $5,000 to be meritorious, to certify such amount as may be found to be just and reasonable thereon to Congress as a legal claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided further*, That no claim of any national of any country at war with the United States, or of any ally of such enemy country, except as the commission or the local military commander shall determine that the claimant is friendly to the United States, and no claim resulting from action by the enemy or resulting directly or indirectly from any act by our armed forces engaged in combat, shall be allowed under this act: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"SEC. 2. All payments in settlement of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made out of the appropriation, current at the time of settlement, for 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel,' as to claims settled by commissions composed of officers of the Navy or Marine Corps, and out of the appropriation, current at the time of settlement, for 'Finance Service, Army,' as to claims settled by commissions composed of officers of the Army.

"SEC. 3. This act shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, ascertainment, adjustment, determination, or payment of claims by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

"SEC. 4. This act shall be applicable to claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after May 27, 1941: *Provided*, That as to any claim in excess of $1,000 this act shall be applicable for the purpose of payment thereof, or the purpose of the certification thereof to Congress for payment, only if the accident or incident out of which such claim arises has occurred, or shall occur, subsequent to December 6, 1941.

"SEC. 5. The act of April 18, 1918 (40 Stat. 532), relating to indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. Claims of the type described in section 1 hereof on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property both real and personal, or personal injury or death of any person, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members, including military personnel and civilian employees thereof, or otherwise incident to activities of such forces, arising at any time while the Coast Guard shall be operating as a part of the Navy may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the manner in this act provided for the settlement of Navy and Marine Corps claims, except that in such cases one or more officers of the Coast Guard may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to a claims commission or commissions or as officers to approve settlements of claims made by such commission or commissions, and all payments in settlement of such claims shall be made out of the appropriation 'General expenses, Coast Guard': *Provided*, That no claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property, or personal injury or death, caused by Coast Guard forces, or individual members thereof, or otherwise incident to the activities of such forces, shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, or paid under the provisions of this act at any time when the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department.

"SEC. 7. In time of war any claims, whether Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, which may be settled under this act may, at the request of the service concerned, be settled by any commission or commissions appointed under this act even though not composed of officers of the service concerned, subject to reimbursement by the service for whom the claims were settled pursuant to the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FRANK AND PAULINA RUBLEIN AND MRS. ETHEL BOWERS (H. DOC. NO. 156)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1639, "An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers."

The bill proposes to pay to Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, father and mother of Ernest J. Rublein, deceased, the sum of $5,000, and to Mrs. Ethel Bowers, mother of Richard Bowers, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damages for the fatal injuries suffered by their sons on August 15, 1934, on Route Numbered 28, about 3½ miles east of Newberry, Mich., when the automobile in which they were riding was involved in a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck.

The records show that at about 6:15 a. m., the truck was proceeding south on the State highway, at a speed of about 20 or 25 miles per hour, approaching the crest of a hill. A Ford coupe, owned by Richard F. Bowers, and occupied by his son, Richard Bowers, and Ernest J. Rublein, was proceeding in the opposite direction, at a speed variously estimated as between 30 and 50 miles per hour. As the vehicles were approaching, the Ford was traveling on the wrong side of the road, and when they were between 20 and 60 feet apart, the driver of the Government vehicle realized that a collision was imminent and swerved to his left in an effort to avoid colliding with the Ford, but the driver of the latter suddenly swerved to his right and collided with the Government vehicle, striking it just behind the right cab door. Gasoline from the tank of the Ford burst into flames, which completely enveloped Mr. Bowers and Mr. Rublein, both of whom were dead when removed from the car.

The reports of the War Department on S. 3932 and S. 3933, Seventy-sixth Congress, which are printed in the attached House Report No. 118, Seventy-eighth Congress, show that the only disinterested eye-witness to the accident testified that—

> At about 6:15 a. m., August 15, 1934, I was coming south on Highway 28, about one-quarter mile behind a Civilian Conservation Corps truck * * *. As the truck was on the slope of a small hill, a civilian car approached from the opposite direction traveling on the wrong side of the road at a rate of approximately 30 to 35 miles per hour. The Civilian Conservation Corps driver, when the civilian car got quite close, swung to the left side of the road to avoid a collision. When about 20 yards apart, the civilian car, later determined to be a Ford coupe, suddenly swerved to the left—obviously the witness' left—and ran into the truck hitting on the right side of the truck. * * *
>
> In my opinion, the driver of the Ford was entirely to blame * * *.

It is apparent from the evidence that the Government vehicle, at the time it approached the Ford, was being operated in a lawful, careful, and prudent manner. It is a well-established principle of law that if a motorist traveling on his right-hand side of the road sees another vehicle approaching on the same side and it reasonably appears to the driver who is on the proper side that there will be a collision unless he turns to the left, and, acting upon such appearance, he swerves his car in that direction and in doing so does what an ordinarily prudent person would have done under similar circumstances, he does not violate the law of the road, and is not negligent. In determining whether such person was justified in turning out to the left, the usual rules applicable to acts in emergencies generally apply and, where the dangerous situation is brought on by the negligence of the person on the wrong side of the road, the conduct of the other driver in turning to the left is not to be judged by the rules and measurements of a calm calculation, but must be judged by its reasonableness in the light of the circumstances as they appeared to him in the situation in which he found himself, brought about by the failure of the other driver to reasonably turn to his own side of the road, when he had ample opportunity to do so.

I am unable to agree with the suggestion that the truck driver violated the law of the road by turning to the left and crossing the center of the highway, and am satisfied that he was not negligent, that his conduct was proper under the circumstances as they appeared to him, and that the proximate cause of the collision was the negligence of the driver of the Ford in failing to reasonably return to his own side of the road when he had ample opportunity to do so.

Approval of the bill would have the effect of granting benefits to the parents of Mr. Bowers and Mr. Rublein which are denied in other cases where the facts are similar. The bereaved families are entitled to our most profound sympathy. However, I can perceive no legal or moral obligation on the part of the Government to award compensation in this case.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal, and the message with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Allen, Ill.	Ford	Merrow
Anderson, Calif.	Furlong	Mott
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gamble	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Gavagan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Gibson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bell	Gillie	O'Leary
Boykin	Gordon	O'Neal
Buckley	Gorski	O'Toole
Burgin	Griffiths	Outland
Cannon, Fla.	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Celler	Harness, Ind.	Robinson, Utah
Clason	Heffernan	Scanlon
Compton	Hendricks	Smith, Maine
Cooley	Holmes, Mass.	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	Holmes, Wash.	Stevenson
Cullen	Izac	Taylor
Dies	Klein	Voorhis, Calif.
Dingell	Knutson	Walter
Dirksen	Lewis, Colo.	Weaver
Ditter	Luce	West
Douglas	Ludlow	Whelchel, Ga.
Elliott	McKenzie	Willey
Fay	Maas	Wilson
Fernandez	Magnuson	Winter
Fogarty	Merritt	Woodrum, Va.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-nine Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the vice president of Manhattan College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which I wrote on Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short-wave radio address to Africa by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Virginia was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial from a labor paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A PIG IN A POKE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today is the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of a great American—Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson believed in freedom of speech and he believed in the three coordinate branches of our Government and the individual responsibilities attached to each.

Mr. Speaker, in that spirit I want the House and the country to know that I have just introduced a concurrent resolution, in which I will be joined in the Senate in its next session tomorrow by my colleague from Michigan the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON, which is very simple in its wording and provides that the Congress—both the House and the Senate—shall create a committee which shall sit in attendance at each and every session of the forthcoming International Food Conference now scheduled to be held at Hot Springs, Va., May 7, 1943; and providing further that each and every session of this conference shall be covered in a normal fashion subject to reasonable censorship—and I stress that word "reasonable"—by the three major wire press services of this Nation, namely, the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press. The sole purpose of this resolution is to assure the Congress and the people of this country that we will continue to have open covenants, openly arrived at.

Regardless of what agreements may be reached at this meeting, if they be in the form of treaties, they are subject to ratification by the Senate, but the point is this, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this Congress is not to be handed a pig in a poke.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Leon J. Obermayer, Esq., of the Philadelphia bar, together with an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7 and an article in the Germantown Telegraph of April 2, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution of the Connecticut General Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF WAR BONDS IN THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of the districts we represent here in the House of Representatives, but last night I was made particularly proud of the First Congressional District of Connecticut, which includes the capital city of Hartford.

The well-known radio program, Information Please, was broadcast from the Bushnell Memorial Hall in Hartford last night, with Mr. Wendell L. Willkie as guest member of the panel. The auditorium was filled to capacity with 3,400 men and women. This audience purchased War bonds to the amount of $2,497,000. One hundred and fifty seats had been reserved for the heads of Hartford business organizations, and it was reported that these business organizations had purchased $200,850,000 in War bonds yesterday.

The Governor of Connecticut, Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, introduced Mr. Willkie and, at the same time, announced that the State of Connecticut had purchased $9,300,000 worth of the new issue of Government bonds, all of which means that more than $212,000,000 worth of War bonds was sold in the city of Hartford yesterday. This represents 1.6 percent of the $13,000,000,000 issue recently announced.

I am sure that this is an activity on the part of Mr. Willkie that our colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will approve.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Dayton Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects—in one to include a statement made by the distinguished Secretary of State yesterday before the Committee on Ways and Means on reciprocal trade, and in the other to include an article written by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. STEFAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE LATE JOHN BOYLAN

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one of the many thousands who attended the two-hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth at that marble memorial today, there came to my mind recollections of a man who played an important part in making this memorial possible, a man who represented my district for a great many years with distinction from the Sixty-eighth to the Seventy-fifth Congresses; a citizen, honored and respected in the State of New York as well as in Washington. I thought for a moment what an insignificant part each of us plays in this life; but being present today at the dedication of this gigantic, colossal, and beautiful monument brought to my mind this man who has gone to the Great Beyond, and I realized that little as we think we do in this life, someone is always doing something worth while. These are days when all of us, even though we think what we do is trivial, must do that much more.

John Boylan will be honored and respected for all time, and I am sure the fact that he had a very important part in inaugurating this monument, the bill providing it having been introduced by him on June 16, 1926, which stands by the Tidal Basin today in Jefferson's memory, means something to each and every one of us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I shall make in the Committee of the Whole today a letter from the Commissioner of Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR DIFFICULTIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read an advertisement that appeared in one of my local newspapers yesterday morning:

WORKING OF ESSENTIAL JOBS?

If any man over 38 years of age prefers not to be drafted and enter military service he stands a better chance of fulfilling that wish if he gets into some line of work which the country urgently needs.

Apply for a job with us at Camp Ritchie (near Waynesboro).

Bring your social-security card to the middle gate—follow railroad to the end and apply at office of B. Perini & Son, Inc.

Work consists of concrete road construction and landscape work.

Working 10 hours per day. First 8 hours, 65 cents; overtime, 97½ cents; all day Saturday and Sunday, 97½ cents.

Work starts at 8 a. m.

Any car owner furnishing transportation for five passengers will be given $3 daily bonus.

Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to every farmer in my district, an insult and an injury to every industrialist with fixed-price contracts and shrinking crews. When will the administration give the farmers and the small businessmen a break?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

JEFFERSON ON AERONAUTICS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the exercises commemorating the two hundredth birthday anniversary of Thomas Jefferson, I feel it will be interesting and informative to the House to recall that when this great American was 79 years of age he set forth his belief that we would have propelled means by which man could fly.

I quote, in part, from a letter he wrote from his home at Monticello to Mr. D. B. Lee, April 27, 1822:

> Age has long since obliged me to withhold my mind from speculations of the difficulties of those of your letter. That there are means of artificial buoyancy by which man may be supported in the air, the balloon has proved, and that means of directing it may be discovered is against no law of nature and is, therefore, possible as in the case of birds.

Mr. Speaker, had Jefferson been a younger man, at the time of this letter, I am certain he would have directed his inventive talents to the creation of means for flight.

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE TREATIES OF 1903 AND 1936 WITH PANAMA, AND OTHER COMMITMENTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 198 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to speak with reference to Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. LANHAM. I am.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the same privilege be extended to other Members during the afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, very few people in all the history of the world have had the gift of a variety of genius. The most conspicuous example in this regard in the Old World was Leonardo da Vinci. In my judgment, the outstanding example in the New World was Thomas Jefferson.

I have esteemed it an unusual honor to be a member of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, and I wish in these remarks today to call attention to one phase of Jefferson's activity not so well known.

Many and memorable are the contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the welfare not only of America but of the whole world. Eminent among those benefactions are the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia statute for religious freedom, and his acquisition of Louisiana, from the 827,987 square miles of which have been formed 10 of the States of our Union. These are likely our greatest heritages from the mind and heart of the immortal whose birth we commemorate today. But he deserves our gratitude also for another service to this Nation and one for which we should be especially thankful now that American inventions are aiding so vitally in the preservation of our American institutions.

Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Washington, was the first administrator of our patent system. Under the act of 1790 the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General, or any two of them, were authorized to issue patents. In 1793 this authority was conferred upon the Secretary of State alone. The Patent Office of today began as a division of the Department of State and remained in its jurisdiction until 1849.

On July 31, 1790, the first United States patent was granted to Samuel Hopkins, of Vermont. In the nearly 153 years that have passed since then some 2,325,000 patents have been issued, most of them to Americans. Among these creations of American genius are the thousands that have helped not only to upbuild our industries and give us material strength but many also to promote and protect our political and social well-being. As I have said, and as the whole world knows, American inventions are in this crisis the most potent implements of our victory in this war and of our economic security after this conflict with despotism. American inventiveness is supplying our Army and our Navy not alone with weapons more deadly than those of our enemies but also with all their needs of food, clothing, transportation, and medical care. Every factory producing the machines and munitions required by our military and naval forces is working with inventions recruited from the uses of peace. Additions to our armament are coming daily from the minds of our inventors to reenforce us and to repulse our foes.

Jefferson's high estimate of the American patent system has been vindicated by its accomplishments in the 153 years that have elapsed since he approved that first grant to Samuel Hopkins. He lived to see the steamboat traversing the Mississippi River and the other waters of the region which his statesmanship had brought under the American flag. Before Jefferson's death, 117 years ago, Eli Whitney's cotton gin, which was patented while he was Secretary of State, had become an important aid to agriculture in the South. Himself an inventor, as well as the first administrator of our patent system, Jefferson was competent to foresee and appraise the benefits of that system.

Both his extraordinary ability and his intimate experience equipped Jefferson to judge the value of patents in his own day and to foretell their importance in the decades to come. Read now what he said more than a century ago, and it will be seen how fully and impressively his words have been verified. While still concerned with the issuance of patents, he wrote:

> An act of Congress authorizing the issue of patents for new discoveries has given a spring to invention beyond my conception. Being an instrument in granting the patents, I am acquainted with their discoveries. Many of them, indeed, are trifling, but there are some of great consequence, which have been proved of practice, and others which, if they stand the same proof, will produce great effect.

President Roosevelt, then, has ample warrant, not merely in the statements of Jefferson, but equally in the light of the past and the present, to envision the patent system as an economic and social advantage to us in the time of war and as a reliance in the precarious conditions that will come with the new era of peace. In his Executive order of December 12, 1941, establishing the National Patent Planning Commission, he recorded that "both American industrial development and our people generally have greatly benefited by the products of American inventive genius." Declaring then that it is essential even in time of war to plan for a full utilization of the Nation's expanded industrial capacity with the return of peace, a problem to which the inventive genius of our citizens can be ap-

plied at this time and which also requires a study to be made of our existing patent laws and procedures, together with other appropriate action, he created a Commission of five members familiar with the problems of science, industry, agriculture, labor, and the consumer. To this Commission he has assigned the duty of conducting a comprehensive survery and study of the American patent system and of considering whether the system now provides the maximum service in stimulating the inventive genius of our people in evolving inventions and in furthering their prompt utilization for the public good; whether our patent system should perform a more active function in inventive development and to determine what methods and plans might be developed to promote inventions and discoveries which will increase commerce, provide employment, and fully utilize expanded defense industrial facilities during normal times.

So it is that the twenty-eighth successor of Jefferson in the Presidency confirms the latter's plea for the recognition of inventors as promotive of our progress and prosperity. For Jefferson realized that patents were at once rewards to inventors and recompenses to the whole public, which continued to benefit by inventions long after the passing of their creators, just as we are now the beneficiaries of Charles Goodyear's ingenuity 100 years after his success in vulcanizing rubber and 80 years after his death. These truths Jefferson expressed in these words:

> In the arts, and especially in the mechanical arts, many ingenious improvements are made in consequence of the patent-right giving exclusive use of them for 14 years.
>
> Certainly an inventor ought to be allowed a right to the benefit of his invention for some certain time * * * Nobody wishes more than I do that ingenuity should receive liberal encouragement.

His clear understanding and most helpful fostering of our patent system have given us a further cause of gratefulness to Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I would like to read to the House. It is dated April 12, 1943, and is as follows:

APRIL 12, 1943.

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
United States Congress.

DEAR MR. MORRISON: I wish to call your attention to one of the most amazing examples of despotic bureaucracy ever practiced on a citizen of this Republic under our supposedly Constitution and Bill of Rights.

I refer to the case of Francis J. Reuter, residing at 3620 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., who for some time was employed by the War Department as the civilian chief of the Army Air Corps' statistical bureau. Mr. Reuter is a university graduate and holder of several college degrees.

More than a year ago, Mr. Reuter, was instructed to prepare a report on Air Corps plane accidents, etc. It comes to my attention that the compilation was so startling that his superiors demanded that he destroy the data. Mr. Reuter, so I am informed, refused to do so. As a result he was relieved of his position and was ordered to report to a southern State where he was assigned to "special duty" which consisted mainly of twiddling his thumbs.

This went on for several months. Then Mr. Reuter, tired of loafing, returned to Washington and demanded that he be allowed to resume his former duties. This was denied. Instead, he was told to report to the War Department each morning, sign in, then go home. Mr. Reuter did this for several months.

He has told friends that his apartment has been invaded by Army officials, without due process of law, and that his private papers and property has been ransacked by these officials who had feared that Mr Reuter may have made copies of his plane crash report.

Sir, I have good reason to believe that the above information to be true. This matter comes to me from a source that has talked to the above-mentioned person. The above story is exactly what the above party related to a friend of mine who is a very reliable person.

Because of the amazing background of this incident coupled with the information already presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to the amazing number of Air Force accidents, I believe that Mr. Reuter should be subpenaed before the Military Affairs Committee or the Truman defense investigating committee, which is now engaged in investigating these plane crashes—in open session—for questioning.

As you know I have for over a year and a half been demanding an investigation of the crashes. On April 5 I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD War Department's own figures which conclusively proved that the accident-prevention program of the Army Air Corps has been a failure. These War Department statistics showed that during the past year crashes caused by personnel errors was reduced by merely 1 percent, and mechanical defects increased by 1 percent. There was something ominous about these figures.

What is the Army trying to cover up? Why have they resorted to every conceivable device to prevent a congressional study of these alarming number of plane crashes?

Any sincere and patriotic group would welcome a thorough congressional investigation aimed to save lives, and most certainly would be welcomed by the flyers, and in addition would be a morale builder to know that everything is being done to safeguard the lives of our boys while in the service of our country.

JOSEPH LEIB,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14, which comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I understand was reported unanimously by that committee. The rule is an open one. The legislation refers to certain American interests in Panama, and I feel sure that the House wants to adopt this rule and get into the heart of the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the adoption of the 1-minute rule some 4 or 5 years ago the Members of the House would ask for time, maybe 5, 10, or 20 minutes individually. The result was that they would take an hour or two before we reached any legislation. So the Speaker and the House in their wisdom put into effect about 5 years ago the 1-minute rule. It is impossible to discuss important and vital issues in 1 minute. Therefore, under the time provided for the consideration of the rules reported by the Committee on Rules, I believe it is advisable not only on anniversaries but when great issues arise to provide time under the rule to discuss other issues. I have always leaned over backward to provide that time, and am glad that today it is in order for any Member to speak on the anniversary of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. But this principle applies, I should say, due to the fact of having the 1-minute rule, to other current issues, matters of importance, answers to the President's address, or maybe even matters that are important to the individual Member of Congress who wants to make a speech immediately on a particular day for home consumption. Otherwise Members have to wait until the end of the day's session after legislation has been disposed of and few are present in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take time except to explain this bill briefly. I desire to say a few words first on this anniversary, and I say them from my heart because I am a great admirer of Thomas Jefferson. I believe he was one of our greatest Presidents and one of our greatest statesmen. Abraham Lincoln always said that he received his main political principles and ideals from Thomas Jefferson. The Republican Party wrote into its first two platforms the Declaration of Independence, that immortal document written by Thomas Jefferson.

If Jefferson were alive today, certainly he would not be in favor of the regimentation of the American people, nor would he be in favor of bureaucracy and the usurpation of the legislative powers by the Executive and by the bureaucrats. It seems to me that President Roosevelt, who professes to follow the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, like St. Peter of old, has followed from afar, and has lost track very largely of Jeffersonian principles, particularly as to the third term and in regard to not entering into entangling alliances, those were the words of Jefferson and not of Washington, and with respect to setting up a government of concentrated powers in the city of Washington.

If Jefferson stood for anything, he stood for States' rights and State sovereignty and against the concentration of power in the Federal Government and the setting up of a huge bureaucracy at Washington. Those were the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, and they have been lost sight of by many

who profess and pretend to be his followers today and instead they are engaged in regimenting the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on the bill which this rule makes in order. I regret that the House is compelled to vote upon this legislation. I do not think it should originate in the House because it involves treaty rights, I believe it should have originated in the Senate. However, it is before us and it is a difficult situation for Members to face. No one wants to oppose this legislation because of our friendship for Panama, and on account of our desire to cooperate with Panama and the good-neighbor policy, particularly in time of war. Nevertheless, this bill should be discussed, and we should have a full presentation of the facts.

What are the facts? The facts are that we are transferring by an act of Congress perhaps $13,000,000 of American property and $2,000,000 by appropriation to the Republic of Panama. We are transferring the water works and sewer systems in the cities of Panama and Colon, and the real estate in Panama and Colon, owned by the Panama Railroad, which in turn is owned by the United States, in the amount of $10,000,000.

We receive an income from that real estate in the amount of $350,000 a year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes more. We pay the Panamanian Government $430,000 annually for the use of the Panama Canal, but now in addition to that we are turning over property from which we derive an income annually of $350,000. We are under no obligation to do this. This bill assumes to carry out some treaties. If that is so, if this is an amendment to the treaties, supplementary to treaties, then it ought to come up in treaty form and go to the Senate of the United States for ratification rather than be initiated here in the House of Representatives.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that under the treaty of 1936 these agreements are made and also that the Supreme Court held that by acts of Congress the land and money can be given to other countries? If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that that is correct.

Mr. FISH. I believe that probably we are acting within the Constitution, but the practice has been under the Constitution that all treaties go to the Senate. This is an indirect way of making a treaty. I am not here, of course, to defend the prerogatives of the Senate. I am very glad to have the House have all the power it can to deal with foreign affairs, but I think it would have been a little more courteous, so far as the bill is concerned, to let it originate in the Senate. It passed the Senate in the last Congress, but there has been a change of one-third of the Members of the Senate since that time. At that time practically every Republican Senator voted against this bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself an additional minute. There has been a big change in the Senate, and if those new Senators should take the position of their Republican colleagues in the last session, this bill probably would not be over here, but we have taken it upon ourselves to initiate it, which I consider unfortunate. I am not going to stand in this Well and oppose it, and go on record against anything that will interfere with our war efforts, or our cooperation with Panama. However, I wanted these facts to be known, and I want it known by every Member of the House that when he votes he is voting to make a gift of $15,000,000 to the Panamanian Government: $13,000,000 in property and $2,000,000 in cash.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 1 minute more.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The commercial value of the property is estimated at $30,000,000, and the cost to us would be $68,000, $80,000 for the waterworks, and $2,700,000 otherwise, and there will be an offset for machinery turned back from Panama to us.

Mr. FISH. The actual amount of property, the value of the property in Panama and Colon today is $10,000,000, from which we receive an income of $350,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

JEFFERSON'S SPIRIT

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are all of us still under the spell of that great American, whose two hundredth anniversary we celebrated today by dedicating a shrine and a memorial to him in this city. Jefferson was indeed a great man, a genius with a variety of talents. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has said he was an inventor. The polygraph that he invented is still in use. He was an architect, a scientist, a philosopher, a statesman, a governor, a member of the legislature, a member of the Continental Congress, a diplomat, a Cabinet officer, and a President. Thomas Jefferson, who called himself a Republican, was so broad, so great that there is room for almost all of us under his banner, regardless of party. Note that I say "almost all of us." Channing, the historian, said:

> Jefferson in truth was an idealist. He was in politics from a sincere desire to save the Nation from those he called Monocrats.

Jefferson believed in principle above party. He wrote in 1783:

> I have never submitted the whole system of my opinions to the creed of any party of men whatsoever in religion, in philosophy, in politics, or in anything else where I was capable of thinking for myself. If I could not go to heaven but with a party, I would not go there at all.

In his first inaugural address in 1801 he said:

> Every difference of opinion is not a difference in principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all republicans. We are all federalists.

Those last words, "We are all republicans, we are all federalists" have puzzled historians through the years, and they have argued as to what he meant. I believe that he meant just what he said. He knew that Alexander Hamilton's influence in the electoral college had elected Jefferson President over Aaron Burr. He was thinking of the past and of the future. Those who are united in principle and not in opinion are still united. Those, on the other hand, who are not Jeffersonian Republicans or Jeffersonian Democrats—those who believe in monocracy, in perpetuation in office against which Thomas Jefferson fought all his life, are not united with Thomas Jefferson in principle, in memory, or in spirit.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on this two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the friend of the common man, it is fitting to make a plea for our elder citizens. The Seventy-eighth Congress has been in session now almost 4 months. Many of the supply bills, war legislation, and other major problems have been considered and disposed of. There has been some talk of an Easter vacation for the Members of the Congress. I realize that it has been an exacting 4 months' period, during which those of us in the Congress have labored early and late with these momentous problems facing us during this critical hour of our Nation's history, when the civilization of the whold world hangs in the balance. In the press of these important engagements, have we not overlooked another problem of equal importance—proper care and provision for our old folks? Many, in the stress of war demands, have failed to realize that the millions of our citizens over the age of 60 years, who are without means of support and whose age and infirmities do not permit them to participate in war activities, are in dire need. They stand on the sidelines while those of younger years are fighting the battle of democracy, attempting to preserve all that we hold dear here in America. We must not, however, overlook in this hour of tragedy that these old folks, these men and women of yesteryear, are the ones who preserved America for us—who carried the torch of liberty and freedom handed to them by their forebears, and they in turn placed it into our hands. In the evening of their life, is it not our bounden duty to make proper provision for them, that they may at least have the minimum of support and comfort during their declining years?

It is true that we have on the Federal statute books a social-security program,

under which some of these old folks receive a small stipend as a contribution to the States for the care of our old people. However, under the operation of this law, an average of only $23 a month is being paid to these aged citizens. We are greatly concerned in the Congress about the rising cost of living, the inflation spiral, and the added burden placed upon the millions of our workers who must pay these increased prices for food, clothing, and shelter. Cognizant of these difficulties, the Congress has increased substantially the income of all of these groups of our citizens, but they have given the old people no consideration. Their modest monthly average of $23 remains the same, while the simple fare they must provide to keep body and soul together has risen in price by leaps and bounds and in many instances doubled. The miserable pittance they were receiving before the advent of high living costs was wholly insufficient to care for their modest needs. Of these elder citizens receiving payments under the insurance provision of the Social Security Act, 252,000 past 65 years receive an average, as I have said, of $23 a month; 74,000 wives of these pensioners who are 65 and over receive an average of $12.25 a month. Widows over 65, totaling 25,000, receive only $20.16 a month. Twenty-eight thousand parents receive $13 a month. Widows under 65, of whom there are 55,000, receive $19.50 a month, and 159,000 children under 18 receive $12.21. Of all persons 60 years of age or over, four-fifths get less than a minimum for decency and health.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that the Congress, through an appropriate committee, make an investigation marshaling all of the facts bearing upon the living costs under existing war conditions of this large group of our elder citizens? I urge that such a course be inaugurated at once. The income of these old people is frozen, but the living costs for their simple fare, clothing, and shelter have increased from month to month. The Congress is entitled to the facts so that it may intelligently legislate upon the subject and deal justly with these citizens.

While it is true the aid given by our Government to these citizens in an endeavor to provide a minimum for their care and support is welcome, nevertheless a grateful government should give the same careful consideration to the needs of these citizens as to other groups. Under the stress and strain of war, increased costs of living have placed a heavy burden upon these old folks.

From time to time it has been rumored here on Capitol Hill that the administration will sponsor a program for an increased allowance under the Social Security Act for these needy citizens who are left by the wayside while the rest of us march on with the crowd, seeking to end the war in victory. However, nothing has been done to that end. I most sincerely urge that all of us who have been charged with the responsibility of representing our various districts in the Congress of the United States give consideration now to this important problem which is becoming acute and which should not be allowed to lie dormant until the close of this congressional year. Regardless of our need for rest and a short respite from our labors, is it not in keeping with the obligations resting upon us to tackle this problem now and forego any recess or vacation until a solution is found? A number of proposals are pending in the Congress for making adequate provision for these elder citizens, but no committee action has been taken and no hearing has been authorized on any of the proposals.

Among these proposals is H. R. 1649, which has a Nation-wide appeal for millions of the citizens of our country in all walks of life and of all ages. The program embodied in this legislation, which was fostered and has been carried on by Dr. Townsend and his organization, has had a wider appeal to the 130,000,000 of people in the United States than any other social-security program. It has made the people of America conscious of the great obligation resting upon our Nation as a whole to deal fairly and adequately with the men and women of America who in their old age are in need of our care and protection. The great heart of America, which has poured out its billions to the nations of every corner of the globe, surely will not let down our own old people in their hour of need. Voters from 419 of the 435 congressional districts in the United States have made demands upon their Congressmen for immediate consideration and action on this proposal. I have been advised that over 10,000 petitions from the various congressional districts of the Nation have been signed, urging such action.

Mr. Speaker, may we not report out this bill, H. R. 1649, for early consideration on the floor of the House, where its merits, and demerits, if any, may be discussed fully and freely under an open rule, so that all amendments which will modify or improve the bill may be made to meet the desires of the majority of the membership of the House?

Mr. Speaker, has not the time now arrived when we should adopt as a part of our program, immediate consideration of this bill and other proposals for modifications and changes in our social-security program, so that early action may be consummated and relief given to these old people, many of whom are in dire need and want? In my opinion, the time is most opportune to inaugurate this program, giving increased allowances to these old people. Our national income is the largest it has ever been in our history. It is growing from day to day. At the same time the volume of consumer goods available for purchase with these swollen incomes is radically curtailed under rationing. The administration is at its wit's end to prevent an inflationary spiral being projected on this great volume of increased wages and salaries, with no outlet for its expenditure. It is true the tax burden will be greatly increased and a considerable portion of these earnings will properly be expended in meeting tax obligations, but there will still be an excess of $30,000,000,000 which cannot be expended for consumable goods and must find lodgment in investments of some sort. A proper allocation through social-security taxation of a portion of this national income for old-age security would not only be a boon to our old people and provide a minimum for decent living, but it would also prevent an inflationary rise and give an outlet for a portion of this excess income. The monthly stipends received by the old people would be expended for necessities of life and would not afford any fuel for the inflationary fire.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all of us, regardless of political affiliation, may join together in a nonpartisan movement to bring about the enactment of necessary legislation to provide now for adequate social security for those of our citizens who by reason of age and infirmities are no longer able to participate in our industrial economy.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, it would be well for every American citizen to pause this day in respect to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. This is the two hundredth anniversary of his birth. He was a very distinguished Member of this body, and it was in this House that he was chosen the third President of the United States. His greatness was born of a crucial period in our history. We are again at a crucial period when there is a demand for greatness.

We admire him for his personality, for the high character of the life he lived. Honor is due him for the high offices which he held, and we are grateful to him for his contribution to society in many fields of endeavor, including agriculture, art, law, politics, and others. But the quality most precious to us, and which should be appreciated more today than ever, is his enunciation of a few great truths based on the laws of Nature, outstanding principles which are as sound now as they were when he lived and which will endure on down through the ages.

The following are a few of the principles for which he stood that are in absolute contrast to the wavering policies of government being followed by our present administration. Let us review briefly a few of our own current controversial problems in the light of true Jeffersonian philosophy.

ON THE SUBJECT OF DEBT AND BINDING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS—FORMULA

Mr. Jefferson said that a man as an individual could not pledge or contract debts that would be binding on the future of his son, but that a group of men or fathers sitting as a legislative body could in the aggregate obligate their children. He was a firm believer in the will of the majority, and figured that according to the accepted tables of mortality, the average expectancy of life of the adult voters represented by the membership of a legislative body was 19 years, and that after such a period of time had elapsed, the surviving authors of the original agreement would be in a minority. It was fundamentally

wrong and morally dishonest, therefore, to contract obligations that could not be liquidated within the lifetime of the majority. I quote his own words:

> The principle of spending money to be paid by posterity is but swindling futurity on a large scale. We seem not to have perceived that, by the law of Nature one generation is to another as one independent nation to another. The earth belongs always to the living generation. They manage it then, and what proceeds from it, as they please, during their usufruct.

USURPATION OF POWER BY EXECUTIVE AND CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Jefferson was a believer in States' rights. The common view of States' rights, however, is misleading and incompetent. States' rights were only an incident in his general system of political organization. He believed that the ultimate political unit—the repository and source of political authority and initiative—should be in the smallest unit, not the Federal unit, State unit, or county unit—but the township or ward. Only the small, personal group should determine the delegation of power upwards. His was a system of extreme decentralization.

Mr. Jefferson was also disturbed about the possibility of the usurpation of power and authority by the executive over the legislative branch of our Government. Surely we need not inquire the position of the present administration on this point. Jefferson's conception of the delegation of power upwards is the very antithesis of present day practice and tendencies. It is obvious to even the casual observer that during the last decade we have witnessed the greatest concentration of power in the hands of the executive and more centralization of authority at Washington than in any equal period of our entire national life. I cannot help wonder just what Thomas Jefferson would have to say on the subject were it possible for him to view the colossus bureaucratic regime called the New Deal. Would he be proud to be known as their leader and to be called their patron saint?

TENURE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. Jefferson was in favor of rotation in the holding of public office. He is very clear on this subject, and he leaves no doubt as to his convictions. These are his words:

> My wish, therefore, was that the President should be elected for 7 years and be ineligible afterward. But the practice adopted I think is better allowing his continuance for 8 years with a liability to be dropped at halfway of the term, making that a period of probation. * * * The service for 8 years with a power to remove at the end of the first 4 comes nearly to my principle as corrected by experience, and it is in adherence to that that I am determined to withdraw at the end of my second term. The danger is that the indulgence and attachments of the people will keep a man in the chair after he becomes a dotard, that reelection through life shall become habitual and election for life follow. That I should lay down my charge at a proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for years, will, in fact, become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance. Believing that a representative government, responsible at short periods of election, is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office.

VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Jefferson was deeply interested in country life and was the owner of about 10,000 acres of land. He visioned a free rural society, strong and independent of governmental interference. Let me quote him directly:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

How different than our present bureaucratic control of agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it unnecessary for me to point out specifically just how far we have strayed from these fundamental Jeffersonian principles which are our inheritance. The average schoolboy can see at a glance quite clearly how we have digressed from them.

Jefferson, perhaps more than any other man, outlined and laid down the fundamental framework of our structure of government. He called himself a Republican in his day, and let me call attention to the fact that it was a republic that he founded and not a democracy, which term is being used so loosely today in describing our form of government, and I believe deliberately by those who would like to change it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that Jefferson said that that government is best which governs least.

Mr. SCHWABE. That is correct.

We have a republican form of government. A republic is a government of laws and not a government of men; a democracy is a government of men, ruled by the decisions of the majority in all things. A republic has a written constitution which places checks and balances upon all three branches of the government, legislative, executive, and judicial. In a democracy the will of the majority is the law, without regard to the rights of the minority, whether it refers to man's relationship with man or his relationship to God and religion, without checks and balances and without any limitation on legislative power, and without any protection for the minority intended by our Constitution. Our Constitution literally provides that—

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Mr. Speaker, the original tombstone of Thomas Jefferson stands today in my home town of Columbia, Mo. The capital of the State is named Jefferson City. As a boy I went to a grade school named Jefferson School. I have recently been elected from a district the majority of whose citizens have for many years called themselves Jeffersonian Democrats. I am firmly convinced they care not what their Congressman calls himself so long as his acts, as Representative of the people of his district, are in accordance with the principles laid down by the great Jefferson. It might be interesting, but I shall not inquire, on which side of the aisle Mr. Jefferson would choose to sit were he present this afternoon. My people back home would not care. Indeed, the party label he would wear would be unimportant.

The point I wish to make is that my constituents believe in him and have an abiding faith in the governmental system which he established. They wish not mere talk of his principles; they are more interested in the practical declaration of the Bible, "By their works ye shall know them."

The mandate from the people last November is, so far as I am concerned, to observe and put into actual practice, as well as to give mere lip service to, these great truths, these permanent, everlasting principles so effectively enunciated by Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have written a few verses which I have entitled "Dehydrating Congressional Freshmen." I trust that this effort will be received in the same spirit in which it is written.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DEHYDRATING CONGRESSIONAL FRESHMEN

(By WALTER E. BREHM)

On behalf of ninety-six freshmen
Who came here with hopes so high,
But now find themselves hanging
Like clothes on a line to dry,

II

I'd like to remind you, Old Timers—
You may take it for what it is worth—
There can never be growth without moisture,
Even though you do have good earth.

III

We need your advice and your counsel;
We respect and admire you a lot;
But we believe that some of our moisture
Might prevent too much dry rot.

IV

Now just because we appear overdampish
And seem to squirt all over the deck,
We want you to know and the records will show
We didn't come here on a raincheck.

V

We have learned after sticking around,
The committees really handle the ropes.
You old boys get poohed; go home for a rest,
And the people back home are the goats.

VI

While we with the excessive moisture,
Feeling our oats and wanting to try,
Are buried in arid committees
Until we are thoroughly dried.

VII

And when we are thoroughly aged,
And dry rot has really begun,
I can see us now hobbling out on a crutch
To take our place in the sun.

VIII

Our voice will be a little shaky,
Our joints a little stiff,
But we'll be as dry as powder,
And how we'll reminisce.

IX

We'll wave our arms and pound the stand;
We'll squeak and rub our head;
Then slowly hobble to our room
To spend ten days in bed.

X

We won't be worth a damn right then;
Perhaps we're no good now,
But neither of us will ever know,
If you keep us under the prow.

XI

So no matter how long we come here
I hope we'll never cry,
"Come on, Old Timers, do your duty.
Hang these freshmen up to dry."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here today to bow our heads in solemn reverence to the memory of a great American of yesterday, an American who so loved America that he dedicated his life to the laying of the foundation of this Republic. When we think of Jefferson we realize 200 years—two centuries—have rolled majestically into eternity. Although the curtain of time has forever closed the portals of his tomb, so long as time shall be, so long as America shall exist, the words and deeds of Thomas Jefferson shall be woven as a golden thread in the fabric of American history.

Let us reflect for a moment upon the life of Jefferson. Let us press aside that mysterious veil of yesterday, and gaze backward down these long corridors of time into the dim and almost forgotten past. Let us parade upon the field of recollection, the memory of this great American who gave his all that you and I might enjoy the type of government we have today.

If his spirit were hovering over this Nation and this assembly today and could speak to us, I feel that there would be an admonition that we draw a lesson from the past; also that we draw a lesson from the history that is being written upon the battlefields of Europe today. As we reflect we are brought to the realization that but a few short months ago we saw pictures of mobs milling in the streets of beautiful Paris. Jefferson, who believed in liberty and unity, would look with wonder upon an America in which he found industrial strife; he would in his admonition point to France with its slow-down strikes and its sit-down strikes and he would point out that while France idled, Germany armed. While France argued as to who should carry the board and who should drive the nail, Germany was working 16 to 18 hours a day producing the greatest mechanized monster the world has ever known; a monster not for the advancement of civilization but for its destruction and the enslavement of mankind.

When war came, France fell. Not because its Army was lacking in courage. The French soldier is known to be among the world's bravest. He loves his country as fervently as we love America. France fell because her soldiers lacked the things which are made with man's hands, for the armies of the world no longer fight with that which is in their heads and hearts alone, they fight with the things which are in their hands.

Let us then turn toward Russia as another lesson which he would bring to us now. We do not believe in the Russian ideals of government. We do not believe in the principles he teaches, but we must admire him for his unity, a thing that Jefferson tried to teach to the early Americans. When war came to Russia and Germany struck with all the mechanized might at her disposal for the first time they met their match. They met their match because they found in Russia a people who had worked longer, who had worked harder, and had worked more diligently to make the things with which to protect their homes.

Friends, you and I can take but little credit for what America is today. America of tomorrow is our problem. The law of life decrees that the torch of progress shall slip from the palsied fingers of age to be caught and borne aloft by the supple strength of youth. Life was ever thus.

This Government, founded by our fathers and passed on to you and me, is a good Government. May God grant that we can keep it so.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the gentleman upon the very fine statement he is making. It is true, and I know the gentleman recalls it vividly, that Thomas Jefferson said that country which is governed least is governed best. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I recall that. It was mentioned also a few moments ago on the floor. But, colleagues, when we pass this Government on to our sons let us pass on a government founded upon the principles of liberty for which our forefathers died. We all remember the story of the bundle of sticks and its lesson that in unity there is strength. Let us remember when we see industrial strife tearing asunder this Nation, that the boys who were with us a short time ago are now fighting upon the battlefields of the world. The time and hours of labor which men might lose in production lines through strikes will not produce the things which will protect their lives and bring them back home.

The great Jefferson set forth many principles of government. It would be well for all Americans to remember his teachings, that no nation is strong in which there is not unity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

THOMAS JEFFERSON: PROPHET AND PATRIOT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is no man among us, here or in this Nation, who has not felt the influence of Thomas Jefferson.

His words, inspired by his splendid faith in the dignity of man, proclaimed to all men that unto the peoples of the western world had been born a nation.

It is thanks to him that the immortal charter of our liberties is today no musty document attesting merely the memory of high hopes unrealized, but a living thing. Americans have lived by it. Americans are dying for it today and for the spirit of freedom which it illumines.

It may be—

Says the historian, James Truslow Adams—

that without a vision men shall die. * * * Without Jefferson the new Nation might have lost its soul.

The University of Virginia, which he founded, as a labor of love, has been called "the lengthened shadow of one man," and I recall during my own days as a student at Mr. Jefferson's university, nearly a quarter of a century ago, that no one thought of him as dead at all. And with good reason. For he was everywhere one went: at beautiful porticoed Monticello, which he loved so well, on the quiet lawn, along the ranges, and about the classic rotunda, from which he might lift up his eyes, and a myriad of his beneficiaries after him, toward the not far distant profiles of the ragged mountains and the azure mists which give the Blue Ridge Mountains their fitting name.

He was in the memory of all—slight the conversation, indeed, which did not yield an allusion to Mr. Jefferson. He was on the tongues of all men; none spoke of him save with reverence and a hallowing respect. But, most enduring of all, he was in the minds of men.

For he has found the most priceless of all touchstones—the shackle-striking force of truth. None knew better than he that "the truth shall make you free," and he devoted a richly versatile life to his great creed:

That to free the souls of men, their minds must first be free.

He never conceived a worthy ideal without putting the thought into action. In support of his bill in the Virginia House of Delegates for general education regardless of "wealth, birth, or other accidental condition" and for education of children of the poor at the "common expense," he wrote:

Whereas it appeareth that however certain forms of government are better than others to protect individuals in the free exercise of their natural rights, and are at the same time themselves better guarded against degeneracy, yet experience hath shewn that even under the best forms, those entrusted with power have, in time, by slow operations, perverted it into tyranny; and it is believed that the most effectual means of preventing this would be to illuminate, as far as possible, the minds of the people at large.

I think—

Jefferson wrote again—

that the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among our people. No other sure foundation

can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

He knew the words of John Dryden:

Of all the tyrannies of human kind, the worst is that which persecutes the mind.

He said it himself, unforgettably:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

He was proud of three things, this tall, proud man with the strong jaw, the reflective eyes, the red hair, as red as the Albemarle clay of his homelands, the red clay on which still stand so many monuments to his architectural genius, the red clay which warmly holds him now. He was proud of these three things most of all: he had written the Declaration of Independence, he had written the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, he had founded the University of Virginia. He knew that the freedoms were not four, nor fourteen, nor a thousand; there was only one true freedom: let us free the mind of man and all else will follow.

He believed that that nation governs best which governs least.

He believed in "a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another" and "leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement."

He had a code for freedom. In 1823 he laid it down:

Freedom of religion, restricted only from acts of trespass on that of others.

Freedom of person, securing everyone from imprisonment, or other bodily restraint, but by the laws of the land. This is effected by the well-known law of habeas corpus.

Trial by jury, the best of all safeguards for the person, the property, and the fame of every individual.

The exclusive right of legislation and taxation in the representatives of the people.

Freedom of the press, subject only to liability for personal injuries. This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning them at the tribunal of public opinion, produces reform peaceably, which must otherwise be done by revolution. It is also the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being.

He believed in the right of men to make a living, without exploitation or regimentation by Government. There is much today he would not understand.

Yes; there is much he would not understand, because he was not content merely to be free himself, nor to talk loftily of freedom, from his mountain height. He put his words to work, to drive a young nation forward to realize his concept of freedom, to understand it, to love it, and to want it for themselves and for all men. As the young draftsman of the Declaration, as the great libertarian President, as the aging sage of Monticello, he stood as freedom's advocate and was honored by his people's trust. For they knew he acted as he talked.

He talked a great deal, as a matter of fact, and he wrote a great deal. He must have felt that there was so little time to give the widest currency to his great mission.

He feared some things. He feared that people might not want to pay the price of freedom, nor share the responsibility for it; that they might, despairing of the multitude of their troubles and their burden's weight, wearily delegate their problems to a paternalistic government. He said, did Mr. Jefferson:

What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government that has ever existed under the sun? The centralizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether of the autocrats of Russia, of France, or of the aristocrats of a Venetian Senate. * * * When all government, domestic and foreign, in little and in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government of another and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated. * * * Wherever there is a great central power, far away, difficult of access, difficult to reach, it is nearly always controlled by class interests, and the great mass of the people suffer by it. Power must be curbed or the people will be reduced to slavery.

One is afraid that he might not like Washington today.

The existence of "the great central power" he feared might try his faith. But he had a great faith in his country. In one of his last writings he said:

I have observed this march of civilization, advancing from the seacoast, passing over us like a cloud of light, increasing our knowledge and improving our condition * * * and where this progress will stop, no one can say.

He had humor, too. Of his election to the Vice Presidency, he wrote:

A more tranquil and unoffending station could not have been found for me. * * * It will give me philosophical evenings in the winter, and rural days in summer. The second office of the Government is honorable and easy, the first is but a splendid misery.

He was a good neighbor, and he liked visiting.

He was the founder of the Republican Party. For some years others wore his mantle and paraded his ideas. But advocates of the great central power do ill to his memory by asserting kinship with his standards. He was not of their ilk.

They carry Jefferson's standard today who fear the encroachments of government as he did, who know natural progress is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground. He recognized the danger to the common man in transferring all the powers of the States to the general Government, and all those of that Government to the executive branch.

He said another curiously prophetic thing; that it would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights.

In these days when many brittle purveyors of shiny new orders heap scorn upon rugged individualism and propose to submerge the man to the tender mercies of a planned and regimented state socialism, it is good to recall the firm conviction of the founder of the Republican Party that agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left free to individual enterprise.

And he was indeed prophetic when he penned his famous warning:

Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread.

He was a realist. He knew that wars recur. He knew that we might expect to be involved in them. He predicted shortages of arms and clothing because "we have permitted ourselves to be dependent on others." He hoped for peace, but he did not promise it in the face of gathering war clouds. Let us see how realistic he was:

I had persuaded myself that a nation, distant as we are from the contentions of Europe, avoiding all offenses to other powers, might expect to live in peace and consider itself as a member of the great family of mankind; that in such case it might devote itself to whatever it could best produce, secure of a peaceable exchange of surplus for what could be more advantageously furnished by others.

But experience has shown that continued peace depends not merely on our own justice and prudence, but on that of others also; that when forced into war, the interception of exchange which must be made across a wide ocean, becomes a powerful weapon in the hands of an enemy domineering over that element, and to the other distresses of war adds to the want of all those necessaries for which we have permitted ourselves to be dependent on others, even arms and clothing. This fact, therefore, solves the question by reducing it to its ultimate form, whether profit or preservation is the first interest of the state.

This, then, is our act of faith on the two hundredth anniversary of his birth: That we recall his precepts with full knowledge that we are engaged in a bitter struggle to preserve the very principles to which he dedicated his life. In the days of victory to come we must not forget. He did not fail his people. We must not fail him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed stimulating and very gratifying to be here today and listen to the very many glowing and sincere tributes that have been paid to the memory of one of the greatest Americans that has ever lived. The memory of Thomas Jefferson, I am sure, will live forever, or at least as long as this Republic stands. The ideals and principles and ideas of Thomas Jefferson are the principles and policies which are being followed today by the Democratic Party.

I note with some regret, however, that some of those who paid tribute to Thomas Jefferson on the floor today took occasion to make an attack on the present administration, claiming in effect that it had forgotten some of the Jeffersonian principles. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the occasion to bring into this debate any matter of partisan politics. It recalls to my mind the campaign of 1940 at which time the Republican candidate for President embraced practically every important policy of the Democratic Party in his attempt to gain the good will and the confidence and the votes of the American people. Today, the Republican Party, following

that line is attempting to claim Thomas Jefferson as its apostle. I submit that is just as farfetched as it possibly can be, and I submit that if the Republican Party wants to really and wholeheartedly embrace the principles and the ideals and the policies of Thomas Jefferson, they can very well do so by joining the Democratic Party and by giving a united service to the policies of this administration, particularly in its efforts to forcefully prosecute the war to an early and successful conclusion. I therefore invite the Republicans to embrace Jefferson's principles by getting into the Democratic Party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I feel very sure that if Thomas Jefferson were here he would favor treating our sister Republic of Panama with the utmost fairness in every way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join my friend from North Carolina in his statement. It is very pleasant to note the disciples of Hamilton eulogizing the first real progressive under our constitutional form of government, the founder of the Democratic Party.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14 authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14 authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. How long is general debate to continue?

Mr. BLOOM. For 1 hour, 30 minutes to be controlled by the minority.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the time is fixed at 1 hour equally divided between the majority and the minority.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the many eulogies of Jefferson this afternoon, I thought maybe the Committee would be glad to get a little information on one subject that has not been touched.

In 1904 the Congress of the United States published this volume I hold in my hand, which is called Jefferson's Bible. It is a very interesting book, and at that time 6,000 copies of this volume were printed for distribution to the Members of the House and 3,000 to the Members of the Senate. On the flyleaf appears this statement:

> The life and morals of Jesus of Nazareth extracted textually from the Gospel in Greek, Latin, French, and English, by Thomas Jefferson.

It is a wonderful little document, and I have been wondering for a number of years whether it could not be reprinted. Let me state that the Government has the plates from which this book was printed originally. All the corrections and interlineations in the book are in Jefferson's handwriting. I think it would be very appropriate at this time, in fact I have been trying for the last 6 months to have this book reprinted, especially since we have the plates. It seems to me nothing would do more good in this country today than the distribution of this Bible, this wonderful book.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I join with the gentleman from New York in the hope that there may be a reprint of this most important little book. I trust the gentleman will find ways and means to have that accomplished.

Mr. BLOOM. I know where to get the means, but not the ways; on the ways, I am lost.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us this afternoon is a very simple resolution and should be very easily understood. I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] made certain statements. I feel that had he read the report and given it careful consideration he would not have made the statements he did on the floor this afternoon with reference to this resolution.

This resolution which we have under consideration now is identical with the one which was passed by the Senate last December. The amendments that were adopted in the Senate at that time were inserted in this resolution when it was introduced at the beginning of this session. No further amendments were suggested or adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. This resolution was reported favorably last year by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but under the gentlemen's agreement toward the close of the session it could not be brought up.

This year again it was presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee and a unanimous report was given on it and the resolution is presented to you unanimously by the entire membership of the committee.

Now, with reference to the property in Panama that the gentleman in New York referred to as being so valuable, may I say that the only property bought or paid for was the property in the city of Panama, not in Colon?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the property in Panama acquired between the years 1870 to 1922, I believe, cost the Panama Railroad Company $658,000. That is all that this land cost the company.

In Colon the property that this Government possesses was acquired by concession from New Grenada—now Colombia. In considering this legislation I want to give its complete picture. Please remember that this original idea was brought up 40 years ago. The first treaty with Panama was in 1903, just after Panama became a nation. That territory had just gained its independence from Colombia and we were very anxious at that time to build the Panama Canal and to make a treaty, and Panama was very anxious to go along with us.

In 1903, the Republic of Panama secured its independence from the Republic of Colombia of which it had hitherto been a part. In that same year, the United States and Panama signed the treaty which established the Canal Zone and established certain relationships between the two countries looking to the construction of the Panama Canal. This treaty reflected (a) the fact that Panama's political institutions were yet to be firmly established, and (b) the fact that the United States was embarking upon a novel task of the greatest magnitude and importance. Thus the United States reserved certain special rights, including the right to intervene to preserve law and order in Panama and the right to take without Panama's consent additional land and water areas for canal purposes.

In 1933, the Presidents of the United States and of Panama, recognizing the new practice of international relations being built up in the American republics as a whole and the increasing spirit of mutual understanding characterizing relations between Panama and the United States, agreed to negotiate a revision of the Treaty of 1903. This was accomplished in 1936. The new treaty established the relations between the two countries on the same basis as those between any two sovereign nations with the exception of those provisions required by the existence of the Canal, in the maintenance, sanitation, efficient operation, and effective protection of which the two countries are jointly and vitally interested.

However, even after the coming into effect of this new treaty, there remained two situations which the people of Panama regarded as incompatible with their sovereign right to manage their own affairs on Panamanian soil without the intervention of any other government except insofar as the joint responsibility of the United States and Panama for the operation of the Canal requires joint activities in the territory of the Republic. These situations were:

First. The continued ownership by the United States of the waterworks and sewer systems in Panama and Colon and the collection of water rates from the

citizens of Panama by employees of our Government. These rates were so designed as to permit the amortization of the entire property by 1957 at which time it was provided that it would be turned over to the Republic of Panama.

Second. The fact that the bulk of the lots devoted to ordinary commercial and residential purposes in Colon, the second city of the Republic, and important and valuable lots in Panama, the capital, were owned by the Panama Railroad Company, an agency of the United States Government. These lots in Colon had been granted for 99 years in 1867 by the Government of Colombia, the then sovereign of the territory, to the railroad company with reversion in 1966 to Colombia. By the treaty of 1903, this reversionary right, acquired by Panama by virtue of her independence that same year, was turned over to the United States. In the city of Panama the lots to be transferred were acquired between the years 1867 and 1922 at a total cost of approximately $68,000.

The legislation now before the Congress proposes to rectify these two situations and to take care of a third situation to be described below. It is presented as legislation because it involves (a) a disposition of property of the United States and (b) an appropriation of funds, both exercises of the legislative power, independently of the treaty-making power. The legislation in no way affects the treaty obligations of Panama and the United States, looking to the maintenance, sanitation, efficient operation, and effective protection of the Canal.

SECTION 1. WATERWORKS AND SEWERS

These properties, to the cost of which the people of Panama and Colon have been contributing for 36 years, are to be turned over to Panama, thus condoning the unamortized balance of the cost thereof, estimated to amount to $860,000. This transfer will have no bearing whatever on the rights and obligations of the two countries in matters of health and sanitation. Maj. Gen. Glen Edgerton, Governor of the Canal Zone, has made the following statement on this subject:

> In my opinion the legislation proposed to permit the recent agreement between the United States and Panama to be carried out contains adequate provision for the maintenance of high standards of sanitation for public health in the cities of Panama and Colon without regard to the ownership of the water and sewer systems of the cities.

SECTION 2. THE SO-CALLED RAILROAD LOTS IN PANAMA AND COLON

Real estate owned by the United States in Panama is of two kinds. The first is held for purposes relating to the railroad and to the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and protection of the Canal. This type of property is definitely not the subject of the proposal before you. It is to be retained by this Government since it is used for railway and canal purposes.

There is, however, another type of property held by the Panama Railroad Company in the cities of Panama and Colon. This is land which private persons, of whom 80 percent are citizens of Panama, have rented from the Panama Railroad Company and on which they or their sublessees have erected improvements for private, commercial, and residential purposes. The use to which this land is put has no relation whatever to the railroad or to the operation of the Canal. It is this land which we now propose to transfer to the Republic of Panama. It has been found by the Secretary of War to be no longer needed for railroad or canal purposes.

In the city of Colon, the land to be transferred comprises the major part of the business center of this city, the second in importance in the Republic. It was acquired by the Panama Railroad Company in a series of concessions received from the Government of New Granada—now Colombia—the then sovereign of the territory which later became the Republic of Panama. The last of these concessions—which replaced previous concessions—was dated 1867 and provides that the railroad company would have the use of the land for a period of 99 years, after which it would revert to the Government of Colombia. In 1903 Panama declared itself independent of Colombia, and thereby acquired the sovereign rights formerly enjoyed by Colombia in the territory of the new Republic, including the above-mentioned right of reversion in these lands. By the treaty of 1903, Panama turned over to the United States Government these reversionary rights. The present appraised value of the lands in Colon is about $10,000,000. An examination of the correspondence leading up to the conclusion of the treaty of 1914 between the United States and Colombia and the treaty itself shows conclusively that there could be no grounds, as has been contended by some, for an assertion that Colombia might hold against the United States a right to reversionary interest in the lands proposed to be transferred to Panama. This committee feels convinced that Colombia has relinquished any and all reversionary rights it might have had to the railroad lands.

In the case of the city of Panama, the lands not now used for railway purposes were acquired at different times by the railroad company between 1870 and 1922 at a total cost of approximately $68,000. They were unimproved lands which, owing to the growth of the city, are now estimated to have a value of $1,500,000.

From these properties devoted to private commercial and residential purposes the Panama Railroad Company derives an annual income of about $350,000.

SECTION 3. THE RIO HATO-CHORRERA HIGHWAY

The construction of this important highway was originally a cooperative enterprise. Panama borrowed $2,500,000 from the Export-Import Bank to finance her share. However, with the development of the war emergency, it was found necessary markedly to raise the standards of construction due to military exigencies and markedly to speed up the schedule of construction. As a result, arrangements were made for the United States Public Roads Administration to take over construction and carry it to conclusion at a cost and under conditions far different from those originally contemplated. It is, therefore, proposed to cancel the loan from the bank to Panama and to consider the entire construction as a United States enterprise.

Articles II and X of the Treaty of 1936 provides for the taking by the Governments of such measures as may be necessary if in the event of some contingency at the time unforeseen, "the utilization of lands or waters additional to those already employed should be, in fact, necessary for the maintenance, sanitation, or efficient operation of the Canal, or for its effective protection." Two years ago the two Governments recognized that an unforeseen contingency had indeed arisen and negotiations were initiated as to the conditions under which there would be made available to the United States Army and Navy such defense sites for air fields, detector stations, searchlight positions, et cetera, as the threatening international situation demanded. As early as March 1941 these sites began to be turned over by the Government of Panama although final agreement on conditions was not reached until May 1942.

On May 18, 1942, the Government of the United States agreed, subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States, to turn over the property and to cancel the indebtedness which is the subject of the proposed legislation. On the same date, the defense sites agreement was signed. Both these agreements stand on their merits, neither is contingent on the other. Both reflect the wholehearted spirit of understanding and cooperation inspiring the relations between the two countries which are allied in the war effort.

The defense sites began to be made available by Panama 14 months before the signing of the agreement. Although the agreement requires approval of the National Assembly of Panama, its execution has in no sense been delayed pending that approval.

On the other hand, the items covered in the proposed legislation cannot be made available to Panama until the legislation is passed.

In conclusion, I cannot do better than repeat here the President's statement of August 13, 1942, regarding the cooperation of Panama with the United States in the present emergency:

> The Panamanian Government has demonstrated its willingness to assume promptly and wholeheartedly the burdens imposed upon it as partner in the defense of the Panama Canal, a responsibility which was accepted by that Government under the provisions of the new treaty.
>
> The attitude of the Panamanian Government in the present international crisis has been thoroughly cooperative. On March 5, 1941, the President of the Republic of Panama issued a manifesto making available for use by the United States certain defense sites in the territory of that Republic. Pending the conclusions of final arrangements regarding the terms on which these sites are to be used, the Panamanian Government has permitted our armed forces to occupy and develop them. Immediately following the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, Panama declared war on the three major Axis Powers, and since has taken numerous protective steps to cooperate with the other American republics in the interest and security of the Panama Canal and the defense of this hemisphere.

This attitude is tangible evidence that the relations between the two countries are now firmly based upon a recognition of mutual interest and a disposition to assume common responsibilities.

The United States Government has been receiving rentals of about $350,000 a year on the Colon properties and they did not cost one cent.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I prefer not to. I only have a few minutes.

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman should yield himself more time and give us some information. He seems to be prepared to give it.

Mr. BLOOM. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. WHITE. I want to know if the profit the gentleman mentioned just now accounts for the fact that for all these years there has been no highway across the Isthmus, no road except the railroad? The only way you can get across the Isthmus is to go through the Canal or pay your fare on the railroad.

Mr. BLOOM. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman does not think that the profits made on the railroad created a monopoly and prevented them from building a road across the Isthmus, so that today goods and passengers cannot get across the Isthmus any other way except by the railroad or through the Canal?

Mr. BLOOM. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman should inform himself on the actions down there.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman. This property, of course, has become very valuable. It is property which is valued today at $10,500,000 and the property in Panama is valued at about one and one-half million dollars.

I am going to take a few minutes now, then I will let some other Member explain other points of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I prefer not to.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to get some information on this bill before the gentleman gets through.

Mr. BLOOM. The Government of Panama has agreed to do certain things for the United States. It has agreed to give us airports; it has agreed to do other things for us according to suggestions made by the military.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. O'HARA. No.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, do I have to yield for a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has counted. One hundred and thirty Members being present, a quorum is present.

Mr. BLOOM. Now, what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. O'HARA. What is the motivating factor behind the giving away of this Government property?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, the idea is that the Government of Panama naturally feels that it does not like to have the Government of the United States own business property that is not used for any purpose that the Government itself needs it for. It is commercial property and the Government of the United States has leased this property in Colon and has been getting revenue out of it. The Government of Panama, the same as any country, naturally feels that it does not like to have any other government own property in the heart of its city, you might say for profit, that is being used for commercial purposes. This only transfers property that the Secretary of War gives his permission to transfer. No property used by the Canal or the railway is to be transferred. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. O'HARA. It does not fully answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'HARA. This is Government property. The railroad and the water system serves our people who are down there defending the Panama Canal or operating the Panama Canal.

Mr. BLOOM. The waterway is an entirely different thing. I will let someone else explain that to the gentleman. This has nothing to do with the waterway. The sewerage system would be transferred to them anyway in 14 years from now.

Mr. O'HARA. I am talking about the water system.

Mr. BLOOM. The water system and the sewer system will be transferred back to Panama in 14 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Answering the gentleman's question, our people down there needed this water system, the railways, and sewerage. That is entirely outside of the Panama Canal and the city of Colon. We have a wide strip of territory that is our property called the Panama Canal Zone. This water works serves the cities. It does not serve the people in the Panama Canal Zone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. I should like to get some information from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLOOM. I am trying to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. We have this bill here under consideration. After all, it relates to the disposition of $15,000,000 of the money of our people. Representing my people, I want to get some information about this bill.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman is talking about the sewerage system, that is one thing.

Mr. O'HARA. I am talking about all of it.

Mr. BLOOM. I cannot answer a question about all of it in that way. If the gentleman will ask me a question about the sewerage system, I will try to answer it.

Mr. O'HARA. I am asking now about the fact that this property does serve our interests in Panama. It does, does it not?

Mr. BLOOM. What property does the gentleman mean?

Mr. O'HARA. I am talking about the railroad and the water system.

Mr. BLOOM. We do not transfer that. We do not transfer anything in Panama that we need ourselves.

Mr. O'HARA. What are we transferring?

Mr. BLOOM. We are transferring the commercial property in Panama, but we are not transferring anything that is connected with or needed by the Panama Canal.

Mr. O'HARA. This is all contiguous to the Panama Canal, is it not?

Mr. BLOOM. Let me read this statement by Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, Governor of the Panama Canal Department, in support of the proposed legislation:

In my opinion the legislation proposed to permit the recent agreement between the United States and Panama to be carried out contains adequate provision for the maintenance of high standards of sanitation for public health in the cities of Panama and Colon without regard to the ownership of the water and sewer systems of the cities.

Mr. O'HARA. Was not this railroad and the water system operated by this country in connection with the operation of the Panama Canal?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but we still retain full control of everything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the Panama Railroad will retain title to the railroad and to all property needed in the operation of the railroad. The properties to be ceded to the Republic of Panama are properties that will not be needed in the operation of the railroad, as well as some houses and buildings rented by commercial establishments, and other properties of that sort. It is just the same as a railroad company might own a commercial building far removed from its other railroad properties necessary in the operation of its railroad.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will yield, the report shows that this is to authorize the transfer of some railroad property, as I understood it, the operating feature of it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is property owned by the Panama Railroad, but the Panama Railroad is owned entirely by the United States Government. What they mean by Panama Railroad property is property owned by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. O'HARA. Does not the gentleman admit that it still serves the Canal?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; it serves the Republic of Panama and not the Panama Canal Zone. There is a difference there.

Mr. O'HARA. I realize there is a difference, but it has also been operated by our Government in connection with the operation of the Canal Zone.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; it is outside of the Canal Zone. It is in the Republic of Panama proper.

Mr. O'HARA. I know, but it was put in there in the first place for the purpose of operating in the Canal Zone.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; not necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the resolution, House Joint Resolution 14, does three things.

First. It transfers to the Republic of Panama the waterworks and sewer system, in the cities of Panama and Colon, which is owned by the United States.

Second. It transfers to the Republic of Panama certain real estate of the Panama Railroad Co., located in the cities of Panama and Colon, which is entirely owned by the Government of the United States.

Third. It authorizes an appropriation of $2,700,000 to pay back to Panama moneys which she expended in the construction of the Rio Hato Highway.

In the Canal Convention of 1903 we agreed to return the system of waterworks and sewers to Panama in 1957. This bill in that regard simply accelerates the date when this property will be returned to Panama. At the time we built this system we were permitted to collect revenue from the citizens of Panama to cover the expenses but there still remains an unamortized balance of approximately $800,000 due on our initial expenditure.

The Panama Railroad Co. acquired the leasehold rights for 99 years to certain lands from the Government of Colombia at an approximate cost of $68,000. This lease would have expired in 1967. In 1903 Panama declared itself independent from Colombia and by treaty turned over to the United States Government these reversionary rights. As a result we would have acquired title to this property in 1967. It is now proposed to turn over to the Republic of Panama those parts of this property which are no longer needed by the Panama Railroad.

The present value of this property is approximately $10,000,000, from which we derive an annual revenue of about $350,000.

In July 1939 we entered into an agreement with Panama that she was to borrow from the Export-Import Bank $2,500,000 for her share in building the highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato, where we have a military base. Due to the exigencies of the war, it was necessary to speed up this work and change the specifications of the highway. This work was undertaken in December 1941 by the Public Roads Administration. Under this bill it is proposed to relieve Panama of her financial obligation for her share of the road work and authorize payment to her of $2,700,000.

It might be mentioned that if we carry out this proposal we will receive approximately $1,000,000 worth of road-building machinery which the Republic of Panama had previously purchased to carry on this construction work.

I am including herewith as part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Thomas A. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, which gives further details of this transaction. I have previously been given unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks this letter:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, January 26, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHIPERFIELD: In compliance with your request of January 13, 1943, the following information is furnished in connection with the cost of the Chorrera-Rio Hato project in the Republic of Panama:

1. United States funds

Appropriation:	
Public Law 361, 76th Cong	$1,500,000
Public Law 353, 77th Cong	873,000
Total funds appropriated	2,373,000
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1943	2,307,741
Outstanding obligations	65,259
Total expenditures and obligations	2,373,000

2. Republic of Panama funds

Expenditures	$2,490,480

The above information as to United States funds is in accordance with the records of this office. The expenditures from funds available to the Republic of Panama are based on the latest financial statement furnished by our Panama office from figures secured from the Republic of Panama.

In accordance with a contract entered into on February 21, 1940, by and between the Republic of Panama, the National Bank of Panama, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., arranging for Panama's share of the cost of the Rio Hato Highway to the extent of $2,500,000, the Republic proceeded with the work of reconstruction of the highway, receiving funds from the Export-Import Bank in the following manner:

The National Bank of Panama advanced to the Republic that portion of the cost of equipment, material, and labor not paid from funds from other sources. For each $50,000 so advanced the Republic issued to the national bank its promissory note payable in dollars, United States currency. Each note constituted an unconditional negotiable obligation of the Republic, to be purchased at face value by the Export-Import Bank, an agency of the United States, to the extent of $2,500,000. Each promissory note was accompanied by a statement describing all equipment, materials, and services purchased or hired in the reconstruction of the highway since the issuance of the last preceding note. The statement set forth the cost of each item and showed the place of purchase of all equipment and materials. The statement was signed by the chief engineer or other Panamanian official in charge of the reconstruction and by a representative of the United States Public Roads Administration.

Each note was accompanied by certificates of the representatives of the Public Roads Administration, showing that reconstruction work to the date of the certificate had been in accordance with plans and specifications agreed to by both Governments, with the terms and conditions approved by the President of the United States, covering the technical conduct of the work. The United States acquired the machinery, materials, and other equipment purchased by Panama with the moneys advanced by the Export-Import Bank, the valuation of which I understand is approximately $1,000,000, a substantial fraction of the entire credit of $2,500,000.

This office is informed that the total obligations incurred through the Export-Import Bank by the Republic of Panama in connection with its share of the reconstruction costs of the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway project may be summed up as follows:

Total amount of commitment	$2,500,000.00
Total disbursed to July 15, 1942	2,450,000.00
Repayments of principal	300,000.00
Total interest accrued to July 15, 1942	122,491.60
Interest paid	109,711.10
Principal owing to Export-Import Bank	2,150,000.00
Interest owing to Export-Import Bank	12,780.50

Interest at 4 percent on $2,150,000, principal outstanding as of July 15, 1942, accrues at the rate of $238.89 per day. It is understood that recently there has been another disbursement of approximately $40,000 to Panama, making a total of approximately $2,490,000 disbursed to date. The road was opened on July 1, 1942, but since then there have been and still continue to be minor post-construction expenses.

Before its reconstruction was begun and much more so after its reopening, the Rio Hato Highway has been used for the transit of troops and equipment of the armed forces of this country. It should be emphasized that the obligation felt by this Government to expend funds on this highway was because Army specifications were in consideration of heavy-duty traffic much beyond that which the Republic of Panama requires for normal transportation, because of other military considerations, and because of the extreme urgency of rapid conclusion of the work.

It is suggested, if further details are desired concerning amounts expended by Panama on account of interest or other charges incident to credits obtained through the Export-Import Bank, that you address an inquiry to that institution.

Very truly yours,

THOS. A. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

The total cost of this roadway will be $4,863,480.

Panama has been rightly designated as our life line. One can hardly picture how much more difficult it would be for us to fight this global war if we did not have this Canal. It is absolutely necessary that we have the fullest cooperation and good feeling on the part of the citizens of Panama toward the United States.

By enacting this measure we set an example not only to Panama but to our South American allies that the words "good neighbor" are not an empty phrase.

In 1936 we entered into a treaty with Panama which provided for the mutual defense of the Panama Canal under which we were permitted to acquire military bases outside of the Canal Zone for antiaircraft purposes. Panama has cooperated with us fully in this respect and has permitted us to acquire these bases

and to take all steps necessary for the common defense of the Panama Canal.

I personally inspected some of these sites and cannot stress too strongly how vital they are for the defense of the Canal. I have also flown over the route of the roadway to Rio Hato which makes it possible to easily supply this important base. Incidentally, this roadway will be a part of the Inter-American Highway.

I believe the reasons why we should support this bill can be best summed up by the statement of Mr. Philip W. Bonsal, Chief, Division of the American Republics, Department of State, when he said before our committee:

> The fact that Panama has made the defense sites available to us does not impose upon us any obligation to turn over to Panama the waterworks and sewers, the railroad lands, and to cancel the Rio Hato credit. However, looking at the matter from a broader point of view, the fact that Panama has not only assumed obligations of a partnership nature with us in the protection of the Panama Canal but has carried out those obligations promptly and satisfactorily does impose upon us an obligation to examine sympathetically and if possible to remedy situations which may exist and which we consider to be inconsistent with the relations which should exist between the two countries under our present concept as to that relationship.
>
> It is my considered belief that the passage of this joint resolution and the implementation of its provisions is of the greatest importance in our relations with Panama. The maintenance of those relations on a basis of greater cooperation is vital, particularly at this time. A failure on our part to fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Government and people of Panama at a time when that Government and those people have complied enthusiastically and effectively with all of their obligations as joint partners in the defense of the Canal would be highly unfortunate from the point of view of our war effort as well as from that of our own relations, not only with Panama, but also with the other American republics.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, by House Joint Resolution 14, which is now pending before the House, it is sought to do three major things, as I interpret the resolution, and those things are: First, to transfer to the Republic of Panama all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the sewage and water systems, which were installed in the cities of Colon and Panama some 26 years ago; and, second, the absolute conveyance to the Republic of Panama of all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lots owned by the Panama Railroad Company, which are now under lease to certain private citizens for residential and building purposes, these being located in Panama and Colon and which are unnecessary for the operation of the Panama Railroad; and, third, the authorization of an appropriation of an amount sufficient to cancel an indebtedness of $2,500,000 owing by Panama, which indebtedness has arisen out of the reconstruction of the military highway connecting the Canal Zone with a strategic air base at Rio Hato.

Therefore, by this resolution we seek to give to the Republic of Panama, without any substantial consideration—and, may I say, in large part without any consideration whatsoever, unless it be under the good-neighbor policy—the unamortized value of the sewer system and waterworks, at the cities of Colon and Panama, which is estimated at $360,000; in addition to that, by this resolution we are proposing to give to the Republic of Panama certain lots and tracts of real estate upon which a value of approximately $11,500,000 has been placed; and we are seeking to secure an appropriation of approximately $2,700,000 for the purpose of paying an indebtedness of Panama arising out of the reconstruction of the military highway of Rio Hato. This makes an outright gift, under this resolution, of more than $15,000,000.

This resolution does not rest on the good-neighbor policy, in my opinion. The Government of Panama and the people of Panama are fully aware of the present war, and of the great emergency which now confronts the world; they are, likewise, sufficiently advised of their own interests in this world emergency and the degree to which they are involved, and they, too, look toward the full and complete protection of their interests in this world crisis. Panama has heretofore cooperated fully with the United States of America; she is continuing to cooperate fully with us; she has given wholeheartedly her full cooperation to our Nation in this war effort, and she is not hanging her policies in this war, in the balance as it were, to be determined upon what our Government may, or may not do regarding the gifts proposed under House Joint Resolution 14, which is now before the House. It is my considered judgment that the Republic of Panama, and her people, would take exceptions to any policy which we might attempt to promote, under the guise of the good-neighbor policy—that is, to give our resources to the Republic of Panama, and to expect in return, therefor, as a consideration for our gifts, the aid and assistance of that country in time of war. Panama has her own interests at stake, which she will guard jealously. She would resent the cheap motives involved in any attempt to purchase the good will, or the friendship of her Government and her people. Friendship is not the subject of sale—and Panama would so determine in this instance.

May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that a large part of the program set forth in the pending resolution should be handled by and through a treaty. The one exception, here involved, is the fact that an authorization for an appropriation of money is sought. This should remain, as a matter of law and as a matter of course, with the Congress. However, the subject of the transfer of the lots and parcels of real estate, and the transfer of all right, title, and interest in and to the sewer and water systems in Colon and Panama, certainly are entitled to the dignity of a treaty between the two countries. This is proposing an agreement between two countries, and such an agreement should have the solemn and binding force and effect of a treaty. Our Constitution makes the following provision respecting treaties, in section 2, article II, as follows:

> He—
>
> The President—
>
> shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senate concur.

Therefore, the House of Representatives has but one function herein, and that is to determine the lone question of the authorization for the appropriation of money—and that question should be entirely segregated from the other questions which are involved in the resolution here presented. Those questions contained in the resolution which should finally and properly be determined by treaty between the two countries should be handled in that manner; the question of authorizing an appropriation of money should, of course, remain with the Congress. These two radically different items should not be bundled together and presented in one resolution, but they should be segregated, and those items embraced in the pending resolution which should be properly handled by treaty between the two nations, should be handled in that manner; but the sole item embraced in this resolution which refers to the authorization of an appropriation of money should, of course, be retained in and determined by the Congress.

It is my fervent hope that some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will, during this debate on this resolution, present some facts which will clarify this entire matter, and I hope someone will offer some contribution which will in some measure justify the action contemplated on the part of our Government. At the present I cannot detect any justification whatsoever for this proposed action.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try my best to clarify the situation which has been brought out by various questions coming from members of the committee.

We have to go back in our consideration of this situation prior to the year 1867, at which time the territory about which we are now talking was under the jurisdiction and part of the sovereignty of the Republic of New Granada. The Panama Railroad was built by private capital and was a private corporation. It got its concession from the Republic of New Granada, whose name was later changed to the United States of Colombia. This concession ran for 99 years. It was a grant. As a part of that grant it enjoyed possession of certain vacant lots in the then somewhat undeveloped municipalities of Colon and Panama City.

As years went by, long before we went down there in 1903, the Panama Railroad, a private corporation, operated the railway across the Isthmus, and held a

concession or a leasehold, as it were, over these vacant lots, which it did not use for railroad purposes at all. Then in 1903, or thereabouts, Panama gained her independence from the United States of Colombia, and made a treaty with the United States of America under which we were to build the Canal, and were to enjoy sovereignty, as it were over a strip 10 miles wide, and to pay Panama what turned out to be an exceedingly small rental for that strip. At the same time that the treaty was made, the United States Government took over the Panama Railroad, and made it a part of its own property. Of course, it took it over subject to the original grant. This grant that we are talking about had been acquired by that railroad prior to 1867, and the grant was to run 99 years. Originally the Republic of New Grenada had a reversionary interest in the whole property and when that came into the picture, instead of the Republic of New Grenada, the United States of Colombia, having the reversionary interest, the Republic of Panama got the reversionary interest, and under that contract, at the end of 99 years, the Republic of Panama would automatically get back these vacant lots. Now, in the meantime, with the growth of the community, the lots became more valuable. What the Panama Railroad paid for the right to use them originally I do not know. The ones in Panama City cost only $68,000, that is, the right to use and enjoy possession of these lots.

The lots have become valuable in recent years, and the Panama Railroad, now an agent of the United States Government, has leased them out from time to time, and the lessees have built grocery stores on them, and business houses of one kind and another, to such an extent that they are now estimated to be worth something like ten million to twelve million dollars, and it is true that a revenue of $350,000 has been coming into the railroad as a result of the leases. In something like 20 years the Republic of Panama is going to get it all back anyway under the original grant. But the people of Panama come to us and say, "You have had an extraordinarily profitable investment which fell into your lap—that is, the lap of the United States Government, as a result of your having taken over the Panama Railroad back in 1903, and, after all, these properties are occupied by Panamanian civilians in business, of one kind and another, and the grant has run 70 years, more or less, and in view of what we have been doing for you in recent years in the way of helping you perfect the defense of the Panama Canal, will you not be willing to let loose from these business institutions in the city of Colon, which have nothing at all to do with the running of the railroad, nothing to do with the management or protection of the Panama Canal—will you not be willing to let loose and let our people own them, and let them be taxed by our Government?"

Mr. Chairman, it means a great deal to them, and it means nothing to us. We have had a fine investment in them, which came to us at practically no cost at all.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the United States of America indemnified the Republic of Colombia for all loss of territory embraced in the Republic of Panama and did not they pay $20,000,000 for that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We will revert to that a moment. It is true a treaty was ratified by the United States Senate in 1915, I think it was—I was a Member of that body at the time—under which the United States agreed to pay to the United States of Colombia in the nature of what might be called damages—I never could understand it; I voted against the ratification, though that is not important—but in that treaty it was again repeated and definitely decided that the reversionary interests in this railroad property should rest with the Republic of Panama. That treaty left that situation undisturbed, and we have been the beneficiary all this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I am reading from Mr. Bonsal's statement which he prepared for the committee in which it is stated that by treaty of 1903 Panama turned over to the United States Government these reversionary rights, so it is my understanding that by the treaty of 1903 we shall receive the reversionary rights, and then we would acquire the property and title to these lots in 1967.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. I was mistaken to that extent, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for correcting me. He is correct. We will not become the owners of this property until 1967, and this property we do not need; it is not of the slightest use to the United States, but it means a lot to the people of Panama, and, after all, they are a small nation (that is no reflection upon them). But I can understand very well how we would feel were we citizens of a small country dominated, indirectly by a gigantic country, and that big country insisted on keeping these little grocery stores in the city of Washington.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I am concerned, regardless of the gentleman's statement. I have an affection for Panama, but we have a very vital interest down there in the Panama Canal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. This realty and this property is of vital interest to that interest of ours in the Panama Canal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not affect our vital interest in the slightest degree.

Mr. O'HARA. But the language of this bill permits, if the Secretary of War sees fit, the transfer of any of the railroad properties or any of the properties.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, that is inconceivable; utterly inconceivable.

Mr. O'HARA. I am merely calling the gentleman's attention to the language of the resolution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is utterly inconceivable. The bill provides that only such properties as are not needed by the United States, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, may be transferred.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made the statement that the particular lots and tracts and parcels of real estate in connection with the Panamanian Railroad have been improved to a certain extent with grocery stores and other properties.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The lessees.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it or is it not a fact that our own Government has put some improvements on this property?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have heard no evidence to that effect, and the committee held exhaustive hearings on it.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. We have not put any improvements at all on this leased property.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not spent a cent on it.

Mr. BLOOM. Not a cent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman confident that all improvements have been placed on that property by lessees and not by our own Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My best information is that the United States Government has never spent a cent on the properties which it is contemplated to transfer. The properties have risen in value, due to the growth of the surrounding city.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. How does the gentleman account for the building of the waterworks and sewage system?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is an entirely different problem.

Mr. WHITE. That is in this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Which is the more valuable—this sewage system and waterworks or this vacant property?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know which is more valuable. The waterworks must be maintained. Our own authorities say that the proper maintenance is guaranteed under this bill. They revert to the city of Panama in 14 years anyway.

Mr. BLOOM. And we sell them water.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We control the water supply which flows through the pipe in the city of Panama and sell them that water and get money for it. That is not changed. Now, for heaven's sake, let the Panamanians send their own civilian collectors around to collect the water rent. As it is today, American agents do that.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. To whom is the water furnished? To our people?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; to the civilian population of the city of Panama.

Mr. O'HARA. Does any of it serve the military or naval population?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That part of it which serves our naval and military population in the zone, which is ours, we still control.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I hope the gentleman will point out that the Panamanian people can justly be disturbed by having the great United States Government operate a public utility and collect money from them for the use of that utility.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, the members of the committee will understand that is a very uncomfortable situation for any people to live in. How would we like to live under such a situation?

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, we operate the Panama Canal there. Do they feel the same way about that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We operate that by treaty with them and we pay them rental. Surely the gentleman would not have that changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I need not remind the members of the committee that the Panama Canal is one of the greatest military and naval assets that we have. I need not remind Members of the House that Panama at once, after Pearl Harbor, did eveything possible, including declaring war against the Axis, to fortify Panama. It is still in danger—much more danger than the United States. It is constantly blacked out. Since Pearl Harbor it has done everything possible to cooperate with all of the other American republics in the security and defense of the Western Hemisphere.

I would like to ask the House to consider just for a moment what would have happened if Panama had not been friendly, had not lived up to her agreement with the United States; not her legal agreements alone, but her spiritual agreements. We have been extremely fortunate. The President is committed to certain agreements.

The Government of the United States last May concluded with the Republic of Panama two agreements each of which stands on its own merits. The first agreement provides for the use by the armed forces of the United States of over 80 defense areas in the Republic of Panama to be used for the defense of the Panama Canal. It was made because the two Governments agreed that there had arisen the conditions foreseen in articles II and X of the Treaty of 1936 to which the Senate of the United States duly gave its advice and consent.

It was an Executive agreement in the sense that no further legislative action is required. The agreement was released to the press on the date signed, with the exception, of course, of the list and description of the sites involved.

The other agreement provided that, subject to the consent of the Congress of the United States, this Government would turn over to the Government of Panama certain properties now held by us in the territory of Panama and would cancel the indebtedness of Panama arising out of the reconstruction of a highway to be used largely for military purposes between Panama City and the strategic air base at Rio Hato. A description of the property which it was proposed to transfer, namely, the waterworks and sewerage systems in Panamá and Colon and the lots owned by the Panama Railroad Company and leased by it for private, commercial, and residential purposes, is contained in the President's message regarding this legislation. The legislation now before the Congress covers these items.

The urgency and necessity for the enactment of this proposed measure cannot be overemphasized, and I feel that we cannot afford at this critical time to delay taking positive action on a proposal which we are assured is so significant to the Republic of Panama, which has demonstrated its willingness to assume promptly and wholeheartedly the burdens imposed upon it as a partner in the defense of the Canal, a responsibility which was accepted by the Panamanian Government under the provisions of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation of 1936.

In referring to the attitude of the Panamanian Government in the present international crisis the President stated on August 13 in his message submitting the proposed measures, and I quote:

> The attitude of the Panamanian Government in the present international crisis has been thoroughly cooperative. On March 5, 1941, the President of the Republic of Panama issued a manifesto making available for use by the United States certain defense sites in the territory of that Republic. Pending the conclusions of final arrangements regarding the terms on which these sites are to be used, the Panamanian Government has permitted our armed forces to occupy and develop them. Immediately following the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, Panama declared war on the three major Axis Powers, and since has taken numerous protective steps to cooperate with the other American republics in the interest and security of the Panama Canal and the defense of this hemisphere.
>
> This attitude is tangible evidence that the relations between the two countries are now firmly based upon a recognition of mutual interest and a disposition to assume common responsibilities.

The occupation by the United States of the numerous defense areas located under the sovereign jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama was not through unilateral action on our part but by the process of friendly negotiations and with the understanding on the part of the two Governments that satisfactory arrangements governing the use of these areas by the United States would be concluded. The defense sites were made available by Panama long before the execution of an agreement and their occupation was in no sense delayed by its formal conclusion. We owe her a debt of gratitude for that prompt action. On the other hand, the items covered in the proposed legislation before us cannot be made available to Panama until the approval of the Congress has been obtained. A failure on our part to enact House Joint Resolution 342 would not only be a repudiation of the act of the Executive, but would mean to the Panamanian people that certain aspirations which they consider entirely justified have been rejected.

At a time when this Government needed a maximum of loyal cooperation and assistance not only from the Government of Panama but from the people of that nation, it would seem wholly ill-advised to bring about a situation of this nature. The people of Panama are in this war. They are subject to all of the hardships which civilian populations everywhere must be ready to bear. The principal cities are in the closest proximity to vital military objectives. Few, if any, parts of the country are free from the presence of the armed forces and of the military installations of this country. The risks which Panamanians face are greater than those of the inhabitants of many parts of the United States. The maintenance of the morale of the population of the Nation is of real importance to us in our war effort.

Thus the urgency of the passage of this legislation becomes apparent. The Panamanians have been extremely prompt in responding to the many demands of the wartime situation. They feel that we should at least be reasonably prompt in meeting what to them are long-held aspirations involving the question of sovereignty over their own territory. It would be difficult to find a more fitting time than the present for us to perform an act which is in complete accord with our conception of justice and fair dealing. The measures proposed are a logical development in the program of our relations with Panama, are consistent with our broad policy of inter-American cooperation, and are submitted to Congress at a time when Panama is giving us effective and wholehearted assistance in our war effort.

I should like to point out again that while the present commercial value that we give up to Panama is $13,000,000, the cost to us was $68,000 for land, and $8,000,000 for waterworks, and $2,700,000 credit; as an offset the Panama Canal will turn back to the United States certain road machinery, which is extremely valuable and needed very much at the present time. The value of that road machinery which Panama turns back to us is $1,200,000. So the actual cost to the United States has been comparatively small.

I believe that this resolution should pass and I earnestly hope it will pass. Panama has always been one of our best friends. Her friendship is a most precious possession.

Permission asked and granted to insert as part of remarks articles II and X

of the treaty of 1936 between the United States and Panama, is as follows:

ARTICLE II

The United States of America declares that the Republic of Panama has loyally and satisfactorily complied with the obligations which it entered into under article II of the convention of November 18, 1903, by which it granted in perpetuity to the United States the use, occupation, and control of the zone of land and land under water as described in the said article, of the islands within the limits of said zone, of the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco, and of any other lands and waters outside of said zone necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works, and in recognition thereof the United States of America hereby renounces the grant made to it in perpetuity by the Republic of Panama of the use, occupation, and control of lands and waters, in addition to those now under the jurisdiction of the United States of America outside of the zone as described in article II of the aforesaid convention, which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said enterprise.

While both Governments agree that the requirement of further lands and waters for the enlargement of the existing facilities of the Canal appears to be improbable, they nevertheless recognize, subject to the provisions of articles I and X of this treaty, their joint obligation to insure the effective and continuous operation of the Canal and the preservation of its neutrality, and consequently, if, in the event of some now unforeseen contingency, the utilization of lands or waters additional to those already employed should be in fact necessary for the maintenance, sanitation, or efficient operation of the Canal, or for its effective protection, the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama will agree upon such measures as it may be necessary to take in order to insure the maintenance, sanitation, efficient operation, and effective protection of the Canal, in which the two countries are jointly and vitally interested.

ARTICLE X

In case of an international conflagration or the existence of any threat of aggression which would endanger the security of the Republic of Panama or the neutrality or security of the Panama Canal, the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panama will take such measures of prevention and defense as they may consider necessary for the protection of their common interests. Any measures, in safeguarding such interests, which it shall appear essential to one government to take, and which may affect the territory under the jurisdiction of the other government, will be the subject of consultation between the two governments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts yields back 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that if the entire membership of the House could have heard what the Committee on Foreign Affairs heard in executive session with reference to the importance and the necessity of this legislation it would be unnecessary to debate this bill in the House today.

The Panama Canal, as was so well said by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who just addressed us, is one of the life lines, and a vital life line, in the defense of the United States. It was necessary for our Government in the protection of that life line to acquire air bases and observation posts at other points outside of the 10-mile strip of the Panama Canal. These things we have acquired, and by reason of it our Government has agreed to grant the concession in this bill which the gentleman from New York has so well explained we can afford to do because we have already gotten many dollars more than the property cost us.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Was there an agreement on the part of the United States when we acquired those bases for fortifications throughout the Republic of Panama to give them the things mentioned in this bill?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This bill is an outgrowth of the agreement we had and this is simply action by the Congress of the United States ratifying the agreement by which we acquired a number of different bases that are vital in the defense of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, until article II and article X of the treaty of 1936 that is set forth.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House can well afford to trust its Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee reported the bill unanimously. While it may not have been unanimous on it in the beginning, yet in the end they all agreed and I feel sure the House can well trust the Committee on Foreign Affairs when it reports a thing unanimously without a single exception. They believe that this bill is necessary, that it is just, and that we should pass it at this time.

In conclusion let me say again that this is a very important bill, and if we want to preserve the Panama Canal and our relations with Panama and the other South and Central American republics it behooves the Congress of the United States to pass this bill.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, together with other Members of the House, it was my privilege to visit Colon and Panama City as well as the Panama Canal Zone, some years ago. We have a tremendous investment in Panama, more than $400,000,000. No one can go to the Panama Canal Zone and understand the geography of the Zone and the strategic importance of that Canal and that narrow strip of property to us in a commercial sense as well as in a naval and military sense, without understanding the importance of keeping the good will of the Panama Nation in regard to its relations with the United States.

This bill should pass. We have to take the word of the committee as to what happened in executive session. We are at war, and I hope we will not do anything in this House today which will in any way alienate the friendship and the loyalty of the Panamanian people toward this Government in our strategic war today.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would the gentleman say that the House bill gives a little bit more protection against any claims for damages or losses sustained in this matter?

Mr. DONDERO. That is a matter we have to take on faith from our committee, that has weighed these matters, and I am willing to accept the word and judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House as to what we should do.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman know what that judgment is?

Mr. DONDERO. Only from reading the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have the two bills here. Perhaps somebody on the other side can answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, now that Thomas Jefferson has been adopted as the founder and patron saint of both parties, I hope today that our first vote after that adoption will be unanimous so as to give the shades of the founders of our parties a rest from oratory.

I am in favor of this legislation and have been from the beginning for one or two very fundamental and vital reasons. In the first place, I look upon Panama as the most vitally important area on earth to the safety of the United States of America. It is our jugular vein, it is our life line, and it is absolutely essential that we have the unqualified confidence, cooperation, and assistance of the entire Panamanian population in order to safeguard that tremendous investment that we have there for our safety which we call the Panama Canal.

In 1936 our Government made a treaty with Panama in which we agreed to do certain things in return for certain things that they have done for us. This bill implements that treaty. They have kept their agreement 100 percent, and it is now up to the great United States, hovering as we do, like a giant beside that little Republic, to make good 100 percent without haggling and without criticism. I therefore hope and pray that this bill will pass and that the people of Panama will know they have our good will exactly as we desire to have theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to transfer to the Republic of Panama all of

the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to water and sewerage systems installed by the United States in the cities of Panama and Colon: *Provided, however,* That pending the establishment of an independent water-supply system, and so long as the Republic of Panama desires to utilize a supply of water from the Canal Zone, it shall pay quarterly to the appropriate Canal Zone authorities the rate of B/0.09 per 1,000 gallons or such other reasonable rate as may be agreed upon by both Governments: *And provided further,* That the turning over to the Government of the Republic of Panama of the physical properties of the water and sewerage systems and the administration thereof, including the collection of the water rates, does not in any way modify the existing arrangement in respect to responsibility for the public-health services of the cities of Panama and Colon as specified in the second paragraph of article VII of the convention between the United States of America and Panama, signed at Washington, November 18, 1903.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal today in commemorating the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. Of course, we are all in accord, as has been reiterated many times during this session, concerning this great American. I am mindful of the fact that Jefferson influenced the statesmen of that era, who were active at the Constitutional Convention, at which time the provision was made that "The Congress shall have the power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof."

This morning it was called to my attention that the Administrator of Lend-Lease has issued a tentative statement with regard to a proposed lend-lease policy involving silver. I thought it would be appropriate to inform the Members so that they might have some definite information on this interesting subject. At this time I want to quote from this statement of the Administrator of Lend-Lease, which outlines nine different proposals:

PROPOSAL TO LEND-LEASE SILVER TO GREAT BRITAIN

1. It is proposed that about 3,250,000 ounces of free silver from the Treasury stock be lend-leased to Great Britain.

2. The British have stated that they urgently need a total of 5,000,000 ounces of silver by the 1st of June. Two million ounces of this silver are needed early in April.

3. The Treasury has certified that the British request for silver is a reasonable one. One-third of the silver is needed for essential war industry requirements and two-thirds for coinage (domestic and overseas).

4. Mr. Batt, of the Combined Raw Materials Board, has stated that not more than 1,750,000 ounces can be obtained from Canada and that the remaining 3,250,000 ounces must come from the United States or Mexico.

5. The position of the War Production Board is that the newly mined silver situation, domestic and foreign, is too tight to permit the United States or Mexico to furnish 3,250,000 ounces of such silver to Great Britain. Metals Reserve Company has a stock pile of silver of only 2,600,000 ounces.

6. Treasury free silver not committed to the Defense Plant Corporation for nonconsumptive domestic uses is needed by the Treasury for future domestic coinage needs.

7. According to the War Production Board not all of the 1,000,000,000 ounces of Treasury free silver committed to the Defense Plant Corporation is tied up, and sufficient silver is available to meet the British request.

8. Metals Reserve will make 2,000,000 ounces of silver available from its stock pile of silver within 30 days provided that it is assured that the silver will be replaced from silver subsequently obtained for lend-lease purposes.

9. The British are willing to agree to return an equivalent number of ounces of silver at the end of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call attention to reports recently current indicating that there are approximately 20,000,000 ounces of silver now on hand in Mexico. Certainly, I would render no disservice to the war program, but it would seem to me that if two-thirds of this silver is to be used for coinage purposes, then certainly there is every good reason to point out that Britain could purchase this silver not only in Canada but in Mexico.

I also want to emphasize that for several weeks we have been considering a stabilization program for the post-war period. We know that currency and money will be the fundamental, basic issue in any agreements between our country and our allies in the post-war era. I submit to the House at this time, in view of the constitutional responsibility placed upon the legislative branch of our Government, that it behooves the Congress to give considerable study, careful study, to the problem posed in this statement recently made by our Lend-Lease Administrator. It is our responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a peculiar bill. We are told on one side of it that the donations to Panama will total about $13,000,000, and then the bill winds up by an authorization of an appropriation to Panama of $2,700,000.

If there ever was a pesthole in the world for sickness and disease, it was the Panama Isthmus, and here under the terms of this bill we propose to surrender the control of the waterworks and sewerage system in the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Under the treaty, we still retain sanitary control of the waterworks, even though the title to it is turned over to Panama.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that these South American countries are subject to revolutions and changes. Why should we surrender the control of the most vital things for the vast population of our people in the Isthmus of Panama, which is one of the important outposts of the United States?

I happen to have visited Panama and I know that we have five or six Army posts there that are dependent on the water supply of the Panama region down there and on this very waterworks we are attempting to give away.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Let me reiterate what my colleague has said, that we do not surrender control of the sanitary conditions at any point, waterworks or anything else.

Mr. WHITE. How does the gentlewoman account for the terms of the bill, when we are turning over the administration of the waterworks and the sewerage system to Panama? What does that mean?

Mrs. BOLTON. If the gentleman would read the testimony, he would see that it does not do that.

Mr. WHITE. I am reading the bill. We are governed by the text of the law in the bill.

May I say to the Members of this House that there is a vast personnel of Americans down there. The fact is, Panama City and Colon were built up by a population of Americans that is served by a regular boat line of Army transports carrying in supplies by the boatloads to supply those communities. On the transport on which I visited the Panama Canal, the evening the transport docked we started to discharge a cargo. We were unloading Carnation condensed milk in large quantities, 10 or 15 cases in every sling, and in the morning when we arose we were still unloading Carnation milk from the western coast. Nobody can appreciate what is contained in this bill. It seems to me it is a gift.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I will do better by the gentleman than he did by me, I will yield to him.

Mr. BLOOM. I yielded to the gentleman. I am not going to make a speech, I want to read from the bill, and I think this will satisfy the gentleman.

On page 2, line 7, appears this language:

> Does not in any way modify the existing arrangement in respect to responsibility for the public-health services of the cities of Panama and Colon.

Furthermore, this bill has been approved by the War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department, and every other department of the Government having anything to do with the matter. I think that ought to satisfy the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a new bill to provide for placing income taxes on a current basis. The bill I have submitted simply provides that payments made during this year shall apply on the tax liability for 1943. The measure further provides that taxes for 1942 shall be paid in deferred installments covering a period of 5 years. In other words, one-fifth of the 1942 tax shall be due and payable during each year for 5 years.

My bill does not make provision for skipping, forgiving, canceling, or rebating. It simply gives the taxpayer a chance to catch up with his taxes by

spreading 1 year's taxes over a 5-year period. The bill also provides that in the event a taxpayer for some good reason is unable to meet his payment, an extension may be allowed upon good cause shown to the collector of internal revenue.

I do not think it can be claimed that this will create a heavier burden for the taxpayers, in view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee is right now giving consideration to an additional tax bill of $16,000,000,000. Our present tax bill is $22,000,000,000. I therefore suggest that in place of attempting to collect the $16,000,000,000 additional taxes that such amount be reduced in an approximate sum that will take care of whatever additional charge may be required, being the one-fifth of the 1942 tax, in order to permit taxpayers to go on a current basis. In other words, one-fifth of $22,000,000,000 is approximately four and a half billion.

The Ways and Means Committee in submitting a new tax bill for additional taxes can simply keep in mind the one-fifth which the taxpayer is going to pay during the year, and reduce the new charge by about $4,000,000,000, making the new and additional tax charge of, say, $12,000,000,000.

Other important parts of the bill, including the withholding feature of 20 percent, are similar to other measures now pending. I believe this proposal is fair. I see no reason why anyone should complain about it. If this House or Congress were contemplating a reduction in revenue, the situation might be different, but since it is necessary to increase the collection of taxes, I see no good reason why my measure should not be approved. I submit it for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, in view of the terrible crisis through which our country is passing, and considering the supreme sacrifice our boys are called upon to make—in all parts of the world today—the American people expect and want to pay their fair share of the cost of bringing this cruel war to a successful conclusion as soon as it can possibly be done. They do want to know, and have a right to know, their tax funds are being spent judiciously, and not being wasted or used for unnecessary purposes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have directed some inquiries about the bill here today for the reason that I had some responsibility passed on to me to pass on this rather important question of voting away some of the physical properties of the taxpayers of the United States.

I rather regret that the gentleman from Texas did not speak first and tell us, as he did later, that this bill is to make good an agreement by our Government with Panama in the exchange of some airports we have now in that country for defense of the Panama Canal. But may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that usually when you come in here with a bill you have so many things about it that are executive and confidential and hush-hush that we have a great deal of difficulty in trying to get simple and intelligent information.

I do think that in fairness to those of us who are not on that great committee we are entitled to the information, because we are certainly responsible to our people when we go back home.

I felt that these properties were of considerable importance to the Panama Canal, which is of tremendous value to the Government of the United States, and I was merely trying to find out from the gentleman from New York and some of the other gentlemen on the committee some of the information to which I thought we were entitled, and which would seem to me, intelligently inform us, and upon which we might base our judgment in the consideration of this bill.

Of course, I am solicitous as to the welfare of the good-neighbor policy, and I do not know how often we are going to have to buy it, but I hope it is not going to be every year.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I just want to say to the gentleman this report was drawn very carefully and I think it contains all the information the gentleman has asked for. If the gentleman has not read the report——

Mr. O'HARA. I want to say to the gentleman I have read the report and every word of the bill, and I felt I knew just about as much about it as any ordinary Congressman does. But I was still entitled to information.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, there is no question about that.

Mr. O'HARA. By this manner I realized the gentleman felt I was not.

It is not my understanding that it is necessary to be a resident of some eastern State to understand the language of this bill or to understand the problems of our Government in Panama. It so happens that it is our responsibility in passing upon this legislation to get information which is not contained either in the bill or the report of the committee on this bill. We have tremendous interests in the Panama Canal; the protection of the lives of our citizens defending that canal is involved, as is the taxpayers' money in the properties of the Panama Canal and those properties sought to be given away to Panama.

I have no apology to make for the questions I have asked in order to arrive at some conclusion; and I am not unmindful of the difficulty I have had in trying to get some simple information.

I realize that some of the members of the committee may be on the inside of some information which I have not been privileged heretofore to have. I hope in the future on any bills of this kind if it is necessary for the House to go into executive session to get this information that we will be able to get it. As a Member of the House I feel that I have the responsibility of being advised as to what the effect of this bill is upon the lives of our citizens, and their possessions.

I hope next time it won't be so difficult to obtain such information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this looks like a very complicated but unimportant bill. It is complicated, but it is also of very great importance. It is of great significance in two ways: First, it is a symbol of how the greatest nation on earth is going to deal with very tiny nations. Second, it is a symbol of how the Executive and the Congress are going to work together. I disagree thoroughly with those who say that this Government was committed in any way by Executive agreements which were made, looking to the action we are authorizing here today. What happened was this: Agreements involving our defense were completed under authority of treaties entered into and ratified between the two countries. Then, in addition, further agreements were made, not by our Government but by the Executive of our Government who had no power to do more than make tentative agreements with the Republic of Panama, dealing with these items that are here today. What is happening here today is that we are asked to back up our agent and make complete an act of the Government of the United States which up to this time has not been an act of our Government, but of representatives of our Government.

In acting on such a matter all of these items have to be considered and weighed in the balance.

We need the friendship of Panama and the good will and comity of Panama unless we are to take a strong-arm position. If we are to take a strong-arm, imperialistic position with Panama, and if that is to be the pattern of our conduct with the other nations in Central and South America, we have a situation involved which, to put it in dollars and cents, is going to cost us many more millions of dollars than the amounts involved in this bill today.

I, as one who looked on this bill with great suspicion when it first came to our committee, am ready to say to you now that I am supporting the bill, not because it is just a little item, but because it is an important step in itself to show the way we intend to deal with our neighbors to the south, a very practical, homely but extremely important and significant part of our good-neighbor doctrine, a doctrine which we expect to extend all over the world.

I further feel that this is an example of the kind of teamwork that will be necessary in the future, as it has been in the past, between the Executive, charged with diplomatic missions, with opening up international negotiations, and the Congress, equally charged with the re-

sponsibility of acting on the legislative proposals made by those negotiations before they can become the act of the United States Government.

Those are some of the issues involved in this little bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Panama Railroad Company is hereby authorized to convey to the Republic of Panama, in whole or in part, all of its right, title, and interest in and to so much of the lands of the Panama Railroad Company located in the cities of Panama and Colon as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, are no longer needed for the operation of the Panama Railroad or for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or defense of the Panama Canal: *Provided*, That any such instruments of conveyance shall contain a provision under which the Panama Railroad Company and any of its successors in interest agrees to fully protect the Government of the United States against any claims for damages or losses heretofore or hereafter incurred by any lessee of any of the lands covered by such conveyance. The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised after June 30, 1944.

(a) Any conveyance of any land in pursuance of the authority contained herein shall be deemed to release any and all reversionary rights of the United States in said property.

(b) The provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the disposal of certain lands held by the Panama Railroad Company on Manzanillo Island, Republic of Panama," approved July 10, 1937, so far as they may conflict with the provisions of this joint resolution, are hereby modified accordingly.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $2,700,000, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Republic of Panama an amount equivalent to the principal and interest paid by that Government on account of the credit of $2,500,000 made available to it by the Export-Import Bank for the construction of Panama's share of the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway, and to pay to the Export-Import Bank an amount sufficient to liquidate the remaining obligation of the Republic of Panama to that bank on account of the aforesaid credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 14, pursuant to House Resolution 198, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for 20 minutes.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, our third President, and the author of our Declaration of Independence. It is a day hallowed in the heart of every American; not only a day of prayerful remembering, but also a day of hope and rejoicing and renewed courage and faith for the tests and tumults that lie ahead.

Today, on the rim of the Tidal Basin in Potomac Park, we dedicated to our country, and to all who abide or shall abide under our flag from this day forth, the new Jefferson Memorial, which stands like a marble and magnificent echo of Jefferson's own Monticello dream of perfection. Let it not be forgotten that this monument represents the visible victory of the late New York Congressman John J. Boylan's long and sustained labors in its behalf. No memorial could ever be dedicated with more dignified pomp and restrained circumstance; no memorial could ever be dedicated with more sincere and earnest hearts. In this dedication, and in the thousands of smaller, though no less significant, ceremonies across this great country he loved so well, we must today rededicate, with equal consecration, ourselves and our concerted efforts to the first principles; we must clarify our minds of all dross and dissension; all the extraneous and superficial rag-tag and bob-tail of pettiness which clutter people as the dead leaves caught among snarled and stubborn tree-roots in a stream clutter the freshets in the spring. Jefferson's tremendous love of humanity began in bursting and jetting freshets of inspiration and endeavor; these rose to tidal waves with the onrush of power and honest will and clear analytical thinking which he put behind them.

For it is not enough merely to slumber and dream in the shadow of a spacious liberty; we must be everlastingly prepared for the night watch and the struggle and the long labor of liberty. In Jefferson's own portentious and prophetic warning, "the tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time by the blood of patriots and tyrants."

The real memorial to Jefferson is not something we build out of marble or brass, however magnificent, however worthy; the real memorial is something we build in ourselves, with blood and bone and spirit. It is the monument of faith and hope and courage and sacrifice, an eternal beacon to mankind.

Thomas Jefferson himself wished to be remembered for three achievements only: as author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statutes of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia. Although he is justly enshrined in our memories for much more than his humility and selfless devotion to his people would permit him to recount, these three deeds would suffice for any man's immortality. In truth, these enclose all that freemen fiercely and jealously cherish: individual equality and personal liberty, equal justice, freedom of thought, of speech, of assembly, and of worship; and free access to public education and public enlightenment which he regarded as the "surest reliance for the preservation of our liberties."

As long as I can remember I have studied and loved the life of Thomas Jefferson. I have probably read as much about him as the average American, more or less. For me, the hero worship of my boyhood, visualized with all the personal intensity that a boy's imagination can muster, has taken on the shape of a shadowy companion. No one sitting under the dome of the Capitol could ever quite forget him; he is in all we think and do that is fine and fearless and unselfish, in all that is America and American.

In addition to his glorious Declaration of Independence, it would be well for each and every one of us this day, and all the days of our years, to read and reread and ponder Jefferson's First Inaugural Address. How pertinent and passionately true for our time and our vicissitudes are these lines from that First Inaugural which ring like trumpets to our troubled minds and hearts:

> During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even these distant and peaceful shores; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. * * * If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men have feared that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law; would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others? Let history answer this question.

History is answering this question, answering it every day, every hour, every moment; answering it with one vast voice and one gigantic effort unequaled in all the chronicle of man's incessant struggle toward the light.

This truth was never more forcibly brought home than last Sunday evening in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, when a distinguished audience thrilled to the presentation of The Patriots, a drama by Sgt. Sidney Kingsley, of the United States Army. The entire cast of the play had come here to inaugurate the bicentennial observance in our National Library. It seemed altogether fitting that the great Library, of which Jefferson's private library formed the foundation, should, for the first time in its history, open its halls to a play devoted to, and animated by, the principles and spirit of that giant who gave the democratic world her birth certificate. It was a noble and memorable performance, a profound spiritual experience from which we arose exalted with renewed faith and renewed courage for the supreme task before us.

I asked the author of this superb American play to tell me how he came to write it, what prompted him to undertake the adventure. I wish to share his answer with this House. He said:

Four years ago, when this study was first begun, I knew very little about Jefferson or the other great men of our early history. I had just come back from Europe. I had seen democracy vilified and spat upon. I determined to find out the meaning of democracy for myself—to find it out from the men who made it, who pledged—and frequently paid—their fortunes and their lives to preserve it. The Patriots was the result of this attempt to cleave through post-World War No. 1 skepticism on the one hand and Fourth of July fustian on the other; to rediscover in all its purity the American faith.

And how magnificently he found it. How richly the long search has rewarded this modest American Army sergeant, Sidney Kingsley—and all Americans. I learned a few minutes ago that the coveted annual drama critics' award has been awarded to The Patriots, as best American play of the year.

There was another young American, and his talented wife, who asked the same question, and found the answer in a poem. He was the noble young American poet, Stephen Vincent Benét, the author of that American epic, John Brown's Body, whose recent death, at the age of 44, was a great and grievous loss to American letters and American life. Moreover, his untimely passing had a special poignance for me, for he was one of my cherished constituents. I quote from the poem:

THOMAS JEFFERSON

(1743–1826)

Thomas Jefferson,
What do you say
Under the gravestone
Hidden away?

'I was a giver,
I was a molder,
I was a builder
With a strong shoulder."

Six feet and over,
Large-boned and ruddy,
The eyes gray-hazel,
But bright with study.

The big hands clever
With pen and fiddle,
And ready, ever,
For any riddle.

From building empires
To planting 'taters,
From Declarations
To trick dumb-waiters.

"I liked the people,
The sweat and crowd of them,
Trusted them always
And spoke aloud of them.

"I liked all learning
And wished to share it
Abroad like pollen
For all who merit.

"I liked fine houses
With Greek pilasters,
And built them surely,
My touch a master's.

"I liked queer gadgets
And secret shelves,
And helping nations
To rule themselves."

The devoted and vigilant leadership we have received from the White House throughout these troubled times, and which we continue to receive; in which we have faith and in which we continue to have faith, brings Thomas Jefferson closer to us. He, too, lived in difficult and disastrous days when the onslaughts from without our land were reinforced by onslaughts from within. But his courage and his honesty remained unshaken, no matter what forces were hurled against it. The restlessness, the turbulence seething in men's souls—these were omnipresent and awesome enough then, in the very birth pangs of our Republic, the last best hope on earth. Today, also, these are terrible phenomena: a whole world tosses in the agonies and convulsions of rebirth. May we prove equal to the task; may we prove worthy of our heritage.

"I have sworn upon the altar of God hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man," said Jefferson. We, too, have sworn it. God helping us, we cannot falter; in that crusade we cannot fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today by including article II and article X of the Treaty with Panama in 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. Sergio Osmena, Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth, delivered before the Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, April 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads (full committee) on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2437. Public hearings will be had.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, April 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, April 14, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1172.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

321. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Byram River and tributaries, Connecticut, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

322. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Black River, Catahoula, and Concordia Parishes, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

323. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $135,982,500 (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

324. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supple-

mental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $578,000 (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

325. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California;* to the Committee on Claims.

326. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of four resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

327. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

328. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TARVER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2481. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 203. Resolution requesting certain information from the President (Rept. No. 355). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2482. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2483. A bill to extend the time during which the 90 percent credit against Federal unemployment taxes for contributions paid into State unemployment funds may be claimed and allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2485. A bill to provide for the payment currently of individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2486. A bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2487. A bill to provide for the direct sale to certain former owners of real property of the United States when it is no longer needed for the national defense or war program; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2488. A bill to repeal the National Labor Relations Act and to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 2489. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to attend the sessions of the forthcoming International Food Conference and declaring the sense of Congress with respect to the press coverage of such conference; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. Res. 207. Resolution waiving all points of order on the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, or any provisions contained therein; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 208 Resolution creating special committee to investigate old-age pensions; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 637, relative to education in the Territories; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to clear the title to certain school lands granted the State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to change the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and to enact no legislation affecting private flying and fixed-base aviation operations not interstate in character; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

526. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. George M. Perkins and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

527. By Mr. FAY: Petition of the Assembly, State of New York, memorializing Congress to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

528. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Resolution 99 of the State of California, relative to memorializing Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to place the full authority to achieve the objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

529. By Mr. BARRY: Resolution of the New York State Legislature, urging Congress to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

530. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to enact legislation vesting the Fair Employment Practices Committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution, and enforcement, together with adequate funds to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

531. Also, resolution of the New York State Legislature, requesting Congress to enact House bill 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

532. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association of Graduate Women of the University of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the resolution recommending that any change in Puerto Rico's educational system be made on the basis of scientific experiments; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

533. Also, petition of the Franklin County Fiscal Court, Frankfort, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to absenteeism from war plants; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, in the resurrection glory of the world about us, heaven and earth are full of Thee; common bushes are on fire with God, and the time for the singing of birds has come. May a spiritual springtime make our own hearts as the garden of the Lord. There may the fair flowers of humility and charity appear, there may fallow ground blossom as the rose, there may barren branches be clothed upon with the beauty of holiness; for,

"Our faith is all a doubtful thing,
Wove on a doubtful loom,
Until there comes, each showery spring,
A cherry tree in bloom;
And Christ who died upon a tree,
That death had stricken bare,
Comes beautifully back to us,
In blossoms, everywhere."

In the name of that One altogether lovely, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 12, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 12, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 9, 1943:

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes; and

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable.

On April 10, 1943:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; and

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty.

On April 12, 1943:

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

On April 13, 1943:

S. 700. An act suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1730. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE-SERVICE OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENT FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under the provisions of Public Law No. 23, approved April 8, 1943, the Chair appoints as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Selective-service Occupational Deferment of officers and employees of the legislative branch, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

HAZEL M. LEWIS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 28)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 52, "An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis."

The bill proposes to pay to Hazel M. Lewis the sum of $1,798.85 in full settlement of her claim against the United States for damages as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when assaulted by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps on September 5, 1938, at Powers, Oreg.

The records show that, while on authorized leave of absence from his organization and in an intoxicated condition, the enrollee, who was accompanied by another enrollee of the same camp who was unsuccessfully attempting to quiet him, threw a rock at Mrs. Lewis, who was walking on a street, which struck her head and caused her to fall, whereupon he attempted to snatch her handbag.

The facts are very similar to those involved in H. R. 5603, Seventy-fifth Congress, "An act for the relief of Peter Sietsma," which I returned, without my approval, on April 11, 1938, mainly upon the ground that the enrollee who caused the injuries was absent from camp and was not acting within the scope of his employment. I made the further observation in that case that the fact that the person causing the injury happened to be a Government employee did not of itself create any moral obligation on the part of the Government, and that no such obligation arose since the injury was brought about by a wanton act committed by the employee while away from Government premises and not performing any official function.

While I greatly regret the injury suffered by Mrs. Lewis as a result of the wanton act of an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, I feel obliged, for the reasons indicated, to withhold my approval of this measure.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1943.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the System covering operations for the year 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of the so-called war security bill, being the bill (H. R. 2087) to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 99

"Whereas the American Meat Institute has evolved a program to achieve proper distribution of meat to the armed forces, to the civilian population, and to lend-lease without interfering with the wartime objective of inflation control; and

"Whereas such program is the result of the work of more than 200 men, including 22 institute committees, over a period of several weeks and was approved at a meeting of the directors of the institute appointed by members from all parts of the United States; and

"Whereas this program was endorsed by the joint livestock committee representing 93 organizations engaged in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock; and

"Whereas it appears that the basis of the program consists of an integrated, centralized control having authority to correlate slaughter and Government buying with civilian needs in order at all times to keep the supply consistent with the demand; and

"Whereas it appears to this body that such purposes are sound: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That it hereby endorses the meat industry program for solving wartime meat problems; and be it further

"Resolved, That Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be, and he is hereby, memorialized to place the full authority to achieve the objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That such person and staff be aided by an advisory committee appointed by appropriate Government authority to represent the meat industry in all its phases and locations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution by mail to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States from California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate telegraph the contents of this resolution to the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator; the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration; the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Honorable Alfred J. Elliott, chairman of the California delegation in the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce:

"STATE OF MICHIGAN,
"MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE.

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation changing the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and particularly to enact no legislation affecting private flying and fixed-base aviation operations not interstate in character

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce and commercial aviation; and

"Whereas the air lines of the United States represent a minor part of civil aviation, and private flying and fixed-base operation represent the major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent right to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying; and

"Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

"Whereas, this Nation now being at war, there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is now vested with full powers under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, and in the light of the present emergency there is practically no civil aviation existing today as such; and

"Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered since the needs of post-war aviation are more a matter of conjecture than of direct knowledge, and the planning for foreign air commerce must be considered separate from the problems of post-war aviation within the United States; and

"Whereas those men who have contributed so much to the development of aviation since the last war are now serving their country in the various branches of the armed services and are unable to voice their sentiments and opinions on proposed aviation legislation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics if and when they return from active duty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Michgan respectfully requests that the Congress take no action on these presently proposed aviation bills and that future aviation legislation be confined solely to problems of foreign air commerce, and that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 be left unamended and unchanged until the present war is over and the peace is established; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Congress, and to each of the Michigan Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house March 18, 1943.
"Adopted by the senate March 26, 1943."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution to endorse Senate bill No. 637 introduced on February 4, 1943, in the Congress of the United States by Senator THOMAS of Utah, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during the emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools'

"Whereas Senator THOMAS of Utah, introduced in the Congress of the United States Senate bill No. 637, appropriating funds to help the States and Territories in the financing of their public-education systems for the purpose of reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities in their elementary and secondary schools;

"Whereas this bill appropriates the sum of $300,000,000 for said purposes;

"Whereas for the effects of this bill, the island of Puerto Rico is included, the same as all other States, possessions, and Territories;

"Whereas in accordance with an estimate of the amount for each one of the States, Territories, and possessions, the amount appertaining to the island of Puerto Rico will reach the approximate sum of $3,500,000; and

"Whereas this Federal aid for public education is necessary and advisable in view of the increasing school needs of our people: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring):

"1. Publicly to endorse Senate bill No. 637 of the National Senate, as a bill of great usefulnes and convenience for public education.

"2. To request both Houses of the American Congress to pass said Senate bill 637.

"3. To send a copy of this resolution to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress.

"4. To send a copy of this resolution to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico, the Honorable BOLÍVAR PAGÁN, recommending that he use his good offices to contribute toward the approval of this bill, and that he state before the proper committees the wish of this Legislature of Puerto Rico that the said bill become a law; and that he also state the need of the people of Puerto Rico for Federal assistance in public education."

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House resolution requesting the Office of Price Administration to adjust the price ceilings on milk in Maryland

"Whereas the dairy industry is the largest source of income to farmers in the State of Maryland, with an annual value of $30,000,000; and

"Whereas milk is the most essential food for the health and well-being of the people of our State; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through the Office of Price Administration has ordered ceiling prices of milk, which have greatly affected the economic structure of the entire industry; and

"Whereas Maryland has drawn thousands upon thousands of people from all sections of the Nation to help in war industries and this, with the rising purchasing power of consumers, has increased the consumption of fluid milk in Baltimore city and the vicinity, alone, by 35 percent in the past 12 months; and

"Whereas, the production of milk for this market has decreased 9.6 percent during the past 12 months and more than 300 dairy farmers have sold their herds or transferred their supply to more profitable markets; and

"Whereas the above conditions have made necessary the importation of an increasing volume of milk at premium prices, in order to meet consumer demand; and

"Whereas the dairy industry of the State, both producers and distributors, are suffering severe losses; and

"Whereas the officials of the Office of Price Administration have been in possession of the facts that indicate the seriousness of the dairy situation in the State, and have publicly stated that price adjustments were necessary to mainain an adequate supply of this essential food commodity; and

Whereas no action has yet been taken to adjust price ceilings and preserve the economic stability of the dairy industry; and

"Whereas it is the function of the Office of Price Administration to establish price ceilings but it is also their responsibility that prices established do not curtail food supplies; this being particularly true of milk, the most nearly perfect food: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the Office of Price Administration be and it is hereby requested to immediately adjust price ceilings on milk in Maryland so that the downward trend in production may be checked, and an adequate supply of milk may be maintained and so that the impending disaster may be averted; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that the chief clerk be and he is hereby directed to

send copies of this resolution to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization; Hon. Marvin Jones, Assistant Director of Economic Stabilization; Hon. Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration; Hon. John S. Schneider, of the Office of Price Administration; Hon. Leo H. McCormack, Maryland director of the Office of Price Administration; Hon. Charles W. Cole, regional price director of the Office of Price Administration, and to the Representatives in the United States Congress from the State of Maryland."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"House resolution requesting the elimination of tariffs on foodstuffs shipped into the United States, during the present emergency

"Whereas there now exists in this country an acute food shortage, which arises out of the fact that we are shipping about one-fourth of our foodstuffs to our armed forces and to other of the United Nations; and

"Whereas it has come to our attention that a food surplus exists in certain other countries adjacent to ours, notably the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas a large tariff on the importation of foodstuffs from other countries increases the cost to consumers of such foodstuffs; and

"Whereas the importation and utilization of this food surplus is therefore not availed of by this country due to the fact that these high tariff barriers make it economically impractical to import the said foodstuffs in any large extent; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable that our country at the present time avail itself of all possible food resources in order to alleviate the food shortages currently present and thereby to raise the standard of nutrition and diet of our people and to release more of our foodstuffs for the use of our armed forces and valiant allies: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the Secretary of State of the United States and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to take such action as they may deem necessary to effect the elimination of tariffs on all foodstuffs imported into this country during the emergency of the present war; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Maryland."

WORK IN ESSENTIAL WAR INDUSTRIES BY OLD-AGE PENSION BENEFICIARIES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and ask its appropriate reference a joint resolution adopted by the 1943 session of the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in essential war industries under certain limitations.

Under the rule, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table, as follows:

Joint Resolution 29

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in essential war service under certain limitations

Whereas the manpower shortage has accentuated the dislocation of necessary food production and aggravated the lack of coordination and delivery of essential war materials that will seriously hamper and retard the effective utilization of the resources of the Allied Nations; and

Whereas such labor shortage may be alleviated by economizing and utilizing our available labor in permitting the recipients of old-age assistance to be gainfully employed to the extent of permissible physical ability; and thereby extend to these aged people the opportunity to labor for victory and democracy; and

Whereas it would appear to be unwise and foolhardy to permit the continued impairment of the ability of our farmers and manufacturers to produce the necessary supplies and material necessary for both winning the war and the peace; and

Whereas the rapid acceleration in the cost of living with the limitations imposed by a pension budget has produced want and privation to our own citizens who have been most modest and meager in their needs; and

Whereas the pensioner has been handicapped greatly not only by the increased cost of living but in the limitations imposed upon him to obtain gainful employment to supplement the pension so as to provide the minimum necessities of life; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable to alleviate such manpower shortage and the distress of such pensioners by enacting legislation for the emergency period of the war that will provide that the earnings of any applicant for, or a recipient of, old-age assistance, received for labor required for the armed forces or for the production of war goods, agriculture, or essential goods or services shall not be considered as income under such pension budget, so as to reduce such pension payment if the earnings are $50 per month or less, but 65 percent of the income in excess of $50 per month shall be considered income for the purpose of the reduction of the pension; and

Whereas such proposed legislation will enable thousands of loyal citizens to assume fully their obligations and duties of patriotic endeavor in the complete mobilization of all our manpower to work or fight to keep democracy safe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to speedily enact suitable legislation that will restore the effective productiveness of our old-age pensioners without loss of pension and alleviate in part both the increased living costs of such pensioners and our critical manpower shortage for the emergency period of the war; be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.)

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION — INTRASTATE AIR COMMERCE

Mr. MAYBANK. I present a resolution adopted by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
Columbia, State of South Carolina.

At a regular session of the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, held at Columbia, S. C., on this 7th day of April A. D. 1943.

In the matter of H. R. 1012 now pending before the Congress of the United States of America.

The commission, having under consideration the provisions of H. R. 1012 now pending before the Congress of the United States of America, and it appearing—

That the said H. R. 1012, if enacted, would altogether destroy the power of the State of South Carolina to regulate intrastate transportation by aircraft, and it appearing further

That the reservation of such power to the several States is necessary in the interest of obtaining adequate and efficient service of such character: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this commission, by adopting this resolution, hereby records its opposition to the passage of said H. R. 1012 and any and all attempts to limit and deprive the State of South Carolina of its right to regulate intrastate commerce within the said State; it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith dispatched to each Senator and each Member of the Congress from the State of South Carolina.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
RUFUS M. NEWTON, *Chairman.*

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF KING COUNTY, WASH.—REGIONAL OFFICE OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY AT SEATTLE

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of King County, Wash., requesting a congressional investigation of the regional office of the Federal Works Agency located in Seattl , Wash. The resolution is a protest arising out of operations affecting the Government and a locally controlled and owned hospital. I assume that, because it is an agency set up by the Senate, to investigate such matters, proper reference might be to the Truman committee. Otherwise, I ask that the resolution be suitably referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 8690

Whereas the Board of County Commissioners of King County, State of Washington, received a letter from Mr. R. L. Durkee, Assistant Regional Director, Federal Works Agency, stating that the board "apparently had taken no constructive action in regard to the building of an addition to Harborview Hospital"; and

Whereas Mr. Durkee further intimated that the Board of County Commissioners of King County had failed in their duty by not providing the necessary $200,000 designated as the sponsor share; and

Whereas the said board of county commissioners could not legally pass or approve an emergency appropriation for an addition to the King County hospital system under Remington's Revised Statutes § 3997-6, Laws of the State of Washington, stating "no emergency exists if it could reasonably have been foreseen at the time of making of the budget"; and

Whereas the Board of County Commissioners of King County sponsored initiatives, and the people of King County voted whether or not an addition to Harborview Hospital be built, and these initiatives were voted upon in the years 1938, 1940, and 1942, but failed to carry by the constitutional majority; and

Whereas the estimated increase in population in King County, State of Washington, is 250,000 persons; and

Whereas the Federal Government have expended millions of dollars in the construction of war plants and defense housing; and

Whereas the local regional office of the Federal Works Agency have failed to make an accurate survey of the health needs brought about by the influx of war workers,

nor have they provided hospital facilities for said additional war workers; and

Whereas the lack of understanding and knowledge of the health problems of King County by the local office of the Federal Works Agency has created a health menace that may endanger the lives and health of the community; and

Whereas the local office of the Federal Works Agency, under the supervision of Mr. R. L. Durkee, have made an outright grant to build a 100-bed hospital at Renton, without first making sure of being able to provide the necessary medical personnel; and

Whereas the Board of County Commissioners of King County, State of Washington, are greatly exercised and concerned with the danger to the health of the community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of King County, State of Washington, That the Congress of the United States be requested to authorize a congressional investigation of the regional office of the Federal Works Agency located at Seattle, Wash., and the serious condition created by the influx of many thousand defense workers into King County, which creates a serious health problem, and that this be done in the very near future.

Passed this 29th day of March 1943.

RUSSELL H. FLUENT,
A. E. PHELPS,
Board of County Commissioners,
King County, Wash.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS COOPERATIVE CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION—FACILITATION OF PRODUCTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of the resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Kansas Cooperative Creameries Association, held at Topeka, Kans., March 30, 1943. There several points brought out in the resolutions to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate.

The creamery men urge that the dairy farmers be allotted more machinery, labor, and transportation in the drive to increase dairy production for victory.

I think the creamery men also are justified in their complaint that certain governmental agencies seem to be engaged in a campaign to promote the sale of butter substitutes by playing down the valuable characteristics of butter. Let the Government confine itself to pointing out good qualities of whatever they desire to have sold, but on its own merits, without making comparisons.

The creamery men also urge that the O. P. A. use the experience and ability of men better acquainted with actual production and distribution operations in formulating rules and regulations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The dairy farmer of Kansas can be depended upon to do his part in producing dairy products that a continued war effort will require. He is giving his labor and his sons to the cause; he asks only that special privileges and selfish advantages be eliminated and that the necessary facilities of labor, machinery, and transportation be provided.

2. In these times of shortage of butter and other dairy products, we resent Government-sponsored campaigns to encourage the use of butter substitutes. If our Government officials feel that the use of such substitutes must be encouraged—we insist that it be done as a separate campaign, leaving butter entirely out of the comparison. We have no fault to find with the promotion and the sale of any product which is sold on its own merits.

3. The Office of Price Administration in setting up rules and regulations for compensation of the different steps of butter from the manufacturer to the consumer, has granted unfair advantages to the manufacturers with printing and distributing facilities to the disadvantage of the manufacturer who has no such facilities.

We recommend that smaller creameries be permitted to engage agents to perform these operations—thus giving smaller creameries the same advantages and placing them on a par with larger companies.

We further recommend to the Office of Price Administration and other Government agencies who have the power to regulate our businesses—that they listen more to those who have practical knowledge and experience in the creamery industry so that rules may be formulated that will be equitable and fair to all and not work to the advantage of one class of operators over another.

4. We commend the officers of the Kansas Cooperative Creameries Association for the zeal they have maintained in upbuilding the cooperative creameries' viewpoint at all times and bringing to the attention of our public officials the recommendations of our association.

5. We wish to especially commend our State dairy commissioner, Mr. H. E. Dodge, for the equitable, fair, and efficient administration of his department and the upbuilding and improving of the industry in our State.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 575. A bill to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution; with amendments (Rept. No. 180).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 993. A bill to rescind the authorization contained in the act of May 24, 1940, for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, no appointment having been made pursuant to such authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 994. A bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

S. 995. A bill to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities; and

S. 996. A bill to limit the provisions of certain laws relating to the pay and promotion on the retired lists of the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey of commended officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. NYE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. GURNEY) introduced Senate bill 997, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 998. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MEAD also introduced Senate bill 999, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1000. A bill to reserve certain public domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1002. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roy W. Olsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1003. A bill relating to the status of Oswald K. Yeager on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1004. A bill granting a pension of $50 per month to all widows of Civil War veterans who have attained or hereafter attain the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Pensions.

AID FOR FLOOD SUFFERERS IN NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, a flood of unheard-of proportions has come to plague my State, and, I learned this morning, the sister State of South Dakota. I have a number of communications from authorities in several counties of my State representing the losses that have been theirs, the damage done to highways and bridges, and seeking Federal aid in meeting the damage that has been done. I find the precedent of Federal aid in emergencies of this kind in legislation which was enacted in 1930, when floods were devastating portions of the States of Georgia and South Carolina. I have drafted a bill in the introduction of which my colleague [Mr. LANGER] joins, and I have just learned that the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], knowing the conditions prevalent in some counties of his State, also desires to join in the sponsorship of the measure. So I introduce the bill for the three of us.

Mr. President, I have had to leave blank in the bill the amount of money to be made available for the purpose contemplated. I have done so only because there is not as yet a clear picture of how extensive the damage is. One county reports losses of as much as $400,000 in the destruction of highways and bridges, but I presume, now that the waters are receding, that within a few days we shall be prepared better to estimate what will be the total need. In the meantime, I urge the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to afford

that early consideration which will let us more readily meet the problem that is presenting itself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 997) authorizing an appropriation for the relief of the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, on account of losses arising from floods, introduced by Mr. NYE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. GURNEY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

EXCUSING OF ESSENTIAL WAR WORKERS FROM JURY SERVICE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a result of studies of the Truman Committee with reference to the subject of absenteeism, I found that a great many essential employees in war industries were absent as a result of jury service. I have a bill to provide uniform procedure for excusing from jury service all necessary employees in essential war industries and occupations and all persons in the armed forces or any auxiliary thereof. It occurs to me that this proposed legislation may not be so well perfected as it should be, but I think that it would be a good subject for the Judiciary Committee or some other appropriate committee of the Senate to consider. So, in order that it may receive consideration, I introduce the bill for reference to the proper committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 999) to provide a uniform procedure for excusing from jury service all necessary employees in essential war industries and occupations and all persons in the armed forces of the United States or any auxiliary thereof, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1730. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ATTEND SESSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE AND PRESS COVERAGE THEREOF

Mr. VANDENBERG. On behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is necessarily out of the city today, in connection with the Truman committee, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall hereby be created a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to consist of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the majority party and one who shall be a member of the minority party, five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be of the minority party. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

It shall be the duty of the committee (as a whole or by subcommittee) to attend any or all sessions of the forthcoming International Food Conference presently scheduled to be held in Hot Springs, Va., beginning May 7, 1943, and to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives (or to the Secretary of the Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if Senate or House is not in session) the program of and the various proposals being considered by such conference.

It is the sense of Congress that the three major press wire services of this Nation, namely, the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press shall each be permitted to be represented at any or all sessions of the conference by one representative from each service and that they be permitted to exercise the normal press coverage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following the concurrent resolution just submitted by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of his colleague an article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning by Ernest K. Lindley on food conference and publicity relating thereto.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—FOOD CONFERENCE RESTRICTIONS

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The restrictions placed on coverage of the forthcoming United Nations Food Conference have stirred up a controversy between a portion of the press and the President. Representatives of the press will be barred from the hotel at Hot Springs, Va., where the conference is to be held. They are to be quartered some distance away, where they will have to rely on communiques and other information funneled through Michael J. McDermott of the State Department, who is to be the press-relations officer for the conference. The controversy so far has produced one small concession: the press may attend two open sessions, one at the beginning and one at the close of the conference.

Freedom of the press, in the usual sense, is not involved. Anyone can say what he thinks about the conference, even if he does not know anything about it. Moreover, sooner or later, the press and the public will find out most, if not all, that occurred at the conference. Presumably the conclusions, if any, will be made public, and after the conference recesses or adjourns more information will leak out.

There is no established rule for coverage by the press of such meetings. It would be interesting to know everything that the President and Mr. Churchill say to each other, but we do not expect them to carry on their discussions with reporters hanging over their chairs. It would be interesting to sit in at the regular meetings of the Combined Chiefs of Staff—those held in Washington as well as the full-dress gatherings, such as that at Casablanca, at which major strategic decisions are reached.

The food conference will not deal with essentially military questions, although food has a bearing on both military and political strategy. Unlike the Combined Chiefs of Staff, its conclusions probably will not need to be kept secret at all.

But there are meetings on nonmilitary matters going on all the time at which the press does not expect to be represented. We don't expect to be present at Cabinet meetings, or at conversations between Secretary Hull and the Soviet Ambassador, or at the meetings of policy-making officials within Government departments. The press sometimes is told, or finds out later, what happened at these meetings—but not at all of them, by any means, until years later, if then.

No government could function if every decision had to be threshed out in the open. Policy-influencing officials must have a chance to express themselves freely, uninhibited by the thought that every word they say might be published. Indeed, a frequent complaint against the Roosevelt administration is that its policy-making officials talk too much for publication—that they fight their battles with each other too much through the press. The effect is to confuse the public.

The difficulties of working in complete public view are multiplied when representatives of a whole group of nations gather. This is generally realized by the press. None of its spokesmen, so far as I have observed, demands that the press be admitted to every meeting, formal or informal, at which the United Nations discuss food. What they want, apparently, is the right to live in the same hotel and talk directly with the representatives of the various nations while the conference is in progress.

This arrangement probably would give it a bit more in the longer run. At the same time, it might materially interfere with the progress of the conference. Most of the work will be technical and of little general interest. It is looked upon in Washington as an exploratory rather than a negotiating conference. But there is always a tendency on the part of more sensational and less scrupulous elements in the press to try to whip up controveries, and it is likely to become pronounced when the news is otherwise dull. Moreover, when the press is available, some representatives are likely to try to use it to gain support for their own views.

A good many international conferences would have accomplished more if all participants had been isolated from the press until they had completed their job.

This is the first United Nations conference. It may become a sort of standing United Nations committee on food. If it should fail, the effect would be serious on plans for bringing the United Nations together on other and, in many ways, more difficult problems. Moreover, it is occurring in time of war, when the general airing of such differences as may arise could have a bad effect on the united prosecution of the war.

The United Nations is a tender but valuable plant, entitled to hothouse treatment. The question of press coverage of the conference while it is going on is a practical one without any clearcut answer. It is a question of a little more or a little less, not of basic principle.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY; JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. VAN NUYS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 136), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the amount authorized to be expended by the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, pursu-

ant to Senate Resolution 35, agreed to January 14, 1943, is hereby increased by $3,000, such additional amount to be used for paying expenses of said committee, or subcommittees thereof, in connection with hearings and investigations with respect to judicial nominations referred to said committee.

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and myself, and out of order, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a pamphlet issued by the Council Against Intolerance in America, entitled "Jefferson Day—A Bicentennial Proclamation," and with it some little known sayings by Thomas Jefferson.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

JEFFERSON DAY, 1743–1943

A BICENTENNIAL PROCLAMATION

April 13, 1943, marks the two hundredth anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. Author of the Declaration of Independence and spiritual father of the Bill of Rights, Jefferson was the architect of American liberty. His words and deeds shine brighter with each passing year.

Today, more than ever before, Jefferson lives in the hearts of the American people. For he held that all men are created equal, that they possess certain inalienable rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. These truths, and the Nation founded upon them, are now challenged by the hosts of tyranny. And to defend them, our countrymen have taken up the sword of freedom.

It is fitting then that this two hundredth anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth should be celebrated as a day of rededication to the truths which he first proclaimed and established. In this celebration, not only Americans, but the people of all the United Nations will participate. For, so long as we cherish, maintain, and strengthen the democratic principles of Jefferson, the United States will remain what he conceived it to be—the world's best hope.

True Americans of all races and creeds, regardless of political affiliation will, therefore, join on April 13, 1943, in commemorating Thomas Jefferson and in pledging our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the triumph of those principles of freedom which he bequeathed to us and to all mankind.

BILL OF RIGHTS SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL AGAINST INTOLERANCE IN AMERICA

SOME LITTLE KNOWN SAYINGS BY JEFFERSON

Conquest is not in our principles. It is inconsistent with our Government.

It is our glory that we first put the ball of liberty into motion.

I think it fortunate for the United States to have become the asylum for so many virtuous patriots of different denominations.

The preservation of the holy fire [of liberty] is confided to us by the world, and the sparks which will emanate from it will ever serve to rekindle it in other quarters of the globe.

The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us.

We are destined to be a barrier against the return of ignorance and barbarism. Old Europe will have to lean on our shoulders, and to hobble along by our side.

The boisterous sea of liberty is never without a wave.

I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than to those attending too small a degree of it.

The disease of liberty is catching.

Freedom—the first-born daughter of science.

We are not expected to be translated from despotism to liberty in a feather bed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH AT CEREMONIES WELCOMING HOME BASIL DOMINICK IZZI

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Barre, Mass., on April 11, 1943, on the occasion of the welcome-home ceremonies in honor of Basil Dominick Izzi by the citizens of Barre, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAUNCHING OF U. S. S. "URIAH P. LEVY"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARBOUR

[Mr. MCNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BARBOUR on the occasion of the launching of the U. S. S. *Uriah P. Levy* at the Federal shipyards in Kearny, N. J., on March 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT OF WOMEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Free Enterprise Calls for the Voluntary Enlistment of Women" delivered by him before the Conference on War and Post-War Demands for Trained Personnel, at Washington, D. C., on April 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOORE

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator MOORE on April 13, 1943, in connection with the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL TO ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER AND RESOLUTION OF FRATERNAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO CHURCHES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, at the Shiloh Baptist Church, on April 12, 1943, and an accompanying resolution of the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, which appear in the Appendix.]

"ORIENTATION" TOWARD MILITARY FASCISM?—ARTICLE BY A. F. WHITNEY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "'Orientation' Toward Military Fascism?" written by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZED LABOR GOES TO WAR—LETTERS BETWEEN HUGH W. WILKINS AND A. F. WHITNEY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters passing between Hugh W. Wilkins and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, published in the April 1943 issue of the Railroad Trainman, under the heading "Organized labor goes to war," which appears in the Appendix.]

DANIEL C. ROPER—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Daniel C. Roper" published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 128, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I may say that it is one of the general investigation resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, does the resolution follow the terms of the resolution passed a year ago authorizing the same committee to investigate?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution is similar to all general resolutions of investigation.

Mr. MCNARY. The resolution applies, as I understand, to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 128) submitted by Mr. GUFFEY on April 6, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

INVESTIGATIONS BY MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RELATING TO MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it has been found that Senate Resolution 131, which was agreed to a few days ago, is not in the form in which similar resolutions are drawn. I should like to ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which the resolution was agreed to, with a view of striking out three words, namely, "and succeeding Congresses."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 131) authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to make such investigations with respect to the Military Establishment as it deems advisable. It is proposed on page 2, line 2, to strike out the words "and succeeding Congresses."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MCNARY. I understand the resolution conforms to the practice established about a year ago, to limit investigations of committees to one session of Congress, or to one Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. The minority leader is correct.

Mr. MCNARY. The authority used to extend over three Congresses.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH. What amount is allowed under the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I have forgotten the amount, but I will say to the Senator

from Massachusetts that, so far as the amount is concerned, the resolution was agreed upon by the Senate a few days ago. The amendment I am proposing would merely eliminate three words in the resolution. The resolution provides that the investigation shall continue through this Congress and succeeding Congresses, and the committee of which the senior Senator from Illinois is chairman has invoked the rule whereby all investigations are limited to the immediate Congress and are not permitted to continue beyond the Congress in which they are authorized.

Mr. WALSH. Does the resolution permit travel by the committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure it does. It is in the regular form.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Illinois, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, knows there has been some suggestion in the committee that an appropriation should be asked for by the committee to enable it to travel and make investigations. I personally, and most of the other members of the committee, have taken a very conservative attitude toward the suggestion. We did not want to appear to be using public funds for hasty and limited jumps from one naval base to another, for the purpose of making superficial investigations, and we have asked for no money for that purpose. If appropriations are to be made for other committees, I am sure some members of the Committee on Naval Affairs would like to have the privilege extended to that committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, and to the majority and minority leaders, that the Senator from Illinois is in error in presenting this request. I was under the impression that the resolution had been agreed to. However, this is not the resolution it was my intention to amend. Therefore, I withdraw my request.

Mr. WALSH. I did not rise necessarily to object to the request, but I did wish to emphasize the view that members of the Naval Affairs Committee entertain on this subject. While it is desirable that visits be made by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, perhaps, to observe the progress of our military activities, I do not want the American people at this time to get the impression—and I am sure the Senator from Illinois agrees with me—that we are engaging in junkets, trips which are not likely really to result in accomplishing very beneficial results.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Massachusetts, and, as I stated a moment ago, I was in error in presenting the resolution, and I withdraw the request, because I am unalterably opposed to the amount that is suggested in the resolution. I thought it was a resolution which had heretofore been agreed to by the Senate, and an error in which was to be cured by an amendment.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly, insofar as I am personally concerned, what the Senator from Massachusetts has said with respect to junketing trips. I do not want any such thing to happen insofar as our committee is concerned, and, as chairman, I shall guard the funds of the Senate with my vote. I do not know whether any committee is going to ask for more money for travel purposes, but I will say, in deference to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and to the members of that committee, that last year a resolution was presented asking for a small amount, and it was favorably acted upon by the Naval Affairs Committee, but no money has ever been spent by the Committee on Naval Affairs in inspecting any naval bases or naval equipment within or outside the United States.

Mr. WALSH. That is a fact; and, indeed, in some cases members of the committee themselves have made expenditures out of their own pockets in order to make inspections, especially in their own home localities.

I can conceive of specific cases and specific instances in which inspections might well be made, but I think they should be designated. From my experience I do not think sufficient advantage accrues to the Government to justify the public being taxed to provide funds to enable members of committees merely to move around from one place to another, and to be entertained by naval officers or military officers, with no opportunity afforded for a thorough, complete investigation into costs and efficiency of military operations. It should be done only when a definite objective requires it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his request.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Friday last, House bill 1860, entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes," was considered by the Senate. At that time the senior Senator from Illinois was in the chair acting as President pro tempore of the Senate. Senators who were present at that time will recall the debate which took place on the bill.

On Saturday last the Chicago Tribune printed an article entitled "Negro Leader Charges LUCAS With Vote Bias." The headline is, "Says he blocked ban on race discrimination." The article proceeds:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 9.—Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council and president of the United Government Employees, today accused Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, of biased action in ruling against a proposed antidiscrimination amendment to the Government pay raise bill passed today by the Senate.

The bill, as it came before the Senate, contained a committee amendment by Senators WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, and WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota, that pay increases under the bill should not go to a Federal Government employee who belongs to a local union which "discriminates against, or denies membership to, any person because of race, color, or creed."

* * * * * *

"All the amendment would do would be to say that a union cannot exist on Government money in Government property, making munitions for this country, if it continues to discriminate against any citizen of the country," BROOKS explained.

On a voice vote, LUCAS, who is Acting President of the Senate in the absence of Vice President HENRY WALLACE, declared that the Langer amendment was defeated, although this was open to question.

"It is regrettable that the southern Senators were joined in defeating full justice in this matter due to the arbitrary and obviously biased ruling of Senator LUCAS, who was presiding," Brown declared in a statement.

He said LUCAS "conspicuously ruled against the best interests and morale of 13,000,000 Negro Americans" in his interpretation of the Senate voice vote.

Mr. President, during the short time I have been serving as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate in the absence of the President pro tempore, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and Vice President WALLACE, I have attempted to carry on the traditions of the United States Senate by according fair and impartial treatment to every Senator on the floor. I wish to take this opportunity, while I am on my feet, to extend an expression of gratitude to those who made it possible for me to occupy this position during the absence of these two very distinguished and able men.

Mr. President, on page 3176 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senators will find, after a discussion of the bill by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and other Senators, that the Senator from New York made the following response to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]:

Mr. MEAD. I agree with my colleague from Ohio, that the amendment should be rejected.

The Senators were talking not about the Langer amendment but about another amendment. Following that the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate said:

The amendment of the Senator from New York is open to further amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, are we about ready to vote on the final disposition of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

* * * * * *

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MCNARY. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. I have spoken to the Senator from New York about the amendment, and I should like to know whether he will accept it. It reads as follows:

Then the Senator from North Dakota read the amendment, after which the following occurred:

Mr MEAD. That would take the place of section 15. I discussed it with my colleague from North Dakota, and, so far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. LANGER. At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a short statement which I have prepared, and in connection with it several newspaper comments and articles.

The Acting President pro tempore then said:

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Then the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] follows; some eight pages of fine print. Then the Acting President pro tempore said:

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The amendment was again stated. Then a colloquy occurred between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and other Senators for some 25 or 30 minutes. Finally the absence of a quorum was suggested, and the roll was called. Then on page 3185 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following occurred after the roll call:

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The amendment was stated.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I have the amendment restated?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The amendment was again stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. President, anyone who was in the Senate at that time knows positively that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment was definitely rejected, and that was not the cause of the extended debate nor was it the basis for Brown's improper statement. Yet in the article given out by Mr. Brown it was made to appear that that is where all the trouble arose in connection with the parliamentary situation on Friday last. That amendment was definitely defeated by an aye-and-no vote, and no one made any contention otherwise.

After that we find the following:

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as amended, in the nature of a substitute.

Then the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] rose and said:

Mr. President—

Now, here is where the trouble started—

Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out section 15 of the substitute.

There was no debate on that motion, and the Chair put the question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

And on an aye-and-no vote the Chair held that the "ayes" were in the majority.

Mr. MEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for a division.

The Senator from Illinois was in the chair at that time and said the following:

All in favor of the amendment—

And the Senator from Illinois was stopped at that point. When he was going to ask Senators in favor of the amendment to stand, and those against the amendment to stand, the Senator from Illinois was stopped by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Chair has already announced the result.

The Senator from Illinois had announced the result, and the Senator from Georgia was technically correct from the parliamentary standpoint.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the able Senator from North Dakota is within his rights. He was addressing the Chair when the question was put.

Without further ado the Senator from Illinois then, acting as the President pro tempore, stated:

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Dakota demands a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

In other words, after the Senator from Illinois had leaned over backward, in fact had practically violated the rules of the Senate by ordering the division requested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the vote was reversed. Technically speaking, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was correct, for as every Senator knows, under the rules, after the vote is once announced the only way under parliamentary practice, that the decision of the Chair can be overruled is by an appeal. Notwithstanding that, the Senator from Illinois, as occupant of the chair, in order to be fair—yes, in order to be more than fair to the Negro people of this country and to the Senate, because the Senator from Illinois knows the delicate feelings by some on the race question, and knows how some people are attempting to play upon the sympathies of the Negroes of the country for the benefit of certain interests—the Senator from Illinois again put the question, and as stated before, on a division vote the Russell amendment was lost. If anyone should be condemning the Senator from Illinois it is the Senator from Georgia and not some lobbyist around the Capitol at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very happy to have the Senator from Illinois confess in open Senate that he did overlook the rule of the Senate on the occasion he has described. The Senator from Georgia felt very keenly that the Senator from Illinois had disregarded the rule and had reopened the question without any parliamentary right to do so; and only for the reason that most Members of the Senate had left the Chamber for the day, so that only a small number were in attendance, did I refrain from appealing from the decision of the Chair. I regretted to see a quorum call had at that late hour. However, if the Senator from Illinois showed any partiality at all, he certainly showed it against the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct. As I said before, I have tried to be fair and impartial in all my rulings during the brief time I have occupied the chair.

So it seems to me that the criticism which has been made is rather unfair. Yet I do not condemn the man, or seriously criticize him, because I understand that the parliamentary situation is difficult for even Senators to understand at times. Brown undoubtedly failed to understand the parliamentary situation. I presume that anyone who is doing the type of work done by Edgar Brown under such circumstances should be pitied, rather than censured. I am not going to censure Brown for his mistake. I am simply going to say that this boy is ignorant and his stupidity has caused him to go out into deep water where it is always difficult to tread.

I do not want the Senate or the Negroes of the Nation to think that I sat in the chair and deliberately violated the rule or their rights. Brown ought to apologize for giving out to the country the statement he has made. The Chicago Tribune is the only newspaper which carried the story, so far as I have been able to ascertain. When Brown presented his statement to the Associated Press, the United Press, and the other newspaper representatives, some of them told him, "Why, Edgar, you are wrong. Senator LUCAS did you a favor; and yet you do not seem to appreciate it or know it, and you are giving him 'the rap' by your statement to the press."

Mr. President, that is all I care to say about the matter. Some persons say, "You should not dignify Brown by taking up this matter on the floor of the Senate. You will make a big fellow out of Brown." But, after all, perhaps it would be better if in the Senate we did just a little more questioning regarding such misstatements which are made either through ignorance, stupidity, or sometimes willfully, wantonly, and knowingly.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say about the matter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall very vividly the event to which references have been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I am not interested in any newspaper controversy or in what might be said by newspaper correspondents; but I am interested in having a true and accurate interpretation of the rules of the Senate. I simply want to make this observation for the reason that, by practice, a form of procedure has developed here which I do not relish from the standpoint of carrying out the work of the Senate. It is true that whenever a decision is made by the occupant of the chair, it becomes final, and debars any further action. Of course, a Senator has two remedies: Either to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was carried, if it was a motion, or to appeal from the decision of the Chair. Those two remedies are recognized.

However, the practice has developed for a Senator, after he finds by a voice

vote that his motion has been lost, or that his position has not been sustained, to ask for a division. Such a request comes too late. Also, if he fails to obtain a division, he suggests the absence of a quorum or requests a yea-and-nay vote. All such actions by a Senator are debarred and foreclosed by our rules. The practice of giving any one Senator a choice of three different remedies should be prohibited. I am going to invoke that rule.

In the case which the Senator has discussed he got into difficulty. On the voice vote on the motion of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Illinois, then presiding, ruled that the motion had been lost—I think it was lost—or sustained; I forget which the ruling was.

Mr. LUCAS. The ruling was that the motion was carried.

Mr. McNARY. Very well—that the motion was carried.

After the Acting President pro tempore made that decision, he permitted a division to be had. The Senator from Georgia was correct in that the Senator from Illinois should have held to his decision at that time. But he yielded in the interest of what he thought was, of course, fair, and did not sustain the position of the Senator from Georgia. That is due to a practice—an unfortunate practice—in which Senators are gambling on results.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right on that point?

Mr. McNARY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the brief time I have spent in the chair, let me say to the Senator that it has been my experience that on a voice vote frequently it is very difficult to determine whether the ayes have it or whether the noes have it. It seemed to me on that occasion that the vote was a close one; yet I held with the Senator from Georgia. Then, in order not to make a mistake, I permitted a division to be had; I knew that I could get the correct answer by means of a division.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I realize the difficulties. I am not criticizing the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. McNARY. Such procedure is bad practice. When the Senator from Illinois announced the decision, he should have stayed with it, because that is the rule. The Senator from Georgia was eminently correct.

I know that the Senator from Illinois was attempting to be fair beyond the rule, and, of course, he should not be criticized. Personally, I think I may say, from my observations of a good many years in the Senate, that while the Senator from Illinois has presided he has been uniformly fair and just in his rulings. I make that observation at this time in the interest of correct procedure in the Senate and in the interest of a fair statement of the situation as I viewed it and as it was discussed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his observations.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT DEDICATION OF THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, our distinguished leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in moving an adjournment of the Senate over yesterday, so that its Members might attend the Thomas Jefferson Memorial dedication, in my opinion, made a very wise decision. The ceremonies were most inspiring. The President of the United States delivered an eloquent address, and the heads of the Episcopal and Catholic Churches, representing the religious activities of America, were most appropriate in their invocation and benediction. The Star-Spangled Banner was very beautifully sung by Miss Grace Moore.

The Senate, which had received individual invitations, was represented by the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is serving in the absence of the Vice President; our distinguished majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who represented Jefferson's State, and many other Senators. The elected officials of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, accompanied the leadership group.

It is my privilege as a member of the Commission to say that it was a most efficiently arranged program, the ceremonies being performed without a mishap. The elements were in keeping with the memory of our great American, as the weather was that of a perfect spring day.

In offering the President's address for the RECORD, I call attention to the quotation from Jefferson with which the President closed his speech. It is one of the greatest utterances of man. I refer, of course, to the sentence:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address of the President, broadcast in connection with the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, Washington, D. C.:

Today in the midst of a great war for freedom, we dedicate a shrine to freedom.

To Thomas Jefferson, apostle of freedom, we are paying a debt long overdue.

Yet, there are reasons for gratitude that this occasion falls within our time; for our generation of Americans can understand much in Jefferson's life which intervening generations could not see as well as we.

He faced the fact that men who will not fight for liberty can lose it. We, too, have faced that fact.

He lived in a world in which freedom of conscience and freedom of mind were battles still to be fought through—not principles already accepted of all men. We, too, have lived in such a world.

He loved peace and loved liberty—yet on more than one occasion he was forced to choose between them. We, too, have been compelled to make that choice.

Generations which understand each other across the distances of history are the generations united by a common experience and a common cause. Jefferson, across 150 years of time, is closer by much to living men than many of our leaders of the years between. His cause was a cause to which we also are committed, not by our words alone but by our sacrifice.

For faith and ideals imply renunciations. Spiritual advancement throughout all our history has called for temporal sacrifices.

The Declaration of Independence and the very purposes of the Revolution itself, while seeking freedoms, called for the abandonment of privileges.

Jefferson was no dreamer—for half a century he led his State and his Nation in fact and in deed. I like to think that this was so because he thought in terms of the morrow as well as the day—and this was why he was hated or feared by those who thought in terms of the day and the yesterday.

We judge him by the application of his philosophy to the circumstances of his lifetime. But in such applying we come to understand that his life was given for those deeper values which persist throughout all time.

Leader in the philosophy of government, in education, in the arts, in efforts to lighten the toil of mankind—exponent of plannings for the future, he led the steps of America into the path of the permanent integrity of the Republic.

Thomas Jefferson believed, as we believe, in man. He believed, as we believe, that men are capable of their own government, and that no king, no tyrant, no dictator can govern for them as wisely as they can govern for themselves.

He believed, as we believe, in certain inalienable rights. He, as we, saw those principles and freedoms challenged. He fought for them, as we fight for them.

He proved that the seeming eclipse of liberty can well become the dawn of more liberty. Those who fight the tyranny of our own time will come to learn that old lesson. Among all the peoples of the earth, the cruelties and oppressions of its would-be masters have taught this generation what its liberties can mean. This lesson, so bitterly learned, will never be forgotten while this generation lives.

The words which we have chosen for this memorial speak Jefferson's noblest and most urgent meaning; and we are proud indeed to understand and share it:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

EFFECT ON HOG PRODUCTION OF LUMBER SHORTAGE AND RESTRICTIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, we are all intensely interested in the food production program which faces the Nation, and the problems which confront us in that connection.

There is one rather minor phase, perhaps, which has impressed me greatly during the past few months, during which time I have tried to assist lumber dealers throughout Nebraska and the central West to obtain lumber for building hog sheds, chicken coops, and other small structures on the farm which are absolutely necessary properly to take care of the young animals and fowl which are continually appearing on the farms.

In order to assist in this program the lumber dealers of the central area were willing to take what is termed "wet lumber," or lumber just as it comes from the mills. They were willing to pay the ceiling price which had been posted by O. P. A. The lumber manufacturers on the west coast were willing to supply the demand with lumber which had not been cured for a sufficient length of time to reduce the moisture content to comply with certain Government regulations. They started to supply the demand, and at that point the O. P. A. decided that such sales could be made if the ceiling price was reduced 15 percent, which was just enough to shut off the delivery of the lumber. Therefore, the farmers have been seriously handicapped in taking care of the pig crop.

Recently the press has carried several notices indicating the seriousness of the situation. This morning there came to my desk a magazine called The Hog Breeder, published at Mendota, Ill. The leading article is by a Nebraskan whom I know very well personally. It is entitled "Greatest Loss in Spring Pig Crop in 20 Years." Strange as it may seem to Senators, practically all the loss is caused by the inability of the farmer to give proper care, and that situation is occasioned by the fact that he is unable to obtain lumber. A hog shed made of wet lumber will protect a sow as well as a hog shed made of lumber which has been properly seasoned for the necessary length of time.

I regret very much that the O. P. A. saw fit to spoil the program which the farmers themselves had been interested in carrying out to solve the problem. In order that those interested may have further information on this rather commonplace but practical subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the article to which I refer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATEST LOSS IN SPRING PIG CROP IN 20 YEARS

(By Fred DeVore)

Now the old Nebraska "sodbuster" is getting old and cranky, but when I look around me, why, I think that the farmer and stock raiser is about in the same fix as the country dog that came to town. If he stood still, the dog catcher nailed him, and if he ran, the town boys tied a can to his tail.

You know we have heard a lot of noise, read a lot in the papers about increased production. We have heard the big shots bragging over the radio that food would win the war and dictate the terms of peace. Of course, a lot of these jay birds that were supplying the wind works and who were doing the planning and figuring out how much you farmers were going to produce and just how to do it didn't know anything about the operation of a farm, and as to livestock, they wouldn't know a stud horse from a Jersey bull if they met him on Main Street or at a night club. But it's all figured out for you, and it's an easy matter, according to them, for you farmers to go out with half the help, half the machinery, and half the equipment you need, and produce more grain, beef, and pork than you ever did before. These guys have always labeled the farmer as just a yokel that is a chronic kicker—that he hasn't known anything but hard work and no fun and that a little extra work won't hurt him anyway.

Now I see they are messing around trying to put a price ceiling on hogs. That's O. K. Hogs are high enough if they leave the price of grain where it is or where it will be governed by supply and demand, but it's my opinion that if they raise the ceiling price of grain and clamp down a low ceiling price on hogs that farmers with short help will devote their time to grain farming, selling their grain at a big price instead of raising hogs or taking the long chance they must now in laying in these high-priced feeder cattle.

Just let them, with their price manipulation, drive more farmers out of the hog business, and you will find that our soldiers and sailors and our workers will not be satisfied with a belly full of straight corn bread, and they might begin to yell for some sowbelly.

Now with meat rationing and meatless days and all the restrictions on buying meat coming up, the men in authority seem to think that this pork and beef is easily produced and that it is bound to be produced no matter how much the farmer is handicapped. I have hundreds of letters from all sections of the Corn Belt that have come to me in the past 3 weeks and it is my opinion that there is the greatest loss in the 1943 spring pig crop that we have seen in 20 years, and this comes at a time when the world is looking to the American farmer to increase pork production. I figure there are two main reasons that are the cause of 75 percent of these losses—first, lack of equipment and second, lack of competent help. For instance, you hog men all know that the comparatively few electric pig brooders now in use have saved many thousands of pigs, no matter whether they were home-made or manufactured ones. Now a man making and selling pig brooders tells me that he pulled all the wires possible but that the boys who control the material used in their manufacture allowed him to make just 300, when he had orders for thousands. If they had just busted up the steel in only one of these scrap heaps or made a few less golf clubs they could have built brooders that would have saved pigs enough to feed an army for a year. You farmers know how hard it has been to get lumber for a hog house. One hog man out in Washington writes me that he had his order in for lumber to build a warm hog house for over a year and with two lumber mills turning out millions of feet of lumber less than 10 miles from him, he had been unable to secure any lumber and as a result of poor housing his first three sows to farrow lost all their pigs. Another farmer in southwest Iowa lost all the pigs from 18 sows and he, too, had been trying to get lumber to build a new hog house.

Then how about tankage? You hog men can't get it, but I notice they still make dog food for the city dogs, and when I see one of these white-collared birds out exercising the family hound after he has wound up a hard day's work at 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and I think of the thousands of my friends among the men who raise pork that are in desperate need of tankage and think of the millions of pounds of dog feed being made for these city blue-blooded curs, why do you blame the old Sod Buster from wanting to give them both a swift kick in the rear end.

Then wire fencing is desperately needed in order to build lots for our pigs, but just try and buy some and see how far you get.

The big majority of our farmers are shorthanded for help. Their boys, hired men, and help have been drafted or have gone to the factories or defense plants to draw enormous wages, and the farmer, while he is used to working 16 to 18 hours, yet he just can't hack it very long at 24 hours a day. He isn't able to sit up with his sows and look after the pigs as he was in former years. Now I have in mind 10 Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska farm boys; just 10 out of thousands in the Corn Belt. I would say that in 1942 these 10 boys produced 1,200,000 pounds of pork. In addition to this, these 10 boys, I would estimate, raised and cared for and harvested 50,000 bushels of grain. Besides this they milked cows, raised thousands of pounds of beef, kept the farm machinery in running order, and still they were inducted into the Army. Now we know it is our duty to fight for our country. The farm boy is just as anxious to get in the ranks as anyone, but I say right here that even the brass hats, that at last seem to realize that we are in for the greatest meat shortage in the history of this Nation or of the world, don't seem to have much of an idea of doing anything to relieve the situation.

I just read in the paper that they were going to rally the Boy Scouts to go out and help on the farm. Now won't that be just fine? Those in authority don't seem to realize that the successful farmer is a jack of all trades—he has to be a mechanic, an electrician, a plumber, a carpenter, a soil expert, a dairyman, a veterinary; he has to know feeds and the results obtained from certain feeds; he must understand the rotation of crops and a thousand and one other things, that successful operation of a farm and raising livestock is one that requires more technical skill and knowledge than any job in the country. The recent survey conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture turns up with some very bad news which certain apologists for the brass hats have been trying to deny or ignore. It is this: "All signs point to a smaller crop in 1943 than was harvested in 1942, for in the 2,789 counties in the Nation only 31 expected a bigger yield this year than in 1942," and in only a few counties did they hope to equal last year's production either in livestock or grain crops. Here in Nebraska 84 county agents answered the Department's inquiry and every one of them expected to see a shrinkage in his county's production, and I know the same condition prevails in every Corn Belt State. And remember, these figures were based on the hope that crop conditions would be as favorable as in 1942 and that the pig crop could be saved as well this year as last year. Well, what's the reason? The county agents sized it up as follows: Shortage of manpower, lack of machinery, and lack of equipment.

Now these are factors which the farmer can do little about. He works on an average of 80 to over 100 hours a week. He can't be expected to work enough harder to make up for the loss of his boy or hired man. There just aren't enough hours in the day or enough muscles in his back to do any more. Now if the farms of this Nation and the production of food products and livestock are to be kept up to par, why this lost labor will have to be replaced, either by machinery or new labor. The farmer can't do anything about it. If anything constructive is done about our food shortage which threatens to become a famine, it will have to be done in Washington by those who have undertaken to manage the country through directives and priorities.

Now some tell us that there is a similar shortage of manpower everywhere. This is not the truth. You can't measure manpower by counting noses. You have got to figure how hard and how much and how long an individual works. Industry has a 40-hour week, with time and a half for overtime. Many of them have feather-cushioned rules and workers get a day's pay for less than a day's work. Now the farmer and livestock breeder has no soft snap of that sort. His hours are limited only by the

strength of his back, and the only feather bed he knows is the one he falls into to rest his tired bones after he has done his day's work in the fields and cared for his livestock.

Any man with sense should realize that the labor shortage has hit the farmer and livestock producer far harder than any other line of industry, and also can anyone doubt that the flow of labor from the farm to the city will continue just as long as factories offer two or three times the wages that a farmer can afford to pay and that, too, for easy work and less than half the hours.

It is my opinion that there is no shortage of manpower in this Nation, except on the farms. The trouble is that labor in industry is not working enough hours or giving the Nation an honest day's work.

Before this war is over this Nation and the whole world will come to realize that the farmer and livestock producer is the most important that any nation can have, and I say it is time for America to recognize that fact. If all the agencies, the czars, the red tape nincompoops, etc., can be made to realize conditions and act intelligently, why even though it is late in the game and great damage has already been done, yet they can do something or devise some plan to see that there is more manpower on the farms, more machinery furnished the farmer and more equipment of all kinds given him. I'd like to send these farm-production obstructors a few samples of the thousands of public farm-sale bills that have been posted on our fence corners in the past season. You farmers know how they read. You know why these farmers were forced to sell their livestock and leave their farms.

Here is a copy of part of a letter written by a prominent banker of Clay County, Nebr., to Representative CURTIS in Washington, D. C.:

"Attached is a bill of one of the many public sales that are being held in this territory. You will note the reason for selling is 'on account of both my boys entering the armed forces.' I understand through changes in draft regulation that taking the boys off the farm for military service has been stopped under certain conditions. We cannot stress the fact strong enough that those boys who have worked with their fathers are the only ones qualified to carry on the feed production. If there is anything further that you can do to avert this condition, it would be appreciated. The boys that are raised on the farm are the only ones with ability to assist in providing feed on a large scale.

"There is another thought that I would like to convey to you, and that is the fact, because of the shortage of labor on farms, there are large numbers of milk cows and shestock going to market that should be kept on the farm for both reproduction of stock and production of dairy products."

Well, the only trouble is he didn't make it half strong enough for when you figure that as busy as a farmer will be this year he won't have time to follow some town boy or some drug-store cowboy around and show him what to do and how to do it. The case of the 10 farm boys I speak of that produced 1,200,000 pounds of pork can be multiplied a thousand times.

Sure we are going to have meatless days and we will, if nothing is done to provide help, machinery, fencing, and equipment for our farmers and livestock men, have plenty of meatless weeks. I say let the brass hats see that labor does an honest day's work. See that instead of horsing around and blowing off steam they at once do something and do it quickly in furnishing equipment, machinery, and competent, experienced manpower for the farm.

I say a great crisis is at hand, for we can make all the war machinery that our ships can float, we can have an Army of 12,000,000 men and still lose this war if our fighting forces and those of our allies and the men working in the various industries are not provided with food. I predict that a meat famine confronts us—that it is far more serious than you have been led to believe, for when it comes down to cases the brave boys that have shut you off from buying needed machinery, fencing, building material, farm equipment, tankage, etc., and that have allowed thousands of our highest trained and most expert producers of pork, beef, milk, and other food products to be driven from their farms or taken out of the production field, I say they are going to be mighty busy passing the buck and will somehow or other try to crawl out of taking the blame.

All this means for you hog raisers to go ahead under whatever circumstances you find confronting you, regardless of labors' 8 hours a day, or of strikes, lack of equipment, machinery, or help, or any other evils. I say, show the Nation that the farmer and meat producers of this Nation are not quitters. Those of you who are in a position to go ahead, you will find that the production of pork for the next several years will be the most profitable business connected with agriculture. The man who can raise good hogs should and will surely make a lot of money. And even if you are forced to do your work as you are now, under a terrific handicap, you can't help but make it pay big dividends.

But above all this you realize that it is a duty of every patriot, every lover of America and freedom to produce to the utmost of his ability. Let labor leaders and racketeers do their worst. Let production of needed war materials be slowed up by strikes over either hours, wages, or some fancied grievance. Let labor slackers hinder production. Let the brass hats still deny you the things necessary to operate at full speed. I say, go ahead and produce every pound of beef, pork, mutton, milk, and grain that you can and I'm certain that when it's all over that the American farmer and livestock man will have done more than his share and that the world will have to recognize what his tremendous efforts meant toward winning the war.

RESTRICTION OF SIZE OF CASKETS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a flood of telegrams from undertakers and operators of funeral homes in Indiana, protesting against the recent order, L–64, of the War Production Board, limiting the size of caskets in width and depth, and in length to 6 feet 3 inches. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point a copy of one such telegram which I have received from Louis J. Lemstra, of Clinton, Ind.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLINTON, IND., *April 12, 1943.*

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of an unsuspecting public, I must protest the casket-size requirements of War Production Board Order 6–64. Our 56 years' experience serving the people of this community indicates that over one-third of our patrons require a full-size standard casket. The ghoulish and inhuman practice of crowding bodies into inadequate-size caskets will result in bitter resentment by bereft families and a consequent lowering of civilian morale. Surely the war is not going so badly that we have been reduced to robbing the dead. Suggest that order be amended to increase size to present standards or allow at least 40 percent production of oversize.

LOUIS J. LEMSTRA,
Manager, First Funeral Home.

Mr. WILLIS. Telegrams of protest have also been received from the following firms and individuals:

The Arthur Day Funeral Home, Bloomington, Ind.; Watson Funeral Home, Cayuga, Ind.; Charles R. Howe, funeral director, Greensburg, Ind.; Emil S. Norris & Sons Funeral Home, Loogootee, Ind.; The Jones Mortuaries, Red Key, Ind.; Gottschall Funeral Service, Ladoga, Ind.; Sonday Funeral Home, Churubusco, Ind.; Murphy Funeral Home, Milroy, Ind.; Nuckols Funeral Home, Anderson, Ind.; Callahan Funeral Home, Terre Haute, Ind.; J. Berhalter Co., Kendallville, Ind.; C. L. Bartholomew, Valparaiso, Ind.; Diggs Funeral Service, Inc., Marion, Ind.; Bob Waltz Funeral Home, Anderson, Ind.; Charles Wally, undertaker, Elkhart, Ind.; C. M. Howard & Son Funeral Home, Cambridge City, Ind.; Jesse F. Phillippi Funeral Home, Zionsville, Ind.; J. P. Whitaker, funeral director, Gosport, Ind.; Rogers & Henderson, funeral directors, LaFayette, Ind.; O. L. Brown & Son Funeral Home, Montezuma, Ind.; Lynam Funeral Home, Greenfield, Ind.; Hallard A. Flynn, Chesterton, Ind.; D. Albert Johann & Sons Co., Evansville, Ind.; Oxemann Funeral Home, Hammond, Ind.; Myers Funeral Home, Worthington, Ind.; C. B. Thomas, Terre Haute, Ind.; Dolph Cross, Terre Haute, Ind.; Hoskell & Morrison, funeral directors, Vevay, Ind.; W. C. Fox, Riley, Ind.; Greenwalt Bros., Topeka, Ind.; Wise Funeral Home, Peru, Ind.; Earl K. Parson, Parson's Mortuary, Muncie, Ind.; Roger C. Gipe Funeral Home, Alexandria, Ind.; Swank Funeral Home, Ashley, Ind.; H. E. Johnson & Son, Butler, Ind.; Curtis H. Schulze & Son, Oaktown, Ind.; E. W. Brockman, Vincennes, Ind.; Carl Schulze, Risinger & Kresgie, Vincennes, Ind.; Curt Debaun, Terre Haute, Ind.; Haverstock Funeral Home, La Porte, Ind.; Main & Sons, Newcastle, Ind.; McKee & Clark, Avilla, Ind.; Thomas A. & Teho. H. Fitch, Lawrenceburg, Ind.; Evans & Webb, Brownsburg, Ind.; Frank H. Berheide, Wayne County Funeral Directors Association, Richmond, Ind.; P. J. Ryan, Vigo County Funeral Directors Association, Terre Haute, Ind.; Lawson & Son Funeral Home, Brazil, Ind.; Miller & Sons Funeral Home, Brazil, Ind.; Wm. W. Moore & Sons Funeral Home, Brazil, Ind.; Dale Mutz, president, Johnson County Funeral Directors, Edinburg, Ind.; Grimms Funeral Home, Delphi, Ind.; Stocker Funeral Home, Vincennes, Ind.; Barnett & Son Funeral Home, Boonville, Ind.; Wallace F. Rohrer, Charles S. Rohrer, New Paris, Ind.; Goodwin Bros., Frankfort, Ind.; Black Funeral Home, Hamlet, Ind.

Mr. President, it is apparent that nothing escapes the designs of the New Deal planners. Not only are we to be regulated through life, but even after death our final rest is to be eternally disturbed by restrictive regulations.

THE SENATE'S PART IN PEACE MAKING AND POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that the first consideration in all our efforts, interest, and planning is the winning of this war. Until we win it no plans can be agreed upon with any certainty. In view of the great interest in

the subject and the many recent publications concerning post-war planning, I desire at this point to read an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 29, 1943:

SENATE IS PIVOTAL

In the midst of a veritable welter of talk about post-war matters, we find it reassuring to see the Senate taking steps to inform itself and have a large share in whatever it may be necessary to do. Excellent Senate committees have already been appointed to consider social, political, and economic measures for post-war times, and it will be well if they get down to work and stick at it on broad, long-range bases. Specific arrangements are just now obviously out of the question, but there are principles to be determined and educational work is to be done.

President Roosevelt apparently welcomes the Senate's interest in post-war planning and to cooperate with the Senate is the most practical thing he can do. Under the Constitution it is the duty and inescapable responsibility of the Senate to ratify or reject treaties and so it is, after all is said and done, pivotal in such connections. No scheme that does not win Senate understanding and approval has any chance of adoption. That this fact has frequently been disregarded by people with the best intentions does not alter it and such disregard has meant the confusion and failure of any number of undertakings that might have paid good dividends.

It has always seemed to us that Woodrow Wilson's fatal error in World War No. 1 was his failure to consider the Senate, admit its determining influence, and work with it. It is speculation, of course, but it is conceivable that the whole course of recent history might have been altered for the better if President Wilson had been the friend instead of the enemy of Henry Cabot Lodge and the group of Senators Lodge rallied to support of his point of view when post-war treaties were in question. It is likewise tremendously interesting to wonder how history would have been made at Versailles if President Wilson had been accompanied there by a considerable group of influential Senators.

Whatever the United States decides to do in regard to post-war settlements will have to be decided inside the governmental structure, and the Senate is ineradicable and unavoidable in the set-up. President Roosevelt is not likely to remember that in theory and forget it in practice as President Wilson did. By the same token, the present Senate seems far more aware than otherwise. The prospect for dual responsibility's working out well is lively, but the Senate cannot be overlooked or expected to abandon its constitutional functions.

Mr. President, I was a Member of the Senate when the war began, when it ended, and when there occurred the celebrated debate on the ratification of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations. It is my judgment that this editorial expresses a well-considered view of our present situation. The editor's references to the Wilson administration are historically correct, and in my opinion they are opportune at this time.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives during the first Wilson administration and of the Senate during his second administration. As the war drew to a close, and as the League of Nations was outlined by President Wilson, I became one of its most ardent supporters and worked for it in and out of the Senate. I made a number of speeches for it both in and out of the Senate.

It was my opinion then, as it is my opinion now, that if President Wilson had been more fortunate in appointing his peace commission there would have been a very different result. That he should have headed the commission was perfectly proper and right, though some objected at the time to his doing so. In my opinion, under the circumstances, there was no other proper head of the commission to be thought of but the President himself. He was exceedingly popular and was leading the world in the effort to organize the nations so there would be a lasting peace. President Wilson was one of the ablest and most attractive leaders I ever knew. If ever a man was perfectly honest and sincere, it was he.

In selecting his associates on the Commission, in my judgment, he made his first great mistake. He chose as his associates his Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing; his then reputed personal friend, Col. E. M. House; Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, and the Honorable Henry White. Several of these gentlemen were outstanding socially, and Colonel House was quite busy but no one ever knew on which side of a question he stood. No one of these gentlemen had the slightest part in fixing the terms of peace, and no one of them had the slightest influence on the Senate or on any individual Senator. They were generally considered by the public at large as men who were willing to permit President Wilson absolutely to fix the terms of peace without suggestions from any one of them, and as being willing to sign any treaty which the President favored. They were all courteous and pleasant gentlemen, but were regarded by many as a total loss in a peace conference.

The elections of 1918 had gone against the Democrats. The House had 237 Republicans, 191 Democrats, and several independents. The Senate had 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Progressive and Republican.

While it is true that a number of Republicans in the Senate, led by such men as Frank B. Kellogg, Irvine L. Lenroot, Le Baron B. Colt, and a number of others, had expressed themselves as being strongly in favor of the League of Nations, it seemed to me that anyone could see that the action of the Senate on the League would be doubtful in any event. The Constitution of the United States gave the President power then as now "to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." If there ever was a time, as it seemed to me then and as it seems to me now, when the President should have taken the Senate situation into consideration, it was after the First World War. President Wilson nad some of the staunchest of friends in the Senate. It was my view then, and I have not changed that view, that if President Wilson had appointed Gilbert M. Hitchcock and Oscar W. Underwood, or either of them, or any one of a number of others who were leading Democrats in the Senate in that day, and, say, Senators Henry Cabot Lodge and Frank B. Kellogg, or Senator Hiram Johnson, or a number of others who were leading Republicans of that day, there would never have been the slightest difficulty in securing the ratification by the Senate of the Treaty of Versailles, including the League of Nations. There were others in the Senate on both sides of the aisle who were perhaps equally outstanding and whom he could have appointed with the same result. If he had appointed only one on one side of the aisle, and only one on the other side, in my opinion, there would have been a ratification of the treaty. If the Senators to whom I have referred had been appointed, there would have been little, if any, difficulty in having the treaty ratified by the Senate.

President Wilson was one of the grandest men in the world. I almost worshipped him, although I know I differred in that respect with some of my colleagues at the time. His ideas about enforcing peace by a league or some such international organization were splendid, and, if they had received the approval of the Senate, they would have changed the course of history, and I believe we would not now be in this war.

Mr. President, I fully agree that that which is now called after-the-war planning is important. All thoughtful people in our country should be considering it. Of course, we cannot now be specific about anything because we do not know and cannot know what the situation will be when the war ends.

In the First World War we decided, almost unanimously, that the United States would demand, and would accept, no territory, no reparations, and no indemnities. This was stated time and again by the President before the war ended. Of course, our European Allies wanted large indemnities, reparations, and territory—and they received all three. I always thought that our statement that we would accept no indemnities, reparations, or territory, weakened our position in the Peace Conference. I may add that I am glad that America has made no such specific statement at this time. We declared we wanted only that the League of Nations should enforce future peace. It was a sincere declaration, but it probably weakened us in our fight for such a league. I favored then, and I now favor, a league to enforce peace, but we should not again be too hasty about making any declarations concerning a league or other matters in connection with the peace treaty until the time is proper.

The Senate of the United States, as one of the constitutional peace makers, must, and I have no doubt will, be represented at the peace table. We must all be practical. We want to follow the constitutional way of making peace. We should not take steps now which might divide us in making peace. Our first interest should be that of our own country, but we should be exceedingly fair, generous, and helpful to our allies. Frankly, I think that some of our ablest, most outstanding, and best Senators on both sides

of the Chamber should be members of the peace commission. Of course, our great President should head the commission, but outstanding members of the Senate should be on the commission. It is the only practical way to obtain a peace treaty which will be effective and successful. In making this statement, I wish to say in all frankness that I do not desire to be considered for membership on the commission; and I make the statement merely for the purpose of bringing about greater unity and of avoiding a repetition of what I consider to be past mistakes. The Constitution provides that two-thirds of the Senators present must ratify a treaty. Therefore, it is highly essential that this body should be represented on the commission so as to bring about and obtain the best results.

Mr. President, my long service in the Senate has led me to make this statement at this time in view of the many suggestions which have been made, and are constantly being made, concerning an after-the-war victory plan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Scott P. Stewart, of Utah, to be register of the land office at Salt Lake City, Utah, vice Albert S. Brown.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dozier A. DeVane to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ray J. O'Brien to be judge of the third circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice to be judge of the fifth circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John K. Caldwell to be Foreign Service officer of class I.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified immediately.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be so notified.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in legislative session I should like to interrogate the Senator from Kentucky for a moment. I ask him whether there is any prospect of the recess which has been discussed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will explain the situation to the Senator from Texas and to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, I shall not press the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had intended to make the explanation next Friday. In the meantime I intended to confer with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] about the matter.

We might as well be frank about the situation. A little politics is being played over the question of a recess. Some 6 weeks ago Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, including the minority leader of the House and the majority leader, suggested that Congress take a recess of a couple of weeks around Easter. I conferred with the Senator from Oregon, as I always do about matters of that kind, and it was generally agreed that we would take a formal recess beginning next Monday, to last 2 weeks, in order that Senators might return to their homes for a few days and secure a little rest, because, as everyone knows, save for the brief adjournment period last December, there has been no recess of the Senate and the House since the war started and, indeed, for a long time before the war started.

I thought the recess had been agreed to generally among those in both Houses who are usually consulted. In the meantime the tax bill has been projected into the situation in the other House, and the minority leader of that body has served notice that unless the House shall pass a tax bill this week, there will be no recess. That presents a difficulty. The House has been working on a tax bill ever since Christmas, and as yet has not gotten anywhere. I do not say that in criticism, but it is a historic fact that the House has not been able to agree on a tax bill, and, in my judgment, it would be a miracle if the Members of the House should agree on one between now and Saturday night.

I continued my conversations at both ends of the Capitol on the subject. It now looks as if there can be no formal recess of the two Houses. I intend to discuss with the Senator from Oregon, between now and our next meeting on Friday, whether, regardless of what the House shall do, we can ourselves take either a formal or informal recess, to enable Senators to obtain a few days rest. I will not be able to advise the Senate about that until at least Friday or Saturday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the purpose of the inquiry was in order that I might somewhat determine my own action with reference to undertaking to call up Senate bill 796, a bill which was before the Senate a year ago, relating to authorization to the Government to take over strike-bound plants.

Mr. McNARY. What is the order number?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is Calendar No. 147. I am extremely anxious to secure action on the bill, and I feel that fairness requires that I give notice to the Senator from Kentucky, as leader, that I shall proceed at the first favorable opportunity to make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. I do not want to disrupt any of the plans the leaders may have in mind, but I suggest now to the Presiding Officer that as soon as I can secure recognition at the appropriate time I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I may say that the Senator from Texas has been courteous enough to confer with me privately about the matter a number of times since the bill was reported from the committee. I have urged, and I still hope, that if we shall have an opportunity to take a little rest, the bill in question will not be brought up until the end of the recess. Regardless of whether we do or do not take a recess, many Senators are prepared to leave for their homes for Easter, and unless a bill of this nature should be brought up next week, there is practically nothing of importance before the Senate which would keep Senators from getting a few days' vacation if they desired to do so. It was my hope that the bill referred to, which probably will be controversial, though I do not know to what extent, will not be taken up until there is a full attendance of Senators. I do not intend to seek to prevent the Senator from Texas having his bill considered at any appropriate time, because the Senate is entitled to pass on it, the committee has reported it, and the Senator is entitled to have it considered, but I express the hope it will not be brought up until such exodus as may take place among Senators over the Easter holiday

shall be at an end, and they shall have returned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his comment respecting this matter. I do not apprehend, however, that there will be a great deal of controversy or argument over this measure. It is fairly well understood by the Senate, and practically in the form in which it is now presented it was passed by the Senate more than a year ago as an amendment to another bill. It went to the House of Representatives, and the House refused to concur, and would not agree in conference. It was before the Senate a year ago, and on account of the situation at that time, respecting the agreement by the two leading labor unions that there would be no strikes, and the President's program of seven points to handle labor matters, it was not pressed, but since that time the bill has been reintroduced, has been considered thoroughly by the Committee on the Judiciary, and has been reported practically unanimously from that committee. So I am extremely anxious to get it before the Senate, and I serve notice that at the first opportunity I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

RESCISSION OF ORDER DESIGNATING SENATOR LUCAS AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently requested the senior Senator from Illinois to be one of the American delegates to meet with delegates from Great Britain with respect to exploring and discussing the refugee problem. The conference will take place within the next few days, and in view of that fact, it will be necessary for me to be absent from the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the order appointing the senior Senator from Illinois Acting President pro tempore of the Senate during the absence of the Vice President be at this time rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is rescinded.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, April 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 14, 1943:

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Oscar Smith, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Special Task Force No. 1, United States Fleet, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Capt. Lee P. Johnson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Rear Echelon, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Capt. Robert G. Coman, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Service Force, Seventh Fleet (Southwest Pacific Force), to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

Capt. Lawrence F. Reifsnider, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander transports, Amphibious Force, Third Fleet (South Pacific Force), to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 14, 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dozier A. DeVane to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

CIRCUIT COURTS OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ray J. O'Brien to be judge of the Third Circuit, circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii.

Philip L. Rice to be judge of the Fifth Circuit, circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii.

FOREIGN SERVICE

John K. Caldwell to act as minister resident and consul general of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Thomas Maxwell Karrh, Berry.
Thomas W. Brock, Mulga.
Lucy P. Thomas, Section.
James H. Dunlap, Siluria.

ARKANSAS

Walter D. Patton, Alma.
Verna P. Reitzammer, Arkansas City.
Etta C. Hendrix, Blevins.
John T. Sumner, McNeil.

CONNECTICUT

Catherine S. Barnett, Suffield.
Albert E. Lennox, Windsor.

DELAWARE

Claborne A. Boothe, Frankford.
Joseph C. Slack, Newport.

GEORGIA

Hezzie McWhorter, Cochran.
Nathan C. Wilkes, Lincolnton.
Aligene B. Howard, Ludowici.
W. Brantley Daniel, Millen.
Robert M. Causey, Tucker.

IDAHO

Clellan W. Bentley, Mullan.

INDIANA

Ora William Irwin, Attica.
Marshall Winslow, Greenfield.
Merton L. Hughbanks, Scottsburg.
Cash N. Essington, Spiceland.
Wayne S. Simms, Waveland.
Mildred M. Shinn, Whiteland.

KANSAS

Irvin T. Hocker, Baxter Springs.
John K. States, Buffalo.
Frank M. Belding, Copeland.
Arch E. Hosmer, Holton.
Katharine A. Blasing, Ogden.
Esta S. Riseley, Stockton.
William J. Dehler, Sylvan Grove.

LOUISIANA

Winnie H. Arras, Gramercy.
Rosa V. Shipes, St. Francisville.

MISSOURI

Elisha O. Bryeans, Oran.

MONTANA

George T. Farrell, Polson.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bertha B. McCurry, Bostic.
Theron C. Dellinger, Crossnore.
Joshua T. Winstead, Macclesfield.
Ethel B Casper. New London.
Wilbur A. Pike, Pikeville.
Ralph E. Martin, Ronda.

OKLAHOMA

James Jones Quarles, Jr., Fairfax.

OREGON

Millard W. Grubb, Ashland.

RHODE ISLAND

Irvin D. Follett, Howard.
Cecil A. R. Hopkins, Hoxsie.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Theresa W. DeBilzan, Andover.
Albert E. Kostboth, Canistota.
Josephine C. Eggerling, Orient.
Thomas L. Dam, Rosebud.
Kathryn M. McCoy, Tulare.

UTAH

Pearl Wilcox, Clearfield.
Richard F. Lambert, Jr., Kamas.

VIRGINIA

Claude B. Nolen, Ferrum.
Edgar S. Moore, Stafford.

WASHINGTON

William E. Jones, Houghton.
Nikolai K. Nelson, Keyport.
Loraine A. Schultz, Reardan.
Robert I. Matheson, Suquamish.
Harry M. Bona, Tillicum.
Fairleigh B. Wilkins, Yakima.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose mercies are renewed every morning, with gratitude in our waiting hearts we breathe our humble praise. We invoke Thy guidance in all our labors that our conduct may be animated by the rule of Jesus. Bear in us a willingness to deal kindly, live nobly, that hope and patience may be enshrined in all breasts.

O fill us with the surge of compulsion to follow on with a broadening vision, yielding to the better impulses of our being which flow and thrill with new life. Gather up our mistakes, our hesitations, and bind and blend them into a volume of united strength that we may walk worthily before our fellow men. Ever clothe us with the pride of self-respect, with self-control, and with a spirit of thoughtful regard for others. We pray that our faith may pierce the future, wisdom be justified in the earth, and the voices of hate forever silenced in the presence of mankind's great, throbbing need. Blessed Lord, give our Speaker the ministry of Thy strength and wisdom, and abide with the Congress in the measure of careful consideration of all problems. In the honor of Thy holy name, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include the address delivered by President Roosevelt at the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and request that when the permanent RECORD is printed the address be printed as of April 13 rather than today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may extend his remarks in the Appendix if they exceed 300 words. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his remarks in the Appendix.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short editorial from the Washington Post entitled "We Shall Never Die."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CRIMINAL WASTE AND FARM RELIEF

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENNETT of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ANTI-INFLATION LEGISLATION

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the President signed an anti-inflation statement which he termed a "hold-the-line" order. The objective is both urgent and praiseworthy, and it brings up some questions that should be answered. The President states in his order that "Congress must reduce and hold in check the excess purchasing power."

That means taxes. Apparently the Ways and Means Committee stands alone between the American people, a clear majority of this Congress, and the President himself in their common desire to secure immediate action on our tax problems. Is that true? Has the committee read the President's message? Is it exempt from those responsibilities? Or is its pettifogging on this vital inflation control receiving White House approval?

The American people are entitled to the answers to these questions. An adequate tax program to protect War bond savings from inflation should have priority over consideration of reciprocal trade agreements.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in the first a letter to the Congress, and in the second a recent article which appeared in the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial on the pharmacy corps bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE ON REFUGEE PROBLEM TO BE HELD IN BERMUDA

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday I learned that an Allied conference on the refugee problem was to be held next week in Bermuda. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been invited to attend that conference, but no member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House was invited—the committee that will have to act upon all immigration questions that pertain to refugees. I have therefore introduced a resolution today—and I hope for prompt action thereon—empowering the Speaker to name three members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization who shall attend the refugee conference at Bermuda as an official delegation of this House, and who shall make a report thereon to the Speaker and to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Inasmuch as I have not consulted anyone on my committee concerning this resolution, and as it will be impossible for me to attend the conference, my resolution must be accepted for what it is, an impersonal protest against the fact that no member of the committee that will have to pass on legislation concerning refugees was invited to the conference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by Gabriel Heatter, news commentator, over station WOL in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address he delivered over station WOL last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a further brief description of The American's Creed, by William Tyler Page.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, first that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged, I hope falsely, that the Members of Congress jump through the hoop when the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. lobbyists crack the whip. I hope that charge is false, but one thing is dead certain, when the 1944 campaign rolls around every Member of this House is going to be confronted by a campaign financed by A. F. of L. and C. I. O. dollars unless he follows every order issued by the so-called leaders of those unions, and even then he has no assurance they will not turn on him. As long as these organizations are collecting millions of dollars a year, and as long as we have a law which prohibits corporations from making political contributions, I know of no reason, even though we do not intend to do anything about the purity of the elections or the preservation of the rights of the citizens to enable them to register their choice, why as a matter of self-preservation we do not place those labor organizations on the same plane as the corporations and individuals who may have millions of dollars to spend for campaign purposes. Let us have an amendment to the law which will prevent any and all organizations or individuals from purchasing an election or intimidating elected representatives of the people. To accomplish that purpose a bill has been introduced by me. It is my hope that it will not sleep in the Judiciary Committee for a year as did my amendment to the antiracketeering amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, may I see if we cannot arrive at some agreement with reference to the limitation of general debate. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] if he will indicate what he thinks would be the proper amount of time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that we run until at least 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, which will give us substantially 2 hours tomorrow after disposition of the preliminary business of the day.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in all probability the conference report on the farm-labor appropriation will come up tomorrow and that might consume an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. TARVER. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman if we concluded the general debate with 2 hours tomorrow, devoting the remainder of the day to general debate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. TARVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue during the day and for 2 hours tomorrow, after the consideration of the bill is resumed, and that then it be concluded, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has prepared and brought to the House the Department of Agriculture's annual supply bill for the fiscal year 1944. The bill represents many weeks of close study of the numerous problems which are involved, during which hundreds of departmental witnesses, as well as scores of Members of Congress, officials of farm organizations and numerous other persons not connected with the Government were heard. I am sure that during the present period of emergency Members of the House and the people of the country generally will appreciate the very great difficulty which is experienced by our committee in attempting to make adequate provision for those activities of the Department of Agriculture which are vitally and directly essential to the war program, to effect such economies in nonessential activities as may be possible with a view to preserving insofar as we can the financial resources of the Nation for use in its war effort, and at the same time to preserve those vital functions of the Department which have been for many years regarded as necessary to its proper discharge of its duty to foster the welfare of American agriculture generally without particular regard only for those branches of agriculture which are deemed to be of outstanding benefit in the pending emergency. For the welfare of American agriculture throughout future years requires, in my judgment, that we shall not unnecessarily cripple at this time activities which will enable the Department to function efficiently after the emergency is over when many of us expect that a crisis in agricultural conditions will transpire, compared with which present agricultural difficulties will fade into insignificance. We have endeavored to prepare a bill which would meet these objectives in a satisfactory way. There can be no question but that the members of the subcommittee have in all sincerity and with patriotic purpose endeavored to work out and bring to you a bill which is fair and which may be successfully defended from just criticism. Whether they have succeeded in this endeavor is a matter for your determination. I want this House to feel that when the pending bill has been finally passed by the House it represents the views of the majority of the House membership, not merely the views of the majority of a subcommitte or of the Appropriations Committee. I, therefore, invite the most careful scrutiny of its provisions and the offering of amendments by any Members of the House who may not be satisfied with those provisions. Notwithstanding our desire to get away for the Easter holidays as soon as possible, this bill should not be passed by the House until its membership has been fully advised as to what it contains and has decided that its contents satisfactorily meet the objectives which all of us should have in mind.

This bill has been more severely cut below Budget estimates than any supply bill enacted for any of the departments of the Government since a Budget was established. When direct appropriations only are taken into consideration the amount of the cut is approximately $240,000,000. When there is added thereto the reduction in reappropriations the amount of the cut is $265,000,000 approximately, but that is far from being the whole story. There is also eliminated from the Budget estimates for R. F. C. loans in the bill $67,500,000, of which amount $10,000,000 was deducted from the Rural Electrification loan item, and $57,500,000 deducted from the Farm Security Administration estimate for the making of loans and for rural rehabilitation. That still is not the whole story. The Budget proposed an authorization for the making of parity payments on agricultural commodities on the 1943 crops, similar to the authorization which was granted in the bill for the present fiscal year for 1942 crops. The authorization for the present year has resulted in an expenditure, which is carried in this bill, and which properly ought to be considered a part of the bill for 1943, amounting to $193,623,000. It is, of course, impossible to calculate what might have been the amount of parity payments on 1943 crops, had the authorization been carried in the bill, or should it subsequently be inserted in the bill, but if we use the amount of payments required in the 1942 program as the basis for calculation, then in eliminating from the bill the authorization for parity payments recommended by the Budget, the committee eliminates from it approximately an amount of $193,000,000. So that when all these matters are taken into consideration the pending bill is cut by

approximately $526,000,000 under the Budget—a reduction of approximately 45 percent in the amount of the Budget estimates.

Those who have been interested in trying to show their desire for economy at the expense of the Department of Agriculture, although permitting their tendencies to extravagance to run riot in other directions, ought to be eminently satisfied with what has been done to the farmers' bill. It has not only been cut to the bone, but a portion of the bone has been excised as well. I do not wish it to be understood from the statements which I have made that I am not in full accord with most of the actions of the subcommittee. As a matter of fact, I am so, and I have participated in effecting substantial economies in numerous cuts which have been made below Budget estimates in the pending bill. I believe that this is the time for economy in any direction which is not directly related to the war effort, and that it is incumbent upon all of us to do what we can to bring about the conservation of the financial resources of the Nation, so that they may be utilized in this war for national existence, which is now being carried on. I cannot say, however, that the actions of the subcommittee in all respects in the pending bill were unanimous acts. In connection with at least two of these actions, which are of outstanding importance, my views were not in accord with the views of the subcommittee. I realize that as chairman of the subcommittee it would, perhaps, be inappropriate that I should undertake to offer amendments on the floor of the House to those portions of the bill with which I disagree, and I shall not undertake to do so, but at the same time I feel that my duty as a Representative of my people, and as a Representative interested in the welfare of agriculture throughout the United States, requires that with regard to those two items, I should fully and clearly express my views to the House, and at a later point in the discussion, it is my hope to be able to do so.

There has been much criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture and of some organizations of the Department. Some of that criticism, in my judgment, has been justified, but at the same time I believe that the Secretary is intensely interested in doing the best job he can under very difficult conditions, and while the judgment of many of us may not be in accord with his in his handling of some of the matters with which he has to deal, it is a question of extreme doubt as to whether any of us who criticize would have been able, under the same circumstances, to have effected improvement in his work as a whole. Certainly bitter excoriation and impugnment of motives of men in public service who are universally recognized to be honest, without the critic being able to suggest more feasible and reasonable plans of procedure to effectuate the ends desired, is without justification.

The problem of the Department of Agriculture would be best met and solved by cooperation between those who discharge its administrative functions and those who as Members of Congress are charged with the duty of supplying funds from the national revenues for the purpose of enabling the administrative duties to be performed and bitter antagonisms between the Congress or Members of Congress and the administrative authorities of the Department of Agriculture should be avoided whenever possible even though to do so may be to allow the Secretary of Agriculture and his aides to discharge some of their administrative duties in a manner not entirely satisfactory to members of the legislative branch of the Government.

I desire at this point to make brief reference to the Budget estimate for $100,000,000 submitted in February for the purpose of allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain additional incentives to spur the production of certain essential war crops such as soybeans, peanuts, dried beans, dried peas, flaxseed, grain sorghums, and so forth. I have already, on February 15, 1943, given to the House a complete statement of my views with regard to the rejection by our subcommittee of the estimate in question, and we are advised that the Department has accepted with good grace the action of the subcommittee and that the Food Administration has worked out a substitute plan which it is hoped may accomplish as much as can be done toward meeting the national need for an increase in production of these essential crops.

I shall now undertake a discussion of some of the more important portions of the pending bill and especially of those portions where the committee in the exercise of its discretion has effected considerable and important changes in Budget estimates. It is, of course, apparent that it is impossible for me within a reasonable time to discuss all of the minor items which are involved. As the bill is read for amendment I shall be glad, insofar as it is possible for me to do so, to advise Members as to the reasons which motivated the committee in making any of these numerous changes in which Members may be particularly interested.

If gentlemen will turn with me to the tabulated statement which begins on page 30 of the committee report, I shall undertake to discuss briefly some of the outstanding items with regard to which changes in Budget estimates have been promulgated in the committee bill.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order and make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I have been in this House 13 years, and this is the first time I have ever suggested the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are very anxious to conclude the general debate, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw that point. I think the absence is only temporary.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, as I say, I have been in this Congress a long time, and this is the first time I have ever made the point. The chairman of the subcommittee is telling us what is in this bill, and I think the Members ought to be here. I think it is most important, but I shall defer to the wishes of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa withdraws the point of order.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the first cut in the office of the Secretary of $100,000 is justified by the reductions which have been effected in other portions of the bill. If the Secretary of Agriculture is to have $526,000,000 less in the way of money to administer than was projected by the Budget, it is quite apparent that his needs for administrative personnel will be considerably lessened. It is probably true that that amount of the cut could be properly increased in the event the cuts which have been provided in subsequent portions of the bill are made effective by action of the House.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The same facts justify the reduction of $125,000 projected in the funds appropriated for the use of office of the Solicitor.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

We have made provision in this bill, and this is one of the very few items of increase over the Budget estimates, for the reprinting of the 1942 Agricultural Yearbook, at a cost of $175,000. That cost is considerably less than would be the cost of the preparation and publication of another Yearbook. The 1942 Yearbook, entitled "Keeping Livestock Healthy," has, as I am sure all of my colleagues from rural sections of the country will agree, been of very great interest to the farmers of the United States. Although our small quota of 400 books for each congressional district has been available for only 2 or 3 months, it has, in most instances, in agricultural sections, been exhausted. So that we thought instead of providing for the preparation of another book which might, as in some cases in the past, not be satisfactory, it would be better to provide for the reprinting of an edition of the 1942 Yearbook in similar number to the number originally published, that is, 231,250.

While we have made no other change in the items projected for the Office of Information as to amount, we have decided that too much of the funds provided for this office has been expended in unnecessary and expensive publicity. We have also been advised that the demand for farmers' bulletins for use in the food for war program has been for some time, and will probably continue to be, of very great volume, so much so in fact that the Department frequently is unable to fill orders for such bulletins until as much as 4 to 6 weeks after their reception. This is considered to be a very undesirable condition and we have therefore directed in our report that $20,000 of the money projected for use in publicity activities be diverted to the provision of sufficient personnel to handle promptly farmers' bulletins orders.

LIBRARY

No change has been made by the subcommittee in the funds estimated for the library of the Department which are apparently the same in amount as were appropriated for the present fiscal year.

EXTENSION SERVICE

In making appropriations for payments to States under the Capper-Ketcham Act and section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act for extension work, the committee is permitted to exercise little discretion but has carried forward in the pending bill, as to the major items involved, the same amount of appropriations which have been made for these purposes for the last several years. It has, however, provided for two reductions. The appropriation of $555,000, estimated for additional cooperative extension work, was made for the present fiscal year, and estimated for by the Budget for the next fiscal year without legislative authority. The limit of legislative authority is $300,000 and the committee has, therefore, reduced the amount of this item to the amount fixed by law. The committee regretfully failed to accord with Budget estimate for an increase of $80,000 for the extension service in Puerto Rico, reducing the amount of that appropriation to $100,000, which was the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year. Deplorable as is the condition of the people of Puerto Rico, the committee has been unable to feel from the evidence adduced that that condition would be ameliorated to any considerable extent merely by the provision of $80,000 in additional money for the extension service.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in the consideration of the bill for the present fiscal year, was required to accept a drastic reduction in funds below Budget estimates. A still further reduction projected by the Bureau of the Budget for the next fiscal year of $29,570 has been increased by the committee to $129,570; that is, an additional $100,000 has been cut from this appropriation. Assuming that the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is of vast benefit to agriculture—and I certainly am one of those who believe that it is—the economy effected by the committee action should be satisfactory even to all of us who are vitally interested in reducing the expenditures of the Government to the barest possible minimum at this particular time. The Budget estimates for crop and livestock estimates were approved without change.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The work of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations is peculiarly related to the war effort at this particular time, and the evidence with reference to its accomplishments was of a nature so satisfactory to the committee as to justify in its opinion the approval of Budget estimates as submitted.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

The Agricultural Research Administration, representing the consolidation of research activities within the Department with the exception of those of two bureaus, should be able in the course of time to effect major economies in the work of the Department, to eliminate duplication of effort and to bring about reduction of personnel engaged in research. The consolidation has not been effected for sufficient length of time for us to be able to appraise now what may be the final result, but we have reason to believe that under the efficient administration of Dr. Auchter substantial economies, and at the same time greater and more beneficial results, will be achieved. We regret very much that we were unable to accord in full with the recommendation of the Budget for an increase in salary of Dr. Auchter, from $8,500 to $10,000. While we realize that the services of Dr. Auchter are well worth the amount of the salary proposed, we do not believe at this time we should increase expenditures of public funds without compelling reason therefor even in small amounts. We, therefore, provide for a salary of $9,000 which will be sufficiently high to pay Dr. Auchter as much as is paid any official under his supervision in the Agricultural Research Administration, but effects a saving of $1,000 below the Budget.

No change was made in the estimate for special research funds of the Agricultural Research Administration.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

What I have said heretofore with reference to the Extension Service is equally applicable to appropriations to States under the Hatch, Adams, and Purnell Acts and under title 1 of the Bankhead-Jones Act. No budget changes have been effected excepting that an appropriation of $63,708, proposed under title 1, Bankhead-Jones Act, for the purpose of taking care of changes in the allocation of these funds brought about by shifts in agricultural population has been eliminated since the appropriation of these funds is not authorized by law.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

The work of the Bureau of Animal Industry in its various subdivisions is of such vital importance to growers of livestock as to make failure to provide sufficient funds for its various activities an act of indefensible negligence. The committee has approved the Budget estimates with the exception of the reduction of $30,000 in the amount estimated for cattle-tick eradication. This work has almost been completed and the funds which are carried in the bill for its conclusion should be amply sufficient for the next fiscal year. As is pointed out in the committee report the Budget estimate for eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease $5,983,800, involving an apparent increase over funds for the present fiscal year of $2,409,931, is not in fact an increase but is in reality a small decrease of $53,400 in working funds; $6,037,200 was available for the present fiscal year, since in addition to appropriation of $3,573,869 for the present fiscal year, there was a reappropriation of prior yearly balances totaling $2,463,331.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

The estimates of the Budget for the Bureau of Dairy Industry involving no substantial change in the current year's appropriation for that Bureau have been approved without change.

If the Membership of the House will pardon me I think that with regard to a large number of these items which are small in amount I will not undertake at this time to offer the explanations which actuated the committee in taking the action they did in connection with the bill. Later on, or during this discussion, if Members desire to interrogate me about those items I shall be pleased to discuss them.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

One major reduction made in the Bureau of Plant Industry of $145,565 is in the soil-survey item. Useful as the soil-survey work undoubtedly is and of value as it undoubtedly is to agriculture, it was not the thought of the committee that this work is of a character which can be directly associated with the war effort at this particular time. The results of such surveys as may now be made cannot be made available to the agricultural interests of the country in less than some 18 months or 2 years, and this, we hope, will be beyond the period of the present emergency.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

In the estimates for this Bureau, as well as for other research organizations of the Agricultural Research Administration, the Budget had projected cuts averaging 5 percent below the amounts made available during the current year. The committee after considering the evidence felt it possible to bring about further reductions aggregating $261,030 in the items proposed for this Bureau, leaving, however, the very considerable balance of $4,608,610 available for its work during the next fiscal year. A discussion of the nine items in which reductions were made and of the one item in which a small increase was granted is not practicable at this time. It is, I think, sufficient to say that a great deal of this research work, while valuable in character, has already effectively covered the fields in which it was engaged and there is not justified by the evidence any feeling that the work, if continued in full volume during the present emergency period, will probably contribute anything to the war effort commensurate with the funds which would be necessary. We have, therefore, made small reductions in various items involving research and have in addition made some reductions in two control programs, gypsy and brown tail moth control and pink boll worm and thurberia weevil control, in the amounts of $13,060 and $57,460, respectively. These reductions in these two control programs still leave for gypsy and brown tail moth control $350,000, and for pink boll worm control $400,000. With the present difficulty in securing labor and the necessity for diverting much of the labor used from agricultural production these amounts will, in our judgment, provide

sufficient funds for the continuance of these programs for the next fiscal year.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I would prefer to complete my statement. After that I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY AND ENGINEERING

Net reductions in the estimates for this Bureau in the amount of $77,376 have been effected, leaving, however, a balance available of $782,829, which should be ample for the continuance of activities of this organization related directly or indirectly to the war effort during the next fiscal year. The committee is of the opinion that the work and studies in farm structures and related investigations, for which $61,195 was estimated, may be suspended for the next fiscal year since it is not of a character essential in the war program.

It has also made a reduction of $19,181 in the amount estimated for farm mechanical equipment investigations. The problem of agriculture today is more concerned with the procurement of farm mechanical equipment already devised and which is not being made available in sufficient quantities to meet requirements than with the devisation of additional types of farm equipment not now in production and which if devised could probably not be manufactured and furnished the farmers of the United States during the pending emergency.

REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

The funds authorized by law for the maintenance of the regional research laboratories have been approved in substantial accordance with the Budget estimate. The report points out some of the accomplishments of the Northern Research Laboratory at Peoria. The administrative authorities have been advised that the work at the three other regional laboratories has not progressed as rapidly nor with such satisfactory results and have been admonished to increase their efforts to show by results justification for the establishment and maintenance of these laboratories.

BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS

The Budget estimates for this Bureau have been approved, representing a decrease of $20,139 below its appropriation for the present fiscal year but leaving a balance to be available of $366,131. This Bureau has been consolidated with and made a part of the new Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. As one member of the subcommittee, I am somewhat fearful that this consolidation may result in submerging the objectives of the Bureau of Home Economics within the scope of activity of the larger organization with the result that less emphasis will be placed upon the type of work which has been carried on by the Bureau of Home Economics and which has been of vast interest and benefit to the American housewife. We were advised that one of the objectives of the new Bureau will be to study human nutrition problems of countries which have been overrun by the Axis and which the Allies expect in the near future to occupy. However worthy this objective may be, it certainly seems to some of us to involve the assumption of responsibilities which should be the responsibilities of these countries when their own governments are again set up and that certainly work of this type should not be permitted to overshadow the work of the Bureau of Home Economics for the American people.

BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER

The fund approved by the Budget of $100,560 for the Beltsville Research Center for central administrative costs, representing a decrease of $5,295 below the appropriation for the current year, has been approved by the committee.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

This work is under the divided jurisdiction of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, the Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior. Important as it undoubtedly is, your committee feels that great difficulty will be experienced in the next fiscal year in the procurement of sufficient labor therefor which can be spared from work in industry and agriculture. It has effected, therefore, a small reduction of $46,342 in the amount estimated by the Bureau of the Budget, leaving, however, a total fund available for this purpose for the next fiscal year of $1,900,000.

FOREST SERVICE

In the Forest Service no reduction below Budget estimates has been made in general administrative expenses nor in the funds estimated for national forest protection and maintenance, except that $415,000 estimated for forest-plantation care has been eliminated and the Forest Service required with its estimated appropriation of $12,826,826 for national forest protection and maintenance to carry on the work of caring for forest plantations with the funds provided in the Budget estimate for national forest protection and maintenance.

Farm forestry cooperation and private forestry cooperation, carried in the Budget under two heads, have been consolidated, involving as they do the same type of work, and a reduction below Budget estimates of $161,942 has been accomplished by the committee, leaving a balance available for the combined work of $646,168. Important as this work undoubtedly is, it is felt that under war conditions the economy indicated may be properly effected.

In forest maintenance, range investigations, forest products investigations, forest survey, forest economics, and forest influences your committee has effected substantial reductions below the Budget aggregating approximately $625,000. Much of this work is covering ground which has been covered for many years and in connection with which additional results beneficial in the war effort cannot be too confidently anticipated. Certainly, under present conditions a reduction in expenditures for these purposes of a very substantial character is justified. Your committee has therefore made the cuts indicated.

In connection with forest fire cooperation work the maximum appropriation authorized by law is $2,500,000. In the bill for the current year $4,000,000 is carried, but that is because of an amendment made in the Senate. A year has elapsed since the Congress last considered this matter, and no effort appears to have been made to secure an increase in the authorization through the medium of legislation reported from the legislative committees of the House and Senate having jurisdiction. Desirable as it may be to exceed the authorization, the committee is without power to do so and the funds carried in the bill therefor total $2,500,000.

There is no provision for any money for the acquisition of lands for national forests except to finish contracts in connection with which the Government is already obligated.

An apparent reduction in the appropriation for forest roads and trails of $1,241,555 is in fact not a reduction since the committee has provided for reappropriation of that amount from the unobligated balances of previous appropriations for forest highways. As to the amount therefor the Budget estimate is approved.

The reduction in funds for the emergency rubber project was made in accordance with recommendations submitted to the committee by the Forest Service with the approval of Mr. Jeffers, Rubber Administrator. Evidence before our subcommittee showed a production of an inconsequential amount of rubber from the guayule project in California is to be anticipated during the next 2 years, and Mr. Jeffers apparently feels that no important contribution to the solution of the rubber problem will be possible through the further extension of the guayule project. Aside from this the Government has under lease 53,000 acres of land, most of which would be useful in other agricultural production where more satisfactory results would be probable. It, therefore, contemplates returning to the farmers who customarily have cultivated these lands as much of the 53,000 acres as possible, but continuing the protection and management of the lands already planted in guayule and of its production of guayule plants with the possible end in view of extending the scope of this project should future developments cause that course to appear desirable. The committee in making the cut indicated has accorded with the views expressed by departmental authorities but feel that it is doubtful that anything like the money which is proposed for appropriation can be wisely expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The administrative expenses of Commodity Credit Corporation are paid from Corporation funds and no direct appropriation of funds is made in this bill therefor. However, the bill does carry an authorization for the use of Corporation funds for these purposes in the amount of $4,500,000, as estimated by the Budget, and which constitutes an increase over funds made available for the present fiscal year of $361,502, which increase has undoubtedly been made necessary by activities in the war program of this governmental agency. The committee has continued the inhibition which it inserted in last year's bill against the sale of Government-owned

or Government-controlled agricultural commodities at less than parity prices without the qualifying provisos which were inserted in the Senate. Thus, we bring forward again for Congress's determination an issue which, in our judgment, should be definitely and finally settled—that is, whether the Government should with one hand be undertaking to bring about parity in farm prices and with the other through the use of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks impede the accomplishment of that objective.

PARITY PAYMENTS

The bill, as heretofore pointed out, carries provision for payment of obligations incurred under this heading under authorization carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the present fiscal year. It carries no provision authorizing making of commitments by the Secretary for the next fiscal year. As a matter of fact, such an authorization is legislative in character, and while it was incorporated in the act for the present fiscal year, this was done under a rule waiving points of order against the bill and in the absence of a rule waiving points of order, an authorization of this character could not be inserted in the pending bill. The attitude of the committee, however, I think it is fair to state, has been motivated in large part by the feeling of a majority of the committee that payments of this type to farmers should be eliminated and further efforts made to insure that all types of agriculture receive parity payments for their products in the market place, rather than through the medium of payments from the United States Treasury. This involves a broad question of policy which should be decided by the Congress.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 specifically authorizes the making of such payments, and I am one of those who believe that until that portion of existing law is amended or repealed, and until all types of farmers are enabled through some other means to secure parity prices for their products, parity payments in justice to agriculture as a whole should be continued. It is small consolation to the farmer to be told that these payments will not be made because he should be able to secure fair prices in the market place, if as a matter of fact, he does not receive such prices in the market place. However, only the producers of wheat and corn are at this time vitally concerned with the continuation of such payments, and since it appears to be the judgment of Representatives from commercial grain-producing areas on the committee that such payments should be abandoned for the present, I have not felt justified to differ with their conclusion as to the action, or rather nonaction, contemplated in the bill for the next fiscal year.

SUGAR ACT

The Budget estimates for the administration of the sugar act have been approved in accordance with what seems to be the established policy of the Congress. As one Member of Congress, however, I cannot fail to approve the viewpoint which was adopted by our subcommittee last year to the effect that the intricate procedure and great expense incurred in the collection of excise taxes and their distribution to sugar producers ought to be avoided, especially under present conditions, when through appropriate action of administrative authorities an adequate price to sugar producers could be assured without this procedure.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

By reducing the estimated appropriation for the administration of this act from $7,813,748 to $3,500,000 and directing that these funds shall be used in the liquidation of Government obligations in connection with wheat and cotton contracts executed on crops for the present crop year, and proposing the abandonment of further activity under the program, the committee has presented squarely to the Congress the question of the advisability of discontinuing or not this activity. The language of the report indicates the loss of approximately $40,000,000 in carrying on the program up to the present time and, further, the participation of only about one-third of the wheat farmers and one-tenth of the cotton farmers has not indicated to the minds of the committee a feeling on the part of the wheat and cotton farmers generally that such a program is necessary or advantageous to them. The expense to the Government involved seems to be out of proportion to any benefits to the farmers.

It is recognized that the subject matter is one with regard to which there are great differences of opinion among men who are interested with equal sincerity in the welfare of agriculture and in the continuation of every facility of the Government which may be of benefit to agriculture and which may not involve governmental expenses disproportionate to the benefits which accrue. The action of the subcommittee represents only the viewpoint of its members, and if the judgment of the House is at variance with the conclusion of the subcommittee it will, of course, take appropriate action to the end that its collective viewpoint may be expressed in the pending bill.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The hearings disclosed that the work of the Soil Conservation Service has been of outstanding importance and benefit, not only to agriculture, but to our Nation as a whole, in the conservation and utilization of those resources which must be preserved for the welfare and enjoyment of all of our people. The testimony of Dr. Bennett and his associates as reported in the hearings as to the accomplishments which have thus far been made, and as to the efforts which are contemplated for the future, amply justify the appropriation of such funds as may be reasonably necessary in the continuation of this work for the next fiscal year. The considerable reductions below the budget amounting to $3,367,856, occurring in the various items under this head, have been a matter of considerable concern to myself because I conceive that this work of preserving the soil, correcting the processes of erosion which have devastated such large areas in our country, and rendering assistance to farmers in soil-conservation districts who are endeavoring in their farm plans to cooperate with the Food Administration, and to serve to the utmost of their ability our national needs for food products in this time of emergency, is a work directly related to the war effort. The reduction of $3,000,000 in soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information must inevitably occasion great difficulty in furnishing to soil-conservation districts the type of technical assistance which has been promised them and without which they cannot function efficiently. It will be recalled that a reduction of approximately $3,000,000 in this project was made last year.

My associates on the committee, however, feel that the procurement of necessary personnel to carry on the work under war conditions will be a matter of extreme difficulty within the next fiscal year. Dr. Bennett gave some interesting testimony concerning losses to the military service from his personnel, which losses, it is anticipated, will continue and probably be accentuated in degree. It is, therefore, doubtful if, under present conditions, his organization can efficiently expend more than the amount provided in the pending bill, $18,675,136 for all purposes, and it is believed the House should approve the recommendations of the subcommittee for this reduction.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LANDS

The Budget estimate under this heading was approved. No money is being provided for the purchase of any more land, but approximately $34,000 is made available to complete pending contracts in connection with which the Government is already obligated. The remainder of the money estimated is necessary for the protection and management of the Government's property already acquired and for its utilization in the manner contemplated by Congress at the time provision was made for its acquisition.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ADMINISTRATION—EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Section 32 funds amounting to $96,000,000 are made available by permanent appropriation not carried in this bill for this purpose for the next fiscal year. Certain reappropriations of unexpended balances, however, were proposed in the Budget which were not approved by the committee. However, the bill does carry an appropriation of unexpended balances of section 32 funds for the administration expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. In connection with this appropriation the committee has inserted a limitation, legislative in character, upon the use of section 32 funds, prohibiting the carrying on

of any program with these funds formerly carried on by the Work Projects Administration. It is hoped this provision will be made in order by the adoption of a rule waiving points of order against it. It is believed that certain projected activities in connection with the use of section 32 funds, and which have been either entirely or in part projected for transfer from Work Projects Administration, should not be carried on further at this time unless they are expressly authorized by Congress. It has been proposed to abandon W. P. A. appropriations. These appropriations were always legislative in character. If any part of the work of W. P. A. should be continued proper provision should be made therefor by Congress and W. P. A. work should not be continued merely by shifting it to another established organization of the Government and the use of funds appropriated by Congress to such organizations.

MARKETING SERVICE, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Certain minor changes and one major change have been made in Budget estimates for the Marketing Service. These are explained in the committee report. They involve reductions below the Budget totaling $288,780, but leaving a balance of $5,811,860, which should be ample for the needs of the Service for the next fiscal year. It is to be noted this amount is $660,949 below the funds made available for the present fiscal year. The major item of reduction is in the funds provided for the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act. Under present conditions affecting the marketing of farm products, it is felt the commodity exchanges play an insignificant part and that their activities have been so tremendously reduced as to justify the reductions recommended.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Most, if not all, of the members of the subcommittee are deeply interested in the provision of sufficient funds for this organization, and yet under present conditions there seems to be no justification for the maintenance of an organization of unnecessary size to deal with this work, as it can be carried on with limitations that exist upon the use of strategic materials. It will be noted from the hearings that in January of this year only slightly in excess of $3,000,000 of the $30,000,000 made available by the 1943 Agricultural Appropriation Act had been obligated. Further obligations in connection with the acquisition of privately owned power lines are contemplated for the present fiscal year and an estimate of $10,000,000 for such purposes has been submitted for the next fiscal year. However, under the opinion of the Comptroller General which appears in the hearings and which limits the acquisition of such lines to their inclusion as incidental to the establishment of larger projects providing for the extension of electric service to unserved persons in rural areas, it is felt these acquisitions will be much more limited in character than has been contemplated by R. E. A. officials.

Reduction in administration expenses totaling $425,000 below the Budget has been made upon the basis of the committee's investigations and particularly influenced by reports of the committee's special investigators. The elimination of $10,000,000 of loan funds will leave $20,000,000 of such funds available for the next fiscal year which, if the war continues and necessary materials are not obtainable in sufficient quantity for a full program, should be amply sufficient. In the event the war should end before the end of the next fiscal year, it is anticipated that Congress, through the medium of a deficiency appropriation, will make adequate provision for the needs of this organization as may then appear to be justified.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

No reduction below Budget estimates has been made for the activities heretofore carried on by the Farm Credit Administration. The administrative expenses for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are paid from funds of the Corporation itself and have been approved in the amount recommended by the Budget. There are, however, certain additions to the funds of the Farm Credit Administration in connection with the work of the Farm Security Administration transferred to that organization which will be hereafter discussed, as well as a limitation upon the use of administrative funds appropriated to the F. C. A., which, it is expected, if approved by Congress, will cause the abandonment of the proposal to revive the regional agricultural credit corporations. A discussion of the reasons thought to justify the insertion of this proviso will be found in the committee's report and also there will be found in the report a discussion of the reasons which motivated the committee in the insertion of section 8 of the bill, which, in effect, prohibits any agency of the Department from engaging in the making of loans which have not first been offered to, and refused by, private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the region where such loans are proposed to be made. It is felt by the committee that there is no excuse for the Government undertaking in areas where adequate credit facilities exist and where loans could be obtained by farmers from private lending agencies at comparable rates to those which obtain in connection with Government loans to engage in competition with private lending agencies in the making of such loans. This, of course, does not exclude the making of loans where local credit is not available or where, if available, rates of interest not comparable with rates on Government loans are insisted upon by private lending agencies.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

If I may pass on, because I wish to have time in which to undertake to answer questions propounded by Members, I want to discuss now briefly two items to which I have heretofore made reference and with regard to which I am not in accord with the action which has been taken by the subcommittee. Of course, I do not like to be in a minority, especially a minority of the subcommittee of which I undertake to serve as chairman, and yet upon an examination of the votes which I have cast in Congress for the last 16 years, I am better satisfied with some of the votes which I cast in the minority than I am with some of those which I cast while I was associated with the large majority. So notwithstanding that I differ from my colleagues, and regretfully so, I feel it to be my duty to advise you as to the reasons which have led me to reach these conclusions which are contrary to those which they have in all good faith reached for themselves.

First, there is projected here a decrease in the appropriations for soil conservation and other benefits of that type, commonly known as A. C. P. benefits, of $100,000,000 below the Budget estimate. That decrease is brought about by language which was inserted in the bill as a substitute for the Budget language upon motion of a member of the subcommittee and after the language had been considered for only a few minutes and without any representative of the Department having been called before the subcommittee to explain the effect of the new language and whether or not this work could be appropriately and properly carried on under the limitations contained in the new language. Among other things the new language limits the administrative expense to 50 percent of that which was incurred during the present fiscal year. Some limitation is necessary. I was as active as any member of the subcommittee in trying to develop facts upon which we could base a reduction in administrative expenses, and we finally secured an admission from the administrative authorities themselves that the amount of the $53,000,000 estimated for that purpose for the next fiscal year might be reduced by $10,000,000.

A reduction of that sort, I think, would be amply justified, but to cut the administrative expenses of this organization 50 percent as provided in this bill, without having any evidence from any member of the administrative personnel of this branch of the Department of Agriculture as to whether or not they could conduct the work of the organization with this limitation on their administrative fund is, to my mind, unwise.

Aside from that, the Secretary of Agriculture on December 5, 1942, announced to the farmers of the country the amount that he would pay them, if they would pursue this crop year certain soil conservation practices, and abide by certain restrictions upon the production of some crops, and in connection with those restrictions produce larger amounts of essential war crops. He had authority of law to make that announcement. Section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act gives him that authority, and he is authorized to obligate the Government up to $500,000,000. He did obligate the Government. He issued this proclamation to the farmers of the country, and in the main they have

signed farm plans indicating the practices they expect to carry on this year, and the amounts they would undertake to produce. That procedure to my mind constitutes a contract between the Government of the United States, a contract authorized by law, and the farmers of the country, and I am not willing to say to the farmers of the country that the Government is going to welch on this contract to the extent of one-fourth of the benefits involved, that we are simply not going to provide the money which has been estimated as necessary to carry out the promise made by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law, and so far as I am concerned I shall not vote to repudiate the solemn contract of the Government with the farmers of the country effectuated in that manner. If in future years it should be decided proper to abandon this program, as a great many men think should be true, then Congress should take legislative action to remove from the Secretary of Agriculture the power which he has been authorized to exercise.

Without regard, however, to whether such payments should be eventually eliminated or not, it is my opinion that the action taken by the subcommittee would involve the repudiation by the Government of obligations assumed by the Secretary under authority of law to the extent of one-fourth of the Government's responsibility.

The Secretary's offer to the farmers of the Nation was published by him on December 5, 1942. I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a letter addressed to me on April 8, 1943, by Mr. Fred S. Wallace, chief, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the accompanying copy of the Secretary's announcement.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1943.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TARVER: This letter is in reply to your request to Mr. I. W. Duggan, director of the southern division, for certain information regarding the 1943 Agricultural Conservation program.

The 1943 program was approved by the Secretary on December 2, 1942. A copy of the press release issued at the time the program was announced is enclosed, as well as a printed copy of the program bulletin.

There is also enclosed a copy of a farm plan sheet used in Georgia. In general, the farm plan sheets used in other areas in the country are similar, with the exception that they are adapted to local conditions. A copy of the farm plan work sheet, which is enclosed, was used to supplement the farm plan by obtaining information needed by county war boards with respect to machinery requirements, the labor situation and related factors. In this connection, it should be noted that page 1 of the farm plan work sheet is largely a duplication of information obtained on the farm plan sheet and, therefore, page 1 of the farm plan work sheet was usually not completed except in cases where deferment of farm labor was involved. Both the farm plan and the farm plan work sheet were made available to county workers on or shortly after farm mobilization week, which was February 6 to February 14. The farm sign-up began immediately after farm mobilization week in most areas and has now been largely completed in most areas. If you desire any further information, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

FRED S. WALLACE, *Chief.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ANNOUNCES THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY'S 1943 ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT RATES

Rates of payment to farmers cooperating with the crop-production adjustment phase of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's 1943 war program were announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Farmers may earn these production adjustment payments in 1943 by complying with their Agricultural Adjustment Agency's acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, at the same time meeting individual farm-production goals for special war crops. Following out the Department's policy of full production of all crops needed in the war, severe deductions will be made from each farm's total crop payments in 1943 for failure to plant at least 90 percent of an acreage allotment and 90 percent of a special war-crop goal.

This provision is intended to encourage farmers to make full use of their available land. In many instances, farmers will be encouraged to substitute special war crops for allotment crops—especially for wheat and cotton. After farmers first meet their 90 percent special war-crop acreage requirement, they may take any special war-crop acreage above this figure and substitute it acre-for-acre for allotment crops in meeting the latter's 90-percent planting provision.

In addition to the crop-production adjustment payment described above, farmers also will be able to earn a production practice—or conservation—payment by carrying out specified agricultural practices which improve soil, help prevent erosion, and increase yields of needed war crops. Since these conservation rates vary by regions and States, they are being announced by State Agricultural Adjustment Agency committees.

Payment rates as announced for 1943, based on normal yield of allotted acreages, are shown below together with 1942 rates.

Crop	1942 payment rate	1943 payment rate
	Cents	*Cents*
Cotton, per pound	1.2	1.1
Corn (commercial area), per bushel	5.5	3.6
Wheat, per bushel	9.9	9.2
Rice, per 100 pounds	2.4	2.0
Peanuts, per ton	125.0	110.0
Potatoes (commercial), per bushel	1.8	----------
Tobacco, per pound:		
Flue-cured	.5	.4
Burley	.6	.4
Fire-cured	1.3	1.2
Dark air-cured	.8	.7
Virginia sun-cured	.6	.5
Pennsylvania type 41	.4	.4
Cigar filler and binder (other than types 41 and 45)	.6	.5
Georgia-Florida type 62	.8	.7

It will be observed from Mr. WALLACE'S letter that the farmer sign-up has now been largely completed in most areas. If the Congress shall now fail to provide the funds needed by the Secretary to discharge these obligations which he has assumed under authority of law, it inevitably follows that the Government must welch on its contracts with the farmers to the extent of one-fourth of the money involved. This, to my mind, is unconscionable. If Congress does not want the Secretary to continue to exercise the authority that is given him to commit and bind the Government to a program of this character, it should amend or repeal section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. It should not repudiate a Government obligation assumed under authority of law. A government which can and will repudiate one type of obligation may be expected to repudiate others. Such conduct on the part of the governing authorities of this Nation cannot inspire confidence at a time when the Government is undertaking to finance its war program through the sale of Government promises to pay. I repeat, if the Government can, and will, repudiate one type of obligation what assurance have we that it will not at some time repudiate others of a different type?

It is not pleasant for the chairman of a subcommittee to thus take issue with the conclusions of his committee, but in this case it is, to my mind, my imperative duty. As a matter of fact, these A. C. P. payments, when originally provided, were justified as being in some measure compensation for the farmers for the restriction of acreage in the production of crops in which large surpluses exist. All of these restrictions have recently been withdrawn by action of the Secretary so far as wheat and corn production are concerned. Cotton and tobacco farmers, however, are still subjected to these restrictions. In the case of cotton a referendum was held shortly after the time when the Secretary announced his offer and the terms of that offer were part of the influences which caused the cotton farmers to approve quotas on cotton acreages. They had also been urged to approve such quotas through speeches of the Secretary, the Director of the Southern Division, A. A. A., Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, and others, published and circulated at Government expense throughout the cotton-growing area, in which cotton growers were advised that if they refused to approve quotas, Government loans would not be available to cotton on the same basis as for other major crops although the Secretary has since given assurance to wheat and corn farmers that they may grow their crops without restriction and still receive without impairment loans and other benefits to which they would have been entitled upon compliance with restrictions. It is to my mind unfair to any type of farmer that the Government's promises and contracts should be abrogated but it is peculiarly unfair to the cotton farmers of the country who were induced to support cotton quotas through the methods which I have outlined.

It will be observed by those who may read the hearings that I have continually urged throughout the hearings that cotton quotas be removed for the present crop year, leaving to the cotton farmers, of course, the right to resume the application of such quotas to crops for subsequent years in referendums held for that purpose if they so desire. This, however, has not been done. The

cotton farmer, therefore, is being left under his self-imposed quota restrictions obtained through representations which under present conditions constitute the equivalent of fraud whether they were so intended or not and at the same time he is being refused compliance by the Government with its solemn contract made under authority of law by the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to the payment in full of benefits that the Secretary offered him immediately before he voted on the quota question.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

We now come to the Farm Security Administration. If you will examine the hearings for the last 2 or 3 years, you will find that I have been as critical of some of the operations of the Farm Security Administration as has any member of the committee. We have conducted examinations running into weeks of time to ascertain the abuses that undoubtedly have grown up in the operation of that organization, and last year we undertook to insert in the bill limitations to correct some of those abuses. They had been granting to individual borrowers in some cases as much as $9,000 or $10,000, and we provided in the House bill that the limit should be $1,000. The Senate, however, raised the amount to $2,500. They had been buying large tracts of land for subdivision among a lot of people removed from defense areas and other areas, and we inserted in the bill a provision which gave them no authority to buy land. They have been conducting the so-called cooperative farm projects, which we consider to be contrary to the spirit of our form of government and to be more in line with the communistic practices of Soviet Russia. So we provided in the bill that the money in the bill should not be used for the maintenance of those projects, but only for their liquidation.

I want to be perfectly fair. The Farm Security Administration has not observed that mandatory provision, and how it got money with the approval of the Comptroller General to carry them on, despite the injunction of Congress, I do not know. We have not been able to find that out yet. I think the Farm Security Administration and its Administrator, Mr. Baldwin, are subject to severe criticism because of their failure to observe that injunction placed in the agricultural appropriation bill last year by the Congress. I think that our examination of witnesses during the present session, as well as the last session, developed the existence of various other abuses in the Farm Security Administration, in the extension of unwarranted amounts of credit to unworthy clients, this having been an abuse of discretion in the field in some cases, and so far as those acts go, or the lack of discretion on the part of the field personnel is concerned, I do not believe that the central administration in Washington ought to be criticized too caustically on account of that. I do not believe that you can condemn an organization with some 15,000 or 16,000 employees serving over 400,000 farmers in the country simply because of foolish acts or the exercise of foolish judgment by some of the administrative personnel of the organization; but I do believe that steps should be taken to correct those abuses. I think that steps should be taken to liquidate not only these cooperative farm projects but all of these community projects, aggregating 151 in number. Yet I feel that this Farm Security Administration in the aid that it has extended to 975,000 farm families, in the aid that it is now extending to 417,000 farm families, has a place in the Department of Agriculture, has a function to perform, a useful function to perform, and that while we should excise these cancerous growths that have attached themselves to this organization, we ought to preserve it for useful and common-sense purposes. All of us may not be satisfied with what the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing, and I think some of us probably are not, but we do not want to abolish the Department of Agriculture on that account. We are not satisfied with what Mr. Baldwin has been doing, at least I am not, and I know a lot of you are not, but I do not believe we ought to abolish the Farm Security Administration on that account. I do believe that we ought to have the organization charged not only with the duty of helping these 417,000 farm families but with the duty of looking after the Government's stake in these families. The Government has invested $417,000,000, and somebody ought to be charged with the responsibility of trying to collect as much of the Government's money as may be possible from its investment.

So I cannot in accord with the action which has been taken by the subcommittee in cutting, first, the amount of Farm Security Administration loans from $97,500,000 to $40,000,000, and in reducing the amount of funds for administration from approximately $36,000,000 to $12,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes. And then providing that $8,000,000 of that $12,000,000 shall be transferred to the Extension Service, and that the whole thing, including the farm tenant loan purchase program shall be put under the jurisdiction of the Farm Credit Administration.

That action was taken without our making any investigation through administrative authorities to determine just how they would undertake to handle this proposition if it should be dealt with in this manner. It is true that Governor Black was asked a casual question when he was before the committee about whether he could undertake to handle the Farm Security Administration business or not, and he indicated a reluctance to reply, and finally stated of course that it might be possible for him to handle it. But nobody from the Department of Agriculture or any branch of it was called before our committee to discuss this new language which was substituted for the Budget language in the bill and tell us whether or not in their opinion they could continue to carry on the work of the Farm Security Administration or any part of it under the Farm Credit Administration with the funds provided and in the manner designated in the bill.

I say that is not the proper way to legislate; that what the committee should do and what the Congress should do would be to try to revise the framework of the Farm Security Administration so as to eliminate the abuses which have unquestionably arisen in the carrying on of the work of that organization, and then provide whatever funds it might deem necessary, upon the basis of competent evidence, to do what the Congress desires shall be done. There was not any evidence before our committee indicating that we could reduce the amount of loans by $57,500,000. That is a guess. There was not any evidence indicating that we could cut the administrative funds by $24,000,000, leaving a balance of only $12,000,000. That is a guess. What effect is it going to have on this work? Do we want the work to be carried on at all? If so, should we not have some competent official to testify before us as to administrative problems that will arise in the event of transfer to the Farm Credit Administration? Would we not like to have the testimony of some officials of that organization as to just how these problems might be dealt with? I do not like this idea of legislating in the dark. I do not care if it is advocated by the Farm Bureau Federation. I have respect for the Federal Farm Bureau Federation. They have an organization in every county in my Congressional district. It is an organization which, in my district, is composed of outstanding farmers, and I have respect for their judgment. But at the same time we know, and I think all of us know, that that federation is now engaged in an effort to turn over as much as it can of the activities of the Department of Agriculture to the Extension Service. This farm-labor program has been placed under the Extension Service. A part of the funds for soil conservation and A. C. P. payments are to be, according to the terms of this bill, turned over to the Extension Service. Now it is desired here to turn over to the Extension Service a part of the administrative problems connected with the work formerly carried on by the Farm Security Administration. I am not willing, as far as I am concerned, to let the Farm Bureau Federation write this bill for me, insofar as my individual vote as a Member of Congress is involved. Yet I am frank to say that the Farm Bureau Federation, with regard to some of these more controversial items, has been all powerful in the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk indefinitely with regard to the items which are here involved, but I want to give a little time to Members who desire to interrogate me.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. It delights me to hear the Chairman say that in liquidating some of these community projects, which were set up to relieve distressed farm families, it shall be done in an

orderly fashion. I presume that in the closing out of the picture of the Farm Security Administration, as the bill does, they will be forced to carry out the mandates of the Congress as have previously been given them. That should mean, of course, that in these projects, where great holdings of land are held in common use, the closing out will be done in such a way that those men who have helped build up these communities will have an opportunity to share in it? Is that the gentleman's feeling?

Mr. TARVER. The matter of the liquidation of the projects would, of course, under the terms of this bill, be entrusted to the Farm Credit Administration. I am not able to state to the gentleman just how they might undertake to discharge that duty, but I should think that the officials of the organization would certainly give preference in the sale of the lands involved in these projects to those who are now occupying the lands, providing they are worthy of credit and providing it is felt the Government's investment would be repaid in the event of sales to them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the Government's interest must be protected and no speculators permitted to profit by such investment. The desirable thing is that the individual on the project might become the owner as well as the tiller of the soil?

Mr. TARVER. That is certainly the desire from my standpoint.

Mr. MURDOCK. And from mine. For it should be our policy to rehabilitate as many worthy farm families as possible and enable them to take root in the soil.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture, who has just delivered an unusually fine résumé on this voluminous and most important bill, explain to the House the position on parity payments as they exist under this bill? As I understand it, we are appropriating in this bill $193,000,000 to take care of the parity payments for the crop year of 1942.

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. There is absolutely nothing in the bill whatsoever for parity payments for the crop year 1943?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman feel there should be some language, in case the crops do not come up to parity, something in the bill to take care of parity payments, in case these crops do not come up to parity?

Mr. TARVER. I entertain feelings similar to those expressed by my colleague from Nebraska.

The members of our subcommittee which comprises representatives from commercial grain-growing areas of the country, have been of the opinion that the farmer should look for his price for his product to the market rather than through the payments of any sums from the Federal Treasury. Cotton is not involved under present conditions, it is selling either at parity or above parity, as are some of the other five major products, but corn and wheat are the products in which producers are interested here. If the representatives from the commercial grain-growing sections of the country want to abandon for the present this measure of assurance to corn and wheat farmers, I do not feel that I am in position to object.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman that it affects corn and wheat in my State. Perhaps it will mean $17,900,000 to the corn and wheat farmers in my State, if the crop does not come up to parity.

Mr. TARVER. I am, of course, in sympathy with the viewpoint that the farmer ought to get parity in the open market, but so long as he does not do that and so long as conditions beyond his control prevent him from doing that, I see no reason why the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to parity should not be observed by Congress and appropriations made to make up the deficit, but, as I say, I do not come from a commercial grain-producing area, and for that reason I do not feel justified in taking issue with the judgment of my colleagues who do.

Mr. STEFAN. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: There is one item here not touched on, or I do not believe he has, for I listened carefully to what he had to say and did not hear reference to it; and that is that the item for rural electrification has been cut.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that the Department only recently released 32 projects over the country on rural electrification, why should there be this cut right now?

Mr. TARVER. As I explained, last year the Congress made available for the present fiscal year approximately $30,000,000 allocated to the R. E. A. I understand that the R. E. A. has used all the money it possibly can in this electrification program but did not nearly take up its funds. We made ample provisions for them; we did not cut out the item but gave them what we thought was reasonably necessary for work during the next fiscal year. The R. E. A. was not able to obligate before January much more than $3,000,000 out of a $30,000,000 item which was made available for the present fiscal year. They have plans for the next fiscal year which should enable them to obligate larger sums of money, but they were not able to show the committee how it would be possible for them to obligate anything like the amount of $30,000,000 as projected in the Budget estimate. We wanted to provide whatever was necessary, and we felt that $20,000,000 was amply sufficient. We realized—and I believe this is stated in the report; at least I want to state it now if it is not—that, if in the operation of the R. E. A., the provision of additional funds should be necessary at any time within the next fiscal year, Congress would be in session, and it is the anticipation of the committee that such additional funds, if needed, will be provided by appropriate deficiency appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was it the attitude of the committee with regard to the experimental research work in forestry that because it did not contribute directly to the war work that it should be discontinued?

Mr. TARVER. No, no; we did not discontinue it. We made some cuts. When compared with the total amounts that have been involved they are not substantial cuts, but taken by themselves alone they might be considered as substantial. Certainly it is a work which might be stepped down, if I may use that expression, for the period of the emergency as not any too directly related to the war effort.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I should like to take just this minute to say that Mr. Taylor of the Farm Security Administration did a splendid job and was of very material assistance in getting badly needed farm labor into my congressional district. If that had not been done the farmers simply could not and would not have planted.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. I may say that the funds under which this program has been carried on by the Farm Security Administration have not been carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill but have been allocated to the Farm Security Administration from the President's emergency fund.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; that is true, but in this case, funds were allocated; realizing the emergency nature of the situation they were successful in having additional funds allocated, which was an indication that they could and would cut red tape if the emergency necessitated it.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I see the item for crop insurance is cut out after July 31. For what reason?

Mr. TARVER. We have brought to the House the question of whether or not, in view of the tremendous losses involved in the crop-insurance program it ought to be continued. I think the committee report indicates that the position of the committee was to bring the matter to the House in a way which would permit the House to arrive at its own conclusion.

The Government in 4 years on this program has lost $41,000,000 above the amounts of the premiums paid by the farmers. The expense, in our judgment, has been out of proportion to the benefits which have been received. Only a little more than one-third of the wheat

farmers have participated, and less than 10 percent of the cotton farmers of the country. The majority of farmers themselves evidently do not see any particular benefit to them. Under these conditions, the committee feels not that it ought to abolish the crop insurance organization but that it ought to bring to the House a provision in the bill which will enable the House to vote on that question and make the determination for itself. Of course, the committee will be satisfied with whatever determination is reached by the House. We do not provide for the elimination of this agency. We provide for the liquidation of the organization and the full compliance with every contract which has been made by the Government or will be made prior to July 1 of the present year.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I may say to the gentleman that the cost of administration has been cut in half since we started in 1939 with wheat. The cost at that time was $26.89 per insured interest.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has been misinformed. The administrative costs have been growing like a Chinese baby.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have the figures from the agency.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will examine the hearings, he will find the facts.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have the figures from the agency that it cost $26.89 per family for wheat for the year 1939.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has the figure per family.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have the figures that 413,221 wheat farm families and 176,480 cotton farm families, a total of 589,701, obtained insurance in 1942, and the cost has been cut to $13.43 per insured interest compared to $26.89 per insured interest in 1939. These are the figures from the agency.

Mr. TARVER. I am talking about the total cost of administering the agency, not the cost per family.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. May I ask the chairman of the committee how it is that the committee did not feel that they should let the House act on these other activities that have been eliminated from the bill? The gentleman said you were going to let the House act on the insurance provisions.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the House will act on everything contained in the bill. We have no power to keep the House from acting upon anything in the bill.

Mr. GRANGER. That is true, but I understand that that matter has been eliminated.

Mr. TARVER. We have brought the question to the House and it is up to you. If you want to continue this program, which is costing the Government so much and is of so little benefit to the farmers, that is your responsibility, but we simply bring that in in this way and show the opinion of the subcommittee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. With respect to the forest-fire items, did the committee propose any language that in any way would interfere with the practice of the Forest Service, when confronted with an emergency involving a fire, of employing emergency fire fighters and then presenting a bill?

Mr. TARVER. No, we have made the usual $100,000 token appropriation for that work, which, of course, it is understood will be supplemented by Congress with whatever funds are necessary to carry on the fire-fighting work. But I was talking about this cooperative forest-fire protection item under the McNary bill, where the statutory limit is $2,500,000, which we could not exceed, although the bill for the present year carries $4,000,000.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement.

Mr. TARVER. The preparation of this bill has been a very difficult matter involving many weeks of study and hearings and infinite attention to detail. This subcommittee has no pride of authorship, nor does it make any assumption of infallibility of judgment in connection with the various actions which have been taken through the medium of this bill submitted to the House for approval. It is earnestly hoped that Members of the House, before they vote on the bill, will study the hearings, and, of course, I know they will be guided in their actions by their conception of their duties to American agriculture in the provision of necessary facilities for that Department which particularly represents the interests of the American farmer.

In what form the bill may finally be passed none of us at this time, with reasonable assurance, can predict, and this is especially true with reference to some of the major and more controversial portions of the bill. In whatever form it may finally be enacted it should represent the collective and informed judgment of the Congress based upon the evidence which has been, and may be, made available with due regard to the opinions of legislative representatives of farm organizations and to the opinions of all others who are deeply concerned about agriculture, but only insofar as those opinions may be found to have been based upon duly ascertained facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the fight is on. We are going to have another grand time on this agricultural bill, in spite of what we tried to do in the committee to avert it. You remember last year this bill was 10 days on the floor of the House.

May I inform the House now—and my chairman, who has just yielded the floor, was not apprised of this fact—that the Committee on Rules has denied us a rule for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. If that is true, it means that about $150,000,000 for the R. E. A., for the farm tenant land purchase program, for the gypsy moth control, for the sweetpotato weevil control, pink bollworm eradication, and for sundry other activities, will have to be stricken from the bill if points of order are made. The amount of $150,000,000, or approximately that amount, will be added to the cut of $526,000,000 below the Budget which has already been effected.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is very true, and those items will be objected to, I am informed.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Does not the gentleman think that the Committee on Rules acted wisely in that the Committee on Appropriations has taken over all the legislative functions of the Committee on Agriculture? In fact, this bill contains more legislation than any appropriation bill that has ever been presented to the House since I have been a Member during the past 22 years.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Directly answering the gentleman from South Carolina, may I say that we have, but these supply bills for Agriculture for several years have had to have a rule for their consideration because many items of an emergency and anticipatory nature, as well as other items, have been brought before us without any authorization from the Committee on Agriculture, until they have mounted up to a considerable sum.

Now may I get right to this point, jumping over some things I had first intended to say. This is the milk in the coconut, as I told the Committee on Rules only a couple of hours ago. The only thing that brought the Agriculture Committee before the Rules Committee to deny a rule is the fact that Farm Security was brought in. That was the one last thing that broke the camel's back. There would not have been any protest from Mr. FULMER'S committee for the 50 items that have been considered year after year in this bill, passed over and not objected to, but for the final stroke that this committee gave Farm Security.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman I made the statement, and several other members from the Agriculture Committee, that the Farm Security item in here was the minor part of the legislation, that certainly there ought to be some revamping, and we have the authority now to investigate it rather than you folks tearing it all to pieces.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I want to tell the gentleman that is the thing that put the burr in the right place and that is what brought them to the Rules Committee this morning. That is the only thing that did it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is making an awfully good and interesting statement. I want to be absolutely clear on it. As I understand the picture, the Rules Committee has denied a rule permitting this bill to come to the floor, I suppose with all points of order waived. Then we have it here, and, if I understood the chairman of the committee correctly, what the committee has eliminated plus these other items will amount to $650,000,000 in round figures?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As compared with what we have heretofore carried in this bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to get very clear on that. Secondly is this point: I assume that the committee struck out the Farm Security Administration budget item?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It goes out under the rule I guess.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, then, as the gentleman has explained, if I understood him correctly, that one item goes out and the contest which is going on throughout the country in connection with whether or not F. S. A. is to be continued in its present method of operation we will say really brought the issue right up to the floor and that is really what we have before us along with many other things?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The point in connection with a lot of these controversial issues is this: The House is going to be denied a chance to vote on them. They will go out on a point of order, and that item will go out on a point of order, the Senate will put it back if it follows their traditions, then we will write the bill in conference and the House will not have anything to do with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I very much regret that because I think we should have a vote on it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I regret it, too, in the interest of the Members of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to the Rules Committee indicating that the Rules Committee had taken away from the House some right which it has.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It has taken away what we have had for years.

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee provides how a bill be considered under the rules of the House. This is not a closed rule.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The Rules Committee did not provide for any consideration of the bill under the rules of the House because the Rules Committee does not have that authority. We have that right without the permission of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I was trying to say. The chairman of this subcommittee has come before the Rules Committee year after year asking for a rule to bring in a bill carrying items for which there was no authority of law but which were set up, established, and created by Executive order. Many members of the Rules Committee believe in operating our Government under the Constitution, not by Executive order. The constitution of the House is its rules. Every time the Rules Committee grants a special rule, the general rules are suspended. In this the committee refused to suspend the general rules.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. May I ask the gentleman a question? Why did you not do that last year? Why did you not do it the year before?

Mr. MICHENER. I will answer that: For the simple reason, as I understood it, and I think other Members understood it that way, we were promised, or at least we so understood the chairman of the subcommittee to say that he would not come back and attempt to do it next year.

Mr. TARVER rose.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, let me answer that, and then I shall yield to my chairman. The House Agricultural Committee has not done anything in this last year to authorize these things.

Mr. MICHENER. Did the gentleman not come before the committee?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, we do not have to go before the Committee on Agriculture. I now yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has made some statements here to which I object. When he tried to get me to make certain promises, I expressly declined. He has made a statement in the committee and on the floor that I made such promises, and there is not a scintilla of truth in the statement. May I say this, further, that the R. E. A. was not established by Executive order and the Farm Security Administration, as functioning now, is not established by Executive order. The Rural Electrification Administration was established by act of Congress, and the only thing which makes necessary the procurement of a rule is that we may consider authorizing R. F. C. loans. If we had appropriated the money and made it a straight-out appropriation, it would not be subject to a point of order, and no rule would be necessary.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Or if we had abolished the Farm Security Administration and not transferred some of its activities to something else, it still would not be subject to a point of order, but we tried to smooth these things out, to make a good job of it. I have been an advocate of economy, and I have been serving for years in writing this bill without any outside influence, and, as a matter of fact, before we get through we are going to write this bill in conference.

Mr. CASE. Is it not true that any items that might be placed in the bill by the Senate not in accordance with the rules of the House, could not be agreed to in conference, but would have to be brought back for a vote in the House?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is my understanding that if the Senate waves points of order and passes a bill, they are not subject to a point of order in the conference.

Mr. CASE. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken, because if the bill comes back to the House carrying legislation, an objection can be made to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report, and then by that procedure it will be in order to object to the consideration of those things except by final vote of the House.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If the Senate adopts these points of order, we cannot raise them in the conference.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. If the Senate puts in items subject to a point of order in the House, it is going to be necessary to have every such item brought back to the House by the conferees for a separate vote on each of these items, and on each of these items there would be allowed 1 hour of debate.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then it will be seen that we are out of a summer vacation, and not merely an Easter vacation. I want to say that we are in one "mell of a hess" from now on on this agricultural bill, and if the great Rules Committee has added to the sum total of intelligence today then I will eat my hat. I do not want to go into different things, because my time has already gone, though I shall yield myself some more time, but I do want to answer my distinguished chairman just a little bit. I want to sort of criticize him a bit. In his opening speech he took up more than half of his time reporting not for the committee but on these items that he objected to. Half of his speech was not defending the committee bill. The chairman was practically alone on these big items, the Farm Security Administration and the incentive payments. The committee stands absolutely against them. The gentleman's own colleagues were against them. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], the other colleagues in the majority of the committee, stand together in these two big items that the gentleman from Georgia took so much time about on the floor of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman think that I should not stand alone when my conscience is involved? If so, then I believe he is wrong.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman's conscience should have followed his obligation to the committee to report for them.

Mr. TARVER. But my obligation to my country is greater than to my committee.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then there is no importance whatever to committees any

more. That is just thrown out of the window. Let me say a word or two about what he said about incentive payments. There is a real question involved, and it is questionable about whether these incentive payments were authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I will yield myself 10 minutes more. It is wonderful to have all this time to yield to yourself, when there have been times when I wanted to have only 2 minutes, just like the gentleman from Mississippi, and could not get it. There is a loophole in the matter of the incentive payments, that we promised these farmers in December, and they should go ahead and plant. There is a loophole all through that. We met on the 1st of February before they planted potatoes on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and we renounced the support of such payments definitely. We voted definitely as a subcommittee on agriculture against it, with only the chairman opposing it. We brought the Secretary of Agriculture up here and we chastised him for entering into agreements, on the 1st of February, before any planting was done. Now he pities the poor farmers, and so on, because they were led on; and yet they were denied definitely by us on the 1st of February when the issue was brought to us; it was denied in two committees, as I recall it.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE. Has not another loophole been found by which the Commodity Credit Corporation, by direction of the Food Administrator, announces now that it will take care of these incentive payments?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, yes. I do not know whether it is the Farm Credit, but I know Mr. Prentiss Brown is advocating incentive payments, in spite of the definite action of our committee and every congressional authority that has been considered. They have all denied incentive payments. We are against it as the appropriating committee for the Department of Agriculture, and in the deficiency committee, of which I happen to be a member, we put it straight to them on the 1st o February. They do not take anything from Congress as meaning anything—these bureaucrats. They are never whipped.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I just wanted to make one observation, since the gentleman has referred to the potatoes planted in Maryland. There is a 20-percent increase. I do not think the prospect of incentive payments had anything to do with that.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, I did not mean that. I simply used it as the earliest possible crop; that it was not planted when we took our definite action. I could not think of anything earlier than potatoes on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Now, so much for the incentive payments. Yet we have Mr. Brown and these people insisting on incentive payments to encourage the farmers. It is to hold down the price to the consumer. That is not in the interest of the farmer. That is not what the farmer wants. He does not want incentive payments. He does not want parity. He does not want bonuses. That is what I think. He does not want incentive payments. He wants a fair price for his product.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the market.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the market. I thank the gentleman. He wants a fair price on the market. That is what the farmer wants. How can I think of any better illustration of these incentive payments than to say to our boys in Africa and the southwest Pacific, "We are going to hold down the cost of living now. We are going to make it cheap to live while you are gone, for ourselves, but when you come back you are going to pay all this deficit out of the Treasury. We are going to live cheap while you are fighting at the front, but when you come back you can pay for our cheap living while you were fighting." That is the effect of it. That is what we are going to give back to the soldiers who are fighting in Africa and the southwest Pacific. We are subsidizing this out of the Treasury with the promise to pay for the low cost of living on the basis of incentive payments to farmers, that Prentiss Brown tells us we must do. The farmers are not for it. I do not think this is American.

I know another thing: They are not for the Farm Security Administration. That is the thing that brought on all this trouble—this Farm Security Administration. People who have been following this thing should not be surprised about it. It has been in the cards. It has been coming to a dead end for a year or two.

Think of how they treated other things in a half a dozen ways. That is what they have done with their communistic projects of one kind or another. They failed utterly on the farm-labor situation. They spent millions and millions and fell down flat, especially on bringing Mexican laborers up here, and they started out on the proposition of taking all these men out of the hills of Kentucky and Tennessee and taking them away out West and colonizing them and giving them good land to live on. That is without any authority of law or anything from us. They started out to do bigger things than Tugwell ever thought of. Tugwell was their papa, you know. They have thought of things that Tugwell never dreamed of. We have a precedent in the deficiency bill this year of denying them absolutely a dollar for farm labor. It would be revealing no secret to say that after the Senate raised them to $40,000,000 we put them back. This deficiency committee stands adamant against them having anything to do with farm labor. Yet today——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I will have to take 10 more minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. I yield the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I agree with much the distinguished gentleman from Kansas is saying. Of course, I voted on the matter he was just talking about to reduce that appropriation which I believe his committee brought in from $23,000,000 to $12,000,000.

Mr LAMBERTSON. Yes. That is where it should have stayed.

Mr. RIZLEY. But what I am wondering about is this: The Farm Security Administration, as I understand, has been operating for years without any authority of law. Year after year they have been bypassing Congress. They have been by passing the Committee on Agriculture which is the legislative committee, because they knew if they came before that committee they would not get these huge sums.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am not so sure of it.

Mr. RIZLEY. So year after year the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Appropriations, has been giving the Farm Security Administration all this money without any authority of law, not sending them to the legislative committee and saying, "Now, you get some authority of law before you get this appropriation." I do not recall that this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture has heretofore been so exercised about the Farm Security Administration operating without any authority of law, but this time, because someone raises the question and says that the Farm Security Administration, like every other agency of Government, ought to have some authority of law before they come to a committee and ask for an appropriation, this question is raised. What I cannot understand is why this Appropriations Committee did not say, "Now, you go and get some authority in law from some committee, and then we will look into your appropriation." Why have you not done that heretofore? That is the point I am making.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Now, you must not make a long speech in my time. You can make a short one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just let me say that it becomes virtually impossible to write this kind of bill without some legislative provisions in it. Everybody will remember that 2 or 3 years ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], made points of order against every item in the bill on plant entomology and quarantine, and a great many other items. We sent that bill to the Senate about one-third of the size it was when reported. If you will go down the line and make a point of order against every legislative provision in this bill you will cut it half in two. We tried to be charitable about it, if anything, the Committee on Agriculture, the legislative committee, has been derelict in not providing the statutory basis for the things that we wrote in. If we want to be constructive we will let some of these go, but if you want to be

technical you can go through it from beginning to end and hamstring the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And only cut out $150,000,000 more, that is all.

I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has it in his lap right now and will have in all likelihood for the next week, 10 days, or 2 weeks; it is in his lap. What does he propose to do about it?

Mr. RIZLEY. As far as I am concerned I am ready to act right now.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The membership on this committee changes from year to year. There are a couple of Members on it this year who were not there last year. We are not always able to do every year what we did the year before. However, we did our best this year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has been discussing farm subsidies, and I think he has been expressing the sentiment of the vast majority of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder if the gentleman knows that last fall when we were considering the farm parity bill the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FULMER] included a statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that under the policy of farm subsidy the farmers of this country have grown considerably worse off in this respect: That 10 years ago 65 percent of them owned their farms, but now 65 percent of them are tenants. That is the effect of farm subsidies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it possible that the change in the attitude of the committee has resulted in any degree from the increasing stench that has arisen from the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If I understand right, the answer is yes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman mentioned Mexican farm labor a little while ago. I do not know whether they are going to get as far north as Kansas, and I question very much whether they will get as far north as my own district, but let me say that in up-State New York for every farmer who has lost his farm through opposition on the part of the Government it will take at least 20 Mexican peons to make up for his effort.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I often have this question asked of me: Why is it necessary to continue any farm benefit subsidy payments at this time when our business, industry, and labor are getting more than they ever got?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is not necessary. If I had my way the A. A. A. would be out for the duration.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I want to note at this time and reiterate with reference to farm security that the Committee on Agriculture went to the Rules Committee and was denied a rule as asked. There is no question about it, and I want to make this statement without time to amplify it, that the farmers in my district and all Kansas are not for the Farm Security Administration, especially now in wartime. It is the W. P. A. of the farmers and there is no excuse for it today. If a farmer cannot make money on his farm today he can do pretty well by working out as a hired hand. If he is without funds he can get a pretty good job as a hired man or he can get a good job in a defense plant.

He should not be subsidized in a time like this. It does not make sense; there is no argument for it. The issue was raised in my campaign, to bring it directly before you as a personal matter, and the radio was used against me by the Farmers' Union of Kansas, and just remember I have six strong Farmers' Union counties in my district. I have been on the State board, a vice president of the State and on the national board. What was the result? The result was that my majority was substantial in every one of the six union counties, and they fought me openly. They said I should be defeated because of this farm-security attitude of mine. As I say, the State president spoke against me on the radio, and the whole campaign was waged against me on the basis of farm security, yet I received from the farmers of my six union counties a splendid majority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas yields back 1 minute.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the draft first took labor away from the farmer; it is pretty well gone. Then you will remember that the prices of things the farmer buys today compared to the last war are about 100 percent higher on the average, yet the things the farmer sells today are only 60 percent of what they were in the last World War.

This committee when bringing in this bill has finished its job of putting small and poor farmers out of business. If this bill goes through I want to tell you that it is the final blow to the small farming element of America.

This committee not only made appropriations but it appropriated to themselves the right to write laws that no Committee on Appropriations ought to be permitted to do. If you do not believe that, look at pages 16, 17, 18, 19, and 22 of the report. They have not only started to make laws for the country in regard to agriculture but they have gone into the Criminal Code as well, providing penalties and penitentiary sentences for offenses by those who do not keep in step with this committee. I tell you that in my judgment, and I do not think it is wrong, this subcommittee of all-wise, all-powerful minds has just about completed the annihilation of the American farmer.

I call your attention to pages 84, 87, 89, 96, and 97 of the bill itself and if you do not think they have written laws in there that they had no right to do then you cannot read English. I also call your attention to pages 1293 and 1301 of the hearings, where you will find the inside of all the conversation that took place in the committee. I do not know whether the Farm Security Administration in New York stinks or not—that is what the gentleman from New York said—but my only comment is that is not the only thing that smells bad in that vicinity.

So far as my section of the country is concerned, and I am speaking only for that section, I want to give you just a few facts about the clients of the Farm Security Administration. You say that is the crux of this whole debate; that is all there is to it, according to the gentleman from Kansas. Since 1932 you have evicted farmers or they have signed deeds to the extent that 2,000,000 farmers have left the homes they once had.

I am going to put in the details here, Mr. Chairman, and I will ask permission in the House to insert in connection with my remarks these charts showing foreclosures in the United States for the past 10 years.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number of farms changing ownership by forced sales and related defaults (including delinquent taxes) per 1,000 of all farms, United States and North Dakota, year ending Mar. 15, 1926–42*

Year	United States	North Dakota
	Number	*Number*
1926	21.6	59.0
1927	23.3	61.1
1928	22.8	55.9
1929	19.5	42.7
1930	20.8	42.3
1931	26.1	50.0
1932	41.7	76.0
1933	54.1	92.9
1934	39.1	43.3
1935	28.3	24.9
1936	26.2	32.5
1937	22.4	31.8
1938	17.4	32.9
1939	17.0	44.4
1940	15.9	49.4
1941	13.9	49.5
1942	9.3	42.4

Division of Land Economics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

It left three classes of farmers in my section of the country. It left the big farmer, it left the small farmer who is still operating, and it left a much larger bunch of people on the highways who had been evicted or who had signed away their property for reasons over which they had no control. The question is what are we going to do with them? This committee says they ought to get a loan, or try until they can get a refusal by everybody in the country who is making private loans. What is the use of taking the ragged farmer with eight or

more. That is just thrown out of the window. Let me say a word or two about what he said about incentive payments. There is a real question involved, and it is questionable about whether these incentive payments were authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I will yield myself 10 minutes more. It is wonderful to have all this time to yield to yourself, when there have been times when I wanted to have only 2 minutes, just like the gentleman from Mississippi, and could not get it. There is a loophole in the matter of the incentive payments, that we promised these farmers in December, and they should go ahead and plant. There is a loophole all through that. We met on the 1st of February before they planted potatoes on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and we renounced the support of such payments definitely. We voted definitely as a subcommittee on agriculture against it, with only the chairman opposing it. We brought the Secretary of Agriculture up here and we chastised him for entering into agreements, on the 1st of February, before any planting was done. Now he pities the poor farmers, and so on, because they were led on; and yet they were denied definitely by us on the 1st of February when the issue was brought to us; it was denied in two committees, as I recall it.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE. Has not another loophole been found by which the Commodity Credit Corporation, by direction of the Food Administrator, announces now that it will take care of these incentive payments?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, yes. I do not know whether it is the Farm Credit, but I know Mr. Prentiss Brown is advocating incentive payments, in spite of the definite action of our committee and every congressional authority that has been considered. They have all denied incentive payments. We are against it as the appropriating committee for the Department of Agriculture, and in the deficiency committee, of which I happen to be a member, we put it straight to them on the 1st o. February. They do not take anything from Congress as meaning anything—these bureaucrats. They are never whipped.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I just wanted to make one observation, since the gentleman has referred to the potatoes planted in Maryland. There is a 20-percent increase. I do not think the prospect of incentive payments had anything to do with that.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, I did not mean that. I simply used it as the earliest possible crop; that it was not planted when we took our definite action. I could not think of anything earlier than potatoes on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Now, so much for the incentive payments. Yet we have Mr. Brown and these people insisting on incentive payments to encourage the farmers. It is to hold down the price to the consumer. That is not in the interest of the farmer. That is not what the farmer wants. He does not want incentive payments. He does not want parity. He does not want bonuses. That is what I think. He does not want incentive payments. He wants a fair price for his product.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the market.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the market. I thank the gentleman. He wants a fair price on the market. That is what the farmer wants. How can I think of any better illustration of these incentive payments than to say to our boys in Africa and the southwest Pacific, "We are going to hold down the cost of living now. We are going to make it cheap to live while you are gone, for ourselves, but when you come back you are going to pay all this deficit out of the Treasury. We are going to live cheap while you are fighting at the front, but when you come back you can pay for our cheap living while you were fighting." That is the effect of it. That is what we are going to give back to the soldiers who are fighting in Africa and the southwest Pacific. We are subsidizing this out of the Treasury with the promise to pay for the low cost of living on the basis of incentive payments to farmers, that Prentiss Brown tells us we must do. The farmers are not for it. I do not think this is American.

I know another thing: They are not for the Farm Security Administration. That is the thing that brought on all this trouble—this Farm Security Administration. People who have been following this thing should not be surprised about it. It has been in the cards. It has been coming to a dead end for a year or two.

Think of how they treated other things in a half a dozen ways. That is what they have done with their communistic projects of one kind or another. They failed utterly on the farm-labor situation. They spent millions and millions and fell down flat, especially on bringing Mexican laborers up here, and they started out on the proposition of taking all these men out of the hills of Kentucky and Tennessee and taking them away out West and colonizing them and giving them good land to live on. That is without any authority of law or anything from us. They started out to do bigger things than Tugwell ever thought of. Tugwell was their papa, you know. They have thought of things that Tugwell never dreamed of. We have a precedent in the deficiency bill this year of denying them absolutely a dollar for farm labor. It would be revealing no secret to say that after the Senate raised them to $40,000,000 we put them back. This deficiency committee stands adamant against them having anything to do with farm labor. Yet today——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I will have to take 10 more minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. I yield the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I agree with much the distinguished gentleman from Kansas is saying. Of course, I voted on the matter he was just talking about to reduce that appropriation which I believe his committee brought in from $23,000,000 to $12,000,000.

Mr LAMBERTSON. Yes. That is where it should have stayed.

Mr. RIZLEY. But what I am wondering about is this: The Farm Security Administration, as I understand, has been operating for years without any authority of law. Year after year they have been bypassing Congress. They have been by passing the Committee on Agriculture which is the legislative committee, because they knew if they came before that committee they would not get these huge sums.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am not so sure of it.

Mr. RIZLEY. So year after year the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Appropriations, has been giving the Farm Security Administration all this money without any authority of law, not sending them to the legislative committee and saying, "Now, you get some authority of law before you get this appropriation." I do not recall that this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture has heretofore been so exercised about the Farm Security Administration operating without any authority of law, but this time, because someone raises the question and says that the Farm Security Administration, like every other agency of Government, ought to have some authority of law before they come to a committee and ask for an appropriation, this question is raised. What I cannot understand is why this Appropriations Committee did not say, "Now, you go and get some authority in law from some committee, and then we will look into your appropriation." Why have you not done that heretofore? That is the point I am making.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Now, you must not make a long speech in my time. You can make a short one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just let me say that it becomes virtually impossible to write this kind of bill without some legislative provisions in it. Everybody will remember that 2 or 3 years ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], made points of order against every item in the bill on plant entomology and quarantine, and a great many other items. We sent that bill to the Senate about one-third of the size it was when reported. If you will go down the line and make a point of order against every legislative provision in this bill you will cut it half in two. We tried to be charitable about it, if anything, the Committee on Agriculture, the legislative committee, has been derelict in not providing the statutory basis for the things that we wrote in. If we want to be constructive we will let some of these go, but if you want to be

technical you can go through it from beginning to end and hamstring the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And only cut out $150,000,000 more, that is all.

I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has it in his lap right now and will have in all likelihood for the next week, 10 days, or 2 weeks; it is in his lap. What does he propose to do about it?

Mr. RIZLEY. As far as I am concerned I am ready to act right now.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The membership on this committee changes from year to year. There are a couple of Members on it this year who were not there last year. We are not always able to do every year what we did the year before. However, we did our best this year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has been discussing farm subsidies, and I think he has been expressing the sentiment of the vast majority of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder if the gentleman knows that last fall when we were considering the farm parity bill the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FULMER] included a statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that under the policy of farm subsidy the farmers of this country have grown considerably worse off in this respect: That 10 years ago 65 percent of them owned their farms, but now 65 percent of them are tenants. That is the effect of farm subsidies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it possible that the change in the attitude of the committee has resulted in any degree from the increasing stench that has arisen from the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If I understand right, the answer is yes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman mentioned Mexican farm labor a little while ago. I do not know whether they are going to get as far north as Kansas, and I question very much whether they will get as far north as my own district, but let me say that in up-State New York for every farmer who has lost his farm through opposition on the part of the Government it will take at least 20 Mexican peons to make up for his effort.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I often have this question asked of me: Why is it necessary to continue any farm benefit subsidy payments at this time when our business, industry, and labor are getting more than they ever got?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is not necessary. If I had my way the A. A. A. would be out for the duration.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I want to note at this time and reiterate with reference to farm security that the Committee on Agriculture went to the Rules Committee and was denied a rule as asked. There is no question about it, and I want to make this statement without time to amplify it, that the farmers in my district and all Kansas are not for the Farm Security Administration, especially now in wartime. It is the W. P. A. of the farmers and there is no excuse for it today. If a farmer cannot make money on his farm today he can do pretty well by working out as a hired hand. If he is without funds he can get a pretty good job as a hired man or he can get a good job in a defense plant.

He should not be subsidized in a time like this. It does not make sense; there is no argument for it. The issue was raised in my campaign, to bring it directly before you as a personal matter, and the radio was used against me by the Farmers' Union of Kansas, and just remember I have six strong Farmers' Union counties in my district. I have been on the State board, a vice president of the State and on the national board. What was the result? The result was that my majority was substantial in every one of the six union counties, and they fought me openly. They said I should be defeated because of this farm-security attitude of mine. As I say, the State president spoke against me on the radio, and the whole campaign was waged against me on the basis of farm security, yet I received from the farmers of my six union counties a splendid majority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas yields back 1 minute.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the draft first took labor away from the farmer; it is pretty well gone. Then you will remember that the prices of things the farmer buys today compared to the last war are about 100 percent higher on the average, yet the things the farmer sells today are only 60 percent of what they were in the last World War.

This committee when bringing in this bill has finished its job of putting small and poor farmers out of business. If this bill goes through I want to tell you that it is the final blow to the small farming element of America.

This committee not only made appropriations but it appropriated to themselves the right to write laws that no Committee on Appropriations ought to be permitted to do. If you do not believe that, look at pages 16, 17, 18, 19, and 22 of the report. They have not only started to make laws for the country in regard to agriculture but they have gone into the Criminal Code as well, providing penalties and penitentiary sentences for offenses by those who do not keep in step with this committee. I tell you that in my judgment, and I do not think it is wrong, this subcommittee of all-wise, all-powerful minds has just about completed the annihilation of the American farmer.

I call your attention to pages 84, 87, 89, 96, and 97 of the bill itself and if you do not think they have written laws in there that they had no right to do then you cannot read English. I also call your attention to pages 1293 and 1301 of the hearings, where you will find the inside of all the conversation that took place in the committee. I do not know whether the Farm Security Administration in New York stinks or not—that is what the gentleman from New York said—but my only comment is that is not the only thing that smells bad in that vicinity.

So far as my section of the country is concerned, and I am speaking only for that section, I want to give you just a few facts about the clients of the Farm Security Administration. You say that is the crux of this whole debate; that is all there is to it, according to the gentleman from Kansas. Since 1932 you have evicted farmers or they have signed deeds to the extent that 2,000,000 farmers have left the homes they once had.

I am going to put in the details here, Mr. Chairman, and I will ask permission in the House to insert in connection with my remarks these charts showing foreclosures in the United States for the past 10 years.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number of farms changing ownership by forced sales and related defaults (including delinquent taxes) per 1,000 of all farms, United States and North Dakota, year ending Mar. 15, 1926–42*

Year	United States	North Dakota
	Number	*Number*
1926	21.6	59.0
1927	23.3	61.1
1928	22.8	55.9
1929	19.5	42.7
1930	20.8	42.3
1931	26.1	50.0
1932	41.7	76.0
1933	54.1	92.9
1934	39.1	43.3
1935	28.3	24.9
1936	26.2	32.5
1937	22.4	31.8
1938	17.4	32.9
1939	17.0	44.4
1940	15.9	49.4
1941	13.9	49.5
1942	9.3	42.4

Division of Land Economics, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

It left three classes of farmers in my section of the country. It left the big farmer, it left the small farmer who is still operating, and it left a much larger bunch of people on the highways who had been evicted or who had signed away their property for reasons over which they had no control. The question is what are we going to do with them? This committee says they ought to get a loan, or try until they can get a refusal by everybody in the country who is making private loans. What is the use of taking the ragged farmer with eight or

ten children out on the highway and telling him first that he must see if he cannot get a loan from a bank. What kind of sense is that when you know he has not a dime, not a cent?

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Prior to the establishment of a great many of these agencies to take care of farmers who are helpless, they had to go to these banks. I used to run one myself. They got whatever we would let them have and they paid whatever interest we charged. Under this bill millions of good farmers, unable perhaps to get loans, and if so only at high rates, will not be able to get a loan from these agencies until they are turned down by the various banks in the county, and then they may come back and ask for a loan.

Mr. BURDICK. Let me refer you to page 1301. I wish I had time to read all these hearings as I read them myself. Here is what Mr. Black says:

> They are not expected to run around the county and expend their time and effort to get a refusal from every money lender in the territory to see whether they can or cannot get credit and really to establish themselves as deadbeats before they can get credit.

Those are the kind of fellows we have been handling out in North Dakota. Here is what they have done. In the last year they raised 772,000 chickens, an increase of 39 percent over what they did the year before. They produced 5,000,000 gallons of milk, or an increase of 22 percent over the year before. These are down-and-out farmers, everyone of them, not one of them worth $50 in bank credit, yet they put 6,975 families back to work and they increased their egg output 36 percent. They raised 904,000 dozen eggs last year, an increase of 36 percent over the year before. They raised 7,803,000 pounds of beef. These no-good farmers, these class-3 farmers, made an increase of 53 percent. I will put in the tables and the program for next year.

TABLE I.—*Report on Farm Security Administration program as of November 30, 1942, in the State of North Dakota*

Farm Security Administration borrowers in the State of North Dakota have made considerable increases in the production of essential agricultural commodities. A sample survey shows that the 6,975 active Farm Security Administration borrowers in the State made the following increases in production in 1942:

Product	Increase in 1942 over 1941	Percent increase
Chickens (pounds live weight)	772,710	39
Milk (gallons)	5,093,100	22
Eggs (dozens)	904,620	36
Pork (pounds live weight)	6,850,500	82
Beef (pounds live weight)	7,803,100	53
Soybeans (bushels)	4,289	(1)
Peanuts (bushels)	91,807	273

[1] No production in 1941.

Under the rural rehabilitation loan program as of November 30, 1942, in the State $13,677,520 had been advanced to 41,232 farm families for loans for operating goods since the inception of the program in 1935. The total collections on these loans amounted to $8,041,741, of which $6,785,357 represents repayments of principal. As of the same date these collections amounted to 83 percent of matured principal and accrued interest.[1]

Under the farm-ownership program as of November 30, 1942, $1,869,215 had been lent to 277 tenants, hired men, and small operators to enable them to purchase and improve family type farms under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Collections amounted to $163,407 of which $119,781 represents repayment of principal. The total collections of principal and interest amounted to 98 percent of maturities of principal and interest.

In addition to making, servicing, and supervising these loans, the Farm Security Administration has brought about the establishment of 131 community and cooperative services which make available the use of purebred sires, machinery, and other facilities to some 675 farm families who otherwise would lack them.

The total number of all farms listed in the 1940 census for the State is 73,962, of which 45 percent had a gross farm income under $600 in 1939.

[1] Collection figures are as of December 31, 1942.

TABLE III.—*Increase in production of essential foods, 1941–42, by all farmers and by supervised borrowers of Farm Security Administration*

Commodity	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		
	Amount of increase, 1941–42	Percent of increase	Amount of increase, 1941–42	Percent of increase	Percent of total increase by Farm Security Administration borrowers
Milk	3,914,000,000	3	1,419,000,000	20	36
Pork (pounds, live weight)	[1] 2,252,000,000	13	192,400,000	36	9
Eggs (dozens)	516,000,000	15	49,900,000	31	10
Chickens (pounds, live weight)	[1] 366,365,000	14	37,100,000	36	10
Beef (pounds, live weight)	[1] 1,767,000,000	11	124,300,000	38	9
Peanuts (pounds)	1,028,000,000	70	101,700,000	88	10
Soybeans (bushels)	104,000,000	98	3,360,000	106	3
Dry beans (pounds)	110,500,000	6	30,100,000	34	27
Sugar beets (tons)	1,616,000	16	113,000	24	7
Total number of farms					6,097,000
Total number of farms actively supervised on which borrower was producing in 1942					463,941
Proportion of all farms which are supervised by Farm Security Administration (percent)					7.6

[1] Preliminary estimate based on commercial slaughter plus home use. Chicken figures include commercial broilers.

I understood the debate on this appropriation bill for agriculture was to be based on food production for war purposes. The farmers are not to be depleted, the farmers are to be encouraged to increase production, because every man on this floor knows that the Nation with the last loaf of bread will be the nation to win this war. Food is our most powerful weapon. I told you that 7 years ago. I had maps on this floor to show you what food would do in the winning of a war, but I did not get any response from that. Now you are right back again after 25 years just where you were before. Food is the greatest engine that the democracies have. We have not only got to feed ourselves and our allies but we will have to feed the world as well.

If you are going to drive these fellows down and discourage them, the men who are producing this food, you are doing an act against this Government in time of war. Let us see whether the rate of production of these busted farmers has been on an equal with other farmers. Other farmers in the United States were responsible for an increase in the production of food, and taking beef, the farmers of the Nation increased their beef last year 11 percent. How much did these busted farmers increase their production? That is the class that the Farm Security Administration has supported. They increased their beef production 38 percent.

They outstripped the average family in the United States, and the reason for it is that their business was planned.

You can take this loaning function away from the Farm Security Administration and make them go to the Farm Credit Administration for loans, but to loan a man that is down and out $2,500 does not mean half of the battle. He has to be advised, he has to know what the soil is, he has to have somebody help him. The Farm Security Administration is the institution that helps these farmers help themselves.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption and understanding of this bill that the loaning functions of the Farm Security Administration have not been destroyed but have been transferred to the Farm Credit Administration?

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is correct, but the Farm Credit loans on bankable paper——

Mr. KEEFE. Am I also correct in understanding that the supervisory work which was formerly done by the Farm Security Administration has not been eliminated or destroyed but has been transferred to the Extension Service?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Therefore, as a matter of fact, is it not a question that we have to determine? The functions remain, but they are transferred from the Farm Security Administration to other agencies.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. So that if those other agencies can continue the work the Farm Security Administration has undertaken, the functions will still be available to this class for whom the gentleman is making a plea, but under different auspices. Is not that the problem that confronts the Congress in passing on this question?

Mr. BURDICK. That is the choice you will have to make. If these agencies will do it. This "if" is the question.

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. BURDICK. Let me read these other figures.

The milk production of all farmers in the United States last year increased over that of the year before an average of 3 percent, but the Farm Security farmers increased their production by 20 percent. The increased production of eggs was 15 percent on the average in the United States, but the Farm Security farmers increased their production 31 percent. The production of beef was increased 14 percent in the United States, but these farmers increased their production 24 percent.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. This thought has occurred to me, and I am troubled about this problem the same as the gentleman from North Dakota. Out home the farmers who have needed the help of the Farm Security Administration have been helped. The Farm Security Administration has rendered a very fine aid to certain types of these farmers. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us whether that is not true in North Dakota, or whether there are a large number in his State who need the help of the Farm Security Administration that has heretofore been given.

Mr. BURDICK. They either need the support of the Farm Security Administration or of an administration just like it, equipped just like it, to do that particular job. The reason they need it is not that we have not raised crops in North Dakota for the last 2 years. I am going to place in the RECORD figures showing that the Farm Security farmers in North Dakota this year paid back all of the debt they owed the Government for 1942, and overpaid it 290 percent. They need this service to get back into production. They have no credit, and very little property.

TABLE 4

Region and State	Loans with 1942 amounts due		Collections for 1942, as of Feb. 13, 1943			
	Number of borrowers	Amount of loans	Amounts which would be due under fixed-payment plan	Amounts collected, excluding extra payments	Percent collected of amounts due	Extra payments
Region IV:						
Tennessee	1,017	$5,531,800	$239,308	$346,191	145	$93,727
Virginia	564	2,998,900	129,735	235,281	181	17,002
West Virginia	240	1,180,400	51,064	45,145	88	7,018
Region V	5,855	23,487,784	1,026,006	1,348,287	131	472,615
Alabama	1,926	7,751,928	341,459	370,084	108	232,492
Florida	179	601,425	32,093	34,789	107	10,286
Georgia	2,401	8,362,349	404,615	581,119	144	185,943
South Carolina	1,349	5,682,081	247,840	362,295	146	43,984
Region VI [1]	4,317	19,180,589	829,752	892,792	108	407,174
Arkansas	1,512	6,553,891	283,521	351,526	124	110,137
Louisiana	881	4,187,241	181,140	154,739	85	52,599
Mississippi	1,924	8,439,457	365,091	386,527	106	244,439
Region VII	1,340	9,406,295	406,916	932,614	229	14,150
Kansas	435	3,298,883	142,697	235,450	165	4,346
Nebraska	351	2,875,555	124,396	313,478	252	7,354
North Dakota	279	1,504,268	65,075	194,574	299	2,225
South Dakota	275	1,727,889	74,748	189,112	253	225
Region VIII	2,615	17,731,156	765,050	1,126,835	147	180,469
Oklahoma	1,081	6,806,601	292,454	448,332	153	122,830
Texas	1,534	10,924,555	472,596	678,503	142	57,639
Region IX	372	2,704,088	116,979	131,244	112	21,137
Arizona	20	169,457	7,331	3,984	54	1,500
California	158	1,420,303	61,442	78,835	128	6,659
Hawaii	165	886,987	38,371	39,826	104	9,978
Nevada	4	35,050	1,516	1,824	120	0
Utah	25	192,291	8,319	6,775	81	3,000

[1] As of Feb. 2, 1943.

TABLE 5.—*North Dakota—Wartime production by standard rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase, Farm Security Administration borrowers*

Commodity	Production by all borrowers		Increase in production by all borrowers		Percent	
	1942	Plan 1943	1941–42	1942 plan to 1943	1941–42	1942–43
Milk (gallons)	28,269,400	32,918,900	5,093,100	4,649,500	22	16
Eggs (dozens)	3,396,500	5,133,440	904,620	1,736,940	36	51
Chickens (pounds)	2,775,320	3,995,710	772,710	1,220,390	39	44
Pork (pounds)	15,205,500	25,905,700	6,850,500	10,700,200	82	70
Beef (pounds)	22,617,400	30,166,200	7,803,100	7,548,800	53	33
Dry beans (pounds)	151,087	200,730	42,774	49,643	39	33
Sugar beets (tons)	6,836	6,032	6,836	−804	------	−12
Soybeans (bushels)	4,289	13,939	4,289	9,650	------	225
Flax (bushels)	125,432	307,275	91,807	181,843	273	145

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. What does the gentleman think might have happened in the way of payment of these loans had it not been for this war and the increased prices that have resulted therefrom?

Mr. BURDICK. If there has been any increase in the price of wheat, it has not appeared in North Dakota. We are still producing at less than the cost of production right now.

I am inserting in my remarks five tables. Tables do not mean much, but if you will approach this subject just as fairly as you would want men to do who were going to try you for something, and remove all prejudice and look this thing squarely in the face, trying to do the right thing for these people and for this country at this time, it will pay you to examine these tables, because every one means a lot to the thing we are trying to do today.

I wish to compliment the Committee on Rules for refusing this committee the right to come in here and write legislation. I assure the chairman of this subcommittee right now that there will be plenty of objections to the consideration of those features of the bill which are not in order. There will be an objection to every one of them.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a very great honor to me to follow the gentleman from North Dakota. He has given the House some of the factual information that I also intended to speak about. It is not necessary that I go over the same ground except, perhaps, to suggest that I did speak about some of those same things on March 1 of this year.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As a practical proposition, it looks as if the debate has directed itself entirely to the item of farm security. Of course, this item in the bill is subject to a point of order, but so would be any amendment that was offered on the floor to appropriate any funds to the Farm Security Administration, because there is no law authorizing it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know that.

Mr. PACE. Therefore, I was wondering what we would accomplish by spending the afternoon discussing the Farm Security Administration when there is no possibility of this House acting on it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will give the gentleman two answers to his question. The first answer is that, as far as the farm-tenant-loan part of the program is concerned, that is not subject to a point of order because it is authorized by law. I earnestly hope that funds for that purpose will be included in the bill.

The second part of my answer is that if I did not get up here this afternoon

and speak my convictions about this matter, and the importance of keeping the program going and building the economic strength of the small farmer of this country I would not be doing what I considered to be my duty.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that I favor some of the operations of the Farm Security Administration just as much as he does, but it is just the practical situation that I have in mind.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand the parliamentary situation that confronts us. I harbor the hope that by some means or other people smarter than myself may be able to find a solution to it, but whether they do or not, I think there are some things that ought to be said on this floor this afternoon. I have heard the remark made by Member after Member in this House to the effect that while we are attempting to win the greatest and most difficult war in history, none of us should bring forth proposals for "social reform," as it is described. I have even heard them say that the soil-conservation program is a "social reform" program, and make statements of that sort. I say to you that whatever argument might be made against the advancement of proposals for the progress of humanity during the war, those arguments ought to lie with far greater force against attempting to use the war emergency as an excuse for putting over a reactionary program and destroying those features of governmental activity which have been of benefit to the poor people of this country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The able gentleman from California refers to the soil-conservation program as a social reform.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said that I had heard it so referred to.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Of course I misunderstood the gentleman who is one of the conscientious and hard working members of the Committee on Agriculture, and I should have known he would not fall into such an error.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, the gentleman will recall, that on one occasion a gentleman was speaking from this well, and referred to the soil conservation program as a "social reform," and I replied to that gentleman, and the gentleman from Missouri and myself sat down in the back of the Chamber and we discussed the matter at that time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We all know that the soil-conservation program is an economic program and very vital to our country's future stability and prosperity.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And I think it is doing more for the future generations of this country than any other program affecting agriculture that we have inaugurated in recent years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman and I have before me a speech of my own that I made on March 1 in which I included the progress and the increased production per acre brought about as a result of the soil conservation program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The only reason that I rose at this time is because I did not want my friend to appear to say something that I knew he did not believe in. We, who know and respect him, appreciate his splendid leadership and his deep interest in the problems of agriculture.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very much obliged to the gentleman, and if I left the implication that he was fearful of, I appreciate his correcting it, very much indeed. It is proposed in this bill that all the functions of the Farm Security Administration be taken away from it, that the agency be abolished, and that those functions be taken up by other agencies of the Government.

There is only one part of that program to which I want to address myself, and that is the rehabilitation loan part of the program, which is the heart of it, the all important part of it, the part in which I am fundamentally interested. I come from California. I have seen some of the poorer folks that came to our State from other parts of the country, not because they wanted to move away from home, not because they wanted to go to California, but because they did not have any other means of making a living. And I know there were thousands upon thousands of farm families who did not come to California, because they did not have to, and the reason was that along came a governmental agency and said, "We know you cannot get credit from any other source, but if you agree to spend this money to get some livestock on your place, and get some simple machinery and get the things you have to have in order to have a balanced farm program, we will make a loan to you, and assist you in carrying on operations," so that through the course of time the net worth of that little family will have increased $100 or $150 or $200 or $250 or $300.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry, not now. It is only one feature of this program that I want to talk about. I want gentlemen to answer this question. If you found an agency of the War Department that was doing a good job in carrying forward its part of the war, and was getting the thing done and doing it well, and it was serving the cause of the war, would you think it would be serving the cause of the war in splitting up the work of that agency into three or four different parts and parceling it out all over the lot? I do not think you would. In previous years provisions were brought into this House and I supported them setting certain limitations on the work of the Farm Security Administration and saying they could not do this and could not do that, and if they did this they would have to do it in a certain way. I have no objection to that: Indeed I think one of the great troubles has been in the past few years that all too many agencies have been set up under Executive order, never considered by a legislative committee, and we just appropriated money for the purpose, so that we are now finally confronted with a situation such as in this bill, where an all important agency in my judgment is subject to a point of order.

Our legislative committees should have passed authorizing legislation. They should have done it long since. For this sort of situation ought not to obtain. The Congress ought to decide once and for all whether they want a certain type of work done or not, and they ought to do it in a legislative bill. In my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, we have one all-important objective connected with the war, from the standpoint of agriculture, and that is maximum food production. The purpose of this farm-security program today, therefore, is not so much putting the individual farm families on the upward road, as the agency has done, but it is to increase the food production of this group of people. That has happened, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] so completely described. Indeed, you have got in America about 1,000,000 farmers at the top of the scale who receive about half of the farm income of this Nation, and at the bottom of the scale you have about 3,000,000 farmers who receive somewhere in the neighborhood of 12 to 15 percent of it. Some of those people can increase their farm production and they do not need hired help to do it. All they need is a little credit to improve their own farm practices and the production of themselves and their families. That is what this agency ought to continue to do. It seems to me that that is what anybody interested in promoting the war program of America would want to do.

If you will think through history a little, you will remember that some of the greatest men in this Nation came from the cabins of some of the very types of farms that this program is aimed to help. You will also know that by and large the sons of families like these families are today wearing the uniform of this country in just about as large numbers as any other group of American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the House to consider whether it is going to improve the morale of these men in the Army if they are to read that this agency, which came in and loaned a little money to their folks to enable them to get on their feet, start the kids back to school when they had not been going, was virtually abolished by an act of Congress. I do not believe they are going to be encouraged by reading that. I think it is a shame. I think it is too bad for this work to be ended. I think we should prevent that from happening if there is any way on earth for us to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. VOORHIS] that many Americans had come along from the log cabin on up the scale is quite true, but none of them came up by the help of Farm Security. They came up by their own efforts, as I recall history. Lincoln went from log cabin to the White House, but he never had an A. A. A. payment nor a loan from F. S. A.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] seems to find fault not only with the Republicans but with the Democrats. I have listened to him for something like 8 years, and he has never been in agreement with any of the efforts, as far as I recall, of either party. He has a party of his own. Of course, that is his privilege, and I wish him success with it—not too much success, however. I do not think there is anything to worry about in that direction.

The gentleman makes his characteristic and typical speech. He blames the Democrats and the Republicans and the country at large because some of the farmers up in his State are unable to make a living. In one of my counties there are 35,000 acres of sand land. Some of it blow sand. It is sour. Along in June or July every year we have a frost up there, and it kills whatever does happen to grow on that land. Even the leaves on the scrub oak wither and die, so you know it is a real frost. Now, who is to blame for it? How are you going to cure it? Certainly not by loans to farmers. Until the good Lord sees fit to change the seasons and to prevent frosts, no farmer who settles on that land is ever going to make a living. The only good thing I know of in the New Deal in that country is that they took that land out of cultivation and made it into a sort of forest reserve. Of course, they had to spoil their effort and waste money by building little grass border paths along the trout streams. Then cut brush in the oak grubs and make shelters out in the open for the rabbits. They did not put any signs on the shelters so that the rabbits would know which one to use for this, that, or the other purpose, but they built those shelters out in the oak openings about which J. Fenimore Cooper wrote so entertainingly. I have photographs of those rabbit shelters. Interesting, but costly, and never used by the rabbits. Whenever the New Deal does start anything good it has to waste some money before they get through.

As a whole the move was a good thing, because it took that land out of circulation. The real-estate dealers in our community used to sell that land to the folks from Chicago, like the farmer from Chicago, Mr. SABATH. They would come over there and they would do this, that, and the other on the land but never were they self-supporting. Most of those people were from the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society, for which I was attorney for many years. Naturally those people failed because the land would not grow anything. All the Government money in the world would not make that land produce. On top of that, they did not know how to farm. I recall one time when one of them came into the office and wanted to sue one of our old farmers for selling him a cow. He said the cow went dry. I said, "I will go out and see." I did not think I could tell by looking at the cow why she went dry, but I did think that by inquiring into the circumstances surrounding it I might be able to learn why that cow went dry. It was June. The pasture was knee high. Where do you suppose they had the cow? They had her tied in a fence corner, feeding her dry hay, and every time one of the children—they had a large family—and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], whom I see before me, will take notice of this custom now, because it might help him to improve his dairy herd—every time one of those children wanted a drink of milk they would take a tin cup and go out and milk into the cup and give the child what he wanted to drink. Naturally the old cow soon went dry. They did not know how to take care of her.

Now, all the money in the world will not make successful farmers out of some of these farmers that the gentleman from North Dakota speaks about. Not because they are not good people—good farmers perhaps—but because the land is not the kind of land out of which farms can be made. It just cannot be done, I gather. For over 8 years to my knowledge the gentleman from that State has been coming down here and telling us about the misfortunes that happen up there, the unfortunate condition of his people. My conclusion is that his home folks are all right but either climate or soil is such that it is not a good farming locality.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will; yes.

Mr. CASE. Certainly the gentleman after observing the circumstances under which he discovered this cow going dry was able to give his client in that instance advice that would help to retrieve the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At that time I did not know the gentleman from South Dakota, and of course I had no source of information except nature and having been brought up on a farm, and I only suggested that they give the cow a little grass and quit milking her every 15 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I am sure the gentleman was able to give them good advice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order. He has not sought recognition from the Chair.

Mr. CASE. I asked the gentleman if he would yield to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman if he seeks recognition from the Chair.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] agrees that the parliamentary amenities have been served.

Mr. CASE. Then, with the permission of the gentleman, I merely wish to say again for the RECORD that I am quite sure the gentleman from Michigan could give advice to correct the situation he discovered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I did not claim any universal knowledge. I had not been to Washington in those days, I had not learned all those things I have learned since coming down here. I did not then know just passing through the city gives one such wisdom; I did not know about that.

The point is, if we are going to have economy we shall have to cut at some place. We have been told time and time again that this war effort was going to take all of our money, yet every time one of these issues comes up, every single time, there is some pressure group around that wants us to appropriate for some particular thing. Some time ago I received a very nice letter from a group of bankers. They lauded me. I did not believe all the compliments on the first page, but they said some very nice things about my having voted for economy. Then I turned to the next page and there it was—but—they wanted an appropriation. That money, you remember, was for the banks to lend to the folks who wanted to build, and they, the bankers, wanted the money appropriated. And I had the same sort of commendatory letters from a group of educators. They thought it was fine, this economy idea, yet when their appropriation came along they went so far as to send some school teachers and professors down here to tell me that that was an exception. And so it is with this. So it is every time we try to limit appropriations. Always a pressure group with a flock of reasons as to why in their particular instance it should not be done.

I realize that this is not a political issue at all. I have one of those letters that came from the city of Milwaukee, the farm organization, or whatever it was. The letter reads:

Milwaukee County Court House, sixth floor, United States Department of Agriculture.

I notice that in it is given a table setting forth the percentage of increase in production, showing that those who had obtained farm security had increased their production by a greater percent than those who had not secured loans. I can understand that. If I only had one cow, one pig, one mule, and 2 acres of corn, I can see how my percentage of production would jump if they would lend me three, four, or five thousand dollars to buy more land, more equipment, and more stock—could not you? Those who secured the loans started from scratch or close to it. Perhaps they did not produce anything prior to getting the loan. Maybe that accounts for that percentage. I would not doubt but what it does.

Do you remember Christmas? We used to have Christmas; I hope we always will—a time to give things to the loved ones, friends, and members of our families. Did you ever know of having

to go around or send out an agent to find someone who would accept a Christmas present? Did you ever hear of that? Anyone I ever offered anything to always took it, and I cannot recall that anybody ever solicited me to accept a gift or went around to inquire if someone would accept a gift. Yet we have the triple A and the Farm Security Administration—I would not call it Christmas gifts exactly, because the farmers do something to get it—doing that very thing, soliciting farmers to accept payments of money. They have been doing it for years, that very thing. You know a little while ago when we had this campaign on to release more wheat, this campaign for incentive payments, this campaign to keep the triple A in existence; do you recall how from your districts you received letters and postal cards, and wires, and some personal visits paid for in all too many instances by the very dollars that we appropriated to be paid to farmers? And yet those committeemen, 123 of them in my own little county, 123 of them on the pay roll, found it necessary to go out campaigning for the A. A. A., using the money that was appropriated for the farmer in political activity. And now here comes this letter from Milwaukee. This is a sweet little bit of propaganda; it is very cleverly written and undoubtedly it is paid for by money which Congress appropriated for the benefit of the farmer, and yet farmer politicans—and if you think the farmers are not politicians remember that they learned right at the source, the grass roots—and yet the people who are supposed to represent the farmers take that money. I do not know whether they represent the farmers or not and use it to keep themselves on the pay roll of the Triple A or on the Farm Security organization. Take that money and electioneer for what? Incidentally, for more payments to the farmers, but primarily for funds which will continue them in office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is disturbing that an organization which is distributing money to farmers finds it necessary to send out paid agents to induce the beneficiaries of those payments to accept them. Is it not time to discontinue that practice? If we have something to give away, if it is worth giving away we do not have to hire someone to accept it. Permit me now to add a few observations about another way money is being used to influence legislation.

PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Powerful political groups have long practiced extortion. Millions of dollars so obtained have been used to influence elections, thwart the will of the people.

Extortion and the use of a portion of the money so obtained to corrupt the electorate, prevent the people from registering their will in the election booth and to control legislation through fear and intimidation have been practiced by big money, by corrupt political leaders and, of late, by convicted criminals who have sought protection and opportunity to ply their trade within the ranks of organized labor.

In 1934, the Congress passed a so-called antiracketeering statute, which was designed to protect the honest citizen engaged in legitimate business. Because one subdivision of that act contained a clause that nothing therein should apply to "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee," and also contained another section—United States Code, title 18, section 420 (d)—to the effect that the courts, in construing the act should not apply or construe any of its provisions so "as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States," the United States Supreme Court, on March 2, 1942, held that extortion practiced by members of a labor union was not illegal.

On the 6th day of March 1942, 4 days after that decision was handed down, a bill was introduced by me to amend those two sections so as to bring within the provisions of the antiracketeering law those racketeers, criminals, ex-convicts, and would-be labor politicians who, seeking refuge behind the label of union labor, were practicing and profiting by extortion.

Although the evil sought to be remedied was acknowledged by practically all, although the remedy was plain, the House Committee on the Judiciary failed to act and it was not until more than a year later that the Hobbs bill was brought before the House and passed.

The Hobbs bill, if it does not meet the fate of the Smith bill, which on two occasions was passed by the House by a vote of more than 2 to 1 but was buried in the other body, will cure the evil at which it was aimed.

It may, however—although I hope not—give the courts an excuse to declare that Congress has approved of other illegal acts which are in a measure protected by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Antitrust Act, and the N. L. R. A., as construed by the courts.

While the Hobbs bill may end the particular form of extortion at which it was aimed, it does not prevent the collection of millions—yes, millions—of dollars by those who are in charge of union activities.

From the hearings held by the Truman committee, it appears that in union dues of $1 a month the two major labor organizations collect something like $132,000,000 a year.

It also appears that, in connection with the construction of buildings at Camp Blanding, one union, in a period of 5 months, collected something like $900,000 in initiation fees. That was but a drop in the bucket.

It is undisputed that millions upon millions of dollars are collected by the international and local union organizations. Those unions are not required by law to make public statements of their collections and disbursements, as are corporations, as is big business.

To remedy that evil a bill has been introduced by me and it is to be hoped that Congress will adopt it.

It has long been the practice of some of these labor organizations to demand and to collect from men seeking to earn a livelihood at the trades in which they are proficient, tribute for the privilege of exercising the God-given, the constitutional, right to work. That practice is not sanctioned by our Constitution. It is a direct violation of the principle that taxation without representation is unjust. It is the method of the tyrant, of the dictator. It is in contravention of the declaration that we shall have freedom from want and freedom from fear—for, speaking generally, it is to secure freedom from want that men work.

Again, it is because fear is imposed that men pay the tribute demanded. They are forced to pay because of violence or threats of violence. Time and time again legislation is jammed through State legislatures and through Congress because of the fear of what labor organizations will do at the next coming election. Members of Congress recall the time when 300 C. I. O. lobbyists descended upon Washington and demanded that Congress act in accordance with their wishes.

Local police authorities, county prosecutors, sheriffs—yes, and in some instances, it may be said, judges—stand in fear of the political power of labor organizations. They stand in fear of the power of labor organizations into which racketeers, ex-convicts, and criminals have muscled their way.

No one can read the daily papers without acknowledging that, throughout this land of ours, gangs of criminals have time and time again taken over the funds and the organization of legitimate labor unions.

The Chicago Tribune recently carried a series of articles exposing a large number of criminals who in that city had collected millions of dollars and who held under their thumbs the employees as well as the businessmen engaged in carrying on many legitimate business activities.

Westbrook Pegler, who for the moment seems to be out of the papers, has time and again given us the facts which show that criminals are engaged openly in preying upon honest employees, honest businessmen.

Do not think for one moment that racketeering is not being carried on at the present time under the protection of labor organizations. Within the month, ex-convicts from Detroit, traveling in Buick automobiles, with gas-rationing books calling for gas sufficient to permit them to travel 3,000 miles a month—36,000 miles a year—were driving back and forth between Detroit and Port Huron, their purpose to so intimidate and frighten drivers of milk trucks that they would pay these ex-convicts for the privilege of earning a livelihood. Those racketeers were hiding behind A. F. of L. badges.

Earlier this week, from Detroit came a letter from a union teamster, who complained because, as he wrote, A. F. of L. teamsters were driving their "big Buick 8's full of their goons, following Coca-Cola trucks," in an effort to force C. I. O. men, who belonged to the brewery workers union, into the A. F. of L. These men already belonged to the C. I. O., but the A. F. of L., by force, would compel them to forsake the union of their choice and join the A. F. of L.

This C. I. O. man further writes:

They—

A. F. of L. goons—

seem to think the laws are not made for them.

These extortionists and other extortionists in the city of Detroit have protection because, and only because, public officials fear the political power of these organizations, which are allowed to contribute millions to campaign funds, and one of which did contribute approximately a half million dollars to the President's campaign fund in 1936.

Tom Dewey, of New York, gained fame and place and the respect and approval of millions of Americans by throwing into prison in New York a few of the more prominent of these extortionists and robbers.

These men gain power and they exercise power because, and only because, Congress and the executive branch of the Government have failed to enact and enforce laws which would render them harmless.

We know that, without money, vast sums of it, and without the terror which they inspire because of the goon squads they are enabled to hire, these men who prey upon American industry would be powerless.

For long there have been upon the statute books of the Nation laws which prohibited contributions to political campaigns by corporations. A similar statute should apply to each and every organization and group which seeks to control political activities by the use of vast sums of money.

Only last summer, the A. F. of L. teamsters union, meeting at its national convention, boasted that it had $4,000,000 in cash in its treasury and that it owned $5,000,000 worth of War bonds, and its executive committee authorized one of its officers to use such portion of its cash as might be necessary to defeat certain candidates, to elect certain others.

We have the Hatch Act, which prevents political activities by Federal employees. If a regard for the purity of our elections, for the protection of the system which gives the people the opportunity to rule, will not influence Congress to act, then self-preservation should induce us to enact legislation which will end this evil.

Just as sure as day follows night, unless Congress clips the claws of ambitious labor politicians, of the ex-convicts who control vast sums collected from workers, Congress will itself become the tool of those racketeers.

If any Member of Congress thinks for one moment that he will have a chance of reelection if he lets this practice continue, then he does not know or does not realize the power of these organizations. It has been demonstrated time and time again that those who have at their command millions of dollars and who exert their power by threatening what will happen at the next election can never be satisfied with the action of any of their puppets.

Sooner or later some issue will arise when a vote will be cast which is displeasing to those who at the moment control the funds of the organization which is in a position to exert its influence at the polls. Then the Member of Congress who has been a yes man, who has followed the wish of that particular labor organization, will, without a moment's hesitation, be cast aside and some official of that organization elected in his place.

To end the acknowledged evil, I have offered an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act—H. R. 2033—which will add to the list of those named in that statute as ineligible for the making of political contributions, labor organizations and groups. This amendment, in a simple, direct way, will reach the existing evil.

Thinking that it might be too simple, too direct, to suit the lawyers in Congress, I have also offered a separate bill—H. R. 2463—which has for its objective the same purpose, and also adds to the list of those ineligible to make political contributions, trade associations and chambers of commerce.

It is my hope that before another election rolls around this Congress, to protect the purity of our elections, to save itself from being required to meet political corruptionists having at their command millions of dollars, will put this law upon the books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I full well appreciate the argument that has been made here that a great deal of this bill, the most objectionable parts at least, is going out on a point of order, therefore there is no need discussing those particular parts of the bill. Yet I think it is very important that we do discuss those parts of the bill in order that the sentiment of this House may be made known so that when this bill goes to the other end of the Capitol that body may restore some of the things that this committee has in effect stricken out by the parliamentary situation into which it has maneuvered this bill.

I want to join with the others in commending the Rules Committee for not granting the rule that was asked by the Appropriations Committee whereby points of order would have been waived against certain sections of this bill. Frequently I have heard complaints made on the floor of this House against the action of the Appropriations Committee in usurping the powers and prerogatives of legislative committees. May I say that this bill today goes further in that respect, I believe, than any bill I have ever seen presented on the floor of the House and I think it is high time that the House inform the Appropriations Committee that its function is to appropriate money and to allot money to the various agencies that have been set up by legislative enactment and not to legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman then would not like to see a bill brought in making available money for rural electrification, for instance? That is one of the items that goes out on a point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would want to see money made available for the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. TARVER. How would you get that done under the statement the gentleman just made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Permit me to finish, please. I join in the statement made by the gentleman from California that it is not proper procedure for this Congress to be appropriating money from time to time for these various agencies that have not been created by statute, that we ought to have a statutory enactment to authorize those various agencies and the appropriations for them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. On that point, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, may I say that we are all conscious of the fact that that committee has been ignored and has been given the runaround by a shorter route over to the Appropriations Committee than coming to the Committee on Agriculture and asking us to pass an authorization bill which would be a foundation for the Appropriations Committee to act upon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The latter method is the way it ought to be handled and that is the only way in which it ought to be handled.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think it is about time that the practice of that fine committee be broken up and that those gentlemen do as the gentleman from Alabama has suggested, appropriate money upon authorizations made by other standing committees of this House.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will let me have additional time.

Mr. TARVER. I will yield the gentleman further time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. It is surprising to my mind to hear the gentleman from Missouri state that his committee should be asked by somebody to bring in legislation to authorize appropriations and loans

of types which have always been carried in this bill. Gentlemen of the Agriculture Committee have sat by here year after year while we have been providing for these appropriations and loans in agricultural appropriation bills and the individual members of that committee have been voting for these items in the agricultural appropriation bill every year. Yet he says now we ought not to have a rule under which points of order against these appropriations may be waived as in previous years because somebody ought to come to his committee and ask them to pass legislation under which these funds can be made available. That proposal to my mind is as illogical as some of the other proposals which were advanced by the Committee on Agriculture to the Committee on Rules this morning. There are, of course, appropriations and authorizations in this bill for various important purposes, including the farm tenant land-purchase program which the gentlemen in prior years have supported and which will go out on points of order today simply because of the injured dignity of the Committee on Agriculture. When the bill goes to the Senate all of those items will be restored, it will come back here, and it will be considered not in Committee of the Whole but under limited debate in the House and the Members of the House will not have the opportunity to express themselves that they would have today if this rule had been granted. So the Committee on Agriculture to my mind has worked against the purposes which I really believe it had in mind.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I was interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that these items would be reinserted in the Senate. It seems to me that gentlemen in the House vitally interested in some of these agricultural items might stop and think for a moment about that. I am thinking of an instance in this present Congress in which an item in the deficiency bill or in the independent offices bill for the National Resources Planning Board was left out by the committee and left out by the House because it had not been authorized by law. It would have been subject to a point of order in the House. Some gentlemen interested in it said that would make no difference because the Senate would put it back. But the Senate did not put it back, it is not in now. The rural electrification program and many of these other things have always been carried in appropriation bills and up to the present time no question was raised for their authority. If the committee had come in without putting those items in the bill, I am sure those same gentlemen would have criticized the Committee on Appropriations and said we were standing on technicalities. This is really a technical position that is being taken. Some of these items ought to be stricken on points of order, but others have been carried for so long that they are almost a matter of law by custom.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman, as a matter of fact, has made a very correct statement and that is the thing we are complaining about. These departments will come up and ask for an appropriation without any authorization. They have been receiving lots of them all of these years. In connection with some of these appropriations which have been referred to, for instance those covering boll weevils and other things, the department realizes that if it came to our committee we would put a curb on some of the waste of money down there. As a matter of fact, in connection with the R. E. A., the Department of Agriculture's right to legislate has never been taken away from the Interstate Commerce Committee and given to our committee which we would like to have.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman take the position that officials of the departments must come to his committee and ask for legislation before you can legislate? Why do you not legislate without waiting for them to come?

Mr. FULMER. The reason they do not do it is because they can come to the gentleman and get any amount for their purposes.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is not barred from legislating just because somebody does not ask him to?

Mr. FULMER. And we do not propose to legislate on some of them because they ought not to be carried out.

Mr. TARVER. Then you do not want any of these things such as the rural electrification authorization?

Mr. FULMER. That is a different question. I am for a great many of those things.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman for many years has neglected to bring in legislation authorizing them.

Mr. FULMER. None whatever. I do not believe there is a Member on the floor of this House who believes that my committee has neglected any duty.

Mr. TARVER. You have not brought in any legislation authorizing them, however.

Mr. FULMER. There are going to be many more that we will not bring in and that should not be brought in; but they can come to the gentleman's committee and get an appropriation of sometimes millions of dollars—that ought to be objected to.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will not stand on the floor and oppose the R. E. A., but he says his committee has not authorized it and is not going to authorize it, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. FULMER. No.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has had years in which to authorize these loans if he had seen proper to do it.

Mr. FULMER. I did not make that statement.

Mr. TARVER. That is the substance of what the gentleman meant.

Mr. FULMER. I disagree with the gentleman. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Agriculture does not have any right to legislate for the R. E. A. That is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But they have never gone to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and asked for any legislation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, what he has done in 3 months under the resolution to investigate Farm Security that was adopted by the House?

Mr. FULMER. Over 12 months ago my committee went before the Committee on Rules with a resolution requesting the privilege of investigating the Farm Security Administration. We got that resolution reported and passed by this House just 2 or 3 weeks ago. Does the gentleman believe my committee can investigate that Administration from every angle in 2 or 3 weeks? We expect to do it, and you ought to wait until we do do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina how much time he thinks we can stand. We have had that in the hearings from January. We usually finish the consideration of this agricultural appropriation in the House in March. The bill must be passed by the 1st of July. The Senate has to have its hearings on the bill, and it must pass the Senate and come back here for further consideration. The Lord knows we are behind time now, yet the gentleman has brought in no report on the Farm Security Administration in 3 months.

Mr. FULMER. Does the gentleman believe we could bring in a report in 3 months?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman expect to have it effective this year or next year?

Mr. FULMER. We are going to have it effective when we get definite information, and weed out the bad, and maintain the good. The gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations have no business going into that item until we bring in our report.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is too late for this fiscal year.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. This unfortunate practice of writing legislation on appropriation bills, continued over a period of years, has brought us to this day when we may see some important and useful agencies dropped out because of the fact that we have not provided the legislation for them that we should have provided in past years. We may lose some of the useful agencies on that account.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is certainly correct.

Then there is this additional feature that I think perhaps this argument has overlooked, that by this bill the Committee on Appropriations has gone far beyond anything it has ever attempted before or that anybody has ever argued it had a right to do; that is, without any recommendation from any legislative committee or from the Department of Agriculture or the Budget Bureau or anybody else having anything to do with the Government, they have sought to disband governmental agencies and to transfer functions from one agency to another, and to do away with agencies that have been set up by legislative enactment of this House. I think that that is far worse than the other practice we have allowed to grow up, but it shows the trend. If we allow this thing to go on, either the Committee on Appropriations becomes the legislative body and the legislative committees fade into insignificance or else that happens which I predict will happen, that this House will disband the Committee on Appropriations or else greatly restrict its powers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I am surprised that the gentleman has forgotten in 1 short year that the House and the Congress disbanded the Civilian Conservation Corps in exactly the way the gentleman says he has never heard of—that is, by denying funds for its continuance. That is the only way in which the Committee on Appropriations under the rules can act for the elimination of a Government agency. That sort of a provision is not subject to a point of order and is not involved in the discussion of whether or not a rule ought to be granted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, but there is this difference: I submit that you have the power to come in here and deny funds to any agency you want to, but when you do that you present an issue to be decided on the floor of this House. When you break up an organization, or say by direct wording that no further contracts, for instance, shall be made under the Crop Insurance Act, or say that certain functions of this particular agency shall be performed by some other agency, and then get a rule waiving points of order, there is nothing left for us to do.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that no point of order could be urged against such a provision, but the matter is still within the jurisdiction of the House. It can strike out all or any part of the language in this bill that it may desire to strike out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that, and the House is going to take some such action as that, too, as the gentleman has already seen. Let me get on with my statement, if I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have always tried to follow the record in reaching a decision on any case. I have read these hearings as best I could since noon yesterday when they were first made available to us, and I submit that is another bad practice of the Committee on Appropriations—the withholding of printed hearings and the bill and the report until 24 hours before a bill comes in, and sometimes until the very time the bill is up for consideration. But I have read as best I can these hearings, and I have tried to find out what was in there upon which this committee based its action, for instance, in doing away with the Farm Security Administration. The only persons I can find who opposed the Farm Security Administration, with the exception of two or three who came along with these gentlemen, were Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a constituent and a friend of mine, and Mr. Oscar Johnston, the manager, I believe, of the biggest cotton plantation in this country, or one of the biggest, comprising thousands of acres, owned by a foreign syndicate. I have a very high regard for both of these gentlemen. Mr. Johnston has done some very fine work with the Cotton Council, and Mr. O'Neal has done some fine work with the American Farm Bureau Federation. But down in my own district, I have farm neighbors of Mr. O'Neal who say that while they have high regard for him, he is wrong, and that he does not know what is taking place down there.

Mr. O'Neal, I dare say, has not been out on some of those upland thin-soiled farms in 20 years, and if he ever goes down there—he stays in Chicago and down here in Washington most of the time—if he ever goes down there to that portion of Alabama, and goes into the country, he usually goes into that rich river-bottom section and he sees the big acres there. My district has a great many of that type of farms, also my own county, but I like to go out into the barrens, or, as they call them down there, the barns, and I like to get out there and see some of those little 40- and 60- and 80-acre farms, where those people are struggling with soil almost too thin to grow anything with which to make a living, but they are making it by the hardest way, and they are doing it because there is a Government agency that is able to come in and lend them some money to rehabilitate themselves, and buy the seed with each year, and to buy a pair of mules and a plow, and a cow and some chickens and things of that kind. I dare say if Mr. O'Neal went out and looked at that type of farm, he would have a different outlook on this program. What does Mr. Johnston know about that? His time is taken up there with this immense plantation of thousands of acres, and with tenants and day laborers working on those farms. He does not come into daily contact with individual farm families that are trying to make a living. I do, down in my district, and I make this challenge, that if any Member of this House will go into his own district and visit those farms, those farms that have been purchased under the farm tenant purchase program, that are being enabled to run under the rural rehabilitation program of the Farm Security Administration, then there is not a Member of this House, if he does that conscientiously and without prejudice and bias, who will come in here and say that the Farm Security Administration ought to be done away with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman think it would be a mistake to cut out of the bill the Farm Security Administration? The gentleman said awhile ago I think that we ought not to carry any appropriations in the bill not authorized by law, and that the Appropriations Committee was usurping functions not intended for it by making such provision. How can the gentleman reconcile those two positions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand, and the point I make is that it ought to be legislatively authorized, but we have not done it in the past, and if we have allowed this custom to grow up, we are subject to condemnation, but nevertheless the committee not only brought this action, and not only cut out the functions and the funds of the Farm Security Administration, but it has left us no means of putting them back into the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. The committee has left in the bill, and while I agree with the gentleman about the transfer of this activity—$40,000,000 is transferred for those purposes, and $12,000,000 for administrative purposes. So that the gentleman is not correct in saying that the committee has left no funds for these activities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the gentleman's committee has destroyed the Farm Security Administration. It is liquidating the Farm Security Administration, and while it has made those funds available for these purposes, it has transferred them over to another agency of government without any recommendation from the Department of Agriculture or anybody else. It has done something that ought to be done only upon the recommendation from the Department or from legislation for a governmental reorganization, and nothing short of that.

The opponents of F. S. A. have brought in a number of individual cases. I can take any Government agency you want to mention and I can pick out bad cases, mistakes that that agency has made. I do not uphold the Farm Security Administration in any mistakes it has made. I have criticized it freely. I thought it made a mistake in its farm labor program. But it did not invite that program. The Government asked it to perform that duty. The agreement with the Government of Mexico laid down the

specifications upon which that labor could be imported. I was glad to see that job taken away from F. S. A. I am glad to see any and all of these mistakes corrected. I believe if this investigating committee is allowed to continue its work we shall see those mistakes corrected, and we shall see the Farm Security Administration continuing to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the highly controversial items in the pending measure, I want to pay a sincere tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. If you will examine these 1,800 pages of hearings, you will probably find less irrelevant matter, less inconsequential material than in any hearing with which I have been identified. That is a testimony to the gentleman from Georgia who has kept the witnesses in the groove. If you want to see some expert inquisitorial work, just devote yourself to the hearings for a little while, because you will see that the witnesses never escaped answering the question. So I say here and now that the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, had done a monumental and fine piece of work in conducting these hearings.

While we have not always seen eye to eye, I do want to say that the amount of energy he has devoted to this bill for 60 days is certainly worthy of public commendation. I hope all the world may hear and particularly the people in Georgia, when I say that he is a great public servant. We differ, of course. We have differed on a number of items, but that does not diminish the fact that he has done an outstanding piece of work.

Then I should pay a tribute to the committee clerk, Mr. Arthur Orr. It has often been said that the clerk ought to beget the confidence of the members. I think I would reverse that and say that I shall be happy if I beget the confidence of Arthur Orr, the clerk of this committee. He has been in this service for 21 years or more. You can search far and wide for someone who is more familiar with the abstruseness, the techniques, the obscurities with which we are constantly dealing. Painstakingly and with great labor, with great diligence has he devoted himself to the job in season and out, and I feel a sense of deep personal gratitude for his friendship, his counsel, and his assistance.

I want to say as much for the other members of the committee. You know, it is no easy task to sit in a committee from 10 o'clock until half past 12 or 1, get a hasty lunch, and get back at 2 o'clock and remain there until 5 or 5:30, digging around, and then drag a ton of literature to your hotel room at night, trying to keep up on a job of this kind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman would speak for himself. I know we would like to speak for his diligence and his efficiency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I humbly thank the lady from Massachusetts. But it is a real job preparing one of these bills. I think we should invite your charity when we come in.

May I make one allusion to this question of points of order that may be raised? I do not know how you are going to write an appropriation bill that does not have some legislative provisos in it. If I went to the trouble to take this bill and start with page 1 and strike out every provision that technically, at least, seems in violation of the rule which interdicts the insertion of legislation in an appropriation bill, I probably could reduce it to 30 pages the first time over. Then if you devote yourself more assiduously to the job there would probably be less than half the original bill remaining. Frankly, I do not know how you are going to do the job, when you deal with anything like the Department of Agriculture, with innumerable bureaus and agencies, countless functions, dealing with the production and distribution of food. It is enough to baffle anybody. I expect if I remained at this type of labor for a quarter of a century I will only have scratched the surface of the problems which one constantly encounters in this task.

A few years ago when HENRY WALLACE was Secretary of Agriculture, he was sitting on the edge of the committee table and in the course of a casual discussion I said, "Mr. Secretary, do you manage to fathom all the things in the Department?" He said, "Well, Congressman, I just think around the periphery, that is about all." He said, "I learned long ago that it is just impossible for me to know more than a small portion of the things that are under my jurisdiction as Secretary of Agriculture."

So we labor with the supply bill for the Department with high hope, with diligence, with faith, and so we come and perhaps ask a bit of charity as you regard our labors.

But I want to be realistic and want to deal with a few of these controversies. The first matter I want to deal with is crop insurance, because that question was raised today. I remember when the Congress authorized insurance of wheat, I stood in this well and battled as vigorously and as diligently as I knew how to stop it. I have not relented in the effort. I have been doing it every year, trying to stop this colossal, disastrous venture in the whole field of crop insurance, but I have been unsuccessful. The committee, however, has finally decided that crop insurance must go if it is the will of the House and if the House approves. There is reason for it. I want to sketch the reason, but before doing so, let me give you a little background. First, crop insurance was authorized by title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It applied in the first instance only to wheat. In June of 1941 the act was amended to include cotton. In substance it assures a yield of 50 or 75 percent, the difference being, of course, a higher premium.

The Crop Insurance Corporation had a capital of $100,000,000. They have completed 4 full years of wheat insurance, and what is the score? Here it is; you will find it in the hearings. In 4 years they collected premiums either in cash or in bushels of wheat to the equivalent of $28,000,000 plus. Fix that in mind; those are the premiums they received from the farmers. They paid out in indemnities $45,000,000 plus; so the excess of indemnities over premiums is $17,000,000. This is item No. 1. Do not forget, however, that the Crop Insurance Corporation does not operate like a private insurance enterprise. In the case of a private enterprise the cost of doing business is reflected in the premium. In the case of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation the administrative money comes out of the Federal Treasury.

How much have we spent on wheat to administer this program in 4 years? Here are the figures: $23,245,688. We paid out $17,000,000 more than we took in; then add the administrative expenses in 4 years and you will observe that we have lost out of the capital structure, meaning out of the Treasury, $41,000,000 plus.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. CASE. Was there any actuarial basis on which the premiums were determined?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They have been assuring us that they have been hiring good actuarial talent in setting up the bases, not only for wheat but for cotton as well.

Mr. CASE. Then how does the gentleman explain the great discrepancy between the premium collected and the benefits paid out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point lies in the fact they feel they have got to insure a hazard even if they know they are going to lose money. I think either myself or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] asked Mr. Smith, the President of this Corporation:

> Suppose you know that in a given area there is either a lack of moisture or some other condition, and you know at a glance that you are going to lose money; do you insure in that area?

The answer was:

> Yes.

We have insured cotton for 1 year. The premiums were six millons plus measured in dollars; the indemnities were $7,474,000. The losses, including those yet to be paid and estimated to be paid, will be approximately $1,335,000 for the first year of cotton insurance.

What shall we do? The National Farmers Union in the program submitted to the committee said: "You should include insurance on flax and on corn." The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who is a member of the subcommittee, said that if we continue to insure these other products they will probably want California fruit insured. Shall we go on and on in this venture

until finally we lose $25,000,000, $30,000,000, $40,000,000 a year? Or shall we take account of realities now and say we will protect the contracts we have out and then stop? I think that is in the interest of a safe and sound agriculture.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe that any farmer in the United States who has a full appreciation of what the true situation is, and that millions must come out of the Federal Treasury year after year because of administrative expenses and the excess of indemnities over premiums, would want us to proceed in that manner.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was interested in the figures the gentleman gave with reference to cotton, to the effect that $1,300,000 has thus far been lost. Does the gentleman have any idea what percentage of the cotton farmers actually took this cotton insurance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; from 10 to 11 percent.

Mr. BECKWORTH. May I ask a further question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it the gentleman's opinion that those were the smaller farmers or the larger crop farmers? Which?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my friend that I have not made a break-down as to the class of farmers who received the benefits.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I know the gentleman has been very careful to count the cost of this insurance to the Federal Government. I am just wondering whether or not the members of the committee made inquiries to find out what amount it had cost the Government in the last 4 or 5 years, or 10 years, in paying for losses on crops in case of excessive rain, excessive drought, and excessive losses of crops due to circumstances over which the farmers have no control?

For instance, a few years ago for about 3 years in succession we made appropriations for the benefit of farmers who lost their crops on account of wind in what we know as the Dust Bowl. I am wondering whether or not if this law is repealed and we go back to the old status, the Government itself would not be called upon over a period of years to expend a larger sum of money to assist farmers who have heavy losses on account of circumstances over which they have no control, than to continue the policy of crop insurance and attempting to develop a greater participation in the insurance program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer to the question raised by my friend is very simple indeed. Why beat all around the bush to achieve that result? Why have hundreds of people on the pay roll? Why have hundreds of actuaries and field men and spend millions of dollars in administrative costs? Why not go right straight to the heart of the problem and take care of them without all this expense and lost motion?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the figures the gentleman has given the House mean that in 3 years' more time the entire capital structure of the farm-insurance program will have been dissipated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just about.

Mr. DONDERO. Why does not the Government charge premiums enough to pay the running expenses of the program?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we charged premiums enough, we could not get sufficient farmers to come in; then you are carrying a huge burden of administrative expense with a disproportionate return.

Mr. DONDERO. Private industry must operate exactly on that basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true, but private industry does it on an efficiency basis, while the Government does not operate quite that way.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Illinois will remember that when this crop-insurance matter was before the Congress in the first instance, it came in as an endeavor to place on a sound economic basis a method whereby farmers might pay for insurance which would guarantee them against these hazards.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly; that is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Wheat was used as the guinea pig because the experts in the Department indicated it was the most susceptible to sound insurance philosophy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and to measurement.

Mr. MICHENER. And to measurement. A little later cotton was added because they thought that that might work. The point I am getting at is this: Has the experiment or the pioneering in the endeavor to accomplish a sound economic objective gone far enough so that we can reach a wise determination? For instance, in a manufacturing project it is usually contemplated that there will be 2 or 3 years running at a loss in the pioneering stage. I agree with the gentleman this should be eliminated if it is definitely economically unsound.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have had 4 full years of experience.

Mr. MICHENER. This should be eliminated provided there has been a thorough demonstration of the fact that crop insurance operated by the Government cannot operate successfully. If it can win it is much better than incentive payments, bonuses, and subsidies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My answer to that is that of course I as an individual sitting on the subcommittee have become fully satisfied that it is a failure, that it will return a loss to the Federal Treasury, that in a period of about 2 or 3 years more we will have impaired to the last dollar the capital structure of the insurance corporation. That is enough to satisfy me.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Has money been lost on the wheat program each year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Each year. There has been no exception.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman two questions, first in reference to page 15 of the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is this related to something I have not discussed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, no. On page 15, the committee report shows 146,621 persons employed in various capacities. Does that include this insurance personnel?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of the work is done by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, but I shall discuss that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My second question is this: Going back to the matter of actuaries. If you have the best actuaries that money can buy or that there is in the country, and the underwriting department passes on poor risks, does that not destroy your insurance capital structure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get to the milk in the coconut, as they say, namely, the Farm Security Administration. First, it is rather regrettable that all the testimony and all the evidence available to the subcommittee does not appear in the hearings. I say that advisedly, and I refer, of course, to the fact that the information that was brought forth by the committee investigators is confidential until filed with the committee and does not appear in the record of the hearings. Moreover, it was not available until the final days of consideration of this measure.

Let us get this whole thing straight. There have been so many misinterpretations as to what is really being done by this bill.

The Farm Security Administration primarily performs three major functions. First, rural rehabilitation loans and the servicing of those loans. Those are loans up to $2,500, serviced by 2,700 home demonstrators or supervisors and an equivalent number of managers, so-called farm managers and others. They have a force of nearly 16,000 altogether. Their first function is rehabilitation loans for people who are trying to get along, together with these service charges. Included also in this work is the farm debt adjustment services.

The second function is farm-tenant purchases under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and the third is water facilities and migrant camps, and so forth.

Let us see what the Budget said about them. It struck from the bill these migrant camps. You will remember the controversy we had on the floor last year

about that. That is out. The Budget did not include any money for it.

There was some money for water facilities and there were $97,500,000 for rehabilitation loans to be obtained under authority of this act from the R. F. C. To make those loans and to service these loans there was an item of $36,000,000. The latter is mostly salaries, travel, and for expenditure. That is where the $36,000,000 goes.

Did we destroy those functions? No, we did not. We did not destroy them. The functions are still in the bill. You will find them on page 87. We still make rural rehabilitation loans, although we cut the amount from $96,500,000 down to $40,000,000. They can still hire people to travel and show folks how to cook and how to till the soil and milk the cows, but we cut the services amount from $36,000,000 to $12,000,000 and then we earmarked $8,000,000 of the $12,000,000 and said that that is to go to the Extension Service because it has 10,200 people in the field already. It has been doing a great job also. There is a county home demonstrator and an extension agent in every agricultural county in the United States. Let me therefore emphasize that this activity has been preserved and will be carried out in the main by the Extension Service.

Let me show you what they did last year, and this is from their report. I refer now to the Extension Service. They reached 71 percent of the farm families of the United States. They made 23,000,000 contacts in a single year. They made 3,250,000 personal calls on farmers. Do we have to have an extension agent knock on the door one day, then have a Farm Security Administrator knock on the door the next day? Or are we going to take a sound, realistic view of this matter and say, "Here are two agencies operating on parallel tracks, one more paternalistic than the other, no doubt, but there is no excuse from the standpoint of efficiency and economy for that sort of situation to exist." So we say, all right, we will preserve the function of making the loans, but we transfer it to the Farm Credit Administration because they are already in the business of extending credit for all purposes, and let the Extension Service handle the home and farm management functions because they are already equipped with offices in 2,900 counties and have a total force in excess of 10,000 men and women to undertake this work. Must we have several agencies with a duplication of organizational set-up doing a similar kind of work? Why not be realistic about this matter by preserving the function of making and servicing loans and rendering home and farm assistance, but doing it through an existing agency which has had decades of experience in this field?

As for the cost of doing business, an examination of the figures of the Farm Credit Administration in handling emergency crop, seed, and feed loans, compared with the cost of administration by the Farm Security Administration will indicate at once which of these agencies has the soundest operation. Travel, personnel, supplies, and other expenses of F. S. A. in making loans aggregating $576,000,000 was about $275,000,000. That means $1 of expenditure for each $2 loaned and serviced. Farm Credit Administration, on the other hand, is carrying about 1,164 loans per supervisor, and the expense has been about $2.39 for the entire amount of each unpaid loan.

Consider the credit functions of the Farm Credit Administration. They have Federal land banks, they have commissioner loans, they have intermediate credit banks, they have banks for cooperatives, they have production credit corporations in every Federal Reserve district, they have 530 production credit associations, with 240,000 farmer stockholders. They have 4,750 people on the pay roll of the P. C. A.'s, exclusive of the Extension Service and exclusive of the Farm Security Administration.

Where is this duplication going to stop if Congress does not stop it? Where is it going to stop if the Committee on Appropriations does not stop it? The legislative Committee on Agriculture has not stopped it. We have the testimony before us. Should we then blink the fact and not think of it realistically and say, "Here is an operation in a credit field, so in consequence let us put them together, consolidate these credit functions, and obtain greater efficiency, greater coordination, and substantial savings. Let us not destroy the function." And it has not been destroyed. Not one of these functions has been destroyed.

As to the question whether the Farm Credit Administration can handle it, I asked Mr. Black, governor of the Farm Credit Administration, when he was before the committee, what he could do about it. I will give you the paging. On page 1308 appears this question:

Is there any reason why the personnel of the Farm Credit Administration could not undertake that responsibility?

Meaning the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. BLACK. I expect that we could do it.

I am telling no tales out of school when I say that I talked to him over the telephone after he appeared before the committee. I said, "Mr. Black, can you handle it?" He said, "Oh, yes; we can handle it." Obviously, he could not say more. His answer was sufficient and satisfactory.

What more do we need? Do we have to have Mr. Wickard come up and give us 200 pages of testimony? After all, Mr. Black is running that agency, and he is a credit expert. It is enough for me when he says that the Farm Credit Administration can handle it. So we put it in the Farm Credit Administration.

There is another reason for it, and that reason does not appear in the hearings. Perhaps I should say many reasons. We hired some pretty good investigators. I think the greatest piece of work this House ever did recently was to pass Resolution No. 69 to set up an investigatory force for the Committee on Appropriations. Good men were selected. We sent these investigators down to investigate, and they came back with a report. I want my friend from Alabama to listen, because I have summarized nearly 20 items that have been turned up by the investigators. I will read them to you. This is a digest of the investigators' reports on Farm Security activities.

No. 1:

Liquidation of the resettlement projects has been definitely delayed.

That is what the investigators said. We put a mandate in the report last year and said, "You have not been doing your job." We criticized Mr. Baldwin very caustically and said, "Now, get busy to liquidate these mementoes of Mr. Tugwell." So the investigators came back with their report and said, "Liquidation of the resettlement projects has been definitely delayed."

No. 2:

Duplication with the Extension Service.

Who said that? The men whom we sent into the field to get the facts.

Next, the Budget said when they went down to call on the Budget officials that the Farm Security Administration is overorganized by 20 to 25 percent. I have known that for years. The Budget has just become aware of it. But Mr. Baldwin must have known it. Since we were in the position of trying a lawsuit without the evidence or witnesses when we had no investigators, we had to take his word. But the Budget Bureau now comes in with the answer to the investigators and says that F. S. A. is overorganized 20 or 25 percent.

Next, they had 230 engineers in 1943. I do not know what they do with so many engineers. They reduced this item to 197 for the next fiscal year. And to it their clerical, administrative, and fiscal help, and they will have 337 in the engineering department at salaries of $925,000. Why were they requested? Is it not the duty of an agency to economize wherever possible and do the public business at the lowest practicable cost?

They spent $630,000 on publicity in the field last year. So said the committee investigators. They spent $550,000 on regional staffs. So said the investigators.

The investigators said that the Home Management Service, with more than 2,000 fine women working in it, could be curtailed or eliminated. You would save in salaries $4,000,000 and $1,000,000 in the travel account. Who said that? The investigators we sent down into the field.

What did Mr. Patterson and Mr. Schwartz, of the Budget, tell the investigators when they went to the Budget Office? This is what they said.

No. 1:

Farm Security Administration branches out contrary to the intent of Congress.

That is the President's Budget Bureau speaking.

What else did they say? They said the migrant labor camps were not well handled.

What else did they say? The Budget experts said they were overorganized.

What else did they say? The Budget experts said that they can simplify their organization by following the Farm Credit Administration plan. That is what we did. We preserved these functions and simply transferred them to the Farm Credit Administration.

What else did the Budget say?

There is duplication with the Farm Credit Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

What else did the Budget say? They said—

It is possible that the social program should be given to the Extension Service.

That is what we did. We transferred the direction of this rural rehabilitation and relief program to the Farm Credit Administration with a proviso that the farm and home management assistance work should be handled by the Extension Service.

I regret exceedingly that the reports of the investigators could not be made available to all Members. Had this been the case, I feel certain that those who at first blush thought the committee had been a bit severe in its action would readily concur in the committee action. Unfortunately, however, the time was short and the report was late in arriving. But here is the case, developed by men in the service of the Appropriations Committee. They are men who are skilled in investigation and have in almost every case had long experience in governmental administration. Their report will, in my opinion, sustain the very action which the subcommittee took in transferring these functions to the Farm Credit Administration in cooperation with the Extension Service.

The Farm Security Administration confesses its own derelictions, because the investigators went to call on Mr. Gibboney, the director of Rural Rehabilitation Division, and what did he say? He said, first of all, that you could eliminate the State offices and it would not be disastrous. If an F. S. A. official makes this concession, why were not the State offices eliminated long ago? Is it not their responsibility to operate as economically as possible, especially so at a time when the people are burdened with taxes?

The investigators found that they have 275 district offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 minutes more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Two hundred and seventy-five district offices, and 567 persons employed in them. The personnel cost $1,708,000, and their traveling expense amounted to $763,000 for the district offices. They have a great information staff. Do you know how many? They have 70 people doing publicity in the field for Farm Security, but that is not the whole story. The word went out that everybody in the field had to do the equivalent of 5 days of publicity work for Farm Security every month. When you break that down, you find it is equivalent to 205 man-years, so that you have another $453,000 on publicity, making a total of $637,000 for this work. Must F. S. A. drum up business and virtually advertise for clients?

Are we not already being overwhelmed by government by publicity? I recognize that a certain amount of paper work must be done but must the air be fairly darkened by a barrage of publicity, directives, releases, regulations, orders, rules, forms, procedures, and what not? Consider the most efficient and successful agencies of the Government. They are the least publicized. They quietly go about the business of rendering service with a minimum of fanfare and publicity. That is why they render good service, beget the confidence of Congress, and avoid controversy and undue criticism. It is bad enough for the office of the Secretary to have to do it. Mr. Salisbury, the head director of information, testified that they got out 2,200 releases last year. That does not include the pamphlets, the books, the brochures, the circulars, the bulletins, the leaflets, and a million other things that they get out. In fact, they have gone publicity wild, and yet here they are trying to publicize themselves instead of trying to reduce it, to get efficient, economical operation. I am for preserving the functions, and we have preserved the functions, but we could not go along with the record of achievement of the Farm Security Administration, and despite our castigations, and our criticisms, they persisted in the errors of their ways, and I see nothing else to do except to suggest that we save the functions and give them to the Farm Credit Administration, which is already operating in the farm-credit field.

A great many things might be said about the efficacy of this program, and I will go along with it. There are a lot of things that I don't like, and I want to say to my friend from Alabama, who examined the testimony of Oscar Johnston, that he should examine the testimony of Administrator Baldwin, when he came back the second time, to reply to Mr. Johnston's testimony. Oscar Johnston testified about a project known as the Plum Bayou project, and after we had gotten the story, we had Mr. Baldwin come back, and here is the story that Mr. Baldwin gave us. The project is 5 years old. It had 293 families on it to begin with. One hundred and twenty-nine left the project in 5 years. Where did they go? Do not fall into the trap that they were taken into the Army, because they did not go there. Forty-one left the project to go into defense plants, 3 went into the Army, 37 elsewhere, 17 were asked to leave, and 26 left for miscellaneous reasons. It is not all gold that glitters, and it is not all a one-sided story, if you please, if you just go to the trouble to examine some of these projects. I correctly interpret the table submitted on this project, 52 of the occupants received 10 or more loans, 37 received grants ranging from $15 to $165 and Mr. Baldwin's own admission, as indicated on page 1707 of the hearings, was that "The operating loans on this project are not in good shape."

Speaking of the aid rendered by F. S. A. permit me to read to you what appeared in a Negro newspaper known as the Delta Leader, in the issue of Sunday, February 21, 1943, under the title, "Others, Too." You will find this editorial in full in the hearings. The Farm Security had gotten out a release to the effect that a Negro had finally paid out in a space of 4 years and got his own farm. Here is what the author of this editorial says:

If the Government wants the truth, we can furnish a long list of Negroes who have bought and paid for farms in 4 years, and who are not connected with Farm Security Administration.

Then this question was asked: Can anything good come out of F. S. A., and, if so, what?

Mr. Chairman, I will go along with the program. I want to help people, but I want to do it efficiently. I do not want a great superstructure of field offices and regional offices and district offices and people constantly knocking on the door. We have two sets of such people in the field now—the Farm Credit Administration and the Agricultural Extension Service—and why should we not utilize them? Why should we not save a little money? Is not that the sensible thing to do? We preserve these functions. Rural-rehabilitation loans will continue to be made. Home- and farm-management assistance will continue under the Extension Service. Farm-tenant loans will continue to be made. The subcommittee, therefore, brings you a program whereby it believes that this function will be more efficiently and economically discharged. What more could it do?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Nobody seems to have any information on the subject of the little farmers who have been served by Farm Credit Administration and how they have increased their milk production by 1,000,000,000——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, do not take up my time on that. That has been read into the RECORD. I know all about it. I have no doubt that they increased their production, and why should they not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. But I have not finished—which amounted to an increase in the milk production of the country of 36 percent of the entire increase. Does not the gentleman think that that is important at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the figures are exact and if the figures are true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman know whether they are true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether they are true. I tried to find out, and they said they used the technique of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and they probably made a spot check around.

I do not know whether they are true or not. If they are true I am glad.

Moreover, there is no reason why production should not increase under the direction of the Farm Credit Administration and the Extension Service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What is the best information the gentleman has?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best information I have is what the Farm Security gave us. We could not go down and find out how much increase there was in a client's butter production in 1942.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. To say that they increased milk production 36 percent by the activity of the Farm Security Administration is ridiculous on its face. When you consider the small number participating in farming, it is ridiculous on its face.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no need for me to belabor the point. The essential point is, we have not destroyed the function. In one case we reduced the amount of the loans available. We have reduced the money for services, personnel, and traveling, by combining it with the Farm Credit Administration. We left the money for farm-tenant purchases exactly on the basis that the Budget sent it to us. There was an effort in the committee to reduce it by $10,000,000. I fought my own colleagues and said, "No; this is a good part of the program. I have fought it for years on one basis or another. I have gotten licked plenty often, but I will go along with that program." So we reported it at $30,000,000 for farm-tenant purchases alone.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On this question of personnel, the gentleman mentioned the Farm Credit which would be left in addition to the Farm Security and Agricultural Extension Service. I understood there were 110,000 people in the A. A. A. Do those figures overlap, or is that another farm administration that goes all over the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. That is still another farm administration organization. Let me say a word about the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and then I want to get to this question of policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield before he leaves that phase of his discussion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will hurry I will yield, but I shall not yield any further.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the gentleman has referred several times to statements that I made. I hope I can ask him this question in some manner, either pontifical or otherwise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry. It was a pleasantry, I assure my friend.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman, of course, refers to the investigation that was made for the subcommittee. I have looked carefully through these hearings and I find no such investigation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not in there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. After all, this Congress must depend upon the hearings that are submitted to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman makes a case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Furthermore, the House has authorized its own investigating committee to go into these very things. I am wondering why we could not at least have had the benefit in some form of the statement of these investigators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry to say to the gentleman that I, as one member, was not in a position of authority to put them into the hearings. I would rather have the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] answer that.

Mr. TARVER. Let me point out that these investigators were only authorized a short time ago. While our subcommittee took immediate action to have the investigation made, the report was not made available until after the hearings had been closed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I have something else that I want to talk about.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to talk about the question of broad general policy. I think the great issue before this Congress and the great issue before the American farmer is this: Shall he continue as a free farmer to get his price in the open market place, or shall he become a controlled farmer operating under a subsidy basis? We are trying to point the way in the bill that we brought in. Do not forget that the National Farmers' Union which appeared through a representative before our committee, made this statement, and he is one of the real friends of the Farm Security Administration. He said, "We favor unchallenged Federal control." Those were Mr. Handschin's words to the subcommittee. He thought perhaps it was a poor exercise of grammar, but that is what he meant. Make no mistake. It is not accidental that our former colleague, Prentiss Brown, has been going over to the Senate side and asking for incentive payments. It is no accident that the President resisted the effort to exclude benefit payments from parity. It is all a part of the great pattern of subsidies by whatever name they are invoked, coupled with control. It is a question of whether this great sprawling Department of Agriculture, with its many ramifications, shall control by the subsidy route or whether the American farmer is going to remain free and find parity in the market place. We have not come to grips with it. We have just cast it off and brushed it off, but it is moving on apace, and we are going to have to settle it.

Let us not undertake to fool the farmer. He will not be fooled very long. We must determine whether the farmer is to be shackled with controls or left to enjoy freedom and fair prices. We can have soil conservation, agricultural research, and similar services without subjecting him to constant control and direction.

But subsidies and incentives are in the air. There are subsidies on coffee and subsidies on petroleum. There are subsidies on milk. If you want to get some interesting reading, read that portion of the hearings on page 1133 that relate to the agricultural marketing service and see where we pay nearly 5 cents a quart in the New York market, in addition to what the State welfare agency pays to subsidize milk to the consumer. Read the hearings and see how we are paying out of the Federal Treasury more than that amount, nearly 6½ cents a quart, in the Chicago area. The State welfare agencies pay a part and the Marketing Administration pays a part as a kind of consumer subsidy.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. It might not be inappropriate in that connection to point out to the House that we have inserted in the bill a provision which would prohibit the transfer of any W. P. A. funds to the section 326 function.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. And that is one of the provisions that goes out by reason of the failure of the Rules Committee to adopt a rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My distinguished chairman is exactly right.

I have never relented in my conviction that the salvation of agriculture is based upon farmers who enjoy freedom and a fair price. Parity in the open market is after all the greatest of production incentives.

We worked on this thing a long time thinking we could point the way to free the farmers to find their price in the open market place. Who has been responsible for this? You and I. The Congress has been just as responsible as anyone. Because we are vulnerable on that point the President has licked us every time. Let us pick up the thread of legislative activity in this field and see what has occurred in the last decade. In the act of 1933 we state in the very beginning that its purpose is to give the farmer purchasing power equivalent to the base period for the period under consideration. That was 10 years ago. Then we passed the Soil Conservation Act of 1936 which provided that when the Secretary finds that the market price is below the fair-exchange value he shall act. We meant that the farmer should have parity in the act of 1933 and in the act of 1936. When the Supreme Court got through we took it up in a late session and passed the act of 1938. We said that the purchasing power of the farmers' commodities should be equivalent to that of the base period 1909–14. We were talking about parity for the farmer without any strings attached. Parity price and parity income became household words. We were persuaded that the formula for farm relief was sufficient bushels times a fair price. In that same act we provided for conservation loans; we provided for parity payments within the limit of funds that were made available by appropriations. We provided for funds to shore up the market. So you see we were aiming at the parity objective in 1933, in 1936, and in 1938.

Then what happened? The thing that happened is chargeable to the Congress because in the Price Adjustment Act of 1938, title V, we appropriated $212,000,000 to make parity payments, but we said in effect: "You must not pay more than 75 percent of parity." You see we began to chisel on ourselves, we just dumped the ante 25 percent. Then in the Appropriations Act of 1939 we appropriated $225,000,000 for parity, but we said: "You cannot pay over 75 percent of parity." We were still chiseling on the very thing that we had so solemnly recited in 1933, in 1936, and in 1938. Then in the Appropriations Act of 1940 we appropriated $212,000,000 for parity, but we said: "No farmer shall share in it if he exceeds his acreage allotment." We were going to hold him right down to it. Then we came along with the penalty wheat provision, of 49 cents a bushel if he hauled the excess wheat to the market, until the Ohio farmers challenged it and it went to the Supreme Court, out of which issued a tortured opinion such as I have never in my life read in the lawbooks. But we were chiseling on ourselves. Is it any wonder that the President licked us at every turn? Is it any wonder that they got the opinion we have been kidding the farmers? We say: "Give him parity." Then we say: "Give him 75 percent of parity"; and then we say: "Do not give him any parity payments if he exceeds his acreage allotment"; and then we say: "Sock him 49 cents a bushel if he hauls too much wheat into the market." We said the same thing in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1941.

Then, in 1940, comes the first of the Price Control Acts, which provided that prices of farm commodities should not be fixed below 110 percent of parity or an equivalent formula. We were going to lead him up into the clouds of ecstasy. Then, in the Price Control Act of 1942, which was enacted when the President said: "You do it or I will," we cut it down to 100 percent or the highest price prevailing in the 9-month-period of that year. And then what? Then came the Pace bill to change the parity formula. Then came the Bankhead bill to exclude benefit payments and parity payments in the calculation of parity under the Price Control Act. Then there was the President's Executive order, that which recited that benefit and parity payments must be included for the purpose of calculating parity ceilings. What is the real answer to the President's contention? It is to bring farm prices to parity in the open market. Once done, it will make no difference whether benefit payments are included or excluded. Moreover, it will bring courage, faith, and hope to the farm producers of the Nation.

Who has been doing the temporizing? We have been doing it. We have made ourselves vulnerable, and I have an idea that we have been kidding the farmer just a little too long. The time has come now to resolve this question of whether he is going to be a free farmer, not under the domination of so many of these agencies, whether he gets a fair price in the market place, or whether he is going to be subsidized and controlled. Mr. Handschin, of the National Farmers' Union, beautifully let the cat out of the bag when he said:

We demand unchallenged Federal control.

You cannot argue with those words. Mr. Handschin is the legislative representative of Mr. Patton's National Farmers Union. I assume he speaks for the organization. They seek unchallenged Federal control. There cannot be freedom and also unchallenged Federal control. It is one or the other. If the object is unchallenged control of agriculture, what of the "four freedoms" for which farmers and the sons of farmers are fighting today in Africa and in the Pacific?

So we have streamlined it. We took out parity payments. After all, suppose they are paid, they must be included, you see, in determining that parity price that the farmer shall get. Would it not be a lot better for him to get his parity price in the market without a parity payment? Would it not be grand if we just pay him for soil-enriching practices and say: "Now, we will get away from all these subsidies, we are going to let you be a free agent, we are going to let you alone"? Oh, Governor Townsend had it right when he came before us to discuss the incentive payment proposition before the committee. Governor Townsend was in charge of the food production program. I said, "Governor, what, in your judgment, is the greatest incentive for getting production?"

Do you know what his answer was? He said: "A good big price; you cannot beat it." That was the answer. But that does not prevail because between our good and beloved former colleague Marvin Jones, who used to be chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the distinguished former Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable James Byrnes, and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, the Honorable Chester Davis, and all those who come to give direction to present policy, the idea is to pay incentive payments based upon goals and programs plus other benefit payments, and thus keep prices from uniformly achieving parity in the open market.

So to recapitulate the action heretofore taken by Congress, we so solemnly enacted into the law of 1933, 1936, and 1938 that the farmer should have a price equivalent to the price in the base period of 1909 to 1914, meaning, of course, a parity price. Then in 1938 and 1939 we appropriated funds, not for parity but for 75 percent of parity. In 1940 and 1941 we appropriated funds for parity but docked him if he exceeded his acreage allotment. At that time we also provided a penalty if he hauled his excess wheat to market. In 1941 and early 1942 we were still proclaiming the parity goal in the price-ceiling acts. In late 1942 came the stabilization order, including benefit payments in the calculation of parity, and there we are. Or where are we? It is neither a consistent, logical, or courageous record when viewed in the perspective of 10 years of effort. The basic problem has not been solved; namely, freedom and open-market parity or control and subsidies?

We are going to get licked on that issue every time until we meet it squarely. No use of clashing or crossing sabers with the President on the thing until our own course is clear. We have woven a serpentine, labyrinthian path. We began with parity at the top, then get to 75 percent of parity. We threw in penalty wheat, we threw in a dockage for overacreage, now the inclusion of parity payments, until finally I do not know whether the farmer knows where he is or not. But I do know one thing. I have been close enough to the soil to know that he wants to be let alone. He does not want somebody to take him over every 40-acre field and tell him when to sow and when to reap.

They dedicated a great memorial to a great President the other day—a beautiful piece of work. How appropriate it is that this bill came to the floor on the day of Jefferson's anniversary. It was he who said, and it ought to be emblazoned on the cold marble, that when they undertake to direct when to sow and reap from Washington the people will want bread. And they are wanting bread today in lots of places. There are lots of children whose bitter cry goes up to God Almighty, as they go to bed without their supper, in a land of plenty. God save America. What is the answer? More control? More money out of the Treasury for subsidies, more incentive payments, or maybe a little larger share of freedom for that rough-handed fellow who sits on the gang plow or holds onto the plow handles, who goes out into the darkness to milk his cows to add to the food supply of the Nation? A little more freedom and a fair price coupled with that freedom in the market place is, in my judgment, the answer that the individual, rugged, devoted, God-fearing American farmer wants as the solution to this problem.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. In spite of all this slavery that we have had described to us last year, is it not a fact that we produced the greatest crop of foodstuffs and other crops in all the history of this Republic?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And that we had an excess after our allies and our own domestic requirements were filled; for the first time in the history of this Republic we had a substantial surplus, some 6 or 7 percent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to answer the gentleman in this way. I want to tell him about the little fellow who went out to the edge of town.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Tell me what I asked the gentleman about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This will be the answer. He got a little old triangle of ground out behind the tracks and what were weeds once and tin cans was made

to become a beautiful fertile place, blooming as the rose with flowers and vegetables. When the preacher called on him one day the preacher said: "Joe, you and God have made this a very lovely place." Joe says, "Parson, you should have seen it when only God had it." In other words, Joe had something to do with it. Joe and God because production depends also on weather.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman permit me to make a little observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman seems to have forgotten awhile ago in the pathetic picture he drew that God and this great beneficent Government of ours had anything to do with the farmers who were wrecked and wrecked beyond recovery.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman it is the very faith of the farmer, close to God's own soil, nurtured and suckled there with the wind going through the trees and the lilt of the lark in his heart that has kept him going when the bureaucrats were all against him and he had no place to turn.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman is so rhetorical and eloquent that I do not know whether he has answered the question or not.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman referred several times to the subsidies which have been paid to the producer. Is it not a fact that that term is a misnomer and that in reality many of these incentive payments and benefits which have been paid to the farmer are actually benefit payments and subsidies paid to the consumer in order to depress prices at a time when the purchasing power of our Nation is at an all-time peak?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly so in the matter of milk that I referred to a moment ago sold in Chicago, in Manchester, in Boston, and in New York, with a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I am not sure whether the gentleman answered my question or not, but may I say to the gentleman that Burdette, I believe it was, one of these great combinations of American philosophers, said that you cannot argue against success.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And God and this administration led the American farmer to the greatest achievement on earth at any time last year.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am very much impressed with the word "success" that has just been mentioned here. I would like for the gentleman to comment on the word "success" when we consider that seven-eighths of the cotton farmers enjoyed, according to the 1940 census, when the total value of their entire crop, counting livestock, poultry, forest products, and what they used from their gardens, a range in dollar value from $1,056 to $456. I would like a little comment on that type of success.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Really, my good friend from Texas should refer that to the querent, in this case the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON]. I need only observe that in my own pocket is a ration card.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In spite of the poetry that has been injected into the case, may I say that the real answer to the gentleman from North Carolina is the fact that God last year gave us the best year in 30 years, not the New Deal

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me conclude with this. When we start reading this bill it will be possible to fairly take the substance right out of it by points of order. Take for instance, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, which has appropriations for peach mosaic eradication, for fruit insects, gypsy and brown-tail moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, cotton insects, Japanese beetle, and so forth. There is no statutory authority for those.

If you want to do a real honest-to-goodness job of butchering a bill, just get your pencils sharp and look at all the provisos in the bill. Figure for yourselves what items are not authorized by law. When the time comes to read each of those paragraphs, stand in your place and say, "Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph." And out it goes.

But what about these activities? Where was the House Committee on Agriculture in not giving statutory character to activities of that kind? We have just taken up the load, that is all. We have gone along in our charitable fashion trying to do a job of producing a bill that will keep these functions in operation as efficiently and as economically as we know how.

If you want to have a great Roman holiday, a great point-of-order holiday, get yourselves fixed for tomorrow when they start reading the bill, and we will send over to the Senate just about the enacting clause and no more. Then you will have your holiday and they will do the job over on that side. But I promise you that when they write all these provisions back in the bill there will be an hour of debate on each one when the bill comes back to the House, and may God give me breath enough to talk an hour on each one. Then we are going to be here until next summer writing an agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. No doubt about that.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. What percent of the dollar does it cost to administer the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not figured it out on a percentage basis, except insofar as this servicing goes. It seems to me that they lay out about $1 for every $2 of loans and servicing that they make. It is enormously high, and it is not an efficient operation.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me conclude where I began. Once more let me address a tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, for his fine, efficient work as chairman of our subcommittee, to all my colleagues on the committee with whom the labor of 60 days in the preparation of this bill was a congenial task, and to the gracious, helpful, devoted, and efficient clerk of the committee, Mr. Orr. I am convinced that given an opportunity, every item in this bill and every action taken by the committee can be defended on the high ground of principle and sound public policy.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I hope he will take the floor on a question of personal privilege. He has been called only an average Congressman. He is so far above it that I want him to refute that statement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

ANSWERING MR. DITTER'S ATTACK ON OUR POWER PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, on last Thursday, April 8, my friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] attacked the Federal Power Commission, the Bonneville Administration, the public utility districts of the States of Oregon and Washington, and the power policies of this administration generally. I called the office of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and notified him I was going to reply to his remarks this afternoon.

I have no apology for my position as an advocate of public power. During the last 10 years the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have never voted together on the power question. On the last 17 roll calls on this subject, covering every phase of the subject, from the passage of the original Norris-Rankin bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority down through the Rural Electrification appropriations and to the recent measures affecting the Central Valley project in California, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, from my viewpoint, has voted wrong 15 times, was absent and unpaired 1 time, and paired wrong the other time. So we thoroughly understand each other on this issue and thoroughly disagree.

ELECTRIC POWER IN THE WAR

If the policies of the gentleman from Pennsylvania had been carried out, there would be no Tennessee Valley Authority today, and that vast wealth of power that is now being used for war purposes in the Tennessee and the Columbia River Valleys would be running waste and

wanton to the sea. This country would be ill prepared to fight this war. Over 75 percent of the light metals going into the air program come from these Federal power plants.

The other day I went into an analysis of the power development in Japan. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the ones who have gone along with him had had their way, today the production of electric power in Japan would probably surpass that in the United States. Japan developed hydro power at an accelerated rate and thus was able to quickly build up a large air fleet.

When you realize that the Axis Powers now control 66 percent of the world's high-grade bauxite from which aluminum is made, you can understand what a terrific advantage it would be to our enemies if every generator on the Tennessee River, on the Columbia River, and on all the other rivers we have developed in the last 10 years were to be stopped and those great developments should come to a standstill.

THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The gentleman from Pennsylvania attacked the Federal Power Commission and accused it of imposing a gag rule because in one hearing on one proposition the Commission thought there were questions involving military secrets and, with the express concurrence of the attorney representing the power company, at whose request the hearing was being held, and with the express agreement of the press representatives present, held that portion of the hearing in executive session. The press representatives continued in attendance throughout both the public and executive sessions, as the hearing transcript shows.

He attacked the Federal Power Commission because it carried out an order of the President providing for supplying this power from the cheapest available source, where it exceeded a reasonable minimum. There are two electric delivery points on the Federal reservation, adjacent to each other.

The reply of the Federal Power Commission to the charges of Mr. DITTER were given in a statement to the press on April 11.

It reads as follows:

In reply to charges made by Representative J. WILLIAM DITTER on the floor of the House of Representatives last Thursday, April 8, that the Federal Power Commission had tried to "gag" its hearing held April 5 and 6 in the matter of the Washington Water Power Co. and was guilty of "collusion" in connection with a rate contract between the Clark County Public Utility District and the Federal Public Housing Authority in the State of Washington, the Federal Power Commission today issued the following statement:

"The press was not barred from the hearing held at the request of the Washington Water Power Co. on April 5 and 6, as the record of that proceeding plainly shows. Since early 1941 the Commission, through adoption of policies established by the War Department, Navy Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Office of War Information, has consistently sought to prevent information with respect to the facilities and operations of the vitally important electric and gas utilities subject to its jurisdiction from falling into hostile hands.

"In its order setting hearings at the request of the Washington Water Power Co., the Commission provided that the hearing should be public 'except insofar as the presiding officer may deem otherwise appropriate in view of the war aspects of the subject matter,' and no objection to the order was made by the company. Accordingly, when, in the course of the hearing, testimony and exhibits showing in detail the facilities, operations, and war industries served by the Washington Water Power Co. and the several other member systems of the giant Northwest power pool were about to be introduced, the trial examiner recessed the hearing and directed counsel for the Water Power Co. and counsel for the Commission to report to him, after conference, their recommendations with respect to closing the hearing to the general public in the light of the testimony and exhibits about to be offered.

"At the resumption of hearing Mr. Alan G. Payne, counsel for the Washington Water Power Co., outlined the procedure which had been agreed upon and stated that after covering the phases of the testimony which 'don't bear, in any way, upon the restricted matters by the War Department, we will go into executive session in which the detailed figures can be presented.' This procedure was followed.

"All press representatives of both news services and trade journals who had been in attendance at the public session were expressly permitted by the trial examiner to remain, as the transcript of the proceeding shows. This procedure was thoroughly acceptable to the press representatives, who expressed the opinion that the testimony and exhibits to be offered during the closed session appeared to be of a character that could not be published under the voluntary censorship code administered by the Office of Censorship.

"Representative DITTER's charge of 'collusion' with reference to the Clark County contract is equally without basis The only connection that the Federal Power Commission has had with this contract, which was entered into on May 24, 1942, or 5 months before the President's directive of October 22, 1942, is that the contract has been filed with the Commission by the Federal Public Housing Authority together with hundreds of other existing contracts for the supply of power to war plants and establishments of other procurement agencies. At the same time the Commission has received from the procurement agencies numerous proposed contracts for service to new war plants and establishments, which have an emergency character. Their review must necessarily be given precedence over that of existing contracts. All contracts for power subject to the President's directive will be reviewed as rapidly as possible.

"In the light of these facts, the charges of gag rule and collusion made by Representative DITTER against the Federal Power Commission are utterly without foundation and it is apparent that he was misinformed at the time he made his statement."

The project complained of consists of two separate services, both of them military projects with one purchaser—the Army. Both can be served from the same substation as one load. The power company wanted to divide them, because one by itself did not amount to 1,000 kilowatts, the Washington Water Power Co., a subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share, came in and attempted to prove that the Federal Power Commission was exceeding its authority in declaring that Government power delivered to a governmental agency for war purposes could not be so treated. The company made this claim in the face of a previous contract between the Army and Bonneville that the loads should be considered together, as one.

This man Kinsey Robinson, president of the company—and a lot of this stuff looks very much like the hand of Robinson and the voice of DITTER—wants to drive these public power projects out of Washington and Oregon, just exactly as they tried to do in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky in the T. V. A. area.

He then attacks one of the public utility districts and pretends that it is a dummy set-up. Oh, how often did we hear that word "dummy" with reference to all these cooperative power associations that are now serving 1,500,000 farmers who would be in the dark today if the policies of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] had been followed. He does not seem to know that the people of Washington, in a State-wide election voted authority for the creation of these public-utility districts which he calls dummies. The obvious errors in his statements show that he has been misinformed.

THE CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT

The Clark County public-utility district was set up by the people of Clark County, Wash., a few years ago, and is now serving a Federal public-housing project, which is exactly what it was intended to do.

I have always contended that the power business is a public business, because electricity is now a necessity of life, and because it must be handled by a monopoly—since four or five different concerns cannot supply electricity for one community, which would make the overhead charges too heavy. Besides this water power is already owned by the Federal Government. Therefore, it is a public business. I have contended that the Government should own these dams, and should own the transmission lines, but that the Federal Government ought not to sell power retail. It should be sold wholesale to cooperative power associations, municipalities, and even to private power companies, provided they agree to distribute it to the people at yardstick rates, or rates based upon the actual cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, with a reasonable return on legitimate investment.

Let us see about this Clark County project they complain about. The Clark County project buys this power from Bonneville at 3.7 mills a kilowatt-hour, and sells it to the housing project for 4.8 mills per kilowatt-hour. That is the cheapest power, they tell me, that is delivered to any housing project anywhere in the United States. Before the T. V. A. was created private power interests were buying Government power wholesale at Muscle Shoals at less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and selling it to the consumers in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.

POWER COSTS IN PENNSYLVANIA

I saw some time ago where power was being sold wholesale on the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania at a little more than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, but when it gets down to Mr. DITTER's constituents

it is sold at an overcharge that ought to shock the gentleman from Pennsylvania. What I cannot understand is why he should, like Job's war horse of old, "smell the battle afar off" and look 3,000 miles away to the banks of the Columbia River to find something wrong with the power business. He should look at Pennsylvania. In 1941 the people of Pennsylvania were overcharged more than $125,000,000 according to the rate in the Bonneville area. Why not begin to clean house in Pennsylvania before attacking the public-utility districts in Washington?

Not one of these public utility districts makes a dollar profit. They are organized not for profit but for service. Every dollar they make is used to extend or improve the service, or to pay off the debts against the district, or to bring about reduced rates. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania goes on and attacks this program and says—and that is the reason that I suspect it is the hand of Robinson and the voice of DITTER, because surely the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not have made this statement of his own volition. He says:

> The counsel for the company presented evidence to show that 42 percent of its gross revenues from any contract with these two war projects would revert to the Federal Government as the normal corporate income surtax.

In the name of all the gods, where did he get that language? Forty-two percent, he said, would go back to the Government in income surtaxes. I have before me the tax report for 1936, the last report available, showing how much taxes the private power companies really pay—not only surtaxes but all income taxes, normal taxes, taxes to the Federal Government, State taxes, sales tax, where levied, and State, district, and county taxes, ad valorem taxes, and all other taxes, and let us see what they paid. In the State of Washington on their gross revenues, instead of paying 42 percent surtaxes on gross incomes the private power companies actually paid 12½ percent in taxes of all kinds. In Oregon, instead of paying 42 percent, they paid 15.8 percent, and in the great State of Pennsylvania they paid 11.7 percent, while the publicly owned systems in Pennsylvania paid 40.1 percent, or more than three times as much as was paid by the private power companies. That includes taxes, cash contributions, and the free service to the municipalities or the communities in which those enterprises operate.

At this point the record should be further cleared in order to destroy completely the force of Ditter-Robinson tax argument after removin the fallacy of the erroneous calculations, based on assuming the Federal tax to be a gross tax.

On April 3, 1943, the war contract negotiation boards of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and Treasury Department jointly announced that the reasonableness of costs to the Federal Government must be determined before any allowance is made for Federal-income or excess-profits taxes. This announcement was issued 2 days before the Power Commission hearings started, This principle was completely ignored. Lack of attention to correct details destroys the entire tax argument of the power company.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in attacking the Federal Power Commission, the gentleman from Pennsylvania not only comes uninformed, but he comes badly misinformed, and he does a great injustice to one of the few commissions that is absolutely above criticism, and that is the Federal Power Commission, which is doing the greatest work in its history today.

THE SPOKANE CASE

He talks about this Spokane case. I have pointed out that those projects are adjacent to each other, one of them being the pumping station, and the other a hospital, and they have only to transmit the power a short distance on the Federal reservation, and the two can be served from the same station.

Here the power company record stops. From information I have obtained, I think it can be demonstrated that the charge of collusion is on the other foot. I feel that an effort was made by the power company through the agents and employees in the power branch of the War Production Board to keep the Army from tying these two delivery points together, as their contract with Bonneville plainly shows was intended, in order to save money for the Government. The unholy set-up at the War Production Board should be investigated. I know from experience that employees of the Electric Bond & Share and their friends in that agency have nullified the intentions of Congress in providing power capacity for the Columbia River, Federal, and other western plants; have destroyed markets for these projects, and are now operating a pool that is under the control of the same group that lobbied against Bonneville and other power appropriations, and indirectly against adequate defense.

The total Government load amounts to 1,250 kilowatts and therefore it comes within the law, within the order they had agreed to obey. Now take the other set-up down in Clark County, and you will find there, as I said, that they have sold that power at the very lowest minimum and without undue profit. The difference between the kilowatt-hour prices I have previously cited does not go into anybody's pocket, but it goes to pay for the lines, for operating this public utility district, and reducing electric rates. I will now tell you where the kick is coming from. This power company's affiliate owns a competitive system there, and it is trying to drive this public-utility district out of business and hold up the rates. They are also keeping strategic materials for additional lines away from those public bodies.

This is the same old battle. It is the old attempt to get control of the great wealth of hydroelectric power along the Columbia River. It is a fight that has been going on throughout all the years. It is the same old fight they made in building spite lines in every farming community to keep the Rural Electrification Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority from serving the farmers of this country and bringing to them the greatest economic blessing they have ever known.

THE PAST RECORD

Ever since H. R. 7642—Seventy-fifth Congress—the bill authorizing the sale of power from Bonneville Dam by the Bonneville Power Administration—was debated in this House, in the spring of 1937, The Electric Bond & Share, its subsidiaries and agents have maintained a Washington lobby to sabotage the Columbia River projects, and to prevent benefits from these debt-redeeming projects from reaching the people of the Pacific Northwest.

I would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania give this House an account of Mr. Robinson's activities in Washington, D. C., during the time H. R. 4852—Seventy-sixth Congress—the Interior Department appropriation bill for the year 1940—was under consideration by both Houses so that the House debate, taking place during the early part of March 1939, and the Senate committee appearance will be clear as to purpose. Mr. Robinson's testimony presented to the Senate committee in opposition to H. R. 4852 as reported in pages 404 to 422 of the hearings is very illuminating. If what he then urged had been adopted by Congress the Nation's air, ship, and chemical capacity would have been materially reduced, and his own home town of Spokane could not have taken care of the war industries now located at that point. Instead of the city of Spokane booming with industries essential to the successful prosecution of the war, if the Washington water power proposal had been adopted as Mr. Robinson urged before the committee, there would now be no Columbia River power flowing into Spokane. This Columbia River power has resulted in Spokane taking its place as one of the leading industrial cities of the Northwest. Fortunately for the country and his home town of Spokane, Mr. Robinson's proposals were rejected by the House and Senate.

The next year Mr. Robinson again unsuccessfully appeared before both committees in opposition to H. R. 8745—the Interior Department appropriation bill for the year 1941. One reason for the Washington Water Power Co. being particularly interested in having someone insert the material in the RECORD on April 8, 1943, can be found on pages 171 and 172 of the Senate hearings on H. R. 8745. Here in answer to a direct question as to the application of the common-carrier principle, which is involved in the problem under discussion, Mr. Robinson replied that his company would not consent to an application of the common-carrier principle. The Washington Water Power Co. has shown by its attitude in the proceedings before the Federal Power Commission and its attitude here, that it is interested in preventing the Government from serving itself with power unless an exorbitant toll is paid to the Washington Water Power Co., by the Government for the privilege. I am sure that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had understood this problem clearly he would never have

become the spokesman for these people and urged that the Army pay $20,000 a year more for the privilege of taking power service from the Washington Water Power Co. than from the Bonneville Administration.

I would like for you to read Senator BONE'S cross-examination of Mr. Robinson as given on pages 172 to 187 of the Senate hearings on H. R. 8745, to find out the type of illegal political activities practiced by Mr. Robinson's company and its allies, and directed against the farmers and other consumers in the State of Washington. Fortunately, again Mr. Robinson's proposals were rejected by both Houses. It is a matter of record after these defeats, the statement has been made on this floor that it was unnecessary for Mr. Robinson to again oppose Bonneville appropriation bills, as Electric Bond and Share would control the situation through the war agencies.

EFFORT TO DEFEAT INTENT OF CONGRESS

Under the leadership of Mr. Robinson's company five private power companies in the Northwest have spent large sums of money in an effort to nullify the Bonneville Act. I would suggest to Mr. DITTER that he read the trial examiner's report on F. P. C. Docket No. IT-5647, covering the accounting practices and expenditures of these companies, and find out, from evidence taken under oath, how the power company officials have illegally spent $1,037,516.51 of the stockholders' and rate payers' money to keep low-cost Federal Columbia River power from reaching the ultimate consumer

If the philosophy advanced by Mr. Robinson is not halted we will find our democracy drifting into a Fascist state. When you read this Federal Power Commission's docket ycu surely will come to realize that these recitals parallel the abuse of capitalists' money that gave Hitler his start. This docket also shows how a very large sum of money was spent with false-front organizations. In addition, F. P. C. Opinion 59, covering these investigations, shows how these companies spent large sums of money in an effort to influence public opinion. For fake presentations and efforts the Washington Water Power Co. alone spent $329,205.05.

This present false-front effort of the Washington Water Power Co. gives another reason for Water Power Co.'s attempt to smear the Federal Power Commission and the Bonneville Administration.

THE CLARK COUNTY CONTRACTS

Now, let us look at this contract about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the Washington Water Power Co. complain: First, it should be pointed out again that the Clark County public-utility district in supplying this housing project at the lowest rate per kilowatt-hour of any housing project in the entire United States, 4.8 mills a kilowatt-hour. This in itself is enough to make the private power companies rise up and try everything in their power to confuse the issue. But it is logical that this public-utility district can serve at low rates, since the profits go to the consumers rather than to Rector Street, New York, but we should examine the records further and see what additional obligations the Clark County public-utility district had undertaken.

The agreement with the housing project requires that the public-utility district purchase the electrical facilities built by the National Housing Agency and pay for them at what they cost the housing agency. This is an unconditional obligation on the part of the public-utility district. It has undertaken this obligation in spite of the fact that its contract for service to this housing project is only a year-to-year contract, and in addition can be canceled by the Housing Agency on 30 days' notice, if the project is disposed of under the provisions of the laws of this Congress. Furthermore, as I have already pointed out, the entire revenues of this public-utility district can only be used for operating expenses, for paying off the public-utility district's debt, and for reducing rates to its consumers. These are the facts concerning the transaction of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania complains. Can it be said that the Government agencies have not adequately carried out the trust reposed in them?

YARDSTICK—COMMON-CARRIER PHILOSOPHY

With such a heading the Electrical World of April 3, 1943, carried an editorial which expresses the feeling of the private power industry in the case at hand. The Electrical World is considered the spokesman for the private interests. It reviewed the Spokane case and indicated that the decision resulting from the hearing might have far-reaching effects in the post-war period. From what is contained in the editorial, it is evident that the private power interests are determined to keep federally owned power from being used by federally owned institutions. Why? Because service to Federal projects can set up rate yardsticks in their midst, and then have a most pronounced effect on a true regulation of rates. Or expressed differently, the industry wishes to retain high rates and destroy the yardstick, so that they can regulate themselves by continuing the past practice of controlling public officials. I wish that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would read the St. Louis Post-Dispatch's résumé of the recent bribery cases in the Federal court at St. Louis, involving the Union Electric Co., and the conviction of its top officials. This review is illuminating at this time and provides an indication of the ends to which self-appointed regulators will go to accomplish their desired purposes.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, as one who has helped to lead the fight for developing our water power and getting it distributed to the people at reasonable rates, as one who has led the fight in this House for rural electrification, I am proud of the record we have made. We have not only developed the water power on which the Nation now depends for energy for its chief war industries, but we have spread rural electrification all over the country and supplied the Nation with yardsticks with which to protect themselves from overcharges for the electricity used in their homes or in their business establishments.

We have blazed the way toward an electrified America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the fact that the complaint which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] made was that they wrote a sentence of 144 words and did not put a period in it. That is what I got out of his complaint.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very much like I imagine the boy who had been expelled from school would feel, who had been allowed to go back to the schoolhouse but not to bring his books. From the interpretation I get after listening to the situation we are in, under the rule adopted in this matter, our speaking here is entirely in vain. We might be allowed when the time for reading the bill comes to offer amendments to strike and strike and strike, and leave nothing except the enacting clause. That is not a very satisfactory contemplation. I thought I saw in this bill, particularly in reference, entirely in reference, to the Farm Security Administration the fine hand of our good friend, Mr. O'Neal. The bill itself, with respect to the Farm Security Administration, reveals that he must of necessity have had a very strong hand in dividing up and distributing amongst several agencies the work that this Administration was called upon to do. I heard the gentleman speak before a committee of the Senate, and it sounded to me like a wagon wheel that was out of plumb, running in every direction and getting louder but getting nowhere. That is the place they invite us to now.

Mr. Chairman, I am not able to go into the ramifications of the justification on paper for the continuation of the Farm Security Administration, but I do know, in my county and in counties next to me, the Farm Security Administration has provided such means, by grants of loans to those who need them and who are worthy of them, and by assistance that has been given to the farmers as, in my opinion, increases the efficiency of production in my county by 50 percent in the last 2 years, and that is not confined to 1942. Wonderful improvement has been made. I have letters in my files from bankers and other businessmen who are not immediately dependent upon farming for a livelihood or for existence, who have appealed to me to cast my vote, it being assumed that is all I had, to continue the Farm Security Administration, admitting that in some particulars perhaps they had made mistakes, but by and large and on the whole, that they had done good work in assisting production in this country and helping the farmers to get upon their feet. We see the results of it. Those results are before us. The speech that my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made should have been made if

he had intended to accomplish anything, in 1930, and withheld from all men who were dependent upon farming for a livelihood for themselves and their families and contributing to the production the country needed, and not let them have it and then see what would have become of this country if those things had not been done by somebody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, those who belabor Farm Security Administration appear to lose sight of the workmanlike job done by that organization and the relatively low cost of the job. It is worth while to point out that the cost of keeping a family on F. S. A. has been only about 10 percent of the cost of keeping a family on W. P. A. Let us contrast the result in human values before we permit F. S. A. to be condemned. Let us consider the important factor of rehabilitation which makes families self-supporting. Let us remember that families on farm security assume an obligation to repay and that they do repay the money advanced them by our Government.

I have been interested in the strong endorsement given to F. S. A. by the press. I believe this reflects the sentiment of the people themselves, and I trust the judgment of the people. As an example of this endorsement I want to quote a recent editorial which appeared in the Progressive Farmer. It is entitled "Help F. S. A. and the Little Man":

Friends whom we know to be honest, earnest, and sincere think they see a bugaboo in the Farm Security Administration. They may know things that we don't know, but few of the charges made seem to hold water in the light of the few things we do know. Here are a few of the things we think are well worth keeping:

1. The tenant-purchase program: When the Bankhead-Jones Tenant-Purchase Act was passed and approved, it was hailed as one of the greatest advances in American history.

We still think it was. It made it possible for worthy tenant families to buy farms on terms they could meet. Some of America's best families are tenant families. This act has made it possible for a few of the most worthy to own homes of their own. Why shouldn't this act be preserved?

2. Rural rehabilitation: City laborers without jobs weren't the only ones to suffer in 1932, 1933, and all the other years of the depression. Thousands of farm families were caught with bare cupboards, few clothes on their backs, and scarcely a roof over their heads. But they weren't put to raking leaves. They were helped to put their debts on a satisfactory basis, were staked to a mule and a plow, and were aided in making arrangements for a crop. We doubt if any phase of the whole relief set-up was better managed than this one.

We will always have those who are victims of misfortune. Crop failures, ill health, mistakes in business ventures, loss of livestock in epidemics, etc., take their toll year in and year out. Why not retain the agency that is prepared to stake the farm victims of misfortune and give them another start?

3. Supervision: Services of the Farm Security Administration to those in need of a lift do not stop with the lending of small sums. Planning aid is given and supervision provided to make certain that the person helped knows how to make best use of the funds and facilities afforded. Provisions for an adequate home food supply through garden and canning, a milk cow, pigs for slaughter, and chickens and eggs are required as a part of the year's work. In many communities cooperative ownership of important machinery is made possible. One of its greatest contributions has been its investment in good health through having made better medical service available.

There is much to be said on the side of Farm Security. We haven't agreed with all their policies, and have said so in these columns. There have been times when we thought they were the victims of too much money. The present Farm Security Administration was saddled with some serious blunders made by its predecessors in some of their wild efforts to effect relief during the depression. Let's not destroy the goose because she has a black feather in her tail. Let's pluck the feather and save the goose.

No doubt there are some policies of administration in the present Farm Security Administration set-up that need revision. The fight waged against it may do much to weed out the mistakes in administration and any mistaken notions some few in its service may have gained. We hope the motive of the fight is not to destroy.

We believe that, as a whole, the Farm Security Administration has done a fine job. It has helped 30,000 farmers to become landowners and it has come to the aid of other thousands of small tenant farmers who were able to find help from no other source. Now that the war calls for all-out production, Farm Security Administration has a logical place in the program. It is the small farmer who is least troubled by labor shortage. With Farm Security Administration loans and supervision he can maintain or increase farm production in 1943 to an extent greater than any other group of farmers. Figures made public just a few weeks ago show that Farm Security Administration borrowers, representing but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farms, produced more than a third of the Nation's increase in milk in 1942. Ten percent of the total increase in chickens and eggs came from these same farms and 9 percent of the increase in pork.

I think it distinctly profitable, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to production figures made by F. S. A. farmers in Florida in 1942, to contrast those figures with 1941 production, and to point to the aims of the 1943 program. We could seriously cripple those aims by failure to recognize the value of the work done by F. S. A. and by withholding funds for the continuation of its work. I do not believe this House so desires to do. The figures follow:

Florida—Wartime production by standard rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase Farm Security Administration borrowers

Commodity	Production by all borrowers		Increase in production by all borrowers		Percent	
	1942	Plan 1943	1941–42	1942 to plan 1943	1941–42	1942–43
Milk (gallons)	3,775,690	4,504,020	948,200	728,330	34	19
Eggs (dozens)	2,684,590	4,002,980	715,090	1,318,390	36	49
Chickens (pounds)	1,501,590	2,376,000	448,330	874,410	43	58
Pork (pounds)	10,995,900	18,701,000	2,884,590	7,705,100	36	70
Beef (pounds)	1,428,830	2,429,270	582,113	1,000,440	69	70
Dry beans (pounds)	938,477	1,415,710	202,620	477,233	28	51
Sugar beets (tons)	129		129	−129		
Soybeans (bushels)	2,650	10,865	2,650	8,215		310
Peanuts (pounds)	17,766,400	29,981,600	4,592,700	12,225,200	35	69

Let me go further, Mr. Chairman, and show how the Southeast as a whole has stepped up production through the efforts of F. S. A. farmers. Let us remember that the Southeastern States have never adequately realized their possibilities as a livestock and poultry producing area. This area is still importing a part of its own needs in these commodities. In my opinion our greatest agricultural development will come in this field; so I would like to show, as an example, how chicken and egg production has progressed in the Southeast through the efforts of Farm Security Administration:

Early in the spring of 1941, many months before Pearl Harbor, the Farm Security Administration asked its borrowers to increase production. In Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina, for example, each family was asked to add a cow, or 2 pigs, or 50 chickens to their farming activities. There was no trouble about cows and pigs, but poultry was another matter. With the exception of small flocks for home use little poultry had ever been produced in this cotton-farming section. Many of our borrowers had a superstition about May or June chicks, and especially about "orphan" chicks. "Seems like they catch the fever," was one farmer's explanation. But he was "willing to try anything that'll help out" and his expression seemed to be fairly typical.

All together the 56,000 F. S. A. borrowers in the 4 States bought 5,000,000 baby chicks. Additional F. S. A. loans were made to pay for the chicks and also for minor improvements necessary to care for them properly. F. S. A. supervisors showed the families how to build home-made brooders and how to mix home-raised grain for feed. Many Negro families added a special treatment of their own—they baptized their chicks by sprinkling water over them.

Through scientific methods of care and feeding, 90 percent—or 4,500,000—of the chicks pulled through. The curse was broken. Cockerels were marketed as broilers and the pullets were kept for egg production. By April 1941, a survey showed that F. S. A. borrowers in the region were getting an average of 500,000 dozen eggs a week, and had bought 8,000,000 more chicks. The pullets from these flocks will come into full production this spring.

It was not clear sailing. Facilities for handling poultry products in the area were almost nonexistent. As soon as broilers and eggs started moving from the farms, local markets became glutted, yet Army camps in the Southeast were

getting trainloads of dairy and poultry products from the Chicago packing houses. The reason, of course, was that neither the Army quartermasters nor the large wholesalers who helped supply them could deal with each little farmer.

The problem was solved through F. S. A. neighborhood group associations which set up marketing services throughout the area. Trucks picked up the produce and hauled it to the nearest center where cooperative processing plants were set up. Poultry dressing houses were organized. In Coffee County, Ala., the association bought a mechanical picker, the first in the county and one of the first in the South. In 1941 a field division of the Southeastern Air Corps training center in Alabama signed a contract with farmers of Coffee County for 8,000 pounds of dressed chicken per month to feed the air cadets. The chickens also were sold on foot to wholesalers supplying defense centers and to local merchants who once drew their supply from the eastern packing houses. Co-ops handled the marketing. Officials elected by farmers completed the contracts, checked weight and quality and did all the other things large-scale handlers insist on.

Many of the eggs were sold to the agricultural marketing association markets in 30-dozen lots. The farmers candled and graded their own eggs and received in most instances better than local market prices at their farms, where the eggs were picked up by trucks operated by local purchasing and marketing associations. From March 28 through April 18, 1942, F. S. A. borrowers in Monroe County, Ala., sold $2,224.22 worth of eggs through the A. M. A. This was the net price received by the families after all expenses of the cooperative egg route, grading, and marketing had been paid.

It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman, that we confine our interest in F. S. A.'s achievements to any one field of agriculture. It has done a good job in many fields. It has taught deserving farm families better agriculture, helped them to enjoy a better living, and encouraged them to a fuller realization of citizenship. These things, in my humble opinion, justify many times over the continuation of Farm Security Administration.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my regret that several agricultural agencies which I consider to be essential agencies are now in jeopardy, and to express my deep regret that we are not even permitted a chance to vote upon the continuance of the Farm Security Administration.

I have not always agreed with the Farm Security Administration in all phases of their work. Less than 2 weeks ago I arose here in the House to criticize the recruiting of labor by the Farm Security Administration in the State of Louisiana. I though that this agency at that time was making a serious mistake in its efforts to recruit farm labor in places where there was an actual acute shortage of labor. But upon subsequent investigation I realized this was a work not welcomed by the Farm Security Administration and was not an essential part of their fundamental service which is rehabilitation—rehabilitation of the unfortunate farmers who have worked from day to day and year to year with no hope in the present and but scanty and meager prospect of hope in the future.

Some 2 years ago in the South we had a fairly normal crop. In one area in the Southwest, which area extended over perhaps six parishes in Louisiana and perhaps six or eight counties in the State of Texas, there was a faulty rainfall, rain falling at the wrong time and in quantities which the land was not able to absorb and this area was left practically without a crop to harvest. I can recall in one parish in central Louisiana the cotton crop was less than 10 percent of a normal crop. I can recall in that parish where the feed crop was less than 10 percent of a normal crop. Those farmers found themselves at the end of a season, which had been generally successful for the farmers of the entire South, without cotton to sell to raise money and without feedstuff to use to keep their livestock going and their farms operating. They were left in a hopeless position. They were the poor who were not able to send a delegation here to Washington. Larger farmers sent delegations; the business people sent delegations here pleading for assistance; bankers from that section sent delegations here for a like purpose. They urged the Government to do something to aid this area which would otherwise be completely prostrate due to the local and complete crop failure. The work was turned over to the Farm Security Administration. This agency went in there with its own individual way of handling the rehabilitation of the poor farmers. They made small weekly loans to the individual families; they made small grants, gave supervisory help, and, at a very small cost to the United States Government, F. S. A. had rehabilitated that area and today those little farmers who were practically wiped out 2 years ago have worked themselves back until they are in a reasonably prosperous condition. Farming on little plots of 40, 60, 80, or 120 acres in that community, they have worked themselves back until today they form an integral part of the agricultural war program and today they are not only not a burden, but are carrying on to produce the food and the fiber necessary to win this war for the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that we might reduce the amount of funds which we are prepared to appropriate to this agency; we might even circumscribe their operations and limit their authority; but that agency which in that region has been termed the "agricultural Red Cross" should be allowed to continue. It should be allowed to continue to rehabilitate where rehabilitation is necessary and it should be permitted to exist to meet other emergencies which may arise in the agricultural regions of the country from time to time. With its personnel and its wealth of experience, I doubt that any other Federal agency is able to handle the small, border-line, hill farmer and assist him as effectively as is the Farm Security Administration. And so I express the deep hope that as this bill moves on into the other body here in the Capitol, ways may be found to restore the Farm Security Administration to the agriculture bill and to carry on the fundamental, essential work of this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the very eloquent gentleman from the State of Illinois in his detailed discourse on the condition of the farmer, a flood of thoughts come to the mind of a man who has operated a farm and had to depend on the market for the sale of his produce and who, by experience, knows some of the reasons for the conditions in which agriculture finds itself today in all this parity payment program we have been struggling with in the 10 years I have been on this floor, and I freely confess I have taken a good deal of punishment in listening to these theories such as expounded by the gentleman from Illinois.

I wish the gentleman from Illinois really understood this thing and would give us the real reason and real cause for the problem of the farmer. Speaking of the Farm Security Administration, he asked: "What good is it?" I will tell you what good it is. In my State of Idaho at this minute, while I stand on this floor, one of the most devastating floods in the history of that State, is sweeping over one of our fairest farming sections. It is only the financial assistance of the Farm Security Administration that has come to the rescue of those people who were driven from their farms, refugees from the flood. It is only the Farm Security Administration that is assisting them in their hour of peril. That splendid work is going on at this very moment.

When a man loses his home, when a man loses his farm through the interposition of price control by the monopolies of this country, it has only been the strong hand of Uncle Sam operating through the Farm Security Administration that has come to his rescue and made it possible for him to have a new start.

The Farm Security Administration as it is presently organized in the Northwestern States is doing a grand work. There is nothing to this ill-conceived scheme by some disgruntled landlords that want cheap farm labor but a plan to wreck this constructive Government agency by working through the subcommittee on appropriations to put this organization out of existence and turn its functions over to other banking concerns. When we deal with the Farm Credit Administration we are dealing with a purely banking institution. Let

the gentleman from Illinois if he loses his farm and his means of subsistence go to this Farm Credit Administration and try to get a new start from that agency. He will find a very different picture from that he painted for us this afternoon. If the gentleman from Illinois really wants to get to the bottom of the thing, really wants to make a correction, why does he not bring in a bill to strengthen the Federal Trade Commission and control these monopolistic practices so the farmer would get a fair and square deal? He said the farmer wants to be let alone. Sure he wants to be let alone. He wants a fair price for the thing he produces and he wants to pay a fair price for the thing he consumes, for the necessities of his trade or occupation. That is what the farmer wants in this country and that is what he has not had. We have seen the price of barbed wire rise from $1.20 a roll to $6 a roll. We have seen the price of farm necessities and everything that is used in agriculture doubled and quadrupled in price. When the war is over the price of the things the farmer produces will be cut down to practically nothing. We saw that done after the last war. We know what the farmer has been struggling against and we in the Congress have tried to assist him. The Farm Security Administration under present conditions is the answer to the problem. I hope that the Senate or somebody else will have brains enough in this Congress to restore this fine function.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the farm-security program I submit the following telegram from President Worth Lowery of the International Woodworkers:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 13, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

International Woodworkers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, strongly urges that Farm Security Administration be given full amount of appropriations requested by President Roosevelt and that this be increased to $1,000,000,000 in order to enlist all farms in maximum food production. Farm Security Administration plan is only alternative to hunger and Farm Security Administration machinery must be saved in order that program for orderly mobilization and use of farm labor under minimum wage and living standards may be put into effect. Record of 463,000 Farm Security Administration farm families in 1942 production proves that every dollar loaned these waiting farmers brings $1.50 in food. Urge you speak and vote in favor of full and increased Farm Security Administration appropriation.

WORTH LOWERY,
President, International Woodworkers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

PARTIAL REASON FOR EASTERN FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to an unusual condition that affects our national economy. We have become accustomed during this period of national emergency to expect shortages and surpluses of various critical materials to develop throughout our Nation. When a condition such as this arises it is the natural thing to take from the district in which there is a surplus and transport the material or commodity to the district where there is a shortage, but when the opposite is the case and we find this policy reversed, I feel that it should be called to the attention of this assembly, not only because it affects the welfare of my home district but also the welfare of the entire Nation.

The commodity I refer to is coal. For more than a century the natural market for Illinois coal has been the city of St. Louis and the city of Chicago. The first railroad in the Mississippi Valley was built in 1836 to supply the fuel needs of the city of St. Louis; however, we now find that after more than a century of supplying the fuel needs of these two cities, a great portion of that market has been lost by the Illinois coal mines because of the so-called smoke ordinances which were enacted during the past few years and are now permitted to continue in effect during this war period. These ordinances force consumers to purchase a higher grade of fuel than can be supplied from Illinois mines. The only advantage gained by the user is that less smoke is emitted during the burning period. Smokeless fuel required to meet these ordinances must be shipped from the East. Thus we find the eastern seaboard States being deprived of millions of tons of coal, coal taken from a district where a shortage already exists and sent to a district where there is a natural surplus. Not only does this create a fuel shortage in the East, it also ties up thousands of coal cars and much railroad equipment, equipment that is badly needed for the transportation of vital war materials. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to present the picture to the House in this way:

Geologists estimate that the Illinois fuel beds contain approximately 200,000,000,000 tons of coal, and although we have been mining coal commercially in Illinois since 1828, we have only removed 6 percent of this vast deposit.

At present only 30 percent of the coal used in the city of Chicago is mined in the State of Illinois. An annual market for 2,000,000 tons of Illinois coal has been lost in the city of St. Louis. This amount was hauled almost in its entirety by trucks.

A concrete example of the effect of regulatory smoke legislation can be found in the vicinity of Belleville, Ill., a city which is 14 miles from St. Louis, where 50 mines out of 60 have been forced to close within the past 10 years, and where formerly 3,000 men were employed in these mines, now 350 men work part time.

As a further example, during 1923 Illinois mines produced 80,000,000 tons of coal and 99,700 miners were employed. In 1940 and 1941 approximately 45,000,000 tons of coal was mined and employment had dropped to less than 50,000. Last year this production had increased to approximately 60,000,000 tons, still 20,000,000 short of the 1923 figure. However, when we consider that in 1923 only 600,000 tons of coal were dug by strip operations, while in 1942 strip mining produced 14,000,000 tons, it will be seen that the shaft mines of Illinois have dropped in production some 33,000,000 tons.

As a further illustration, 9,600,000 tons of coal is shipped from the State of West Virginia alone into the city of Chicago. This State also supplies St. Louis with approximately 1,000,000 tons of so-called smokeless coal.

The W. P. B. recently granted the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. priorities for the material to build 1,000 coal cars. These cars require approximately 20,000 tons of steel, which is very critical material. It also proves the shortage of railroad equipment; thus it seems a waste of transportation equipment to permit such long hauls of coal merely to meet the requirements of smoke ordinances while millions of tons of coal are available at the door of these 2 cities. Any man who has attempted to obtain a priority that he might purchase steel for building or any other purpose is no doubt quite surprised when he finds a sufficient amount of steel to build 10 synthetic rubber plants allocated for the construction of these coal cars when 3,000, at least, of the 8,000 cars used in this haul could be released by these cities using coal from Illinois fields.

It requires, I am informed, 15 days for a coal car to leave Chicago or St. Louis, travel to West Virginia, be loaded, return to either of those cities, and be unloaded; thus 1 car would make 2 trips each month and would haul approximately 50 tons of coal each trip, or 100 tons per month. From these figures it will be seen that from 7,000 to 8,000 cars are tied up annually in hauling coal from West Virginia to these 2 cities; coal cars which, because of the nearness of the Illinois coal fields, would require but 3 to 4 days for a round trip, thus saving 10 to 12 days on each car for a round trip.

A serious fuel shortage existed during the past winter in the Eastern States. In some sections, schools were closed. If coal from West Virginia was shipped into the East, which is its rightful market, and coal from Illinois was used in Chicago and St. Louis, it can readily be seen that much transportation would be saved and eastern fuel needs could be met, thus relieving the oil shortages, as thousands of conversions from oil to coal have been made in homes and apartments. One ton of coal is equal in heat units to approximately 4½ barrels of oil. If 6,000,000 of the 10,000,000 tons of coal which now goes to the Middle West were shipped to the East, the same amount of heat would be obtained as would be obtained from 27,000,000 barrels of oil. This 27,000,000 barrels of oil would go a long way toward solving the fuel shortage existing each winter in Eastern States. I contend that Illinois can supply this 6,000,000 tons through increased production before another winter arrives. I contend that approximately 3,000 coal cars could be diverted to other essential war needs. There are thousands of idle miners in Illinois today who would be given work. Already overtaxed trans-

portation facilities would be relieved of this long, needless coal haul.

The 3,000 gondola coal cars released by modifying these ordinances during the duration could be converted into oil tankers at a cost of $1,050 each. Each car would hold approximately 6,000 gallons of oil. One complete round trip of these cars would mean the transporting to the east coast of 18,000,000 gallons of oil.

As to my interests, some will charge they are selfish, as I represent a mining district; however, I contend that my reasoning is logical. We are all in this war and must all make sacrifices to win it. I will admit that much benefit has come to St. Louis and Chicago through having cleaner cities; however, they should follow the example set by the city of Washington, D. C., which last December set aside its smoke ordinance for the duration and permits the consumer to purchase coal wherever he chooses.

The city of St. Louis and the city of Chicago used Illinois coal without ill effects for more than a century. They have both become great industrial centers because of this cheap fuel. I am asking them to set aside their smoke restrictions only for the duration. The entire Nation can benefit if this will be done and the only price that they will have to pay is that the good housewives of those communities will find it necessary to wash their curtains two additional times each year.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I note that while the bill carries a recommended total for 1944 of $707,040,844, it does not carry funds for the continuation of parity payments for 1943 or for 1944. It does carry a total of $193,623,000 for parity payments for the crop year of 1942. I feel that before we complete the debate on this bill a full explanation should be made in order that the farmers will know just exactly how the pending measure will affect the program under which they now operate.

This is the ninth year of my service here, and during the whole of that time I have spent my best time and efforts on legislation to give the farmer cost of production plus a fair margin of profit for the things he produces. We have had a great many agricultural bills in this House, and I doubt that I have ever missed listening to the debate on any of them and have made it a point to attend meetings whenever and wherever agricultural problems were discussed. I have always felt that unless the farmer is given equality with industry and labor, we from the Midwest can never solve our economic problems. Unless the farmer is prosperous, there will be no prosperity in the towns and cities of our land.

The parity proposition has come closer to the idea that has always been in my mind and that is that we should have a farm dollar which is equal to the dollar of the wage earner, the businessman and the industrialist. We are now closer to cost of production than we have been for a long time, and the reason I bring up the subject of parity payments at this time is not alone that the committee did not see fit to put some language in the bill to provide for parity payments in 1943 but because I feel that we should do something here to assure the producers of our food that they will get at least cost of production for their labor or be assured of parity. I know that some Representatives are of the opinion that the farmer should expect his fair price in the open market and not rely upon subsidy payments from the Federal Treasury, but I feel that the farmer ought to get parity. Of course, I am in sympathy with the viewpoint that the farmer ought to get parity in the open market, and so long as conditions beyond his control prevent him from doing that, I can see no just reason why the provisions of the A. A. A. Act of 1938 relating to parity should not be observed by Congress and appropriations made accordingly. If the committee does not feel inclined to put the amount in the bill, I feel that there should be some equivalent safeguard so that should corn, wheat, or any of the five major crops go below the parity price, the farmer would have at least some assurance that he would get a return approximating his cost of production.

I realize that there will be sufficient time to discuss this point, and others will have something to say about it, and perhaps the situation will be clarified, but as long as we have this appropriation bill before us dealing with all phases of agriculture, nothing should be left undone to safeguard the farmer who is now called upon to make a tremendous contribution to the war effort. Not only is he called upon to raise the food for our own civilian population and for our own armed forces, but for the armed forces and the civilian populations of the United Nations. That will be followed, in my opinion, after the war is over, by a demand upon the American farmer to raise a tremendous amount of food to feed the hungry people in every country in the world. The demand for the food which is now admitted to be as important as powder and bullets, will be tremendous when this war comes to an end. The demands upon the farmer are tremendous now. These demands will be more gigantic as the war progresses and as the months go by. Never before in the history of the world has humanity prayed for food as it is praying for food today. The farmer with his family broken up as a result of the war; with most of his boys and hired help gone, is faced with a tremendous task of producing more food than he has ever produced, and with less help. Harassed by storms, insect invasion, and uncertain weather; worried by lack of new machinery and scarcity of repairs and parts, the farmer has never before been so handicapped and never before has so much been expected of him.

There is no reason, then, in my opinion, that we should neglect this opportunity to give him assurance of fair return for his endeavor, and I am interested in some definite plan of assuring him parity in this bill.

This bill has considerable language in it that may be subject to points of order because it is legislation in an appropriation bill. It changes part of the farm program. In one instance, it transfers the functions of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration, and reasons for that are given in the committee report. It also abolishes the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation revealed by the committee to have operated at great loss. It cuts considerable funds from the conservation program and transfers substantial activities to the Extension Service.

In my State, according to the information that I have been given, the Farm Security Administration and the Extension Service work harmoniously. I am afraid that discontinuance of funds for parity payments may adversely affect the fundamental A. A. A. program. Several Members have asked me how the program is working out in the State of Nebraska. For that reason I have made some particular inquiry at the Department of Agriculture, and I give you the break-down on what the farmers in Nebraska received in benefit payments from preceding appropriations:

1941:	
For agricultural conservation program	$19,212,810
For parity payments (mostly wheat)	8,671,000
For sugar-beet benefits	1,683,692
Total	29,567,502
1942:	
Agricultural conservation program	$16,452,000
Parity (mostly wheat and corn)	17,619,000
Sugar beets	1,834,861
Total	35,905,861

This shows that substantial payments have been made to our farmers. I have been questioned about the administrative expense of the program. Examination of administrative expenses in other States reveals that cost of administration in Nebraska is relatively low and, as a result of streamlining the program after Pearl Harbor and eliminating considerable expense for personal services and travel, the administration of the program in Nebraska continues relatively low. For your information, I now include in my remarks the county association expenses for Nebraska for the 1942 program:

County committee	$322,406
Community committee	173,256
Office personnel	536,197
Field personnel	311,285
Total, personal services	1,343,144
Travel	94,536
Rent, equipment, and supplies	140,542
Total, 1942	1,578,222

In 1941, the total cost of administration in Nebraska was $2,026,398. In

1941, the personal services were $1,724,000, and the travel was $143,478. The showing in 1942 improved as compared to 1941.

You should bear in mind that the farmers themselves pay a sizable share of the expense of conducting the program. For example, the 1941 expense of $1,578,222 was met by a contribution of $950,222 by the farmers themselves and $628,000 that came from Federal appropriations.

My district is composed of 24 agricultural counties. The program affects most of the farmers in my district. In order to make the picture complete, I include as part of my remarks the local administration association expense payments in the Third District of Nebraska for the calendar year 1942:

County:	
Antelope	$29,981.48
Boone	27,762.94
Burt	25,694.52
Butler	33,319.74
Cedar	21,674.77
Colfax	23,781.73
Cuming	22,084.64
Dakota	16,081.95
Dixon	28,599.59
Dodge	27,687.15
Hamilton	31,071.50
Knox	28,428.93
Madison	25,506.95
Merrick	17,040.65
Nance	19,700.12
Pierce	20,623.91
Platte	32,279.34
Polk	27,677.86
Saunders	36,633.86
Seward	29,311.38
Stanton	23,844.96
Thurston	26,585.34
Wayne	31,031.47
York	27,407.99
Total	633,812.77

Mr. Chairman, another agency in which I am interested and which affects my district is the Rural Electrification Administration. I notice in the bill that the item for rural electrification has been reduced considerably. I feel that a full explanation should be made to the House on this item, in view of the fact that rural electrification has been so valuable in my State and is needed so badly now that there is such a shortage of labor. Many of our farm homes have been wired and equipped; many poles have been set; insulators and transformers have been installed, and all that is necessary in many cases is the copper conductor. I know there is a shortage of copper but I feel that these lines should be completed as rapidly as copper is available to us. The War Production Board notified me only a few days ago that it had given the green light to 32 projects over our country, several of them in my State and one very important one in my district.

Rural electrification is badly needed on our farms, and the money loaned to the various electrification districts will be returned to the Treasury of the United States if the Almighty will give us good weather and crops are produced.

Electrification will help industrialize the Middle West and bring closer to the source of production the processing of things we grow on the land. I feel, therefore, that the committee should refrain from too greatly reducing the appropriation to provide funds for the program of electrifying the farms of America.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much about reducing Government expenses not connected with our war effort, and most of us have taken this stand many, many times.

The particular information to which I would like to call your attention is that year after year we continue spending huge sums on an agricultural control program. We are now appropriating money for control and money for production. It is time to slow down on the control and to give impetus to the production of food needed to win this war. The bill before us has not changed these big payments enough. It removes parity payments after a time, and it reduces the agricultural conservation payments to $300,000,000, but where does it provide a reduction in these big checks of from $1,000 to $50,000? It should not be necessary for me to take the time to call your attention to this situation. The taxpayer can see no reason for us to continue to provide these funds, and the housewife feels she is paying enough for her food in the market place without subsidizing the big operators with Federal funds. And, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have opposed most of these schemes when on the rare occasions it was allowed to come before that committee. I am in favor of restoring freedom of action to the farmer and freeing him from control at every turn and as much as possible from the necessity of subsidy and payments from Government agencies. I want to set the farmer free and let him produce, let him collect at the stock scale and the elevator instead of the courthouse. I want to hear the farmer sing or whistle once more as he works—not sullen or resentful toward his Government for its regimentation and interference.

Following is a list of the larger payments to the various States:

TABLE I.—*Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1941 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs*

State	Number of payees	Total payments
Alabama	531	$1,029,188.57
Arizona	784	2,432,184.38
Arkansas	2,153	5,425,200.74
California	2,332	6,685,584.48
Colorado	380	652,932.91
Connecticut	32	212,602.47
Delaware	15	22,084.32
Florida	316	792,979.60
Georgia	1,019	1,909,163.42
Idaho	409	710,937.38
Illinois	2,021	3,200,165.67
Indiana	522	858,948.27
Iowa	1,799	2,725,225.51
Kansas	2,660	4,428,210.88
Kentucky	111	186,835.86
Louisiana	716	1,663,474.72
Maine	66	131,603.03
Maryland	52	71,089.30
Massachusetts	9	96,080.71
Michigan	14	22,585.94
Minnesota	432	877,850.76
Mississippi	1,940	6,792,817.14
Missouri	851	1,722,729.01
Montana	1,262	2,026,001.56
Nebraska	882	1,525,334.35
Nevada	19	39,962.60

TABLE I.—*Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1941 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs*—Continued

State	Number of payees	Total payments
New Hampshire	1	$1,811.44
New Jersey	11	186,729.24
New Mexico	699	1,359,903.29
New York	30	204,119.98
North Carolina	313	553,681.53
North Dakota	1,072	1,738,598.81
Ohio	347	625,554.02
Oklahoma	889	1,381,303.84
Oregon	710	1,490,861.63
Pennsylvania	39	87,882.08
Rhode Island	3	3,276.02
South Carolina	873	1,553,005.15
South Dakota	627	999,024.58
Tennessee	269	519,377.95
Texas	6,428	12,520,490.66
Utah	88	155,424.56
Vermont	8	41,008.20
Virginia	25	44,193.23
Washington	1,195	2,326,883.22
West Virginia	1	1,194.79
Wisconsin	39	116,805.35
Wyoming	254	498,293.73
Hawaii	26	72,092.91
Puerto Rico	32	55,160.04
Total	35,206	71,778,449.78

The small or average farmer received as follows:

Twenty-one and one-tenth percent of the farmers received less than $20 each as agricultural conservation payments.

Fifty-three percent of the farmers received less than $20 each as parity payments.

Fifty-two percent of the farmers received less than $40 as agricultural conservation payments.

Seventy-eight percent of the farmers received less than $40 as parity payments.

Eighty-one percent of the farmers received less than $100 as agricultural conservation payments.

Ninety-four percent of the farmers received less than $100 as parity payments.

The following table shows that these subsidy payments are not based on food production. For example: California, producing over 7 percent of the food of the Nation, obtained $12,000,000 as subsidy, and Mississippi, producing 1.8 percent of the food and fiber of the Nation, received over $28,000,000 as subsidy.

It would take a billion and a half for subsidies if all farmers got the amount Mississippi receives. You will note Mississippi got over five million in big checks, to big operators, for the year of 1941, which is more than all the farmers got in the 17 following States: Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Texas, in big checks to only 6,400 operators, received more for the first 11 months of 1942 than the farmers in 21 other States received, which States are as follows:

Arizona	$2,245,000
Connectict	818,000
Delaware	754,000
Florida	3,142,000
Idaho	6,571,000
Maine	1,601,000
Maryland	2,606,000
Massachusetts	810,000
Nevada	224,000

New Hampshire	400,000
New Jersey	1,151,000
New Mexico	3,060,000
New York	6,948,000
Oregon	6,585,000
Pennsylvania	6,570,000
Rhode Island	100,000
Utah	2,694,000
Vermont	1,195,000
Virginia	5,860,000
West Virginia	2,595,000
Wyoming	3,597,000

You will also note that 6,400 farmers in one State received more money than over 600,000 of the small farmers of our country.

This list includes many States that are among our leading agricultural States. They are Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

It should be noted that New York is one of the leading agricultural States in food production. That State alone produces more than half as much food and fiber as Texas, but her 153,000 farmers get less subsidy than 6,400 farmers in Texas.

Pennsylvania's 169,000 farmers get less than the 6,400 big Texas operators.

Do you know any reason for paying more subsidies to 6,400 farmers in one State than to 150,000 in another State? There are 35,000 big operators getting a total of over $71,000,000. Do you believe the American taxpayer wishes to support such a program or is interested in paying these enormous subsidies year after year?

ALABAMA

Ed Hennell, Leighton	$17,528.41
Leonard Preuit, Leighton	11,048.00
G. Preuit & Hennell, Leighton	2,073.91
Gordon Preuit, Leighton	2,053.24
Estate of G. N. Preuit, Town Creek	3,528.97
State Department of Corrections and Institutions	15,269.75
Charles Dixon, Andalusia	6,294.28
Charles Dixon & Co., Andalusia	9,100.00
Robert M. Boykin, McIntosh	6,161.75
A. J. McLenmore, route 4, Montgomery	6,562.00
Price C. McLenmore, route 4, Montgomery	3,517.55
T. W. Oliver, Montgomery	7,027.75
J. Freeman Suttle, estate, Suttle	7,546.43
W. G. Balch, Harvest	5,347.43
Ben Cunningham, Florence	5,302.72

ARIZONA

H. L. Abbott, Phoenix	13,571.05
Arizona Citrus Land Co., Waddell	19,641.60
Arizona Farm Products Corporation, Casa Grande	15,192.02
Hartlett Heard Land & Cattle Co., Phoenix	11,912.53
Allen Belluzzi, Avondale	15,850.73
J. G. Boswell Co., Phoenix	15,543.62
Casa Grande Valley Farms, Inc., Casa Grande	14,745.58
Chandler Improvement Co., Chandler	11,748.71
A. M. Clark, Coolidge	12,875.17
Cortaro Farms Co., Macana	33,526.34
M. J. Dougherty, Phoenix	13,264.17
Leo Ellsworth, Highey, route 1	10,071.86
Lawrence Ellsworth, Highey, route 1	8,051.75
J. H. England, Coolidge	12,756.28
Peter H. Ethington & Sons, Casa Grange	$18,938.74
Fred Haner, Buckeye	12,695.54
A. G. King, Buckeye	17,709.38
W. H. Lane, Sahuarita	18,682,28
Miller Cattle Co., Phoenix	16,623.06
T. C. Rhodes, Chandler	17,149.61
Santa Fe Land & Improvement Co., Phoenix	16,260.90

ARKANSAS

W. G. Alexander, Scott	12,815.15
Arkansas Board of Penal Institutions, Gould	26,045.19
J. O. E. Beck, Sr., estate, Hughes	21,175.52
J. O. E. Beck, Jr., Hughes	13,510.77
L. A. Black, DeWitt	14,367.63
Fairview Farms Co., Tyronza	16,084.19
J. A. Gwaltney, Osceola	17,927.99
Howe Lumber Co., Wabash	16,536.49
R. T. Kuhn, Marion	17,815.81
Lowrance Bros., Inc., Driver	16,853.11
B. D. Magness, Earle	13,877.86
Mallory Farms, Chatfield	14,009.71
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna	20,276.34
Southern Rice Products Corporation, Carlisle	14,912.74
Tillar Mercantile Corporation Co., Tillar	16,964.34
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson	16,397.50

CALIFORNIA

Sam and D. M. Biancucci, Firebaugh	19,928.92
Vernon Britton, Firebaugh	20,821.31
J. W. Browning Co., Colusa	18,261.79
Califlax Co., Fresno	17,896.81
Camp-West-Lowe Farms Co., Shafter	18,151.90
A. E. Christiana, Madera	20,304.45
Consolidated Farms, Stratford	18,493.56
Ray Flangan, box 103, El Nida	18,607.66
Tom Flangan, box 103, El Nida	1,352.43
Russell Giffen, Mendota	58,961.38
Ralph Gilkey, Corcoran	20,412.04
Bernal W. Giffen, Mendota	23,120.47
Heck Bros., Stratford	24,200.13
Hotchkiss Estate Co., Firebaugh	38,229.71
Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield	23,331.92
Natomas Co., Sacramento	25,125.34
J. E. O'Neill, Fresno	21,023.44
Forrest Riley, Corcoran	21,215.17

COLORADO

American Crystal Sugar Co., Rocky Ford	10,540.72
Hatchett Cattle Co., Pueblo	9,050.31
San Luis Valley Land & Cattle Co., Crestone	7,493.35
Arkansas Valley Sugar Beet & Irrigated Land Co., Holly	4,506.67
R. B. Holt, Walsh	5,866.93
Horse Creek Land & Cattle Co. Denver	5,029.76

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford	48,437.23
Aetna Life Insurance Co., Hartford	38,088.86
Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford	24,031.01
Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford	45,906.76
Griffen Fuller Tobacco Co., Hartford	3,132.52
Hartman Tobacco Co., Hartford	3,083.21
Jean E. Shepard Est., Hartford	6,991.13
South Windsor Tobacco Farms Co., Hartford	3,827.55

DELAWARE

Continental American Life Insurance Co., Wilmington	2,642.29
John S. Isaacs, Ellendale	2,758.30

FLORIDA

American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation, Quincy	7,677.64
J. W. Gibson, Inc., Lee	9,100.00
Ideal Holding Co., Fort Pierce	7,179.98
Interior Fruit Co., Winter Haven	9,054.91
A. B. & D. B. Kidler, Inc., Lakeland	$8,258.02
Lykes Bros., Inc., Tampa	9,508.75
Macclenny Turpentine Co., Macclenny	8,638.40
L. Maxcy, Frostproof	8,724.65
Mayo Rosen Co., Shamrock	7,291.75
Moody Turpentine Co., Wewahotee	9,100.00
Pace Farms, Inc., Pensacola	8,372.63
Southern Florida Rosin Corporation, Lakeland	8,935.95

GEORGIA

Mrs. Ola Aultman, Warwick	5,289.02
Better Rosin Corporation, Cogdell	9,100.00
W. C. Bradley Co., Columbus	7,262.28
Brunswick Peninsula Corporation, Brunswick	7,075.78
J. B. Davis & Co., Camilla	7,053.27
J. Edgar Dyal, Baxley	8,683.18
Wm. Jackson, Est., Donovan	11,532.73
Moselle N. Palmer, Waynesboro	9,431.60
Tarver Turpentine Co., Valdosta	9,100.00

IDAHO

J. W. Hays, Idaho Falls	10,261.14
Kootenai Valley Farm, Inc., Bonners Ferry	9,669.57
Wagner & Co., Craigmont	5,881.01
W. T. Wagner, Lewiston	5,303.14
James F. Wren, Fenn	4,830.76

ILLINOIS

Babson Farms, Inc., De Kalb	13,482.79
Federal Life Insurance Co., Chicago	10,781.08
First Trust Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Chicago	29,152.32
Rebecca Lowrie, Galesburg	11,150.88
Thomas A. Scully	11,405.52
Hiram Sibley, Est., Sibley	14,781.89

INDIANA

American United Life Insurance Co., Indianapolis	6,890.96
John C. Blood, Mount Carmel, Ill.	4,579.00
John Brevoort, Vincennes	6,316.67
Mitchell Partnership, Windfall	6,429.16
L. A. Waugh, Crookston	7,065.26

IOWA

Adams Bros. & Co., Odebelt	14,302.21
American Mutual Life Insurance, Des Moines	12,203.26
Amena Society, Amena	15,760.26
Bankers' Life Co., Des Moines	23,834.82
Brenton Bros., Inc., Dallas Center	12,582.14
Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, Des Moines	33,418.91
Joe Lindburg, Davenport	10,007.86
Des Moines Joint Stock Land Bank, Des Moines	7,976.08
Independent Order of Foresters, Mason City	9,243.24
Litchfield Realty Co., Des Moines	9,036.61
National Life Co., Des Moines	9,100.93

KANSAS

Bank Savings Life Fund, Topeka	14,374.48
John W. Baughman, Liberal	16,079.20
R. B. Christy, Scott City	12,005.91
Collingwood Land Co., Johnson	18,317.69
Federal Land Bank of Wichita, Wichita	16,858.68
George E. Gano, Hutchinson	10,077.64
G-K Farms, Colby	11,134.95
Sledd Farm Corporation, Lyons	10,994.98
J. L. Burnett, Kendall	6,292.96
Maud Collingwood, Plains	66,271.62
Lee Collingwood, Est., Hutchinson	6,837.19
Collingwood Grain Co., Johnson	2,294.98
W. A. Cross, Lewis	7,265.83
Howard J. Floyd, Ness City	8,220.52
Foster Farms, Rexford	9,261.80

KENTUCKY

Helen Tyler, Hickman	5,038.83
Clarence Le Buss, Cynthiana	3,003.33
Clarence Le Buss & Son Co., Lexington	1,303.08
C. M. Hornsby, Hickman	3,337.13
Bower Bros., Evansville, Ind	3,882.19

LOUISIANA

Elizabeth M. Amacker, Lake Providence	$10,922.94
Beene Planting Corporation, Bossier City	11,594.29
Burnside & McDonald, Newellton	14,083.38
H. D. Farms, Shreveport	12,492.99
T. B. Gilbert & Co., Inc., Wisner	12,845.75
Panola Co., Ltd., Newellton	13,694.08
Robert R. Rhymes, Rayville	12,335.72
Kansas Planting Corporation, Shreveport	8,313.23
A. B. Learned, Herriday	9,284.88
A. F. McDade, Sr., McDade	8,625.49
W. H. North, Dixie	8,121.62
J. M. Petitjean, Thornwell	9,414.65
O. L. Pollingue, Port Barre	8,710.43

MAINE

Walter Christie, Presque Isle	5,364.15
Ben Marks Co., Inc., Presque Isle	5,282.04
Reed Bros., Fort Fairfield	6,709.89
Woodman Potato Co., Presque Isle	7,554.98

MARYLAND

J. H. and W. S. Baker, Buckeystown	3,915.17
A. Lee Towson, Jr., Middle River	3,023.34

MASSACHUSETTS

John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston	81,387.25
Columbian National Life Insurance Co., Boston	4,902.83

MICHIGAN

A. B. Chapman & Sons, South Rockwood	2,293.50

MINNESOTA

Farmers & Mechanics Savings Bank, Minneapolis	12,435.93
Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, St. Paul	75,761.30
M. J. Florance, Hallock	11,931.54
Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis	13,813.53
Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Minneapolis	11,851.84
St. Olaf College, Northfield	11,338.90
Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank of Minnesota, Minneapolis	18,560.45
Kennedy Trading Co., Kennedy	8,417.55
Maple Island Farms Co., Hollandale	8,800.13
Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., St. Paul	8,872.98
State of Minnesota Department of Rural Credit, St. Paul	9,031.79
Minnesota Valley Canning Co., Le Sueur	7,646.80
Union Investment Co., Minneapolis	6,283.14
Winona National Savings Bank, Winona	7,379.79

MISSISSIPPI

Abbey & Leatherman, Robinsville	15,150.44
C. C. Aderholdt, Clarksdale	11,921.40
Ashton Planting Co., Clarksdale	10,827.71
Banks & Co., Hernando	10,788.47
C. B Box Estate, Midnight	18,581.41
J. Brooks Plantations, Shelby	12,370.08
P. Brooks & Co., Inc., Drew	15,678.00
P. Brown, Drew	15,700.27
Carpenter & Graft, Rolling Fork	13,137.12
Cason Bros., Duckhill	10,334.20
Irby Charping, Hitler	10,135.37
J. P. Cole, Highlandale	14,711.75
R. M. Dakin, Cleveland	12,752.38
Dean & Co., Tribbett	11,058.57
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott	50,141.39
Delta Planting Co., Deeson	21,217.18
Dixie Farms, Vance	15,717.73
J. R. Dockery, Dockery	17,879.18
Lillian N. Evans, Shuqulak	10,590.16
J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon	18,579.21
Roy Flowers, Mattson	10,801.08
J. L. Gaddis, Jr., Bolton	$15,194.81
B. F. & W. Harbert, Robinsville	15,405.25
Hopson Planting Co., Clarksdale	17,560.51
G. Johnson, Clarksdale	10,710.47
Jones & Rickett, Hollandale	10,590.09
King & Anderson, Inc., Clarksdale	19,201.65
C. W. King Estate, Clarksdale	14,684.01
Henry Kline, Anguilla	12,832.45
Kline Planting Co., Alligator	12,135.38
M. S. Knowlton, Perthshire	15,491.49
S. H. Kyle, Clarksdale	13,588.33
F. B. McKee, Friars Point	10,869.59
Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman	48,126.90
Smith Murphy, Sumner	10,477.40
R. Vance Norfleet, Lula	11,876.70
C. P. Owen, Robinsville	11,828.34
R. W. Owen & Son, Evansville	18,857.62
Panther Burn Co., Panther Burn	15,056.40
M. R. Park, Greenville	11,054.21
G. D. Perry, Hollywood	13,394.47
G. D. Perry, Jr., Maud	10,825.89
Percy Ray, Indianola	10,015.92
Refuse Planting Co., Greenville	11,066.27
Robertshaw Co., Heathman	15,701.61
Mrs. Roberta P. Smith, Cleveland	10,463.95
Howard Stovall, Stovall	11,924.44
Neal Streater, Jr., Rosedale	11,549.51
M. P. Sturdivant, Glendora	16,100.39
W. B. Swain & Co., Hollyknowe	16,679.04
Trail Lake Plantation, Tralake	10,619.62
F. C. Wagner Plantations, Dunleith	20,625.75
C. S. Whittington, Greenwood	10,988.74
Wildwood, Inc., Greenwood	16,646.27

MISSOURI

E. P. Coleman, Jr., Sikeston	12,531.80
P. B. Crouthers, Lilbourn	13,215.91
Deering Farms, Inc., Deering	10,074.32
General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis	52,170.67
J. Ralph Hutchison, Caruthersville	11,444.17
Kansas City Life Insurance Co., Kansas City	17,328.75
A. Parker Kersey, Caruthersville	12,497.20
W. T. Riley, New Madrid	10,584.02
Commerce Trust Co., Kansas City	9,180.63

MONTANA

Campbell Farming Corporation, Hardin	17,600.38
Schnitzler Corporation, Froid	11,349.27
Sheffels Bros., Great Falls	11,165.92
Antler Land Co., Wyola	6,282.95
Bar B Co., Wisdom	8,173.65
Buffalo Creek Co-op, Shepheard	8,659.93
Crow Indian Tribe, Crow Agency	9,458.24
Ed Kopac, Hardin	8,055.78
Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe, Forsythe	9,200.11
Northern Pacific R. R. Co., St. Paul, Minn	9,538.84
Wesmeyer & Shawhan, Billings	7,389.32

NEBRASKA

Bankers Life Insurance Co., Lincoln	20,291.17
Brown Land Co., Omaha	13,406.10
Federal Land Bank of Omaha, Omaha	77,605.56
Fremont Joint Stock Land Bank, Lincoln	10,062.58
Lincoln Joint Stock Land Bank, Lincoln	16,561.87
Kilpatrick Bros. Co., Imperial	8,566.00
Vernon E. Linn, Kimball	8,324.02
Harry Minor, Hyannis	8,407.48
Old Line Insurance Co., Lincoln	3,218.73
Security Mutual Life Insurance Co., Lincoln	6,258.73
Tobin Bros., Tekamah	5,451.39

NEVADA

Utah Construction Co., McDermitt	7,671.84
W. T. Jenkins Co., Battle Mountain	3,077.07
Lucille M. Jones, Lovelock	3,298.27
C. A. Sewell, Elko	3,293.80

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire Savings Bank, Concord	$1,811.44

NEW JERSEY

Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark	82,126.74
Prudential Life Insurance Co., Newark	80,040.82
Seabrook & Baitinger, Bridgeton	8,417.94
Investors Management Corporation, Inc., Bridgeton	6,354.54

NEW MEXICO

Hal Bogle, Dexter	18,825.40
Del Cerro Cooperative Association, Las Cruces	17,032.33
Diamond A Cattle Co., Roswell	10,406.98
Lesser, Goldman & Co., Roswell	14,747.41
D. F. Stahmann, Las Cruces	17,033.44
J. P. White Co., Roswell	19,361.99
Ira D. Aten, Vermejo Park	9,140.04
Buffalo Valley Farms, Hagerman	7,182.55
W. H. Driggers & Sons, Santa Rosa	9,100.00
Mescalero Indian Cattle Growers' Association, Mescalero	9,500.00

NEW YORK

Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City	35,488.85
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City	101,863.82
New York Life Insurance Co., New York City	15,932.83
Security Mutual Life Insurance Co., Binghamton	10,026.39

NORTH CAROLINA

McNair Investment Co., Laurinburg	11,654.88
John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg	7,246.45
Z. V. Pate Estates, Edwin Pate, executor, Laurinburg	7,145.14
Z. V. Pate, Inc., Gibson	10,685.38
D. R. & S. N. Clark, Tarboro	5,871.90
M. C. Braswell Farms, Rock Mount	4,108.04
M. C. Braswell Farms, Battleboro	5,568.85
W. S. Clark & Sons, Inc., Tarboro	4,802.67
Erwin Cotton Mills Co., Erwin	3,060.09
W. J. Long, Garysburg	6,967.22

NORTH DAKOTA

John S. Dalrymple, Minneapolis, Minn	10,589.25
John S. Dalrymple, Jr., Minneapolis, Minn	2,054.41
William Dalrymple estate, care of John S. Dalrymple, Minneapolis, Minn	3,209.08
John J. Deschenes and Henry M. Baldwin, Hillsboro	12,152.87
Elk Valley Farms, Larimore	7,568.88
Grand Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota, Fargo	15,309.83
McKenzie County Grazing Association, Watford City	7,039.29
State of North Dakota, Bismarck	57,445.53
J. W. Scott, Gilby	6,333.92

OHIO

Agricultural Lands, Inc., London	10,981.62
William Matthews, Wilmington	8,161.30
Ohio National Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati	12,483.14
Orleton Farms, London	11,499.07
Union Central Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati	49,153.77
Samuel B. Hartman estate, Columbus	5,170.93

OKLAHOMA

Land Office Commissioners, Oklahoma City	7,987.90
G. E. Davison, Peck	5,353.17
E. A. Mills, Bristow	5,687.39
Tom Moran, Tipton	6,878.31

OREGON

U. S. Alderman, Dayton	$5,054.27
Harold Barnett, Pendleton	7,339.97
Collins & Banfield, Pendleton	9,820.16
Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton	8,662.78
Eastern Oregon Land Co., Ontario	7,782.76
Carl Engdahl, Pendleton	8,304.39
Cary V. Loosley, Fort Klamath	8,285.09
Pendleton Ranches, Inc., Pendleton	9,156.06
L. L. Rogers, Pendleton	8,793.40
Warner Valley Stock Co., Adel	8,741.33

PENNSYLVANIA

Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia	7,634.16
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia	7,631.13
Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia	13,022.69
Trexler Farms, Allentown	6,262.92

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville	12,148.09
D. K. McColl, Bennettsville	11,893.51
J. E. Mayes, Mayesville	7,158.80
R. J. Mayes, Jr., Mayesville	12,243.10
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	4,021.12
J. F. Bland & Co., Mayesville	7,260.14
J. F. Bland, Jr., Mayesville	4,605.45
Margaret E. Bland, Mayesville	4,904.99
The Gardner Co., Society Hill	6,843.52
Mannings Farm Corporation, W. S., Cherow	6,922.58
State Farm, Boykin	5,435.85
C. W. Stone, Clinton	8,291.07
P. A. Wallace, Bennettsville	9,968.73

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lower Brule Livestock Association, Lower Brule	5,856.18
Midland National Life Insurance Co., Watertown	7,261.73
Rural Credit Board of South Dakota, Pierre	13,959.43
F. R. Barthold, Hartley	4,076.20
A. W. Rewinkle, Batesland	4,473.22
Tom Berry, Belvidere	4,251.58
Dewey County, Timber Lake	4,579.18
Edmunds County, Ipswich	4,535.96
Spink County, Redfield	4,925.24
Faulk County, Faulkton	4,508.07
Sully County, Onida	4,134.44
Hansmefer & Co., Bristol	4,770.75

TENNESSEE

Dillard & Coffin Co., Memphis	10,841.48
Walter Delaney, Ridgely	7,429.00
Mrs. Mildred B. Duncan, Lucy	5,572.16
B. C. Dunlop, Ridgley	4,158.19
W. E. Dunlop, Ridgley	6,702.51
Fort Pillow State Farm, Fort Pillow	6,400.46
John C. Jackson, Tiptonville	9,584.03
C. F. Parker, Tiptonville	8,856.00
Tennessee Farm Corporation, Clarksville	5,033.45
J. E. Waughn, Tiptonville	6,171.52

TEXAS

Lee Moor, Clint	22,830.24
Alcorn Land & Imp. Co., Sugar Land	18,890.26
L. R. Allison, Tornillo	11,802.44
R. L. Batte, Cameron	11,851.43
J. L. Bivens, estate, Amarillo	12,076.08
E. W. Boyt, Devers	15,705.44
G. C. Brillhart, Spearman	10,130.87
Geo. Chance, Bryan	14,718.66
Mrs. Lucy F. Cooke, Corpus Christi	15,901.88
Mrs. Ruth Chapman Cowles, Wapahachie	11,713.72
Dallas Joint Stock Land Bank, Dallas	11,158.52
Double U Co., Levelland	12,500.77
J. R. Durrett, Amarillo	11,012.78
J. R. Goss, Telephone	14,924.92
Gulf Coast Rice Production Co., Bay City	$18,090.98
Gulf Coast Water Co., Bay City	10,345.34
H. B. Hart, Gruver	10,533.88
Hudspeth Farms	10,793.69
C. L. Kilgore, Amarillo	14,187.28
Murray & Murray, Grapeland	10,064.64
Oil Development Co., of Texas, Amarillo	10,122.71
George W. Orr, El Paso	10,191.07
Conner Parish, Ralls	12,113.30
M. G. Perry, Robstown	10,413.55
Pierce Estate, Inc., Pierce	16,210.90
J. Earl Porter, Caldwell	10,878.13
L. M. Price & Co., Stratford	15,933.03
Milt M. Reinhold, Delhart	10,472.47
Southwestern Life Insurance Co., Dallas	10,780.64
Texas Land & Development Co.	16,401.83
Texas Land & Mortgage Co., Ltd., Lubbock	10,897.09
Texas Prison System, Huntsville	48,107.64
Texas Public Service Farm Co., Beaumont	12,475.94
United Farms, El Paso	10,793.72
Byron & Gist, Adrian	8,242.10
Capitol Freehold Land Trust, Chicago	9,455.22
A. S. Gage Ranches, Marathon	9,690.00
Grandfalls Farms, Inc., Grandfalls	7,010.75
T. B. Masterson, Truscott	9,578.94
Martin Zimmerman, Floydada	8,808.49

UTAH

Deseret Livestock Co., Salt Lake City	5,982.34
La Sal Livestock Co., La Sal	3,281.48
Peery Land & Livestock, Salt Lake City	5,277.90
Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., Salt Lake City	3,246.63
W. W. Whitney, Tremonton	3,739.57
John Adams	3,802.22
Wilse A. Nielsen	3,476.41

VERMONT

Nat. Life Ins. Co., Montpelier	25,919.27
Vermont Realty, Inc., Burlington	4,643.60

VIRGINIA

Eastern Shore Canning Co., Inc., Machipongo	3,008.06
G. I. Webster Co., Inc., Cheriton	9,470.00

WASHINGTON

C. J. Broughton, Dayton	16,827.21
Fed. Land Bank of Spokane, Spokane	17,275.58
Fred W. Hair, Prescott	11,095.91
W. A. Longmeier, Lind	10,001.42
McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Thornton	14,519.60
John Hoffman, estate, Walla Walla	9,188.01
Fred Lasater, Prescott	9,158.65
Casper L. Woodward, Walla Walla	5,695.06
Vergyl Tompkins, Prescott	4,404.26
Ed Tucker, Walla Walla	8,357.53
Sheffels Bros, Govan	7,754.83

WISCONSIN

Equitable Reserve Association, Neenah	6,193.03
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee	47,517.57
Old Line Life Insurance Co., of America, Milwaukee	11,356.04

WYOMING

Miller Land & Livestock Co., Parkman	10,646.80
Dana Meadows Sheep Co., Rawlins	3,734.41
H. W. Keeline & Sons, Gillette	4,611.37
Leo Sheep Co., Rawlins	4,120.00
Mortons, Inc., Douglas	9,350.00
L. G. Phelps, estate, Meeteetse	7,011.21
E. V. Robertson, Cody	6,769.95
The Swan Co., Chugwater	9,439.18
Herman Werner, Ross	5,551.52

Mr. Chairman, this whole agricultural program is based on quicksand and one who follows its machinations can come to but one conclusion. There is more interest in conserving the New Deal than in conserving the land of our country. Why continue this affair any longer? It has no place in wartime—it did not even make sense in peacetime.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill fiscal year 1944, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that neither on this nor the other side of the House are there any requests for further time by gentlemen who are present, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement entered into earlier in the day with reference to the duration of general debate may be abrogated and that general debate on the bill H. R. 2481 do now close.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Acting President pro tempore, had appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. LODGE as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Congressional Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of Officers and Employees of the Legislative Branch of the Government, established by Public Law No. 23, approved April 8, 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of the testimony before the House Committee on Small Business today on the price of oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks later to be made in Committee of the Whole I may have permission to insert a short statement issued December 5, 1942, by the Secretary of Agriculture and a letter from the head of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The general debate having concluded, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read to the bottom of page 1, line 6.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 2481, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported House Joint Resolution 155, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 155 and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the following respective purposes, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Censorship

Notwithstanding section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation to the Office of Censorship contained in such act shall be available in an amount not to exceed $165,000 for printing and binding, and $175,000 for traveling expenses; and in addition such appropriation shall be available for the payment of living and quarters allowances (including heat, fuel, and light) to personnel stationed outside the continental limits of the United States in accordance with standardized regulations dated December 30, 1942.

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Public Health Service

Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1943, for pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1943, $2,900,000.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Locomotive inspection: For an additional amount for locomotive inspection, Interstate Commerce Commission, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, $11,700.

The Tax Court of the United States

Salaries and expenses: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, there may be expended $18,000 for travel expenses from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent deficiency appropriation. It is necessary that money be provided immediately in order to meet the final pay roll for April on two of these activities and that authorization for reallocation be immediately provided for the other two. The principal item is for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service. The need for the additional appropriation is due to the fact that the original estimate was prepared prior to the declaration of war, and war conditions have made it necessary to increase their facilities, personnel, and supplies.

The other appropriation is a small item of $11,700 for locomotive inspection required by the Interstate Commerce Commission, due to a change of law effective after the original appropriation was made increasing the rate of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence for persons in travel status.

There are two other paragraphs, neither of which provides an appropriation, one from the Office of Censorship, authorizing the expenditure of additional funds for printing and binding and the other for the Board of Tax Appeals, providing additional allocation of funds for traveling expenses.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes in with a unanimous report from the committee. As the gentleman from Missouri said, the only major item is for $2,900,000 for the Public Health Service in the matter of hospitals, including additional cost of rations and additional help required to maintain the injured and wounded in the war. I think the resolution should pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include quotations and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley Junior Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 899. An act to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the William Wrigley Junior Co;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.;

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, April 15, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings on the petroleum situation. Independents will testify.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

329. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the estimate of appropriation for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $100,000 (H. Doc. No. 159); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

330. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $6,889,800 (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

331. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the foreign trade zones board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WARD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2437. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; with amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1616. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2486. A bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 2490. A bill to authorize the fee simple conveyance of certain property of the United States in Puerto Rico now occupied in usufruct; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. Res. 209. Resolution creating a select committee to attend the Anglo-American Conference on Refugee Problems; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in essential war service under certain limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2491. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Eisik Goldmann, Czarne Goldmann, Lilly and Guidon Goldmann, Hersz Arbermann Hausman, Augusta Laura Hausman, Joseph Hausman, and Edgar David Hausman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; to the Committee on War Claims.

My Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2494. A bill granting an increase of pension to Albert Steinhauser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2497. A bill for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

534. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Bessie Hubbs and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

535. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of various citizens from the State of Indiana, and especially from New Palestine, Ridgeville, Dunkirk, Farmland, Union City, Indianapolis, Henryville, Memphis, Hagerstown, Fort Wayne, and Angola, favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

536. By Mr. ROLPH: House Resolution No. 167 of the State of California, endorsing the meat-industry program for solving wartime meat problems, and that Chester C. Davis be, and is hereby, memorialized to place the full authority to achieve the objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

537. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of the Beauregard Parish school board, DeRidder, La., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 637 and urging support of the legislation; to the Committee on Education.

538. Also, petition of the St. Landry Parish school board, Opelousas, La., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 637 and urging support of the legislation; to the Committee on Education.

539. Also, petition of the Calcasieu Parish school board, Lake Charles, La., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 637 and urging support of the legislation; to the Committee on Education.

540. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of sundry citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

541. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry residents of Pomeroy, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082 to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

542. Also, petition of sundry residents of Walla Walla and nearby areas, protesting against the income-tax levy on service men, especially those in the combat zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

543. Also, petition of sundry residents of Rosalia, Plaza, and Thornton, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082; to the committee on the Judiciary.

544. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. Lawrence A. Britton and members of his congregation of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

545. Also, petition of Rev. T. Milton Gladen and members of his congregation of Chester, W. Va., urging the reduction of absenteeism, conservation of manpower, and the speeding of production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration, and urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

546. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Building Construction, Highway Pavers, Sewer and Tunnel Workers' Union of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Eddie Rickenbacker; to the Committee on Rules.

547. Also, petition of Francis Jean Rueter, specialist, management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father, who dost bring together the discordant notes of our weak humanity into harmony, bend low to every heart. Do Thou persuade all in this sacred silence that Thine only begotten Son is light and in Him there is no darkness at all. Grant that the graces of love and obedience may be summed up in us giving a foretaste of the remunerative wealth of a good, useful life. O bless us with the glimpses of the heartening, purifying spirit of Him who looks to the morning lands of eternal day.

Dear Lord, do Thou lead us along the pathways of the wisest thought and breathe Thy cleansing spirit through our false sense of freedom and self-indulgence. Endue us with Thy power in molding our character and inspiring our behavior. Then life's true reward will not fail us, its dreams will come true, and our labors will live on. This day may we meditate no bitterness, utter no words of intemperate speech, and witness no harshness in our conduct. We pray for grace to resist every evil influence, for that serenity which sustains in the severest ordeal, and for that strength of soul which turns to advantage every burden. In the blessed name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which I have received from Robert E. Webb, Vice Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, Transportation Act of 1940, on the subject of interterritorial freight rates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERTERRITORIAL FREIGHT RATES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most involved and highly technical problems is the proper adjustment of interterritorial freight rates. This matter vitally affects the South and other class rate territories of the United States. The Board of Investigation and Research has made a summary report on the study of this subject, which is now available to the Members of Congress. In a short time the complete report will be published.

There are so many factors involved in the solution of this question that I call the attention of the Members of the House to the report on the subject, in the hope that some legislative policy may be formulated by which equal justice may be substantially done to the shippers of freight in the various class-rate territories in the United States. While the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have made an intensive study of this question and are familiar with it, I am sure the great majority of my colleagues have not had either the time or opportunity to make sufficient investigation and will be glad to have the report.

Mr. Webb is a citizen of Kentucky, a resident of the southern class-rate territory, and has had large experience in the rate making. I know he desires that equal justice be done to all and is sympathetic with the interests of the South.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUPPLIES FOR THE NAVY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 206) on the bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy for printing in the RECORD.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1900, to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Spencer Leader, by its able editor, William B. Tunstall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Maury Maverick at the meeting of the American College of Surgeons at Richmond, Va., March 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE BILL H. R. 1900

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to file a supplementary report to accompany the bill H. R. 1900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain brief editorials from Texas newspapers favoring the trade-agreement policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SUNDSTROM were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

WAR BOND SALES IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of our country have the people been asked to subscribe to so large an amount of War bonds as in the present War bond drive for $13,000,000,000.

The people of this mighty Nation have never failed in War bond drives. The evidence of patriotism rests in the fact

that the last War bond drive for $9,000,000,000 went over the top.

The State of New Jersey has done its part not only in supplying men in the armed services, in supplying industrial requirements and production, but also in supplying money to finance our war effort.

It was with especial satisfaction that I learned, and it gives me very great pride to announce, that the Prudential Life Insurance Co., located in Newark, N. J., has just subscribed for $400,000,000 in War bonds, the largest single subscription ever made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a narration which is, in a sense, the keynote of the Vision of Victory show which the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., of Rochester, N Y., presented to a total audience of 17,000 in 6 performances at the Eastman Theater on April 1, 2, and 3, 1943, under the leadership of Mr. Herbert Eisenhard and Mr. Carl S. Hallauer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the North Dakota Council of Christian Education, supported by the following churches, endorses the program of the Farm Security Administration: Baptist, Nazarene, Moravian, Disciples, Methodist, Presbyterian, United Brethren, Congregational, Christian, Evangelical, Salvation Army, Church of God, German Baptist, Christian Reformed, Church of the Brethren, Reformed Church in America, Episcopal, Wesleyan Methodist, Evangelical and Reformed, and United Lutheran.

In addition to that, Rev. Father Eagan, Bishop of the Catholic Churches of North Dakota, has already expressed his views upon this bill in the most thorough-going article that I have had occasion to read. That article by the bishop is now a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The following national farm and labor organizations support the Farm Security program: American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., the Trainmen's Brotherhood, and the National Farmers' Union.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD a letter from North Dakota Council of Christian Education, together with a letter from the Farmers' Union of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein some observations by Paul Walker, a reporter from Harrisburg, on his experiences in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADEQUATE SUPPLIES FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation and of the west coast in particular are well aware of the fact that the largest single force on the side of the United Nations, the Russian Army, is fully committed to the struggle against Germany and cannot be shifted elsewhere. They understand also that, as matters stand, it is probably sound strategy to concentrate upon Germany from all sides in order to bring about Germany's early and complete defeat, thus eliminating half of the Axis and making all forces available to then concentrate on the other half of the Axis—Japan.

Nevertheless, the people of the west coast, and, I believe, of the country as a whole, are vitally concerned that the forces in the Pacific be adequately supported, and they insist that there be no skimping in that support in order that they may adequately hold the Japanese from our shores and make such advances as may be possible from time to time.

I hope and trust that our leadership in this war is sending adequate supplies of men and matériel to General MacArthur and the forces in the Southwest Pacific. The people of the west coast will not forgive any failure in that respect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder how effective our program of economy really is as regards the Public Works Administration under the Federal Works Agency?

A cut of 26 percent in personnel was recently made with less than 20 percent cut in total salaries. During the years from 1934 to 1937 approximately 250 engineers were employed with the same amount of supervisory personnel as now exists. Today we find 16 engineers still retained with 28 supervisors and assistants to supervisors on the pay roll.

A considerable number of men laid off were brought from the field forces and had been with the organization for from 10 to 20 years. Seniority evidently was not considered, as many of the supervisory personnel which were continued did not possess this point of service.

Is it true or false economy to still retain the same number of supervisors with an increase in salary to handle 16 engineers when the same supervisors formerly handled 250 engineers?

CURTAILMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about what the gentleman from Ohio was just discussing, but since the subject of economy has been brought up I should like to tell the House that, following the authorization to the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate civilian personnel, the rate of hiring of new employees in the Government has been so reduced that we have today between 200,000 and 250,000 fewer employees than we would have had if the pressure had not been put on to stop that expansion. In addition to that, in the temporary pay legislation of last December the Director of the Budget was required to secure reports from the various agencies on the savings that could be effected by the extension of the workweek to 48 hours. As a result of that legislation, he has ordered the separation of 41,631 people from the pay roll, which will save about $80,000,000 on an annual basis. Together the two items amount to a saving on an annual basis of at least $400,000,000. The Congress is entitled to the credit for this economy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. William L. Batt, Vice Chairman, War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER from the Committee on Rules submitted the following report on the bill (H. R. 1364) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 362) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1364, a bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same

to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SURPLUS GASOLINE IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, for the past year I have been gathering information and data about the gasoline situation in Pennsylvania. I have been in constant touch with Secretary Ickes. I told him that if gasoline was actually needed for the war effort we would give up our A cards and cars as well.

Within the past week refineries in western Pennsylvania have informed me that they have had to close down their refineries because they did not have storage facilities available. In yesterday's paper [holds up the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette] we read the story of a reporter who saw gasoline dumped back into the ground. The refinery tells us, because of the lack of markets and lack of storage facilities, thousands of gallons of gasoline are being dumped back into the ground. We know the refineries must continue to operate because there are many byproducts that are needed for the war effort, yet here we see refineries closing down and refined gasoline dumped back into the ground while war workers cannot obtain gasoline—a tragic situation.

I have introduced a resolution, House Resolution 205, to investigate this situation, and have asked the Committee on Rules to help me get some action and report this resolution out favorably.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gasoline being dumped into the ground in Pennsylvania or back in Mississippi, Louisiana, or Texas, where it is produced?

Mr. WEISS. Back in Pennsylvania we produce oil and gasoline also.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects; in one to include a speech by E. Guy Talbot, and in another an essay on absenteeism.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made yesterday, and to include therein some articles from which I quoted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONFERENCE OF UNITED NATIONS ON FOOD

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 there will be held a United Nations food conference at Hot Springs, Va. Up to date it appears this conference is being surrounded with an air of secrecy and mystery. Members of the press will not be permitted to be present except at the opening and the closing and will not even be permitted to stay at the same hotel as the delegates.

I think that the Congress should have something to do with this conference. Certainly we are going to have something to do with the results of any agreement which may be worked out there. I have therefore introduced a House resolution providing for the appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of a committee of five members of the Committee on Agriculture to attend this conference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and in one to include a short editorial from the Plymouth Pilot and in the other to include resolutions adopted by the Post-War Congress on Peace, St. Joseph County, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters from the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson on the hoof-and-mouth disease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

THE HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the Members to the fact that I am putting in, under an extension of remarks, a couple of letters I have received from an authority outside of the bureaucratic end of this Government with respect to the menacing and uncontrollable hoof-and-mouth disease and its generous and generally attempted importation from Argentina. I would like to have you read these because the man whose remarks and whose letters I am putting in the RECORD knows whereof he speaks. Some of you have sought to have and have employed him as a judge for your cattle shows both here and in Canada. He knows what he is talking about. Read the letters.

THE PRIVATE CAPITALISTIC ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] in congratulating the Prudential Life Insurance Co. on subscribing for $400,000,000 of defense bonds. But let us not be unmindful of the fact that the Prudential obtained the insurance reserves with which to make that subscription from the people in this country who grew up under the private capitalistic enterprise system and who voluntarily subscribed for those insurance contracts against which these reserves stand. It is but another illustration of the fact that we have the finest economic system on earth today, as imperfect as it may be and as important as it is for us to improve it at every opportunity.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received in the mail a short letter from J. Nelson Frierson, dean of the law school of the University of South Carolina, in whom folks down my way have great confidence. He writes as follows:

> Deeply concerned about the kind of postwar world that we will be part and parcel of, I feel very deeply that a most important step to be taken now is to extend the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a further period of 3 years. I hope that you feel likewise.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I fully concur in the views of the dean and sincerely trust that the Ways and Means Committee, which is now considering House Joint Resolution 111, will soon make a favorable report thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because there seems to be some doubt about whether the administration wants to continue that constitutional provision guaranteeing free speech and a free press, I am introducing a bill which makes it an offense for anyone in the executive department to hold one of these conferences where the purpose is to give away our property or to bring in several hundred thousand or a million or two refugees without having a Congressman and a Senator present. The passage of this bill, if we can get it through, will let the people have something to say about that sort of action. At least it will let the people know what is going on. We have enough of dictatorship. Let us go no further along the road of abolishing free speech and a free press. Let the people know the road they are to travel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

RENEWAL OF RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual for me to read a letter to the House, but this letter comes from an old, old Republican friend of mine and I cannot resist the temptation to read it to you.

The Honorable ADOLPH SABATH,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I see that there is a question of renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act which expires on June 12 and the currency stabilization and dollar devaluation legislation scheduled to die on June 30.

In my opinion, the attempted sabotage of the President's program by certain elements in the Congress is one of the most dangerous threats to our safety and welfare as a nation. As a Republican born and bred, but one who is giving President Roosevelt 100 percent support under present-day conditions—and as one of your constituents—I urge with all the earnestness I possess that you support the renewal of these two measures.

Sincerely yours,

M. H. NORTHAM.

P. S.—Don't be fooled by any handful of reactionaries with whom you may be associated. The people of this country are for winning this war and for having a decent place to live after it is won.

M. H. N.

Mr. Speaker, the writer of this letter, I am sure, expresses the sentiment and wish of the vast majority of the American people, and the winning of the war and insuring the continuation of our liberty-loving mode of life after the war is won can be accomplished under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the subcommittee handling the agricultural appropriations appeared before the Committee on Rules seeking a rule waiving points of order on the agricultural appropriation bill. A good many of the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture appeared and opposed the granting of this rule. The Committee on Rules saw fit not to grant the rule. Personally, I thought it was a mistake not to grant the rule. Granting that everything the legislative committee argued was true, I still thought it was a mistake not to grant the rule.

The result is that you have now 20 or more important items in this bill against which points of order will lie. Undoubtedly the points of order will be made against most of those items. Regardless of whose fault it is, regardless of who is usurping whose authority, you cannot explain to that farmer back at home the fine technical difference between the rights of one committee as against another.

I think this matter ought to be reconsidered and that these items ought not to go out of the bill in the House. The legislative committee is not going to increase its prestige by such procedure. You know that when this bill goes to the Senate it will probably put these items back in the bill, but there is the danger that they may not be put back at all, and you will have trouble then explaining your reasons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE REFUGEE QUESTION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to discuss the refugee question and the Bermuda conference that is to take place shortly, but I find that time does not allow it. However, I join my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in the belief that our committee should be represented at the Bermuda conference.

The world is afire. Millions of people are being slaughtered. The civilized world is looking to all free nations and all democracies to do something for the unfortunate women and children who are in danger of being killed. The United States will be called upon to do its share in this great program.

It seems to me that some members of our committee should be present to advise the conference with respect to a legislative program. Without injury to our economic structure we can open the door to a certain number of people by using the unused quotas that have not been allocated for the last 5 years. The Allied Nations will do nothing unless we in this country extend our sympathy to these refugees and allow a certain number to come into this country. For that reason I support House Resolution 209.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE JAPANESE PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much concerned about a news item appearing in the Washington Evening Star yesterday quoting Gen. John L. De Witt, commanding general of the Western Defense Command in San Francisco, who made a very interesting comment regarding the Japanese situation on the Pacific coast:

"A Jap's a Jap," and "it makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not," Lt. Gen. John L. De Witt said yesterday in opposing "the sentiment developing to bring back some of the Japanese to the west coast."

He said further:

I don't want any of them. We got them out. They were a dangerous element. The west coast is too vital and too vulnerable to take any chances.

I think there is a tendency on the part of the American people generally to minimize the importance of the Japanese situation in the United States, particularly because the events in the far Pacific have been favorable to us during the past few months, although the situation is serious at the present time.

I have a resolution pending before the Committee on Rules calling for an investigation of the entire Japanese problem in the United States. There are conflicting rumors, charges, and counter charges continually concerning the Japanese problem. The greatest confusion exists in the minds of the American public regarding this question. I submit gentlemen, Congress has the responsibility to investigate all the facts in this situation. I believe it can best be handled by Congress delving into the whole question and solving it in a realistic matter of fact and humane fashion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a statement made by me on

the floor of the House on Friday, April 9, 1943, during the consideration of the bill H. R. 653, known as the Hobbs bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain resolutions adopted by the Child Care Conference of Wayne County, C. I. O. Council, Detroit, Mich., March 28, 1943, in respect to the placing of child care under a centralized Federal agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES SHOULD ADVOCATE INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM AFTER THE WAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, recently a meeting was held here in the Capitol, attended by a large number of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. The occasion was an address by Mr. Francis H. Brownell, president of the great American Smelting & Refining Co., of New York City, an organization that has world-wide international mining business, and is a great producer of the precious metal. Mr. Brownell went into some detail to explain his position concerning the international monetary system to be established after the war. The meeting was very interesting, and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggested that they would like to have a meeting of the members of their party and invite Mr. Brownell to a conference, so that he might be able to explain to the Members on that side the meaning of this international situation.

I ask unanimous consent in this connection to revise and extend my remarks and include his address, as to which I have an estimate from the Public Printer. It will cost about $150.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOULD HELP LEADERSHIP

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] seldom gets as far off base as he did the other night when he said that "if President Roosevelt were to announce he was not a candidate, he would impair his position in Congress and elsewhere as our war leader."

Out of his own experience as floor leader of a disturbed Democratic Party, the gentleman must know better. The truth, I venture to assert, is that nothing would so greatly strengthen the President's position in Congress and elsewhere as a flat declaration by him that he would not be a candidate for a fourth term as President under any circumstances.

Nothing would so strengthen his leadership in advocating post-war policies as to divorce his advocacy from his personal political fortunes. He would become then the voice of a great cause and not the voice of ambition. There is no other explanation for the groundswell of anti-fourth-term resolutions by State legislatures.

It may be, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has complained, that the fourth-term issue has become a subject of politics, but the issue, if it has become such, was raised by the chairman of the National Democratic Committee when, at this time, with conventions months away, he called for a short campaign, knowing full well that would be to the advantage of a President in office seeking renomination. His action was that of a basketball team, in possession of the ball and one point ahead, stalling for time and praying for the referee's whistle.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri calls up a conference on a joint resolution. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk reported the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator'), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

"EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

"SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

"(b) Not more than 2 per centum of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and re-

turn, including such expenses as first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

"(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

"(1) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

"(2) the term 'worker' includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

"(3) the term 'agricultural labor' includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

"(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
M. C. TARVER,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment.

The House measure appropriates a total of $26,100,000 for the farm labor program to be expended under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States. Of this sum $100,000 is earmarked for administrative expenses of the Federal Office of Extension, not less than $13,500,000 for apportionment to the extension services of the States for the farm labor program within the States, and not to exceed $12,500,000 for use cooperatively by the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service in connection with interstate and imported farm labor.

The Senate amendment provides a total appropriation of $40,000,000 to be expended under the supervision and direction of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution appointed pursuant to the Executive order of March 26, 1943, of which not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 is for apportionment to the several States for use by the extension services for agricultural labor within the States, and not more than $20,000,000 is made available for expenditure by the administrator for recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor within the United States, and elsewhere. In connection with the latter sum, the administrator is authorized to utilize facilities, services, and personnel within the Department of Agriculture and to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies, or individuals, and to utilize their facilities, and services.

The conference agreement retains the House amount of $26,100,000 to be expended "by" the Administrator instead of "under his direction and supervision," as proposed by the Senate for the purposes and in the

manner set forth in the resolution, and instead of under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges as provided in the House measure.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with respect to allocations to the States for expenditure by the State extension services for workers within the States, fixing the sum to be so apportioned at not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 instead of not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000 as provided by the Senate, and not less than $13,500,000, as provided by the House.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision for the expenditure of a portion of the appropriation by the Administrator reducing the amount from not to exceed $20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, to not to exceed $13,050,000, and eliminates the provision in the House measure for the expenditure of not to exceed $12,500,000 by cooperative agreement of the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service with respect to interstate and imported labor. The Senate provision is further modified by eliminating authority for the making of grants, the use of repayments of money advances as a credit to the appropriation, and the placement of workers.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure with respect to the transportation of workers out of a county without prior consent of the county extension agent. It differs from the House provision in that it does not require consent of the State commissioner of agriculture in the case of transportation of agricultural labor out of the State. The Senate amendment places a requirement of 1 year's prior residence and engagement in agricultural labor as a requisite to the applicability of the provision and further stipulates that an appeal may be taken to the Administrator from the action of the county agent in refusing transportation to such worker. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision eliminating therefrom the appellate feature.

The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to that in the House measure prohibiting the use of the funds to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership in connection with agricultural labor. The Senate amendment differs from the House measure in that it excepts from the provision imported workers to the extent required to comply with agreements with foreign governments, and also permits the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural labor which may provide that prevailing wages shall be paid for particular crops and areas and that shelter shall be provided for such labor. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain provisions with respect to expenditure of the funds without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (competitive bidding) and the exemption from the withholding or deduction provisions of section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code in connection with payments to aliens brought in under the joint resolution. The conference agreement retains these provisions.

The Senate amendment contains provisions for covering into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, effective July 1, 1943, the revenues to be obtained from use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers. In the absence of such provision such revenues would be available for reexpenditure. The House measure contained no comparable requirement. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

The Senate amendment and the House measure contain similar provisions with respect to the use of Civilian Conservation Corps camps for farm labor shelter. The Senate language, however, provides that any camp being utilized by any other agency of the Government or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization shall not be transferred for use under the joint resolution without the consent of the agency or organization utilizing it. The conference agreement accepts the Senate modification.

The House measure placed no limit upon the amount of the appropriation that could be used for administrative expenses except in the case of the allocation of $100,000 to the Federal Office of Extension. The Senate amendment prescribes that not more than 2 percent of the appropriation may be used for administrative expenses of the Administrator and sets forth the major categories of such expense. The conference agreement adopts the Senate recommendation.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5f) contains provisions designed to permit recipients of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act to work as agricultural workers during the continuance of the hostilities in the present war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced. The House measure contained no corresponding provisions. The conference agreement retains these provisions in amended form. Title I of the Social Security Act now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. This means that if any recipient of old-age assistance should earn money for working on a farm, his old-age assistance might be reduced or discontinued on the ground that his need was less or no longer existed. The provisions in the conference agreement will enable the States, if they so desire, to continue to pay old-age assistance at the present rates to persons who are receiving such assistance at the present time, notwithstanding the fact that such persons earn income as agricultural workers during the continuance of hostilities in the present war and the succeeding 6 months; and the Federal grants-in-aid with respect to such assistance will continue to be made without regard to the fact that the States in such cases do not take such income into consideration for the purpose of determining the need of such persons for old-age assistance.

The Senate amendment (sec. 5b) provides that aliens brought into the United States under the joint resolution shall be exempt from the payment of head-tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges. The House measure contains no corresponding provision. The conference agreement retains this provision as a part of section 5 (g) which also provides that native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to enter the United States to perform agricultural labor shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act of February 5, 1917, which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage money by corporations, foreign government, and others. Such admissions are to be permitted under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such regulations are not to include the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States and in the event they require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident, which he is unable to furnish, the admitting officer may waive such documentary evidence if he has other proof satisfactory to him that such person is a native of the country claimed by him. Each person is to be provided with an identification card with his photograph and fingerprints and if he fails to maintain his status as an agricultural worker or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission he is required to be deported. The authority for these admissions is limited during the period of hostilities in the present war.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
M. C. TARVER,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is primarily to help in winning of the war. In the production of food—the most essential munition of war—the lack of farm labor is a serious bottleneck. The purpose of this bill is to provide for the employment, transportation, and distribution of farm labor to points where it will be most effective in the production of food.

As will be recalled, the principal difference between the House and the Senate bills was, first, the amount provided by the bill and, second, the method of administration and control. The House provided for an appropriation of $26,100,000 and the Senate increased that amount to $40,000,000.

The conference agreement retains the House amount of $26,100,000 to be expended "by" the Administrator instead of "under his direction and supervision," as proposed by the Senate, for the purposes and in the manner set forth in the resolution, and instead of under the direction and supervision of the United States Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges as provided in the House measure.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision with respect to allocations to the States for expenditure by the State extension services for workers within the States fixing the sum to be so apportioned at not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000, instead of not less than $13,500,000 and not more than $20,000,000, as provided by the Senate, and not less than $13,500,000, as provided by the House.

The conference agreement retains the Senate provision for the expenditure of a portion of the appropriation by the Administrator reducing the amount from not to exceed $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate to not to exceed $13,050,000, and eliminates the provision in the House measure for the expenditure of not to exceed $12,500,000 by cooperative agreement of the Federal Office of Extension, the State extension services, and the United States Employment Service with respect to interstate and

imported labor. The Senate provision is further modified by eliminating authority for the making of grants, the use of repayments of money advances as a credit to the appropriation, and the placement of workers.

The Senate amendment—section 5b—provides that aliens brought into the United States under the joint resolution shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges. The House measure contains no corresponding provision. The conference agreement retains this provision as a part of section 5 (g) which also provides that native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to enter the United States to perform agricultural labor shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act of February 5, 1917, which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage money by corporations, foreign government, and others. Such admissions are to be permitted under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General. Such regulations are not to include the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States and in the event they require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident, which he is unable to furnish, the admitting officer may waive such documentary evidence if he has other proof satisfactory to him that such person is a native of the country claimed by him. Each person is to be provided with an identification card with his photograph and fingerprints, and if he fails to maintain his status as an agricultural worker or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission he is required to be deported. The authority for these admissions is limited during the period of hostilities in the present war.

Mr. Speaker, there is much in this legislation that is in the nature of an experiment. But it is the practically unanimous agreement of the conferees of the two Houses arrived at after exhaustive consideration and is the most practical solution of the problem that we have been able to devise. It is at least a step in the right direction.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this comes with the unanimous report of all of the conferees on the part of the House who were able to be with us at the end of the negotiations with the Senate. The amount carried in the report is the sum of $26,100,000, which was carried in the bill when it passed the House. That is divided equally between the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the different States, and the Administrator of Food Supply, who was appointed by the President while the bill was pending in the Senate. I believe that most of the abuses that were created by the Farm Security Administration in the handling of interstate and foreign labor on farms will be eliminated as a result of this bill.

In addition, there is an amendment at the end which will permit Western Hemisphere native-born residents to come here temporarily to work on farms. On the other hand, there is a protection against people coming in here whom the War Department and the rest of us would not like to see. In other words, everyone who comes in is obliged to be photographed and fingerprinted before he comes in and must carry an identification card that will protect us against trouble and make those people go out when we wish. There is also in the bill prohibiting the movement of this labor between the States at the expense of the Government without the consent of the local county agricultural agents.

On the other hand, there is nothing in the bill that will prevent these people moving from State to State if they want to do so on their own account and not at Government expense.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is provision made for them to be returned to their home countries after the war?

Mr. TABER. After the period of their employment in the agricultural enterprise is concluded. It does not wait until the end of the war. At any time it is desirable that they be sent back, they can be sent back under the provisions of this amendment that was worked out in conference day before yesterday.

I hope that the report will be adopted because I believe that at any rate insofar as the intrastate effort is concerned—that is, within the individual States—it will help very materially, and it will help to a very large extent on the importation of foreign labor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Allen, Ill.	Byrne	Elliott
Anderson, Calif.	Cannon, Fla.	Ellison
Baldwin, Md.	Capozzoli	Ellsworth
Barry	Carter	Fay
Bates, Mass.	Celler	Fogarty
Bell	Culkin	Forand
Boykin	D'Alesandro	Gamble
Bradley, Mich.	Dies	Gavagan
Bradley, Pa.	Dingell	Gibson
Buckley	Disney	Gordon
Burgin	Douglas	Guyer
Hagen	McWilliams	Scott
Hart	Maas	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Madden	Smith, Va.
Hendricks	Magnuson	Starnes, Ala.
Hess	Merritt	Stearns, N. H.
Holmes, Mass.	Mott	Stevenson
Izac	Myers	Taylor
Judd	O'Hara	Tolan
Kennedy	O'Leary	Treadway
Keogh	O'Toole	Vursell
King	Outland	Wadsworth
Klein	Pfeifer	Walter
Larcade	Price	Weaver
Lewis, Colo.	Robinson, Utah	Whelchel, Ga.
Luce	Rogers, Calif.	Wilson
Lynch	Rowe	Winter
McGranery	Russell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two separate subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. Pending consideration of that motion, I desire to make this statement and submit a unanimous-consent request.

The original unanimous-consent agreement with regard to general debate made on yesterday was that general debate should continue for 2 hours today. There are a number of Members who left the floor upon the assumption that that agreement would be carried out and that they might have time in general debate today. Afterward the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into by the House abrogating the original agreement and closing general debate. In fairness to the gentlemen who were unable to be heard on yesterday and who acted upon the assumption which I have stated, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate may be extended for 1 hour, the time to be equally controlled and divided between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have I will not be able to discuss the bill at length. I simply want to say that I regret very much that the subcommittee has seen fit to kill the Farm Security Administration item. I have criticized the Farm Security Administration but I do not believe we are going to remedy the situation by killing it entirely. It has done some good work and I should like to see the good part carried on. The remedy lies not in killing it but in cleaning it out if that needs to be done.

This House recently authorized a committee to make an investigation of the Farm Security Administration. That committee has not yet had time to report. Yet before it can report, the Appropriations Committee in this bill strikes down that agency. The Farm Security Administration has done things which I did not agree with and I have freely said so, but it has done some good things also. I want to be fair enough to give it credit for the good things which it has done. It has helped a great many poor farmers, many of whom could not have secured help otherwise. When we had two crop failures in Louisiana recently, the Farm Security Administration did all it could to relieve distress. It is urged that the Farm Security Administration has gone further than the proper scope of its work. That may be true, but if so, the Agriculture Committee of this House which is now making a study of this question should bring a bill to this House defining and outlining the field of activity of this agency. We are now having a hard struggle to produce all of the foodstuff which we need in our Nation. Our farmers, from the smallest to the largest, have a great responsibility upon them to produce this stuff and they should be encouraged. If this agency will contribute to production to aid the war effort, as many think it will, it ought not to be killed at this time. I reiterate that I think the objectionable features ought to be removed from this agency. The remedy, therefore, lies in removing the bad and keeping the good.

I also regret, Mr. Chairman, to see the crop-insurance program stopped. We have not had a chance in the cotton South to really find out how it works; we have just started to, and I do not think it ought to be stopped; I think it ought to be continued, and our people ought to have a chance to thoroughly test it out.

I mention hurriedly, Mr. Chairman, the question of rural electrification, which this bill has dealt a severe blow. Rural electricity has been one of the greatest boons to country life. It is a serious thing to strike that blow at our farm life. With reference to these appropriations and others in this bill, it is regrettable that the parliamentary situation is such that they cannot be placed in the bill. The House ought to have an opportunity to vote on these matters, but the parliamentary situation makes that impossible with reference to several items. I trust that the other body, not hogtied by these rigid parliamentary rules, will see to it that reasonable appropriations for deserving agencies and items will be placed back in the bill.

I do want in this closing moment, however, Mr. Chairman, to commend the subcommittee on its provision giving us more of the 1942 yearbooks. That is a splendid yearbook, and I am sure every Member can use the increased allotment he will receive.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise on this occasion to call attention to the Bermuda conference called to settle the important problem of saving human lives. America is an integral part of this conference.

I do not have to tell you the conditions that prevail in the Axis countries, and I do not have to repeat again the story of millions of people who are being killed by the Nazi hordes. We talk a lot on this floor and at mass meetings, but mass meetings today are of no avail. They will not stop the torture and slaughter of countless Nazi victims. We must have action—not tomorrow but now—tomorrow may be too late. I am not speaking of the Jewish people alone, I am speaking of and in behalf of all people who are under the Nazi yoke, who are being slaughtered by the thousands every day.

What is the purpose of this conference? It is to determine what can be done to save men, women, and children from Nazi wrath and certain doom. The American people have always been generous in times like these. Whether the disaster confronting less fortunate fellow men was a drought, a flood, or an earthquake, America has always offered her help. The disaster Europe's subjugated people are facing is horrifying. The American people must do their share to alleviate the sufferings of these victims of Nazi wrath. We must insist that the conference does not turn into an exploratory meeting, but that it work out a concrete plan of action under which as many people as possible can be saved as soon as humanly possible. There is a rumor to the effect that the British Government claims Great Britain has done enough; that Churchill made the statement a week ago that they had done more than their share and that it was up to the rest of the United Nations to do something about the refugee problem. It may be true that up to now England has done more for the refugees than we have. But when the Prime Minister, asserting that Britain is maintaining a certain number of refugees in British territory and Palestine—includes in this number not only legitimate refugees but also evacuees, internees, and prisoners of war—it is not a very fair statement on prevailing conditions. The question as to America's stand on the refugee problem has been raised all over the world. Our allies and friends are depending upon our traditional sympathy for the oppressed and persecuted while our enemies have been propagandizing the fact of our rather passive stand. We dare not fail the people who trust us so implicitly and we cannot afford to give more ammunition to our enemies by continued silence and inaction.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of which I have the honor of being chairman should be represented at that conference both by the minority and the majority so that we shall know definitely what legislation we may propose or recommend to the House at such time as we get the necessary information. It seems to me this committee has been ignored. The conference is scheduled to start on Monday. The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has introduced House Joint Resolution 209 authorizing the Speaker to appoint a select committee of three from the Committee on Immigration to sit in on this conference and study the question so that we may be able to intelligently propose some legislative remedy. As a Democrat I fully subscribe to the policy outlined in this resolution and I submit to the House that the Committee on Rules should immediately consider this resolution and that the House should pass on it in order that we may approach this program in an intelligent manner.

Up until a week ago 3,000,000 people had been killed, over 600,000 people were in concentration camps, and over 5,500,000 people forced to become slaves of the Nazis. There is no hope for these people; even those who are able to leave or escape from Axis territory have no place to turn to as long as the doors of the other countries are closed to them. Yes, England has been liberal; England has done her share; other small nations have too, but that is not enough to solve the problem. The question arises, What will we do if we call upon the Allied Nations to do something for these poor devils who are doomed to die. The question is: What will America do? What will the American people say? How far do the American people intend to go to help their suffering fellow men?

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is our responsibility, our sacred duty as human beings and as a civilized nation to open our doors to a limited extent and to extend our helping hand to the victims of our common enemies. We should at least offer a haven of refuge to the innocent youngsters whose homes have been destroyed and whose parents have been murdered.

I know that there are thousands of families in these United States who would be more than willing and happy to take an orphan child into their home. Why cannot we be the leaders in this program and why in the name of heaven can we not be humane about this problem and forget about our restrictive policies? In the last 5 years we have kept out of this country over 216,000 people who would have been entitled to come in under the present quota law. Why can we not allocate this unused quota number to deserving people who are otherwise doomed to certain death?

I submit to the House that the world hopes for action by this Congress, which is the only body that can save these men,

women, and children from complete annihilation. There are four or five million who are threatened to be exterminated by the Nazi Government unless we can get them out of there. I do not expect England to do more than she can. I do not expect any country to do more than it humanly can, but for God's sake we are a great people, we are the greatest nation in the world, can we not absorb some more people, can we not do something for these poor unfortunate people to save them from utter destruction?

Mr. Chairman, I am therefore in full sympathy with this resolution and I hope and trust that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and other Members of this House will call upon the Rules Committee to let the Committee on Immigration have some representation at this conference in Bermuda so that we can in all fairness to our people analyze and consider this matter and tell the world that we will take care of some of these refugees and that the American people will do everything in their power to bring some relief to the persecuted and the oppressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, if the resolution referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] includes minority representation, I shall certainly support it as a member of the Rules Committee. But may I say to the Members of the House that the present set-up of the delegation to be sent to the Refugee Conference in Bermuda is composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and Senator LUCAS, without any minority party representation. Unless there is minority representation, the Republicans of the House will not be committed to any action that may be taken in Bermuda. We have a right and we demand minority representation at this conference and at all other important international conferences.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under this resolution there will be minority representation.

Mr. FISH. That is why I said I would support it as a member of the Rules Committee when it reaches us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas for this 4 minutes' time to discuss the pending appropriation bill.

May I say that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I was somewhat amused at some of the arguments made yesterday as to usurpation by the Appropriations Committee of legislative functions of the legislative committees of the House? Let us see just exactly where that argument leaves us.

If you will turn to page 37 of this bill and start right there, you will find appropriations for Japanese-beetle control, sweetpotato-weevil control, fruitfly control, Dutch-elm eradication, and so forth and so forth. How did those items get in the bill and where is the authority to put them in the bill? No legislation has been brought to this House by the great Committee on Agriculture providing for a justification and authorization of those appropriations. There is no authority in the law for them. They have been carried in these appropriation bills ever since I have been a Member of Congress. The Congress has taken it as a matter of precedent that it had the right to approve these appropriations without raising a point of order. So the Rules Committee has heretofore granted a rule waiving points of order that may be raised against these appropriations.

Now, I ask the members of the great Agricultural Committee, if you object to the Appropriations Committee writing these appropriations into this bill, why, in good conscience and faith, have you not brought legislation here that would justify the granting of these appropriations? Most of the Members of Congress are in favor of appropriations for the control and eradication of insect pests, and so forth. If, therefore, objection is raised to these items on the ground that they are not authorized by law, the appropriation will have to be stricken from the bill, and thus, so far as the House is concerned, the activity must cease.

As the situation now stands, despite the fact that I want to see Japanese beetle control effected, a point of order will lie against that and most all of these other appropriations, and I understand they will be stricken from this bill. A fine situation now exists as a result, as I see it, of a failure on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to bring in legislation that would justify and authorize the making of these appropriations.

Let us look at this situation with reference to the Farm Security Administration. I regret that I do not have and will not have an opportunity to vote upon this question of Farm Security properly. I regret that this House cannot, under the situation as it now exists, preserve in this bill provisions for the continuation of the decent parts of Farm Security and eliminate from this bill those parts of Farm Security which are conceded to be bad by even the most ardent proponents of that organization. But I think it may be fairly said that this Committee is powerless to deal with the situation. Why? If you go through the bill you will find that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has attempted to transfer the functions of Farm Security to the Farm Credit Administration in one of its functions and to the Extension Service as to some other functions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, these provisions as to the transfer of certain functions to which I have referred are clearly contrary to law and that whole provision will go out on a point of order. Then if I were to try to offer an amendment to restore to this bill provisions providing for the continuance of the good parts of Farm Security, I would again be met by a point of order that the Farm Security Administration is not authorized by law. It is a creature of Executive order. So I ask this great Agricultural Committee that has the welfare of the farmers at stake and pleads so loudly here on the floor for the Farm Security Administration, what have you been doing all of these years that you have not enacted legislation to authorize the establishment of the Farm Security Administration? Why have you left it to the Appropriations Committee to bring in the thing that the House really wants and the people of this country want? The people should understand that we who believe in basic features of Farm Security are not to be given an opportunity to vote either for or against it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in my district I have a very fine group of farmers who are divided as between the Farm Bureau, National Grange, and Farm Union, and many are for the F. S. A. and the A. A. A. and many are against the activities. I very much regret that I shall not be given the opportunity to vote on these issues right straight on the nose. I do wish there were some way that we could have a vote on these respective elements in this bill. To that extent I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin who just spoke.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What provision is made in this appropriation bill, which eliminates the Farm Security Administration, for the collection of the accounts now in force?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only provision I see that will come out of it is that the other body will take care of everything and the bill will come back here and we will have to agree to it, and have no chance to vote on the various elements involved and all so that we shall not eventually have to accept just what the other body hands to us.

Mr. WHITE. Under that provision the House is in a pitiful condition, is it not, when it has to depend on the other body?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so. That is why I disagree with how we are now involved. I would certainly be willing to give up the jurisdiction of the committee of which I am a member on this bill, so that the Committee on Appropriations might bring the matter before us and give us a vote on this proposition. I cannot vote the way all my farmers want me to vote. That is not possible because they are so terribly split. But I should

like to have the privilege of putting myself on record for or against these different propositions so that they may know what my position is.

I can understand at the same time why a lot of people disagree with the continuation of these expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury informs us that he will have to borrow this current calendar year $70,000,000,000, and that is after we pay in the taxes we are supposed to pay in, in order to finance all these undertakings.

It does seem to me, generally speaking, that people are now in a position, with all of these billions flowing from the Treasury, to go ahead and do some of the necessary things without drawing so many checks from the Treasury, which we could get along without at the present time. From that standpoint I should personally like to see many of these expenditures discontinued, and as far as I am personally concerned I think I am in a position to vote along that line.

Let us take a chance on this for 1 year. By that I do not mean to say that we should completely wreck and destroy and fold up the triple A organization, let us say. What I mean when I say the organization is the general machinery. I mean we should not keep all the employees on the roll. I think the record shows that there are approximately 146,000 employees under that one bureau. I do not believe it is necessary to have all those employees during this war stress we have to carry until we work out of this situation we have gotten into.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel there is anything wrong about the general House plan of having the Committee on Appropriations not legislate and the legislative committees not appropriate?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I tried to make myself clear on that point a moment ago. As long as this House has the privilege of meeting here and acting on a proposition, I am not going to get all hot and bothered about that, because, after all, it is the action of the House. If the job is done and done well, why should I worry too much about whether it is my committee that does it or whether it is this group right here on the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it crystal clear that I have the utmost respect and highest regard for every member of the able subcommittee who has labored painstakingly and diligently on this quite cumbersome and all important bill. I want to express my personal appreciation to the Committee on Rules for their courageous stand in connection with the consideration of this bill in upholding the integrity of the legislative committees of the Congress, and in seeing to it that the governmental departments be not permitted to by-pass or ignore the committees that have been set up in Congress to hear, investigate, and make recommendations in respect to legislation, whether it be the enactment of new laws or repealing or modifying existing laws. This is as it should be. If the Congress ever reaches the point where the laws which govern our people are to be considered or prescribed by just one committee of the Congress, then there would be little excuse for continuing any of the legislative committees. This practice seems to be growing; growing everywhere. Here in the House we pounced upon the executive branch of the Government for what we termed legislation by Executive edict or decree. We did it recently when we put the rider on the debt limitations bill in respect to salary restrictions. Some of us thought we were preserving the integrity of the legislative branch of the Government in the passage of the Bankhead bill. Let the record be kept straight. I am not complaining about the many changes in existing laws incorporated in this bill, and if the Congress wants to change the rules of the House to permit the Appropriations Committee to legislate, maybe we can go along with that providing the Appropriations Committee can be subdivided so that it will take care of the entire House membership, but so long as we have the existing rules we should abide by them; if the rules are wrong, let us change them in the orderly and regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to acquaint Members with another act of omission or commission which the distinguished subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has been guilty of, and what they have done to a group of my people where I come from. Gentlemen know about the conditions in their own part of the country. I call attention to the fact that under three separate acts of Congress, known as the Cotton Statistics Act, the Cotton Standards Act, and the Cotton Futures Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is required and authorized to maintain certain offices to render certain services to certain people. One of those acts is known as the Smith-Doxey Act, which gives the farmers an opportunity to have their cotton classified, to have the staple classified, so that they could have the services of the Department of Agriculture free of charge. That, as I say, is an act of Congress known as the Smith-Doxey Act. Another is the Cotton Futures Act, which makes it incumbent on the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain an office to classify the cotton to be sold in the future and have stored. Then there is the Cotton Standards Act, which also imposes on the Secretary of Agriculture the duty to fix certain standards. There are five of these offices, which the Committee on Appropriations, with one stroke of the pen, has absolutely abolished. These offices are created without any expense to the Government, yet we do not find one of them left on the eastern seaboard. They abolished the one at Charleston, the one at Savannah, the one at Mobile, the one at Galveston, and the one in Altus, Okla. The farmers have no place to turn to, to get their cotton classified, and the dealers have no place to turn. Anybody who buys cotton on the market has the right to go and request that this cotton be classified. They have no place to turn. These offices are operated almost without cost. No member had an opportunity to present figures for their attention. That was secret. The Bureau of the Budget cut them out. At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to restore the offices in these five places. If we do not protect our cotton, if we do not protect those that Congress designated should be protected, what help is there for them?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Did the gentleman make any application to be heard?

Mr. RIVERS. No; I did not. I did not know anything about it. I did not find anything about it until a newspaper reporter told these things were cut out. However, the newspaper reporter found out, but when I inquired the matter was secret.

Mr. PLUMLEY. And I say to the gentleman that any Member of Congress from the time that I have served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RIVERS. I have no doubt of that, but the point is that I did not know these offices were abolished and not one of the Members where these offices are located knew about it. I did not know until I found out from a newspaper reporter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us to what extent this machinery has been made use of by the farmers and by the cotton buyers in respect to futures?

Mr. RIVERS. I can only speak of the situation in my part of the country, and there this year we had 40,000 to 50,000 services to the people. That section grew about 200,000 bales of cotton. The office at Galveston, Tex., cost $16,000 to operate, and they took in $26,000 and odd. It fluctuates. Take, for instance, futures. They may not have any futures this year, but they have to have the service in case it is wanted—just like having a fire department.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And whoever avails himself of this service must pay for it?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; except the farmers under the Smith-Doxey Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I have ever been more exercised or aroused than when I observed in this morning's paper that not only the public but the

gentlemen of the press are still going to be barred from attendance at the food conference, which is to be held on May 18, at Hot Springs, Va. I understood this whole issue had been settled. I thought after Saturday night's announcement from the White House that the orders had been reversed, and that the public was going to be allowed to listen to the hearings and what was going on, and that everything would be all right. But I observe that the plans have been changed, and once more they have thought it necessary to resort to a lot of star chamber tactics. I dare say that never since George I of England, who could speak nothing but German, was sent over from Hanover to create his own puppet and kitchen cabinet, have such high-handed methods been inaugurated in any free government. I think the newspaper reporters and Members of Congress on the appropriate committees should be allowed to listen in and to participate in this conference.

I also say the powers that be are setting a very unfortunate precedent if we allow such a conference to have its doors closed to the public. When we start the important peace conferences after the victory which is bound to come, if we allow those conferences to proceed behind closed doors without the American people having an opportunity to know what is going on and having to submit to canned releases from the O. W. I., it is a most dangerous procedure and one which will threaten the entire future of this great Republic of ours. It will change a free, liberty-loving nation to the status of many European states that are allowing their delegates and representatives to make their rules and regulations for them without letting the Congress or any other legislative body in on what is going on. This is a most unhealthy situation.

I hope the Congress will express its opposition to such a condition, and that before we get through we will vote upon resolutions which have already been presented to the House. As I understand it, two of those resolutions have been introduced, and I hope action will be taken on them. Just before making these remarks I was accosted by a colleague who informed me there is a well-founded story going around to the effect that this so-called food conference is being held simply to start the post-war planning. If this is so, it is all the more reason for the rest of us to have full information of the procedures, and to see to it that no agreements are reached which do not receive wholehearted approval of the American public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to seem to be in the position of criticizing the Appropriations Committee for legislating without authority, but in defense of the civil service I would like to call attention to three items in this bill.

On page 6 there is an item providing for the payment of $9,000 per annum to the office of Solicitor. Then on page 17 they provide for the payment of a salary of $10,000 to one individual. Then on page 19 they provide for payment of a salary of $9,000 to one particular person.

Either we have civil service or we do not have it. If the civil service should not apply to these particular persons or offices, we should know the reason for it. You will not find anything in the report or in the hearings as to why this action should be taken. Obviously, the reason for these items appearing in the bill is so they may be paid more than they would receive under classified civil service. If they are entitled to be paid these sums, we should know why. It is clearly a case of legislation without authorization. If this is a practice the Appropriations Committee feels justified in following, we should know that also.

I would like to have it explained so that we will understand wherein the committee feels it should assume the authority to do so.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for whom I have great respect.

Mr. TARVER. All of the items to which the gentleman refers have been in previous bills with the exception of one. Those items were carried in the bill last year. I would like to ask the gentleman if he did not vote for them then?

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I say that I have depended upon the sound judgment of the distinguished chairman, in a matter of this nature, that I did not last year scrutinize the bill for matters of this kind. I assumed there was authorization for it. Just now I find out that the Committee on Appropriations just fixed that salary. I hope it is not too late to make a correction if it ought to be done. When we see a mistake has been made we should be allowed to correct it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman can offer an amendment to cut the amount of the salary if he so desires.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas is considering raising a point of order, and let these individuals come under the classified civil service. He thought it fair to raise the question now, so if there is an explanation, we might have it. They may be worth these larger amounts, but what I am asking the gentleman to do is to tell me why you fix the salary for these three individuals and not require them to come under the classified civil service? If Civil Service Classification Act should not apply, and the Committee on Appropriations feels it ought to legislate on an appropriation bill, without authorization from the House, there should be some good reason to justify such action.

Mr. TARVER. I will tell the gentleman. Dr. Auchter, the head of the Agricutural Research Administration, is drawing $8,500. The Budget recommended a salary of $10,000. We provided $9,000. He has a number of men working under him who are drawing $9,000. Does the gentleman think it appropriate that a man who is head of the bureau should be drawing less salary than the men working under him?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think in view of the statement of the chairman, the whole situation ought to be examined. Of course, I do not have all the facts, but it seems to me that it is inconsistent, also, for an employee to be under classified civil service, and at the same time have a salary exceeding the amount provided under civil service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The point I am making is this, if you are going to put this man under classified civil service, he should be there. If you are going to single out certain individuals and pay them higher salaries and expect to have classified civil service, then you are embarking on a rather shaky policy. Under such policy if a certain employee, under civil service, is not receiving the compensation to which he feels he is entitled, he goes to the Appropriations Committee of the House for consideration of more compensation. I say such a thing ought to be pretty carefully guarded. As a policy it ought not to be followed.

Mr. TARVER. Would the gentleman be willing to submit his views to the House and let it vote on what is the right thing to do?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; certainly; but I depend so much upon the chairman of this great subcommittee to do the proper thing in regard to matters of this nature. I know he is sincere, and hesitate when I find it necessary to disagree with his views.

Mr. TARVER. The chairman of the subcommittee like all human kind is prone to err, and he has no objection whatever to gentlemen of the House correcting his mistakes if he has made mistakes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. The distinguished gentleman is very considerate.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad the gentleman is bringing up this salary proposition, as he is a member of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House, I believe.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder what his committee has done to make some investigation to see why it is that the civil service has got in the position of wholesale allocations upward, in some cases allocating one position two or three or four steps. Has the gentleman gone into that proposition?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The committee is attempting to go into that very problem. And for the information of the gentleman, it appears from information

that has come to the attention of the Committee on Civil Service that there has been a considerable amount of liberty taken by the heads of departments and agencies, to do a lot of promoting not in keeping with the rules or the intent of the Civil Service Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be regarded as particularly criticizing the Committee on Appropriations, which everybody seems to be taking a crack at this afternoon, but I want to say a practice has grown up in this House, a practice of many years' standing, which, to my mind, is no less than reprehensible. Here is a bill coming to the floor of this House that the Members of the House never saw until immediately before it was to be considered. It consists of 89 pages. The hearings consist of 1,800 pages, and a voluminous report. Now the Members of the House are supposed to study and digest all this and vote on the matters therein contained, intelligently, with only that opportunity of study.

I have read—now, mind you—a breakdown of this bill in the Philadelphia Record published on the 14th day of this month, under United Press date line of April 13, a day before the bill was available to the Members of this House. Apparently the press knows earlier what is going on here than do the Members themselves. At least they had the bill on the 13th and we get it on the 14th.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to my friend from New York that the action of the Committee on Appropriations is no worse than the action of other committees reporting bills. Many important bills are reported to the floor as this one was, with just as little chance for the Members to familiarize themselves with them as they had with this one.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Was that paper published in the morning or afternoon?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I could not say. All I know is that it appeared in the Philadelphia Record. I have a copy of the article here in my pocket if the gentleman wants to see it. I know that it carried a break-down of the bill, and bore the date line April 13.

Mr. TABER. The bill was reported to the House at 2:30 p. m. on the 13th.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But it was published in summary form under U. P. date line of 13th of April 1943 in a city 150 miles distant from Washington.

The Members of the House should be furnished bills for study and consideration with sufficient time to give them an opportunity to know what these bills contain and to study the hearings; but, like in this instance, other important bills are first seen by the Members on the day they come up for general debate and consideration. This practice should be changed, although it was in effect when I first had the honor of becoming a Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, let me show you how the Farm Security Administration has worked in my State. There are approximately 41,000 farm families in the State. As of December 31, 1942, approximately 7,508 loans were outstanding and 2,523 borrowers had paid their loans in full. Since the initiation of the program in 1935, $15,559,200 has been advanced to individuals for farm-operating purposes, and of this sum $6,771,700 has been repaid. This reflects in my opinion a very healthy over-all repayment record with 87 percent of the maturities having been paid to date. In addition, we have collected $1,071,600 in interest payments. The balance of the indebtedness is well secured by chattel mortgages.

Now I want to call your attention to how and to what extent these small farmers who have been aided by this agency of the Government have contributed to the increase of production of vital food materials in the State of Montana. For instance, in 1941 our milk production was 733,000,000 pounds; in 1942 it was 754,000,000 pounds, and the increase is accounted for by the F. S. A. operators to the extent of 95 percent.

Pork, pounds: produced in 1941, 58,000,000; in 1942, 69,000,000, and 20 percent of this increase was accounted for by F. S. A. borrowers. Eggs, dozens: 17,583,000 in 1941, and in 1942, 19,583,000, an increase of 19.4 percent attributable to F. S. A. borrowers. Beef: our production in 1941 was 292,000,000 pounds, and in 1942 it was 421,000,000. Seventy percent represents the increase and of this 5 percent was contributed by F. S. A. borrowers. Chickens, pounds: In 1941, 13,800,000, and in 1942, 16,384,000. Of this increase, 8 percent is accounted for by the F. S. A. borrowers.

Dry beans production for 1941, 28,400,000 pounds; 1942, 33,800,000 pounds. Increased 46 percent.

Sugar beets, 1941, 793 tons; 1942, 947 tons. Increased 19.4 percent.

Flaxseed, 1941, 888,000 bushels; 1942, 2,550,000 bushels. Increased 187 percent and increase by F. S. A. borrowers 3.4 percent.

At this point in the RECORD I insert the following table:

Increase in production of essential crop and livestock products in 1942 over 1941, by all farmers and Farm Security Administration borrowers in the State of Montana

Product	Unit	All farmers				Farm Security Administration borrowers				Percent of total increase contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
		1941 production	1942 production	Amount increase	Percent increase	1941 production	1942 production	Amount increase	Percent increase	
Milk [1]	Pounds	733,000,000	754,000,000	21,000,000	2.9	89,899,000	109,882,000	19,983,000	22	95.2
Pork [2] [3]	Pounds	58,724,000	69,462,000	10,738,000	18.3	5,262,030	7,451,370	2,189,340	42	20.4
Eggs	Dozens	17,583,000	19,583,000	2,000,000	11.4	1,383,860	1,772,140	388,340	28	19.4
Beef [2] [3]	Pounds	292,203,000	421,355,000	129,152,000	44.2	9,335,270	15,835,800	6,500,430	70	5.0
Chickens [2] [4]	Pounds	13,800,000	16,384,000	2,584,000	18.8	928,493	1,144,040	215,547	23	8.3
Soybeans	Bushel									
Dry beans	Pounds	28,400,000	33,800,000	5,400,000	19.0	5,367,840	2,895,830	−2,472,010	−46	(5)
Sugar beets	Tons	793,000	947,000	154,000	19.4	46,921	46,698	−223	−.5	(5)
Flaxseed	Bushels	888,000	2,550,000	1,662,000	187.2	22,072	79,062	56,990	258	3.4
Peanuts	Pounds									

[1] 1942 production estimates for all farmers are preliminary and unpublished.
[2] Estimates for all farmers are preliminary and unpublished.
[3] Live weight.
[4] Estimates for all farmers do not include commercial broilers.
[5] All farmers increased production but Farm Security Administration borrowers decreased production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will concede that the F. S. A. through making these loans has done a lot of good, but let me ask the gentleman this: Considering the prevailing prices for what the farmers are producing and the fact they are paying off their loans, does not the gentleman believe there is less need for loans of this type?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is not any question about that, but my point is that unless the Farm Security Administration or this Farm Credit Association is given the authority and the money with which to take up the slack to aid these small farmers in the production of vital food products, I think we would be making a terrible mistake at this time. I do not know how much, I have not had a chance to figure it out, but unless a sufficient appropriation is given to one of these agencies to take up some of what has heretofore been taken care of by the Farm Security Administration, we shall be making a grave mistake. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe it advisable for the Government to lend $150 on a cow at the present time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to tell the gentleman something: It is a question of production of food; it is not a ques-

tion of money; we have got to have food; we are facing already a food crisis and it will rapidly become worse. The people in the cities are just as much—and in fact more—interested as the people in the country. If the people in the cities should face the situation where they could not get their milk, their butter, their cream, and so forth, you certainly would see them hungry and they will howl. The farmer will feed himself first. He is a fool if he does not. The city people should get behind the small farmer. He will produce the small vital foods, such as fruit and vegetables, milk, butter, eggs, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of this heated and vigorous debate on matters relating to the Cotton Belt, the Corn Belt, the Wheat Belt, and all of these other belts, I want to take a moment of your time to call attention to another belt, the health belt. I was delighted today to notice an article in the Washington News, a portion of which I read:

DRAFT RECORDS SHOW COLORADO CLIME BEST

Colorado's Chamber of Commerce today has Army ammunition to support claims of healthful climate in the Rocky Mountain area.

Col. Leonard G. Rowntree, chief of Selective Service's medical division, revealed that "in the health belt, around Colorado, 7 out of 10 men can qualify for military service"—the highest percentage of physically fit men in the country.

* * * * *

Rowntree told the United Press later that he didn't elaborate before State-conscious Senators on the healthiest State or the least healthy State for obvious reasons.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I also saw the article to which the gentleman refers and I was delighted to observe that it says that the health belt is around Colorado. I may say that Kansas adjoins Colorado and therefore would be in that particular belt the gentleman is discussing, as I understand it. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The fact is well known to the people of Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and other surrounding States because every summer they come to Colorado in great numbers. We are delighted to have them and we hope they will continue to come in increasing numbers. We extend a cordial invitation to the rest of you who have not had the opportunity of partaking of our salubrious climate to also visit the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado and there be refreshed and invigorated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman quotes the chamber of commerce.

Mr. CHENOWETH. No. I am quoting Colonel Rowntree, the Chief of the Selective Service Medical Division, who gave these facts to a Senate committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure the Members of Congress will appreciate hearing from the chamber of commerce of the gentleman's State.

Mr. CHENOWETH. We will see that you get some literature.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have had the privilege of living in that atmosphere, and a man who could not have good health in the rarefied atmosphere of Colorado and under the inspiration of the great Rockies ought to die anyway.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I say that Pennsylvania produces the finest lubricating oil in the world and we furnish lubricating oil for 30 percent of the motor vehicles of the United States.

Mr. CHENOWETH. So our friends can come to Colorado. I thank the gentleman. I hope more of your oil is so used.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Is it true that a man has to be very healthy in order to live in Colorado and to exist out there at all?

Mr. CHENOWETH. No. Colorado is where those who are afflicted go to regain their health. It is a privilege to live in Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I was about to ask the gentleman from Colorado, who preceded me, if he would yield for a moment, because I wanted to ask him for permission to say a word or two about Arizona grapefruit. I am sorry his time was not extended so that I could do that.

I do not wish to complain because of the fact that we are cutting down on this bill in view of the fact that we must cut down on many items during the war period, but I cannot help but feel that when an agricultural appropriation bill is brought up, that is when we begin to do most of the slashing. May I say further to the committee that I recognize their wisdom in providing for further issues of the Agricultural Yearbook for 1942. The livestock people of the West, I feel, appreciate that book, which is a scientific treatise on keeping livestock healthy, and I am glad that provision is in the bill.

In a few minutes time I cannot mention, much less discuss, many features of the bill, but I would like to say something about the Farm Security Administration. I noted what the gentleman from Louisiana said a moment ago that while F. S. A. had made mistakes and was in need of a housecleaning, it was reform, and not eradication, that was the proper remedy.

I do hope that the committee has taken full account of the additional burden that is being transmitted now to the Farm Credit Administration so that many of these desirable functions can be carried on in a proper way under that agency.

I was one who advocated crop insurance. I know certain business interests of this country were opposed to crop insurance. They said it was interfering with private enterprise. It is pointed out in this report, I notice, that crop insurance has been a losing proposition to the Government. We expected it would be for a while at the start. I wonder how much the people of America have paid to put private fire and life insurance in its present happy condition in the economic world?

There are many other things I would like to discuss. May I call attention at this time to the heavy cuts in regard to surveys and research work in the Forestry Department?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think it is very short-sighted to stop these long-range programs in forestry because that is one of the greatest resources we have for the plastic industry and other great industries of the future? It seems to me that this bill goes much too far in the destruction of long-term programs for the sake of relatively small immediate savings. In the same way, I think the complete abolition of the Farm Security Administration at this time is very unwise and will probably contribute much to the shortage of food vital to the war effort.

Mr. MURDOCK. In regard to the first question, I certainly agree with the gentleman for I too recognize the significant contribution which has always been made and which may hereafter be made by scientific research. On page 59 of the bill are several items which have been severely cut: Forest management has been reduced almost half of what it was a year ago. Range investigation has been cut nearly 50 percent over last year. Forest influences have been cut in like proportion. I doubt the wisdom of such drastic curtailment even in wartime. In the Committee Report on page 13 the committee says:

Much of this research, in fact, has no particular military value.

Now it all depends upon what is meant by "much." We might say that much of this research is at the very heart and core and origin of the most significant military value. The German people are quite scientific. They are utilizing their forests to the uttermost at this very moment and they have a feeling that with the forests of Europe for their utilization they can face the rest of the world. Now we have forest

resources greater than theirs. Can we utilize those resources as well or better? Do not think for one moment that because it takes 200 years to grow a pine tree that all of this experimental work being carried on pertains to a long-range program. Every day we are discovering useful facts which are the fruits of long-range investigation but are of immediate use. Lumber is a necessity of war. New uses are being discovered for forest products—plywood and plastic have a great part to play in this struggle. As for forest influences, they are quite material as well as spiritual.

The gentleman from Colorado who just preceded me was undoubtedly very serious when he spoke of the bracing effect of the mountain air of Colorado upon his people. It is the ozone of the forest that gives the inducted men of Colorado their physical stamina and high standards, but Colorado is not the only mountain State which has these forests. It was Emerson who wrote, "He that liveth by the pine foundeth an heroic line." However, forest influences have a more immediate and material effect. We are looking to our rangers to grow more grasses, to furnish more runoff, to feed more cattle, to grow more crops, and to produce more food. I regard scientific investigation which will reveal these facts of nature just about as important in the winning of this war as are the studies and investigations of the inventors' council or any of the important scientific investigations to substitute for Mother Nature in the making of synthetic rubber. It is short-sighted policy to be too conservative in appropriating money for such work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago I attended a trustees meeting at Tuskegee Institute. Since that time I have wanted to make a short report to the Congress on some of the very fine work that is being done there. Although I have been a trustee for several years, this was my first experience on the ground. I wish I might give you the picture as a whole—but there is not time.

The whole atmosphere of the Tuskegee Institute is one of which any State could be proud. The Governor of Alabama has become greatly interested in the work being done there, and though I find myself in considerable disagreement with certain of his views, I do commend him highly for his recognition of the value of the work at this school. It is possible that more State support may be forthcoming with the same cooperative arrangement between the self-perpetuating board of trustees and the State group as exist between Cornell University and the State of New York. This would make possible additional educational facilities in agriculture as well as in rural education. Both of these subjects are so much needed throughout the South that it is particularly fortunate that Tuskegee already serves in a regional capacity rather than being merely a State school.

You will be interested to know that a unit of colored nurses is with the troops overseas. Some of these young women were trained at Tuskegee. For many years Tuskegee nurses have staffed hospitals and worked in the wide public-health fields. Now a midwifery school has been added. The future benefit of this far-seeing project cannot be estimated.

The agricultural program there is one that is very far-reaching. Stop for a moment to realize that there is an almost untapped possibility of food supply on the small farms of the South. These colored farmers love the land but they need to know how to make it produce. The agricultural school serves as a teaching center whose influence is felt throughout the South.

Few of us here have any conception of the difficulties facing any program of rural education in our Southern States. Teachers are needed and Tuskegee prepares these teachers. I wish I could convey to you some sense of the spirit that is given these young people who in their turn go out all over this country trying to give their people the opportunities of education.

Another school that has infinite possibilities is the commercial home-economics department. Here men and women are given the necessary preparation to fit them into responsible positions in restaurants, hotels, and so forth, where they can excel.

But I am particularly anxious to tell you of the school of aviation and of the Government pilot-training school nearby.

Tuskegee Institute is responsible for what I shall call the preflight "screening school." It is held at Moton Field, dedicated on Sunday, April 4, to the memory of Dr. Moton, the able and beloved successor of Booker T. Washington. From this screening school the flying cadets go to the Government school where, under the very able and deeply understanding leadership of a young Texas flying officer, they win their wings.

Now, there are those among our colored people who stand belligerently against any form of what they call segregation. Criticism of this aviation school has been voiced, I think, very ill-advisedly. To my mind, Tuskegee saw with a very real vision that the first steps toward wings for our colored boys are best taken in a completely colored school where they are not subjected to the attitudes which drive them in upon themselves and give them a sense of inadequacy. In the air men must feel themselves gods, or, like Icarus, they lose their wings and fall to earth.

Although the ratio of accepted students as flyers is a little lower than that of the average white air school, the quality of the successful candidate leaves nothing to be desired.

One of the reasons why he does not qualify in as high a ratio as the white student is due partly to his educational difficulties. This brings out dramatically one of the problems before this country: Adequate educational opportunity to all groups. When these colored lads can have such equal opportunity, in all likelihood their ratio of acceptance as flyers will be as high as other groups.

The first squadron of colored flyers has left for combat duty, taking the hearts of Tuskegee with them. I am sure the entire membership of this House wishes them well and hopes for them a high record of honor and of glory.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat embarrassed by the generosity, courtesy, and the insistence of my distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, that I make myself of record on this bill.

It may be fortuitous or not that some of us cannot be in two places at once. It all depends on what you think.

The facts are, I was impressed into service yesterday afternoon at the hearings in the naval appropriations subcommittee room, and it, therefore, was not possible for me to present myself during the discussion of this pending bill in general debate.

Today I found, to my surprise, that all time in general debate had expired, and except for the gracious courtesy of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, anything I might desire to offer would not be or have been in order.

I had prepared a speech, with which I shall not abuse you because so many of the things to which I referred therein were covered yesterday much more ably than I could have done or hoped or could have expected to do had I been permitted.

I do wish to say, however, that no Member of Congress has any alibi for not having appeared before our subcommittee. We sat some 60 days, and we invited all comers to be heard. Nobody was excluded.

There are a good many things in this bill which would not be in it, were I to draft it. There are a lot of things left out of it which I would include, were I to be judge, jury, and executioner.

However, we have brought you a bill which we have finally agreed unanimously to support, and here is my hand for that, as agreed.

I would like, however, to say the truth is found in the fact that the safety of the Nation and the fate of the world rests with a group of hard-working individualists we call free farmers who can and shall, if I can fix it, find a free market. Food will win the war.

You know, Jefferson said that—

> When the Government undertakes to say who shall sow and who shall reap, the people will starve.

He could have gone further by saying indepedence would be sacrificed on the altar of collectivism.

He did say, and, as the sole Representative of a 100-percent Jeffersonian Democratic-Republican state, I repeat:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

I could say bodies too. I hate, and my people hate, tyranny in every form, however covered or disguised.

I do not have to say that I am for the individual farmer to the end that he shall, as a laborer, get the reward thereof,

at a fair price in an open and a free market. He is worthy of his hire. I am for less and less of Government control, and the attempted subsidization of the farmer.

I am for everything that betters his lot, not at his expense, but am opposed to a lot of superficial bureaucratic nonsense which burdens him, as the sycophantic hypocritical New Deal philosophers try to make him a goat or a guinea pig.

Naturally, therefore, I am opposed to letting a lot of bloodsucking bureaucrats and their link boys subsist on or off the bodies of the sweating farmers of America, by virtue of promises of subsidies, gratuities, and incentive payments, so-called.

We have a lot of people in every State who have lived off the New Deal too long. Under the guise of and being classed as Republicans, they have played ball with every New Deal team that had a dollar to spend for them. Bloodsuckers!

The New Deal is on the way out. They should go with it if the farmers have any self-respect, and they have, or will have when they understand what some people who have lived high off them have done to them.

The farmer asks for freedom and fair prices. He should have both. These bloodsucking barnacles can get neither for them, despite their speeches and promises and self-serving efforts to build up their political prestige and personal and political power.

The sooner the real farmers get rid of this baggage the lighter will be their load and the quicker they will get somewhere. I have listened to the claptrap of these people for 10 years. I tell my farmers they are misled to follow the advice of these false prophets who work in a fog and can only see a dollar sign for a farmer, if and when the coin slides into their own pockets.

When, if ever, will the real honest-to-God farmers of America assert themselves and get rid of these high-pressure theorists, salesmen, and bureaucrats, who have lived off them too long?

Of course, I do not like the pay-roll theorists and politicians who are attempting to do for themselves as they exploit the farmer country-wide, at his expense. It is a crime.

The largest group of bloodsucking barnacles on the Ship of State is found in the multiplied unnecessary tentacles of the octopus of the Department of Agriculture. They strangle and destroy the farmer's meal ticket in their maneuvers to feed themselves, as they fool the real farmers of America they try to subsidize.

I shall not put any more into the RECORD.

The bill we have brought you has been hammered out on an anvil of diversified reactions to all situations. It is confessedly a compromise. It should be passed as is, without substantial amendment, if those who are against it are for their country first. That is the test.

I am for the bill as is.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] the remaining time on this side.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House in its wisdom will restore the provision with regard to the continuance of crop insurance. I recognize that up to now the program has not been a success. Over the period of 4 years the wheat insurance program has suffered a loss of $17,000,000. In 1 year of operations the cotton insurance program, according to the report, has suffered a loss of $415,000.

As we consider those losses, I beg you to consider some things the Congress is doing to bring security to other groups.

Do you recall that a few weeks ago you appropriated about $175,000,000 as the Government's part of the fund under civil service in order that those who work for the Government, who already earn a fairly good wage, may be safe and secure when they retire?

Do you recall that the Government is now spending about $100,000,000 to deliver oil and gasoline to the consuming public a little more cheaply?

It seems to me, therefore, that when you view the whole picture it is not so much that we have lost up to now under this program.

I have tried, in my feeble way, since I have been a Member of the Congress, to bring to the farmers of the Nation some feeling of security. They have had very little. I think the soil-conservation and the soil-building program is one of the great things we have done for the farmer, for his future, and for his security. We have provided that at least for the next several years he is assured a fair price, with commodity loans of not less than 90 percent of parity. It seems to me that with crop insurance we will have further fortified his position in order that he may have some knowledge when he plants of what the harvest is going to be.

Without this insurance, when the weather goes wrong, when the insects come, when many of the hazards for which the farmer is in no sense responsible visit him, he is utterly helpless.

It seems to me that in this great program of trying to bring help to those upon whom we are dependent for the food to sustain our lives, the least we can do is to continue the wheat- and the cotton-insurance program, great as it is, leaving it to those who are chargeable with its administration to adjust its figures, to adjust its indemnities, and to adjust its premiums to the point where it will be a self-sustaining program. I want it constructed into a program where not even the administrative expenses will be chargeable to the Federal Government. I think it should be made entirely a self-sustaining program, where the farmer would pay a premium sufficient not only to pay for the losses but to bear the administrative expenses. In a Nation-wide program that cannot be done in a day.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Would the gentleman feel that the program should be extended to other crops such as the principal crop raised in Iowa?

Mr. PACE. I certainly think that if the data are completed, and I understand they have been securing the information for 2 or 3 years, this program should immediately be extended to corn. I should like to see it extended in time not only to the basic commodities but to all commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, namely.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of paragraphs in this bill that are subject to points of order. It has become the practice in the House to reserve points of order and have debate on the items subject to the points of order. I serve notice now that as these points of order are made I shall not permit any reservation but shall demand the regular order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The problems of food production and distribution cannot be confined by national boundaries. Our food production needs are inexorably linked with the consumption needs of the fighting forces of all of the United Nations. What we need to produce must in large measure depend on what other friendly nations closer to the fighting can produce. The Congress cannot act with any degree of intelligence in passing on our own food production problems unless it is in possession of complete information relative to the needs of our armies and relative to the ability of our allies to supply portions of those needs.

When the war is over, the Congress will undoubtedly be called upon to make far-reaching decisions in regard to our domestic agriculture as well as in regard to our attitude toward foreign agriculture development that will seek American money, technical skill, or American markets. These decisions will be of far-reaching importance to the economy of the world and will surely vitally affect the very existence of the American farmer. They should not be undertaken without a broad background of general information that very few, if any, Members of this House possess at this time. On the other hand, we cannot, when the war is over, wait to accumulate the background knowledge that will be then needed. It will then be too late. We must prepare now or we shall find ourselves unready to take advantage of the opportunity for the direction and coordination of agricultural trends to our own advantage. It is true that the entire membership of this House cannot devote itself to a detailed study of such post-war or even immediate wartime international arrangements relating to agricultural activities. But a select committee of this House can.

On the other hand, the Congress should, and I am sure will want to, make

its own decisions based on its own first-hand knowledge of world agricultural needs. The Congress will not be content to allow any other branch of government to make these decisions. The responsibility is ours, and we must not try to avoid it. It is not sufficient to say that the executive branches of government are studying the same problems. I am sure that they are properly preparing themselves to meet their respective responsibilities. This is as it should be, but we cannot entrust to the executive branches the functions of legislation. Neither should we interfere with the proper work of the executive in these lines. We should be ready to cooperate with the executive branches in every possible manner. I have little patience with that school of thought that would seek to inject congressional interference into the pending inter-American food conference which is to be held in the near future under the auspices of the State Department and at which this country will be ably represented by a delegation headed by our former colleague, the ex-chairman of the Agricultural Committee of this House, the Honorable Marvin Jones. I have confidence in Marvin Jones and in the State Department. The pending food conference is one of executive officials. Let us applaud the State Department for its recognition of the importance of agriculture in the world order, and at the same time resolve to give the Nation an example of equal foresight and intelligent planning on the part of the legislative branch.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. In a moment. The only practical method available to this House for the accumulation of the facts necessary to make intelligent decisions is through the use of select committees. I have, therefore, today introduced a resolution providing for the appointment by the Speaker of a committee of seven to study both the present wartime needs and the post-war needs of agricultural planning and cooperation that this body may most intelligently and effectively meet its obligation to the soldiers of this and of the other United Nations to provide the maximum amount of needed food and fiber at the proper times and places, and later to perform its duty to the American farmers of seeing that in the post-war readjustments proper consideration is given to the most advantageous use of the productivity of American farms.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, something has been said in the course of general debate about the fact that this bill has a number of legislative provisions which are subject to points of order and which could only be considered, if the Rules Committee brought in a rule waiving those points of order. Yesterday, the Rules Committee, after a full hearing of the matter, turned down the application for a rule. I think that the Rules Committee is to be commended for that action in protecting the rights of the legislative committees of the House. If gentlemen will examine the bill that we have before us now they will find that there are from 30 to 40 legislative provisions in it. Perhaps there may be more—I know there are that many—provisions which are not permitted under the rules of the House to be included in an appropriation bill. I think all the Members are familiar with the rules which provide that the legislative committees have no power to make appropriations, and that the Appropriations Committee has no power to legislate. Those rules have been in effect since the adoption of the Budget act in 1921. We may or may not have made a mistake in the adoption of that act. However, it is the law and the rules made under it are the rules of the House.

I can see that there are some advantages perhaps in having a legislative committee make appropriations, as was the practice before 1921, and I can see some advantages now to those who are the sponsors of legislation in having the Appropriations Committee exercise legislative powers. It is very easy, if you can get a legislative item in an appropriation bill, to get that provision enacted into law, rather speedily. We have to pass appropriation bills. They do not have to come in under a rule. They are in order at any time. The President does not veto appropriation bills, and he cannot veto individual items in appropriation bills; so that if I were sponsoring legislation I think I could see some great advantages in bypassing the legislative committees in the House, going to the Appropriations Committee and inducing them to attach a legislative provision to the appropriation bill. That is a practice which has become rather general. Last year when this particular appropriation bill was before the House, the subcommittee went before the Rules Committee and secured a rule which permitted the waiving of points of order. That was done the year before, and I do not know how far back that practice has been followed. I think the Committee on Agriculture in the House has been at fault in that it has not, previous to this time, objected before the Rules Committee to the granting of a rule of that kind. I think it should have taken action at an earlier date to protect its rights and the rights of all legislative committees by insisting that a rule of that kind be not granted. I believe if the protest had been made in previous years, the Rules Committee would have done what it did this year, vote to preserve the integrity of the legislative committees, and would have refused a rule.

What has happened since this practice has grown up? Simply this: When the Agriculture Department wants certain legislation, it does not come to the Committee on Agriculture. Why should it, if it can go to the Appropriations Committee and have that committee put a legislative provision in an appropriation bill? Then, if the rules can be waived so that points of order cannot be made, the provision becomes a law with little further trouble. That is certainly easier and simpler than to go through all the routine of legislative processes in both the House and Senate. So there are obvious advantages, as I have pointed out, and that is exactly what has been done by the Department of Agriculture on many occasions. It has also been done by organizations interested in securing legislation. They have bypassed the Committee on Agriculture and have gone to the Committee on Appropriations. You will find in the bill today many provisions that were presented by farm organizations that are of a purely legislative character.

Is that the way to legislate? It is strictly against the rules of the House. It is a matter in which the Agricultural Committee is interested to no greater extent than other legislative committees. The legislative provisions in this bill do not all cover matters which can only be properly considered by the Agricultural Committee. There are provisions there which should go before the Banking and Currency Committee, and others which should go before the Committee on the Civil Service.

There are more such provisions this year than there were last year, and there were more last year than there were the year before.

I have the greatest respect for the members of the subcommittee which brought in this bill. They are able men, thoroughly versed in the subject of agriculture, and all of them my very good friends. I dislike very much to take any position which is in opposition to the position which they have taken in this matter.

I am doing so only because I believe it is important that we preserve the integrity of the legislative committees of the House.

The contention has been made by those who have spoken that the Committee on Agriculture is to blame for not having brought in some of these legislative matters that are included in the bill. The reason the Committee on Agriculture has not brought in some of this legislation is because nobody has been before the committee asking for it. Most legislation which we consider in Congress comes from the outside. It comes from groups and organizations, it comes from governmental agencies. Unless there is support for and interest in legislation from outside Congress it does not get very far. The Department of Agriculture has adopted the practice of going to the Committee on Appropriations. The farm organizations have adopted the practice of going to the Committee on Appropriations. Hereafter let us follow the rules of the House and have those who are seeking legislation come before the proper legislative committee. That is the position which the Committee on Agriculture is taking today.

I am not speaking on the merits of any of the proposals in this bill which may be subject to points of order. The matter should simply be considered on

the basis of whether or not it is sound legislative practice, whether it is within the rules of the House to proceed in this way.

I make this statement simply because I want the members of the Committee of the Whole House to understand the position of myself and the position of all members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that many of the items in this bill, or several of them at least, were instituted by Executive order and that no committee of Congress ever had an opportunity to consider the merits of the proposal?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Wholly aside from this question of which committee should handle it, does not the gentleman feel that this great structure of agricultural legislation and plans set up to take care of the Department needs overhauling as to policies?

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman is right. I think there should be some changes and some overhauling, and I think it should be done by the legislative committee.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly if the gentleman from Ohio is correct, that should go before a legislative committee.

Mr. HOPE. It should go before the legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble do now close.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Could not the gentleman wait until a little later in the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I would like to speak on the preamble.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Could not the gentleman take his time a little later?

Mr. CASE. I want to talk on the subject which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] spoke about.

Mr. TARVER. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the preamble close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], upon the very splendid statement he has made regarding the parliamentary situation confronting the House at this time.

I also commend our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, for his very splendid efforts in bringing to the House this appropriation bill. He and his subcommittee have done a great amount of work.

There are one or two things that I think might be proper in discussing the preamble to the bill; one is the fact that the hearings were deliberately withheld from the membership of this House. Hearings containing approximately 1,800 pages, with dozens and dozens of charts, were placed before the Members of the House only a few hours before the debate on this bill was started. A transcript of the hearings was made available to the press of the country, because the press had to make up news stories. The Members of this House have to make up their minds with regard to all of these provisions, and yet this information was deliberately withheld from us. It is humanly impossible to have read and considered the great abundance of material which is contained in the report and hearings on this bill in the brief time we have had. While I am commending my colleagues, I want to commend the Committee on Rules of this House for refusing to grant a closed rule, waiving all points of order. I know the Committee on Agriculture of the House, and I know well enough that the fine and tender sensibilities of the members of that committee have not been offended in the slightest. But, frankly, our committee does resent the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has apparently constituted itself into a supercommittee.

I want to call your attention to this fact: I stated before the Rules Committee yesterday that in a slight degree, at least, the Committee on Appropriations is responsible for the terrible predicament in which we find the Farm Security Administration today. Here is the reason: In 1937 our committee reported to this Congress and this Congress passed the Bankhead-Jones Tenant-Purchase Act. From that day in 1937 up until the present time the administrators of that agency have not darkened the doors of our committee room. We have not been advised regarding their activities. Eighty percent of their program has been carried on pursuant to legislative authority contained in appropriation bills. Yet, after having permitted the administrators in the Department to bypass and circumvent our committee for, lo, these many years and to get themselves into the present muddled condition, they now seek to destroy the agency completely—the good as well as the bad parts of it.

I congratulate the Committee on Rules in permitting the bill to come to the floor of the House subject to all proper points of order to the end that the integrity of every legislative committee of this body might be protected, and that these department officials might be forced to come before the committees which have created their agencies and which have initiated their legislation.

This bill is important; it contains many important appropriations and many worth-while provisions; but I want it understood our committee has not neglected its duties. As pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, we have not been consulted, we have not been given an opportunity to confer with the Department officials, and there has been no necessity for a conference between them and the House Committee on Agriculture. Why? Because the Committee on Appropriations has taken care of all their needs and provided all of the funds and all of the legislation. Certainly we are justified in considering this bill in the House under an open rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, we confront a practical situation. I want to express the hope that we will recognize it as such, and that is that although the bill is wide open and points of order can be made against a great many items in it, I express the hope that Members will recognize that a great many of these minor appropriations have been carried for a great many years. If points of order should be made against them it would merely mean that we would march up the hill and march down again, for the items will be restored in the Senate and the conference. We might as well recognize that and save a lot of time and printing. Now, just a word about this parliamentary situation.

I do not believe that the agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations should be charged with any malicious purpose in the way this bill was presented. I do not happen to be a member of the subcommittee that reported the bill, so I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] did reserve points of order on the bill when it was presented. Had there been any conspiracy to deprive Members of their rights, he could have overlooked doing that, and, under the ruling given last week, the Committee on Agriculture would be helpless today. And I recall to your attention that several members of the Appropriations Committee took the lead to protect the rights of the Judiciary Committee and other legislative committees at that time.

I also call your attention to the fact that if the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], appealed to the Committee on Rules for a closed rule on this bill, he did it by a custom in which the Committee on Agriculture itself has acquiesced, and on which it has relied. The subcommittee handling this bill has been practically invited by the Committee on Agriculture to report bills carrying legislation and to ask for a special rule waiving points of order, through the failure, year after year, to propose legislation to give certain items statutory authority.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I did it by direction, the unanimous direction, of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CASE. Technically, perhaps; although the gentleman will remember the haste of some Members to get to the Jefferson Memorial prevented discussion of the point. A custom has grown up whereby this bill has carried many items, such as those in the Bureau of Plant Industry, without legislative authorization. And more recently larger items, such as the Farm Security Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, have had funds only because a rule waiving points of order was obtained by the Committee on Appropriations. So if we find ourselves in a peculiar situation today, it is the result of a practice that has grown up by the consent, and, you might say, by the sanction of the Committee on Agriculture. Certainly they have relied on it.

Now then, this is a practical situation and it can be met by the use of common sense and a little restraint. There is no need to have the bill riddled if Members will confine their points of order to those particular portions of the paragraphs to which they object and leave the balance of the language in the paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time on the preamble paragraph has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses

For the Secretary of Agriculture, hereafter in this act referred to as the Secretary, and other personal services in the Office of the Secretary in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, and other necessary expenses, including the purchase of one and the maintenance, repair, and operation of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment; freight, express, and drayage charges; advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, $1,473,184, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1944 for such services and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $75,476, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1944 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1944, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, hereafter in this act referred to as the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services, and the appropriations made in this act shall be available for such purposes, and to expend from appropriations available for the purchase of lands not to exceed $1 for each option to purchase any particular tract or tracts of land: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $25,000 of the appropriations available for salaries and expenses of officers and employees of the Department permanently stationed in foreign countries may be used for payment of allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a): *Provided further,* That with the approval of the Secretary, employees of the Department stationed abroad may enter into leases for official quarters, for periods not exceeding 1 year, and may pay rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the discharge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country where custom or practice requires payment in advance: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast, except as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests, with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same: *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for laboratory investigations to determine the possibly harmful effects on human beings of spray insecticides on fruits and vegetables: *Provided further,* That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee for an explanation of the last proviso relating to the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities produced outside of the United States.

Mr. TARVER. The proviso in question has been carried in the bill for a number of years. It was originally inserted in an effort to encourage the use of cotton twine rather than the use of twine produced from materials imported from India.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would this include binder twine?

Mr. TARVER. That is true, but I think under present conditions there is no possibility of its including binder twine, because binder twine is not used by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman sure?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not used on its experimental farm?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot answer that question, nor do I think testimony was given about it before the committee. I believe it was testified that there was no twine available at this time made from foreign material—I mean any importation of foreign materials.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes; sisal from Yucatan. That is our only source of binder twine. We can no longer get it from the Philippines.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will note that the proviso in question excepts materials used incident to research or experiment, and there could be no binder twine used by the Department except as it may be incident to that type of work.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Apropos the gentleman's last statement I am wondering if the committee has made any inquiry as to whether or not, for example, the Board of Economic Warfare or other war-making agency has not made arrangements for the importation into this country of sisal from Yucatan to take the place of Manila hemp and might be in a position where they might have to purchase some of it?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I believe the Department of Agriculture and its officials could have been depended upon to advise the committee if there were anything of that sort in prospect. This language, as I have stated before, has been carried in the bill for a number of years. As a matter of fact, we had no evidence with regard to it at all. No Member of the House appeared for or against it. It simply has been carried forward as having been included in the bill heretofore; and, as stated, I feel that if the Department of Agriculture or its officials testifying concerning this item anticipated any difficulties of any kind by reason of its continuance they would have acquainted the committee with that fact.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall not move to strike it out, but I leave the thought with the Chairman that we would better look pretty carefully into items of this kind and not adopt them merely because it is an old, old item. We are in a different situation today.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will examine the thousands of individual items that we have had to deal with in this bill and realize the comparative shortness of the time, although it has been 2 months we have had to consider the bill, he will understand that there is a tendency on the part of the committee not to consider matters which are not in controversy and with regard to which no Member of Congress has indicated any interest.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that request was made for a rule waiving all points of order against this bill. In this connection, I desire to inform the House that I for one have not changed my viewpoint or my position on bringing in a closed rule depriving the membership of the privilege which is theirs under the regular rules of the House, unless it be on a highly technical or complicated revenue or tax bill, nor do I feel that we should bring in a rule that would waive all points of order on an appropriation bill which deprives any legislative committee of its functions.

You will recollect that 2 years ago upon the urgent request of my old friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, we brought in a special rule on the agricultural appropriation bill making in order and permitting certain ap-

propriations which had not been approved or authorized by the Committee on Agriculture. Again, last year, many legislative matters were included in the agricultural appropriation bill. At that time I stated on the floor of the House that, while I was bringing in the rule owing to the imperative need of the early passage of the agricultural appropriation bill, it was the last rule waiving points of order that I would offer and that, henceforth, the Committee on Appropriations could not look to the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule waiving points of order on their bill because of the fact that it would deprive the Committee on Agriculture of its legislative function.

I am not especially interested in the Committee on Agriculture because you will recollect I have opposed some of that committee's bills and even some of the rules that were granted; but I do feel it is my duty to stand by the House and the will of the House in not permitting the Committee on Appropriations or subcommittees thereof to deprive the legislative committees of their rights and functions. If we continue to do it with this committee there is no question but what other subcommittees on appropriations will come to us with the same proposals and the result will be that the Appropriations Committee will become also the legislative committee and assume the jurisdiction and the rights of the legislative committees.

When we created the Committee on Appropriations nearly 20 years ago we took away from the legislative committees the right and privilege to appropriate. Having taken away from them that function, now an effort is being made to take away from them the right to legislate. We might as well abolish all of the legislative committees and leave the entire jurisdiction over all matters to the Committee on Appropriations and allow it to legislate as well as to appropriate. I know that is not the wish or the desire of the House. So the Committee on Rules yesterday, voting on the resolution for a rule to waive all points of order, declined, by a majority vote, to give its approval of the resolution.

At noon today the Speaker and other Members urged me to call a meeting this afternoon because some members of the Committee on Rules had indicated they were willing to change their vote and would vote for a rule waiving all points of order on the 30 or more legislative provisions in the bill. I complied with the request for the calling of a meeting for the purpose of reconsidering the vote denying a rule for the consideration of the bill, although I was reasonably certain that those Members who voted against the resolution for a rule would stand by their former action. My reason for calling the meeting was to avoid any inference that I refused to aid the Committee on Appropriations in expediting the passage of the bill. I have at all times cooperated in expediting the business of the House, but I do not believe it should be done by the usurpation of the powers and functions of the duly elected legislative committees of this House.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I think that the members of the Appropriations Committee are glad that the gentleman took the position he did. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself the other day when the bill was reported from the Legislative Appropriations Committee which failed to reserve points of order took the lead in trying to have that situation corrected. The gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the subcommittee, consented to have those items stricken out. The Appropriations Committee wants the rights of the legislative committees preserved and the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee that 2 years ago he did not want to grant this kind of a rule any more should have put the Agricultural Committee on notice and they should have taken action to protect themselves.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and in that connection wish to say that I have suggested that the Committee on Agriculture take up and consider any and all deserving provisions in the bill that will go out on points which have been sustained against them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no more interest in the subject matter whether points of order against this bill shall be waived than does any other Member of the House, especially those Members of the House who happen to represent agricultural constituencies. I pursued in this case, as chairman of the subcommittee, the course which has been pursued by all other chairmen of subcommittees on agricultural appropriations during the 16 years of my membership in Congress. There has always been included in the agricultural appropriation bill a great many legislative provisions.

This time the Committee on Appropriations, without a dissenting vote, directed me to appear before the Rules Committee and request a rule waiving points of order against this bill, and that I did. I advised the Rules Committee as I advise you that the matter was of no more concern to me than to any other Member of the House. If the House does not desire to vote on these numerous items which have always been carried in the bill, that is the business of the House. As far as I am concerned, I would appreciate the opportunity to vote on them and to vote them up or down as might be in accordance with the majority judgment.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise some question as to the good faith of the gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture who came en masse before the Rules Committee and opposed the granting of this rule. We have just read paragraph 1. There are at least two important legislative provisions in that paragraph. These gentlemen who oppose the waiving of points of order against the bill have not risen here to make points of order against these legislative provisions, and it is now too late for them to do so. So what objective did they have in mind in urging the Rules Committee not to grant a rule waiving points of order against the bill and in insisting that no legislative provision shall be carried in the bill unless they want to raise points of order against these legislative provisions?

There are numerous other legislative provisions in this bill. I want to see whether or not the gentlemen from the West are going to raise a point of order against funds for barberry eradication. I want to see whether or not the gentlemen from New York and New Jersey and the Northeast are going to raise points of order against the Dutch-elm appropriation. I want to see whether or not gentlemen from Texas are going to raise a point of order against the pink bollworm program, which involves an expenditure of $400,000.

Good faith is good faith. If you do not want any legislative provisions in this bill, then make the points of order that you know you can make and have those legislative provisions stricken from the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say on behalf of one member of the legislative committee that I do not want to be capricious by making points of order. As we read this bill I believe that many points of order will be reserved in the hope they might be discussed. We expect that many points of order which could be made will not be made.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not believe there should be any legislation in this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. TARVER. Why does not the gentleman make points of order against the provisions in the bill which he has been advised by the Solicitor of the Department this morning are subject to points of order, and which are in the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the members of our committee are the keepers of their own conscience and will exercise their own good judgment in that regard.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I shall not undertake to discuss the gentleman's conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there are two laws of the House. One is the written law and the other is the unwritten law. Under the unwritten law of the House, a custom that has been common practice for so many years that the mind of man runneth not to the contrary,

we have included in this bill these items to which objection is now being made and applied to the Committee on Rules for the usual rule making them in order. It has not only been the practice for many years but is in compliance and conformity with the rules of the House.

The great committee which has sponsored this departure in procedure convicts itself. If those items which have been in these bills for so long were not meritorious they would not have been retained all these years. This House has approved them year after year. If the items are so meritorious and this committee is so jealous of its prerogatives, why has it not long ago authorized them? Either the House all these years has been doing continuously what it ought not to have done or the committee has been derelict in its duty.

My good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, insists that he must defend the House against itself, and in order to defend the House against itself he refuses to allow the House to determine its own course of conduct.

The Chairman of the Committee on Rules does not propose to serve the House. All he proposes is to prevent you from determining what you want to do. Thereby the Committee on Rules fails in the greatest function which has been assigned to it, because the very purpose of the power delegated to that committee is to permit this House to do what in its good judgment it decides it should do. But he even refuses to permit you to vote on it.

The Committee on Appropriations cannot bring a rule here and take away any of your rights unless you agree to it. It takes a majority of the House and it would today have taken two-thirds of the House to adopt that rule, still the Chairman of the Committee on Rules is unwilling to let you determine a question which requires a two-thirds vote to adopt.

I ask you, is the Committee on Rules, the great Committee on Rules, serving the House, is it serving the Nation when it refuses to let two-thirds of the Members of this House take the action they want to take?

The sole purpose of the Committee on Appropriations in presenting this bill is to serve the Congress and the Nation. I realize that most of the items in this bill are reductions of expenditures, and I realize there are those in the House who do not want to reduce nonessential expenditures even in time of war, and that gives rise to the extraordinary question presented here.

When this committee, in accordance with the custom of long standing, submitted to the Committee on Rules the usual stereotyped rule, which has been adopted year after year, the purpose of the committee was principally to reduce expenditures. We have reduced items in this bill which, even though they are sometimes warranted in time of peace, certainly are not warranted in time of war. They are not warranted when we are putting on a drive this week to encourage the purchase of bonds. We are urging the child on the street to invest one dime in a stamp. Still you are opposed to our saving that dime for defense purposes and are insisting that we invest it in some purpose that is not essential to the war program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I have a pet peeve that has not been confessed or exposed or emphasized in the discussion that has been heard here during the past 2 days. I think we have sufficiently gone over the question of how far the Committee on Rules is in error, and that enough has been said about the iniquities and sins of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the Committee on Agriculture. The Subcommittee on Appropriations have been kind enough to me, and I am not going to criticize them. But I went into the committee room the other day, last Monday, and asked for this bill. I knew certain people had it. I had seen it in the hands of certain people. I said, "I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I desire to have that bill." I was refused it.

I do not remember specifically of asking for these hearings. I am now told that I could have gotten them, but what good are the hearings if you do not have the bill? I said, "I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I should like to know what is in that bill." I said that newspapermen had copies of it, and the answer was that they had to make up a story. I said, "That is well and good, but I have to make up my vote." It still remained true that I could not get the bill. It was not distributed or released until Tuesday and just a few hours before the bill came on for hearing in Congress.

What is this book of 1,803 pages good for, if you do not have the bill upon which it is founded? How can you read such a book in a few hours, especially if you are pressed with other important public business? I say there ought to be a rule of this House which would provide that a bill of this character should be laid before us at least 2 days in advance of the time it is called up for discussion.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Missouri that the time has been fixed by the Committee at 17 minutes, and that he feels constrained to recognize those who indicated their desire to speak in that time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, be allowed to proceed for 3 minutes in addition to the 17 minutes already fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the subcommittee, but I had overlooked the fact that the time had been fixed. I think it a very bad practice after time has been fixed to extend that time in favor of someone else, and I therefore decline to take advantage of the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. As a member of the Committee on Rules, and in view of the controversy that has developed here, I feel hesitant in saying anything, because I do not know just how far it may be proper to go in discussing what the committee did or did not do. For myself I have felt that the unusual fact that the agricultural appropriation bill has already been cut $500,000,000 below the Budget estimate, and because of the unusual situation that confronts the Nation today, particularly in the field of agriculture, we ought to disregard whatever things may have happened in the past about jurisdiction, and let this whole matter go to the Committee of the Whole for settlement. However, I do not think that the blame for this situation can properly be laid at the door of the Committee on Rules, and I doubt if the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is chairman of the whole Committee on Appropriations, is the proper person to undertake to do so. In my judgment, both the legislative committee and the subcommittee on agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations have been somewhat at fault. Many of the items in this bill which are subject to points of order have been put in the appropriation bill now for several years, and the Rules Committee has been called on from year to year to grant a rule waiving the points of order in order that they might be kept in the bill.

A year ago or more notice was given that the Rules Committee felt that this is a bad practice, and in an effort to preserve the legislative jurisdiction of all the committees of the House they were not going to grant special rules any more in such cases. If the Committee on Appropriations had notified the people interested in the particular items in controversy, they would have gone to the appropriate committee and obtained authorization of law therefor. The legislative committee of the Committee on Agriculture appeared almost en bloc before the Rules Committee and opposed the granting of this special rule, but gave as the only substantial reason for not having authorized these things by law that nobody had ever requested them to do so. I do not think that the Rules Committee ought to be required to nurse this baby. It is not ours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman think that the announcement 1 year ago was given as a warning to the

Committee on Appropriations not to take action 1 year in advance, or does he regard it as a warning to the Committee on Agriculture to take appropriate action? The Committee on Agriculture has had ample notice and a full year in which to act and up to this date it has held no hearings, introduced no bills, and taken no action whatever to exercise the prerogatives which they are now using as a monkey wrench to disrupt the only bill which can provide funds to keep the Government operating.

Mr. CLARK. I am not saying that justifies the legislative Committee on Agriculture, but I do say that if the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Agriculture had notified the interested parties in the Department of Agriculture a year ago that they could not put these legislative items in the appropriation bill, they would probably have gone to the legislative committee, and the whole thing would have been properly solved.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And may I say to the gentleman that neither the Department of Agirculture nor any interested parties in the Department of Agriculture have ever applied to the Committee on Agriculture, either for funds or for legislation. Requests for appropriations do not come from the departments but from the President.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the gentleman will not take any more of my time. I think we are just quibbling over jurisdiction. We ought to go to the jury on the merits of this proposition. As to those farmers who may be hurt by lack of something in this bill, you will have a sweet time trying to explain the jurisdictional difference between congressional committees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a result of the action of the Rules Committee, the officials of the Department of Agriculture next year will go to the proper legislative committee for authority.

Mr. CLARK. There is no doubt about it, and they should have gone there in the first instance by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations refusing to put these items in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, following the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] just a step further, let us remember the old maxim, "He who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands." The gentleman from North Carolina has made it clear that neither the Committee on Appropriations nor the Agricultural Committee had clean hands in this matter when they appeared before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from North Carolina said much that I intended to say, and said it in a much better and more convincing way.

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if, after all, this Subcommittee on Appropriations has not only exceeded but abused the privilege it has of reporting legislation to the House. As a matter of fact, this subcommittee would not be in existence were it not for the limitation specifically placed on its power in the declaration of the House creating it.

Before its existence the Agriculture Committee had the power not only to report legislation but also had the power to report appropriations implementing its legislation. When the present Committee on Appropriations was set up, there was a division of power affecting agricultural legislation; that is, the Committee on Agriculture remained the policy or legislative committee, and it was specifically provided that the Appropriations Committee was to check up and only appropriate such authorized sums as were justified by the spending department. At times it is very difficult not to include some small legislative item in an appropriation bill. The House recognizes this fact and does not complain. It does complain, however, when a subcommittee on appropriations attempts to usurp the power and privileges of the regularly constituted legislative committee.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, relies upon unwritten law in the House as distinguished from the written law, or the rules. I am sure when he thinks this matter over, he will abandon any such notion, and I shall expect him to retract that statement before the debate is concluded.

Power feeds on power. Bureaucracy thrives on bureaucracy, and takes into itself a little power in the beginning, more power a little later, and, as the years go by, such additional power and authority as the people will stand for. By the same token, the Appropriations Committee has been exceeding its authority, and taking unto itself unwarranted power for a number of years last past. This subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], is the chief offender. Like other bureaus, this subcommittee has gotten away with much in the past, until at last it takes unto itself the right to fix salaries, make legal Executive orders, and write legislation in general.

In short, if not called to order and stopped in its mad course, it will soon lead the procession of bureaus and oligarchies in the House. The very conduct of its chairman throughout this debate best illustrates what I have in mind. The budget system and the present Appropriations Committee, with its statutory powers, can perform a splendid function and bring about economy in Government. If permitted to run wild as a supercommittee, like all bureaus in a democracy, it will destroy itself. It is the duty of the House to stop this mad rush, put an end to this egotism, and teach the departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Government dealing with agriculture that they cannot go before this small subcommittee, hold secret hearings, and get appropriations and legislation at the same time.

The Rules Committee and others who are opposing this conduct on the part of this subcommittee are doing the Appropriations Committee a genuine service. Now, there are some items like the Dutch-elm item, the boll-weevil item, and the barberry item, and some other small items in the bill, that are subject to a point of order, but which are not policy making in their scope, and to which no one will make a point of order. Be that as it may, the privilege to make a point of order should be retained in the individual Member of the House.

No one on the Appropriations Committee claims that this committee has any right to report many of the items included in this bill. No one claims that open hearings were held on those important items and that other Members of Congress or persons outside of the Congress were permitted to express their views or give any information whatever to the subcommittee. Only the Department and such persons as the committee desired to hear were permitted to participate in its executive sessions. Then, after weeks of hearings before this subcommittee, one day such parts of the hearings as the committee thought should be submitted to the public appear in printed form. In this particular case the volume contained 1,800 pages. The bill was not available to the Members of the House until the day it was called up or possibly the day preceding its consideration.

In short, no one had any information about what the bill contained excepting this small group composing the Agricultural Subcommittee. Mr. Speaker, this is not democratic action. At times it may be advisable and expedient so far as appropriations alone are concerned. It is all wrong, unjust, and tyrannical so far as legislation contained in an appropriation bill is concerned.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee, made clear just what happened in the Rules Committee. He was severely castigated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. That tongue lashing was not justified by the facts. It was the majority of the Rules Committee, and not the chairman, that determined the action the committee took in this matter.

The Rules Committee has shown courage. It has acted in the interest of the entire Congress, including the Appropriations Committee itself. I am sure that a majority of the House believes in constitutional government. The rules of the House are the constitution of the House, and if we do not like those rules, then they should be changed; but no committee should by unwritten law become so bold as to feel that it can violate the rules and then get special dispensation in the form of a gag rule to prevent the Members of the House exercising their parliamentary rights.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TARVER. The Rules Committee not only did not bring the matter to the floor of the House, but by refusing to grant a rule prevented the House from voting on it.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. It refused to ask the House to sustain the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in his effort to knowingly and intentionally and

with malice aforethought violate the rules of the House. It should be complimented for such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to say anything at this time, but after listening to these gentlemen, members of the Committee on Appropriations, running all around over the lot trying to cover up their own sins by blessing out members of my committee and members of the Rules Committee, it reminds me of what usually happens down in South Carolina when we have a political campaign.

We campaign together—that is, speak from the same platform. In practically every instance, instead of my opponent speaking on the issues and national problems confronting the country and the Congress, he proceeds to cover up his own sins by blessing out the Congressman.

I remember a couple of years ago we had a very large crowd at a certain campaign meeting and my opponent was talking about what Congress had done and what Congress had failed to do. He pointed his finger at me stating "He is responsible, he is the Congress." He would yell out, "Why, he's been in Congress 18 or 20 years and he hasn't done a thing." He said, "I'm going to pause for a moment for some lady or gentleman to tell me one thing he has ever done during all these years he has been in Congress." Thank God, one fellow way back in the crowd held up his hand and said, "I can tell you what our Congressman has done." My opponent said, "I would like to know. Just tell me what it is." This party said, "Well, he has beat hell out of everybody that has ever run against him."

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I have a very high regard for the gentleman who referred to the fact that some of these items have been carried in the appropriation bill annually for several years.

This is true with several minor items pertaining to Japanese beetle, boll weevil, potato weevil, and several other similar items. However, here is what is going on in connection with the operation of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations. Legislative items are increasing from year to year. For instance in this bill you will find perhaps forty-odd-legislative items clearly subject to a point of order. Now who is responsible for this? Certainly not my committee.

The Secretary of Agriculture can go to the White House, get the approval of the President and it is submitted by the Budget Director who operates under the President to the Appropriations Committee, all of which is unknown to me and the members of my committee.

Organizations, various groups in some instances, in the interest of their own selfish interests, much prefer legislating through the Appropriations Committee, realizing that if the item in which they are interested in is placed in the bill it will be protected under a closed rule when it reaches the House. There is a certain leader of a certain farm organization who I believe is absolutely responsible for certain items being placed in this bill. Why they are in the gallery right now watching the efforts of their friends, certain members of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Why should the Secretary of Agriculture or any of these groups come to my committee if they are able to bypass my committee by going through the Appropriations Committee?

My committee has been trying to be helpful but we are interested in legislation that can be brought on the floor of the House under an open rule.

At this time the Committee on Appropriations comes in here with perhaps forty-odd-legislative items.

They propose to split up and tear asunder the Farm Security Administration after having acted as a wet nurse for this agency ever since it has been in existence without any authority of law, regardless as to what effect it might have on the production of farm crops during the year of 1943.

No legislation has ever been passed by Congress authorizing the Farm Security Administration. This agency was set up by an Executive order.

My committee tried a year ago to get the approval of a resolution for the purpose of making a thorough investigation of the activities of the Farm Security Administration but we were turned down. We succeeded in having a resolution passed by the House the other day authorizing 7 members of my committee appointed by me to make this investigation, but there is a certain farm organization that is hell-bent in putting this agency out of commission without giving us a chance to make this investigation. Perhaps realizing that we might be able to find that this agency has accomplished many good things that would overcome the bad and that would permit the agency to continue along certain lines.

This kind of procedure on the part of the Appropriations Committee that is placing legislative items in the appropriation bill, putting same through the House under a closed rule, as far as I am concerned, is too much in line with what is going on in many of the departments, especially the various war agencies. I feel sure that the Members of this House appreciate the efforts of the members of my committee and the efforts of the Rules Committee in attempting to put an end to this unfair procedure. I have been chairman of the Agriculture Committee for about 2 years. I want to state frankly that I have always reserved unto myself the right to make my views known in the committee as well as on the floor of the House in regard to any legislation channeled down to the committee, in a great many instances supposed to be "must" legislation.

It is the duty of the members of my committee to pass on the real merits of all legislation considered by the committee and we are willing to come to the House under an open rule.

I can assure you that the members of my committee have no bitterness toward the members of the Appropriations Committee or any other committee, but we do want to have all committees of the House, including my committee, operate on a fair basis.

When I see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the great Appropriations Committee, getting up here on the floor of this House trying to cover up his own sins and the sins of the Agriculture Subcommittee by blessing out somebody else he can rest assured that I am aware of the fact that his close friend, Mr. O'Neal, and several of his leaders, are sitting in the gallery with sad hearts because the Rules Committee has stated for the second time "Thou shalt not pass."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, all time on the pending paragraph has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor, including salary of the Solicitor at $9,000 per annum, and including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $1,679,105, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the budget for the fiscal year 1944 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $123,250, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $845,000: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1944 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1944, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 6 beginning in line 6 and reading: "including salary of solicitor at $9,000 per annum" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House in taking so much time on a matter of procedure, but, lest the country get a false impression, we ought to keep the record straight. In all the time I have been in the House this bill has never been reported without vigor-

ous and indignant complaint by some Member that the House was denied copies of the hearings and the bill in advance of consideration. It is a stereotyped complaint—and never less justified than it is this year. Up until this year, Mr. Chairman, it has been the invariable custom of the Committee on Appropriations to release the hearings and report the bill on the day on which it was brought to the floor for consideration. There is more than one reason for that, but one will suffice. It cannot be known what provisions the bill will carry until it has been submitted by the subcommittee to the whole committee. For example, in the last few days House Joint Resolution 96 was reported from the whole committee so completely changed that it did not carry a single word of the original bill. So, the Member in demanding to see the bill last Monday was demanding to see it before it had been written, because it is not written until approved by the whole committee.

But this Congress, in order to give the House as early a view of the appropriation bills as possible, changed the custom of many years' standing and now reports all appropriation bills a day earlier. And we always release the hearings on the preceding Monday morning. Never before in any Congress have the hearings and the bill been released to the House so long before consideration.

But they still bring in the same old criticism. The peculiar thing about these criticisms is that they are always directed at the Committee on Appropriations when other privileged committees follow the same plan. Has anybody ever seen the Committee on Ways and Means release its bill until the day it was considered? And yet, you never hear any objection to that. But on every agriculture appropriation bill you have the same old time-honored complaint.

The amusing thing about it is that the gentlemen who are most vociferous about not receiving a copy of the hearings in time for a complete reading never read them through. I challenge any man on the floor of this House to rise now and say that he ever read these hearings through.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. How could one read the hearings through, 1,500 pages, in 2 or 3 days?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have been available 4 days. Anybody can read 1,500 pages in that time. But no one has ever read them through in that time and no one has ever read them after that time. Has anybody here read through the hearings on the last bill?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Reading them afterward would do no good.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly it does good. The final action on the bill is not taken usually until long after it passes the House. It goes to the Senate where it usually remains for a couple of months and then comes back to the House with Senate amendments and after going to conference comes back for final consideration of the conference report. It is invariably a month or two before final action is taken, and none of these gentlemen ever read the hearings through.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I spent 2 nights on them this week.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the very point. The gentleman read those portions in which he was interested. The average Member of the House is interested at most in only one or two items in the bill; he is concerned in some one or two subjects, and he has ample time between Monday morning and the day when the bill goes to the floor, to read those items in which he is particularly interested. But they complain about not getting the hearings earlier. They do not expect to read the 1,500 pages about which they complain. They do not want to read them. They would not read them if they had all the time in the world.

But they have had time this year to read them had they so desired—and now a Member on the floor rises to say that he took advantage of the opportunity.

It is, of course, a criticism without point or justification.

And now as to the issue raised by those who object to the items carried in this bill. What is the alternative? Suppose the Committee on Appropriations has not included those items in the bill? You would have had no bill and the Department of Agriculture bureaus on these items would have been without support. In short, if these items had not been included—as they have been included all these years—you would have completely disorganized and disrupted the activities of the Department of Agriculture. What choice had we, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There was a duty to be performed; the Department of Agriculture had to be provided for, the agriculture of the Nation had to be provided for. Provision had to be made to produce food to win the war. Where would we have been had we left it to the Committee on Agriculture to do it? And the Committee on Agriculture has not given it any attention at all; has made no attempt to bring in authorizations, although, as was said by the chairman of the Rules Committee, they had a year's notice. What now is the alternative, Mr. Chairman? Are you going to cease to appropriate? Is the Government going to cease to function because the Committee on Agriculture has not in its own time and in its own good way even considered authorizing legislation?

I will tell you what these gentlemen propose to do. They propose to send this bill over to the Senate and let the Senate write it. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that this body is a coordinate branch of the American Government. As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives, directly representing the people, is charged with the initiation of all appropriation legislation. Still, if you follow the suggestion, if you allow these items to go out on points of order, it goes to the Senate, and the Senate will put them back or not, as it chooses. We brush the House of Representatives aside and leave legislation on these subjects to the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think that, if what he says is the proper legislative procedure, we ought to change the rules of the House so that the Appropriations Committee can legislate or the legislative committees can appropriate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The rules of the House specifically provide for just such contingencies. That is why the Committee on Rules was authorized under the rules to bring in a special order of business. This proceeding and the similar proceeding we have had each session for years when this bill was considered is in complete accord with the rules and the practice of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an observation and a confession. My observation is that this is the first time in the history of an agricultural appropriation bill that somebody is mad because we have cut it too much and they want to raise it. Everyone before that has been waiting for us, and wanting to eat us up on the floor, to lower the bill. Now there is a crowd of spenders here who are waiting to raise it. This is the first time in the history of an agricultural bill we have had this situation.

I may say that I am proud and happy that I have been an integral part of all this cutting. I have been in every bit of it, and I am happy to be a member of this subcommittee. And while I went before the Rules Committee spurred by the activity of the legislative committee to be there and asked that they give us this rule, I did not mean it. Down deep in my heart I was hoping that they would refuse it and I want to thank the Rules Committee for denying this rule because it makes me a lot more important than I ever was before in my life. I will be one of seven men who will hold up the bill in conference with the Senate, and I never before had so much importance in my life in being one of seven to act almost wholly in lieu of action by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I have always had the impression that practically every Member of the House sooner or later wanted to be chairman of a committee; but in view of what I have heard in the last 30 minutes from the chairman of the Rules Committee, frequently referred to as the most powerful committee in the House; the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee, the next most powerful committee; and the chairman of the Agricultural Legislative Committee, the third most powerful committee in the House, I have about concluded that nobody wants to be chairman of a committee.

It reminds me of that Biblical expression, "they all with one consent began to make excuses."

However, it may be fortunate that this situation has arisen because it affords an opportunity to clarify or correct an existing practice of long standing, one generally admitted should not exist. The Agricultural Legislative Committee will hereafter no doubt submit appropriate legislation for the consideration of the House and, if enacted into law, will relieve the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture of the necessity of calling on the Rules Committee for a rule waiving all points of order against an appropriation not previously authorized by law, and then the Rules Committee can establish a definite policy of refusing to grant a rule that would permit of such legislation without unanimous consent in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I made a point of order against an item in this bill fixing the salary of the Solicitor at $9,000. As I understand it, the Solicitor's salary is $8,500. The services of the Solicitor are no doubt worth a great deal more than $8,500 or $9,000, but at the present time his salary is fixed under the Classification Act. This item is legislation in an appropriation bill, and I therefore raised the point of order. I can assure the gentleman that the raising of the point of order is not personal.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know whether the gentleman supported legislation passed last week which would increase the salaries of all Federal employees or not. Perhaps he did but if he did, he is decreasing the salary of the Solicitor here because the Solicitor has been paid heretofore $9,000. How can the gentleman justify increasing the salaries of all other Federal employees and undertake to make an exception of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture by decreasing his salary?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will read the conference report of the conferees on the bill to which he refers he will find that the Solicitor will get an increase under that new bill and his salary is not reduced.

I have nothing against the Solicitor. I do not know the gentleman at all. But I believe that his salary and the salaries of other Federal employees under the Classification Act should be increased in the regular manner and not by special dispensation of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the Solicitor now receives $8,500 in accordance with the Civil Service Act?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; under the Classification Act.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that the Solicitor now receives $9,000 just as provided in this bill under the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the present fiscal year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be, but it was fixed by the Appropriations Committee under a different act and not by the Reclassification Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on another matter. I generally follow the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, on all matters.

He has referred to the need for the Committee on Appropriations bringing in the various items in this bill so that we may secure production of food in this year. I beg to take issue with him, for the reason that I am convinced that if we should appropriate $10,000,000,000 or more in this bill it would not make much difference in the production of food in 1943. It is up to the farmers throughout this country to produce the food, and they are going to produce it with the manpower and machine power made available to them, which is very limited.

We recognize that we must produce an abundance of food to take care of the armed forces and other commitments made by our Government, together with the civilian needs. The farmers of the country will do that, and we are backing them in their effort. Whatever items may be contained in the bill for the production of food I do not believe will have any material effect upon what the farmers produce in 1943.

With reference to the controversy that is going on here between the Committee on Appropriations and our Committee on Agriculture, I can only say this. I subscribe to a good many things that the Committee on Appropriations has included in this bill as legislation. However, I feel that many of these matters should be passed upon by the Committee on Agriculture. I recognize that during the past 10 years many agencies have been created by Executive order. The Congress, the House, and the Committee on Appropriations have been largely under the control of the administration, at least up to November 3, 1942, and the majority members on the committee have put into appropriation bills items that have not been passed upon by the legislative committee. These are the items we should consider as being subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that we are here to write an appropriation bill today. Of course, the bill is subject to points of order. For my own part, I have always opposed the rules that have been granted from time to time to make these agricultural bills in order. I think the Committee on Rules did the right thing when it refused to grant this rule. However, regardless of what anybody thinks about that, that job has been done, and it is up to us now to proceed under the rules of the House to write the legislation. I am hopeful that we may proceed without too much acrimony, that there may be a little less of personalities as we go along through the bill, and that we may, each of us, have the opportunity as our conscience dictates to make points of order, to offer amendments, and to vote as we feel our duty lies.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture: For printing and binding 231,250 copies of the remainder of the quotas for the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1942, entitled "Keeping Livestock Healthy"), as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $178,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 10, line 20, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 11.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a lengthy speech on this amendment. Your good judgment will dictate your votes without much argument by myself.

I know we would each like to have an additional 400 of these very good yearbooks, a reprint of the 1942 publication. These are very good, exceptionally fine, agricultural yearbooks, and are a credit to the Department of Agriculture. We would like to have these 400 copies each to give to our constituents upon request, no question about it. There are 40,000 farmers in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota. I sincerely believe that the 1 percent of these farmers who would obtain these 400 yearbooks would appreciate having their copies of this book. However, I still more sincerely believe that if these farmers were to choose between having these volumes and the using of this $178,000 for a first-class fighting plane or light bomber, a decided answer would be given. Yes, if I were to ask my farmers, any of them, whether this $178,000 should be spent for yearbooks or for a bomber to help MacArthur, the answer would be: "Let us send the bomber to MacArthur and to hell with the yearbook."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard this old argument about sending bombers to MacArthur for a couple of years now. It is not original with the gentleman from Minnesota.

We have been authorized since January 12, 1895, a period of 48 years, to print 470,000 yearbooks annually for distribution through the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate, and for the use of the Department of Agriculture. We provided for printing last year 231,250, and we eliminated from the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1943 funds which would have been used to prepare another yearbook.

Your committee this year could have included in this bill funds for the preparation of another yearbook, but in view of the fact that this yearbook has been available for only 2 or 3 months, and has been in such great demand that the supplies of Members from agricultural areas of the country have already become practically exhausted, we thought to save some money by not providing for the preparation of another yearbook but by providing for the reprinting of the same number of the agricultural yearbook of 1942 that we had for distribution heretofore, using the same material that has already been prepared and, insofar as it may be done, the same plates that were used in the printing of the original edition.

This is not an extravagance, this is not a matter of enabling Members of Congress to play politics with their constituents. If there is any Member of this House who feels that he needs 400 yearbooks of the Department of Agriculture in order to be reelected to Congress, I think perhaps he would be justified in voting in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, this is connected with the war program in this way, that the farmers of the country are in need of the information contained in this very useful book in an effort to carry on their cooperation with the food production program in our war effort. Not the Members of Congress but the farmers of the country have found this to be a useful and necessary book.

We have already cut this bill $526,000,000. If all points of order are made which can be made we shall cut it an additional $125,000,000 to $150,000,000. No supply bill in history has ever been cut so drastically. Is there anyone here who feels that he will be accused of extravagance if we provide this $178,000 recommended in the bill for the dissemination of this useful information? Of course 400 yearbooks are not very many, but I have followed the practice of sending them to school libraries, to vocational education teachers, and I am sure that one book for a whole vocational-education class is not very many, but in that way I am able to distribute the information pretty generally throughout my district in the places where it can be most useful. Of course we could use a thousand or two thousand more for each congressional district, but we have not suggested anything of such an extravagant nature as that, though we do think that under existing circumstances we are justified in providing for the printing of the same number carried in appropriations for prior years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should have these yearbooks each year. I am frank to admit that last year I voted to suspend the publication of same. The 1942 Yearbook is the best that I have ever seen. I have not seen all of the yearbooks published since 1895, but I can tell you that the fathers who have boys in the service and have younger boys who need to know about farming and taking care of livestock certainly need these books in their school studies.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. These books are on sale, are they not, for $1.75 apiece?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I understand that they are not on sale for any price. No more are available at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that the veterinarian column in every livestock journal that goes into all these homes carries sufficient information to keep all the livestock in good health? These books going to high schools, as the Chairman of the Committee just intimated, does not mean anything.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is a fairly new Member, and I have been here only 2 years myself, but the longer he is here, the more he will appreciate these yearbooks. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I might say this, that the gentleman who has just spoken is one of the new Members who did not get any copies. I would almost be willing to buy some of them myself, for I certainly do need them, and I am sure that all of you Members will have a great demand for them. I hope you will not vote this section out.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may not be a new Member, but in the 26 years that I have been here I might say that this year I have received more requests from farmers for this yearbook than I ever have in all that time before.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to say a word or two about two other sections. I trust when we come to the section that refers to cotton classification, that we will return a sufficient amount to reestablish the four stations at Savannah, Ga., Charleston, S. C., Galveston, Tex., and Altus, Okla., which have been stricken from the bill. This cotton classification is the best thing for the farmers and encourages them to produce a higher grade of cotton than ever before. The other item is crop insurance. It is a good program, and I think it should be retained.

The other item is F. S. A. You want to relieve the farm-labor situation, and if we had more of these little F. S. A. farms, and they were operating as the ones in Oklahoma and Texas do, we would not need to worry about a food shortage.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the heat which has been generated by some of the older Members, plus the moisture which may be contributed by the freshmen, will certainly be a great boon to production in the country this year. I can tell you as a freshman how you can get several hundred yearbooks, and it will not cost 1 dime. All you have to do is to get behind my bill which I introduced in the beginning of this session and which is now resting in the Printing Committee and which will prevent the "lame ducks" who were defeated in November from still holding and keeping the yearbooks over in the document room, to release them to us new Members. Those books are published in November, and the candidate is either defeated or elected in November. If he is defeated, you still give him 400 yearbooks, but just try to get one of them away from him. He will not even answer your letters. So some of you help me get that bill out of committee and prevent the franking privilege from continuing until June 30, 6 months after a man is defeated.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I just called the Superintendent of Documents, and I am told that the 1942 yearbook is still on sale for $1.75, so that the gentleman from Oklahoma is misinformed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Then I shall be very glad to buy that one, and the chances are that if these books had been worth very much politically and the gentleman's opponent had sent them out, he might not have been defeated.

Mr. BREHM. My opponent was defeated before he got these yearbooks, and I could have defeated him if he had had 5,000 of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 42, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Office of Information, $1,866,000.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry. In view of the closing of debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, may

I inquire if the total is not considered as a part of the last paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The total in this bill is in the form of a separate paragraph.

Mr. TARVER. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the total close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want about 10 minutes, out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert a copy of a letter from Prentiss Brown to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman JED JOHNSON, and a notation from Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to remind the gentleman that for the insertion of extraneous matter he must get permission in the House. The Chair is also constrained to remind the gentleman that the time has been fixed and limited to 5 minutes. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, today one of the publishers of one of our weekly newspapers in my district sent me a copy of a letter from Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., dated March 25, 1943, written to my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. JED JOHNSON. The letter is as follows:

I have sent the following telegram to the Office of Price Administration district offices:

"Effective March 25, 1943, an amendment to MPR 169 exempts 4–H and Future Farmers of America club animals from the custom slaughtering provisions of paragraph 1364.401 of MPR 169, where such animals are certified to be club animals in a sworn certification by the club agent, agricultural county agent or vocational agriculture project leader, and written permission for such exemption is received from the local Office of Price Administration district office.

"Club cattle or calves means any cattle or calves which have been bred, raised, and fed only by a member of a 4–H or Future Farmers of America club.

"Slaughter of such animals may, if necessary, be charged against civilian quota for the next quota period."

After your conversation with me and in view of the facts you presented, I went into the whole matter very carefully with the above result.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN.

My predecessor's wife somehow secured a copy of this letter and mailed it to at least one publisher in my district, with this notation in her handwriting on the margin, as follows:

Our Third District Congressman takes credit for putting this over, and in the Antlers American (his own paper) he is called the Churchill of the Kiamichis.

Fact is, Prentiss Brown said STEWART came to his office half drunk and "cussed out" his clerks in such a manner that he refused to see him.

That is signed "Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright."

Only half of the statement of the gentlewoman is correct. I did cuss out a few of them. I make no apology. The order was issued. I made no effort to see Mr. Brown. If he conveyed to the gentlewoman the fact that he refused to see me, he made another misstatement.

I wish I might have an hour to go into some of these matters. The former Congressman, Mr. Cartwright, is serving his country now in the capacity of a major, and we all give him a hand in that respect. He was also an ex-service man of the First World War. He was a single man during that time but claimed exemption as a member of the Oklahoma Legislature until the 6th day of November 1918, when he finally answered the call of his country 5 days before the signing of the Armistice. I did not want to go into these matters, but on the 17th day of December he made a speech here in Congress entitled "Till We Meet Again," a prepared speech backed up by 12 other Members of this Congress. With the speech went a blotter and these were mailed from Washington under his "lame duck" frank after I had been sworn in as Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that debate on this paragraph has been limited to 5 minutes, and the gentleman has consumed the time fixed.

Mr. STEWART. If the Chair will bear with me, unanimous consent would give me permission, would it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to object to the gentleman's request, yet ordinary expedition in the handling of this bill requires that I object to such request, and I am constrained to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, $3,431,502, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, of which amount not to exceed $1,801,649 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of the chief of bureau at $10,000 per annum, and not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I make a point of order against the language on page 17, line 17, "including the salary of the chief of bureau at $10,000 per annum."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, while the point of order is conceded, I think it appropriate to say that Dr. Tolley has been receiving and is now receiving this salary, and the effect of the gentleman's point of order is to reduce the salary of this very efficient public official. However, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of Administrator, including the salary of the Administrator at $9,000 per annum, and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $60,965.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the following language on page 19, in lines 5 and 6: "including the salary of the Administrator at $9,000 per annum," is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insular experiment stations: To enable the Secretary to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, $83,292: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, at his discretion, transfer such property and equipment, including the library, of the Hawaii Experiment Station, formerly maintained by the Department, as he may deem necessary and advisable to the experiment station of the University of Hawaii, which has been conducted jointly and in collaboration with the former Federal station under the Act of May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386–386b); and the Secretary is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULMER. I make the point of order that the language on page 22 beginning in line 19 and ending in line 25 and reading as follows: "and the Secretary shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the research work of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts with research of the Department in similar lines, and make report thereon to Congress," is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late inasmuch as the portion of the bill

against which the point of order is made has been read and the Clerk was reading the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order raised by the gentleman from Georgia. The Clerk had read a substantial part of the following paragraph and had reached line 17 on page 23.

Mr. FULMER. I think, Mr. Chairman, I made my point of order in time. Maybe the Clerk had started the following paragraph, but I was on my feet and feel that I made my point of order in time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the reading of the paragraph had been completed. Under the rules it is essential that a point of order against a paragraph be made immediately after the reading of the paragraph.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the following language beginning in line 5 on page 23 beginning with the word "*Provided*" and ending with the semicolon on line 12, page 23, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the convenience of those who may wish to follow this matter in the RECORD when it is printed, I ask unanimous consent that the language against which the point of order is made may be incorporated in the point of order and suggest that this procedure be followed in future points of order on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will restate his point of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the language on page 23, line 5, reading as follows: "*Provided*, That the Secretary may, at his discretion, transfer such property and equipment, including the library, of the Hawaii Experiment Station, formerly maintained by the Department, as he may deem necessary and advisable to the experiment station of the University of Hawaii, which has been conducted jointly and in collaboration with the former Federal station under the act of May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b)", is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be so technical as we were in the case of the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina, accidentally passing over a paragraph before the language was discovered, we shall have to insist that the paragraphs be read word by word in their entirety in order that we may keep up with the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia understands that the paragraph on page 23, as indicated by the gentleman from Kansas, has been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, $5,983,800: *Provided*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, or cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease, and if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the payment of indemnities to owners of such animals but, except as hereinafter provided, no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any purebred animal.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. TARVER. To invite the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] to the fact that this item aggregating something in excess of $5,000,000 is not authorized by law; and I am wondering if he desires to make a point of order against it as he did against some three items $1,000 in excess of amounts authorized by law a few moments ago?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for calling that matter to my attention; in fact, I am astonished that the Committee on Appropriations would include a legislative item of this magnitude in the bill without making a point of order against it themselves.

Mr. TARVER. I do not want to make a point of order against it; I am approving it. I think it ought to be in the bill; but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is legislation appropriating over $5,000,000 and I am willing for him to make a point of order against it if he so desires.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As long as the gentleman requests it I shall be pleased to do so at his request.

Mr. TARVER. And I shall be pleased to have the gentleman do it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want me to do it?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman wants to he may; I do not want to make it. The gentleman has stated his position and this is legislation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If no one else desires to I will claim the honor of saving $5,000,000.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The chairman of the subcommittee comes in here with an appropriation bill which he vouches for; then he stands up on the floor and tries to get somebody to make a point of order against an item which he says is unauthorized. Is this parliamentary conduct?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan as to the propriety of my conduct certainly is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Is a point of order pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is not. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inspection and quarantine: For inspection and quarantine work, including the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle and dourine in horses, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of livestock——

Mr. LAMERTSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thought a point of order had been made against that language. I wish to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to make the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. I respectfully submit that discussion and business having intervened, it is now too late for the gentleman to make his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the gentleman. The point of order comes too late and is overruled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the ruling of the Chair just now, may I inquire if while the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] was on his feet, after challenge of the Chairman of the Subcommittee, he had made a point of order, would it have come too late?

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman I certainly would have raised no

objection because I wanted him to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was not made and, therefore, the Chair was not called upon to make a ruling.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that the Committee on Agriculture had a meeting yesterday afternoon at which time this particular item was discussed, as well as numerous other items involving eradication of insect and animal pests, plant diseases, and that sort of thing which have been carried in the bill for a number of years without any authorization. It was decided at that meeting that no member of the Committee on Agriculture would make a point of order against any of those items. The committee felt that much of the work was worth while, that it had been carried on for a number of years, and that the committee should not, in view of the wide interest in the work and the value of the work, make a point of order at this time.

However, in order to avoid the charge that has been made by the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that by not objecting to matters of this kind we are building up an unwritten law in the House or an unwritten rule which apparently in his mind has precedence over the written rules of the House, I was instructed by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee to say that if these items appear in the bill next year members of the committee will object to them. We hope that before that time those in the Department of Agriculture and Members of Congress who are interested in these items will bring the matter before the Committee on Agriculture so that they can be considered as legislative items.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's committee is willing for the Agricultural Appropriations subcommittee to legislate on matters in which the Agricultural Committee is interested, but is not willing for them to legislate on appropriations in connection with which the Agricultural Committee does not desire the adoption of funds for that purpose?

Mr. HOPE. Nothing that I have said would justify the gentleman in drawing the inference which he has drawn. The gentleman apparently desires that someone make a point of order, but I am not in a position to make it and no member of the Agricultural Committee is in a position to make the point of order.

We have no desire to interfere with this work, but we do feel that the time has come when the Appropriations Committee should appropriate and the legislative committees should do the legislating and in order to make sure that the legislative committee is not waiving any of its rights I make that statement at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will not get the impression that I take the position that an item unauthorized by law is in order on an appropriation bill regardless of how many times it has been carried in the bill, or how often it has been approved. My reference was to the custom of the committee to ask for a rule for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to have the gentleman make that statement. Let me say in conclusion, the thing I am objecting to, and I think the thing that all members of the legislative committees in the House should object to, is the custom which the departments have of coming to the Appropriations Committee and asking them to include an appropriation item in a bill when it is not authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I think what the Appropriations Committee should do in a case of that kind is to say: "You have made a case. This is a good item, but unfortunately we do not have any authority to include it in the bill. You will have to go to the Legislative Committee and ask them for the authority." But apparently that has not been done. We have had in the Legislative Committee numerous measures authorizing appropriations where the sponsors of the legislation suggested and urged the committee to include an appropriation in the bill. That, of course, would be subject to a point of order and if we had brought such a bill in then we would have had to go to the Rules Committee and get a rule to include that appropriation in the bill. The Committee on Agriculture, however, has never followed that practice. I submit what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander and both committees should obey the rules of the House in this particular.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The departments never ask the Appropriations Committee for money. The President submits the Budget request. The representatives of the department come before the Committee on Appropriations only when they are called to testify. They come up because they are subpenaed. The President requests appropriations.

Mr. HOPE. The departments submit their requests to the Budget; then the Budget submits them to the committee; then the officials from the department come up to justify those requests.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The departments do not ask anybody for money. The Budget asks the departments for estimates and transmits those estimates to the President, who approves or disapproves them and messages the revised estimates to the Speaker, who refers them to the committee. The departments come only at the request of the committee, and they are not permitted, under strict Executive order, to ask for any appropriation at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Department of Agriculture does not make requests of the Bureau of the Budget for appropriations for the Department?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not. The Budget asks the Department to make estimates and when they come up here they can only answer questions. They are prohibited by Executive order as well as by custom from making requests for anything not already requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman will concede, will he not, that they frequently ask for items that are not covered by legislation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they positively cannot ask for anything. They cannot volunteer any information except in response to an inquiry directed to them by some member of the committee.

Mr. HOPE. The point that I am making is that the departments in submitting their requests to the Bureau of the Budget do frequently request funds for items which have not been authorized by legislation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They never ask the committee, the Bureau of the Budget, or the House. The Bureau of the Budget calls them in and says, "How much will it take to handle certain activities?" They tell them. What they tell them they are not allowed to divulge to a committee of the House except on explicit inquiry. They would come before the Committee on Agriculture if they were requested just as they come before the Committee on Appropriations, but they would be no more authorized to ask the Committee on Agriculture for funds than to ask the Committee on Appropriations. The department does not come to the House or to the committee except by invitation. And the departments make no requests for money. It is the President, the Executive, who makes these requests.

Mr. HOPE. I have not made myself clear to the gentleman. What I said was that these departments frequently make requests for items which are not authorized by law. That is the way these items come up here. I do not believe there is any doubt about it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They positively make no requests for funds. They do not come to the Committee on Appropriations, and they do not come to the House or any of its committees except on invitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make an observation on the statement of my colleague just preceding. He stresses the fact that we as a committee authorize appropriations for items for which they ask. That is not at all what has brought this fight to the floor of the House. It is not that we have authorized little items for which they have not gone to the agricultural policy committee for authorization. The thing that has brought this fight to the floor of the House is that we have cut items, and no one ever came from the Department of Agriculture or any other department to ask us to cut an item. Get that. They have not come up here to ask us to cut items. That is what has brought this fight to the floor of the House. We cut them, and they never asked for that.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. We are going to cut a lot more when we make these points of order. The gentleman understands that, does he not?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is your responsibility, not ours. We offered to give you a chance to debate them on the floor and pass on them in the House. The point that the gentleman was making, that we usurped authority on little items, is not the thing. The gentleman himself admits that his committee does not want to make points of order against the items they are not objecting to. What has brought this fight here is that we cut items, and no department ever asked us to cut items.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there any money appropriated in this bill for the production credit associations that make loans to farmers, and similar associations, either for administrative expenses or for lending purposes?

Mr. TARVER. It is my understanding there is no money of that type in the bill.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I close by reiterating that the only reason we have this fight here that was brought by the agricultural policy committee to the Rules Committee and that has been talked about here over and over again today, the only thing that broke the camel's back, is that we did something to the Farm Security Administration. Keep that definitely in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hog-cholera control: For the control and eradication of hog cholera and related swine diseases, by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county authorities, $100,580.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this debate has reached a point where some bitterness has entered into the consideration of one of the most important agricultural bills in our history. Every item in this bill is of tremendous interest to the people in every part of my district and State. Although I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which had charge of this bill, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I feel that the public is anxious that we eliminate all appropriations and all expenditures that have no direct bearing on the winning of the war. I also feel the public is anxious that we provide sufficient funds to carry on the regular functions of the Department of Agriculture in order that the gigantic job of food production can be carried out. There is very little opportunity to reduce expenditures except in appropriation bills. But that does not mean we should not consider these bills carefully in order that we do not do an injustice to some departments whose functions are so necessary to carry out our program of food production. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have always felt that we should protect the prerogatives of legislative committees. I agree that wherever it is possible, we should eliminate legislation in appropriation bills. But I am sure even some of the legislative committees wish us to eliminate unnecessary appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I rose at this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about one item in which my people are very much interested, and that is the item relating to hog cholera. I notice that the appropriation has been cut for the eradication and control of hog cholera.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will recall that last year in connection with the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1943 the House in the conference report agreed to the elimination of $1,500,000 of traveling expenses. That was section 4 of the present bill. The Budget estimate for a number of these items, including hog cholera, deducted from the appropriation for the present year the amount of the saving that was represented proportionately by section 4 adopted by the House relating to traveling expenses. That meant a reduction in the hog cholera of $1,420.

Mr. STEFAN. And the gentleman feels that the amount appropriated here, $100,580 for that purpose, will continue the program?

Mr. TARVER. That is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman very much. The great loss in the spring pig crop has attracted unusual attention. Those of you who know little about hog raising should read an article recently written by my friend Fred DeVore. I include it in my remarks for your information:

GREATEST LOSS IN SPRING PIG CROP IN 20 YEARS

(By Fred DeVore)

Now, the old Nebraska "sod buster" is getting old and cranky, but when I look around me, why, I think that the farmer and stockraiser is about in the same fix as the country dog that came to town. If he stood still the dog catcher nailed him and if he ran the town boys tied a can to his tail.

You know, we have heard a lot of noise, read a lot in the papers about increased production. We have heard the big shots bragging over the radio that food would win the war and dictate the terms of peace. Of course, a lot of these jay birds that were supplying the wind works and who were doing the planning and figuring out how much you farmers were going to produce and just how to do it didn't know anything about the operation of a farm, and as to livestock, they wouldn't know a studhorse from a Jersey bull if they met him on Main Street or at a night club. But it's all figured out for you, and it's an easy matter according to them for you farmers to go out with half the help, half the machinery, and half the equipment you need, and produce more grain, beef, and pork than you ever did before. These guys have always labeled the farmer as just a yokel, that is, a chronic kicker, that he hasn't known anything but hard work and no fun, and that a little extra work won't hurt him anyway.

Now, I see they are messing around, trying to put a price ceiling on hogs. That's O. K. Hogs are high enough if they leave the price of grain where it is or where it will be governed by supply and demand, but it's my opinion that, if they raise the ceiling price of grain and clamp down a low ceiling price on hogs, that farmers with short help will devote their time to grain farming, selling their grain at a big price instead of raising hogs or taking the long chance they must now take in laying in these high-priced feeder cattle.

Just let them with their price manipulation drive more farmers out of the hog business and you will find that our soldiers and sailors and our workers will not be satisfied with a belly full of straight corn bread and they might begin to yell for some sow belly.

Now, with meat rationing and meatless days and all the restrictions on buying meat coming up, the men in authority seem to think that this pork and beef is easily produced and that it is bound to be produced no matter how much the farmer is handicapped. I have hundreds of letters from all sections of the Corn Belt that have come to me in the past 3 weeks and it is my opinion that there is the greatest loss in the 1943 spring pig crop that we have seen in 20 years, and this comes at a time when the world is looking to the American farmer to increase pork production. I figure there are two main reasons that are the cause of 75 percent of these losses: First, lack of equipment; and, second, lack of competent help. For instance, you hogmen all know that the comparatively few electric pig brooders now in use have saved many thousands of pigs, no matter whether they were home-made or manufactured ones. Now, a man making and selling pig brooders tells me that he pulled all the wires possible but that the boys who control the material used in their manufacture allowed him to make just 300, when he had orders for thousands. If they had just busted up the steel in only one of

these scrap heaps or made a few less golf clubs they could have built brooders that would have saved pigs enough to feed an army for a year. You farmers know how hard it has been to get lumber for a hog-house. One hogman out in Washington writes me that he had his order in for lumber to build a warm hoghouse for over a year and with two lumber mills turning out millions of feet of lumber less than 10 miles from him he had been unable to secure any lumber and as a result of poor housing his first three sows to farrow lost all their pigs. Another farmer in southwest Iowa lost all the pigs from 18 sows and he, too, had been trying to get lumber to build a new hog-house.

Then how about tankage? You hog men can't get it but I notice they still make dog food for the city dogs, and when I see one of these white-collared birds out exercising the family hound after he has wound up a hard day's work at 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and I think of the thousands of my friends among the men who raise pork that are in desperate need of tankage and think of the millions of pounds of dog feed being made for these city blue-blooded curs, why do you blame the old sod buster from wanting to give them both a swift kick in the rear end?

Then wire fencing is desperately needed in order to build lots for our pigs but just try and buy some and see how far you get.

The big majority of our farmers are short-handed for help. Their boys, hired men, and help have been drafted or have gone to the factories or defense plants to draw enormous wages and the farmer, while he is used to working 16 to 18 hours, yet he just can't hack it very long at 24 hours a day. He isn't able to sit up with his sows and look after the pigs as he was in former years. Now I have in mind 10 Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska farm boys; just 10 out of thousands in the Corn Belt. I would say that in 1942 these 10 boys produced 1,200,000 pounds of pork. In addition to this, these 10 boys, I would estimate, raised and cared for and harvested 50,000 bushels of grain. Besides this they milked cows, raised thousands of pounds of beef, kept the farm machinery in running order, and still they were inducted into the Army. Now we know it is our duty to fight for our country. The farm boy is just as anxious to get in the ranks as anyone, but I say right here that even the brass hats that at last seem to realize that we are in for the greatest meat shortage in the history of this Nation or of the world, don't seem to have much of an idea of doing anything to relieve the situation.

I just read in the paper that they were going to rally the Boy Scouts to go out and help on the farm. Now, won't that be just fine? Those in authority don't seem to realize that the successful farmer is a jack-of-all-trades—he has to be a mechanic, an electrician, a plumber, a carpenter, a soil expert, a dairyman, a veterinary; he has to know feeds and the results obtained from certain feeds; he must understand the rotation of crops and a thousand and one other things. That successful operation of a farm and raising livestock is one that requires more technical skill and knowledge than any job in the country. The recent survey conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture turns up with some very bad news which certain apologists for the brass hats have been trying to deny or ignore. It is this: All signs point to a smaller crop in 1943 than was harvested in 1942, for in the 2,789 counties in the Nation only 31 expected a bigger yield this year than in 1942, and in only a few counties did they hope to equal last year's production either in livestock or grain crops. Here in Nebraska 84 county agents answered the Department's inquiry and every one of them expected to see a shrinkage in his county's production, and I know the same condition prevails in every Corn Belt State. And remember, these figures were based on the hope that crop conditions would be as favorable as in 1942 and that the pig crop could be saved as well this year as last year. Well, what's the reason? The county agents sized it up as follows: Shortage of manpower, lack of machinery, and lack of equipment.

Now, these are factors which the farmer can do little about. He works on an average of 80 to over 100 hours a week. He can't be expected to work enough harder to make up for the loss of his boy or hired man. There just aren't enough hours in the day or enough muscles in his back to do any more. Now, if the farms of this Nation and the production of food products and livestock are to be kept up to par, why, this lost labor will have to be replaced, either by machinery or new labor. The farmer can't do anything about it. If anything constructive is done about our food shortage, which threatens to become a famine, it will have to be done in Washington by those who have undertaken to manage the country through directives and priorities.

Now, some tell us that there is a similar shortage of manpower everywhere. This is not the truth. You can't measure manpower by counting noses. You have got to figure how hard and how much and how long an individual works. Industry has a 40-hour week, with time and a half for overtime. Many of them have feather-cushioned rules and workers get a day's pay for less than a day's work. Now, the farmer and livestock breeder has no soft snap of that sort. His hours are limited only by the strength of his back, and the only feather bed he knows is the one he falls into to rest his tired bones after he has done his day's work in the fields and cared for his livestock.

Any man with sense should realize that the labor shortage has hit the farmer and livestock producer far harder than any other line of industry, and also can anyone doubt that the flow of labor from the farm to the city will continue just as long as factories offer two or three times the wages that a farmer can afford to pay, and that, too, for easy work and less than half the hours?

It is my opinion that there is no shortage of manpower in this Nation except on the farms. The trouble is that labor in industry is not working enough hours or giving the Nation an honest day's work.

Before this war is over this Nation and the whole world will come to realize that the farmer and livestock producer is the most important that any nation can have, and I say it is time for America to recognize that fact. If all the agencies, the czars, the red tape nincompoops, etc., can be made to realize conditions and act intelligently, why, even though it is late in the game and great damage has already been done, yet they can do something or devise some plan to see that there is more manpower on the farms, more machinery furnished the farmer, and more equipment of all kinds given him. I'd like to send these farm production obstructors a few samples of the thousands of public farm sale bills that have been posted on our fence corners in the past season. You farmers know how they read. You know why these farmers were forced to sell their livestock and leave their farms.

Here is a copy of part of a letter written by a prominent banker of Clay County, Nebr., to Representative CURTIS, in Washington, D. C.:

"Attached is a bill of one of the many public sales that are being held in this territory. You will note the reason for selling is 'on account of both my boys entering the armed forces.' I understand through changes in draft regulation that taking the boys off the farm for military service has been stopped under certain conditions. We cannot stress the fact strong enough that those boys who have worked with their fathers are the only ones qualified to carry on the feed production. If there is anything further that you can do to avert this condition, it would be appreciated. The boys that are raised on the farm are the only ones with ability to assist in providing feed on a large scale.

"There is another thought that I would like to convey to you, and that is the fact, because of the shortage of labor on farms, there are large numbers of milk cows and she stock going to market that should be kept on the farm for both reproduction of stock and production of dairy products."

Well, the only trouble is he didn't make it half strong enough for when you figure that as busy as a farmer will be this year he won't have time to follow some town boy or some drug-store cowboy around and show him what to do and how to do it. The case of the 10 farm boys I speak of that produced 1,200,000 pounds of pork can be multiplied a thousand times.

Sure, we are going to have meatless days and we will, if nothing is done to provide help, machinery, fencing, and equipment for our farmers and livestock men, have plenty of meatless weeks. I say let the brass hats see that labor does an honest day's work. See that instead of horsing around and blowing off steam they at once do something and do it quickly in furnishing equipment, machinery, and competent, experienced manpower for the farm.

I say a great crisis is at hand, for we can make all the war machinery that our ships can float, we can have an Army of 12,000,000 men and still lose this war if our fighting forces and those of our allies and the men working in the various industries are not provided with food. I predict that a meat famine confronts us—that it is far more serious than you have been led to believe, for when it comes down to cases the brave boys that have shut you off from buying needed machinery, fencing, building material, farm equipment, tankage, etc., and that have allowed thousands of our highest trained and most expert producers of pork, beef, milk, and other food products to be driven from their farms or taken out of the production field, I say they are going to be mighty busy passing the buck and will somehow or other try to crawl out of taking the blame.

All this means for you hog raisers to go ahead under whatever circumstances you find confronting you, regardless of labor's 8 hours a day, or of strikes, lack of equipment, machinery or help, or any other evils. I say, show the Nation that the farmer and meat producers of this Nation are not quitters. Those of you who are in a position to go ahead, you will find that the production of pork for the next several years will be the most profitable business connected with agriculture. The man who can raise good hogs should and will surely make a lot of money. And even if you are forced to do your work as you are now, under a terrific handicap, you can't help but make it pay big dividends.

But above all this you realize that it is a duty of every patriot, every lover of America and freedom to produce to the utmost of his ability. Let labor leaders and racketeers do their worst. Let production of needed war materials be slowed up by strikes over either hours, wages, or some fancied grievance. Let labor slackers hinder production. Let the brass hats still deny you the things necessary to operate at full speed. I say, go ahead and produce every pound of beef, pork, mutton, milk, and grain that you can and I'm certain that when it's all over that the American farmer and livestock man will have done more than his share and that the world will have to recognize what his tremendous efforts meant toward winning the war.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $362,740 for personal services in the District of Columbia,

of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401–404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated butter factories, repairs to buildings, and not to exceed $5,000 for the construction of buildings, $755,720.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of making inquiry of the chairman of the committee whether this amount appropriated for the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been reduced in proportion to the diminution of the dairy herds by those herds that have been driven to slaughter by some of the foolish regimentation that has worked such hardship upon the dairymen of this country.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman does not expect me to enter into a discussion of the subject broached by him in his inquiry. The appropriation for the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been decreased by $897, if that is a matter in which the gentleman is interested. That, of course, is a matter involved in the matter of travel reduction.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, in my judgment $897 is in no way commensurate with the reduction that should be made in comparison with the diminution of the dairy herds in this country by those that had to be sent to slaughter.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman, if he is serious in the matter, offer an amendment to cut down this amount?

Mr. LANHAM. Insofar as I know, this amount may be necessary, but when it comes to being serious about this matter, certainly this matter is serious, and certainly the people interested in the dairy business of the country are very serious about it. I dare say that all of us have heard complaints from our constituents that many dairy herds have either been auctioned and taken to other parts of the country or else have been slaughtered through the sheer necessity of the case, in view of the fact that the prices they have been allowed to receive for their products have not been sufficient in many instances to justify them in carrying on, unless they are willing to do so at a substantial loss.

Mr. TARVER. I am in hearty sympathy with the observations made by the gentleman, but of course he does not intend to imply that this subcommittee in writing an agricultural appropriation act could do anything to remedy that situation.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not, but I hope that the gentleman and his committee in making this appropriation will see to it that part of the funds for the Bureau of Dairy Industry may be used to stop this senseless slaughter of dairy herds in this country.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I realize this committee has no control over the lack of wisdom exercised by the O. P. A. officials, in fixing ceiling prices for milk. This is getting to be a very serious problem in my State. They are slaughtering the dairy herds and going out of business, and yet if we insist to the O. P. A. that this course will do just this, if they do not allow a better ceiling price for milk, it is just like pouring water on a duck's back. They refuse to do anything favorable, and almost every day I receive letters from constituents saying that another dairy herd has been sold. The cattle bring perhaps $100 a head or a little better than that, and when the dairy is operated at a loss, the dairymen sell their herds.

I do not see anything to be gained by that except one thing, and that is that when the war is over, and all the dairy herds in my State and other States unfavorably affected by the O. P. A. price ceilings, and by the differentials in freight rates—when that has been accomplished, the preferred dairy States can sell their milk to the South, together with other dairy products. I do not know whether Congressmen who represent these dairymen in other States would desire to take advantage of the war situation and dry up the dairy industry of the South. I do not think they would, and I do not believe there has been pressure brought upon the O. P. A. by the Congressmen of other States which has led them to annihilate the dairy business of the South. I hope tomorrow to speak a little more about this at an appropriate time, and may endeavor to point out the unwise and unfair manner of the O. P. A. operation in the handling of livestock in my State. In short, it dries up the local livestock auction market, together with the farmer's market on other products. It dries up the local livestock auction market, and sends the animals through to the larger packer so that he may build up his business and survive at the expense of the small auctioneer's market and the farmer himself, multiplying the strength of his monopoly so that he can go on after the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases: For investigation of the production of cotton and other fiber crops, including the improvement by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, fiber yield and quality, cotton soil fertility, and the control of diseases, $422,940, of which sum not less than $14,700 shall be used for experimenting in Sea Island cotton, including its hybridization with other varieties.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] had to say a few minutes ago with reference to the operations of the Office of Price Administration.

I do not like to drag myself personally into this question today, but I must confess that I am still shivering because of the fact that yesterday I ran out of oil in my house. My wife called up our source of supply to find out how she could get some more oil for the furnace, and could not get it. This morning after I wakened shivering, with the temperature in the house at 45 degrees, I called up the gentleman who has normally supplied us. He said, "Congressman, here is the situation: I have in my company storage facilities for 1,000,000 gallons of oil. I am full. I have been full for some time past, but now when folks have run out of coupons they will not permit me to distribute it. My source of supply wants me to get rid of some of my oil so that they can continue their contracted deliveries with me and put more fuel oil into my tanks. I don't know whether I can give you any oil or not. If I do, if I give you oil for your house in order to keep you warm I may be subject to a $10,000 fine. I may be subject to being put in jail." They have all the oil they can use. He said, "I have had to refuse shipments from my source of supply, and yet under the O. P. A. regulations I am not permitted to take care of you to keep you warm in your house."

I do not care for myself alone. You do not care either if we want to die of pneumonia and the rest of the people want to freeze to death. That is all right, but why do we not get some common sense into this thing?

I want to say to this House that I am a Republican. You know that. Prentiss Brown is a Democrat. Prentiss Brown served in this House for many years as the Representative of my district. He was my Congressman, and I was proud of him. Now I am proud to be his Congressman, but I think they are not giving Prentiss Brown a chance to do a good job as Administrator of the O. P. A., and why not give him a chance just once in a while?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman is fortunate if he has only been out of oil 1 day. My tank has been dry for 6 days, and I have not been able to get a gallon.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I hope you do get some if your house is as cold as mine has been.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think it would be much better if we had the system that Canada has? The oil is under one head. The supply, the rationing, and the price is all under one head. They have been warm in Canada all winter while we have been cold.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am glad to have that contribution from the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I will say that I do not pretend to know the answer exactly. I am not conversant with the Canadian situation, but I do think that much of our trouble in this country stems from the fact that we have been far too busy finding too many jobs for too many people and not centralizing the thing right down where it belongs and getting the job done for the American people.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observations and I speak very seriously after great study and without any partisanship whatsoever concerning this oil situation. I am firmly and definitely convinced through those studies that unless we open up the barge canal across north Florida you will not have any relief substantially from this oil situation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to have that observation from the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman from Florida I appreciate his sincerity regarding the Florida ship canal. My mind is open on that subject.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. But may I say this: I pointed out a few minutes ago that here is a situation in Washington where your house may be cold, the house of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is cold, and my house is cold, yet here is my source of supply sitting here with a million gallons in storage, and a situation has developed whereby he is not permitted under the possible penalty of going to prison or a fine of $10,000, to distribute that oil to his customers.

Of course, we are told when we run out of fuel oil that the thing to do is to contact our rationing board. Have you ever tried that? My wife stood in line yesterday for almost an hour and a half and there were only seven other people in that line, yet they all stood there an hour and a half before any of the several clerks even paid any attention to them and then when they were finally waited on, the smart-aleck female clerk told her that the thing for her to do was to write to the rationing board a letter and they would take it under consideration and see whether they would give us any additional fuel oil, and then she made some other wisecrack to the effect of "why did you not measure up your house correctly in the first place; do you not know you have such things as closets to consider in your measurements, and so forth." In fact, her attitude bordered on the point of being downright insulting. But the point is this, Mr. Chairman, my house is out of fuel today and if I am going to keep from getting pneumonia I have to have oil today, not next week or the following week or whenever the rationing board gets around to acting upon my supplementary application. So I say the system is cockeyed.

I think it calls for a recheck, and I am satisfied in my own mind that if they will take the brakes off Prentiss Brown and give him a chance to go to town he will do the job.

Mr. GREEN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If the people of New England and the Atlantic seaboard are compelled to wait until the Florida barge canal is constructed they will be cold for three more winters if the testimony of every Government official in this matter is worth anything to the Members of this House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The observation I still want to make is this: Here we have a man sitting in Washington with 1,000,000 gallons of oil in his tanks, yet under penalty of law he is not permitted to distribute that to his customers because of a bunch of red tape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman not modify his request and make it 6 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request accordingly and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. I see no reference in this bill to the production credit associations, but on page 97, section 8, is this provision:

SEC. 8. None of the funds herein appropriated or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or of any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in the negotation, solicitation, or execution of any loan which has not first been offered to and refused by the private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the region where such loan is proposed to be made.

I should like to know whether or not this provision would prevent existing production credit associations from continuing operations in that field?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from Nebraska asked a similar question earlier in the day. My reply to him, based upon the best available information, was that there are no funds for administrative expenses of the production credit associations carried in this bill and, therefore, the limitation referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina would have no application to the production credit associations.

Mr. HARE. That is, the production credit associations would be allowed to continue as they have in the past?

Mr TARVER. The gentleman can construe the provision as well as I in that respect. This is only a limitation on administrative funds carried in this bill, and since I am advised there are no administrative funds carried in this bill for production credit associations, necessarily it would have no effect at all so far as their operations are concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman if he will be kind enough to ascertain from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia whether or not the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration occupies such position and relationship to the Production Credit Association that his salary might be affected by this limitation?

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman that in my judgment there might be some question as to that. I want to say also that I am advised that the chairman of the full committee intends to offer a motion to strike section 8 of the pending bill with the approval of the member of the subcommittee who wrote this section and who offered it for inclusion in this bill. I believe therefore that inquiries with regard to its construction might very well be postponed until we reach section 8, because perhaps the gentlemen making them are being concerned about something which may not be found to be a material issue.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate the information furnished by the chairman of the subcommittee but I was anxious to know before that time because an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman know whether or not such provision would prevent the Federal land banks from making Land Bank Commissioner loans?

Mr. HARE. I am sure I cannot answer. I am trying to get information myself. I suggest that the gentleman direct his inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. If I could feel that the committee would act in accordance with my own opinion I should feel constrained to delve into the matter further and discuss it with these gentlemen, but I think it is going to be stricken from the bill, and I see no reason for discussing it at length now when we have not reached the portion of the bill in which the section is included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of making a correction. At the hearings recently before the Committee on Appropriations the Chief of Army Engineers stated that he could complete the missing link in the barge canal in 2 years. The contractor appeared before the committee, a man who has performed $200,000,000 worth of Government war construction successfully, recently and stated that he has available labor now unemployed; that if given 3 weeks to move his existing machinery to the site of the barge canal, he will put up a bond to construct the barge canal link in 10 months and at or less than the amount estimated by the Army engineers. That is the best evidence I know of. I know of none except the opposition who contend that it will take more than 10 or 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2481 and had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures may be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS]?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I dislike very much to do this because we will probably be on this bill tomorrow; also, I would like to hear some of the testimony that I understand is to be given at this hearing. For that reason I feel constrained to object. I would like to be on the floor when this bill is being considered tomorrow, and for that reason I object.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Unfortunately I have great trouble in trying to find a time convenient both to the membership and to the secretary. I would not like to have a committee meeting without the gentleman being present and I am hopeful, if he insists upon his objection, that tomorrow if it appears there is any possibility of holding this committee meeting I may then renew the request.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is satisfactory, but for the present I will have to object.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

PAYMENT OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, with reciprocal trade treaties, has pointed the way to reestablishment of world peace by a restoration of world trade.

The work that Mr. Hull has been doing is of special significance to the people of the Third Congressional District of Maryland. The lifeblood of our district is large-scale manufacturing and sea-borne commerce. We live by trade, our people profit by trade, and those nations with whom we trade likewise profit. It is to the mutual advantage of each that international trade should be fostered. After this war this principle will have even greater significance.

Trade makes for the material well-being of our Nation and the other nations of the world. Without it free enterprise is dead.

Mr. Cordell Hull is doing a great service not only to America but to all the peace-loving nations of the world, and he should be encouraged to carry on.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a summary of the testimony at the oil hearing this morning before the Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made on the agricultural bill and to include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by C. C. Hogg, vice president, National Petroleum Co., Pleasantville, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances in the RECORD and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE, for Friday, Saturday, and Monday, on account of official business.

To Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. HOLMES of Washington), for April 14, 15, and 16, on account of illness.

To Mr. SIKES, for 3 legislative days, on account of illness of mother.

To Mr. DELANEY, for April 19, 20, 21, and 22, on account of official visit to Naval Academy at Annapolis.

To Mr. LAFOLLETTE, from April 16 to May 1, on account of necessary business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter sent to the Speaker by Under Secretary of War Robert B. Patterson, with an enclosure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

332. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reduce time to plead and to regulate service of process in proceedings to cancel naturalization, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. Supplemental Report to part 2 to accompany H. R. 1900. A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy (Rept. No. 353). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 206. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1900, a bill preventing the payment of excessive fees; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1364, a bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 30, Seventy-eighth Congress. Resolution dealing with the investigation of the national war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1114. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1702. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWSOME: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2077. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2498. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus war materials owned by the United States and by corporations owned or controlled by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2499. A bill to aid in the preservation of freedom of speech and of the press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2500. A bill to suspend until termination of hostilities the compulsory retirement age of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 2501. A bill to provide for the relief of certain contractors and subcontractors due to increased costs; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2502 (by request). A bill to make subject to the tax on amounts paid for the transportation of property amounts paid to the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2503. A bill to amend setions 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 2504. A bill to rescind the authorization contained in the act of May 24, 1940, for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, no appointment having been made pursuant to such authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 210. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to attend the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 211. Resolution to provide for the creation of a committee to investigate agricultural trends and governmental policies in regard to agriculture; to recommend a coordination of the agricultural policies of the various branches of the Government, and of the various governments of the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2505. A bill for the relief of D. T. George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of James I. Bartley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2508. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONKIEWICZ:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Marie Engert; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Thomas V. Corey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of P. Audley Whaley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Betty Robins; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

548. By Mr. BURCHILL of New York: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, that the Congress of the United States enact suitable legislation vesting the fair employment practice committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution, and endorsement, together with adequate funds to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

549. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to speedily enact House bill 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

550. By Mr. CARTER: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 of the California Legislature, urging that the Congress of the United States appoint a committee to immediately investigate conditions that prevail in the motor-trucking industry in the Western States in respect to necessary parts and tire replacements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 10 of the State of California, relative to the allocation and distribution of food and farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

552. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the State of California, memorializing the President, the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the War Production Board with respect to the urgency of prompt completion of all units of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

553. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 3261, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, recommending to the Congress of the United States of America that General MacArthur's request for immediate aid for pursuing the war in the Pacific be granted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

554. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, expressing opposition to any and all legislative measures now pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress which would impair or destroy the right of the State of Maine to regulate intrastate commerce by aircraft within its own borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

555. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Petition of the Illinois House of Representatives (the senate concurring herein) urging the Congress of the United States to enact such measures as will immediately defer or exempt from military service all essential farm labor and services for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

556. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Rev. G. Russell Nachtries and 40 other residents of the town of Cornwall, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

557. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Riverhead, Jamesport, Aquebogue, Orient, and Mattituck, Long Island, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

558. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mineola, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

559. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Petition of Bethel B. Day, president of the Idaho Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other citizens of Idaho, urging passage of House bill 2082, in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

560. By Mr. FISH: Petition of M. O. Bennett and 17 other residents of Highland Falls, N. Y., for favorable action on House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

561. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 3261 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, adopted March 31, 1943, recommending to the Congress of the United States that General MacArthur's request for immediate aid for pursuing the war in the Pacific be granted; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

562. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. W. M. Taylor, president of the Woman's Missionary Union of the First Baptist Church of Corsicana, and 120 other citizens of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 709; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

563. Also, petition of Granville G. Rutherford and 62 county committeemen of Navarro County, Tex., favoring incentive payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

564. Also, petition of Granville G. Rutherford and 62 county committeemen of Navarro County, Tex., favoring incentive payments to farmers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

565. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of sundry members of the First Baptist Church of Jersey Shore, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

566. Also, petition of sundry members of the First Methodist Church of Jersey Shore, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, like ruffled pools that cannot reflect the bending blue of the calm sky, fretted by every passing wind, we come with feverish spirits and anxious cares to the healing balm of Thy presence, there to find the perfect peace of those who stay their minds on Thee. For this quiet moment of devotion we would hush into stillness our busy thoughts. So relentlessly are we driven by the pressure of demanding days that our souls become jaded and drained.

In these solemn and searching days of the Passion, help us to take time to be holy. We would turn from the tragic, troubled world without to the inner kingdom of our own hearts knowing that there are the issues of life and that as a man thinketh in his own heart so is he. We would dim all lesser lights that the light within may shine with a new radiance. In that light we would see ourselves, stained by selfishness, warped by prejudice, blinded by pride, duped by false lights that fail. Grant unto us the grace of penitence that we may not grow insensible to our need of forgiveness, from one another and from Thee. In the crises of our times join us with those who across the waste and wilderness of human need, preparing the way of the Lord, throw up a highway for our God. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 16, 1943.*

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to law, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, and Mr. ANDREWS as members, on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of Officers and Employees of the Legislative Branch.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. THOMAS of Utah].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND NEW YORK CITY COVERING TRADE OPERATIONS AT STAPLETON, STATEN ISLAND, N. Y.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, chairman of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1941 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition transmitted by Henry W. Pinkham, of Newton Centre, Mass., of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt convening of a world conference to provide food for the starving, to establish peace by negotiation, to provide disarmament by general agreement, and to inaugurate a world government to succeed existing international anarchy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the California State Sheriffs Association, in convention assembled at Sacramento, Calif., favoring amendment of the Constitution so as to deny American citizenship to all Japanese, including the native-born; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ernest G. Albright, of Oklahoma City, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that certain alcoholic liquor in the State of Oklahoma be placed in channels useful to the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the California State Sheriffs Association, in convention assembled at Sacramento, Calif., protesting against any proposal looking to the reconcentration of Japanese in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A telegram dated at Highland Park, Mich., in the nature of a memorial, signed by Rev. Harvy H. Springer, evangelist, and Rev. W. O. Love, pastor, Hazel Park Baptist Tabernacle, Hazel Park, Mich., remonstrating on behalf of a meeting of 22,000 church members from 52 congregations against the enactment of certain pending legislation which allegedly might regiment the Nation, imperil marriage vows, divide families, and destroy liberties; and also protesting against the enactment of House bill 2087, to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes, on the ground that such legislation could be used to persecute preachers of the Gospel, Christians, and political opponents, stifle free speech, a free press, and freedom of expression in religion and politics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from the Puerto Rican Independence Assembly, San Juan, P. R., signed by its president and secretary, praying for the enactment, with appropriate amendments, of the so-called Tydings bill granting independence to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Resolution 167

"Whereas the American Meat Institute has evolved a program to achieve proper distribution of meat to the armed forces, to the civilian population, and to lend-lease without interfering with the wartime objective of inflation control; and

"Whereas such program is the result of the work of more than 200 men, including 22 institute committees, over a period of several weeks and was approved at a meeting of the directors of the institute appointed by members from all parts of the United States; and

"Whereas this program was endorsed by the joint livestock committee representing 93 organizations engaged in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock; and

"Whereas it appears that the basis of the program consists of an integrated, centralized control having authority to correlate slaughter and Government buying with civilian needs in order at all times to keep the supply consistent with the demand; and

"Whereas it appears to this body that such purposes are sound: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it hereby endorses the meat industry program for solving wartime meat problems; and be it further

"Resolved, That Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be and he is hereby memorialized to place the full authority to achieve the

objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That such person and staff be aided by an advisory committee appointed by appropriate Government authority to represent the meat industry in all its phases and locations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution by mail to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States from California; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly telegraph the contents of this resolution to the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Honorable Alfred J. Elliott, chairman of the California delegation in the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Texas State Legislature; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 46

"Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world is exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requiring that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

"Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

"Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competency and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

"Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines, and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Texas State Legislature, now in session, goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Texas Members of Congress."

A joint memorial of the Alaska Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"*To the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, to the Congress of the United States, and Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate in Congress from Alaska:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the salmon industry in Alaska produces great wealth for the Nation; and

"Whereas the salmon industry is capable of being greatly increased through proper extension and protection of spawning grounds; and

"Whereas it is a scientific fact that with proper regulations and spawning areas the salmon industry can be greatly expanded; and

"Whereas the expansion of the salmon industry would be of inestimable value in creating wealth for the Nation; and

"Whereas the present spawning grounds are inadequate for the proper expansion and development of the salmon industry:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialists, respectfully pray that the proper departments examine and survey the salmon spawning grounds for the purpose of enlarging spawning areas, in order to bring about a further increase in the amount of salmon processed in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialists will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 16, 1943.

"Passed by the house March 22, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 24, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint memorial of the Alaska Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"*To the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States during the Seventy-seventh Congress assembled, did cause to be passed an act cited as public bill No. 208. Said act removes from the coverage of the workmen's compensation laws of the Territory of Alaska, all those workers now employed on any defense project on the lands of the United States within the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas by such act these workers now come under the provisions of the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act; and

"Whereas the Honorable ANTHONY J. DIMOND now has caused to be introduced in the House of Representatives a bill cited as House bill No. 336, this act would nullify the provisions of public bill No. 208 and again put such workers under the coverage of the Alaska workmen's compensation laws; and

"Whereas the benefits of the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska provide a complete coverage and are more satisfactory under local conditions of the Territory than any other law on the subject covering compensation:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that immediate steps be taken to insure the early passage of House bill No. 336.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the Senate March 11, 1943.

"Passed by the House March 23, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 26, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two memorials of the Alaska Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Memorial 1

"*To the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable A. J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"That there are vast areas in the Territory of Alaska of unoccupied, unappropriated, nonproductive and unused land, some of which is suited to agricultural purposes, some contains mineral, much of it contains timber, and, from all indications, petroleum and other valuable products.

"That the paramount need of the Territory in times of peace is further settlement, and the development of all its known and potential resources.

"That the present war has taken into the armed forces of the United States great numbers of young men constituting the overwhelming majority of all those who are physically fit, for military service, and that these men, residents of the Territory, are the ones upon whom the Nation must rely for the future settlement and development of the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully prays that Congress enact the necessary legislation for the purpose of granting to every resident of Alaska now in the armed forces of the United States, and every branch thereof, upon his honorable discharge, not to exceed 160 acres of unappropriated land or public domain in the territory, whether agricultural, mineral, or timber lands or land suited to any other purpose, in connection with the settlement and development of the Territory, to be selected by the applicant, and that United States patent therefor be issued upon the filing of an application and the approval of a survey of the land selected.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 24, 1943."

"House Joint Memorial 12

"*To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Honorable A. J. Dimond, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"We, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represent that within the past few months vast areas of the public domain in Alaska have been withdrawn and set aside in reservations, and the sale, location, selection, and entry thereof under the public-land laws, mining laws, and leasing laws prohibited, including the areas withdrawn pursuant to Public Land Order No. 12, authorized by Eexecutive Order No. 9146, as follows:

"Area consisting of 8,320,000 acres, known as the Tanana River area and Copper River-Mentasta-Tok River area, which has been set aside as a right-of-way 40 miles in width for the Canadian-Alaska military highway and the branch highway to Gulkana, and the areas described in Public Land Order No. 82 consisting of the area described as the northern Alaska area, containing 48,800,000 acres, the area known and described in the order as the Alaska Peninsula area, containing 15,600,000 acres, and the area known and described in the order as the Katalla-Yakataga area, containing 3,040,000 acres; and

"Whereas the area mentioned in Public Land Order No. 12 is set aside as a right-of-way for a highway, although it is greatly in excess of any other known right-of-way ever set aside in any place as a right-of-way for a highway, and it has been rumored that the area will be used for colonization purposes or other purposes in the future; and

"Whereas the area set aside in Public Land Order No. 82, aggregating 67,440,000 acres, has been set aside on the ground that it is needed in the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas the Government already has the power to take over, set aside, condemn, use, and occupy any and all parts of Alaska, both within and without the public domain, needed in the prosecution of the war, and the withdrawal of vast areas of public land in the Territory into permanent reservations does not seem to be necessary in the prosecution of the war, but will be a tremendous handicap and detriment in the present and future development of the Territory; and

"Whereas some of the areas set aside are known to contain mineral wealth and other portions of the area undoubtedly are of great potential mineral value and will undoubtedly yield strategic and necessary minerals if prospecting and development are permitted, as it has been in the past, on the public domain and in the forest reserves:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist prays that steps be taken immediately to permit prospecting, settlement, and development in the areas described in this memorial and set aside by the public-land orders pursuant to Executive authority; that the same be open to prospecting and settlement under such restrictions only as are necessary in the prosecution of the war; that the whole area set aside, except so much as is needed for a right-of-way for the Canadian-Alaska Highway and so much as may be needed for location and operation of airfields, roads, and other necessary purposes in connection with the prosecution of the war, be restored to entry as soon as possible, and that no further areas in the Territory be set aside or reserved for any purpose except in connection with the prosecution of the war or except for some public and necessary purposes, and that the area so set aside be restricted to the purposes for which they are required and to the area necessary for that purpose.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 25, 1943."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Macksville, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PLANNING FOR POST-WAR PEACE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Vermont has passed the following joint resolution memorializing Congress on the aspects of planning for post-war peace:

Assembly Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution memorializing Congress on the aspects of planning for post-war peace

Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of world affairs to enlarge the basis of organized society in order to preserve civilization and to enable the peoples of the world to live in peace and be free;

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That mankind should be united in an organization with adequate power to preserve freedom and maintain peace through a system of law as opposed to force; and be it further

Resolved, That the Vermont delegation in Congress be requested to exercise its influence toward the initiation of appropriate action to further such ends; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is instructed to forward to each Senator and the Representative of this State in the Congress, a copy of this resolution.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.
ASA S. BLOOMER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved March 23, 1943.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

I ask that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution of the State of Vermont will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have two resolutions of similar import which are significant because they are the acts of town meetings. First, I present a resolution adopted by the citizens of Brookfield, Vt., in town meeting on March 2, 1943. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Axis governments in their folly and madness and crime conceive that they are wise enough and strong enough to destroy and annihilate other nations and to rule the world.

Resolved, That the town of Brookfield pledges to help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of master races and of people who have destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

Resolved, That the town of Brookfield pledges to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to our Members of Congress.

There is a similar resolution adopted by the town of Sherburne, Vt. I call attention at this time, in order to give importance to the meaning of these resolutions, to the fact that heretofore my colleague [Mr. AIKEN] has presented similar resolutions from other towns of Vermont adopted in town meetings. The town meeting is a significant institution in New England. I have heretofore presented similar resolutions from other towns.

I wish to remark that it is significant of the sentiment of the people of Vermont that the general assembly and the towns in their town meetings are acting upon this very important question.

I also call attention, in this connection, to the fact that the Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, which represents a cross section of the industry of Vermont, has adopted similar resolutions which heretofore have been inserted in the RECORD.

The resolution adopted by the town of Sherburne, Vt., reads as follows:

SHERBURNE CENTER, VT.,
March 6, 1943.

To the Honorable WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Senator, Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The acceptance of the following resolution was voted at our annual town meeting at Sherburne, Tuesday, March 2, 1943.

"Whereas the Axis governments in their folly and madness and crime conceive that they are wise enough and strong enough to destroy and annihilate other nations and to rule the world;

"*Resolved,* That the town of Sherburne pledges to help win, at whatever personal cost, the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of master races and of people who have the destiny and the power to dominate and enslave other peoples.

"*Resolved,* That the town of Sherburne pledges to help work for a peace in which the United States recognizes to the full and fulfills her responsibilities in a world of free peoples; and

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to Members of Congress."

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs.) HAZEL H. JOHNSON,
Town Clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions just presented by the Senator from Vermont will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SHORTAGES IN FARM LABOR, FARM MACHINERY, LIVESTOCK FEEDS, ETC.—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask to have noted and appropriately referred but not printed in the RECORD the fact that petitions by way of resolutions of various towns, of which I present a list, have been sent in, representing action by these towns in town meetings upon the subject of shortages of farm labor, farm machinery, livestock feeds, fertilizer, and other production factors.

The petitions or resolutions presented by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] are as follows:

Resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Agricultural Council of New England, at Windsor, Vt.; and

Resolutions adopted by citizens, in town meetings assembled, of the towns of Brookfield, East Montpelier, Montpelier, Newport, Pawlet, Poultney, Richmond, Rochester, Shoreham, St. Johnsbury, and Tinmouth, all in the State of Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions in the form of resolutions presented by the Senator from Vermont will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REGULATION OF INTRASTATE COMMERCE BY AIRCRAFT—MEMORIAL OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF MAINE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Maine. I take the resolution to be in the nature of a memorial protesting against certain legislation dealing with the control and regulation of aircraft. It is believed by the commission that the authority asked by the legislation in question conflicts with the authority of the State of Maine in this field. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it appears that legislation is now pending before the Congress of the United States designated H. R. 1012 with reference to the regulation of commerce by aircraft; and

Whereas it appears that under the proposed legislation the Congress of the United States would assume jurisdiction over purely intrastate commerce by aircraft and would purport to prohibit the regulation of such intrastate commerce by the several States; and

Whereas it appears to this commission that the enactment of such legislation would be in violation of the Constitution of the United States and would be an assumption of power never delegated to the Federal Government by the States or by the people; and

Whereas this Commission is of the opinion that the power to regulate such intrastate commerce should be retained by the several States: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Maine express its

opposition to any and all legislative measures now pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress which would impair or destroy the right of the State of Maine to regulate intrastate commerce by aircraft within its own borders; and it is further

Resolved, That an attested copy of this resolution be sent forthwith to each Senator and Representative of the State of Maine in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Adopted at Augusta, Maine, this 9th day of April 1943.

FRANK L. SOUTHARD,
JAMES A. BOYLE,
GEORGE E. HILL,
Public Utilities Commission of Maine.

PREPARATION FOR LASTING PEACE—RESOLUTIONS FROM VERMONT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on April 2 and 3, 1943, a Conference on Preparation for a Lasting Peace was held at Goddard College, in Plainfield, Vt., under the sponsorship of the American Association of University Women, Vermont State division; the American Legion, Department of Vermont; Granite Cutters' International Association of America, Barre branch; Roman Catholic Diocese of Burlington; United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America; Vermont Bar Association; Vermont Church Council; Vermont Conference of Social Work; Vermont Congress of Parents and Teachers; Vermont Education Association; Vermont Federation of Labor; Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs; Vermont and Quebec Universalist Unitarian Convention; Vermont State Farm Bureau; and Vermont State Grange.

The purpose of this conference was to examine some of the problems involved in the preparation for peace with a view to preparing a memorandum on the attitudes of Vermonters for transmittal to the President and the Vermont congressional delegation.

Under the chairmanship of Dean Joseph E. Carrigan, of the College of Agriculture, University of Vermont, the delegates in conference adopted three resolutions, which have been transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Vermont delegation in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1. PEACE POLICY

In the midst of a global war America is called upon to share in the greatest enterprise of all history—the establishment of permanent peace in a world united for certain common aims. The war can, if we will it, be transformed from a struggle for animal survival into a supreme effort to establish, everywhere in the world, the human values to which this country dedicated itself in the Declaration of Independence, the Federal Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address.

To do so, however, will require a courageous affirmation of faith. We must overcome the brutalization that goes with the hideous business of war, the cynicism that is implied in the final appeal to force, and the disillusionment that is likely to follow any setback to high expectations. We must assert our faith in the essential oneness of the human family, and the limitless potentialities of the individual human being. The rule of master races and master classes must ultimately give way to the democratic ideal of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" everywhere in the world.

To assert any less ambitious goal is cowardly defeatism and a betrayal of those in every land who have suffered and died in the hell of war. To deny that we can ultimately achieve a fraternal commonwealth of all peoples is to accept our enemies' belief in the national state as the highest good.

At this critical time the United Nations, confident of victory, are hammering their war and peace aims into weapons of psychological warfare and into standards to which all men may turn their hopes. We pledge our own efforts and, so far as we can secure them, the efforts of those organizations we represent, to work for a peace based on the following principles:

1. America must assume its full responsibility in the promotion and maintenance of institutions of regional and world solidarity. America must neither be isolationist nor imperialist nor moved only by considerations of national interest narrowly conceived.

2. The defeat of military aggression is our first task, and our victory will be hollow unless it involves the control and eventual elimination of the war-making power of national states. Collective security requires international armed forces, under international authority, to enforce international law.

3. Friendly understanding among all peoples is essential to enduring peace. To bring to the making of the peace a spirit of revenge and a desire to punish the German and Japanese people would be to accept the brutal standards of their own war lords and their theories of racial differences.

4. Equality of opportunity and of rights for all peoples and all races is an essential application of a basic American idea to world reconstruction. Peoples in need of assistance to full self-government should receive such aid from international agencies in which they have increasing representation. No people should be subjected to the sovereign rule of another.

5. Cultural and political differences are not insurmountable barriers to cooperation for world peace. Russia, China, and Great Britain are our indispensable allies, not only for the defeat of the Axis, but in the creation of a stable world order, in which alone democracy can expand and flourish. No effort must be spared by this country to achieve closer understanding and cooperation with those countries, and to secure mutual advantages in international interchange.

6. Enduring peace can be established only on a foundation of economic well-being, both at home and abroad. At home, government, business, labor, the farmers, and consumers should cooperate in achieving full employment and social security with a maximum of individual initiative compatible with public interest. The ultimate responsibility for attaining these ends rests with government. Abroad, America should cooperate unreservedly with all nations in relief and reconstruction, the gradual removal of trade barriers, the stabilization of currency, and the ultimate achievement of freedom from want everywhere in the world.

7. A world government federating all peoples for the furtherance of human values must be our ultimate political objective. It will only be achieved by the gradual extension of supernational agencies in one field of action after another. This country should never lose the initiative in undertaking joint action on a continuing basis, for political, economic, social, and other purposes, with the other countries of the hemisphere, with our principal allies—Britain, China, and Russia, with all the United Nations, and eventually with all the world.

We believe that these principles should guide American action not merely at some future peace table but now in the conduct of the war. The way we fight the war and the institutions we set up to achieve victory will shape the peace more surely than any mere statement of intentions. The building of a world of peaceful progress is not a matter of a single peace treaty, but of continuous growth in which what we do now or next month may be of decisive importance. We, therefore, favor the taking of all possible steps now in the reaching of joint decisions and the creation of joint agencies of the United Nations, both for the winning of the war and the winning of the peace.

RESOLUTION 2. PREVENTION OF INFLATION

We urge the imposition of a compulsory savings law and of such additional progressive taxes as will minimize the danger of a disastrous inflation, the presence of which would imperil any plan for post-war stability.

RESOLUTION 3. STUDY OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD REPORT

We recommend for study and serious consideration by the Congress the report of the National Resources Planning Board. The report appears to embody the essentials of the "four freedoms" by extending the scope of social security, proclaiming a new Bill of Rights, encouraging education, and laying the groundwork for full employment opportunities, with the Government assuming responsibility for implementing the planned development of democracy. We urge the continuation of appropriations for the Board.

MEMORIAL OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENT LABOR ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. DAVIS. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary a memorial in the form of a resolution adopted by the American Independent Labor Association executive committee, Edw. C. McKelvey, secretary.

There being no objection, the memorial in the form of a resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT
LABOR ASSOCIATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 8, 1943.

Whereas the American Independent Labor Association in its constitution upholds the American form of free popular government, the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States providing for free speech, free press, and the right to criticize the elected representatives and public servants of the American people; and

Whereas the war securities bill, H. R. 2087, by Representative SUMNERS of Texas, is so drawn as to endanger these rights and privileges of the people, by denying the right of discussion and criticism through intimidation, and in effect nullifying part of our United States Constitution; and

Whereas it appears there is sufficient provision for the apprehension and punishment of saboteurs and spies and all public enemies under existing law; and

Whereas this bill would in effect bring about in the United States an obnoxious system of snooping such as is now existent in Nazi Germany: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Independent Labor Association with the concurrence of all chapters express its vehement disapproval of this bill, and ask that you do all in your power to defeat this legislation and vote against same.

EDW. C. MCKELVEY,
Secretary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Under what order are we proceeding?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, Wednesday, April 14, marked the fifty-second anniversary of the Pan American Union——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have stated many times that I want the order relating to the routine morning business enforced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further petitions and memorials, reports of committees are in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Vida B. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 181).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford; without amendment (Rept. No. 182);

H. R. 1160. A bill for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 183); and

H. R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Junior; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 184).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 159. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez; without amendment (Rept. No. 185); and

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Joseph Spear; without amendment (Rept. No. 186).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair; without amendment (Rept. No. 187);

H. R. 1583. A bill for the relief of Reuben T. Little; without amendment (Rept. No. 188);

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 189); and

H. R. 2067. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 190).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 235. A bill for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 191);

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 192); and

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Fred Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 193).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; without amendment (Rept. No. 194);

H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 195); and

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 196).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, approved May 7, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 197).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 156. A bill relating to the status of retired judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 198).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 2020. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 199).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 991. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; with amendments (Rept. No. 200).

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 107 RELATING TO AN INVESTIGATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. LUCAS), from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 139), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 107, agreed to April 7, 1943, relating to the investigation of technological resources by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, hereby is amended by striking out the following language as it appears in said resolution: "in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during this time of serious war crisis many troublesome domestic problems——

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. I have stated over and over again that I want the rule concerning routine morning business enforced, so that we can get through with that order. I again ask that the rule be enforced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order when the Senate is proceeding under the order of introduction of bills and joint resolutions. Has the Senator from Texas a bill he wishes to introduce?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes, Mr. President; I have a bill to introduce at this time. If remarks upon the bill are not in order at this time——

Mr. McNARY. The introduction of the bill is in order, but not a speech. I should be delighted to hear the able Senator discourse on the bill a little later. He can introduce the bill now and speak after the routine morning business shall have been concluded.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator, and introduce the bill at this time; and I promise that he shall not be deprived of the speech later.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Texas will be received and appropriately referred.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of providing a 25 percent increase in the rate of old-age assistance paid to aged needy individuals during the present war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1006 (by request). A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1007. A bill to provide for the temporary promotion of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Ernest M. Cote; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1010. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved August 29, 1935, relative to death benefits; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1011. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Saint Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. WILEY also introduced Senate bill 1012, which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 1013. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Gibbons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1015. A bill granting an increase of pension to Minnie M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

EXTENSION OF PATENTS ON ACCOUNT OF WAR EMERGENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 19 I introduced Senate bill 890 to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency.

In the correspondence which I have received relative to the bill since its introduction, a number of suggestions have been made which I believe merited inclusion in the bill.

The principal change relates to the inclusion of the licensee along with the owner of a patent.

Accordingly, I introduce for proper reference a new bill to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners or licensees are unable to derive benefits

from them on account of the war emergency.

The bill (S. 1012) to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners or licensees are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Patents.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, line 10, after "$2,400", insert "$600 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

BERMUDA CONFERENCE ON REFUGEE PROBLEMS—SAFETY OF JEWS IN NAZI-OCCUPIED EUROPE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 137), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas a conference of importance and far-reaching implications is now under way in Bermuda for the purpose of exploring the refugee problem emanating from the chaos and confusion brought about by Hitler's mad attempt to impose his new order upon the peoples of Europe; and

Whereas under a program of planned mass murder 2,000,000 defenseless Jews have already been brutally massacred by the Nazi hordes and a damnable policy of extermination has been proclaimed by Hitler against the Jewish people; and

Whereas this vile policy has uprooted and made destitute and stateless the remaining European Jews who are not only marked for slaughter but are abandoned with no one to speak and act on their behalf; and

Whereas the American traditions of justice and humanity demand that we extend the helping hand to every victim of cruel oppression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bermuda Conference be advised that the Senate of the United States advocates an immediate and stern policy of action to save the remaining millions of the Jewish people in Europe, and that such a humanitarian objective be consummated speedily in a manner which will restore to these helpless victims of Hitler the rights and dignity of a free people.

POLICIES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES IN THE DISSEMINATION AND CONTROL OF INFORMATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and comprehensive study of policies, methods, and practices of Government agencies relating to the dissemination and control of information during the present war. The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of any studies undertaken pursuant to this resolution, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

UNVEILING OF BUST OF THE HONORABLE JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this morning at 11 o'clock exercises were held in the reception room of the Senate on the occasion of the unveiling of the marble bust of former Vice President John Nance Garner. I hold in my hand a transcript of the proceedings, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD, and also be printed as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the proceedings referred to were ordered to be printed as a document and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM OF CEREMONIES AT THE UNVEILING OF THE BUST OF HON. JOHN NANCE GARNER, FORMER VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE RECEPTION ROOM OF THE SENATE, SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1943

1. Opening address by Hon. Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex., chairman of the ceremonies.

2. Unveiling of the bust by Mr. Bascom Timmons, Washington correspondent for Texas newspapers.

3. Address by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, Tex.

4. Address by Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL, United States Senator from Texas.

5. Address by Hon. Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex., Secretary of Commerce.

6. Address by Hon. TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from Texas.

REMARKS OF ROY MILLER, OF CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow Texans, we are here to honor a great Texan and a great American, whose life of public service constitutes a national heritage. No other individual in the proud history of our imperial State of Texas has ever achieved greater distinction in the length and quality of his service to the State and to the Nation.

Born in a log cabin, the issue of rugged pioneers, reared amid surroundings where hard necessity produced courage and self-reliance and built character, John Nance Garner early became the architect of his own destiny. Successively county judge, State representative, Member of the Congress for 30 years, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Vice President of the United States for 2 terms, his 46 years of continuous distinguished public service stand almost without precedent or parallel in the annals of the Republic.

Intense patriotism, unquestioned integrity, absolute honesty, fearless courage, rare simplicity, and common sense are the homely virtues that adorn that incomparable record. No stain mars the purity of his honor; no blemish obscures the brilliance of his sword; no whisper of suspicion has ever raised a question of doubt concerning his blameless career. His life itself is an enduring monument to his name and fame.

"Nothing can cover his high fame but heaven; no pyramids or monuments set off his memories, but the eternal substance of his greatness."

Texas is proud of her representation in the Congress and in other branches of the Federal Government. Texans, for the most part, like their beloved State, are big and broad and self-sufficient.

Present here today to join in this simple tribute to their friend and ours, the former Vice President of the United States, are four such typical and distinguished Texans who represent their great State in places of high responsibility. Busts of former Vice Presidents adorn the niches that surround the Senate Chamber, placed there by official act of the Senate, but this public unveiling and dedication is testimony, if any be needed, that John Garner, alive and in full vigor of mind and body, still lives also in the hearts and affections of a legion of devoted friends and admirers.

As the hastening years come and go, here within the walls of the Capitol Building of the country he has loved and served, future generations who gaze upon his rugged countenance may renew their faith in the simple precepts and principles of true democracy to which his life has been devoted, and which constitute the sure foundation upon which has been built the United States of America—the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation of all time.

REMARKS OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Chairman MILLER. It is my very great pleasure to present to you one of Mr. Garner's warmest friends, the Speaker of House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN. [Applause.]

Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman and friends, without any manuscript at all, I am more than happy, glad, and proud to participate in these ceremonies, because we have just unveiled a likeness of a great Texan, a great American, a great soul.

Mr. Garner once had power, and he exercised that power fearlessly, and I believe at all times to the best interests of the country he loved and desired to serve.

Texas has produced many great people, great hearts, great souls, great minds, great citizens.

I knew John Garner as I have known few men, because our association was intimate and very frank. My estimate of him is and has been that he was and is an outstanding citizen, and no one of my time served his country more nobly and in a finer fashion than did John Garner.

Sometimes when people are in power, we speak of them often, we like to glory in the fact that we are their friends and that they are ours; but when power leaves their hands, many times we recede from them. In a thousand ways John Garner was kind and fine to me when he occupied a great position of power and responsibility, where he could reward or punish. I loved him then. Today, when he is the most distinguished private citizen of our State, without power to reward or punish, I want the world to know that I love him just as much as I did when he had power. [Applause.]

So I am glad to be here, by my presence, if not by my words, to do honor to a great friend, a great Texan, a great American, and a great soul. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL

The rugged individualism, inherent honesty, and brutal frankness of John Nance Garner, of Texas, are the characteristics which carved for him an important niche in the history of the greatest nation on earth, symbolized by the niche in this Nation's Capitol into which we today place this marble likeness of him.

His many friends here and throughout the Nation recognize these sterling qualities in him, but few perhaps have envisioned their origin. They sprang from the soil and soul of Texas. Of sturdy pioneer parents he was bred and born with the germ of Texas he-man in his blood. Rubbing shoulders from childhood to manhood with the realities of life in the wide open spaces where all opposing elements operate relentlessly and continuously, completely sterilized his mind against all hallucinations concerning the somewhat popular fad that the millennium can be immediately produced by legislation or edict. Fearlessness of personal consequences whenever right was involved has been outstanding in his entire brilliant career. This likeness of him, carved in marble, is no more permanent than the undying, unchanging, uncompromising realities of human existence as contemplated by our Creator, and recognized, advocated and practiced by this realist—John Nance Garner of Texas.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JESSE H. JONES

Were some other man than John Garner involved, there might be a handicap in the role we fill here today.

Were I to ascribe to John Garner a quality or characteristic he did not possess, I would quickly be caught up, for most of you know him, some of you very intimately. But no one who has known John Nance Garner would seek to add to the stature of this gifted son of the Lone Star State and of the Nation, nor can we do justice in words to the admiration and esteem in which we hold him, both as a man and as a statesman.

John Garner passed 38 years of his useful life under the dome of this Capitol. Some of you saw him come here as a youth and emerge as a trusted and able captain. You knew his political philosophy, which was a broad liberalism framed within the basic American tradition. You knew of his value in conferences and in shaping legislation.

John Garner left a mark in his public service that will endure, but it is not his biography or the record of his public service of which I wish to speak. It would be difficult to name the outstanding quality he displayed in public service. He had a lucid mind, balance, capability, conviction, courage, intelligence, initiative, earnestness, practicability, high decency, and faith in his own judgment.

However, it is not only as a statesman, but as a delightful friend and congenial companion that I like to think of John Garner.

He has a positive genius for friendships, and as he rose in statesmanship, and his horizon broadened, so did his friendships grow. He was in public life a partisan, but his warm human qualities knew no party lines.

In his long service here he lost no friend and left no enemy.

The New York Times once said of John Garner editorially, that he had never disappointed the American people, and the only way he could disappoint them would be not to live to be a hundred.

To Texas he has merely changed from our most distinguished public figure to our greatest private citizen.

I am glad to tell you he is well, as happy as one can be in these times, busy, intensely interested in his country, and sure of its endurance as the greatest republic on the face of the earth.

All of us, rich in happy memories of John Garner, extend to him and Mrs. Garner our affectionate greetings.

REMARKS OF SENATOR TOM CONNALLY

We have gathered to unveil and dedicate a marble bust of Hon. John N. Garner, former Vice President of the United States. It will stand in the Senate wing of the Capitol and will serve as a perpetual reminder of the eminent public services Mr. Garner rendered in this majestic building that houses the Congress of the United States.

We have here chiseled in marble the features of him whom we honor. No cold and impassive marble can adequately portray the outstanding qualities of this able, genial, and forceful public character. There cannot be imparted to pulseless stone the warmth and the charm of his vigorous personality. Voiceless statues cannot throb with the vitality of the leadership which he displayed. There cannot be captured and imprisoned within walls of rock the trenchant intellect that guided his public career and exerted such compelling influence upon those with whom he was associated in the national service. This carved and chiseled figure can, however, serve as a reminder and memento of the great qualities which animated his life and thrilled those with whom he had contact.

Hon. John N. Garner is a native Texan. He rose from humble beginnings through indomitable purpose and worthy ambition. Frail of health in his youth, he removed to Uvalde in southwest Texas because of the advantages of its climate. Becoming a member of the bar, he rapidly advanced in his profession and in the esteem of his fellow citizens. He served as county judge and then for two terms was a member of the Texas House of Representatives. In 1902, he was elected a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and took office on March 3, 1903.

The Nation is familiar with his career from the day he assumed his duties in the House. With rare energy and indefatigable patience, he served upon committees and devoted his abilities with diligence and perseverance to public questions. He steadily rose to a position of prestige and standing. These qualities made him minority leader and in 1930 they led him to the Speakership of the House. He served in that high station with distinction. In 1932 he was nominated as Vice President, as the running mate of Gov Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic candidate for President. For 8 years he presided over the Senate of the United States. He was more than a mere presiding officer. He exerted a potent influence upon legislation and national policies. His extensive and thorough knowledge of Government establishments and departments and legislative practices made him always the source of wise counsel and adroit strategy. He enjoyed esteem of Senators on both sides of the aisle. His career attracted the admiration of both political friends and foes. When he laid aside his official duties as Vice President, he retired to the peace and happiness of his home at Uvalde, Tex., amidst his friends and early acquaintances. There he now resides in dignity and comfort. Pilgrimages are made to his home by thousands who seek advice and the refreshing contact of his personality. There he holds court—a court of democracy and friendly cooperation and cordial counsel.

We unveil, today, to the public gaze this marble bust of this great Texan and this great American. It can be no more than the shadow of the looming figure of his life and example. It can be no more than a mere reminder of his career here. We dedicate it as a monument to the gallant qualities that made him a great public servant and endeared him to the noble people whom he served so well.

Chairman MILLER. Before I close, may I say that we wish to extend our sincere thanks and appreciation to the Architect of the Capitol, David Lynn, the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, for the splendid cooperation and assistance in arranging the program so efficiently.

The sculptor of the marble bust of Hon. John Nance Garner, the thirty-second Vice President of the United States, is Mr. J. E. Fraser, of Westport, Conn. Mr. Fraser was also the sculptor of the bust of Theodore Roosevelt, the twenty-fifth Vice President.

Mr. Garner was the only man besides Schuyler Colfax to be Speaker of the House of Representatives and Vice President of the United States. Mr. Colfax served as Vice President under President Ulysses S. Grant.

Mr. Garner was the sixth man to be elected for two terms as Vice President, preceded by John Adams, of Massachusetts, George Clinton, of New York, Daniel D. Tompkins, of New York, John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, and Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana.

APRIL 16, 1943.

Hon. JOHN N. GARNER,
Uvalde, Tex.:

We have just had the privilege of participating in appropriate ceremonies unveiling and dedicating a bust of our dear friend, former Vice President of the United States, which now takes its place among the immortals who have served our great country with honor and distinction through a glorious past. Among them all there is no more honored or worthy name than that of John Nance Garner. For ourselves and many other friends we send affectionate greetings with the fervent prayer that for many years to come you will enjoy that peace and satisfaction which comes from duty well and faithfully performed. We send also our warmest greetings to your devoted wife, who has contributed so abundantly to your remarkable career of distinguished public service.

TOM CONNALLY.
W. LEE O'DANIEL.
SAM RAYBURN.
JESSE H. JONES.
BASCOM TIMMONS.
ROY MILLER.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO PLYWOOD FACILITIES AT THE HIGGINS AIRCRAFT PROJECT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there has been considerable discussion concerning the erection of new plywood facilities in connection with the Higgins Aircraft project in New Orleans. I will not trespass upon the time of the Senate by reviewing the rather lengthy history of this project, but I respectfully ask that correspondence I have had with Mr. C. E. Wilson, Vice Chairman, War Production Board, relative to this matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

I feel that all the facts which have developed in this matter should be available to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 2, 1943.

Hon. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: It is my understanding that the Higgins Industries of New Orleans have been given approval for facilities to construct buildings and purchase material for a complete veneer mill for the construction of a plywood factory and molded plywood plant whose cost collectively would run into millions of dollars.

Industry experts advise me that this is a direct threat to war production of critically needed aircraft plywood. I am further advised that the records of the War Production Board and the Aircraft Scheduling Unit at Wright Field show that industry is now producing more aircraft plywood than called for by the armed services.

It is apparent that any trained mechanics or executives which the Higgins organization might hire must come from the present plywood factories and would increase the serious manpower shortage and decrease production in plywood plants which are now effectively serving aircraft builders.

It cannot be denied that it is a serious mistake to allow any materials for building and equipment which is not definitely needed.

It would be infinitely more desirable if emergency requirements should arise to utilize facilities already partially equipped and thus save critical materials and manpower. The plywood industry which embraces many small manufacturers has largely at its own expense equipped itself so that its production is now several times the present or anticipated requirements according to all information which has been made available to me.

I wish to protest any hasty or ill-advised action in this connection and I respectfully call for an immediate report.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

APRIL 5, 1943.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In response to your inquiry of April 2 regarding the approval for the plywood plant addition at the Higgins aircraft plant in New Orleans. On November 17, 1942, the War Production Board approved the construction of an aircraft plant to be operated by the Higgins Aircraft Co. at New Orleans at a cost of approximately $20,000,000. Subsequently thereto, additional projects at the installation were approved, bringing the total to $23,735,000.

Thereafter the Higgins Aircraft Co. requested approval for a plywood addition to be operated solely in connection with the construction of the cargo-carrying plane program, and which plywood addition involved an expenditure of only $255,000. This request was reviewed and it was determined that if plywood were purchased from existing manufacturers for the use of the Higgins Aircraft Co. that it would be necessary that this plywood be manufactured under humidity control and that the plywood thus manufactured would require careful packing in moisture-resistant packages so that it would be received by the Higgins Aircraft Co. in proper condition for wood aircraft manufacture. It was further determined that the Higgins plant would also have to be air-conditioned and humidity controlled in order to properly manufacture wood aircraft parts and completed planes. It was considered in the best interest of the war effort to authorize the expenditure of $255,000 rather than to interject any obstacle to a project which had already been approved and which totaled $23,735,000. Surveys by the War Production Board indicate an excess of plywood over all present war and civilian requirements of approximately 1,000,000 square feet per month. This covers all classes of plywood and not only aircraft plywood.

Except for the seven plywood plants located in Oregon and Washington, all plywood plants in this country are operating at least one full shift at capacity, and the seven plants in Oregon and Washington are not operating at capacity, due to the log shortage and labor conditions surrounding this situation in the western territory.

The views of all branches of the War Production Board have been taken into consideration. The project was considered as a whole.

The project has again been reviewed and again it is the determination that the $255,000 expenditure for that portion of the Higgins aircraft plant is essential as part of the total expenditure in excess of $24,000,000, and that it is considered good policy to centralize responsibility for the entire program, especially when this can be accomplished for only 1 percent of the cost of the total project. The approval of the plywood addition to the Higgins project is the approval of a necessary link in the entire project and not the approval of another plywood plant.

If you have any further question or desire any further specific information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

APRIL 7, 1943.

Mr. C. E. WILSON,
Vice Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Thank you for your letter of April 5, 1943, in reply to my letter concerning the proposed plywood plant addition in New Orleans.

Your letter is apparently identical in its wording with views expressed in a letter by Donald M. Nelson.

Frankly, however, I am less concerned with what your letter states than with what it does not state.

Accordingly, I am requesting your immediate reply to certain definite questions I should ordinarily hesitate to request such an early reply except that I am certain that, of course, you undoubtedly have all of the information and files readily at hand or you could not otherwise have made your decision respecting the plywood plant addition at the Higgins Aircraft plant in New Orleans.

I am interested in ascertaining the answer to the following questions:

1. Is it true that the Higgins concern took up the question of the availability of aircraft plywood with the Army Air Forces aircraft scheduling unit at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio?

2. Is it true that this scheduling unit subsequently made an investigation of the entire matériel situation?

3. Is it true that the aircraft scheduling unit advised Higgins that they could supply him with the required aircraft plywood (from existing producers) to meet his production schedule without interfering with the present aircraft production schedule?

4. Is it true that subsequently the Higgins concern brought this matter to the attention of the War Production Board in Washington?

5. Is it true that the War Production Board subsequently made an independent survey?

6. Is it true that the War Production Board then came to the same conclusion as the aircraft scheduling unit—namely, that there was sufficient productive capacity in the United States to take care of all requirements, including Higgins' proposed program?

7. Is it true then that the approval of the plywood addition for the Higgins aircraft plant in New Orleans reverses the original conclusions of Wright Field and the War Production Board?

8. If the original surveys of the aircraft scheduling unit at Wright Field and the original War Production Board survey indicated that sufficient production was available to supply the proposed Higgins aircraft plant, in what manner has that plywood supply or the outlook for the future plywood supply been altered? In other words, what is the basis for the change, if there has been a change of attitude?

9. Is it true that the proposed plywood plant addition to the Higgins aircraft plant at New Orleans would require the use of critical and strategic materials for its construction?

10. Is it true that in the operation of this proposed plywood plant addition some personnel or labor would probably be drawn from existing plywood manufacturers?

11. Is it true that there is already a shortage of manpower in the plywood industry?

12. Is it true that the Lumber Division of the War Production Board and the Plywood and Veneer Section both originally opposed construction of the proposed plywood plant addition at New Orleans?

13. If they did originally oppose the project, have they changed their views, and, if so, on what basis?

14. In your letter you mention the manufacture of plywood under humidity control. Is it contended at the present time that existing manufacturers do not manufacture plywood under humidity control?

15. Is it true that the current practice in the plywood industry at the present time is to ship plywood in a manner designed to resist moisture?

16. Has it been definitely established that an air-conditioned plant is essential to the production of aircraft plywood?

17. If such air conditioning is necessary to a degree beyond the ordinary humidity controls employed in plywood plants, would it not be possible to install such air-conditioning equipment in existing plants?

18. In view of your statement that at the present time there is an excess of plywood over all present war and civilian requirements of approximately 1,000,000 square feet per month, is it contended that the new plant is needed to supply additional aircraft plywood? And if so, please explain.

19. Is it true that leaders in the industry have indicated that if additional production beyond the present surplus is needed, that such production can be readily secured from existing facilities?

I also read with interest your statement that "it is considered good policy to centralize responsibility for the entire program, especially when this can be accomplished for only 1 percent of the cost of the total project."

The item of $255,000 as an item of expense is not the basic issue. The basic issue is whether existing plywood facilities are adequate and whether the proposed addition would represent a duplication and whether it would represent critical materials and labor in its construction.

Another very obvious question is whether the new project in its operation would require personnel and labor diverted from existing facilities to the detriment of the war program.

Please understand that these questions are directed to you not in an effort to embarrass you but to secure an accurate factual résumé of a number of points which are apparently in dispute. I am vitally interested in this matter and I can assure you that at all times I will vigorously protest any unwarranted du-

plication in any field where there are existing adequate facilities whose duplication during a war period particularly involves critical materials and critical manpower and a possible disruption of existing facilities.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

APRIL 13, 1943.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of April 7 in which you present a number of questions relating to plywood facilities in connection with the Higgins aircraft project in New Orleans.

I am certain that you fully realize that direct answers which you request to specified questions do not tell the complete story. Questions and answers to be of value should be considered only with the entire project under consideration.

Questions 1 through 7 may be answered in the affirmative.

The answer to question 8 is that nothing in the supply-demand situation on an overall basis has occurred to alter the general conclusion that there is sufficient capacity in the United States to produce airplane-grade plywood to meet the demands of our aircraft program as now defined if that, by itself, was the only question under consideration.

Question 9 is answered in the affirmative with the qualifications that the amounts of critical and strategic materials needed for the plywood part of the Higgins project are not formidable.

Question 10 is answered in the negative. We have the assurance of the Higgins organization that in their employ are key men of the requisite skills to operate the veneer and plywood parts of the project and that the additional ordinary labor needed is readily available in the area of the Higgins project. We have been assured that there is no need to nor will there be any pirating of men from existing plywood or veneer manufacturers.

As to question 11, our analysis indicates that any shortage in the lumber field is of men engaged in getting logs out of the woods.

Question 12 is answered in the affirmative but only when consideration was given to the project as a separate plywood plant and not as a vital part of the entire Higgins Co. aircraft program.

As to question 13, the plan as a coordinated, entire project is approved by the War Production Board.

In answer to question 14, it may be stated that some manufacturers of plywood employ humidity controls in their plants (for example, the Crescent Co. of Louisville, Ky.); some do not (for example, the Roddis Co. of Marshfield, Wis.). The practice depends upon the climatic conditions in the areas of manufacture.

Question 15 is answered in the affirmative and the degree of protection afforded depends upon the distance of the shipment and the locality of the consumer.

Question 16 cannot be answered categorically. Air conditioning would be required in a plywood plant located in such an area as New Orleans. It might not be needed in localities in the North, but if plywood is to be shipped to New Orleans it will be requisite that air conditioning warehouse facilities be provided in New Orleans if that is where the aircraft is manufactured. This would also require proper and special packing, shipping, handling, etc.

Questions 17 and 19 are answered in the affirmative.

Question 18 directly raises the basis of approving the Higgins project. As previously stated, the decision was not upon the grounds that there was not sufficient plywood capacity in the United States to meet the needs of the aircraft plywood program. An over-all program for the Higgins Aircraft Co. was approved. This involved a plant expenditure of over $24,000,000 for the production of cargo plywood planes. Mr. Higgins stated repeatedly that a necessary condition to the satisfactory completion of his contract was that he be able to control directly, on the spot, the production of the particular kind of plywood needed for his project. He cited numerous difficulties that he has encountered in the past in obtaining the quantities of plywood necessary to his boat-building program and stated further that the prices charged have been considerably in excess of what appeared to him to be reasonable. In view of the soundness of representations made by Mr. Higgins that his responsibility for the proper performance of his entire airplane contract was importantly conditioned upon being given complete control over the production of the necessary plywood, it was considered poor economy to insist upon the saving of a very small percentage of the project cost if by so doing we would becloud the issue as to where the responsibility lay for carrying the complete project through to a successful conclusion.

I am in complete accord with your expressed aim of preventing the expenditure of funds and the use of scarce materials for unnecessary facilities. However, I have equally strong convictions about the placing of responsibility. In this case, after reviewing all the facts, I resolved that the plywood project warranted approval.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

JEFFERSON AND EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson and Education" delivered by him at the Hotel Alms, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PAN AMERICAN UNION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Pan American Day Cooperative Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., April 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON — ADDRESS AND ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles prepared by Senator THOMAS of Utah, one entitled "Jefferson Gave Us Our War Aims," broadcast on April 13, 1943, and the other entitled "Jefferson and the New World," prepared for New Masses of March 17, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Freedom of the Press" delivered by him before the Washington (D. C.) Kiwanis Club on April 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASTAGE OF MANPOWER AND ITS UNECONOMICAL UTILIZATION IN THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the manuscript of a radio speech prepared by him upon the wastage of manpower and its uneconomical utilization in the war effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTION OF POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to the construction of power plants in the United States and Canada, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE CIVILIAN WAR SERVICE—STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, April 13, 1943, relating to House bill 1742, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

OFFICIAL TRIBUTE TO THOMAS JEFFERSON BY CLAUDE G. BOWERS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address prepared by Claude G. Bowers as the Nation's official tribute to Thomas Jefferson on the occasion of the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE PHILIPPINES—ADDRESS BY SERGIO OSMEÑA

[Mr. HAYDEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The United Nations and the Philippines, delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, April 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF NEWS—ARTICLE BY FREDERIC W. COLLINS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Government Control of News," written by Frederic W. Collins, and published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $26,100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943, to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9322, dated March 26, 1943, for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the

production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, as follows:

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting, placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps; (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; and (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

"EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

"SEC. 3. (a) Not more than $13,050,000 of the funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances; (4) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; and (5) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

"(b) Not more than 2 percent of the funds appropriated by section 1 hereof shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administrator, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations, and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of one year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

"(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this joint resolution shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(c) For the purpose of this joint resolution—

"(1) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

"(2) the term 'worker' includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

"(3) the term 'agricultural labor' includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the Act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

"(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of Section 3 of such Act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other

documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such Act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this joint resolution. No provision of this joint resolution shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
M. C. TARVER,
ELMER H. WENE,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor. The conference report is a privileged matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senate that the House passed a joint resolution regarding farm labor, which came to the Senate. Under the measure as it passed the House $26,100,000 was appropriated. The joint resolution, as passed by the House, contained many provisions which were not agreed to by the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee reported an entirely different measure, which was afterward passed by the Senate. It carried an appropriation of $40,000,000.

When the joint resolution came to be considered in conference, the first important change made was that the Senate conferees had to agree to a reduction of the amount from $40,000,000 to $26,100,000, the amount fixed by the House when it passed the joint resolution. Frankly, I do not see much objection to that.

A change was made in the amount to be paid to the extension services. The Senate amendment provided that not less than $9,000,000 and not more than $13,050,000 of the sum appropriated should be allocated to the States for the extension services in the various States, so far as workers in the various States were concerned. The conference committee did not have much trouble in agreeing upon that half, so to speak, of the measure which provides $13,050,000 for the farm-labor service within the States.

Then under section 3 of the amendment recommended by the conference committee, $13,050,000 of the money appropriated by section 1 is proposed to be appropriated for the interstate service and for the foreign service, because, as we all know, a great many workers have been imported from Mexico heretofore, and it was supposed that a good many would be imported from Mexico, and possibly some from other countries. However, certain restrictions were placed upon the importation of labor. No persons were to be imported except from North America, South America, Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto. No persons were to come from European or eastern countries.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Was that modification a compromise, or was it made upon the insistence of the House conferees?

Mr. McKELLAR. The modification was a compromise arrangement, and I think a very fair one. The States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Wyoming, and other Western States were tremendously interested in that feature of the joint resolution, as was also the State of Michigan, which must have a good many itinerant laborers, and I think New York State also must have such laborers at stated periods. The $13,050,000 was agreed to for that purpose, but limitations were placed upon it. In other words, not more than 2 percent of the funds to be used may be used for administrative purposes. There are a number of other limitations in the measure to which I need not refer.

The conferees finally used the Senate measure as a base for coming to an agreement. What the conferees did was to bring about a modification of the Senate measure rather than the House measure which had already been passed by the House.

Mr. President, I wish to say that when the joint resolution first came before the committee I was ill and unable to be present, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] became the head of the subcommittee. I think if Senators will examine the report they will find that the Senator from Georgia and Senators working with him achieved an excellent result. A very difficult situation confronted them. Questions relating to immigration came up for consideration. I am speaking of the second half of the joint resolution. There was practically no dispute with respect to the first half. Members of the House and Members of the Senate had no trouble in agreeing with respect to the first half of the measure, but when it came to the second half there was very great difference of opinion. A great many limitations were placed in it, because it was necessary to make certain that the greatest care was exercised in dealing with immigration, and strict provisions were placed in the measure providing for taking these workers out of the country after the emergency period is over.

One other provision was placed in the measure which I think is valuable. Old men who are now receiving old-age pensions would be precluded from doing such work as the measure deals with if the present law were not changed; that is, if they undertook such work they would lose their old-age pensions. The next to the last section of the measure provides that such men may engage in agricultural work without losing their pensions. I think that is a very wise provision.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Would that provision cover postal employees who have retired? Could they now go back and work for the Post Office Department under the provisions of this measure?

Mr. McKELLAR. It refers only to social security, and I suppose they could do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In respect to the question of immigration, what measures were taken in conference for protection in that situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean what measures were taken to protect against the workers remaining in the country?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; what measures were taken concerning those who may be brought into this country? Was the bringing in of such labor limited to certain areas or to certain countries?

Mr. McKELLAR. The bringing in of such labor is limited to those countries with which the United States has agreements. The State Department last year or the previous year made an agreement with Mexico, and since then I think has made an agreement with the Bahama Islands. I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that agricultural laborers brought into the United States must be native-born persons of the country with which we have the contract or agreement. In other words, a person who is not a native-born Mexican cannot go to Mexico, and then come into the United States under this provision. He must be a native-born Mexican, or if brought in from Haiti, must be a native-born Haitian, or if he comes from the Bahama Islands he must be a native-born Bahamian. I think the committee has used all the care of which it is capable to make sure that there will be no loopholes with respect to the question of immigration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I observe on page 4 of the conference report, paragraph (g), this language:

In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America,

South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto—

Is that not the only reference made to the geographical regions from which laborers may be brought in?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The conferees thought that language covered the situation.

Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that I am familiar with the measure. I took no part in the hearings had before the subcommittee, but I learned a great deal about it in the conference committee, in which I took part. However, I wish to refer all Senators who have questions to ask to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is, to my mind, an expert on every question raised in this measure. I will say again that no Senator could have done better or more conscientious or more successful work on a piece of legislation than the Senator from Georgia has done in this instance. So I will ask any Senator who from now on wishes to know something about the measure, to direct his questions to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on the joint resolution. I did not sign the conference report because I still have a good many misgivings about this proposal. I can say at the outset that the measure which was passed by the Senate was much better than the one which was passed by the House, and I think the joint resolution which came out of conference is by far the best measure of the three. Certainly I join with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in the admiration and appreciation which I have for the work done by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Certainly he has labored hard, and has complete mastery of the subject.

However, there are in the joint resolution certain items which I think are open to very serious question. The first occurs on page 3 of the conference report, in section 4 (b), in which the statement is made that—

No part of the funds herein appropriated * * * shall be used directly or indirectly to * * * impose minimum * * * housing standards * * *, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country. * * *

That seems to me to be an extraordinary statement. It is a matter of common knowledge, well-known to practically every American citizen, that the housing standards in the countries of many of the migratory workers are extremely bad; and yet in a statute we propose to go on record as saying that none of the funds appropriated shall be used to improve those miserable housing standards unless the worker involved happens to be a foreign worker who is imported into the United States. That is something to which I can not subscribe.

Then, on page 4, in paragraph (g), appears one of the basic features of the conference report. It is in connection with the importation of workers into this country. All of us can agree that it is worth while to import foreign laborers into this country to do needed farm work. We can also agree, I think, that it would be much better to do without some of the products of agriculture than it would be to open a loophole whereby hostile saboteurs or hostile aliens could sneak into our country. We can agree to both those propositions. I am willing to concede, and do concede, that a conscientious effort was made in paragraph (g) to safeguard the admission of aliens; but that every precaution has been observed, as was stated here a moment ago, I think must be denied. A great deal has been made of the fact that the admission of aliens shall be confined to the admission of native-born residents of the foreign country concerned. I do not need to dwell on the fact that in a great many of the countries which are contemplated under the act no very elaborate or very accurate or very hard and fast system is established for the registration of births, and that we would scarcely be willing to rest our whole policy on the birth records which exist in many of those countries.

Let me read the paragraph:

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace.

I think all Senators will agree that the last phrase I just read substantiates what I said about the great difficulty of obtaining any dependable proof that persons coming in under this act are or are not native-born residents of the country concerned.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Would not that particular paragraph practically set aside the provisions of the quota law, if the persons concerned were native-born residents of a country whose quota had been filled, and if they made application to come into the United States?

Mr. LODGE. The purpose is to avoid, let us say, having hostile aliens go into the countries in question and then come into the United States. The requirement that the persons coming into the United States must be native-born residents of the country from which they desire to come is made for the purpose of avoiding the very danger of which the Senator from Pennsylvania speaks.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see in the conference report anything which would prevent anyone who last week became a resident of one of the countries concerned from coming into the United States. The paragraph simply waives the payment of a head tax, as required by the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. It would not prevent those who become residents of one of those countries last week from coming into the United States, if they pay the head tax. The paragraph does not prohibit them from coming in at all, as I see it.

Mr. LODGE. That is true. It lifts certain restrictions with regard to entry into the United States of native-born residents of those countries.

Mr. AIKEN. And it gives those persons certain advantages over those who have recently become residents.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has stated that the purpose is to keep out alien enemies and saboteurs. I am also in favor at this time of keeping out another class—refugees from Europe. We may as well be frank about that.

The language used in the conference report provides that anyone who begins residence in one of the countries referred to may come into this country. The word "native" is not used. It has been my hope that when the measure went to conference that subject would be taken care of. Does the Senator think the present language meets that situation?

Mr. LODGE. I think there was a sincere desire to meet it, but I question whether the language used does meet it.

There were three further steps which could have been taken to improve this language so that it would mean exactly what I think all Senators want it to mean. In the first place, provision is made that the regulations are to be prescribed with the approval of the Attorney General. I think that provision could have been amended so as also to include the approval of the Secretary of War and of the Secretary of the Navy, who, under our system, have a prime responsibility for preventing sabotage and for directing antisabotage. If they were given a hand in drafting the regulations and in the administration of the act, we would have an added assurance that the act would not be used as a means for the entrance of saboteurs. That, however, was not done.

Another improvement which I think could have been incorporated would have been to set a definite numerical limitation on the number of persons who may be admitted under the terms of the proposed act. We could have set the limitation at whatever figure is needed to harvest the crop; but that was not done.

A third step which I think would have been desirable would have been to require that a report to Congress be made of all admissions under the authority of this language but that was not done. As I say, I think the measure reported by the conference is a great improvement over its predecessors; but, as I have tried to indicate to the Senate, it leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the Senator give us any statistical information as to the number of residents of other countries who are now in countries bordering the United States?

Mr. LODGE. No; we did not go into that subject.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand, it has been estimated that about 250,000 of them are in Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and the South American countries.

Mr. LODGE. We did not go into that question.

Mr. DAVIS Under the terms of the proposed act, they could make application to enter the United States.

Mr. LODGE. A great deal depends on how the law is administered. I wish to be fair about it. Much is left to the discretion of the officials who are to enforce the law. The intent of those who drafted the language was to confine admissions entirely to bona fide farm workers and to prevent, so far as possible, the entrance of hostile alien saboteurs. I think a few more precautions could have been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 4 (a) of the joint resolution requires the consent in writing of the county extension agent before farm labor may be moved from one county to another. Did the conferees feel that that question came within their province and was consideration given to it?

Mr. LODGE. I believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] can answer that question better than I can. My impression of the joint resolution is that it will not be of great help to agriculture so far as moving farmers from one part of the United States to another is concerned. That is my general impression, but I shall be glad to have the Senator from Georgia answer that question, and make any additional observations he may care to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the fair statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts regarding the joint resolution. I certainly agree with him that the conference report is infinitely preferable to the House measure or the measure as passed by the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts, as a member of the conference committee, will recall that the section requiring the approval of the county agent was subject to very bitter controversy within the conference. It was discussed at considerable length. The Senate language had modified the House measure to a very definite extent. The original House measure required the approval of the county agent before any laborer could be taken from one county to another with the funds provided in the joint resolution. It not only provided for approval by the county agent before any funds could be employed to pay the transportation of any laborer from one county to another, but also required that the commissioner of agriculture of any State, or the equivalent officer of such State, file a written approval before any laborer could be moved beyond the confines of the State where he was located. The Senate committee struck out the latter provision, requiring the approval of the Commissioner of Agriculture. It also modified the language requiring the approval of the county agent by limiting it to workers who had resided in the county for a period of 1 year or more, and who had continuously for that year been engaged in agricultural employment.

The Senate committee further provided for the right of appeal from any decision of the county agent to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution.

In the conference the House conferees, without exception, and without regard to party affiliation, were adamant in their insistence on the provisions of the House text, and the provision of the conference report represents a compromise, as is usually the case when there is a wide divergence of opinion between the conferees on the part of the two bodies.

In the opinion of the Senate conferees, the Senate language, which excluded laborers who had not been continuously employed for more than 1 year in agricultural pursuits within the county, would eliminate all the migratory labor which has heretofore formerly been engaged in movements from crop to crop as they mature throughout the country. The Senator from Vermont knows that approximately half a million persons engaged in seasonal agricultural labor have constantly moved from State to State and from county to county.

There is nothing in the provisions of the joint resolution which would prohibit the use of the funds provided to pay the transportation of those who have heretofore been migratory laborers. It would, however, give the county agents the right of approval or disapproval of the removal of a farm laborer who had been continuously engaged in agricultural pursuits within a specific county for a period of more than 1 year.

I realize that there are a great many objections to that provision; and as a member of the Senate conferees I supported the Senate provision, allowing an appeal by any party who was affected or interested; but there is something to be said in support of the position of the House. Some of the House conferees have had some very unhappy experiences in their districts in the pirating of farm labor, as they call it. It seems that those who had engaged in recruiting the labor had, by offering unusually attractive wages, seduced from their employment those who were under contract for a year or more, or those who were engaged as tenant farmers, and had caused considerable disruption of the farming activities within the counties where the labor was located.

The conference report is a compromise. It is not absolutely pleasing to the Senate conferees. The House conferees, of course, insisted on all of the House language. I do not think the measure as reported by the conferees would impede the movement, with the funds provided in the joint resolution, of any of those who have heretofore been migrants and have been engaged in traveling from place to place to gather crops or do other agricultural work.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator for an interpretation at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand what the Senator says about the meaning of section 4, the phrase "if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto" refers to a continuous year.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my construction of that language that this provision would affect only those who had not been residents of the county and continuously engaged in agricultural employment for a period of more than 12 months prior to the time the recruitment takes place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator; and I hope we may rely upon that interpretation as being authentic.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator will recall the discussions which were had with respect to those who might be brought into this country under the terms of the joint resolution. With respect to subsection (g) of section 5, on page 4, will the able Senator from Georgia advise us whether or not in his opinion only native-born persons could be brought in under the terms of the joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is perfectly clear to me that under the provisions of the joint resolution only native-born residents of American countries may be brought in. I could not clearly understand the Senator from West Virginia, but I was rather surprised to hear him express a contrary view in his questioning of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The language of subsection (g), in the second line, is as follows: "of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto."

Wherever, in other provisions of this section, there is reference to such residents, it certainly all relates back to the original description of native-born residents. There is no question to my mind that the joint resolution relates only to native-born citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, that was the understanding, I believe, of every member of the conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It no doubt was the intent, but does the language of the joint resolution as agreed to in conference accomplish the purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I think so, unquestionably; all the conferees thought so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Paragraph (g) reads as follows:

> In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has never been the custom since I have been in the Senate after describing a certain class of individuals to continue to spell out the entire description throughout the language of a measure. It would make the legislation rather cumbersome to say in 8 or 10 places in a short subsection:

> Any such native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto.

It would certainly be reiteration to the very highest degree. As I understand the rule, unless exception be specifically made the definition first made prevails throughout the entire paragraph, and throughout the entire legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is especially so in this case because the law as it now stands prohibits other nationals from coming in.

Mr. RUSSELL. For that reason, the words "such resident" whenever they are employed were used to refer back to "residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then it is quite certain that the intent of the joint resolution is that it shall apply only to native-born residents.

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the congressional intent is concerned, that was certainly the intent of the conferees and of the House. It was so stated during the debate on the floor of the House. I had occasion to read the RECORD this morning. It was also the intention of the Senate conferees. I do not believe the language permits of any other construction, but the congressional intent is clearly to confine admission to those who are native-born residents of the Americas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to again return to section 4 (a). Will not the practical effect of this section be to freeze farm labor where it now is with the exception of the migratory or floating labor? As there is now no farm-labor surplus in any county, I cannot conceive of a county agent giving his written consent to the removal of any laborer from his county to another county, say 50 miles away, even though the county 50 miles away might be in desperate need of labor for harvesting. So, will not the effect of this section be to freeze farm labor, and particularly the lower paid farm labor, where it now is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that a difference in the degree of pay received by the laborer would make any difference. As I understand, the limitation relates to the use of the funds appropriated. It does not attempt to hold any person in a county. Some of the House conferees contended that any person could walk across the county line 2 feet into another county, and the county agent of the county where he had been residing would have no jurisdiction over him, and would not be required to certify that he could be spared from that county before he could be moved.

I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Vermont, and say that it was undoubtedly the intention of the House conferees, all of whom said they had no surplus labor in their districts, to retain permanently their own farm labor to the extent required in their respective counties. That was undoubtedly the intention.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has said there is nothing in the measure which would prevent a laborer from walking across the county line into another county where there existed a greater demand for labor at higher prices. That is the trouble. He would have to walk, because the only labor available to move is the labor which does not have the price to pay for carfare or any other method of transportation to the county where labor is more sorely needed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may answer the Senator from actual experience; take my own county of Shelby, Tenn., which is near the junction of two or three States. During certain periods such as strawberry picking time, and cotton-picking time, thousands of laborers have for many years gone to Mississippi and Arkansas, and other portions of Tennessee to help gather crops, and will continue to do so after this law is enacted.

Mr. AIKEN. In those instances is not their transportation paid by the man who hires them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before propounding my question, I may say that the more I read section 4 (a) the more remarkable the legislation appears to me to be. That is particularly true since I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Vermont, when he said that an agricultural worker in a county may cross the county line and thereby escape the provision written into section 4 by the House for the purpose of preventing a worker leaving the county.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had started to say that the House objected to striking out that portion of the language relating to approval by the State commissioner of agriculture on the ground that the laborer or any other person might walk out of the county and thereby remove himself from jurisdiction. I did not make the statement as an argument for or against the proposed legislation. I was undertaking to explain some of the difficulties we encountered in the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood what the Senator was stating, but am I correct in understanding that the prohibition contained in the provision against the transportation of workers outside a county without the written consent of the county agent may be avoided by a worker by the simple expedient of stepping across the county line? If so, my objections to the provision have been largely eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt very seriously whether it would have that effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the construction to be placed upon it then the House is certainly not getting what it thought it was getting.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the worker crosses the county line the employment in the county he leaves ceases, and jurisdiction will be transferred from the county of residence to the county where he is working. So if he should cross the county line and engage in agricultural employment across the county line, I think he would relieve himself of the necessity of obtaining approval of the agent of the county wherein he had resided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator is mistaken in the new opinion which he has stated with respect to this matter. May I read the section to which I have reference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to have the Senator read it. I have read it several times, but I always enjoy hearing the Senator from Wyoming read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Georgia has read the section 150 times, if not more, because I know he had a great deal to do with drafting it.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I will state to the Senator from Wyoming that I had nothing to do with its drafting. It came to us from the House; it is wholly the idea of the House and a part of the House joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When I said that I thought the Senator from Georgia had something to do with drafting it, I had in mind that the Senate committee rewrote the House language. The provision is very different from that which originally came to us from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the main, section 4 is a part of the language originally contained in the House joint resolution, with a modifying provision in the last three lines of the section.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As it comes to us from the conference it provides as follows:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working—

That means clearly that he may or may not be a resident of the county. I will repeat:

No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county—

That means the county where he resides, or the county where he is working—

without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county—

That is either county, and therefore either extension agent—

if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

The question I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia is this: If an agricultural worker is working in a county in which he has not resided for 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has not been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation for that year, does the prohibition of the law apply?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the intent that the prohibition of the law shall not apply in such case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is right. So it is clear, then, that if the worker crosses the county line into a county in which he has not been a resident for a year, the funds may be used to transport him? I think there can be no doubt about that, and it pleases me very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am inclined to agree with the construction of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the law will be so administered, because, as the measure was originally drafted, the intent clearly was to prevent workers moving from one county to another or outside a State without the consent in writing of the county agent, but there is now nothing in the joint resolution which prescribes the standard that shall guide a county agent. He may refuse his consent for any reason satisfactory to him. That means, Mr. President, that the Congress, in the circumstances, would have been delegating to a county agent the discretion to determine how the funds of the United States should be expended for the purpose of providing agricultural labor.

In the Senate committee we were much concerned about this matter, lest the county agents should have the right to obstruct the transportation of workers that we wrote in a provision for an appeal. The Senator from Georgia, when the joint resolution was before the Senate for consideration, pointed, with a good deal of satisfaction, and justly so, to that provision. I want the Senate to know that it has been stricken from the joint resolution. It is as follows:

Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized in another place of employment.

The purpose of that provision was to give the Administrator power to overrule an unjust and indiscriminate action of a county agent in preventing the transportation of workers who were available for transportation; but the conferees have stricken out that proviso and the Senate conferees have agreed to its elimination.

I was very much disturbed by it, but in view of the interpretation of the remaining language upon which the Senator from Georgia and I now agree, that a worker by crossing the county line may escape the prohibition of the county agent and may then be transported to work, of course I have no objection to the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, first, to the Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire whether there is any provision for having the imported laborers returned to their homes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there is such a provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there any requirement to that effect?

Mr. RUSSELL. I consider it to be a requirement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Where is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will observe the language of the latter part of subsection (g) of section 5, as follows:

Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

The joint resolution, by its express terms, expires on the 30th day of December, unless there be a continuing resolution, and it is my construction that the imported laborers will be subject to deportation at any time after the 30th day of December 1943, unless the Congress shall extend the legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator think that under the language just quoted the agricultural laborers could be deported and required to leave the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is certainly the intention of the Senate conferees that when the imported laborers shall have performed the tasks for which they were imported they shall forthwith and immediately be returned to the country of their origin. If they do not return voluntarily under the terms of the joint resolution, with transportation paid for them as is provided herein, it would then be the duty of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to pick these people up and deport them, as they would any other aliens who were in this country illegally.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I promised to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to make the observation that I have some doubt that the interpretation placed on section 4 (a) by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and concurred in by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is a correct interpretation. The limitation upon the expenditure of the Federal funds relates to a certain class of agricultural workers—namely, those who have been continuously engaged in agricultural work in a county for a period of 1 year or more. That is the classification to which the limitation and the expenditure of the Federal funds applies. So that, whenever an agent of the Government who has the authority to employ these funds for the transportation of any worker undertakes to do so he is required, as I interpret the provision, to inquire whether the individual has been engaged in agricultural work, and, if so, in what county; and if he finds he has been engaged in a certain county for a year immediately preceding the time when he undertakes to transfer him to engage in agricultural work in that county, then he must go to the county agent before he can use Federal funds to transport the worker. He must go to the county agent where the agricultural worker has resided. Of course, it would be a mere subterfuge for the agricultural worker to step beyond the bounds of a county and say, "I am free from the limitation that Congress has placed upon my transportation to other fields of agricultural work; I have freed myself, and I have a right to demand that the funds of the Federal Government be employed to transport me, because I have kept from without the jurisdiction of the county agent, who is clothed with jurisdiction under the provisions of this section; I have stepped outside the county some 2 or 3 feet, and here I am, Mr. Uncle Sam, transport me from Georgia to North Dakota."

Mr. President, clearly it is the intention of this provision that the limitation shall apply to a classification, and that classification is workers who have been continuously engaged in agricultural work in any county for a period of a year, and they are subject to the jurisdiction of such county agent so far as the administration of these funds is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me that I may make a comment on what has just been said by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that what the Senator from Louisiana has just said was the intention of those who originally drafted this provision in

the House, but it is clear that they did not state that intention in this language, because we have the distributive word "or" there, in undertaking to clothe the county agent with the discretion to refuse the right to transportation. Let me call the attention to the Senate again to this language:

> No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working.

That means clearly from the county where he resides or from the county where he is working. There can be no other interpretation of it. I am emphasizing this because I want it clear that the purpose which the drafters of the House provision had in mind is not being carried out in the language now before the Senate, and I am happy it is not being carried out, for I think it would be outrageous to appropriate millions of dollars and then say that a county agent in some county may, by his mere wish, prevent the farmers of this country from obtaining the workers they need and should have, and whom the Congress of the United States is trying to make provision they should have.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. To start with, there is no intention on the part of Congress, in adopting the conference report, to prohibit any farm laborer from going anywhere in the United States where he desires to work. He can pay his own way, he can go voluntarily, and anyone in the United States who desires the services of such a farm laborer may pay his transportation. No effort is made to create a condition of involuntary servitude, but it is provided merely that the funds of the Federal Government may not be used to transport such a worker unless a certain condition has been complied with, and the condition, which the able Senator from Wyoming did not read, is that "if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period." That is a controlling condition in this particular provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may have the indulgence of the Senator from Georgia for another moment, let me say that I did read that clause. I am very glad the Senator has called attention to it, because it is that clause, in connection with the distributive word in the first part of the paragraph, which makes it clear that the county agent of the county in which the worker is working has no authority to prohibit his leaving if he has not worked in that county for a year.

Mr. President, I merely desire to emphasize, for the benefit of those who are to administer the law, that the barrier which was sought to be erected between the farmers of the United States and necessary workers in other parts of the United States has not been erected. Statutes must be interpreted, not by what the draftsman intended, but by what the draftsman said, particularly when in a situation such as the present it is clearly pointed out on the floor of the Senate what the language means.

If this language meant anything else, I should say that the report should be rejected, I should say that the joint resolution should be vetoed if passed, because to my way of thinking it is perfectly outrageous to convey to a county agent the unregulated and unrestrained authority to prevent workers who need transportation and who need jobs from obtaining transportation in order to get the jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. After hearing the discussion, I must say that I am somewhat confused. I thought the purpose of section 4 (a) was to give the county authority the right to retain in the county agricultural workers. Am I wrong in that, I ask the Senator from Georgia or the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no doubt, if I may answer the Senator from Louisiana, that those who drafted the measure in the House had that objective clearly in mind, and that is why some of us in the Senate called it the peonage amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the proposed law could be so easily thwarted, that is, by one crossing the county line, I do not see why we should adopt that provision at all. It should be stricken out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me now?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The discussion of section 4 (a) has been very interesting, but let us return to the subject of having the laborers who are brought into the United States taken back to their countries of origin.

I believe the Senator from Georgia has expressed the view that the language contained in the last paragraph of the bill meets that situation. I wish to call attention to that language. It reads:

> Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions, who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission—

And so forth. Who fixes the terms of his admission? Who creates the status for which he was admitted? Provision is to be found in the same paragraph, as follows:

> shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General.

In other words, the proposed law does not fix the terms under which such a person shall enter; it does not say when he must leave: the law says that the Commissioner of Immigration may fix the terms and may create his status in this country.

What is to prevent the Commissioner of Immigration from admitting such a foreigner on such terms that he may stay here as long as he pleases? What I am afraid of is that if such people may come here while needed, and the Commissioner of Immigration permits them to stay longer without any limitation upon their time, when the war is over they will not leave. What work will such a man go into, or what employment will he seek? I am thinking about our own men who are out of the country at this time, and who will return.

I submit that under the proposed law the Commissioner of Immigration would be given the power to fix the time such person could stay in this country, that the Commissioner of Immigration is to fix his status, and that he must comply only with such terms as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Immigration. That is the way I read the language, and if I am wrong, I should be very glad to be set right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I certainly hope the Senator is in error in his construction. Certainly the person who drafted the provision had no such intent. If I understand the language, there are a number of very definite limitations. In the first place, it refers to those "desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States during continuation of hostilities in the present war." Not only would such immigrants be confined to agricultural labor, but they would be very definitely confined to the period of hostilities of the present war.

That is a specific limitation. Upon the conclusion of the war each and every one of these persons will be subject to immediate deportation. We cannot write legislation which will guarantee that whoever may be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will do his duty, but certainly I think we have the right to assume that every public official will attempt to carry out the will of the Congress, and to enforce the laws passed by Congress relating to immigration.

There is another limitation. The Senator from West Virginia has stated that there is no assurance that these persons will not transfer from agricultural labor to other employment. I was impressed when the Senator raised that question when the bill was before the Senate previously. Certainly it is clear from three or four phrases in subsection (g) of section 5, that the moment one of these aliens leaves agricultural employment he shall be immediately deported to the country of his origin. There can be no question about that, because it says the alien shall be imported only to perform agricultural labor. Further on in the subsection it is provided that any alien who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted shall be deported. What is the status? For agricultural labor within the United States? If he fails to maintain his status of an agricultural laborer the clear mandate of this subsection, in which the Congress speaks to the Commissioner, is that the Commissioner shall deport him forthwith, and the rules and regulations which the Commissioner might make certainly cannot supersede the clearly expressed will of Congress in that matter. If persons brought into this country cease to perform agricultural labor, if they fail to

comply with the terms of their admission, if they stay here after the cessation of hostilities, they are immediately to be deported.

Not only that, Mr. President, but these persons are brought into the United States under a contract or agreement which has been entered into with the Government of Mexico, let us say, or with the Government of the Bahama Islands. The contract or agreement specifically provides that they are to perform agricultural labor, and agricultural labor only, and that they are to be deported from this country at such time as the proper agency of the Government determines that they should leave the country. I do not think Congress can afford to say that these persons shall stay in the United States for not more than 3 months, or 6 months. We do in fact say that they shall stay only during the present war; that when hostilities cease they shall be deported. We say that they must engage in agricultural labor, and if they change to any other form of labor they shall be deported.

Perhaps the section is not as clear as it might be, but to my mind it is sufficiently clear. I want Senators to bear in mind that in discussing the question of foreign labor we are discussing one of the smallest phases of this entire matter. I doubt very seriously if in any event more than 25,000 to 30,000 foreigners will come into this country under the terms of this measure. In years past, before the recent change of government in Mexico, it was not at all uncommon in any one season for tens of thousands of Mexicans to come across the border and to engage in agricultural employment. Such legislation as that proposed would not be necessary under the old order. Before the present administration of the Government of Mexico was established, tens of thousands of Mexican laborers were brought across the border and engaged in agricultural labor in this country. No question with respect to such laborers was raised under that old procedure. Now it is necessary to enter into a contract with respect to foreign labor. Now it is necessary to have the consent of the Mexican Government. Now it is necessary to have funds provided with which to pay for the transportation of this labor, and to pay for its recruitment.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we are not going to have a great flood of foreign labor under the provisions of this measure. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, the farmers in the Southwest will not receive as many foreign laborers as they were accustomed to receive under the old order, when not one dime was paid for the transportation or recruitment of the labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may state further that these persons are to be admitted under an agreement with the Government of Mexico, and if they violate the terms of that agreement, or if they fail to maintain the status for which they are admitted, or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of their admission, they shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General. A direction to the Attorney General is provided to issue a warrant against such persons, and to deport them.

INCREASE IN OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY INDIVIDUALS DURING THE WAR

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during this time of serious war crisis many perplexing domestic problems confront the Nation. We have the wage problem, and wages have been increased in many lines of industry to enable wage earners to cope with the increased cost of living. We have the farm problem, and prices on some farm commodities have been advanced to enable farmers and ranchers to cope with their increased cost of production. We have the Government-employee problem, and legislation has recently been enacted increasing salaries and wages of Government employees to enable them to cope with the increased cost of living. These actions on the part of Congress and other departments of our Government bear indisputable evidence that the cost of living has materially increased.

Let us consider another class of people in the Nation who are vitally affected by the increased cost of living. I refer to the class of people which our Nation has, by constitutional amendments, statutes, and popular opinion, declared to be entitled to old-age assistance. I do not intend to go into the whole subject of old-age pensions, because that philosophy of handling public welfare has been fully discussed and finally adopted by this Nation. I am going to discuss altering payments under the plan to enable old-age pension recipients to meet the general increase in the cost of living due to the war. These old-age pension recipients, due to the increased cost of living on account of the war, find themselves adversely affected to a dangerous degree by three factors:

First. Many of these old folks have sons, daughters, or other relatives who were contributing to their support who are now serving in the military forces of our Nation and who because of their low pay are unable to make much, if any, contribution to their support. Of perhaps greater importance, their absence also deprives these old folks of the tender touch of a loving hand; therefore all nursing and personal care must be by nonrelatives who in most cases expect pay for their services, thus adding to the cost of living.

Second. The cost of food, clothing, shelter, and medicine has increased to these old folks to the same degree, or more, than it has increased to those who have had their salaries and wages increased. It must also be born in mind that the diet of these old folks in most cases was reduced long ago to the plainest and cheapest food items. Therefore, they cannot reduce the cost of living by cutting out choice and fancy foods, because their income has not been sufficient to permit them to enjoy those luxuries. The only way these old folks can reduce their cost of food is to eat less of the least-expensive foods, and it will be very difficult for them to do that and properly sustain their body and strength.

Third. In many States, if not all of them, the revenue for paying pensions has been greatly decreased by gasoline rationing and other causes incident to the war, and the decrease in State revenue for this purpose has resulted in a reduction in old-age pensions of just twice that amount because of the Federal money-matching plan now being used.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the old folks of the Nation face an immediate dire emergency. In many instances they are suffering untold hardships due to the lack of the bare necessities of life. Their problem needs immediate consideration by Congress. The States are helpless to remedy the situation because their revenues in many cases have shrunk, and few States feel they could impose further State taxes on their citizens in addition to the burdensome Federal taxes which have been so greatly increased during this war. I believe it is also quite generally recognized that our war effort is a national task and not a State task. The present alarming situation, which is adversely affecting the welfare of our aged citizens, has been brought on almost entirely by the war; therefore, it should be dealt with as a national problem and solved by our Federal Government.

I am fully aware of the fact that it will require more money to solve this pressing problem. I am fully aware of the staggering tax burden now being carried by our people. I am equally alarmed about our enormous and rapidly-increasing national debt. I realize that if we are to remain solvent as a Nation we must reverse our present course and must inaugurate a program of reducing our national debt. That reversed course can only be accomplished by having our Government adopt a policy of spending less than it receives. In the case of normal domestic activities, I am ready and willing to adopt that new policy right now, provided it is applied on the whole domestic front, not piecemeal to only a few of our Federal departments and activities. Until the Congress is ready to launch a general campaign to reduce expenditures for domestic purposes equally and proportionately in every field of endeavor, I shall insist that our old folks and other needy classes of our people be treated more in line with the treatment accorded the favored classes.

Certainly, the proper way to start economizing is not by denying food, clothing, medicine, shelter, and care to our old folks, many of whom are right at the particular time in their lives when they need such necessities more than ever before. It is sad, indeed, and very unfortunate that they have reached the declining years of their lives, and are approaching the sunset in so helpless a condition; and nobody realizes how unhappy that condition is more than do the old folks themselves. But we are learning from this terrible war, in which the life of our Nation is at stake, that there is something more important than

money. Money is necessary, of course, but money alone will not win this war. Men are required in order to win this war—big men, strong men, patriotic and self-sacrificing men, men who can and will face the enemy on the seven seas, on every continent, and in the air, and fight him and subdue him. The noble pioneers for whom I am today seeking justice, produced many of the brave, strong, patriotic, self-sacrificing men who are fighting our war. Many of our fighting men are sons and grandsons of those noble pioneers. Yes, it is true they made and saved little money, but they produced brave fighting men, who today are of more value to America than is money. Can we lightly brush aside their meager requests, and permit them to suffer during their declining years?

They have skimped and denied themselves many things they really needed, and have waited patiently, while almost every other class of our people has been cared for. But now necessity has forced them to ask for an adjustment in order that they may live on the basis of decency and respectability that the people of our great Nation intended they should enjoy.

Mr. President, partially to solve this pressing and important problem, I propose that throughout this Nation for the duration of the war we freeze old-age pensions at the top monthly figure for each individual during the past 12 months, plus 25 percent. I propose that monthly pensions be calculated on that basis, and paid on that basis. I propose that the funds for paying the pensions be provided by having each State contribute the maximum revenue currently collected or otherwise provided for that purpose under present State laws, and by having the Federal Government contribute the balance. I realize, Mr. President, that this proposal does not settle the old-age-pension problem permanently, but it is intended to give some immediate relief to these old folks during this dire emergency. In the meantime I trust the whole problem of old-age pensions will be given full consideration by this Congress at the earliest possible date.

Mr. President, I have, earlier today, introduced a bill intended to accomplish what I have proposed, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1005) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of providing a 25 percent increase in the rate of old-age assistance paid to aged needy individuals during the present war, introduced today by Mr. O'DANIEL, and referred to the Committee on Finance, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of section 3 the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the amounts paid under the foregoing provisions, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1943, and ending with the second quarter following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, an amount equal to 25 percent of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $50: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made under this subsection to any State for any quarter unless (1) the amount expended for old-age assistance in such State for such quarter from funds appropriated or made available by such State and its political subdivisions is at least equal to the greatest amount so expended in such State from such funds for any quarter during the year 1942, and (2) the average amount, for such quarter, of old-age assistance paid to individuals who receive such assistance in such State is at least 25 percent greater than the average amount for any quarter during the year 1942. Amounts payable under this subsection shall be computed and paid in the manner prescribed by subsection (b), insofar as such subsection (b) is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask to what committee the bill will be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). To the Committee on Finance.

THE WAR IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, repeated warnings by Gen. Douglas MacArthur as to the gravity of the situation confronting the Allied forces in Australia, and of the importance of the Pacific war to the people of the United States have moved me to address the Senate today. I speak as a strong supporter of the armed services of the country. Upon no occasion since I came to the Senate have I failed to support adequate preparedness and vigorous conduct of the war by our Government.

Since 1939 it has been apparent to most of us that the United States was vulnerable to attack on the Pacific side. It was generally known by those in the Government that Alaska had an area greater than that of all the original Thirteen Colonies combined, and, in addition, one could include also the areas of Maine, Vermont, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Michigan, and still be very short of expressing Alaska's tremendous size. Alaska has 590,884 square miles and 378,000,000 acres. The population at about the time of our entrance into the war was approximately 75,000 people.

A glance at the map would have convinced anyone that Alaska was a tremendous territory, guarded before the war by two companies of American infantry soldiers at Chilkoot Pass barracks, with virtually no airfields or defensive installations. When the war broke out in 1939, it was apparent to many of us—that is, to those of us who realized that the world was one and that we were a part of it—that sooner or later we could not escape involvement in what seemed to be a world conflict. There were some of us who thought we saw danger lurking in the Pacific, and who urged that plans be made hurriedly to strengthen the defenses of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands.

The Aleutian Islands are absolutely barren except for muskeg and tundra and rock. They are the most direct route for an attack against Japan or for an attack by Japan against the United States. It could be seen by a glance at the map that, by way of the Aleutians, the route from Japan to the mainland of the United States was nearly 1,400 miles shorter than the route between Japan and the United States by way of Pearl Harbor. So it was obvious that we were forcing a dangerous enemy to come along a route 1,400 miles shorter, inviting attack against this country by way of an undefended route.

After much discussion, in August of last year a special committee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was appointed to make an inspection of the Army bases in western Canada, on the Alaska mainland, and in the Aleutian Islands. I had the honor to be chairman of the special committee. We flew between 8,000 and 10,000 miles—from Spokane to Edmonton, then to Dawson Creek, Watson Lake, and Whitehorse, Canada, over the course of the Alcan Highway, into Big Delta and Fairbanks, Alaska, on to Nome, and out to the Bering Strait, on the ferry route course to Russia and the Far East. From Nome we proceeded to Anchorage, the headquarters of General Buckner, head of the Alaskan command, and then out through Naknek, Cold Bay, and Dutch Harbor, the scene of the Japanese attack of June 3 and 4, 1942, and then to the island of Umnak, our farthest outpost at that time.

During the last few days persistent reports have come that, despite our continued bombing raids from our present island outposts in the Andreanofs, the Japanese have materially strengthened their positions on the islands of Kiska and Attu; and we have definite information that they are actually building adequate air fields at those two important points, from which the Alaskan mainland and our Pacific coast ports can be bombed and our shipping further restricted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. How long ago did the Senator's committee visit Alaska?

Mr. CHANDLER. The committee visited Alaska in August of last year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator and his committee, when they returned from their trip, submit a report to the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate?

Mr. CHANDLER. We did, and I have a copy of the report in my hand. It was submitted in secret to the Committee on Military Affairs, to the joint Chiefs of Staff, and to the President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Since the Senator's committee submitted its report in August of last year, 8 months ago, to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, to

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to the President, what action has been taken upon the recommendations of the committee?

Mr. CHANDLER. In answer to the Senator I should like to read from the report, which was dated September 1, 1942. Then if the Senator will give me a little additional time, as I go along I shall comment on what I think were the results accomplished because of that inspection. The committee said, on September 1, to the Military Affairs Committee, to the President, and to the Joint Chief of Staff, that—

> The Japs are rapidly fortifying the Island of Kiska. The planes we have on the ground are reported to be slower and less maneuverable than the Jap Zeros.

We obtained that information from the boys who were flying the planes, and I take it no challenge of that statement will be made.

The committee further said:

> The longer we delay offensive action against them the more expensive it is going to be in men and material to dislodge them. There is no question in our judgment of the extreme importance of the Alaskan Territory and Siberia as strategic points to any offensive against Japan, and likewise for Japan to use against us. It is, in the opinion of the committee, very bad, but can be remedied very quickly and effectively by the addition of troops, planes, and equipment. Certain minimum additions are suggested.

I may say to the Senator that in addition, there is contained in the report an inventory of every man, every gun, and every installation we found in Alaska and in the Aleutians on our inspection tour.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask the Senator, without desiring to disclose any military secrets, if any action has been forthcoming as a result of the recommendations of his committee and its revelation of the seriousness of the situation and needs.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think I should say, in fairness to the Army, and certainly in fairness to the President of the United States, who seems to be deeply concerned over the situation as we pictured it, that almost immediately reinforcements in men, materials, and equipment were sent. However, the committee has felt that just what we predicted 8 months ago might happen has almost happened. We have told ourselves many times that certain things would not happen and could not happen, and then we have waited until an opportunity presented itself for our enemy to bring about the things which we said could not happen. It was said that the Japs could not make airfields there. Airfields are there.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask the Senator, if the recommendations which he had made had been carried out would they not have entailed the sending of sufficient reinforcements to prevent the building of airfields?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the recommendations of the committee had been followed, we would have blasted the Japs from American territory at Kiska, and they would not now be there. We feared that a loss of time and a failure would result in greater cost to the United States in men and materials and would permit the Japs to have an opportunity to do just what they have done; that is, dig in and improve their position on those islands.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator says, in fairness to all concerned, that reinforcements were sent to Alaska. In spite of the reinforcements which have been sent, certain developments to which we have referred have occurred. Is it true that wholly inadequate reinforcements went to Alaska?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly they were inadequate to drive the Japs out of our territory. There is no question about that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Was not that the only reason for sending reinforcements there? It was not merely to mark time. It was to drive the Japs out of Alaska.

Mr. CHANDLER. The committee said that so long as the Japs remained at Kiska they were a definite threat and menace to the people of the United States, especially Alaska and the western coast. We recommended and urged that the Japs be driven out at the earliest possible moment. Eight months have elapsed, and the Japs are still there.

The committee formed the opinion, which was concurred in by high military officials in the area, that if the Japanese had attacked Dutch Harbor in force on June 3 and 4 last year, they would have taken that important port. Of course, that would have been a serious tragedy to the people of the United States. Our shipping to Nome, which flows through the Unimak Pass, would have been cut off. We would not have been able to supply the port of Nome except by our ferry route. If this outpost had fallen, it would have opened Alaska and the Pacific mainland to repeated Japanese bombing raids. A submarine base would have been established, which could have harassed and menaced all our shipping in the north Pacific, and which might have resulted in cutting off our supply lines to Hawaii.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In the Senator's judgment, after a study of the Alaskan situation, does he believe that the holding of Alaska and the maintenance of posts in Alaska by this country are essential not only to the defense of Alaska and Canada, but also to the western section of the United States?

Mr. CHANDLER. A failure adequately to recognize the importance of Alaska in the world scheme of things is, in my judgment, one of the most nearly fatal things of which the people of the United States could be guilty. In my judgment such a failure could not be remedied if it were grave enough.

Mr. BRIDGES. If it is true that airfields are now being constructed by the Japs in the islands to which the Senator refers, and progress is being made there, would it appear that we had accomplished anything, or are standing still, or are we losing ground in that section of the Pacific?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think we have lost ground. I have undertaken to compare the attempt of the Japanese to go up the Aleutians to the situation in Malaya, when the Japs went down through the jungles and down the Malayan Peninsula. Many persons have said that they could not go up the Aleutians and attack Alaska and the continent of the United States. My friend from New Hampshire knows that many persons said that they could not cut their way through the jungles and down the Malayan Peninsula, but they did. They attacked one of the most powerful fortresses in the world, that of Singapore, and reduced it in a very short time.

Since the committee was there in August, we have moved out from our farthest advance post, which was then generally known to be at Umnak. We have moved out into the Andreanofs. I have an idea that we are within 40 or 50 miles of the Japanese installations at Kiska. So I am not in a position to say that we have not made some progress toward strengthening and garrisoning the stepping-stone islands between Dutch Harbor and Kiska; but apparently we have not been able to mount and organize a successful offensive against the Japanese positions at Kiska.

Mr. BRIDGES. How can the Senator say that we have made progress?

Mr. CHANDLER. We have moved out from island to island in the direction of the Japanese mainland. We have not actually retreated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think that our status there is as good today as it was, inasmuch as the reports which are coming through indicate that the Japs are building airfields in the islands to which the Senator refers?

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have an answer to my question.

Mr. WALLGREN. I think I can answer the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe I can, too, but I will let my friend answer it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. WALLGREN. The Japanese have been on Kiska since about June 14 last. Kiska does not lend itself to the building of air bases. We understand that the Japs are now trying to build air bases on Attu and Agattu, two islands which are approximately 300 miles to the west.

The building of bases at Attu or Agattu would not mean anything to us, because they would still be too far away from Dutch Harbor and Kodiak. If they could, however, take one of our land bases in the Andreanofs, they might cause us some trouble. In the past 8 months, we have moved out in the Andreanofs close enough to the Japanese at Kiska to afford a cover for our heavy bombers.

From the present base we can bomb them every hour. The Japanese have dug in very cleverly. They have protected themselves against the type of bomber which is being used, and I doubt

whether this bombing is doing us any good. While there, we learned that the men who are really doing the fighting, and doing the flying of the planes, are anxious to go around Kiska and occupy one of the nearby islands, such as Agattu or Attu, in order to shut off supplies into Kiska. If that could be done, we might starve the enemy out of there, because, as they are dug in at the present time, it would be very costly in lives of American sailors to get them out. At the present time, we are moving closer to them daily. Up to the present time, I think we have done a pretty fair job. Already we have twice wiped them out, and they came back in behind some bad weather. On two different occasions, we cleaned out completely every plane and every ship they had in their harbor. The minute the weather moves from the west to the east we find that they have dug in there again like a hill of ants. We have had a difficult problem in ridding ourselves of the Japanese in that area, but I think that at the present time the Army and the Navy are doing a pretty fair job.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to reply to my friend and colleague. I have before me a newspaper article under an Adreanof Island date line, which reads as follows:

Despite repeated bombings, the Japanese are pushing to completion a long fighter field on Kiska and a long bomber field on Attu, the Eleventh Bomber Command headquarters disclosed today.

That was after we were told that fields could not be built on these two islands. I have quit letting people tell me what my enemy cannot do. I would as soon believe he can do anything, and from what has occurred of late I am almost certain that he will. But we were told this could not be done.

I continue to read.

The Kiska runway, which within 2 weeks may have Zeros zooming from it to meet American bombers, has been bombed six times.

Before they were able to build the airfields they were using Zeros on floats. They were floating them on the water of the harbor, and the harbor at Kiska is an exceptionally good one.

Attu has been attacked twice by 10 Liberators which unloaded 20 tons of explosives.

After the bombings, apparently the Japanese crawled from their trenches surrounding the fields and used the loosened stone.

In other words, when we loosened up the stone they raked it up and used it to build airfields.

These runways may indicate that the enemy is preparing: First, to repel a naval bombardment with Zeros.

That is an assumption which I am almost certain is correct.

Second, to repel any landing on the few existing beaches.

Third, to harass our advance bases if possible.

Fourth, to hit our shipping lines.

Fifth, to launch an offensive of his own against Alaska.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am reading from a special dispatch from the Andreanof Islands, under date of April 3, 1943.

Mr. LODGE. Who wrote it?

Mr. CHANDLER. The name of the author does not appear, but it was reported in the New York Times of April 3, 1943.

Mr. LODGE. It is a newspaper dispatch.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a newspaper dispatch. It continues as follows:

The use of transports on June 4, 1942, indicates that he has had this idea in his mind, it was stated.

To outfit these 2 airfields will require technical equipment that will have to be flown in or sent in by surface ships and submarine. The Japanese have tried surface ships and lost 15 to Navy guns, torpedoes, and Army bombers.

PROGRESS ON RUNWAYS

Their last effort at this writing was on March 26 when a 2-to-1 outnumbered and outgunned American task force turned back three cargo ships escorted by two heavy cruisers, two light cruisers, and four destroyers.

That is difficult for me to understand. The report was made that with only one ship, I believe, we turned back three cargo ships escorted by four heavy cruisers, two light cruisers, and four destroyers.

It is not known if the Japanese have used submarines, as they did at Guadalcanal.

It is not known, but on June 3 of last year, or a few days later, they were turned back from Dutch Harbor, and I will state why they were turned back. They had their transports there, their aircraft carriers, and other naval support. We also had some support, which was not too far away. But they were turned back because they accidentally stumbled onto an airfield not known to them about a hundred miles west of Dutch Harbor. When they encountered land-based planes—and we had a few there—they did not know what it meant. They were surprised and shocked, got into a fog bank, and turned back.

When Attu and Kiska runways are working, fighter planes will be able to fly from Paramushiro, on the Kurile Islands, to Attu, 735 miles, and on to Kiska, 195 miles.

So I dislike to hear any of my fellow citizens express the belief that the Japs will not be able to complete airfields. It is my deliberate judgment that they are not only able to build them, but that they will soon be completed, if they are not already completed, with ships taking off from them now. It would be only about 900 miles from their bases in the Kuriles, and it would be just as easy for them to fly airplanes from the Kuriles and from the Aleutians as it is for us to fly them by way of Seattle, or Portland, and reinforce our garrisons in the Aleutian Islands.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator made the statement that someone who was in authority, apparently, told him, or told his committee, that it was impossible for the Japanese to build airfields on these particular islands. I do not want any military secrets divulged, but the Senator made such a statement. Did the military authorities make the statement, or was it the statement of some civilians? Who made the statement that it would be impossible to do what has now been done?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall a specific statement. I say that it was the general opinion of all those who seemed to be handling the situation that the territory was so rough that it would not be possible to build airfields on those two islands so that land-based planes could be operated from them. They cited the fact that the Japanese had been there a long time and had continued to use float landings which were in the harbor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Were the authorities to whom the Senator has referred military authorities or officials of our Government? I am not asking for names, but I should merely like to know the nature of their official capacities.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is my opinion that the opinion was shared in general by the officers of our Army, and for that reason they did not take it as seriously as they should have. They did not think the situation would become so serious as it seems to me to be at the present time.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. Discussions with officials who had been at Kiska revealed that shortly after the Japanese landed at Kiska they tried to build an air base. They started their work but apparently gave up the job. From that time on, or from sometime along in July until September, when the Senate committee was there, the only planes which were flying to meet our bombers were Japanese Zero planes on pontoons, indicating that the enemy had no land-based aircraft or air bases in that area. As I have said, that was in September. I doubt that the Japanese have been able to build an airfield on Kiska because I am personally acquainted with many persons who have been there from time to time, as well as many fishermen who have operated in that region.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then am I to understand that the Senator from Washington does not now believe—in the middle of April—that such airfields as have been reported as being built are in existence?

Mr. WALLGREN. I do not believe the Japanese are building any air base on Kiska, but possibly they are building air bases on Attu and Agattu. Those bases lie far to the west and would not be very important except to prevent us from using those islands as stepping stones in order to reach Paramushiro or the Kurile Islands. I think that is the way to defeat the Japanese.

Mr. CHANDLER. I regret to say that I am in sharp disagreement with my friend, who is a member of the committee, on that point. I wish to read further from the dispatch. Of course it

may not be correct, although I believe it to be:

The commanding officer of a photo intelligence department, who can read from his photographs whether a Japanese has tracked the snow, described the sunup to sundown progress of these runways.

First signs of the Kiska job were observed on December 31; those on Attu on March 11, when the strip was 10 days along.

The work emphasis on Kiska is the runway. No major new construction outside of gun and antiaircraft emplacements has been observed on Kiska since January 1. Even road equipment is off the roads, apparently to hasten the runway's completion.

The more than half mile of Kiska runway is built on a ridge by cut and fill methods. The Japanese are using bulldozers. It is believed they also have some 50 light trucks, at least 50 hand-propelled carts and movable narrow-gage rails and the never absent pick and shovel.

No attempt at camouflage appears to be made, as the fog provides sufficient hiding.

Large buildings near the bottom of the fill apparently house runway equipment. Laborers live in neat, revetted huts in a valley about a half mile away.

A hangar, when the time comes, could be concealed easily in the deep cut from which the fill is being made.

The field——

That is the air field which could not be built; but, like the little man who was not there, it is there.

The field is guarded with four heavy antiaircraft batteries. Fox-holes and trenches line the east and southeast ends of the runway.

The Attu construction, begun March 1 or thereabout, indicates the Japanese are strengthening their air defenses, perhaps as far back as Tokyo on the northern approach chain.

That is a report from a base in Andreanof Islands which was printed in the New York Times. The correspondent was there, and said he saw the headquarters.

The Japs, in my opinion, now have that base, and planes and bombers are available not only for Kiska but for Attu. Of course, if we say they have not and then it turns out that they have and we have not made allowances for it or have not taken it into account, we will be in trouble again.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to ask the Senator a question which he no doubt will be able to answer. It is with relation to who is in command of our armed forces in Alaska. Who has that responsibility and what is the extent of the division of authority if any? I think that this may have something to do with the condition about which the Senator is talking.

Mr. CHANDLER. A little further along I shall read the recommendations of the committee with respect to the command. In command of the western defense is Lieutenant General DeWitt, whose headquarters are in San Francisco, which is a long way from the center of operations. The general in command of the defense of Alaska is Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, a citizen of Kentucky. When we were there his command was based at Anchorage, Alaska. I have information which would indicate that perhaps it has since been moved to Kodiak. If so that is an important change. If the Senator will permit me, however, a little later on in my remarks I shall come to that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly shall, but I shall like to know how the naval command ties in with General DeWitt's command?

Mr. CHANDLER. The head of the naval command is either Admiral Freeman or Admiral Greenslade.

Mr. WALLGREN. The officer in command was Admiral Theobald.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who is in command of the western naval operations?

Mr. WALLGREN. Admiral Freeman was in command at the time we were there.

Mr. CHANDLER. The naval officer in command may have been changed. When we were there the admiral in charge of naval operations in the Alaskan and Aleutian areas was Admiral Theobald, with headquarters at Kodiak.

Mr. BRIDGES. In an emergency who would make the decision as to what would be done. Would General DeWitt or the admiral in charge of the naval district? Would Admiral Theobald or would General Buckner make the decision?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not believe any general in the army could answer that question. I do not believe that the President of the United States could answer it, and I shall not undertake to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall yield in a moment. In some instances if it is a case of repelling a land attack it is one officer's job; at another place if it is a sea invasion it is another officer's job; in another place after a landing is made the command passes to another officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suppose the Japanese do not send word in advance whether there is to be a land attack, a sea attack, or an air attack. So who would be in command?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will have to answer by saying that a statement of the Secretary of the Navy to which I intend to refer a little later confused me greatly the other day. He said it was believed that the Japs had heavy troop concentrations north of Australia and that we did not know whether they had them there for offense or defense. I do not reckon we do; I do not reckon anybody knows; but I have an idea they could be used for either, and, perhaps, both, and I think we ought to make arrangements to entertain them in either event.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I think it ought to be said that the Secretary of the Navy and other highly placed military officers, and naval officers, too, stated that the force north of Australia at a place called Truk, I believe, has not merely sprung up there in a week or a month but was there even before we got into the war. Truk is their strong bastion, just as Pearl Harbor was ours. Of course it is impossible to read any one's mind and to know whether they are in any given place for offense or defense; we cannot do that; but it is a mistake to assume that the concentration at Truk has just occurred. They have been there all the time, even before we got into the war, and, in view of the fact that we have knocked off so many Japanese ships and planes they have got to keep a concentration there or give up their line of communication.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator's statement is entirely correct, but when the Secretary says he does not know whether the concentrations of armies and of ships are for offense or defense, I am prepared to agree, for I not only think he does not know but I do not believe anyone else knows. We have got to be prepared, for it is liable to be either or both, and we have got to be prepared for anything in war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not understand that the distance from Kiska to Yokohama or Tokyo, which lie close together, is approximately between 1,500 and 2,000 miles? Is that the Senator's understanding as to the distance?

Mr. CHANDLER. I had the figures showing the distance.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is between those two figures.

Mr. CHANDLER. From the Japanese naval base at Paramushiro, in the Kurile Islands, to Attu is 735 miles, and on to Kiska is 195 miles, which would make the distance between those points a little over 900 miles.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the distance between the places I have in mind is somewhat greater than that; but assume it is as much as 1,600 miles, it has often occurred to me to wonder why it was that Japan should be so tremendously concerned and should spend so much money to retain its base on Kiska Island. The Senator has said that they have an airfield there. Undoubtedly they have. Why do they have it, and why are they making such a fight for it? I desire to call the Senate's attention to a very ready answer to the query, I have just put, and that is this:

As I remember, Yokohama is a city of about 800,000 inhabitants, and Tokyo, which adjoins it, which is really a part and parcel of the same city, contains about 8,000,000 inhabitants. I think Nagoya comes next, with 1,200,000, then Kyoto, with approximately a million, then Osaka has three or four million inhabitants, and straight down, almost on a line, to Kobe, with a million, there are 6 or 7 great Japanese cities having a population of 15,000,000 or more.

If we had an air base in Kiska it would, to my mind, be of tremendous value in enabling us to raid Japan with bombers. I believe that is the real reason why Japan is making such a fight to retain Kiska, and why we are in like manner

trying to recapture it. I hope the day will soon come when our forces will recapture Kiska and recapture the airfield there, and if our bombers from there, in that locality, could raid the six cities I have mentioned, which comprise about one-third of the population of the Japanese islands, the war would soon be over, in my opinion, because those cities, with the exception of Tokyo and a very limited space in each of the others, are made up largely of very inflammable structures, and there would not be very much trouble in destroying them by bombing.

I am glad the Senator is discussing this matter. I hope the time will soon come when we may recapture Kiska, including the air base, and drive the Japanese out and undertake in that way to destroy Japan itself.

Mr. CHANDLER. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Tennessee for his observations, and I comment on his statement by saying that from our best airplane base in the Alaskan defense command it is about 1,300 miles to Unimak. We have moved on into the Andreanofs. It was generally thought by all that when the Japs made their move to come up to the Aleutian Islands they shot for Dutch Harbor but encountered the land base airfield at Unimak and turned back to Kiska.

I said a few moments ago that the distance from Japan to the United States through the Aleutians is 1,400 miles shorter than it is from Japan to the United States by Pearl Harbor. The Aleutian route is not only the best, but it is the logical route for Japan to use in attacking us. Of course, the Kurile Islands are the logical route for us to take in attacking them.

In what they did they had one of two purposes. They wanted to protect their flank. If Stalingrad had fallen, while I am not certain about it, I believe that the Japs would have prepared to attack Siberia. If they had protected their flank by a submarine base, we could not have interfered with them from the west coast, and they might have gone into Siberia, and might today be our neighbors 50 miles across the Bering Straits. I have a fear of what would have occurred if that had happened, a fear which in me is real, because I have seen the conditions. The fear is not real on the part of many men who have not seen the situation, and it is not real to some who have, but it is my feeling that if they were ever our neighbors in Siberia, instead of the Russians, we could not hold Nome, and I would not be certain that we had not built highways and hard-surfaced roads right into the United States over which they could come and attack Chicago and Detroit, and come right into the heart of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. While the Senator is correct in stating what it is possible they had in mind, my own judgment is that their principal purpose was a defense purpose. They knew that a United States bomber from the island of Kiska, or the island of Attu, or any one of the other islands close to Japan, could bomb all the cities I have named and return to its base in one flight. Under those circumstances, the Japs have considered it vital to retain their hold on Kiska. There is no other possible reason for their action, because at the present stage of the war it seems to me they would never undertake to invade the United States by that route.

Mr. CHANDLER. They have not only held their position, but they have improved it, and probably a submarine base has been established there, which probably will menace the shipping of the United States in that area.

I disagree with those who say we should go around them and leave them. The old-fashioned general said, "You should never leave an enemy force behind you," and if we go around a force like the one there, the enemy's airplanes and submarines may come on and cause much trouble. We have had many narrow escapes. I am not willing that we should court narrow escapes, because sometime the escape may be too narrow and we may not get off.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is giving a pretty clear and comprehensive picture of conditions in the Alaskan neighborhood. As I understand, the situation has been growing gradually worse in spite of anything we have done to date. If that be true, there must be some fundamental reason for this progress in reverse by American forces, particularly when this area is a sort of key to the defense not only of Alaska but of western Canada and western United States.

What is the weakness which is bringing about this condition? Is it a lack of unified command, is it the fact that we have General DeWitt down in Seattle, and an admiral down there, another admiral in Alaska, and another general there? Is that the key to the failure in the Alaskan situation?

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator will not try to get me to explain the commands, because I am unable to do that; I do not understand them. I do not know whether anyone else understands them. If we were able to establish a unified responsible command in one man, who would have the say, and if we had a sufficient amount of material and a sufficient determination, we could now blast the Japanese from the islands of Kiska and Attu, and we should have done so in my opinion long ago.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the Senator indicates that it is a lack of a top authority, a unified command for the area which really, in his judgment, is responsible for the conditions which have come about in that area.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think certainly that is in a measure responsible. What could have been done or would have been done if we had had a unified command I am not prepared to say, but I assert our object could have been accomplished more easily and more quickly and more effectively if we had had a unified command.

Mr. BRIDGES. The failure must have been due to one of three things, either the lack of a unified command, poor judgment of the men in the field command, or lack of sufficient forces or reinforcements sent to Alaska to do the job.

Mr. CHANDLER. It might have been a failure to realize we are fighting on the Pacific side a first-class war against a treacherous enemy, and we may have failed to estimate the strength and the ferocity of the enemy on that side. The condition may be because of that.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WALLGREN. It may also be due to the failure to recognize that the Aleutian Islands really afford stepping stones for us into Japan. I think that is the way to defeat Japan. It is possible to get into Japan without touching foreign soil at all. If we could occupy any islands to the west of Kiska, we would be within bombing range of Paramushiro, which is the Japanese naval base on Kurile Islands, and if we could occupy one of those islands—and we can do it as easily as they can one of ours—we would then be over the heads of the Japanese, and could bomb Tokyo daily. I think we have failed to recognize the importance of that particular area, and for once I should like to see someone in our Army, or our War Department or Navy Department, choose the front, instead of allowing the enemy constantly to choose the front.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I should like to make a contribution to the discussion. In the fall of 1939 General Arnold, then Major General, Chief of the Air Corps, remarked to me that if a first-class military foe should establish a base of operations in Alaska, the entire Pacific coast area would become untenable for defense. I know that General Arnold was alive to the situation, but the high command, whoever that may have been, thought other areas throughout the world were of greater importance, apparently, than the defense of Alaska and the Pacific combat areas.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator from Oregon for that observation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be observed in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] that General Arnold is still in command of the air force. He is a member of the General Staff. He sits in daily, not only with the staffs of our own Army and Navy, but with the combined staffs of all the United Nations, who plan strategy, and I am quite certain that General Arnold is just as alert and alive to the situation now as he was in the fall of 1939.

I presume all these staffs and all these high-ranking officers are confronted with the fact that we have not been able and are not now able to have all we would like at every place we would like to have

it. The question of allocating what we have in the way of air forces and naval forces and armies and all the other military arms is a question as I see it, of determining where any given force is most needed at a given time. If we had enough planes, if we had enough ships, if we had enough men to have complete control of the air and the sea and the land everywhere in the world where we have to fight, of course we would soon end this war. But when we have to fight on so many fields, when we have to fight on so many fronts, and are by the process of manufacture obliged to increase our equipment all the time, it is a military and naval question where to send the equipment at any given time.

Mr. President, General Arnold not only is still in charge, but he sits in, as I say, every day with all the other high-ranking military and naval experts who are supposed to know pretty much what is going on in the world, and to know the situation everywhere. I think General Arnold has demonstrated almost amazing ability in the organization from practically nothing, so far as the air force is concerned, until we now have an air force of 2½ million men. They are doing a fine job everywhere they are fighting; they are giving a good account of themselves everywhere. I am satisfied, as the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, said yesterday, that as fast as it is possible for us to send planes and men and all other equipment to places where they are needed, they will be sent. There are many difficulties involved. One is shipping. There is no use of going into that. Of course I am not undertaking to circumscribe the situation in Alaska.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] had a conversation with General Arnold in which General Arnold said that if the Japs ever got a base in Alaska they could endanger the shipping all over the west coast. Of course, we all know that it does not take a military man to understand that. I do not know anything about the accuracy of the statement, but I have been told that unless the Japanese should get as far east as Umnak they would not be regarded as a menace to the United States. That has been told to me as a general opinion of the military authorities. I do not know whether it is worth anything even to drop it here as a hint, but if that be true I do not think we ought to become panicky over the fact that the Japs are in Kiska, although I should like to see them driven out of there as soon as possible. There is no proof here that the Japs have an air base in Kiska. We wonder whether they have, but the evidence does not show they have. There is nothing to prove that they have. If they cannot build one in Kiska—and what they are trying to do is to build bases on Attu, and on the adjoining island——

Mr. CHANDLER. Agattu.

Mr. BARKLEY. Attu, Kiska, and Agattu—they certainly are not coming our way this side of Kiska in the building of air bases. I think we are bound to assume that our military and naval authorities are fully apprised of the situation, and are not asleep with respect to it. There may be differences of opinion even in military and naval circles as to the best course, but it is my understanding that they have arrived at a unanimous opinion, and it is the opinion of the staffs of the Army and the Navy, and of all the members of the United Nations staff who sit here day by day in determining strategy, where any given part of our equipment should be sent. We are bound to assume further that they have more inside expert knowledge about the matter than we have, certainly more than I have. I speak only for myself. I am bound to be willing to, and I gladly am willing to, leave the question of strategy to them. They are responsible. If they cannot win this war for us we are sunk anyway. We cannot win it here, and I would not want to be placed in charge of trying to win it anywhere in the field.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to make a comment before I yield. I shall yield in a moment. I am more frightened about the situation than I was before my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] spoke, for when we made our report we were deeply concerned because the officials here knew so very little about Alaska and about the Aleutian Islands. I am certain that my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] will substantiate that statement. If the War Department now does not fear even the occupation of Dutch Harbor, why, that frightens me more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not speaking for the War Department. I offer that, of course, not as an expert opinion, but I probably would place as much reliance upon it as the Senator from Oregon would place upon a casual conversation had between him and General Arnold. I do not know how much we are at liberty here to repeat private conversations held with military officers, and for that reason I would not attempt to quote anyone who is an authority on the subject. But we hear all kinds of reports bandied around. We hear all sorts of opinions expressed. If one sits down to dinner in a restaurant, and there is a military or a naval officer near, one hears profound military opinions expressed as to what ought to be done, and, I presume, we ought to weigh those things.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, my expressions with respect to this matter are based upon my observations and things I have seen. Dutch Harbor and the fortress at Dutch Harbor in the hands of the enemy would control shipping through the Unimak Pass, which is the pass through which ships go from the Pacific into the Bering Sea from the United States to the port of Nome. I am frightened that the Army should not be alarmed at the danger of losing control of those shipping lanes, coupled with the knowledge we have that bombing could easily be done from Dutch Harbor, or from Unmak, because if Dutch Harbor falls, then Unmak, the field 85 miles to the west of it, would be bound to be in the hands of enemy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for an observation?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know General Buckner, of Kentucky. He has been in the Army all his life. He is a graduate of West Point. His father was a distinguished Civil War soldier, and a close friend of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. He was at one time Governor of Kentucky. There is not a finer officer than General Buckner. He is in command in Alaska. I do not know what General Buckner's views may be on a subject of that sort. I have not seen him for 4 or 5 years, since he was stationed in Washington at the War College a number of years ago. It seems to me that General Buckner, who is on the ground there all the time, must have some very valuable views, which no doubt he has communicated to the War Department in his reports. I do not recall the name of the other general referred to a while ago. I ask my colleague what his name is.

Mr. CHANDLER. He is in San Francisco. He is General DeWitt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, General DeWitt. He is the general area commander for that region. But General Buckner or any other general who is stationed on Alaskan soil and in charge of the Alaskan portion of our defense certainly ought to have some valuable views as to the relative question of Kiska, Unimak, Unalaska, on which is located Dutch Harbor, and all the others of the string of islands which extend to the west. I do not know what General Buckner would say about the situation; I have no information as to his views about it; but certainly the War Department has his views, and I know the War Department trusts him. They would not have placed him in charge of Alaska if they did not trust him, and have faith in his ability and judgment and discretion and his courage and all the other qualities which go to make up a good commanding officer.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to make one comment, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, we had numerous conferences with General Buckner. I am glad to join my colleague in expressing great confidence in General Buckner's ability as a military man. I may say that if the War Department had followed General Buckner's wishes in this matter my remarks would have been entirely unnecessary. General Buckner was conscious of the seriousness of the situation, because 2 days before the Japs put a garrison on Kiska, General Buckner was personally on the island of Kiska, having flown out there on reconnaissance, and had in mind to take it for the American Army, but we were too late. The Japs got in first. Except for the fact that he was there 2 days before they arrived, they would have captured him along with the island.

It must be remembered that staffs in Washington make military plans taking into account the whole earth. The plans are made in consultation with representatives of other nations, and those nations have their say. They have come here and insisted upon and asserted their right to have more planes and more tanks and more men and more materials. Sometimes I fear that we have made sacrifices, to which I do not object except when there results a direct threat to the people of the United States. Unless one has seen that country, unless he has flown over it, he cannot fully appreciate conditions. Let any Senator who says it is a junket to fly over that territory go out there and fly over it. We lose more men there through flying accidents than through combat. Time after time the four Senators who made that trip experienced difficulties and dangers so great that they might very well have lost their lives. We were in serious trouble, going over and around mountains that towered 20,000 feet in the air and through fogs that never lift. We went there, at the direction of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to perform a service for the people of our country; and we have a right to object to having Senators or anyone else in the country undertake to refer to that trip as a junket. It was no junket; it was no fun; it was no pleasure.

Now to get back to General Buckner. If the high command at Washington had listened to General Buckner, the Japs would not be in Kiska at this hour. I do not know whether or not they have an airfield there. The man who is out there says they have. I believe they have. Perhaps they have an airfield at both Kiska and Attu, and will not rest until they bomb our ships and inflict more damage.

Now I yield to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in everything which has been said by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who was the chairman of the subcommittee, and who led the group consisting of himself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and myself, which went to Alaska. I am not at liberty to repeat certain conversations, but I say again that General Buckner himself made some observations, and I am satisfied that if he had been supplied with the necessary material, equipment, and men, the Japs would not today be in Kiska.

That brings up the question stated by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and to whose statement none of us can take exception. It is his thought that if we had an abundance of everything we could completely dominate every situation.

That brings us back to the question as to why we do not have an abundance of everything; and that brings us to something which the Senate and the Nation must take cognizance of before we have a victory, if it is to be a victory. We must stop labor racketeering, strikes, closed-shop difficulties, and difficulties resulting from troubles and disputes over union rules, all of which interfere with production in this country. Only a short time ago the Secretary of War stated that in the month of February we should have built 500 more airplanes than we did build. The reason why we did not build them and why we are not now building more than we are is because we are not today utilizing to any proper extent the manpower resources of the Nation. I pointed to the experience in France. The sit-down strike originated in France. When the sit-down strike in France became effective, France failed industrially; when France failed industrially, France failed politically; and when France failed politically, her army crumbled.

I shall not presume further on the time of the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BRIDGES rose.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the answer which the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made, and which in turn was made by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. HOLMAN] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], to the question I raised, I think merely emphasizes one of the points I made. I understood the Senator from Kentucky to say that one of the reasons for the situation was the fact that we had only so many planes, so many troops, and so forth. However, that had absolutely nothing to do with the point I had in mind, let me say to the Senator. If the trouble in Alaska and the resulting condition which exists there are due to the lack of a unified command, of course, no more planes, no more guns, and no more troops would be required for operations under a unified command. The Senator has said that General Buckner is an able and outstanding officer; but apparently General Buckner does not have full authority there. The authority is divided.

I say that what may be the reason for the lack of progress in that area is the fact that we need to have in authority in that battle area one man for both the Army and the Navy, a man who will say what shall be done. If such authority were given to one man, we would not have to determine whether the attack is to be by air or by land or by water, before we were able to decide whether a naval commander or an Army commander was to take charge. We should have one top authority for each battle area. That is the only way to win a war and the only way to conduct a campaign.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to open up an old controversy. I do not know whether the Senator would put an Army officer or a naval officer in charge. It has not been the policy to put either one in charge of the operations of both our Army and our Navy. Under our Constitution the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. So we do have one man in charge; and, of course, in making decisions he confers with the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Chief of Operations of the United States Navy, the head of our Air Corps, and all the other officers who belong to the group designated as high commanding officers not only of our own forces but, inasmuch as we are fighting all over the world, of the forces of other nations; because in this global war it is necessary to consult other persons whose views on military matters are entitled to some consideration and whose advice may be valuable.

I do not know whether the Senator means that, in addition to the President of the United States, who cannot avoid his responsibility under the Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, there should be another single person in authority over both the Army and the Navy. I do not know whether that is what the Senator means by "a unified command."

Mr. BRIDGES. No, Mr. President; I mean a unified commander for any particular battle area—like General MacArthur in the southwest Pacific. For example, when the Japs moved against Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, the officers in charge of our forces in that area did not have time to go back to the joint board and find out who should take the leadership.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. Some one man from either the Army or the Navy should be in authority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Neither can they give orders to the joint board. They are in command in a given area, with whatever equipment they have. They have the authority to use those forces according to their discretion and as their judgment dictates.

But, of course, we cannot have 40 commanders all over the United States giving orders to the General Staff in Washington. The conduct of the war must be decided upon by one authority; and the decisions are being made in Washington every day.

If it is argued that General Buckner, in Alaska, should have the power to determine how much material should be sent there and how it should be used, I would not agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. BRIDGES. No, Mr. President; what I mean—and I think the Senator understands what I mean——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am making a very earnest effort to try to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. What I mean is that we should not wait until we are in the center of the fight to decide whose should be the job—whether the job should be the Army's or the Navy's. One man should have the authority, should issue the orders, and should coordinate the activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case of an operation exclusively naval in character, of course the naval officer in charge in

that area would be in command. Likewise, in the case of an operation pertaining exclusively to the Army, the Army officer in charge in the area involved would be in command. But in a case in which the naval officers and Army officers in the region concerned must work with each other, I think we should have the cooperation of both.

Mr. BRIDGES. Suppose such cooperation is not had?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, either an admiral or a general or both should be in command.

Mr. BRIDGES. Or both?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have observed the conduct of General DeWitt as head of the Western Defense Command; and it is my belief that he is a fine general and that, if his views had been concurred in by others who had a right either to agree or to disagree, the situation there would be much better. General Buckner is a fine soldier. Of course, every field soldier thinks that his sector is the most important. I agree that it is difficult to give them all the things they ask for, but I do believe that the high command in Washington should have given General DeWitt and General Buckner more things than they have been given.

The report of the special committee was made directly to the President and to the Senate Military Affairs Committee 8 months ago. I should like to call it to the attention of every Member of the Senate, because it is worth while reading.

In view of the current grave situation, I wish to quote briefly from the report. It is still held secret and confidential so far as the inventory of men and equipment is concerned. Although, as I have heretofore said, I believe the situation has improved materially, and did improve after our conferences with the President and with Admiral Leahy, there are still specific recommendations which have not been given the attention which, in my opinion, they deserve.

We called attention to the imperative and vital need for a completely unified and responsible command for the Alaskan and Pacific coast areas, and the need for immediate recognition of the commanding position of the Territory of Alaska in the necessary offensive and defensive actions controlling the Western Hemisphere, together with the necessary manpower and supplies to utilize it as such.

I have heretofore referred to the fact that the Aleutian Islands afford the shortest route between the Japanese and American mainlands. The Japanese are athwart our offensive lines. We cannot win wars today without carrying the fight to the enemy. We stressed the need for the recognition of Alaska and Siberia as keys to the most effective offensive that this Nation can launch against the Japanese mainland, and the recognition that the Japs are actively and effectively setting up fortifications on American soil, and that further delay—this was 8 months ago—in dislodging them from these American outposts will inevitably result in greater losses of men and equipment.

Following the committee's report, the Alaskan command was almost immediately strengthened somewhat in men and materials.

As I have previously stated, our front line was moved out from Umnak to the Andreanofs, within easy bombing range of the Japanese on the island of Kiska; but so far as I have been informed, during these 8 months no determined effort has been made actually to dislodge the Japs from Kiska or to regain possession of those islands for the United States. There is no doubt that those islands are now being used as refueling bases, and it seems likely that they will soon be utilized for land-based planes, so that attacks can be launched on Alaska and on the Pacific coast mainland. In my opinion such attacks would be launched preparatory to a possible actual invasion of those areas.

Mr. President, regardless of press reports and the statements made by some of our military men over a period of months minimizing the Japanese gains in this area, it is a deadly serious situation and the longer they are permitted to remain there the higher will be the cost to us in men, munitions, and equipment in order to dislodge them. It cannot be done by planes alone. They have dug in, and it will require a definitely superior air force, land army, and fighting ships to put the American flag back on that part of our territory. It is, as I have said, 1,400 miles closer to Japan from the Pacific coast through the Alaskan mainland and the Aleutian Islands than through Hawaii, and by the same token it is also the shortest route from Japan to the Pacific coast; and, although there are those among us who say that the Japs cannot come through the Aleutians and make an attack against the United States, it should be remembered that the Japanese went down the Malayan Peninsula through the jungles and conquered the mighty fortress of Singapore in a very short time.

While the primary purpose of the Senate committee's investigation was to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of our arms and personnel in that area, other subsidiary investigations were made. The committee inspected the highway to service the ferry route airfields and their transportation movements, and the oil development and pipeline construction for air fuel supply. It investigated the possibility of coal production on the west coast to supply fuel to certain outlying posts. It looked into the possibility of increased agricultural production in such areas as the Matanuska project near Anchorage. It sought to locate strategic minerals, including chromite, tungsten, antimony, nickel, and tin.

I may add that there are abundant supplies of those materials in Alaska; and some day the Government will provide sufficient funds, equipment, and men to get those materials out. In the years ahead we will not be dependent on islands 10,000 or 12,000 miles across the ocean, on countries which are so far away that the hazards of war immediately occasion the cutting off of our supply. We will develop such materials along the west coast, in the Western States, and in our Alaskan Territory, where they are found in abundance, so that when trouble comes again we shall be ready.

The subcommittee inquired into the morale of the Army, the Navy, and civilians, and gave close attention to the equipment needed by State defense councils working in cooperation with the military and naval authorities.

Full supporting data and information are included in the written report filed with the Senate Military Affairs Committee, which cannot be made public because of its nature and the strategic importance of the area. I earnestly hope, however, that Members of the Senate will take occasion to review it at their convenience because, in my opinion, this is a most vital area and it is easier for us to conduct an offensive against Japan from this country. It likewise is easier for them to conduct an offensive against us through this country.

A delayed dispatch from the Andreanof Islands, written by Eugene Burns, and carried in the Washington Post of April 13, had the following to say with respect to the situation before Kiska:

> Despite repeated bombing, the Japanese are pushing to completion a long fighter field on Kiska and a long bomber field on Attu, the Eleventh Bomber Command headquarters disclosed today.
>
> The Kiska runway, which within 2 weeks may have Zeros zooming from it to meet American bombers, has been bombed 6 times.
>
> Attu has been attacked twice by 10 Liberators, which unloaded 20 tons of explosives.
>
> After the bombings, apparently, the Japanese crawled from their trenches surrounding the fields and used the loosened stone.
>
> These runways may indicate that the enemy is preparing:
>
> First, to repel a naval bombardment with Zeros.
>
> Second, to repel any landing on the few existing beaches.
>
> Third, to harass our advance bases, if possible.
>
> Fourth, to hit our shipping lines.
>
> Fifth, to launch an offensive of his own against Alaska. The use of transports, June 4, 1942, indicates that he has had this idea in his mind.
>
> When Attu and Kiska runways are working, fighter planes will be able to fly from Paramushiro to Attu, 735 miles, and on to Kiska, 195 miles.
>
> The commanding officer of a photo intelligence department, who can read from his photographs whether a Japanese has tracked the snow, described the sunup to sundown progress of these runways.
>
> First signs of the Kiska job were observed December 31, those on Attu March 11 when the strip was 10 days along.

I shall pass for the moment from the North Pacific to the conduct of the war in the South Pacific, about which so much has been said during the last few days. Several days ago the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, at a press conference, was quoted as having said that although the Japanese had powerful troop concentrations north of Australia, it was not apparent that they had concentrated any powerful fleet support,

without which, according to the Secretary, it would not be possible to conduct effective operations against the continent of Australia. Mr. Knox further said that he did not know whether the Japanese concentrations were to be used for offensive or defensive purposes. Certainly all of us would agree with that statement—the Secretary did not know whether they were to be used for offense or defense—but it is quite certain that all of us will agree that they could easily be used for either.

General MacArthur immediately took sharp issue with the Secretary of the Navy by saying that powerful Japanese naval forces were within striking distance of Australia and that they could only be held off if the Allies retained control of the skies. He further said that the first line of Australian defense is our bomber line, and then added:

> The Allied naval forces can be counted upon to play their own magnificent part, but the battle of the Pacific will be won or lost by the proper application of the air-ground team.

Aerial reconnaissance has shown definitely that the Japs have had naval concentrations at Rabaul, Buin, Kavieng, Ambon, and other ports in the islands north and northwest of Australia, and that these concentrations are greater than they have ever been before.

Recent attacks on Port Moresby, Milne Bay, and Guadalcanal indicate that the Japanese air strength has been greatly increased in the South Pacific. Gen. Sir Thomas Blamey, Australian Commissioner of the Allied ground forces, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, General Kenney, and the Australian Minister of External Affairs, Hon. Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, are all agreed that the situation in the South Pacific is urgent, and that unless prompt action is taken by the Government of the United States serious consequences may result. According to the statement of the Australian Minister of External Affairs at a press conference immediately after his conference with the President of the United States, he made a plea for adequate supplies for his country and for the South Pacific area. He attributed our victories so far to quality and not quantity of equipment and supplies. That, by the way, was what saved England after the battle of Dunkirk. It should be remembered that never were the British able to match the Germans in quantity of planes; but by qualitative superiority of Spitfire and Hurricane fighters they were able to save the British Isles from that terrific onslaught.

He said the Australian people are impatient at the thought of long delay in pushing the Pacific war to victory. The Japanese, he said, are being given time to tap almost unlimited resources of the conquered areas for a possible renewal of their Pacific advance which seemed almost irresistible as Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore, the Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines fell, one after another, a year ago.

The enemy must be attacked, he said, with the utmost possible vigor, and his installations and shipping destroyed and, he added, "it is suicidal to give him time to dig in."

I believe it is time now that the leaders of our Government and our military men realize the deadly seriousness of the Japanese menace to the people of the United States. The war against Japan is no second-class war. It is, in my opinion, the toughest struggle that has ever faced the people of the United States. A reading of the Japanese conquests of Manchuria and China, of the tactics used, of their extreme cruelty and brutality, of their extreme fanaticism and determination to conquer or die, ought to now convince our officials that this war is one that we cannot afford to neglect.

There are many of our people who believe sincerely that Hitler is the No. 1 menace to the world and that we should first conquer Hitler and the German military establishment. I am wholeheartedly in favor of helping the British and the Russians break the power of Hitler and destroy all the diabolical schemes he has planned, but I should hate to envision a time after Germany becomes prostrate—as it is my belief that she will be eventually—when we would be left entirely alone except for the loyal support of China, a magnificent people without arms, to fight the Japanese. Most of us will recall a suggestion in the speech of the Honorable Winston Churchill a fortnight ago, in which he promised his own people—the British people—that when the European war was over their boys would return home, or at least he promised them a partial demobilization. We have no assurances that Russia will ever fight Japan. Lend-lease shipments are passing Japanese ports and boats for the use of the Russians. We have no understandings with the head of the Russian Government which would cause us to believe that we can count on his help in a war against Japan. It should be remembered, too, that many of the people of this country indicated to the people of England that the German war was theirs prior to the Japanese attack against us at Pearl Harbor. I do not say they will, but I know they could say to us when they are no longer in danger, that perhaps the Japanese war is our war. Many times the Japanese have accomplished the impossible. It was said that they could not bomb Pearl Harbor—they did. It was said that they could not construct airfields on Attu and Kiska—the airfields are there. It was said that their fliers were squint-eyed, that their planes were top-heavy, that they were worn out with the war against China, and some of our military strategists predicted that if they had little enough sense to go to war against the United States, they would be defeated in from 2 weeks to 3 or 4 months. I would not minimize in any degree the brilliant strategy and the tremendous bravery with which our boys and our allies in the South Pacific have acquitted themselves. The sides have never been even since the start of the war. They have had more numerous planes, and more numerous ships. Against such tremendous odds our boys have forced them to take great losses, and only by superior courage and training, and by the use of superior ships—both airplanes and surface ships—and the bravery and brilliant strategy of our well-trained soldiers have we been able to keep the battle from running more strongly against us than it has.

The Japanese at Pearl Harbor destroyed the striking power of our Pacific Fleet. It is now said that we have restored it. I hope that is true, but there will be no indication of it until our fleet, with airplanes as coverage, go forth to hunt the enemy. All of us know that with the Japs based on those islands we cannot send our ships out without full air coverage, or they will suffer just as the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* suffered in the early days of the war.

General MacArthur is a magnificent American, and a real fighting man. His expressions are ones of mingled sadness and bitterness, and it is apparent to every citizen of the country that he is sorely disappointed because he has not been furnished adequate planes, men, and equipment in order to conduct an offensive against the Japanese. This must not be continued. The sacrifices of our men in that area have been too great and the heartache to the people of America too real.

There are Members of this body who have seen "Flying Tigers"—men under the command of General Chennault—after they returned from China. Based on what I know, it is my belief that General Chennault is the finest air officer in the world today. When Colonel Scott, from Georgia, returned, and when the boy from my own little home town in Kentucky, Second Lieutenant George Bailey, returned with a record of having shot down 9 planes, they said that every time General Chennault sent his fliers into battle they always had the advantage, and were never at a disadvantage in aerial combat with the Japanese, because they used his tactics. China has been begging and pleading for 500 planes for Chennault, for sufficient ground troops for Stilwell, for sufficient support so that he can go back into Burma. It will be remembered that General Stilwell's classic remark was "We were driven out of Burma; they licked hell out of us, and I don't like it."

When will we open the Burma Road again? I would not minimize the hazards and terrific undertaking of trying to get supplies and equipment into China. It is, in fact, a problem of logistics. It is tremendously difficult, but General Chennault has said that if he could ever get those 500 planes to China, he could drive the Japs out of China. Is that important to the people of America? If we delay, or do not furnish 500 planes to China, who knows but that the battle there may be lost.

I am not a military strategist, but if we can fly a thousand planes over Germany day after day we can on one day take 500 of them and send them to China. If we would send them to China we might be able to save those stanch, determined, Christian, God-fearing, good Chinese, the Generalissimo and his wife.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek was educated in Georgia and at Wellesley. When asked about Sherman's march from Atlanta to the sea, she replied to the people, "I wish you would not bring that up; I am a southerner and that is a painful subject to me." She retains many of those fine qualities which she developed as a girl while a student in the schools of Georgia and Massachusetts. She asks no greater honor on earth than to live and die for China. She has said that she fears nothing because God will not let her die until her mission shall be finished. Day after day she stands by her husband, and flies into the jungle, and into the front lines, and subjects herself to the rigors and hazards of modern warfare so that she may make a contribution to her people and to us. The Members of the Senate heard her when she appeared before this body, modest and determined. She should have been in the hospital, but, great spirit as she is, she risked her personal health day after day in order to carry this message to the people of the United States. If we do not get planes to China, I do not see how the Chinese can stay in the war another year or another 2 years. If they should get out of the war what would happen? The Japanese will crush the tremendous Chinese empire just as they crushed Manchuria. When they take charge of a country, the lights go out; inhuman cruelty and brutality are visited upon men, women, and children, because it is their purpose to destroy and obliterate from the face of the earth any other race. If we do not get the planes to China, it is my opinion—it may not be correct, but it is my judgment—that China will not be in the war in another year or in another 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the problem is more extensive than getting 500 planes to China? Is it not true that the transportation of gasoline and other equipment requires the opening of the Burma Road in order to give substantial aid to China?

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend from Ohio is correct. If we could open the Burma Road, it would facilitate our efforts and China's efforts. It would make the problem of transport easier. I hope the Senate understands that I am not underestimating or minimizing the troubles and difficulties of getting supplies and materials to China where they are so badly needed and where such good use could be made of them. I say, in spite of the obstacles and hazards, they must go; they must be sent; they must get there, and they must be used against this enemy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What concerns me is that, apparently, the policy which has been announced, in some speeches, at least, seems to be to disregard entirely the Pacific end of the war until the other is finished. If we are going to open the Burma Road, as I understand, it cannot be done except by reconquering Burma, and the only time we can reconquer Burma is in the winter. It is necessary to begin next October, or the road will not be open until 1946.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that the time is here to begin to plan for opening the Burma Road. Otherwise, I agree with the Senator, for it seems to me that to expect China to continue her activities against Japan for 2 years without substantial support in material and supplies is almost hopeless.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator. Some persons are expecting too much of China. I doubt if China can do it, however earnest and supreme is her desire to fight by our side and to help us eliminate the tremendous menace of the Japanese.

Recently the Committee on Military Affairs visited the Japanese relocation centers in the United States—110,000 Japanese approximately were removed from the west coast. The commanding general there thought they might be a menace to the people of that section of the country, and the Army could not afford to take a chance. So the President of the United States by Executive order ordered the Japanese taken out of that military area and put in relocation centers in widely scattered areas in the United States. Ordinarily the Government would have no authority, except as a military necessity, to take a citizen of the United States away from his home and deprive him of his liberty. Sixty-seven percent of the Japanese thus removed and put in relocation centers are citizens of the United States. They are Nisei, second generation Japanese who were born and educated in the United States, and have never been to Japan. Yet they are all mixed up together, citizens and aliens and Japanese from Hawaii. Senators have heard the statement that the Hawaiian Japanese are loyal. I hope they are, and some of them are, but it should be remembered by the people of the United States that in Hawaii every man has his finger on the trigger and one false move and a Japanese is killed. That may have something to do with it, but some of the Hawaiian Japanese are in relocation centers in the United States. If it had been believed that they were loyal, there was no reason for moving them out of Hawaii to the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Does our friend from Kentucky have any reason to believe or feel that our military and naval commanders and those who are responsible for the conduct of the war on our part are any less eager and anxious to redeem Burma or to open the Burma Road or to take planes and other materials to China than are the Senator from Kentucky and the others of us?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should not want to think so, but, if I had the means that are at their disposal, some of these places I could have taken sooner than they have.

Mr. HILL. That might be true; but I doubt it. The Senator has not the over-all picture they have, because I do not know of any man outside those in high command who could possibly have the picture which they have.

The Senator from Kentucky has, I think, on different occasions expressed his great confidence—a confidence which I share—in General Marshall, who is our Chief of Staff and perhaps more than any other man is supreme commander in this situation. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky still entertains the confidence in General Marshall which he himself has expressed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have the greatest confidence in General Marshall, but he is on a joint Chiefs of Staff conference which confers with the British, the Russians, and other members of the Allied Nations group. I am not certain, but it may be that sometimes some other country's case appears to be so urgent and so necessary that they do what that country wants, and we wish to show how big-hearted we are and how anxious we are to help everybody, so we do not do as much as we ought to do for our own people.

I feel so earnestly that the problem of Alaska and the Aleutians is one that offers such a direct menace to us that it ought not to be overlooked. I feel that no member of the joint Chiefs of Staff who represents the United States should be overpersuaded. I cannot help but remember that there have been numerous occasions in the history of the world when our diplomats and statesmen and generals have been completely out-generaled and overtalked or out-talked, and I fear sometimes we are not paying as much attention to the Japanese menace as we ought.

Mr. HILL. I think all of us share the feeling as to the importance of the Aleutian Islands of Kiska and Attu and the importance of taking those islands as soon as we can; but the Senator has illustrated the very thought that is in my mind. He moves from that front, important as it is, to the Southwest Pacific, to Australia, and then on to China, illustrating the very situation which confronts us that we have so many of these very vital areas——

Mr. CHANDLER. I realize that.

Mr. HILL. And of course our high command in the first place is faced with a situation as to which they have the facts which we do not have, and that they have to decide not what is vital, not what is important, but what is the most vital and the most important as of the moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I fear that they have missed that, because there is just one Japan. If the Senator had been here all the time, he would have observed that I started in Alaska and the mainland of the United States, then went through the Aleutians, and all the way around China, and all the way around to Australia. I have encompassed the whole Japanese situation, because the

Japanese are the enemy about whom I am anxious. If I thought that the officers of the high command of our Government knew as much about it as I think they ought to know, if I thought they were as anxious about it as I think they ought to be, I assure the Senator I would not say a word about it.

Mr. HILL. I am as anxious as is the Senator, but I think I realize, as I am sure the Senator does, the important problem that faces our high command.

The Senator has today predicated his speech on the inspection trip he made to Alaska last September, I believe.

Mr. CHANDLER. Last August.

Mr. HILL. It happens that following that visit of last August, to be more specific, on October 14 last, after the Senator had returned from his trip, General Marshall appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I was present on that occasion, as were the other members of the committee, together with the Senator from Kentucky, and I was very much impressed by what the Senator said on that occasion; and if the Senator will bear with me——

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have the Senator read the testimony. I enjoy hearing him read, and if he has it there, I should like to have him read it.

Mr. HILL. If something else has happened, if the Senator found out anything since he made the statement last October, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has not been present during the entire course of my remarks.

Mr. HILL. I have been here most of the time.

Mr. CHANDLER. If he had been here, he would have heard what I had to say about it.

Mr. HILL. I have been here during most of the Senator's remarks, and I have not heard anything the Senator said that, to my mind, affords any particular basis for the Senator speaking as he did last October, immediately after his visit, and now speaking as he does today.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let us hear it.

Mr. HILL. I read now from the report of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on October 14 last, when General Marshall was appearing before the committee, and was on the witness stand. The remarks of the Senator from Kentucky were, of course, addressed to General Marshall, the witness before the committee.

Senator CHANDLER. I recently visited an important military front—

Of course, that was the Alaskan front.

and I want to compliment you, General, on the morale of the soldiers and the job those fellows are doing in that important sector. If I have any claim to fame in this period it is because I have followed your leadership in trying to get us prepared, and I am prepared to go on with that.

The junior Senator from Kentucky continued:

We had quite a debate yesterday as to whether the soldiers would make political speeches and whether the Senators would run the war. I have no objection. Some of you fellows may be pretty good politicians, but if the Senators go out to war and the generals try to run politics, I think we will be in a hell of a shape.

[Laughter.]

Then the Senator from Kentucky continued:

I don't think there is anybody more anxious to succeed in this than you are.

That is, speaking to General Marshall about winning the war.

I don't think there is anybody more anxious to succeed in this than you are, and you are directing my military ideas about how to get this thing done and get it over, and I am going to stick with you, I am going to fight with you every time I have a chance.

Then, continuing, the junior Senator from Kentucky said to General Marshall:

I don't know how important it is for you or your associates to have my unbounded faith and confidence, but you have it and I am going to help you all I can.

I read these words because I remember that testimony, having heard it while sitting as a member of the committee, and it impressed me greatly. I knew the distinguished Senator had just returned from his Alaskan trip when General Marshall came before the committee, and I thought those were very strong words, "unbounded faith and confidence." Then I heard the statement of the Senator this morning on the floor of the Senate, or most of it—I left for a few minutes——

Mr. CHANDLER. Did the Senator hear, in the statement the Senator from Kentucky made, anything that suggested any lack of confidence in General Marshall?

Mr. HILL. No; but I wish to say that General Marshall, in whom the Senator has expressed unbounded faith and confidence, and to whom the Senator has pledged his continuing help, is the man who, in the final analysis, certainly so far as our military operations are concerned, has to my mind, the prime responsibility.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think that is an accurate statement at all.

Mr. HILL. He is our Chief of Staff. It is like——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the Senator's statement. He is making a speech, and this is my time.

Mr. HILL. Let me say one more thing, if I may.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is a good deal like what General Joffre said. Some one asked him, "Who won the battle of the Marne?" General Joffre replied, "I don't know who won the battle, but if it had been lost, it would have been Joffre who lost the battle." If we were to lose the war, if we were to have any unusual catastrophe, any terrible situation of any kind, I imagine that George C. Marshall, as Chief of Staff, would have to bear the prime responsibility.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the Senator's statement; it is not mine. General Marshall is a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He serves with other members, who represent other nations. I have not mentioned General Marshall's name, I think. I have had no occasion to say anything that would reflect on him. I have no reason to take back any word I uttered on the occasion to which the Senator refers. I think General Marshall is a fine general. He is a graduate of V. M. I., the only graduate of V. M. I. ever to become Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States. He was under Pershing in the last war. He is a fine gentleman. But he does not have complete say. He has some say. MacArthur manifestly is not satisfied with what has been given him. General Marshall is in the Pentagon Building here in Washington. MacArthur was in Bataan, and now is in Australia——

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Not now. Let me continue a little while, and then I shall yield.

General MacArthur is in Australia, confronted with 200,000 Japanese, and with an iron ring forged around him, after a year's delay. I wonder what General Marshall can do about that, if he does not do what MacArthur asks him to do. MacArthur said, "Send me some planes, and send me more men, and send me more ships in order to destroy the Japanese menace." It is a menace to MacArthur personally, and to his entire army.

Let me read something the Senator from Kentucky said in September of last year. My friend the Senator from Alabama is careful to dig up things which put a Senator in an inconsistent position, but the Senator from Kentucky is in no inconsistent position.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Not now. Let me read what the Senator from Kentucky said on September 1 of last year.

The Japs are rapidly fortifying the island of Kiska.

That was on September 1 last year. This is in the report signed by the Senator from Kentucky.

The planes we have on the ground are reported to be slower and less maneuverable than the Jap Zeros, and the longer we delay offensive action against them the more expensive it is going to be in men and materials to dislodge them.

That was no reflection on General Marshall, that was a statement of fact which I made from personal observation, that we should furnish as speedily as possible men and materials with sufficient power to drive the Japs out of Kiska.

I did not advertise that to the country; I did not advertise how many men and how many planes and how many ships we had. I never said a word about that because that would not have been helpful. But I did tell the President of the United States and Admiral Leahy, and I filed this report, and the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington will tell the Senate that we were deeply concerned with the situation in Alaska after we made that investigation.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to say that no one could have made the inspection trip to the Alaskan military and naval establishments without being alarmed

at the lack of defense for that area of our country. The back-door approach was wide open to enemy attack. The western section of the country is very grateful to the interest and concern of the junior Senator from Kentucky for his alert attention in this matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. If General Marshall has the supreme authority and power, as the Senator from Alabama indicates he has—which I say he has not—then I suggest that forthwith he do what General Buckner wants done in the Alaskan defense command, and forthwith do what General De Witt wants, and forthwith do what General MacArthur wants in Australia. I do not say that with any lack of confidence in General Marshall, and the Senator from Alabama has no right to suggest that I have a lack of confidence in General Marshall.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. HILL. What I tried to emphasize in the beginning was that General Marshall has before him the over-all picture, and he has the over-all responsibility, and must deal with the over-all picture, the over-all situation, with his over-all responsibility and with what he has. General Marshall has told us that one of his greatest problems arises from the fact that each commander in each particular theater of operations is naturally tremendously impressed with his own situation, and each one naturally wants more planes, more matériel, more men. We want to send them all the planes, matériel, and men we can; but after all General Marshall, having the over-all responsibility, and seeing the over-all picture, has to send to each theater the most he can, bearing in mind the needs not of any one theater of operations but of all theaters of operations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I realize that, and I would not say that General Marshall has not done the best he could in every situation which has been presented to him, so far as he has been able to do so, subject to the limitations which we all know must surround him. But I say that when we came back to the United States and undertook to talk with higher Government officials about Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, we were impressed with the fact—and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] will bear me out in the statement—that high officials here did not know anything about the Territory, that they had never been there, that they had never seen it. They knew it was a tremendous Territory, but they know absolutely nothing about it, and said so frankly. I do not know whether General Marshall has been to the Aleutians or to Alaska, and if he has not, he does not know anything about that Territory except what has been told him.

Mr. President, persons who agree with General Marshall sometimes have other interests. I have none except the interests of the people of the United States. I would love to help, so far as we are able to do so, England and Russia, and every other country which fights on our side, but not at the expense of placing the people of the United States in grave danger. This statement was made 8 months ago:

> There is no question in my judgment of the extreme importance of the Alaska Territory and Siberia as strategic points in any offensive against Japan and likewise for Japan to use against us.

This statement is contained in a secret report. It was not released 8 months ago. During the 8 months, for some reason, I do not know why, we have not been able to dislodge the Japanese from Kiska. The Japanese are still there. So long as they are there, they are a menace to all the people of the United States. The failure to dislodge them has made the job harder. The Japs have dug in as they have gotten in matériel, men, equipment, planes, and have established fields which they did not have 8 months ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. A moment ago my colleague gave expression to a view which probably he might want to modify, and that is the object of my interrogation. He rather intimated that other chiefs of staff and other staff officers here from the various nations may have overpersuaded our General Staff and our Chief of Staff to neglect some other part of the world in order to help them. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky would not want it understood that he thinks that the officers of Great Britain, for instance, who sit here with ours, and sit in on all the decisions which are made with respect to the world-wide fronts, would want to persuade our Government to neglect Australia, which is an integral part of the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Australians think the British have neglected them somewhat, I am sure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. The Senator says so. I do not know.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Australians do. There is no question in my mind that the British have neglected them somewhat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. They ought to criticize the British then.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well, I will answer my colleague's question. I feel that each one of the representatives of England and Russia represents his own country. They do not represent us. If they do not talk for their own countries they have no business in this country. If I went to such a gathering I would talk for the United States. I would not like to be outwitted, or outfussed, or overpersuaded against the interests of our own people. I realize that someone has to take the worst of it, but I do not want it to be our own people at all times. Will Rogers said we never have lost a war and we never have won a conference, and I become nervous when I find we are going into a conference with some of these other folks, although they are our friends. I want them to succeed, but I cannot agree to help them succeed against the best interests of our own people. I do not claim there is no other American who is not as anxious to protect our interests as I am, but if he does not see the true situation I am alarmed. When high-ranking officials of this Government, who are sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff as our representatives, do not know anything about Alaska and the Aleutians, what shall be said about it? They have not been to Alaska or to the Aleutians. No one had told them about that region. One of them had just come here from another country. He knew that we were spread out all over the earth, fighting everywhere, and against many enemies, and that all our forces needed supplies. I agree that all our forces need help and supplies.

I am pleading, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, with those who have charge of the job and who are able to have it done, to think more seriously of the importance of the war with Japan and of the great danger which results from having permitted it to continue for a year, without our having made much progress in fighting it. We took Guadalcanal after a terrific fight. The Australians helped us take New Guinea, or a large part of New Guinea. We went across the Owen Stanley Mountains from Port Moresby, and after having suffered great loss, captured Buna and Gona and other little places and drove the Japanese up into the hill country. The capture of those places will not mean much to us if the Jap fleet comes down from Singapore and Amboina and makes an assault on Australia, and overpowers Australia, simply because Douglas MacArthur does not have enough planes, does not have enough equipment, does not have enough men.

For what purpose do Senators think MacArthur is in Australia? Do they think he is "hollering" simply to hear himself "holler"? If anyone loses the Australian war MacArthur will lose it, and our troops will die defending Australia. Australia has a population of 7,000,000, which is about equal to that of the State of Texas. It is a country with a small population.

Mr. President, I am deadly in earnest about this matter. We can help England defeat Germany. In a few days I hope General Eisenhower, with the British Army and the American Army, will drive the Germans out of north Africa and take away Axis air bases there. Then a ring of steel will be drawn very tightly around Germany, from Russia down through Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, north Africa, to Gibraltar, and we will have Germany completely encircled. I am interested in that; I am anxious that that movement be successful; but I am anxious, Senators, that we shall not fail elsewhere. The Secretary of War said yesterday that he is going to send MacArthur all the planes he wants. I know the Secretary of War said that. He is a fine man, a courageous man, a fine Secretary of War. I know he wants to do all he can, but talking will not accomplish the result. The stuff needed must be on hand. It must be gotten to MacArthur.

Mr. President, General MacArthur's expressions have been of mingled sadness and bitterness. If one cannot read that

in his messages to the people of the United States one is not a good psychologist. General MacArthur is bitter and he is sad. He is bitter because the Japs drove him out of the Philippine Islands, and it was not his fault. He made a magnificent fight, but the Japs drove him out. Then he went to Australia, and with the equipment sent him from the United States he saved Australia from invasion. He did not save General Wainwright. He did not save the Kentucky boys, the Tennessee boys, the Georgia boys, whose names appeared in the first dispatches from the Philippines. They are in Japanese prison camps. God knows where. No one else knows. But I know how the Japanese have treated prisoners. I know the extreme cruelty which has been meted out to war prisoners and newspapermen and private citizens of the United States who have been in internment camps in Japan.

While the Japanese did that, in this country over 19,000 young Japanese between the ages of 18 and 37 were polled by the Army in the hope that, because they were American citizens, they would volunteer to fight for this country. Five thousand of them said their loyalty was to Japan, not to this country; and some of them expressed the wish to get indemnities when the war was over and as they said, when we were defeated. Those Japanese have lived for many years in the State of my friend the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. They have had vast opportunities. They have amassed $200,000,000 of the wealth of this country—the Niseis, those who were born in this country, and the Kibeis, those who went to Japan for their education, and returned to this country. We are housing them and feeding them at a cost of 45 cents a day for each one. It cost us 55 cents a day to feed an Army private, so it is obvious that the Japanese are rather well fed. This year the Army has procured their food at a cost of $70,000,000 to the taxpayers of the United States, and they want $80,000,000 for it next year. I want any Senator who goes to one of the relocation centers to observe the kind of treatment we are according the enemies of our country and the citizens of our country. Those camps, I say to the Senate, are fomenting hatred against the people of the United States; and if they are not discontinued, if some of those people who are loyal do not go into the Army and fight for the country, and if others who are enemies of the country are not placed in concentration camps, and if others who are declared loyal by the F. B. I. are not let out of the camps and allowed to work for the country, we shall have another Indian problem on our hands or else we shall be continuously supporting another generation of people, many of whom would help destroy the United States of America, if they had an opportunity to do so.

General MacArthur is obviously sorely disappointed over the failure to have furnished him adequate planes and men and equipment in order to conduct an offensive against Japan, so that he may be enabled to go back to the Philippines. When he left the Philippines he said, "I am coming back." But more than a year has passed, Mr. President, and he has not started back. There may be places more important than Australia, but in this war no places are more important to me than Oregon, Washington, California, Arizona, the Aleutians, and Alaska; they are our country.

This failure must not be continued. It cannot be justified. The sacrifices of our men in that area and the heartaches of our people are too great and too real to be ignored. Those who have so far carried on the battle so successfully must be supported. The Australian Minister of External Affairs says that Australia is not consulted on many decisions and that it should have greater representation in dealing with questions of global strategy. I do not know whether or not that is so.

He says they are not consulted. I am sorry if they are not, because I think they are important now—important not only to us but to the whole world scheme of things. He says it is a plain fact that Australia is bearing the brunt of the main Japanese war activities, that 80 percent of the land forces in New Guinea and in other areas of the South Pacific have been Australian, and that, in addition to the frightful losses occurring in actual combat, severe tropical diseases have accounted for nearly five times as many casualties.

Mr. President, contrary to comment rather widely made, the Senate has tremendous influence. I appeal to the Senate to use its influence with the high officials of our Government and with those in charge of our military affairs. Let Senators urge upon them the full realization that we are fighting, not one war, but two wars, and that the enemy in the west is growing stronger day by day because of our failure, our inability to carry the fight to him, even while the enemy in the east seems to have passed for the moment the zenith of his power.

I have been informed that the Secretary of War will send General MacArthur all the planes he needs. I take it that if he did not need any the Secretary of War would not send any to him. Because of those conversations, I take it that it was not any accident that General MacArthur and General Blamey and Mr. Evatt and all the other officials at one time eagerly sought to bring to the attention of the Government of the United States the true situation in the South Pacific area. I sincerely hope that, with God's help, the Secretary of War will be able speedily to keep his promise to General MacArthur.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wonder if the interpretation which the Senator has placed upon the statement made by the Secretary of War is justified?

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope it is. Perhaps it is not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since the Senator is discussing that all-important question, I think we should know precisely what the Secretary of War said.

I hold in my hand the New York Times of this morning. In a front page article written by Mr. Sydney Shallett, I find these sentences at the very outset:

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, promised an "increasing flow" of planes to Australia today but pointed out at his weekly press conference that there were many demands for military supplies from all quarters. This was a polite but unmistakable rebuke to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's determined efforts to get more planes.

If the correspondent of the New York Times who was present at the press conference drew the correct conclusion, the interpretation which the Senator has so generously placed upon the statement of the Secretary of War is not the correct one.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sorry if it is not; and I appreciate having my friend correct it, because I want to have the correct impression of it, and I want the Senate to have the correct impression of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may have been in error.

This is what the Secretary of War said, according to the New York Times:

The allocation of a limited supply to meet very large demands is a very difficult task. Priorities must be determined in the light of detailed studies of the whole global military situation.

To that statement I think very few can take exception. Of course, it is necessary to make a decision with respect to priorities. What the Secretary is discussing is what the priorities are and what they ought to be.

Then the Secretary of War went a step further; and this is the statement by Mr. Stimson which must be interpreted if we are to decide exactly what the policy of the War Department is:

We will keep our American and Australian flyers supplied with sufficient planes not only to replace losses but also to build up our aircraft to counter the increasing enemy air strength.

As I read that, it is merely a pledge of a decision to continue a defensive campaign. If I correctly understand the remarks of the Senator, his feeling, based upon his visit to Alaska, is that defense is not enough and that we should attack. If we are merely to send sufficient planes to MacArthur to counter the increasing strength of the Japanese, it will be a long time before the sort of an attack which ought to be made to keep China in the war, and to redeem the American soldiers who lost their lives or their liberty at Bataan, is made. I am not altogether certain, therefore, from what the Secretary of War has said, that he intends to follow a policy of granting sufficient priorities to MacArthur and the men in the South Pacific to wage the sort of war which ought to be waged there if the Japs are to be prevented from organizing and consolidating the tremendous resources which they have captured, and also organizing the vast manpower of the territories which they have overrun to make the machines and the airplanes with which to carry the war to us.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I agree with my friend from Wyoming. Without the power to carry the fight to

the enemy, we have no choice except ultimately to lose; and if that is to be the policy, I am certainly sorry to hear it. The statement has just been reported to me—I do not have the text of it—that the Secretary of War had promised MacArthur all the planes he needed. I had hoped that that was what he said. I had hoped that that would mean, not that we would have sufficient planes to repel 100-plane bomber attacks on Milne Bay, Port Moresby, and Guadalcanal, but that we would have, as we have had until recently, superiority in the air over the entire area, without which we cannot win that battle.

I want Senators to understand that I fully realize that every sector commander and every area commander thinks his sector is the most important. The War Department, the President, and all those who have charge expect those men to urge support for their commands so that they can do the job which has been assigned to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to his colleague?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I agree that no commander would be worth his salt unless he insisted that he be given not only all that he needs but even more than he needs, because it is always better to have more than is needed than to have less than is needed.

Assuming that commanders all over the world are urging and insisting that our Government send them what they think they need, and it is impossible to do it in all the areas of the world, who is to decide where these things shall be sent, and where priorities shall be given? I do not believe we can leave the decision to the individual commanders in various parts of the world. The decision must be made by those who have the power, and the facts on which to base allocations to the various countries. If we could give every general all he needs, or all he thinks he needs, our problem would be simple, provided we could get the material to him. The question of shipping enters into consideration very seriously.

I am in entire sympathy with my colleague's general objectives. However, I want him to consider that we do not have all the material which is necessary to give every commander what he needs, or what he thinks he needs; and the reason we do not have it is because we had nothing when we started. We have had to hold back the enemy with one hand while we made things with which to fight him with the other. We have been compelled to fight a defensive war until we could get superiority in ships, in the air, and in manpower. If we can not send matériel to every commander who wants it, who is to decide who is to receive it? Are the individual officers in the field to decide, or is the officer in command of the whole picture to decide?

Mr. CHANDLER. If through failure to supply a general in the field his situation becomes progressively worse—and in some instances their situations have become progressively worse—what are we to do? My colleague realizes that I am in earnest, because on no occasion since I have been in the Senate have I failed to support the President and the armed forces. I have never failed to advocate adequate appropriations for the Army and Navy, for everything which was essential to prosecute a vigorous war. I am trying to bring to the attention of those who make the decisions the feeling of a commander in the field, such as General Buckner, General DeWitt, or General MacArthur. Let me say with all the force I can command that I believe their situations are urgent. I believe that their commands are so important that somehow they should be supported more strongly than they have been supported.

I would not for anything ask that a single plane be diverted from some theater of the war where it would perform a useful service for our country to some place where it would not perform any service. However, I cannot escape the conclusion that as long as the Japanese are at our doorstep, as long as they are athwart our main supply line, we cannot carry the fight to the enemy. They are right across our main highway, and we must get them off. If we do not, if we permit them time to dig in—and they are digging in—it will make the war longer, and the cost to the country in men and materials will be greater. The grief in millions of homes will be more intense because of the necessary sacrifices involved.

It does not improve any situation for me to say now that 8 months ago I urged certain recommendations. I do not know why they were not adopted, but they were not. The situation still exists, and because those recommendations were not followed 8 months ago the cost in men, materials, and time will be much greater. In my opinion the whole campaign has been upset. We must pursue an offensive campaign if we are to achieve ultimate victory.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, and then I shall be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to remind the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which inspected Alaska—and there can be no harm now in stating what heretofore has not been stated—that at the time of the completion of the runways on the island of Umnak, where we were, there was not sufficient defense equipment to protect those runways from occupation and use by the Japanese after we had completed them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the statement of the Senator.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation, which I think we should all understand. The General Staff, or the high ranking officers who decide questions of allocation, are not failing the officers in the field. Of course, we expect the officers in the field to present their cases, and they have done so, and are doing so constantly. Every one of them, including General Eisenhower in Africa, General MacArthur in Australia, General Stilwell in China, and General Buckner in Alaska, have known and have been kept advised by the Chief of Staff as to what their allocation was and what they might expect. I do not know to what extent any particular general ought to go over the heads of his superior officers, through newspaper propaganda, to build a fire under the high-ranking officers in order that he may get what he wants, regardless of what may happen to other generals in other fields. I am not familiar with that particular type of military tactics. It may be all right, but it strikes me as being more political than military.

All the officers in the field have known, every time there has been a decision, what they could expect and what they were to get. I am sure that nobody thinks that the Government of the United States or the General Staff of the Army, or the high ranking naval officers—the Navy also has airplanes in the Pacific—are building planes and parking them on some field, and not sending them wherever they are needed as fast as possible. With reference to Australia, I am sure that my colleague knows, as we all know, that fighter planes cannot fly to Australia. Bomber planes can fly to Australia, but fighter planes must be transported by ships, and ships must travel in convoys. No convoy can go faster than the slowest ship in the convoy. The ships are able to make only three round trips a year between the United States and Australia. Even though we had fighter planes piled up in the airports of the United States, ready to fight, and with a pilot in each cockpit, we could not get them to Australia except by transporting them in ships, and it takes a long time to get them there. There are so many things entering into the equation that I do not think we ought to hold responsible the ranking officers in Washington or their allied associates, or anyone else who is doing the best he can to bring about the construction of all and more than we need, because we have not been able yet to produce enough and get the shipping facilities enough and fast enough, and train all the pilots who are needed.

Do Senators realize that only two out of every hundred air pilots in our air force now were in the Army when we declared war on the 8th of December 1941? Ninety-eight out of every hundred of our pilots have been trained since that date. They are giving a good account of themselves. On the average they have knocked down 6 Japanese planes for every 1 of ours lost. On the average, we have sunk from 2½ to 3 ships of the Japanese Navy or merchant marine to each one of ours they have sunk. These men are giving a good account of themselves with what they get.

I have no doubt that as soon as we are able to produce and ship enough equipment, airplanes, tanks, guns, and everything else, and get them to where they are needed, no officer in command of any field will have any just complaint against the treatment he has received in the matter of allocating what we are able to produce, which is a marvel of conversion of industry in a peaceful country not only unused to war but unprepared when we got into it.

I do not think the world could ever witness a more complete and successful transformation from a peaceful nation into a warlike nation than we have been able to accomplish. If we had had all these things to start with we would not have this problem, and no complaint could come from any source about the supply of ships or anything else. We did not have them. We have had to make them, and do the job while we were holding off the enemy. When we shall have attained superiority in the air, on every field, and on all the oceans—and we shall soon have it—we shall have no complaint about what our Army does.

I should like to take time enough to refer to what happened in north Africa. An effort has been made to discredit our Army in north Africa by saying that it did not fight or did not perform its part, and was shunted back into the rear.

Mr. President, the little sector in north Africa where the Germans broke through for a brief time with a hundred tanks and a complete armored division was held by less than a division of American soldiers, without a single tank. They put out of business 33 out of 100 tanks with nothing but a new instrument called the bazooka—whatever that is. I suppose it takes its name from Bob Burns' musical instrument, because it may look like it. I do not know what a bazooka is; but the fact is that less than a division of our boys held a German armored division with a hundred tanks, and the Germans did not gain 10 feet from the American boys in that fight. Yet a great effort has been made by someone in this country to discredit our soldiers in north Africa, and the effort to discredit them finds its way into the columns of the newspapers.

I feel that I ought to make that statement because a great injustice has been done by someone. I do not know who started it. I do not wish to call any names, but some commentator has started the rumor that our soldiers did not hold up their end of the stick in north Africa. No more magnificent fight was ever made. Our men were not seasoned troops like the Germans, or even like the Eighth Army, or the First Army, or any other army which has been fighting for 3 or 4 years. It was practically their first fight in north Africa, the first actual battle in which they had engaged; and yet with a smaller number and without a single tank, but only with rifles and the bazooka—whatever it is—they put out of business more than a third of the tanks the Germans sent against them and drove them back. In the end the Germans did not gain 10 feet in the space which they occupied.

I do not think our people at home, whatever be their motives or their desire to be read or heard over the radio, or because of any other motive which may prompt them, ought to go to the extent of trying to discredit the American soldier, who is fighting all over the world to preserve democracy and extend it, if possible, and doing it in a way which makes us all proud of the men we are sending into all quarters of the world.

Mr. CHANDLER. I heartily agree with the statement which my colleague has made. I do not minimize in any way the difficulties involved in this war. I have heretofore said that the fact that our fliers are well trained and our equipment is good, and we have kept qualitative superiority in those fields, is the only thing that has enabled us to make as successful a fight in this war as we have been able to make so far.

I should like to have every citizen of this country realize the gravity of this situation. I fear we do not. Recently I read a book entitled "Bushido," written by Alexander Pernekof. It undertook to detail what happens to a people when the Japanese military takes control. The lights go out. The civilization which we once have known would disappear for all time. The peoples whom they have conquered have undergone extreme cruelty and brutality, heretofore unknown. It is the story of Manchuria. It is the story of the puppet state of Manchukuo. It is the story of the Philippines. It is the story of Singapore; and unless we are wide awake, vigilant, and determined, it could be the story of the Aleutians, of Alaska, and of the Pacific Northwest. If the Japs are ever able to take Siberia—our military men do not think that is possible; I wish they did, because it is possible—I shudder to think of what might happen to the Alaskan mainland and subsequently to the heart of the United States.

Recent letters to me from my own people show their concern over this situation. I have before me one such letter, which I wish to read to the Senate. It is from my friend, G. K. Harmon, of Buchanan, Ky. He has four sons in the United States Navy, two of them serving in the South Pacific at the present time. He says:

Hon. A. B. CHANDLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As one who is vitally concerned in the successful outcome of the war with Japan, as well as the other Axis Powers, having at this time four sons in the United States Navy, two of whom are serving in the South Pacific area, I am addressing this letter to you with the hope that you will give some serious thought to the Japanese menace that our boys are facing.

Seemingly the Prime Minister of Great Britain and a lot of our war leaders in Washington are treating the Japanese as of secondary importance—Germany, Italy, etc., coming in for first consideration, while Japan is solidifying her positions and creating a greater menace to us with every passing day. I do not claim to be a great war strategist—

He is only a plain citizen of the United States, deeply concerned not only for the fate of his own boys but for the fate of the whole country. Yet Senators ask me why I am concerned about the situation.

I do not claim to be a great war strategist or anything of the kind, but I can see where we are being subjected to greater danger with each day from the inhuman, ferocious Japanese.

We know how they wrested the Philippines from us and are at this time strongly entrenched on them and it will take the lives of many of our boys and much time to recapture these islands.

Had General MacArthur had sufficient force and equipment at the time these islands were invaded he could have kept them and we would not have to go back there and attempt to recapture what we already had in our control. The same is now apparent in other areas of our southwest Pacific war zone.

Listen to this—

and the Secretary of the Navy does not seem to see eye to eye with the general who is right on the ground and knows whereof he speaks, but the Secretary wants to procrastinate and hesitate in the Japanese campaign and treat it with secondary consideration while our boys are at the mercy of the relentless Japanese foe.

Listen to this plea—

Senator, please take this matter up with the proper officials and see if something cannot be done that will place Japan on a parity with Germany and with the other Axis powers so that a full measure of assistance and supplies may be supplied to General MacArthur so that he can blast the Japs from the whole Pacific before they get so strongly entrenched.

Listen to this—

In passing, I wish to say that I am a Democrat and have always been a Democrat, and am not criticizing the administration, but am concerned—

I, too, am a Democrat; I have always been a Democrat, and I am concerned just as my friend from home in Kentucky is concerned—

about the outcome of war in the Pacific as well as elsewhere.

I repeat, my colleagues, the war in the Pacific is not a second-class war and Japan is not a second-class foe. It is a first-class war against, in my judgment, the toughest foe on earth at this hour.

With kindest regards to you, dear Senator, I remain your friend.

G. K. HARMON.

I have felt moved to read this letter in its entirety because it coincides with the feelings of thousands of good citizens of the United States whose only opportunity to speak in these trying times is through one of their chosen representatives. We must carry this fight to the enemy. Without the power to carry the fight to him, we have no choice except ultimate subjugation to his wishes. MacArthur and his men and our allies in Australia must be supported by the voice of the whole people of the United States, and they must be supported now and in force. We must not dally; we cannot afford to delay. Delay may bring disaster to the entire country. We have had too many narrow escapes in this war. Can anyone tell me why the Germans did not go to England from Dunkirk, when they had 250 divisions and could be met by only 1 British division on the other side of the Channel? Can anyone tell me why

the Japanese did not go back to Pearl Harbor after they had destroyed the striking power of our Pacific Fleet? If they had, they would have taken it, as the Germans, if they had gone 20 miles across the English Channel, would have taken England.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let me remind the Senator what we were told in Alaska about Dutch Harbor after it had been bombed. Will the Senator comment on that?

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank my friend. The general stated that if the Japanese had attacked Dutch Harbor in force on the 3d and 4th of June, they would have taken it, and if we had used the same power and force to get them out that we have used at Kiska, they would still be there. It is 10 times harder to blast a foe out of Dutch Harbor than it would be to get a few Japs off Kiska. The Senator from Oregon will agree with me in that statement. The Senator knows that Dutch Harbor would have been in difficulty under attack. Are we going to keep on courting narrow escapes and hope that we shall escape all the time, as we have escaped so far. I want Senators to look at the map, those of them who have not had time to study it. The map is of the greatest importance to the people of America. Look at the map and see what might happen if the Japs were able to take the important port of Dutch Harbor, and then remember how nearly they came to doing it. What would have been the consequence to the people of the United States if they had?

Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senate today because of my deep conviction that the officials of this Government and the military men have never realized the importance of the war in the Pacific. They have never counted it a major war, in my opinion, and we will never succeed in overcoming this frightful enemy until we take into account the fact that he is a powerful and relentless foe.

May He who holds the destiny of all of us in the hollow of His hand strengthen and sustain the hands of those noble sons of ours to carry on this bitter, cruel war. It was not a war of their choosing. May the God of Providence save many of them from the wrathful fury of the god of war, and may the perpetual light of God's sunshine be always upon those who, in the cause of freedom, again give their all so that another generation may live.

GASOLINE AND OIL SHORTAGES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, unless something is done, and done soon, to obtain increased production of petroleum, I am convinced that the military forces of the United States and our allies are going to be faced with gasoline and oil shortages at a time when adequate supplies of these are critically needed.

The oil discovery record of 1942—last year—was very poor; too few new wells, with too small production capacity, were brought in during the year.

During 1942 it was necessary, in order to meet the huge demands of our own and our allies' armed forces, to draw upon our storage stocks to the amount of 57,500,000 barrels. Senators, that was approximately one-tenth of our storage reserves. And the demands for oil and gasoline for military purposes during 1942 will probably seem small when we are required to meet the demands for 1943 and 1944.

This is our war to finance; this is our war to supply manpower; this is our war when it comes to making ships and planes and tanks and guns; and, emphatically, this is our war when it comes to supplying high-octane gasoline and the other petroleum products which are needed to carry on a modern war that covers all parts of the globe.

The figures of the Bureau of Mines show that in 1942 the demand for crude oil produced in the United States totaled 1,395,000,000 barrels, while the wells in the United States fell 10,000,000 barrels short of producing that quantity.

A committee from the Petroleum Industry War Council estimates that by the end of 1943 the demand for crude oil will exceed the maximum efficient producing capacity from all present fields, even assuming that adequate transportation is provided for a few areas not well supplied with transportation.

Incidentally, I want to note that construction of pipe lines and more pipe lines is not all there is to getting adequate petroleum supplies. Pipe lines transport only oil and gasoline; they do not produce crude petroleum.

Unless new wells are brought into production, this Nation, and the United Nations, are going to face a serious shortage of gasoline and oils just when the need may be the greatest.

Discoveries of new production in the past 2 years are not encouraging. Last year, 1942, new production discovered amounted to only 317,000,000 barrels. In 1941 the record was 361,000,000 barrels. This is a decided let-down from past years—one and two-thirds billion barrels in 1934, an average of 2,000,000,000 barrels new discoveries each in 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938; just under 1,000,000,000 barrels each in 1939 and 1940.

Let me summarize the statistical position of petroleum production and use:

In 1942 we used 1,395,000,000 barrels of petroleum and products.

In 1942 we produced 1,385,000,000 barrels of crude.

In 1942 we used storage stocks to the extent of 57,950,000 barrels.

In 1934 we discovered 1,699,000,000 barrels of reserve oil.

In 1942 we discovered only 317,000,000 barrels.

Mr. President, why is it that, just when the needs for petroleum and its products reach a maximum, the drilling of new wells, the development of new reserve supplies of petroleum have almost ceased?

There is only one answer. The Government of the United States, through price and other restrictive policies, actually is forcing a decreased production of petroleum, and, of equal and disastrous importance, is discouraging explorations for new oil fields.

In order to make a paper showing of holding down consumers' prices, the price for crude oil is being held down to such a low figure, compared to increased costs of labor and materials, that the wildcatters are not—well, they are not "catting"; that is all there is to it.

Representative WESLEY DISNEY, of Oklahoma, who has a first-hand knowledge of the oil industry, informs me that the costs for crude production in 1942 over those of 1941 amounted to 14 percent. But the price of 36-gravity crude in January 1937 was $1.22 per barrel. Last March 15 the price for the same crude in the same market was $1.17 a barrel. But the price of 63–67 octane gasoline, during the same period, rose from 5.125 cents a gallon to 5.5 cents. The price of crude has been driven down; the price for gasoline has been allowed to rise.

The small independent operators depend upon the prices they receive for crude for their living; it is their incentive to open up new fields. The big companies, engaged in refining and transportation and distribution of the finished product, are not so much interested in higher crude-oil prices. They buy as well as produce crude; they sell gasoline and oils made from petroleum.

I say, Mr. President, the little independent operator, upon whom the United Nations must depend largely for petroleum production, is being driven out of business.

Oilmen in whom I have confidence tell me that a rise of 50 cents a barrel in the price for crude would result in resumption of wildcatting, would bring in the needed new wells, and start crude production on the upgrade. We need that increased production of crude. Fifty cents a barrel is a small price to pay, considering the need.

Mr. President, I say the situation is serious. Some action should be taken, and taken promptly. It is the duty of the Executive branch of the Government to grant this increase—50 cents a barrel is necessary, the oil producers tell me—and to do it right now. If the Executive fails, the Congress should act promptly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point copies of telegrams I have received in the last few days in connection with crude oil production and crude prices. There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *April 11, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Knowing you are always willing to do what you can in behalf of independent producers in Kansas we are urging that you attend meeting to be held April 14 when Governor Schoeppel, T. A. Morgan, William Ainsworth, E. B. Shawver, and H. E. Zoller all from Kansas will appear before the Patman Committee on Small Business to make a plea for an increase in price of crude unless something

is done. We believe the small producers of Kansas will be unable to operate their business in the future. In the State of Kansas are a large number of small producers or royalty owners and we know you are vitally interested in their problems.

JACK JAQUISS,
President, Kansas Oil Men's Association.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The crude-oil situation is alarming.

Fictitious potentials have led our national leaders to believe there can be no shortage of oil. This is not true. If the present trend continues, we will lose many battles in 1944 because of grounded planes and tanks. It can be corrected if proper action is taken.

We know that you will go along with us, but that is not enough—we need someone to fight.

Everything concerning the crude oil situation will be brought out at the hearing before the Patman Committee on Small Business on April 14 at Washington.

We plead with you to attend this meeting so that you can hear first-hand about the situation from the people who know.

Yours truly,

H. M. GILLESPIE,
Secretary, Indian Oil Co.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We produce oil in several fields in Kansas. We know Kansas is producing all the oil it can produce without waste and in a number of pools more than it should produce. Costs of development and producing have increased around 40 percent. Oil cannot be produced at present price without loss to producer. Would appreciate very much if you can attend Patman hearing April 14.

THE WOLF CREEK OIL CO.

ELLIS, KANS., *April 12, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

As you know, the small independent oil producers are the operators who usually have found most of the new oil sources in any given year. Under present conditions now existing in the oil industry, especially in regard to the low price of crude, it is not humanly possible for the smaller operators to respond to the numerous appeals of the petroleum administrator for more wildcat drilling and from the obvious fact that we are using our oil reserves much faster than we are finding new supplies to replace them points to a dangerous condition, especially since the demand for oil by our armed forces is increasing daily. May I urge in this connection, that you attend the hearing set for April 14 before the Patman Committee on Small Business to further familiarize yourself with this dangerous situation.

R. A. NICHOLSON.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The oil business, in our opinion, must have relief soon if development is to continue. We hope you can attend the oil hearing April 14 before the Patman committee.

CARL HIPPLE OIL CO.

MCPHERSON, KANS., *April 12, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Please attend on April 14 the oil hearing before the Patman Committee on Small Business. Kansas production cannot be maintained without increase in price of crude to stimulate wildcat exploration. Entire State is being overproduced with waste at present time.

E. K. CAREY, *Oil Producer.*

WICHITA, KANS., *April 12, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

It is highly important that you attend the Patman hearing on small business April 14 and urge upon this committee the importance of seeing that appropriate steps be taken to insure the survival of the independent oil producers. The entire war program depends upon an adequate supply of crude oil and there is grave danger of there being a real shortage of oil unless immediate steps are taken to insure an increase in oil exploration.

ALLADIN PETROLEUM CORPORATION,
GEORGE H. BRUCE, *President.*

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Patman Small Business Committee hearing April 14 of utmost importance to Kansas oil production conservation and exploration. Urgently and respectfully invite your attention to and presence at this hearing. Only way possible to stimulate wildcat drilling is a higher price for crude oil. Situation now critical.

H. T. RITCHIE,
Oil Producer.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

May I urge that you attend the hearing of the committee on crude-oil requirements before the Patman Committee on Small Business on April 14? I believe the price of crude most important and pertinent to present situation. I believe that the petroleum industry cannot replace this natural resource at present cost of production. The price structure should be reviewed in the interest of our wartime needs and with fair treatment to producer. To increase production from present Kansas wells will unquestionably result in waste of crude.

A. W. KINCADE,
President, Fourth National Bank.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 10, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the hearing before the Patman Committee on Small Business, which is scheduled for April 14, to consider the problems of the independent oil producer in Kansas:

Kansas is producing all the oil the State can produce without waste and to justify more wildcatting and development, due to the shortage of manpower and the cost of operation, it is very important that we should have an increase in the price of oil.

Your earnest support of our problem would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

SOLAR OIL CORPORATION,
JAMES DAVIS.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *April 12, 1943.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

It is impossible for the small oil operator to continue operating or do any developing at the present price of crude oil while operating costs have advanced 30 to 60 percent and no advance in price of crude oil.

R. E. YOUKER.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a statement made yesterday before the House Committee on Small Business by E. B. Shawver, president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association. It sets forth the facts as to the critical oil situation clearly and correctly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am E. B. Shawver, of Wichita, Kans., independent oil producer and president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association. I have been producing oil for 28 years—during that time I have drilled hundreds of wells and have discovered a number of new pools.

I own and operate over 150 wells—most of them are small and stripper wells, average depth over 3,000 feet. From 1934 to 1942, inclusive, I produced 5,869,722 barrels of oil gross. My average cost of lifting that oil, which includes labor costs for pumpers, roustabouts, repairs, fuel, etc., was 0.3614 per barrel. The cost increased from 0.2825 in 1934 to 0.5306 in 1942. This is for producing oil, only.

My average cost, combined of exploration, developing and producing this oil over this period of time—1934 to 1942—has been $1.205 per barrel. This does not include any salary for officers. I am the only officer—and draw no salary.

The only reason I have been able to stay in the business was on account of my depletion credits.

Now I want to explain to you my operation in the past 2 years on my wildcat and semi-wildcat wells. The costs I quote here are the actual costs to me—drilling with my own tools, no depreciation: In 1941-42, drilled in wildcats and semiwildcats, as follows:

10 producing wells, total cost	$203,497.63
12 dry holes	98,916.82
Total for development	302,414.45

I estimated the recoverable oil from these 10 wells as follows: 405,000 barrels; less the one-eighth royalty, 50,625 barrels; total, 354,375 barrels at $1.17 equals $414,681.75.

Lifting cost over life of lease at 53 cents per barrel	$188,031.38
Development cost	302,414.45
Total cost	490,445.83
Total sales of crude oil	414,681.75
Total loss	75,764.08

These are the records as shown by my books—I have a copy of the records and will be glad to file it if you so desire.

Under these conditions it is impossible for me to continue, as I cannot possibly operate at a profit. In 1941-42 I sold 1,286,840.91 barrels of oil, gross, and discovered in this period 405,000 barrels of oil, gross—so I depleted my reserves over a 2-year period, 880,840.71 barrels. To continue on this basis means only one thing—failure. Therefore I have decided to quit the oil business. I know something about farming and ranching. I am going to do my part in helping win this war by producing food and raising livestock.

In all my experience in 28 years producing oil I have never seen conditions like they are today. I have seen the time I could not find a market for my oil, and have sold oil for $4 per barrel. I have sold oil as low as 18 cents per barrel at a greater loss than we are taking today, but in those days I always had in mind the fact that supply and demand controlled the price. That is not true today. We have refiners in our State shut down one-half the time for the want of crude oil. They would be willing to pay a premium for oil if they could get it, but it cannot be had.

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. We independent producers are not asking for an increase in prices for a personal financial gain only. You know if anyone makes large profits at this time it will go for taxes anyway. We have something else in mind—we can foresee a shortage of oil. In fact, we have a shortage now.

Here is the way I feel—if it costs more to produce the required number of tanks or planes to do the job—produce them at any cost. But what good are your tanks and planes without fuel to operate them? I don't want my boy or your boy or any other man's boy to return and say "Dad, we could have done the job sooner if we did not run out of gas," or he might even have to say "We lost the war because of a shortage of fuel."

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we will not conclude today until all Senators have their speeches made, and it is desirable to pass on the conference report as soon as possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator yield to us so that the conference report may be agreed to?

Mr. DAVIS. There are others who desire to make long speeches on the conference report.

Mr. President, I rise again to speak about one of the most serious problems that confront the citizens of western Pennsylvania—namely, the hardships and inefficiencies occasioned by the gasoline-rationing policy which prevails in that area.

This area of western Pennsylvania represents a geographical unit completely separated from the eastern portion of the State. It represents, moreover, a most strategic war production area, and an area which makes a substantial contribution not only to its own economic development, but to the development of other areas as well. This region has been designated as a part of zone 1, under the gasoline rationing regulations—and this notwithstanding the fact that this region produces much more gasoline than it uses. Even so, however, those agencies charged with the administration of the gasoline-rationing program have not seen fit to remove western Pennsylvania from the restricted zone. And the continued adherence to this indefensible policy has brought about the following results:

First. A considerable amount of valuable machinery and productive equipment is lying idle, because of the fact that there are no further facilities available for the storage of excess gasoline and oil products which are produced in this region, the continued accumulation of which has completely overtaxed all available storage facilities. These products are not being shipped to any other regions, nor are they being used in any manner whatsoever.

Second. An inexcusable loss of manpower and productive employment has followed upon this first condition, for, with facilities already overtaxed, there is no possible way in which the continued operation of the gasoline refineries in this region can be achieved.

Third. A problem of unavoidable absenteeism in vital industries has been brought about because of the fact that the limited gasoline ration permitted in this area is not sufficient to meet the essential needs of a great number of industrial employees, many of whom must travel as much as 30 or 40 miles to and from their work each day. And since the public transportation systems are completely overtaxed and unable to provide necessary transportation in this area, many man-days of valuable time are lost in this region each week.

Fourth. Many lines of civilian enterprise in western Pennsylvania have been adversely affected by the fact that a larger gasoline allowance is permitted in the State of Ohio, just a few miles away. Shopping and other necessary civilian transactions have followed the gasoline trade into Ohio, with the result that a number of the merchants in western Pennsylvania are experiencing very difficult times.

Fifth. The war production effort in this region, as well as the civilian morale have been adversely affected by this policy. Necessary absenteeism, consequent upon insufficient gasoline allowances, has served to threaten the production output of many war production centers in this area. And civilian morale has been dealt a damaging blow because the citizens, themselves, can easily recognize the fact that this tringent gasoline rationing policy in western Pennsylvania is as unnecessary as it is unproductive.

The people of this region are sincere, hard-working, patriotic citizens; and if this gasoline were being transported and effectively used in other regions, or effectively used by our armed forces in the prosecution of the war, they would be the last to object; but the facts are otherwise. The gasoline is not being shipped. Facilities are lying idle. Men are not able to get to and from their work; and many merchants in this area have suffered considerable losses in their business by reason of the fact that gasoline allowances in Ohio are such that they will permit these citizens to go into that State and make many purchases, which have heretofore been made in western Pennsylvania.

While I have repeatedly called these matters to the attention of the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator; and while a number of delegations have presented these same facts to these agencies, no adjustments have been forthcoming in this untenable gasoline rationing program in western Pennsylvania. I sincerely trust that Mr. Harold L. Ickes and Mr. Prentiss Brown will inquire into this matter more thoroughly, and come forward with the reasonable and sane adjustments which are so sorely needed in this particular area.

As an indication of the adverse conditions now being brought about by reason of this particular policy in western Pennsylvania, I wish to include as a part of my remarks a letter written me by Cornelius D. Scully, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, together with a resolution adopted by the mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania. The resolution sets forth in some detail the grievous conditions which now exist in western Pennsylvania, by reason of the present gasoline-rationing policy prevailing in that area. I sincerely hope that this resolution and the conditions which it points out will be carefully reviewed by the administrative agencies concerned; and that the righteous adjustments, which the Representatives of this district seek, will be forthcoming at an early date.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, *April 8, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Member of United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Herewith please find copy of resolution passed at a meeting of mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania held in this office on Wednesday, April 7, with reference to the exclusion of western Pennsylvania from district 2. Your cooperation in bringing about the objective of this resolution will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
Mayor, City of Pittsburgh.

Whereas the mayors and burgesses of the cities and towns of western Pennsylvania wish to do everything in their power to aid the war effort and fully realize that unnecessary controversy does not so aid, but in order to properly represent the people of their communities, must protest discrimination shown when West Virginia and four Pennsylvania communities are granted gasoline rations exceeding those extended to their citizens; and

Whereas in this time of crisis the 26 counties in western Pennsylvania here represented are together one of the most vital war industry areas in the United States with 90 percent of all industry engaged in production of material of war; and

Whereas the transportation systems of this area are taxed to the point where serious break-down is threatened, and this situation continues to grow worse with the erection of new war plants and the introduction of additional war workers where public transportation facilities are already inadequate; and

Whereas this area is the principal producing area of Pennsylvania grade crude oil, with production five times that of West Virginia; and

Whereas this area forms an economic unit in conjunction with northern West Virginia, eastern Ohio, and portions of Maryland and is separated economically and geographically from the remaining portion of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas the counties of western New York State formerly included in the buffer zone have appeared and asked to be included; and

Whereas assurances have been had from the Office of the Petroleum Administrator that he would reconsider the decision heretofore made, placing the 26 counties into district 1; and

Whereas we had been previously informed that it is administratively impossible to cross State lines in establishing ration districts, this has now been done by putting the cities of Sharon and Farrel and the boroughs of Sharpsville and Wheatland into district two, and has therefore eliminated what has been one of the strongest arguments advanced by the officials of the Office of Petroleum Administrator, and is a clear discrimination

against other Western Pennsylvania communities equally engaged in war industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the assembled mayors and burgesses, representing two and one-half millions of people, in communities whose war plants produce 40 percent of the steel which is going into our war effort, and large percentages of electrical and other equipment, present most respectfully to the Petroleum Administrator and to the Office of Price Administration the necessity and propriety of their personally reviewing the situation to the end that promptly, and in the interest of efficient and successful war production, and in the interest of maintaining morale and public confidence, this group of counties may be placed in District Two; Be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee be empowered and instructed to do everything within its power to accomplish the purposes of this resolution, including transmittal of the Resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from the area represented, and through such agencies as the United States Conference of Mayors, and through communications and interviews with all Federal officers concerned.

REGISTRANTS FOR GAS CONFERENCE

MAYORS OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Cornelius D. Scully, Pittsburgh, Pa.; John O'Connell, Jeannette, Pa.; R. E. Umber, Uniontown, Pa.; Charles B. Mayne, New Castle, Pa.; Charles R. Barbour, Erie, Pa.; Elmer J. Maloy, Duquesne, Pa.; J. G. Bollilender, Franklin, Pa.; John A. Conway, Johnstown, Pa.; Hugh J. Ryan, Bradford, Pa.; Samuel A. Stroth, Jamestown, N. Y.; Dennis Mutscheller, Beaver Falls, Pa.; Henry S. Coshey, Greensburg, Pa.; Joseph Lescanac, Monessen, Pa.; W. M. Campbell, Butler, Pa.; Fred F. Whipple, Meadville, Pa.; P. J. Hoenig, Titusville, Pa.; J. G. Payne, Oil City, Pa.; W. C. Walley, New Kensington, Pa.; M. F. Horne, Arnold, Pa.; H. D. Minerd, Connellsville, Pa.; W. D. Brickermyer, Grove City, Pa.; J. Bradly Marble, Washington, Pa.; John J. Mullen, Clairton, Pa.; Lowell W. Munroe, borough manager, Ellwood City, Pa.

BURGESSES

P. J. Caul, Ambridge, Pa.; J. J. Gerneth, Verona, Pa.; W. R. Stopp, Oakmont, Pa.; J. Edward Manion, Carnegie, Pa.; Charles W. Ashton, McKees Rocks, Pa.; Emil Stritmatter, East Pittsburgh, Pa.; H. R. Rowland, Wilkinsburg, Pa.; R. M. Withington, Vandergrift, Pa.; Charles J. O'Laughlin, Aliquippa, Pa.; R. W. Steber, Warren, Pa.; Thomas G. Bishop, New Brighton, Pa.; J. R. Maloney, Indiana, Pa.; W. I. McInerney, Midland, Pa.; William Parkerstone, Stone Boro, Mercer County; John A. Wagner, Mt. Oliver; W. E. Llewellyn, Port Vue, Pa.; C. W. Homer, Greenville, Pa.; Dr. U. F. Higenbotham, Fayette City, Pa.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a letter on the same subject, gasoline rationing, which I received from Fred F. Whipple, mayor of the city of Meadville, Pa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF MEADVILLE, PA.,
APRIL 12, 1943.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that I would like to explain the meeting held last week in the city of Pittsburgh. At that time, we organized 52 cities and boroughs in western Pennsylvania for the period of the duration. This organization was formed for the self-preservation and welfare of our people. You know that there are no political representatives closer to the people than the mayors and burgesses of their respective communities and the people look to us in times of discomfort and trouble to aid them.

Why Mr. Ickes has placed us in the Atlantic seaboard, I don't know. That area has nothing in common with western Pennsylvania. We are separated from them by that sparsely populated area lying through the mountains and we are a part, both western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio, of that great Shenango Valley industrial section. We have one county—McKean—that produces more crude oil than the entire State of West Virginia, yet they saw fit to place West Virginia in district No. 2.

In summing our case up, I believe we are justified in asking for the same rights and privileges and use of Pennsylvania gas that Ohioans enjoy with Pennsylvania gas.

I will be most interested to hear your reaction to the above letter. With very kindest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

FRED F. WHIPPLE,
Mayor.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to obtain an answer to a question which is raised in the conference report; that is, why is it necessary that it contain on page 3, section 4, paragraph (b) a provision which prohibits any of the funds provided for in the joint resolution to be used directly or indirectly to impose minimum wages or housing standards? That language is very definite insofar as American citizens are concerned. Then further on it contains an exception for foreign citizens. I should like to have explained to me why it is desirable to have the measure contain a provision of that kind which would most certainly enunciate something like a legislative monstrosity. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for the purpose of making a reply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I fear the Senator from Massachusetts has entirely misconstrued the theory of the measure. There is nothing on earth in it which prohibits the use of any part of the fund to house laborers who may be transported, or who may live in tourist camps, or in the camps which have been established by the Farm Security Administration. As a matter of fact the Senator will observe in section 2 (a) under subdivision (3) that the extension services are specifically authorized to lease, repair, alter, and operate labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Practically the same language is found in the powers which are given the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. The Senator from Massachusetts was in the conference committee, and of course he knows the facts concerning this language. It appears that an agency of Government, the Farm Security Administration, last year in moving some of these workers would not make them available to a farmer unless the farmer furnished certain housing facilities which in the opinion of the Farm Security Administration were adequate and were as they should be.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] read on the floor some testimony which was submitted to another committee of the Senate, showing that the Farm Security Administration in some of these matters had acted in a very arbitrary manner in regard to the housing facilities of migrant workers; that it had required housing conditions which were far superior to any that heretofore existed.

In the language to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers there is no limitation on the expenditure of the funds to provide housing facilities. It undertakes to prohibit the employees of any department of the Government from prescribing standards and making them a prerequisite to the importation or the placement of laborers on the farm. It has no relation to the expenditure of funds for housing, or the expenditure of funds for the payment of the farm workers. It undertakes only to prevent the practice which was followed last year by the Farm Security Administration in seizing upon the movement of agricultural migratory labor as the occasion to bring about what might be termed as some form of social reform in the condition of farm laborers.

The language, of course, does not draw any distinction, as the Senator seems to indicate, between the imported labor and the labor that is within the United States, except insofar as it is necessary to protect existing agreements with foreign countries. It so happens that the existing agreement with Mexico provides that certain housing standards shall be followed in protecting the laborers who are brought in from Mexico. The committee thought there ought to be an exception in that case, and that the Congress ought not to undertake to repeal an agreement which a sister republic, a good neighbor, had entered into in entire good faith.

It also, I may say, provides that provision can be made as to the rate of pay and as to the shelter of the American citizens who are transported from section to section. If the Senator will read the last proviso in section 4 (a) on page 3, he will find that it says:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

The only exception made which gives any benefit at all to any foreign workers, as the Senator implies, is in the case of agreements which have already been entered into between this Government and the Government of any foreign country for the importation of foreign labor.

The whole provision, in my opinion, was more or less unnecessary. The Senator from Massachusetts knows how the House conferees felt about it and how the House felt about it. Someone had suggested that the Farm Security Administration was organizing unions of farm laborers, and that its officials were seizing upon their power to expend Federal funds as an occasion for imposing certain reforms and certain ideas of some of the employees of the Farm Security Administration on the farmers.

It seems that for some of the migratory farm labor they had undertaken to provide working hours very similar to those prevailing in industry. Everyone familiar with farming knows that a 40-hour week on a farm would be an absurdity, and that any farmer who undertook to farm on the basis of a 40-hour week certainly would come to grief and to failure. So the House had written into this provision the limitation that no part of the funds should be spent by any agency of Government which attempted to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose and enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to agricultural laborers whom they might transport.

The Senate undertook to mitigate that provision by providing that with the exception of the existing agreement which had already been entered into, the same rule would apply to foreign labor that applied to labor within the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator for taking the trouble to reply to me at such length. I may say he has given me the best reply I have received so far, and I have been asking a good many questions about the matter. But his reply still does not alter the fact that plain English is plain English, and that this piece of legislation definitely states that—

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or hertofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards—

That is quoted. Then the measure goes on to say—

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country.

If it is desired to exclude the Farm Security Administration from conducting such activities, and to include some other agency of the Government, that could be done in simple English, it seems to me, without resorting to language as reactionary as the language contained in the measure before us seems to be.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late. I do not desire to detain the Senate much longer; but I do wish to recapitulate, for the benefit of Senators who were not in the Chamber when I commenced my remarks, my other objection to the measure, which is that it provides for the immigration into this country of native-born residents of the specified countries, and I believe that the phrase "native-born residents" can create a loophole for hostile persons, and possibly for saboteurs, to get into this country; because it is well known—and anyone who has traveled in the Americas is aware—that the machinery there for recording births and for determining whether or not a certain person was born in the particular country concerned is most rudimentary. That fact is recognized in the language of the measure, which, in effect, later on gives the administrative agency the power to admit practically anyone it wishes to admit; because the joint resolution reads:

And in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace.

That is the objection I have to the provision. Although it was drawn up with the utmost sincerity, I think it has the effect of being more or less of a joker. I believe it could have been better safeguarded, so that we would get the benefits of importing the labor and producing the agricultural crops without at the same time running the dangers to which the language exposes us.

Certainly, Mr. President, we do not want to lose our heritage for a mess of pottage, or in any way endanger our country and its institutions because of the existence of an emergency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a short time ago after the joint resolution was debated on the floor of the Senate, and passed, it was referred to conference, and from the conference this report has come. We have heard a great deal said here about bringing labor into the country. I wish to point out to the Senate that the number of persons who might come in would not be controlled, but that an invitation would be issued to the countries covered by the measure and to their people to apply for admission and to come into this country. For instance, on page 4 of the report, in section 5, paragraph (g) we find this language:

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax—

And so forth. In other words, the individuals themselves might make application to come into this country, and they would be permitted entry without bond. They would be permitted entry without tax, and their way to enter would be paved. What would the measure do beyond that? It would appropriate $26,000,000 to pay for the travel of persons who might indicate they wanted to enter this country for the purpose specified. It would pay for their housing, for their training, for subsistence, for health service, for burial expenses. I know the answer will be made that there is no immigration quota for persons coming from those countries.

However, what has kept the people of those countries out of our country has been the fact that heretofore they have had to pay their expenses in coming here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look at page 5 of the report he will find provision that—

Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940.

The committee considered the whole question which the Senator is now raising; and in order to be certain that the Attorney General would have indisputable evidence as to the identification of the persons concerned, the requirement was made that each one shall be provided with an identification card, with his fingerprints and his photograph, at the time when he comes in.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What the Senator has said goes very much to the question which was discussed—the question of the identification of native-born residents—but I am saying that, in my opinion, under the joint resolution, a flood of those persons will come into this country, for the joint resolution provides that any one of them who may apply for entry into this country may enter, and it further provides for the payment of his expenses in coming into the country and for the payment of his subsistence after he comes in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that if I thought that were the case, I would vote against the conference report; but I do not think it is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I can not see anything else in the language.

I believe it has been stated here by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for whose views and opinions I have great respect that he did not think many persons would come in under the provisions of this measure. I believe he said perhaps 25,000 would come. Suppose 25,000 should come in. I cannot see why only 25,000 would come, with the high wages paid in this country, with traveling expenses offered to them, with their subsistence and housing offered to them, and even their burial expenses offered to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no more of them will come for a very simple reason. The governments of those countries will not let them leave. In times past as many as 150,000 to 200,000 Mexicans have come across the border and engaged in agriculture, and nobody became excited about it. Now the Mexican Government will not let them come. It has specifically limited the number who may leave Mexico to 50,000. Last year only about 15,000 came.

The same provisions to which the Senator refers as threatening the foundations of the Government were in effect

last year. Last year we paid their transportation. Last year, under contract, we agreed to see that they were housed, and that they received as much as 30 cents an hour. We paid for the transportation of household goods, and paid burial expenses. We did all that last year; and yet crops were lost because we could not get enough of them under the conditions of which the Senator complains.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Accepting the figures of the Senator from Georgia, let us assume that 26,000 should come in. It it proposed to appropriate $26,000,000 to look after 26,000 persons.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has evidently not even read the joint resolution. Under section 2, $13,000,000, or half the money to be appropriated, would go directly to the county agents to handle local recruiting within the States. Only $13,000,000 would be available to the Administrator for all the functions he must perform; and all of it cannot be spent, as the Senator says, on transportation, training, and burying of Mexicans, because there are too many other phases of the joint resolution.

The Mexican phase of the joint resolution is a very small matter. Last year something like 200,000 Americans were transported from one section of the country to the other, as has been done for many years past, to engage in agriculture. This year we will continue to transport some of those Americans. Thirteen million dollars of the money will go to the county agents to be used for local recruitment and training of farm labor. The Senator would have the Senate believe that only Mexicans would be involved under the terms of the joint resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. Less than 4 percent of all the labor involved under the terms of the joint resolution will be labor from Mexico or from any other foreign country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I stand corrected in that respect. I believe the Senator is correct. But what about the other millions, not only for the Mexicans but for persons from Central and South America and the Bahamas?

Mr. RUSSELL. The only difference between the joint resolution and the existing law is that under the terms of the joint resolution the head tax, which I think amounts to about $8, would be waived. If anyone wishes to come to the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution, he must be an agricultural laborer. He must agree to labor at a certain place and under certain conditions, under the contract which is entered into. The only difference between the present law and the joint resolution is that we waive the payment of the head tax which has heretofore been required, and waive the provisions of the contract-labor law, to permit persons from the United States to go to other countries and undertake to find agricultural laborers. Heretofore that has been prohibited by the immigration law.

At present there is no quota applying to the countries of this hemisphere. Tens of thousands of residents of Canada work in the United States every day. They cross the border and go back. This fact has not been mentioned, but already four or five thousand Canadians have been mobilized, to be brought to New York State, Massachusetts, and other New England States, under the provisions of the joint resolution, to engage in agricultural labor.

So far as foreign labor is concerned, practically the only thing the joint resolution does is to waive the head tax and waive the provisions of the contract-labor law, which thus far has prohibited anyone from bringing in labor under a contract to do agricultural work. Under the provisions of the joint resolution we would pay the transportation of a selected group. That is about the only difference between the joint resolution and the strict requirements of the existing immigration law. Otherwise, there is no departure from the policy which was pursued during the year 1942 by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator speaks of a selected group. Does he mean a selected group of persons from other countries?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do; a selected group of Mexicans, for example.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Wherein is there any selection, when the language of the joint resolution permits anyone who wishes to come in to make application?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator construe the joint resolution as providing that any person in South America who wishes to come in will have his transportation paid?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I had any such view as that about the joint resolution I would vote against it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us look at the language on page 4, in section 5 (g):

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917—

And so forth. If that is not an offer to the persons themselves to apply for entry into the United States, rather than the selection of persons, I cannot read or understand language.

Mr. President, the hour is growing late and I know that a vote is desired. I invite attention to subsection (b) of section 4, on page 3, under the heading "Limitations." This section is a limitation upon the expenditure of funds proposed to be appropriated. Subsection (b) provides:

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country:

So far I raise no question; but this language follows:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

Am I to understand that language to mean that the funds appropriated under the joint resolution, Government funds, may be used to negotiate any labor contract with an employer of farm labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question arose in the Senate committee as to whether or not, under the language of the House bill, which prevented any agency from directly or indirectly fixing wages, any person employed through these funds could be assured the prevailing wage. It occurred to some members of the committee—and I have forgotten who offered the amendment—that it might be difficult to persuade a farmer to leave Georgia and go to work in Florida if the farmer had absolutely no idea what he was going to be paid when he got to Flordia. So this language was inserted in order that those who were attempting to recruit labor could obtain an agreement from the farmer who needed farm laborers that he would pay the prevailing wage. They, in turn, could assure those whom they were seeking to recruit that they would receive fair treatment and shelter if they left their homes and undertook to assist in gathering crops in some other State. That was the purpose of the language.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it does not go beyond that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this appears to be an appropriation of money to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. As I understand, a new office has been created. In effect, a new bureau has been created. In my judgment we have enough bureaus in the Government. I am opposed to the creation of any more, and I am opposed to any measure which would effect that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	McFarland
Austin	Ellender	McKellar
Bankhead	Ferguson	McNary
Barkley	George	Maloney
Bone	Gerry	Maybank
Bridges	Gillette	Millikin
Burton	Guffey	Moore
Bushfield	Hayden	Murdock
Butler	Hill	Nye
Capper	Holman	O'Daniel
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Overton
Danaher	Lodge	Radcliffe
Davis	McClellan	Revercomb

Robertson	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wallgren
Shipstead	Tydings	White
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. I think it is desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER's name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], on business of the Senate.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is absent from the city, conducting hearings for the Special Committee to Investigate Production and Uses of Fuel Oils.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Florida.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages.

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] has been called from the city on public business.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who, I am advised, if present and voting, would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business as members of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Gerry	Murdock
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Guffey	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maloney	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Maybank	Wagner
George	Millikin	Wallgren

NAYS—18

Bridges	Lodge	Robertson
Bushfield	McNary	Shipstead
Capper	Moore	Taft
Danaher	Nye	White
Davis	O'Daniel	Willis
Holman	Revercomb	Wilson

NOT VOTING—39

Andrews	Downey	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Brewster	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Buck	La Follette	Truman
Byrd	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Walsh
Chavez	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Murray	Wiley

So the report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR EXERCISE OF STABILIZATION FUND POWERS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, earlier in the day I reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency Senate bill 991 which proposes simply the continuation of the powers relating to the stabilization fund, which has been in existence now for over 9 years. Since all the bill proposes to do is to extend the time within which the powers may be exercised, and since we have passed upon that matter on four different occasions in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if the Senator from New York has any further announcement to make in connection with the measure?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what the Senator from Michigan means by "further anncuncement."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know if it is definitely understood in connection with this action that the proposal to continue the present power to devalue the dollar is definitely postponed for the session?

Mr. WAGNER. I can only say that the committee passed upon that question and eliminated that feature from the bill. The bill now deals only with the question of stabilizing the foreign exchange of the dollar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I correct in understanding that the remainder of the bill, which has been eliminated for the time being, is not to be renewed?

Mr. WAGNER. Not so far as I know.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I conferred earlier in the day with the able Senator in charge of the bill, and later with the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I understood the plan was that the devaluation feature would be abandoned for this session.

Mr. WAGNER. That feature has been eliminated from the bill. I take it that is what it means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is going to be a definite statement to that effect, or I shall object.

Mr. WAGNER. I say that so far as I am concerned it is eliminated and will remain eliminated.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that was the understanding I had, that it was eliminated, and would not again be brought up at this session of the Congress.

Mr. WAGNER. I believe that is true.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 991), to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain that I have consented to this arrangement on the basis of what was specifically stated to me to be the unqualified agreement that the effort to pass legislation extending the power to devalue the dollar will not be resumed at this session.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who is authorized to enter into such an agreement, and I should like also to be advised if such an agreement has been entered into.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator from Utah is entitled to the information, and I want it also.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly want it.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I am opposed to devaluation, but I think it is entirely unfair to ask a Senator to speak for 95

other Members. As the Senator from Michigan knows, any Senator is permitted to offer any special legislation at any time he desires. I do not think it is a fair question, and I do not think it can be fairly answered.

Mr. WAGNER. I can speak for myself and say that I do not propose to do so, if that is what the Senator from Michigan would like to know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. He suggests that the question I asked is unfair. I should like to ask if it is not the understanding of the Senator from Connecticut that the statement I have made is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Frankly, if I understood the Senator's question correctly, I do not think it is correct or fair. Insofar as I am concerned, I do not want the proposal made again. I wanted to see the provision in question stricken out, and I made that proposal in the committee. I was anxious to have it go out, and it was stricken out. But obviously no chairman or any committee member can speak for 95 other Senators as to whether this proposal will again be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator. I am asking the Senator whether those who are in charge of the proposed legislation have not asserted as a part of the program to pass the measure this evening, that so far as they are concerned, there will be no effort made to renew the extension of the devaluation feature.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that is true, but it cannot be binding upon every Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want to know.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, but I have been somwhat interested in this particular bill. I think there can be no doubt that there would be no request from the Treasury for the renewal of the devaluation provision, which has been eliminated from the bill, certainly not until after the end of this war, when currency fights of some sort may arise which would then make it necessary to consider a matter of this kind; but certainly not during the war period. I think one might confidently conclude that the Treasury will not again ask the Banking and Currency Committee to consider the devaluation section.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I do not want at all to prolong the discussion. I do not believe anyone is authorized to agree on any such matter as has been suggested. It was my opinion in the Banking and Currency Committee today, and it is still my opinion, that if the Government finds itself rigidly tied to gold, when an international conference on international exchange is held, we will probably find this country at a very decided disadvantage. I do not know at all what the President's attitude is on this matter. I heard the Secretary of the Treasury this morning, and I was rather disappointed in the statement made by him with reference to the devaluation policy. As one member of the Banking and Currency Committee it would not surprise me at all if the President of the United States should be forced by reason of international conditions to ask for an extension of this power, and I certainly do not want to be bound by any such agreement as I have heard suggested this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 991) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment. On page 1, after line 9, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. The second sentence added to paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, by section 12 of said Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The powers of the President specified in this paragraph shall be deemed to be separate, distinct, and continuing powers, and may be exercised by him, from time to time, severally or together, whenever and as the expressed objects of this section in his judgment may require; except that such powers shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(c) All the powers conferred by this section shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended and the operation of the stabilization fund terminated."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John Russell Young, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified (reappointment).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Rhoton Parrott Clift, of Tennessee, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott P. Stewart, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be register of the land office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

REREFERENCE OF NOMINATION OF WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. William Embry Wrather, of Texas, to be Director of the Geological Survey, came to the Senate on April 9, and by mistake was referred to the Committee on Commerce because it was misunderstood as being a nomination to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be rereferred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, where it belongs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, today the Committee on Military Affairs reported favorably the nomination of Mr. Rhoton Parrott Clift, of the State of Tennessee, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office of the War Manpower Commission. That nomination has been held up for some time.

Mr. Clift has the office, and he is an entirely worthy man. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clift's nomination be considered and confirmed at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the nomination been on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not on the calendar. The nomination was reported today.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator said it had been held up for some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. It had been held up in the committee for some time—since March 23, as I recall. Of course, Mr. Clift is anxious to know what action is to be taken.

The ACTING PRESIDFNT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today the Committee on the District of Columbia reported the nomination of John Russell Young to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nomination at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the nomination a reappointment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I think Mr. Young has served most acceptably; and personally I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Russell Young, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of Mr. Young's nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Rhoton Parrott Clift to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Memphis area office of the War Manpower Commission.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John Russell Young to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Scott P. Stewart to be register of the land office, at Salt Lake City, Utah.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Fred M. Taylor, Greenville.
Marvin S. Wick, Hermosa Beach.
Dale K. Campbell, Mariposa.
Charles S. Catlin, Saticoy.
Alfred R. Montegani, Tiburon.
Charles E. Conner, Torrance.

ILLINOIS

William E. Clark, Amboy.
Myrtle M. Hyland, Cherry Valley.
Blanche Linebarger, Elwood.
George C. Guard, Equality.
Vernon F. Nixon, Lomax.
Charles H. Anderson, Mount Pulaski.
Rudolph Mueller, Sherrard.
Melvin Higgerson, West Frankfort.

MAINE

Nelson A. Harnden, Belgrade Lakes.
Afton H. Farrin, South Bristol.
Lucy H. Bromley, South Windham.

MINNESOTA

Howard H. Gunz, Center City.
Henry A. C. Saggau, Ceylon.
Albert O. McEachern, Delano.
Dagny G. Sundahl, Grove City.
Earl Stanton, Hayfield.
Charles Smith, Lake Wilson.
Joseph G. Bauer, Madison.
Carl C. Heibel, Northfield.
John M. Lannon, Prior Lake.
Hjalmer A. Johnson, Soudan.

NEVADA

Charles E. Merkel, Beatty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William T. Hemingway, Hemingway.
Blanche B. Hudson, Ruffin.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Krevosky, Grant Town.
Jeremiah W. Dingess, Huntington.

WISCONSIN

Dominic W. Riley, Baldwin.
Bernard G. Schramske, Boyceville.
Shirley C. Harrison, Cottage Grove.
Lola M. Meyer, Dane.
Alfred P. Schwalbach, Germantown.
Wenzel M. Dvorak, La Crosse.
Joseph F. Kaminski, Lake Delton.
Raymond J. Voemastek, Rib Lake.
Stephen J. McShane, Rice Lake.
Katharine G. Lynch, Sullivan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord reigneth, He is clothed with majesty; the Lord is clothed with strength wherewith He hath girded Himself; the world also is established, that it cannot be moved. Thy throne is established of old and Thou art from everlasting. The floods have lifted up their voice, the floods have lifted up their waves. The Lord on high is mightier than many waters, than the mighty waves of the sea.

O look upon us while we breathe the chant of the ages: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." Enable us to repose our confidence in Thee that we may be sustained by the unbroken inflows of strength and power. Constantly remind us that the basis of all worthy achievement is unswerving fidelity to chaste speech and dignity to the accepted sanctities of public and private life. We humbly pray that the Divine Mind may bless the avenues through which the plans and purposes of our country are directed. O Thou before whose eyes nothing is hidden, beckon us all into Thy paths, breasting the currents of doubt and unjust criticism. Stimulate us to find the very floors of truth and justice and to follow the guide posts of Thy injunction:

Who shall ascend unto the hill of the Lord; he that hath clean hands and a pure heart and hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.

Through Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. John Carson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the charge has been quite frequently made on the floor of the House in the debate on the agricultural appropriation bill that there is something communistic about the Farm Security Administration. Let me read this report from a concern that would be the last one in the United States ever to be charged with favoring communism—the American Medical Association:

Any plan to promote improvement in the collective family health among Farm Security Administration clients should redound to the general benefit. The aid given farm families which improves their economic condition and enables them to liquidate their obligations has a sound economic basis.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the source of that statement?

Mr. BURDICK. The American Medical Association report appearing in Harpers for April.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to know who the authority is. If it is the American Medical Association, that might be one thing; but if it is signed by some individual, that is quite another.

Mr. BURDICK. I will hand the gentleman the published statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have a telegram from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference which also strongly urges support of the Farm Security Administration. I think that also would be the last organization to endorse anything communistic.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for that information.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Building Construction Trades Council of the metropolitan district of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 370), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Sunday, April 11, 1943, written by Mr. Walter Trohan, entitled "One and Half Million Poles Reported Held as 'Red Pawns'"; and further to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in today's Times-Herald of Washington entitled "Hull Unaware of F. D.-Eden Poland 'Deal.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a table showing the Farm Security Administration program in 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Un-American Activities has ready for distribution a report on the Axis front movement in the United States. This is the first section, with other sections of the report on this same movement coming out from time to time. I suggest to all Members that they read these sections thoroughly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

QUESTIONNAIRES AND REPORTS DEMANDED OF BUSINESS CONCERNS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to put into the RECORD for the benefit of those whose business it is to look into the problems of business, especially questionnaires and reports demanded, a case recently brought to my attention.

At my request an official of the Cleveland Twist Drill Co. gave me the following:

> To conform to Government requirements it has come to the point where it takes practically all of the time of our chief men, and the running of the business has to be delegated to younger assistants.

Relative to one order he informs me as follows:

> The order came to us from the Cleveland Ordnance Department and is what is known as a war-aid shipment, and apparently went to England for the British Ministry of War Transport.
>
> There were 47 packing cases in this shipment. The ordinary business procedure is to put a list of the contents of each box in that box, but in this instance we had to make out an 8-page packing list of the entire shipment, listing the contents of each of the 47 boxes, and then put 1 of these 8-page documents in each box and attach 2 more copies to the outside of the box. I am enclosing an extra copy of this packing list, so that you can see exactly what it is. Three of these for each of the 47 boxes took 1,128 pages.
>
> In addition, we had to make out 32 copies of what is called a receiving report, but which corresponds to an ordinary commercial invoice. * * * The invoice for the shipment under discussion covered 47 boxes and 10 pages. The instructions, you will note, called for making 32 copies of this receiving report, 30 of which were sent to one address, which appears in the directions as CLD Property Branch. I am not clear just what this indicates.
>
> You can see for yourself how complicated these instructions are and what difficulties are involved in understanding and following them. The 32 copies of this 10-page invoice made 320 pages of additional paper work in connection with this transaction, and, added to the 1,128 pages of the packing list, gives a total of 1,448 pages. I hope this gives you the information that you wanted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include an article from Editor and Publisher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FORT WAYNE AND THE SECOND WAR LOAN DRIVE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to find the words to adequately express my pride and joy at being able to announce to the House that a community in my congressional district—Fort Wayne, Ind.—was the first major city in the United States to oversubscribe its quota in the Second War Loan Drive, which started on April 12.

Fort Wayne is a thriving industrial community of typical American homeowners, located in the heart of the rich northeastern Indiana farm country. Hundreds of Fort Wayne sons and daughters are serving in the armed forces of the Nation, and many have been decorated for gallantry.

Fort Wayne was assigned a quota of $13,600,000 in the Second War Loan Drive. A few hours after the drive opened on Monday of this week, national press associations flashed the news that Fort Wayne had gone over the top in its bond drive, subscribing $16,000,000. Leaders of the drive in Fort Wayne, not satisfied with this, announced that they expected to raise at least $20,000,000 before the end of the campaign.

Those who are acquainted with Fort Wayne's record in this war, and in World War No. 1, were not surprised by this news, for Fort Wayne and Allen County already lead the State of Indiana in War bond pay-roll deductions, while the State of Indiana continues to lead the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Wayne sons and daughters are giving their lives in the cause of freedom and democracy, on battle fronts throughout the world. And Fort Wayne mothers and fathers are backing them up on the home front with extra dollars for War bonds—matching, as best they can, the sacrifices of their loved ones. Fort Wayne has met the challenge. Fort Wayne has gone over the top. All hail, Fort Wayne.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief address by Colonel Garner, director of planning of the Army postal service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that that subcommittee may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that either a subcommittee of a committee or a committee itself should be granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House while a bill is being read in the House under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BRYSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after all other business, and all other special orders heretofore entered are disposed of, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of freight-rates discrimination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a bill that I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution by the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, adopted by them on the 27th of February 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days a letter from the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, addressed to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. JED JOHNSON, was distributed to at least two newspapers which have sent me the original copy, with a note in the margin, in the handwriting of my predecessor's wife containing the following statement:

Our Third District Congressman takes credit for putting this over, and in the Antlers American (his own paper) he is called the Churchill of the Kiamichis.

The fact is, Prentiss Brown said STEWART came to his office half drunk and "cussed out" his clerks in such a manner that he refused to see him.

The SPEAKER. In passing on this question the Chair desires to read rule IX on Questions of Privilege:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to adjourn.

The Chair thinks the gentleman states a question of personal privilege, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, if you will refer to the RECORD of April 15, page 3420, you can read the letter, the subject of this discussion, without rereading it or reintroducing it at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I hope the gentleman will read the letter again. I think it would be very interesting and very enlightening to the Members. In short, would the gentleman please read the letter?

Mr. STEWART. On the 25th of March, 1943, the 4-H Club boys and girls and Future Farmers of America, farm boys and girls, were in attendance of the annual sale—fat-calf show—offering prize calves at public auction. I contacted the branch of his department which deals with price ceilings of cattle on foot, of the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, O. P. A. Administrator. I will refer to them, since I do not remember their names, as the satelites of this branch of O. P. A. But before I had an opportunity to state my case I was turned down.

When I am for anything I am enthusiastically for what I am for. I tried to impress them with my seriousness in a vernacular which they understood. After I saw that I had not registered sufficiently, I contacted my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JED JOHNSON], my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WESLEY DISNEY], and my senior Senator, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I get the story correctly, they used practically the same language. But the final result was that after Mr. Brown had been appealed to, not by me—I have never had the pleasure of meeting him—I did, however, go to the Committee on Agriculture where my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] was in attendance of a committee meeting, with my colleague the gentleman from Oklahome [Mr. DISNEY], and when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] talked with Mr. Brown he gave him the assurance that he would give the matter favorable consideration, in amending the then order to where the sale may go forward on the open market. Mr. Brown later verified that, as I am told by my friends the gentlemen from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM and Mr. JOHNSON], he assured them that he would amend the order to where the 4-H Clubs and the F. F. A. Clubs of Oklahoma might proceed with the sale without selling their fat calves at a loss on the ceiling of 16 cents a pound to the packers. The order was issued at 3 o'clock; the sale started at 7 o'clock the same day.

I was not trying to encroach upon the privileges, prerogatives, or political welfare of anyone. The individual that contacted me was State Senator Phil Lowery, one of my colleagues while in the State Senate of Oklahoma, a constituent of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. We have worked for the betterment of the cattle business together for many years. I did not write a newspaper release. I did not ask Senator Lowery to contact a newspaper. My sole interest was in these boys and girls who make an annual pilgrimage to the State capital city in the hope that their calf would win the blue ribbon. I repeat, I was enthusiastically for an amendment permitting this sale. I was for it strong, and I think the satellites thoroughly understood my position, and that much of the statement is admitted.

The other part of the statement I leave with you, my colleagues. I was on the floor of the House what time I was not before the O. P. A. experts. I always hope for the best but am prepared for the worst, and in my many years in public office in making campaigns I have never taken occasion to deny anything. But as aforesaid, I happened to be on the floor of the House aside from the time I was calling upon that branch of the O. P. A. the entire day, and my 434 colleagues are far better prepared to pass honest judgment upon me and my condition than these three fellows who had undergone quite a heated conference.

You know, I have had many kinds of experiences in politics. I have had lady opposition. I was not advertising myself when I picked up an editorial from the Daily Ardmorite and reproduced it in my newspaper, the Antlers American, with an appellation which I did not spurn, as "Churchill of the Kiamichis." I shall offer this at this time without taking the time to read it. It is as follows:

CHURCHILL OF THE KIAMICHIS

Now comes a news story from Washington labeling PAUL STEWART, Congressman from the Third District, as the "Churchill of the Kiamichis," and along with the news story appears a picture of Britain's great Prime Minister and the Third District Congressman who hails from the very foothills of those far-famed southeastern Oklahoma mountains.

Some are prone to criticize the Congressman for shattering an old congressional custom that a freshman Member keep his mouth closed at least for his first 2 years in that body. Well, friend Paul has been shattering precedent all of his political life and that's quite a long time if one cares to look at the record. He is likely to shatter precedent and have something to say on any question affecting people of this district, and if that be treason, the meek and lowly in Congress will have to make the most of it, that's all.

Paul doesn't like labor racketeers and isn't afraid to say so right out in meeting, of Congress or anywhere else. He doesn't like some phases of the Denison Dam set-up and voices same. These are his two pet peeves, and he further doesn't like the ceiling price on eggs which makes him pay 69 cents per dozen in Washington while farmers in his congressional district can only get 31 cents for same.

Now the action of the gentleman from the Kiamichis may shock the sensibilities of some of the top-hatted gentry in Congress, but they might as well gird themselves because they are likely to hear more of PAUL STEWART, when he sets out on a tour of smashing precedent.

Somehow the people back home seem to like what he does and says, so there doesn't seem to be very much the "sacred cows" in the Nation's Capital can do about it.

If you are interested, you may read the letter as to the charge of "Churchill of the Kiamichis." I want to thank the editor now. I do not think I have written him and thanked him for this appreciated editorial.

I have not interested myself in the decisions of the O. P. A. other than this calf sale. There is not a single employee in the O. P. A. upon my recommendation. The only employee I know appointed from my district was one of my predecessor's campaign managers, then a W. P. A. supervisor. He was recently hired as personnel director. He is the only one of my constituents I know on the O. P. A. pay rolls. This information came from Congressman PATMAN'S district, out of the Paris News. But I am not making a lot of controversy about that, because I do not know whether handling the patronage of the O. P. A. is an asset or a liability, from some of the mail I receive and from some of the things I hear.

So much for that.

I appreciate that my predecessor was the friend of many of you. I make no controversy and have no bad feeling in that respect. I came here under the plan provided by the Constitution, which is the blueprint of our parliamentary form of government, which provides for a turn-over in Congress every 2 years, if the people so decree. So here I am, one of us. On the 21st of January, after I had been sworn in, this document came to my post-office box in Antlers:

House of Representatives. Part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Free. Till We Meet Again. Speech of Hon. Wilburn Cartwright, of Oklahoma, in the House of Representatives, December 16, 1942.

And it was sent out under Mr. Cartwright's "lame duck" frank, as you will observe. This happens to be addressed to me. The postmark is Antlers, Okla., January 21, 1943.

Now, I know you are going to like me better as you know me longer. I feel that your deep heartache of regret in losing one of your former colleagues will wear off; but you know, even though it were not for the fate of politics, sometimes the Lord steps in and we have to elect new Members to succeed those whom the Lord has placed His hand upon, but somehow we have carried on for 78 sessions up to date.

Mr. Cartwright's speech is a very nice little instrument; but do you know where the mistake was made? It should have been made and mailed out before July 14, 1942. It would have been worth a great deal more, in my opinion, to the gentleman's aspirations had it been distributed about a week before the primaries.

I did not win this race by default. I shall not burden you by reading a letter from Charles Hathaway, president of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include it at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OKLAHOMA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Oklahoma City, Okla., June 8, 1942.

To All Members of Organized Labor:

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: There is important business at hand—the business of defeating PAUL STEWART who is running for Congress in the Third District against Wilburn Cartwright, the incumbent.

STEWART, as a member of the senate in the last legislature, is the lad who introduced the vicious Senate Bill No. 171 wherein he sought to prohibit labor unions from taking in as members persons employed on tax-financed projects and providing for inspection of the records of labor organizations. Had the bill passed, it would have destroyed the labor movement in this State. That is the caliber of the man we are dealing with.

The Third District includes Carter, Love, Marshall, Bryan, Atoka, Pittsburg, Latimer, Pushmataha, Choctaw, McCurtain, and LeFlore Counties, and has been represented by Wilburn Cartwright since 1928. Seldom is a Congressman 100 percent for labor, but Cartwright's record is outstandingly good. We can be sure that PAUL STEWART, if by some tragic chance he were elected, would be a hundred percenter against the boys in overalls.

It is my desire to consolidate labor's strength against STEWART and in behalf of Cartwright, believing that he has the best chance of election. There are other good men in the race, but a vote for them means a split that might give STEWART top place when the votes are counted. That is a risk labor cannot afford to take. So I am asking you to do anything and everything you can, both as individuals and as unions to get this job done. I am asking you to send me a contribution for this "Beat Stewart" campaign if it is at all possible, and I am sure in most instances it is. It is up to you and me as union members to make believers out of these labor haters.

Please let me hear from you immediately.

Fraternally yours,

CHAS. HATHAWAY,
President.

Mr. STEWART. I believe that when a man gets a nomination against a 16-year political set-up and organized labor doing everything it can to defeat him, that he is entitled to be treated decently. I know the membership of the House do not appreciate this kind of second-hand propaganda coming from an individual under her own signature sent to the newspapers of your district. I will reread the lady's notation:

Our Third District Congressman takes credit for putting this over, and in the Antlers American, his own newspaper, he is called the Churchill of the Kiamichis. Fact is Prentiss Brown said STEWART came to his office half-drunk and cursed out his clerks in such a manner that he refused to see him.

But the truth is I did not try to see Mr. Brown. I thought we could promote our cause better by having the older Members of the delegation contact him, who were personally acquainted with him, Members who have served with him. My interest was a battle for the boys and girls of Oklahoma, and I want to tell you that group of doctors of philosophy in O. P. A. who passed upon prices of cattle on foot have not got any business being there. They have no more practical cow sense—and my friend KLEBERG knows what I am talking about—than anyone else who is not in the cow business. It is pitiful. They discourage the growing of the prize stock by the youth of the country. The State of Oklahoma has spent millions of dollars as an incentive to encourage the livestock industry, and today the livestock men look forward to every graduating class for the F. F. A. boys from the Oklahoma A. & M. College and the 4-H Club boys from the Oklahoma A. & M. College as potential managers of their ranches. In many instances these boys have advanced to the point of being able to carry on business in their own names. These boys and girls are farm boys and girls. The people of Oklahoma made the incentive to make it possible for the boys and girls to buy these calves, yet in many cases under the O. P. A. they rule—before this order was amended—a boy would not have been able to get half the money he had invested in his calf. Banks make them loans sometimes up to $100 to buy their calf. Then they have to feed and pamper them and give them every kind of attention in the world making ready for sale. He puts his whole year in developing this calf with a determined desire to enter it in the State fat-stock show. And then, too, we have some altruistic citizens in Oklahoma who have made it a rule for many years to buy the blue-ribbon calf at a dollar a pound, barbecue it, and give a real picnic to these boys and girls.

Oklahoma is a great State. We have great people. We have oil; we have

coal; we have grain; and, next to Texas, we have cattle. We pay high freight rates, we have many public handicaps, but we have wonderful resources. Do not be fooled too much by reading The Grapes of Wrath, but just look Oklahoma over from the four corners and you will not find a stronger type of citizenship in the world. They came from all the other 47 States of the Union. It was a blending of blood and the ideas of the East, the West, the South, and the North, and they developed really a great State. We do not have to apologize to any State in the Union; we can take care of ourselves under almost any and all kind of circumstances.

I want you Members of Congress to know that when the blow is slightly under the belt we do not appreciate it. I am not trying to avoid a campaign. In fact, I will be disappointed if I do not have opposition. I will be ready for the campaign when it opens and we always give them an interesting campaign in the Third District of Oklahoma. I do not know of any political rule used throughout the country that has not been tried in Oklahoma, and if I am not equal to the occasion I will not have any right to return as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Winning the war is the first order of the day and then do my best to see that the people of Oklahoma receive fair play. The rules of Congress at first sight looked difficult and confusing, but there are many advantages that can be taken by just a single Member. I did not come up here to write the rules of the Congress. I came up here to learn and abide by them. If I cannot always work on the majority side of the rule book, maybe there will be some place on the minority side of the rule book where one Member can have a lot to do with what might happen.

I want to put this matter squarely up to you and say that if Mr Brown made that statement he is quoted to have made he made a misstatement. Here is the document and it is all in longhand, referring to the margin thereof. A gentleman asked that I read this again.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. STEWART. Well, he may refer to page 3420 of the RECORD of April 16 and get that information.

Mr. Speaker, I said something yesterday about the former Congressman, my predecessor, being an official in the armed forces, for which we were all ready to give him a glad hand. He is to be commended. But he was a full-grown single man in War No. 1, a member of the Oklahoma Legislature. I have the record here and I can substantiate everything I tell you. He claimed his exemptions and was placed in class 5 and deferred until the 6th day of November 1918, only 5 days before the signing of the armistice. Since these matters have been gone into from the opposition point of view, I feel I am answering only blow for blow.

I thought in my own mind it would be well for us to talk this matter over, because it might help us all in the future. I have tried not to offend any Member of the Congress. I have tried to be just as gentle and mellow as the facts warranted from every angle of this discussion. Here is that little blotter that went out. It went out under Mr. Cartwright's frank in this envelope. You know the trains could have carried a lot of Victory mail to and from our soldiers for the weight of this speech and blotters. You can carry a lot of Victory mail in place of 30,000 blotters.

I am not going to take up any more of your time. I have this matter before you. I will hold in abeyance until further developments and I want to thank each of you for your attentive attention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to insert certain material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, if the House is in session tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the House is in session tomorrow, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dry-land agriculture: For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, $230,563: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment of any new field station.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of directing a question to the chairman of the committee.

On page 20 of the committee report, under the item "United States Warehouse Act," the report recites "For the enforcement of provisions of the United States Warehouse Act" the Budget has estimated $440,910, and the committee has recommended $400,000. I have no particular fault to find with that. But turning over then to page 28 of the report which refers to the same matter the language there says:

United States Warehouse Act. Discontinuance of new licensing, and inspection of licensed warehouses in the West.

In my congressional district there are more than 75 warehouses that have been licensed by the Federal Government and that are inspected, of course, by the Federal Government. I am wondering what the language "discontinuance of new licensing and inspection" means. It does not seem to relate to anything in the other provisions of the act.

Mr. TARVER. There is no conflict between the two provisions of the report. The language which the gentleman quotes on page 28 embodies the reasons given by the Budget for the reduction made by the Budget in the submission of its estimates to the committee, and that was a reduction of about $23,000. The committee made a reduction of approximately $40,000 below the Budget estimate for the reasons which are outlined on page 20, from which the gentleman has quoted.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that the committee made that reduction and based it upon the elimination of the crop insurance program. Of course, you will have the same number of warehouses to inspect and the same amount of grain, but it is all right with me if you want to take that $40,000 off. I think the reason given does not perhaps mean very much, because inspections of the crops involved in Federal crop insurance are insignificant and, of course, are in the same warehouses with other commodities to be inspected. As stated, I am not complaining about the reduction of this small sum, but does this bill cut out future inspection by the Federal Government of these Federal-licensed warehouses where grain is stored? I notice the report states:

Discontinuance of new licensing, and inspection of licensed warehouses in the West.

Mr. TARVER. It involves a reduction in that type of work which has been carried on heretofore. May I say to the gentleman that no Member of Congress after the Budget figures became available for inspection came before the committee to testify that that economy could not be effected without injury, so the committee assumed that it would be possible to accord with the Budget figures in that respect and effect a small economy.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is all right with me. I just wanted to make sure that we were not going to stop completely the inspection of these Federal warehouses, because I have a large number of them in my district. I have received a number of wires this morning from a number of elevators that did not understand what the effect of this would be.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the Budget cut means that the inspection will be curtailed only to the extent on that account that it would be curtailed by the lack of $23,000 by which the Budget reduced it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman will examine the hearings, he will see that it is contemplated that one entire region will be eliminated, but that region is not identified.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman mean that the bill contemplates the elimination of one region?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. The report states "in the West."

Mr. PACE. The question is where the West begins.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the chairman tell me about that, in view of what the gentleman has said?

Mr. TARVER. The chairman of the committee can add nothing to the statement he has already made, which is that the Budget submitted this estimate for a small reduction and that budget was available for the inspection of the gentleman and all other Members of Congress for some 2 or 3 months before the committee completed hearings on this bill. The Budget said that this small economy could be effected without seriously interfering with this work. Neither the gentleman nor any other Member of the Congress came before the committee to protest.

Mr. RIZLEY. Evidently the chairman knows whether any particular region in this country is eliminated in this bill, in view of what my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], a member of the Committee on Agriculture, says the hearings disclose. I should like to have the chairman tell me whether there is a section of the United States in which you eliminate entirely the further licensing of Federal warehouses or the inspection of warehouses that already exist there.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know that I can make the facts in the case any plainer than I have endeavored to do. We have been assured that the work is not to be discontinued. We have not been given information that any particular region of the country is to be eliminated from the inspection work. We have simply been told that the reduction of $23,000 in this type of work could be effected without serious interference with the work.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Truck crop and garden insects: For insects affecting truck crops, ornamental and garden plants, including tobacco, sugar beets, and greenhouse and bulbous crops, $232,340.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE: On page 41, line 5, after "crops", strike out "$232,340" and insert in lieu thereof "$239,440."

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget decreased the truck crop and the garden-insect appropriation investigation by $16,180. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Agriculture Department approved of that decrease and went further by decreasing it another $75,000.

I am particularly interested in a Bureau of Entomology station located in my congressional district at Sumner, Wash., for which $7,100 was requested originally, or discussed by Dr. Annand, appearing for the Bureau, which testimony appears in the hearings on page 407. There is not much discussion in the hearings dealing with that one station at Sumner, Wash., other than two or three lines.

The Bureau of Entomology decided to take care of the cut by discontinuing certain tobacco-insect research, together with the elimination of two stations doing bulb-insect research largely, one at Babylon, Long Island, and the other at Sumner, Wash. They justify this on the ground that research work on ornamental crops is unnecessary in time of war.

Since the Budget Bureau cut was made, the Bureau of Entomology admits that much of the work at the Sumner station has shifted to research on truck crop and garden insects which will plague bulb growers who are now using their fields for growing essential "food for victory" crops. They are unfamiliar with the insect problems involved and need the help of the Sumner station more than ever.

The Entomology Bureau has stated that if the $7,100 needed for operating the Sumner station last year is added on to the truck crop and garden insect appropriation item they will continue this station and change its classification from an "ornamental" research laboratory to a strictly truck and garden insect crop research station. The Entomology Bureau willingly concedes that the station, in view of changed circumstances in the food production picture, should be maintained for the thousands of growers in the Puyallup and Sumner Valleys.

The Washington State Legislature has appropriated funds to be used for matching purposes on all such Federal projects in the State.

The scarcity or complete unavailability of standard insecticides such as rotenone will complicate the problems of growers in trying to deal with crop pests. Research assistanc to supplement pest-control action programs in this area is vital to the full use of former bulb fields for food crops. This also applies to those amateur farmers who in many cases are trying to operate former Japanese holdings and who find themselves needing the expert help of Government entomologists.

Every grower organization and chamber of commerce in the Sumner Valley has bitterly protested the discontinuance of the Sumner station. It will hurt agrarian morale severely if this station is pulled out.

I believe that as a matter of policy we are making a mistake in cutting down the appropriations for these bureaus, at a time when the emphasis is being placed in publicity by the Department of Agriculture and by all agencies dealing with the war on the need for expanding agricultural production, particularly in the field of vegetables.

This Sumner station is located in one of the richest vegetable-growing sections in the entire United States, the Puyallup Valley. Formerly Japanese-Americans largely occupied that area, and now white people are taking over the Japanese farms and attempting to raise vegetables. They lack that familiarity with the problem which would be made possible were this bureau to be continued.

I am submitting this amendment for the Committee of the Whole to take whatever action it deems best in this particular. I am sorry that the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to cut down the appropriations for other stations throughout the country. I believe it to be of vital importance at this time that we educate the American people as to the plant pests and the insect dangers in connection with the growth of vegetables in the United States. God knows we are not getting enough vegetables here in the city of Washington or anywhere else in the country. Were we able to expand the potentials of our rich valley lands in the richest soil areas in the United States and to educate those people in a position to produce the crops, including the white people replacing the Japs, we might be able to bring to bear in the solution of the vegetable shortages in this country very material help.

Economy which is at the expense of food production is ill-advised. Every assistance should be provided actual and potential food producers to enable them to combat successfully plant and insect pests. We plead for more berries, fruit, vegetables, yet deny the expert advice needed for efficient food production. We cannot rationalize such indubitable inconsistency to the people of the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I recognize that only a small amount is involved in the amendment offered, but I hope at the same time that it may not be adopted. As a matter of fact, the Budget Bureau recommended a deletion of three stations—a tobacco station in Florida, a station at Sumner, Wash., referred to by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and a station in Babylon, Long Island, as I recall. Evidently the Budget must have been satisfied after the justification was presented by the Department, that this type of work could probably be shifted somewhere, so they deleted the amount relative to this particular item, and that necessitated the closing of a station. In view of the fact that the testimony presented to the Budget must have been rather persuasive to that effect, or the investigations of the Budget must have been convincing that the item ought to be deleted, and that in the interest of economy or otherwise the work ought to be transferred, I sincerely hope that the item as reported by the committee will not be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cotton insects: For insects affecting cotton, $140,730.

Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil and the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, $400,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are many people who are favorable toward economy but they want it practiced on the other fellow. I hope that I am not assuming that attitude.

There is a provision in this bill, as the Clerk has just read, providing $400,000 for pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control. The appropriation for this purpose in the present fiscal year was $483,135. The Budget estimate was $457,460 for the fiscal year 1944—the year beginning July 1, 1943. The amount recommended for appropriation in the fiscal year 1944 is $83,135 below the amount appropriated for this purpose in the fiscal year 1943. The pink bollworm is perhaps the most destructive insect that has ever attacked the cotton plant, and the cotton plant, of course, is the largest crop of the South. If any insect is allowed to destroy the cotton crop it will cost the taxpayers of the Nation untold millions of dollars—not only the taxpayers but the people themselves who farm cotton. There are about 14 counties in the lower Rio Grande Valley I believe that are now infested with the pink bollworm. In 1941 there were only 4 I believe. There has been greater infestation on account of crop and weather conditions. The threat is to all of the cotton areas, particularly to the old South—areas like Mississippi, Georgia, southern Texas, eastern Texas, and Louisiana. The pest is coming up, and has been coming up, from old Mexico for more than 20 years. There is a constant menace on our border. The pest has repeatedly broken through and now infests some considerable portion of Texas, and this Congress cannot spend money more wisely than in doing everything that may be necessary to stop this pink bollworm.

I have risen in the House at this time to make these remarks because I think the matter is of such great importance that it should be discussed. I am not offering an amendment to restore the Budget estimate of $457,460. I do know that the hearings indicate that this testimony was given to the subcommittee, to the effect that a supplementary or deficiency appropriation might be required this year. I do not absolutely know that the $400,000 recommended here is inadequate, but I think it is and I am sure that it is a matter of such grave concern that the Members of the House should have it called to their attention.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman tell the House as to how the pest is to be combated, and the importance of keeping after this pest, lest it get out of hand and spread over the country?

Mr. MAHON. If the pink bollworm gets out of hand and spreads over the country, it will destroy the South from an economic standpoint. If this worm gets out of hand, then the South will be the only major cotton-growing region in the world which is confronted, as I say, with the boll weevil and with the pink bollworm. Other areas have the pink bollworm, but they do not have a combination of these two insects.

The method of combating it consists in going in and destroying the remains of the crop after the crop has been harvested, and destroying the bolls and the cottonseed where the pink bollworm resides. That work has been impeded this year on account of unfavorable weather in that section. I am not speaking in a critical way of the subcommittee, and am not asking for an amendment to increase, but I should like to know if the chairman of the subcommittee feels that the $400,000 is adequate to do the job, because he knows well that his own State of Georgia is threatened by the pink bollworm.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this matter is of great importance, yet I do not believe that anyone at this time is able to estimate how much money will be needed to cope with the problem this year. If the sums provided are insufficient, I feel that Congress will be in session, and will be in a position to provide any additional funds necessary when the necessity therefor arises.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for that statement and withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bee culture: For bee culture, apiary management, and the propagation and distribution by sale of bee-breeding stock, $75,530: *Provided*, That the rates at which such sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROWE: In line 8, on page 42, strike out the numerals after the dollar sign and insert in their place "79,500."

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, if I were appearing here to speak on behalf of any item that might be peculiar to any district and a benefit to that district, of course I would expect that others would rise and ask that equal consideration be given to the districts from which they might come, which have a particular thing which is adapted to their districts.

I appear for these few minutes on behalf of one of God's little agents that is a benefit to all humanity, the lowly honeybee.

Many of us have an appreciation that honeybees are the only source of honey and beeswax.

Few however realize that although the bee industry produces in excess of 200,000,000 pounds of honey and 4,000,000 pounds of wax in our country, they are only byproducts and that the bee's principal role is in the pollination of the many agricultural crops for the production of seed and fruits.

The commercial fruit growers are almost entirely dependent upon the lowly honeybee for the transfer of pollen from one variety to another.

This can be more deeply appreciated when we know that the pollen of the apple blossom is so minute in size that one bee in a single season will transfer in excess of 100,000 of them.

The keeping of bees is an art and is not subject to the flexibility of ordinary vocations. Their existence depends upon the peculiar temperament of a rare few of our people. Their value lies only in the mind of those who love and raise them. Banks or the Government will not accept them as collateral, yet like the gallant English aviators in the defense of England, never were there so many dependent upon so few, as the people are dependent on the little bee.

What has it done for us and what proportion of the necessary work does the honeybee do?

The United States Department of Agriculture tells us that in a study made in the orchards of California the work of pollination by different insects showed that the lowly honey bee does 82.3 of it all.

How important this pollination is can be appreciated by an experiment conducted in the State of Michigan. A J. H. Hale peach orchard, favorably located on a farm near Coloma and containing a few scattering varieties of other trees, had produced but a few fruits in 10 years of its existence. The owner, learning this variety was self-sterile, added South Haven and Elberta trees to his orchard. In spite of this, his orchard produced less than 10 bushels of peaches in 1926, 10 years after their planting. Before the succeeding blossoming season, 20 colonies of honeybees were located in the orchard and it produced the first crop of fruit in 11 years.

What are we doing to the wild insects that do a part of this essential pollination?

We cultivate large areas of our land and destroy the nests of the ground-habitating type.

We have cleared the land and robbed the trees, cutting them down where the wild honeybee lived. Over 53,000,000 acres of additional lands have been cleared and cultivated since 1910.

The old rail fence has been eliminated and been replaced by the steel wire fence, thereby eliminating the nesting place of our bees. We burn the fence rows, railroad right-of-ways, pastures, and so forth, destroying the wild pollinating insects.

Sheep grazing starves our bees by trampling the ground and eating the vegetation. Sheep have increased in population over 4,000,000 in the last three decades.

Forest, brush, and grass fires destroy all types of pollinating insects.

Our good roads and the automobile take a very heavy toll. It is estimated that 229 pollinating insects are killed in

each mile traveled by an automobile at a speed greater than 25 miles per hour. Fifty percent of these were bees.

Poisoning by insecticides takes a very heavy toll.

Foul-brood, a very fatal and serious disease, takes its tremendous toll also.

Our beekeeper is drafted into the armed service. He cannot turn his work over to brother or son or dad. He destroys his bees, melts his wax, and sells his honey, wax, and used equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, but I hope that other Members will not make similar requests. If we are to finish the bill today, we cannot spend more than the time provided for by the rules in the consideration of a small item of this character, which is less than $4,000. However, I will not object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I am glad the gentleman has brought up this point, because the lowly honeybee is very vital to the pollenization of a lot of our crops at a time when we want top production.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman. I am not unmindful of the courtesy accorded me of the additional time.

It may come to pass that this Government will have to subsidize the conservation of our pollinating insects. Profitable agriculture is impossible without them.

We spent $79,500 in 1943 and this appropriation measure intends taking $3,970 of that away in this coming year. If there was ever a time when it should be increased it is now when food material is so sorely needed following this war. I do not ask that it be increased but I do ask that we do not reduce it.

It is estimated that while nitrates are almost impossible to obtain as a fertilizer, the pollinating of legumes will add 90 pounds per acre to lands where they are planted and cultivated.

We are spending $400,000 to eliminate insects that destroy our grapes, yet in 145 varieties of grapes, 72 were self-sterile and 73 were uncertain, which means without pollination there will be no grapes for insects to destroy.

We are spending millions of dollars to try and save what the pollinating insects make it possible for us to have. Yet with honey production falling 12½ percent last year, notwithstanding an increase of 10 percent in the number of hives, we cut out that part of the appropriation that has to do with the study of bee diseases being conducted out at Laramie, Wyo.

This money we are spending is the little help we can do to carry out the plan of the Great Master Architect and his little bees to enrich the estate of man. I hope that this amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was happy to note the interest of our good friend from Ohio in bee culture. For a long time I thought I was the only one who had produced honey and raised bees, but even our committee clerk is an apiary culturist. One of the largest beekeepers we had in the Congress was the gentleman from California, Mr. Buck, some years ago.

Our good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] seeks to restore $3,970 to this appropriation. That $3,970 is a reduction by the Budget, not by the committee. The committee gave this function the full Budget amount; $3,970 was deleted after the Budget had gone into the matter and determined that either this work could be transferred elsewhere or the efficacy of the work did not merit the expenditure at this time for the ensuing fiscal year. For that reason, in view of the fact that the committee has accorded the full Budget amount, I trust that this $3,970 that was deleted by the Budget will not be restored and that will furnish an opportunity to close up this station perhaps for a year or two and transfer its functions elsewhere in the interest of greater efficacy and economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. If it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. TARVER. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I amend the request, Mr. Chairman, to make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BEE CULTURE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, bee culture, one of the most important activities in this country, in some sections is being destroyed.

The honeybee is the only domesticated insect in the world. It has been domesticated for thousands of years, even as far back as the earliest Biblical times. Honey was the only sweet known to the ancients, and therefore constituted one of their chief elements of food. It was then, and is now, one of the safest and most wholesome foods known to man.

There were no honeybees in America when this country was discovered. They were brought here by our pioneer ancestors. Washington Irving said when he visited our western territories, about 100 years ago, that old men could remember when the first bees crossed the Mississippi River. Bee culture has now grown to be one of the most important activities we have. It is not only important from the standpoint of honey production, but it would be all but impossible to maintain our vast orchards and vineyards without swarms of bees to pollenize them.

I have in my district one of the greatest producers of queen bees in the world, the Stover Apiary, at Mayhew, Miss. That apiary ships queen bees all over the world. It shipped 48,000 queens in 1 year.

If you have a colony of bees of low grade, they will ship you a queen bee, that is already inoculated, in a little container that has one end stopped up with wax that she eats. You may kill all the queens in your colony, and by the time she eats through that wax she has become acquainted with the colony and they will accept her as their queen. She will lay her eggs, and in less than 60 days your bees will all be dead, and you will have a full colony of the finest Italian bees.

Throughout the South and West there was a plant called melilotus that the bees fed on, that I think produced the finest honey in the world. In the last few years some kind of blight has got into this melilotus that has destroyed it—some disease, some blight, or some pest that has not yet been overcome, as far as I have been able to find. Melilotus is a plant something on the order of alfalfa, and its flowers furnish food for these producing bees that I said make about the finest honey in the world. If the Department will use this money in finding a method of destroying that blight, and restoring our melilotus fields, it will be rendering a service that will be worth untold millions to the people all over the country. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

I remember we had a fight here many years for a small amount to try to exterminate the pink bollworm. It might have been stopped at that time, but it has now grown until it has become a national menace.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The amendment is to provide money that had been taken out of this appropriation that is to sustain a plant in Wyoming, a laboratory that studies diseases of the bees, and produces better breeding stock. It was called to my attention by A. H. Root of the Root Co. in Medina County in my district.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am complaining of is that the Department of Agriculture is not devoting itself to the destruction of that disease, blight, or pest that is destroying the vast fields of melilotus that once covered the untilled ground in the lime belts of the country and that produced the finest bee feed in the world.

Men who own bees ship them from one place to another, hundreds of colonies at a time, in order to find feed for them. They used to ship these bees into those vast areas where this melilotus grew and let them stay while they fed on the surrounding territory. Now they are having to ship them wherever they can find some other source of food, and often it cannot be found at all.

So I wanted to call this matter to the attention of the House and of the Department of Agriculture in the hope that something might be done to destroy this blight and help to save our bee culture, one of the most important agricultural activities in America.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I want to endorse everything the gentleman has said. Up in my district we buy queen bees and have them shipped up from Mississippi. One of the difficulties has been the high percentage of deaths among the queens in shipment. We have sought for some years to get a little more financial help, but the subcommittee has never considered it.

Mr. RANKIN. If this melilotus growth is restored to the waste lands in the lime belt area it will produce enough food to feed bees enough I dare say to supply the honey of the whole country; and that is land that is absolutely going to waste. Melilotus will grow luxuriantly in a lime gully that will not grow anything else.

Let us not forget that the beekeepers are among our most valuable farmers and that bee culture is one of the most important branches of American agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have purposely withheld from getting into any controversy in this debate as it affects the various committees which have been interested in it. Personally, I regret that such misunderstanding has come up in the House and between members of these committees because I think each committee has its definite place in the decisions which are made before the bills come to the floor for consideration. I do feel, however, that the Committee on Agriculture has a great deal to do with the legislative matters as they affect the Department of Agriculture itself, and I feel that my worthy chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], has every right to take the position he does. Nevertheless, I want to make it perfectly clear, as far as I personally am concerned, that I am very glad the Committee on Appropriations has the power to cut to the bone various appropriations which are asked for by the various departments. If they keep on going in this direction, we may be able to do something to harness and control the bureaucratic Frankenstein which has been growing by leaps and bounds and from day to day so that finally they challenge the very power of Congress itself.

It may not appear to the individual Member of this House that his prestige and authority back home, vested in him by the people of his district, are being threatened by these bureaucrats. The Office of Price Administration has run roughshod over the will of Congress on a number of occasions. I believe, however, that the Committee on Appropriations has the power to clip these bureaucrats so they will pull their heads back into their shells and will not go on challenging the power of the Congress or the people back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] is recognized for 2½ minutes, the balance of the time.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and I hope that it will be adopted. Up in our country we are having more or less trouble with our bees, and particularly at this season, because it is still cold up there. Some farmers are having difficulty in getting sugar to feed the bees. Those who live in a clover country know we have got to have bees to have clover seed and know that we have got to have clover for our dairy cattle.

I think this amendment should be adopted. It is a small amount. The other day we passed a bill here providing for the building of a mill in the Amazon country to crush babassu nuts and make babassu oil. We are paying for it, paying a large sum of money, yet the Appropriation Committee would withhold this small amount of $3,900 to continue a work that is close to us and far more intimately and directly connected with our agriculture.

I have heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] and what they have to say about bureaucrats. It does seem to me we have reached a sorry point when we are considering appropriations which affect all sections of the country that some members of the Committee on Appropriations will not accept the views of anybody, not even a Congressman, if they can bolster their argument against an amendment by quoting the Budget Bureau. The Budget Bureau, after all, is just another bunch of bureaucrats, and possibly when it comes to the bee question some of them would not know a bee from a bullfrog.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

All time has expired on the pending amendment. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 64, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign parasites: For administrative expenses in connection with the introduction of natural enemies of injurious insects and related pests and for the exchange with other countries of useful and beneficial insects and other anthropods, $19,740.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to propound an inquiry of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with regard to a provision a little further along in the bill. I mention it now in order to know what the situation will be when it is reached.

If the chairman of the committee will turn to page 64 of the bill he will observe there is a proviso prohibiting the expenditure of any of the funds appropriated in that paragraph for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned stocks at less than parity. With that I am in full accord. But it appears to me, if the gentleman will refer to page 63, beginning in line 11, that you have voided the proviso when you provide that all necessary expenses incurred in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses. If in disposing of these crops the expense is nonadministrative, what is the effect of the proviso on page 64 prohibiting the expenditure of any funds for the administrative expenses involved in the disposition of such commodities?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that the question of construction which he propounds has not previously been called to my attention, but I feel sure that if the Congress shall adopt the inhibition contained in the last proviso against the use of administrative funds for the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks below parity, no such stocks will be sold below parity. I say that for this reason: While we carried a similar provision in the appropriation act for the present year, with subsequent provisos modifying it, there was not anything in the act of the present year which would have prevented the use of funds transferred from other sources in the sale of these Government-owned and controlled stocks and the administrative authorities, as will appear from the hearings, have testified before our committee they tried in good faith to carry out what was evidently the purpose and the intent of Congress; so that if the Congress leaves in the bill this inhibition I am sure that the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation will not sell or dispose of any products at less than parity.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman knows that is what I want to accomplish. The language in lines 11 to 18 on page 63 is contained in the 1943 act?

Mr. TARVER. That is so.

Mr. PACE. That is not new language?

Mr. TARVER. That is not new language.

Mr. PACE. And the interpretation which I fear has not been given to it.

Mr. TARVER. That is right. The officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation have indicated their feeling, and I think it is a correct feeling, that they should in good faith obey the wishes of the Congress as expressed in such provisos if placed in the appropriation bill, and I am sure, although it might be possible for them to evade it, if it is placed in the bill now pending the officials of that corporation will not violate its spirit.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman will agree that the language is rather confusing and apparently contradictory.

Mr. TARVER. I do not think I would like to enter into a discussion of its construction at this time. As I said a while ago, the matter has never been mentioned to me before, and I do not want to render off-hand opinions after 1 minute's notice on the question of the construction of language which is somewhat confusing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say that was the only method of drafting that particular proviso to give authority to the corporation. They first acquired a lot of grain bins, then subsequently sold them if they had no further use for them. So they have respected the interdiction that heretofore was written in the bill.

Mr. PACE. That is the sole object of my inquiry, to be sure that we accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, an interesting poll came to my desk the other day, a poll taken by the Fortune magazine. I have heard on many an occasion that one or two of the farm organizations claim to represent a good many more farmers than they actually do. If there is anyone who wishes to take issue with this poll and who believes that these figures are not truly representative, I wish he would correct the record at this time. For your information, I should like to read from the most recent issue of Fortune magazine the following:

> The zeal of the national farm organizations in speaking for the interests of farmers often makes it appear that farmers are unusually well organized and well represented. Actually, the organizations have a relatively small membership, less than 30 percent of all the farmers.

I may add at this point that Fortune magazine has been fairly reliable as a polling agency. This is the question Fortune magazine asked in making its survey:

> Do you belong to any farm or agricultural organization?

The persons who answered that they did not were 70.5 percent; persons answering that they belonged to the Farm Bureau, 17.7 percent; those belonging to the Grange, 3.4 percent; to special farm organizations, 4.7 percent; to the Farmers Union, 2.2 percent; and to other organizations, 4.3 percent. So, according to this poll, over 70 percent of the farmers of our land belong to none of these organizations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman would find about the same percentage when it comes to labor, that only 30 percent of labor of this country is within the organizations and the other 70 percent is unorganized labor.

Mr. BENDER. I cannot dispute the gentleman's statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Still, organized labor assumes to speak for all labor.

Mr. BENDER. Possibly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I saw those figures when they came to the office. I think if the gentleman would get a little larger picture of that situation, or if the magazine would, it would have gotten a little truer picture of the facts.

For example, I know a dairy organization that has thousands of members and that is producing over 1,000,000,000 pounds of milk, and that is not represented at all in this list. I do not know anything about the rest of the United States, but as far as Wisconsin is concerned those figures really do not amount to anything at all because, I dare say, somewhere between 60 and 80 percent of the farmers belong to some dairy cooperative or some organization that is represented by the National Milk Producers' Association. Big cooperatives like the Badger Cooperative would swell those figures to somewhere between 60 and 80 percent.

Mr. BENDER. The only comment I wish to make is that I regret that farmers are not better organized. I should like to see the farmers organized to a far greater degree than they are. If this poll is a correct portrayal of the national picture, then I say it is most regrettable.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I think the gentleman will find, if he makes an investigation of the magazine, that the figures are inaccurate and do not give a true picture, because they represent the so-called "all farmers," and most of those who say they belong to no organization farm a half acre or a lot somewhere in a city.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know as to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who just spoke about those who have a half acre or a lot in the city left out all those window-box farmers in the cities, too. They ought to be put in there somewhere.

Mr. BENDER. A further comment from this magazine is this:

Do you belong to any farm or agricultural organization?

	Total	Economic level		
		High	Medium	Low
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
None	70.5	49.8	70.9	86.7
Farm Bureau	17.7	30.2	17.9	6.3
Grange	3.4	4.6	4.2	2.1
Special	4.7	9.2	4.3	1.8
Farmers Union	2.2	5.8	.9	.9
Other	4.3	7.2	4.0	2.7
Multiple totals	102.8	106.8	102.2	100.5

It is significant that less than 15 percent of poor farmers belong to farm organizations, against about 50 percent of the well-to-do. Proponents of wartime subsidies to the small farmers have had rough sledding as a result of this disproportionate representation. (Over 30 percent of well-to-do farmers are enrolled in the American Farm Bureau Federation, under the leadership of Edward A. O'Neal.) The Pacific coast is the most strongly organized section of the country with about 55 percent of its farmers organized, many of them under the powerful Associated Farmers of California. The northeastern States are the next most highly organized section, with about 45 percent membership.

The fact that over 70 percent of the farmers belong to no organization raises the question of how that majority makes known its beliefs.

Mr. Chairman, I think that when the American people must face rationing of food of all kinds it would be a serious error if this House were to do anything which would weaken the production of essential war foods. In my opinion, the elimination of the Farm Security Administration would definitely weaken our food-production program.

Last year the most significant increases in food production were achieved by the half million small farm families assisted by Farm Security funds. The increase in milk production by these families in 1942 was sufficient to meet the requirements of two and one-half million active men. The increase for 1943 in milk production by these small farmers will provide enough milk for an additional 3,000,000 active men. The 1942 increase in eggs was sufficient to feed almost 3,000,000 active men, and the planned increase for 1943 would be sufficient to feed an army of 5,000,000 men.

No one on the floor has attacked Farm Security Administration for failing to do a competent food production job.

I think that this is the heart of this issue. Do we intend to do everything we can to increase food production? If so, we definitely do not want to destroy the one agency of the Department of Agriculture which has the contacts, the experience, and the knowledge to guide the increased food production of the two and a half million small farm families in the country.

For the past 25 years the small family-sized farmer has suffered from a competitive disadvantage. Today a third of our farmers produce 60 to 70 percent of all the crops which are commercially marketed. All of us, I believe, know that the basic strength of this country has been opportunity on the farm. Yet that opportunity has been vanishing in the past 25 years. Low prices, droughts, loss of foreign markets, mechanization, control by processors, and a number of other factors have all tended to destroy small-family farmers. Now, during this war period, with high farm prices and with the desperate need for all-out food production, the small farmer has the opportunity to pull himself out of debt and to make a very genuine contribution to our war program. In my opinion, it would be a grievous error to withdraw Federal assistance from these people. We will need a solid farm-family economy in the post-war period, and we need

it now to obtain maximum food production.

In conclusion, I wish to read from a letter I received today from Mrs. Bertha S. Snook, county chairwoman of the Miami County Republican Executive Committee: In this letter she says:

DEAR MR. BENDER: I want to aid and abet your support of the Farm Security Administration, which I understand the committee has turned down. I know of its work in this region and the good that has been done by workers who come in personal contact with the small farmers.

Mrs. Snook has first-hand information regarding the workings of this organization.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to attempt to clarify the question raised by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a few moments ago with reference to the effectiveness of the proposed limitation on the administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation prohibiting the use of those funds in the sale of Government owned or controlled commodities at less than parity.

In view of the language which he quoted at that time, contained in the prior part of the appropriation language for the Commodity Credit Corporation in the bill, and which I shall quote again, reading from page 63:

Provided, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:

I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia and the Committee to the limitation in the third line of the proviso—

But not including other personal services.

In other words, this proviso has no reference to services other than those which are specifically mentioned, legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, and there is expressly excluded other personal services, so that other personal services are necessarily paid for with administrative funds.

If the proviso to which I have referred, eliminating the power of the Corporation to sell Government owned or controlled stocks at less than parity is adopted, it will not be possible for the Corporation to use administrative funds provided in this bill for the disposition of such stocks.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, referring to the first paragraph on page 64, I ask the gentleman from Georgia this question with respect to the sale of the Commodity Credit wheat. The gentleman will recall that we passed a bill providing for the sale of 100,000,000 bushels of Commodity Credit wheat at 85 percent of corn parity, and at corn parity prices. Assuming that that wheat is not all disposed of before July 1, would not this prohibition on page 64 prevent them from selling the balance of such wheat at 85 percent or at corn parity prices?

Mr. TARVER. So far as the administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation are concerned, I think undoubtedly that would be true.

Mr. GILCHRIST. With reference to the act that we approved on March 25, providing for the sale at 85 percent, that act being only a month old, it provides that no such wheat shall be sold at a price less than the parity price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Along the eastern and southern area of the United States it is still sold at 85 percent of parity, but in the corn area it is sold at corn parity.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the center word. There may be some astonishment that one coming from the heart of an industrial district, should take 5 minutes time on an agricultural appropriation bill, but I rise to pay tribute to one of the greatest customers of agricultural products in America—the automobile industry. I have before me a recent advertisement of the Ford Motor Co.:

Tomorrow a motorcar, a square meal, and a suit of clothes from the same crop.

It, of course, refers to the great study of the soybean by Mr. Henry Ford.

In the test-tube of science, a vegetable which for thousands of years had given man food and oil, suddenly revealed a storehouse of hidden riches.

As a result of Ford pioneering this remarkable product is producing an amazing variety of other useful commodities, such as enamels, paints, soap, pressed board materials, and molded plastic parts for airplanes and automobiles, replacing critical materials for many manufacturing uses.

This example of experimentation on the part of the Ford Motor Co. is typical of the long-range view of the entire automotive industry looking to the conversion of farm products to industrial uses. And, as cheaper means for converting farm products are found, marketable value will be given to 250,000,000 tons of agricultural materials now practically wasted—stalks, straw, beet-tops, etc.

Regardless of wartime dislocations, there is a growing interdependence between industry and agriculture. It is a two-way proposition begetting greater unity—urban and rural harmony.

The motor industry is looking forward at the present time to the post-war period. That much can be expected from this farsighted study can best be judged by the assistance that has been given agriculture through the utilization of its products by industry in the past.

For example, some of the farm products used by the Ford Motor Co. in a normal year of car production, which products could be multiplied threefold for the entire industry are: 2,000,000 pounds of soybean oil, 89,000,000 pounds of cotton, 800,000 bushels of corn, 2,400,000 pounds of linseed oil, 2,500,000 gallons of molasses, 3,200,000 pounds of wool, 1,500,000 feet of leather, 1,000,000 pounds of lard, and 350,000 pounds of mohair. This list of products which I have enumerated does not include lumber, minerals, rubber, and many other natural resources. So the automobile industry is the best customer of agricultural products.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to say for the benefit of the Ford plant that some weeks ago it was rumored that Mr. Ford would not go into the automobile business after the war. I wrote Mr. Edsel Ford, and he replied that certainly they would be in the automobile business, and they were planning far into the future at this time.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman. And I am confident that the Ford name will continue to be a symbol of mechanical progress and efficiency for many years to come.

In this regard I wish to include in these remarks a statement recently made by Mr. Edsel Ford and reported in the Washington Post:

We are already doing our own planning with the future in mind. We did this same thing immediately after the last war. The longer the war goes on, however, the longer it will take us to get back to automobile production.

When the men come back from the war with increased mechanical training, we should also be able to get a great new development in mechanized farming. Agriculture has had a temporary set-back, but it would make enormous strides if it could have the benefit of the brains that industry has at its disposal. It should have more modern instruments, better tractors, and other machinery. As this is a mechanical war, all the farmer lads will come back more mechanically minded than ever. They will be able to use machinery more effectively; they will have learned to take better care of it, too, and should help to bring about a wholly new concept of agriculture that would benefit not only our country but the whole world situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin rose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph relating to foreign parasites may conclude in 18 minutes, and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Fortunately, the debate today is going along on a somewhat higher plane than yesterday. I would like to take a few minutes to say that, as far as I am concerned personally, I have had a very fine reception from the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that I went before the subcommittee and made three recommendations: First, one was to coordinate the agencies at State and county levels; second, reduce large A. C. P. payments to big land operations; third, recommended the use of public funds, as recommended by Secretary Wickard, in place of using these funds for a control program. There

would be much more sense at this time, in my opinion, to use this money for incentive payments than to have it used as a control program. I wish that the chairman of the subcommittee sometime today would explain to the House what procedure we are going to follow as to incentive payments. We should be definite on this question of incentive payments so the farmer will have this information and can produce accordingly.

Personally I am on record in favor of incentive payments in preference to the control program during this war period. I would like to see the funds provided in an orderly and legal manner. I do not like to see this bill passed without the incentive-payment program being cleared up, because I think the producers are entitled to that information. This whole matter of whether we are going to have incentive payments or whether we are going to have it according to law or have it through the back door, should be settled right here today, and I hope the chairman will do so.

As far as this bill is concerned, you can double the amount or you can cut it in two and it will not make much difference as long as you let the O. P. A. run hog wild like they have the last 6 months. It does not do any good to appropriate money for production of food if you are going to let O. P. A. continue to be the bottleneck preventing maximum production. Unless we correct what the O. P. A. is doing, we are going to waste half of this appropriation, and I am just as sure of that as I am that I am standing here before you today.

For example, we have the food canners still faced with uncertainties. This is not only a question of price. We have the evaporated-milk people producing under maximum possibilities. We continue to have the small packer going broke every day.

All this confusion of the O. P. A. is harmful. Last September when we had the price-control bill under consideration, many statements were made, and attitudes evidenced by men in high public office that resulted in a marked reduction of dairy products below the corresponding months of 1942. This continued, and by December the national production of butter was 110,000,000 pounds in comparison to 116,000,000 pounds in December 1941; cheese production in December 1941 was fifty-eight million and in December 1942 only forty-five million, and from January 1 to April 15, 1943, we are producing 78 percent of the cheese we produced during the same months in 1942. After Labor Day 1942 there was also a reduction in evaporated milk production in comparison to the previous year. In December 1941 there were 286,000,000 pounds of evaporated milk produced while there were only 174,000,000 pounds produced in December 1942. The problems of the fluid-milk producers is brought up daily here so I will not discuss this problem.

There are 340,000,000 acres of cultivated land in the United States. The acres will produce all the food needed with the manpower, machinery, and price to justify the production. We slaughter on an average 18,000,000 head of cattle a year and 10,000,000 calves. If the cattle were fed to a hundred pound additional weight 90,000,000 of additional beef would be provided. As there are about 9,000,000,000 pounds of beef and veal produced, this would be a 10-percent increase of supply. There are over 25,000,000 dairy cows averaging 4,600 pounds of milk. If feed were provided at a reasonable price 25,000,000,000 pounds of additional milk could be provided. This 25,000,000,000 pounds of milk is an appreciable increase over the 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk that represents our national production.

We have some 700,000,000 bushels of wheat as a carry-over in sight. Our corn, oats, barley supplies are fast disappearing. In Canada there are about a billion bushels of wheat, oats, and barley. These grains cannot find their way to the world's markets, due to shipping. By removing the near embargo we now have a part of the source of feed supply could be provided in our efforts to increase the meats and fats so needed at this time. Another year may show a greater need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am a new member of the Committee on Agriculture and I assure you I do not have much dignity to be offended by any action that the great subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture might have assumed. However, I am sure that the committee knew exactly what it was doing, and I think it is no secret, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] has said, it was their intention to discontinue Farm Security and parity payments and other activities that have been carried on by this Government. I do not wish to restate the things that have been so eloquently said by my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and others with reference to the need for farm security. It is not of so much concern in my district and in my State, but I am reminded of the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, whose anniversary we have recently celebrated. Much was said about Jefferson and about his philosophy but little has been said as to his philosophy as to the land and man's relationship to it.

He said that farming was the natural occupation of man. It has been reechoed by the great Lincoln. It was the philosophy of another great American whose history is somewhat obscured, Andrew Johnson, who preached the doctrine that man came from the soil; Theodore Roosevelt, a great leader in conservation, and our great President now, whose chief cornerstone as far as agriculture is concerned is founded on soil conservation and farm security. Those two things are under attack, and they are vital things. It was the Jefferson philosophy that man should govern himself, in opposition to the philosophy of Alexander Hamilton. He assumed that man, living close to the soil, inasmuch as that was his natural habitat, should be informed; that he should be educated; that he should have access to a free press; that he should have access to good roads; that he should have good schools; that he should have religious freedom; and having those advantages he was a safe individual. He could govern himself, with very little government at the top.

We are striking right at the vitals of the difference of opinion between those two philosophies, and it will be a sad day for agriculture should we follow the policy of Alexander Hamilton, in that it will tend toward the commercialization of farming. If this is done, it will destroy the farm family that has been the bulwark of American civilization. President Roosevelt's farm policy, as I have said, has been based upon the necessity of rehabilitating and conserving our soil and our forests. That is not only of benefit to the farmer but offers security and wealth to the Nation because the generations to come will depend upon the land for their food and shelter.

Farm Security, as I have previously mentioned, was instituted to do what Jefferson would have done to the farm family—provided for its education, its health, its religious, political, and economic freedom. The attempt made here by the big commercial farm interests is intended to deny the very things that Jefferson has said and that President Roosevelt is trying to do.

It is contended by the opponents of Farm Security that to lend a directing hand to them is communistic, but may I say that these small farm people, who have had little experience, if any, in the handling of any amounts of money, need the direction that Farm Security has given. If it were not done, financial assistance would be of little value and the money would be wasted. The need of Farm Security is not confined to any particular district. It is a problem as broad as our land. In every State and section there is need for these programs. To conserve the soil is a governmental problem, and an appropriation to conserve it is a national asset. To assist the small farm people, though many of them fail, is another national asset, in that it makes for better citizenship which redounds to the benefit of the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In Jefferson's second inaugural address he advocated the development of our rivers. Of course, that was almost a century before the use of electricity was discovered——

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to go on to the Rural Electrification Administration, I only have a few minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I just wanted to say that if he were here today he would be backing up our power program.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman for his contributions, and I believe if Jefferson were here today he would approve the valiant fight the gentleman from Mississippi has continuously made to bring electricity into the farm homes of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak in order. I shall talk about foreign parasites. The foreign parasite I am going to talk about is Marshall Field.

Mr. Chairman, during the recent debate on the pay-as-you-go tax proposal we heard much from the opposition regarding the making of war millionaires.

I take the floor at this time to call upon those who used the war millionaire argument against the Carlson amendment, to give some consideration, at least, to plugging the loopholes in our present tax laws through which a minority of very wealthy individuals have not only been able to dodge payment of rightful taxes to the Government, but, in several instances, have actually robbed the Government of income it had formerly received.

The method of tax-dodging to which I refer is accomplished by operating several businesses as individual partnerships so as to offset the gains of some against the losses of others. It is well known that under the present law the profits of partnerships, or individual proprietorships, are taxed only when earned, and there is no additional tax when the funds are withdrawn from the business by the owners.

This has made it possible for certain millionaires to purchase for cash corporations now enjoying war-swollen profits, changing them from corporations to partnerships, or individual proprietorships, thus escaping corporate taxation which, as everyone here knows, is much greater, because, under present law, the income of a corporation is taxed against the corporation when it is earned, and taxed again to the stockholders when disbursed as dividends.

Of course, I do not know how many wealthy individuals are practicing this tax dodge, but it has been revealed that Marshal Field, publisher of PM and the Chicago Sun, is one. An investigation shows that within recent months Field has purchased two highly profitable industrial concerns engaged in war production, and a bus system operating between Chicago and the northern Indiana industrial district. These acquisitions, I am told, were made at comparatively low prices. Because the war-swollen profits of these enterprises were subject to steep excess profits taxes, they were obtainable at bargain prices by Field, who is able to use these profits to offset, in part, the heavy losses he has incurred in his publishing ventures.

Now, under the former ownership of the enterprises purchased by Field, most of the exorbitant war profits were paid to the Government in taxes, but under Field's ownership these enterprises are operated as personal ventures, or partnerships, and thus escape the excess profits tax. The profits of the companies acquired by Field can be crossed with his publishing losses for tax purposes.

That this was Field's intention is made plain by the disclosure that the Delta Manufacturing Co. of Milwaukee, acquired last August, was immediately converted into a partnership in which Field is the dominant member. Details of another acquisition, that of the V. & O. Press Co., Hudson, N. Y., have not been learned but it is reported that this enterprise is also now being operated as a partnership. I do not have any information, as yet, on the form of organization for the recently acquired bus company, to which I have referred.

In ordinary circumstances a business making profits greatly in excess of normal would pay a tax of 90 percent on the surplus profit. This is in addition to regular corporation and income taxes. The Government, however, will collect no part of the swollen profits of the companies acquired by Field as long as they are operated as personal ventures or partnerships, and the excess profits do not exceed Field's publishing losses. Not only are these profits exempt from the excess profits tax, but also from the regular corporation income and surtaxes.

Substantial as the profits are from the recently acquired properties, they are not expected to offset entirely the losses on the field publications, which are estimated to run from six to seven million dollars a year. However, Field will shoulder only a small fraction of these losses, because they can also be used to cut down the tax that he would otherwise pay on his large investment income.

Mr. Field's recent purchases indicate that he greatly underestimated the losses which would be incurred in his newspaper ventures. Mr. Field and his associates were convinced, apparently, that the net losses, after taking into account the tax saving on his investment income would be readily absorbed. When these calculations went awry Field's financial advisers discovered the possibility of acquiring other profitable properties whose earnings could be used to finance the newspapers instead of being paid into the Federal Treasury to help pay the cost of war.

In addition to the properties acquired, I am told that Mr. Field made unsuccessful attempts to purchase other manufacturing companies which held big Government contracts. One company, a manufacturer of aircraft parts, turned down his offer after consulting with officials of the War Production Board. Board officials told the company that all Field had to offer was money, and the Government needed brains and managerial ability in the company. Another concern, a manufacturer of naval ordnance, rejected an offer from Field because the owner felt that the sale would impair the company's production efficiency and prove detrimental to the Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given these details in order to prove my point that, under the present tax laws, there are loopholes by which millionaires can evade or dodge taxes. The dodge being employed by Mr. Field has been condemned by the Twentieth Century Fund founded by Edward Filene, the Boston merchant, and whose works are well known to all who are interested in problems of taxation. Strangely enough, its publication Facing the Tax Problem in which this practice is condemned, was sponsored by Attorney General Francis Biddle, A. A. Berle of the State Department, and others who usually see eye-to-eye with Mr. Field on most issues. The director of the fund is Evans Clark, husband of Frieda Kirchwey, editor of the Nation.

The following is quoted from page 173 of this book.

> Suppose that a certain individual owns and operates two businesses, a grocery store, and a printing establishment, and that the grocery store is losing money while the printing establishment yields profits. If an excess-profits tax is applied collectively to the businesses of this particular individual, the losses of one business tend to offset the high profits of the other, and no tax may be due. If the tax is applied to each business separately, however, the printing establishment pays a tax. The usual solution of this situation, at least in principle, is to tax each business separately.

In a footnote the problem is further discussed:

> The problem posed in the text has only once been faced in American taxation. The only Federal, State, or local unit to levy an impersonal tax on the net income of unincorporated business is New York State in its recently enacted tax on the net income of unincorporated concerns. The tax commission has had to decide whether the loss of one business should be allowed as a deduction from the profit of another business if both businesses are owned by the same person. Its decision has been that the deduction should be allowed—a decision that has obvious, perhaps compelling, administrative advantages, but that is not entirely consistent with the idea of impersonality upon which the tax is presumably based.

On June 1, 1937, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress requesting changes in the income-tax law to plug some of the loopholes that were being used to advantage by wealthy tax dodgers. He mentioned several methods that were being employed at that time and these were corrected by legislation. But tax dodging by operating several businesses as individual proprietorships or partnerships so as to offset the gains of some against the losses of others, was not among the methods mentioned. He no doubt will want this loophole plugged, too.

I hope the Ways and Means Committee will give it proper consideration before the new tax bill is reported.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Not only that, but unless this Congress changes the law, September next Marshall Field III will inherit about $200,000,000 that will escape taxation entirely.

Mr. SHAFER. That is true; that is what makes him a foreign parasite.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this bill and the elimination of the Farm Security Administration recently, I had occasion to refer to the activities of the Farm Security Administration in my State—Idaho—in assisting the small farmers and the men who

want to get reestablished on a farm. In the course of my remarks I mentioned the fact that a disastrous flood was now sweeping over one of the finest farming sections of Idaho. In this connection I have just received a report from the Administrator confirming that information, and I read from his letter of April 14:

APRIL 14, 1943.

Hon. COMPTON WHITE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WHITE: A few days ago you inquired whether the Farm Security Administration is making plans to help families affected by the flood of the Boise River.

Mr. Duffy, our regional director at Portland, has wired me that our State director is serving on the Governor's committee which was set up to handle this problem, and our county supervisor is serving on the local committee. Arrangements have been completed for the use of Farm Security camp facilities to provide temporary housing and relief for farm families. The first group of evacuees is already located in the Farm Security Administration labor camp. Extensive damage is being sustained in all types of agricultural property, including houses and furniture.

Mr. Duffy reports that emergency crop and feed loans and R. A. C. C. loans will probably be used to the maximum. This credit, of course, is limited to agricultural operations, and Mr. Duffy has requested an allocation for grant funds to handle this disaster situation. Such funds will, of course, be used primarily for subsistence and similar needs associated with human welfare.

The flood peak is expected to come in approximately 10 days.

You may be sure that our local representatives stand ready to render every assistance possible within the limits of funds available to the farm families suffering from flood damage.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

C. B. BALDWIN,
Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, judging from the communications pouring in, not only from Idaho but the whole Northwest, I am convinced that the subcommittee in striking down the Farm Security Administration has done a great disservice and removed a most helpful organization, helpful to the man who is struggling to get on his feet.

I read a telegram from a veteran farmer, president of the Farmers' Union of the State of Idaho, Jesse Vetter:

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *April 15, 1493.*

COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Building, Washington, D. C.:

Washington (Idaho) Farmers' Union strongly opposed recommendations of House Agriculture Appropriations Committee abolishing Farm Security Administration reducing Agricultural Adjustment Agency appropriations, abolishing nonrecourse loans. These programs been very helpful to family sized farms. Proposed changes would hamper food production in this area.

JESSE VETTER, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, permit me also to read a telegram from a veteran farmer of Twin Falls, Idaho:

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON WHITE,
United States Representative:

After 30 years' farming experience, I find Production Credit Association only satisfactory credit agency for farmers. Banks have always charged excessive interest in past. Hope you can help protect over 7,800 farmers in south Idaho district who are aroused over any change as appears in new agricultural bill.

GEO. L. WATT.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The cases referred to in the flood area of the gentleman's State are, of course, being taken care of now through rehabilitation loans from the F. S. A.

Mr. WHITE. The F. S. A. is the only organization that can do it, now that we have discontinued the W. P. A. to handle hardship agricultural cases of this kind; and I may say further to the gentleman from Minnesota that thousands of people who have lost everything they had in the Dust Bowl, in the great States of Kansas and Oklahoma, veteran farmers—and even farmers from the gentleman's State for that matter who have lost out to the insurance companies on mortgages—have flooded into the northwest States and are being helped by the F. S. A.:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *April 16, 1943.*

Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

It would be a mistake to adopt that part of the Department of Agriculture supply bill requiring loans submitted to production credit associations first be refused by private agencies. It is my observation that production credit associations have done a very dependable and constructive job in financing farmers, and their set-up is such that it does meet their requirements. As consistent feeder of lambs and cattle I request that you use your influence to see that production credit associations system is not disturbed.

CARLYLE CHAFFIN,
Chairman, Bonneville County Beet Growers Association.

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO, *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Feel that House Appropriations Committee bill will affect Farm Credit Administration. Farmers need all possible help raising crops and this type legislation should not pass.

NEIL F. BOYLE.

OGDEN, UTAH, *April 15, 1943.*

Representative COMPTON WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

We, in behalf of some 2,000 wheat producers of the intermountain territory, plead with you to vote for our existence in the present bill presented by the House Committee on Appropriations by voting against the transfer of Farm Security Administration to Farm Credit Administration; to vote against the discontinuance of parity payments, as certainly the present price of wheat is far below parity, while everything else is soaring daily; to vote against the transfer of Agricultural Adjustment Agency to county agents; and, finally, to please vote against the requirement forcing cooperatives to first be turned down by private banks before loan applications may be presented to Farm Credit Administration for loans. Cooperatives all over this territory are operating under loans from Farm Credit Administration, and, certainly, it is the cooperatives who must stay in existence during this emergency to bolster production, and we cannot allow cooperatives to be taken over and sold down the river by private banks after the boom is over, which was the case after the last war. Farmers need more support now than ever before if we intend to hold up production and feed the world. If we sell out the American farmer, we are selling out America, and we urge your support and will appreciate your reply.

FARMERS GRAIN COOPERATIVE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 14, 1943.*

COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization, representing thousands of workers in five Western States, recognizes Farm Security Administration as vitally necessary to food production in this area. Urge you exert all possible effort to gain adequate appropriation for maintenance and expansion of Farm Security Administration farm program among small farmers as most efficient and effective means of relieving food problem for the war effort.

NORTHWESTERN COUNCIL LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired. All time on the foreign parasites has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, $4,608,610, of which amount not to exceed $615,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this morning from one of the large farm operators in my district which I think is expressive of the sentiment of many of the farmers in that part of the country. It ought to be called to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country. This man and his associates operate 800 acres of farmland in my congressional district. They handle several hundred milk cows and a large number of cattle and hogs. This letter graphically tells of the difficulties they are encountering in connection with this operation. Listen to a portion of this letter:

The pressure exerted by the local United States Employment Office for men to go on the farms has produced some help. We have tried out about 11 men in the last 2 weeks without much success. Some of these men worked on the farm 5 or 10 years ago and then took softer jobs in stores and industries. Now they just can't take it. We have been paying these men $25 a week with living quarters, 2 quarts of milk per day and 2 dozen eggs per week, which, of course, is a very expensive situation for farm help. It takes about 5 of this type to get the same results as 1 experienced man like Private Behrens could get, and if we have 5 novices around we need another supervisor to keep them working. If anybody has any doubts that this farm labor represents a vicious cycle and problem detrimental to efficiency, I will be perfectly happy to present some figures and some real factual findings.

We already were forced to sell 50 head of dairy cows, and we hope we won't have to stop our beef raising entirely. From November 1 to December 22 a total of 9 calves were born

in our dairy barn and only 3 survived. The rest died either from acute enteritis or because the cow had been left in the stanchion instead of being moved into a box stall to facilitate the birth. The calf was born in the gutter behind the stanchion and with the cow's head tied in the stanchion it could not, of course, give the calf the immediate after birth care that is necessary and within a day or two the calf died. I would not say that this was ill-will on the part of the farm help we have, but they simply don't have experience and can't foretell in sufficient time when the cows should be put in the box stalls, which should be no less than 2 or 3 days before. We were going to overcome this particular problem by building a lot of additional box stalls and putting the cows in them 2 months beforehand in order to preserve the calves, but we could not get any building permits. The shortage of material would have made this appear wasteful. We then decided to dispose of most of the dairy herd before we had a total loss.

Now we are having the same problem with our beef calves. Since January 1 there were 32 calves born and there are only 14 that survived. Normally, we would have had about the same number born and would have lost perhaps 2 at the most. The reason for this is the same as explained above.

We lost a great many young pigs this winter. They were not wormed in time; their accommodations were not kept dry. We, therefore, decided to dispose of them and we sold all of the pigs—small ones, big ones, brood sows, and all—with the exception of four which we kept for our own use. They were sold to the livestock buyer, Mr. Hubert A. Meyer, of Plymouth, Wis. If you wish to get confirmation of these facts, I suggest that you get in touch with Mr. Meyer.

One of the main reasons for having steers and feeders in the wintertime has been our dire necessity for fertilizer in the fields. If skilled men would take care of this, the fertilizer would be hauled out daily from fall until spring and by this time of the year it would be well spread out on the fields. Due to the inexperience of our help and the shortage of help, not more than 10 acres of our total land at this time has been covered. The fertilizer is piled up high next to the barn. We had all we could do to keep our concrete barnyard cleaned up in order to keep the cattle from walking knee deep in filth. None is on the fields. In the meantime thawing has set in and the fields are soft. We can't get out on them with the tractors, and we don't have enough help to drive out with the team, nor could we get a rubber-tired spreader. The fields will have to go without being fertilized, and the negative results will be shown in a year from now.

I did not intend to write you a wailing story and make an issue of this matter because I do appreciate the hopelessness of trying to find understanding in Washington, but since we have been in communication I thought I would write you these facts, and time will tell that the facts cited do not anywhere near cover all the dangers and disasters that are threatening the farms in Wisconsin every day.

I have made a very careful study of all angles in the past 6 years because I have enjoyed, as a relaxation, to visit and work with the farmers. I have planted many acres of land myself; I have driven the tractors in the last 2 years 14 to 16 hours a day, and so has my wife. We have constructed and designed mechanical improvements, worked toward cleaner and better milk, and have pioneered for sanitation on the farms. Neither one of us would have to do it for a living. We could have played golf, drunk highballs, and discussed politics, but our children shall remember as long as they live that their parents tried their best. Our children are all active on the farms every spare minute they have. My son, who is a student at Culver Military Academy during the winter, will be home soon for vacation and he will be on the tractor and doing the best he can from early morning until late at night. I am seriously debating whether I should interrupt his education (he is 15 years old and an excellent student) to keep him working on the farms. He is more serious and practical at his age than most of these imitation farmers I received through the employment office.

This morning I felt particularly miserable when the farm helper came to feed the steers at 8:30 a. m., whereas they should be fed and watered every day at 6:30 a. m. on the dot. The irregularity of feeding will not help to produce the results wanted, and half of the corn used is thus wasted. It is regularity that counts.

Again, I want to tell you that I don't intend to wail to you nor do I expect any sort of relief, but I am sure that my letter will become much more important and much more significant in 2 or 3 years from now than it can possibly be today. The worst descriptions throughout the Nation of the farming and cattle-raising problem could not be exaggerated, but it has gone too far for price fixing and other controls to do any good. It still takes 9 months for a cow to have a calf and 2½ to 3 years for the calf to be raised to be taken to market, or 4 or 5 years to be a milk producer. No short-cut training or efficiency program will change the laws of nature. I am afraid the price fixing, scare program, and the drafting of farm labor in the past year have done serious damage, but this is not news to you or anybody else—it could not be. It must be part of the general plowing-under program. But, my friends, be careful, as even the plows get mired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I offer this further suggestion? I think Members under the 5-minute rule insofar as possible should confine their remarks to the bill. There is still hope, I understand, of an Easter vacation. If we are to have that or any chance of that we must complete this bill as rapidly as possible, and while I have no objection to any Member speaking who wants to discuss the merits of the bill, I do feel that they ought not to discuss extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, perhaps, I would do well to express the thought I have in mind in commendation for the work I feel this subcommittee has done on the bill that they have brought before us. I know every Member on the floor is sitting through this debate because they are vitally interested in the problems affecting agriculture and the problems of our farmers. I want to make an appeal to my colleagues in the House who have a particular interest in the dairy farmer. I want to ask you, if you agree with me, to get your views down to the O. P. A. I believe that more can be done for the dairy farmers of the country right now by talking to the officials of O. P. A. than can be done in any other department of the Government.

Last night I received a petition that I have before me signed by the owners of 6,060 dairy cattle in the State of Connecticut asking me to submit a petition to Prentiss M. Brown. They make some very interesting statements in the letter that accompanies this petition.

They petition for relief from the O. P. A. They say that, "We, the milk producers of Connecticut, respectfully submit this petition for an increase in the price paid to farmers for the milk, based on actual costs of production. We know that unless a fair price is given we shall be forced to liquidate our herds."

As proof that liquidation is going on, I hold in my hand announcements of auction sales of dairy cattle in that one small county by one auctioneer announcing 13 different sales, a total of 286 milk cows that will be sold or have been sold between March 15 and April 20.

As these farmers point out in the letter they have sent me, the price the dairies get for their fluid milk is the same today as it was in December 1941, yet in the meantime grain has increased from $44 to $56, labor from $40 a month and found to as high as $115 a month and found, and the high-priced labor is mostly inexperienced farm labor.

In 1941 good cows in that area cost from $100 to $125. Today the average cow costs from $200 to $225.

They point out that unless O. P. A. will give them some relief and give it to them immediately they have no alternative but to sell their herds and the responsibility for the shortage of milk that is bound to develop must rest on the shoulders of the O. P. A.

They point out that unless this relief is granted and speedily, it will be too late. They point out also that a farmer should be able to plan fertilization of mowings and pastures and better seedings for increased production before it is too late to do this work.

They say further, "The only correction, as we see it, is to increase the ceiling price to the consumer and give the benefit to the producer or make a flat price of 10 cents a quart at the farm for 3.7 milk and subsidize the consumer through the dealer."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman expects to get any relief from the O. P. A., he is going to be sadly disappointed, because after all I am convinced that they are not interested in securing the production of food, they are more interested in putting in their reforms and trying to remake our economy in this country.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am going to present the facts to the O. P. A., as I have before. Maybe the gentleman is an optimist. But let me say that unless some relief is given to the dairy farmer the situation is going to be very dangerous and acute in every part of this

country, and when the people find they cannot get the milk that they need, there is going to be more unrest in the country than we have ever seen and more than I ever want to see.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The people will be lucky if they get the milk at any price, irrespective of what the farmer receives for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to enable the Secretary to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water-supply or sanitary system and of connecting the same with any such building, and exclusive of the cost of any tower upon which a lookout house may be erected, shall not exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or more, may be improved out of the appropriations made under this act for the Forest Service by an amount not to exceed 2 percent of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary; to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting and other measures to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, soil waste, and the formation of floods, and to conserve water and including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase lawbooks, reference and technical books, and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, equipment, and materials stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Forest Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment, and materials, including the cost of supervision, transportation, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies and materials are procured for warehouse stocks: *Provided further*, That the appropriations for the work of the Forest Service available for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replacement of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reimbursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control, and credited to appropriations currently available at the time adjustment is effected: *Provided further*, That the Forest Service may rent equipment for fire-control purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time payment is received, as follows:

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I wonder if the committee went into the question of the moving pictures and propaganda that is prepared by the Forestry Service in the Agricultural Department designed to promote the Government ownership of forests, and just where are those items?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that no evidence was adduced before the committee indicating the work described by him in the Forestry Service and the hearings show nothing in regard thereto, as far as I recall. I do not know of any funds carried in the bill intended for such purpose and none have been justified for such purpose.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman that I am advised that the worst type of communistic propaganda is being indulged in by this organization.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry that no one came to the committee in time for it to investigate the charge. As a matter of fact, it has not had information of that sort and has had no evidence of the carrying on of that type of work so far as the Forestry Service is concerned, and as far as I know, none of the funds estimated for here are intended for such work.

Mr. TABER. I am anxious to find out so that I may offer an amendment to get rid of that activity.

Mr. TARVER. I do not think we ought to act or could act intelligently upon the basis of a rumor, which I feel is probably without foundation.

Mr. TABER. It is not a rumor without foundation. It is a fact. This is a very serious situation.

Mr. TARVER. At any rate, may I say to the gentleman that there should be evidence of the intention to use a portion of these funds for purposes such as have been described by the gentleman before the House should undertake to cut out part of the funds in this bill upon the assumption that they might be so used. If the gentleman or any other Member of the House or anyone else, inside or outside the House, had information of the carrying on of practices of this sort with moneys appropriated under this bill or of the intention to carry on such practices with moneys to be appropriated in the next fiscal year, such individual ought to come before our committee and advise us. We have had no such information, and I, for one, do not feel that we should act in the absence of information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did make an independent research on the matter, and found that a motion picture such as the gentleman refers to was actually produced, according to the Budget Director, in the Department of Agriculture. Incidentally, you will find on page 1516 of the hearings the amount of money that has been expended or will be expended for motion picture work by the Forest Service for the instant fiscal year, 1943.

Mr. TARVER. I am wondering if the gentleman in talking about motion pictures does not have in mind an activity which is alleged to have been carried on and not at all under the Forest Service, as I understand, involving the expenditure of some $12,000 of funds appropriated to the uses of the Department of Agriculture but not appropriated to the Forest Service. That is a separate matter, which was called to my attention after the hearings of the committee had closed and with regard to which I have instituted some investigation, but, as I understand, the investigation does not in any way involve the Forest Service.

Mr. TABER. Without the specific evidence as to the item out of which this comes, I hesitate to offer an amendment to cut out the activity. On the other hand, I feel that this activity should be stopped. It came to my attention after adjournment last evening, which is the reason it was not brought to the attention of the gentleman before. I feel that it is a very serious situation and a very dangerous situation.

Mr. TARVER. I am glad that the gentleman agrees with me that action should be had only after investigation.

Mr. TABER. It would not take much investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b) (not to exceed $397,368), and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and acts supplementary thereto, and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries, or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of

forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not to exceed $646,168; including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Terirtory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the committee has cut the farm forestry item $150,000 below the Budget. There is also written into the bill some language which I think is subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

I rise at this time to tell the members of the committee that the farm forestry project, which was known as the shelterbelt project, was at one time operated by the Forest Service as the Plains States forestry program. They did an unusually fine work in planting trees in many of our Plains States. We now have miles upon miles of wonderful trees. Some of the trees that were planted in 1936 are 30 feet high, bringing to us windbreaks, protection, posts, and wood for our farms, and protection for wildlife, bringing back to our part of the country song birds, and holding of snow and moisture. We are anxious in Nebraska, which is the Tree Planters State, to continue planting these trees on additional farms. We do not want this program of tree planting liquidated.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In addition to what the gentleman has already delineated as the benefits from those trees, may I say that they also serve as a great benefit to the soil, that is, as to soil conservation.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. The Forest Service first inaugurated this work. It is now being done by the Conservation Service. My idea is that this work should continue. Forestry did a great job. Conservation can continue it. Our farmers want the program continued. It is a worth-while project in States which know the ravages of drought.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that these 6-year-old trees, planted in 1936, are now 40 feet high?

Mr. STEFAN. They are 30 to 40 feet high.

Mr. GROSS. How high were they when they were planted?

Mr. STEFAN. They were seedlings.

Mr. GROSS. That is an unusual growth. That is good soil, is it not?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it is an unusual growth. Some of the cottonwood trees planted during the drought are 30 or more feet high. The average growth is good. They are providing fine protection to our farms.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to make a point of order on this appropriation bill because it contains legislation, but I am interested in protecting a program which has proven valuable and is something in which all of the farmers are interested. I should like the chairman of the committee to tell the House what has been done with this program so we can understand it.

Mr. TARVER. In my discussion of the bill on Wednesday I undertook to do that. The gentleman evidently overlooked my remarks. The provisions insofar as they relate only to the consolidation of these two activities are not subject to a point of order. There are some provisions in the paragraph that might have been subject to a point of order, but they are not so subject now after this discussion by the gentleman.

The objective of the committee was to consolidate these two branches of the Forest Service dealing substantially with the same problem. We have not eliminated the shelterbelt from consideration upon the same basis that other sections of the country may have consideration; that is, we so arranged this appropriation—and we did it last year—that the shelterbelt farmers could get the same consideration in this private forestry program and farm forestry program that farmers in other parts of the country could get, and no more. We think that is fair, and that is what will be done under the terms of this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. How much money is in this bill for farm forestry?

Mr. TARVER. The amount for farm and other private forestry cooperation is $646,168, which is a cut of $161,942 below the budget, which the committee, realizing as it does the importance of this work and its great value, feels nevertheless can be sustained at this time because of our emergency war needs.

Mr. STEFAN. Are we to infer that the forestry project will continue under the Soil Conservation as heretofore? The gentleman's committee originally took this away from Forestry and put it in Soil Conservation.

Mr. TARVER. The shelterbelt project in the Middle West, as such, that is, this huge shelterbelt project originally intended to traverse the country from Canada to the Gulf, will not be continued, but the farmers living in that area may obtain from the Forest Service the same type of aid and on the same terms that farmers in other sections of the country may obtain similar aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am as much interested as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in economy, but I am very much interested to get a definite statement that the farm forestry or the so-called shelterbelt program will not be entirely liquidated. The farmers in the Middle West do not want any preferential treatment, but they should be able to get seedlings to plant, so that there may be windbreaks, and there may be soil conservation, and that they may bring back wildlife.

Mr. TARVER. I regret very much that I have not been able to state the matter in a way so that the gentleman can understand. I believe I answered fully that the situation is simply that there is provided for in this bill no shelterbelt program in the Middle West as such, but the farmers living in the so-called Middle West shelterbelt area can get assistance of the Forestry Service just as the farmers anywhere in the United States can get it, under the same terms.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, will they be able to get trees to plant?

Mr. TARVER. Upon the same terms as other farmers get the same things, upon the same type of cooperation. The Government is not going to do it without cooperation, as the gentleman will be able to ascertain by reading the bill, but under the same cooperation required of all farmers, these shelterbelt farmers will be able to get the same kind of aid from the Government that all other farmers will get.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I fear that this language on page 57, beginning in line 18, after the colon, beginning with the word *"Provided"*, including the language on page 58, from line 1 to line 12, will destroy the program in the Plain States, and I make the point of order against it because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman cannot discuss the paragraph and then make a point of order against it. The point of order does not lie. It comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order against the language beginning on page 57, line 18, with the word *"Provided,"* down to and including the language on page 58, line 12. This point of order is made after debate has been had. The point of order, therefore, comes too late, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest research: For forest research in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the act entitled "An act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects," approved May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U. S. C. 581, 581a, 581f–581i), as follows.

Mr. BEHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the appropriate number of words. I shall not take the 5 minutes, nor have I any intention of criticizing the subcommittee. However, I call attention to the fact that forest research has been reduced by $625,000, and the reasons given are that their services are not essential to the war effort. If my information is correct, the Budget Bureau has stated in testimony that 80 percent of all of the work which the Forestry Research Department is now doing is directly in the interest of the war effort. So, if you were to reduce the original appropriation of $2,125,000 by 80 percent, only that which is being used in the war effort would be $1,800,000. Therefore, they have been reduced, at least in my opinion, $300,000 below the services which they are actually rendering in the war effort in supplying and making available wood in its different forms for the Army and the Navy, since the appropriation as it now stands is only $1,500,000. Here is an interesting fact which may not be known to some of you, but according to actual weight there is two and a half times as much wood being used in the war effort as there is actual weight of steel being used in the war effort. I trust that the Senate committee in their wisdom will see fit to restore, if not the full $625,000, at least $300,000, so as to take care of at least 80 percent which they are doing in the war effort. Forestry, in my opinion, is one of the most essential activities of our entire conservation program, and certainly research, not only to supply but also to conserve, is one of our most vital national programs in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, to answer the gentleman briefly. This is one of the easiest things to take out, this research in forestry. The main thing that is involved here is manpower, and one of the commonest reasons we have from our testimony here was that this is not going to be maintained on its proper present basis, because of the lack of manpower. That is the main argument, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. These services are losing their manpower. It is something that is not directly connected with the war effort. Research in forestry certainly can wait, and the lack of manpower is not going to permit it if this amount is restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously interested in the continuation of all possible research and experimentation, not only in forestry, but in the various branches of scientific development where there is hope for benefit to the American people.

It is my firm conviction that America's destiny of success and victory in this war rests upon two things. One, of course, is our great form of government, embracing those four cardinal virtues of higher living, freedom of speech and press, public assembly, and the fourth, which is the keystone in our great arch of civilization, freedom of religion. Coupled with that form of government, the next reason why we are destined for victory is on account of the natural resources of our great Nation; the minerals beneath the soil, metals, oil and petroleum products, forest resources, the rich productive soil to produce food, fisheries, and so forth.

The producing power of the United States today and for the last several years, probably the last two generations, has been greater than any other two or three of the major nations combined.

This generation owes plenty to the future generation. We are now depleting our forest products. We are now depleting our mineral resources in a greater proportion than has occurred in any other period on account of the very emergency of this war.

Mr. Chairman, there will be other wars to fight one or two generations from now. We might well expect history to repeat itself.

America's forest resources and possibilities are inestimatable, they should and must be protected from fires. They should and must be replenished and perpetuated. Likewise the soil must be preserved against soil erosion and wasteful uses and practices. It is obvious that our minerals including petroleum resources are exhaustable. They likewise should be preserved and protected in every manner consistent with the war effort.

Civilizations have become impoverished and the power and strength of nations lost on account of depletion in and loss of natural resources. This is particularly the case in the loss of productiveness of the soil of food and other necessary commodities.

While China was supreme in the production of food and other essentials from the soil, she was the world's strongest nation. Ancient strength and leadership and control hovered in the Nile Valley largely on account of the fertility and productiveness of the soil.

For America's future strength, it is highly essential that this Congress foster every possible medium of conservation, preservation, and perpetuation of America's natural resources. America's future security demands that every possible field of experimentation, research, and development be not only continued but advanced and increased. If and when America occupies a secondary place among nations of the world as a producer, then she will lose her existing leadership and certainty in world affairs. Scientific research, experimentation, and development offers America her best assurance of continued world leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest influences: For investigations and experiments at forest experiment stations or elsewhere for determining and demonstrating the influence of natural vegetative cover characteristic of forest, range, or other wild land on water conservation, flood control, stream-flow regulation, erosion, climate, and maintenance of soil productivity, and for developing preventive and control measures therefor, $75,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this item of "forest influences" is one which the committee has seen fit to cut approximately 40 percent, one of the heaviest cuts it has made in any item in the bill.

It happens that a very important piece of work has been carried on in my own section of the country by the Forest Service under money provided in this section of the bill. There is an experimental laboratory, an outdoor laboratory, known as the Sandimas experimental forest, which is conducted in the San Gabriel Mountains of southern California, with which I am quite familiar and about which I would like to talk for a couple of minutes.

I regret sincerely that the cut was as deep as it was. This laboratory is of tremendous importance to us in southern California. We live in a semiarid region where the difference between desert on the one hand and a very beautiful productive valley on the other is water. This experimental forest plant means the developing of methods of conserving water in the mountain areas to a greater extent than heretofore; of determining what types of forest coverage are best for the conservation of that water; of determining how we can predict what our local water supplies are going to be in future years. Those local water supplies are our most valuable ones, of course.

There has been an investment of some $2,000,000 made in equipment, gages, weirs, and other types of equipment in that section, equipment which should certainly be adequately maintained, but which I am not sure can be adequately or properly maintained under this cut in the appropriation.

The Forest Service itself, confronted with the necessity of reducing personnel, has seen fit to do it in other places than in this immediate type of work.

Furthermore, from this experimental laboratory there has come daily, six or eight times a day, information to the Weather Bureau that enabled it to make more accurate forecasts for aircraft

operation in one of the sections of the country—shall I say with due modesty, the section of the country where there is more aircraft activity than any place else. The work of this laboratory has been the means of enabling us to forecast floods as we could not do before. Their work has been used by the Corps of Army Engineers in their work on flood control and in a number of other ways this work has been invaluable.

I am not offering an amendment, for I know what its fate would be. I do, however, feel impelled to make a short statement on the importance of this work.

Mr. Chairman, if time will permit, I cannot refrain from commenting on the remarks of the gentleman from New York a while ago about a picture that is supposed to have been made by the Forest Service encouraging Government ownership of forests. I do not know anything about that. I do not know whether the Government ever made such a picture. I never saw it. But it does occur to me that I once saw a moving picture put out by a community which showed how its fire department worked. I just wonder whether that would be termed "communistic propaganda" in favor of municipal ownership of fire departments or not. For my part I believe in municipal ownership of fire departments and I do not believe that is communistic. I want to say that I think the national policy of the conservation of our forests which was started under that great Republican President, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, and which has its heart in the conservation of forest lands by putting them in public ownership and reserving them for private use under a sustained yield program is a right policy, not a communistic one. I think it is a good American policy and I do not know otherwise the rights of future generations can be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, all that the gentleman from California has said may be true, and I would be glad to have an increase in the appropriation if we could save the money some other place, but it just seems that frequently there is not enough money to go around. We could save some money by striking some employees off the pay roll. The paper this morning tells us that over before the Ways and Means Committee yesterday one of the most patriotic and respected Members of the House was charged by a witness from the Department of State with making a pro-Hitler speech while commenting on testimony. The man who made that charge in an open committee meeting is paid from Federal tax money. I do not know why the Congress, which appropriates the money, should keep on the pay roll men who make that kind of a charge against Congressmen and make it openly before committees of the House. Let employees of the executive department and everyone who desires to criticize do so; let them charge the people's Representatives with lack of ability or lack of diligence but never with lack of loyalty. It may be that Congressmen no longer have any self-respect; it is possible that they lack the courage to resent charges of that kind in an effective manner, but, if that be true, it should be true that, as an expression of loyalty to the people who sent us here, we put an end to that kind of procedure. I do not know from personal knowledge what happened in the Ways and Means Committee hearings this morning, but some of the Members who were over there tell me that another witness started off on the same line of talk.

How long can Congress expect to retain the respect of the voters who sent us here if we allow employees whose salaries we provide for by appropriations to get up in committee rooms when they are speaking officially as representatives of the executive department and as witnesses and tell us we are pro-Hitler? How long are you going to stand for it? How long would you stand for it in your own business if some employee told you you were dishonest, disloyal, were not attending to your business? Who made employees of the executive department judges over us? None of them hold commissions from the people. None was selected by the people. None was elected by the people. All are just employees, holding jobs because of political favor.

I hope that the Committee on Appropriations when some of these bills come along which carry the money to pay the men who are making such charges will see that those men do not get any of that money hereafter as servants of the people; that they be severed from the Goverment pay roll. Get rid of them. Do we not owe it to the loyal men and women, the loyal citizens who sent us here, to nail false and malicious charges like that made yesterday? Do we not owe to them at least, if not to ourselves, the duty to fire those people and quit paying them with the taxpayer's money? Let us brand that charge and similar charges for what they are—a part of the administration's campaign to smear all who venture to criticize the silly, foolish policies of the New Deal. The taxpayers vote to send us here. We know that they know we are going to be paid with money they provide through taxation, and yet we sit here day after day and let those representatives of these various departments come up here and charge that we are disloyal and unpatriotic—that we do not represent the people who send us here. Let those who make those false charges remember that the voters in our respective districts last November gave the lie to those charges. Let us get rid of them. Let us have an end to this thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman took the floor and referred to the matter he did; it is most unfortunate.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is one whom we all respect. I do not like to judge my fellow men too severely. Unfortunately some questions were asked in committee which I think were in a manner that conveyed an impression which the distinguished gentleman from California did not entertain in his mind. The impression was created, however, and I know he did not intend so to mean, but the impression was created throughout the country that he felt that our country had encircled Nazi Germany from an economic angle and that that was one of the causes for Germany going to war against the world. I cannot concede for a moment that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] had that in mind, and if so, of course, he is in error.

When a person asks questions that he reduces to writing, it is one thing, it is deliberate, but when a man asks questions extemporaneously, or speaks extemporaneously in debate, it is quite a different thing and I place a different interpretation upon it than I would upon what a man reads from a prepared manuscript. We all know that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is a very fine American. The questions he asked, unfortunately, created such an impression, an impression I am confident he did not intend to convey and which he does not entertain for the least moment, because certainly the most adverse consideration for the best interests of our own country would be to have such an impression an erroneous impression, created either in our own country or throughout the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am trying to make a statement which is noncontroversial. It is my interpretation. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is better able to state what his state of mind is than I am, but I am trying to give my own interpretation as a result of what I read in the newspaper in the hope that the expressions of mine will rapidly clear up a situation the continuance of which is not for the best interests of our country.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I do this for the purpose of giving notice that in the interest of the expeditious handling of this bill I shall make points of order against all gentlemen who hereafter undertake to discuss any matter, no matter how great in importance it may be, which is not related to the pending bill. I am sure that in adopting this position I am in accord with the wishes of the majority of the membership. If I did not think so, I would not adopt the position. I do not believe that the Members in the consideration of an agricultural appropriation bill want to have a free-for-all

scrap here between Members on both sides of the aisle with regard to questions which are entirely disassociated from the pending measure, and while I have the utmost desire not to be obnoxious to my colleagues who may desire to speak, I do think I am justified in taking that position hereafter. It is my purpose to make points of order against any gentleman whose remarks are not adjusted to the pending bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture is a war measure. If it is not a war measure, then we should make it so. I think it is something more than oratory when we are constantly told that food is essential to this war effort. If there is anything in this bill that will increase production we ought to keep it in the bill. If anything has been left out of the bill which will increase the production of food for ourselves, for our Army, for our allies, or the rest of the world, it ought to be put in. If there is anything else that can be spared, which we can get along without, it should be left out of the bill. I could not help but think of a great many farm folks back home, during these days we have been considering the bill.

I thought of old men past 75 years of age who have moved back on the farm because their sons had gone to war. I thought of old men whose fingers were stiffened from pain, caused by arthritis, those old men who are milking cows, those old men who are rising early in the morning and going about, doing work that they should not be doing because of their age. I am thinking of the women and children and other people doing their best to carry on to produce food in order to keep us from starving. Again I say, that production in agriculture for war should be our principal objective here.

Unfortunately, that has not been the case in connection with the farm program of this country until recently. Only last September, to be exact, on September 7 when the Commander in Chief sent his message to the Congress, in reference to price control of farm products, he stressed control first, not production.

If you will refer to that message you will find there were four objectives set out: first, control of the farmer and his prices, and second, adequate production. We would be in a sorry mess if we proceeded to first make airplanes, providing for a well-controlled industry, at a price to suit everybody and then after all these preliminaries attempt to get an adequate production of planes; yet that is exactly what was set forth in that Executive message with reference to the production of food.

This country is apt to be hungry. Other countries are hungry. It is our duty to make this measure a war measure, and put into it everything which will encourage production on the part of the little producer, the large producer, and everyone who can help feed a starving world.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has now been demonstrated that the recommendations of the President in the message to which the gentleman refers has curtailed production. Does not the gentleman feel that those restrictions should now be lifted and the farmer given some encouragement to produce food for the Nation and our armed forces?

Mr. CURTIS. That is very true. I have long felt that the great powers and prerogatives of the Office of Price Administration should be used to increase production and not destroy production.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree with everything the gentleman from Nebraska has said. Does the gentleman feel that curtailing loans made by the Government heretofore and which may be required hereafter, through Government agencies, is going to operate to increase the production of food so sorely needed at this time?

Mr. CURTIS. My position in reference to loans for farmers has often been stated. I favor those loans which will encourage production and take care of the man who cannot get a loan any place else. Much good has been done by these types of loans. However, I am opposed to the Federal Government going into the banking business in competition with the private banking institutions, authorized under State and National laws. If we destroy the banks of the country, we are not helping the farmers. However, with those loans which the banks cannot handle, the Government has stepped in and has done a great deal of good. They have helped a great many farmers who have added materially to our food production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I realize the temper of this House in regard to the Farm Security Administration. I realize that in the name of economy many worth-while services of the Department of Agriculture are being eliminated by denial of funds or transference to other departments. This is being done at a time when in my opinion food production is of prime importance. If the work of the Farm Security Administration has had a social significance, if they have been guilty of contributing to the rehabilitation of thousands of American farm families, and I challenge any man to deny this fact, that is to their credit.

In my opinion no safer precaution against un-American subversive movements can be taken than to take dispossessed farm families, victims of the Dust Bowl tragedy and the great factory farms, and place these same families on small farms, help them get the fundamental necessities of farm life, and start them again on the road of self-reliance.

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of 1942 the order for the evacuation of Japanese nationals or persons of Japanese descent from the west coast immediately raised one serious problem—that of food production, to which resident Japanese had contributed in that area so importantly through their intensive cultivation of truck crops.

Because of its available trained field organization, the Farm Security Administration, under the authority of the Wartime Civilian Control Administration and with funds provided by the Fourth Army Command and the President's emergency fund, was assigned to keep these farms in production. It was a rush order both ways—to get the Japanese out and to get others to take over the farm operations and continue production.

Key personnel was rushed in from all western F. S. A. regions and local operations were set up almost overnight. Farm Security had no part, of course, in the evacuation itself. Its job was to find others who could take over the farming operations of agricultural evacuees, to arrange equitable transfers of equipment and land rights, to protect the property interests of those evacuated, and to assist those who needed it to continue production.

The job was virtually completed in less than 2 months' time. The Japanese vacated 6,789 farms, comprising about 233,000 acres. More than $2,000,000 was disbursed to Japanese farmers as reimbursement for crops, leases, and equipment. Farms were taken over by all types of competent operators, ranging from large commercial producers to small farmers and workers. Loans were made to 651 applicants to finance them in their new or expanded operations.

There was virtually no interruption in production on these farms. In testimony of the satisfaction with which this assignment was carried out, Lt. Gen. J. L. Dewitt, commanding officer of the Western Defense Command and the Fourth Army, wrote the Secretary of Agriculture that the F. S. A. has "discharged its assignment with outstanding efficiency" and added that "the superior manner of performance merits the highest commendation."

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a telegram from Father Charles Phillips, chairman of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference of California. While I am not a member of this organization, I have the greatest respect for the work that the leaders of this great church group have accomplished in rehabilitating the farmers in low-income groups. Their constant Christian aid in helping to solve the material as well as the spiritual needs of the poor of our land is well known to all.

The National Catholic Rural Conference of California has given their approval to the continuance of the Farm Security Administration in their efforts to rehabilitate the poorer farm families

of our great State. I insert a copy of their telegram at this point:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 12, 1943.*

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

National Catholic Rural Conference of California strongly urges continuance of Farm Security Administration. National food production can only be increased effectively by the lower two-thirds of American farmers who, weakened in manpower, need guidance and financial assistance of Farm Security Administration. The poorer farm families supplied extra large quotas of boys for armed services, girls for war production. This type farm families is stabilizer for democracy postwar period. Farm Security Administration carries into practice ideals and principles of Catholic rural life. American rural life finds in Farm Security Administration its sole promise of survival, resurgence of old rural America vitality. Specifically Farm Security Administration has made enviable record handling Mexican imported labor in California. Kindly acquaint all California Representatives with telegram.

Respectfully,

Father CHARLES PHILLIPS,
Chairman, National Catholic Rural Life Conference of California, formerly of Sevastopol.

I submit that the charges of communism and socialism against the Farm Security Administration are amply answered by the support of one of the greatest Christian church organizations in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, since food is a most important and one of the most discussed issues in the country today, I call your attention to the fact that there is no use in talking so much about producing unless we are going to save after we have produced.

I noticed in the newspaper that War Department officials admitted the other day that in some of the Army camps 20 percent of all food finds its way to the garbage cans. It was just this kind of thing that made me march down here in the Well of this House a few weeks ago and declare war on waste.

Since I coined the slogan that is now nationally adopted, "Lick the platter clean," it has gone over the country and people are falling in line. I am happy to know that it is having this effect everywhere.

The Manpower Commission could do a whole lot in helping to create greater supplies of food. For instance, in some of the factories, as in some of the Government bureaus, there are so many employees that they are in one another's way. I have a letter here from an industrialist who is supplying vital materials to the war effort. He says that his men, who have been trained up through the ranks and who are the only men who can do certain kinds of work, are being taken, when there are other men who stand in each other's way who should be taken. The jobs I am referring to are in a lime plant and the work is too heavy and too dirty for women.

I have a report from an airplane factory where one man boasted that he drove only three rivets in a day.

These are the kinds of things that need to be looked into. Then food production could be increased. Our supplies of food could be increased by different methods of grading in canneries. For instance, let us take tomatoes. In grading we too often find that in a load of tomatoes 30 percent are graded class 1, when at least one-half of the remainder, which sell at an unprofitable price to the producer, could be in class 1 if the standards were revised.

This class 2 product is just as good as class 1 when it gets into the can. Because a tomato is small is no reason why it should not be graded class 1. Because of grading standards many tomatoes which would be graded as class 2 at the canneries are left in the field because it would not be profitable to the farmer to bother with them.

Too much emphasis has been placed on class 1 commodities, when class 2 products are just as good and contain just as many vitamins once they are in the can.

I was at the livestock market 2 weeks ago and saw hundreds of hogs weighing 125 pounds being marketed. A simple recommendation on the part of a Government agency that hogs be fed to greater weights before marketing would be more profitable all around. Feeding a 125-pound hog for another 60 days would double his weight and make the marketing more profitable. The Agriculture Department boys should encourage these things. A heavier hog should be the premium hog on the market. They should extend their efforts along these lines and the farmer would cooperate simply because the suggestion was made. It is not necessary to establish new bureaus with large operating costs to accomplish these little things.

I am glad to tell you that the Department of Agriculture sent a request to my office this morning for 150 of my posters saying "Lick the platter clean." They are to be displayed in the restaurants in the Department of Agriculture and other agencies within the next few days. So we are getting cooperation, but what we need is a better program, a better organized program, with not so much confusion, which has its roots downtown in the various bureaus.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has performed a very outstanding service in this country with his program of "Lick the platter clean." I hope the program succeeds throughout the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would in no way detract from the glory which has covered the gentleman in his worthwhile project. However, it has always been my impression that—

Jack Spratt, who ate no fat,
And his wife, who ate no lean,
Started the original slogan
Of "lick your platter clean."

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may be entirely right, but it is a good slogan now as it was then, if what the gentleman says is correct. However, I have not sought any glory. The situation is somewhat changed today and I am interested in saving food so that our soldiers and the public get enough to eat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, of which not to exceed $18,675 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, with apologies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is my opinion that this appropriation subcommittee is also licking the platter clean. Furthermore, may I tell the distinguished gentleman from New York that on the basis of what knowledge I have about the Forest Service, the only moving pictures I have seen have certainly not been Communistic. The Forest Service, through the use of films, shows how to fight forest fires, how to build forest trails, how to protect wildlife, and other related matters.

As far as the personnel of the Forest Service is concerned, a well-developed, patriotic, and highly thought-of group in the individual communities in which they happen to be stationed. We are proud of the men and women of this Service for what they have done in this country and the fine work they have performed is the badge of their merit.

Mr. Chairman, according to the committee report there will apparently be around $6,000,000 less available for forest fire protection than has been available for this fiscal year. This is utterly incomprehensible. Certainly no one would advocate that forest fires should be allowed to run wild and thu disrupt communication systems, transmission lines, and other life lines needed in the war effort, endanger forest resources which are even now failing to produce the lumber needed for war purposes or to endanger industries engaged in war activities, throw up smoke blankets which will seriously interfere with aviation, divert manpower from war industries and farming to go on fire-fighting jobs, and in

many other ways allow uncontrolled forest fires to seriously disrupt the all-out war effort.

As I recall it Congress last year appropriated to the Forest Service for forest-fire control some $4,500,000 in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942. There is overwhelming agreement on the part of military and civilian authorities that this money has been used to most excellent advantage during the current fiscal year. Because of the loss of C. C. C. camps it has been especially indispensable. The bill as reported here today includes no funds for continuing that essential protection job.

In addition a reduction of $1,500,000 has been made in the fund for forest-fire cooperation with the States. It is true, as pointed out on page 13 of the committee report, that this sum is in excess of the maximum amount authorized by law. However, Congress did not hesitate to waive aside this technicality last year in view of the war emergency situation. The forest-fire situation will undoubtedly be as critical, if not more so, during the coming months than it was last season. Congress recognized the emergency needs at that time. By all means it should not fail to do so again.

I understand that the War Department has tentatively agreed to request an appropriation of $2,750,000 in its appropriation bill for use by the Forest Service in providing fire protection within the coastal zones of the country; the fire situation in those zones being especially acute from a military standpoint because fires silhouette ships for submarines and smoke blankets the shore lines in a dangerous manner. I presume it makes little difference which bill carries the funds needed for protection of the coastal zones. However, such action would still leave all the rest of the forested country—away from the coastal zones—lacking in the special protection given them during the current fiscal year. This back-from-the-coast country would have $3,000,000 less for forest-fire protection than it has this fiscal year.

The principal use made of these funds during the past fire season—and one which by all means must be continued during the coming season—has been to recruit, train, and place short-term fire-fighting crews within critical areas, ready for instant attack on all fires which may occur. These crews were formely available from the C. C. C. camps, but since the C. C. C. boys are gone an enormous hole in the fire-protection organization has had to be plugged. These small crews serve this purpose. They are made up principally of high-school boys and under the intensive training and fine supervision given them by the Forest Service they have done a grand job. If these crews are not available it will be necessary, when fires are on the run, to call on workers from industrial plants, logging operations, and farms, as well as from military forces, and thus seriously disrupt urgently needed production and the training program of our troops. Is it not just common horse sense that at least the amount of funds provided by Congress for the current fiscal year should be included in this bill for the fiscal year 1944? At any rate many of us from the forested sections of the country would like to have had the assurance of the committee that an amount of funds equal to that available for the current year would be provided for forest-fire control during the next fiscal year.

It is false economy to prune down the appropriation for the Forest Service at this time when its resources are needed so much to prosecute the war and to maintain and protect our national heritage.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas under Forest Service administration, including not to exceed $59,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $2,537,168 for forest development roads and trails, representing the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated therefor for the fiscal year 1943 by the act of September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867), together with $1,241,555 from the unobligated balances of previous appropriations for forest highways which is hereby reappropriated for forest development roads and trials; in all, $3,778,723, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, or construction of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $7,500.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, on page 61, line 23, the word "trials" appears. That is a mistake. I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate correction be made, and that the word "trails" should be inserted in its place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item of forest roads and trails is one of the most important appropriations that the Congress is called upon to make, and I say that from 50 years' experience in living in the forest lands of the undeveloped sections of the West. When I read this appropriation for forest roads and trails it is quite apparent to me that the Forest Service has received more consideration than the F. S. A., or when it comes to other appropriations. On page 49, under the paragraph for white pine blister rust control we find an appropriation there, "including employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere" amounting to $1,900,000. On page 55 still applied to the District of Columbia, with other items, we find an appropriation of $12,826,826. On page 57, the amount for expenditure in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, the appropriation amounts to $646,168. Then it is all boiled down into personnel on page 59, "in all, salaries and expenses," $15,646,074, and from there going on down to page 65, it says not to exceed $886,034 may be expended in the District of Columbia. Then they come down to this important item of forest roads and trails, with a little appropriation cut to $2,537,168 for forest roads and trails, and on the next line above, not to exceed $59,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia. Fifty-nine thousand dollars to administer $2,500,000 from the District of Columbia. Is not that a fine system? I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was not correct, when he said that the Forest Service had a propaganda machine in the moving pictures.

The Forest Service is the best propagandized organization in these United States working for the Government, and do not make any mistake about that, and here we have buried in the undeveloped sections of Idaho in the district that I have the honor to represent, one of the greatest mineralized sections in the United States, with minerals of all kinds, all needed in the war effort locked up in the mountain fastness with no access roads, and I have been here for 10 years fighting with the Forest Service to get them to spend a little money to be used to build forest roads and trails and to open up that country. And when they do build a road, where do they built it? On the highest summits they can find—skyline drives, if you please, inaccessible for 6 months of the year, covered with snow.

I have gone up to the Appropriations Committee here and in the Senate time after time asked for an increase in this item, to open up our minerals—minerals needed today to support our war effort—minerals while our Government is going out into Australia and into Canada and South America and spending money like a drunken sailor to get strategic metals when we have all this at home. Do I get any sympathy or help from the Forest Service? I say no, and I can show you from letters in my files where that when I asked for a road to some particular mine that is already equipped, with a mill, ready to get to work and go into production when an access road is built, and they tell me it is a primitive area and that a road cannot be built in there. A primitive area. Why, Congress does not make primitive areas, nor has the President of the United States set up these inaccessible areas. They are established by the Forest Service, a bunch of bureaucrats, bureaucrats that are restraining the development of the United States in no small way.

This Forest Service needs investigation, and I do not mean maybe. Recently the Bureau of Mines went back into the national forest, and took diamond drills in there to explore for antimony and found tungsten—tungsten, one of the most strategic metals we need today, tungsten, that costs $2 a pound; tungsten that comes from China, bottled up by a hostile fleet, when all the time we had these metals right in Idaho, locked up, waiting for a more liberal policy of our Government departments—departments that have complete control of the mountainous region in which these vast undeveloped mineral resources are located. Few people penetrate the inaccessible regions of Idaho—and the Forest Service discourages the prospector in every way

it can—as the records of the office of the First Congressional District will show.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to read a memorandum which is submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and which I feel is of interest to all the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, and appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives on April 10, 1943 as the House Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of officers and employees of the legislative branch, we desire to make the following announcement to the membership of the House of Representatives:

1. Under the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, we understand it to be our duty to receive from the duly elected officers of the House of Representatives requests for the occupational deferment by their selective-service board of any officer or employee of the legislative branch within their jurisdiction.

2. Request for deferment of any officer or employee shall be submitted to the committee in writing, stating the specific reasons for the requested deferment.

3. The committee upon request will hear in executive session only officials of the House of Representatives making request for occupational deferment for persons within their jurisdiction.

4. The committee will meet only in executive session and its decision either approving or disapproving requests for deferment will be final.

5. Under the provisions of this act we as a committee, if we approve, request deferment by the proper selective-service board and any deferment must be finally granted by the selective-service board.

6. Members of the House of Representatives will understand that under the provisions of this act we are in no case charged with the responsibility of passing upon requested deferment for personal employees of any individual Member of the House of Representatives.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING R. THOMASON,
W. G. ANDREWS.

APRIL 16, 1943.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed $4,500,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation in carrying out its activities as authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture as to whether on page 64, under the title "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," funds are provided in that section to take care of the present food program, including the rationing of farm machinery and the work of the war boards in connection with it?

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman that this proposed appropriation, $300,000,000, is a reduction below the Budget estimate of $400,000,000, without direction to the administrative authorities as to how they shall apportion the reduction. The original Budget estimate of $400,000,000 was to be divided approximately half and half between soil-conservation benefits and payments made to the producers of the major agricultural commodities, conditioned upon their producing certain amounts of so-called essential war crops, in connection with their carrying out of certain agreed farm programs. Those are the only purposes for which this money is provided. I do not know exactly what the gentleman has in mind in propounding the inquiry that he has submitted.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Under our present program in order to increase food production and make proper allocation of farm machinery we do have in the Department of Agriculture a food program and a farm-machinery allocation program which will also require appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. This program is just for the purposes which I have indicated.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the making of payments pursuant to secs. 303 and 381 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, $300,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1945, solely for programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, pursuant to 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive: *Provided*, That the portion of said amount available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount expended under the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, for salaries and administrative expenses for carrying out programs under such acts for the period from July 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive: *Provided further*, That in order to effect such 50-per cent reduction such part of the funds available for salaries and administrative expenses shall be transferred under section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, to the existing extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States to enable them to carry out all necessary educational, informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States and no other funds than those so transferred shall be expended for such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil-building practices and soil and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of such amounts shall be available after June 30, 1944, for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to July 1, 1944: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no local committeeman selected under the provisions of section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 388 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be compensated for services rendered for more than 100 days if a county committeeman, or for more than 25 days if a community committeeman: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative

expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the distribution, through established trade channels and nongovernmental agencies, including farmers' cooperative associations, of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1943, 1944, and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof, and including the payment of inspection fees or taxes for such inspections as may be required under State laws, and the Secretary shall comply with such State inspection laws whenever they are applicable to any such farming materials under his control: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1943 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers: *And provided further*, That no part of such amount shall be available for carrying out the provisions of sections 202 (a) to (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULMER. On page 65, beginning in line 9, with the words "*Provided further*," I make a point of order against all of that section down to line 18, including the word "activities," the language reading, "*Provided further*, That in order to effect such 50-percent reduction such part of the funds available for salaries and administrative expenses shall be transferred under section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, to the existing extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States to enable them to carry out all necessary educational, informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States and no other funds than those so transferred shall be expended for such activities"; that it is the legislation on an appropriation bill without authorization. I make that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order against the language on page 65, in line 9, to and including the word "activities" in line 18. The Chair does not hear the gentleman from Georgia or the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the gentleman from South Carolina address himself to the point of order and the reason for it, and state also whether all of the language from line 9 down to the word "States" in line 17 is subject to a point of order. I am of the opinion that all of that language is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have another point of order in connection with this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would restate his point of order with respect to the language he has already brought to the attention of the Chair and the grounds for his point of order. As the Chair understood him, it was that it was legislation without authorization.

Mr. FULMER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman any other ground for his point of order with respect to that particular language?

Mr. FULMER. No; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has other points of order against the paragraph?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate those?

Mr. FULMER. On page 67, line 16, down to and including line 3 on page 68, which language is as follows: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1943 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers: *And provided further*, That no part of such amount shall be available for carrying out the provisions of section 202 (a) to (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938," on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill without any authorization in law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make any further statement in support of his point of order?

Mr. FULMER. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is that that is legislation on an appropriation bill without authorization?

Mr. FULMER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the points of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order with reference to the proviso beginning in line 9 on page 65, extending to the word "States" in line 17, on the same page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do concede that the language which begins in line 15, "to enable them to carry out all educational, informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States," is subject to a point of order. I do not concede, however, that the rest of the language is.

In section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act there is this provision:

All funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture for their transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments, as the Secretary may request, to cooperate or assist in carrying out this act.

I think that clearly there is legislative authority for all of that proviso except the last three lines read by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate in that section the language to which exception is taken?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Except the language beginning in line 15, page 65, the second word:

To enable them to carry out all necessary educational, informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States.

And I should like to submit the language and the proviso of those lines deleted if the point of order with respect to the proviso is sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the Chair may understand, the gentleman concedes that the language beginning in line 15 reading "To enable them to carry out all necessary educational informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States and no other funds than those so transferred shall be expended for such activities," is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. In reply to what the gentleman from Illinois has just said, may I state that it is true that section 11 of the Soil Conservation Act does provide that all funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture. It might be argued that if this was an allotment to some bureau in the Department of Agriculture that there was legislative authority, but I call the Chair's further attention to the fact that the language in this bill allots this money not to some department or bureau in the Department of Agriculture, but to the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States. Under the language of section 11 it would be possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to request the cooperation of the extension service in the various States and if this were done then it would be in order to allot all or a part of the appropriation to the extension service in the various States, but I know of no request from the Secretary of Agriculture to the extension service of the various States to cooperate with this program in the manner specified, and I submit, therefore, that the language of section 11 does not grant authority for making the transfer that is attempted to be made in the language to which attention was called by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further in answer to the gentleman from Kansas?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be observed that in the first line of this paragraph on page 64 occurs this language:

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17 inclusive—

And so forth. So that for all practical purposes this money is made available to the Secretary of Agriculture under these two basic acts of 1936 and 1938 for the purpose of carrying the essential provisions of the law. In the Soil Conservation Act of 1936 in pursuance of the authority that is carried in this bill there is a provision in section 11 that the gentleman from Kansas concedes, that the funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment either to Federal agencies or to State agencies; and I contend there is clear authority, therefore, for the discharge of any responsibility that may be by the Congress given to the Extension Service through the Secretary of Agriculture with exception of course of the last three lines which I concede to be legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that if it is his understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture has requested the extension service of the various States to cooperate or assist in carrying out the act of 1924——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that that weakens the contention that I make whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, simply because the Secretary of Agriculture carries into effect a certain enactment and under basic authority being permitted to employ not only State agencies but Federal agencies but make allotments thereto for the purpose of carrying it out as set forth in this respect.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to the enabling language at the beginning of this paragraph, line 8 on page 64. If this were not legislation on an appropriation bill why would it be necessary to write this enabling clause?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the customary thing to do where the Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the responsibility under a mandate from Congress.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the gentleman hold that without this clause the point of order would not lie against the section to which he refers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. We must take the thing in its entirety and we are following out the custom of delegating responsibility to the Secretary and saying to him that he can employ both Federal and State agencies for this purpose.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the Secretary of Agriculture have power to allocate the funds referred to without the language contained in this section? Would the gentleman contend that he has authority to transfer those funds to the extension colleges?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do contend that the Secretary has that authority and that the only legislative language here is that contained in the three lines, 15, 16, and 17, which particularize the matter.

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the Chairman that I think I have stated the point? I do not believe there is any controversy as to what the issue really is. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The question I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois is whether or not this "provided further" proviso is an integral part of the proviso immediately preceding. The proviso immediately preceding reads:

Provided, That the portion of said amount available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount expended under the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, for salaries and administrative expenses for carrying out programs under such acts for the period from July 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive: *And provided further*, That in order to effect such 50-percent reduction such part of the funds available for salaries and administrative expenses shall be transferred—

And so forth. My point in asking the question is that it occurred to me that if the language to which the gentleman from Kansas has objected is an integral part of the original proviso, that it is necessary to have this language to carry out the reduction, then the language may be in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think what the gentleman from South Dakota states is quite true, that both of these provisos must be considered together, that there is clearly a retrenchment on its face that brings the matter within the Holman rule under the first proviso on page 65. The second proviso is quite germane to the retrenchment proviso and seeks to effectuate that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard?

Mr. TARVER. May I ask, Is the Chair considering all the points of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina or only the one relating to the language on page 65? I desire to be heard whenever the Chair may consider the point of order which I understood the gentleman raised to the last proviso in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say in response to the gentleman's inquiry that for the present we are disposing of the first point of order made to the proviso on page 65.

Mr. TARVER. May I inquire whether the gentleman made a point of order to the last proviso in the last paragraph?

Mr. FULMER. I did.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on that.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, if a part of a paragraph or section in a bill is subject to a point of order and a point of order is made to the paragraph or section, does that not carry out the entire paragraph or section?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, for clarification, the point of order was not made against the entire paragraph as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The entire proviso. That is what the gentleman had in mind?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. If the Chair is giving serious consideration to the point raised by the gentleman from South Dakota, referred to also by the gentleman from Illinois, to the effect that this proviso comes under the Holman rule, I would like to be heard on that point—that is, if the Chair is giving consideration to that phase of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair doubts that that is involved. It may arise a bit later.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, so there will not be any misunderstanding on this subject, I object to consideration of the whole paragraph and I make a point of order against it that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I include the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the first point of order submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] makes a point of order against the proviso beginning in line 9, page 65, reading as follows:

Provided further, That in order to effect such 50-percent reduction such part of the funds available for salaries and administrative expenses shall be transferred under section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, to the existing extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States to enable them to carry out all necessary educational, informational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs in these States and no other funds than those so transferred shall be expended for such activities.

The gentleman from Illinois concedes that the point of order is sound and well taken for that part of the proviso beginning after the word "States" in line 15, as follows: "to enable them to carry out all necessary educational, informational, and promotional activities," that it is subject to the point of order, being legislation upon an appropriation bill.

If any part of the proviso is subject to a point of order, the whole proviso falls, therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

If the Chair understood the gentleman from North Dakota correctly, he made a point of order, in addition to the point of order submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, against the whole paragraph as being legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Chair has ruled, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota withdraws his point of order. The point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to resubmit the proviso.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the points of order still pending should be disposed of before amendments are offered.

The CHAIRMAN. A second point of order is pending. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I understood there was a point of order against another portion of the paragraph, the concluding proviso. I only wish to be heard at this time on the point of order as far as it relates to the concluding proviso, that is, on page 68, line 1:

That no part of such amount shall be available for carrying out the provisions of section 202 (a) to (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Those are the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which make available $4,000,000 from this fund for the maintenance of the four regional laboratories. We have already appropriated in a preceding paragraph of the bill $4,000,000, from the Federal Treasury and not from this fund for those laboratories. For that reason, it became necessary to provide that the same amount should not again be made available from this particular fund, which would result in $8,000,000 being made available to the four regional laboratories when no such amount was estimated therefor.

This is a limitation under the Holman rule. This simply limits the expenditures which are authorized under this paragraph, so that this appropriation which has already been made in a preceding paragraph of the bill cannot be duplicated from these funds.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, after rereading this provision and hearing the gentleman's argument, I confine my point of order to the proviso on page 67 beginning in line 16 and running down through line 25, ending with the word "producers."

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the gentleman, he originally made the point of order against the last two provisos but now withdraws the point of order as to the second proviso and makes a point of order only against the proviso to which he has just referred.

Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order made by the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TARVER. I wanted to be heard only on the point of order which he has withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from South Carolina makes the point of order against the language beginning in line 16 and running down to and including the word "producers" in line 25 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. With the information available to the Chair, the Chair is of the opinion that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language beginning in line 23 on page 66 with the words *"Provided further,"* and running down through the word "control" in line 15 on page 67 is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Kansas on his point of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this proviso contains this language:

That such amount shall be available for the distribution, through established trade channels and nongovernmental agencies, including farmers' cooperative associations, of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carriyng out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1943, 1944, and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended.

It further provides—

for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof, and including the payment of inspection fees or taxes for such inspections as may be required under State laws, and the Secretary shall comply with such State inspection laws whenever they are applicable to any such farming materials under his control.

I submit that all of that language is legislation. It imposes additional duties upon the Secretary. It is not authorized under any existing legislation. It further directs and orders that the Secretary shall comply with State inspection laws whenever they are applicable.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in order to shorten the debate, may I say to the gentleman that we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 66 beginning in line 11 and reading as follows:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no local committeeman selected under the provisions of section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 388 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be compensated for services rendered for more than 100 days if a county committeeman, or for more than 25 days if a community committeeman.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that there is a proviso in this paragraph to the effect that administrative expenditures shall be reduced by 50 percent of the expenditures for the current year, 1943. The proviso referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina is nothing more than a restrictive limitation which is retrenchment on its face. It is clearly not only germane to the paragraph but comes within the limitations of the Holman rule. I submit that it is in order at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have in mind the particular limitation in this language?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have in mind the limitation to this effect: In the first place, it relates to the curtailment of expenditures, namely, 50 percent of the amount of expenditures of 1943, and in so doing, it brings about an economy by a curtailment on the amount to be paid the local committeeman, which is the intention of this appropriation, and, consequently, that would appear from the language itself to be a retrenchment of expenditures.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this proviso simply prohibits the payment to any local committee of a per diem of more than 100 days for a county committeeman and for more than 25 days for a community committeeman. There is nothing else but a proviso. It is a pure limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the gentleman from New York, he asserts that it is a retrenchment in expenditures.

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the Chair to the report of the subcommittee dealing with this bill, on page 15, to the following paragraph:

Another proviso limits the per diem of county committeemen to 100 days and community committeemen to 25 days per annum. The table on page 707 of the hearings indicates that for the calendar year 1942 the employment of county committeemen ranged from 50 days in the northeast region to 217 days in the north central region, and that the expenses of county committeemen for 1942 totaled $4,500,000. The Budget break-down shows county association expenses for 1944 at an estimated amount of $53,500,000, and other administrative expenses at $11,891,000, making a total of $65,391,000. This is approximately 16 percent of the total appropriation. This the committee deems an excessive amount. The limit on per diem is therefore in line with the reduction of administrative expenses to 50 percent of the 1943 expenditure.

One of the three conditions for making in order a limitation under the Holman rule is a reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States. It seems to me clearly under that, that since the basic law made no restriction on the number of days a committeeman might serve, and this language specifically places a limitation on both the county and the community committee men, that clearly it is a retrenchment and in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of

order against the language on page 66, line 11 to line 19, as follows:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no local committeeman selected under the provisions of section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 388 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be compensated for services rendered for more than 100 days if a county committeeman or for more than 25 days if a community committeeman.

The point of order submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. In order to come within the Holman rule, it is necessary for a proviso upon its face to show that there is a retrenchment. The Chair is unable to see anything in the face of the proviso that on its face shows a retrenchment and a reduction. The point of order of the gentleman from North Carolina is, therefore, sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 64, line 20, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000" and on page 66, line 7, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to save $100,000,000. I have offered it, in addition to that, with the idea of cutting out the funds out of which subsidies and incentive payments may be made, so that the farmer's price, as it is figured, shall be on the basis of a fair price to the farmer, rather than on the basis of subsidies from the Government. In connection with this proposition I call attention to several things. In the first place, at the present time we have a very large number of committeemen and employees in the Agricultural Department. The number will run upward of 100,000, and under this particular set of appropriations—that is, this item of the four pages that have been read—there are 37,000 employees with a total expenditure to them of something like $55,000,000. On top of that, on page 736 of the hearings, it is stated that $15,000,000 out of $400,000,000 are incentive payments. All we have to do to cut down to the $200,000,000 figure that I have suggested is to get rid of the incentive payments and cut down the expenditures for these 37,000 employees by $5,000,000, or a reduction of 11 percent in the pay roll. That is not an unreasonable request. I hope that we will do what the farmer has asked us to do, and that is cut out incentive payments and fix things where the farmer will get a fair price for his product—cut down some of these unnecessary employees in the Department of Agriculture scattered all over the country, and save to the Treasury of the United States $100,000,000.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The committee has attempted in the language on page 64 to have this $300,000,000 expended for the purposes in the act when they put in the following language:

Solely for premiums under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, and for compliance with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as amended.

Does the gentleman think that under that language the Secretary of Agriculture can place any construction on the appropriation that will permit the use of that $300,000,000 or $200,000,000, as provided in the gentleman's amendment, for incentive payments?

Mr. TABER. I do, because they pay no attention whatever to the authorization acts that are passed. All they care about is to get their fingers on the money and they cut loose just the same as they have in the past. They have been doing it right along and they will continue to do it if they get this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a proposal to further reduce by $100,000,000 a fund for which the Government of the United States by authority of law has become obligated. As I pointed out on Wednesday of this week, the Secretary of Agriculture, under section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, has authority to obligate the Government before the beginning of any crop year, up to $500,000,000 for these types of payments. On December 5, 1942, by declaration circulated generally throughout the country, he did just that to the extent of $400,000,000. The farmers of the country have now completed, in the main, the signing up of their farm work sheets and have accepted the terms of his offer. Now we are asked to say that the Government is only going to pay half of it because some gentlemen feel that half of this amount of $400,000,000, is really in the nature of incentive payments.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not now.

That may be true, but similar objections could have been made against the payments made under the program in prior years. The same objections could have been raised against the enactment of any law which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bind the credit of the country to the extent that he has bound it for the purposes for which he has bound it.

This is a question of good conscience; not a question of whether we ought to make incentive payments or any other types of payments or not. It is a question of whether or not the promise of the Government of the United States is worth 100 cents on the dollar. If there should not be incentive payments made in connection with this program, then you should introduce and have referred to the diligent Committee on Agriculture a bill proposing to eliminate the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York that part of the payments which would be made in this program are in the nature of incentive payments.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not just now. I am going to have to ask for a little more time, and if I get more time I will yield when I finish.

Part of these payments, one-half of them, according to the original Budget estimate, which has been cut $100,000,000, were to be made to producers of the major agricultural commodities, conditioned upon their producing a certain amount of so-called essential war crops. That is the question I took up when we had the Federal Farm Bureau officials before us in connection with the $100,000,000 supplemental estimate for incentive payments. I sought to get the Federal Farm Bureau Federation officials to differentiate between that extra $100,000,000 which was sought and which was denied, and $193,000,000 plus, carried in the original $400,000,000 estimate, which was to be paid out in accordance with the plan which I have just discussed. At that time they felt there was some difference, but upon a reexamination of the question subsequently they reached the conclusion that these were incentive payments, and asked the subcommittee to decrease the amount of the fund to $300,000,000, and to provide that all of that $300,000,000 should be used exclusively for soil conservation practices. Those who want to follow the Federal Farm Bureau Federation blindly should remember that the Farm Bureau Federation is advocating the appropriation of $300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Just as has been proposed in the committee bill. They have not asked the Congress to cut the amount to $200,000,000. They simply want it paid out for soil conservation practices, and none of it paid out for these so-called incentive practices.

The committee has not followed their recommendation in toto. I do not know why, because I think it is the only recommendation they have made which has not been adopted by the committee. But the committee, in the pending bill, has provided for $300,000,000, and has left to the Department the question of how it will apportion that $300,000,000 in paying the $193,000,000 plus, that it has contracted to pay for soil conservation practices, and $193,000,000 plus, that it has contracted to pay for the so-called incentive payments or crop payments. Of course, under that plan the Department is going to be embarrassed. It is going to have to determine whose debt it is going to pay and whose debt it is going to decline, or whether it is just going to welch on 25 percent of all the obligations involved, or pay some in full and others not at all. I do not know

how the Department is going to handle that sort of proposition.

We substituted here the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] proposed, as he stated, in accordance with the suggestion of the Farm Bureau Federation, for the Budget language. You will note that they got into a lot of trouble by doing it. A lot of that language has already gone out on points of order. The advantage of having the Budget language in the bill, in my judgment, would have been that that language has been construed time and time again by the office of the Comptroller General and the rights of the Government and the farmers of the country under that language have been well established. We are adopting if we make this appropriation, different language which again will have to be construed. While I regret to have taken issue with the members of my subcommittee regarding the adoption of that language I still do not believe that it is wise; but I am here now for the purpose of undertaking to sustain as earnestly as I can at least the item in the committee bill, $300,000,000. I think it would be tragic if we made a further reduction in the amount of this proposed appropriation, and I cannot conceive of the House approving an amendment to do so. Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who sought to interrogate me.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who has given this bill, I know, a great deal of study, again to explain if he has not done so the language on page 64, beginning in line 20:

> $300,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1945, solely for programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, pursuant to 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942—

Under the language of the bill as written could any part of the $300,000,000 be used for so-called incentive payments?

Mr. TARVER. It could be used for the crop payments which are provided for by the Secretary's order of December 5, 1942, which are sometimes referred to as incentive payments. That was the understanding of the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], at the time he offered the amendment in the committee and I am sure he will agree with me that that was the purpose of his amendment.

If there is any question whatever about the Department being authorized to use part of this fund for making good the contracts of the Government in that connection then the word "solely" appearing here should be stricken out and I hope may be stricken out; and I think the gentleman from Illinois will agree to it being stricken out.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we all have a fairly good understanding of just what is intended by the language covering the appropriation. The Secretary of Agriculture and his Solicitor appeared before our Committee on Agriculture and stated definitely that they had construed the law so that the entire soil-conservation money could be used as incentive payments, and they said they intended to use it in that manner. If this is the intent of the members of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, then it is clear that they can use the entire $300,000,000 for incentive payments, and the language placed in the bill which seeks to have it used for soil-conservation purposes does not mean anything.

Mr. TARVER. The language placed in the bill seeks to have it used for soil-conservation purposes and for payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Under the first section of that act which amended the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act payments of the type we have been discussing are expressly provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, may I pursue my inquiry a little further?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under the program of incentive payments as announced by the Secretary they proposed to pay incentive payments for the planting of soil-depleting crops.

Mr. TARVER. It was to pay producers of the major agricultural commodities with the understanding that in connection with their production there should be produced certain quantities of these essential war crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; for which he was to pay them incentive payments.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I want to get clear for the record is whether we should have some legislative intent here as to whether or not we intend this $300,000,000 to be used for the purpose of paying incentive payments for the planting of the so-called war crops.

Mr. TARVER. The language of the bill, as I understand it and as the committee understood it and as the author of the amendment in the subcommittee understood it, leaves to the Department of Agriculture the discretionary power to apportion this $300,000,000 to the same types of payment that were contemplated in the original $400,000,000 Budget. It could not, of course, meet all of the obligations which were provided for in the Budget, but it would be vested with discretion as to whether it would use $200,000,000 of this amount for soil conservation practices payments and $100,000,000 for these other types of payments whether they be called incentive payments or not; or whether it would evenly divide the sum into two $150,000,000 funds and use half for one purpose and half for the other according to the proportion contemplated in the submission of the original Budget.

The matter under the language of the bill is unquestionably left to the discretion of the administrative authorities, in my opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the purpose of clarity, is it not true that when this item was carried in other years there was of course a justification of the figure and it was so set apart and the subcommittee and the Congress knew just how they were to divide it? There was nothing binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture and he could have used all of the funds for one purpose or for another. Is not that correct?

Mr. TARVER. That is true from a strictly legal standpoint, but I think the justifications submitted were morally binding on him and I do not think in all probability he would have been inclined to violate the plans which he outlined in the justifications and carry out other plans than those which he submitted to the Congress as being in prospect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By the same token, of course, there is the moral obligation on him to carry out any commitments that he thinks are binding on him under the language carried in the present bill.

Mr. TARVER. Yes; to the extent he is able to do so, which will not lead to the complete result that I think would be desirable.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand the gentleman, the Government has already obligated itself to pay out something like $193,000,000 for incentive payments; is that right?

Mr. TARVER. There is a difference of opinion about whether they are incentive payments or not.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. So-called incentive payments.

Mr. TARVER. The Government has obligated itself to the extent of $400,000,000, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If this appropriation be reduced to $300,000,000, as proposed by the gentleman from New York, then there would be substantially nothing to carry on the ordinary soil-conservation program as it has been practiced in the past?

Mr. TARVER. That would depend on how the Secretary exercised his discretion. He could take it all away from the soil-conservation benefit payments or to the extent of the amount of obligation for the other type of payments, which is approximately $200,000,000, and

leave only $100,000,000 for the soil-conservation payments. He could divide the amount half and half and welsh on each type of contract to the extent of 25 percent, if he so desires. If you cut it to $200,000,000 he may use $100,000,000 for one purpose and $100,000,000 for the other purpose and cut the amount of the Government's obligation or refuse to meet the amount of the Government's obligation to the extent of 50 percent thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, had the proposal to make this reduction been made before the contracts were made with the farmers for their crop plans for this year, that would be one thing, but to propose now that a reduction be made below the amount of funds required to meet the commitments already made is another thing. Farm operations going on since last July are involved in these funds. I point out that the language of the bill provides that this particular amount of money under discussion is solely for programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the practices under the Soil Conservation Act pursuant to 1943 programs carried out "during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943." That means, of course, that all of those who planted winter wheat last fall planted it on the basis of the program on which they understood commitments had been made. We cannot, in good faith, go back on the contract now.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the practice of the House and of the Congress in previous legislation. I have here the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on bills in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and I call your attention to the fact that in the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1940, approved on the 6th of April 1940, was carried an item of $60,000,000, and that $60,000,000 was appropriated for no other purpose than to make good the commitments made late in 1939 on the 1940 crop planted in the balance of 1939 and the year 1940, and harvested in 1940. It was found that the regular appropriation was not sufficient to meet the commitments made in the sign-up.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that after the A. A. A. was declared invalid in 1936 we appropriated money to pay obligations which had been incurred by farmers who had planted winter wheat, acting in good faith under that program. It is exactly the same situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CASE. Yes; that was the same situation and the same principle is involved. I quote the language of the Appropriations Committee report on the 1940 deficiency bill:

> The $60,000,000 is designed to provide without delay the additional funds necessary to meet the 1939 program commitments.

The sole question that should arise then is whether or not $300,000,000 will be necessary to meet the commitments already made. After the meeting of the full committee the other day, in order that I might know exactly what the situation would be under this proposal, I called up the Department and asked them for a specific report on this point. It must be borne in mind that the original Budget request was for $500,000,000, $100,000,000 of which was for the incentive payment program. That was eliminated and then the subcommittee reduced the remaining $400,000,000 requested to the $300,000,000 in the bill. Now the gentleman from New York proposes to cut that $300,000,000 down to $200,000,000 for 1942 payments. Can it be done? A year ago the total amount of money required to meet the obligations was $395,296,000, for the same thing as it is proposed to use this money for.

The question arises, will there be more people in the program this year than last year? The statement of the Department in direct response to my question on that point was this:

> About 70 percent of all farmers in the United States participated in the 1941 program. It is estimated that about 73 percent of the little over 6,000,000 farmers participated in the 1942 program. It is believed that considerably more than 80 percent of the farmers will participate in the 1943 program.

In other words, there will be more farmers participating this year. The commitments and the funds required will be larger then, rather than smaller, except for the savings required in administration under other limitations in the bill. Consequently, if we should reduce this appropriation by $100,000,000, we will simply have to go up the hill again and make a deficiency appropriation to carry out the contracts and commitments already made. Why place ourselves in that position?

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why did they not tell that story on page 736 when they had the opportunity before the committee instead of intimating that $195,000,000 of it was incentive payments?

Mr. CASE. Of course, I cannot explain that; I am not a member of the subcommittee and was not present, but there can be no question that if the sign-up is larger than last year, this appropriation is likely to be too small rather than too large.

Mr. TABER. I cannot understand why there should be two different stories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the issue in this case is quite complicated if looked at from one standpoint, but if looked at from the standpoint of the philosophy of this administration it is a very simple issue. The President of the United States and his aides in the Department of Agriculture do not want to see agricultural prices rise at this time, and they have been successful in depressing the prices of many agricultural products. Farm price increases have been blocked. The theory of this administration is that it is better for all concerned for agricultural prices not to rise.

We have sought all these years to secure an increase in the price of agricultural commodities, not an inflationary price, and now when we have an opportunity to get an adequate increase the power of the Government is exerted to prevent a sufficient and adequate increase in the price of agricultural products.

The theory of this administration is that we shall enable the farmer to get this increased production by paying him a subsidy out of the Treasury. There is no doubt in my mind that if natural laws were permitted to operate agricultural prices would increase sufficiently to make Government payments unnecessary, yet legislation which would permit that rise would, in all probability, be vetoed and would not become the law. So the only way the farmer has any opportunity to get a more adequate and proper price for his commodity is by the method proposed here of providing a subsidy. With that method I am not in accord, but as a practical matter that is the only method now open to the farmer.

Moreover, farmers in all the various States of the Union are now fully convinced and assured in their own minds that they will receive these soil conservation payments, not $300,000,000, not $200,000,000 as proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from New York, but $400,000,000 as proposed by President Roosevelt in the Budget. Farmers have been told under authority of law that they will receive these payments. It is true that farmers can very properly say, "We do not want Government payments, all we want is a fair price for what we produce." In my judgment that is a sound position. Why should the farmer have to get down on his knees and ask for a subsidy when he can now, if permitted by the regulations to do so, get a fair price in the market place. But he is not allowed to get a fair price in the market place. His cost of labor cannot be considered in fixing the price. The Department of Agriculture admits the situation exists but in effect tells the farmer: "Well, the theory of the Government is such that we are going to make up that price to you in these conservation payments." I disagree with the method which is being followed, but what can we do? We cannot in good conscience go to these farmers who have been promised these conservation payments to make it possible for them to pay for labor and to produce this food and this fiber, and say that we have turned down this appropriation. If we do turn it down, then as the gentleman from South Dakota says, it will be simply a matter of later coming in here and asking for an appropriation to fulfill the obligation of the United States Government to the agricultural producers of the Nation. The

full $400,000,000 as recommended by the President should be appropriated.

Therefore, I say to you that our only alternative at this moment, as the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. TARVER] says, is not to repudiate the agreement but to follow through and make it possible for these payments to be made, realizing that some of us do not feel that this is a proper method, but realizing on the other hand, that there is nothing else at this stage that we are able to do about it.

It can also be said that the program of soil conservation is important to the country in days of war as in times of peace.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I see the majority leader on the floor. May I ask him if he can advise the House as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do so.

We shall meet tomorrow, unless the pending bill is disposed of today. If by chance it should be disposed of today—and that chance now looks very remote—I intend to ask unanimous consent that we adjourn until Monday. However, if the bill is not disposed of today, we shall meet tomorrow.

If the pending bill is not disposed of tonight and we meet tomorrow, we shall take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill tomorrow if time permits; otherwise it will come up Monday.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and then we shall take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill, under the explanation I have just made.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and there will also be considered the bill H. R. 1900, a bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs, known as the war brokers bill. I understand that on Tuesday next the conference report on the pay-raise bill will come up in the Senate, and if it is disposed of there we should like to dispose of it here. If that is not done on Tuesday, it will come up on Wednesday.

On Wednesday there will be the naval auxiliary bill, H. R. 1563.

On Thursday there will be considered another bill out of the Committee on Naval Affairs, H. R. 1364, relating to the women's reserve.

The Committee on Ways and Means has reported out a 4 months' extension of the Bituminous Coal Act. If by any chance a rule on that bill should be reported by the Committee on Rules, that bill will be brought up next week.

If any agreement is made as to the tax bill, that bill will be brought up as soon as possible. I intend to give reasonable notice to the Members as to when that bill will be brought up. I think they ought to be given a day or two notice before it is brought up. That is my personal viewpoint.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman can get the tax bill up for consideration, he is going to do it as quickly as possible, I presume?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if the differences are adjusted, it might be that we could let it go over for a couple of weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think the country would like this. I think the country wants the bill as quickly as we can possibly pass it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in the hands of my friends as to that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that another body, to which I am not permitted to refer, thinks this bill is so important to the country that it also will not take any recess because it wants to act as quickly as possible after we get through with the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my personal opinion that if an agreement is reached the matter should be disposed of as quickly as possible.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think we can get along very well about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no question about it.

There will be no legislation on Good Friday, of course, as far as I am concerned.

I hope that action will be taken that will be satisfactory and pleasing to the great majority of the Members.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not possible to complete the consideration of this bill today, rather than meet tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that question. That is in the hands of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. There is nothing very controversial on next week's program, then?

Mr. McCORMACK. Outside of the bituminous coal bill and the tax bill, I have tried to make it as noncontroversial as is humanly possible.

Mr. MICHENER. The bills on which the rules are granted are all bills having to do with the war, were reported unanimously from the legislative committee, and unanimously from the Committee on Rules, and there is no known opposition on the floor to the bills at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield, I have heard some talk about a tax bill here today and about the gentleman's saying that the other body was wanting it. I wonder if my recollection is right that the minority could have sent a tax bill to the other body some weeks ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose we do not get into that discussion just now. We are getting along very happily and harmoniously.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am wondering how any minority could send any bill through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why there is not some expression from some other members of my committee on this vital thing right now, especially when my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] referred to the fact that when the Supreme Court threw out the A. A. A. we had to appropriate for a deficiency, and compared that to this situation, which is utterly ridiculous. This is what happened. The Secretary of Agriculture was brought up before a deficiency subcommittee to justify an item for incentive payment, and that deficiency was set aside, and they let the Subcommittee on Agriculture hear the Secretary of Agriculture on the proposition of incentive payments on the 1st of February.

The Secretary of Agriculture indicated to us that maybe there was a little loophole, and possibly some promises had been made, but not many but it was 2 months before any possible planting was to be made, and we let it be definitely known to him right there by a 6-to-1 vote, that we were opposed to incentive payments. That was on the 1st of February. Now, does legislative action mean anything any more? The deficiency committee accepted our verdict as a matter of course and the thing was denied. That is the situation that my colleague compares to the former situation. I cannot understand it. If we as the appropriating committee are now reversed and the legislative committee having not indicated it favored incentive payments, why should we provide in this bill anything for them? Let the chips fall where they may, and let the future take care of itself. We have denied incentive payments as effectively and definitely as anybody could have done it. I did indicate to my committee that I wanted to go along with them when they were tapering off, but I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York, to more clearly carry out what Congress has already told the Secretary of Agriculture definitely, and we did that on the 1st of February. The American farmer, I repeat, as has been so often expressed here, prefers a fair price on an open market.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to see if I cannot get some limitation on the time for debate on this amendment—not on all amendments to the paragraph. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, in order to submit a parliamentary inquiry. With the number of people standing who ex-

pect to be heard, how much time will that grant each person?

The CHAIRMAN. There are eight members standing, and that will give each 5 minutes' time.

Mr. PATMAN. Then I shall not object.

Mr. TARVER. I make it 5:35, the last 10 minutes to be granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is the author of the language.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said a while ago that the minority could not pass a tax bill, but the minority did defeat a tax bill by sending it back to the committee, because if the minority had voted with the majority, or a substantial number of them, the bill would not have been recommitted.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not in order. He is not discussing the amendment before the House. Notice has been given that debate should be confined to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. PATMAN. This amendment is to save $100,000,000, so the gentleman from New York says.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman should proceed in order, and not proceed to discuss the Ruml plan. He should talk about the pending amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. When I made the statement that this amendment proposes to save $100,000,000 the gentleman from Georgia says that that is the Ruml plan. Why, the Ruml plan was to save $10,000,000,000, or to give it to the war profiteers, and not $100,000,000. The gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. TARVER. I misunderstood the gentleman and I hope that he will proceed in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield. This amendment is to save $100,000,000 we are told. It affects the farmers. I question the attitude of the gentleman from the great State of New York to save this $100,000,000. First, it will deprive the farmer of $100,000,000, and if his attitude prevails on the tax bill, and they let these war profiteers have $10,000,000,000 first, then the farmer will be ruined by uncontrolled inflation.

So, the farmer is hurt both ways. A few years ago when it was proposed that three and one-half million soldiers should receive $2,000,000,000 in payment of a just and honest debt that Congress had confessed, many of the people who are now advocating this large $10,000,000,000 bonus opposed it because they said it would cause ruinous inflation; absolutely destroy the country; $2,000,000,000 of a debt——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the Chair required the gentleman from Texas to confine his remarks to the amendment. I shall not mention the matter again. I have made the point of order two or three times. The gentleman from Texas is now discussing the bonus which was disposed of several years ago and comparing it with the issues raised by the Ruml plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order that the debate must be confined to the amendment. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the Chair. So this so-called bonus to 3½ million veterans would absolutely ruin the country, but now we find the same people who stated that $2,000,000,000 would absolutely ruin the country, advocating a $10,000,000,000 bonus to war profiteers. Imagine the demand that the war millionaires made at the beginning of the war——

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Texas is not proceeding in order to discuss the pending amendment to this bill. It seems as though the dignity of the House should be such that we should have the rules of the House observed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order that the gentleman from Texas should confine his remarks to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. TARVER. The trouble about that is that after making such a ruling the gentleman from Texas proceeds in violation of the rules and the Chair does nothing about it.

Mr. PATMAN. I resent that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not violate the rules and I do not want this taken out of my time. I am discussing current information and legislation that is pending before this Congress and the effect it will have on the farmers, while you are trying to ruin the farmers in two ways. In one way, by reducing the budget from $500,000,000 to $200,000,000, 60 percent, and another way that has been discussed, of making a new crop of war millionaires by giving a $10,000,000,000 bonus and causing ruinous inflation and destroying the farmer. It is absolutely germane. I want to state to the gentleman from Georgia that I am personally disappointed because he did not offer an amendment to increase this amount. The Budget recommended it and the gentleman brought in a bill for $300,000,000 which was $200,000,000 under the budget. There is no effort being made to increase it, but he is putting himself in a defensive position by permitting the minority to offer an amendment to reduce that small amount.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I just have 5 minutes. The gentleman had 15 minutes. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining. The time has been limited.

Mr. PATMAN. So the point is this amendment should be defeated and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] should offer another amendment to increase this amount. Of course, he understands the strategy better than I do. I have always gone along with him and his committee and I hope to continue to do so, but I can express my personal disappointment in the failure of the committee trying to increase the amount, at least to the amount recommended by the Budget, and instead of that, putting themselves in a defensive position of trying to resist an amendment to lower the amount.

May I say in conclusion that if this policy continues of ruining the farmers by reducing this amount and violating these contracts and then the policy of making this new crop of war millionaires by giving them a $10,000,000,000 bonus to war contractors, we will be on the road to ruin by reason of inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would devote the same energy in convincing the administration that they should pay the farmers decent prices at the market places for their products there would be no need for any appropriation in this bill to pay incentive payments or subsidies.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw my request for time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We find that the Secretary of Agriculture has made certain obligations on the part of our Government for which we are compelled to appropriate money. He made the statement to the farmers that he would pay incentive payments for the production of certain crops. Afterward he said he would make those payments provided the Congress appropriated the money. It is assumed that the Secretary has made certain obligations and it is up to us to meet them, but the thought occurs to me that the Secretary might well have conferred with the Committee on Appropriations and the legislative Committee on Agriculture before he committed our Government to the payment of several hundred million dollars in incentive payments.

There have been many loose practices that have sprung up in the past 10 years wherein those in charge of our Federal Government have committed Congress to making appropriations without knowing whether or not those appropriations would be made available. It seems to me the time has come when the Secretary

of Agriculture and others who are policy makers in the administration should at least confer with committees in Congress before they commit us to large expenditures.

There is no need to continue making subsidy appropriations or incentive payments on the part of Congress when some other agency of Government could by a stroke of the pen assure the farmers that they would get parity or decent prices at the market place rather than to commit the taxpayers of the country to paying out subsidy payments in large amounts; and I think that here in Congress we could probably do something to remedy that situation, because the farmers of the country do not want subsidy payments, they do not want incentive payments; all they are asking is a decent price at the market place rather than to be kept under control by a bureau down in Washington. I think we could handle this thing if we wanted to go at it in the right way, but it seems as though there are some here who still want to follow the practice that we want to give the Department of Agriculture control over the activities of the farmers of this country. I hope the time will come that we can get this thing straightened out. Whether the time is proper now or not is up to the Committee to determine. It may feel that the Secretary has committed us to making incentive payments. I assume that the majority here will rule, but I think the time has come when we should cut out all incentive payments and all subsidies and give the farmer a decent price when he sells his produce in the market place.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman mind giving us his opinion as to where the Secretary got this idea of incentive payments? Did he borrow the idea from some other country or was it cooked up down here in his own Department? What was the real thing to cause him to make a committal?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know whether he borrowed the idea, but in looking at the picture of some of the things that have been put into operation it seems as though we have taken on just about everything they have over in the British Isles. Now, that may be the proper course to pursue when it comes to rationing, price control, and all these other things, but it occurs to me that in our economy where we could produce abundance, we should establish our own policy rather than to borrow some of the practices of other nations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What makes the gentleman think that this money would be used for incentive payments since the language of the bill clearly states that it shall be used solely for soil-conservation payments?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because the Secretary of Agriculture and his Solicitor stated that they are going to spend it for that purpose and no other purpose. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture has definitely decided to wreck the soil-conservation program as intended by Congress, and, in the name of winning the war, is changing the entire program to suit his fancy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the 5 minutes I had requested.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, on March 1 of this year I made a little speech in the House in which I submitted some figures on the accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Act. In that speech I pointed out that if we took the 5-year period 1928 to 1932 and the 5-year period 1938 to 1942, two 5-year periods, one before the Soil Conservation Act and one afterwards, we find that in the earlier period the production of wheat per acre was 14.14 bushels; in the latter period it was 15.88 bushels. The production of corn in the first period was 24 bushels per acre and in the latter period was 30. In the production of cotton in the earlier period it was 173 pounds per acre and in the latter period it was 248 pounds per acre. The production of peanuts in the earlier period was 683 pounds per acre and in the latter period was 739; and so on. I traced other commodities.

It is my personal belief that the soil-conservation program has been one of the fundamentally necessary steps to take in this mature civilization we live in now if we are to protect the rights of future generations. It is not any longer possible for us to go ahead and exploit the natural resources of this country as could be done in an earlier period of our development with more or less impunity. So I think this program is fundamentally sound.

I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York because I think it would cut this program way below what is fair and just in view of what the farmers of this Nation have been given to understand would be done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that this program has resulted in a tremendously increased value in the fertility of the top soil of America which is a natural resource of the Nation which future generations will be permitted to enjoy just as present generations do?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think there is any question about it, I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina; and I will say to the gentleman further that since the time the white man first began to farm on the North American continent there has been a destruction of the valuable top soil at a very alarming rate. The time has come when some generation has got to take account of stock and introduce a program which will reestablish that fertility again and I think now is that time.

It seems to me the question before us now goes right to the root of the controversy that has revolved around this bill. I believe that most Members of the House feel this way in general.

We do not think that incentive payments or any other sort of payments ought to take the place of a fair price to the farmer for the crops he raises. I do not think they ought to. On the other hand, there are a good many of us who feel that in time of war when the all-important thing is the winning of that war, there may be times and occasions, just as there are in mining and in industrial production when it may be wise governmental policy to say to farmers: "If you will grow a new crop that you never grew before at an expense to yourselves, we will give special consideration to you for your patriotic act." I do not think that that is at all the same question as that of reducing the ceiling price below parity on a farm commodity in consideration of soil conservation payments, a procedure I am against.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I want to ask the gentleman from California, does he believe a man who professes to be doing everything he can to help win this war can stand up here and oppose the payment of money that is going to help these farmers produce these great crops we have to have?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman I do not see how anybody can do that. I agree with the gentleman's thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the speeches that have been made on this amendment make it appear that I am going to have the unpopular side of this question. May I say to the Members that I am for soil conservation in this country handled in the proper way, but the appropriation that is in the pending bill is such that we might as well stop kidding ourselves. I have heard lots of very eloquent arguments here this afternoon about what we are doing to help the farmer win the war. Those arguments have worn out. All we are doing in this conservation bill is give the farmers of the Nation a measly hand-out and that is everything we are accomplishing.

The Soil Conservation Service is a good organization. If this money were transferred to that department where it could be used for real soil building and conservation purposes, I would be for it. This act is being administered, as you gentlemen know, and as the gentleman from Michigan said a while ago, in such

a way that it is being taken advantage of by 80 percent of the farmers this year. Why? Because we have sent out from this Government agents soliciting farmers to go into this program, soliciting the farmers and asking them to take money that we are trying to give them. If it were not for that they would never be in it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman complain because the Government has undertaken to encourage farmers to protect the fertility of their topsoil, and in an effort to further encourage that great activity, the Government has made available to those farmers the very measly sum of money that the gentleman mentions?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. We have had, since the beginning of the Department of Agriculture, money appropriated for the Extension Service. Congress has created the offices of county agents, and we have appropriated money for them. We have appropriated money for an educational program for the farmers of this country. I stand up and I reiterate here that I think the people of this country who are able to do so have got to take care of themselves. I may say further that the farmers of this country want to do that if you will let them alone. I have spoken to four groups of farmers in my State within the last month, and they are laughing at Congress for this kind of legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Apparently the gentleman does not think any good has been accomplished by this program?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I say in sections where a real conservation program has been carried out, yes; but they will come to my farm where I have not an erosion problem, they will go to my neighbor's farm and if we will sign a few papers, we are entitled to so many tons of fertilizer, we are entitled to so many tons of lime and if we say we do not want it, they tell us we are entitled to the check. It is done on every farm in the State. They employ people to go around and urge the farmers to take money from the Government and that is what this Congress is continuing by this appropriation.

If you think you are helping the farmers of this country, just look at the statistics and you will find that over 50 percent got less than $40 a year out of the program. They are laughing at Congress trying to make them think we are doing something for them. Of course, they are accepting it. But you go back among the rank and file of the farmers and you will find they do not believe in it, they are laughing at us for insisting that they take it.

There is another point. The reason for this is to justify a vast growth in the Department of Agriculture in particular activities instead of their being curtailed as they should be. The Department of Agriculture was instituted for a pretty good reason, and it served this country well, but in the last few years it has become, until the war made the War and Navy Departments large, the biggest department of our Government, a colossal department that has been spending millions and millions of dollars. Their whole objective has been to get control of the farm and the farmers of this country against their will.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean to go on record as being opposed to the soil-conservation program, and does the gentleman mean to go on record as stating to this House that he does not think this program has been worth anything to the Nation?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I say that the soil-conservation program as it is being administered in this particular section is not answering the purpose. It is not conserving the soil of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add to this debate one or two observations in connection with the potential food production program for 1943, which is set forth in an interbureau committee report which I have had fall into my hands by accident.

The acreage production of 1943 compared with 1942, and the quantity production of foodstuffs, meaning all the principal foodstuffs in this country, shows percentages covering hogs, cattle, sheep, wool, milk, eggs, chickens, turkeys, corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums, hay wheat, rye, flaxseed peanuts, soybeans, sugar beets, sugarcane for sugar, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, potatoes, tomatoes, and so on down the line.

In connection with acreage or production, 1943 feasible, compared with 1941 and 1942, the highest figure I find is 120 percent on peanuts for nuts and oil. On grain sorghums, for instance, it is 112 percent; on hogs, 112 percent; on chickens, 111 percent; and on oats, 98 percent.

These are the most startling figures I have found anywhere. The report is the most stimulating I have run onto in all the Government records with reference to the possibility of our producing food for our own people and for those to whom we have made commitments not only with reference to 1943 but the years immediately ahead of us.

It seems to me that perhaps as constructive a thing as this Congress can possibly do is to take whatever steps are necessary to get an increased production of foodstuffs of all kinds.

I hope the Members of the House will attempt to obtain copies of this report and digest it, in general, at least. I understand the reports are not for distribution, but I guess any Member can go down to the Department and at least get a copy to look over. This one came to my desk by accident; as a matter of fact, I do not know how it got there. It contains information I have been trying to get hold of, but I did not dream that such a survey had been made.

Coming down to this amendment, the farmers in my district are split wide open on this proposition. Many of them are opposed to incentive payments. They want a fair price at the market place covering all of their costs, a reasonable return for managerial ability, and a reasonable return on their investment. Certainly I have encouraged them in that approach all I could with reference to a fair market price. Others want these incentive payments.

If I can rely upon this report to which I have referred, it does not appear to me that incentive payments are going to stimulate production to any great extent, because this report deals with the feasible production. If the feasible production ran 120 or 130 or 140 percent of 1942 on many of these particular operations, you might come along with an incentive payment and stimulate the production to that extent; but if the feasible production is no greater than the survey indicates, just how are incentive payments going to greatly increase actual production?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixteen Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman understand that $71,000,000 out of this money last year went to those receiving checks of over $1,000, that there were checks to life insurance companies as high as $300,000, to the great prison farm in Texas of $48,000, and to many others of $48,000 to $50,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know it was a substantial amount, but I do not have definitely in mind the amount.

Mr. Chairman, let us see if I cannot clarify this whole thing. In the first place, the Budget Bureau asked for $400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944 with which to carry on this conservation work. The Budget reduced it from 1943 by $44,000,000. The committee reduced the amount further, from $400,000,000 to $300,000,000.

The gentleman from New York offers an amendment to reduce it from $300,000,000 to $200,000,000.

First of all, let us take a look and see how this $400,000,000 was to be divided. One hundred and seventy-four million dollars, roughly, was to go for these so-called soil-conservation practices. That means terracing, rebuilding, liming, and all that sort of thing. That was less than half of the whole amount.

Secondly, the remainder of the amount less administrative expenses was to be used for the so-called adjusted conservation payments. Cotton was to get $77,000,000, corn was to get $50,000,000, wheat was to get $60,000,000, and peanuts was to get $750,000. Therefore, roughly, you have a little less than one-half of

the $400,000,000 to go to the soil-building practices and the remainder to these so-called subsidy payments.

The committee inserted in the bill a proviso reducing administrative expenses from $65,000,000 to about $33,000,000, so what you have under this language at the present time is about $173,000,000 for soil-building practices, you have the necessary funds for administration, and you may have a little less than $100,000,000 for so-called conservation or subsidy payments. There is no confusion about it and there should not be.

My own idea at the time I submitted this matter was that we ought to eliminate these subsidies entirely and use whatever money the Committee makes available for so-called soil-building practices.

The gentleman from New York offered an amendment cutting the amount to $200,000,000. If it were adopted and if there were appropriate language to go with it, it would do just exactly that thing; it would leave enough money for administrative expenses and so-called soil-building practices and water facilities. But we thought to be generous; we thought to sort of taper off on this thing—$100,000,000 this year and probably the balance of it next year. I did not want to see it happen too abruptly, but we are going to have to come to grips with this issue sooner or later. There is no question about it. You can do it now if you like.

I think I was moved by some impulses of generosity, shall I say, to sort of taper off on this thing a little bit and then hope that next year we will get somewhere in making a cleavage on this issue and holding very resolutely to the soil-building practices and getting away from the subsidies.

Do not be alarmed as to the amount involved. Do you know how much the $100,000,000 is compared with the farm income for 1942? Figure it out for yourself. The farm income plus subsidies was about $16,000,000,000 in 1942. One hundred million dollars is five-eighths of 1 percent of that amount. Of course, I appreciate that $16,000,000,000 of income applies to all farm crops and not merely to basic crops. Yet folks get into this well and attempt to compare this amount with the whole amount of the agricultural enactment.

The only other question I want to discuss is this, namely, whether we are going back on commitments made by the Secretary. We are having a little difficulty. I was amazed that the Secretary could find an interpretation in the 1938 and the 1936 acts to the effect that he could pay incentive payments for carrots and onions and potatoes, and all that sort of thing. I cannot recall that there ever was any discussion or implication to that effect when those acts were before the Congress many years ago, and yet the Secretary, according to his solicitor, has that authority. He said in paying $100,000,000 money for this purpose plus the twenty-five million—the so-called section 32 funds—for the purpose of paying direct incentive payments to farmers the question is whether there is a commitment. It is also contended that the entire $400,000,000 is a commitment. Let us see. When the Secretary made his announcement, and you will find it on page 817 in the hearings, he said this to the farmers, "Provisions of the 1943 program, subject to such legislation as Congress may hereafter enact, and the making of payments contingent on such appropriations as the Congress may hereafter enact."

That is the language of the release that the Secretary made to the farmers of the country. That is the statement that he made in the bulletin that went out, namely, that provisions of the 1943 program are subject to such legislation as Congress may hereafter enact and such appropriations as Congress may hereafter provide. When all is said and done there is no absolute commitment. It is a conditional commitment depending on the action that Congress will hereafter take.

So, to recapitulate the situation, there is $300,000,000 in the bill. There is $178,000,000 for soil-building practices, and the remainder administrative expenses, for advances and for the so-called A. C. P. payments, if he desires to make them. I am of opinion that notwithstanding any moral responsibility that the Secretary may entertain, he can take all the money in the bill if he so desires and use it either for subsidy payments or soil-enriching and soil-building or soil-compliance purposes. There is nothing in the law to make him follow one course or the other. He can take the money and divide it as he sees fit. If you think we ought to save the subsidy payments, and pay only for soil-building practices, then the $200,000,000 indicated by the gentleman from New York, under his amendment would be sufficient for that purpose. As I say, I just wanted to taper off on the thing here and I was disposed to err on the generous side.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the Soil Conservation Act was passed, it was intended to be a measure that would provide for soil-building practices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman feel that it is poor practice on the part of the Secretary or any other agent of the Government to attempt to make commitments and to commit Congress to a certain policy or to make certain appropriations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of the difficulties in all commitments by radio or release through the press is this, that when you announce the program for a given year you find that the folks do not always read all of the release, particularly that language which says that the program is contingent on legislation or appropriation hereafter to be made, and so they follow the program that is laid down as they see it and sometimes are oblivious of that language and, after all, that is very important.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that if Madame Perkins would say, we will give the miners $100,000,000,000, that that would be a commitment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have an idea of what the Congress should do under those circumstances.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. As I take it from what the gentleman says, he recognizes that the farmers gain under that particular point, but did the committee consider making a limitation providing that no part of the funds appropriated should be used for the purpose of entering into contracts or commitments for the next year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would say to my friend that that would be legislation on an appropriation bill and clearly subject to a point of order. That would be dealing with an appropriation for the following year. However, the proposition merits consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 83 and noes 111.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that it is too late to demand tellers.

Mr. TABER. I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. The Chair had announced the result of the vote, and a motion had been made that the Committee rise.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Georgia had not been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. TARVER. The Chair had announced the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York demands tellers.

The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that the request comes too late. The Chair would say in deference to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Georgia that there had not been formal recognition of the gentleman from Georgia.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TARVER and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WHIT-

TINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE HONORABLE MARVIN JONES

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 a well-known radio commentator had some very nice things to say about my distinguished predecessor in Congress, the Honorable Marvin Jones.

Those of you who knew him during his 24 years of service as a Member in the House of Representatives are, I feel confident, glad to know that he is making the same high success in another field as he did in the halls of Congress.

It gives me great pleasure to quote the following from a talk by Mr. H. R. Baukhage, nationally-known radio commentator:

From Washington on a Saturday afternoon when the otherwise rather slim news ration is supplemented with some food for thought in the announcement of the definite date of forthcoming United Nations food conference.

There was considerable satisfaction over the selection of Judge Marvin Jones as chairman of the American delegation. Jones is now acting as adviser to Stabilization Director Byrnes and has his office in the White House. Until he was named judge of the United States Court of Claims 2 years ago, he had been a Member of the House of Representatives from Texas since 1917. His quiet unassuming persuasiveness and courteous southern affability ought to make him an excellent representative of the United States. And there was probably another reason why the President felt that Jones fitted the general scheme for which this conference hopes to lay the foundation. We have had a hint of what is in the President's mind when he thinks long thoughts about food. He expressed himself to Alf Landon, one-time Republican aspirant for the Presidency, perhaps this-time aspirant as well. Mr. Landon said when the boys gathered about him as he left the White House today that the President talked about hopes for raising the standard of living of the backward peoples. Landon thought the idea had merit and mentioned the point that increasing the consumption of food of these people would benefit world markets.

Marvin Jones, in his long term of service in Congress, spent considerable effort on increasing the market for the products of that part of America from which he comes—a southern district where wheat and cattle as well as cotton are important. Jones started as a tenant farmer and knows what is lacking in the consuming ability of that group. Jones piloted much of the administration's farm legislation through the House.

Such was the sentiment of Mr. Baukhage. I would like to add personally that the appointment of men of Marvin Jones' caliber will do more than any other one thing to provide practical and equitable solutions to the multitude of knotty problems which face this Government on every hand.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I will yield for unanimous consent requests.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein telegrams from the following persons: Harold Brown, secretary of Montana Farmers' Union; D. W. Chapman, president of Montana Farmers' Union; Charles J. Yearger, of Conrad, Mont.; W. W. McFarland, of Conrad, Mont.; Neis Petersen, of Conrad, Mont.; D. J. McCall, of Comertown, Mont.; and C. C. Parker, of Valier, Mont.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken for these consent requests be not charged against the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the other special orders for the day are completed I may have the opportunity of addressing the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 213) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That LEX GREEN, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Claims.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a telegram I received today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain quotations pertinent thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein a letter from the regional manager at Milwaukee, chairman of the farm security program for Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain telegrams on the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a short article.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is a very valuable treatise on the history of money in the United States by the late Senator Cockrell. In this time when the money question is to the fore, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein that speech in installments of the prescribed limit until the entire speech has been printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope all these unanimous-consent requests are not being taken out of the time of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, and I rise to inquire whether they are?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that while that is probably not a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will keep in mind the hope of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Speaker will indulge the gentleman so that he may have his entire 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a horrible spectacle now being enacted in the State of Pennsylvania. Following the taking of the census in 1940 the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania in the majority were Democrats and in the State senate the majority Republicans. Following this census taking of 1940 it was decided that the State be reapportioned. Several bills were introduced in order to bring the situation to a head and reapportion the State. A committee was appointed to agree on a fair reapportionment. On that committee 12 Republicans were appointed and 12 Democrats.

A bill was agreed upon. That bill was introduced and passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature and became law. Within 1 year, Mr. Speaker, the new majority leader of the senate, a Republican senator, introduced a new bill to reapportion again the State of Pennsylvania, designed to take away and deprive the city of Pittsburgh of its three distinguished Democrats who now represent that district and to prevent their returning to this House. In the city of Philadelphia this new bill will take away one Member of the Congress. The reapportionment is a foul blow to democratic government.

Ordinarily you would say, this was rather a shame-faced thing to do. The present majority leader of the senate voted for the Apportionment Act of 1942. In these days to gerrymander a State for nothing other than a political purpose and scheme is certainly something to ponder. That is not all. The worst is yet to come.

Our Governor took office in January and in his inaugural address asked from the legislature unity of action and purpose so that we may carry on the war effort. He asked for an adjournment of politics. But lo and behold, in yesterday morning's Inquirer, he had this to say to the newspapermen when asked for his opinion of the filibuster:

> It is just the good old American way. When we Republicans were in the minority we bellyached when they ran over us. It just has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, I denounce any man who would stoop so low, or who would demean his office in making so contemptible a statement as that uttered by Governor Martin. This shows an utter disregard of the rights of minorities and a complete lack of understanding of the fundamental rights of the citizens of Pennsylvania. It is certainly not the statement of a man properly occupying the exalted position of Governor of a great State, but rather may it be likened to the dead mackerel that both shines and stinks in the moonlight. It is not yet too late for the Governor to repent and this is his place of locus penitentiae or a place where he may well repent for that loose statement. Let him be big under the circumstances and tell the people of Pennsylvania that he did not mean that. That he will guard and protect the rights of all of the people of Pennsylvania, which include the minorities. He said it has to be done. I say to Governor Martin that the things that must be done and have to be done would be first of all win the war and send word to our boys on Guadalcanal, in north Africa, and on all the fighting fronts that he is exercising his power as Governor of Pennsylvania in the best interest of all of the people.

Do not let our boys down. I would say to Governor Martin, take those words back, and take them back quickly. He was charged in the last campaign with having resigned his place as a major general in the United States Army in order to run for Governor of Pennsylvania. It is true he had a notable career in the last war, and in the reorganization of the Pennsylvania National Guard, and as a friend and American, I say to Governor Martin, you have made a very serious mistake, so take those words back. You really never meant just that. So that you want unity, you want harmony, and you want a maximum amount of production from our great industrial State, and that maximum industrial production can only come from unity and harmony, from all our people. Do not tell our people that you merely represent the interest of the Republican Party. Do not ignore minorities. Give them the respect that is their due.

One of the men who made America great and that we all feel proud of is General Grant. I say to the Governor, let him read about Lee's surrender. Let him read what Grant told Lee at that great surrender when he passed his sword to Grant. Grant said, "No." And when it came to turning over the horses, Grant said, "Take them back home with you. You are just in time for plowing." Be magnanimous and gracious in victory.

I say, Governor Martin, you do not speak for me as a Pennsylvanian because I have tried to guide myself not along political lines but rather have I always kept my eye on that great horizon where victory will come, and complete victory. We do not need politics, but we do need to win this war. I never in all my life read such a statement from a man occupying a high place. I still think that public office is a public trust and I pray God that Governor Martin will recant and ponder this loose talk of his. Yes, I say that Governor Martin must do the proper thing because Governor Martin has gone too far; but let him explain to the people and to our boys out on all the fighting fronts that he is the Governor of all the people of Pennsylvania, that he is not going to run roughshod over anybody, that he will remember his oath of office and that only through unity can we conquer our common enemy. Do not let your career close by being crowned in ignominy as a cheap rasping politician at a time when your country is engaged in a life and death struggle.

You can do that by showing this legislature that they are in error, that they did reapportion our State in good faith 1 year ago, and you can see that the Representatives in Congress from that great State shall at least have a fair chance.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I remind the gentleman of the fact that less than a year ago the leaders of the Republican Party and the leaders of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania made an agreement as to the reapportionment, and it was the implied understanding that that reapportionment was to extend for the balance of this census period, in other words, until 1950. By their actions the leaders of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania are breaking at least an implied promise that that reapportionment they agreed upon would stand.

May I say also that the legislature dominated by the Republicans in Harrisburg this year will go down in history as a legislature that accomplished nothing whatever, practically, except legislation which ripped out of office Democrats who were serving the public and who have been serving the public for many, many years.

Mr. McGRANERY. I thank the gentleman.

The big thing over and beyond all this with me is that I should like Governor Martin to hark back to his own inaugural address, in which he pled for unity and for an adjournment of politics for the duration, instead of saying now as the leader of our great State, "Yes, they did it to us, now we will do it to them. We have the votes and that is all that counts. Let him remember that victory means everything."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I find it necessary to detain the House at this late hour. I want the House to know, and, of course, the very able employees of the House who are always a matter of my concern, that the provocation is not of my own making, but the circumstances of a moment ago certainly require an answer.

I shall not attempt, Mr. Speaker, to put on any pontifical robes, nor shall I try to assume an air of innocence with reference to the observations that I make. I shall make no pretense of

ignorance of political movements. I shall be blunt and forthright, even if some look upon them as faults.

It seems to me that it ill behooves a stalwart and stanch new dealer, who in season and out of season has defended the shortcomings, the incompetencies, and the irregularities of the administration here in Washington, to protest against the turn which political considerations has taken in Pennsylvania.

I had supposed that my very distinguished and able colleague from Philadelphia who addressed the House a moment ago would have resorted to an entirely different tack as he made his observations with reference to Pennsylvania. I had supposed that there would be that complete candor and frankness which are always persuasive and convincing. It was a difficult role which he assumed this afternoon. Under ordinary circumstances he is the exemplification of frankness, and candor. Today he attempted a masquerade. Today he assumed a role that did not fit him. One would think that he had never had a part in politics, that he was a novice. After his years of experience here in Washington and his contacts in the political circles of Philadelphia he is not a novice. I am not persuaded, and I doubt if others here are persuaded, that his protest over gerrymandering was prompted by his innocence or his ignorance of political movements.

Let us look at the facts. There is nothing unusual or extraordinary about them. They are commonplace. This is the situation. The Republicans are in power in Pennsylvania, just as the New Deal is in power in Washington. Those on the minority side here know only too well what that means. When the juggernaut of the New Deal gets going on the other side of the aisle we are crushed. At least it was so prior to the present Congress. There was no use squealing about it. There was no use making a lot of noise about it. It gave us not only a bellyache but a headache as well. It was inevitable and we had to take it. Now, for my friend to lament that the methods with which he has become acquainted here in Washington are present in Pennsylvania ill behooves him. I know that he has delighted in times past—and I am not critical of him in that respect—he has delighted in the power that the majority wielded here. Certainly we knew that you new dealers were in command. We knew that you were rolling along. You were in complete control because the voters had put you in control. And the Republicans are in control in Pennsylvania today. The gentleman referred to a horrible spectacle. Those were his opening words. There is a horrible spectacle being staged in Harrisburg, and the horrible spectacle is not in the Governor's office. The horrible spectacle is that a group of minority members are putting on a filibuster in the hope that their continued talk will block legislative procedure. It is a horrible spectacle.

As I think of that filibuster, of the continued talking, I am reminded of the fact the O. P. A. in its food point program has placed twice as much value on tongues as on brains. It would appear that the New Deal values, twice as much for tongues as brains, have been adopted by the new dealers in Harrisburg. The spectacle is not only horrible, but shameful. It sabotages legislative processes. It strikes at the machinery of government. It throws a monkey wrench into the operations of the law-making body.

Governor Martin needs no defense. Governor Martin need not recant. Governor Martin has been honest and he has been frank. Governor Martin has said what everyone here knows. If the Democrats were in power they would be doing what they charge the Republicans with, and we would not hear a word of it. Why all this camouflage? Why all this veneer? Why all this sugar-coating? Would my friend have us believe that the new dealers would do otherwise if they were in power?

Governor Martin has made his name beyond any possible attack. His record speaks for itself. His life is an open book. He need fear nothing from any new dealer here in Washington. He made his name first in the fighting forces as a private. Step by step he was promoted until he became a major general. My friend speaks of his concern for the boys at the front. Governor Martin was one of the boys at the front. And he has a boy at the front. He has a boy that knows the gore and the grime of battle. Governor Martin knows what war means. He knows it as a fighter and as a father, not as a politician. Governor Martin is not making political hay out of the war. As a father of a fighting boy he knows of the heartaches of the mothers and fathers of Pennsylvania. As a patriot he knows what the sacrifice must be, and he is willing to make it. As a soldier in the ranks he knows the price that must be paid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection?

Mr. McGRANERY. I have no objection. I am enjoying my friend very much.

Mr. DITTER. Just as I did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. I say to the House today, and I dismiss all suggestion of politics, it may be presumptuous for me to speak for Governor Martin. I venture to do so, however.

I believe, as I know the man, as I know what he stood for long before he was Governor of the State, long before he had anything to do with reapportionment, as I think of his home ties, as I think of the altar where his boy was reared, I know that Governor Martin is beyond, far beyond, anything that might smack of partisanship or politics in the prosecution of the war. He has given what only a father can give. Those of you who are not fathers cannot understand. He has given his pride and his joy. Governor Martin dreamed dreams and saw visions for that boy. They were too sacred to permit of political consideration. Governor Martin in the past gave himself as a part of the fighting forces. Today he gives of himself by offering his son. More than that no man can give.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. No. I would like to take my own time, but I thought the gentleman from Michigan was ahead of me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The Chair apologizes. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Louisiana will have to yield in order for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] to be recognized at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not ask for the privilege of proceeding immediately, but if the gentlemen will yield for the purpose of allowing me to make a request to speak after they have spoken.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection to the gentleman proceeding before I do. I would be glad to have him do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention whatsoever of entering into this discussion. I have all the respect in the world for my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY], and also all the respect in the world for my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Not just at present. Later I will.

Mr. Speaker, in all my experience in the 6 years I have been a Member of this House, never have I heard any Member of Congress make such a frank confession as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] in admitting that the only reason the Legislature of Pennsylvania had for passing a congressional reapportionment bill at this session was for political advantage. He seemed to take a great deal of satisfaction out of that fact and admitted it very frankly.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania in the past few years has had a few more Republican voters than it has had Democratic voters. The State is almost evenly divided between the two parties insofar as voting strength is

concerned. But what has the Republican Party attempted to do by this measure that they are putting through the legislature? They are gerrymandering the congressional districts of Pennsylvania so that if the same percentage of the people of Pennsylvania remain Democratic and the same percentage remain Republican as has existed for the last 3 or 4 years, the Republicans will have 24 Representatives in the National House of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania and the Democrats will have only 9.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is a denial of the fundamental rights of the voters of Pennsylvania when, by gerrymandering, they disfranchise a great portion of the Democratic voters of that State. Just think of it. With Democrats almost as numerous as Republicans, there will be sent down here, by gerrymandering tactics, 24 Republican Representatives and 9 Democratic Representatives, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] takes the floor of the House and praises that type of practice. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania subscribe to the doctrine that possession of power makes it right for one to do what he chooses?

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party does not subscribe to such a doctrine, nor has it ever followed such a policy or practice. It is not the American way, and I do not believe the people of Pennsylvania will approve what is being done at Harrisburg by the Republicans.

The gentleman speaks of the conduct of some of the representatives at Harrisburg. If he will read the record of the proceedings at Harrisburg in the last 4 days he will see that nothing was done there except in a perfectly constitutional manner. There are very, very few speeches on record in the house of representatives at Harrisburg or in the senate at Harrisburg this week. There has been less talk in Harrisburg this week than in any other week since the legislature met there in January. The only thing the minority part did was to ask the clerks to read the bills that were before the house and senate. That is constitutional in every respect.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for a compliment?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Not now. The main accomplishment of the assembly at Harrisburg, including the house and senate, since they have been in session this year has been the passage of legislation which ripped out of office the persons who have been serving the public of Pennsylvania for many years.

We have a Democratic treasurer elected by the people of Pennsylvania. We have an auditor general, a Democrat, who was elected by the people of Pennsylvania. The proposal of the Republicans, and what they are going to put through in a ruthless and brutal manner, is to take away all of the employees of these elected Democratic officials and place them under officials who were elected by the Republican Party in the past year, and they are doing away with a system that has existed in Pennsylvania for generations. When the auditor general of the State is elected by the people and he is a Democrat, why should he not have power over his employees? But the Republican legislature does not believe in the system and practices that have made Pennsylvania a great State for the last 40 or 50 years. The same thing is true of the office of the Democratic State treasurer. He has made a wonderful record. They could not find any fault with him; they could find no other way to destroy his efficient administration except by taking away from him his loyal employees. And so they pass bills taking away from these duly elected Democratic officials their power.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more reprehensible practice in this United States, and there could not be any more reprehensible practice. I am very, very sorry that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] has placed himself in a position of defending such tactics and saying that it is perfectly all right for those who have the power to deny the people of the State proper representation in the Congress of the United States, and to deny the minority party of the people of Pennsylvania any proper representation whatsoever. If we approve such practices, we have stooped pretty low.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2½ minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for this purpose?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] wants to yield, too.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. I yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there has been all this discussion about Harrisburg, and I am the Representative from that city, I wish to make a few short statements at this time.

In the first place, it has always been my conception of my duty here in Washington that I was to represent the people of Pennsylvania in matters of national legislation, and that what I did down here did not have anything to do with what the Legislature of Pennsylvania did back in Harrisburg. It is entirely their problem and it is not a problem of the Congress of the United States to try to tell the people back in Pennsylvania what they should do. That is fundamental, it seems to me.

In the second place, this reapportionment bill seems to be eminently fair. I have read it. It leaves the State practically the same as it was before the 1940 reapportionment, except in the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. There may be some complaint about what has been done in those particular areas, but by and large it goes right back to the situation that existed before the 1940 reapportionment. There is nothing unfair about it, and I cannot see why it should be a matter of debate in the Congress of the United States; that it is seems to me to be absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Has the gentleman followed the district lines of the city of Philadelphia? Does he feel they are fair?

Mr. KUNKEL. I said before that I had not studied the district of Philadelphia.

Mr. SHERIDAN. If the gentleman has not studied all of the bill how can he say it is fair?

Mr. KUNKEL. I said that outside of the city of Philadelphia and the city of Pittsburgh they had not made any change.

Mr. SHERIDAN. But Pittsburgh and Philadelphia constitute the big areas, do they not?

Mr. KUNKEL. Certainly they are large areas.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Does not the gentleman feel that he should follow the district lines to determine whether they are fair?

Mr. KUNKEL. My statement was clear and plain; I said "outside of Harrisburg and Philadelphia."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Reference has been made here to the war record of our distinguished former Governor, General Martin.

Now let me state when General Martin reached Army retirement age, he then, and not until then, became a candidate for Governor. His brilliant record both in time of peace and in time of war have won for him the heartiest commendation of the people of my State of Pennsylvania and of the Nation. He served in the Pennsylvania National Guard since 1898, and during Spanish-American War served in the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. He served on the Mexican border and served in World War No. 1 from July 15, 1917, until April 25, 1919, commanding the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry of the Twenty-eighth Division, one of the fightingest combat divisions in the A. E. F. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, also the Reilly Medal in 1937. He was made a brigadier general in 1922, named adjutant general in 1939, and named a major general in June 1939 to command the Twenty-eighth Division, National Guard. He was named as commanding general, Twenty-eighth Division, in 1941 in World War No. 2. General Martin has been a fighting general who understands the horrors and hardships of war, the cold and heat, the filth and fatigue, and his record as a fighting commander of the Twenty-eighth Division in World War No. 1 is a brilliant record of which he

may well be proud. He has been no desk commander. He has been a genuine fighting leader throughout his career.

Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] that General Martin is a man of unselfish leadership who has devoted his life to a service of public good. He is a practical man, honest, and a man whose career has been characterized throughout by utter integrity, sincerity, and a consistency of performance over the years that made him the choice as the leader for the great State of Pennsylvania in this critical war period. I might add I am proud to come from the Keystone State and serve under the leadership of this brilliant soldier, lawyer, executive, and Governor.

Mr. KUNKEL. I was going to make that point before I stopped. That is the fact that General Martin was over-age for his rank in the Army when he ran for Governor of Pennsylvania, which I think is extremely important.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes, under a previous special order.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make the observation, and I believe I was remiss in not having made the observation earlier, that I know of no man coming out of Pennsylvania from the Democratic ranks who enjoys a greater prestige and a finer reputation, nor a man whom I hold in higher regard and esteem, than my distinguished friend from Philadelphia [Mr. McGRANERY]. I want that to definitely appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] desire me to yield for him to make the same statement with reference to his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

Mr. McGRANERY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would be very happy to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just adopt his words and let it go at that.

Mr. McGRANERY. I am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for giving me the opportunity of saying that there is no man who is more appreciated at the Philadelphia bar and socially than my good friend [Mr. DITTER]. Of course, Mr. DITTER and I enjoy positions in opposition politically only. I know of no man in this House that I have a fonder regard for than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Or who better serves his constituency?

Mr. McGRANERY. I cannot go that far.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Who better serves his party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And for and in behalf of the Members on this side—who better serves his district, his State, and his country. Mr. Speaker, one of the gentleman a while ago said something about the actions of the legislature up there in Pennsylvania. I do not know anything about the facts but from what has been said I gather that the new dealers think their ox is being gored. At least they are sobbing because they seem to be taking it instead of handing it out. My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] just suggested to me that perhaps I could judge of the justice of this controversy which has been going on the last 20 minutes by the amount of noise that was made and where the squealing came from. He said that out there on the farms in Illinois when an old sow gets her feet and snout in the trough and then is hauled back by the tail and an ear she squeals because she is being pulled away from the feeding trough. From the way these gentlemen on the right—the majority side—complain about what is happening up in Harrisburg I gather they are being separated from the political swill they were enjoying ever since the New Deal came to power. It sounds that way from the sidelines. A politician separated from his patronage and slush fund always squeals.

One of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania said he thought that the course that the Legislature of Pennsylvania had taken was taken to gain some political advantage. But I cannot agree with that. I think that the Legislature of Pennsylvania, being Republican, and being disgusted with what is going on down here, recognizing the waste, the extravagance, the incompetency, and the disregard for constitutional government here in Washington, knowing how foolish it is to try to follow these silly policies which have been put into existence down here, are now getting patriotic and are trying to get a few Republicans here who will serve the people of the State and Nation and not follow along, as they have for so many months and years, the dreamers and fuzzy-wuzzies at the other end of the avenue. These new dealers have been just rubber stamps. Some of those Democratic districts might just as well have bought a rubber stamp for a dollar and sent it down here so far as the legislative records of some of the boys are concerned. For years some Members bragged of following without question the New Deal lack of philosophy.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY], too. I recall, and you will find it in the RECORD, that on the 10th day of last December he took me to task on the floor, although I did not happen to be here at that time, but I answered him later, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1943, pages 103 to 110, because, as he said, I had loaned the use of the frank to two Nazi agents. I did nothing of the kind. That just was not so. Now, if there is no more truth to his charges with reference to the Pennsylvania Legislature than there was to that statement about me, there is no use of anybody bothering themselves about it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] on one occasion during debate stated that he was a member of the bar, and then he went on and insisted that being a member of the bar did not necessarily mean that a man was a lawyer. I gather from what was said here today that he is a lawyer. That being true, and having the good of the profession at heart, it would seem that after the Supreme Court and three Federal judges had printed statements showing that this man William Power Maloney was nothing but a pettifogging shyster, he would take heed. I use that term advisedly. I would not use those words myself, but that is the interpretation of William Power Maloney's conduct that three Federal courts printed in the official reports of cases decided in the Federal courts and in a Supreme Court decision so far as his conduct was concerned. The courts did not use those two words, but that is a fair interpretation of what the opinions hold. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, being a lawyer and knowing the ethics of the profession—that is, the ethics lawyers are presumed to have—I cannot see why anything that any legislature up in Harrisburg could do would turn his stomach after he is able to swallow William Power Maloney and all his works. It would appear to the innocent bystander that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] is just getting a little political gas off his stomach. We all wish him a quick, and happy, recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a copy of a bill which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill to provide for the payment of 3 years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender on or before April 16, 1944, or to provide for the payment of 2 years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender after April 16, 1944, but on or before April 16, 1945.

This bill has two paramount purposes: One, to help the members of the armed forces of the United States and their relatives; and the other, to win the war as quickly as possible.

This bill should go a long way toward saving the United States people billions of dollars in taxes. It is estimated that if this war lasts 5 years longer—and many experts here in Washington say it will—that the total cost for those 5 years will exceed $500,000,000,000. It is estimated that the annual salaries paid to the members of the armed forces amount to $10,000,000,000, thus if the war were to end within 1 year the United States would pay in salaries and bonuses according to the terms of this bill $30,000,000,000. For that 1 year the total cost

of the war would be $100,000,000,000, which includes the salaries of all members of the armed forces for that 1 year. Thus accordingly if this bill were to help cause an added incentive to win this war in 1 year the taxpayers of this Nation would be saved $370,000,000,000. By the same calculation, if the war was to end in 2 years instead of 5, then the taxpayers would be saved $280,000,000,000.

We all realize that America and the armed forces do not need an incentive or bonus to fight their hardest, nor do they need same for their acts of bravery. However, it is my belief that the vast majority of Americans feel that this bill would be no more than fair to the members of the armed forces and their families. A good professional baseball team plays good baseball at all times, but if that team is to receive the national championship and a bonus the players usually play a superhuman game.

On the other hand, think what 3 years' pay would mean to the private, corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, captain, or a member of the Navy or Marine Corps who gave up his practice of law or practice of medicine, or his business. This bill would enable that person to be rehabilitated when he needed it the most. When the bonus of the last World War was paid it came so long after the war that much of its good was lost because of the delay.

Why not let the armed forces of the United States try to hit the "jackpot" by making this bill law?

Mr. Speaker, this bill reads as follows:

A bill to provide for the payment of three years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender on or before April 16, 1944, or to provide for the payment of two years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender after April 16, 1944, but on or before April 16, 1945

Be it enacted, etc., That all members of the armed forces of the United States of America shall be paid the sum equal to the amount of three years' of compensation for personal services, based upon the annual compensation for personal services, provided that Germany, Italy, and Japan shall have unconditionally surrendered to the United Nations on or before one year from the date of the introduction of this bill, said one year from date of introduction of this bill being April 16, 1944; said amount to be paid immediately after said unconditional surrender.

Provided further, That if Germany, Italy, and Japan do not unconditionally surrender on or before April 16, 1944, then every member of the armed forces of the United States of America shall be paid the sum equal to the amount of two years' compensation for personal services, provided that Germany, Italy, and Japan shall have unconditionally surrendered on or before two years from the date of the introduction of this bill, said two years from the date of introduction being April 16, 1945, said amount to be paid immediately after said unconditional surrender

Provided further, That the annual compensation for personal services shall be based on the amount each member of the armed forces is receiving at the time of such unconditional surrender.

Provided further, That all members of the armed forces of the United States of America who have died, or who have been killed since the declaration of war by the United States on Germany, Italy, and Japan, or all those members of the armed forces of the United States of America who may die or be killed before April 16, 1944, or April 16, 1945, shall be entitled to and shall receive the same amount of compensation or benefits as outlined under the above circumstances, said payment of compensation or benefits to be paid to the closest legal kin of the said deceased.

Provided further, That as used in this act the term members of the armed forces of the United States of America includes the Army, Navy, Marine, Coast Guard, Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Women's Reserve, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard Reserve.

INCOME-TAX COLLECTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in Philadelphia in selling to the general public, to corporations, and to financial institutions the huge sum of $400,000,000 in Government bonds. I received today a letter from the gentleman who is in charge of that drive. He writes as follows:

In many quarters the comment has been made along these lines: "People who are up to date in the payment of their taxes would buy more bonds than they now feel free to purchase when they are 1 year behind in their income-tax payments."

The gentleman goes on to say:

The Treasury, as you know, is making every effort to sell as large a proportion of the current offering to individuals a possible and that is one of the principal things we are stressing in the drive. This is another important instance, therefore, of how both Congress and the Treasury could help tremendously in the proper handling of the whole problem of war finance, by putting the thirty-odd million taxpayers on an up-to-date, current basis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter directed to the majority leader by Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. TOWE), for 4 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. SASSCER, for April 19 to 22, in order to attend sessions of the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 5 days, on account of official and personal business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, April 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

333. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a report on the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the last 60 days, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2513. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 2514. A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint and sale with respect to Federal taxes as are allowed under the ap-

plicable State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr FULMER:

H. R. 2515. A bill to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2516. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture; to the Committe on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2517. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to increase the allowance to dependent children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2518. A bill to establish a reserve fund from rents for the purpose of demolishing or removing temporary housing after the termination of hostilities; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2519. A bill to require the establishment of a classification of freight and a scale of class rates, for application to transportation of property by railroad, so adjusted as not to discriminate among regions or territories in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2521. A bill to provide for the payment of 3 years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender on or before April 16, 1944, or to provide for the payment of 2 years' pay for all members of the armed forces of the United States should Germany, Italy, and Japan unconditionally surrender after April 16, 1944, but on or before April 16, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 2522. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through civilian employment with countries allied with the United States in the Second World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr MILLS:

H. R. 2523. A bill to limit the purposes for which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank of Washington to foreign governments and persons in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 2524. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to investigate the supplying of equipment and facilities for furnishing electric power and energy for war purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to see that the proper bureau or commission of the Federal Government be requested to extend the time in which game may be kept in storage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reduce marketing costs and increase the producer's share of the consumer's food dollar; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to establish a pharmacy corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCORMACK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Rev. Dr. Jacob S. Payton, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, during this commemorative season we renew our vows of loyalty to Thy Son, the Saviour of the world, who still moves forward, even amid the desolations of war, to establish His kingdom of love and His reign of universal peace. Thou beneficent giver of springtime in wartime under whose breath the blossoms replace the snows, and life and beauty triumph over the death and barrenness of winter, breathe upon our souls that all worthy desires and holy aspirations may come to fruition.

In this hour of national danger we pray for the land we love. Make plain the path of duty to these Thy servants. May they act always in the fear and the admonition of the Lord. Support our brave defenders in the ordeal of battle with a strong reliance upon Thy Word, and protect our leaders from any failure that might warrant any charge of not having kept faith with them.

This prayer with the forgiveness of our sins we offer in the name of the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 991. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Governor of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram from the California State Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HULL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GETTING MAIL TO SOLDIERS OVERSEAS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the public has been told that the problem of getting mail to our soldiers overseas is due to the lack of shipping space to carry the mail. According to the statement of the Office of War Information, this agency alone used each 2 weeks 135 tons of shipping for foreign propaganda. In other words, each month over half a million pounds of printed propaganda goes overseas, crowding out some of the soldier mail and delaying more of it.

I am not questioning the importance of the propaganda department; but I do believe our men overseas are entitled to better mail service than this. I have been recently told of men out at Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington who have been sent overseas, have been in service overseas, have been wounded and have returned to this country for convalescent treatment without hearing from home until their return here. A letter from home is the big event for the average man in service; and I submit he should come ahead of the 270

tons of monthly propaganda which is being sent across the ocean.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include excerpts from testimony taken before the subcommittee having in charge the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE LOANING AGENCIES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many telegrams in opposition to section 8 of the bill H. R. 2481, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, now under consideration. I shall read only one of those telegrams, as follows:

Hon. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nevada Wool Growers Association are much concerned with that part of the appropriation bill which forces livestock operators to borrow from local and private banks and to have these loans refused by such banks before they can attempt to borrow from cooperative loaning agencies. Many Nevada livestock operators are at the present time financing their operations through the Nevada Livestock Production Credit Association which is grower owned and controlled and feel that this method of livestock financing serves the livestock people far better than private banks who at this time are very liberal in their loans, but as you will recall, were unable to meet livestock financing needs during the depression. It is understood that the appropriations bill will be voted upon tomorrow, and we earnestly request your support in opposing that part of the appropriations bill which would make it necessary for our loans to be turned down at a private bank before we could continue our present method of financing with our cooperative loaning agencies.

Regards,

GORDON GRISWOLD,
President, Nevada Wool Growers Association.

THE JAPANESE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a letter that I have received on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 53]

Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	O'Konski
Arnold	Gavagan	O'Leary
Auchincloss	Gerlach	O'Toole
Barry	Gibson	Outland
Bates, Mass.	Guyer	Pfeifer
Beall	Hall,	Philbin
Bell	Leonard W.	Pracht
Bender	Halleck	Price
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Boykin	Harris, Va.	Rizley
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Sadowski
Buckley	Heffernan	Satterfield
Burchill, N. Y.	Hendricks	Scanlon
Burgin	Holmes, Mass.	Schwabe
Byrne	Izac	Scott
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Cannon, Fla.	Judd	Sheridan
Capozzoli	Kearney	Short
Celler	Kee	Sikes
Chiperfield	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cochran	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Coffee	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Curtis	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Dewey	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	LaFollette	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Lane	Stevenson
Dilweg	LeFevre	Sumners, Tex.
Dingell	Lewis, Colo.	Taylor
Ditter	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Lynch	Tolan
Drewry	McGranery	Towe
Eaton	Maas	Treadway
Elliott	Madden	Vincent, Ky.
Ellison, Md.	Magnuson	Vorys, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Maloney	Vursell
Fay	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Fellows	Merritt	Walter
Fenton	Miller, Conn.	Wasielewski
Fish	Miller, Mo.	Weaver
Fogarty	Miller, Pa.	Weiss
Folger	Mott	Whelchel, Ga.
Forand	Murphy	White
Fulbright	Myers	Wilson
Furlong	Nichols	Winter
Gale	Norton	Wolcott
Gallagher	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 290 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent Mr. PITTENGER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from the Ambassador of Poland, J. Ciechanowski, to the editor of Life magazine in reply to the former United States Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Honorable Joseph E. Davies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article entitled "Too Much Loafing in Shipyards."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Farm Security program and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the Clerk had completed reading the paragraph ending on line 3, page 68. Are there any further amendments to the pending paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 65, line 6, after the colon, insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments or subsidies or for any expense for or incident to the payment of incentive payments or any other form of subsidy payments."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. TABER. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman has been recognized and has been granted permission to proceed for 15 minutes. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are deciding many important matters these days, but nothing more important than the question presented in this amendment.

We are determining in our disposition of this amendment this afternoon the policy of the Government on subsidies. We are determining it not for this bill; not for this day or this year. We are deciding it for many years to come—so many years that we cannot look far enough into the distance and see the end of it. We are determining not merely the question of subsidies for farmers, but the question of subsidies for labor, subsidies for industry, subsidies for everybody to whom money may be shoveled out of the Federal Treasury.

In response to releases laying the basis for this proposition the papers for the last week have carried statements that subsidies were being considered for labor in war plants and subsidies for industry in the production of supplies urgently needed for civilian consumption. A general policy of governmental subsidies is involved and this proposal to establish agricultural subsidies is the electric spark to touch off a vicious circle of gratuities from the public revenues involving the expenditure of untold amounts for many years to come.

Why this insistent determination to dispense open-handed charity where none is asked or desired? The Congress has repeatedly gone on record as being opposed to subsidies, as being opposed to hand-outs from the Treasury, as being opposed to the taxation of the whole people of the United States for the benefit of any one group or industry. Never has this Congress or any of its committees agreed to or acquiesced in or committed itself to a policy of incentive subsidy payments in any form.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will excuse me if I do not yield just at this time.

A subsidy is uneconomic, unethical, and un-American. It degrades those who receive it and robs those who pay it. The American people do not believe in subsidies; American agriculture does not believe in subsidies and American farmers do not want subsidies.

But whether the farmers want them or not—whether the taxpayers approve them or not—they are about to be made a part of our national economy. It is the contention of subsidy advocates, as reported in this morning's Washington Post, that this House, in appropriating $300,000,000 for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources yesterday afternoon, allocated $100,000,000 for incentive payments, as subsidies to farmers, as hand-outs from the Public Treasury. In view of the debate on the floor the bureaucrats who have been persistently endeavoring to secure appropriations for that purpose will undoubtedly take that view of it. Only a clear-cut, unequivocal enactment by the Congress can prevent it. And that is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just a moment, if the gentleman will permit.

According to the opinion of subsidy advocates expressed on the floor at the time, if we leave the appropriation in the form in which it was adopted last night we are instructing the Department to adopt the policy they have been so anxious to adopt all these months, and to begin using money secured by the Government through the sale of War bonds and taxes, to carry out its plan of regimentation of American agriculture.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will allow me to proceed just a little further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The farmers are opposed to it. The farmers do not want these hand-outs; they want their prices in the open market, just as everybody else receives his wages and prices and income in the open market. Every farm organization is opposed to it. Every national farm organization has officially gone on record against it and has adopted planks opposing it in its annual platform. The House itself, in passing the Steagall bill, in passing the Pace bill, and in passing the Bankhead bill, emphatically rejected such palliatives and enunciated the principle upon which we must stand now and after the war. In passing these bills the House went on record officially by overwhelming majorities in opposition to such propositions as this, and notwithstanding these recent and successive enactments there are Members of the House who support the Department's requests for subsidies.

What is the purpose of the Department in insisting on a policy of incentive subsidy payments, Mr. Chairman? Whether farmers get the money in the open market or whether they get it in subsidies, they get the same amount of money.

The only difference is whether they get it all in the market or whether they get part of it in a check from the Treasury. And to prove it beyond the peradventure of a doubt here is an Associated Press report, under the date of April 7, published in newspapers all over the country:

HIGHER PRICES FOR FIVE WAR CROPS ANNOUNCED BY CHESTER DAVIS—SUBSTITUTE FOR WICKARD SUBSIDY PLAN AFFECTS DRY BEANS AND PEAS, PEANUTS, SOYBEANS, AND FLAXSEED

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Food Administrator Chester C. Davis announced tonight that the Government would guarantee farmers higher prices for five vital war crops—dry beans and peas, and peanuts, soybeans and flaxseed—to encourage greatest possible production.

The higher prices will replace a $100,000,000 incentive payment program previously announced by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. Funds for such payments have not been provided by Congress because of farm bloc opposition.

* * * * *

The Food Administrator said the Government would support grower prices of the five crops at higher levels than previously announced by Wickard through purchase and loan operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the case of dry beans and peas and soybeans, the new support prices are higher than present Office of Price Administration ceiling prices. * * *

The Agriculture Department said the increase would adjust processor ceiling prices to permit a fair price to growers.

There you have the complete and conclusive vindication of the program for which we have been fighting in our opposition to subsidies. If Congress would provide subsidies and the farmer would accept them, the farmer's prices would be kept below parity and the department would control the market and keep the heavy hand of dictatorial regimentation on the farmer. They would keep the farmer dangling on the end of a line baited with incentive payments. And when the war is over they would discontinue subsidy payments and knock the bottom out of farm prices just as they did in 1920. But if the farmer declines to take the bait and Congress refuses incentive payments then they will give the farmer a fair price in the open market. That is what this press release says they now propose to do, providing Congress continues to refuse money for subsidies.

The press release distinctly states—and it was given out at Department of Agriculture headquarters—that these new prices "replace incentive payments because funds for such payments have not been provided by Congress."

That is what we are deciding here today—whether the farmer will have a fair price in the open market which he can maintain after the war, or whether he will be brought to heel by baited hand-outs to be discontinued, and the farmer thrown to the wolves as he was after the last war.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to yield to my colleague but I have only a minute or two remaining. If there is time, I shall be glad to yield later.

But the most salutary effect of the denial of subsidy payments by the Congress is the reluctant compliance by the Department with the Price Control Act of October 1942. In this law, passed in the House and Senate and signed by the President, Congress directed that if at any time it became necessary to increase the production of any agricultural commodity, such increase should be secured by increasing the price in the open market. That law had been consistently ignored, and they would continue to ignore it if we agreed to this appropriation of $100,000,000 for subsidy payments. But when it became apparent in the last few weeks that Congress would adhere to its purpose of refusing subsidies, then—in compliance with the express provisions of the statute—they announce, at last, an increase in prices in the open market instead of incentive payments out of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry, but my time is almost up. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Mr. Chairman, the vital consideration here is the provision of a system of price control under which we can maintain parity prices at the close of the war.

Since the disastrous collapse of farm prices following the last war—a collapse which eventually involved the entire Nation—we have been waging a fight to secure legislation which will protect agriculture after the war similar to legislation already secured by every other group and industry. Little by little we have won our fight until even before the war we had secured an approach to parity of most agricultural products. We must perfect that legislation to withstand the shock of the price blockbusters which will fall all over America following the close of this war.

Already in the Committee on Appropriations we are insisting that every contract for war supplies shall contain a cancelation clause under which production can be promptly discontinued when peace is declared.

The night the telegram comes announcing that an armistice has been signed, telegrams will flash to every manufacturer of war munitions in the United States.

Instantly production will cease, their doors will close, and out upon the street will pour millions of men—men who have been drawing the highest wages in history, but who will then be without a job.

We must throw out upon the streets and highways of this country 20,000,000 men who have been getting top wages for years. From across the seas we will bring millions more. And here at home we will demobilize the remainder of our Army of more than 11,000,000 men—men who must get back in civilian life and find a job.

Simultaneously we will discontinue the shipment abroad every day of millions of dollars' worth of foodstuffs. The amount of food we are producing today is unparalleled in the history of any country. We are producing today one-third more hogs than we produced in normal times. We are producing vast surplus quanties of every kind of food and when the war is over it must be thrown back on our domestic markets and all too frequently where there is no one with a job, no one with a purchasing power to buy it.

What is going to happen? You do not have to ask what is going to happen. You know by sad experience what is going to happen. We are going to have vast surpluses of everything in the world the farmer produces with nowhere to market it, nobody to buy it, and nobody to pay for it. What will naturally follow? Unless we establish and maintain now a price system we can maintain in that dark hour you are going to have nickel cotton, 5-cent hogs, 6-cent eggs, 30-cent wheat, and everything else in proportion. Unless we now take steps to prevent it another agricultral holocaust is as certain to follow the end of the war as day follows night.

We have only one life line, only one recourse. And that is to completely eschew subsidies and establish parity prices by floors in the same category with the floors under wages, railroad rates, coal, and every other safeguard of group income established by law.

Nor let us not ignore the source from which these proposed subsidies are to be drawn. Every dollar for these subsidy payments must be derived from the sale of bonds or from taxes. They must come from the taxpayer's pockets. We are just launching the greatest war-loan drive in history. Thirteen billion dollars must be raised in the next few weeks. And we hope to bring on the floor next week a record-breaking tax bill. Every dollar must be squeezed from the people that the traffic will bear. People are willing to be taxed to support our armies abroad, but they are not willing to be taxed for subsidies. Do you want to add in this bill to the already staggering burden of taxes which the Nation must pay when the farmers themselves are demanding that subsidies be abolished?

This bill appropriates $300,000,000 for soil conservation. If you take away the $100,000,000 for incentive payments there will be only $200,000,000 left for soil conservation. But if you adopt this amendment then you will have the full $300,000,000 for soil conservation and you will have an extra $100,000,000 for the farmers out of the increase in prices which Administrator Chester Davis promises if subsidies are not voted.

Let me plead with all who are friends of the farmer, and all who have any regard for the United States Treasury, and all who are friends of the taxpayer, to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how soon is the gentleman going to ask that debate be limited?

Mr. TARVER. At such time as I feel the House or the Committee desires some limitation imposed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are we going to have any more 15-minute requests?

Mr. TARVER. I am not advised as to what other members of the Committee may have in mind as to the submission of requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, you might just as well strike out from the bill this reduced appropriation of $300,000,000 as to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. What is a subsidy? What is an incentive payment? There is, of course, a difference of opinion among gentlemen as to whether or not the soil-conservation-practices benefits which are included in this program are subsidies. There are differences of opinion as to whether or not other benefits provided in the program which has been carried on for several years and which is projected for the next fiscal year are incentive payments.

When a farmer engages in certain soil-conservation practices, such as the planting of legumes, the liming of his soil, the construction of terraces, all of which increase the value of his land, and the Government pays him some amount on account of the labor and materials which he has used in carrying out those practices, there are a great many people who consider that to be a subsidy to the farmer. I have never felt that that is true. I have always believed that it is the expenditure of public money to assist the farmer in the conservation of national resources and that in his labor and in his expense and in the materials that he uses in carrying on these practices he furnishes a consideration for the sums of money that are granted to him, and that the funds so paid him should not be considered as subsidies.

But do you know whether the Comptroller General is going to rule that that sort of a payment is a subsidy or not? There is ground for legal construction of such payments as subsidy payments, and it is entirely possible that the making of such payments might be prohibited if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is adopted.

Consider next the question of incentive payments. Perhaps these payments to which I have just referred are incentive payments. Perhaps they are payments which are calculated to offer an incentive to the farmer to improve his lands. They might be so construed by the Comptroller General.

We come next, however, to the payments which are the so-called crop acreage payments, the amounts which are allocated to the producers of the major commodities under the program projected for the next fiscal year, to the payments contemplated for the production in connection with the production of these major commodities of the so-called essential war crops.

I have previously stated in argument on this bill that in my judgment those payments may be properly described as incentive payments. Do you desire to prohibit them? On yesterday you rejected an amendment to the bill which would have cut the amount $100,000,000 and would have reduced them, at least. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on the floor yesterday, made certain statements with regard to whether or not the Government had entered into a contract with these farmers with which I respectfully differ, although I admit that there are some statements in the hearings sustaining the position which he assumed.

I insist that in the announcement of this original program on December 5, 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture made no statement whatever that that program was dependent upon the appropriation of money to carry out the Depart-

ment's obligations by the Congress. If you will turn to page 3359 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the RECORD of Wednesday of this week, you will find that I inserted in the RECORD the Secretary's announcement, and if you will examine that announcement carefully you will find that it contains no such limitation and no intimation of there being any further action by Congress necessary in order to enable him to carry out this program. As a matter of fact, it is, I think, generally agreed—as far as I know, nobody disputes it—that he had the authority to make the announcement and that he was not restricted under law in making the announcement, as to whether or not the Congress should subsequently appropriate funds. That authority apparently was given him, as I have previously pointed out, under section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Let me read the first part of this announcement, and I hope you will read it all:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ANNOUNCES THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY'S 1943 ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT RATES

Rates of payment to farmers cooperating with the crop-production adjustment phase of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's 1943 war program were announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Farmers may earn these production adjustment payments in 1943 by complying with their Agricultural Adjustment Agency's acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

In connection with the announcement, the specific rates which will be paid are set out in a table which is published on the same page.

The farmers have accepted that offer. Does that constitute a contract or not? What right do we have to repudiate it? That is a question which I think ought to attract your serious consideration before you either adopt this amendment or make any reduction in the funds which have been provided for complying with these contracts.

Talk about being opposed to subsidies and incentive payments. I questioned the representatives of the farm organizations carefully regarding that subject matter. They did not announce that they were opposed to subsidy and incentive payments, without this qualification in each case, "In lieu of fair prices in the market place." They are opposed to subsidies and incentive payments in lieu of fair prices in the market place. But we do not have fair prices in the market place, and we have no assurance that fair prices in the market place are going to be provided in the near future.

No Member of the House can rely upon the evidence of representatives of these farm organizations, saying that they were opposed to these subsidy and indemnity payments in lieu of fair market prices, as justifying him in voting to eliminate all payments which might be under some construction called subsidy or indemnity payments in the pending program.

Not subsidize agriculture? Assume that is desirable. But you are subsidizing industry. Indemnity payments are being made in industry today to workers to stimulate their activities. Subsidy payments are being made to the producers of copper and other strategic materials, and in many other ways production in industry is being stimulated by the making of incentive or subsidy payments.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to suggest as an example the Maritime Commission and its program of subsidies for shipping.

Mr. TARVER. That is true.

Perhaps those practices are wrong. Perhaps the practices we embarked upon in the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the prior passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act were all wrong; but we have not amended those laws, we have not repealed those laws. We have induced the farmers of the country to believe that we propose to carry on this program year after year, and we have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to announce it and to commit the Government to these obligations.

Now it is proposed at one fell swoop first to make an appropriation of $300,000,000 to carry out the purposes of these acts and then to adopt in that appropriation a limitation which in all probability will prohibit the making of any of the payments provided for from the $300,000,000 fund.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the egentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman agrees, then, that this $300,000,000 or a great portion of it could be used for incentive payments or subsidies under the present bill?

Mr. TARVER. As I said on yesterday I think the $300,000,000 could be used in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for carrying out the purposes designated in the Agriculture Adjustment Act or in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I think there is no question whatever about that. Whether those payments are subsidies, whether they are incentive payments, that is a question upon which I am not undertaking to pass. But if this amendment should be adopted, it would have to be passed upon by the Comptroller General. If he should say that they are all subsidies or that they are all incentive payments, you might as well not appropriate $300,000,000 or any other sum. You might as well strike the appropriation from the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TARVER. No; I think not. I want to get along with the debate. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I would like to know is whether the distinguished chairman is in favor of paying incentive payments, as he understands them. I understand that this amendment is intended to strike out all payment of what we have understood to be incentive payments.

Mr. TARVER. What I would like to see is the farmer get his fair price in the market place, and until that I am in favor of having this program which has been authorized by the Congress and under which we have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments in behalf of the Government carried out, and I think it would be a bad thing for the Congress to undertake to repudiate that program which it has authorized. We should repeal the law or amend it, if we want to make this change.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to know how much, in the opinion of the gentleman—and I think he knows—of the $300,000,000 will be absorbed in the soil-conservation payments themselves.

Mr. TARVER. That would be, as I previously explained, in my judgment, a matter in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. He could not meet all of the obligations which he has assumed with this $300,000,000 because he has assumed obligations totaling $400,000,000 in amount, including administrative expenses.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then aside from the incentive payments.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know what you would call incentive payments. Will the gentleman tell me whether a man who undertakes to improve his land by the planting of legumes would be said to receive incentive payments under the circumstances?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would say to the gentleman that any payments made to a farmer for soil conservation are not incentive payments within meaning of the common use of the word. Nobody but a lawyer would contend otherwise.

Mr. TARVER. That is a matter on which the Comptroller General would have to pass.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in accord with the chairman of the subcommittee, that the farmer should receive an adequate price in the market place. Is there anything in the law now that would prevent the Price Administration from fixing that kind of a price for the farmer's products?

Mr. TARVER. They can fix a maximum price for the product that would be a fair price, but whether a product such as wheat or corn would move on upward to that price that had been fixed is at least debatable, inasmuch as you have such a tremendous surplus of wheat and corn today.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. I can tell the gentleman of an incentive payment that can be defined as such, that no man could dispute. I never saw any hemp grown in my part of Kentucky until recently.

They came out there and got them to grow so many acres and they pay them a certain number of dollars for their seed crop, and this year they have cut down the crop and agreed to give them a certain price. That is an incentive payment.

Mr. TARVER. I think this amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I think this amendment enters dangerous ground at this time. It may imperil the production of badly needed vegetables. I see here the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. Within the past 2 weeks he has appointed a special committee of 40 among the minority Members to study the problem of food. Within the past week I have attended three meetings of the committee or subcommittees of that committee. The facts brought before us would indicate that a year from today we may face a very serious vegetable shortage in this country. Today you cannot buy potatoes in the city of Washington.

I have here the latest survey of intentions to plant for this year. Take the situation on dried beans and potatoes. It is not good. I see the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. Last year the State of Nebraska had 38,000 acres in beans. The goal for this year is 100,000 acres. Today, under the intentions to plant, there are only 83,000 acres signed up. Those are signed up on the basis of payments embodied in or affected by the money appropriated in this bill.

Take your potato-crop situation. The farmer is promised that if he plants and produces between 90 and 110 percent of his potato goal he will get 50 cents a bushel extra for a portion of them. He may get some from the A. A. A. and some through operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has funds in this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He gets 20 percent of his increased acreage.

Mr. CASE. So he is dependent, in part, upon the incentive or insurance encouragement proposed in this bill. Today he is out trying to buy seed potatoes. Adopt this amendment and say none of the money in this bill can be used for these programs, and you throw an element of uncertainty into the potato plans of every farmer. Shall he buy seed? Shall he plant other crops on these acres? This is the practical problem he faces and we face.

If we want to say that the O. P. A. should let prices go up in the market and provide incentives that way for next year, that is one thing, but to say this shall apply for this crop season, is a very dangerous thing.

If we want to say, you cannot use any of this money in this bill to set up an incentive program for next year, that would be a different matter, but to come in now and say in the midst of the planting plans for this season, none of this money can be used to carry out a planting program now under way, may put on this House a responsibility for the vegetable shortage that threatens us a year from today.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman quoted figures for Nebraska, indicating that the intention would be considerably less than the objective. That may be true for the State as a whole, but I have reports from the crop-production committees in my district indicating that they will go over the objective; but that is under the program outlined in the Secretary's statement of December 2. I agree with the gentleman that I fear this amendment will go too far and retard the program that the crop-production committees in my district have set out to do.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and we should think carefully before we rock the boat at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are some facts in connection with our present food situation and with reference to our price situation that I feel should be brought thoroughly to the attention of the House. They seem to have escaped the "long hairs," the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, and the office of Director Byrnes. This is the picture. The more times you have a subsidy, with the ever-increasing purchasing power on the part of the people, the more you encourage unnecessary consumption and the more you contribute to a scarcity. Scarcity is the prime basis for uncontrolled inflation. That is what you are leading to with subsidies and incentive payments. The farmer should be given a fair and honest price for what he raises. The way for us to bring about that situation is to get rid of this highly inflationary and incentive scheme and the way to get that situation corrected immediately is to stand up and say we are going to do business right.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield at this time. I want to get this across, and I do not have time.

We have had all sorts of doubts thrown in, doubts as to whether something means what it says or not; whether the language that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has submitted means that soil conservation payments cannot be made. Frankly, I do not believe that is so. It is my opinion that it is not so. The thing that disturbs me is that those who have argued against it say they do not know whether it means that or not. I would hate to come before the House and express that position, because I believe that at this time we should have positive and definite ideas as a result of reading the language that is presented to us, and not wander all over the lot.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman believe the Cannon amendment would include soil conservation payments?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe that it would prevent soil-conservation payments. I do not have any idea that it would, because it is placed in there after a direct order to the Government to use the money for that particular purpose. There is nothing whatever to say that when you directly and deliberately provide that a certain thing shall be done, a reservation, unless it absolutely prohibits that thing, would not accomplish that purpose. That is a fundamental rule of legal construction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Has not the gentleman from New York always regarded these soil-conservation payments as a subsidy to agriculture—all through the years?

Mr. TABER. Certainly I have.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has?

Mr. TABER. I have; but these are not subsidy payments within the legal definition.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to the gentleman that in hearings yesterday before the House Committee on Military Affairs the vice president of the United Automobile Workers, Mr. Goldstein, who is likewise a member of the War Labor Board, stated that they were proceeding to put in a system downtown of incentive payments, both to labor and industry, in face of the fact that we are on the highest wage scale we have ever seen in this country, and they are doing it, as I construe it, without authority of law. I wonder if the gentleman does not really mean that price is the great incentive to production, and that when prices are high like they are, and the demand unlimited, subsidies are not necessary?

Mr. TABER. That is absolutely correct. This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we ascertain in what direction the gentleman intends to modify the amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to several Members on this side who think there is a possibility that the last clause of the amendment might involve other payments—although I am convinced it does not, under the strictest interpretation of the rule—I ask to strike out all of the amendment after the words "incentive payments." There can then be no doubt that it applies to anything but incentive payments, and in that way the issue will be so clearly drawn as to preclude apprehension as to any other interpretation.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia. I seldom have that privilege.

Mr. TARVER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I think we ought to meet this problem not by changing the verbiage of amendments and changing the issue after argument already has been had, but by submission of a new amendment after one is rejected, and I think we should have a vote on this proposition submitted by the gentleman from Missouri. Then if he wants to submit another amendment, we can pass on that. I object to the modification.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I ask unanimous consent that the vote be now taken on the amendment in order to expedite consideration and determine whether the House approves or disapproves of incentive payments.

Mr. FULMER and Mr. COOLEY objected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman permit a request at this time that all other Members who wish to speak on this amendment have 3 additional minutes, 8 minutes instead of 5?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to submit that request I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak subsequently on this amendment have 8 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the gentleman knows I shall have to object to that. I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right. The gentleman got his 15 minutes; now he wants to cut everybody else off.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I did not object to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina; I just objected to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that every Member have 8 minutes instead of 5 whether they wanted it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to object to any Member speaking more than 5 minutes, the rest of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas object to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. As I understand, the gentleman from North Carolina had been granted unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes. Am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the gentleman's inquiry the Chair states that permission was refused on objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Was not that request reconsidered?

The CHAIRMAN. The request was objected to when it was submitted the second time.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New York made a very forthright effort to curtail this provision by striking out $100,000,000. We now have before this House a very insidious and dangerous amendment sponsored by one who professes to be the best friend of the farmers of the Nation in this body, the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations. I earnestly sympathize with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who has labored so hard in behalf of the farmers of this country. Every time he comes before this House he faces the necessity of contending and contesting with the chairman of the full committee.

We may as well be fair about this. There are many Members of this House who have always regarded this entire appropriation as a subsidy to agriculture. If it is so regarded by the sponsor of this amendment he knows and knows well that under this amendment the entire appropriation will go out of the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was frank enough to admit that he has always regarded these appropriations as subsidies. This is a very comprehensive amendment. I know the fundamental philosophy which generated the passage of this act back in 1938. It was not so regarded by the committee that sponsored it nor by the House at the time it passed it.

We cannot ascertain accurately the value of an acre of topsoil. As we look down the long corridors of time into the future there is no mathematician who can determine the cash value of an acre of land. We have regarded this appropriation as a national investment in the greatest natural resource the Nation possesses, to wit, the topsoil, the fertile topsoil of American farm land, and we have passed these bills year after year for the purpose of enabling poor struggling farmers to protect and to build up their topsoil for future generations. We have looked on the dead lands of other countries and we were mindful of the fact then that we here in America were likewise mining our own topsoil. Under this program the topsoil of America has been enhanced in value countless billions of dollars. This is one of the greatest investments this country has ever made.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The engineering experts tell us that half the national wealth in the way of topsoil at least has been lost within the last 300 years.

Mr. COOLEY. Such information was submitted to the committee at the time this bill was originally introduced.

Mr. HARE. And they state that if it is not restored and if the erosion continues for another 300 years we shall not then be able to support the population on the soil we have.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman's position is entirely correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. A lot has been said of late about turning the farmers loose. During World War No. 1 we broke sod and planted land to corn and wheat that never should have been planted at all, and we had the dust storms we all remember that almost destroyed certain sections of our country. We also remember the floods that came because of the rapid run-off of water, and we had to appropriate billions of dollars in order to meet this awful menace to our country. Unless we continue this soil conservation program we shall face the same situation a few years in the future that we faced after World War No. 1.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank my friend for his observation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter, a matter that addresses itself to the good judgment of the membership of this House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has referred to the matter under consideration as the soil conservation program. I assume that he includes in that statement the fact that the soil conservation legislation was enacted as a separate proposition and that later, because the control proposition of the A. A. A. was declared unconstitutional a part of that law was engrafted upon the Soil Conservation Act, the purpose being to give an appearance of constitutionality.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman seems to be thoroughly familiar with the history of the legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Which one is the gentleman talking about, control or soil conservation?

Mr. COOLEY. Soil conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain how many Members want to speak on the amendment. Fourteen gentlemen have risen. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment conclude in 70 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 70 minutes. Does the gentleman include all amendments thereto?

Mr. TARVER. And all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 70 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I mean amendments to this amendment, not amendments to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How much time is that going to give each Member?

The CHAIRMAN. Eighteen Members have stood. Seventy minutes have been allotted. A little short of 4 minutes to each of the Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in order for a gentleman who has had 15 minutes to try to limit the rest of us to a little short of 4 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEAGALL. The parliamentary inquiry I desire to submit is whether or not the request of the gentleman from Georgia did not contemplate that each Member requesting time would have the usual 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say in response to the gentleman's inquiry that the unanimous consent, regardless of what the gentleman had in mind, was for 70 minutes' time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I asked that all gentlemen desiring to speak rise, and 14 gentlemen rose. I then submitted the unanimous-consent request for 70 minutes. Now it appears 18 wish to be heard. I ask that the request be modified to provide an hour and a half debate, 5 minutes to each of the Members who want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member will be recognized for 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEBERG: Mr. KLEBERG moves to amend the pending amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri by striking out all after the words "incentive payments."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, in reality and in my conception the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri did not require amendment, but in order to clarify the atmosphere with reference to the possibility that his amendment might be tortured into a proposal to so limit the use of the $300,000,000 carried in this section of the bill as to not make it applicable to soil conservation work and authorized benefits, I have offered this amendment.

There is a very patent situation here before this House and one only. That is the question as to whether or not we are going to add to the tremendous system of wheels within wheels and increase the agencies which produce red tape and increase the restrictions by the continuation of uncertainty and confusion to those engaged in the production of the most vital of our present war needs, food.

You have a situation here before you at this moment to start putting this country back on a basis where men can truly work for it and not feel the ignominy or shame of having proffered to them without their request incentive payments for the sole purpose of performing their patriotic duty.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri if my amendment fails, because no one within the sound of my voice but who, deep down in his heart, knows that in legal construction there is nothing wider from the intention of that amendment than to prevent the use of the $300,000,000 for soil-conservation purposes. There cannot be and there never has been any doubt but that the Nation intends to conserve the source of its wealth to serve a vital interest.

I would like to call your attention to a situation which recently arose in this House when my good friend from Georgia [Mr. PACE] found himself in a position with reference to trying to help in the production of peanuts, when the peanut bill came on this floor, occasioned entirely, Mr. Chairman, by a system under which we function now, when by reason of the actual impact of Government and the confusion occasioned by the operation of the O. P. A. with reference to peanuts, it became necessary for this Congress to undertake to adopt legislation to rectify a situation which arose entirely because of legislative abuse of the fundamental principles upon which this Nation has been based and upon which it is to stand if it is to stand. The continuation of incentive payments if permitted to go on, and if this amendment is voted down, will bring about a situation which will bring greater injury to the war effort of this country than, in my candid opinion, could be accomplished or will be accomplished by Hitler and Hirohito combined.

I am for this amendment, Mr. Chairman, because it brings us back to an opportunity to do things the American way.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to mean that he is for the soil-conservation payments but against any of this money being used for incentive payments?

Mr. KLEBERG. Entirely so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Kleberg amendment. In the form in which the Cannon amendment was originally offered, it would not only have prevented the use of incentive payments this year, but by reason of the latter part of the amendment would have prohibited the use of any funds for the administration of all of the price support programs; I mean by that the programs which have been inaugurated under the provisions of the Steagall amendment to the bill which increased the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation back in 1941.

Under that program there have been inaugurated price supports on all the oil seed crops, flax, soybeans, and peanuts, and on practically all fruits and vegetables, on potatoes in particular, and I think there are some other commodities upon which price supports have been placed. That has been done under a bill which passed this House without a dissenting vote. It is a program which has been approved by Congress and one which is in operation, one which if discontinued might very seriously affect our food production this year. It could conceivably bring about a crisis in food production.

The Kleberg amendment strikes out that provision. If the Kleberg amendment is adopted, I shall support the amendment as amended, which simply provides that none of the funds in this appropriation or any other appropriation in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As I understand, with the Kleberg amendment adopted, the amendment would mean that the soil-building program would be maintained and these funds would be available for the soil-building program.

Mr. HOPE. That is my understanding, that nothing would be affected except incentive payments. The soil-building program would be maintained and the various price support programs would be maintained.

Mr. PACE. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri would sustain that interpretation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that the gentleman from Kansas has stated the matter accurately. That was the purpose and purport of the original amendment. And the Kleberg amendment clarifies the situation beyond any possibility of misconstruction.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the House appreciates his assurance in that regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. If the Kleberg amendment is adopted and then the original amendment is adopted, can

this money be used for any other purpose than soil conservation?

Mr. HOPE. It can be used for any of the purposes which are authorized under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, but it cannot be used for incentive payments, which in my opinion are not authorized under that act. It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture contends that incentive payments could be lawfully made under that act. This would prevent that from being done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, during the years I have served in Congress I have had the privilege of observing the operations of many of the Members who have gone along with me from year to year, for instance, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I want to be frank. The gentleman from New York is still sticking to his guns, because he has always opposed practically any appropriation that included the word "farmer."

I cannot exactly understand the recent position of my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] after watching him running all around over the lot here today taking clearly the opposite side from what he has always taken during these years in connection with farm legislation. Now that he has changed his mind I find him riding in the same boat and sleeping beautifully and satisfactorily in the same bed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

This puts me in the same position as a certain laborer on one occasion down in South Carolina—my State. This laborer, in coming in for his meals, was placed in the kitchen at a table. One day he came in and for some unknown reason was ushered into the dining room. He took his seat and looked around and viewed the contents of the table and remarked, "Good Lord, how times have changed."

I notice in section 8 of this bill that the only way a farmer can go to the Federal land bank or some of these other lending agencies to secure a loan if this section remains in the bill is, first, he has to make application to a bank, corporation, or insurance company, and if he is turned down, then the Federal land banks or these other agencies can make him a loan.

When we had a serious depression and all of these corporations, banks, and insurance companies were loaded with what they thought to be worthless paper loans to farmers, they joined with other interests and came to the Congress, stating: "Do something for the farmer." They were interested in creating these lending agencies with the hope that they may be bailed out of their serious situation, and they got what they wanted.

Now there is plenty of money in the banks and they say that the farmers are prosperous. In this situation, they want to wipe out all of these institutions and drive the farmers back to the banks, lending cooperatives, and insurance companies. Again may I state, "Good Lord, how times have changed."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] cracking the ceiling of the House, pleading long and loud, "Cut the soil conservation appropriation $100."

In other words, cancel our obligations to the farmers and save $100,000,000.

Just a few days ago this same gentleman was very active for the passage of a tax bill that would give back to a number of Wall Street millionaires 10 billions of dollars. Again, Mr. Chairman, in the language of the laborer, "Good Lord, how times have changed."

I call to the attention of the gentleman from New York that just a few days ago a statement was carried in the press that the Army seized all of the poultry products in the market places in the city of New York because these products could not be bought in quantities sufficient to take care of the Army.

I want to say to you in closing that you cannot keep them flying or keep them rolling unless you can keep them eating.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I come from the great State of Wisconsin, and that State has a rather large number of cows. We always have made an effort to milk the cows, and the people out there in that State do not lie awake nights and continually try to figure out schemes to milk the United States Treasury. I would like to get the question of incentive payments cleared up. This bill asks for $300,000,000, which amounts to $50 a farm. I do not think we want to discuss the good or bad features of the A. A. A. That is not a question involved. Regardless of how much money it has cost, if it has convinced the people of this country that they should take an interest in their soil, I think it has been well worthwhile. While I have never approved of spending so many millions of dollars on soil-depleting crops, and not supporting livestock production sufficiently, that question is not involved here today. The question involved here for every man to decide for himself is whether during this war he wants to tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and say to him that he must spend this money wholly on soil conservation, or whether you want him to spend $300,000,000 as he sees fit in order to get the most food that can be produced in order to win the war. I do not like to see anybody get so worried about this incentive business. We are doing it every day. We heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and his peanut bill here, which did not get by, and incentive payments are going on with the C. C. C., which is doing it. They are doing the same thing with hemp. Look up the hemp business, and you will see the incentive payments that are being made. I do not know of any way by which they will get a man to raise hemp, who never raised any hemp before, unless you give him enough to produce it. We need this hemp for rope for the Navy and we are paying an incentive to obtain it. Take the question of canned goods: I am quite sure that when this war is over somebody will get up in this Well and say that they gave the canners a subsidy during the war. The canners did not ask nor do they want a subsidy. I do not see why we should get so righteous today and try to stop these incentive payments if they are needed by Secretary Wickard.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have great respect for the gentleman's judgment on these matters. Do I understand that he favors the $300,000,000 provided in the bill, and along with it the permission for the expenditure of funds in addition to what we understand are used for soil-conservation purposes, as set forth in the 1938 act? In other words, he wants to pay what we have said here are incentive payments in addition to soil conservation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is not the picture. I said the question is whether you want to spend that $300,000,000 under the old agricultural program or whether you want to leave it to Secretary Wickard to use in his discretion as to what crops shall produce the food, and the qualities of crops he wants in order to win this war.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman realizes that we are subsidizing the canners in this country during the war. They have gone into a program by which the Commodity Credit puts the money into the hands of the canners and is subsidizing them. This is against their wishes, I am sure.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They are incentive payments, or subsidies, whichever sounds better.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And also Jesse Jones is subsidizing all oil that goes to the East, at $1 a barrel, in spite of the fact that the committee was not disposed to put a bill through the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois. I might say that as far as the $50 a farm to the farmers in this country is concerned, the O. P. A. is doing more to cut down production, while we are talking about this thing, than this bill will probably ever accomplish.

Mr. O'HARA. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the development of this hemp program the farmers have been signed up, and they have had to be given something in order to get them into the production of hemp, and they are incentive payments.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

We should give Secretary Wickard the opportunity to use these funds for producing food to win this war; we should not tie his hands by a control program when he desires to carry on a production program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret to see some of the developments that

we have witnessed in connection with this bill. It seems that the matter of committee jurisdiction has become involved in the consideration of this legislation. In that connection I might say that there are several provisions of this bill that I think invade the jurisdiction of the committee of which I am a member, but I want to say that, insofar as the matter of jurisdiction is concerned, I am more interested in preserving the jurisdiction and prerogatives of the legislative branch of this Government as such than I am in any controversy between the committees of this House. I am sorry to say that under existing conditions the one way we have of preserving the powers that belong to the Congress is through control of the Nation's purse. I do not have time to go into the details. This matter has been fought out over and over. At one time an approach was made by Mr. Henderson and his associate, Mr. Ginsburg, to obtain authority to use the methods that are now proposed in making up a parity price by permitting these payments to be made under Jesse Jones, the Federal Loan Administrator. They had such a provision in an amendment to a bill that was before the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was thrown out of the window by unanimous approval of that committee. The same provision was reported to the Senate as part of the same measure, enlarging the authorization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and after 2 days' debate it was rejected by the Senate. The proposal for subsidies has been fought out here until everybody understands it. Everybody knows the attitude of the Congress with respect to parity prices for the farmers of this country and everybody knows now that we never intended to allow the use of subsidies or so-called incentive payments in calculating parity for the purpose of fixing price ceilings on farm commodities.

When the first price-control legislation was passed, we were asked to grant unrestricted authority to fix the price of farm commodities, under the orders of the Price Administrator at that time. Certain limitations were adopted, but that bill contained a specific provision exempting labor from any action on the part of the Price Administrator. That provision remained in the bill without qualification until the recent price-control bill was passed. Wages were raised from time to time during all the months that this club was hanging over agricultural prices. This not only because of the authority itself to fix ceilings, but continuous threats were indulged in and carried in the press from one end of the country to the other. During all that time wages were permitted to rise, either as the result of demands or, as in some instances as the result of strikes, at a time when we were engaged in the manufacture of weapons for our boys who were risking their lives in the Nation's defense.

Now, what is proposed? That we will give the farmer a small subsidy or incentive. As far as the price level is concerned, it amounts to almost nothing. We are going to be put in the position of giving the farmers a few crumbs and putting them in the attitude of having sought aid in the form of gifts from the Federal Treasury, but while doing that we are to give substantial incentive payments that really count to everybody else.

The statement has been made recently that $2 a day will be handed out to industrial workers, not to make up a fair price for industrial workers, but to be added to the price that is considered fair. But it is intended to reduce the price that farmers would receive below parity which is agreed by everybody to be fair and just and only add to the reduced price incentive payments to make up the difference. That is what we are asked to do. That is the plan and the farmer is asked to come in and participate in that program. It is unfair, unjust, indefensible, and in open disregard of the will of Congress. I suggest that Members from the cotton States find out what is about to be done to cotton. Plans are being prepared now to reduce the price of cotton. The parity price of cotton now is 19.96 cents. Plans are under way to place ceilings on raw cotton at 18.76 cents and make up the difference by a C. P. payment of 1.2 cents. This is what is about to be done in the case of cotton. I think it well worth consideration of Members representing cotton-growing communities. I can assure you our people are going to be interested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, some 30 years ago the Lower House of Congress used to be the more progressive branch of Congress. They used to be the friends of labor and agriculture, and the Senate was more or less the conservative branch. Since I have been in Congress that has been reversed. I sincerely hope that I have not been the cause of that disease.

This is the third time that I have arisen to address the House since my withdrawal 2 years ago.

I feel that my experience and my contact with the people during those 2 years was wholesome and made me a better Congressman. I am only sorry that more of you could not have shared that vacation and that contact with me.

I feel that you older Members have been kept too close to the grindstone, to know what real America is thinking. You ought to take a leave of absence, a furlough for 6 months. Go back home and get acquainted with your constituents, with public opinion. Leave all your troubles, Ruml plan and all, with the newly elected Members, with us freshmen. We will take care of them.

We are not surprised over the wrangling between the Agricultural Committee and the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. They are all fagged out, too tired to know who's who, or which is which. The overambitious subcommittee in its zeal to annihilate the F. S. A., crop insurance, parity, and incentive payments for needed crops, forgot all about what is appropriation and what is legislation. They just went haywire. What is true of these committees is true of others.

The Ways and Means Committee wrangled for months to devise a tax-collecting scheme that would without pain extract 20 percent from the boys and girls that work on a subsistence wage. The committee labored and brought forth two mice, neither of which the Congress or the people wanted. Then the Judiciary Committee brought in the "gestapo" bill, a bill to circumvent the Constitution. It also brought in the labor-baiting bill.

In the name of war, Congress has done a lot of foolish things. It has surrendered authority to bureaucracy, that was not its to surrender. It has blindly appropriated billions for foreign nations, but when it deals with its own people it has become penny-wise and pound-foolish. Are we laboring under an inferior foreign complex, or are we still just plain American citizens? I can assure you that 90 percent of the people still believe in themselves, still have confidence in their Nation, in America.

Agriculture is not a partisan question. Most of the things we eat, drink, or wear are the products of toil and soil. They are neither Republican nor Democratic. I have always felt that partisanship should end on election day. After the election those of us who are honored with a public trust should just become plain citizens. Our only motive should be the best interests of our Nation.

I am afraid the Subcommittee on Appropriations has given us just the debit side of the ledger of the F. S. A., crop insurance, and incentive payments. They have told us about the expenditures and probable losses. They have not given us the credit side, or told us how many farm families were saved or restored, who would have otherwise become a public charge. They have not told us how much it would cost us to take care of these as public charges. They have not told us how much it cost private insurance companies to get a start and be put on a paying basis.

They have built up the same picture against the F. S. A. and crop insurance as certain propagandists built up against labor. These informed us that labor refused to work more than 40 hours a week, but, a little investigation showed that many people worked from 60 to 80 hours a week in war industries. It further developed that it was mostly under the cost-plus contracts that labor did not work over 40 hours. This is not because of the refusal of labor, but because the employers discovered that the bigger the cost the bigger the plus.

Then these same propagandists started in on another falsehood. They again built up the debit side, but not the credit side. They accused labor of absentee-

ism. They built up quite a case, but when the credit side of the ledger was shown, it developed that most absenteeism was due to the fact that there were many new employees who were injured, many of them killed, handling complicated machinery that they were not accustomed to.

Then it was discovered that considerable more absenteeism was caused by the employees wasting their time chasing around to comply with rules and regulations of the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. It was discovered that a great deal of their time was wasted because of the time it took them to get to and from their places of employment. This was due to lack of housing conditions and transportation because of lack of tires and gasoline.

The Farm Security Administration, with all its faults, has been the best of all the farm set-ups. It helped the farmers who needed help. That is one thing the Federal land banks do not do. I know that the F. S. A. has reestablished and saved hundreds of farm homes. If both sides of the ledger had been fairly shown, I am satisfied that the account would have been fairly well balanced. There is room for improvement, but I think the Appropriations Committee had better leave that legislation to the proper committee, the Committee on Agriculture.

Whether crop insurance is going to be a success or failure is too early to show. Mistakes have been made. So have private companies made mistakes. I have no doubt that many of these mistakes have been corrected if both sides of the ledger had been shown us. I repeat the function of a subcommittee or any other committee is not to come on the floor here showing just one side of the ledger and then finding fault with any Member who does his duty and attempts to show both sides.

I am not one to stick to technicalities, if that legislation had been good legislation I would be for it. But it is bad legislation. We have heard a lot about incentive payments. What are incentive payments? Cost-plus contracts are incentive payments. I have not heard anybody object to those. We remitted hundreds of thousands of dollars to the railroads and to the Federal Reserve banks in franchise taxes. Those were incentive remittances, but nobody objected to those; that was all right. The only time you want to retrench is when you want to retrench at the expense of agriculture.

We talk about incentive payments. Whether right or wrong your Government went into North Dakota and in January called the farmers together and asked them to produce more flax and signed a contract with them agreeing to pay them certain amounts additional if they would produce that which the War Department wanted; and now you are going to renege on it and these farmers have already written me by the hundreds. They want to know whether if the Government can violate its contract it is still binding on them and whether they still have to produce the flax which is a risky crop.

I want to know whether we are going to keep our word. You may say that the officials had no business signing those contracts, but they did sign them and you have not punished them for doing it. They have made that promise and Uncle Sam's "John Hancock" is on that agreement. That is one reason why I am opposed to this amendment.

The Farm Security Administration has helped more than 40,000 low-income farmers in North Dakota obtain the means to continue farming. Feed, seed, livestock, and equipment have been made available to them through the rural rehabilitation program which they would otherwise be unable to obtain.

The success of this program in North Dakota is attested by the progress which these families have made. The average borrower was only making a net income of $428 the year before he received his first loan, but made $1,362 in 1941. His net worth increased from $543 to $1,105 during this same period.

The total amount of money which has been lent to individuals in North Dakota under the rural rehabilitation program amounted to $15,589,852, as of February 28, 1943. Of this amount almost one-half has already been repaid, namely, $7,263,567. This represents 88 percent of the amount of matured principal.

But the success of this program should be measured not only by the financial progress which the borrowers have achieved but also by the real contributions made in the production of essential war commodities. Seventy-eight percent of the Farm Security Administration borrowers received over one-fourth of their income from dairy enterprises in 1941; 41 percent received over one-fourth of their income from beef. These enterprises are undergoing rapid expansion. In 1942 the 7,000 active borrowers who had a full crop year on the program increased their production of milk 22 percent; of pork, 82 percent; of beef, 53 percent; and of flax, 273 percent. It is significant to note that these increases were made by F. S. A. borrowers, who constitute only 9.4 percent of all North Dakota farmers, according to the 1940 census, and were much greater than their proportionate share of the increases made by all farmers.

Preliminary estimates indicate that there was a decrease of milk production by all farmers in the State; that the increased production of pork by all farmers was 56,300,000 pounds, of which 6,850,000 pounds, or 12 percent, were contributed by F. S. A. borrowers; and that the increased production of beef by all farmers was 16,600,000 pounds, of which 7,800,000 pounds, or 47 percent, was contributed by F. S. A. borrowers.

The total value of this increase in production achieved by these borrowers, during one year, of commodities which the country badly needs, is much greater than the amount of money which has been lent. The value of the increased production of milk, pork, eggs, chickens, and beef alone amounted to more than $5,000,000, compared to loans made during the year in the amount of $2,294,157.

The Farm Security Administration has also made loans in North Dakota, under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to 305 low-income farmers for the purchase of family-type farms, as of December 31, 1942. Collections on these loans, not including extra payments, have amounted to 98 percent of the matured principal and interest. A total of $2,037,535 has been lent in this State under the farm ownership program, to be repaid in 40 years, and $113,964 had been repaid on the principal as of December 31, 1942, not including extra payments, which amounted to $10,053.

A large percentage of the total grants made by the Farm Security Administration went to farmers of the Dakotas during the drought years, when more than half the rural population of these two States at one time or another received assistance from this agency. In 1938, to help North Dakota farmers recover from the drought disaster, 311,000 grant payments were made, totaling $7,128,752. As farmers recovered from their difficulties, the need for grants progressively declined. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, only 638 grants were made in this State. The standard program of supervised credit, on the other hand, was helping the small farmers of North Dakota increase their food production to record high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, the term "incentive" payment is yet too flexible a term to have a fixed meaning. This amendment would prohibit any incentive payment. Some call soil conservation incentive payments, and others say not. Some call parity a subsidy, some call it an incentive, and others say it is neither. We have just experienced a different interpretation between Congress and the executive branch as to whether soil-conservation payment was a deductible item from parity price.

Mr. Chairman, no court and no department has yet defined "incentive payment." I had a conversation with two of my constituents. One said he was violently opposed to incentive payments; the other said he was not. After they wrestled with it for a while they found out there was no disagreement on any point. What is incentive payment? It has not been defined; it has not been departmentally, officially defined. If for no other reason the language is dangerous, not knowing what breadth its future interpretation might be. Even before the war emergency some of the departments made strange and unexpected interpretations of many bills passed by Congress. We are likely to have still more of the same. Parity, soil conservation, special agreements for special crops on which we are short, loans, and nearly every other aid to the farmer may easily be construed as a subsidy and incentive, or both. Since many bills are being reenacted to avoid constructions never intended by Congress, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri should be more specifically defined; and if not done, other unexpected

trouble is likely to arise as to what it includes; and unless agreement is reached as to what is meant, I will have to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Caroline [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have always followed with confidence the leadership of the great chairman on appropriations. I listened today with intense interest to his 15-minute speech, and I must say it is the first time I have ever listened to him and had hir confuse me. He speaks of fair prices to the farmer on the open market. That we certainly have not had. And under present O. P. A. ceiling the farmer is being penalized.

I am fundamentally opposed to subsidies; but subsidies we have, and it looks as if subsidies will always continue. We marched up the hill with agriculture, but today it looks as if we are marching back down the hill, for eventually the farmer will be in the same place that we found him when this administration came into power.

I cannot see in these incentive payments any difference than those carried in other appropriation bills to provide funds for the building, construction, preparation, and so forth, for the War Department, Navy Department, and merchant marine, and for industries that are necessary to the war effort. The payments that we propose to make the farmers under this provision are for crops that are necessary to be raised to promote the war. So if he cannot get a fair price for them on the open market, then I am for giving him this subsidy, or whatever it may be called. We are making a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is it not a fact that we are unable to import these necessary protein feeds from any country in the world?

Mr. BONNER. There is no other place that we can get them, and such payments as these will assure them.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We must either produce them or we must go without.

Mr. BONNER. It is essential that we produce them. Speaking of the farmer, Mr. Chairman, it is rather strange that our own Federal Government has sent agents out rurally to solicit his help to take them away from the rural districts and carry them into the cities for industrial purposes with incentives of high pay. This idea about creating a farm army is the most absurd thing that a person could think of. You just do not make a farmer anywhere else but in the rural area and on the farm. He has got to love farming, and with fair treatment he wants to stay there. The inducement is great that he leave home and go into the city at subsidized prices. No one is offering the farm laborer a subsidy. He has got to stay there and toil, sweat, and work for the love of farming, for the love of his country. It is far beyond me to understand how anyone can object to these payments if he does not object to all the payments that have been carried heretofore in appropriation bills. After all, gentlemen, the farmer is the backbone of our country. He is entitled to fair and just legislation—equal to that accorded labor and industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we all understand the need for food and the question seems to be whether we are to rely upon the farmers to produce it or upon the Department of Agriculture. Some of us remember when the Triple A of the Department of Agriculture began killing little pigs, plowing under cotton, and limiting the acreage of corn and wheat. Some of us know now what happened when the Department of Agriculture turned its hand to farming and carried on the agricultural business instead of letting the farmers do it. Do you remember how not so long ago they were going to limit potato planting? Now, if the farmers are to be permitted to produce food, and it would be my idea to let somebody who knows somethin„ about it do it, they will undoubtedly produce all they can and they would like to have a fair price. A fair price must include the cost of the labor of the farmer and all those who work with him.

How are the farmers to get a fair price for the things they grow? Are they to get it through the open market or through subsidy payments? That seems to be the issue here today. Will the bureaucrats cease trying to ignore the law of supply and demand, the laws of nature, or will they continue to buck both?

The Department of Agriculture some time ago repealed the laws that nature has had in force for many years. That is, it made an effort to do so. It also attempted a repeal of the law of supply and demand, but their repealer has not seemed to work very well. The old laws are still in force. The Department's orders have failed to bring more or less rain or sunshine.

It looks to the outsider as though the purpose of the Department down here, the Triple A, and the purpose of those committeemen back in the districts, is to perpetuate themselves in office. Almost all of the Members of this House have been yelling at one time or another about the bureaucrats. A whole lot of this money is going to be used, if you have incentive payments to keep these bureaucrats traveling around trying to find somebody to take it. Is it not true now that the Department of Agriculture wants these incentive payments, instead of letting the farmer's production be increased by higher prices, to make dogs or something like that out of the farmers. You know, when you feed the dog you make him stand up or roll over and he does his little tricks in order to get something to eat. The Department of Agriculture has for several years been whipping the farmers into line. It makes them sit up, lie down, and roll over. If they do not comply with every whim of the bureaucrats, comply with all the bureaucrats' orders, rules, and directives, they do not get the payments. If you sell a bushel of wheat over what you are told to sell you are in trouble because the fellow happened to make a mistake in measuring acreage before the wheat was sown. They come around and measure the acreage after the wheat is grown, and if the last wheel pusher does not agree with the first, the farmer is out of luck. So then you have to run down to the Triple A headquarters downtown and you have to kiss the big boss' foot in that office in order to get the payment. You do not always get it then, not if he has some other fellow that he thinks has a reason why you should not have it. But we know how those things work out in the country. Why not just cut out this subsidy payment, which is nothing more nor less than a bribe, and which puts the farmer at the mercy of these petty politicians throughout the country, which lets them say whether or not he shall do this, that, or the other, which gives them a chance to say whether the farmer's boy is an essential worker on the farm or goes into the Army.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that is what they are doing. And they are spending money voted to aid farmers to aid their campaigning to keep in existence their own jobs. We have been yelling about the bureaucrats and about waste and unnecessary spending and now we are asked to give them several hundred million dollars more to keep them in office, while they enslave the farmer. What do you want to do that for?

Mr. COOLEY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was just getting ready to tell the gentleman I would be glad to yield to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, on January 8, 1943, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation issued a joint statement. There are two brief paragraphs in that statement which read as follows:

> We demand that whenever Government imposes agricultural price ceilings, its officers and agencies exercise their responsibility and authority to approve only such price ceilings as will neither discourage nor prevent increased production.
>
> Furthermore, we insist that the use of subsidies in place of fair prices in the market place be discarded.

Most of the debate we have had since the gentleman from Missouri took the floor has been based on the assumption that we are operating in a free economy. The whole argument of the gentleman who asked us to stand up here and tell how this fair price was to be received

was based on the approach that we operate in a free economy. These farmers in the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation and these other organizations know what is going on. They know this is a planned economy. They know there is an O. P. A. They know that we have moved into a new atmosphere, a new control, and, therefore, this language, "that whenever Government imposes agricultural price ceilings."

That is what we are talking about here today. I am very much in favor of the Cannon amendment as presented by the gentleman from Missouri. I will go along with the Kleberg amendment to that amendment as presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

If there is anything on earth that is repulsive to me, it is for the people who perform the stoop labor in this country in the production of foodstuffs to be forced to deal with the appropriating whims of a Congress for a portion of their wages in the form of the goods which they offer on the markets of this country.

If we are to have planned economy, if the O. P. A. is to operate, let O. P. A. set price ceilings which give these fair prices. That is what your O. P. A. plan is for. The responsibility is on O. P. A., because we have given them the authority to establish these fair prices. Any man who has operated a farm, any man who lives on a farm, any man who runs a farm, whether through hired labor or through his own stoop labor, knows what he will do when the price is fair. That is all the farmer asks for.

Why does O. P. A. want incentive payments and subsidies in the first place? It makes their job administratively practical. If O. P. A. can reach over into this purse here and pick out subsidy money every time they put a producer in the squeeze, there is always relief for O. P. A., not the farmer. That is what you are proposing here in connection with this $100,000,000 appropriation, to give relief to the O. P. A. to make their job administratively possible, to enable them to take producers out of the squeeze which they put them into when they bring the price ceiling down to a point which approaches the cost of production.

Under this war economy under which we operate today, we have no right to force the farmers of this country to operate under such a scheme. As far as I am concerned, I do not propose to go along with a program which puts them under that kind of a proposition.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is the gentleman familiar with the hemp program that is being operated in my district? What effect has the Cannon amendment on that program?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sorry that I have not read the contracts between the Department and the hemp growers and other farmers such as the tomato growers, I should say, and other people of that kind; therefore, I cannot answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the discussion this afternoon has taken an unfortunate technical turn. Some of the Members of this House who are loyal friends of agriculture have taken their time here this afternoon to bring some of the most strained technicalities into this discussion and to suggest that because, perchance, it was difficult to define an incentive payment we should make no effort to prohibit an evil that we all recognize as evil, simply because it is difficult to define.

As I see it, the difficulty of definition should not deter us from doing our plain and clear duty of preventing the continuation of a program to which probably 90 percent of the Members of the House have already declared their opposition.

The large majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle have recognized and publicly stated that the farmers of this Nation should be paid a fair price, a price adequate to encourage production, and that that price should come as it does for labor and industry from the people who buy those farm products and should not come out of the Federal Treasury.

I think we all have a pretty clear understanding of what we mean by incentive payments. We all know that it is a term applied to the program that was proposed by the Department of Agriculture and rejected by the Committee on Appropriations of this House prior to the time that this bill was brought in. I do not believe that any fair-minded man will contend that he does not understand what the term means as used in the Cannon amendment. Oh, I grant you that there may be misinterpretation upon the part of the officials of the Department. I think the experience of the past would indicate that we might expect the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. to deliberately and purposely misinterpret the meaning and the intent of this Congress, and try to do something that we did not intend. But the very fact that we realize that disposition on the part of these agencies makes it necessary to pass the Cannon amendment. The bill in plain language now says they shall use this $300,000,000 only for the purposes set out in the Agricultural Adjustment and Domestic Allotment Act, and nowhere in that act is there any provision for the so-called incentive payments. The Cannon amendment should not be necessary, but surely it does no more than the present language should do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I cannot. I have only a moment. The situation is clear and the membership of this House recognizes what the issue is. It is not how we are going to interpret a phrase. We have tried to place a fair interpretation, we have tried to pin down these gentlemen representing the Department and the O. P. A. We are still trying to pin them down and make them give the farmer fair prices and price ceilings in keeping with the clear expression of congressional intent. Those of you who are friends of the farmer know that the question involved here is whether the farmer shall be paid like a businessman in the market place as Congress intended, or if he is to hold a tin cup up to the Department of Agriculture like a beggar. I say to you, come along with us and vote for the Cannon amendment and make this O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture recognize and do what Congress wants them to do. Put it in plain language, so the people of America can understand what the Congress meant. The man back home would not understand what is meant by reading this bill. You and I understand that the $300,000,000 now in this bill are not available for incentive payments as the bill stands now but you cannot explain that to the public, and you cannot bind a group of Government agencies with a provision that the public cannot understand and which the agencies do not want to understand. Let us make it clear to all that can read, so that they can understand. They can understand the Cannon amendment and the Kleberg amendment. I agree that the Kleberg amendment is not necessary, but let us put it in to meet the wishes of our technical friends who fear that the words "incentive payments" will be misunderstood. Then let us do justice by the farmers, by saying, "You can get your price in the market place, and you need not hold out your hat for a subsidy." Let us stay with the big issue. Do not go to hunting rabbits or technicalities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, we must agree that the farmer wants to get, and ought to have, a fair price in the market if he can. He does not want to be like the Italian, grinding away his hurdy gurdy with his tin cup and his monkey and asking the people to give him alms and contributions. There is no question about what ought to be done, but we are up against a condition and not a theory at this moment. I represent a district which has not heretofore grown hemp, but the Government is now asking us out there to put in six or seven hemp plants. It is necessary to have hemp in this war effort. We cannot succeed in this war without hemp, and still hemp is an incentive crop. This amendment could be or might be interpreted in a way that might prevent hemp production. It is a condition that we are up against in my part of the United States and not a mere theory.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. For a question.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Why cannot they fix a price so as to make it an incentive?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Who would fix such a price? Who are "they"? You could not get a price on hemp. Our farmers do not have any prices quoted on hemp, and they do not as yet have experience in raising it. The Secretary gave out a statement as long as 2 or 3 months ago

asking us to produce hemp, and promised to protect farmers by incentives or other payments, and they went out all over several districts in my State and signed up the farmers. You must have, I think, three or four thousand acres of hemp before they will put in that plant. They have gotten the farmers to sign up for hemp acreage. I know several districts in my State where the farmers have agreed to put in this hemp at the solicitation of the Government. Farmers do not know what the price will be, but the Government has assured the farmers they will give them some payments, and now we should go forward and fulfill these promises. That in and of itself is sufficient for me and, I think, for the rest of us who want to support the war effort. That is sufficient reason why the amendment should not be agreed to. There may be other reasons. Farmers do not want to stand on the corner and ask for a subsidy; but they must in this case. There is no other way to do it for the raising of the 1943 crop, and that is all that this amendment relates to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I have the figures here on the matter of flax in the State of Iowa. They grew 240,000 acres of flax, and in order to get the flax needed they will have to increase that to 380,000 acres, and the amount signed up is only 310,000 acres. That is with the flax incentives.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Hemp is peculiarly and absolutely an incentive crop, as it stands this year, and it cannot be interpreted otherwise. I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when he offered this amendment. I do not think it is a sequence that we will get fair prices in the market even if the amendment is carried, and I am convinced about what I said about hemp. This is at least one of the ways to provide the money to induce farmers to raise this crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose the Defense Supplies Corporation posted a price on hemp of so much a ton, or whatever the unit is on which it is purchased, which made it 150 percent of the so-called incentive. Would not the farmers of this country produce that hemp and deliver it to the Defense Supplies Corporation?

Mr. GILCHRIST. They would not do it for 1943, because the time is past when that must be posted. The farmers in Iowa, from lack of experience, do not know how much hemp they can raise, or whether they can raise it at all, or how many units they can raise. They should know this week, they should know now, in order to raise hemp this year and thereby help to beat hell out of Hitler.

I fear that this amendment will harm the production of what are called war crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if the Kleberg amendment to the amendment is adopted I propose to support the Cannon amendment, with the distinct understanding that the Cannon amendment does not disturb the appropriation for soil-building practices, as described on the bottom of page 737 of the hearings, estimated to cover $173,000,000. It is my understanding from the authors of the amendment that it is their intention that that fund will be preserved and these soil-building practices will be authorized. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say the gentleman is entirely correct, and no other interpretation is possible.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is my understanding also.

Mr. PACE. Then that means we can vote for the amendments with the understanding that the soil-building program will not be disturbed. Here is what will be disturbed. It is set up in the hearings that the remainder of this money will be paid to certain crops, cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco, and that they will go to the corn producer and say "Mr. Jones, we will pay you 3.6 cents per bushel on corn if you will plant so many acres in flaxseed." They do not pay him the 3.6 cents for growing corn. They pay him 3.6 cents for growing flaxseed. They give him 3.6 cents and let us say the parity price of corn is $1.05. Then when O. P. A. fixes the ceiling price on corn they deduct the 3.6 cents from it and fix a ceiling price on corn at $1.014. So what the incentive payment means is that you can go to a farmer and give him 3.6 cents on corn, and then when you fix his price you take it away from him. I say to you emphatically that the farmer is not the slightest bit interested in or benefited by these payments, because they are given to him and then taken away.

In the case of cotton this provides there shall be paid 1.1 cents per pound on cotton. They pay him 1 cent and then if the parity price on cotton is 20 cents, they fix the ceiling price at 19 cents. They give him a penny on the price and then when they fix the price in the market they take it away from him.

But we do have another program under the Steagall amendment operating through the Commodity Credit Corporation; and the gentleman who offered this amendment and the gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber who are interested in it say that the price-support program is a worth-while program and it should be supported. The Commodity Credit Corporation goes out, for example, and says to the soya bean producer, "We will guarantee you, although the parity price is $1.60, to get production we will guarantee you $1.80 a bushel for your soya beans." The farmer goes in the market place and gets $1.80. There is not any deduction made. It is understood by everyone in this House who has studied the farm problem that this idea of paying a man a payment for producing a crop and then turning around and taking it away from him when you fix the price has not been beneficial and cannot be beneficial to the farmers of this Nation. But the President and the Price Administrator say they are going to continue to make these deductions, regardless of the wishes of the farmers or the will of the Congress.

So I appeal to you, let us support this amendment, and when Jack Hutson comes over here, as he must soon, and asks for additional authority and funds to carry on the price-support program which is conducted through the Commodity Credit Corporation, we line up with him 100 per cent and see that the farmer gets a fair price and gets it at the market place, and that the selling price is fixed at parity and not one dime less than parity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the one real factual statement that has been made on this issue has just been made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I think it represents not only his views but the views of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], as I understand. They propose to support the Kleberg amendment to the Cannon amendment and then support the Cannon amendment.

Now, let us get the parliamentary situation clear. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered an amendment. Objection was taken on the ground that it was uncertain whether it might, under the ruling of the Comptroller, interdict the payment of soil-building payments. That was amended by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] so as to clarify that issue. That is the issue that is before us.

Now, there has been rather indiscriminate use of terms here, which only tends to add to confusion. Do not forget that first of all we have the so-called Soil Conservation Act, passed in 1935, for which there are approximately seventeen-million-dollars-plus in this bill that have nothing to do with the discussion at hand. Those are for demonstration and investigation practices carried on by the Soil Conservation Service.

The other two are the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 for soil-building practices carried on by the farmer; and secondly, the act of 1938, under which there might be a change of land use, for which payment is made.

The whole basic program then can be summed up as follows: You pay the farmer for two things. First of all, for soil-building practices under the act of 1936. Secondly, for adjusting his acreage, under the act of 1938. The former is the soil-building program, which is protected by the Kleberg amendment. The latter is the so-called adjusted conservation payment, which is commonly referred to as a subsidy.

Now, how did this come about? It came about in 1932 when prices were so low; when there were surpluses of basic commodities, like corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco. When the act of 1933, and later the act of 1938, was enacted, we said, "There are surpluses in the land. How shall we go about getting the price lifted, in view of those surpluses?" They said, "The thing to do is to cut down on the acreage of these sur-

plus commodities and then pay the farmer for shifting the land to some other use and some other purpose." That was the beginning of the program. These subsidy payments were, after all, nothing more than a bridge to get across this price gap. Nobody has mentioned this afternoon that the quotas on corn have been suspended. There are no quotas on corn. There are no quotas on wheat. There are no quotas on sugar beets. There are no quotas on rice. All those have been suspended under the emergency power that the Secretary has in the act of 1938. So, what they propose to do is to carry on these payments, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary has said to the farmers of many sections that quotas on wheat, corn, rice, and other commodities have been suspended. The amendment that is before us undertakes to preserve the soil-conservation practice. In fact, by leaving that $300,000,000 in the bill, there will be more money for that purpose than there would otherwise be.

My good friend from Georgia has alluded to the fact that you could not get parity anyhow. That is quite right under this Executive order. You gave the farmer a nickel on corn, then you take it away from him in including the parity ceiling under this so-called benefit inclusion which the President included in his order.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Please apply that to hemp as it stands this afternoon. You cannot get a fair price——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; there never was a greater misconception or a greater misstatement than that made by the gentleman from Iowa. There is nothing in this program that deals with hemp. Hemp is handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the paragraph that just preceded this, and if you have any doubt about it, I can read the language of the Department's own justification.

The real way of getting prices in the open market is not by this program that we are carrying on since the quotas were suspended but through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I will ask my friend from Georgia whether that is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there was an allotment of time that was not used, I would like to proceed a couple of minutes longer, if possible.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I also have asked for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The only Member who has not responded is the gentleman from South Dakota. If there be no objection, 3 minutes of the time that was allotted to the gentleman from South Dakota will be allotted to the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman said "this appropriation or no other appropriation carried in this bill." Is the gentleman sure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure. The language of the amendment is "payment," not "loan." The Commodity Credit Corporation deals with loans.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not get the money with which it operates out of this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They have their own capital structure.

Mr. TABER. They get it out of their own set-up and their capital is replenished at the end of the year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly. They have a capital stock structure of $100,000,000, and when it is impaired it is repaired by action of the Congress, as has been done in times past.

Mr. PACE and Mr. CASE rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, first, to the gentleman from Georgia; then I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. PACE. And it is perfectly understood that this amendment will not restrict the operations or the programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Let us get this clear: The Commodity Credit Corporation has funds which it can use for administrative expenses. The Cannon amendment also has the phrase "for any expense incident to." Will the Kleberg amendment also take care of that?

Let us have the record clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record is quite clear that the loans the Commodity Credit Corporation makes are out of its own capital fund, and when its capital structure is impaired it is repaired by action of the Congress.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. TARVER. I think if the gentleman's argument is correct then the proviso which we have inserted providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation may not sell farm products at less than parity is null and void.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so.

Mr. TARVER. I can see no distinction between the two.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not feel there is any difficulty about the matter with a plain restrictive proviso in the bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One question with reference to the removal of restrictions: What assurance have we that the administration will allow prices to rise to make up the difference? They might object and lay the blame on Congress, throw it back into our laps.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that we do not need the assurance because under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 the level was set at parity or the highest price between January and September 1942.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Think of corn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; suppose we take corn at a dollar. The effect of the Executive order is to recognize parity prices and then deduct the benefit payments, deduct the soil-conservation payments, and in consequence the price will be considered as at parity even though it is not. We solve this very knotty problem that has been pushed into the lap of Congress by the Executive veto by this action. But I want to say once more to my good friend from Georgia with whom I have differed on occasions that he has made a thoroughly factual statement about this matter and is exactly right, and I propose to follow his leadership in supporting the Kleberg amendment and in supporting the Cannon amendment as so amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, in this situation I think it is vitally important that we know what we are doing in regard to this hemp program because I want to advise the Congress that we have an extremely serious situation confronting our national defense in the shortage of hemp. I wish you would not get the flax situation and the hemp situation confused, because they are entirely separate.

Hemp comes from a weed that is produced solely for the making of rope and rope products for our Navy. It just so happens that on the 15th of this month the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I think the gentleman from Illinois is confused in some of his interpretations of this bill, let contracts for the construction of some 40-odd plants costing in the neighborhood of a couple hundred thousand dollars each. Those plants are being built in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

In the production of this hemp the farmers have been given an incentive payment and I am fearful that it must be paid out of this appropriation bill. I am not speaking of the plants, I am speaking of the hemp itself. So I hope that the gentleman from Missouri with his amendment is not interfering with our defense hemp program and I caution the House about this situation because I have followed it rather closely and I am very seriously concerned about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman feels or understands that the hemp incentive payments are to come out of this he is mistaken because it is my understanding they are coming out

of the Commodity Credit Corporation fund.

Mr. O'HARA. I am very much disturbed about that. My opinion is not definite. This hemp is a weed and the farmers have to be given an incentive to go out and grow this crop. They have had to be guaranteed either by incentive payments or contract relation on the production so that they could go into production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say that the Commodity Credit Corporation buys the entire crop of hemp.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman have a copy of the contract that is made with the grower?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmers are guaranteed $50 a ton for No. 1 hemp straw as the gentleman knows, but that is graded down so the farmers will be paid for it by the Government if they do raise a crop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that they have located two or three of these mills in my district, and I have been very much interested in the matter. The plants have been built. I do not think there will be any difficulty with the amendment now pending.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is something we should be sure of.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How long does it take to grow these hemp plants?

Mr. O'HARA. It is an annual crop.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it an annual crop?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Is it possible that my friend from Illinois is for incentive payments if the plants are in his territory or district and against them if the plants are in the gentleman's territory?

Mr. O'HARA. I would not want to comment on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I still think that this Kleberg amendment is an indirect way of adopting the Taber amendment. If the chairman of the committee differs with me, I should be very glad to yield to him for an explanation.

In other words, by the adoption of the Kleberg amendment all funds herein appropriated over and above soil conservation funds will remain in the Treasury. That means that this bill will be further reduced an additional $100,000,000.

I do not know when "incentive payments" became so evil and so immoral. They have had some friends on the floor of the House in the past, although I have not even been one of them. Now it seems to be something horrible to offer some inducement to the farmers of America to produce the food needs of the Nation.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. That is not where the evil comes in. The evil comes from offering it to them, giving it to them, and then turning around and taking it away from them.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not done in this program. The gentleman complains because of circumstances which are apparently beyond the control of Congress, to wit, the actions of the O. P. A.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If this amendment is adopted the effect will be to give the farmers of the country $100,000,000 extra. We have appropriated here $300,000,000. It can be used for soil conservation or for incentive payments, as was explained by the chairman of the subcommittee when the appropriation was under consideration yesterday.

If this amendment is not adopted, $100,000,000 will be taken out of the $300,000,000 for incentive payments, and only $200,000,000 will be available for soil conservation. But if the pending amendment is agreed to, then the entire $300,000,000 will be used for soil conservation purposes and in addition the farmer will get the other $100,000,000 in the open market, as indicated by the head of the Food Administration as reported in the two Associated Press releases which I read to the committee a few minutes ago. In other words, if this amendment is agreed to, the farmer gets another $100,000,000 in the open market—a total of $400,000,000 instead of the $300,000,000 provided in the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is correct in his interpretation, of course, that is one thing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There cannot be any other interpretation.

Mr. COOLEY. No, because the gentleman is usually always right.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; but because as the gentleman knows, the current appropriation is being used this year entirely for conservation purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. I respectfully decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I may not be justified in taking issue with the chairman of the full committee, but my opinion is that if you adopt this amendment you might as well provide that none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purposes for which they have been provided.

Mr. COOLEY. I thoroughly agree with the observation just made by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Last year and for the 2 former years we have been using it all—as much as $500,000,000—for conservation purposes, and under this amendment will continue to use it for conservation purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not yield, but it is all right.

This entire program is an incentive program from beginning to end. The whole purpose of it was to induce the farmers of the Nation to do certain things. If you put this word "incentive" in here, do you think the Comptroller General is going to be guided entirely by the definition of the gentleman, or the interpretation of the gentleman from Missouri? Of course, he might look at these CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the purpose of trying to find out the intent, but this is what Webster says about the word "incentive":

> Incentive: That which incites, or has a tendency to incite, to determination or action; motive; spur; as, money and pride are incentives to action.
>
> Synonyms: Goad, stimulus, incitement, provocation, encouragement, inducement, influence.

This whole program is an incentive program. If you say that no part of the money can be used for incentive payments, I apprehend that there is some danger that the entire appropriation will not be available for the purposes for which we all want it made available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the language of the bill itself is quite clear, because the language is to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the act of 1936 and the act of 1938. It gives him a chance to use that extra $100,000,000 if he wants.

Mr. COOLEY. Those provisions are very broad and comprehensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 65, line 2, after the colon, insert "*Provided further*, That no part of the said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments or subsidies or for any expense for, or incident to, the payment of incentive payments or any other form of subsidy payments."
>
> Kleberg amendment to the Cannon amendment: Mr. KLEBERG moves to amend the pending amendment by Mr. CANNON of Missouri by striking out all after the words "incentive payments."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk now read the text of the Cannon amendment as it would be if the Kleberg amendment were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, qualified by the Kleberg amendment: On page 65, line 2, after the colon, insert "*Provided further*, That no part of the said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. If I understood correctly, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] accepted the Kleberg amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is for the Committee of the Whole to accept or reject an amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER), there were—ayes 131, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, let us see if we cannot reach some agreement to close debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto. I do not know how many gentlemen contemplate amendments and discussion, but seven gentlemen have risen. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, and that I may have the last 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does that include all amendments to this section?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia, that all debate upon all amendments to the pending paragraph be limited to 40 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 2, after the word "inclusive", insert "*Provided*, That no total payments for programs under the Agricultural Act of 1938, and for soil conservation and water conservation practices, for any year to any person, firm, or corporation under this section shall exceed $500: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding $500 to which he would otherwise be entitled."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I submit two points of order. The first is to the place where the gentleman proposes to insert the amendment. The Cannon amendment has been inserted at that point, and the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas should follow the Cannon amendment instead of following the word "inclusive" in line 2 on page 65.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may follow the so-called Cannon amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall reserve the other point of order because I have not had an opportunity to examine the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I must ask for the regular order. I gave notice that I would do this at the beginning of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is in the nature of legislation insofar that it involves the question of payments of $500 or less, as I understood it, when it was read—I have not had time to examine it. It does not show retrenchment upon its face. While portions of it might be construed as limitations under the Holman rule, the amendment as a whole does include legislative provisions and for that reason is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman in the connection in which water practices are provided under the soil conservation act under consideration?

Mr. TARVER. They are provided under the Wheeler-Case act, to be expended by the Department of the Interior in connection with which the Department of Agriculture has some service to perform. I am not able to answer the question of the Chair in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's question was under the soil conservation act under consideration for which $300,000,000 are appropriated, what water practices are authorized?

Mr. TARVER. Except for those mentioned I know of none.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I started this discussion by suggesting that the words used by the amendment are those which follow the language in the terms of the bill. The bill provides that funds shall be used for certain purposes, and I simply use the language followed in the bill. Secondly, the very same amendment was considered by the House on March 9, 1942, and at that time the question of its being in order was discussed, and it was approved by the committee. I see nothing in this except a limitation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the language of the gentleman's amendment identical with the language under consideration at the time he refers to on March 9, 1942?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, and I refer the Chair to the RECORD of March 9, 1942, at page 2117. The only difference in the amendment is that at that time the amendment was for $1,000, and this provides $500.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman in connection with the point of order read the amendment submitted in 1942 at that time, to which he refers?

Mr. REES of Kansas. On page 2117. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] reserved the right to object by asking that the amendment be perfected and read for the information of the House, and there was no objection. The amendment was offered at page 73, line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair repeats the question: Was the amendment considered a year ago to which the gentleman has referred in identical language with the language which he now offers, particularly the language in the second proviso of the amendment? Was that identical with the language then under consideration?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It was.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman read the language of the amendment offered a year ago?

Mr. REES of Kansas—

Provided, That no total payments for any year to any person, firm, or corporation under this section shall exceed $500: *And provided*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding $500 to which he would otherwise be entitled. In the case of payments made to any individual, firm, or corporation, or estate on account of performance on farms in different States—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman further. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would apply to funds other than those covered by this act. Consequently it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The language of this amendment follows the language in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair would call attention to the fact that under the amendment cited by the gentleman during the consideration of an appropriation bill in 1942, the language of that amendment was confined to the appropriation then under consideration. The first two lines of that amendment read as follows:

Provided, That no total payments for any year to any person, firm, or corporation under this section shall exceed $500.

That is under the act then pending. The Chair would remind the gentleman that under the amendment he now proposes, and I read from that amendment:

Provided, That no total payments for programs under the Agricultural Act of 1938, and for soil conservation and water conservation practices, for any year to any person, firm, or corporation under this section shall exceed $500; and provided that this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding $500 to which he would otherwise be entitled.

It is clearly in violation of the rule, because it is not limited to the appropriation under consideration. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point

of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 63, line 2, after the colon, insert as follows: "*Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500: *And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as read follows the proviso in line 2, page 63. Should it not be page 65?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. I rather think it should follow the Cannon amendment and not the colon in line 2.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be modified accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified so as to follow the Cannon amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment to limit the amount of soil-conservation payments to any one individual, firm, or corporation to $500. I do this for the reason that I believe that if soil-conservation payments are to be made, they should and ought to go to the individual farmer, and to the small and middle-sized operator rather than to big concerns, who really get a large share of the money.

This may seem like repetition to you, but I would like to call your attention again to the manner in which these soil-conservation funds are distributed. I do not have the figures for 1942, but I am informed they do not differ a great deal from those of 1940 and 1941. In 1940, for example, this Congress appropriated soil-conservation funds of almost a half billion dollars. It was distributed to 6,000,000 farmers. This last year quite a number of additional farmers were included in the program. During that year 27 percent of the farmers in the program got payments of $20 or less. Half of them got $40 or less. In 1940 we settled with half of our farmers by paying them $58,000,000. This is just about as much money as it took to administer the act.

In 1941 we find almost the same conditions. Twenty-one percent of our farmers received less than $20 each, and 52 percent of them got $40 or less in conservation payments, and 80 percent of them received a hundred dollars or less.

Even last year, I am informed, that more than 95 percent of our farmers got less than $500 in soil conservation payments. So you are not going to injure the farmer at all if you adopt this amendment, and you will provide for a little more equitable distribution of the funds that are taken from the Federal Treasury. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, has nothing, of course, to do with the question of parity payments.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

Mr. FULMER. In other words, if the amendment is adopted some of these large farmers who have been getting $85,000 or $135,000, will not be able to get that amount?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I want to know if they would be permitted to get up to $500?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, they would be permitted to get as much as $500 and no more.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman think the action of the House just taken will entirely eliminate the evil that he complains about, because the only money now in the bill is for soil-building practices, and certainly we want all the land preserved wherever it may be and in whatever size tracts?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hardly think so. I am trying to provide for the use of these funds where I feel they more rightfully belong. I do not think, in view of all circumstances, that the big operators would expect the Federal Government to pay large amounts to them. I think they will be glad to cooperate with their tenants. I just cannot think that, in view of need for more crops and considering the need of all tillable acreage, big operators will take advantage of tenants, who get these payments for conserving the land and property of the landowner.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not injure a real soil conservation program. The soil conservation program, as such, has accomplished a great deal of good. It has helped the farmer to protect and save his soil, so as to put it in better condition for raising crops in the future. I believe it was intended when the act was passed, that the farmer, by reason of these payments, would be encouraged to permit part of his land to be taken out of production to prevent what was regarded as a crop surplus. It also paid the farmer some money in a time of low prices and poor crops.

Mr. Chairman, what we need now is more acres in cultivation as far as it can be done; and instead of limiting our crops we need more and more production to meet a fast-diminishing supply of food. Of course, we want to conserve the soil, but the stress right now is for more food to meet what I believe to be a critical situation.

Mr. Chairman, do you realize that with about 75 percent manpower of what we had last year and with about 75 or 80 percent of machinery and equipment the farmers and producers of this country are being asked to produce almost a third more food than in 1942? It is needed to take care of the demands of our armed forces as well as to meet commitments to our allies, who are in need of this help, and then to supply our own civilian population, millions of whom are employed in essential war industries.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again that I do not think our Government should be expected to continue to make payments to the large operators in sums of thousands and tens of thousands. I hardly believe they would expect it under present conditions. They should be willing to accept the smaller payment, especially when it is their land that is being improved.

Mr. Chairman, we can continue a constructive soil program. It can be done with fewer restrictions. The thing we must do now is to give the farmer a freer hand and less red tape. We ought to pay him a fair price for his crops, compared with what it costs him to produce it. Then, just as far as it can be done, he ought to be provided with machinery and equipment to do it. It should be borne in mind that, after all, food is a very essential war material.

Mr. Chairman, the American farmer, together with the members of his family, are willing to work for long hours and under a lot of inconveniences necessary by reason of war conditions.

The American farmer will do everything he can to perform the task assigned him. Just give him a fair break, and he will do his part and then some. The American farmer will not be found wanting in this crucial hour.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REES of Kansas was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE to the amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Add the following:

"*And provided further*, That in applying this limitation there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and tenant or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accord with fair and customary standards of rent and sharecropping prevailing in the locality. In the case of payments to any person on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, or possessions, the limitation shall be applied to the total of the payments for each State, Territory, or possession for a year and not to the total of all payments."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. TARVER. To make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to the Rees amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. As I understood the reading of the amendment, the amendment clearly contains legislation. It changes the terms of existing law with reference to the method of computation of payments of the kind provided for in the paragraph. It does not on its face indicate any saving of funds carried in this paragraph of the bill so as to come within the provisions of the Holman rule. It places upon administrative authorities additional duties to perform to those duties which are now required by law, and it seems to me that it is for these reasons clearly legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOPE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is purely a limitation. It is a modification of the limitations contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. It provides simply that under certain circumstances the Rees amendment shall not be operative. It is not legislation, it is simply a modification of the Rees amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kansas and also the gentleman from Georgia whether or not it is true that under the Soil Conservation and Allotment Act or under regulations provided by the law there is a method for ascertaining the relationship between the shares accruing to landlords and tenants and the amounts that are to be paid to landlords and tenants? In other words, the question is whether or not any additional provision or legislation to those now existing by law or by rules and regulations are embraced in the gentleman's limitation?

Mr. HOPE. There is a provision in the Triple A Act—I cannot quote it word for word—which does relate to the relationship between landlord and tenant and provides that the relationship shall not be changed where it once exists.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to make any response to the inquiry?

Mr. TARVER. I have no further statement to make, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] proposes an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in the following language:

And provided further, That in applying this limitation there shall be excluded amounts representing a landlord's share of a payment made with respect to land operated under a tenancy or sharecropper relationship if the division of the payment between the landlord and tenant or sharecropper is determined by the local committee to be in accord with fair and customary standards of rent and sharecropping prevailing in the locality. In the case of payments to any person on account of performance on farms in different States, Territories, or possessions, the limitation shall be applied to the total of the payment for each State, Territory, or possession for a year, and not to the total of all payments.

A point of order is made to the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is replied that under the Soil Conservation Act and under the rules authorized by that act, as stated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and in response to the Chair's inquiry, that the rules and regulations provide now for determination by local committees substantially as provided in this limitation. The Chair understands that in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act there is a limitation with respect to the total payments in the several States or territories. In view of the statements made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that are not controverted by any statute or regulation brought to the attention of the Chair, and in view of the construction placed upon the act and the rules and regulations under the act, the Chair is constrained to hold that the pending amendment is a further limitation upon the limitation pending as proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

As the Chair interprets the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] it does not change the terms of existing law with respect to the method of ascertaining payments or the duties of local committees. It does not place upon the administrative authorities any additional duties to perform. No duties will be performed except those now required by law. The local committees under rules and regulations now pass upon the standards of rent and sharecropping. Under the rules and regulations as authorized by the Soil Conservation Allotment Act these committees would pass upon the leasing and sharecropping under the Rees amendment. The said committees would do no more and no less under the Hope amendment. Under existing law and under the Rees amendment the landlord's share would be determined and the tenant's share would be determined by the local committees. Under existing law and under the Hope amendment the local committees would perform the same functions that they would perform under the Rees amendment. No additional legislation is contained in the amendment. No additional duties are prescribed. The Rees amendment and the Hope amendment neither contemplate any additional duties nor any additional obligations. They require the performance of no additional duties. The Rees amendment is a limitation and the Hope amendment is a further limitation, and as such is a limitation of the same kind as the Rees amendment, with no additional functions to be performed by the local committee.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 3½ minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Not at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this exclude landlords?

Mr. HOPE. No. This amendment affects the Rees amendment only in this way: It says that it shall not be applicable to landlords who have more than one farm and who would receive as their payment for the total number of farms more than $500. It is submitted in order to protect the tenant because if landlords are prohibited from receiving more than $500 it means in very, very many cases they will not go into the program and if the landlord does not go in the tenant cannot go in. That will mean that large numbers of tenant farmers who want to go into the program and receive these payments, small as they may be, will not have that opportunity. It is offered solely for the purpose of preserving the rights of the tenants and to enable them to get their share of the money which we are appropriating at this time.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is this the same amendment as was passed by the Committee on Agriculture and later passed by the House about 2 years ago, introduced by Mr. Marvin Jones, of Texas?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The Committee on Agriculture reported a bill containing this provision which passed the House and passed the Senate with some amendments. It never became law because the conferees never got together on the matter. But last year when the agricultural appropriation bill was before the House the amendment was offered and agreed to in Committee of the Whole by a large majority. I do not remember the vote, but it was by quite a large vote.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it will mean if a landlord owns 10 farms and has 10 tenants the landlord will only get $500, but his tenants may share in the amount of the soil-conservation payments for that particular farm upon which they are located?

Mr. HOPE. The landlord would get whatever amount would be coming to him. That may be more than $500. The $500 limitation will not apply to him. He might get a thousand dollars if that is his share of the payments, but it will keep the landlords in the program and it will mean the tenants can stay in the program because the landlords are not going to come into the program unless they get something out of it commensurate with the acreage of land and investment involved.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment nullifies the purposes of the other amendment.

Mr. HOPE. It strengthens the Rees amendment because it permits the tenants to get it. If you do not adopt my amendment, it means the tenants will not have a chance to get any of these payments because the landlords will not go in and the tenants cannot go in.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What is the idea in the Rees amendment of offering people who are tenants more than people who farm their own land? If you

want to have class legislation that is it. People who work on farms are just as poor as tenants.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to have the gentleman from Kansas explain that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am referring to the Rees amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How will it affect a man who has five farms and five tenants? How will that money be distributed between landlord and tenant?

Mr. HOPE. The amount which the tenant can receive will be limited to $500. If the landlord's share of the payment would amount to more than $500, he would get whatever his share would amount to.

Mr. STEFAN. On each farm?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; on each farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hope substitute amendment to the Rees amendment and for the Rees amendment as amended by the Hope amendment. May I say this is almost identical with the amendment we adopted last year. It does not change the present operations except in amount. We now have in the triple A act a limitation of $10,000 on the amount to be paid to one individual unless he gets it as his prorata part of a tenant or sharecropper operated farm. A man can get $1,000,000 if he gets it under the limitations provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

In my part of the country most of our counties have decreased in farm population by 25 percent or more, simply because the big land operators can make more money by taking tenant-operated farms and working them with hired help, land where formerly two or three or more families lived. And you cannot blame a man for operating in the way that makes him the most money. This amendment would put men back on the farm because it would make it more profitable to cultivate large land holdings through tenants and sharecroppers.

May I call attention to the fact that following the war we are going to have literally thousands of folks roaming the streets looking for jobs. Richard Roe, when he lives on a farm, even if he does not make a very good living, is a much better citizen than Richard Roe is when driven into town and on W. P. A. Before the war about three-quarters of W. P. A. in the northern and plains section of Texas, were tenant and share-cropper farmers who had been run off the land. They were run off the land not only because of power machinery, but also because of the farm program.

The Rees amendment, as amended by the Hope amendment, simply reduces the amount of money that a man can get under the program unless he gets it as a part of a tenant- or sharecropper-operated installation. I submit that the amendment is highly desirable and will have many wholesome consequences if enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hope amendment. This matter was submitted to the Agriculture Committee in a bill known as H. R. 3800, by Marvin Jones, of Texas. It passed that committee unanimously and was voted on in this House just a year ago, the identical amendment, with the exception of the fact there was a $500 provision in it as carried in the present Rees amendment.

My view of this matter is that you are going to drive the tenants off the land if you do not provide some form of a remedy here as provided by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. I call to your attention what a $500 limitation really means. A farm which would bring about $500 to its operator would be an allotment in cotton, for example—and I come from a cotton country—of only 180 acres, the total acreage of the farm amounting to 450. Here is a man who has saved his money all his life. He has gotten a little farm of 40 acres, has increased it to 80 acres, and has gone along adding to it from time to time until he gets it up to 450 acres. Under the Rees amendment, as presented originally, if he gets more land than 450 acres, he would then not be able to draw more than $500. That is all he could draw in the cotton country. I do not know how this would apply to every type of product over the country, but on a 180-acre cotton allotment he would draw $500.

Why is it that in a free country, in all candor, we want to say to an individual that he cannot own a place of more than 450 acres? We settled that problem here just a few days ago when the $25,000 salary limitation amendment was voted on.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. How many hoe hands would it take to scrape 450 acres of cotton in Arkansas?

Mr. GATHINGS. How many would it take in rocky Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. We do not scrape, we use cultivators, but we scraped cotton when I was a boy in Mississippi with hoe hands, and it took a lot of them to do it. Four hundred and fifty acres is a big cotton field.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is absolutely true. When Henry Ford started out, he had a little room back in an alley. I believe that in this free America a man ought to be able to produce and have the initiative to go higher and get as much land as he can operate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I should like to know what it is about a politician that the very same politician who breaks his neck giving millions to some gangster, some ruthless man on Wall Street, will turn around and try to cut down the little man who is trying to grow just a little bigger than he is.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All in the world this amendment does is try to give a little more money to the ordinary, average farmer, in place of giving it to these big operators, who do not need the money. There is not a thing in here that takes any money away from the ordinary, average operator. We are trying to give him more money instead of less.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in the past these big subsidies to big operators have been declared needed so that the big producer would come into the program and reduce his production. If they were giving us the facts then, why should they be continued when we are spending millions to increase production? Now they are trying to justify them in the name of the tenant.

Mr. Chairman, let us just stop a minute right now and look this thing in the face. This Hope amendment has been in here before. It defeated the proposal to reduce these big checks last year. The average farmer of the country has no hope in the Hope amendment. We are supposed to legislate for the benefit of all groups. We are supposed to promote a program to best furnish food to win this war. We bring in this bill and cut down the low-income farm people, people who have not been subsidized over $150 per year. Then some say we cannot take these big checks and the millions away from these big operators, even after we have taken the small subsidies away from the low-income group. That is what those who oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] are trying to do. Anyone that votes for the Hope amendment will vote to continue the $10,000 to $100,000 checks to the big land owners of this country. Do not be deceived.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not have time to yield. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that as long as he can get $15,000,000 to $17,000,000 a year for his congressional district, and as long as he supports a program that provides 5,000 or 6,000 farmers in one State more than 600,000 other farmers of the country get, I shall continue to disagree with him. Everyone knows the high regard I hold for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], but that does not keep me from opposing his position here today. This bill cuts down the total appropriation but it does not say one word about taking $1 from the big checks you are trying to give to the big operators of the country.

I am not opposed to any man owning 100 acres, 1,000 acres or 100,000 acres or 1,000,000 acres of land but I say that as a governmental policy not only in war-

time but in peacetime we should be interested in the family sized farm—the farm that is owned and operated by the man who lives on the farm. If we are going to have a progressive agricultural country, the kind of a rural America we should want, we must consider the great bulk of the farmers and not the few that have inherited or acquired large areas of farm land. If we are going to subsidize anybody connected with agriculture—we should subsidize the type of farming that is best for American agriculture and for the American people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, better than 50 percent of the farmers in the country, over 3,000,000, get less than $40 each out of the present fund.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his observations. I think everybody here knows that 6,400 farmers in 1 State get more than 600,000 other farmers in the United States. Look it up. You will find that 1 big operator gets more than 5,000 small operators. Does that make sense when we want to produce food in maximum amounts?

We could discuss the subsidy checks that go to some of the other congressional districts. It is not a partisan matter, because this campaign for big subsidy checks from the United States Treasury has been a nonpartisan matter. Of course, the majority party has continued it. They work pretty good at it. But we surely should not continue this during wartime. It is not based on common sense or common justice. There is not a man in this House or in this city, including the Department of Agriculture, that can stand up here and say that this money has been distributed either on the basis of common sense or on the basis of common justice.

The Rees amendment says no one person, partnership, or corporation can obtain more than $500 in 1 year as a subsidy check. The $150 to $200 subsidy to the lowest agricultural income people is being abolished in this very bill. Since these $150 to $200 subsidies have been abolished to the low-income group, do you think it will be any unpardonable sin to reduce the subsidy to the high-income agricultural group to $500? It is still more than twice as much subsidy per year as the low-income group ever did receive even during the drought period. Let us not deceive ourselves. We will not be deceiving anyone else for long. We cannot refuse a subsidy of $100 to one man and complain about the limitation of a $500 subsidy to another man any more than we can subscribe to a set-up that freezes one man's wages at 30 cents per hour, but provides for little freezing up the pay scale. Vote down this Hope amendment, and support the Rees amendment. If you do you will be following a policy based not only on common sense but on common justice as well.

There is no reason to continue these big checks to county and State institutions, to insurance companies, and other corporations. Remember the big operators in one State obtained $12,000,000, or more than the total received by the total farmers in 23 other individual States. Remember, the big operators in Texas received $12,000,000 and only 6,400 of them, while the 153,000 farmers in New York received but $6,000,000; the 169,000 farmers in Pennsylvania received but $5,000,000. The small or average farmer in Texas gets little or nothing but vocal assistance, as well as the average farmer of the whole country.

Once again, I repeat, vote down this Hope amendment. It will nullify the benefits of the Rees amendment. And by all means support the Rees amendment. I do not have any hope in Mr. HOPE's amendment.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Time has been limited on the amendment, and the gentleman's name does not appear on the list of those who desire to be recognized. The Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman for debate at this time. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. GILCHRIST. There is an amendment pending at the desk which I have offered, and it would be in the nature now, since the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has been offered, as an amendment to an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the disposition of the present pending amendment. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk against reported the amendment of Mr. REES of Kansas and the amendment of Mr. HOPE.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to the Rees amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 47, noes 68.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. As many as are in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eleven Members, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which is at the desk to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHRIST to the Rees amendment: After the words "share renter" in the Rees amendment insert the words "or tenants."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] to the Rees amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 56, noes 33.

So the Gilchrist amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 93, noes 42.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 68, line 3 strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add the following: *"Provided, however,* That any payments received by the farmers other than those received in marketing the crops shall not be considered as a part of the farmers' parity income but shall be considered as a separate earned income."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is not germane to the paragraph to which it is offered.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I cannot, because I notified the House in the beginning that I would not permit the reservation of points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is a further limitation to a section contained in this bill, which itself is a limitation, and, further, in connection with this, that this in effect is carrying out the wishes of the House, because we previously adopted the Bankhead bill, which was later vetoed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, the amendment being in the following language:

On page 68, following line 3, *"Provided, however,* That any payments received by the farmers other than those received in marketing the crops, shall not be considered as a part of the farmers' parity income, but shall be considered as a separate earned income."

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 65, line 5, strike out the figure "50" and insert the figure "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to cut down the administrative expense for distributing the $300,000,000 provided by the section. Last year, according to the committee report, the administrative expense for distributing $450,000,000 was over $65,000,000, which was deducted from the farmers' share of the appropriation provided for soil conservation and domestic allotment purposes. The bill cuts the amount 50 percent down to $32,500,000 for administrative expense, which I maintain is altogether too much money to expend for administrative expenses in disbursing $300,000,000. The report shows that there were 146,621 persons on full-time and part-time employment to take care of the triple A act, of which 18,000 were full-time employees, and the remainder of the 146,000, part-time employees. The more we cut down the administrative expense, the more money will go to the farmers out of this $300,000,000 fund, and I insist that here is an opportunity to save an additional $12,000,000 for the farmers, and still give between $19,000,000 and $20,000,000 for administrative expenses, which should be ample to take care of the distribution of the $300,000,000. I do not know how the committee arrived at the $32,500,000 provided for in the bill, but that amount is far in excess of what is needed. Let us save a little money and pass it on to the farmers, rather than have it expended for a large group of administrative employees who are quite willing to accept the money. We are the ones to determine how much shall be expended.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand the department even goes out and makes airplane photographs of the farm territory for the purpose of sitting down and trying to calculate the number of acres put into this or that crop.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about it. That is a part of the program.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is absolutely inaccurate to do that from the air without the finest possible equipment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct. I maintain that to appropriate $33,000,000 as provided in the bill is too much for administrative expenses. They can do the job with between 19 and 20 million as provided in my amendment, and I urge that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this item of administrative expense for the agricultural adjustment program came before the subcommittee the chairman pursued it page after page and developed the whole story. In brief, it is about like this: For 1942 they would have expended something in excess of $65,000,000. They had 146,000 field men, including county committeemen, community committeemen, and compliance chapters. We were persuaded it was excessive, and after going into it thoroughly we cut it down 50 percent. That means a drop from $65,000,000 to about $33,000,000. The gentleman from Minnesota proposes to make it 30 percent, which would be roughly about $20,000,000. I am not at all sure that is going to be enough. I would prefer not to hamstring this program. I believe we should go along this year and in the meantime the matter will be further investigated. If it develops there is still excessive expenditure for administrative purposes, then the subcommittee will certainly go into it further and come back with a recommendation for further reductions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think they should really spend more than 5 percent of the total sum for administrative purposes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may be that 5 percent might be the right amount, but I can understand that in certain sparsely settled counties it will cost more to serve the people. I am not prepared to say whether 5 percent would be a sufficient amount or not.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But they have said they never needed to spend more than $45,000,000 before, and I cannot understand how it got up to $65,000,000 last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thoroughly agree it is excessive. That is why we cut it in half.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman recall what amount was expended by the Department of Agriculture for traveling, and has that amount been cut?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That amount has been cut. In fact, the Department was under some restriction by the action of the House last year. Some of their field activities were impaired, so they came back and represented to us at great length what their difficulties were, and it has been adjusted in an amount whereby there are reductions all the way through the bill for traveling.

Mr. O'HARA. I take it the gentleman is in favor of reducing the incentive for travel payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am, definitely.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This is the place where all these employees are running around the country making speeches against Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman's language might be modified to say that some of them are; not all of them.

Mr. TABER. Well, a lot of them are. They are not doing it in my district, but they are in adjoining districts and all around. I get complaints from Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. It is a good place to let them attend to their own business instead of trying to run the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the amendment will not prevail and that we will go along with this 50-percent economy for the next fiscal year. If the amendment adopted today is written into law and the administrative funds herein provided can be saved in large part, I am sure that it will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire if there are any other amendments pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has sent an amendment to the desk.

Mr. TARVER. May I ask if all time has expired except the 5 minutes which were reserved?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. TARVER. I want to be heard before this amendment is voted upon which is now pending, but I would like to defer my remarks until all the amendments have been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to present his amendment?

Mr. LEMKE. I do not, because after the adoption of the Cannon amendment apparently they are not going to fulfill their contracts with the farmers on this flax. I had intended to provide a sufficient amount to do it. Therefore, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are going to get the full amount, but they will get it in the open market.

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is the only amendment on the Clerk's desk and the only amendment that has been brought to the attention of the Chair.

Does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] desire recognition?

Mr. LEMKE. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] desire recognition?

Mr. BURDICK. I do. May I make this inquiry, Mr. Chairman? Am I to be recognized on this amendment or on the full legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to speak generally, the pending amendment perhaps should be disposed of first. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be heard on the pending amendment?

Mr. TABER. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee will find, if it examines pages 740 to 760 of the hearings and adjacent pages, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself collaborated in endeavoring to develop evidence which

would justify a reduction in the administrative expenses of this organization.

It is very clear to my mind that a tremendously greater amount of money has been estimated for administrative expenses than has been justified. The cost of administering the farmers' benefits ranges from 0.2 percent in some counties to 15 percent in others. This range is not so great as it was formerly. We have been driving away at this matter for several years, and it has been proved to our satisfaction that there ought to be restrictions upon the amount of administrative expenses if for no other purpose than that of saving to the farmers as much as possible of the money carried in this program. But we ought not to make the reduction so drastic as to prevent this organization from functioning. Remember that with $300,000,000 they have got to handle the same number of contracts as they would were the amount $400,000,000. Examine the hearings and you will find that the only evidence which would justify a reduction of the administrative expenses was sufficient to justify a reduction of $11,000,000, which would be about 20 percent of the $53,000,000 estimated for disbursal to the various county associations throughout the United States.

I felt that this limitation should have been 80 percent instead of 50 percent of the amount of expenses for the present fiscal year. Certainly a reduction to 30 percent would, in my judgment, absolutely make it impossible for the administrative authorities to carry on the program. You might as well provide 10 percent, 5 percent, or 1 percent.

This contemplated reduction in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota would be absolutely destructive of the program and prevent its being carried out in an orderly way.

The committee provision, which I have not resisted because I feel bound by the judgment of my colleagues, is, in my judgment, too low a restriction, and more money ought to have been provided, but not as much as was estimated for by the Budget.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Am I to address myself to this portion of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Then I do not desire any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may speak to the bill if he desires.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not inclined to put the request because of the limitation of 40 minutes; but if there is no objection, the Chair will allot to the gentleman also the 3½ minutes not used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall object, but I do want to make this statement under a reservation of objection, if I may: I think there is probably only one other controversial portion of this bill which will not go out on a point of order. There is, therefore, a possibility that within a reasonable time the House may complete the consideration of the bill, and I am sure it is the desire of all of us to do that today if it can be done within a reasonable time. I am, therefore, asking—I am not objecting to the gentleman's request—but I am asking Members, insofar as they can, to make their remarks brief and address themselves to the issue that may be pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds at its disposal another 2½ minutes, which, without objection, the Chair will accord to the gentleman from North Dakota.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. Under the rules of the House, a Member may move to strike out the last word and be recognized for 5 minutes, may he not?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the rule.

Mr. BURDICK. Then I intend to move to strike out the last word a sufficient number of times to get 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized for 9½ minutes now if he cares to use it.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, when I first read this bill I was surprised and dumbfounded. I knew that we were debating an agricultural bill during the greatest war in history, and in which we are engaged on every point on the globe. Appeals had gone out for more food and I, therefore, anticipated that this debate would be an exchange of views as how best to increase our production. To my amazement I found that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, in bringing in this bill, actually curtailed production, and by their own admissions assert that the purpose of the bill is to abolish the Farm Security Administration.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] admitted this on several occasions in this debate, and gives as his reason that the Farm Security organization in his State tried to defeat him in the last election.

No showing has been made against the great production record of the Farm Security Administration; no showing has been made that this agency does not aid distressed farmers who have no property and no security; no showing has been made that this agency has not established a high and almost perfect system of health for these people, approved by the American Medical Association. Not one word has been offered against the repayment record of the farmers under this Administration, but yet in light of all this positive and favorable evidence, this committee has attempted to wipe out this agency. The committee has ignored the many, many church and Christian associations of the country, from Lutheran to Catholic, which have asserted that this agency is doing a wonderful work for the poor farmers of the Nation, and that they see nothing communistic in its operation.

What is behind this determination to wipe out not only a useful, indispensable, and good organization, and how is its death to be brought about?

First of all, the agency is transferred to the Farm Credit Corporation, which is a banking facility, well knowing that none of the clients now operating under the Farm Security Administration could possibly obtain a loan; they have limited the loans to 75 percent of the value of the undertaking, when the committee knows that these clients have nothing to offer. They next compel the farmer to travel about the country and get refusals from private lenders, before he is eligible to apply to a place which cannot possibly loan him any money. Finally, the amount to be loaned is more than cut in half, when it should be double what it was last year. If we are actually in need of the production of food to win this war, why does this committee insist on putting out of business a great army of food producers who are showing better records in production than the average farmer?

Behind this move, written in every line of the bill is a conflict of philosophies. The one represented by the Farm Security Administration being to put the down-and-out farmer and his family back on the soil with the Government aiding him to aid himself. The other philosophy is the selfish business view that says let him shift for himself and protect the banking interest of the Nation.

This view is well represented by the Farm Bureau Federation which was originally started by contributions from banks, railroads, and insurance companies, and which has always catered to the big farmers and has not attempted to raise up the fallen farmer.

Who wrote this bill? The gentleman from Georgia, chairman of this subcommittee is an able, genial, and conscientious Member of this House. In his speech he openly stated who wrote every amendment to the bill—the Farm Bureau Federation. He admonished members of that subcommittee that some of these amendments would start a controversy, but the Farm Bureau held to its purpose.

In this work of abolishing this great agency of the Government, the Farm Bureau had its own way, and you will take particular notice that in transferring the work of the agency, the Farm Bureau saw to it that the transfer was made to the extension agents of the country. Last year it was the same plan; in the bill to supply farm labor it was the same thing. The Farm Bureau wrote in the provision that the extension agents were to do this work.

The Farm Bureau has been fortunate in having a Member of Congress—one of the very ablest Members—represent

their interest in this Congress. That Member is not only a Member of Congress, but a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the subcommittee which attempts now to wipe out the entire Farm Security Administration.

Who offered the amendment in the committee to place the extension agents in control of this agency? The gentleman from Illinois. Who offered the amendments which the gentleman from Georgia advised would start trouble? The gentleman from Illinois. Who had in mind the total annihilation of this agency? The gentleman from Illinois. Who knew exactly what the Farm Bureau wanted this function turned over to the extension agents for? The gentleman from Illinois. Who attempted to wipe out this great rural health service? The gentleman from Illinois.

If this Congress had followed the gentleman from Illinois, the production of food in this critical wartime would have gone down, but the membership of the Farm Bureau would have gone up. Gone up for the reason that in many States the extension agents are the solicitors for membership of the Farm Bureau. If you do not believe it, listen to this letter:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STATE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES COOPERATING

NATCHITOCHES, LA., *February 16, 1943.*

DEAR LEADER: You are invited to be present at a meeting held Monday evening, 7:30 p. m., February 22, 1943, at the Natchitoches Parish Training School for the purpose of organizing a chapter of the Farm Bureau. This meeting will be under the auspices of the Extension Department and will be conducted by a member of the State office, assisted by the county agents.

AMELIA J. LEWIS,
Local Home Agent.

Not only that but I have a mountain of evidence that in a great many sections of the United States the extension agents collect the membership for the Farm Bureau by holding it out of Government payments that are cashed through the extension office. The gentleman from Illinois is too wise and too close to the Farm Bureau to not know this practice. If he did not know it, he is using his great talents for an organization that not only knew it but accepts the money from the extension agents.

In this terrible war, let us not let personal grievances direct our course, let us not grant favors and privileges to any farm organization, let us build an army of production including farmers who are too poor to struggle alone but who know how and will produce. Let us leave this petty, peevish, and selfish business all out of consideration and contribute our manly part in winning this war.

We should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish in backing up production in the United States at this crucial hour. If our fighting men need more guns, there is not a Member here who will say "no." If our Army of food producers need help and assistance, there should not be any Members here who object because it will take money to do it. We can save on many things but never on guns and food while fighting for our existence.

This bill, as reported to the House by this subcommittee, is a crime against our production efforts, a crime against the health service of the underprivileged, a crime against the consumers who will shortly know what it is to be hungry, and, whether intended or not, it is a sabotage of our war efforts.

It is an axiom of law that a person intends the natural results of his own acts, and there can be no doubt but what this committee took its orders from the Farm Bureau, through its willing and able agent on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois. This action was apparently deliberate and intentional, for the committee now says they were 2 months working on this matter. This committee totally overlooked the fact that they were an appropriation committee and seized upon a golden opportunity to write the laws of the country while they had an able adviser to direct their course. If this procedure can go on unchecked, what is the use of having a Congress? Why not turn the duties of Congress over to the Farm Bureau Federation, and make their "prime minister," the gentleman from Illinois, the official directing head of legislation of the people—the role which he has unceremoniously acted in this bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman at any time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman referred to the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman is on the deficiency subcommittee and that subcommittee cut out Farm Security.

Mr. BURDICK. I thought he was on this subcommittee.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What does the gentleman think about the wisdom of trying to combine in one agency a lending business which is supposed to be done on the basis of cash loans and all the rest of it, like the Farm Credit Administration tries to be run, with an agency that is supposed to be making loans to try to help out the poor farmer, where they cannot get any help any place else. Does that make sense?

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is right. If the people in the eastern part of the United States, where they never see poor farmers, would stop long enough to understand the conditions in North Dakota, they would know that we have had to assist 41,000 out of 71,000 during this administration, and not one of them could get a dime from any bank or institution in the State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman is aware of the fact that the Democrats from the Eastern States have always been very friendly to the gentleman's position as he stated it today.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement that there is not a poor farmer in the eastern part of the United States.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the percentage of loans of the Farm Credit Administration in our Western States, such as the gentleman's State of Montana, runs as high as 87½ percent and interest payments are all kept up?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. If no other amendments are to be offered to the pending paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PARITY PAYMENTS

To enable the Secretary to make full parity payments for the crop year 1942 pursuant to the authorization under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, $193,623,000, to remain available until June 30, 1945, and to be merged with and made a part of the appropriation under this head in said act, and the unobligated balance of appropriation so merged shall remain available until June 30, 1946, for administrative expenses (including expenses of county and local committees), and not to exceed $5,000,000 of said unobligated balance may be expended for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia (including personal services) and elsewhere (excluding expenses of county and local committees), including such part of the total expenses of making acreage allotments, establishing normal yields, checking performance, and related activities in connection with wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco under the authorized farm program as the Secretary finds necessary to supplement the amount provided in section 392 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The second proviso contained under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1942 agricultural conservation program and shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 was not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under said program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to address myself particularly to this section. I am going to try to pay my respects to this bill as a whole and show how it is viewed by the farmers of my section, which view is typified by the following telegram I received from an agricultural committee of Great Falls, Mont.

Protest vigorously Department of Agriculture appropriation bill as reported out by House Appropriations Committee.

Demand Farm Security Administration crop insurance, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, soil conservation, and parity payments be continued. Demand restrictions on loans by Government agencies be eliminated from bill. Urge you oppose transfer of functioning of Farm Security Administration, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Agricultural Adjustment Administration to Extension Service and Farm Credit Administration as bill proposes. Request you keep us informed as to what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, this is what this bill does. I want you to note this language because it shows that after all the banks are going to have a stranglehold on the making of loans to the farmers by the Farm Credit Administration, inasmuch as the Farm Security Administration has been wiped out. This is in section 8, on the last page of the bill:

Solicitation or execution of any loan which has not first been offered to and refused by the private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the region where such loan is proposed to be made.

I have this moment been informed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that that provision is going to be stricken. It should not have been brought in here in the first place.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman ask who is responsible for putting it in the bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. May I ask who is responsible for putting this language in the bill?

(No answer.)

The bill as it is now hamstrings these agencies in making loans.

I have been connected with the banking business, and I know that when a fellow comes in who has liquid securities that can be sold on the New York Stock Exchange to offer as security he can get money at a much lower rate of interest than a man who has a few cows, horses, and that sort of thing, to offer as security.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman try to define the region from which he comes and tell me how many institutions in his region a farmer would have to go to in order to qualify?

Mr. O'CONNOR. God only knows. He would have to go to the banks, lending institutions, and building and loan institutions, and I do not know where else he would have to go.

The point is that they could charge any rate of interest they wanted to in order to hamstring a prospective borrower. If he asked for a loan, they would not refuse him, they would say, "Yes; we will give you the loan, but we will charge you interest at the rate of 9 or 10 percent." That might be comparable interest for that kind of a loan, whereas a man with liquid securities that would be salable on the New York Stock Exchange could get money at 5 percent. The greater the risk the higher the interest charged.

Now, I hope that crop insurance will be kept in the bill or put back into the bill. The farmer is the one person in our entire economic set-up who has to take a chance.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman expressed the hope that crop insurance might be kept in the bill. The fact is that the committee by the provisions of the bill has killed crop insurance.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand, but I also understand an amendment is to be offered to put it back in.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope that amendment prevails.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I, too, hope it prevails. I am for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518; 55 Stat. 255–256), $3,500,000, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is probably the only very controversial paragraph left in the bill. I may be mistaken about that. I ask unanimous consent to pass over this paragraph for the present in order to determine whether or not that is true. If no controversy arises in the remainder of the bill then we ought to be able to return to this paragraph after completing the reading of the bill and finish passing the bill this evening. If there are other major controversies, that would not be true. I can see no reason why we should not pass this paragraph for the moment and return to it after the further reading of the bill is completed.

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order against the paragraph, and I do not want this colloquy to deny me the right to make that point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Indeed not. I should not urge that as a reason for failure to consider the gentleman's point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be permitted to make his point of order. Is it the desire of the gentleman from Georgia that points of order be disposed of at this time?

Mr. TARVER. No. I ask that all questions on this paragraph, including points of order, be passed over for the present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made the statement that as far as he knows this is the only paragraph remaining about which there will be a controversy. I am sure the gentleman knows by the motions I made as a member of the Committee on Appropriations when this bill was considered in the full committee that there will be some controversy over the paragraph with reference to the Farm Security Administration, and it will take probably a couple of hours to discuss that.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman cannot offer any amendments to restore the Farm Security appropriation if it is stricken on a point of order, because there is no legal authority for it. I am not anticipating any controversy there.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments that I propose to offer with reference to the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. TARVER. That also will be out of order if it is in the nature of the loan provisions.

Mr. RANKIN. It will be with reference to the amount provided in the bill. The amendments will be in order, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Let us pass over this paragraph for the present and see what else develops on the reading of this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I have an amendment on the warehousing provision.

Mr. TARVER. Some other amendments may be offered, but I thought it would be advisable to see just how important further controversy might be.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. We have had a good full week, and it is apparent to me that we cannot get anywhere near finishing this bill unless we stay to a very late hour. I do not think we ought to be expected to stay any longer tonight. I think we may as well finish this bill Monday.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the Committee rose; and, Mr. MCCORMACK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2481, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEARNEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

THE BOMBING OF TOKYO

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago tomorrow this country was electrified with the news that Tokyo had been bombed. In our eagerness to destroy the nerve center of our enemy in the Pacific the first attack was a source of encouragement to every American. In part, it avenged Pearl Harbor.

Since that time, however, we have done little to injure the Japanese. Our full effort has been devoted almost exclusively to the European end of the Axis. The Pacific end has been all but forgotten. Where a little could do so much, less has been given. Our failure to send more aid to China can be excused by reason of the impossibility of delivering the goods in Chungking. This does not, however, explain our failure to send into the Australian sector at least sufficient equipment to guarantee the security and safety of the people of Australia.

It is a sad commentary that we celebrate the anniversary of the bombing of Tokyo by headlining the appeals from MacArthur for more bombers and greater security for Australia. The repeated demands emanating from MacArthur calling for more planes are answered by an announcement that members of the military shall not be candidates for political office. I am sure that this inspires the Japanese with awe.

The need for planes in Europe cannot be denied, but why must we boast our momentous production of aircraft and yet find it impossible to send 1,000 extra planes to MacArthur? Why must we pictorialize the launching of our ships, naval and commercial, and yet profess we cannot supply the shipping to carry goods to MacArthur? While we do not overlook the splendid accomplishments in the South Pacific with the limited equipment available one cannot help wondering how much greater Japanese losses might have been had greater amounts of aircraft, munitions, and men been placed at the disposal of General MacArthur.

We proudly boast of having seven fleets. Perhaps one properly placed would be more effective. Of the seven fleets possibly one can be spared to drive the Japanese out of Kiska, as was so forcefully discussed yesterday in another body by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. If Kiska had proven to be a real graveyard for Japanese shipping our efforts there would then be worth while, but unfortunately this has not been the case. Our failure to aggressively thwart the Japanese in their attacks throughout the far Pacific will prove ultimately a very costly program for this country.

One might overlook the failure to augment our aid to China, the failure to supply MacArthur, and the neglect of Kiska, but one receives little consolation knowing that the earnest appeals of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek for aid to China are being satisfied by a proposal to release the Japanese in this country now assembled in relocation camps for return to the west coast. At the present time it is being suggested that the loyal and disloyal Japanese be segregated and the loyal Japanese be returned to their homes and farms on the Pacific coast whence they came.

Those in charge of the War Relocation Authority, after a few months experience, feel capable of judging the loyalty of these people without having had any previous experience with the Japanese. The one man in Government who knows as much or more than any other official concerning the Japanese in this country unfortunately is not being utilized at this time in connection with the War Relocation Authority. I refer to an officer of the Naval Intelligence, who, having spent 3 years in Japan, spent 4 years in Los Angeles as a naval intelligence officer particularly investigating the Japanese problems. The advice and experience of such people in government is not being utilized in a problem of this magnitude; on the contrary, new planners are evolving means whereby they may relieve this country of the burden of caring for the Japanese. If the proposal to return the so-called loyal Japanese to the Pacific coast is carried out, the responsibility of even one act of sabotage or for one life lost due to secret information being given to the enemy will rest entirely with the War Relocation Authority. The people of California do not want it, and the Nation as a whole cannot afford to take the chance where the lives of our troops and the safety of our ship movements are so critically involved.

I trust this program will not be put into effect.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I make two separate unanimous-consent requests: That out of the hundreds of editorials that have appeared since the passage of the Hobbs bill on Friday last, congratulating the Congress upon its passage, I be permitted to insert several of them, which have been called to my attention, under each unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was not objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include tables showing the exports and general imports between the years 1922 and 1941, these figures being taken from the reports of the United States Customs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include as a part of my remarks certain endorsements and messages of approval of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, written to Mrs. Ovita Culp Hobby, and a letter written to General Somervell by Maj. Gen. John T. Lewis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is nearly 1 year old. It has performed a very fine service as an auxiliary to the Army, and it is hoped, now that they have won their spurs and have done their work, no matter how prosaic, most enthusiastically and efficiently and are releasing 60,000 men for active combat duty, that within a few days they will be made an integral part of the Army. These are the only women now not actually in the armed service to which they are accredited. The WAVES and Marines are a part of the Navy, and the SPARS are a part of the Coast Guard. I hope that the House will vote on the bill shortly to take these women into the Army. They have done a good job and are a credit to themselves and to the Army.

I asked Mrs. Hobby, Director of the WAAC's, what the Army said of the WAAC's, and received the following reply, which includes a copy of a letter written by Maj. Gen. John T. Lewis, A. U. S., commanding:

Col. Frederick G. Rogers, commanding officer at Fort Sheridan, Ill.:

"We are very glad to have you with us. Reports come in from every office in which you are employed that they don't know how they got along without you. Wherever you go, that feeling will be experienced by those with whom you work."

Col. Edwin N. Hardy, commanding officer at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.:

"These young women are showing marked ability and genius in taking over essential jobs from able-bodied men. Yet they have been giving their brother soldiers keen competition in military adherence. All of us are glad to have the WAAC at Fort Huachuca. They are proving of real value in our war effort at their stations."

Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General of the United States Army:

"Yes; the WAAC is proving itself worthy of its purpose. We need women to do many essential military tasks. This is a great team play, and woman power will have an important part in the victory."

Col. Charles K. Nulsen, commanding officer of Fort Sam Houston, Tex.:

"I wish to commend you and the personnel of the Thirtieth Headquarters Women's Army Auxiliary Corps company for the superb appearance at the inspection held by me this morning. I was deeply impressed by the military appearance and conduct of the women of your unit. The condition of the headquarters barracks and mess hall deserve the highest rating. During my entire service as an officer in the Regular Army I have never inspected a more outstanding organization. Your company has set a standard of performance which I consider a goal that should be the aim and inspiration of every Women's Army Auxiliary Corps company assigned to duty with the Army. In paying you and the members of your company this tribute I also pay deference to the incomparable womanhood of the United States of America."

Colonel Nulsen added in a letter to Director Hobby:

"I and the officers of my staff who have been so fortunate as to have members of this organization assigned to duty in their respective offices are deeply impressed with the seriousness and high sense of duty these young women have displayed."

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff:

"Although the Corps is still in the formative period of organization, its members have convincingly demonstrated their ability to render a vital military service. The standards of discipline, training, and general efficiency are on the highest level and are a complete reassurance to the officials of the War Department as to the outstanding services which will be rendered by this organization. A recent Executive order expands the Corps to a possible total of 150,000, giving women an opportunity to serve in many more positions than were originally contemplated.

This expansion became necessary because of the repeated requests from the commanders of our troops and services. I am confident that the women of America will meet this urgent need of the Army."

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Allied commander:

"Every WAAC is replacing a man who will thus be free for service at the fighting front. I insist that every man replaced by a woman go into active combat service. During my months in England before coming to Africa, I discovered how valuable the services of women soldiers are to the armed forces. On the whole, the presence of women raises the whole tone of the Army. Men are better disciplined when they are around. For example, men keep themselves neater because men probably always will want to preen a bit before the opposite sex."

Brig. Gen. M. G White (re the fact that WAAC's are manning instrument detectors for antiaircraft batteries):

"They do a lot better than men and learn more quickly."

Col. Frederick Schoenfeld, commanding officer, Philadelphia recruiting and induction district:

"Although a women's auxiliary is a new element in military history the record of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps to date indicates that its particular chapter in the story of this war will be a tremendously exciting and important one. Its formation comes as no surprise to those who have kept a sharp eye on developments in the world and its outstanding achievement is a source of shock only to those who underestimated the ingenuity and patriotism of American womanhood."

Maj. Gen. I. H Edwards, Assistant Chief of Staff:

"If given additional WAAC's the number of males will go down. We have a plan before Congress to put the WAAC's in the Army. A woman is just as useful to the Army in many jobs as a man. And as the WAAC grows in size, we will have to draw much less male manpower into the Army."

He added that the Army was having "extremely good luck" with the WAAC's, "getting the cream of the womanhood of the country."

Col. John W. Downer, commanding officer of Camp Upton, N. Y.:

"I am happy to offer you the welcoming hand of comradeship. We know that yours is noncombatant service, but you are nevertheless soldiers in the fullest sense. You have done as we have done—offered these years of your lives, your energies, and your talents in the service of your country. Your conduct, I am sure, will reflect the ideals of your organization. I know you will uphold these ideals proudly, so that we may be proud of you, and for you."

I cannot help but feel a great pride in these comments, the majority of them by officers who have observed WAAC's on posts where they have released enlisted men for active combat duty.

Sincerely,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Director.

APRIL 3, 1943.

Lt. Gen. BREHON SOMERVELL,
Army Service Forces,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL SOMERVELL: As a result of your letter of March 26, I have made special inquiry to determine the reaction of Army personnel in the military district of Washington to the work that members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps are doing in replacing men in noncombat operations.

I am gratified to say that this inquiry brought considerable evidence to support the feeling this headquarters had already developed; that as the WAAC's come onto a post and go to work, their ability, work, and enthusiasm for their jobs meet all expectations of the officers in charge and, in addition, earn for them respect and acceptance by all ranks of Army personnel who have opportunity to observe their work and conduct.

For example, at Fort Washington, where there is at work a company of the WAAC's, the consensus reveals favorable reaction on all sides with repeated remarks upon the willingness of the WAAC's to volunteer for extra duties in connection with their assigned jobs and upon their competence. Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, commandant of the Adjutant General's School, has stated publicly:

"The WAAC's fell into the routine immediately without wasting any time to become acclimated. I have never seen higher standards of cleanliness, neatness, and sanitation. And morale! Why, the WAAC's are tops. They are full of enthusiasm for their work. They work with great determination. We could use many more of them if we could get them."

Likewise, Col. E. W. Timberlake, commanding officer of the antiaircraft command, to which are attached several WAAC companies, has also stated publicly:

"The exchange of Army personnel and WAAC's (in the Sixty-second Post Headquarters Company) is made on a one-for-one basis, and, frankly, I have found the WAAC's work, both quantitatively and qualitatively, to be equal to that of the enlisted men they replace, particularly in accuracy, neatness, and speed. It has become possible to transfer enlisted men, whom WAAC's replace, to tactical and more advanced technical jobs for which their attainments fit them in this and other commands."

Sergeants in the antiaircraft headquarters, who are in direct charge of the work of the auxiliaries, have commented upon the capabilities of the WAAC's and the quickness with which they learn. They have also commented upon the responsible attitude the WAAC's take toward their work and their efficiency.

About the most recently arrived WAAC company in the district, at Fort Belvoir, Brig. Gen. Edwin H. Marks, commanding officer, says:

"I believe an earnest, energetic addition has been made to the personnel of this post which will prove of real value in replacing enlisted men now required for other duties. In drill formation and military courtesy, they have given evidence of discipline and training. They wear their smart uniforms with a certain swagger that leads one to feel they take pride in their organization. Fort Belvoir welcomes these patriotic young ladies and congratulates them on their esprit de corps."

Other officers and enlisted men at Fort Belvoir share the enthusiasm of their commandant for the way the WAAC's are going about their jobs, remarking on the discipline, capability, and enthusiasm to work at anything to which they may be assigned.

This was well summed up by a Signal Corps officer at Fort Belvoir, who is supervising the switchboard operators, when he said: "They might not replace men to climb telephone poles and in similar jobs, but it won't be for lack of trying."

All of the personnel in this command, Army and WAAC alike, realize that as the WAAC companies come in to go to work, there are naturally some small adjustments to be made as WAAC's take over jobs formerly held by enlisted men, just as there would be if a similar number of men came in as replacements. It is especially gratifying to know that WAAC's are actually on jobs in the posts of the military district of Washington and that, in performance of those jobs, they are meeting in a workmanlike manner the need which prompted the founding of the corps.

Need for women to replace men in noncombat operations within this district is such that I share wholeheartedly your interest in the WAAC recruiting campaign. I should like to assure you that the personnel of my entire command are also convinced of the Army's serious need for eligible women not otherwise engaged in essential war work, and of the high importance of the drive.

We take some gratification in the fact that the single WAAC recruiting office in this command, which is located in Washington, D. C., and is the only one in the Nation staffed entirely by WAAC personnel, is making a reasonable showing in recruiting work. As a matter of fact, the district stood third among service commands of the Nation with a record of 62 percent of its quota actually enrolled in the period January 1 to March 21 of this year. This standing was only nine-tenths of 1 percent behind the service command in second place.

I should like further to assure you of every cooperation from this command in insuring the success of the WAAC recruiting program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. LEWIS,
Major General, Army of the United States, Commanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 991. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until

April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

334. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation made pursuant to the Appropriation Act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law 644, 77th Cong); to the Committee on Appropriations.

335. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the possession, control, maintenance, and use of carrier pigeons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

336. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 221 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in me by the said statute, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2147) for the relief of Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2525. A bill to provide for the taking into custody, during the continuation of the existing war between the United States and Japan, of any or all Japanese residing in or found in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2526. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2533. A bill to create a revolving educational trust fund as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson by providing for the use of unclaimed deposits in national banks for the purpose of making loans to young men and women to assist them in obtaining a higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELMER:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution creating a committee of coordination; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the cherry trees located around the Tidal Basin and throughout the District of Columbia shall be known as Korean cherry trees; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 214. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture of the various agricultural credit and loan programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislatur of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that an international organization of all nations will achieve the lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make immediately available metals and other critical materials to produce synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant every Alaskan in the armed forces 160 acres of unappropriated land or public domain in the Territory of Alaska after the war; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2528. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2529. A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of John M. O'Connell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2532. A bill granting a pension to Delar Milam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

567. By Mr. CULKIN: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York (concurred in by the Senate of the State of New York), favoring an international organization of all nations to eliminate nationalism and economic and military aggression in order to achieve a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

568. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Resolution of the New York State Legislature, declaring its profound conviction that an international organization of all nations to achieve the elimination of rampant nationalism and economic and military aggression, and to secure the prosperity and welfare of all the peoples, must be an essential condition of the peace; and memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

569. By Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Petition of Mrs. L. E. Hendricks, on behalf of a group of citizens of La Porte, Ind., urging Congress to follow the action of the Indiana General Assembly, which in its last session passed a concurrent resolution to limit the term of the President of the United States to two four-year terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

570. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of Medford, Mass., favoring the naming of a naval vessel after the city of Medford; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

571. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging opposition to House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

572. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging passage of legislation to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

573. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Waitsburg, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

574. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Rev. Allan R. Knight and other residents of Cortland, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

575. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging establishment of an international organization of all nations to insure lasting peace through the abolishment of nationalism and economic and military aggression and guarantee the right of all people to worship as they please without fear of persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

576. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. Ashley G. Booth and members of his congregation of Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

577. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Petition of the Cook County Council of the American Legion, recommending that proper legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States to the end that any salary received for service in our armed forces during this present warfare be exempt under the provisions of our income-tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

578. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the pastor, Hugh O'Neill Memorial, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to American ideals of education in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

579. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Newton Center, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to world conference on food and negotiation of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

580. Also, petition of Ernest G. Albright, petitioner, Oklahoma City, Okla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to contraband whisky in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1943

(Legislative day of Friday, April 16, 1943

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join devout multitudes treading the Way of Sorrow. We lift our eyes to a green hill outside a city wall and to a lone cross against the sky—a cross so old and yet so new; it is a cross crimsoned by the cleansing love of a redeeming God, a cross hallowed by forgiveness for hate's most cruel blows, a cross sanctified by loving solicitude for all mournful mothers weeping at crosses where hang their sons, a cross glorified by the Father's brooding presence as into His hands is committed the pure soul of man's Best Man. May that cross be for us and for all men the sublime symbol that truth will conquer error, that light will dispell darkness, and that at last life will prove stronger than death.

Give us eyes to see that a mocking robe may be more regal than cloth of gold, that a crown of thorns may glow with a splendor surpassing kingly coronets, and that a garden of suffering may hold more beauty and fragrance than a sheltered bower of delight. On the stepping stones of our dead selves may we mount to newness of life—to the singing Easter of the soul, as we pray, each at the inner shrine of his own heart: Nearer my God to Thee, e'en though it be a cross that raiseth me. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CONSIDERATION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate met today following a recess, that the transaction of routine morning business be proceeded with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Utah). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEW PETROLEUM FACILITIES TO SERVE NEW ENGLAND AND EASTERN SEABOARD—LETTER FROM MAJ. J. R. PARTEN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to present for the RECORD a current letter from Maj. J. R. Parten, Director of Transportation in the Petroleum Administration for War. Major Parten is one of the ablest civilian administrators in connection with the war effort, as every Senator who has ever heard him testify will readily agree. In this letter Major Parten succinctly summarizes the new petroleum facilities which will be available by next winter to serve New England and the eastern seaboard. He pronounces them sufficient. He rejects other and alternative schemes. For the information of Senators who wish to be authentically informed on this subject, I ask that Major Parten's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD and that it be referred to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is now being wooed by some of these alternatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, April 16, 1943.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: In reply to your letter of April 3, the specific new facilities which are being installed to meet the east coast petroleum supply situation are the extension of the 24-inch war emergency pipe line from Norris City, Ill., to New York and Philadelphia, on which work is now proceeding rapidly, and a 20-inch products pipe line from Texas to the New York Harbor area.

We have just been advised by the Requirements Committee of the War Production Board that the 20-inch pipe-line project has been approved all the way to the east coast. Orders already have been placed and preliminary field work is under way for this project.

The 24-inch line will handle crude oil and heating oil. The flow of heating oil through this line, together with production from refineries located on the east coast, will be sufficient to meet all essential requirements of this product. The 20-inch line probably will start operations at a capacity of about 165,000 B/D, with an ultimate capacity of 235,000 B/D. It is expected that material will be available in such sequence that this line can be completed and placed in operation with the initial capacity of 165,000 B/D by the end of this year, and that materials for full capacity operation can be made available early in 1944.

The total pipe-line capacity, after completion of the 2 projects mentioned above, will be 743,000 B/D. Other facilities are estimated to bring the total deliveries up to 1,670,000 B/D, including the local production in the area.

The Florida barge canal project has been proposed as the best means of meeting the petroleum supply situation on the east coast this winter. We have not been able to agree with this contention for the following reasons:

1. Even if the canal could be completed in time and barges and tugs constructed, the use of critical materials per barrel of oil delivered to the consuming areas on the east coast would be excessive in comparison to other methods of supply.

2 The opinion of Major General Reybold is that the canal could not be finished under 2 years at the minimum.

3. Even if the canal could be completed in 10 months, and even if critical materials were made available for the construction of barges and tugs in spite of its inefficient use, the first barge of oil would not reach Philadelphia before about the middle of March and could not be transshipped to New England and arrive in consumers' tanks before about April 1. By April 1 the requirements will be less than the supply, and stocks will already have started to accumulate for the following winter.

If there is any further information that I can furnish, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. PARTEN,
Director of Transportation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 221 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement for the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS, OR ADVOCATE OVERTHROW OF THE GOVERNMENT BY FORCE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation covering the third quarter of the fiscal year 1943 (January 1, 1943, through March 31, 1943), relating to the investigation of Federal employees who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPOLATION (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A letter from the chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law and with his approval, a report submitted to him by Col. Robert W. Johnson, Chairman of the Board of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by members of the Hugh O'Neill Memorial Presbyterian Church and Sunday School at San Juan, P. R., favoring the retention of Dr. José M. Gallardo as Commissioner of Education of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Puerto Rico Teachers Association, San Juan, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the people of Puerto Rico to define its political status by means of a plebiscite; amendment of the organic act of Puerto Rico so as to place the responsibility of education in the island in the hands of the people, and also expressing the position of the association in connection with statements of members of the so-called Chavez committee on the language question in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Whereas after the enemy obtained control of over 92 percent of our normal supply of raw rubber, the Baruch Rubber Survey Committee recommended that an annual production of 1,106,000 tons of synthetic rubber

must be attained if our essential civilian and military motor vehicles are to be kept rolling throughout this mechanized war; and

"Whereas Rubber Director William M. Jeffers has done his best to follow the program outlined by the Baruch committee, but the program has been sharply cut by other agencies of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the necessary highway transportation of war workers, war commodities, and needed civilian supplies will be tragically crippled unless more tires are soon made available; and

"Whereas the agricultural and petroleum industries are prepared to supply the main basic ingredients for the manufacture of synthetic rubber tires: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois hereby commends Rubber Director William M. Jeffers for his efforts to keep the wheels rolling under the American military machine and the civilian economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois memorializes the Members of the United States Congress to do all in their power to make immediately available sufficient metals and other critical materials to build and equip as many factories as are needed to produce annually a minimum of 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be mailed by the secretary of state to Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, majority and minority leaders of both parties in each House of Congress, all Illinois Congressmen and Senators, Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, War Production Board Chairman Donald M. Nelson, Office of Defense Transportation Director Joseph B. Eastman, Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss M. Brown, and Economic Stabilization Director James C. Byrnes.

"Adopted by the senate, March 10, 1943."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
"*Albany, March 26, 1943.*

"Whereas it is the hope of every American that out of the suffering and horror of this war there shall rise the foundations of a lasting peace which will give to all peoples of the world the right to worship as they please without fear of persecution, and to the minorities everywhere the fullest protection of those inalienable rights which should be the heritage of every human being; and

"Whereas there can be no lasting peace unless rampant nationalism and economic and military aggression are eliminated from the world; and

"Whereas a lasting peace requires the prosperity and welfare of all the peoples; and

"Whereas such aims can be achieved only by an international organization of all nations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York declares its profound conviction that an international organization of all nations to achieve these results must be an essential condition of the peace: And be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end, and directs that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York."

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., favoring authorization and direction by the Congress to the Office of Price Administration to do all things necessary to stabilize and distribute fluid milk and fluid cream within California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., favoring prompt acquiescence in General MacArthur's request for immediate aid in pursuing the war in the Pacific area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens of Mount Pleasant and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying for repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program as being an unnecessary waste of public funds and a hindrance to the production of an adequate food supply; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by Maple River Grange, Michigan, favoring the enactment of House bill 1698, to amend the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living" (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.), and House bill 2002, to require that parity reflect increased farm labor costs for the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the act of October 2, 1942, and expressing opposition to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and its policy of subsidy payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The memorial of several supervisors of the Grand Trunk Western Railroad Co., of Fort Huron, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making it illegal for foremen to organize; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the child-care conference of Wayne County (Congress of Industrial Organizations) at Detroit, Mich., praying that the child-care program be placed under one agency or that a special agency be created to handle it as a war problem and also that adequate appropriations be made therefor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolution of Local No. 404, United Automobile Workers (American Federation of Labor), of Muskegon; Local No. 703, United Automobile Workers (American Federation of Labor); and Local No. 946, United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations), all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Austin-Wadsworth war-service bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of Wyandotte, Mich., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The petition of members and friends of the Calvary Mennonite Church, of the West Outer Drive, Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of pending legislation for the purpose of making marriage and divorce laws uniform throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I present and ask to have appropriately referred a number of resolutions in the nature of petitions and memorials adopted by the Legislature of California on various subjects and ask that they be printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

There being no objection, the resolutions presented by Mr. JOHNSON of California were referred to committees and ordered to be printed in the RECORD under the rule, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Resolution 94

Resolution relating to foot-and-mouth disease in imported cattle

Whereas a joint committee of this legislature has, in hearings relating to the shortage of meat in California, received expert testimony that if Argentine cattle were to be imported into the United States such importation would be practically certain to result in outbreaks of the foot-and-mouth disease among California and other American cattle; and

Whereas such importation, instead of increasing the meat supply in the United States, would, by destruction of the American cattle supply, decrease the total amount available and subject the people of this country to the possible harmful effects of eating diseased meat; and

Whereas the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture, through Dr. S. C. Fladness, undertook an investigation of the situation in Argentina with respect to prevalence of the foot-and-mouth disease about a year ago, and has apparently made a report on the situation to the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the officers of this State charged with the administration of laws designed to protect the people and animals of this State against the foot-and-mouth disease have made appropriate efforts to obtain that report or the results thereof and despite the legitimate interest of the people of this country in the results of this report it has thus far been unavailable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That in order to protect the livestock of this country, its food supply, and its general economy the Members of the Congress of the United States from California be, and they are hereby, requested to demand a copy of this report so that there shall be no secrecy upon a matter that is so vital to the well-being of every man, woman, and child in this country, and if such demand fails to make the report available that the Congress of the United States, by and through its appropriate committees, subpena Dr. S. C. Fladness to testify as to the results of his investigation of the foot-and-mouth disease situation in Argentina, and any other country from which the Federal administration proposed to import cattle; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency—two resolutions:

Senate Resolution 99

Whereas the American Meat Institute has evolved a program to achieve proper distribution of meat to the armed forces, to the civilian population, and to lend-lease without interfering with the wartime objective of inflation control; and

Whereas such program is the result of the work of more than two hundred men, including 22 institute committees, over a period of several weeks and was approved at a meeting of the directors of the institute appointed by members from all parts of the United States; and

Whereas this program was endorsed by the joint livestock committee representing 93 organizations engaged in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock; and

Whereas it appears that the basis of the program consists of an integrated, centralized control having authority to correlate slaughter and Government buying, with civilian needs in order at all times to keep the supply consistent with the demand; and

Whereas it appears to this body that such purposes are sound: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That it hereby endorses the meat-industry program for solving wartime meat problems; and be it further

Resolved, That Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be and he is hereby memorialized to place the full authority to achieve the objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; and be it further

Resolved, That such person and staff be aided by an advisory committee appointed by appropriate Government authority to represent the meat industry in all its phases and locations; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution by mail to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Members of the Congress of the United States from California; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate telegraph the contents of this resolution to the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator; the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration; the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization; and the Honorable Alfred J. Elliott, chairman of the California delegation in the House of Representatives.

And—

House Resolution 167

Whereas the American Meat Institute has evolved a program to achieve proper distribution of meat to the armed forces, to the civilian population, and to lend-lease without interfering with the wartime objective of inflation control; and

Whereas such program is the result of the work of more than 200 men, including 22 institute committees, over a period of several weeks and was approved at a meeting of the directors of the institute appointed by members from all parts of the United States; and

Whereas this program was endorsed by the joint livestock committee representing 93 organizations engaged in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock; and

Whereas it appears that the basis of the program consists of an integrated, centralized control having authority to correlate slaughter and Government buying with civilian needs in order at all times to keep the supply consistent with the demand; and

Whereas it appears to this body that such purposes are sound: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it hereby endorses the meat-industry program for solving wartime meat problems; and be it further

Resolved, That Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be, and he is hereby, memorialized to place the full authority to achieve the objectives of such a program in a person and staff thoroughly and practically experienced in the problems of the meat industry; and be it further

Resolved, That such person and staff be aided by an advisory committee appointed by appropriate Government authority to represent the meat industry in all its phases and locations; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution by mail to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States from California; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly telegraph the contents of this resolution to the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Honorable Alfred J. Elliott, chairman of the California delegation in the House of Representatives.

To the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Joint Resolution 23

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the War Production Board to rescind its revocation of the order to reconstruct the Albion River Bridge

Whereas there exists on the Mendocino coast a bridge spanning Albion River which is 18½ miles south of the city of Fort Bragg; and

Whereas the precarious condition of this bridge is manifested by its excessive swaying and deflection; and

Whereas its complete failure may occur at any moment, since it is impossible to maintain it in a safe condition; and

Whereas this bridge is of the utmost necessity in moving war materials, particularly redwood lumber from the sawmills of the Caspar Lumber Co., at Caspar, Calif.; the Union Lumber Co., at Fort Bragg, and the Rockport Lumber Co., at Rockport, Calif.; and

Whereas the War Department is now building an airport to be located 3½ miles north of this bridge and thus it is essential to have the road open for delivery of materials for war; and

Whereas this bridge spans a deep canyon with no detour available and the failure of the structure would disrupt traffic so as to require the use of a circuitous route over unimproved mountain roads with attendant delay in ultimate delivery of vital war materials to the San Francisco Bay area; and

Whereas failure of this bridge would impede the shipments of lumber, transportation of fish and farm products, and would result in the blocking of the coast road to all civilian and military traffic; and

Whereas a contract was let by the California State Department of Public Works to reconstruct the Albion River Bridge; and

Whereas, by an order issued by C. E. Wilson, executive vice president of the War Production Board, on March 31, 1943, the preference-rating order for the construction of the new bridge was revoked: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges that the War Production Board rescind its cancelation order and continue with the work of having the Albion River Bridge reconstructed; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to C. E. Wilson, executive vice president of the War Production Board, in Washington, D. C., and a copy each to the Congressmen and Senators from California.

GRAZING OF CATTLE IN NATIONAL PARK AREAS—RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I also present and ask to have appropriately referred a telegram, embodying a resolution signed by J. A. Beek, secretary of the Senate of the State of California, which is in the nature of a memorial.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The telegram embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *April 16, 1943.*

Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am directed by the senate to telegraph to you the following Senate Resolution No. 104, adopted by the senate relative to grazing of cattle on or adjacent to national parks:

"Whereas the war effort requires increased production of livestock and to that end various agencies of the Federal Government have requested and sought to encourage the increased production thereof; and

"Whereas over one-half million acres of California's best range land are now in military reservations where livestock cannot be grazed, and this loss must be replaced by other land if increased production is to be had; and

"Whereas there are within the State of California several national parks which have an overabundant supply of feed capable of supporting large numbers of livestock throughout the summer months without endangering the food supply for deer and other wildlife and without interfering with the use and enjoyment of such parks by tourists who are now unable to use the park facilities to the same extent as in years past; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of range lands adjacent to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, heretofore used, have been made unusable for grazing purposes because of threatened livestock trespass action against livestock owners in the event their livestock wanders into the park and by requiring fencing which has not heretofore been required; and

"Whereas, by reason of the aforesaid policy, thousands of acres of feed in the counties of Tehma, Shasta, Lassen, Inyo, Tulare, Fresno, Mono, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and others have been made unusable to producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Federal authorities be, and the same are hereby, requested to make available the grazing lands within the national parks in California to the livestock producers of this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the lands adjacent to the Lassen Volcanic National Park be made available by a more liberal policy as to the incidental trespass of livestock from said lands in said park; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to send by telegram a copy of this resolution to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing California in the Congress of the United States."

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate,
State of California.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY—COMPENSATION TO CIVILIANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina, and also to have it referred to the Finance Committee, which is now considering Senate bill 450.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 450 regarding compensation to civilians

Whereas the United States is engaged in a total war and many civilians are patriotically contributing their services in such necessary activities as civilian defense work; and

Whereas many of these civilians, including the civilian defense workers, may be injured and become burdens on their families or society unless provision is made to protect them from financial loss caused by such injuries; and

Whereas the members of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina believe that the Federal Government should make provision to protect these citizens rendering invaluable service to our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact Senate bill 450, introduced by Senator PEPPER, which provides for compensation to civilians, including civilian defense workers; and be it

Further resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice

President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and the Representatives from South Carolina.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY—CHANGE OF NAME OF COLUMBIA ARMY AIR BASE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of South Carolina in connection with the change of name of the Columbia Army Air Base to the Lexington County Air Base, South Carolina, and to have the concurrent resolution referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution to memorialize the War Department of the United States, or such board or officer as has authority thereabout to change the name of the Columbia Army Air Base to Lexington County Air Base

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina has given to the Army air base in Lexington County the name "The Lexington County Air Base"; and

Whereas the county of Lexington provided the necessary funds for such base, but it has since been designated by the name Columbia Army Air Base: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the War Department of the United States of America, or such other board or officer as has authority thereabout, be, and he is hereby, requested to change the name of said air base to the "Lexington County Army Air Base."

FOOD PRODUCTION—PLEDGE OF PENNSYLVANIA FARMERS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it is common knowledge today among the people of America that the food production effort which must be put forth by this Nation will be without precedent in our history, and that to achieve the goals in view and to meet all the demands which are being placed upon America's food production capacities will require the whole-hearted cooperation of every one of our citizens, as well as a tremendous effort on the part of all those who are engaged in the farming industry.

There is no group in America which more fully appreciates the need for complete success in this food production venture than the farmers of America, themselves. The farmers of America, although their efforts have in large part been restricted in recent years by means of a thorough-going program of governmental regimentation, have, nevertheless, responded to this great food production program with enthusiasm and determination.

As an indication of the manner in which the farmers of America have resolved to meet these food production needs, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from the Region 1 Office of the Department of Agriculture, under date of April 13, 1943, which letter sets forth the increased yields for a number of vital commodities which the farmers of Pennsylvania have pledged themselves to attain in the year 1943. These pledges make clear the fact that despite all the difficulties and problems that are now plaguing the farmer—manpower shortage, lack of equipment and supplies, and unsatisfactory price arrangements—the farmers of Pennsylvania and America are determined to do their utmost to hasten the day of our complete military victory, by meeting the food production goals which this Nation has set for itself.

Mr. President, I ask that this communication be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in order that its members may be advised of the tremendous food production accomplishments which the farmers of Pennsylvania have undertaken to achieve during the year 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, REGION 1,
Upper Darby, Pa., April 13, 1943.

Hon. JAMES JOHN DAVIS,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: We recently sent to farmers who are cooperating with the Farm Security Administration in Pennsylvania the attached letter asking them whether they are producing more food and how we can help them to do so. I feel that their replies are illuminating and I thought you would like to see a few representative ones, copies of which I am attaching. We can make available the entire file from your State if you want to look them over.

What impresses me most about these letters is the fact that these farmers feel that they and other American farmers like them can increase their food production. These families have qualified themselves as authorities by producing far more than their share in the food increases for 1942. You may have seen the recent announcement by the Department of Agriculture reporting that Farm Security families throughout the Nation, although constituting only 7.6 percent of the Nation's farmers, increased their milk production in 1942 by 1,419,000,000 pounds, which was 36 percent of the total increase in that year for the Nation. Their increases in other war-needed commodities also were much greater than their proportionate share.

Farm Security families in Pennsylvania have pledged further increases in 1943. To some of us their 1943 pledges, like those in 1942, seemed quite ambitious in face of production difficulties. However, these families have ample labor in their own large families and, considering their splendid accomplishments during 1942, I am inclined to place their collective judgment of what they can do above our own. The pledged increases for 1943 over 1941 in war-needed commodities for Pennsylvania are as follows:

Milk, 44.3 percent, 59,041,600 pounds; eggs, 63.8 percent, 1,628,270 dozen; poultry, 72.5 percent, 1,154,410 pounds; pork, 92 percent, 3,051,960 pounds; beef, 76.9 percent, 1,179,970 pounds; dry beans, 84.3 percent, 122,940 pounds; and soybeans, 497.9 percent, 53,436 bushels.

These borrowers, of course, assume that the assistance they need will be available. The replies to our letter indicate that their chief concern is to get credit, technical supervision, and equipment necessary to do the job. With larger operators, of course, the factor of labor would be at the top of the list; but, as I have already pointed out, this is not a major problem with these family farmers who need only the assistance necessary to put their family labor in full-time work.

We are bending all our efforts to assist all farmers, large and small, to maintain and increase their food production to meet our mounting war and civilian needs. I would be glad at any time to have you get in touch with me or with Carson F. Mertz, 108 West Beaver Avenue, State College, Pa., who is State director for the Farm Security Administration in Pennsylvania, for any further information.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. WOOD,
Regional Director.

LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—LIST OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a list of 4,208 petitions favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States. The petitions are listed by States and the towns from which they come.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of petitions received by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860:

Alabama:	
Dora	3
Jasper	1
Robertsdale	112
Tyler	1
Total	117
California:	
Calusa	1
Exeter	1
Los Angeles	35
Oakland	1
Total	38
Connecticut: Hartford	1
Colorado:	
Colorado Springs	2
Fort Collins	97
Greeley	1
Total	100
Florida: Zephyrhills	1
Georgia: Buford	1
Illinois:	
Chicago	1
Moweaqua	1
Total	2
Iowa:	
Boyden	1
Clarion	1
Jesup	1
Newton	1
Oskaloosa	1
Total	5
Kansas:	
Kansas City	1
Topeka	2
Total	3
Louisiana:	
Choudrant	1
Crowley	2
Winnfield	3
Total	6

Maine: Brunswick	1
Maryland: Fort Meade	1
Massachusetts:	
Brockton	1
Middleboro	1
Total	2
Michigan:	
Bay City	1
Fenton	1
Gobles	1
Howell	1
Lachine	1
Ludington	1
Muskegon	1
Port Huron	1
Saugatuck	1
Total	9
Missouri:	
Ava	87
Edina	28
Kansas City	41
Milan	82
Monroe City	18
Warrensburg	60
Webb City	564
Total	880
Nebraska:	
Axtell	1
Crookston	1
Greenwood	1
Kearney	2
Palisade	1
Total	6
New York:	
Albany	1
Binghamton	25
Canandaigua	1
Corning	95
Falconer	1
Fulton	16
Highland	27
Houghton	77
Ilion	1
Lynbrook	1
Newark	1
New York City	1
North Chili	138
North Tonawanda	1
Rochester	1
Stanfordville	45
Total	432
North Carolina: Asheboro	1
Ohio:	
Huron	1
New Philadelphia	1
Pioneer	1
Youngstown	1
Total	4
Oklahoma:	
Ada	67
Aline	16
Apache	16
Boise City	71
Crescent	167
Duke	6
Duncan	17
El Reno	14
Enid	231
Fort Cobb	38
Gage	50
Kenton	162
Muskogee	19
Oklahoma City	1
Perkins	25
Pond Creek	103
Seiling	55
Shattuck	1
Stillwater	24
Oklahoma—Continued.	
Thomas	18
Tulsa	147
Tupelo	172
Wayoka	1
Weatherford	10
Wheeless	18
Woodward	272
Total	1,771
Oregon: Pendleton	1
Pennsylvania:	
Allentown	1
Camp Hill	1
Harrisburg	1
Mechanicsburg	1
Newton	1
Philadelphia	3
Quarryville	1
Ruffs Dale	1
Total	10
South Dakota: Boneita Springs	29
Tennesse: Jonesboro	1
Texas:	
Austin	1
Belton	27
Big Spring	19
Blue Grove	1
Buckholts	2
Caldwell	2
Claude	35
Cleburne	1
Dalhart	15
Dallas	112
Dayton	1
Elgin	33
Fort Worth	1
Galveston	1
Graham	68
Hereford	60
Houston	2
Junction	2
Keene	156
Killeen	79
Lyford	2
Mason	2
Pettus	1
Pittsburg	1
Raymondville	24
Robstown	2
San Antonio	1
San Juan	1
Taylor	7
Waco	1
Weslaco	55
Wichita Falls	2
Total	717
Vermont: Burlington	1
Virginia: Maxwell	1
Washington:	
Custer	17
Pullman	1
Total	18
Wisconsin:	
Clintonville	47
Madison	2
Total	49
District of Columbia: Washington	1
Grand total	4,208

INSPECTIONS OF STEEL PLATE BY CARNEGIE-ILLINOIS STEEL CORPORATION—ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 7 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and at the request of the chairman of the committee, I submit an additional report on steel, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and also in report form.

I will say, Mr. President, I believe that the report and press release cover the situation. Other than that, I merely suggest that the Members of the Senate read the report, which will be available to them tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, printed, and printed in the RECORD.

The report above referred to is as follows:

The Irvin Works of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, is a continuous-strip steel mill erected for the purpose of producing huge quantities of strip sheet steel, primarily for use in the manufacture of automobiles. Mills of this type have been switched to the manufacture of steel plate for use in ship construction. They were not built for that purpose, and their operation as plate mills involves certain technical difficulties. These included the lack of facilities for the stacking of plate for cooling by air. At the Irvin plant there was no room for the creation of sufficient additional stacking facilities, and it was necessary eith to limit production to the quantity of plate that could be air cooled or to quench and cool the plate by artificial means. The latter practice was adopted, and after some difficulties, techniques have been developed which it is believed enable a good rate of production to be made without so injuring the product as to cause it to fail to meet specifications. In the course of these experiments many heats of steel were rejected for failure to meet specifications.

The responsibility for the quality of the steel plate produced at the Irvin Works was, in the first instance, that of the chief metallurgist of the plant.

The steel plate was purchased chiefly for Government use by or on behalf of the Navy for naval ships, the Maritime Commission for merchant ships, and the Treasury for lend-lease operations. The specifications as to quality were determined by the several Government agencies in accordance with their conception of what they needed for the purposes for which they desired to use the plate.

The Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, like most other steel companies, had a practice of taking a so-called ladle test of the open-hearth steel produced by it, from which it determined the chemical analysis of each heat or batch of steel produced. The slabs produced from each heat were numbered, and a system was set up to keep a record of the applicable heat number, so that only slabs having proper chemical structure would be used to produce plate of specified character and so that the customer could be informed as to the chemical analysis of the heat from which the plates delivered to it were made.

Most of the Government agencies, relying upon the integrity of the company, did not have a practice of checking as to the chemical analysis. The Navy, however, took test borings of the completed plate purchased by it from which chemical analyses were made by it. There is a range within which it is expected that such analyses would differ from those made from ladle samples. Before the hearings, the committee requested that the Navy furnish any information which it had on this and all other phases of the situation. On April 16, the Navy informed the committee that it had examined its records and that they indicate no variance from which the Navy can conclude that the steel furnished to it was chemically defective.

No such check can be made as to the chemical nature of the steel furnished to other agencies.

The undisputed testimony before the committee was that through carelessness and negligence the heat numbers of approximately 5 percent of the steel processed at the Irvin Works were transposed or otherwise lost. Instead of taking the action necessary to trace the correct numbers or to insure their careful notation in the future, a practice was evolved by which false and fake chemical analyses were entered in the records. Analyses were made up which would be within the range which could be expected from the grade of steel that was supposed to have been put through the mill. The company admitted the practice and denied that it had been known to or countenanced by its chief officials, who apparently were not sufficiently familiar with the operations of their own plant to know its limitations. The company asserts that with exceptions, said by the company to be rare, the steel processed in the mill was of the grades which should have produced plates that would have been accepted if an honest and true chemical analysis had been made. This appears to have been true of the plate tested by the Navy. The committee at all times has assumed that it was true of at least most of the plate furnished to the agencies that made no chemical analyses. However, the chance of detection in the case of such steel plate was much smaller. When dishonesty exists, it is difficult if not impossible to accept a plea to the effect that "Our people were dishonest, but they would not be that dishonest."

In addition to, and in the opinion of the committee, much more important than the faking and falsifying of the chemical analyses, there was a practice of faking and falsifying the physical tests to which the finished steel plates were subjected to determine their tensile strength. It was more important because even the right grade of steel with a proper chemical analysis might make poor plate for a number of reasons. This would be especially true if the mill was run beyond the capacity to quench properly or if such quenching was not properly done. It was also more important because no customer, including the Navy, had a practice of making tests other than those made on company testing machines operated by company employees. The Navy exercised more care in this respect than the other agencies because the machines were operated by company employees in the presence and under the supervision of Navy inspectors, which was not done except in rare instances by the other agencies.

However, the men in charge of making these tests for the company testified that about 5 percent or more of these physical tests were deliberately faked for the purpose of falsely reporting that it was in accordance with specifications. In most instances this was accomplished either by manipulating or misreading the testing machines so as to produce a result better than the true result. The company men in charge of the operation of the machines testified that they instructed the testers under them to cheat, but not to cheat by more than 2,000 to 3,000 pounds. It has not yet been determined whether such limitations were followed by all the workmen.

In some instances where the test was so low as to require a retest a sample of different plate was substituted for the purpose of assuring that the retest would be successful.

The Navy has informed the committee that its records indicated that the tests were being properly run in the presence of its inspectors and that it could not reasonably be expected to frustrate the deliberate and dishonest but successful attempts to deceive its inspectors. The committee agrees with the Navy that there can be no complete defense against dishonesty. The Navy does not in any way dispute the evidence, which remains uncontradicted by the company, that many of the physical tests, including many in the presence of Navy inspectors, were faked.

The committee accepts the Navy's conclusion that it set up procedures which, except for dishonesty, would have protected it. It should also be pointed out, as was done at the hearing, that the Navy inspectors caught one company tester cheating and complained to the management with the result that he was demoted and transferred to other work by the men whose instructions he was following.

In addition, there was evidence that plate which had failed to pass visual inspection for laminations and other physical defects was passed.

This case requires particular emphasis because of the improper and obstructive attitude which was taken as to it by the Carnegie-Illinois Corporation when the matter was first brought to its attention. Instead of cooperating in an investigation of a serious situation which had arisen by reason of the carelessness and negligence of the management, it attempted to delay and obstruct the investigation by refusing access to records and an opportunity to examine witnesses. When it became impossible to continue such tactics, it resorted to attempts to minimize the importance of dishonesty which it was forced to admit had been practiced by its employees. The presentation of its case before the committee was marked by a lack of frankness and candor.

There has been discussion recently as to the Carnegie-Illinois situation, much of it obviously inspired by the company's efforts to escape the public condemnation of its careless disregard of Government specifications.

It should be noted, however, that no company official has taken such a position publicly. Mr. B. F. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corporation, stated to the committee: "We are just as shocked to get these facts as you and we are just as desirous of correcting them as you are" and "I consider it was very, very poor management."

The opinion of the War Production Board with respect to the actions of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation was succinctly stated in a letter from Mr. C. E. Wilson, executive vice chairman of the War Production Board, to Mr. Irving S. Olds, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, dated March 24, 1943, in which he stated that:

"The evidence taken at the closed hearing of the Truman committee on March 22 and at the public hearing yesterday seems beyond question to substantiate the charges of falsification of records and tests at the Irvin works. Although the evidence adduced to date does not prove that the culpability for the falsification goes higher than the chief metallurgist, Mr. McGarrity, it does nevertheless indicate, in our opinion, poor management on the part of the officials of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation.

"Needless to say, this entire situation has deeply disturbed us at the War Production Board, and we are determined, as we feel certain you are too, that immediate steps shall be taken to put an end to all falsifications, to take appropriate disciplinary action with regard to those responsible for such practices no matter how high in the organization they may be, and finally so to readjust your organization that in the future we can look forward with the fullest confidence to effective, efficient, and straightforward operation of your corporation and its subsidiaries."

The committee has been assured that the above statements still constitute the official opinion of Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and Mr. Hiland G. Batchellor, Director of the Steel Division of the War Production Board. Mr. Olds has replied to Mr. Wilson that steps are being taken to comply with the demand of the War Production Board.

The committee is also authorized to state that the above statements of Mr. Wilson upon behalf of the War Production Board were made after consultation with the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission and are concurred in by both of them.

The committee's attention has been called to the fact that there has recently been much more vigilance by inspectors to make certain that specifications are fully complied with and that in some instances, as, for example, visual inspection for physical defects such as lamination, the specifications are written in such general terms as to leave considerable room for the exercise of judgment on the part of inspectors.

The committee has been informed that plate mills which are under construction at Provo, Utah, and at the Homestead works, which were originally supposed to have been completed and in production this spring, have been unavoidably delayed by reason of the aluminum program. It has also been informed that a slab mill in another plant of the United States Steel Corporation has been so overloaded that it may have to shut down for extensive repairs and rebuilding, which would mean a loss of 80,000 to 90,000 tons of steel plate per month. This will throw an extraordinary burden upon the continuous strip sheet mills which, according to Mr. Hiland Batchellor, Director of the Steel Division of the War Production Board, were never intended to be used in the production of plate and cannot operate indefinitely on heavy production. For example, according to Mr. Fairless, Irvin Works was designed to turn out a maximum of 50,000 tons a month of the products for which it was designed. According to Mr. Fairless:

"This taxed finishing capacity to a point where the material had to move rapidly or the mill would have been forced to shut down. Inspection could not keep pace with production."

After the hearings by this committee and the express instructions of the War Production Board, a vigilant inspection has been instituted and the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation fears that it will not be able to maintain its production if it is required to conform to the specifications required by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission.

Difficulties are also being encountered by it and other companies, due to the rigid construction placed on inspection instructions such as those dealing with the visual examination for physical defects where necessarily there is a wide latitude for difference of opinion.

Mr. Nelson has telegraphed all companies asking that in determining these questions of judgment, where reasonable men might properly differ, the inspectors should not be too strict. Mr. Nelson desires to make it clear that the telegram did not mean that specifications subject to exact ascertainment should be disregarded. He has requested the committee to include in its report a statement that he has read and concurs in the report.

Neither Mr. Nelson nor any other responsible official has suggested that the chemical analyses or physical tests for tensile strength and elongation should be disregarded. The determination as to whether such tests indicate that the steel is up to specifications does not involve judgment. It either is or is not.

The Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation has suggested that specifications are too strict and that some steel that would be rejected under the specifications would be suitable for the uses for which it is intended. The specifications are of course to be determined by the Navy Department and the

Maritime Commission. They have not been changed, but studies are about to be made to determine whether in the opinion of the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission they can safely be changed.

The committee believes that if the specifications of the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission are unduly high and that an increase of production can be obtained by revising the specifications so as to make them read the way they should have read in the first place, such specifications should be revised. This is especially true if, after a study which the committee understands is about to be instituted, facts as to the metallurgy of the steel plate as used in welded hull construction are developed which were not known and understood by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission at the time that they determined their specifications. However, if such studies should indicate that the specifications as they now exist are proper and that they cannot be safely reduced, even under the exigencies of war, then a full and honest inspection in accordance with those specifications should be required, regardless of the effect upon production unless special uses can be developed for substandard plate marked, priced, and used as such.

The committee understands that it is the position of the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, and it certainly is the position of the committee, that all suppliers of materials to Government agencies must supply them in strict conformity to the specifications determined by the agencies. Such suppliers must not substitute their opinion for that of the Government agencies. Particularly, they must not falsify inspections or engage in other practices for the purpose of deceiving Government agencies into accepting materials which differ from those ordered. Where the suppliers of materials believe that they could safely be subjected to different standards of quality from those prescribed by the Government agencies, it is their duty to call such facts to the attention of the Government agencies for acceptance or rejection of the suggestions.

The committee recommends that all suppliers of materials to Government agencies examine their inspection practices in accordance with the above statement. The committee expects their inspections to be honestly made. There is no substitute for honesty. There is no excuse for frauds.

Similarly, there is no occasion to permit at this critical time any loss of production through overextreme cautiousness in the interpretation of specifications in those cases where for good practical reasons specifications must allow for some exercise of judgment, due caution, and care on the part of inspectors.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 16, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1016. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of W. J. King; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1018. A bill providing for payments to States and their political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on real property acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

DISCLOSURE OF GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA MATERIAL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am submitting today in the Senate two resolutions requiring the Office of War Information and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs to file with the Secretary of the Senate all propaganda material which this country is distributing to the people of foreign nations and to its own armed forces.

Under present conditions, propaganda is undoubtedly a valuable weapon in the war, although I think its importance is overemphasized by many. Faced with a propaganda directed against us, it is undoubtedly necessary to resort to counter propaganda and to psychological attacks upon the morale of the enemy. Our Government is, therefore, spending millions of dollars today on short-wave propaganda to foreign countries in every conceivable language and for the distribution of printed matter throughout the world.

It is obvious to me that the people of the United States want to know what is being said in their behalf. What promises are being made? What statements of national policy are being disseminated throughout the world? Ugly rumors are abroad that much of this short-wave broadcasting is futile and idiotic, and very inferior to that of other nations. It is said that some of it is communistic and some of it is fascistic, and that much of it tries to play European politics, about which we know nothing, instead of presenting the American point of view.

We certainly do not wish to be accused later of double-crossing foreign people because we do not carry out the statements made secretly in our behalf and without our knowledge by irresponsible Government employees, many of whom are not even Americans.

There can be no claim that this material must be kept secret, for in its very nature it is being broadcast to all the world. It is already in the hands of all enemy governments and United Nations governments. Only in America it seems to be impossible to obtain copies, and the American people are the only people in the world who do not have access to it.

Finally, it is important that there be a complete historical record of all features of this propaganda organization. Unless an official record is required, much of the material is likely to be destroyed. Perhaps some of it is already destroyed.

I am also submitting a resolution to require the filing of O. W. I. material distributed to the armed forces. Conceivably some of this may require secrecy, and I have therefore provided that upon request of the general staffs secrecy will be ordered, but I doubt whether the heads of the armed forces are transmitting any secret orders or instructions to their soldiers and sailors through the O. W. I. Samples of O. W. I. propaganda which we have already seen lead me to doubt seriously whether the soldiers are receiving an impartial account of the facts dealt with by the propaganda they receive. Propaganda by any government is basically dangerous. We have seen the effects of its misuse in foreign lands. Surely in the United States of America there is no reason why it should be conducted in secret.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The two resolutions submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States during the war period has found it necessary to embark upon a campaign of transmitting news, information, and propaganda to the peoples of foreign lands by radio, written literature, and motion pictures; and

Whereas it is highly desirable that the Congress and the people of the United States have full information regarding the matter which is thus being distributed, including particularly the policies declared and promises made in their behalf; and

Whereas, although this matter is being widely disseminated to enemy nations and is necessarily fully available to the people of enemy nations and of the United Nations, but is not available to the American people, the Congress of the United States, and the American press and radio: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Director of the Office of War Information and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs are hereby directed to file with the Secretary of the Senate of the United States within 2 weeks after the passage of this resolution:

(1) Authoritative transcripts of all material broadcast since January 1, 1943, by short wave or otherwise, to countries other than the United States of America, including the nations of the Western Hemisphere, this material to be deposited both in the language in which it was broadcast and in a direct English translation thereof, together with actual recordings of such broadcasts where such recordings are available;

(2) Copies of all written literature distributed in any manner among the people of such foreign countries since September 1, 1942, this material to be deposited in the form and language in which it was distributed, and in a direct English translation thereof;

(3) Copies or prints of all motion pictures, or other visual material circulated among the people of such foreign countries since September 1, 1942; be it further

Resolved, That after the adoption of this resolution the Director of the Office of War Information and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs shall deposit daily with the Secretary of the Senate of the United States the material described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) above within 72 hours after any such material reaches the foreign people to whom it is directed; be it further

Resolved, That the material so deposited shall, upon its deposit with the Secretary of the Senate, be available for inspection, study, and publication by authorized representatives of Members of Congress and by authorized representatives of the press, radio, and magazines of the United States.

The resolution (S. Res. 141) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the Office of War Information is producing sound-recorded material, printed

material, motion pictures, and other visual material, and distributing the same to the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the men in such armed forces do not have available all the information and material distributed through ordinary press, radio, and motion-picture channels, and particularly when they are overseas their information is largely dependent on the material supplied by the Office of War Information; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States, and particularly the relatives of members of the armed forces, have a direct and vital interest in knowing what material is supplied to the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Director of the Office of War Information is hereby directed to deposit with the Secretary of the Senate all such material, whether sound recorded, printed, written, or filmed, within 1 week after such material is distributed to the armed forces of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That such material shall upon deposit with the Secretary of the Senate, be available for inspection, study, and publication by authorized representatives of Congress and authorized representatives of the press, radio, and magazines of the United States; unless in any case it is accompanied by a certificate of the General Staff of the Army or the General Staff of the Navy that such material is a military secret, in which case such material shall be deposited in the Congressional Library and preserved for public use whenever the General Staff giving the certificate shall certify that secrecy is no longer necessary.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR CHANDLER'S ADDRESS ON CONDITIONS IN THE PACIFIC AREA

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with the consent of the able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I wrote him last week end regarding the thoroughly inspiring address which he delivered in the Senate last Friday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator A. B. CHANDLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHANDLER: I want to express my gratitude to you for your courageous, forthright speech in the Senate regarding the unescapable necessity of putting greater current emphasis upon our war in the Pacific. I can also speak for thousands of fathers and mothers in Michigan and Wisconsin whose boys largely constitute the Thirty-second Division, which has been carrying a large share of the bloody burden of the fighting in the Far East. It is entirely understandable why they should be deeply moved when General MacArthur asks for help. Day by day I hear from them in countless numbers.

I realize that civilians must leave decisions of strategy in a global war to the military experts. (I hope this distinctly includes "civilians" in high places.) I do not propose to be any sort of an armchair strategist attempting to interfere with the decisions of the General Staff upon which we must all depend for ultimate victory. But I do not believe it is amiss for us respectfully to remind these experts that there is a tremendous bulk of American public opinion which, while hating Hitler and enlisting for his total defeat, looks upon Japan as an equally prime enemy, particularly as respects our own American hazards.

In view of your personal investigations in the Pacific area, you have more of an authentic right to speak about these things than do some of the rest of us. That is why I welcome your sturdy address. You have reflected my own mind; and I want to say so to you. I would not let up on Hitler in any degree: but I would hope and believe it is possible, in the distribution of our total resources of the United Nations, that MacArthur's men may be promptly sustained with more "tools" for an earlier and less costly Pacific victory than may otherwise be possible.

With warm personal regards,
Cordially and faithfully yours,
A. H. VANDENBERG.

THE FUTURE OF SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Has Small Business a Future" delivered by him at a meeting of the Greater Cleveland Council Smaller Business of America, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on March 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAY PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR BROUGHTON OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Raleigh News and Observer of April 7, 1943, containing a proclamation by Governor Broughton, of North Carolina, in connection with the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS BY THE NAZIS—ADDRESS BY COL. JOHN J. GRIFFIN

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Jewish persecutions by the Nazis, delivered by Col. John J. Griffin, chairman of the Council of Draft Boards of St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1943, under the auspices of the St. Louis Council American Jewish Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY GOULD LINCOLN ON SPEECH OF SENATOR CHANDLER AS TO STRENGTHENING FORCES IN PACIFIC AREA

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chandler, in Demanding Strengthening of Pacific, Sounds Doctrine That Is Good Americanism," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY FRED PASLEY ON SENATOR CHANDLER'S SPEECH AS TO STRENGTHENING FORCES IN PACIFIC AREA

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Coast Menaced by Japs, Senate Told," written by Fred Pasley and published in the New York Daily News of April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JESSE JONES AND RUBBER PRODUCTION—ARTICLE BY OWEN L. SCOTT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Jesse Jones Succeeds," written by Owen L. Scott, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD—ARTICLE BY GEORGE CREEL

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the recent report of the National Resources Planning Board entitled "From the Cradle to the Grave," written by George Creel and published in Collier's magazine for April 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN P. ALTGELD—ARTICLE BY IRVING DILLIARD

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the late John P. Altgeld entitled "The Eagle That Is Remembered," written by Irving Dilliard and published in the Survey Graphic for August 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

STEEL-PLATE PRODUCTION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the people of Pittsburgh have been shocked by recent reports that production of steel plates is threatening to fall off sharply. Pittsburgh newspapers have published reports that in one mill more than 100 cars of steel plates are backed up awaiting inspection. In another plant 50 carloads are backed up.

It is easy to imagine what this means to the war effort. Without a steady, full-volume supply of steel plates we simply will not get the destroyers and escort vessels we need, nor the merchant ships to carry supplies as the time comes for the invasion of Europe.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette made a careful investigation of what is causing steel-plate production to fall off, and it concludes that it is due to a demoralizing fear that has swept the steel-inspection services in all the mills throughout the country as the result of disclosures made before the Truman committee.

I myself have not had time to make a personal inquiry, but I hope to do so and have something more to say about this matter at a later date. Meanwhile, for the information of the Senate I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a number of illuminating articles and editorials which have appeared in recent days in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 18, 1943]

AN EXPLANATION—"FAKED" STEEL CASE—ITS TECHNICAL SIDE

If you are interested in the technical side of the "guessed" or "faked" steel controversy, here are the facts as prepared by the Post-Gazette's Washington correspondent:

Plates produced at the Irvin works are rolled from slabs made at the Edgar Thomson works. Each slab is given a heat number which shows it to be within the analytical range as developed in the ladle test of the steel at Edgar Thomson and as required for the finished steel.

In the reheating of the slabs at the Irvin works preparatory to the rolling, the heat numbers become obliterated but the slabs are put into the reheating furnaces in rotation and are discharged from those furnaces in rotation, so that there could be little or no question that the plates produced analyzed correctly as determined by the heat ladle test at the Edgar Thomson works.

Under Navy regulations tensile strength tests are required on four pieces of steel out of every heat, the heats ranging from 120 to 190 tons. The American Bureau of Shipping regulations required two tests out of each heat.

The Navy regulations for ship plates call for a tensile strength of 60,000 pounds per square inch and the American Bureau of Shipping calls for a tensile strength of 58,000 pounds per square inch.

Different plates from the same heat upon tests of sheared portions inevitably show a variation of tensile strength and both in the

case of the Navy and the American Bureau of Shipping the requirement is for an average of 60,000 pounds and 58,000 pounds, respectively.

Material that might test as much as 3,000 pounds below the required standard would be acceptable if the average of the tests from any one heat was at the prescribed figure because the specifications call for steel from three to four times as strong as would be necessary to meet the stresses and strains to which ships have been subjected within human knowledge.

There were cases at Irvin works where steel for the American Bureau of Shipping failed to come up to the 58,000-pound specification but where it was over the 55,000-pound minimum. Instead of having the record show the precise tensile strength, testers "pulled up" the strength to the required 58,000 pounds, although required company procedures was to list the actual test result and notify the customers of such result to ascertain whether the customer desired the steel.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 16, 1943]

STEEL SLUMP BLAMED ON TRUMAN COMMITTEE'S BUNGLING SLOWS WAR OUTPUT—PROBERS' FAILURE TO DEVELOP WHOLE STORY IN IRVIN PLANT CASE SCARES ENTIRE STEEL INDUSTRY

(By Raymond Z. Henle)

The Truman committee's sensational exposure involving production of steel plates was a distorted presentation of the facts because it brought out only a small part of the whole story, and it is threatening a dangerous slump in the entire steel industry.

An exhaustive, independent inquiry just completed by the Post-Gazette's Washington correspondent shows conclusively that steel plates rolled at the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co.'s Irvin works were suitable for the use intended for them.

COMMITTEE'S PROBE IS HELD INADEQUATE

The Truman committee's investigation was inadequate and misleading because it failed to bring this cardinal point into the open.

The net result of the Senate inquiry has been to hamstring manufacture of steel plates so seriously that Navy and War Production Board officials believe the entire war effort may be in danger unless prevailing public impression can be corrected without delay.

Official production figures for April are not available, of course, but preliminary and informal reports to the War Production Board on production trends show that instead of April being the month in which all records for steel plate production would have been broken, this month's production may fall seriously below previous months—possibly fall off as much as 35 percent. The effect is being noticed equally on manufacture of steel itself and steel products other than steel plates.

These views can be corroborated by the Truman committee by the simple method of commanding the testimony of any of a half dozen admirals in the Navy or any of the top officials of the Maritime Commission or American Shipping Bureau. The Post-Gazette's Washington correspondent is able to state this as a fact.

SLOWING OF ENTIRE PROGRAM FEARED

Lower production prospects are due to the demoralizing fear the Senate inquiry has instilled into every steel plant, and even more significantly into every Government inspector—both those inspectors who come under the Navy's jurisdiction and those under the Maritime Commission.

Steel plates which were considered before the Truman committee's inquiry as satisfactory by any reasonable standards now are being subjected to time-killing precise methods of examination.

The Truman committee failed to show that all of the steel plates for the Navy—and inspected by Navy inspectors—precisely met Navy specifications. It failed to show that all of the steel plates intended for the Maritime Commission, and inspected by American Bureau of Shipping inspectors, were suitable for use in the construction of merchant vessels.

BAD WELDING POSSIBLY TROUBLE

There was no adequate testimony before the Truman committee to show that all Government specifications are based on a 3-to-1 and 4-to-1 safety factor, namely, that the Government requires steel plates three or four times as strong as really is needed to construct an ocean-going vessel, and that the Carnegie plates were only fractionally off maximum A. B. S. specifications for merchant vessels.

And if the Truman committee will reopen its investigation, it may find that the Kaiser-built tanker, which buckled, fell apart, not because of defective steel, but because of inferior welding—and it may develop some other interesting information.

The furor that has resulted from the Truman committee's inquiry was due, first, to the committee's failure to get at all the facts, and, second, to the unexplainable blundering by Carnegie officials in failing to tell their story of steel manufacture and the significance of what happened at the Irvin works.

The whole story—intelligently told and intelligently prodded—would have brought out that while a few Carnegie employees guessed or faked certain figures that are put down in computing the tensile strength of steel, there was never any question that the steel plates involved in the controversy were inadequate for safe construction of merchant vessels.

The net result of the Senate inquiry has been to hamstring the manufacture of steel plates so seriously that Navy and War Production Board officials believe the entire war effort may be in danger unless prevailing public impressions can be corrected without delay.

PROMPT ACTION HELD NECESSARY

Unless vigorous methods are taken quickly to dispel the fear and doubt that has spread over the entire steel industry from president to lowliest checker, and over the military and civilian inspectors corps connected with the industry, officials are convinced that the vital destroyer and escort vessel program—already behind schedule—may be seriously jeopardized.

This can be established by the Truman committee if it will take the trouble to call men like Rear Admiral Emory S. Land and Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, chairman and vice chairman of the Maritime Commission, or any of the admirals whose province of authority is in ship construction or procurement of material.

With the time believed near for our big invasion attempt, the critical importance of any delay in the escort and cargo vessel building program cannot be overestimated and it is significant that keenly worried Government officials for several days have been working on methods to overcome the harm that has been done.

AIM TO REASSURE FIRMS

Donald M. Nelson, War Production Board Chairman, in company with the Maritime Commission and the Army and Navy, is advising all steel companies and all company and Government inspectors that while they must take measures to insure a continuation of reliable steel, they must cease letting their fear of criminal prosecution or trouble with a Senate committee lead them into making laboratory and mechanical tests beyond the range of reason.

A telegram containing sentiments to that effect has been prepared for transmission to every steel company, and every inspector, military and civilian, in the country.

In addition, a secret meeting is scheduled to open before the end of the week in the War Production Board under the auspices of H. G. Batcheller, head of War Production Board's steel division, which looks toward a change in steel specifications, which a number of experts believe to be desirable in view of the rapid change in ship construction from the riveting to the welding technique.

These experts are to be "locked in a room" and requested not to come out, until they have agreed on new specifications which will be accepted by the Army, the Navy, and the American Bureau of Shipping—which inspects for the Maritime Commission.

CITES MYSTERIOUS ASPECT

Aside from the inexplicable attitude of company officials who appear to have been either ill-advised or grossly inarticulate, perhaps both, and aside from the attitude of participating members and counsel of the Truman committee who appear to have had no zealous desire for the whole truth, there is one mysterious aspect of the scandal that may bear additional though subsidiary attention.

On April 8, Carnegie officials were given a further opportunity to state their case—not before the Truman committee but before War Production Board's steel advisory committee, to which interested admirals in the Navy, generals in the Army, and officials of the Maritime Commission were invited.

The steel executives made a showing at this hearing satisfactory to all present and several key Government officials made formal statements to the effect that the end, for ultimate use of the steel plates involved in the guessing or faking, was suitable for merchant ship construction and they would be glad to get as many more of exactly the same kind as could be delivered.

PUZZLED BY NELSON ACTION

While this writer knows what happened at this meeting, unfortunately he does not have access to the minutes.

The mysterious angle is why War Production Board Chairman Nelson did not make these minutes public, as they would have gone far to clear up a national misunderstanding, and why a press release was authorized which failed to give the full story of a meeting so important as this.

My inquiries have produced the information that exoneration of Carnegie was not the duty of the War Production Board or its steel advisory committee. This might be true in peacetime, but scarcely in connection with a situation which directly affected, not a single steel company, but an entire industry and the entire war effort.

Another queer aspect of the case is the findings of one Prof. S. H. Graf, of Oregon State College, that the steel used in the plate where the breaks began in the buckled Kaiser ship, *Schenectady*, was of very poor quality.

POINTS TO GRAF'S TESTS

Professor Graf's own tests showed that the steel plate which cracked had a tensile strength of 55,350 pounds per square inch at 60 degrees F., and 58,600 pounds at 20 degrees, the temperature prevailing when the Schenectady cracked up. Steel of such tensile strength is scarcely very poor steel in anybody's language when it is considered that merchant ships can be built with 57,000-pound steel and have a nearly four-to-one safety factor.

This writer has sent Professor Graf a telegram inviting him to further explain himself and publicity will be given to it in this newspaper if an answer is received. Officials of the American Bureau of Shipping, to mention only one agency, will be interested in his reply.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 17, 1943]

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD CHIEFS ACT TO HALT STEEL SLUMP; NELSON PROTESTS EXTRA-RIGID INSPECTION—MEETING TODAY TO DISCUSS PLATE SPECIFICATIONS—TRUMAN COMMITTEE REPORT GIVEN NEW JOLT AS NAVY O. K.'S PRODUCT OF IRVIN WORKS

(By Raymond Z. Henle)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Vigorous efforts were launched in Washington today to overcome the dangerous slump in steel plate production admittedly caused by the recent misleading and inadequate investigation by the Truman Committee.

The Post-Gazette's exclusive disclosure in its final editions this morning that this condition existed brought these two important official reactions:

1. H. G. Batcheller, Director of the Steel Division, War Production Board, announced that a meeting will open here tomorrow to discuss the entire question of steel-plate specifications, in the hope of reattaining full production."

2. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, sent a telegram to heads of all steel-plate mills in the United States warning them that plate production may be cut so sharply by too rigid inspection that the entire naval and merchant shipbuilding program may be crippled.

Chairman Nelson asked for "honest good judgment" in steel-plate inspection, but at the same time pleaded against "blind, unthinking insistence on unattainable perfection."

These steps were taken as reports continued to pour into the War Production Board, Maritime Commission, and Army and Navy procurement offices that a demoralizing fear had swept the inspection services of the Nation's steel-plate mills as the result of the Truman committee's investigation.

IRVIN STEEL DECLARED O. K.

Reports were received of carloads of plate piling up in certain steel mills behind a fear-ridden inspection service indulging in what Nelson was forced to describe in a public statement as "blind, unthinking insistence of unattainable perfection."

Meanwhile, another important development was learned by the Post-Gazette to have taken place in the clearing up of misunderstandings caused by the Truman investigation.

The Navy Department officially notified the Truman committee that steel it received from the Carnegie Steel Corporation's Irvin Works met the rigid Navy specifications.

The Truman committee acknowledged that the report had been received but declined the Post-Gazette's request to make it public.

The Post-Gazette has learned, however, that the report is based on an exhaustive investigation by the Navy's civilian inspectors at Carnegie made under the direction of Capt. F. L. Oliver, United States Navy chief of the Navy inspection service in the Pittsburgh district.

Nelson, in his telegram to the heads of steel-plate mills, said, "I have complete confidence that there will be no repetition anywhere in the industry of the kind of thing disclosed before the Truman committee.

"But it is equally important," he continued, "that the volume of steel plate produced and shipped be maintained, and overrigid inspection practices could easily defeat that end."

MINOR VARIATIONS INEVITABLE

"The Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Department, and the War Production Board fully realize that 100-percent uniformity in steel is rarely attainable. Minor variations will frequently be found in steel plates which can be used for ship construction with complete safety since the naval architects' specifications are invariably drawn so as to leave an ample margin above the maximum stresses which are to be expected in actual service. * * *

"With the enormous and increasing pressure of our shipbuilding program it is absolutely necessary that sober good judgment guide the entire testing and inspection process. If to avoid all appearance of laxity, we stand up so straight that we lean over backward, we shall simply delay the whole shipbuilding effort—with possibly ruinous consequences. It would be quite as bad to be too rigid as to be too lax."

KEY OFFICIALS TO MEET

The meeting called by Steel Division Director Batcheller, a Pittsburgh steel man on war duty in Washington, will bring together important officials of the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, the American Bureau of Shipping, the shipbuilding division of the War Production Board, and representatives of the steel-plate industry.

That such a meeting would be called was forecast in this morning's exclusive Post-Gazette exposure of the dangerously serious production situation facing the steel industry in general.

The meeting looks toward a change in steel specifications which a number of experts believe to be desirable in view of the rapid change of ship construction from the riveting to the welding technique.

TO ATTEND CONFERENCE

Director Batcheller announced that the following representatives of the steel-plate industry would attend:

E. C. Bain, of Carnegie Steel Corporation; E. P. Entwistle, of Bethlehem Steel Corporation; L. P. McAllister, of Lukens Steel Co.; J. H. Mead, of Inland Steel Co.; E. C. Smith, of Republic Steel Corporation; R. E. Zimmerman, of United States Steel Corporation; L. E. Ekholm, of Alan-Wood Steel Co.; C. C. Henning, Jr., of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation.

Navy Captain Oliver, of the Pittsburgh inspection district, will be among the Navy's representatives at the meeting.

In spite of the fact that the Truman committee revealed guesswork or faking at the Carnegie plant which resulted in the Maritime Commission receiving steel somewhat under tensile-strength specifications, shipbuilding officials for some time have been thinking about a change in the present high and rigid specifications.

HOPE FOR NEW SYSTEM

The knowledge, however, that steel-plate production was dropping precipitately following the Truman investigation caused an immediate need for action, and many officials in the Government earnestly hope that a new and better specification system will be worked out before slumping production endangers the whole war effort.

The Post-Gazette disclosed this morning that while April had been expected to be the record-breaking month for steel-plate production, preliminary and informal reports indicated it actually might fall as much as 35 percent below March because of the demoralizing effect produced by the Truman investigation on the inspection service.

The Navy Department's formal report to the Truman committee on steel received by it from the Carnegie plant may officially correct some misunderstandings held by the Truman committee—or at least its counsel—on the method by which naval steel was inspected at Carnegie.

HOW INSPECTORS OPERATE

Hugh Fulton, counsel for the committee, informed the Post-Gazette's correspondent today that civilian inspectors under Captain Oliver's jurisdiction accepted the word of Carnegie Co. inspectors on specifications. If the Truman committee will reopen its investigation, it will find that this is not the case.

Captain Oliver has 84 Navy officers in his Pittsburgh district headquarters. None of them do any actual inspection. This is done by several hundred civilian inspectors, hired under civil service. There were 14 such Oliver inspectors at Carnegie, handling 10 percent of the plant's total output.

The American Bureau of Shipping, inspecting for the Maritime Commission, had one part-time inspector at Carnegie, as did Lloyds, which inspects for the Lease-Lend Administration. Navy inspectors had no connection with the American Bureau of Shipping and Lloyds' inspectors.

The Post-Gazette's independent investigation developed that each heat of steel out of Carnegie's furnaces was tested by the Navy's inspectors in accordance with Navy specifications.

TESTING PROCEDURE OUTLINED

All so-called F-heat specifications were not recognized as such by the Navy inspectors but as a new heat, whereupon it was put through the customary Navy paces of testing. Steel from these heats was recognized on the basis of these Navy tests, and the Navy's own heat number was applied.

On the basis of this testing, Navy inspectors then made their customary chemistry analysis in its own testing for tensile strength.

In this morning's article, reference was made to the mystery of tests made by Prof. S. H. Graf on steel plates in the Kaiser-built ship *Schenectady*, which buckled. The professor's testimony figured in the Truman committee hearing.

The Post-Gazette received a telegram today from Professor Graf declining further information and referring inquiries to the American Bureau of Shipping. Further information about Graf's work is being sought by the Post-Gazette and, according to present indications, may prove highly interesting.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 17, 1943]

CRISIS IN STEEL PLATE

The dangerous situation in steel-plate production for American ships, revealed by the Post-Gazette yesterday morning, received quick confirmation and new emphasis from Donald Nelson, War Production Board Chairman.

In a telegram to heads of all steel-plate mills Mr. Nelson warned of "possibly ruinous consequences" if production continues to be delayed by insistence on rejection of plate because of minor variations which do not affect serviceability in the slightest.

It is an outgrowth of the methods and procedure of the Truman committee, which seems to have forgotten the old warning against tearing down the wall in order to get rid of the wallpaper.

The wallpaper had an ugly spot. When the Senators developed testimony that tests had been faked at the Irvin works of the Carnegie-Illinois Co., the public was shocked. There was no excuse for it, as the Post-Gazette commented immediately following the hearing.

But the manner in which the committee proceeded from there seems to have dealt a serious blow to the rate of production. Navy, Maritime Commission officials, and War Production Board representatives are all gravely concerned. Preliminary reports from various plants indicate that the output of plates may drop as much as 35 percent—which would be a body blow to the war effort.

Insofar as the committee's findings prompted a recheck by every steel company on inspection methods and procedure, the result was all to the good. But if jittery inspectors and plant officials, big or little, go beyond reasonable precautions and undertake new, time-consuming checks and double-checks to make sure that they personally are 110 percent in the clear, Uncle

Sam isn't going to get the ships he so urgently needs.

The Truman committee seemed entirely satisfied to leave with the public the impression that dangerously substandard steel has been going into American ships. Why didn't it call as witnesses on this point the ranking naval officers on Procurement and Material and Ship Construction—or Admirals Land and Vickery of the Maritime Commission?

Take the Navy first. The Post-Gazette has been advised that not one ton of substandard steel went to the Navy. Yet families with sons or relatives in the service have possibly misinterpreted fragmentary testimony to imply that faulty materials have been used which add to the normal risks of active duty.

We have great confidence in the Navy and its personnel. The men, who head up its inspection service are imbued by the same spirit as their brother officers who hold commands at sea.

As far as the Maritime Commission and lend-lease are concerned, we understand that their ships are designed with a safety factor of 4 to 1. In other words, specifications call for materials which should in theory withstand four times the expected stresses or strains at sea. One report on the steel in the Kaiser ship failure which prompted the inquiry showed that the plates were approximately 5 percent below what they should have been. Without excusing the company's ethics for a moment, would that not mean a safe margin over any anticipated requirements?

It is a serious disservice to a nation at war to create widespread apprehension as to the stability and seaworthiness of our ships. It was a glaring omission not to call for expert testimony on that point from the officers best equipped to speak with authority and without bias.

Let's not weaken the wall while getting rid of the soiled paper. But one step in the latter process invites comment. The Carnegie-Illinois company has suspended four supervisory employees in the metallurgical department of the Irvin works. In view of their testimony in Washington, that was possibly to be expected. Metallurgists, however, are technical men trained to follow fixed procedures without particular concern as to policies or production records. Ordinarily it would seem unlikely that "faking," even if they considered the steel in question serviceable, would originate with them.

Are they being "tossed to the wolves"? Perhaps not. The company's top executives have apparently not concluded their investigation, or if they have, may hesitate to act in view of the grand jury proceedings. But in fixing responsibility the important thing is to ascertain where the idea started rather than who carried it out.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calander to which there is no objection, beginning at Order No. 150, the point we had reached at the last call of the calendar, on April 2.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar beginning with Order No. 150

GEORGE H. CROW

The bill (H. R. 1893) for the relief of George H. Crow was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Austin	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lodge	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wagner
Eastland	Mead	Wallgren
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wheeler
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business as members of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Is there objection to the consideration of Order of Business 150, House bill 1893?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1893) for the relief of George H. Crow was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAPANESE ACTIVITIES AT KISKA AND ATTU

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement to the Senate with respect to the situation I spoke of on the floor of the Senate last Friday, the defense by the Japanese of Attu and Kiska, and the military installations on those two islands. I will comment on the subject very briefly, and read short excerpts from dispatches, and then ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remainder of the dispatches, one of which is an Associated Press dispatch from the Andreanof Islands, dated March 31, and another a copyrighted story by the North American Newspaper Alliance from an advance Army base in the Aleutian Islands dated March 30. I read from the Associated Press dispatch as follows:

The Japanese are "stronger than ever on Kiska and Attu," returning Army pilots reported after bombing the enemy bases in the Aleutians for the thirtieth time in March at a 25-foot elevation.

(The Navy announced yesterday that Kiska had been raided eight times Wednesday. The first mention of bombing of revetments indicated increased defenses.)

To Senators who do not know what revetments are, I will say that they are works, either dug in the earth or having dirt piled up, so that planes on the side of the runways may be protected, or that shore gun emplacements and installations may be made fully protected from bomb hits or bomb fragments.

A returning pilot, who had flown over Kiska since last July, said:

"The Japanese heavy and light gunfire was the heaviest yet. More lead was thrown into the air at us today than a month ago, and it was more deadly."

A study of actual photographs showed that hits were scored in the enemy camp here and that the runway, being constructed under great difficulties for use by Japanese fighter planes, and the "revetment area," were damaged.

Mr. President, last Friday in the Senate we had quite a sharp disagreement as to whether there was an airfield on Kiska and an airfield on Attu. I am not certain that the fields are in shape to be used in launching planes, but they are being built, and I fear that unless stopped they will be completed in a very short time, and that planes will be using the airfields there to bomb the positions of the troops of the United States in the Andreanof Islands.

I continue to read from the dispatch:

It was the first mention in a Kiska communiqué of revetments, which are used for the protection of installations. Thus it was indicated that the enemy has progressed to the point where revetments had been built and possibly to the stage where the Japanese expect to make use of the field.

* * * * *

Another officer said—

He is one of the officers who had returned from the bombing raid—

"We can keep on bombing them until the year 1960 and they'll still be there as strong as ever."

* * * * *

Twenty airmen died violently in March while dropping 320 tons of bombs, the crews of a medium bomber, a heavy bomber, a Lightning pilot and two bombardiers.

They were lost during those operations.

Then the story of another raid over the targets on Kiska indicated that Japanese buildings were located all around the hills and in the valleys; that many of the buildings which were used to house delicate defense instruments, as well as revetments, were observed which had not been previously noted. The statements of those who are there on the ground, some of whom fly over the islands every day, and who observe and know conditions, are to me a clear indication that the Japanese positions in those islands, and their opportunities to use, perhaps in the near future, land-based aircraft, are improving every day, and I repeat, Mr. President, that they strengthen my belief that immediate action is imperative.

Mr. President, I ask that an article entitled "Interest in Pacific War Peril Gratifying," by Ray Richards, published in the Los Angeles Examiner of April 14, 1943; an Associated Press article headed "Flyers find enemy on Kiska stronger," published in the New York Times of April 17, 1943, and an article by William Gilman headed "Commando air raid hits Kiska; flyers skim base at 25 to 75 feet," published in the New York Times of April 19, 1943, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of April 14, 1943]

INTEREST IN PACIFIC WAR PERIL GRATIFYING—CHANDLER CALLS FOR FIRST ATTENTION TO JAP PROBLEM

(By Ray Richards)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Far western Members of Congress today said they had greeted as "a distinct gain in a national cause" the active interest being exhibited in Pacific coast war concerns by the Chandler subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Kentucky Democrat, is now near the end of an inquiry into the operation of the 10 relocation centers in which 106,000 west coast Japanese are confined, and has consistently turned the attention of the important Military Affairs Committee to the peculiar danger of the war with Japan.

Recently the subcommittee, at the behest of Senator CHANDLER, asserted formally that if any congressional committee inspects world battle fronts, the Pacific theater be given first attention as the most critical.

PRAISED BY HOLMAN

"It's refreshing to find an easterner like Senator CHANDLER willing to direct national attention to west coast defense and the importance of devoting greater attention and greater effort at once to our most dangerous foe, Japan," commented Senator RUFUS C. HOLMAN, Oregon Republican.

"In this war, as in most other international matters, the thought of easterners has been turned by lifelong habit toward Europe. Now things are changing a little, under the horrible menace in the Pacific which we of the far West sense so clearly. The attention of the whole Nation is switching at least a little to the Pacific, and such men as Senator CHANDLER are doing the pointing.

"It is by such things as this that Members of Congress take on the qualities of statesmen—the ability to handle the affairs of their home districts well, yet work in the world picture.

"Senator CHANDLER'S broad-mindedness is an example of what we of the west coast feel all Members of Congress should possess, and Kentucky will not lose by having such a man in the Senate."

Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Democrat, of Alaska, said that an inspection trip which Senator CHANDLER and other members of the subcommittee made to Alaska last year had brought great improvement in the war situation there.

"Senator CHANDLER reported his findings quietly to the War Department," Delegate DIMOND said, "and very quickly we found our worries relieved." Alaska and the Nation are thus made safer, and in other practical ways the Chandler report was of extraordinary value.

"This is the kind of highly intelligent and devoted labor in the national interests for which all westerners are grateful."

Said Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, California Democrat:

"Until recently we westerners have had a pretty lonely task in pointing out that Japan is receiving time to consolidate, that General MacArthur needs more airplanes, that the Japanese must be driven from our Aleutian Islands.

"Now we sense an optimistic attitude, made so in large part because legislators of the eastern region, prompted by Senator CHANDLER, are becoming cognizant that Japan is our deadliest enemy, the only foe that threatens an attack on our continental soil.

"I think many easterners in the months to come will follow Senator CHANDLER'S example. If they do, it will bring positive and powerful action against Japan, and that action will make us safe if it is not delayed too long."

Senator CHANDLER'S committee is now awaiting official comment from the State, Justice, and War Departments on a plan to take most of the west-coast Japanese residents out of expensive relocation centers, put those who are declared harmless at farm work and place others under Selective Service, the dangerous elements to be confined in detention camps at civilian industrial tasks.

Other members of the subcommittee are Senators HOLMAN; HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts; and CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota—Republicans; and MON C. WALGREN, Washington; JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana; and JOSEPH C. MAHONEY, Wyoming—Democrats.

[From the New York Times of Saturday, April 17, 1943]

FLIERS FIND ENEMY ON KISKA STRONGER—REPORT MORE ANTI-AIRCRAFT AND OTHER DEFENSES—EIGHT MORE RAIDS ARE MADE

ANDREANOF ISLANDS, ALASKA, March 31 (delayed).—The Japanese are "stronger than ever in Kiska and Attu," returning Army pilots reported after bombing the enemy bases in the Aleutians for the thirtieth time in March at a 25-foot elevation.

(The Navy announced yesterday that Kiska had been raided eight times Wednesday. The first mention of bombing of revetments indicated increased defenses.)

A returning pilot, who has flown over Kiska since last July, said:

"The Japanese heavy and light gunfire was the heaviest yet. More lead was thrown into the air at us today than a month ago, and it was more deadly."

A study of aerial photographs showed that hits were scored in the enemy camp here and that the runway, being constructed under great difficulties for use by Japanese fighter planes, and the revetment area, were damaged.

It was the first mention in a Kiska communique of revetments, which are used for the protection of installations. Thus it was indicated that the enemy has progressed to the point where revetments had been built and possibly to the stage where the Japanese expect to make use of the field.

So far there has been no indication that the fighter strip on Kiska, or the bomber strip on Attu, being constructed under similar terrain difficulties but much less frequently raided, have been put into use.

The eight raids were carried out Wednesday by formations of Liberator heavy bombers and Mitchell medium bombers, escorted by Lightnings and Warhawks. They marked the forty-seventh raid on Kiska this month and the eighty-first since March 1.

At his press conference today, Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, said that the raids were "raising a good deal of havoc" with the Japanese. He declined to predict the outcome of the heavy raids or to speculate whether the Japanese would be able to finish their fields and put them into operation. Asked if he thought the raids might block completion of the project, he said, "Of course, we hope that."

The subject of possible United States invasion of Kiska was brought up, with Mr. Knox again declining to speculate. Asked if Kiska's geography offered any landing beaches suitable for invading parties, he said he doubted there were very many.

At the opposite end of the Pacific Navy bombers and fighters scored successes yesterday in three raids against enemy strongholds in the Solomons.

The first raid, in the morning, was an attack by Avenger torpedo bombers, escorted by Wildcats, against Japanese installations at Munda on New Georgia Island, a 200-mile flight from the Guadalcanal airfield.

In the afternoon Dauntless dive bombers, protected by Wildcats, flew to Kolombagara Island and smashed a building believed to have been a power generating station.

On the third sortie Avengers, surrounded by Wildcats and Corsair fighters, attacked and sunk an 80-foot Japanese vessel in Rekata off Santa Isabel Island.

A study of aerial photographs showed that the Japanese had more gun emplacements in Kiska and Attu than they had March 1.

Another officer said: "We can keep on bombing them until the year 1960 and they'll still be there as strong as ever."

Bad weather is causing difficulties. March 15 was the only good bombing day of the year.

Maj. Gen. William A. Butler, commanding general of the Eleventh Bomber Command, said:

"If I could only have 7 days of flying weather I'd go after every strong spot on Kiska and Attu and blast them to kingdom come. As it is, we bomb the devil out of them 1 day and then after 4 days' rest they're stronger than ever."

Although March was by far the best flying month of the Aleutian war, Army pilots

could not deliver their cargoes 17 days. On the remaining days they seldom knew how they would find their home field.

Twenty airmen died violently in March while dropping 320 tons of bombs, the crews of a medium bomber, a heavy bomber, a Lightning pilot, and two bombardiers.

Only one of the March raids was at 9,000 feet. The others were from grass level to a mile high. The average was at the deadliest height under the cloud ceiling, about 2,500 feet. There the Japanese can reckon the altitude by the cloud ceiling and can bring antiaircraft weapons to bear accurately almost immediately.

JAPANESE CONSERVE AMMUNITION

The Japanese have learned not to waste ammunition. They know now that our pilots are not frightened by bursts. So the enemy waits until our planes are in range.

During the month our pilots bombed and strafed the almost completed fighter strip on Kiska built out of a solid mountainside, and the newly begun fighter strip on the beach at Attu. They bombed the submarine base, the seaplane hangars, barracks, field dumps, radio installations, and gun emplacements. They drove incendiaries and tracers and explosive machine-gun bullets into hundreds of Japanese machine-gun emplacements and into charcoal-heated houses and circular tents.

The Japanese brought to Kiska about a dozen float-type Zero planes. Most of them are in operation, because the Japanese have refused to fly them into combat. Only once have they attacked. Three jumped our weather plane.

On March 30 four missions got through to the target: Five heavy bombers in the first at 2,500 feet, six heavy bombers that barely cleared telephone poles, four Lightnings that dove through a hole in the overcast, and six heavies. In this action the first Liberator was lost in 9 months.

The heavy bomber took fire before it got over the target. As it was over North Head, Kiska Harbor, flames were streaking out of the fuselage. It crashed about 100 yards offshore.

A rescue plane was ordered to keep away because it was a useless risk in the face of heavy Japanese fire.

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1943]

COMMANDO AIR RAID HITS KISKA; FLIERS SKIM BASE AT 25 TO 75 FEET—VISIT COOKED UP BY TWO UNITED STATES LIEUTENANTS IS SERVED HOT BY SIX BOMBERS THAT GO TOO FAST FOR A WRITER TO GET SCARED

(By William Gilman)

ADVANCE ARMY BASE IN THE ALEUTIANS, March 30 (delayed).—The weather was dirty and this mission—a wild Commando raid from the sky—was even more so. But all 32 of us had volunteered, so the sooner it was over the better.

The bomber command's head, Col. E. H. DeFord, lent me his flying boots and Capt. Edward Bendere of his staff added his own flying mitts—and both men asked that I bring the articles back.

It all turned out worth the risk—to see our six Mitchell medium bombers race through Kiska's withering antiaircraft fire and the blasts of our own bombs, at a low-level altitude ranging from 25 to 75 feet, hurling destruction at such selected targets as the island's submarine base, its nearly finished runway, and the buildings housing delicate defense apparatus.

Other results: All six pilots have been recommended for Distinguished Flying or Service Crosses, with other medals for their crews. Two men were wounded, not seriously. Three of the planes were hit, but all flew back to an American base where one of them had to make a crippled landing without wheels.

Kiska raids are planned by the higher Air Force officers. But today's was cooked up by two lieutenants eager to give the Japanese a special brand of hell.

AN ENGINEER AND AN ARTIST

One is George A. Barber, of Lubbock, Tex., who intended to be a mechanical engineer when he was graduated from Texas Tech 3 years ago.

The other is William R. Candy, of Braintree, Mass., a former art student.

Their plan had its beginning 5 days ago when they discovered a new approach to Kiska, quite by accident. It caught running Japanese completely by surprise.

The pair of lieutenants returned to their base, begging for permission to repeat such a raid. Between Lieutenant Barber's salesmanship and Lieutenant Candy's sketches, the plan was sold to Colonel DeFord and Maj. Gen. William O. Butler.

The call came this morning and we were soon on our way in two Mitchell medium bombers wearing Mae West life jackets, parachute, and with tin hats for the five men in each ship.

At the outpost base where we landed, four other Mitchells were waiting. The planes were made ready for the proper take-off hour that would bring us to Kiska shortly before dark.

In a tent Barber and Candy produced charts and explained the scheme to the rest of us. The six mediums were to do it alone.

We lay around a few hours and then we were off, skimming low over a slate-covered sea.

"Here we go," Barber called. The plane banked steeply, and the others obeyed in formation.

We each lit a cigarette. Kiska's snow-topped volcano was looming. I donned my tin helmet and wormed through the crawlway. In the nose the bombardier, John G. LaRock, of Independence, La., was singing as he crouched behind the machine gun.

SONG FOR A TIME LIKE THIS

"I always sing, whistle, anything, at a time like this,' he said.

I sat on a little seat, with the copilot's machine gun barrel between my feet. LaRock rested his elbow on my knee. Barber gunned the motor and over the cliff we went.

I felt very naked inside the glass nose. We were roaring down the plateau at 300 miles an hour. The Japanese buildings rushed to us. It was no surprise, this time. To our left, the hills were alive with gun flashes. Red tracers poured at us.

LaRock's gun was chattering and our tracers streamed ahead. Between my knees the copilot's gun joined in the strafing.

There was bedlam, and no time to be scared in the 20 seconds taken to make the raid.

Everything flashed past. First, the target building which contained the delicate instruments which warn the Japanese of ships or planes approaching. It was 25 feet below us when our two 300- and two 500-pound bombs dropped.

Streaming through our bomb bursts, Candy threw two more 300-pounders into the erupting building.

The neat Japanese barracks flashed past and we dropped the rest of our bomb load, blasting out a path with machine-gun fire, ran the North Head gantlet, and away to rendezvous.

Two other planes, after bursting over the cliff, swung to the right and plastered the sub base, causing an explosion that leaped 250 feet into the air. The remaining pair swung to our left, bombing a heavy gun battery and the runway.

It was dark when we landed, but there was radiance in the faces of the ground crews and the infantry standing on hills. It's nice to have men glad to see you back.

BILL PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 205) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear and render judgment upon claims for damages resulting in the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROMOTION OF FLOOD CONTROL IN THE BASIN OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 649) to promote flood control in the basin of the Republican River, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "consent", to strike out "and approval."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, as to why the Republican River has been picked out from among all the rivers of this country for flood control. I can understand why there ought to be some sort of control over Republican oratory, but I cannot quite understand why, with all the floods which, from time to time, occur throughout the country in the various valleys and rivers, the Senate of the United States should be asked to discriminate against all the others in behalf of the Republican River.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Republican is the only river that could overflow at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to understand what the explanation is. I missed the gem of wisdom uttered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BUTLER. The senior Senator from Michigan said that the Republican River was the only one that could overflow at this time. As a matter of fact the district was once represented by a very prominent member of the majority party. He attempted for a great many years to have the name of the river changed. The river was given its name so long ago that I cannot give the Senate the history of the name.

Mr. BARKLEY. My understanding of the explanation is that the Republican River has been dry so long that any sort of little shower causes it to overflow; therefore, there must be some control placed over it.

Mr. BUTLER. I will tell the Senator that we have had some real floods in that area, both Republican and others.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's explanation is satisfactory to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this act and of article XI of the compact consented to and approved by Congress by this act—

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) In order that the conditions stated in article XI of the compact hereby consented to shall be met and that the compact shall be and continue to be operative, the following provisions are enacted—

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 10, after the words "consented to", to strike out "and approved."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, lines 16 and 17, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact authorized by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River," approved August 4, 1942 (Public Law 696, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 736), signed by the commissioners for the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 31, 1942, and thereafter ratified by the Legislatures of the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which compact reads as follows:

"REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

"The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, respectively, or individually as a State, or collectively as the States), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the waters of the Republican River Basin, and being duly authorized therefor by the act of the Congress of the United States of America, approved August 4, 1942 (Public, No. 696, 77th Cong., ch. 545, 2d sess.), and pursuant to acts of their respective legislatures have, through their respective Governors, appointed as their commissioners: M. C. Hinderlider, for Colorado; George S. Knapp, for Kansas; Wardner G. Scott, for Nebraska; who, after negotiations participated in by Glenn L. Parker, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I

"The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Republican River Basin (hereinafter referred to as the 'Basin') for multiple purposes; to provide for an equitable division of such waters; to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to controversies; to promote interstate comity; to recognize that the most efficient utilization of the waters within the Basin is for beneficial consumptive use; and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of destructive floods.

"The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Basin constitute the basis for this compact, and none of the States hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"ARTICLE II

"The Basin is all the area in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which is naturally drained by the Republican River, and its tributaries, to its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. The main stem of the Republican River extends from the junction near Haigler, Nebr., of its north fork, and the Arikaree River, to its junction with Smoky Hill River near Junction City, Kans. Frenchman Creek (River), in Nebraska, is a continuation of Frenchman Creek (River), in Colorado. Red Willow Creek, in Colorado, is not identical with the stream having the same name in Nebraska. A map of the Basin approved by the commissioners is attached and made a part hereof.

"The term 'acre-foot,' as herein used, is the quantity of water required to cover an acre to a depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

"The term 'virgin water supply,' as herein used, is defined to be the water supply within the Basin undepleted by the activities of man.

"The term 'beneficial consumptive use' is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of the Basin is consumed through the activities of man, and shall include water consumed by evaporation from any reservoir, canal, ditch, or irrigated area.

"Beneficial consumptive use is the basis and principle upon which the allocations of water hereinafter made are predicated.

"ARTICLE III

"The specific allocations in acre-feet hereinafter made to each State are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply originating in the following designated drainage basins, or parts thereof, in the amounts shown:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 44,700 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 19,610 acre-feet;

"Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 7,890 acre-feet;

"Rock Creek drainage basin, 11,000 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 57,200 acre-feet;

"Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Nebraska, 93,500 acre-feet;

"Blackwood Creek drainage basin, 6,800 acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 7,300 acre-feet;

"Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 21,900 acre-feet;

"Medicine Creek drainage basin, 50,800 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 16,500 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 21,400 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 27,600 acre-feet;

"The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the junction of the North Fork and the Arikaree River and the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas State line and the small tributaries thereof, 87,700 acre-feet.

"Should the future computed virgin water supply of any source vary more than ten (10) percent from the virgin water supply as hereinabove set forth, the allocations hereinafter made from such source shall be increased or decreased in the relative proportion that the future computed virgin water supply of such source bears to the computed virgin water supply used herein.

"ARTICLE IV

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado, annually, a total of fifty-four thousand, one hundred (54,100) acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 10,000 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 15,400 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 25,400 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet; and

"In addition, for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado, annually, the entire water supply of the Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Colorado and of the Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Colorado.

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Kansas, annually, a total of one hundred ninety thousand, three hundred (190,300) acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 1,000 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 23,000 acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 500 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,400 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 12,600 acre-feet;

"From the main stem of the Republican River upstream from the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas state line and from water supplies of upstream basins otherwise unallocated herein, 138,000 acre-feet; provided, that Kansas shall have the right to divert all or any portion thereof at or near Guide Rock, Nebr.; and

"In addition there is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Kansas, annually, the entire water supply originating in the basin downstream from the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas state line.

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Nebraska, annually, a total of 234,500 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 11,000 acre-feet;

"Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Nebraska, 52,800 acre-feet;

"Rock Creek drainage basin, 4,400 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

"Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 2,600 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 800 acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 1,200 acre-feet;

"Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 4,200 acre-feet;

"Medicine Creek drainage basin, 4,600 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,700 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 2,100 acre-feet;

"From the North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska, the main stem of the Republican River between the junction of the North Fork and Arikaree River and the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas state line, from the small tributaries thereof, and from water supplies of upstream basins otherwise unallocated herein, 132,000 acre-feet.

"The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the

State, for use in which the allocations are made.

"ARTICLE V

"The judgment and all provisions thereof in the case of *Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of Colorado, et al.*, v. *The Pioneer Irrigation Company*, decided June 5, 1922, and reported in 259 United States Reports 498, affecting the Pioneer irrigation ditch or canal, are hereby recognized as binding upon the States; and Colorado, through its duly authorized officials, shall have the perpetual and exclusive right to control and regulate diversions of water at all times by said canal in conformity with said judgment.

"The water heretofore adjudicated to said Pioneer canal by the District Court of Colorado, in the amount of 50 cubic feet per second of time is included in and is a part of the total amounts of water hereinbefore allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado and Nebraska.

"ARTICLE VI

"The right of any person, entity or lower State to construct, or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated for beneficial consumptive use in such lower State, shall never be denied by an upper State: *Provided*, That such right is subject to the rights of the upper State.

"ARTICLE VII

"Any person, entity, or lower State shall have the right to acquire necessary property rights in an upper State by purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs, and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI: *Provided, however*, That the grantees of such rights shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements during the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said political subdivisions of the State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Should any facility be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

"Any repairs to or replacements of such facility shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

"ARTICLE IX

"It shall be the duty of the three States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, shall collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE X

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"(a) To impair or affect any rights, powers, or jurisdiction of the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in, over, and to the waters of the Basin; nor to impair or affect the capacity of the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, to acquire rights in and to the use of waters of the Basin;

"(b) To subject any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State, or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"(c) To subject any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to any extent other than the extent these laws would apply without regard to this compact.

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislature of each of the States, and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing, among other things, that:

"(a) Any beneficial consumptive uses by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State of the waters allocated by this compact shall be made within the allocations hereinabove made for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"(b) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Basin shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin is of paramount importance to the development of the Basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin shall be made except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of this compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of this compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes.

"(c) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the waters allocated by this compact which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over and to such waters: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the law of the appropriate State and in conformity with this compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

"In witness whereof, the commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the States.

"Done in the city of Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, on the 31st day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1942.

"M. C. HINDERLIDER,
"Commissioner for Colorado.
"GEORGE S. KNAPP,
"Commissioner for Kansas.
"WARDNER G. SCOTT,
"Commissioner for Nebraska.

"I have participated in the negotiations leading to this proposed compact and propose to report to the Congress of the United States favorably thereon.

GLENN L. PARKER,
"Representative of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) In order that the conditions stated in article XI of the compact hereby consented to shall be met and that the compact shall be and continue to be operative, the following provisions are enacted—

(1) any beneficial consumptive uses by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by such compact, shall be made within the allocations made by such compact for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State;

(2) the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the basin shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the basin is of paramount importance to the development of the basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the basin shall be made except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of such compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of such compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes;

(3) the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the waters allocated by such compact which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such waters: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with such compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) "beneficial consumptive uses" has the same meaning as when used in the compact consented to by Congress by this act; and

(2) "Basin" refers to the Republican River Basin as shown on the map attached to and made a part of the original of such compact deposited in the archives of the Department of State.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes."

CLAIM OF LOUIS H. PINK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 776) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States, which had reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after "New York", to insert "or his statutory successor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has submitted an amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "together with interest thereon."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not object to action on the amendments, but I should like the bill to go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar No. 153, Senate bill 776, was called awhile ago, its consideration was objected to by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. I have since discussed the matter with him, and I understand that he has no further objection to the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered and acted upon at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 776) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the amendments to the bill have been agreed to. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States, for remission of liquidated damages assessed against such company as surety under the provisions of contract No. I-1p-129, dated May 12, 1928, between the United States and Greenwald and Tudor and E. Deffebach, for certain highway construction in Sequoia National Park, Calif.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from and payment of any judgments thereon shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States."

LAWRENCE ANTHONY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 628) for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$905" and insert "$609"; on page 2, line 4, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$4,000"; in line 6, after the word "time", to insert "and the sum of $577.43 in full satisfaction for all funeral expenses of his wife, Ella Murphy;" in line 9, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500"; in line 12, after the word "time", to insert "and the sum of $562 in full satisfaction of all medical expenses incurred"; and in line 15, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$4,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Lawrence Anthony, of Collis, Minn., the sum of $609, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his automobile which he was operating was struck by a United States Army truck at a point on Highway No. 18, 2 miles west of Corona, Calif., on December 14, 1941; (2) to R. E. Murphy, of Collis, Minn., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a passenger in such automobile at such time and the sum of $577.43 in full satisfaction for all funeral expenses of his wife, Ella Murphy; (3) to Mary E. Armstrong, of Riverside, Calif., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a passenger in such automobile at such time and the sum of $562 in full satisfaction of all medical expenses incurred; and (4) to R. E. Murphy, of Collis, Minn., as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy, the sum of $4,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of the estate of Ella Murphy against the United States for compensation for the death of said Ella Murphy, who died as a result of injuries sustained by her while riding as a passenger in such automobile at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUNISHMENT FOR ESCAPING CUSTODY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

The bill (S. 212) to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person lawfully held in custody other than on a charge of felony by any officer or employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the administration of the immigration or naturalization laws, who escapes or attempts to escape from such custody, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

DEPENDENTS OF FRANK EDWARD DACE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 367) for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Secretary of War in his report to the Committee on Military Affairs recommended that compensation with respect to this claim should be limited to $5,000. The bill before us, reported favorably by the committee, contemplates an award of $11,800. Will the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee explain to us the basis upon which the Department's recommendation was rejected and the sum proposed by the committee was accepted.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I do not have any notation before me, but the bill was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], a member of the committee. At that time there were several bills under discussion before the committee. The bill as originally introduced, according to my best recollection, called for the payment of $10,000. After a brief discussion of the matter, the committee decided that the amount should be cut to $5,000. I understand the question raised by the Senator from Connecticut is with respect to the reduction of the amount from $10,000 to $5,000.

Mr. DANAHER. My question has reference to the $11,800 which the committee recommends, as compared to $5,000 which the Secretary of War recommends. I want to know how the difference of $6,800 was arrived at.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, my recollection, which is vague, as I have stated, is that the original bill introduced by the junior Senator from California called for the payment of $10,000, and that after discussion it was decided, and agreed to by the Senator from California, that the amount should be limited to $5,000. My further recollection is that the person in whose interest the bill was introduced is the widow of a man who was killed in an airplane accident. He was not a member of the armed forces, but was a civilian flier, and was killed in the course of testing one of the planes. That is all I now recollect about the matter, but I shall return to it in a moment and shall try to supply the Senator with the particular information for which he asks.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be made perfectly clear, let me say that certainly I am sympathetic regarding an award to the widow of a pilot who was flying acceptance flights for the United States

Army; but I do wish to know whether, as a matter of policy a $10,000 award is to be made to the widow of every man who is killed, regardless of whether he carried insurance. If there is to be a limitation, I should like to know whether $11,800 is a fair limitation. Perhaps it should be greater.

Therefore, I should like very much to have it made perfectly plain why it is that in this case there is a special bill making an award in the sum of $11,800 for the death of Mr. Dace.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the passage of the bill would naturally, in itself, fix a policy, for that the man who was killed was not a member of our armed forces, according to my recollection, and was not in uniform, but was a civilian pilot called upon to make a test of the particular plane. As the Senator has suggested, the passage of the bill would, as I have indicated, fix a policy. That was one of the questions discussed in the committee. The question was asked the junior Senator from California if in his opinion the bill, if passed, would not fix a policy, so that hereafter as to any civilian pilots killed or injured in the testing of Army planes, their dependents would be entitled to come into court and ask for compensation as a result of the death or bodily injury received. That was one of the points discussed.

By the way, Mr. President, let me say that I seem to remember further that it was argued that the amount originally asked for should be reduced, for that there would be a discussion of the matter upon the floor of the Senate, and the bill would have a better chance of passage if the amount were reduced. I shall try to provide the Senator with other information, in view of the discussion in the Senate, since we did not have any stenographic notes made of the arguments presented in the committee. But the point the Senator has raised was one of the points——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire to have the bill go over?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the question of policy involved, I think we should all look into it. In the Finance Committee we have a standing subcommittee on veterans' legislation. We have the National Service Life Insurance Act, under which insurance is provided. There was opportunity for automatic coverage for all men who were not covered as of a given date.

In other words, Mr. President, there was serious question as to whether there should be such enormous awards in the face of the impending casualties, which certainly will run into many thousands.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM D. WARREN

The bill (S. 805) for the relief of William D. Warren was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws or any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Army, William D. Warren (C-2428987), of Boulder, Colo., shall be held and considered to have served 90 days in the First Territorial Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry, during the War with Spain and to have been honorably discharged from such service; but no pension, increase of pension, pay, or bounty shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act, prior to its enactment.

WALTER C. BLAKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 282) for the relief of Walter C. Blake, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000"; and at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter C. Blake, of Springfield, Mass., the sum of $1,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained by the said Walter C. Blake from the loss of an eye caused by an injury received in April 1919 while he was an employee of the United States Armory at Springfield, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR C. NORCUTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000, to Arthur C. Norcutt, of Mason City, Nebr., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his son, Roger Thaine Norcutt (CC7-280466), who died on July 17, 1937, as the result of a disease contracted by him while an enrollee in the Seven Hundred and Fifty-ninth Company, Civilian Conservation Corps, at Mitchell, Nebr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. KELLY

The bill (H. R. 401) for the relief of James W. Kelly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIOLA DALE

The bill (S. 765) for the relief of Viola Dale was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 165, Senate bill 765, which was passed over at my request for the reason that an error had been made in the report of the committee. The chairman of the committee which made the report is present in the Chamber and is willing that the error be corrected. The amendment reported by the committee should read "$1,500" instead of "$500."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 765) for the relief of Viola Dale.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$7,500" and in lieu thereof to insert "$500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Viola Dale, of Superior, Ariz., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by her as a result of a collision of the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger and a Forest Service truck which occurred on the Klamath River Road, Siskiyou County, Calif., on March 19, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 1, line 6, by striking out "$500" and in lieu thereof inserting "$1,500."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. C. BLOUNT AND OSCAR WILLIAMS

The bill (S. 625) for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. C. Blount, of Pensacola, Fla., and Oscar Williams, of Muscogee, Fla., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of a dwelling house located in Baldwin County, Ala., which was destroyed by fire on December 21, 1942, when an electric power line which was severed by a United States Navy airplane fell on such dwelling house and set it afire: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JAMES B. LEWIS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 410) for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, after the enacting clause, to strike out down to and including the figures "May 31, 1940", on page 2, line 4, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to James B. Lewis, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $200, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, as a result of the collision of the automobile in which he was riding, with a Civilian Conservation Corps ambulance on United States Highway No. 17 at a point about 10 miles west of New Bern, N. C., on May 31, 1940; (2) to Jarvis T. Mills, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, and personal property destroyed, in such accident at such time; and (3) to Richard D. Peters, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him in such accident at such time: *Provided*,

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to James B. Lewis, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $200, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, as a result of the collision of the automobile in which he was riding, with a Civilian Conservation Corps ambulance on United States Highway No. 17 at a point about 10 miles west of New Bern, N. C., on May 31, 1940; (2) to Jarvis T. Mills, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him, and personal property destroyed, in such accident at such time; and (3) to Richard D. Peters, of Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him in such accident at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY FRANCES HUTSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 807) for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,470", and insert "$2,245.90", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Frances Hutson, of La Junta, Colo., the sum of $2,245.90 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred, by her as a result of her having been hit by a bullet from a revolver fired during an altercation between two soldiers which occurred in La Junta, Colo., on December 13, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORTON FIEDLER

The bill (H. R. 1522) for the relief of Morton Fiedler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN

The bill (H. R. 1792) for the relief of Arthur G. Klein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOUGLAS R. MUTHER

The bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of Douglas R. Muther was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENNSYLVANIA COAL & COKE CORPORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 351) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation, of New York, N. Y., in the amount of $24,540.02, representing the amount deducted from contracts Nos. Tps-20037 and Tps-20041, dated October 26, 1937, and November 10, 1937, respectively, for the furnishing of coal to the Treasury Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropricated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDDIE SANDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 520) for the relief of Freddie Sanders, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "Tennessee", to insert "and the sum of $500 to Edd Harris, in full satisfaction of all injuries sustained by him while riding as a passenger in such wagon at such time", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Freddie Sanders, widow of Jim Sanders, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all her claims against the Government of the United States on account of the death of her husband, who died on November 9, 1940, as a result of injuries sustained on November 2, 1940, when the wagon which he was driving was struck by a truck operated by an employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority on Highway No. 64, about 2 miles west of Hornsby, in Hardeman County, Tenn., and the sum of $500 to Edd Harris, in full satisfaction of all injuries sustained by him while riding as a passenger in such wagon at such time: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris."

TOLL BRIDGE AT ASTORIA, OREG.

The bill (S. 693) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934, was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 13, 1934 (heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved August 30, 1935, January 27 1936, August 5, 1937, May 26, 1938, August 5, 1939, December 16, 1940, and July 14, 1941), authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted, with the following amendments to the first section of such act:

(1) By inserting after the words "chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Pacific County, Wash., and his successors in office" the words "or the chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Wahkiakum County, Wash., and his successors in office";

(2) By striking out the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at a point in Clatsop County, Oreg., suitable to the interests of navigation"; and

(3) By striking out the words "in trust for Clatsop County, Oreg., Pacific County, Wash., and the city of Astoria, Oreg.," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in trust for Clatsop County, Oreg., Pacific County or Wahkiakum County, Wash., and the city of Astoria, Oreg.": *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ETC.

The bill (S. 514) for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche H. Karsch, of Memphis, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of $7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from December 1, 1931, until the date of payment by the Secretary under the provisions of this act, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid upon a portion of such estate which was not subject to tax.

MOUNT VERNON, ALEXANDRIA & WASHINGTON RAILWAY CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1667) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, in section 1, page 1, line 4, after the word "determine", to insert "whether or not a cause of action for damages exists in connection with"; in line 7, after the words "corporation, and", to insert a comma and the words "if such court determines that such cause of action does exist,"; in line 9, after the word "damages" and the comma, to strike out "consequential, incidental, or otherwise"; and on page 2, line 12, after the words "if any" and the comma, to strike out "regardless of whether or not there was a taking by the United States of the said franchise, rights-of-way, and/or other easements, tracks, structures, terminals, going business, and goodwill and other property rights, and/or whether or not any act of the Secretary of the Treasury or other agency of the United States was unlawful or tortious."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN VESSELS

The bill (H. R. 2238) to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to hear the able junior Senator from Maryland discuss the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, when it became necessary for us to build a merchant marine most quickly, it also became necessary to do various things which at times seemed to infringe temporarily upon the rights of various individuals, and to subject them to certain hardships. Included in the activities were those conducted under the policy under which the Federal Government seized many vessels belonging to individuals and private corporations. Ordinarily there was not time to secure them in any other way, since possession of the ships had to be obtained immediately. The result was that many ships were taken. Naturally, in many instances the owners of the ships were subjected to very severe hardships.

As a result of the fact that the Government has since then been able to construct many of the boats which it needs, and for other reasons, the situation is now such that many of the boats can be returned. Consequently, this bill provides that the War Shipping Administration may return certain boats, and the ones which are contemplated to be returned under the bill are those which are engaged in fisheries or in industries allied to the fishing industry.

This bill would permit some of the boats to be returned to the owners if the owners so desire. These vessels had been secured under purchase or requisition or charter. When under this bill it is determined by any department which is using one of these vessels that that particular vessel is no longer required, the owner will, in the discretion of the War Shipping Administrator, be given an opportunity to get his boat back, provided he returns the purchase money, less so much as may be necessary to put the vessel in condition suitable to be operated for fishing purposes. He would also receive some allowance for the use of the boat. If the owner does not wish to take the boat back, or if an agreement cannot be reached as to the basis of return, there is a provision by which the boat can be sold through the operation of competitive sealed bids.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2238) to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of services of merchant sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have no particular interest in House bill 2281, and I have no knowledge of the proposed legislation, but I understand that this bill is more or less in conflict with a bill sponsored by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I ask that it go over until the Senator from Missouri can be present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REFUND OF CERTAIN FREIGHT CHARGES BECAUSE OF FRUSTRATED VOYAGES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administration of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the joint resolution grows out of this situation: When the infamous attack was made by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, a number of merchant ships were on their way to Pearl Harbor. Some others had not actually started there, but had collected freight for that purpose. The bill provides that in all cases in which the Government had collected the freight charges in advance, the amount of these freight charges shall be returned to the owner.

This bill would apply only to vessels owned or operated by the United States. Of course, some of the vessels were operated by private owners, and naturally the bill could not have any bearing on that situation. In quite a number of cases the Government had collected these freight charges in advance, and yet it was not able to deliver the freight, because of what may be referred to as frustrated voyages. About $250,000 was so collected. Surely the Government should in all such cases be in a position to return the money. It is possible that there is already sufficient authority of law under which these freight moneys may be returned by the United States, but in order to make assurance doubly sure it was deemed wise that this bill should be introduced. I think it should be passed. It is certainly a most reasonable measure for certainly the United States Government should not retain money paid in advance for a service to be rendered and then not carry out its agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The bill (S. 650) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 10, 1932 (heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 14, 1933; June 12, 1934; May 24, 1935; June 5, 1936; June 16, 1938, and May 24, 1939), granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Garrison, N. Dak., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.,' approved February 10, 1932."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FORREST W. DICKEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS CHARLES J. BAIR

The bill (H. R. 1238) for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED TAYLOR

The bill (H. R. 1219) for the relief of Fred Taylor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF TED VAUGHAN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1845) for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. E. COTTON CO.

The bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REUBEN T. LITTLE

The bill (H. R. 1583) for the relief of Reuben T. Little was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIDA B. ROGERS

The bill (H. R. 1627) for the relief of Vida B. Rogers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH SPEAR

The bill (H. R. 1597) for the relief of Joseph Spear was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVA BURTON RICKEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$4,443.15" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,943.15."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

W. HAROLD SHACKLEFORD

The bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. JUAN RAMIREZ

The bill (H. R. 159) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT KISH LEE AND ELIZABETH KISH

The bill (S. 915) for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Robert Kish Lee, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States mail truck driven by Vincent Amatrudi, an employee of the Post Office Department, in the performance of his official duties, in New York City, on July 31, 1939; the said Robert Kish Lee having obtained a judgment for $500 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such injuries, and (2) to Elizabeth Kish, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $112.72, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and other expenses incurred by her on account of the injuries so sustained by the said Robert Kish Lee; the said Elizabeth Kish having obtained a judgment for $112.72 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such expenses: *Provided*, That the said Robert Kish Lee and the said Elizabeth Kish shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Vincent Amatrudi from liability for the payment of such judgments: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MARY LYNN MORROW AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVERETT A. ALDEN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

H. M. REID & CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2067) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such

court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, approved May 7, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, for the past 3 or 4 years bills have been passed covering this subject matter. I am curious to know from the Senator in charge of the joint resolution if this measure relates to former legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] reported the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. In a word, I wish to know if the measure which is now on the calendar corresponds in substance with previous legislation which has been enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is an extension of the previous legislation. Because of the extreme shortage of manpower at the present time, such legislation is more urgent than it has ever been. Similar legislation has been enacted by the Congress on other occasions. I hope the joint resolution may be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Public Law No. 542, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 7, 1942, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944"; and by striking out "July 1, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1943."

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

The bill (S. 156) relating to the status of retired judges was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 260 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 375), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 260. When any judge of any court of the United States, appointed to hold his office during good behavior, resigns his office after having held a commission or commissions as judge of any such court or courts at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years, he shall, during the residue of his natural life, receive the salary which is payable at the time of his resignation for the office that he held at the time of his resignation. But, instead of resigning, any judge other than a Justice of the Supreme Court, who is qualified to resign under the foregoing provisions may retire, upon the salary of which he is then in receipt, from regular active service on the bench, and the President shall thereupon be authorized to appoint a successor; but a judge so retiring may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake or he may be called upon either by the presiding judge or senior judge of any other such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as such retired judge may be willing to undertake. Any judge who has heretofore retired, or who hereafter retires, under the provisions of this section, may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided.

"In the event any circuit judge, or district judge, having so held a commission or commissions at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years as aforesaid, shall nevertheless remain in office, and not resign or retire as aforesaid, the President, if he finds any such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of mental or physical disability of permanent character, may, when necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional circuit judge of the circuit, or district judge of the district, to which such disabled judge belongs. Any judge who has heretofore retired or who hereafter retires voluntarily under the provisions of this section, or whose mental or physical condition caused the President to appoint an additional judge, shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the remaining judges of said court who shall, in the order of the seniority of their respective commissions, exercise such powers and perform such duties as by law may be incident to seniority. In districts where there may be more than one district judge, if the judges or a majority of them cannot agree upon the appointment of officials of the court, to be appointed by such judges, then the senior judge shall have the power to make such appointments: *Provided*, That in determining the seniority of district judges in any State for the purpose of exercising the power of appointing officials of the court, any district judge whose jurisdiction extends over more than one district shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the other district judges in such Sate, in all districts except the district of his residence.

"Upon the death, resignation, or retirement of any circuit or district judge, so entitled to resign, following the appointment of any additional judge as provided in this section, the vacancy caused by such death, resignation, or retirement of the said judge so entitled to resign shall not be filled."

SEC. 2. The act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1204; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 375b), entitled "An act to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior," is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Any Justice of the Supreme Court who retires or who has retired under the provisions of this act may nevertheless be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties, in any judicial circuit, including those of a circuit justice in such circuit, as such retired justice may be willing to undertake; a circuit or district judge so retiring or retired may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake; and any judge of any other court of the United States so retiring or retired may be called upon by the presiding judge or senior judge of such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as he may be willing to undertake. Any such judge so retiring or retired may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided."

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the District of Columbia shall be considered as a judicial circuit.

TOBACCO QUOTAS

The bill (H. R. 2020) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill covers only one point, and that is that any person who has an allotment for raising certain types of tobacco may have the allotment increased by one-half acre. That is the only point involved. The bill would give each person who can produce a certain type of flue-cured tobacco an increased allotment, up to one-half acre.

Mr. McNARY. Is there a shortage in tobacco of that type?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not sure as to the reason for the legislation. It is recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill would permit anyone to raise at least half an acre of tobacco, whether he is now raising any or not, or to increase his quota by half an acre. The bill passed the House almost unanimously. It is recommended by the Department of Agriculture, and by all the tobacco-producing States. It is intended to correct a sort of hiatus among tobacco growers who are shut out by the present law.

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, it would not affect the quota heretofore given to tobacco growers. It would affect all those who now desire to engage in tobacco growing.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. It represents an expansion of the tobacco industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is permissive, to the extent of allowing an expansion by one-half acre of the allotment of each grower. That is not much tobacco for the ordinary farmer, who produces 6 or 8 acres by his own labor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2020) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The resolution (S. Res. 139), an original resolution reported on April 16, 1943, by Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. LUCAS), from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 107, agreed to April 7, 1943, relating to the investigation of technological resources by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, hereby is amended by striking out the following language as it appears in said resolution: "in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement for the information of Senators, many of whom have come to me privately to inquire about the business of the Senate for the remainder of this week and possibly next week.

I wish to state that when the Senate shall have concluded its business today it will be my purpose to move an adjournment until Thursday next. We have completed the calendar, and there is nothing urgent upon it for consideration this week, or next, so far as I can see.

The House Committee on Ways and Means is now considering a tax bill in an effort to pass it this week if possible. It was announced that they hope to pass such a bill by Wednesday. Frankly, I have my doubts whether the House can pass a tax bill by Wednesday because the bill has not as yet been agreed to by the Committee on Ways and Means; but if they should pass a bill this week it could not reach the Senate before Thursday next. It will then have to be referred to the Committee on Finance, which will take it up promptly if not immediately.

I would not be able to say that if the House of Representatives should send a tax bill to the Senate on Thursday the committee would be called together Friday of this week; but I have consulted with the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I can assure the Senate and the country that immediately upon the passage of a tax bill by the House, and its receipt by the Senate, the Committee on Finance will take it up for consideration. How long a time that committee may require to consider the bill may depend on the type of bill which shall be sent here by the House. We cannot foresee that, but I wish to say that I have no intention of making any arrangement regarding the absence of Senators which would interfere with the consideration of a tax bill by the Senate whenever it is ready for consideration upon a report from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment.

I see no possibility of the Senate considering a tax bill this week, and, as I have said, it is impossible to say whether the Finance Committee will be able to report a bill in time to take it up on the floor of the Senate next week. It may be impossible to have it ready for consideration before Monday 2 weeks from today. I hope certainly that Senate consideration of the bill will not be delayed longer than that, assuming that we receive it from the House of Representatives in time to consider it by that date.

So I am making this statement in order that Senators may know the legislative situation for the remainder of this week, at least, and it may be for next week, depending entirely upon the progress of the tax bill through the House of Representatives and through the Committee on Finance.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am very glad that the able majority leader gives no assurance beyond this week. The information which I have is that possibly the tax bill may be here early in the week, and it is probable, in my judgment, that it may be reported to the Senate for action next week. I am sure that if it shall be reported by then we shall all want to be here.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McNARY. I am only adding a word of caution to that which has been spoken by the Senator from Kentucky, that, while Senators may well provide for their absences this week, I do not think we can give any assurance relative to next week, because we are all anxious to have prompt action on the tax bill.

Mr. President, I have no objection to, nor am I exultant about a recess at this time even though for a few days. I am anxious that the Senate proceed with its business, pass all necessary legislation, including the appropriation bills, and adjourn in midsummer for a definite time. That is my purpose and my ambition. I am sure I shall have the cooperation of the able Senator from Kentucky, and I believe the same feeling exists among the leaders of the other House. I rose only for the purpose of saying that I am sure we will not have a tax bill this week, but we may have one next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's words of caution supplementing mine on the subject. In other words, to be concrete, I think that if Senators desire to absent themselves from the Senate after today for the remainder of this week they may feel at liberty to do so. If they are absent longer than this week, they should hold themselves ready to return at once upon notice by the Senate that a tax bill is ready for consideration. I will say to the Senate that if a tax bill should be ready for consideration next week, they will receive prompt notice to return to Washington in order that it may be taken up for consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I take the Senator's statement regarding this week as meaning that the War Department civilian functions appropriation bill will not be taken up by the Senate this week?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so. That bill is still in the committee and I do not know that it will even be reported this week, but under the circumstances it could not be reported before Thursday and I should not feel disposed to taking it up at any time this week.

So the statement which I have made is for the information of Senators, who may govern themselves accordingly.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS REPORTED BY MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar Nos. 2, 3, 9, 17, and 67, which are bills which were reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs, and have been on the calendar for a long time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair may suggest that if the Senator would refer to one bill at a time, the Senate could follow him more easily.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The first is Calendar No. 2, Senate bill 217.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shoud have to object, for the reason that under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate started today at the point where the last call of the calendar was concluded. When we have an agreement to call the calendar in toto, of course, the Senator's request would be one we could not oppose, but, inasmuch as we started this morning with Order No. 150, on page 5, I think it would be unfair to return to the first bill, because no notice was given of that, although on Friday notice was given that there would be a call of the calendar beginning with No. 150. I think, in the interest of those who are absent necessarily, I should have to object to considering the bills today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask when the calendar will be called again?

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator mean the entire calendar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. I merely am inquiring as to when the calendar will be again called.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to that I cannot say.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are several bills on the calendar which have been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs which I should like to have considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I interpose the remark that the Senator from North Carolina, I presume, means when will the calendar be called from the first order number to the last?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot state to the Senator just when that will be done, because I do not know. If there is any emergency involved in the measures referred to by the Senator from North Carolina, he could ask that they be taken up or move that they be taken up without regard to the call of the calendar. Those bills have been on the calendar for some time, they were objected to when the calendar was called first, and went over. Of course they were not called again, because we began with the

consideration of the calendar where consideration was left off the last time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The only reason I am making the request is that the War Department is insisting that some action be taken looking to the passage of the bills, but if there is objection, of course, I shall not insist.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest that the bills may be considered on Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate will meet on Thursday, and I should be perfectly willing to have the bills considered then.

Mr. McNARY. That would be agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose, without even calling the whole calendar through, the Senator could get up his bills on Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. Postponement until Thursday would give opportunity to those who are absent and those who are present to look into the bills. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That arrangement will be satisfactory to me.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MEAD submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this act shall apply to all civilian officers and employees (including officers and employees whose wages are fixed on a monthly or yearly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, except those in or under the Government Printing Office or the Tennessee Valley Authority) in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that this act shall not apply to (a) elected officials; (b) judges; (c) heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies; (d) officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; (e) employees whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose; (f) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed; (g) officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and (h) individuals to whom the provisions of section 1 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes', approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law Numbered 17, Seventy-eighth Congress), are applicable. As used in this section the term 'elected officials' shall not include officers elected by the Senate or House of Representatives who are not members of either body.

"SEC. 2. Officers and employees to whom this act applies and who are not entitled to additional compensation under section 3 shall be paid overtime compensation computed on the same basis as the overtime compensation which was authorized to be paid under Public Law Numbered 821, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid only on the portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation not in excess of $2,900 per annum: *And provided further*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid on such portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation notwithstanding the fact that such payment will cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of forty-eight hours in any administrative workweek, the heads of departments, establishments, and agencies may in their discretion grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty.

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c), officers and employees to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are intermittent or irregular, officers and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches (except those in the Library of Congress, or the Botanic Garden, and per annum employees in or under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol who are regularly required to work not less than forty-eight hours per week) to whom this act applies, and, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, officers and employees whose hours of work are governed by those of private establishments which they serve and for whom on this account overtime work schedules are not feasible, shall be paid, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized under section 2 of this act, additional compensation at the rate of (1) $300 per annum if their earned basic compensation is at a rate of less than $2,000 per annum, or (2) 15 per centum of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum if their earned basic compensation is at a rate of $2,000 per annum or more.

"(b) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies and who is entitled to no additional compensation under subsection (a) or subsection (c) for a pay period, shall be paid for such pay period, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of $300 per annum, unless his overtime compensation under section 2 for such pay period is at least equal to such additional compensation.

"(c) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are less than full time, or whose compensation is based upon other than a time period basis shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation at a rate of 15 per centum of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum.

"(d) In no case shall any officer or employee be paid additional compensation under this section for any pay period amounting to more than 25 per centum of his earned basic compensation for such pay period.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall apply to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees.

"SEC. 5. The act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law Numbered 450, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 46, Seventy-seventh Congress), as amended, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this act is in effect.

"SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not operate to prevent payment for overtime services in accordance with any of the following statutes: Act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 261 and 267); act of July 24, 1919 (41 Stat. 241; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 394); act of June 17, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450, 1451, and 1452); act of March 2, 1941 (46 Stat. 1467; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 109a and 109b); act of May 27, 1936, as amended (52 Stat. 345; U. S. C., title 46, sec. 382b); act of March 23, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 20, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided*, That the overtime services covered by such payment shall not also form a basis for overtime compensation under this act.

"SEC. 8. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find that within the same Government organization and at the same location gross inequities exist, to such extent as to interfere with the prosecution of the war, between basic per annum rates of pay fixed for any class of positions under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the compensation of employees whose basic rates of pay are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, the Commission is hereby empowered, in order to correct or reduce such inequities, to establish as the minimum rate of pay for such class of positions any rate within the range of pay fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the grade to which such class of positions is allocated under such act.

"SEC. 9. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of coordinating and supervising the administration of the provisions of the foregoing sections of this act insofar as such provisions affect employees in or under the executive branch of the Government.

"SEC. 10. Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and committee chairmen, on or before the tenth day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

"SEC. 11. The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this act, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress such information as the Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the first day of each quarter, require for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall from time to time, but not

less frequently than the thirtieth day after the beginning of each quarter, determine the number of employees so required, and any personnel of any such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released at such times as the Director shall order. Such determination shall be reported to the Congress each quarter. Section 2 and 3 of this act shall cease to be applicable to the employees of such department or agency unless the head thereof shall certify within thirty days from the effective date so prescribed by the Director that the number of employees of his agency does not exceed the number determined by the Director to be required for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions. Any determinations and directions made by the Director under the authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, are hereby continued in effect until modified by him. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments and agencies any employees released pursuant to this section whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies, and the services of these employees are to be utilized by the departments and agencies before additional employees are recruited.

"SEC. 12. Amounts received as overtime compensation or additional compensation under this act shall not be considered in determining the amount of a person's annual income or annual rate of compensation for the purposes of paragraph II (a) of part III of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or section 212 of title II of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1932, as amended.

"SEC. 13. This act shall not apply to civilian employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States or to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and such employees may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

"SEC. 14. This act shall take effect on May 1, 1943, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

"SEC. 15. This act may be cited as the 'War Overtime Pay Act of 1943.'"

And the Senate agrees to the same.

JAS. M. MEAD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
WILLIAM LANGER,
HARRY F. BYRD,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in view of the unanimous report signed by the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and also in view of the fact that we have retained in the bill the basic standards for overtime pay, namely, the formula which provides for a year of 360 days, I believe that no detailed explanation is necessary. As I have said, the report is unanimous. We retained the heart and center of the Senate bill as passed by the Senate. Therefore, unless Senators desire to ask questions, I request that the conference report be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, and several officers for promotion, all in the Regular Army;

Holmes B. Springs, to be State director of selective service for South Carolina, under the provisions of law (compensation, $5,600 per annum); and

Under the War Manpower Commission, as follows:

James Asbury Downey, Jr., from the State of Alabama, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Birmingham area office of the War Manpower Commisison;

Henry K. Arneson, from the State of Arizona, to be area director for Arizona, at $4,600 per annum, in the Phoenix office of the War Manpower Commission.

Ben Alvin Barnard, from the State of California, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Los Angeles area office of the War Manpower Commission;

William Gordon Ennis, from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Hartford area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Mary E. Miller Dewey, from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Waterbury area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Harry Hardie, from the State of Maryland, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Harold Philip Redden, from the State of Massachusetts, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Springfield area office of the War Manpower Commission;

William Harry Barron, Jr., from the State of Missouri, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Dale Yoder, from the State of Minnesota, to be Chief of the Planning Division in the Bureau of Program Planning and Review, at $8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission;

Chester A. Smith, from the State of Minnesota, to be principal administrative analyst in the Office for Field Management, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission;

Vincent DePaul Murphy, from the State of New York, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Utica area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Richard H. Abbott, from the State of Ohio, to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at $5,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Oscar Smith, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Special Task Force No. 1, United States Fleet, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943;

Capt. Lee P. Johnson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander rear echelon, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943;

Capt. Robert G. Coman, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Service Force, Seventh Fleet, southwest Pacific force, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943; and

Capt. Lawrence F. Reifsnider, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander transports, Amphibious Force, Third Fleet, south Pacific force, to rank from the 12th day of April 1943.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified. That completes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 16), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC FOREIGN SERVICE

Maxwell M. Hamilton, of Iowa, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 16), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Charlie N. Parker, Cotton Plant.

FLORIDA

Arthur E. Woodburn, Marathon.
Hollis F. Anderson, Mayport.
Cora L. Lott, Princeton.

KENTUCKY

Tandy M. Riddle, Pikeville.
John H. Mitchell, Salem.

LOUISIANA

John A. Moody, Cotton Valley.
Azalee W. Nelson, Haughton.
Andrew C. Burns, Shongaloo.

OKLAHOMA

Oscar E. Bailey, Calvin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Before entering upon this week of sacred memories we would wait upon Thee, O Lord. For Thy matchless record of patient endurance, of love that was stronger than death, and of words that have comforted all succeeding generations we give thanks unto Thee, the Victor of Life.

We pray for those of our armed forces upon the calendar of whose lives there may be a Gethsemane with its agony, and a Golgotha with its cross. Sustain all such with the promise which Thou didst offer beyond a borrowed tomb: "Because I live, ye shall live also."

Make America mighty in all spiritual weaponry, O God. During a day when her citizens are called upon to defend themselves against the rulers of the darkness of this world, may they put on the sheaths of truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God.

May the deliberations here this day be carried on with a view single to the welfare of our land and the advancement of Thy kingdom. We offer our prayer in the name and for the sake of Him who has redeemed us through the sacrifices of that first Holy Week. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 17, 1943, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Secretary of the Navy Knox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein three letters, a letter written from Prentiss M. Brown to Congressman JED JOHNSON with a notation on the margin thereof by Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright; a letter which I wrote Mr. Prentiss M. Brown regarding the notation by Mrs. Cartwright; and a letter from Mr. Brown to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REDISTRICTING IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last year the Republican and Democratic Parties of Pennsylvania redistricted the State, pursuant to a fall in the population, as is provided by the laws and the Constitution.

At the present time the legislature at Harrisburg, in both houses, is dominated by the Republican Party. A second redistricting is being contemplated and a bill has already passed the Senate. This bill would change the representation from the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia in such manner as to thwart the will of the electorate there and to provide for three less Democratic representatives from Pittsburgh.

I do not have any particular conceit about my own services in the House. I realize very well that this country has gotten along before I was down here and will after I am no longer here, but the reason I took the floor today is that if I hear any pious or platitudinous remarks on the part of the Republican Party of Pennsylvania that they wish to abandon politics during the time of war, I hope that this cynical attempt to thwart the will of the people will rise to haunt them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NEW ENGLAND MOTORISTS URGE REPEAL OF FEDERAL USE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence may be granted to my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a portion of Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mark Sullivan on the Ruml plan, appearing in today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

TRAINING OF NONFARM YOUTH FOR FARM LABOR

The Clerk called the first business on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 75, to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes. I will withhold it.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, may I state to the House that we have passed at least one or two bills recently proposing to create a land army, to get labor on the farms, and a bill carrying $26,000,000, most of which goes to an overworked extension service to try and get labor on the farms. I do not believe there is a man on the floor of this House who does not realize that the 4-H boys and girls have done the best line of work on the farm of any group we know about.

The purpose of this bill is to get together the girls and boys in the rural areas, the small villages, the small cities, who speak the same language of the 4-H boys and girls—who really already know considerable about farming—and get them on the farms to help do this work and at a small cost.

I agreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] sometime ago to accept an amendment limiting the appropriation to be spent under this bill to two and one-half or not over three million dollars. It appears that Members are willing to spend millions to create a land army and provide housing facilities, to buy uniforms, pay doctor bills and, I suppose, give them a pension after the war is over. However, when we present you with a bill based on common sense and economy, then it goes over from week to week.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request and let the bill pass.

Mr. COLE of New York. I may say to the gentleman that insofar as I personally am concerned I have no objection to the bill, but there are other Members interested who have asked me to see that it goes over.

Mr. FULMER. I do not believe there is a single Member except the gentleman from New York that will object to the passage of this bill under the circumstances realizing that here we have a bill that will actually do more to secure farm help for the amount of money to be spent than any bills passed by Congress or any bills now pending in Congress for this purpose.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request, and I hope no Member will object to the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the requests I have had and promises made to the Members, I cannot withdraw the request. Personally I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required. Are there further objections?

There being no further objections, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to assist in assuring an adequate supply of food for the armed forces, the civilian population, and the allies of the United States during the continuation of the war in which the United States is now engaged there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to employ qualified persons as assistants to train nonfarm youth for farm labor and to supervise 4-H Club and other farm youth work projects. Such assistants shall be under the direction of the extension services of the State agricultural colleges. The United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, and the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall coperate with the State agricultural colleges in recruiting and training youths for farm labor in order to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 1, line 7, after the word "necessary", insert a comma and the following language: "but not to exceed $2,500,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Page 2, after line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SECTION 2. This act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman move to strike out the last word of the amendment? Does he want to speak on the amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening of this week at Constitution Hall in this city, the national commander of the American Legion, Col. Roane Waring, will make his first public address since his return a couple of days ago from a visit to the fighting fronts in North Africa. I believe each Member of this House has been invited to attend that meeting. Because of the short time available to the committee in mailing the invitations, I want to assure every Member of the House that he is invited, and that a seat will be reserved for him if he telephones to the national office of the American Legion at 1608 K Street NW., without delay.

I hope every Member of Congress will hear Colonel Waring's address.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REAPPORTION AND GERRYMANDER

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the country and the Congress to take note of a plot now being engineered by the Republican National Committee to take over control of the Congress by having the legislators of the various Republican-controlled States of the Union legislate out of office Democratic Members of Congress; thus, they seek to do what they cannot do by a vote of the people of the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How did the gentleman get the floor at this stage of the bill to speak about Pennsylvania politics?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moved to strike out the last word and asked unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members in charge of the Consent Calendar would want to protect the membership and the calendar, and would object to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi received consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes. A similar request was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Chair put the request. No objection was raised.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the plan of the Republican National Committee is to have the States in which its party exercises control, reapportion and gerrymander the congressional districts in such a manner as to make it impossible to elect Democrats to Congress.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, the Republican Party now in control is furthering the Republican National Committee's plan at this moment by forcing through reapportionment legislation which will reduce the Democratic representation in the National Congress by at least five Members, and this result is being achieved by the most reprehensible and ruthless type of gerrymandering of the district boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, by gerrymandering out of office five Democrats and substituting in their place five Republicans, it can be readily perceived that by such action in one State alone control of the Congress can be practically switched from one party to the other. This is a direct denial of the will of the people and contrary to the intent of the Constitution.

A Republican State senator is reported to have said:

We have control of the senate, we have control of the house, our Governor is a Republican, and we have the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, minority leader, upon the chairman of the Republican National Committee, and the chairman of the Republican National Congressional Committee to call a halt to this disgraceful plot, and it is time for the Congress to make a proper study of the Federal statutes relating to apportionment of congressional districts and to enact legislation which will in the future prevent methods by which the will of the people can be thwarted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman call upon the Democratic National Committee to see that they do the same thing in North Carolina, Tennessee, and a few other States?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman he cannot cite an instance where the States which were controlled by the Democrats gerrymandered Republicans out of office.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If you had gone along with me last year or 2 years ago in

passing a reapportionment bill, we would have saved Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and some other States from this trouble.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understood that the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The House is proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COLE of New York. But the gentleman's request was to speak out of order for 1 minute.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I conclude by saying that gerrymandering is contrary to the intent of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's request is granted and without objection the gentleman may speak out of order for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be something wrong with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] this morning. This past week two or three gentlemen from Pennsylvania, including Mr. MCGRANERY and the gentleman who just spoke, sobbed for 15 or 20 minutes from the Well of the House and all that anyone could gather from their remarks was that a Republican legislature was trying to give the State of Pennsylvania a fair, honest redistricting, which would, so the gentlemen seemed to fear, permit the people of the territory included in the respective districts to send to Congress someone who would accurately represent the various districts.

To the innocent bystander that would seem to be commendable action. But perhaps it would pull a slippery New Deal coattail out from under some who have been riding it.

Some folks up in the gallery came down afterward and waylaid me when I was going out and asked, "What is the matter with those fellows?" I said that I did not know anything about the legislature of Pennsylvania, but from what had been said on the floor it was evident that the New Deal had been repudiated in Pennsylvania and that the legislature of that State was undoing some of the "shenanigans" of the New Deal which had been put over during the preceding year.

What is the matter with these fellows from Pennsylvania? Can they not take it? The new dealers certainly have been handing it out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I know what you are squabbling about. I know what is the matter. You would like to hand it out, but you cannot take it. You do a lot of sobbing. You said: "Point to an instance when the Democrats had acted unfairly." Forget the Democrats and talk about the new dealers. They have control of the party organization. Have you forgotten the Sheppard committee report which told that the New Deal was using the taxpayers money for corrupt political purposes? Have you forgotten about how down in Kentucky in the campaign before the last one when the New Deal was using the taxpayers' money there to elect a Senator? Have you forgotten all that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman has requested the Chair to call the gentleman's attention to the fact when he has transgressed the rules. The Chair thinks it is unfortunate to mention the name of the Senate or a Senator. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to be called to order for the education and the edification of the other Members of the House, if such procedure will aid in a better observation of the rules. Does the Chair mean the Sheppard committee?

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman referred to a Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Speaker and to the House and the gentleman on the other side and to everybody who thinks an apology is due them.

Do you recall that committee from the other body that made a report here that the taxpayers' money was being used for corrupt purposes, not for honest, legitimate political purposes but for corrupt political purposes, and the taxpayers' money at that? That was a report from over at the other end of this building from what might be referred to as a committee of the Upper Body, do you recall that? And so it has been for the last 6, 8, or 10 years. Every time you get a report from a committee on the other side of the Capitol that is doing a patriotic duty you catch some dirty, slimey politician spending money for corrupt political purposes or wasting the taxpayers' money, or putting "reds" on the public pay roll, and sometimes it was money that was appropriated to feed and clothe people. Do you remember that statement about the ill-housed, and the hungry and the people who were suffering? Do you remember that, and the money we appropriated to help those people? The gentleman asked us to cite instances. Why, if I were to cite all of the instances of that kind of corrupt and illegal procedure it would take up a whole week's time. Right up there in Detroit today the O. P. A. is holding a hearing to determine why ex-convicts, mind you, from the ration board are getting an allowance of as much as 3,000 miles a month, 3,000 miles a month rubber and gas, 36,000 miles a year to drive from Detroit to Port Huron, Mich., to make the drivers of the milk trucks in Port Huron come across and contribute to a fund, which amounts, according to the testimony before a committee over there on the other side, to $6,000,000 a month; and if the other union collects $1 a month from each of its members—and it claims 5,000,000 members—that makes $11,000,000 a month—$132,000,000 a year.

Over in Holland, Mich., which is part in the Fifth Republican District in Michigan, the Harrington Coal Co. has 10 drivers or employees. Five of them belong to one union, and the outsiders come in there and try to make the other 5 kick in before they can go out and deliver coal at the dock. Before they can work to support their families. Have we freedom here in America?

Now the administration is asking the American people to buy $13,000,000,000 worth of bonds, but before the American worker can spend 1 cent to buy Defense bonds he has to kick in to a fund which amounts to $11,000,000 a month, think of it, $11,000,000 a month to the political allies of the administration in power. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] wants to have us cite an instance of political corruption. Think of it, taking the money that otherwise might be used to purchase War bonds to fatten the treasury of the political allies of the New Deal. Oh, it is a sweet situation. It stinks to high heaven, and the people know it.

The people of the United States know that while this administration talks about freedom from want and freedom from fear and a free press and free speech, it does not mean a word of what it preaches.

While thousands of American boys are sacrificing their lives, while the whole country is going without and doing its utmost, the planners and the new dealers are undermining the very foundations of our Government, are standing back of crooked political labor politicians and racketeers, who are compelling honest, patriotic Americans to pay tribute for the privilege of working to support the men they have sent to the front.

The people know that this administration is using this war to maintain itself in power. It is using this war to advance the personal political ambitions of its supporters. It is back of the un-American, the unfair, the unjust practice of compelling American citizens to pay tribute to the labor unions, which, in turn, support the administration and its un-American schemes.

Answer me this one question: Is it right, is it just, is it fair, is it decent for any organization, for any group of men, to force American citizens to pay for the privilege of working at a job which will aid in the defense of our country, in the defeat of our enemies, which tends directly to support the fighting men who day by day—yes; hour by hour—are dying for us?

There is but one answer to that question, and that is that any man who supports that kind of a proposition is denying to American workers their constitutional, their God-given right to labor to support themselves, their families, and the Army of our country.

Yet this administration is doing that very thing. And I challenge any Member on the majority side to debate that

question here on the floor of the House. I have issued that challenge time and again during the last 2 years and never yet has it been accepted. The failure of the administration, of the party leaders, to accept it is an acknowledgment of their guilt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1291, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIVES AND INHABITANTS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1573, relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (e) is hereby added to section 1 of the act entitled "An act to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto," approved February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1234), as amended, to read as follows:

"(e) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who on the effective date of this subdivision (e) are residing in the continental United States or any Territory or insular possession of the United States and who are not citizens or subjects of any foreign country, regardless of their place of residence on January 17, 1917."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act relating to the immigration and naturalization of certain natives of the Virgin Islands," approved June 28, 1932 (47 Stat. 336), is hereby revived and made fully operative as to natives residing in any foreign country on the effective date of this act, and section 2 of the act cited is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto," approved February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1234), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who have been or may be admitted to the continental United States or to any Territory of the United States, the Virgin Islands of the United States, or Puerto Rico as nonquota immigrants and who are not citizens or subjects of any foreign country, if not ineligible to citizenship, may upon petition and upon full and complete compliance with all other provisions of the naturalization laws be naturalized without making a declaration of intention."

SEC. 4. Clauses (1) to (4), inclusive, of subsection (b) of section 328 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, 1152), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, and has resided in the United States continuously since such entry, or entered the Virgin Islands of the United States prior to July 1, 1938, and has resided in such islands continuously since such entry;

"(2) Is a person of good moral character; and

"(3) Is not subject to deportation, but this clause shall not relate to inadmissibility at time of entry into the Virgin Islands of the United States."

SEC. 5. (Clause (1) of subsection (b) of section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, 1161) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"For application for record of registry, $18 except that no fee shall be charged and collected in the case of an alien applicant who entered the Virgin Islands of the United States prior to July 1, 1938, and has resided continuously in the islands since such entry."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1941, permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REPATRIATING NATIVE-BORN WOMEN RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1289, to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1295, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CREATING A BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1025, to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a board of legal examiners in the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what his objection is? I have just worked out with the veterans' organizations a satisfactory solution of their objection to the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman worked out the objections of the American Bar Association to the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They have none. The American Bar Association House of Delegates in a recent session endorsed the bill by formal resolution, which I placed in the RECORD a few days ago.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it the purpose of this bill to create a Federal Board of Examiners to reinvestigate the qualifications and legal attainments of lawyers who have been licensed by the several States to practice in the courts of the country?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, not at all. It has nothing to do with the right to practice in the courts. It simply deals with the employment of lawyers in the Federal Government. They do not investigate their right to practice.

Mr. COOLEY. No, not their right to practice, but the bill sets up a board of legal examiners for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not lawyers who have theretofore been licensed to practice in the State Federal courts possess the necessary legal training to hold legal jobs in the bureaus. Is not that the purpose of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is not a correct statement of what they do.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain the real purpose of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. What they do is to pass upon those who apply for Federal positions, just like any other civil-service procedure, and select the ones they think are best qualified. In this particular instance, a part of the examining is done by your own local attorneys and judges under a system that has been investigated by the Bar Association and found to be good. Instead of having examiners here in the Civil Service Commission exclusively pass on the qualifications of the applicants, their own neighbors and the judges before whom they have practiced do a part of the examining. They do the oral examining.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman mean that the board of legal examiners contemplates participation in the activities and deliberations of that board by judges back in the States in which the applicants live?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. That is the system that has been in existence now for more than a year. The local boards are composed of judges and practicing attorneys.

Mr. COOLEY. Does that mean that the applicants appear before judges in their native States for the purpose of an oral examination?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; before the local boards.

Mr. COOLEY. Then the judge certifies as to the qualifications and eligibility of the applicant?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, the judges and attorneys.

Mr. COOLEY. That information submitted by the judge is filed with the Federal Board of Legal Examiners?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is filed with the Civil Service Commission Board of Legal Examiners and constitutes a part of the examination procedure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gentleman's statement to the effect

that the American Bar Association has approved this bill, I am inclined to withdraw any objection which I may have.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I objected to this bill in the beginning, or asked that it be passed over without prejudice, for the simple reason that it did not properly consider the veterans' preference provisions that are written into other laws.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has agreed to an amendment which is satisfactory to the veterans' organizations, and we have agreed, if the amendment is adopted, not to oppose the bill. Frankly, if that provision is included in the bill, I am rather inclined to think it will be an improvement on the situation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements which have been made, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. My understanding is that the gentleman has conferred with representatives of the several veterans' organizations, and an amendment to protect the veterans' preference has been agreed upon, and that it is the intention of the gentleman from Georgia to offer that amendment at this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct. If consent for consideration of the bill is given, I shall offer an amendment which I agreed upon after consultation with the representatives of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Solicitor General of the Department of Justice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was no intention upon the part of the Civil Service Committee of the House to weaken the rights of the veterans under the Veterans' Preference Act, was there?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No. The gentleman is correct. The committee wants to protect the veterans. We feel that this bill improves the chances for veterans who want legal positions with the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. But the fact is they were not properly protected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That may be possible, but it is not the intention of the committee in proposing this legislation to deprive in any wise the veterans of any rights. Their rights must, of course, be protected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1753 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

"The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote the efficiency thereof, and ascertain the fitness of each candidate in respect to age, health, character, knowledge, and ability for the branch of service into which he seeks to enter; and for this purpose he may employ suitable persons to conduct such inquiries, and may prescribe their duties, and establish regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the civil service. In exercising the authority herein provided the President may appoint within the Civil Service Commission a Board of Legal Examiners to determine and administer, in consultation with the Civil Service Commission, the regulations and procedures governing the examination, selection, appointment, promotion, transfer, reinstatement, and status of attorneys in the classified civil service, in accordance with the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883, as amended, entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States.'"

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 2, line 14, change the period to a colon and add the following proviso: *"Provided*, That all such regulations and procedures shall give full force and effect to all laws, executive orders, and civil service rules which provide any preference, exemption, or waiver for ex-servicemen or their wives or widows."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SALE OF 3.2 PERCENT BEER TO INDIANS IN MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1976) relating to the importation, manufacture, sale, or possession within the State of Minnesota of certain nonintoxicating beverages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is on the floor, and I ask him to explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and reported out by that committee unanimously, favorably. The bill has for its purpose the permitting of the sale of nonintoxicating liquor to Indians in the State of Minnesota. Minnesota has a State law which prevents the sale of 3.2 percent beer to any Indian. If the Indian is sold beer by any person, the seller would be violating the law. The view of the Committee on Indian Affairs was that it is a discrimination and an unfair discrimination against any person who has Indian blood in him. The legislative committee of the Chippewa Council appeared before our House committee and unanimously endorsed this bill and asked its passage. Within the State of Minnesota there has been no opposition to the bill either from the Indians or the white people, and in addition to that, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has approved the bill and asked that it be passed. In a letter dated February 25, 1943, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, I quote the following:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
February 25, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: With reference to Mr. KNUTSON'S bill, H. R. 1976, this bill in its substance received departmental approval last year. The intent of the Chippewa Tribe, as of Mr. KNUTSON, according to my understanding, was that Indians should be allowed to buy nonintoxicating beverages (3.2 percent or less alcohol, as defined in the State law to be nonintoxicating) anywhere in the State. I am in accord with that idea. The Indians are now scattered far and wide through industrial areas; they have in the Army and the Navy a greater proportion of their number than perhaps any other population group in the country; and it seems very desirable to remove, in the modest way proposed in the bill, a discrimination which they resent.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN COLLIER, *Commissioner.*

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and ask the gentleman under that reservation some questions—if he is not trying to legislate such to be by this bill that never was and never will be?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the question is rather vague, but I say this to the gentleman, that the Indians are American citizens, and under the present law in Minnesota any person with any Indian blood in him at all is regarded as an Indian, and is banned from even buying any beer. I do not believe that it is fair to say to a certain group of people that has the largest proportion of their population in the Army, of any group of Americans, that because they have Indian blood in them we are going to deny to them the privilege that we accord to every other man and woman in this country. Is it fair to the Indian? The Department of the Interior has had this matter under consideration for some time, and Mr. Collier says it is unfair. Every member of that committee says it is unfair. The private counsel appeared in behalf of the Chippewa Indians, and he says that it is unfair. Every white person in the State of Minnesota thinks it is unfair. Why should the Congress now say that it is fair to discriminate against the group of people that are today baring their breasts to the danger of war, just the same as every other American citizen in the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the gentleman, I am sure he understands the significance of my question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It was broad, I will admit.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman understood that I meant the legislation in this bill was to the effect that certain intoxicating liquor and intoxicating beverage was not intoxicating. He understood it, but I want to ask the gentleman if he is not trying to invade upon the rights of the States and to render null and void a State law by congressional egislation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no; just trying to do justice by a race of people who

have been mistreated and discriminated against.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. BRYSON objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 647, to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the George Washington Carver National Monument may be established as provided by this bill. It is appropriate that this recognition of his distinguished services to humanity be made. Dr. Carver received his formal education in the district which I have the honor to represent. He attended Simpson College at Indianola, Iowa, received his degree of bachelor of science from Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa, in 1894, and his master's degree from the same college in 1896. He was one of the world's outstanding scientists and educators. His exemplary life of quiet devotion to his fellow men is a shining light in these dark days of war. We honor ourselves by honoring Dr. Carver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift or purchase, the site of the birthplace of George Washington Carver, distinguished Negro scientist, located near Diamond, Mo., together with such additional land and any improvements thereon as the Secretary may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. In the event the Secretary is unable to acquire such property, or any part thereof, at a reasonable price, he is authorized and directed to condemn such property, or any part thereof, in the manner provided by law.

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall constitute the George Washington Carver National Monument and shall be a public national memorial to George Washington Carver. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of such national monument, and shall maintain and preserve it for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

(1) Maintain, either in an existing structure acquired under the provisions of section 1 of this act or in a building constructed by him for the purpose, a museum for relics and records pertaining to George Washington Carver, and for other articles of national and patriotic interest, and to accept, on behalf of the United States, for installation in such museum, articles which may be offered as additions to the museum; and

(2) Construct roads and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest within the boundaries of the George Washington Carver National Monument.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the period, strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 2.

Page 3, line 2, after the word "sums", insert "not to exceed $30,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2197, to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269, 1273), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 1978; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315i), is hereby amended (1) by adding after the word "improvements" the following: "and for the purchase of lands for grazing and related purposes," and (2) by adding at the end of the section the following: "Lands acquired through appropriations made pursuant to this section shall be deemed to be in the same status as public lands."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "lands", insert "for necessary driveways and."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "purposes", insert "except that not more than half of such 25 per centum of such revenues shall be appropriated or expended for the acquisition of land."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "lands", insert "and shall be subject to all applicable public-land laws."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 495, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see both the majority and minority leaders on the floor. I am going to make a request in which I understand they agree.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the leadership of the House to call up this bill for debate not to exceed 30 minutes between now and the end of the week, preferably at the time a similar bill is to be acted upon having to do with the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that the unanimous-consent request be that it be in order for the Speaker to recognize the gentleman to call up the bill; not for the leadership to call it up.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am very glad to amend my request accordingly. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would make this statement, that there has been a tentative agreement between the leaders on both sides, that it may be in order that this bill may be called up at such time during the week as it can be reached on the regular calendar of business, and that there be 30 minutes of general debate, the time to be equally divided between the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and the ranking minority member of that committee.

I make that as a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

SECOND-CLASS APPLICATION FEES OF NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1004, to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS HELD BY LOCATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2370, providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] a question. In the last three lines on the last page of the bill it is stated that the claimant shall be required to file in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1 for each year that this act remains in effect, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

My question is: If the claimant is in the armed services in some part of the world where he cannot be present to file his claim how are his rights to be protected?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that members of the armed forces are adequately protected in this respect in the act we passed in 1940 for the relief of soldiers and sailors. It was the intention at that time, that ample protection be afforded under that act for those who were holders of unpatented mining claims for the duration of the war.

I recall distinctly that at the time of the enactment of the Selective Service Act in September 1940, I attempted to put in an amendment to protect such holder of unpatented mining claims who were inducted into the armed forces from requirement of the annual assessment work. This move was on request of the small mine operators' associations in Arizona. The provision was not included in the Selective Service Act in definite form, but it was later included in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act passed in October 1940, so that existing law does offer full protection for the men in the armed forces. It is the intent of this legislation to take care of all other claimants other than those in the armed forces, which in my opinion the bill does.

I hope this is adequate answer to the gentleman from Iowa and I want to thank him for his consideration of this important matter. Let me say further that this bill is a very worthy one and I am anxious that it be passed today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona and withdraw my reservation. This is a worthy bill and should be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, for the duration of the war and until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July after the termination thereof: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim, in order to obtain the benefits of this act, shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1 for each year that this act remains in effect, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Alaska", strike out the balance of line 9 and all of lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941, RELATING TO WOMEN'S RESERVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1616, to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries or some member thereof to call up this bill after there shall have been considered under the rule a similar bill reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs dealing with the women's organization.

My reason for doing this is that the bills are practically similar, and I find that the Navy bill is not on the Consent Calendar. I think it would be entirely unfair to the House to bring up this bill on the Consent Calendar, have it acted upon, and then have a similar bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs dealing with the Women's Auxiliary in the Navy considered and amendments made. I think the best thing to do would be to have the House consider first the Navy bill under the rule and then take up this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The bill to which the gentleman is addressing his remarks affects the SPARS.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that this bill is almost identical, if not identical, with the bill relating to the WAVES?

Mr. BLAND. On which a rule has been issued; that is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I recall, the WAVE bill simply gives to the WAVES the same rank that the WAAC's now have and permits the WAVES to be sent overseas exactly the same as the WAAC's are now sent overseas. Is it the purpose to give like treatment to the WAVES, the WAAC's, the SPARS, the WOWS, and the rest of them?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know anything about the WOWS, and I do not know anything about the rest of them, but it is the purpose to give like treatment to the SPARS. As a matter of fact when the bill was originally passed in the House relating to the SPARS it contained such a provision which was eliminated in the Senate, and we concurred.

Mr. MICHENER. May we have the assurance of the gentleman that he will not bring in a bill a little later to modify either one of these bills in order that they all may be current?

Mr. BLAND. That would depend upon the nature of the emergency. I would hardly feel that I should make any assurance of anything at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first knowledge I have had of this particular bill. I would suggest that the gentleman withdraw it until we have a chance to know what its status is. Has the gentleman a rule for this bill?

Mr. BLAND. I have not. I have it on the Consent Calendar. The Committee on Naval Affairs has a rule for the similar bill out of that committee. My request is that I may be permitted to bring it up after the Navy bill is acted upon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I suggest to the gentleman that he defer action on the bill to allow us an opportunity to familiarize ourselves with it. This is the first notice we have had of it.

Mr. BLAND. I am not going to quarrel about it with my friend from Massachusetts. I think that when the House has acted on the Naval Affairs bill he will permit me then to bring the bill up; and if the gentleman so desires, I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman feels as I do that all of the services should be treated exactly in the same manner?

Mr. BLAND. I do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is only common justice.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

USE OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS INTERCHANGEABLY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2437, authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads if this is not the same measure that I objected to when it was tacked on an appropriation bill. In the meantime we held hearings in our committee at which representatives of the postal organizations gave this bill their endorsement. The Post Office Department has given assurance that postmasters will not be permitted to make these changes of clerks and carriers indiscriminately and that the Department will make certain that postmasters will be curbed from committing any abuse of authority granted to them under this bill? Furthermore, this is merely emergency legislation.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, while the United States is at war and for 6 months thereafter, the Postmaster General may, when the interest of the Service requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency may assign any post-office employee to the duties

of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office employee without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Postmaster General may, in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, may temporarily assign any post-office clerk or city delivery carrier to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office clerk or city delivery carrier without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

"SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks, city delivery carriers, and railway postal clerks interchangeably."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS COLUMBIA RIVER AT OR NEAR ASTORIA, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1114, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., authorized to be built by the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees by an act of Congress approved June 13, 1934, as amended, as heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved August 30, 1935, January 27, 1936, August 5, 1937, May 26, 1938, August 5, 1939, December 16, 1940, and July 14, 1941, are further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 13, 1942.

SEC. 2. The first section of such act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 949), is amended—

(1) By inserting after the words "chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Pacific County, Wash., and his successors in office" the words "or the chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Wahkiakum County, Wash., and his successors in office."

(2) By striking out the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at a point in Clatsop County, Oreg., suitable to the interests of navigation."

(3) By striking out the words "in trust for Clatsop County, Oreg., Pacific County, Wash., and the city of Astoria, Oreg.," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in trust for Clatsop County, Oreg., Pacific County or Wahkiakum County, Wash., and the city of Astoria Oreg."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and page 2, lines 1 and 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the act approved June 13, 1934, as amended, and heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved August 30, 1935, January 27, 1936, August 5, 1937, May 26, 1938, August 5, 1939, December 16, 1940, and July 14, 1941, authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg."

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR MEMPHIS, TENN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1702, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Memphis, authorized to be built by the Memphis and Arkansas Bridge Commission by an act of Congress approved September 27, 1940, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from August 10, 1942.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "September 27, 1940, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from August 10, 1942," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "August 10, 1939, and heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved September 27, 1940, are further extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from August 10, 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF A FREE, PUBLICLY OWNED AND OPERATED BRIDGE ACROSS CALCASIEU RIVER AT OR NEAR LAKE CHARLES, LA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1731, granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Calcasieu River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Lake Charles, La., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled, "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME OF CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. CROIX RIVER AT OR NEAR HUDSON, WIS.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2077, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis., authorized to be built by the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, by an act of Congress approved July 17, 1942, are hereby extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from July 17, 1943.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY GRADUATES AS ENSIGNS IN THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2486, to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint as ensigns in the line of the Coast Guard all cadets who in 1945 and thereafter graduate from the Coast Guard Academy: *Provided*, That the number of cadets appointed annually to the Coast Guard Academy in 1943 and each year thereafter shall not exceed 300.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include as a part thereof a resolution I am introducing authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775. I represent Lexington and Concord, in the State of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Soviets Hold Poles Captive, Catholics Told," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Saturday, April 17, 1943, and also an article by Adele Allerhand, entitled "Probe of Red Atrocity Urged," which appeared in the Sunday Times-Herald of April 18, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters and an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Raymond Clapper, and also an editorial appearing in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a let of a few of the alphabetical agencies which have been created during the past few years, as well as 10 points listed by the Land O'Lakes News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	O'Leary
	Gore	O'Toole
Arnold	Guyer	Outland
Barry	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Bender	Harris, Va.	Philbin
Bloom	Hart	Phillips
Bolton	Hébert	Ramey
Boykin	Heffernan	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hendricks	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Rolph
Capozzoli	Izac	Rowe
Celler	Jeffrey	Sadowski
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Sauthoff
Culkin	Kearney	Schwabe
Curtis	Keefe	Scott
Dies	Kelley	Shafer
Dilweg	Kennedy	Sheridan
Douglas	Keogh	Short
Drewry	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Elliott	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Elmer	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Elston, Ohio	LaFollette	Starnes, Ala.
Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	Luce	Stevenson
Fellows	McGregor	Taylor
Fernandez	McKenzie	Towe
Fish	Maas	Treadway
Fitzpatrick	Madden	Vorys, Ohio
Fogarty	Magnuson	Vursell
Folger	Maloney	Wadsworth
Forand	Merritt	Wasielewski
Furlong	Merrow	Weaver
Gamble	Miller, Mo.	Weichel, Ohio
Gavagan	Mott	Whelchel, Ga.
Gavin	Murphy	Wilson
Gerlach	Nichols	Winter

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 141), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1563, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2481, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee last rose, the Clerk had completed the reading of the first paragraph on page 70 of the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 70, strike out all of lines 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot stand silently by and see the crop-insurance program destroyed. The amendment which I have offered does not seek to increase the funds for the administrative expenses of the crop-insurance program. The bill carries $3,500,000. It must be admitted that that is not sufficient to carry on the program fully, but it is my hope that on further review of the program in the Senate an appropriate amount can be provided.

My amendment strikes out the last six lines of the paragraph, which is the proviso that provides for the liquidation of the Crop Insurance Corporation and the crop-insurance program.

This program was inaugurated 4 years ago. Financially, it has not been a success up to now. The participation has not been as broad as it will be and has not been as broad as we hoped it would be by this time. The wheat program has been operating for 4 years and the cotton program for 1 year. It is hoped that corn will soon be brought into the program. The data on that commodity are now available, I understand. As the years go by, the program should be expanded to include other crops.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of this Nation have a right to have an organization set up—and no commercial establishments can do it—whereby they may insure themselves against the hazards over which they have no control.

It is admitted that the administrative expense up to now is high, but it is hoped that as the program develops the premiums will be sufficient not only to absorb the losses but to absorb all of the administrative expense.

As I have mentioned before, this Congress is appropriating millions and millions of dollars for the administration of other programs for the security of the workers of this Nation. Just a few weeks ago you appropriated $175,000,000 in one lump sum as the Government's part of the security program for civil-service employees, to put into the pot for their retirement when they reach the retirement age. The instances where the Federal Government is paying the administrative expenses of these security programs for the time being are too

numerous for me to mention within 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Government is also running an insurance business for shipowners.

Mr. PACE. As my colleague has stated, untold millions are being paid to the shipowners in an insurance program, and in addition it was called to my attention a few moments ago the longshoremen and seamen have an organization for protection against unemployment, and the Government is paying all the administrative expenses in that case.

If I am not mistaken, the Government is paying the administrative expenses of the war damage insurance program today, insuring millions and millions of people against property damage by bombs, and so forth. I understand all the administrative expense of this program is paid by the Government.

I hope that after the short time this program has been tested, with the promise it holds for the farmers of this Nation, that the Congress will not now vote to liquidate the Corporation, to liquidate the program, and stop this protection. There are times when the farmer has done his best, he has planted his crop, he has done his work, yet bad weather comes, insects come, and other hazards arise over which he has no control whatever. It seems to me that the farmers of this Nation, providing the food and the fiber to sustain the Nation, are entitled to have from the Congress some assurance when they plant their crop of what the harvest is going to be. Under this program, if they pay their premiums, they know they will be assured 75 percent production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe that I am just as much in favor of any proper and legitimate method of endeavoring to aid the farmers of this country as any Member of this House could possibly be. I am not even opposed to subsidies under certain conditions. Last Saturday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was very much so opposed. This, of course, in its operation is a subsidy, and yet the gentleman desires to retain it. When the agricultural appropriation bill enacted in 1938 was pending in this House, in connection with a conference report on February 8, 1938, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], who had charge of the conference, said this:

> We have further provided in this report, more in nature of an experiment than anything else, crop insurance for wheat with a view of seeing how it is going to work.

In other words, this business of crop insurance was started as an experiment and we have experimented with it for 4 years. No one would have been more delighted than myself if it had been successful. As it has operated so far, a little more than one-third of the wheat farmers and 7½ percent of the cotton farmers have taken advantage of it. The gentleman speaks of affording this measure of protection to certain classes of the farmers, and yet his interest in the subject matter seems to be vastly in excess of the interest of the farmers themselves. In one of the counties in my congressional district up until 2 weeks ago there had been received one application, according to the county newspaper, from a cotton farmer in that county for insurance in this program.

It has cost, as has been pointed out, when the excess of indemnities over premiums is considered, and when administrative expenses in excess of $23,000,000 are taken into consideration, between $40,000,000 and $41,000,000 to the Government for this 4-year program. That is not all. If the farmer has gotten anything out of it, the farmer has gotten it in the difference between what he paid and what he received. He paid about $28,000,000. He received about $45,000,000. In other words, he received benefits of about $17,000,000 in excess of what it cost him. How much did it cost to get those benefits to the farmers of the United States, principally the wheat farmers? It cost the Government over $23,000,000 to get $17,000,000 worth of benefits to those wheat farmers, and, as I said, I am not opposed to subsidies under certain conditions, or for the attainment of certain objectives, but I do think that if you are going to give a subsidy of $17,000,000 to the wheat farmers or the cotton farmers, then we ought to do it in some other way than under the process by which we spend $23,000,000 plus of Government money to give that subsidy to them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is there not something more to that? The figures given in the table, of course, gives a total administrative expense of $30,000,000 to get the $17,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. But that includes estimating administrative expenses for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. CASE. Against which no premiums are taken?

Mr. TARVER. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman allow the rest of us adequate time?

Mr. TARVER. That is not within my power, but I have not been objecting to anybody having time, and it is not my purpose to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a subject matter with regard to which we ask you to take the judgment of the subcommittee at all. It is a subject matter about which we want Members to exercise their own judgment. We have simply brought in here in this bill the suggestion that now is the time, in view of the lack of success of this program, when the Congress ought to give careful consideration to its discontinuance, by refusing further appropriations.

We started it as an experiment and that was frankly stated at the time of the inception of the program. If you think the experiment has been successful, then you should vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. If you feel that 4 years is not sufficient time to try it out and determine whether or not there is a prospect of its being eventually successful, then I still think you should vote in favor of the amendment. But if you are convinced, as I am, that this program was improvidently entered upon to begin with and it has not been of very great benefit to the farmers of the country and there is no prospect of its being of very great benefit to them and that it is too expensive to the Government in comparison with the benefits accruing in the program, then you should vote against the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think I should call attention to the fact that the demand for this insurance on wheat in 1942, after 4 years' operation, dropped off 14,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TARVER. And the demand from cotton was from 176,000 cotton growers out of 2,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to set up a plan of crop insurance for the wheat farmer was before the House during the Seventy-sixth Congress, I voted against it. I felt then, and I am more convinced now, that the proposal was impractical; that if it were possible and actuarially sound for anybody to establish a fair rate on a growing crop, whether it be wheat, corn, cotton, or any other crop, the insurance companies of the United States would have their agents out in the farming country soliciting that business. The insurance business in the United States has been operated on sound business principles.

On numerous occasions the Federal Government has tried to go into the insurance business and I believe I am correct when I say that, without exception, these experiments have caused the taxpayers huge sums of money.

Reference was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to the fact that we spend a lot of money insuring ships and cargoes at the present time. I do not think there is any comparison between insuring ships in time of war and the insuring of growing crops at any time. I doubt if anyone will contend that war makes farming more hazardous. It may make it more expensive and may bring about additional problems for the farmer, such as labor scarcity, but I would remind you that just 2 weeks ago we appropriated $40,000,000

in an attempt to relieve the labor scarcity. Financially this has been a disastrous experiment. We have been trying to insure the wheat crop for 4 years and each year the losses are greater—$4,000,000 the first year, $9,000,000 the second, $12,000,000 the third, and $23,000,000 los. last year.

Unless we bring the activities of the Crop Insurance Corporation to an end today, we may as well face the fact that this program, if carried to its logical conclusion—which would be the insuring of not only growing crops but even livestock—the Federal Treasury would be assuming losses of better than $500,000,000 a year. Such insurance losses could only be considered as an unsatisfactory method of subsidy—unsatisfactory inasmuch as no one could tell just how great the loss of subsidy would be in any given year.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he does not agree with me that the farmers of the country at this time are engaged in war work and in our war effort just as definitely as though you are operating ships?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. FULMER. And would this be the proper time, if we ever got away with it, to do it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely. The farmers have indicated that they are not concerned about insurance. They are not taking out this insurance that has been offered to them in any worth-while amount. The statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that it had dropped off 14,000,000 bushels of wheat in the fourth year of experiment indicates that the farmer does not think the rate is attractive, or for some other reason he does not want to pay that premium.

Mr. FULMER. That is because of the much better prices that they get under normal times. They would take the chance.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You mean they will not buy this insurance when prices are good?

Mr. FULMER. During higher prices they would come more nearly taking a chance of carrying the insurance themselves than in normal times.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Let us hope we are at the point where the farmer can get a fair price on the market. At least, I hope so. I think the fact that the farmers have not taken to this program is sufficient proof that they are not interested in buying this kind of insurance.

Reference has been made to this being a subsidy. It is, but it is a subsidy of an unknown amount.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. How do you expect the people of this country to have faith and confidence in Government that will not do business on the same basis as private enterprise?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They cannot do it successfully. Every time the Government goes into business it loses money. It is no more reasonable to say we are going to offer attractive rates for the insurance of wheat and cotton than it is to extend that service to any hazardous industry. You might as well try to insure the production of the dairy farmer, which cannot be done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman being from the State of Connecticut, I would remind him that the Hartford Life Insurance Co. felt that this was sufficiently promising to justify the experiment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What company?

Mr. COOLEY. The Hartford Insurance Co.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is no such company.

Mr. COOLEY. The Hartford?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is no such thing.

Mr. COOLEY. There is some insurance company at Hartford, Conn. I may not have the correct name.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There are two companies in Hartford that tried to do something with crop insurance and dropped a few million dollars, paid off their losses, and got out. You could not coax one of them into it today.

Mr. COOLEY. I am frank to admit that the experiment did not prove successful.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It was disastrous. What makes you think the Government can write this kind of insurance successfully?

Mr. COOLEY. I might even agree that it was disastrous, but it was recognized by private insurance companies that we have now entered a field which private enterprise cannot enter and does not contemplate entering.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They cannot write that type of insurance, neither can the Government, unless the Government is willing to pour millions of dollars into it as a subsidy.

Mr. COOLEY. It was contemplated at the time this bill was enacted that it would probably take 10 years to determine the success of this experiment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Each year the record gets worse. Losses have gone up from $4,000,000 the first year to $23,000,000 last year. Last year the promise was made that if given one more year they would do better. They failed again. Now is the time to rescue the taxpayer. That is reflected by the hearings that were conducted at that time.

I am satisfied that the experiment has gone so far that it has indicated a terrific loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. COOLEY. In support of the Pace amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to find out how many Members desire to be heard on this amendment. Eleven Members are standing. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from Georgia will include in his request that the last 5 minutes be reserved for the committee.

Mr. TARVER. I so modify my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have certain information regarding the activities of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation which I cannot discuss in the brief period of 5 minutes, but I will include the information in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the committee responsible for initiating this legislation realized in the beginning that we were embarking upon a grand experiment in the hope that we might be able to work out some self-supporting program over a period of years. Everyone conceded that the bill contemplated an insurance program which no private corporation in America would dare undertake. No private corporation in America was in a position to accumulate the necessary information and the necessary statistics in all of the agricultural counties in which it was contemplated that this insurance corporation would be forced to operate; but with the tremendous organization which the Government had in the field of agriculture at the time the bill was passed it was believed then that within a very few years we should be able to obtain sufficient data upon which to determine fair premium rates.

I have not been greatly disappointed by the activities of this Corporation. In passing I should like to say that it has not operated extensively in my State nor in my district, and I certainly have no selfish motive in further sponsoring the activities of this corporation other than to see that the experiment has a fair trial.

I want to impress upon those who would destroy crop insurance the further fact that just a short while ago we authorized the making of 3-year contracts with farmers in the wheat and cotton

sections. These contracts have been entered into in good faith and in good faith they should be executed fully on the part of the Government. I feel that this House should not be greatly influenced by the recommendation of the subcommittee which is now in control of this bill. If the crop-insurance program is to be discontinued it should be discontinued only after the House Committee on Agriculture which handled the legislation to begin with has conducted extensive hearings with the idea of determining the feasibility of continuing the program.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Am I right in believing that this proviso does take care of any contracts entered into prior to July 1, 1943?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not see how it could with only three and one-half million dollars provided in the appropriation. Certainly this is not enough even to service the contracts now in existence and even if the Pace amendment is adopted you only leave the Corporation in a crippled condition with the small sum of three and one-half millions to operate on.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is it not true that the administrative costs of this agency are about half what they were at the end of the first year?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is right and I also feel that the information which I will insert in the RECORD will be very enlightening to the membership. The participation in the program has greatly increased and the cost has greatly decreased.

The matter referred to follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE INFORMATION

PARTICIPATION IN WHEAT INSURANCE

The number of farm units that participated in the crop-insurance program for wheat was 165,775 in 1939, 360,496 in 1940, 371,401 in 1941, 412,519 in 1942, and 510,000 (estimated) in 1943. From 1939 through 1942 the Corporation insured a total production of 363,446,000 bushels of wheat on 1,310,191 farms. Premiums totaled 41,876,662 bushels. Losses were suffered by 407,202 farmers. Indemnities paid them totaled 62,436,809 bushels. In providing this insurance protection the Corporation sustained a net loss of $17,417,271 from its capital stock.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN WHEAT PROGRAM

Such expense of administering the wheat insurance program was $4,457,932 in 1939, $5,691,405 in 1940, $5,185,644 in 1941, $4,914,618 in 1942, and $3,701,825 (estimated) in 1943; that is, even though participation has been increased by more than 200 percent during the 4-year period, the total administrative expenses have been materially reduced, as is evidenced by the fact that the average cost per insured farm for 1943 will only be 27 percent of the 1939 cost.

PARTICIPATION IN COTTON INSURANCE

The number of farm units that participated in the crop insurance program for cotton was 176,497 in 1942, and increased to 220,000 (estimated) in 1943.

ADMINISTRATIVE ECONOMIES EFFECTED IN 1942

During the past year the number of the Corporation's branch offices was reduced from 7 to 4 in the interest of economy and simplifications of field operations. It is anticipated the annual saving made in this respect will range from $165,000 to $200,000, and the employment of 80 less people.

Further economies were effected by utilizing the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the purchase and sale of wheat and cotton commodities necessary to the Corporation as price protection. Under this arrangement the annual cost will approximate $40,000 as compared with an approximate cost of $250,000 had the Corporation maintained its own commodity organization.

The Corporation is now operating with slightly fewer employees than the recent quota set by the Bureau of the Budget.

BENEFITS TO WHEAT GROWERS THROUGH INDEMNITIES

As to the benefits received by the wheat growers under the program, 10,163,899 bushels with a cash value of $5,605,931 were paid to 55,932 farm units in 1939; 22,899,182 bushels with a cash value of $13,826,427 were paid to 112,763 farm units in 1940; 18,836,772 bushels with a cash value of $13,926,437 were paid to 130,765 farm units in 1941; and 10,536,956 bushels with a cash value of $12,158,003 had been paid to 107,742 farm units up to January 31, 1943, for the year 1942. In other words, for the 4 years 62,436,809 bushels with a cash value of $45,516,798 were paid to 407,202 farm units as a result of their loss of all or a part of their crops. When it is recognized that this number is almost equal to one-third of the total number of commercial wheat growers in the Nation, it must be realized that the benefits gained from such insurance could not fail to have far-reaching beneficial effects in the wheat-producing areas of the country.

BENEFITS TO COTTON GROWERS THROUGH INDEMNITIES

As to the benefits thus far received by the cotton growers under the program, 32,171,537 pounds with a cash value of $6,555,283 had been paid to 25,856 farm units up to January 31, 1943, for the year 1942. Thus, nearly 15 percent of the cotton growers who were participating in the program had received benefits through this payment of indemnities up to the aforementioned date, January 31, 1943.

COMPARATIVE COST OF ADMINISTRATION

The question of how the expenses of the Corporation compare with those of privately owned insurance companies is often asked. In reply to that question, on October 7, 1941, the Corporation decided to appoint an outside, disinterested committee to make a study of the operations of the Corporation with respect to the insurance of wheat, with authority to make recommendations. On page 37 of its report this committee has made the observation that "from the standpoint of the operation of an insurance business, the administrative expenses of the Corporation over the first 3 years compare favorably with those of the fire-insurance companies, which have generally operated over long periods." The committee arrived at this conclusion after comparing expenses of the Corporation for the first 3 years with like expenses of more than 500 stock and mutual fire-insurance companies during the same period.

AN OBSERVATION

When the crop-insurance program was first initiated, it was generally estimated that it might take as much as 10 years to work out a satisfactory program, and to meet any losses incurred during that period of experimentation an authorization for the appropriation of $100,000,000 was made. It should be noted that less than one-half of the time suggested has passed to date, and that the losses thus far incurred have involved less than 25 percent of the authorization given. In the meantime, definite improvements have been made in the program during each succeeding year, and the Corporation is just now arriving at a place where it can draw more and more upon its experience, and less and less upon theory in formulating its program. It would seem, therefore, that if the Federal Government is to properly realize upon its investment, it should continue the program until a more complete trial has been given.

FARMERS TAKING CROP INSURANCE FOR THE LONG PULL

The introduction of the 3-year contract for wheat in 1943 did not result in any loss of business. The fact that almost one-half a million wheat farms are insured under the 3-year contract is evidence that farmers are taking insurance as a desirable business practice rather than an occasional flyer to gamble against a bad year. Many farmers have invested their money in premiums and have collected no indemnities. In some instances these premium payments already exceed the amount the farmer would receive if he had a total loss. These farmers are expecting the insurance to be available to them when they have a bad year.

GOVERNMENT HAS SUBSTANTIAL INVESTMENT IN CROP-INSURANCE EXPERIENCE

The Federal Government has made a substantial investment in the pioneering of a program for Federal insurance of wheat and cotton crops. A part of this is represented by operating experience as well as actuarial information that could be gained in no other way than through the actual operation of a crop-insurance program.

This investment in the pioneering of a system of Federal crop insurance is not for wheat or cotton farmers alone. Its benefits will be directly reflected in any future establishment of insurance for other producers. Abandonment of this investment and the progress made thus far would not only further remove the possibility of such protection for other producers but would also make its eventual adoption more costly.

If the Congress still desires to make it possible for wheat and cotton growers to provide a large part of their own security against crop failure, this information and experience constitutes a tangible asset that can be capitalized upon only by continued operation.

BALANCED OPERATIONS IN REACH

Through the continued application of this experience to the development of the program, substantial progress has been made in improving the operating position of the Corporation. A 3-year contract, a major change to stabilize operations of the Corporation, is in effect for wheat in 1943 for the first time. This and other changes in contract provisions as well as refinements of the actuarial structure will result in continued improvement of the Corporation's operating position. Furthermore, these changes and the direction of current progress give very definite promise that a position of balanced operations will soon be reached.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS REDUCED

Congress has now made its initial investment in establishing a program of Federal crop insurance. The period of high administrative costs is past. This is demonstrated by the cost records of the Corporation, which compare favorably with those of commercial fire-insurance companies.

The cost of handling each wheat-insurance unit in 1942 was only 44 percent of the cost in 1939, first year of the program, and the 1943 budget is based upon a per unit cost of 27 percent of the 1939 costs.

INCREASING PARTICIPATION; GREATER STABILITY

Participation of farmers in the Federal crop-insurance program is increasing. As this participation increases, the operating stability of the Corporation will continue to improve. This is the experience of the Cor-

poration as well as insurance companies in general—the greater the participation the greater the spread of the risk and the consequent greater stability of the operation.

HIGH PRICES NO INSURANCE AGAINST CROP FAILURE

High prices and commodity loans provide no income for the man whose crops have failed. Crop insurance does—and the need for it has become greater with the elimination of the measure of insurance formerly provided by farm program commodity payments.

NEED FOR INSURANCE REMAINS

The proposal to abolish Federal crop-insurance protection to wheat and cotton farmers does not abolish either the hazards to these two crops or the consequences of crop failure to the producers and their communities. Nor does the action taken provide any alternative to meet the financial and human costs of crop failure which led to the establishment of a Federal crop-insurance program after 20 years of effort on the part of the farmers and investigations by the Federal Government.

To abandon this program which enables wheat and cotton farmers to provide themselves with a measure of security against years of crop failure is once again to expose the Federal Government to the full measure of the relief burden in times of crop failure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the argument against Federal crop insurance reminds me of a New York City lawyer who bought a big cotton farm. A few days after the seed had been planted he took a few days off and visited his farm. His superintendent was driving him through the clean and beautifully bedded fields. "Why," said the owner, "I thought you wrote me that you had planted cotton?" "So I did," replied the astonished superintendent, "and that's just exactly what I've done." "Where is it then?" demanded the owner.

The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] insist on abandoning farming operations, ceasing to cultivate, and destroying the seed merely because the full-grown plants have not matured when the seed have just been planted.

Now, it is just as foolish, it seems to me, to expect results from this sound program at this early stage in its development as it would be to expect crops to appear, mature, and be gathered before the harvest season. The fact that so few wheat farmers, about one-third, have availed themselves of this program does not mean that it is a failure. That was expected. None should be surprised. That has been the experience of insurance throughout the ages. Very few people buy insurance the first time an agent solicits them. Few buy upon the second solicitation. More buy the third time, or the fourth, or fifth, and eventually nearly everyone becomes insured.

The administrative expense, I want to point out to the House, has been reduced every year of its existence. The percentage of cost of administration will continue to go down until it is well within the limits of soundness. This program is one of the most sound, forward-looking, and beneficent that Congress ever inaugurated. The whole thing is set up on a strict actuarial basis. Ten years was the expectancy before maturity. Over a 10-year period the profits of the later years should balance the losses of the lean years of beginnings.

No baby ever skipped the crawling stage. So it is also with institutions. The empire of insurance stands firm today upon the wreckage caused by those who despaired and quit.

Those companies whose founders kept their faith in the soundness of actuarial principles and practice, and were wise enough to hold on through the crawling stage, have reaped their rich reward. These have proven a boon to humanity. They won through to success while others, just as good, but led by quitters, failed—hurting not only their stockholders but also their policyholders. Faith is the victory.

Crop insurance as offered by the United States Government is sound. It deserves our faith. It will win the victory. Insurance is sound because of the spread of its coverage. Death is certain, but no one can foretell when it will come to any individual. However, the death rate per hundred thousand insureds may be foretold to the tick of the clock. So it is with this program. When we get a sufficient coverage, which is in the offing and which will be achieved within a shorter time than many anticipate, this will be absolutely without cost to the Government and will be of great benefit to the farmers. The law of the average is as true of crops as it is of life, if the group be large enough to make it accurate.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is it not true that many critics thought that the guaranty of bank deposits would not work?

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly so. The soundness of that was doubted for years.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It did not work from the standpoint of the States, but it does from the standpoint of the National Government.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; like every other kind of insurance its soundness depends upon the spread of its coverage. When large enough it is sound.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if it is not illustrated by the fact every old-line insurance company had to start and none of them made money until they had run for a number of years.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir, that is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder, too, if we might not keep in mind that this relatively small amount that the Government spends on this might be multiplied many times over by our appropriations to the Disaster Loan Corporation to take care of failures that come in many parts of the country?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, that is true. I thank all these gentlemen for the contributions they have made to this debate.

Mr. Chairman, this is a service our Government can render that no other agency on earth can. We cannot expect any other agency to bring stability to the income of the American farmer except the Federal Government. We have the necessary potential of coverage that will, when attained, render this insurance not only inexpensive to the beneficiaries, but also without cost to the Government.

The education which the administration of this corporation has plowed under and harrowed into the cultivation of this soil is not lost. Some gentlemen ask if they have not paid out more than they have received. Of course, they have. So does every farmer who breaks his land, cultivates it, plants seed, and quits. That is exactly what we have done up to this time, in this stage of the development of this corporation. We have prepared the ground and planted the seed and just as we are getting ready to gather the crop, some say, "Quit." But wisdom and experience counsel: "Give the child a chance, he'll grow to be a self-sustaining, strong man in the appointed time."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to approach the discussion of this provision of the bill from the angle advanced here earlier in the day and the latter part of last week when an argument was made against this item on the ground it was a subsidy and then associated it with an appropriation that was then before us for incentive payments.

It was argued that the theory of incentive payments was undemocratic and un-American. That may be true, but it is a policy that has been followed by this Government for a century.

You will remember when the protective tariff policy was first inaugurated, it was for the purpose of encouraging infant industries to increase production. It was nothing less than an incentive payment to industry itself. So this is not a new policy. Right or wrong, it has existed for a hundred years. It was inaugurated for the purpose of increasing production and affording people additional employment. The incentive payment appropriation carried in the bill this past week was solely for the purpose of increasing production.

It has been argued that crop insurance, the item now being considered, amounts to a subsidy. That may be true, but we have given subsidies or we have given payments for crop failures for many, many years. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] raised a very important point a few moments ago when he said that we may take a loss on insurance. We may, but if we do not take it here we will take it somewhere

else. We will take it in the way of appropriations for losses sustained by farmers on account of droughts, insect infestation, and other losses sustained from conditions over which the farmer has no control, and this will be far more expensive than insurance. I have in my hand an excerpt from House Document 150, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, a table presented by the President's Committee on Crop Insurance in 1937. Some of you were here at that time. I did not have the pleasure or the honor, but I assume that that committee was called on to present to the Congress some of the subsidies, some of the payments that the Congress had been called upon to give to the farmers in the way of relief, and that it was submitted as an argument in favor of crop-insurance legislation.

This is presented and given by States for a 10-year period from 1926 to 1936, the year previous to which the report was submitted. In that year it says in table 4 that the net Federal expenditures for agricultural relief during the 10 years was $615,937,000, largely for crop failures, I assume. That, on an average, was about $61,000,000 a year that Government was making in the way of payments for crop failures, nearly four times as much as the Government lost last year on crop insurance, and yet they call this a subsidy.

Crop insurance on cotton has existed for only 1 year, and I do not think the experiment has been given a fair trial. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether a majority of the cotton farmers knew that insurance was available in time last year to apply for insurance, and I really think that at least another year should be given in order that the policy may be given a fair trial before abandoning the program. If we do this, the chances are Congress will go back to the old policy and be called upon to make appropriations when crops are lost on account of droughts, excessive rains, insect pests, and so forth, which will, in the light of past experience, be much more expensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the cotton farmers of this country prosperous. I do not have any cotton in my State. I should like to have the wheat farmers of this country prosperous. I have very little wheat in my district.

I know that farmers are the biggest gamblers on earth. They take more chances than those in any other line of industry. They go forth in the springtime and put their seed into the ground trusting in the Lord for a good yield. They have to fight against the winds and the waters, against bugs and blight, against floods and fungi, against droughts and disease. In a district adjoining mine, at this very time whole farms have been swept away or ruined by the rising waters of the Missouri River. We have to take chances against the chinch bugs, grasshoppers, borers, hail, and frost, and drought. When we get all that taken care of, then the biggest gamble we have is the market.

Of course, private industry does not want to take chances on that kind of a business and does not, but the Government can well afford to protect these men against disaster, for it is no more than is done in many other lines of work. So far this program is in its infancy, and any insurance company cannot make money from the start, nor until it has built up a considerable bulk of business. But I think we can afford to pay about 6 cents a year per capita, and that is all it is costing us now. I am going home and tell my people that I am willing they should pay 6 cents a year to see that the cotton farmers down South are prosperous and do not go into raising corn, and that the wheat farmers of Kansas are prosperous, and that we should continue on the principle of live and let live. If after full trial this experiment is shown to be successful, then it should be extended to other crops, as well as to wheat and cotton. Give it a full and fair trial before killing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that the men who are attempting to strike out this provision and who are opposed to this crop insurance program come from those areas that are not affected. Certainly the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is not interested in crop insurance, but he is interested in a high protective tariff that levies tribute upon every farmer in America to keep his industries going.

A few years ago the men from the Northwest came to me and said, "The grasshoppers are ruining our crops." That did not affect Connecticut, that did not affect some other districts whose representatives here have spoken against this provision. But in some of the Northwestern States, after the crops were in the field and were laid by, vast swarms of grasshoppers came in and destroyed every stalk of it. Royal Johnson of South Dakota, who was at one time chairman of the committee over which I now preside, told me that they came over his home town so thick that before they could cut out the lights they had banked against the sides of some of the buildings a foot and a half deep. That sounds like a ghost story in Connecticut and in some of the other districts where they have never had such a disaster.

Another thing, the gentleman from Connecticut has never seen a boll weevil disaster, and neither has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] because he lives beyond the reach of the boll weevil menace. But I happen to live in a territory where the boll weevil sweeps over occasionally, and I have seen the finest prospect for a crop on the 4th of July that I ever saw in my life, in a county that made 30,000 bales of cotton the year before, and I have seen that crop almost entirely wiped out by the boll weevil and those farmers unable to make enough money to pay their taxes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The year before last many counties in my district made less than 10 percent of a normal crop on account of the boll weevil.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. We need this insurance for just such emergencies.

Another thing, there are vast numbers of farmers in this country, such as the apple growers and fruit growers, who sometimes lose their entire crops from frost. They need this insurance. There are other pests, there are dust storms, droughts and other disasters.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wanted to supplement what the gentleman said about the grasshoppers. They came into North Dakota in such volume at one time that they even stopped the trains. The trains could not run until the tracks were cleared of the grasshoppers. They wiped out hundreds of thousands of acres sometimes overnight.

Mr. RANKIN. Those farmers would be glad to get insurance, and I am in favor of providing it for them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Right now in my district, along the Missouri River, which is on a rampage, thousands and thousands of acres of land are being flooded. Those farmers need this kind of insurance, because nobody else will insure them.

Mr. RANKIN. I was coming to that. There is another danger, the floods along these streams. I happen to live in an area which is subject to floods. A large portion of my State, especially that portion represented by the distinguished gentleman who is now presiding over the Committee of the Whole, is subject to disastrous floods occasionally. The farmers there would be glad to pay insurance premiums in order to guarantee that they would not be entirely wiped out by a disaster of that kind.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman can advise his constituents that I would be very happy to write all the flood insurance they want.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman from Connecticut would be glad to write anything that is absolutely safe.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Sure.

Mr. RANKIN. And then to protect his own people with a high protective tariff that robs every farmer in America to pay the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the record I am not going to get very much excited about this as far

as it applies to South Dakota, in spite of all the tears that have been shed for the Dakotas and the Northwest. I have been looking at the tables in the hearings. The astonishing fact is that the bank has been broken on this insurance proposition by the grand old States of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri.

The total indemnities paid out last year exceeded the premiums collected by about $3,000,000 or $4,000,000. Four of five Central States accounted for more than that much and the truth is that the States of North Dakota, Montana, and South Dakota helped to provide the surplus to reduce the amount of loss.

Let me give you the figures from page 891 of the printed hearings. Illinois last year got $2,166,000 in indemnities and paid only $331,000 in premiums. Indiana received $1,618,000 in indemnities and paid only $312,000 in premiums. Kansas received $2,017,000 in indemnities and paid $1,206,000 in premiums. Missouri received $1,428,000 in benefits and paid $287,000 in premiums.

So, the story is not what has been suggested, as far as the Northwest is concerned. Last year South Dakota paid $397,000 in premiums, and received only $129,000 in benefits.

I wish I had time to take the States one by one. However, a careful analysis of the table found on page 891, taking all the years in which this wheat insurance has been in force, would lead one, I believe, to the conclusion that there has not been enough history written as yet to make a proper determination of the story of crop insurance. So because of that fact, and not at all because of nonexistent special benefits to my State, I doubt that we should condemn crop insurance forever. We simply do not have enough experience for making a sound judgment. But, as I said at the outset, I am not going to become excited if the program is suspended. It is costing money as of today, taking the country as a whole.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from South Dakota is taking the best years you had in South Dakota for many years, but if you take the average for the last 10 years, I think the gentleman's figures would be turned around.

Mr. CASE. Let us see. Take the entire story for the 4 years. I am looking at the figures here and calculating quickly. During the entire 4-year period that the wheat-insurance program has been in effect, South Dakota is in the bank for only about $200,000; whereas, if you take the entire story for the State of Illinois in the same period, you are into the bank for $4,000,000. Four million of the total of 17,000,000 lost on premiums, to say nothing of Illinois' share of the $23,000,000 for administrative costs. Now, perhaps these 4 years are not representative for either State. That is exactly the point I sought to make. The real lesson that one who looks at this table State after State must draw is that there is not enough history written yet to determine a proper actuarial basis.

I say this also because of talking with farmers on the subject. Each year, the number of farms that have been insured has been going down in most of the Northwest States. That is true in my own State. After the first 2 years, the number of insurance contracts has been steadily going down, because the rates when it was started were too high in proportion to the actual long-range production record. The rates were based on the bad years that we had immediately preceding the last 4 years. Again, I would say that a sober judgment would be likely to say we ought to have a longer history on which to base a sound evaluation of the value of the crop-insurance program.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think his farmers would rather have paid what they did and have received back the small amount they did, than to have their crops eaten by grasshoppers and get nothing at all?

Mr. CASE. Surely the gentleman is not suggesting that the insurance scared the hoppers away. If that could be so, I would be excited. The fact remains, however, that in my State the number of farmers insured has gone down from 19,446 in 1940 to 9,553 in 1942. Ten thousand farms that were insured 3 seasons ago have dropped out. Over 50 percent off. There must be some reason.

Reference has been made to floods along the Missouri River and the need for insurance protection against them. Let me say that the insurance we ought to have in the Dakotas, and the real insurance that would take care of a lot of this food problem, would be to put reservoirs up there on the Missouri River. I see the gentleman from Montana nods. There is a longer stretch between the Fort Peck Dam in his district and the floods in Sioux City and Omaha without a single dam to catch the floodwaters and put them to use in growing crops than the entire length of rivers like the Ohio and the Tennessee. Give us a few dams, up there in North Dakota and South Dakota to store this water for irrigation and we will be insured against drought and your Central and Southern States will be insured against losses by floods. That will be real insurance and the whole country would get the benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the real merits or demerits of the crop-insurance program, I want to ask the Members of the House to think seriously for a minute whether this is the proper time to destroy a program that had been in operation only 3 or 4 years on the wheat crop, and only 1 year on cotton, I say, at this time in the midst of the greatest struggle ever in the history of this country. Do you believe that destroying this insurance program will add particularly to the morale of the farmers of the country? Just keep up what the subcommittee is trying to do under this bill and you will wake up some months later hungry because of a tremendous food shortage. You cannot win this war unless we can produce to take care of our own needs as well as tons and tons for our allies. I predicted last year what would happen if we did not pay more attention to agriculture and now you are doing everything possible to bring about a food shortage. I was the first Member of this House to introduce a bill for crop insurance, realizing that annually almost every Congress had been passing relief bills costing millions of dollars because of crop failures in first one State and then another.

I believe the record will show that an average of $60,000,000 annually was paid out for relief during the 10 years before the passage of crop insurance, and I thought to get folks away from coming here and asking Congress to pass bills for relief by working out an insurance program that would take care of that unorganized class of people, that group of people who are responsible for feeding every other group, would be the proper thing to do. When this matter came before our committee, we went into it thoroughly, and we had those who had been interested in insurance come before our committee and I do not believe that out of all the insurance companies back in the days when they were initiated there was one able to bring about profits, according to the record in a period of less than 3 to 5 or 10 years. We have this organization set up. There will have to be some amendments, and I am interested in offering some amendments to the original act, but in this great emergency, we should not destroy the program, without giving an opportunity to find out just what we might do to be helpful in the way of amending the original act and thus work out a program that will save the farmers of the country. To me what you are attempting to do in the midst of this great food shortage emergency is pitiful.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois who is always interested in the farmers of the country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There is a matter that I wish the gentleman would discuss. Apparently this has not spread over enough of the country, to cover a sufficient number of crops, so that there is too much risk in one place.

Mr. FULMER. That is one of the things that our committee has in mind. We want to do something to make this more general and as we gain experience and information we can take on other crops. As far as I am concerned, it ought to be a definite part of the program that we should have the entire crop covered. The pitiful thing about it is that when you have a disaster in South Carolina, as we had in 1941 when farmers lost 50 percent of their cotton crop the next year, it may happen in some other cotton State or some other section in the United States.

If we had a small premium, covering the whole acreage of crop production, wheat and cotton, for instance, the premium would be so small that all farmers could participate, and in the meantime take care of the losses where they happened. The people in my State of South Carolina, because of 1941 crop failure, will not get over that disaster in the next 5 or 10 years. The banks who

had loaned money to farmers in producing the 1941 crop in South Carolina, the Production Credit Corporation and the seed loan agency also had losses because of that disaster, and I hope we may have time to give proper attention to this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I have received no less than a dozen telegrams from farm leaders in Montana asking for crop insurance.

If we look at this section of the bill, what are the first sentences?

Administrative and operating expenses, $3,500,000, including employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Again the District of Columbia is taken care of—

printing and binding, purchase of law books, books of reference, periodicals and newspapers—

And so forth. What in the name of God has law books got to do with providing insurance for wheat, cotton, or any agricultural product? Yet it is in this appropriation bill, written by this committee that is trying to establish an unprecedented record for economy. I notice that in the House, whenever economy is thought of, the heavy fist of the economy group is directed against the farmer. Why do they not apply some economy somewhere else? Why always hit at the farmer and take it out of his hide first?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I thought the gentleman might be interested in knowing that for the 4 years the amount paid by the farmers of Montana exceeds the indemnities they have received by $340,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is true, but in years of drought and insect ravages it would be the reverse.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am sorry I only have a few minutes.

I noticed with interest a statement made by my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]. He went back into the history of the tariff. I want to recall the attention of the House to what Alexander Hamilton, the first Treasurer, said when the first tariff bill was introduced to protect and lift up infant industries. He said, "If we pass a tariff law we must reach into the Treasury of the United States and pay the farmers something, not by way of subsidy, but to put him on a level with the tariff-protected industry." That is what Hamilton said upon the beginning of the tariff policy that cost the country more than anything ever inaugurated by us.

Now, who is taking a chance today? I was raised on a farm in Iowa that today lies under the waters of the Missouri River; the finest land in the world, together with thousands of acres of other equally good land. Today along the banks of the Yellowstone River in my State of Montana there are thousands of acres now lying under its waters which were seeded to wheat last fall. Who is taking the chance? It is not the manufacturer or the laborer. It is the man who plants the crop. In the first place, he does not know whether his seed will grow or not. He does not know whether it will come up or not. He does not know whether he will be droughted out in the summer or whether he will be flooded out in the spring. He does not know but what the grasshoppers or other insects will come along and eat his crops up. Yet year after year he plants his crop, takes his chance, and fills the bread baskets of the country, out of which the people in the cities eat, many of whom try to make the farmer appear to be the one receiving something for nothing. Yet without him and his efforts they would starve. He is entitled to some protection.

There is not a man who understands this problem, who is honest with himself and honest with the country, realizing the things we are up against at this time, who will vote against this amendment. Yet I do not believe there will be anything left for wheat or cotton when these people in the District of Columbia get through with it, and when everybody else who works for the Government gets through with it. There will not be much left for the wheat or the cotton grower.

When the cotton growers are prosperous, it helps the wheat growers in Montana. Prosperity in one part of the country extends to all other parts of the country. I want to see our cotton growers prosperous, just as I want to see the wheat growers prosperous. I would favor any bill to help the farmer in any section of the country. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, we cannot and we must not fail the people who heroically year after year feed us—and take the chances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I just thought the gentleman might be interested in knowing that North Dakota has paid in considerably more than she has received on this crop insurance. I have the tables here. The first year she received about $10,000 more in indemnities than she paid in premiums, but in the last 3 years, it has been the other way. The net result is that for the 4 years in which Federal crop insurance has been in operation, North Dakota has paid in $1,150,000 more in premiums than she has received in indemnities. Apparently, if the proposition has not been paying out, the fault does not rest with the farmers of North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that the $1,150,000 is only a small part of the reserve we would have helped to create if it had not been for a mistake made the first year in organizing.

But that is just a small part of the whole program.

This is not a subsidy any more than life insurance is a subsidy. The farmers pay the premiums. You might say that life insurance is a failure because a few companies in which I was insured at one time failed. But that does not destroy life insurance, and I am glad I still have some insurance in some companies that are solvent.

Now let us see whether it is impossible to insure crops. That suggestion has been made, but Lloyd's insure everything and anything. They are still in existence. It is simply a question of working out rates and premiums. That cannot be successfully done in every instance in a year and a half or 2 years.

It is unfair for us to have passed this law to begin with and then try to cripple it and destroy it before it has had a fair and honest test. There is not any question that, especially at this time, it should not be destroyed. Yesterday you took away incentive payments. Now you take crop insurance away from the farmer. Yesterday you violated the contracts you made with the farmers of this Nation to raise more flax. Today you want to cripple them a little further by taking away the crop insurance at a time when our Nation is in need, at a time when the Nation's food supply is in danger. The time has come when we should use common horse sense. It used to prevail in this House. I am sure we will come back to it again before we take a vote on this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] seems to complain that the farmers in the Northwest have paid out more than they got back. The answer is that they did not have a disaster for which to collect insurance.

Mr. CASE. Oh, no. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. It would be just as logical if that be the case for us to quit our life insurance because we are not getting more out of it than we put into it.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I hope these gentlemen will not take all my time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield very briefly; but I should like to proceed.

Mr. CASE. I am not complaining, but I do not want the blame to be on the Northwest for breaking the bank. I do not want us charged with disasters we did not have and Federal money we did not receive. The fact is the States of the Central region were responsible for the losses if any States were. I personally think that the rates set up on the basis of the years preceding 1939 were not fair to Northwest States and were overly favorable to other States. Regardless of that, or perhaps because of that, I think the figures to date do not offer a sound basis for determining the

true value or the true cost of Federal crop insurance.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota declines to yield further.

Mr. LEMKE. May I suggest this, that the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska are the leading States that feed the Nation its bread. There are only 16 States in this Union that raise enough wheat to support themselves, only 16; and I think the same could be said of the cotton States. There are only a few cotton States that clothe and take care of the rest of us.

This is a national issue; it does not affect one or two States; it affects the life of this Nation, it affects them not by giving subsidies but by giving them insurance on crops in areas that are more or less risky. The premiums will on an average pay the losses. These losses would be spread over a period of years. That is all this insurance does.

As I stated yesterday, the subcommittee gave us only the debit side of farm security, crop insurance, and incentive payments. And in their zeal to build up this debit side some Members were inaccurate in their statements concerning these institutions.

On the opening day of debate on this bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who apparently had a great deal to do with writing the bill, quoted the witness for the National Farmers' Union as saying, "We favor unchallenged Federal control" and "we demand unchallenged Federal control," as may be seen from the RECORD, April 14, pages 3378–3379. The gentleman from Illinois, with all his great ability, utilized this alleged quotation from the witness of the National Farmers' Union as his jumping-off point for a most effective argument.

Having been closely associated with the Farmers' Union for many years, and being curious at the intent of the National Farmers' Union, which as we all know, is one of the oldest and largest farm organizations, I took the opportunity to consult the testimony to which the gentleman from Illinois referred, and also to call upon the witness who represented them to find out if the gentleman from Illinois was on solid ground in making his charge.

I found in the course of the very thorough testimony presented by Mr. Handschin, the Farmers' Union witness, that he said, on page 1446 of the hearings, not that the Farmers' Union favors or demands unchallenged Federal control of farmers, but quite the contrary, that the Farmers' Union is in favor of full Federal control of Federal agricultural programs with greater official responsibility by farmers in those programs. So that the record may be clear, I will read into the RECORD the recommendation made by the representative of the Farmers' Union:

> We must move faster toward one single food-production agency, at local, county, State, regional, and national levels, so that prompt action can be secured both on local needs and on national decisions. However, we insist that two conditions must be met in making further changes toward a unification of agencies. First, there must be unchallenged Federal control, and second, local activities must be carried on to a larger degree than now by farmers themselves through official committees. Any proposal which disregards these principles will hinder the war and be resented by farmers.

You will note that the reference to unchallenged Federal control refers definitely to the establishment of a unified Federal farm program, and the Farmers' Union insists that Federal authority shall be unchallenged in the conduct of such Federal programs, financed by Federal funds. You will note their emphasis upon placing more of these programs in the hands of actual farmers in their counties and communities.

Proceeding further in the hearings, I find that the gentleman from Illinois questioned the witness on this point. On page 1452 the witness answered the gentleman from Illinois as follows:

> We should not be in a position where any State, any group of farmers, any group of farmers raising a particular commodity, any farm organization, any agency operating in the State, should be in a position not to comply with what is necessary for a Federal program.

And further:

> We must not have a situation where we have 48 different programs. That has occurred in the past. It will be unthinkable in this war and in these times.

Obviously the witness had reference to the existing situation whereby State and county public agencies, the extension services, and the county agents, receive functions and funds from the Federal Government but are not under obligation to cooperate fully with the decisions reached for the Federal farm programs. It is that situation which has led to much of the bureaucracy and ineffectiveness of administration of the laws this body has passed in the last decade to aid farmers.

That situation is not to be found in the administration of the military or naval affairs of this country, nor in the direction of our war effort in industry or labor. We would not for a moment tolerate awarding Federal powers and funds to local authorities or private groups without requiring their full cooperation in exercising those powers and expending those funds.

The subcommittee attempted to carry still further this dismembering of Federal authority in regard to agriculture. The subcommittee brought in here, and the gentleman from Illinois must be partly responsible for its action in this regard, a bill which would have taken further powers away from the Federal authorities and awarded them to county and State agencies not controlled by the Federal Government. The committee bill would have given funds to agencies not responsible to Federal Government, and, indeed, in some cases, responsible to a private group of farmers. The debate on the bill has brought forth clearly the intention of the leaders of this minority of farmers to gain yet fuller control of the Federal Government. It is no wonder that the gentleman from Illinois would be opposed to unchallenged Federal control of Federal funds and Federal functions.

It is interesting also that the gentleman from Illinois apparently acceded to a serious limitation upon the elected farmer committees which now have a considerable degree of responsibility in carrying out the Federal programs. On this point, too, he apparently is in disagreement with the National Farmers' Union and in agreement with the American Farm Bureau Federation, which has for several years attacked this system of elected committees.

In conclusion, permit me again to state that there never will be a final solution to the agricultural problem until the farmer gets cost of production for that part that is domestically consumed.

I have again introduced the cost-of-production bill, H. R. 2475. I ask every Member of the House to get a copy of it and study it. When this bill becomes a law no further appropriations for agriculture will be necessary. The farmer will get cost of production, and that is all he asks.

This bill covers 43 agricultural products. It takes the whole agricultural structure out of the red, the debit side, and puts it on the credit side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to this question from two standpoints. In the first place, I voted against the Cannon amendment on Saturday because it was my belief that at least certain moral commitments had been made to some of the farmers of this country which Congress would break if it did not make that appropriation or make possible the carrying out of those commitments. I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should have obtained authority from Congress first; nevertheless, I think there is a great deal in what the gentleman from North Dakota has just said. I am informed that there are in the hearings of this committee records to the effect that 3-year contracts have been made with certain wheat farmers for this insurance, and if I am not mistaken, unless the Pace amendment is adopted, those 3-year contracts will in effect be broken and that contract between the Government and those farmers will not be kept.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Every contract contains the provision that it is subject to—and I quote:

> Any subsequent legislation including appropriations statutes affecting this contract that Congress may hereinafter enact.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That would give us an out. It would perhaps technically and legally mean that if the appropriations were not made that perhaps the Government could not be held liable; but so far as the moral understanding between the farmer and the Government is concerned, it is not my opinion it makes very much difference.

So far as my own district is concerned, we do not have any cotton nor more than a couple of acres of wheat in it, and I have no interest from the standpoint of my own district in this particular matter.

But I do not think it would be any argument to get up in this House and say that because it would not be profitable for a private company to provide police protection for a community therefore the Government should not provide police protection. Neither therefore do I think it is a sound argument to say that because a private insurance company cannot insure crops profitably therefore it should not be done by the Government.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would rather not if the gentleman will pardon me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California declines to yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Right there it seems to me the question to be determined is whether it is desirable to have crop insurance knowing full well we will have to take account of some of the hazards under which such an insurance system will operate. I certainly think it is desirable if it can be worked out. I certainly agree with those Members who do not believe that enough time has been given to determine whether crop insurance may be worked out satisfactorily. I shall therefore support this amendment.

Furthermore, although I believe it is true that this paragraph is not subject to a point of order nevertheless from any fundamental conception of what legislation is, it certainly seems to me that for the Appropriations Committee to bring in a bill with a provision that there shall be no funds whatsoever provided for a program that was set up by legislation after due consideration is in practical effect legislation. Certainly if such a program as this is to be abandoned, it ought to be done only after a legislative committee of the House has held hearings upon the question, has heard the whole case described to it and can pass a piece of legislation which will wind up such a program in a decent and orderly way. I do not believe that it is possible in an hour or so here to revamp the whole farm program of this country, nor do I think it is safe to do so in the face of world conditions today. That is my final reason for being in favor of the Pace amendment and in order to prevent a provision going into this bill that will wipe out one of the programs which has been put into effect during the past few years to take away some of the hazards of farming.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. I have said on the floor of this House several times that there is going to be a lot of revamping, but not in this emergency.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is quite right. I think we can improve a number of things about the agricultural program. I believe it can be simplified. But such action must be taken only when the House as a whole knows what it is doing and is sure it has considered its steps carefully.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We have had plenty of wheat and plenty of cotton in the 5 years I have been here. I am wondering, in view of the fact these things represent about 15 or 20 percent of our crops, what is going to happen to the other 70 or 80 percent of our crops that have been going on without this benefit, and I refer particularly to livestock.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am discussing this question generally, not from the standpoint of those two particular crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me discussed the fact that the crop-insurance program was not one that could be profitably carried on by private insurance companies. That point has heretofore been made by other speakers and I do not think there is any question but what we all agree that according to the figures now available and with the information now on hand we are unable to intelligently set rates that would make this crop insurance profitable to private companies. To my mind the very fact is certainly a sound and very basic reason for allowing the Government to provide this type of insurance. If it were profitable to private insurance companies then undoubtedly they would be in the business and there might be no excuse for establishing a Government corporation to carry this on. If this crop insurance were being provided by private companies at reasonable rates I would feel that it would be neither necessary nor desirable for the Government to enter the field. The gentleman from Connecticut discussed that problem earlier and gave some consideration to the problem of insurance for shipping. He stated that the reason the Government was now writing insurance on foreign shipping was because conditions were such in the shipping industry that private companies could not write the insurance. Exactly the same situation prevails in regard to insurance on crops the production of which is just as vital to the winning of this war as is the shipping necessary to carry those crops after they are produced. The very same reason that makes it desirable for the Government to insure the shipping that carries those crops after they are produced certainly makes it reasonable for the Government to write the insurance that is necessary to assure the production of those crops.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is not the gentleman's contention that raising crops is more hazardous in time of war than in normal times, is it?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly my contention. It is far more hazardous. In normal times we can expect to get an adequate supply of labor to harvest our crops and to gather in our crops. Today we cannot do that. We do not know whether we will be able to harvest the crops that we grow, we do not know whether we will be able to make the crops that we are planting and certainly it is more hazardous, many times more hazardous, and the very conditions that make shipping hazardous at this time have made the growing of crops hazardous. Both shipping and farming are today especially hazardous at this moment because of the war in which the United States and the world are now engaged.

Let our Government do for our farmers some of the things we say we want it to do. Every one of us gives lip service to the importance of food. A number of us do not stand up and vote like we talk about the importance of food. I feel sure this Congress this afternoon will vote to do for the farmer just as it does for other people by adopting this amendment.

With reference to the question raised by the chairman of the subcommittee when he spoke awhile ago and suggested that possibly a little less than 50 percent of the money that has been spent during the 4 years of the life of this program was in excess of the amount which actually went to the farmers themselves as loss payments I trust that the overhead expenses will continue to be reduced. They have been materially reduced since the establishment of the program just 4 years ago.

They are only 50 percent as great now as they were then and even today the farmer is getting as large a share of this insurance money as most of us are getting out of the insurance policies we carry. I carry life insurance, so do most of you. I carry fire insurance, so do most of you. There is hardly an insurance company that pays out more than 50 percent of its income in death or fire loss claims. As a matter of fact, this Government Crop Insurance Corporation is actually paying to the farmer today almost exactly the same proportion of its total income that the commercial companies pay to their policyholders as death losses or as fire losses out of their total income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was looking over some figures that were put in the RECORD back when we adopted the crop-insurance program or extended it to cotton, and I notice that the statement was made that from 1926 to 1936 there had been spent in this country for emergency agricultural relief $600,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. Sixty million dollars a year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which would have been taken care of if we had had crop insurance.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and not only is the Government as such interested; contrary to the statements of some of the Members I find that farmers are deeply interested in this crop-insurance program. In fact, the chairman of my State A. A. A. committee has long ago discussed with me the possibility of using all of the conservation payments for the issuance of comprehensive crop insurance. By doing this we would be able to greatly increase the spread and thereby lower the rate, thus aiding both the Government and the farmers. Let us, therefore, instead of destroying this worthy program, enlarge and extend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] for 2 minutes, before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized to conclude the debate on this amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe even the friends of crop insurance will say that it is a perfect program. I have been very hopeful that we could get crop insurance on a sound basis at an early date. On April 7, 1941, the Board of Directors of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation requested the appointment of a subcommittee entirely disconnected from the agency to make a thorough study of the agency and requested them to make an impartial and unbiased report at the earliest opportunity. This subcommittee spent months of time and hard work and have made an excellent report. The three men selected to study this agency were Mr. Herman L. Ekern, former attorney general and insurance commissioner of the State of Wisconsin, Mr. Robert J. Laubengayer, of Salina, Kans., a man who was very much interested in the first establishment of the triple A and a true friend of the farmer, and Mr. W. A. Cochran, of the State of Iowa. These men went into this program thoroughly and made 16 recommendations. The report was filed late last year.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a short statement regarding this Board and their work:

At a meeting of the board of directors of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on April 7, 1941, it was decided to appoint an outside, disinterested committee to make a study of the operations of the Corporation with respect to the insurance of wheat, with authority to make recommendations for such changes in the procedure of the Corporation as would, on the basis of sound insurance principles, enable it to best serve the wheat farmers of the United States, at minimum expense to the Government under the all-risk crop-insurance plan authorized by Congress.

A committee of three, to be known as the wheat crop insurance consulting committee, was appointed, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The committee consists of the following members:

Herman L. Ekern, Chicago, Ill., chairman; lawyer; insurance law, company organization and management; former commissioner of insurance, attorney general, and Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin; author of Wisconsin Life Fund, original soldiers and sailors' war-risk insurance act, and coauthor of railroad retirement acts and various teachers' retirement plans;

Robert J. Laubengayer, Salina, Kans.; publisher of Salina Journal; member of the committee of three who wrote the wheat plan for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (1933–34); former president of the United Life Insurance Co.; former vice president of the Kansas Livestock Association; former member of Farm Security Advisory Committee, and active in cattle raising and farming; and

W. G. Cochran, M. A., Glasgow University and Cambridge University; fellow, Institute of Mathematical Statistics and Royal Statistical Society; former statistician, Rothamsted Experimental Station (England); now professor of statistics, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa; and an authority on the application of statistical methods in agriculture.

This committee was instructed to examine and study all phases of the Corporation's activities and, if possible, to make its report and recommendations by June 30, 1942. A preliminary meeting of the committee with the manager of the Corporation and members of his staff was held at the branch office of the Corporation at Chicago, Ill., on June 4, 1941. Other meetings of the committee have been held as follows: July 18, 1941, Chicago, Ill.; September 8, Ames, Iowa; October 17, Chicago, Ill.; November 18–22, Denver, Colo. (the Corporation's national crop-insurance conference); December 26, Chicago, Ill.; January 5–6, 1942, Memphis, Tenn. (conference on cotton-crop insurance); January 15, Chicago, Ill.; February 3–4, Chicago, Ill.; February 27–28, Chicago, Ill.; March 18–19, Kansas City, Mo.; March 25, Chicago, Ill.; April 27, Chicago, Ill.; May 18–19, Washington, D. C. (conference with Secretary of Agriculture); and June 5–6, 15, and 19, Chicago, Ill.

In its studies, conferences, and meetings, the committee has been assisted by members of the legal and actuarial staff of the chairman and by assistants to W. G. Cochran. In addition to the meetings, the individual members of the committee have had consultations and conferences with directors and officers of the Corporation, its personnel in the Washington office, the branch offices, and in the field, and with members of State and county committees, farmers, and others who have had a part in the initiation and operation of the Wheat Crop Insurance Plan.

Among the matters discussed at these meetings which have been subsequently incorporated into the crop-insurance program are the 3-year contract, the reduced-premium plan, and the premium-rate-schedule plan.

All information and records requested of the Corporation by the committee have been furnished so far as available and practicable, and the Corporation has been prompt and most helpful to the committee. The committee desires to acknowledge and express its appreciation for the very helpful cooperation of Directors Ralph Stauber and E. D. White, Manager Leroy K. Smith, Assistant Manager Cecil A. Johnson, and various members of the staff of the Corporation at Washington, the branch offices, and in the field.

The committee also acknowledges the assistance given in the preparation of this report by George Junkin, associate of W. G. Cochran; also the following associates of the chairman: Russell H. Matthias, secretary of the committee; E. D. Brown, Jr., actuary; J. P. Boesel, T. H. Buenger, and J. N. Averitt.

It seems to me we have just got to the place with this agency where it ought to be given an opportunity to work on the basis of the recommendations they made. I know some of the faults of this agency. One of the main faults was that they did not write a contract for more than 1 year. Beginning last year they have been writing 3-year contracts. I think that is the only way you are going to get this agency on a sound fundamental basis. This is an experimental program, and I am not satisfied with all its operations, but I say here and now that I think that if the recommendations of the special committee were followed the program would soon be on a sound basis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the recommendations of the Wheat Crop Insurance Consulting Committee:

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends:

That the farmers' premium payments should be adjusted to provide, over a period giving a reasonable insurance average, for the indemnities;

That the policy of meeting administrative expenses of the Corporation by congressional appropriation should be continued as a basic and essential part of the program for the farmers;

That to encourage increased participation, especially in high-risk areas, premiums should be quoted to the farmer for both the 50 percent and the 75 percent contract;

That as promptly as practicable provision be made that government agencies operating any wheat program or granting aid or making loans to wheat farmers should require participation of such farmers in the wheat crop insurance program;

That the present plan of insurance, as modified beginning with the 1943 crop year by the 3-year contract, and the schedule rating and reduced premium plans, is the most practicable at this time.

That no insurance be granted after the 1942 program for a 1-year term, and that, beginning with the 1943 insurance program, insurance be granted for a 3-year term subject to cancellation on the part of the farmer on 1 year's notice to take effect at the end of the second year.

That as promptly as practicable the term be made continuous subject only to termination by notice during the current year to take effect no earlier than at the end of a specified subsequent year;

That the yield percentage premium plan be investigated further by the Corporation to determine its suitability for the high-risk area;

That in consideration of any alternate plan in which premiums are omitted or deferred during any year, the term of the insurance should be for a sufficient period to secure a reasonable insurance average without right of cancellation, and with reasonable provision to secure payment of premiums;

That the Corporation should have complete control over the formulae used in calculating county check yields. If necessary to secure this end, the use of a common county check yield for crop insurance and other A. C. P. purposes should be discontinued;

That the appointment and removal of State crop-insurance supervisors be made by the Corporation on approval of the regional director and the State committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and that the appointment and removal of county crop-insurance supervisors be made by the State crop-insurance supervisor on approval of the county committee;

That the work of soliciting participation should be made under the direct supervision of State and county crop-insurance supervisors or other individuals designated by the Corporation where no supervisor has been appointed, and should be intensified with an increase in the efficiency of the sales force in the offices of the county committees, to handle effectively the business at the time the farmer is at the county office, and by telephone, mail, and otherwise;

That the Corporation should be given increased supervision over State, county, and community committees in the presentation

and sale of crop insurance for the purpose of obtaining increased participation through more efficient and effective sales force;

That the Corporation give further study and consideration to the type of sales plan used in Michigan;

That adjusters be appointed on a written application and questionnaire to be filed with the State committee; and

That payments to be made by the Corporation for the services of State and county committees and other Government agencies be allocated by the most practicable method on the basis of the time and expenses chargeable to the service and the results obtained for the Corporation.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT J. LAUBENGAYER,
WILLIAM G. COCHRAN,
HERMAN L. EKERN,
Chairman, Wheat Crop Insurance Consulting Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing so stubborn as a fact. All that you need do is evaluate the facts and then come to a conclusion.

Let me preface what I am about to say by stating that last year when this bill was under consideration and this particular item was under consideration a multitude of pleas went forth from the Well of this Chamber to give crop insurance 1 more year. "It will do better." We gave it 1 more year and it did not do better. It did worse.

If it is so appealing, why in the space of 4 years have less than one-third of the wheat farmers taken out crop insurance? That is the record. If it is so attractive to the cotton farmers why have only 10 out of every 100 cotton farmers taken out crop insurance? That is the testimony. That is the stubborn fact that you cannot escape.

Then there is one other stubborn and very illuminating fact. It cost the equivalent of 1⅐ bushels of wheat for every bushel of wheat that went back to the farmer in the form of an indemnity. This is the way you arrive at it.

From the farmer in 4 full years we collected the equivalent of 28,000,000 bushels of wheat as premiums. Out of the Federal Treasury we added the equivalent of 23,200,000 bushels of wheat for overhead expense. Every argument made here about the comparability with private insurance falls of its own weight when I merely remind you that every private insurance company, no matter what it insures, carries its own loading charge and its own overhead. Here all the overhead is paid out of the Federal Treasury.

In 4 years it has cost $23,200,000, on the basis of dollar wheat. So what is the arithmetical score? From the farmer we took 28,000,000 bushels in premiums and from the Treasury 23,000,000 bushels, as expenses. Put them together and you get 51,000,000 bushels. How much did we return to the farmer as indemnity? Forty-five million bushels. For every bushel of wheat that the farmer received as indemnity we expended the equivalent of one and one-seventh bushels of wheat. Four full years. Is not that enough?

Now we are taking you at your word. Last year you besought us to give it 1 more year. We gave it 1 more year. There once more we are confronted with a loss. The loss in 1939, adding administrative expenditures and the excess indemnities over premiums, was $6,700,000. In 1940 it cost the Government $10,400,000. In 1941 it cost $12,000,000. In 1942 it cost the Treasury $12,000,000. There are the unassailable facts. With all your rhetoric and all your vehemence, you cannot wipe out a line of it, because it is the testimony, it is the record from the Crop Insurance Corporation itself.

The gentleman from Mississippi indicated what the future is. He said, "Why not insure fruit?" The farmers' union says we ought to insure flax and we ought to insure corn. If you are going to insure the thing that comes out of the soil, why not insure livestock, to which the wheat and the corn, the soybeans and the other cereal grains are fed? Why not go all the way in this thing? But if you do, I prophesy your loss will be not $45,000,000 in the space of 4 years, I prophesy there will be a loss of perhaps hundreds of millions if it is carried to its logical conclusion.

Do you want to gamble with the Federal Treasury on that? If so, it will be only a little while until the demands will rise in this House for an expansion of the commodities on which crop insurance shall be issued, and when that day comes, make up your minds to a tremendous loss to Uncle Sam.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 70, strike out all of lines 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 65, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

To carry out the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a–590f), which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and moisture conservation to be carried out directly and in cooperation with other agencies, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books and periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying automobile in the District of Columbia, furnishing of subsistence to employees, training of employees, and the purchase and erection of permanent buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same with any such building, shall not exceed $2,500 except where buildings are acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes and except for eight buildings to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $15,000 per building: *Provided further*, That no money appropriated in this act shall be available for the construction of any such building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment: *Provided further*, That reproductions of such aerial or other photographs, mosaics, and maps as shall be required in connection with the authorized work of the Soil Conservation Service may be furnished at the cost of reproduction to Federal, State, county, or municipal agencies requesting such reproductions, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, as follows:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in the paragraph beginning *"Provided further,"* line 12, page 71, and continuing to the end of the paragraph, on the ground that the same is legislation on an appropriation bill, and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean to the end of line 8, or to the end of the paragraph on line 25, page 71?

Mr. HOPE. After line 8, page 72.

The CHAIRMAN. That includes the two provisos, as the Chair understands the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Does the point of order include the words in line 8 on page 72, the words "as follows"?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not care anything about the words "as follows."

Mr. HOPE. No.

Mr. CASE. My question is whether or not the point of order should go simply to the end of line 7. I understood to go to the end of that paragraph, which would have taken in the words "as follows," in line 8.

Mr. HOPE. I intend to include everything down to and including line 8 on page 72.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOPE. Nothing further than to say that it clearly appears that the language is legislation. It provides for certain uses of the money which are not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the language referred to is unquestionably out of order and for that reason the point of order undoubtedly will lie, and be sustained. We desire to offer an amendment which will include language that is not out of order to replace the language stricken out by the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order that the language indicated by him beginning on page 71, line 12, and concluding with the words "as follows", page 72, line 8, is legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 71, after the word "government" in line 12, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made the appropriations for the work of the Soil Conservation Service shall be available for meeting the expenses of warehouse maintenance and procurement, care, and the handling of supplies, materials, and equipment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the Chairman of the Committee a question. I call attention to page 70, line 22, and am wondering what the language means. The language I refer to is as follows: "including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia."

It is difficult for me to understand what that language means.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's inquiry is as to the particular use of the word "means" I take it.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. The word of course is very general in its connotation and I think it is not possible to give it a very well restricted definition. I think that under this language the Soil Conservation Service for the purpose of the act for which it was set up, could use the money provided for any means which might be essential to carry out the objectives of the act under which it was established, if the means are specifically not prohibited by the statute.

Mr. TABER. It is new language to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $1,126,120.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the so-called Rees amendment which was adopted in committee on last Saturday, which amendment reads as follows: On page 63, line 2, after the colon, insert as follows:

Provided further, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500: *And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter of payments not exceeding the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled.

The gentleman from Kansas uses as his argument for the need of his amendment that the big farm owner or operator is not entitled to a payment over $500, even though he is in compliance with the program. For your information, if either the landlord or tenant is to receive these benefits, both of them must be cooperators. It is, as I understand it, impossible for either one or the other to participate in the program—both, I repeat, must be in compliance. Accordingly, let us analyze what this amendment, while offered as something of benefit to the small farmer, would in truth do to the small farmer or renter.

Let us take a case in my district. One large estate is composed of over 14,000 rich, fertile acres of Illinois land. The owner is an out-of-State resident. My guess is that he has about 75 renters on this land. If the Rees amendment becomes effective, the estate no doubt would withdraw from the program. Through such possible withdrawal, it automatically throws the tenants out of the program. Regardless of whether these tenants heretofore had earned less or more than $500, they would now not be able to earn a thin dime. The effect of this would be to disrupt the objectives of the program. Whether you believe in the legislation or not, it happens to be the law of the land. If the law is wrong, let someone introduce a bill to repeal it and then allow the Congress to go on record for or against its continuation.

Likewise, untold numbers of farmers in my district operate 320 acres of land. Their payments could be over $500, but you are saying here that he is not entitled to such payments because he happens to own and operate such a farm. In other words, you intend to penalize him for owning such a tract of land.

Similarly, a tenant farming 300 or 400 acres could, under the program, earn over $500. Are you going to say to him that because he is a large acreage farmer that he is to be punished for trying his best to produce more food to help win the war? At the same time, John Jones down the road a mile, who is likewise in the program, can earn $499 because he is not such a large operator.

This year many of my farmers have taken on additional land to operate because if they did not do so, some of the land might possibly be idle. In wartimes no one wants to see such a thing happen. Accordingly they rent or operate more land, work hard and through long hours are able to play a part in bringing about increased production. To this man you are going to say, "well, if you were not so patriotic and desirous of helping to win the war, you would or could farm on a smaller scale and thereby earn payments from Uncle Sam."

Recently a lady in my district, and I do not know whether she is an owner or tenant farmer, wrote me that she was farming 400 acres of tillable land and that the help problem was severe. She stated that many mornings she got up at 2:30 or 3 o'clock in order to do her housework before dawn when it became necessary for her to go to the field to drive a tractor or some other machine. This lady, if she is a cooperator, would no doubt be entitled to a payment of over $500. Do you want to say to her that she is not entitled to it while Susie Jones down the road who produces half as much foodstuffs, can qualify for a payment of anywhere from four to five hundred dollars.

The gentleman from Kansas, Congressman REES, says he wants to cut the payments to big landowners and operators so as to make larger payments available to the little farmer. This cannot happen, of course, because any cooperator can only receive what he earns through compliance, and if he is a small operator, he is limited as to earnings, due to the size of his farm.

Let us be fair about this matter. Let us not put ourselves in the position of saying to one group of our citizens that we will penalize them if they do one thing and tell another group we will pay them for doing the same thing on a smaller scale.

And besides that—since when has it here in the United States become a crime or penalty for owning more than one farm or for a tenant to be a big farm operator. Let us stop arguing these matters and keep on making every effort to treat every citizen alike. The adoption of this amendment is class legislation, pure and simple. This is still America, the land of the brave and the free, and we are fighting a war to keep it that way. Many stand on this floor and shout that we must keep initiative and free enterprise alive in this country of ours. If you believe that, then you should be against the Rees amendment. I repeat, if you feel the whole A. A. A. program is wrong, then to approach the program before us fairly intelligently and honestly why do you not introduce legislation to repeal the act and bring it before the House for final consideration.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his fine statement If it is logical to reduce payments down to $500, could it not be said that payments could be reduced to $50 or $25?

Mr. ARENDS. Certainly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have all the respect in the world for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] who just left the floor. I honor his judgment as a legislator. There is no one whose opinion I respect more with reference to farm problems. I regret that I differ with him to payments of funds from the Federal Treasury to the big operators.

He suggests that because the amendment I proposed limits the amount any one operator may have from the Federal Treasury as allowance for complying with a program intended to improve the soil and make it more valuable to the sum

of $500, is all wrong, and that the owner of the large tracts of land will not permit the conservation of their own land, with Government assistance unless they may have payments running into the thousands of dollars. These funds, after all, were intended to be earned, but were to be used to conserve the soil and make their land more valuable. He says we are penalizing the large farm owner. In the first place $500 is about as much as an operator can collect on that many acres of land. Furthermore, can it be said that a man or woman is being penalized because he is limited to $500 as payment for conserving the land that should be conserved in any event?

If you call it punishing or penalizing a man or woman who operates land that is needed right now to grow all the food crops possible, to say we are going to limit the payment to you for conserving the soil, to $500, then I fail to understand your line of reasoning. When this soil-conservation law was put into effect as I understand it there were about three main objectives considered. In the first place this legislation was put into effect when farm prices were low, and when there was a so-called surplus of crops. The soil-conservation program has accomplished a great deal of good. It has helped to offset low prices. It has assisted a lot in drought areas. It has provided funds to farmers when they were very scarce. And, very important, the program has provided for conservation of soil, and protected it where it otherwise would not have been protected. Land was permitted to lie idle or to produce crops that were not producing when it seemed such food crops were not needed. We see now, of course, much of such crops may be needed, and needed badly. Mr. Chairman, of course, the soil-conservation program should be carried on, but it does not seem very appropriate to me that either tenants or owners ought to expect the Federal Government to provide money by the thousands to assist in complying with a program that most of them would follow, in any event; except, however, that right now we want to discourage permitting land to lay idle when it might be producing crops so much needed for food at this time.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not at this moment. I am sorry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a far different picture from that of a few years ago. It is not less food we want. It is more and more food. We want more, and not less, acres in production. Farm prices, while not as satisfactory as they should be in some instances, are higher than a few years ago. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not cut the amount to which the average farmer would be entitled under the act. Not at all. As I told this House Saturday, more than 95 percent of our farm operators really got less than $500 last year.

I just cannot believe there are very many of our operators who feel they should have these large amounts from the Federal Treasury, but I do not believe this House, in view of the present condition of our country in this terrible crisis, wants to say "Certainly; we ought to pay $10,000 or $15,000 or $20,000 or more, if you please, to individuals for protecting their own land which they can well afford to protect themselves if they will do it." Certainly we have the national program and it should be maintained. To give a third of this $300,000,000 to about 10 or 12 percent of our operators is not the way to do right now.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for whom I have the greatest respect.

Mr. ARENDS. Let us leave out the large farm operator, the large farm owner, and approach it from the standpoint of the small individual.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All right. That is just exactly what I have been trying to do. I have the highest regard and respect for the woman you spoke about who got up early in the morning to work on the tractor. She is making a real contribution In my opinion, you will not find many women who are doing farm work, and are producing food, that earn more than $500 in soil-conservation payments. If she is farming her own land, she is taking care of it too, and is raising all the food crops she can. You will find very many women or men who own a large enough tract of land, under the present program, to get more than $500, if they operate their own land. I am for her, and I think she will be happy if she gets a good price for her crops, and will also be glad to go along with those who claim these large amounts, and take a reduction down to the $500 in the event her payment would exceed that amount. As a matter of fact, she would have to be in pretty full compliance on a pretty good-sized tract of land in order to claim more than $500.

Mr. ARENDS. Is she not entitled to it if she operates somebody else's land?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the operator is a tenant, then that tenant, if he follows the program and complies to the extent of a credit of $500, he or she is entitled to her share of the money so long as the Government sees fit to pay it.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the opinion of each and every Member on the floor of this House, even though I may have a different view. I want at all times to accord the same respect to the other Member's opinion, that I would have him respect my own. If this House and this Congress by a majority vote, does not agree with me—well and good. After all, it is the majority that should prevail.

I certainly did not intend to take the time of the membership of this House to discuss the matter further.

Mr. Chairman, I directed your attention on yesterday as to how these soil-conservation funds have been distributed in the past. That distribution has not changed materially. I do not have the figures for 1942, but they are not much different from the year 1941, I am informed, and 1940 are somewhat similar. They vary a little, but not a great deal in the aggregate.

In 1941 the amount distributed was approximately $443,000,000. Six million farmers participated. Fifty-two percent of those farmers got $40 or less; They got $58,000,000. Eighty percent got $100 or less. They got about one-third of the money; the other two-thirds went to 20 percent of the operators. That year 98 percent got less than $500. Last year, I am informed that not more than 5 percent in number got more than $500 and from there on the payments went into the tens of thousands.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure as much as $50,000,000 of this appropriation could be saved for the Treasury of the United States, without injury to anyone.

In this crucial hour when farmers are asked to bend every effort to raise every bit of food possible, and to till every acre of land available, I feel those who have been the recipients of payments in the thousands and tens of thousands of dollars should forego these payments, and make their own contributions to the conservation of their own soil, above the $500 payment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the judgment and views of each and every Member of this body, who may not see these things as I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses in carrying out the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), in accordance with the provisions of section 392 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, approved February 16, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1392), as amended by the act approved January 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 41–42), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, there is hereby reappropriated so much as may be necessary of the unobligated balances of the funds made available for the purposes of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c): *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by said section 32 of said act shall be available to carry on any program formerly carried on by the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section just read on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and seeks to provide an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, although that section was stricken out, I wonder if the chairman of the committee would take time to tell us what could be affected by that particular clause in the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no need to discuss the provisions of the bill that have been stricken out on points of order.

We had in this paragraph what I regard as one of the most important provisions in the bill, that is, a proviso in the concluding portion of the paragraph, to the effect that no part of the funds

appropriated by section 32 of said act shall be available to carry on any program formerly carried on by Work Projects Administration. If gentlemen will examine the justifications, they will find that some $81,000,000 of the $96,000,000——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How is any discussion with reference to the provision in the bill which has been stricken out in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is undertaking to respond to the question propounded in parliamentary language by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. TARVER. Eighty-one million dollars of the $96,000,000 which is carried by a permanent appropriation, known as section 32 funds, is projected for use during the next fiscal year in the carrying on of a program which was formerly carried on in part by Work Projects Administration in the furnishing of food to school children throughout the United States in what is commonly known as the school-lunch program. Our subcommittee was not averse to a continuance of the school-lunch program, if it could be authorized by law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. I trust, Mr. Chairman, I may not be interrupted by frivolous points of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My point of order is that the gentleman did not ask to proceed out of order. The gentleman is not discussing anything that is in any legislation we are now considering.

Mr. TARVER. I am discussing the paragraph about which the gentleman from Massachusetts asked for information. I am not doing it of my own volition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. TARVER. The committee, as I have said, was of the opinion that Work Projects Administration activities ought not to be transferred section 32 funds, which are intended primarily for disposition of surplus agricultural commodities, of which we do not have very many at this particular time. We felt that the proposal to use a major portion of section 32 funds for carrying on what were essentially W. P. A. projects was a proposal to do something which the Congress should authorize before it is done, and that this inhibition against the transfer of W. P. A. projects to section 32 funds ought to be included in the bill. We were frank to point out in our report that it is legislation that, as against a point of order, could not stand. But nevertheless, we thought it ought to be included. We carry no section 32 money in the bill.

Mr. CLASON. In other words, the committeefelt there were some worthwhile projects which would be taken care of in this paragraph which was stricken out under a point of order?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, yes. Everything is stricken out under the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. PACE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The entire paragraph was stricken. Nothing is before the House for consideration.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to rise in opposition to that same pro forma amendment under which the miscellaneous information was obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. Except by unanimous consent the gentleman from Massachusetts could not have been recognized for the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no last word, for the paragraph has been stricken out.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $175,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made by section 12 (a), title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612), shall be available during the fiscal year 1944 to enable the Secretary to further perform the duty imposed upon him under applicable laws to protect the interests of consumers with due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, which sum shall be available for administrative expenses (including not to exceed $37,200 for printing and binding) in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of the aforesaid section 392.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the section just read on the ground that is legislation on an appropriation bill and seeks to appropriate funds not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order as stated is, in the opinion of the committee, not good.

The Consumers' Counsel provision is authorized under legislation enacted by Congress and approved on May 12, 1933, contained in section 602, Title VII, of the United States Code. In connection therewith and as a matter of fact in the same act there was contained an appropriation of $100,000,000 set out in section 612 of the same title. I quote:

There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the administrative expenses under sections 601, 608, 608 (a)-608 (c).

The amount of money, therefore, which is here appropriated was appropriated originally under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 and this provision merely involves the reappropriation of $175,000 of that unobligated balance. The authority, as I have said, for the establishment of the Consumers' Counsel is contained in the same act as codified in the code sections to which I have made reference.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PACE. Yes; I should like to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the Chair will observe that the paragraph to which objection is made seeks to appropriate for consumers' counsel in the Department of Agriculture $175,000 to be taken from an appropriation that was authorized by the Congress in 1933.

The most serious objection on my part is that the Congress a few months ago enacted a law limiting the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture. It is an act approved on January 31, 1942. This act provides:

That in the administration of this title—

That is all of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, section 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended—

The aggregate amount expended in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1942, for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia, including regional offices in the several States, shall not exceed 3 percent of the total amount available for such fiscal year for carrying out the purposes of this title of the act.

So, under that language, all administrative expense is limited to 3 percent. If Congress appropriated $100,000,000 for a particular purpose, there is automatically allocated not exceeding 3 percent for administrative expenses. Then this act goes on to state further:

In the administration of section 32 of the act entitled "An act—

And so forth—

And the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended and those sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as amended—

That is the act under which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] says he gets his authority. May I read that again?

And those sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as amended which were reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937 as amended, the aggregate amount expended in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia, including regional offices, and in the several States, shall not exceed 4 percent of the total amount available for such fiscal year for carrying out the purposes of said acts.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman will admit that this is an effort to secure $175,000 in addition to the 4-percent limitation of the administrative expenses to set up a Consumers' Counsel in the Department of Agriculture, when we now

have 1,800 counselors in the Office of Price Administration to protect the interests of the consumer. That is the first objection: That it is clearly in direct violation of a limitation in the law which provides that all administrative expenses shall not exceed 4 percent of the amount appropriated. This is an effort to get an additional $175,000.

Mr. Chairman, the peculiar thing about this item, so far as the views of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] are concerned is that on page 1169 of the hearings when this matter was presented to the subcommittee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] made the following statement:

> This language is legislative in character because if you are already authorized to do that you do not need it. If you are not authorized to do it we cannot give you such authorization in an appropriation bill.

That is exactly my contention on the second point. He goes back to an act that was passed in 1933 that the Supreme Court of the United States has declared unconstitutional, some portions of which, particularly the marketing agreement features, have been reenacted into law and which contained an appropriation of $100,000,000 without year. That is to say, it contained an appropriation of $100,000,000 to remain available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that that money was not available for a Consumers' Counsel Division and this language that is in here is not a reappropriation which would have to be made in order to make the money available?

Mr. PACE. Not only that, but if this $100,000,000 appropriated in 1933 is still available it does not have to be reappropriated. It is just like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] said, at the time the matter was presented to the committee, and let me read again his words:

> This language is legislative in character because if you are already authorized to do that you do not need it.

That is, part of the $100,000,000 is still there.

> If you are not authorized to do it, we cannot give you such authorization in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is no more than an effort on the part of the Department of Agriculture to secure an additional $175,000 in excess of the 4 percent, which is a direct violation of the law and is not authorized by law and is legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] desire to be heard further?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the Chair should remember that the first point raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] in presenting his point of order was to the effect that the appropriation is not authorized by law, and in my original statement to the Chair I pointed out wherein that point of order cannot in our judgment be held good.

The gentleman's argument has covered a wide field. He has gone into the question of alleged conflict with another statute enacted by the Congress, but I think in fairness the point of order as originally submitted is the one which should be passed upon by the Chair.

The gentleman could have made a point of order against the paragraph on the ground that it is in one of its particulars legislative in character.

Mr. PACE. I made that point of order.

Mr. TARVER. But not in the particulars stated by the gentleman. Not upon the ground it is not authorized by law, because it is authorized by law; not upon the ground that it constitutes a conflict with another statute enacted by the Congress. I do not concede that to be true. As a matter of fact, except for this appropriation or proposed appropriation there could be expended $334,000 of the unexpended balance of funds appropriated in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 for this purpose. All of that act was not held unconstitutional. The gentleman seems to be under the impression that it was, but that is not true. And there are available for use in conducting this Consumers' Counsel Division, as I understand it, some $334,000 in that unexpended balance without the enactment of this legislation but with the enactment of this paragraph the amount that could be expended would be limited to $175,000 and to the extent that we are undertaking to limit it to $175,000 the provision may be legislative in character. But that objection has not been raised by the gentleman. That involves a question of saving.

Let me point out before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Consumers' Counsel Division is not a part of the Agricultural Marketing Administration, but by Executive order has now been transferred to and made a part of the Nutrition and Food Conservation Branch of the Marketing Reports Division of the Food Distribution Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I care to add anything further. I feel that the point of order advanced by the gentleman is without merit.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] makes a point of order against the pending paragraph that it is legislation not authorized by law. The paragraph undertakes to reappropriate $175,000 of the permanent appropriation under an act of 1933 and to limit the appropriation by the language of the pending paragraph to the purpose set forth in the pending paragraph, and thus undertakes to limit the reappropriation of $175,000 unallocated to the previous appropriation by a limitation that would apply to that act rather than a limitation that would apply to an amount appropriated under the terms of this bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. That is the point of order that I suggested was a good one, but the gentleman did not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to say that that was among the points of order made by him, that it was legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman did not make that specific point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARKETING SERVICE

For the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere as may be necessary in conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, either independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations what would have happened if we had not stricken that last paragraph? Ten words will be sufficient.

Mr. TARVER. By the gentleman limiting me to 10 words he makes it impossible for me to answer the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I thought. That is the reason I put a limit on it. I never could get a yes or no answer out of anybody on that side. I only asked the question to call the attention of the House to the proceedings when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], to tell us what might have happened if a section of the bill had not been stricken. The absurdity of that is apparent when we remember that we sometimes do not know what will happen when the bill becomes a law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the act authorizing him to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the act of April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471–476), and to perform the duties imposed upon him by chapter 14 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cotton futures (26 U. S. C. 1920–1935), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923, as amended (7 U. S. C. 51–65), including such means as may be necessary for effectuating agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution, inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies thereof under such agreements, $937,580.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 79, line 18, strike out $937,580" and insert "$992,428."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be agreeable to the gentleman for the committee to accept this amendment and avoid some debate.

Mr. RIVERS. It would tickle me to death.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to allow me to explain the reasons for accepting the amendment?

Mr. RIVERS. I will yield interminably if the gentleman will accept my amendment.

Mr. TARVER. The action of the subcommittee in accepting the gentleman's amendment is occasioned by these reasons. As I understand, the amendment provides for the continuance of cotton classing and grading stations at Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, Galveston, and Altus, Okla. The first four of those stations mentioned are fee stations; that is, charges are made to those who have services performed there. The stations cost about $40,000, and the fees amount to about $34,000, so there is a loss in that connection on the part of the Government of only $6,000.

I understand that the Altus station costs about $9,000 and is a station at which free service is furnished to the members of one variety cotton improvement association. Therefore, the cost to the Government is $9,000 at that station, and no fees are collected to offset that cost. However, the amount involved is small.

The attention of the subcommittee was not directed to the subject matter during the course of the hearings. Last year when the Budget undertook to eliminate one or two of these stations, the committee put them back, and their action was subsequently approved by the Congress, so we feel that under the circumstances it would be proper to accept this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that formerly there was only one delivery point on the New York exchange and that was New York. Under the present system, where they have southern deliveries, the farmer does not have to lose the difference.

Mr. TARVER. I do not believe it is necessary to say more than that if we are going to accept the amendment. I simply wanted to explain the facts that we think justify accepting it.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman and his subcommittee, because I think they have done the right thing.

Mr. TARVER. It is not the action of the chairman alone. I consulted with my colleagues, and they agreed to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Attention was called to the fact that the expense was a little more than the receipts.

Mr. TARVER. At the first four mentioned stations. The one at Altus, Okla., is altogether expense.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. In that connection I wish to call attention to the fact that Galveston had a clear profit of about $10,000.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. May I say that had it not been for the gentleman from South Carolina many of us who are interested in the cotton industry would not have known about this situation. I would say that this will mean a saving to each farmer of approximately $10 per bale on his cotton when it is properly classified. I am certainly glad this amendment was offered, and I am happy the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations was willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee, has just called attention to the fact that there has been but little expenses attached to the services for the operation of the Cotton Futures Act, Cotton Standard Act and the so-called Smith-Doxey Act permitting classification for cotton growers. In that connection I will call attention to the fact that insofar as the port of Galveston is concerned there was no loss whatsoever, but a clear profit of approximately $10,000 in the past year.

The bill as reported would have eliminated Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Mobile, Ala.; Galveston, Tex.; and Altus, Okla. The Committee on Appropriations should not be criticized for this action as it was a clear recommendation of the Budget.

The laws pertaining to these classification points were not enacted with any view of balancing the Budget but for necessary service to one of our most important products of agriculture, the cotton industry, an industry which has furnished more export trade for the United States for the past 100 years than any other. One of the laws under which these stations have been operated is for services rendered absolutely free to the cotton farmers. Under the other two a fee was charged and under those fees applicable to two of the acts in question, the port of Galveston cleared a profit of approximately $10,000 upon the whole.

I am very thankful to the chairman of the committee for accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to reinstate all five of the points that would have been eliminated under the bill as reported. I am advised by inquiry to the Department of Agriculture that the office at Galveston would still be necessary under the Cotton Futures Act to provide classing services for any cotton to be delivered on future contracts at that point much of which would be carrying out the lend-lease program.

The bill as reported would have required the sending of samples to Houston or New Orleans for classification. It would involve travel expenses and delays, and would no doubt, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, result in complaints on account of such delays.

I am also advised by the Department of Agriculture that as to the Cotton Market News Service it should be said that Galveston is one of the 10 designated markets, and that it has been very helpful to have the Galveston classifying office maintain contacts with the Export Quotations Committee of the Galveston Cotton Exchange. The closing of the Galveston office would mean that contacts with the Quotations Committee would be limited to those of a traveling representative and to mail and telegraphic communications, and result in relaxation of supervision of these designated markets.

I respectfully call attention to the fact that Texas has been a very prominent producer of cotton for more than a hundred years. It has frequently produced from a fourth to a third of the entire cotton crop of the United States, and Galveston has invariably been one of the prominent ports through which the cotton produced in that entire area found its way to the markets of the world.

The ports, Galveston, Houston, and New Orleans, have for many years led in the cotton market. In fact, the three ports have generally been almost on a parity, first one and then the other in the lead. In 1937, the receipts and stocks at Galveston were in the first place, closely followed by New Orleans and Houston in the order named. In 1938 New Orleans led; Galveston and Houston being slightly behind. In 1939, Houston led, followed by Galveston and New Orleans. In 1940, New Orleans led, closely followed by Houston and Galveston in the order named. In 1941, Houston led, Galveston being second, and New Orleans third. In 1942, Galveston led, Houston being second and New Orleans third.

In actual operations under the Cotton Standards Act Houston was first in 1939; Galveston second; in 1940, Houston was first and New Orleans second; in 1941 Houston led, Galveston being second; in 1942 New Orleans led, Galveston being third; in 1943, up to February 20, Houston led, New Orleans and Galveston being practically the same.

Under the Cotton Futures Act, in 1939, New Orleans led, Galveston being third. In 1940, Houston led, Galveston being second; in 1941, Houston led again, with Galveston second; in 1942, Houston led, Galveston being only a few hundred bales behind; in 1943, up to February 20, Galveston led, Houston being second.

I give these figures for the purpose of showing what an important part has been performed by the port of Galveston in the cotton trade of the last 6 years.

I am also advised that by abolishing Galveston under these laws it would not result in any saving of money as the

personnel would have to be correspondingly increased at Houston. The Houston Cotton Exchange now reports that it already has a congestion of this business, and that their facilities are already taxed to capacity. Under the circumstance, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina should be adopted, it having already been accepted by the distinguished chairman of the committee in charge of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, $400,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to give me some information about the item on page 79, beginning on line 22, concerning the United States Warehouse Act. I understand that the Department asked the Budget for $431,500 for the administration of this act, but the Budget cut the amount to $440,910, and the committee decreased that to $400,000.

My attention has been called to the fact that if this reduction is made the inspections of grain and warehouses in my State and throughout the Pacific Northwest will be eliminated. I had thought I might offer an amendment to put it back to the figure given by the Budget, but I should like to have the information from the chairman and the members of the committee, because I am sure they do not intend to eliminate the inspection of grains and warehouses to the detriment of the food we now must have, and certainly we do not want to have this food spoil.

Mr. TARVER. Nothing is further from the intention of the subcommittee. We did provide for discontinuance of operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, which, in our judgment, would bring about a considerable reduction in the operation of the United States Warehouse Act.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am told by the Department that in spite of the fact that the committee contends that the liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation provided for in the bill will lighten the burden of this activity to an extent sufficient to bring about a reduction of $40,110, that that is not the fact, that it will not do that.

Mr. TARVER. And may I say to the gentleman that in my judgment the statement in that regard is not well founded. It seems to me that reduction unquestionably must be brought about by a liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, but let me also say that I do not believe that we could in debate on the floor arrive at a correct understanding of just what that reduction might be, and that the best plan would be to have evidence submitted to the Senate committee when the bill reaches that body to determine the effect of liquidation of the crop insurance operations on this item, so that we could act upon the matter intelligently.

Mr. STEFAN. I know that no one understands this bill better than the gentleman from Georgia, and I am sure that he would not want to do any injustice. I, too, am anxious to reduce expenditures where possible if that can be done without detriment to the food program.

Mr. TARVER. Absolutely not, but may I say to the gentleman that it is a rare thing to have any organization of these departments or any other agency come before a committee and say that they can get along on anything less than they asked for. I do not recall more than one or two instances of that kind in my experience, and I do not think that we can accept what they say as representing all of the facts.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer my amendment. All I want is assurance to safeguard the food-production program. I would not like to see abandonment of the inspection work in Nebraska.

Mr. TARVER. Should it be decided that that is the case we will be very glad to consider the matter further.

Mr. STEFAN. On the assurance of the gentleman from Georgia, I shall not introduce my amendment.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The warehouses have been growing, and they are very ambitious to take over the State proposition. The gentleman's State and my State, among others, were pioneers away back yonder in grain inspection and warehouse propositions.

Mr. STEFAN. All I want to say is that we do not want to have food spoilage at a time when some believe we may yet experience a food shortage.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, I think the situation might better be put that a few extra jobs are in danger of spoiling, that is all.

Mr. STEFAN. On the assurance of the gentleman from Georgia that this will not mean the elimination of inspection, I shall not introduce my amendment.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I do not want to make a speech, but I rise to commend rather than to criticize. The able chairman of the subcommittee, and his colleagues, have been doing a very fine piece of work in many particulars, and, while I am not in full agreement with all that has been done in this bill, I do want to express my commendation to the committee for retaining in the item of marketing farm products a provision for the continuance of a cotton-testing station for making analyses of cotton fiber, in College Station, Tex. There is only one other such laboratory in the United States, and, with the vast volume of cotton now being used in textiles, it is essential that this laboratory be continued and not abolished. It has been in existence for 10 years, and has done excellent work. I rise to commend the chairman and the other members of the committee for providing sufficient funds to continue this cotton-testing laboratory.

The Clerk read as follows:

Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August 15, 1921, as amended by the act of August 14, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 181-229), $350,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary may require reasonable bonds from every market agency and dealer, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to secure the performance of their obligations, and whenever, after due notice and hearing, the Secretary finds any registrant is insolvent or has violated any provisions of said act, he may issue an order suspending such registrant for a reasonable specified period. Such order of suspension shall take effect within not less than 5 days, unless suspended or modified or set aside by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 17, page 80, down to the bottom of and including line 3 on top of page 81, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Marketing Service, $5,811,860, of which amount not to exceed $298,413 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in line 20, page 81. Instead of the sum "$298,413" it should be "$1,298,413", and I ask that the Clerk be authorized to make the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), $20,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this paragraph is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law. I refer to paragraph beginning on line 11, page 82, continuing to bottom of line 3, on page 83.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded. The law authorizes appropriations for the purpose of carrying on the work of rural electrifi-

cation, but there is no authority of law for the procurement of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The point of order should be sustained.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been conceded by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. POAGE. But I do not concede it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I think clearly that the part of the paragraph beginning in line 15 to the end of the paragraph is subject to a point of order, because it does provide procedure not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to interrupt him? If that is correct, then the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order. If part of a paragraph is subject to a point of order, then the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order.

Mr. POAGE. I am afraid the Chair is correct in that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is to the paragraph beginning on page 82, line 11, and concluding with line 3 on page 83. The point of order raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is conceded in part, by the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the subcommittee, the particular concession being as to that part of the paragraph following the sign and figures $20,000,000.

Inasmuch as a part of the paragraph is subject to a point of order, the whole paragraph falls. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 82, after line 10, insert: "Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), $20,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores this part of the appropriation. I presume that as far as the committee is concerned there will be no objection to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say, and the gentleman will bear me out, that in other years we used to carry this as a direct appropriation in this year. The only reason for putting it on a loan basis from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that it is set up as a reimbursable item and comes back. So that from the standpoint of the Government it does not make any difference, except that it shows up as an additional item of $20,000,000 in the total appropriation for the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the Rural Electrification program has done more for the farmers of this country than everything else the Department of Agriculture has ever undertaken. To me it is absolutely ridiculous to appropriate $800,000,000, a large part of which goes to interfere with the farmer and harass him to death, and then refuse to appropriate $20,000,000 to help extend rural power lines to those homes that are not now receiving it.

I know it has been contended that there is lack of strategic material. We did not hear that complaint when they were building a dam in Quebec that cost $69,000,000 and required more strategic material than would be used in the rural electrification program in 4 or 5 years.

In addition, we are gradually getting these regulations relaxed. We are gradually getting strategic materials. A vast amount of material is now lying idle in the way of lines that have been abandoned. For instance, where there are two concerns serving a town or a city or a community, and one of them buys out the other one, they leave a large amount of this material that can be used to reach these farmers' homes.

There are a great many of these lines underground that can be redeemed, that are not now being used. Again, we are attempting to increase the production of copper, aluminum, and steel and those things that are necessary to build the lines. I am told that from here to Richmond there is now lying idle an old telephone system of lines that could be used to reach the farmers' homes not only in Virginia and Maryland but throughout the country. So that as far as there being a scarcity of strategic materials is concerned, I submit we can find materials to not only absorb this $20,000,000 before the year is out, but probably two or three times that amount.

I sincerely trust that this amendment will be adopted and that we will not give this great rural-electrification program a death blow at this time. As I said, every farmer in America who has electricity in his home is wild about it and the ones who do not have it are praying for it. They are appealing to you and to me and to everyone else in authority to help them get it.

I trust that this amendment will be adopted and we will not give this rural electrification program a death blow at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is not more interested in the matter of providing sufficient funds for the use of the Rural Electrification Administration than I am. That, I think, is evidenced by the fact that the pending bill, before the point of order was submitted, carried funds in the amount of $20,000,000, through the method of the procurement of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since that kind of provision, although carried in the bill for other years, has been stricken this year on a point of order, the Rules Committee having granted no rule under which this portion of the bill could be considered, the gentleman now desires to substitute for the loan provision a direct appropriation from the United States Treasury. I do not think this amendment is in the interest of the R. E. A. I think if you will let this bill pass without the loan provisions, the Senate will undoubtedly restore the amount of the loans as provided in the House bill when it was originally reported to the House, a provision which was supported unanimously by the subcommittee, and then after that is done the parliamentary situation will be such that the House can and undoubtedly will promptly agree to the Senate language, which at this time it cannot do under our rules, and therefore and thereby the funds necessary for the continuance of the administration of R. E. A. and for the objectives contemplated by the act under which it was created, will be achieved.

I pointed out at the time I submitted the bill to the House that on account of the lack of strategic materials for construction the R. E. A. has not been able to function as we could have wished during this year and that out of $30,000,000 made available in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1943 only a little over $3,000,000 had been obligated as of some date in January of this year, and no matter how much money we might undertake to provide in order that it shall be used for the R. E. A. program it is extremely doubtful that they will be able to enlarge their operations to any considerable extent until after this war is over.

I think it is foolish to provide more money than they can properly and wisely spend. It is all right I think to have a loan authorization of $20,000,000; then they can go to the R. F. C. and if they can show justification for it they can secure loans in whatever amount they need, whether it be for $3,000,000, whether it be for $5,000,000, or whether it be for $10,000,000, and thus be allowed to operate to the fullest extent possible; but if the gentleman's amendment is adopted we are going to appropriate $20,000,000 out of the Treasury.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. TARVER. Without regard to whether they are going to be able to use it or not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that this provides for loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5. If they do not lend it, it does not cost anything. This is the one way to keep from shutting the door of hope in the face of the farmer for the next year so far as rural electrification is concerned.

Mr. TARVER. No; it is not; the door of hope is not going to be shut in his face. On the contrary this money is going to be provided, but it ought not to be provided in the way the gentleman wants to provide it.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that we should not

depend on the Senate's doing what the House should do.

Mr. TARVER. I think the Committee on Rules should have provided a rule and the House should have adopted it, waiving points of order against this project, and there would be no argument about it, but they did not do that and that is a matter beyond the control of the gentleman from Mississippi or myself. I think the gentleman, however, will find that provisions will have been made in this bill before it is finally enacted into law for the continuance in a reasonable way of the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration but I do not think that provision ought to be made in the manner which the gentleman suggests by his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN: Insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That these loans shall be exclusively for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman offers this amendment as a proviso at the conclusion of the Rankin amendment?

Mr. BOREN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it undertakes to change existing law.

Mr. RANKIN. It is to diminish.

Mr. TARVER. I understand that the purpose of the gentleman is to restrict certain contemplated operations of the Rural Electrification Administration in its acquisition of existing power lines and that the amendment is offered with the idea that the acquisition of such lines will be prohibited. The hearings on the bill however, which I think should be considered by the Chair in ruling on this point of order, disclose an opinion of the Comptroller General in which according to his judgment it is indicated that the acquisition of such lines when it is done in connection with a project extending the service to unserved persons within rural areas is within the purview of existing law. Assuming that the Comptroller General is correct in his opinion, the gentleman seeks by his amendment to restrict the operations of th corporation, to curtail them within narrower limits than have been prescribed by existing law and to that extent to change existing law, giving to them authorization for carrying on certain types of activities. It is legislative in character, and while I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I do not think whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is adopted or not that this amendment ought to be considered or can be considered under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOREN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman on the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in my judgment, restricts this particular appropriation and is definitely a limitation on the use generally of the appropriation that is to be made in this particular item.

The opinion of the Comptroller General of the United States referred to by the gentleman from Georgia does not undertake to deal at all with the legal issues involved here. The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi contained the phrase "and purchases of facilities", which indicates that this money might be used for the purchase of facilities already established and serving even urban areas. The original purpose of Congress in passing the Rural Electrification Act as defined in sections 3, 4, and 5 and the paragraphs referred to is for the construction and operation of lines to rural areas to serve people not already served by central power stations. The language of my amendment appears in the law that established the Rural Electrification Authority in at least four different places.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in the following words:

Provided, That these loans shall be exclusively for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service.

The Chair is unable to see where there is any limitation in the language used and concludes it is legislation, therefore sustains the point of order.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 82, line 10, and page 83, line 4, after the word "reports" in line 10, page 82, strike out "$2,258,000" and insert "$2,477,510", and after the word "Administration" in line 4, page 83, strike out "$2,258,000" and insert "$2,477,510."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The amendment comes too late. The paragraph to which it is offered has been read, and we have passed on to a subsequent paragraph.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are reading this bill, as I understand it, by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] desire to be heard?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I desire to be heard on the point of order. That item is included in both sections and in order to include it I had to wait until the last section was read, so I am offering it to both sections of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be recognized to offer an amendment to the section on page 83 beginning with line 4, because that paragraph has not been reached, or that section has not been reached.

The point of order is made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that the amendment on line 10, page 82, comes too late inasmuch as a succeeding paragraph has been read and debated. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as to line 4 on page 83.

The CHAIRMAN. As indicated a few moments ago, the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman until that paragraph is read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, $2,258,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The changing of the total would not in any way affect the amount made available for salaries and expenses for the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia——

Mr. TARVER. I am not propounding a parliamentary inquiry to the gentleman. I am propounding it to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. RANKIN. No, I did not yield for that purpose at all. If he wants to talk to anybody let him talk to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman submits a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the Chair whether or not if the Committee of the Whole should change the amount stated as the total for the two items of appropriations, its action in so doing would in any way affect the amount of the appropriations.

Mr. RANKIN. I will try to answer that.

Mr. TARVER. I did not propound the question to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] but to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

In response to the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] the Chair is inclined to think that the inquiry is really in the nature of a construction of the law in the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to recommend to the gentleman from Georgia the same storm cellar he was trying to dive into a while ago. That is the Senate of the United States. If

this amount is put in here, I am definitely sure that the Senate he was relying on a while ago to correct his own mistake will certainly correct his error in making the point of order against the first part of my amendment a while ago.

Here is the reason for this point of order. On March 3, 1943, the Rural Electrification Administration had 734 employees, and I want you to listen to this. The Budget has ordered a cut throughout many Government agencies and has ordered the R. E. A. to cut to 720 by its circular No. 408, under authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress. If the item is permitted to stand at $2,258,000, as the committee reported it, this will mean that 81 more of the R. E. A. employees will have to be released.

I submit that the R. E. A. has not been built into a bureaucracy. There has never been an agency of this Government since I have been here that has rendered so great a service for the number of men it had on the pay roll. The Bureau of the Budget has found that 720 is the smallest number of employees with which the R. E. A. can properly function, yet in order to retain this figure of 720 employees it is necessary that this item be raised by the $219,510 that I have provided in this amendment. The Budget itself recommended that they be not cut below 720 and unless this amendment is adopted, 81 more employees of the Rural Electrification Administration will go off the roll. I submit this is no time to be crippling that great organization that is rendering such a wonderful service to the farmers of this country.

Mr. COOLEY Does not the gentleman believe the administration would of its own accord cut these employees out if they were not needed and necessary at this time?

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely.

May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina, that if I found, or if I thought, that the Rural Electrification Administration had a lot of surplus pay-roll riders on its pay roll I would be the first man to demand that they get rid of them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many employees does this provide for?

Mr. RANKIN. It will restore the 81 that will be cut off.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean the appropriation in the bill, $2,258,000.

Mr. RANKIN. It would be 81 from 720, or 639. The Bureau of the Budget has said that 720 is the smallest number they ought to have.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for the 720?

Mr. RANKIN. The bill would make it 639; but my amendment raises it back to 720, to which the Bureau of the Budget said they are entitled.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does the gentleman contemplate restoring the employees whom the Budget Director ordered separated under Public, 821?

Mr. RANKIN. No. These are the ones the Bureau of the Budget did not order separated. The Bureau of the Budget said they ought to have 720 employees, and this bill will cut them down to 81 below that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is not proposing to abrogate the order of the Budget under Public, 821?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I am really complying with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in this amendment. If the gentleman from Georgia would withdraw his point of order, then I would make this apply to the other section. But I say that this ought to be adopted. Then if there is any straightening out to do, the Senate of the United States will do it unless we can do it when we go back into the House. So I submit that this amendment ought to be adopted, along with the one we adopted a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair is informed that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi has not yet been reported. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 83, line 4, after "Administration", strike out "$2,258,000" and insert "$2,477,510."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: In lieu of the amount in line 4 and in lieu of the amount offered by Mr. RANKIN as an amendment thereto, insert "$22,258,000."

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The Clerk misread my amendment a while ago. Mine should be "$22,478,000", instead of "two million." He misread it. I should like to have that corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is informed that the language the Clerk read is the language that was sent up to the desk by him. If there was a mistake, it was not the mistake of the Clerk.

Mr. RANKIN. I ask that that be corrected.

Mr. TARVER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi offered an amendment which would have provided that the total available for the Rural Electrification Administration, of which he is so fond, would be some $2,000,000 plus, when as a matter of fact we have already provided in the bill in accepting his amendment a total of $22,258,000. In view of the action taken by the committee, I want to register my objection to reducing the total of that appropriation to two millions some-odd-thousand dollars as proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi.

We all know that as a matter of fact whenever an appropriation bill is passed the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct totals. There is no necessity for amending any total because whatever action is taken by the Committee of the Whole with reference to the items in an appropriation will necessarily be reflected in the total, and changing the total and having it state an incorrect amount in no way affects the amounts of money carried in the items of appropriation themselves. My amendment is not necessary here, but if you adopt any amendment at all you ought to adopt the one I offered, because it correctly states the sum total of the two items of appropriation for which you have provided.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment. I take this time only to keep the record straight. This is one of the items on which we had the benefit of the experience and the work of the investigators under the direction of the subcommittee. I shall lay out to you very briefly the recommendations that were contained in that report, and I have the report before me.

In the first place, they said that no new personnel was needed, and that it would occasion savings of $150,000. They said there could be a proportionate reduction in other expenditures, saving another $50,000.

Those are the investigators, experienced men hired by the Congress, reporting to us as a subcommittee and to the full committee. The report came to us through the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

In addition, the investigators indicated that the officials of R. E. A. had manifested to them that they proposed to reduce their staff. That is not me speaking; it is the investigators speaking who went down and talked to the Civil Service Commission. They indicated, also, there could be a consolidation of some contact activities on the cooperatives that would save another $50,000. That is not me talking; it is the investigators who went to St. Louis and talked with the R. E. A. officials there and came back and made their report.

The investigators also found that if the acquisition program were curtailed you could save another 25 percent.

They also found that there were 45 in the so-called applications and loans division who were working on the scrap-metal drive. These 45 were on the pay roll of R. E. A. but were working on the scrap drive. They got their salaries from R. E. A. but got their travel expenses from the War Production Board. If they are not doing that work, they should be on somebody else's pay roll. They found also that 12 engineers of R. E. A. had been transferred to and were working on the Alaska Highway. Also, they found an additional number on the R. E. A. personnel had been transferred to the Bureau of Home Economics, and one was transferred to the White House. The committee summarizes this

list and said in view of these transfers, these folks working elsewhere, obviously they should be put on those pay rolls, and altogether effect an economy of $420,000 to $425,000. There is no guesswork about the conclusions of the committee. They arrived at it scientifically, on the basis of testimony that was offered, and may I say that it is not going to handicap these activities in any respect. If it did, the subcommittee certainly would not have taken that action.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is the report of these investigations to be found in the hearings?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it came in to us too late to be incorporated in the hearings.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then we may be assured that the special committee report of this special investigating committee of the Committee on Appropriations will be made available to the Members of the House so that they may know the result.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that it will, and I may say it should be incorporated now, except that it came a little too late to get into the hearings.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, a number of the employees of this Administration have been reduced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The committee found that they were employed in other services of the Government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Twelve of their engineers had been transferred to the Alaska Highway and 45 other personnel were engaged on the metal-scrap drive, and some others reported that the chief of that particular section was trying to find some work to keep him busy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Many of us are very much interested in the work of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am also. I want the R. E. A. program to go forward and want it administered as efficiently as possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is the gentleman sure that ample funds are granted to carry this work forward?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am satisfied.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand that there were 45 Rural Electrification engineers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Twelve have been transferred to the Signal Corps, on the Alaska Highway, and 45 other personnel had been working on the scrap-metal drive from September 1, 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They were not engineers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment to the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Georgia, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as an amendment to the substitute of Mr. TARVER: Strike out "$22,258,000" and insert "$22,478,510."

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 34, noes 89.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and the substitute was agreed to

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi as amended by the substitute of the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration in the District of Columbia and the field, including printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority attending meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $750 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by personal service without regard to the provisions of any other act; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; garage rental in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration; employment of persons, firms, and others for the performance of special services, including legal services; necessary administrative expenses in connection with the making of loans under the provisions of the act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i-1020n, 1020o), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans made under the provisions of said act and similar acts administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating to loans for crop production, feed, seed, and harvesting; examination of corporations, banks, associations, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided*, That the requirement (12 U. S. C. 952) that Federal land banks and joint stock land banks shall be examined at least twice each year is hereby modified so that such examinations need be made only once each year: *Provided further*, That the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657) shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for the fiscal year 1944 and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said administration shall determine, and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30, 1944, said administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year 1944 to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during the fiscal year 1944 of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto; in all, $689,259, together with not to exceed $3,938,561 from the funds made available to the Farm Credit Administration pursuant to the act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i-1020n, 1020o).

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language beginning with the word "proviso", line 15, page 84, continuing on down to and including the word "thereto" in line 4, page 86, is legislation not authorized by law on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this only for the purpose of advising the House what the effect of some of these actions is. The total appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration will be about $7,852,408. The several amounts are for the purpose of examining and supervising the various in-

stitutions on a proportionate basis which is made up as follows: To be obtained from assessments of the cost of supervision of banks for cooperatives, $308,716; from assessment from the cost of supervision of Federal land banks, $886,794; from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for supervision of each agriculture credit corporation, $63,897; assessments for cost of supervision of Federal intermediate credit banks, $223,512; from assessments from the cost of supervision of production-credit corporations, $280,441; assessment for examination of banks for cooperators, and so forth, $268,500, and from the general fund from the Treasury, $689,259.

Of course, the effect of the point of order which was made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], which is good, because it is legislation, is that this method of assessment and of supervision which has been developed by the Farm Credit Administration cannot be carried on without additional legal authority.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I simply want to say that we have a Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives which is in session a good part of the time. If the Farm Credit Administration desires to carry out this procedure and will come before that committee, I am sure they will be given a careful hearing.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans: For loans to farmers under the act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i-1020n, 10. o), as amended by the acts of February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 26), June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 939), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C. 1020n-1), and July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 444), and July 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 700-701), $4,907,273, together with the unobligated balance (exclusive of the amount of such balance made available for "Salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration, 1944") of the appropriation "Crop production and harvesting loans" as made in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937 (50 Stat. 8, 11), and as continued available by the acts of February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 26), June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 939), June 25, 1940 (12 U. S. C., 1020n-1), July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 444), and July 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 700-701), together with all collections of principal and interest on loans heretofore or hereafter made under said act of January 29, 1937 (12 U. S. C. 1020i-1020n, 1020o); *Provided*, That no employee of the United States on whose certificate or approval loans under said act of January 29, 1937, as amended, or other acts of the same general character, are or have been made, shall be held personally liable for any loss or deficiency occasioned by the fraud or misrepresentation of applicants or borrowers, if the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration shall determine that such employee has exercised reasonable care in the circumstances, and has complied with the regulations of the Farm Credit Administration in executing such certificate or giving such approval. Notwithstanding any such determination by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, this provision shall not be construed to prevent any criminal process against any person who was a party to or had guilty knowledge of such fraud or misrepresentation.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULMER. I make the point of order against the language on page 87, beginning with line 1, down to and including line 16, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of making a few remarks at this point with reference to the Farm Credit Administration.

Of course we know in this House that an effort has been made to transfer the functions of the Farm Security Administration over to the Farm Credit Administration.

I notice the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has left the floor. I trust someone will ask him to return, because I want to say something about what the gentleman from Illinois said on the floor last Wednesday when he made reference to the transfer of these functions to the Extension Service and to the Farm Credit Administration.

I know the director of the Extension Service in my State. He is a very close friend of mine. He was reared in my district. His people live and vote there and are my good friends. He has never said a word to me about the transfer of Farm Security to the Extension Service, but I was interested in this question from the standpoint of the Extension Service, so I addressed an inquiry to Dr. M. L. Wilson, Director of the Extension Service in Washington, Department of Agriculture, as to what he thought about the transfer of this function to the Extension Service.

I want to read his letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1943.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: In reply to your inquiry regarding my attitude toward the rehabilitation work of the Farm Security Administration, I beg to state that the Extension Service is a cooperative service composed of the Federal Extension Service, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State extension service of the land-grant college in each State. In the State it is administered by an extension director who is cooperatively employed by the United States Department of Agriculture and the State land-grant college. In answer to your inquiry, therefore, I should have to express my personal opinion and not that of the 48 extension directors.

My position has not changed since I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee last spring, at which time Senator RUSSELL asked me: "From your observation, then, you conclude there was more cooperation than there was duplication of effort; * * * I asked the question because it has been intimated—not only intimated but stated that there was tremendous duplication and overlapping in the fields and activities of the county extension agents and the farm security agents."

In reply to this question, I stated: "I see the extension program as being the over-all educational program. It touches all farmers in the county. It has the entire program for agricultural betterment of the county. And then for those low-income people who have the rehabilitation loans, I feel that they need this individual help month by month. That work is done much better if it is tied in with the loans. The farm security agents supervise the rehabilitation loans and other part of the work that is connected with them. There is no duplication. The two support each other. They get along very well." (See Senate Hearing on Agricultural Appropriation Bill for 1943, pp. 961-963.)

This continues to represent my personal views. There should be, and is in many States, a very close tie-in between the Extension Service and the Farm Security Administration in the wartime agricultural program in the county.

Sincerely,

M. L. WILSON.
Director of Extension Work.

I was interested in the statement that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made with reference to the transfer of the farm security functions to the Farm Credit Administration. The gentleman read a question taken from page 1308 of the hearings, but the gentleman only read a part of the question and said it related to the transfer of the Farm Security Administration functions. I will ask every Member to turn to pages 1308 and 1309 of the hearings and read the questions propounded to Mr. Black and his answers. You will see that the answer that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted did have something to do with the Farm Security Administration, but only to the debt adjustment service. It was so limited in the question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Furthermore, I submit that a careful reading, almost a casual reading of those questions and answers, will show to you that Mr. Black was arguing that the Farm Credit Administration set-up was not sufficient and was not organized along proper lines to handle the Farm Security Administration functions. You can see very easily what his thinking is with reference to this transfer of functions.

I believe in all fairness we should read that testimony before reaching a conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph end in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. How is the 5 minutes to be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. Between the four gentlemen standing, as best the Chair can apportion it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from California

such time as may have been allotted to me.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to follow up what the gentleman from Illinois told us awhile ago and to point out what the effect of some provisions of this bill will be. This bill proposes to put the program of making rehabilitation loans to one-half of the farmers of America who are the small farm operators of this Nation and which are made in order to enable these farmers to increase their food production into an agency that has never carried on such a program and has had no experience with it.

Furthermore, it is proposed to cut the program to about 40 percent of the Budget figure. Such action will render it virtually impossible for the program to be carried out, as we well know. The proposal of the committee will furthermore mean attempting to merge a cooperative credit structure including the production credit associations and the land banks which are supposed to constitute a sound credit system cooperatively owned by the farm borrowers therefrom with the program now conducted by Farm Security, a program of granting rehabilitation loans to that group of farmers who cannot manage to get credit anywhere else. If I had a little more than a minute and a quarter I could give you once again the record of increased production of food brought about by this group of farmers who have borrowed from Farm Security. I could show you that they are 91 percent current on their loans; I could show you that their children who once did not have a chance to go to school are in the most part back in schools; I could show you that these people have been given a chance in life and they are the kind of folks I believe America stands for giving a chance in life.

I regret exceedingly to see this program scuttled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall manifestly have to be content with some very brief observations. The first one is this: In addition to what appears in the record about transferring Farm Security to the Farm Credit Administration I talked to Mr. Black on the telephone when he returned from Kansas City to Washington. He has his regular headquarters in Kansas City. He supplemented the statement he made in the record to the effect that they can discharge these functions in farm credit.

Point No. 2 is this: Must we have two, three, or four credit agencies? Why not put them all under a single head where they belong, because the coordination and integration of agricultural credit will certainly be more efficacious.

Point No. 3 is this: We did not destroy the functions of Farm Security and those who believe we did should look at the context of the bill. Rural rehabilitation loans have been reduced; we have scaled them down from $97,500,000 to $40,000,000. The administrative funds have been reduced. We cut them down from $36,000,000 to $12,000,000. We earmarked $8,000,000 for the Extension Service. With respect to the report read from Mr. Wilson a moment ago, if I were Mr. Wilson and I were in the Department of Agriculture, I would probably have written the same kind of letter.

Must I remind you that in 1937 we set up emergency crop seed and feed loans within Farm Credit? They did not want that function either because certainly it is not the most desirable thing to administer, and I can understand that they do not always want those things that involve that kind of an operation. It may be an undesirable function, but it is not for Mr. Wilson to say, it is not for Mr. Wickard to say; it is for the Congress to determine whether there shall be a consolidation of these credit functions in one agency for the purpose of economy, of efficiency, and better coordination of the whole farm-credit function that is necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. With regard to the Farm Tenant Purchase Act known as the Bankhead-Jones law may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Congress has created and designated a corporation to administer that act and gave the corporation the name of the Farmers' Home Corporation and it had never been permitted to function. I am wondering why the gentleman's committee did not come to the rescue of that creation of the Congress, to wit, that corporation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that notwithstanding the fact that it was created in the act of 1936 the Secretary of Agriculture has never set up that corporation but preferred to operate under the Farm Security Administration which exists by Executive order.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LOANS AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and production credit associations, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere, through making and servicing of loans under this and prior law, $12,000,000, of which $8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the States to provide such farm and home management assistance as may be necessary to borrowers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for these purposes shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional offices.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 87, line 17, insert the following:

"Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation, Department of Agriculture: To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including (1) farm-debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior law; (2) loans; (3) grants; (4) the prosecution of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration on July 1, 1941; and (5) projects involving provision of water facilities, including such facilities authorized by the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), $36,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration), without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of law-books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding.

"In making any grant payments under this act the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000. Such advances shall be made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal

and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

"None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ('Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation') shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500."

Mr. VOORHIS of California (interrupting reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I could save the House time by saying that this amendment is the exact language of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration included in the bill for last year, with the exception it includes water facilities and some other things; otherwise it is the exact language of last year's bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in lieu of further reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that will not preclude offering a point of order against it?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the gentleman from New York has permitted the gentleman from California to discuss his amendment and that a point of order does not lie.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the Chair may say that the granting of the gentleman's request for printing of the amendment at this point in the RECORD would not preclude him from making a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Does the Chair also intend to hold that after the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has made his speech and explained his amendment that presentation of a point of order does not now preclude the submission of a point of order against his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] addressed the committee with regard to the meaning of the amendment which he had submitted. There has been discussion on the amendment and it is now too late for the gentleman from New York to submit a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the point of order, the Chair may say that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] secured unanimous consent during the reading of an amendment that he was recognized to offer.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman did not ask unanimous consent to do anything until after he had explained his amendment. Then he submitted a unanimous consent request but before he submitted the request he had discussed the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order stage had not been reached at the time the gentleman made the statement. The point of order of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is overruled.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that his amendment be printed in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill and that the activity and the appropriation of the funds for the purposes indicated has not been authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, to thank the gentleman from Georgia very much for his kind intercession. On my part, I concede the point of order and may I say that I regret very sincerely an important program of this kind has to go down this way.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I conceded the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. The gentleman from California concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loan fund: For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $40,000,000. Such advances shall be made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph just read that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to the paragraph is conceded by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I understood the point of order of the gentleman from New York was directed at all of the language after and including line 11, on page 88, through line 17, page 89. If it was not so directed, then certainly a point of order should now be made against the paragraph beginning with line 11, on page 89, and ending with line 17, because that paragraph would be without meaning left in the bill at the place in which it is located.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph was not included in the point of order and could not be included because it had not then been read. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to submit a point of order against the paragraph?

Mr. TARVER. I am not in a position to make a point of order against anything contained in the bill. I am simply calling attention to it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I frankly doubt the correctness of a point of order made against that paragraph, therefore, I shall not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, at a time when word comes to us of the extreme peril of General MacArthur in the South Pacific, it seems almost trivial to be discussing anything here in Congress except the dire need for the expending of every effort here at home to supply him with the sinews of war. Yet, in the broader sense, this whole war is being fought to sustain and make possible an industrious

and productive America for the future. We are passing on far-reaching policies that will directly affect that period. In the main I am wholeheartedly in agreement with both the spirit and the word of the heroic objectives which this subcommittee now proposes. They would simplify and thereby make more effective the whole domestic-farm program. Certainly we do not want our boys to come home to an America where the Government has become greater than the people. Our Department of Agriculture has grown like a vine, its size out of all proportion to its ability to serve the American farmer. There is a danger there. We are fighting a war on the general theme that peoples are the greater, and that governments are created by them and subservient to them.

In this portion of the bill we deal with farm credit. While most of us are completely concerned with the use of credit for purposes of immediate production, I hope that we do not lose sight of the need for a wiser, broader, simpler farm credit policy for our Nation in the future. For 20 years our farmers found their sources of credit dried up and had to look to extraordinary sources for their credit. Now, almost overnight, the farmer has become a good credit risk. There are those who want to supply his credit needs.

Now I am a farmer. I have always used private credit. There is something in my breeding that makes me resist subsidies—I have never accepted any. I trust that my opinions may be considered as unbiased, therefore, and sincere.

Our task is to develop a source of credit that will protect our productive farmers through foul weather as well as fair. No one proposes the abandonment of the existing Government credit sources for either industry, the banks, or agriculture, hence our problem is simply one of developing a sound policy. A credit policy adaptable to the local conditions in each of the 48 States, a credit policy that will assure production in this great area of free trade and—may we hope—free markets. No one denies but that the score or so of Government agencies now serving agriculture can be combined into fewer agencies. Our task then is to take stock of the farm credit experience of the past 20 years.

What have we learned from the impacts of the First World War on American agriculture? We have heard much of the ridiculous and the suicidal things that have been done in the name of farm credit. There have also been the sound, the eternal, and even the miraculous done in the name of farm credit. Shall we deny them also?

I am not criticizing the subcommittee. They had no way to find out the real grass roots truth. All that they could do was to call in the men, here in Washington, who head the credit agencies. That was all, and on the impressions left they had to appropriate and determine the destiny of programs, good or bad, according to the testimony, according to the human statements and more human reactions occurring in those hearings. And so they brought in this bill. In the main a good bill, a heroic bill, and yet, a war bill, bursting like a blockbuster among us.

Now I have seen something good in the nature of a farm credit policy grow in my own district. Like Phoenix, it grew from the ashes of frustration and dismal failure; it grew from 10 years of struggling with every form of the alphabet and every type of agricultural credit—some fair and some terrible. We had all of the score and perhaps more of agencies that grew upon the farm credit structure like twigs upon an unpruned tree and, as we attempted to cure cancer with mustard plasters, naturally our farmers were not benefited. They dived further into debt because of the burdens of long haul transportation and increased production costs. They were more often impeded than assisted by bureaucracy designed to save them.

Believe it or not, the cost of some of so-called Government credit rose as high as 27 percent in some cases, that is, the various deductions and limitations placed upon the hiring of that money, in addition to interest, made the total deductions that high and the available and usable monies left for my neighbors was reduced that much.

In the face of all this my neighbors, living upon some of the most productive land in the United States, faced elimination as productive followers of the established doctrine of American enterprise and individual initiative. Then, in the spring of 1940, their condition was such that private credit could not serve them with safety to itself. They were isolated, economically, and the President declared that district a distress area. The Department of Agriculture was called upon to study the whole situation. An attitude was taken looking toward a credit policy based, not upon scarcity and controlled crops, but upon increased production. We said that sound loans could only be made to truly productive enterprise. We also said that the security of the individual farmers in any given agricultural community was only part of the collateral upon which credit was extended.

The local bankers (in the main they support this farm credit policy), the local merchants, the utilities, the local editor, the local professional man, labor, supply dealers—all these had a contingent interest in the credit extended in a broad sense to any individual. I believe this fact valid with any enterprise in any section. It is the golden rule of credit risk. While only the farmer signs the note out there, everyone knows that the inability of the farmers to pay back borrowed money is a threat, not only to him as an individual, but to all those who are privileged to live in the community made possible because of the new wealth which he produces.

A threat to his security is a threat to the security of all. Last year they made $8,000,000 worth of loans without loss; they also built up a credit fund looking toward a self-reliant future. In the end, credit must be predicated upon productiveness. The credit of a community or nation rests upon the protection of its fertility and productivity. I firmly believe that the people I represent have a contribution to make toward a sound credit policy for this Nation's agriculture. They should be permitted to make it in their own way at this time.

In a way, they want to repay more than the aid we gave them. I believe that this, as well as other types of farm credit should be investigated, criticized, and studied by, preferably, a subcommittee from the Committee on Agriculture. And I have introduced a resolution to do just that. That subcommittee should go out among the people and see how they live and how they use and respect their credit. They should go to my district and to your district, and everywhere that programs involving farm credit are in operation.

No program should be destroyed by indirection nor by temple-feuds, nor should it be destroyed until it has been thoroughly investigated and its virtues either accepted or found wanting. The future need for real credit security for American agriculture demands that we have an intelligent and well understood farm credit policy. For as sure as the sun comes up tomorrow, as sure as the grass will grow green upon the hills next month, the American farmer will pass out of this crisis of manpower and machinery into a world-wide crisis of competitive economies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 89, lines 11 to 17, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of getting rid of some language in the bill that at the present time means nothing. I hope the committee will accept it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The language by itself, alone, in my judgment, does not mean anything, but I do not believe the House would like to pass a bill containing an expression of this sort in the middle of the bill not related to any language in the context; so I can see no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I take this time for the purpose of discussing the next section to be read, which is on farm tenancy. I have in days gone by called the attention of the House to numerous activities on the part of Farm Security Administration which were not authorized by law. I have brought to the attention of the House numerous accusations and criticisms which have been leveled at that agency of the Government; more than a year ago I sought an investigation of the Farm Security Administration, not for the purpose of destroying the worth-while activities of that organization but for the purpose of separating the good from the bad and for the purpose of trying to force the administrators to comply with the wishes of Congress regarding the program it was administering. That investigation was

delayed until recently, and recently an investigation has been authorized. I know that in the conduct of that investigation it will be the purpose of the committee to determine how far afield the agency has gone, and to make recommendations to this House regarding the activities which have been authorized to be administered by that agency.

The section which will next be read is subject to a point of order, all except lines 9, 10, and 11, which provide $30,000,000 for the purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Tenancy Purchase Act. The law already authorizes the use of 5 percent of such funds for administrative purposes, and I expect to make a point of order against all of the legislation in the next section for the reason that I think the Committee on Appropriations has taken unto itself the power to legislate for this agency, and has sought to transfer its activities to the Farm Credit Administration. I happen to know that in years gone by Governor Myer, of the Farm Credit Administration, wanted to have no part of the Farm Security Administration for the reason that he was afraid that it would impair the financial integrity of the Farm Credit Administration, which had to sell its debentures on the open market. He did not want to be accused of conducting a relief agency or any agency which smacked of relief as the Farm Security Administration did at that time. I have reason to believe that Governor Black, the present Governor, does not want the responsibility of administering this law, and I do not believe the Farm Credit Administration at this time is equipped to do the necessary supervising in connection with the loans to be made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection I would like to read what Governor Black said when he was asked that question:

> We have never had in our organization funds sufficient to give the type of supervision which is necessary in connection with some of the types of loans they made.

He further said that they did not have the organization.

Mr. COOLEY. In connection with this provision next to be read, they only provide $500,000 to supervise the loans which have accumulated through the years, and my guess is that they have now $200,000,000 worth of loans in all of the counties and townships and communities of this Nation. So that this is definitely an effort on the part of the committee to legislate this activity out of existence. The provision for the appropriation in lines 9 to 11 the committee has the right to make, and I hope that that will be permitted to remain in the bill. The effect of this action would be that the Farm Security Administration would remain intact, and remain in charge of the Tenant Purchase Act for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and to reduce and retrench expenditures, said act shall be administered by the Secretary through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation of the Farm Credit Administration and by utilizing through cooperative agreements the personnel and facilities of the Federal land banks and the national farm-loan associations, $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of this act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provision of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph for the reason that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman point out what particular parts he feels are legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. The entire section, from line 19, on page 89, down to and including line 8, on page 90.

Mr. TARVER. So far as the section requires the Secretary to carry out the duties to which reference is made in the paragraph through the Federal Farm Mortgage Administration, of the Farm Credit Administration, and to utilize the personnel and facilities of the Federal land banks, it is legislation, and the committee at the proper time will offer an amendment which will be in conformity with the rules. We concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order to the paragraph is conceded and is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. The point of order is that the paragraph contains legislation in an appropriation bill, particularly the language which provides that a sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and the further language which authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan such sums to the Secretary; and the further language that authorizes an increase in the issue of outstanding obligations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman making a point of order against the entire paragraph?

Mr. CASE. I am making a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. COOLEY. I wonder if the gentleman would not amend his point of order so as to make it applicable to everything after the comma in line 11, so as to save the appropriation contained in lines 9, 10, and 11 which are authorized by law?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota makes a point of order against the paragraph. The point of order is conceded by the committee and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration, to carry out the provisions of section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1014–1029), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said act, $421,039.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that the paragraph is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the paragraph relative to the secretary being required to act through the Farm Credit Administration is subject to a point of order. The paragraph will be reoffered without the offending language, but for the present the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas is conceded, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Farm Credit Administration, $18,517,571.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment for insertion immediately following line 11, on page 93.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 93, after line 11, insert:

"FARM TENANCY

"Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act, and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered in order that administrative funds may be made available for the continuance of the work of protecting the investment which the Government has in farm-tenancy land-purchase loans, approximately $195,000,000. If we fail to provide any administrative funds for the administration, under this heading, then no one would be charged with the responsibility of collecting from the borrowers and looking after the interest of the Government in connection with such collections.

Of course, we cannot anticipate what may be done in the Senate. It may be necessary to further consider this item, but whether anything is inserted for farm-tenant loans in the Senate or not, certainly an amount for administrative expenses should be provided.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman state to the House that in his opinion $500,000 is a sufficient amount to properly supervise and look after the collection of these loans?

Mr. TARVER. I regret that I do not have sufficient information upon which to base an intelligent answer to the gentleman's question. The budget estimated $1,300,000, plus, for administrative expenses for this program. It is proposed to leave out of the program, as far as the present action of the House is concerned, the making of any additional farm tenant loans. I certainly feel that an adequate amount should be carried in the bill to take care of the collecting of loans already made and protection of the interests of the Government in those loans. I cannot say to the gentleman that $500,000 is the exact amount of money which will be necessary for the purpose, for the question of how much money would be necessary for that purpose alone was not investigated by our subcommittee.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the basic law provide that 5 percent should be made available for administrative purposes?

Mr. TARVER. Not exceeding 5 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the gentleman state to the House that somewhere in the neighborhood of $200,000,000 of loans were not outstanding?

Mr. TARVER. I think the amount is $195,000,000, plus.

Mr. COOLEY. Those loans are in practically every agricultural county in the United States. Is that not the fact?

Mr. TARVER. I think, if the gentleman will pardon me, if $1,300,000 was estimated by the departmental authorities with the approval of the Budget, as sufficient to carry on the larger program, involving the making of $30,000,000 additional loans, $500,000 might reasonably be expected to be sufficient to take care of the collection of loans. I do not think either the gentleman, or myself, or anyone else at the present time is in a position to say that that is the exact amount that will be necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. But I would like to call attention to the fact that on the point of order just made the rural rehabilitation loans which have heretofore amounted to approximately $90,000,000, have gone out of this bill. Now you still have an accumulation of rural rehabilitation loans plus the tenant purchase loans, aggregating in all about $190,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. But this item is not intended to take care of rural rehabilitation loans. I should suppose that in the other body, which is not bound by the rigid rules under which we function, some provision will be made for the collection of the $417,000,000 owing to the Government, whatever it may do about continuing F. S. A.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I want to correct a statement that was made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], that these loans are in every county. They are not. They are not in half of them.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman means the general-purpose loans?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is a fact that rural rehabilitation loans according to the evidence before the gentleman's committee have been made in every agricultural county in America.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I do not doubt it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an additional amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER to follow the amendment previously agreed to:

"LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

"To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. 1014–1029), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said act, $421,039."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this is the provision which was stricken on a point of order a few moments ago. The basis of the point of order was that as originally contained in the bill the language required the Secretary to act through the agency of the Farm Credit Administration.

The identical amount of money provided in the language of the original provision of the bill is provided in the amendment and I desire to say in this connection that in the opinion of the subcommittee no excuse exists for longer delay in the liquidation of these so-called resettlement projects. I feel, while I am interested in the work of the Farm Security Administration and I think a great deal of the work has been of value especially to low-income farmers in the United States, that the authorities of the Farm Security Administration have been acting in defiance of the mandate of Congress with regard to the liquidation of the so-called cooperative projects, which they state, however, involves only 15 of the 151 projects they have. Even if the Farm Security Administration had been continued by action of Congress or may yet be continued there ought, nevertheless, to be a positive and mandatory direction to whatever authorities may have further charge of the program that the resettlement projects in toto should be sold, should be liquidated, and the interest of the Government in those projects absolutely and entirely washed out. I believe that the Farm Security Administration if it should be continued or whatever organization of government may be vested with authority to continue its work will do a far better job and a job far more satisfactory to the American people if it abandons these experimentations which in my judgment do not have the approval of the people of this country.

I believe, however, that it is necessary to provide these funds that are carried in this amendment, $417,000 approximately for the work of liquidating those projects.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In fairness to the present Administrator of the Farm Security Administration I should like to observe that he inherited these projects from the old Resettlement Administration which was administered by Mr. Rexford Guy Tugwell. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that notwithstanding the fact that he did inherit the unpopularity of these projects that they have been very slow in complying with the wishes of Congress regarding an immediate liquidation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is my understanding that these have been and are being liquidated at the rate of 500 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department, or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs, or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department, or any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in, the making of loans under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended, or the making of loans or advances in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in food production financing bulletins F-1 or F-2 of the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loan Branch.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section just read on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the gentleman to elaborate on his point of order and point out what part of the section is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOPE. This section has for its apparent purpose a prohibition of further loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. There is no provision in this bill making an appropriation for this corporation. So the limitation on its face is against officials of the Department of Agriculture who might exercise supervisory functions over it and its activities.

The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations were created in 1932 under the Hoover administration. There were originally 12 corporations, 1 in each Federal land bank district. Later legislation was passed which authorized the consolidation of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations and the return of capital not needed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held as a revolving fund subject to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

In the meantime, and on March 27, 1933, an Executive order was issued which transferred the jurisdiction and control of the regional agricultural credit corporations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under whose jurisdiction they had originally been set up, to the Farm Credit Administration, and in that order the functions which were transferred were defined as follows:

The functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its board of directors relating to the appointment of officers and agents to manage regional agricultural credit corporations formed under section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932; relating to the establishment of rules and regulations for such management and relating to the approval of loans and advances made by such corporations and of the terms and conditions thereof.

Under that Executive order and under the law it is the duty and the function of the Farm Credit Administration to make rules and regulations to supervise the operations of the regional agricultural credit corporations and to approve loans made by them. I think it is generally recognized under the rules of the House that any language purporting to be a limitation which either imposes new duties upon a Government agency or prohibits it from performing the duties which have beer. assigned to it is not a limitation but is legislation.

In this particular case the Farm Credit Administration is prohibited or rather its officers are prohibited under the legislation from directing or authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, to make loans and perform the other functions that are imposed upon it by law. That being the case, it is apparent that the officials of the Farm Credit Administration will be unable to carry out their duties in supervising the operations of the corporation, in approving loans, and other duties which have been assigned to them.

It can very readily be determined that this is legislation, I think, by considering the interpretation which officials of the Farm Credit Administration will place upon our action if the section remains in the bill. Certainly they would understand it to mean that Congress no longer expected them to carry on the functions which under the law they are to exercise over the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. In other words they will conclude that Congress had changed its policy and has forbidden them to do what heretofore under the law they have been authorized and directed to do. That, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion very clearly constitutes legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to submit to the Chair the very purpose of the limitation is to prevent the expression of a certain task, function, or duty. It may never achieve that result, as a matter of fact, in substance, but that is its primary purpose. So I submit this is a very good limitation and quite within the rules and does not constitute legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order against section 2 which begins "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized to be expended shall be used," and so forth.

It is the view of the Chair this section is clearly a limitation, and if there are no funds provided in this section the limitation will be ineffective. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 93, line 12, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of striking out the provision intended to prevent the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation from making loans after next July 1. It, of course, would not affect the loans which are being made by that organization during this crop year prior to July 1.

I do not know how many members of the committee are familiar with the history of the regional agricultural credit corporations but they were established under the Hoover administration and actively functioned in making loans to farmers and livestock producers during the period from 1932 to 1934. Later when the need for these loans was no longer acute the corporations began a process of liquidation. Since 1934 the Corporation has not been active in making loans except those made out of the branch office at Wenatchee, Wash. These loans were made to fruit growers in that territory after all other credit agencies had withdrawn from the field. In the meantime Congress had passed legislation authorizing the merger of the district corporations and the return of capital not needed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation subject to the call of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

A few months ago the need for financing food production brought about a reopening of loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C. It is making two types of loans, both of which are of the character which banks and other financial institutions cannot make and are not making.

Both types of loans are under the food program. They are made to enable farmers to produce crops which are especially desired at this time, crops of which there is a shortage, crops which in many cases the particular farmers to whom the loans have been made have not been in the habit of producing.

These are nonrecourse loans. The banks will not make them. There are two kinds, the F-1 and the F-2 loans. In particular the F-2 loans are loans for which farmers can get credit from no other source. They are made to enable a farmer who is producing a new crop with which he is not familiar to get money with which to make his cash outlay. If it turns out, as it may, that his crop is not suitable for that section of the country, and is a failure, or a partial failure, the farmer is liable only to the extent of his production. No bank, no financial institution can make a loan of that kind. If they did, the bank examiners would close them up in a hurry. This organization is not competing with ordinary, accepted financial institutions.

Let me call your attention to the types of loans which are being made. At a recent meeting of the Montana State War Board it was stated that before these loans were announced plantings of

not to exceed 35,000 acres of dry beans were anticipated in the State, but that with the availability of these loans the acreage would be increased to at least 75,000 acres. Edible dry beans are one of the critical food materials. It was also stated that the flax acreage would be increased by at least 100,000 acres in that State as a result of these advances.

I submit that this time, when the country is facing a food crisis, is no time to take away from producers a source of credit which they can get in no other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can agree upon a limitation of debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that we are not going to be able to finish this bill before 7 o'clock. It seems to me it might be better for the Committee to rise.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know why we should not be able to get through before 7 o'clock. This is the last controversial paragraph of the bill, as I understand. As far as I know, there is no other amendment pending except the one that is to be offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, to strike out section 8. I want to observe the wishes of the House, of course, but I believe we can get out of Committee with this bill by 6 o'clock.

Mr. HORAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, in case this amendment is voted down I have an amendment, but I promise I will make the debate on it brief.

Mr. CURTIS. I have an amendment, too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. I think the Committee ought to rise.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in order to test the sentiment of the Committee, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to speak on this amendment?

Mr. HORAN. I have a proposed amendment of my own, in case this amendment is rejected, which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Washington to speak to his own amendment at this time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a little bit unorthodox. The late hour and the limitations on time certainly give me but little hope. If this amendment is voted down, I wish to submit an amendment, because my own town and my own district had the only R. A. C. C. program in the Nation until just recently. My amendment is so worded as to exclude that particular program from the restrictions of this section. Even the bankers generally favor the program in force out there. They are not for some of the other things going on now. I feel certain I may say that the banks endorse the program and the townspeople endorse it. I insist it is a program that is well worth the study of this body when they are seriously considering the formation of a sound credit policy. It is a community proposition. It is a sound program which made $8,000,000 worth of sound loans last year without loss. I hope to see it preserved irrespective to what happens to the Hope amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as usual, it is a case of where the facts simply have to prevail. This Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation was set up in 1932. There were no production credit corporations at that time, and there were no production credit associations. This came in the very depths of that 1932 depression. We did not have these other agencies at that time. Now we have them, and so it is proposed to supplement those agencies, making substantially the same kind of loans with this new set-up. Let me tell you what this will do, because the testimony is abundant. One can illustrate by example. If you want to expand your acreage of soybeans, and you need $500, you make application for the loan. The county war board will certify and say, "Here is John Jones, who is going to grow soybeans, and he wants $500." The loan is certified. You put in a crop and harvest it, and if you get $500 back out of the crop, you pay off your loan. If you get only $200 back out of your crop, you pay $200 on your loan, and Uncle Sam marks it paid, and the $300 is absorbed in the Treasury. That is what this is intended to do.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have only 3 minutes. I have no bias or prejudice in this thing one way or the other. I do not know that it substantially affects my area. I do not want you to be fooled as to what we are doing. The gentleman from Kansas said they are nonrecourse loans. That is right. They cannot be endorsed and sold unless the farmer should give his consent. That is one of the provisions, and if there is a loss, it will be taxed to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HOPE. The loans are to be made only for the production of food, and particularly the food for war purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right, but what about our production credit association which has loaned about $450,000,000 for general purposes?

Mr. CASE. Is it not for small loans on exactly the same basis as the Defense Plants Corporation is making loans on the basis of hundreds of millions of dollars for the projection of plants and the finding of minerals, and so forth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. But we have two instrumentalities making loans already. That is the essential difference.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All food pertains to the war, and what right have we to select one particular item and say to the farmer that we will make him a nonrecourse loan and let Uncle Sam pay the bill, while you want to make the other fellow pay his loss.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Judge Tarver conducted a very exhaustive examination of this matter and he said to Mr. Black that this is the most fantastic proposition that he had ever heard put before a committee of Congress in the course of 16 years. In my humble judgment no case was made. That is the reason why I think the amendment should be rejected.

The production credit associations already cover this field quite thoroughly. There are presently 12 production credit corporations and 529 production credit associations with about 269,000 farmer stockholders. These associations now have a total of 3,081 full-time and 1,669 part-time employees. These associations operate in every section of the Nation and make loans for seed, feed, livestock, fertilizer, fencing, and a host of other things. They can make every kind of a loan required in the production of war crops and other food. The only question before us therefore is whether these regional credit corporations, authorized to make similar loans, and now in a process of liquidation shall be brought back to life to supplement what is being done by the production credit associations and through emergency crop, seed, and feed loans.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, on January 21, 1943, Secretary Wickard sent out this release to the press, which allocated $200,000,000 to $225,000,000 for the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make loans to farmers to produce food. I hold in my hand a statement of a bank in my district. At the close of business December 31, 1942, they had loans outstanding in the amount of $226,621. They had cash and sight exchange in the sum of $853,851. That same bank, at the close of business February 16, 1943, had loans amounting to $185,133. They had cash in the bank and sight exchange $942,901. The local institutions are well able to care for the needs of their respective communities. These banks are full of cash and they would like to obtain farm loans without competition from several governmental loan concerns.

I say to you I do not see where there is any reason for $225,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to make additional loans to the farmers when we already have too many duplicating agencies in this field, driving up and down the Nation's highways burning up rubber and gasoline. They have supervisors over supervisors, State offices, regional offices, and county offices. I think the committee should be commended for bringing in section 2 which would eliminate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation from carrying on its functions, so that private enterprise can continue in this country. The expenses for the operation of these governmental bureaus are paid by the taxpayers including the banks and other private loan companies and individuals with whom they compete.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not contend that this little bank he is talking about could make loans of the type that are being made for food production by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation?

Mr. GATHINGS. I will answer the gentleman by saying here is the original release issued by Secretary Wickard. Over on page 3, it reads:

Where it is determined that the producer actually needs equipment, such as a tractor, combine, peanut picker, or similar items of machinery, and that his operations (including any custom work which may be available to him) will enable him to pay for such equipment in 2 or 3 years, purchasers of such equipment may be financed.

Would the gentleman contend that there is any bank in his district that would not like to make a loan so that a farmer could purchase a tractor or other farm implement? Now this business of creating new agencies duplicating existing government lending mediums is absolutely going too far.

If you believe in the elimination of unnecessary expenses of government—the taking of the Government out of competition with private business and the continuation of our American way of life through free enterprise I hope you will vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and leave the section in the bill which was recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

A few days ago I introduced a bill to eliminate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation from continuing their lending operations. I am proud that under section 2 of this bill the same result is accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 35, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 93, line 23, after the word "amended", insert "unless such loans are to be made in a region in which, and with respect to a commodity with respect to which, a credit program under such section with respect to such commodity in such region was in effect on July 1, 1942."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens shall not apply to (1) the temporary employment of translators when competent citizen translators are not available; (2) employment in cases of emergency of persons in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than 60 days; (3) employment on the emergency rubber project; (4) employment by the Rural Electrification Administration of not to exceed 20 junior engineer trainees who are citizens of other American republics; and (5) employment under the appropriation for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not expect to take the 5 minutes. I simply take this time to get some information from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the subcommittee. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not Governor Black appeared before his committee, or the Secretary of Agriculture, or anyone else connected therewith, requesting that section 8 be placed in this bill.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. I do not think the Department of Agriculture or any official of the Department is responsible for section 8.

Mr. FULMER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, my good friend, if he would give us some information as to just who appeared before his committee requesting that section 8 be placed in the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Let me say to the gentleman that no one, so far as I am advised, came before the committee requesting the inclusion of section 8, although many Members of Congress, including the members of the subcommittee, have received complaints from financial institutions throughout the country protesting against the policy of the Department of Agriculture in some of its lending branches, in making loans of the type which would be made on the same terms or comparable terms by private lending facilities, operating in the localities where such loans are made. It is not necessary as in the gentleman's committee, that somebody come before the committee and expressly request the enactment of certain legislation before the committee takes action.

Mr. FULMER. The thing I am interested in is in that the agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations having permitted Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Oscar Johnson, and others interested in destroying the Farm Security Administration and Crop Insurance believing neither of these had anything to do with putting section 8 in the bill, many of us who are interested in the farmers of the country are anxious to know who is responsible.

I understand that many Members of the House, including myself have received letters from banks and associations representing banks wanting something done to destroy the lending agencies set up by the Congress The question that I am now interested in is: Are the Members of this House and especially the Members on appropriation ready to destroy these agencies and place the farmers of the country in this great emergency as well as after this war, when we may have another serious depression, at the mercy of the banks lending corporations, and insurance companies to secure crop loans and land mortgages? Being a banker before coming to Congress and realizing the position of farmers in securing loans from banks and those engaged in lending money on farm lands prior to establishing these Federal loan agencies I am not willing to destroy these agencies. It appears that because of the letters which Members have been receiving which are based more or less on selfishness is the reason for the placing of section 8 in the bill.

Now, let us see what this section will do to the farmers of the country if passed, especially during this great emergency and after the winning of this war at which time we may have another long-drawn-out serious depression. If the section should be adopted before farmers could make application for loans from the Federal land banks, production credit corporations, and the seed-loan agencies they would first have to make application to banks for production loans and lending corporations and insurance companies for land loans and be turned down. I believe one reason that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is going to offer an amendment to strike this section from the bill is because they have come to the conclusion the amendment will not do everything they had in mind when it was placed in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned this is the most ridiculous and outrageous attempt to kick millions of innocent farmers in the pants, especially at a time when they, their wives, and children are engaged in long hours of work doing their very best to produce even a normal production of food which is so necessary in winning this war that I have ever witnessed since I have been a Member of Congress. I have an amendment prepared, which I shall offer, to strike section 8 from the bill if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee fails to offer his amendment for the same purpose or if the section does not go out on a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

It has been repeatedly announced during the discussion of this bill that the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would offer an amendment to strike section 8 and that there would be no opposition on the part of the member of the subcommittee who was originally responsible for the insertion of this section.

I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the chairman of the full committee [Mr. CANNON] because I feel that section 8 is too inclusive in its terms, or I should say, too exclusive. I do think, however, that there is a practice on the part of the Department of Agriculture which ought to be reasonably restrained, and that the banking institutions of the country which have at the present time ample funds with which to make loans, in cases where they are prepared to make the same type of loans that will be made by the agency of the Department of Agriculture and upon the same terms and with the same rates of interest, ought to have that business. In such cases there is no reason why the Government of the United States should step in and take away the business of these private lending agencies. As I have said, I think the language of this section is too broad.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. What is the gentleman's definition of the word "region" in this section where it states that the loan must have first been offered to and refused by the private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the region where such loan is proposed to be made?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman who is now addressing the Committee is not responsible for the language of the section; he did not write the section, and the use of the word "region" in that connection is undoubtedly too broad.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the membership will find if they will look into the matter of business loans that we have provisions that the loan cannot be made until it is first offered to a local institution then referred over to some governmental agency in the event the local institution does not want the matter.

Mr. TARVER. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will state to the gentleman from Georgia that if he will remember back to 1933 he will recall the effort that was made to insert a similar provision in the original T. V. A. Act.

Mr. TARVER. It was not the same provision.

Mr. RANKIN. No; it was a similar provision.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with, the remainder of the bill to be printed in the RECORD, with the right of Members to offer amendments if they so desire.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman include in his request the right to make points of order against the language not read?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request to include the right of Members to make points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, be open to amendment, and subject to points of order.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill reads as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further,* That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

SEC. 8. None of the funds herein appropriated or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or of any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or of any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in the negotiation, solicitation, or execution of any loan which has not first been offered to and refused by the private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the region where such loan is proposed to be made.

This act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order or any amendments to section 7?

Are there points of order to section 8?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 8 on the ground that this section is legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is not a limitation, but goes beyond the authority of the committee in that this section is in effect a direction to officers and employees of the Department to offer all loans to private lending agencies before such loans are made.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. In view of what has transpired and the fact that the chairman of the full committee is going to move to strike out the section I ask unanimous consent that the section may be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. I think it is not subject to a point of order, but the gentleman yielded to me to submit a unanimous consent request and I ask consent to have the section stricken from the bill. If it is to go out anyway why take time on a point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I object to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. This question has come up before. The language in the latter part of section 8 says:

Institution or association to engage in the negotiation, solicitation, or execution of any loan which has not first been offered to and refused by the private lending agencies.

It goes beyond the scope of authority and offers a directive. It is not a limitation.

In Cannon's Precedents, volume 7, No. 634, page 639, a ruling on an amendment to an appropriation for books and apparatus for the education of the blind, which would have required that none of the appropriation be expended unless two copies of each publication be furnished free of charge to a certain institution—there was a directive—the Chairman said:

From a careful reading it seems to the Chair that the amendment directs the Commission to do a specific thing, actually changing the basic law creating the Commission, and that the amendment does not restrict in any sense the appropriation.

This provision is subject to the same criticism. The head note on this decision reads:

Professed limitation not to become effective unless or until affirmative action was taken held to be out of order in an appropriation bill.

An amendment withholding expenditures of appropriations unless and until certain books were supplied free to the National Library for the Blind was ruled out of order.

That was in 1928 and one of the most distinguished Members on the other side of the House was then presiding, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

This section is also subject to the further point of order that it attempts to limit an appropriation not contained in the paragraph.

Volume 8, section 1636, of Cannon's Precedents it is stated that—

No limitation of expenditure is possible upon a paragraph which does not propose an appropriation.

This paragraph proposes no appropriation, but it puts this directive on it.

The Chair in that instance ruled:

There is no appropriation proposed in the paragraph we are considering now, and for that reason this could not be a limitation and it is not germane to this particular section. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this section is legislation on an appropriation bill, and besides it is out of order because it attempts to put a limitation of expenditure upon a paragraph that does not carry any appropriation at all.

I submit that for those two reasons, as held by the decisions set out in Cannon's Precedents, to which I referred,

this section is out of order and should go out of the bill, and that both points of order should be sustained.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply call the attention of the Chair to the fact that while many of the Government lending agencies or semi-Government lending agencies are not included in this bill, yet there are appropriations here for the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, all of which make loans to farmers. If this provision stays in the bill it means that the officials of these organizations must in addition to the duties which are imposed upon them by law make an investigation in the case of every application, to determine whether or not the application has been offered to and refused by private lending agencies customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character in the region where the loan is to be made. It has been held time and time again that where a provision of this kind imposes duties upon a Federal official which are not required by law it is legislative in character and subject to a point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. And where they are just affirmative and directive they have been held out of order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the observation that some one of these employees to whom a salary would be denied under the appropriate limitation would be required to make the determination that a loan had been first offered to and refused and consequently it would be imposing additional duties that are not now required by law. The proposed limitation is not upon the funds that are authorized anywhere in the bill to be lent but upon salary funds and the language itself imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order against section 8 that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Kansas make the further point of order that it provides for additional functions to be discharged by certain people not required under existing law to discharge those functions.

The matter is not altogether free from doubt, but in view of the language of section 8, and in view of the additional duties imposed and the additional determinations that must be made, it seems to the Chair that such language is legislative in character. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 97, line 2, after the period, insert "None of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any individual whose compensation is based on the amount or number of loans made."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent the soliciting by Government employees of loans that are now being handled by private lending agencies.

My amendment would provide that none of these men shall be paid on the basis of the number of loans they make or the amount of the loans they make.

I can best illustrate what I am trying to reach here by reading a paragraph from a letter I received from one of my bankers. It is as follows:

During the drought years and depression years of the 1930's this bank advanced funds to a tenant farmer to carry on his operations. With the help of the bank his financial situation gradually improved. By late 1939 the bank felt warranted in advancing him funds for the purchase of a herd of stock cows for raising cattle. This proved to be a profitable venture for him, so in July 1941, when he had become a good credit risk, the Production Credit Association induced him to pay his loan of $1,800 to the bank and borrow from them.

My amendment would say that you could not use the funds herein appropriated or authorized to pay the compensation of any employee whose compensation is based upon the number of loans or the amount of loans made, to take away all the incentive of these individuals.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. There is no appropriation in this bill for officials of the Production Credit Corporation, so how does the gentleman expect to stop the practice he describes by this amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. I think some of the funds that pay these individuals are in this bill. There are quite a number of Government employees, various employees of the Department of Agriculture, who are going about driving into farmyards and soliciting loans from individuals who never have been clients of the Government. I am in favor of those loans that reach a group that cannot get credit any place else, but I maintain we are not helping the farmers in America if we destroy their local banks. We must decide whether we are going to go all out and have Government ownership of banks, or restrict the soliciting of loans by Government employees.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no employees of the Department of Agriculture who are paid on the basis of the number of loans they may be able to negotiate. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, we carry no administrative funds for the Production Credit Associations in this bill. As I said a while ago, while I am in sympathy with the idea that local financial institutions ought to be allowed to make all loans where they are willing to make them on a comparable basis with the Government loans, I can see no reason whatever for inserting a provision such as the gentleman has offered as an amendment here in this bill, realizing that it will have no effect whatever and constitute mere surplusage. So I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2481, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1944, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour and the possibility that there may be some roll calls in connection with the passage of the pending bill, I hope that we may not be required to proceed further with it tonight.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further proceedings on the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 215), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this joint resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 113) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2238. An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; and

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1869) entitled "An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, at the conclusion of other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an appeal adopted at a meeting of the executive board of the Polish-American Union of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech recently delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a copy of a bill which I recently introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE] may extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered over WSB.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] for 15 minutes.

WAR AND FREIGHT-RATE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Nation is in the throes of the gravest emergency which has confronted it since the founding fathers through blood and sweat and tears established on this continent the citadel of liberty we all revere. The foundations were laid deep and strong. Those who followed built wisely on those foundations and kept the faith down through the generations—in good times and in times of stress.

The towering structure has long been the inspiration of less-favored peoples everywhere. To them the United States of America has been and is the land of opportunity. Now, more than ever, with the hounds of hell unleashed on the world by ruthless tyrants and international gangsters, who would smother the torch of liberty and trample underfoot the blessings of freemen throughout the world, the hopes of ravished peoples in Europe and in Asia and in the islands of the seas rest on us and our gallant allies and their prayers for our victory rise to heaven.

We as a Nation have solemnly resolved that the citadel of liberty shall stand undefiled—that freedom shall not perish from the earth. We have resolved that the ruthless dictators who would enslave free peoples shall be smashed into unconditional surrender at whatever cost in blood and treasure.

Millions of the flower of our youth are in training here or are taking the fight to the heartless and bloodthirsty enemy on land, on the seas, and in the air on a dozen fighting fronts, and the products of our genius and of our industry in enormous and increasing numbers are being used by our courageous allies on many other fields of battle. In a very real sense the United States is the arsenal of democracy.

Casualty lists among our armed forces are rising as the tempo of war increases and we strike the enemy hard at every opportunity. Much more blood will flow in the fight to preserve the freedom that has made great our Nation and those gallant peoples who fight on our side against the forces of evil. Treasure in undreamed of amounts is being poured out, with no end yet in sight. The cost of victory will be staggering. It can be met for our part only when we as a people unite as one man and put our all into the titanic struggle.

On land and sea and in the air our intrepid armed forces are writing glorious pages of history. The Axis dictators who boasted that the democracies were soft and decadent, who promised their peoples the war would never come to them as they ravished one defenseless country after another and robbed and enslaved their peoples, are beginning to feel the wrath and the might of the United Nations. Every day and every night we are taking the fight to them, smashing their war industries, their transportation systems, destroying their planes on the ground and knocking them out of the air.

American industry is performing miracles every day. The volume of planes and tanks, ships and guns now being turned out was called fantastic not so long ago by the enemies who now are feeling our might on an ever increasing scale. And we have only begun to produce the engines which will in God's good time put an end to the aggressors who in the flush of early victory over the weak and poorly defended thought themselves

even greater than the Almighty and turned their backs upon Him.

We have a long way to go. We hope for early victory but know in our hearts the way is long and rough and the cost unmeasurable. And we know that the sooner we attain maximum production of the implements and munitions of war the quicker the victory for which we earnestly pray. It behooves us as thoughtful citizens to remove every possible impediment that postpones maximum production. We need every plane and tank, ship and gun, and every pound of ammunition and explosives and other vital supplies that the genius and industry of our country can produce. Anything which is permitted to stand in the way of maximum output helps Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini, not the United Nations. Every day's delay means unnumbered killed and maimed among our gallant fighting men and the loss of uncounted treasure.

You Members from other sections of the country which are doing their utmost toward implementing the huge Army, Navy, and Air Force which with our allies will destroy the enemy, will pardon my expression of pride and satisfaction in the accomplishments of the South, which likewise is doing its full part even in the face of very real handicaps. Huge areas have been set apart throughout the South and Southwest for Army training camps, maneuver grounds, artillery ranges, sprawling airplane plants, aviation training schools, shipyards, textile, steel, and other manufacturing plants.

Representing, as I do, one of the largest textile districts in the world, I am particularly pleased with the accomplishments of this vital industry. Textiles, as you know, are one of the most essential elements for war. The Army and Navy E has been conferred on a number of industries in my district, thus showing that they are turning out maximum production of war goods.

When we read of the heroic deeds of our armed forces all over the globe, men from your section and from mine, our hearts swell with pride. We tell ourselves that we shall not let them down, that they shall have every plane and tank, ship and gun, and every pound of supplies they need to hasten the day of victory. We mean just that.

Yet, my friends, I sometimes wonder whether we are prepared to go all the way down the road of complete unity and remove any and all barriers to full utilization of our productive resources wherever they may be located. My firm conviction is that until this is done without regard to sectional or regional interest, but with full regard for national interest, we shall be unable to give our courageous sons and brothers, husbands, and sweethearts on the far-flung fighting fronts the complete support to which they are entitled and on which they depend.

The South is busier than at any time in its history doing its bit in this grave crisis in the life of our Nation and civilization itself. But the States in that geographical area would gladly do more if handicaps which have retarded industrial development were removed and the green light given to Dixieland. I say this in all earnestness and without rancor. The story of freight rate discriminations against the South—and also against the great Western States—is not a new one. It is hoary with age. Whatever the reasons for inaugurating such a policy when the Nation was younger, whether just or unjust, the time has passed when it can be seriously defended in the light of the realities of modern development. Especially is this true when treacherous, unprincipled enemies are at the Nation's throat and our own fighting men and those of our allies need every unit of military equipment that maximum American output can produce.

This matter has been the subject of recent debate in both branches of the Congress. A number of bills, including one by myself, are now pending before the House seeking to strike the shackles that impede the progress of southern industry and agriculture. These discussions are peculiarly apropos just now because the Interstate Commerce Commission is in process of concluding hearings on the latest petition of the Southern States for removal of rate discrimination against that section. It is furthest from my thought to seek to bring pressure to bear on that hard-worked public body. Indeed my only purpose in mentioning the pending cause before the Commission is to remind you that no such proceeding would now be under consideration there but for the fact that a highly inequitable rate structure exists to the detriment of the South. The Southern States have long sought to correct this situation through such channels as are open to it. From time to time in past few years some of the more glaring inequalities have been modified. But the fight to achieve even very partial and piecemeal revision of the long-existing discriminatory rate structure has been an uphill one.

We of the South nurse no illusions. We know that the fundamental problem involved is highly complex. The rate structure of which we have long complained was evolved over a long period of years. Unfortunately, the Southern States seem always to have been on the short end in each step of that evolution. As we view it—and I am confident my friends from the Western States will support this statement—the situation created by this inequitable rate structure extends clear down to the economic fundamentals of those areas adversely affected. For that reason piecemeal treatment, no matter how well intended or how impartially handled, cannot solve the problem. The situation is so serious that a major operation is called for. We appreciate such relief as has been granted from time to time, limited though it be. The roots of the economic disease still remain to retard the full development of a region which God has richly blessed with resources and with a population that would gladly pass along to other sections the products of those resources if the artificial handicaps which hold back their full flow were removed.

It was the matchless Henry Grady, in speaking of our Southland, who said:

> Far to the south lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the Temperate Zone.

And we ask no special favors. The situation calls for none. Simple, even-handed justice is all the South has ever asked in this regard. Equal, not special treatment is what we have always sought.

The Congress has not been unmindful of the inequitable situation which exists in the rate structure as we now know it. When the Transportation Act of 1940 was passed it provided, among other things, for the creation of a Board of Investigation and Research. Within the past few weeks that body has submitted to the President and the Congress a report recommending the abolition of the long-standing regional differentials in freight rates and the establishment of a uniform rate structure. This report has been published in House Document No. 145, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, under the title "Summary Report on Study of Interterritorial Freight Rates."

This board consists of three members, two of whom declared that such uniformity is necessary "to provide equal opportunity for the economic development of all parts of the country without artificial rate handicaps or preferences."

This report was signed by Robert E. Webb, of Kentucky, and C. E. Childe, of Nebraska. Nelson L. Smith, of New Hampshire, board chairman, filed a dissenting report, stating that while he agreed with the general conclusions, he did not believe that the board should recommend legislative action.

I intend no criticism of Mr. Smith when I remind this House that it so happens that he hails from the New England area, which has been in position to benefit most from the long-standing discriminatory rate structure. I would go further and commend Mr. Smith for his agreement with the "general conclusions" of his two board associates, which, if and when made effective would eliminate the injustices and inequalities which have so long retarded economic development of the South. Apparently Mr. Smith would leave the Interstate Commerce Commission full discretion as to when and how the "general conclusions" of the board shall be given effect.

I have no grounds for questioning the complete sincerity of Mr. Smith in assuming this position. At the same time I feel that he will accord me an equal measure of sincerity when I say emphatically I agree with Messrs. Webb and Childe in recommending affirmative action by the Congress. Upon studying this report you will find that it proposes that provision be made for "exceptions in special cases where differentials are clearly justified." Arranging for such

special exceptions would be a very proper function of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I have the greatest respect for members of the Commission and not the slightest desire to reflect in any way upon that body. It is hardly necessary for me to remind Members of the House that the Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act is responsible to the Congress and reports directly to the Congress.

Members of the House also have recently received an elaborate report following long research and investigation by the Tennessee Valley Authority. This report was transmitted to the President, who in turn, transmitted it to the Congress for the information of its Members. It is my earnest hope that Members will enrich their knowledge by a careful reading of this exhaustive report, published under the caption, "Regionalized freight rates: Barrier to national productiveness." House Document No. 137, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, will contain this report. You will find there the facts unearthed by a staff of experts, with specific illustrations showing the manner in which these regionalized rates penalize the South and the West as well as bestow preferences upon the highly industrialized North and Northeast. This report treats the problems presented by the present freight-rate structure primarily from the standpoint of the national interest. I quote the concluding paragraph:

> The immediate issue is lack of equal competitive opportunity. The transcendent issue, however, is freeing surplus, or idle, or uneconomically employed manpower, materials, and energy, located not in the South and West alone but throughout the Federal Union. We are a great Nation; but we have loaded our gigantic power with unnecessary shackles. Not the least of them is the existing regionalization of freight rates.

One can readily understand the fear expressed by some Americans that to encourage greater industrial development in underdeveloped foreign countries would lessen the markets for our surplus manufactured products and, in turn, create unemployment and reduce living standards in the United States. The President, in one of his semiweekly press conferences a few weeks ago, pointed out the fallacy of this argument. He wisely and strongly contended that by helping certain backward nations increase their productiveness we would create greater employment in those countries and add substantially to their purchasing power, thus creating a wider market for our surplus products.

The President illustrated his point by recalling that during the depth of the great depression wide unemployment prevailed in a certain Southern State. The stores were filled with things to sell, but nobody had any money to buy even the necessities of life, not to mention the little luxuries which we all enjoy. When work was provided in large volume purchasing power was distributed and the people began to buy the things they needed. In other words, a market for goods was created where none existed before.

This argument has within the past few weeks received strong support from a quarter from which many of us doubtless would not expect it. I refer to a section of the preliminary observations of the post-war committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. This is a large committee—some 90 members—representing a cross-section of American industry. Discussing economic opportunity throughout the world, the Post-war Committee says:

> It must always be remembered that the economic value of trade between the United States and other countries increases in proportion to the development of those countries with which we trade.
>
> There is a widespread impression that if nations which formerly had little, if any, manufacturing activity should subsequently develop through their own efforts substantial manufacturing enterprise suited to their labor and resources they will thereby reduce the potential export markets of American industries and will reduce employment and living standards in this country. This, however, does not necessarily follow. Abundant statistics show that, as manufacturing increases, buying power also increases and so does the demand for imports.
>
> The volume of trade depends much more upon the buying power per individual than upon the degree to which the products of one country are complementary to those of another.
>
> It follows, therefore, that world-wide efforts to raise the standard of living of the underdeveloped peoples through the more intensive use of their natural resources are bound to be beneficial to the people of the United States, as well as to those whose opportunities are thus broadened.

My friends, those quotations come from no sectional group and from no agency of the Federal Government. They come from a well-considered report prepared by a group of hard-headed and successful businessmen, spokesmen of the private enterprise system under which our country has made such marvelous strides—men who are accustomed to take a realistic view of matters that affect their interests as manufacturers who must make a profit to remain in business. In my judgment they also represent clear thinking deserving of hearty commendation. I commend not only the parts of that report which deal with matters of foreign trade, but the entire document, which is thought-provoking and enlightening and could be read with interest and profit by every Member of this body.

And I commend this particular section because it strongly supports the contention of the Southern States and the Western States that greater industrial development in those regions would benefit not the South and the West alone, but the entire country. I submit that the reasoning of these businessmen is eminently sound, as simple as two and two make four. In the light of the above quotations no one would seriously contend that wide economic expansion in the South would reduce markets for the products of other sections of the country. Such development in any region necessarily would promote trade with other regions. A large increase in purchasing power in any populous region necessarily begets a demand for goods. When individuals have ample means at their disposal they not only begin to buy things, but they want variety. They are not content with repetitious purchasing of the same things, the products solely of their own section. They want to branch out. That has always been true of individuals everywhere.

So when we ask for the green light to insure wider development of the South we seek no selfish advantage. We merely seek the opportunity for a fuller utilization of the resources with which God has so amply blessed the Southern States. Such a development would benefit our section as a matter of course, but the entire Nation would share in the greater degree of prosperity that came to us. And our heroic fighting men would share in this greater development, not only in a largely increased flow of military equipment and supplies to the fighting fronts, but in the great economic advance which would come to our country after they shall have won the victory and returned home.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DILWEG (at the request of Mr. MCMURRAY), for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROGERS of California (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HÉBERT, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BUFFETT, for 12 days ending April 30, on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2103, a bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense, and for other purposes, at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m. in room 328, House Office Building, on Tuesday, April 20, 1943, to consider H. R. 838, declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain and providing for

the administration thereof; H. R. 2047, to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden; H. R. 2209, to cover the positions of registers of the district land offices into the classified civil service and to fix the compensation thereof; H. R. 2210, to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and H. R. 2484, to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions in the performance of their official duties.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

337. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriation for the Office of Price Administration in the amount of $3,000,000 to enable that office to make arrangements for the printing of necessary forms and other materials for rationing programs (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Board of Economic Warfare for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $36,150,000 (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $2,053,000 (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

340. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Petroleum Administration for War, for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $5,473,000 (H. Doc. No. 166); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

341. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Relocation Authority of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $48,170,000 (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

342. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of War Information of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $47,342,000 (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

343. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting estimates of appropriations for the War Shipping Administration of the Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $2,372,350,000, and general provisions pertaining to the constituent agencies of the Office for Emergency Management (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

344. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Solid Fuels Coordinator for War, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $895,000 (H. Doc. No. 170); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1563, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 113, a joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2534. A bill to provide for the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 2535. A bill to provide for the presentation of the national flag to the family of any person in the military or naval service of the United States during the present war whose death occurs while in such service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.

H. R. 2537. A bill to extend the provisions of the National Cattle Theft Act to all livestock, poultry, and agricultural commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2538. A bill to grant enlisted men of the armed forces base pay for 1 year after their discharge or release from active duty and to permit them to serve for 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to livestock grazing; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to reinstate certain property upon the tax rolls of Harding County; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to name the airfield located near Albuquerque, N. Mex., now designated as the A. D. T. S., or the Oxanard Field, the Captain Virgil Lusk Field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to use their influence so that sufficient metals be allocated to build and equip enough factories to produce at least 1,000,000 annual tons of synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 450, regarding compensation to civilians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River from the eastern gasoline and oil ration zone to the Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerks desk and referred as follows:

581. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: House joint memorial of the State of New Mexico, requesting the President and Congress of the United States to continue the financial support of the Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

582. Also, house joint memorial of the State of New Mexico, Sixteenth Legislature, to the Congress of the United States relating to livestock grazing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

533. Also, house joint memorial of the Sixteenth Legislature, State of New Mexico, to the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of War, to name the air field located near Albuquerque, N. Mex., now designated as the A. D. T. S., or the Oxanard Field, the Capt. Virgil Lusk Field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

584. Also, house joint memorial of the Sixteenth Legislature, State of New Mexico, uring the Congress of the United States that appropriate action be taken to reinstate certain property upon the tax rolls of Harding County; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

585. By Mr. BARRY: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging establishment of an international organization of all nations to insure lasting peace through the abolishment of nationalism and economic and military aggression and guarantee the right of all people to worship as they please without fear of persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

586. By Mr. BRYSON: Concurrent resolution of the house of representatives of the State of South Carolina to change the name of an airport; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

587. Also, concurrent resolution of the house of representatives of the State of South Carolina, favoring enactment of Senate bill 450; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

588. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Ellen A. Winslow and others, requesting support of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to the wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1943 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

589. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the enactment of soldiers bill, H. R. 1548, introduced by Representative SAM M. RUSSELL, providing for common defense and protection of the health and morals of persons in military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

590. Also, petition of 18 members of the Harmony Baptist Church, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the enactment of the liquor advertising bill S. 569, introduced by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, making it unlawful for any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record advertising beverages to be carried in mails, by railroad, or by any common or private carrier from one State to another; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

591. Also, petition of 26 members of Harmony Baptist Church, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the enactment of the military camps' liquor abolishment bill, S. 860, introduced by Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

592. By Mr. HULL: Petition of 23 residents of Fall Creek, Eau Claire, Altoona, and Stanley, Wis., favoring support of House bill 997 and Senate bill 216, proposing the establishment of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

593. Also, petition of 75 members of the Winnebago Tribe of Indians in Wisconsin urging consideration of House bill 64, an act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

594. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Carrie Miller and 57 other residents of Johnstown and Gloversville, N. Y., appealing for passage of House bill 2082, where, by its enactment, untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

595. Also, memorial of the New York State Legislature, declaring its profound conviction that an international organization of all nations be established to achieve the elimination of rampant nationalism and economic and military aggression, and to insure a lasting peace for the prosperity and welfare of all the peoples and memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

596. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Dorothy H. Levenson, corresponding secretary of the Wheeling Chapter of Hadassah, Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the influence of our Government be directed toward opening havens of refuge for our Jewish brethren who have escaped from countries under Nazi rule; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

597. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. Weekly and members of the McMechen Methodist Church, McMechen, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

598. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general secretary, Union Republican Party of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a bill introduced by Hon. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. J. W. Marshall, of Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and Lord of the nations, we come before Thee in the name of our Saviour to implore Thy blessing upon our country, its people, and its institutions, its industries, and its farm lands, its homes, schools, and churches, its men and women in the various services, its governments and courts of justice. We pray for our national leaders, especially for the Members of Congress in session today. Endow with Thy wisdom and Thy spirit these representatives of the people and of God on whom depend in a large measure the destinies of all mankind.

We confess that as a nation we do not deserve all Thy blessings, that we have been proud and sinful, that too confidently we have leaned upon the arm of flesh and relied on men instead of putting our trust in Thee. Penitently we ask Thee to forgive us for the sake of Thy Son who bore the sins of this Nation and of all men. By Thy spirit direct our hearts and minds so that every momentous decision may be in accord with Thy will.

We close this petition with the request that Thou wilt particularly guard and bless all of our men on the battlefields and that ultimately the liberty and freedom for which they fight will be guaranteed to all and that all men everywhere will come to know Thee as Saviour and Lord and that the peace of the Prince of Peace shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Hear us, for we come humbly in the name of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges;

S. 212. An act to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 351. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E Hamilton;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes;

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932;

S. 693. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge board of trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States;

S. 805. An act for the relief of William D. Warren;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; and

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, approved May 7, 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay; and

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a splendid article prepared by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] appearing in Collier's magazine this week on reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECOND WAR LOAN DRIVE, BRAZOS COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, since Members from other States and districts have called attention to records made in the second war loan drive now in progress, I want to cite the outstanding record made by Brazos County, Tex., in this drive.

Assigned a quota of $475,000, a pre-campaign rally was held on Main Street in Bryan, Tex., Saturday night, April 10, at which time speeches were made by First Lt. William J. P. Griffin, who had served in the Pacific area; Judge A. S. Ware, county chairman of the campaign, and District Judge W. S. Barron, and while it was not expected to take pledges at this time, enthusiasm ran so high that a subscription was taken, at which a total sale of bonds amounted to $803,156.25, which exceeded the quota assigned to that county by $328,156.25, and at last reports the county expected to reach the million-dollar mark.

This example set by one county in Texas should be an inspiration to other counties throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter on the Victory tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include two editorials in support of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION POLISH OVERSEAS UNIT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is no people for whom the American Nation has a greater sympathy than those of Poland. They have been crushed, pilloried, and persecuted from both sides of their boundaries. And every American on the battle front or on the home front wants to see the day when Poland will again be an independent nation taking its place in a friendly community of nations.

For 3 years the Polish Government in exile has been working to keep morale within Poland alive against the time of liberation. But now reports are constantly reaching me and other Members of Congress that the propaganda activities of the Polish Unit of O. W. I.'s Overseas Division are destroying rather than building the morale of the helpless Polish people.

These reports tell us that much of this propaganda follows the American Communist Party line and is designed to prepare the minds of the Polish people to accept partition, obliteration, or suppression of their nation when the fighting ends. The same is true of Yugoslavia, where, I am told, the name of the great Mihailovitch is blocked out by O. W. I. radicals.

If it is true that Communists have infiltrated into the O. W. I.'s Overseas Division and are following the party line in their propaganda to Poland, as well as other countries, then it is an outrageous violation of the faith that is reposed in Elmer Davis and Robert Sherwood. If this is not true, then the Polish people in America are entitled to have allayed the rumors which may be enemy inspired.

The best way to find this out is to have all of this propaganda made available here in the United States. The enemy knows all about it, so Americans should not be in the dark.

The press and Congress also should know the names and backgrounds of the people who have the delicate task of interpreting American ideals to foreign lands. I am informed that the man in charge of the Polish Overseas Unit of O. W. I. has not lived in Poland for 15 years and has been active in French Communist circles, coming recently to America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter by Louis J. Kehoe, of Wellman and Washington, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one on taxation and one on motors in the east.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Arkansas Democrat on possible tax delinquents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a concurrent resolution passed by the Arkansas Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Shreveport Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have received within the last day a pamphlet from the office of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] entitled "Debt Limit of the United States." On the face of this little pamphlet are typed these words:

> This document discloses how money is created to run the war. Billions could be saved on unearned interest paid.

I commend to all Members a reading of this pamphlet. Particularly I hope you will read the first portion containing the testimony of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and of ex-Senator Robert L. Owen on this question. If you want to omit reading the last few pages which contain my own short testimony, that will be all right, though I hope you will read them, too.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader what the program for today will be.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, after disposition of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill we will take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill. There is a bill from

the Naval Affairs Committee, the war brokers' bill. Whether that will be taken up today will depend upon the time for consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I understand there is not much controversy about the District of Columbia appropriation bill, if any. I do not know about the war brokers' bill. If there is any time remaining after disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill and if there is any reason why the war brokers' bill cannot be taken up, there is a resolution from the Committee on Rules relating to Puerto Rico, with which we are all acquainted and which I understand will not take up much time. That may be called up.

In other words, taking the afternoon, I do not see anything controversial. If it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, should there be any roll call I will ask unanimous consent that it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should say that would be quite agreeable. I understand there is somewhat of a lure for some people in this city this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand so.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting letter from Mr. Eastman regarding the oil situation in New England.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the conference now going on in Bermuda and to include a short editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in reference to gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address recently delivered at Hendricks College.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE HONORABLE FRANK E. HOOK

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of my home-town paper this morning. In it I find this statement:

> Resignation of Burkett Williams, regional administrator of the Office of Price Administration, will be announced in the next few days, this newspaper learned authoritatively today. Appointment of former Congressman Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, was rumored in Government circles here.

Mr. Speaker, folks thought they were voting some of these new dealers out last November, but they were mistaken; they were not voting them out at all; they were merely transferring them. Oh dear, oh dear; we are hooked again.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE FRANK E. HOOK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in his speech a moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] seems to be very much excited because a former Member of Congress, Hon. Frank Hook, of Michigan, is being appointed to a Government position.

I wonder when the gentleman from Ohio became so intensely interested in cleaning up the Government pay roll. A few weeks ago we had up here the question of striking the name of a Negro from the pay roll, whom the Dies committee had found to be a Communist, connected with 21 Communist organizations, and who, the committee said, had been making Communist lectures all over the United States, in Mexico, and in Europe. Yet the gentleman from Ohio voted to keep him on the Federal pay roll at $5,600 a year. Now, as between this Negro, whom the Dies committee found to be a Communist, and our distinguished former colleague from Michigan, Mr. Hook, I will take Mr. Hook.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE FRANK E. HOOK

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a soldier written to the editor of some papers in Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from Southern California Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

EXCESSIVE LAUNDRY CHARGES TO MEN IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House something that is not doing the armed forces any good nor is it helping the morale of the Army I refer to excessive laundry charges for our soldiers.

I have a complaint here, the laundry bill of a soldier who has to pay 20 cents apiece for shirts to be laundered; undershirts, 15 cents; underdrawers, 15 cents; socks, 7 cents; handkerchiefs, 3 cents; overalls, 30 cents; turkish towels, 10 cents; and so on.

I can see no good reason why the O. P. A. does not take a hand in this matter. This certainly is wronging the soldier who wants to keep himself the way we would like to see him look. He should not be taken advantage of in this way. When a soldier must pay $12 per month for a laundry bill out of his $50 salary, that is not right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of business in order on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON SAW LOGS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, speaking of price ceilings the most recent order has been on saw logs. Anybody who knows anything about the sawmill business or who has ever been a lumberjack or a muleskinner knows a log near his mill is not to be compared with one that has to be hauled 50 miles before it gets to the mill; yet some of our great efficient doctors of philosophy or someone else who does not know anything about the sawmill business has put a ceiling price on saw logs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is consideration of H. R. 2481, on which the previous question was ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on what is known as the Cannon amendment, appearing on page 65, line 2.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Rees of Kansas amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 65, line 22, after the colon insert "*Provided further*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments."

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KLEBERG. Is this the so-called Cannon amendment as amended by an amendment I offered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge of that. It is the so-called Cannon amendment. The Chair does not know whether or not it was amended after the gentleman from Missouri offered it.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 88, noes 39.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 90, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—230

Abernethy	Gale	LeFevre
Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	Lesinski
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Lewis
Andrews	Gathings	Luce
Angell	Gavin	Ludlow
Arends	Gearhart	Lynch
Auchincloss	Gerlach	McCowen
Bell	Gifford	McGehee
Bender	Gillette	McGregor
Bennett, Mich.	Goodwin	McLean
Bennett, Mo.	Gordon	McWilliams
Bishop	Gore	Maas
Blackney	Gorski	Mahon
Bland	Gossett	Manasco
Bradley, Mich.	Graham	Mansfield, Tex.
Brehm	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Mason
Bulwinkle	Gross	May
Burch, Va.	Gwynne	Merrow
Burchill, N. Y.	Hale	Michener
Busbey	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Conn.
Butler	Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Pa.
Camp	Halleck	Mills
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Monkiewicz
Carlson, Kans.	Harless, Ariz.	Mruk
Carson, Ohio	Harris, Ark.	Murray, Tenn.
Carter	Harris, Va.	Newsome
Chenoweth	Hart	Norman
Church	Hartley	Norrell
Clason	Heidinger	Norton
Clevenger	Hess	O'Brien, Ill.
Cochran	Hill	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Mo.	Hinshaw	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	O'Neal
Colmer	Holmes, Wash.	Pace
Compton	Hope	Peterson, Fla.
Cox	Horan	Pfeifer
Cravens	Howell	Pittenger
Crawford	Jarman	Ploeser
Culkin	Jenkins	Plumley
Curley	Jensen	Poage
Curtis	Johnson, Anton J.	Powers
D'Alesandro	Johnson, J. Leroy	Pracht
Davis	Johnson, Ward	Randolph
Dawson	Jones	Rankin
Day	Jonkman	Reece, Tenn.
Dewey	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Dingell	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Dirksen	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Disney	Kerr	Rizley
Ditter	Kilday	Robertson
Dondero	Kinzer	Robsion, Ky.
Douglas	Kleberg	Rockwell
Drewry	Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.
Durham	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Dworshak	Lambertson	Rohrbough
Eaton	Landis	Rowan
Ellis	Lane	Rowe
Engel	Lanham	Russell
Fenton	Larcade	Sabath
Fisher	Lea	Satterfield
Fogarty	Leavy	Schiffler
Folger	Lemke	Schuetz
Forand	Lesinski	Scott
Gale	Lewis	Shafer
Gallagher	Luce	Sheppard
Gamble	Ludlow	Sikes
Gathings	Lynch	Simpson, Ill.
Gavin	McCowen	Simpson, Pa.
Gearhart	McGehee	Slaughter
Gerlach	McGregor	Smith, Maine
Gifford	McLean	Smith, Va.
Gillette	McWilliams	Somers, N. Y.
Goodwin	Maas	Sparkman
Gordon	Mahon	Springer
Gore	Manasco	Stanley
Gorski	Mansfield, Tex.	Steagall
Gossett	Martin, Iowa	Sumner, Ill.
Graham	Martin, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Grant, Ala.	Mason	Sundstrom
Grant, Ind.	May	Taber
Griffiths	Merrow	Talbot
Gross	Michener	Talle
Gwynne	Miller, Conn.	Thomas, Tex.
Hale	Miller, Pa.	Thomason
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills	Tibbott
Hall, Leonard W.	Monkiewicz	Towe
Halleck	Mruk	Treadway
Hancock	Murray, Tenn.	Troutman
Harless, Ariz.	Newsome	Van Zandt
Harris, Ark.	Norman	Vinson, Ga.
Harris, Va.	Norrell	Wadsworth
Hart	Norton	Ward
Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.	Welchel, Ohio
Heidinger	O'Brien, Mich.	Welch
Hess	O'Brien, N. Y.	West
Hill	O'Neal	Wheat
Hinshaw	Pace	Whitten
Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.	Whittington
Holmes, Wash.	Pfeifer	Wigglesworth
Hope	Pittenger	Willey
Horan	Ploeser	Winstead
Howell	Plumley	Wolcott
Jarman	Poage	Woodruff, Mich.
Jenkins	Powers	Woodrum, Va.
Jensen	Pracht	Zimmerman
Johnson, Anton J.	Randolph	
Johnson, J. Leroy	Rankin	
Johnson, Ward	Reece, Tenn.	
Jones	Reed, Ill.	
Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.	
Judd	Rees, Kans.	
Kean	Rizley	
Kee	Robertson	
Kerr	Robsion, Ky.	
Kilday	Rockwell	
Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.	
Kleberg	Rogers, Mass.	
Knutson	Rohrbough	
Kunkel	Rowan	
Lambertson	Rowe	
Landis	Russell	
Lane	Sabath	
Lanham	Satterfield	
Larcade	Schiffler	
Lea	Schuetz	
Leavy	Scott	
Lemke	Shafer	
LeFevre	Sheppard	
Lesinski	Sikes	
Lewis	Simpson, Ill.	
Luce	Simpson, Pa.	
Ludlow	Slaughter	
Lynch	Smith, Maine	
McCowen	Smith, Va.	
McGehee	Somers, N. Y.	
McGregor	Sparkman	
McLean	Springer	
McWilliams	Stanley	
Maas	Steagall	
Mahon	Sumner, Ill.	
Manasco	Sumners, Tex.	
Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom	
Martin, Iowa	Taber	
Martin, Mass.	Talbot	
Mason	Talle	
May	Thomas, Tex.	
Merrow	Thomason	
Michener	Tibbott	
Miller, Conn.	Towe	
Miller, Pa.	Treadway	
Mills	Troutman	
Monkiewicz	Van Zandt	
Mruk	Vinson, Ga.	
Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth	
Newsome	Ward	
Norman	Welchel, Ohio	
Norrell	Welch	
Norton	West	
O'Brien, Ill.	Wheat	
O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten	
O'Brien, N. Y.	Whittington	
O'Neal	Wigglesworth	
Pace	Willey	
Peterson, Fla.	Winstead	
Pfeifer	Wolcott	
Pittenger	Woodruff, Mich.	
Ploeser	Woodrum, Va.	
Plumley	Zimmerman	

NAYS—90

Allen, La.	Gilchrist	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Granger	Murdock
Anderson, N. Mex.	Green	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Gregory	Nichols
Bates, Ky.	Hagen	O'Connor
Beckworth	Hare	O'Hara
Bonner	Hays	Patman
Brooks	Hobbs	Patton
Bryson	Hoch	Priest
Burdick	Hoeven	Rabaut
Case	Hull	Ramspeck
Chapman	Izac	Richards
Clark	Jackson	Rivers
Coffee	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Cooley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sauthoff
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Scanlon
Costello	Kefauver	Spence
Courtney	Larcade	Stefan
Creal	Lemke	Stewart
Crosser	McCord	Stockman
Cullen	McCormack	Sullivan
Cunningham	McKenzie	Tarver
Domengeaux	McMillan	Tolan
Ellison, Md.	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Fernandez	Mansfield, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Flannagan	Miller, Nebr.	Wene
Ford	Monroney	White
Fulbright	Morrison, La.	Wickersham
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	Wolverton, N. J.
Furlong	Murdock	Worley
	Murray, Wis.	Wright

NOT VOTING—113

Anderson, Calif.	Folger	Murphy
Arnold	Forand	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	O'Konski
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Leary
Barden	Gillie	O'Toole
Barry	Guyer	Outland
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Beall	Hébert	Philbin
Bloom	Heffernan	Phillips
Bolton	Hendricks	Poulson
Boren	Herter	Price
Boykin	Holifield	Ramey
Bradley, Pa.	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Jeffrey	Rolph
Buffett	Jennings	Sadowski
Burgin	Johnson, Calvin D.	Sasscer
Byrne	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe
Canfield	Kearney	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Keefe	Short
Capozzoli	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Celler	Kennedy	Smith, W. Va.
Chiperfield	Keogh	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	Kilburn	Snyder
Dickstein	King	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Kirwan	Stearns, N. H.
Dilweg	Klein	Stevenson
Doughton	LaFollette	Taylor
Eberharter	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	McGranery	Vursell
Elmer	Madden	Walter
Elston, Ohio	Magnuson	Wasielewski
Englebright	Maloney	Weaver
Fay	Marcantonio	Weiss
Feighan	Merritt	Whelchel, Ga.
Fellows	Miller, Mo.	Wilson
Fish	Mott	Winter
Fitzpatrick	Mundt	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Outland against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

General pairs:

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Jeffries.
Mr. Folger with Mr Buffett.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr Jennings.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Price with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Rolph.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 65, following the Cannon amendment insert "*Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500; *And provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter or tenant of payments not exceeding that amount to which he would otherwise be entitled."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss SUMNER of Illinois and Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 119, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks have permission to correct the totals in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations carried in the bill, and together therewith the amount of permanent appropriations and trust funds, and that similar information be contained in the table in regard to similar items available for the present fiscal year in the Agricultural Appropriations Act of 1943, and in connection therewith the Budget estimates for 1944 covering similar items.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

	Appropriations for 1943	Budget for 1944	Bill reported to House	Bill as passed the House
From Federal funds:				
Carried in the bill:				
Direct appropriations	$686, 101, 585	$947, 134, 491	$707, 040, 844	$715, 099, 662
Reappropriations	69, 537, 935	28, 449, 655	4, 691, 210	4, 691, 210
Loan authorizations	140, 000, 000	157, 500, 000	90, 000, 000	
Contract authorizations	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Total carried in bill	895, 639, 520	1, 133, 084, 146	801, 732, 054	719, 790, 872
Not carried in bill: Permanent appropriations	138, 557, 496	103, 132, 663	103, 132, 663	103, 132, 663
Total from Federal funds	1, 034, 197, 016	1, 236, 216, 809	904, 864, 717	822, 923, 535
Trust funds (not carried in bill) [2]	179, 495, 310	11, 322, 860		

[1] Commitments up to full parity for the 1942 crop authorized in the 1943 Appropriation Act and proposed in the Budget for 1944 for authorization for the 1943 and 1944 crops. The bill as reported, and as it passed the House, eliminates the Budget proposal and makes no provision for parity payments in connection with the 1943 or 1944 crops.

[2] Funds held in trust by, but not belonging to, the United States.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 216) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HOMER A. RAMEY, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I should like to have an understanding with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on the length of time to be allowed for general debate.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Texas and I can agree on the time to be allowed for general debate, but I respectfully suggest that we go on with the general debate in the Committee of the Whole and come to an agreement later as to closing debate.

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that I have no requests for time, and I do not believe there will be requests for over 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. When there are no further requests for time we can start reading the bill, if that is agreeable to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. All right.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2513, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

This is a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1943. It is the regular supply bill for the forthcoming fiscal year. The subject matter of the bill is at the very doorstep of Congress, so to speak, because appropriations are made for the city of Washington and the District of Columbia. Washington is the most unique city in America, and perhaps the world. It is not under the jurisdiction of any State, but is an area laid out for the Capital of the Nation, and the type of government is unique. For years and years there has been no scandal involving the government of the District of Columbia, and I would say that Washington perhaps is the cleanest city from the standpoint of municipal government in the United States.

Washington is at this time not only the Capital of the United States but it is the capital of the world. It is the nerve center of the world, and the bill takes on an added significance and importance this year by reason of that fact. The committee gave a couple of weeks to the hearings on the bill, hearing witnesses from the municipality, and also hearing from the representatives of the citizens' associations. The hearings were well attended by the members of the subcommittee. This is the second or third year

that Mr. Williams has been the clerk of the subcommittee. He did a grand job.

The city of Washington requires about $55,000,000 a year for its operation. That seems like a tremendous sum, but when we remember that the city of New York requires about $500,000,000 a year, the amount required for the District of Columbia does not seem so tremendous. The funds used in carrying on the functions of the government come from four sources. In the first place, there is the general fund, the general tax fund in the District of Columbia, which the residents pay. That is the largest amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What is the rate of taxation on real and personal property?

Mr. MAHON. The rate of taxation is $1.75, I believe, on real estate in the District of Columbia. However, that rate is not fixed by this committee. This, as the gentleman knows, is an appropriations subcommittee. Then there is the highway fund, which is utilized for street and bridge improvement and many other purposes. Also, there is the water fund, a fund collected from water users in the District. In the fourth place, the Federal Government makes a contribution and has regularly made such a contribution to the District of Columbia. The Revenue Act of 1939, a legislative bill, provided that the Federal contribution should be $6,000,000 annually. That is the sum provided in the present bill.

In many of the municipalities of America, a large portion of the tax money is devoted to the paying of the debt of the municipality, and the interest thereon, together with a sinking fund. Congress has wisely provided that the District of Columbia cannot go into debt except by special permission from the Congress, and that permission has prevented the District from going into debt on a large scale. The present indebtedness of the District is about $11,300,000. In this bill we provide $6,850,000 for the liquidation of a portion of that debt, and after the fiscal year 1944 the debt of the District of Columbia will be less than $5,000,000, which is a better fiscal statement than could have been made a few years ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who holds that funded debt?

Mr. MAHON. It is a debt due to the Treasury of the United States, on account of Federal Works Projects, P. W. A. projects, the purchase of park land, and so forth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it is not represented by outstanding securities?

Mr. MAHON. No. That is not my understanding. There are about 13,000 employees in the District of Columbia, about one-third or slightly more than one-third of whom are classified under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The population of Washington has increased tremendously in the last few years. The present estimated population is about 900,000 people. The largest item in the bill is something over $12,000,000 for the public-school system. The largest expenditure of the city is for schools. It is interesting to note that with this great upswing of population the scholastic population is not appreciably increasing. Approximately the roll of school children is about the same as in previous years. The population of the District of Columbia, from the standpoint of race, is broken down about as follows: Thirty percent colored and 70 percent white. And in the schools it is broken down about as follows: Forty percent colored and 60 percent white.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How are those percentages moving at the present time? Which group is increasing?

Mr. MAHON. I think the figures show that the proportion in the schools has been about the same in recent years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With reference to the total population in recent years, has the colored population kept abreast with the increase in total population, as to percentage?

Mr. MAHON. I would not say that it has during the last 18 months, but I have no figures on which to predicate that statement.

One of the interesting things that Washington has done during the last year has been to put into operation a real physical-training program in the schools. Washington schools are among the best in the Nation.

The second largest item in this bill is for public welfare. The sum for this purpose carried in the bill is in excess of $8,000,000. Heretofore we carried in this bill, and we carried it for several years in fact, a provision which limited the amount of direct relief that any one individual could receive. That rate has been previously $24 for a single person and not more than $30 for a couple, and $6 additional for each child. The bill this year does not carry ceilings on direct relief, it being thought by the committee that better results could be had at this unusual time when living costs have gone up materially, by permitting the public-welfare officials to administratively set the ceilings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes additional. The police force requires something over $4,000,000. Crime does not pay, but crime makes the taxpayers pay, and we are providing in this bill something over $4,000,000 for the police force, and something over $1,000,000 for the retirement for policemen and firemen.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I notice that you have increased the number of policemen for the city, which is probably necessary. In going over the town I see we have a great many policemen in their twenties, young fellows. I talked with a young fellow a few nights ago. He was married recently. I assumed he was deferred from the draft. That may not be within the province of the Committee on Appropriations, but I think the gentleman ought to suggest to the city officials or the police department of Washington that they get older men in place of a lot of these young men and let these young men go and fight for their country, as they should.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would like to make a statement in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] because this subject has been considered by the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. We found that many months ago there were numbers of both policemen and firemen who desired to enter the armed services. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, however, took the view that to allow those men to go into the armed forces would deplete the ranks of able and seasoned men, and that we would have an appreciable increase in crime in the District of Columbia, and the city would have a break-down of its law-enforcement agencies. It was upon the action of the Commissioners that scores of those men who have desired to enter the armed forces have remained here. Numbers of them have come to my office and said, "Won't you intercede with the Commissioners so that we can enter the armed forces?" with the understanding that they want to come back to their jobs when the war is over.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to say there has been a very rapid turn-over in the police department. I believe there were something like 600 who left the force last year. It has been very expensive to train policemen. It has been very difficult to get men in the first place, and to train them and to keep them. While a number of policemen have entered the military and naval forces, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have sought to prevent the ranks from being too greatly depleted, because Washington is one of the vital cities of the world. Bear in mind, however, that Washington policemen are subject to the draft and they are not accorded a blanket deferment. I understand that the Commissioners have requested deferments in relatively rare instances. In selecting new policemen, effort is made to select men from III–A classification brackets.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] about training these men, you could not say that those boys in their early twenties have had any great amount of training. I have gone over the town lately and I have seen men on the force who have not been there very long; young fellows in their early twenties.

Mr. MAHON. I wish the gentleman from Louisiana would check with Major

Kelly, the chief of police, with regard to his remarks, in order that we may be sure that he is doing no undue injury to loyal, faithful policemen in the District of Columbia, a great majority of whom are not those young lads to whom the gentleman makes reference, and that he will give any specific case which he may have in mind. The gentleman should bear in mind that there are about 1,800 policemen, and it would not be possible for him to be acquainted with all of them without making a very detailed study.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I do not want to reflect on any loyal policeman. I have the greatest respect for them, but I am talking about these young fellows that I see every day, and I am sure the gentleman from Texas must have seen them. I have talked with some of them. I know they are young fellows. They have no more right to be here secure in their positions than the other boys of this country of the same age.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes and I decline to yield further for the present.

I will say that I have not in recent months personally talked to any young man who is a policeman in the District of Columbia. I am not fully familiar with the age limits, but I do know that the police force has lost about 600 men. They would have lost many more of them, because many were being offered commissions by the Army and the Navy, and it was only after definite action that the Commissioners upon their own volition and without any recommendation from Congress, were able to prevent the loss of much of the key personnel of the police system of this capital city. I am not speaking of the draft. Prior to last December men could volunteer for military service and the police force lost many key men who volunteered for duty in the Army and Navy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman briefly on that point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Just to further clarify the issue, because I think it must be known to all of us that these men who have been lost from the police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia have gone from those services where they had security and where they had to go into the armed forces with no promise from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that those jobs would be available to them when they returned. Those men have been separated from their jobs. Many of them have actually resigned. Men have come into my office and said, "We are resigning from the police force and the fire department so that we can go into the armed forces," when the police department and the fire department members were not given assurance by the Commissioners of any release from their jobs for the duration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MAHON. On that point I will yield briefly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This discussion brings this thought to my mind: If it is true that most of our young people are going into the military forces, I would like to know who it is that is going to commit all these crimes, because all the criminal records I have ever studied indicate that crime springs primarily from actions of younger people. Can the gentleman give us any light on the proposition as to whether or not the criminal activities in this city are on the decline or on the increase, so that we can get some idea as to whether or not there will be a greater demand for policemen for the duration than there is at the present time? I am not directing this inquiry to any type of criticism of what has been done. I simply want to know what is going on in the city. Are crimes being committed by older people or younger people, and if all the younger people are going into the military service who is going to commit these crimes?

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman if he will turn to the hearings and read the statements made in the hearings he will get considerable information regarding the crime record in the District of Columbia. The present proportion of crime is just about at the same rate that it has been in previous years.

There has been a considerable increase in crime among the juveniles, you know, those who are under 18 years of age; there has been tremendous increase in juvenile crime.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Formerly it was said that the juveniles committed crime because of lack of funds, they had to go out and take property to get funds; now they commit crimes because they have so much money they get into devilment while they are spending it. Actually, the lack of proper training of the child in the home is responsible for waywardness. We need not fear if the home, the school, and the church will do their duty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there any attempt on the part of our Commissioners, the police officers, or whoever has control, to bring women into the job of policemen?

Mr. MAHON. I have not heard that idea previously suggested.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We may have that situation to face in a few months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. It is true also that juvenile delinquency is not confined to Washington; it covers the whole Nation.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. The city of Washington has less juvenile delinquency than many cities, and fewer of certain types of crime; gangster crimes, particularly.

Mr. GRANGER. We hear frequent complaints that the property owner in Washington does not pay the same tax obligations as property owners in other cities pay. What about the application of the special improvement taxes, sewer, sidewalk, roads, and taxes of that sort that the people in other cities have to pay? Do the people in Washington, the property owners, pay those taxes?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from Utah that they do by and large pay the taxes to which the gentleman refers, but this question of what should be the tax rate in the District of Columbia and what should be the amount of the Federal contribution is one of the time-worn questions that has come down through the years, and I do not think it would be profitable to discuss that matter at this time. The Commissioners do have the right to increase without further legislation the real-estate taxes in the District of Columbia if they are threatened with incurring a deficit.

We have provided the Budget estimate of 100 additional policemen plus 25 policemen above the Budget in order that we might take that extra precaution in guaranteeing the safety of the Nation's Capital as well as might be done through the police force.

One of the large items in the bill is for the Health Department. The Health Department, we would think would be in extreme difficulty now on account of the notoriously crowded conditions in Washington, but we find from the statement of the chief health officer of the District, Dr. Ruhland, that the general mortality in the District of Columbia is the lowest at this time of any time in the history of the District. Infant mortality is the lowest, and so are all other specific causes of death. So the health conditions in the District of Columbia are good. Some of the measures which have been put into operation by appropriation of this Congress have played not a little part in the improvement of the health conditions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have heard a lot of people talk about the rats here as being a possible source of disease. They say there are just hordes of rats in some places in the city and this has worried people no little. I wonder if the gentleman has gone into that subject at all.

Mr. MAHON. That is one study that the gentleman from Texas has not undertaken. There are of course large numbers of rats in all the States of the Union, of all the different types. I know that in the District of Columbia the Health Department and the Commissioners have been seeking to control the rodents to which the gentlewoman referred.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is the danger of the spread of disease through the rats that worries people.

Mr. MAHON. That is quite true. Almost every day people are coming into the city of Washington by plane from the four corners of the earth where there are various diseases, and the transmission

from those remote places to Washington requires such a short length of time that there is the danger of the bringing in of various types of disease—cholera, typhus, and other diseases.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand there has been a great increase in venereal disease in the District of Columbia. I read in press reports the other day where there were 40,000 cases, and I believe the same article stated that because of lack of confinement facilities 23 highly infectious cases could not be detained for cure and properly segregated. What has been the cause for this increase? Where does the responsibility lie? Is it because of laxity on the part of the police force in their inspections, or who handles that particular phase?

Mr. MAHON. I would advise the gentleman that the control of venereal disease is primarily the problem of the Health Department.

There is considerable testimony in the hearings and there is additional testimony available to the committee. Of course, venereal disease is one of the great threats to health all over the world and Washington is no exception.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss briefly the fire department, which requires an expenditure of something over three million dollars a year. The fire record in the District is good. There have been some unfortunate losses of life. During the fiscal year just passed twenty-two people have been killed by reason of fire.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. How many members are in the fire department of the District?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have that figure before me. The clerk of the committee will give that figure to the gentleman.

The fire department in the District is well staffed. The rate of insurance in the District of Columbia is lower than any municipality in the Nation that I know of. The fire losses are small. A city which has a per capita fire loss of no more than $1.50 is considered to have an excellent fire record. In the District of Columbia the per capita fire loss is $1.09, which is one of the very lowest in the Nation and it testifies to the efficiency of the fire department.

I could go on at length and discuss with you other features of this bill. There are more separate items in the bill than in the agricultural appropriation bill which we have finally disposed of today. So it goes without saying that I cannot take up every individual item.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. I know the gentleman is well informed on this subject as he is on many others and I would like to ask the gentleman what the status in Washington is, if he has had occasion to study it, as to the gasoline shortage with reference to busses and the fire department and other private cars, such as those of the Commissioners, and so forth.

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to say to the gentleman that there are some interesting figures regarding gasoline in the hearings and the gasoline taxes, by the way, in the District of Columbia for the first 6 months of this fiscal year, the amount of money raised from the gasoline tax, was greater than from the first 6 months of the fiscal year which began on July 1, 1941, despite the fact that since July 1, 1941, gasoline rationing has gone into effect; but the explanation of the reason why we have had this additional increase in gasoline tax receipts is the legislation put through the House raising the tax 1 cent per gallon on gasoline.

The bill carries a provision for a people's counsel to serve with the Public Utilities Commission. This position has been vacant. The position was created by law, but it has been vacant since 1936, the position not having been filled since that time.

This position is filled upon direct appointment of the President of the United States. I may say in reference to this matter, that the citizens' associations have expressed considerable interest in this position of people's counsel and the committee appropriated the necessary amount of money for the employment of a people's counsel. It leaves the matter up to the discretion of the President as to whether or not such appointment will be made.

There are a few legislative provisions in this bill which the committee thought wise to include. They are subject to a point of order. They are not far reaching in their consequences, but if any Member does not already know about the legislative provisions he will find in the report on the bill just what the various legislative limitations and provisions are and I think that a point of order would lie against them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In discussing the amount of money that is expended for the District of Columbia, the gentleman does not take into consideration or did not discuss, of course, the millions of dollars of emergency funds that have been expended within the District.

Mr. MAHON. The District of Columbia is treated much like other municipalities and States insofar as that is concerned in sharing in other Federal funds. For example, the State of Kansas and the State of Texas receive certain highway money through the Federal Treasury. The District of Columbia shares in the same way in that type of program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In that particular program, but there are millions of dollars that have been expended here of emergency funds other than just the ordinary highway funds that come from the gasoline tax.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know just exactly what type of emergency funds the gentleman is referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am speaking about the construction of bridges, extra streets, roads, and things of that kind. I am not objecting to the expenditure.

Mr. MAHON. Those expenditures are from the gasoline-tax fund in cooperation with the Federal Government, as would be the case with the States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then we have, of course, great sums of money, which are properly spent, for hospitals and things like that, such as contributions, that do not come in this particular measure.

Mr. MAHON. I am not sure what the gentleman is referring to in that case, but I may say that in the hearings there is a break-down of every Federal expenditure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not criticizing the expenditure, but I thought the picture should show a larger amount expended.

Mr. MAHON. At the end of the fiscal year 1943, the present fiscal year, there will be a surplus in the District treasury of over $6,000,000. We are contemplating that the salary raise and other items will require $5,000,000 above the $54,000,000 provided in this bill for the fiscal year 1944.

But even so, considering all the expenditures of the District during the fiscal year 1944, it is contemplated that at the end of that year there will yet be a surplus of something over $2,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was under the impression that a good deal of money was spent for special funds for sewer work, street maintenance, and things of that kind, in addition to the ordinary expenditures of the kind that may be found in the State of Texas or in Kansas or other States.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe so, not for those purposes. Of course, the municipal government here, which is largely paid for by the taxpayers of the District, does have the ordinary functions that a city similar to Washington would have, and there are many other Federal funds expended here.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The general picture is, then, that whatever money is spent in the District by the Federal Government is included in this bill?

Mr. MAHON. Millions and billions of dollars are spent here by the Federal Government on Federal functions. I am not discussing those things. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, he will clarify the particular question he has in mind.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has mentioned the police department and the difficulties it is having. We have here a tremendous influx of people from all parts of the country. Does the gentleman have figures in reference to the crime rate and law-enforcement conditions in the District of Columbia at the present time?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that the figures were before the

committee and are available in the hearings. Evidence was given regarding the various types of crime. Major crimes are not on the increase in the District of Columbia. Minor crimes are on the increase in the District. Juvenile delinquency is on the upgrade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the President has issued a challenge which Congress should accept.

While the first amendment to the Constitution expressly states that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press and while Congress has made no attempt to do so, the President has assumed to deny freedom of the press and to challenge Congress to support the constitutional guaranty.

By his decision that the international conference meeting to discuss the question of food for the world shall be secret, he has thrown down the gauntlet to the Congress of the United States.

By the decision to prohibit the press from being present at the Bermuda conference, which is expected to take action with reference to refugees, he indicates that he believes that he has become a dictator.

Through the Office of War Information, which feeds propaganda, undisclosed to our own citizens, to foreign nations and to our armed forces, this muzzling of the press has been carried on.

Resolutions have been introduced in both branches of Congress, requesting that members of each body and of the press be represented at the discussions at the food conference to be held on May 18 at Hot Springs, Va.

A morning paper carries the statement that yesterday a number of the Members of the other body complained that it was outrageous to clamp down a censorship on the International Food Conference at Hot Springs, not of a military nature.

That newspaper story carried the further statement that although the Senators made their protest, they expressed the opinion that any hope of modifying or lifting the press ban rests only on President Roosevelt.

There was much complaint during and preceding the last campaign that Congress did not have the respect or the confidence of the people. Columnists and editors, lecturers and radio commentators—none speaking with authority or for or in behalf of the people—seemed to delight in taking turns at kicking Congress around. Congress was the goat. Congress was the whipping boy.

The people, however, on election day, because they knew their individual Congressmen and because Congressmen hold office by virtue of the votes of the people of their district rather than through permission granted by columnists, editors, lecturers, and radio commentators, made their own selections and disregarded the abuse and advice given by self-appointed critics.

Having elected the present Members of Congress, the people back home expect us to protect them and to safeguard their constitutional rights. The future of this country depends to a large extent upon free speech and the freedom of the press.

It is encouraging that Members of the Senate and Members of the House expressed their determination that the press shall not be muzzled. But words and resolutions are not enough. There must be action.

To get action on April 15, H. R. 2499 was introduced. That bill declares that it is the policy of these United States to reaffirm adherence to the principle of and to preserve inviolate freedom of speech and of the press.

It further makes it unlawful for any representative of the executive department of the Government to hold secret conversations, discussions or conferences with the representatives of foreign governments which have for their purpose the giving away of the resources of our country or the modification of our immigration laws.

The bill may not be all that it should be. It may be but a crude attempt to accomplish a desirable purpose. It has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and it should receive action.

For several years the President has followed a course which, if continued to its logical conclusion, will destroy constitutional government. That is a strong statement, but it is a true statement.

Not so long ago we were told by the President himself that his administration had returned to Washington in 34 months powers which, in improper hands, would shackle the liberties of the people.

Those powers have been returned to Washington. Those powers are now, as we know, in all too many instances in the hands of improper individuals. Some of those powers are in the hands of foreign-born individuals holding high places in policy-making agencies of the Federal Government. Some of those individuals, who wield this power, are, by their previous utterances, committed to the policy of overthrowing our Government, if not by force, then by subterfuge.

The most powerful weapon in their hands is the power to suppress the press. They know that, if their plans and schemes, their conspiracies, can be uncovered and exposed to the light of day, the danger can be met and overcome. They know that, if they can work in secret and commit this country and its people to foreign, subversive ideologies our freedom will be lost.

The President has had much to say about the "four freedoms." We are involved in a war because, it has been said, we must carry the "four freedoms" to the uttermost corners of the earth.

Of those freedoms all but the freedom of religious worship have been circumscribed and limited. There is no longer freedom from fear, for, protected by the agencies of the administration, ex-convicts, and goon squads, on rationed gasoline and tires, drive from city to city, intimidating citizens who have committed no offense against the law; levying tribute, running into millions of dollars per month, on American workers who must pay in order to exercise their constitutional right to earn a livelihood.

There is no longer freedom from fear, for, throughout the length and breadth of this land, women and men are compelled day by day and day after day to stand and deliver, pay the price of a union membership, in order to work in defense of their country, or take a beating at the hands of gangsters who hide behind a union organization and who collect for union politicians and racketeers.

Throughout this land day after day some businessman must consent to being robbed of a portion of his earnings by someone who claims to represent a union, or have his business destroyed.

The charges just made are true. I challenge any Member of this House to successfully deny them.

No longer here in America is there freedom from fear. No longer is there freedom from want and, unless this Congress acts, no longer will there be free speech and a free press.

This Congress is in session. It has been challenged. The people of the country—your constituents and mine—know that the gauntlet has been thrown down to us. Can we retain our self-respect; will we deserve the trust which the people have reposed in us, if we do not now, without delay, take action to meet this challenge of the President and pass legislation which will make it a criminal offense for anyone representing the executive department to commit this country or its people to any course of procedure, to any policy, which has not received the approval and the sanction of the people's representatives in Congress assembled?

Let us take that question home with us and, when we go to bed tonight, ask the good God above to help us solve it and to give us courage to put into force the solution which we reach.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we place before you at this time is the one that makes appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1944. The total amount in the bill as recommended by your committee is $54,789,434, which is $220,264 below the Budget estimate, and $1,516,504 under the 1943 appropriation. The committee has provided for the payment of considerable indebtedness—which was between eleven and twelve million dollars—and if this bill is enacted into law, the indebtedness of the city will be a little over $4,000,000.

It is always a pleasure to work with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] who is chairman of the subcommittee which has had this bill under consideration. Other members of the committee have contributed a great deal to this legislation. I feel a word of praise to them is in order at this time. These members include Messrs. COFFEE of Washington, GORE of Tennessee, ANDERSON of New Mexico, DWORSHAK of Idaho, and JENSEN of Iowa. To our committee clerk, Mr. Williams, should go much appreciation for his valuable and efficient work.

I recommend to the membership of the committee a careful reading of the hearings on this bill, because they contain many more items than are contained in most of the appropriation bills which we bring to you from time to time. Washington is now the capital of the world. In fact, Washington is cosmopolitan, and that means that it belongs to all or most of the world, and that it is no longer local. An able news writer in one of the local papers recently stated:

Nothing happens any place that isn't concerned with Washington or with which it isn't concerned.

The population of the city is nearing the million mark, and there is much crowding of humanity in this small area of a little over 6 square miles. In Washington proper there are over 850,000 people, with over 250,000 colored, and thousands of people from every corner of the world. You can hear practically every language of the world spoken on the streets of Washington, and even English is spoken so peculiarly in many instances that it is no more the American language which we hear on the streets of the cities and towns in typical American States. It is a dizzy, confusing city, which not only bewilders the temporary residents and foreigners, but makes pre-war Washingtonians groan and despair.

As the war progresses the legislation for our Capital City becomes more and more important. The activities here are so important and so widespread that they are linked to every part of the life of all of the citizens of our entire Nation.

The fiscal condition of the Capital is good. Every effort is being made to put the city on a balanced budget. In other words, to put the city on a pay-as-you-spend basis. If Members will turn to page 29 of the hearings, they will find a table containing interesting facts about how much money is taken from the Federal Treasury each year for expenditures within the District of Columbia. These figures indicate that while we are appropriating the funds collected from the taxpayers of the District, Federal expenditures here are quite liberal. There is no reason at the present time to increase the Federal contribution to the District.

The distinguished chairman has given the committee a very complete picture of the details in this bill, so I shall confine myself merely to a few observations which may be of interest to the committee. First, I wish to point out that this bill is, in reality, a citizens and taxpayers' bill. That is because your committee has made personal investigations of many facilities located in the District. The committee has discussed with many officials of the city and private citizens the needs of the city, and has taken into serious consideration the wishes of the representatives of the various citizens' organizations. In my opinion, never before have we presented to you a District of Columbia appropriations bill which reflects so many of the ideas of the majority of the citizens and taxpayers as does the bill we present to you at this time.

In my opinion, the committee has not been unmindful that Washington is the Capital of the Nation and that it belongs to all of the people of the United States. During this time of our great emergency hundreds of thousands of our own constituents are quartered here, and they come from every congressional district in the United States. It was from the broad view of protecting the financial and the general welfare of all of the District citizens and the welfare and the interests of all of the people who are here, even temporarily, that your committee considered this bill.

I had the impression throughout the hearings on this bill that a majority of the committee recognized the fact that the residents of the District of Columbia do not have the privilege to vote as do the citizens of other States and municipalities of our Union. Taxation without representation is not popular in the American mind. We are not unmindful of the anxiety of many Washington people to sometime be given the benefits of franchise, and I have taken special notice in these hearings that most members of the committee have done their utmost to act and serve to the best of their ability so that the people here will be given the best possible representation. Until the future brings changes in the manner under which the District is to be governed, I am sure that they can depend upon this Congress to represent them efficiently, honestly, and vigorously, so that their interests will be cared for and not impaired. The day may come, Mr. Chairman, when the people of the District of Columbia will have their own representatives in the House and in the Senate to speak, vote, and act for them, but until that day arrives, I feel sure that under the present conditions, the District is enjoying good representation.

The hearings disclosed that Washington is more free from crime than many other cities of our country. It has one of the best police forces of any city of this size. The committee has increased the personnel for the police department, and the bill before you provides for an additional 125 policemen. Under the supervision of Major Kelly and his efficient staff, a planned and efficient program of crime elimination, law enforcement and better patrolling of outlying areas is in the making. The District Fire Department is considered one of the best in the land, and the loss from fire is negligible. Those of you interested in fire-insurance premiums will find some interesting information on that subject in the hearings. Real-estate tax is low in Washington compared with other cities, but rents continue high.

There are quite a few sources from which additional revenue can be secured, and the Commissioners, I understand, are giving considerable study to these available sources of more revenue.

In spite of recent newspaper reports regarding unhealthy locations within the city, the Congress should be informed that after discussing the matter with the health authorities here and making some personal investigations, we find that Washington is considered to be one of the healthiest cities in the United States. Improvement in health matters are being made continuously, and we are assured that precautions have been taken against a possible epidemic in the Capital, and we were also assured that there is absolutely no danger at this time from an epidemic. With the shrinkage of the world due to rapid air transportation, diseases prevalent in foreign countries can be easily transmitted to the various municipalities of the United States, including Washington, but the health officers assure us that even against these possibilities precautions have been taken.

The school system of the District of Columbia, under the direction of Dr. Frank W. Ballou, is one of the best in the country. The city has a dual school system and has fitted itself into the war picture; in fact, the Washington school system is at war. Vocational, physical training and subjects of tremendous value to our war effort have been inaugurated and are being increased. This is not only true among the schools where white children are taught, but also in the schools where colored children are taught. The Washington schools are experiencing the same difficulties that other schools of our land are faced with in the matter of teachers. Thousands of teachers over our country have left the schoolroom and have either gone into the service or taken positions which pay better salaries. In Washington, school teachers are paid better and work under better conditions than teachers in many other cities of the country. In spite of this, Washington schools are losing their teachers.

So serious has this situation regarding teachers become that I am prevailed upon by many educators to secure a definite statement from the War Manpower Commission for a ruling as to whether or not teachers can be rated as an essentiality during the war. Only today I have a reply from the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who tells me that the Commission has certified educational services as essential, and an activity and occupation bulletin has been issued to all local selective-service boards to that effect. Mr. McNutt tells me that consideration for occupational deferment is extended to persons teaching one or more subjects which have a definite relationship to the war program. The local offices of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission have copies of the lists of essential occupations on file. It is suggested that persons interested in the scope of coverage extended to educational services call at the nearest local office, where these data may be examined. Teachers, with the exception of music, art, and dancing teachers, have definitely been excluded from the list of nondeferrable activities and occupations, and it is urged that persons whose occupations were not specifically mentioned remain on their jobs until such time as an official announcement concerning a change in the status of their activity or occupation is made.

Business in Washington is good, in fact, the business here is the best in its history. The population is increasing by leaps and bounds. The city is growing so

rapidly that it will soon pass the million mark. No other city in the United States is enjoying the cash business as is our Nation's Capital. Members of the committee were impressed by replies to many questions propounded to witnesses that the citizens considered Washington to be about the best governed city in the United States, and many witnesses indicated that they would not care for any change of the form of government in Washington, even though some time in the future a change in the Constitution would grant the people franchise. Most of those to whom we talked favor the commissioner form or city manager form of government. Washington is governed by a Board of three Commissioners who are appointed by the President of the United States. The president of the Board is John Russell Young, a lifetime resident of Washington and an able newspaperman. Other members are Guy Mason, an able lawyer, and Gen. Charles W. Kutz of the Corps of United States Engineers. These Commissioners are very active and have performed and are continuing to perform excellent work for the District of Columbia. Many of us have made it a point to see these Commissioners at work, and so far as I am concerned, I can only express my high appreciation and commendation for the services of these able men. They have surrounded themselves with efficient and able personnel, and to the best of my knowledge, these officials have the best interests of the District at heart, and are continually planning and working for better conditions and better programs in order that the District of Columbia will continue being the most beautiful, the most healthful, and the safest capital city in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I say to the gentleman that I appreciate very much the splendid statement he has made, giving us a history and outline of the manner in which the affairs of the District of Columbia are conducted.

There are a few questions I should like to propound to the gentleman, if I may. One of them has to do with the question of expenditures within the District. I propounded to the able chairman of this committee a moment ago the question of whether or not funds are spent in the District by the Federal Government in addition to those indicated in the report. I find, upon examination of the hearings, that a considerable amount of money has been expended. I think the city of Washington has perhaps been preferred in the expenditure of that money.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will turn to page 29, he will find a consolidated statement for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and the 6 months ending December 31, 1942, of funds received from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration for relief purposes, funds advanced to the District of Columbia under the Social Security Act, loans and grants made to the District by the Public Works Administration, grants under the George-Deen act, grants for vocational education of defense workers, venereal-disease control, and maintenance of fair labor standards, and grants under the Federal Highway Act.

If the gentleman will turn to the first column he will find that, including the regular $6,000,000 Federal contribution, the Federal appropriations used here were over $24,000,000 in 1941, over $14,000,000 in 1942, and about $11,000,000 for the first half-year through December 31 of 1942. Of course, a lot of these funds are similar to funds other States receive. I could not tell the gentleman whether in proportion they are higher or lower, but they are very liberal.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thought we should have a more complete picture and let it be known that not only $6,000,000 of the Federal taxpayers' money was spent here.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman agree that this is a complete picture?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. I appreciate very much the gentleman's picture.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, who has rendered unusually fine service on the committee because of his familiarity with municipal affairs.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am sure the gentleman is pointing out that all of these items he has read are for services similar to those granted other States.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. We did not think it was our function to go in and check whether they gave too much or too little to the District of Columbia. That depends upon the Administrator in Washington. We simply had to trust his integrity.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will yield further, I call his attention to page 103 of the hearings, beginning with the question of alcoholic beverage control.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand there is a sort of a monopoly on the liquor business in the city of Washington. I wonder if the gentleman has any information on that subject?

Mr. STEFAN. I have often wondered about that myself. I have propounded many questions to those who appeared before us on that subject. You will find them on page 109.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the reason I am asking the gentleman about it.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will be interested to know that liquor can be bought cheaper in Washington than in any other place. There are 1,644 retail establishments within this space of a little more than 6 miles square. I was wondering about the people who seem to have a franchise on the license of selling package liquor. They are holding it down to a little over 300. This franchise is good for life. I asked the direct question whether or not Mr. Lodge knew of any monopoly in the District of Columbia and he did not think that one existed. One thing developed in the hearings, that perhaps the city could recapture considerable money if they had a District of Columbia sales-supply house rather than having so many dispensaries. Mr. Mason, the Commissioner, indicated perhaps we could recapture several million dollars in the District of Columbia. Does that answer the gentleman's question? I do not know if there is a monopoly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it sounds like it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Kansas, whatever there may be in the way of monopoly, the Congress of the United States has it in its own alcohol control act, so that if there is any criticism we can take it to ourselves.

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not a fact that there is more liquor sold in the city of Washington than anywhere else?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. They come here and buy it cheap and take it to other cities where liquor costs more.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And they drink it, too, do they not?

Mr. STEFAN. They drink it, too.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wanted to ask about this question of rates of taxation. The rate of taxation in the city of Washington on real estate is $1.75 per 100?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is that not about half the average tax rate throughout the country?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, our tax rate is apparently much higher than that in Nebraska, but they say they tax not on the assessed valuation but on the actual valuation, but we still think it is pretty low.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize the gentleman's committee does not handle that question.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement he has made. It was very informative. Particularly I was interested in his statement about Washington being the capital of the world. The fine facilities we have for education and health, of which we approve. Last summer I ran into a section of this city by accident which revealed the most deplorable housing situation there is anywhere in the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Even in a beautiful city like Washington you can find unsanitary holes, places of filth and dirt. There are spots, as elsewhere, which should be and are being cleaned up. You can find 5 or 10 people living in 1 room if you make a search of housing conditions. The town is crowding up and every effort is being made to eliminate some of these evils.

Mr. GRANGER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I am sure you would never find anything like that in Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. No, indeed you would not. Not as bad as some places I have seen here. But they are being cleaned up.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to congratulate my colleague for the very fine statement he has made on the affairs of the District of Columbia. I realize he is one of the hard-working members of that committee, and he has brought us some fine information. Coming from the Midwest we are concerned a little about the cost of things. I was a little shocked to find that a meal in Washington cost two or three or four dollars which out in your district can be had for a dollar or a dollar and a half.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, yes. A steak here costing $1.50 or $2 we can get out home for 75 or 80 cents.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. With reference to monopolies, is there any bread monopoly in Washington or any food monopoly? Has the gentleman discovered that?

Mr. STEFAN. I do not know. I suspect there are all kinds of monopolies in Washington. There is a prolific field in the District for combines and monopolies. Take, for instance, the matter of bread. I happen to know something about that, and I think the Congress will be interested in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The other day I was talking to a baker, an independent baker, who lives in Virginia. He is a reliable and fine gentleman. He wanted to know something about Congress. In the course of the discussion he told me there is a bread monopoly in Washington. I did not know it. When we go to the grocery store here we pay 11 cents for a 16-ounce loaf of bread. The wholesaler pays 9 cents for it. This man mentioned the names of some of those monopolies. The Continental, the General, and Ward's. He tells me they have a monopoly on the bread business here and in various other cities. He said the same thing is true at Norfolk, Va. The independent bakers between Norfolk, Va., and Washington are just being squeezed to death by this monopoly, I was informed. He told me that these big bakeries bake two kinds of loaves of bread, one weighing 21 ounces and one weighing 16 ounces. They go out in the same wagon, but when the wagon reaches a point where the monopoly has control of the bread business they unload the 16-ounce loaf, which sells for 11 cents, but when they reach a town where they have competition, where they want to snuff the independent baker, they unload a loaf weighing 21 ounces, and they sell it for the same price, 11 cents. Something should be done about that.

I may say further that since this independent baker told me his story about bread prices, I have made some inquiry in Washington and have been told by a reliable grocer here that ordinary 16-ounce loaves of bread in Washington sell for 9 cents per loaf and home-made bread sells for 14 cents per loaf.

I thank my colleague for bringing that to my attention. I had almost forgotten about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is uniformly kind to me, as he is to all others. It is easy for the Members to pass by the important duties that the members of the subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia bring to this House.

I simply want to pay not an unwarranted admiration but a very merited admiration to the chairman and to the distinguished minority member and to all those who aid each year in the duties they perform so well in connection with the appropriations for the National Capital.

Mr. STEFAN. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia is very kind, and I know I speak the sentiments of my distinguished chairman and the other members of the committee when I thank him very much and when I add that we recognize the excellent service work that the gentleman from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, has rendered and is rendering for the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. What justification was made to the subcommittee that warranted the committee in placing the proviso in page 72 to set aside section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and further ignoring the Civil Service and the Classification Acts? If we continue on this course, we might as well repeal section 3709. Are they going to let the contracts without competitive bidding?

Mr. STEFAN. I doubt that there is not competitive bidding. Witnesses have told me that most contracts are let under competitive bidding. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not true.

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that there is this provision which waives section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, also the Civil Service Classification Act. This was thought necessary by the District Commissioners and the committee by reason of the fact that in drawing these plans there was not sufficient District personnel on the pay roll, and it was not possible for them to get the personnel to do the work. So they got in touch with several agencies able to do this work and worked out the best arrangement they could. It is the most practical way, in my judgment, in a small item like this to handle the matter—not only the economical way but the practical way.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, another question that has been asked regarding the kind of food that is served in the city jail here in Washington. I have a letter complaining about it, and some Members have asked about it. I made some investigations in this connection and I include in my remarks a sample menu of the food that is served there:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PENAL INSTITUTIONS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JAIL
BILL OF FARE, WEEK ENDING APRIL 1, 1943
General Mess

Friday

Breakfast: Fried bologna, oatmeal, bread, water.
Dinner: Fried fish, stewed tomatoes, corn bread, bread, water.
Supper: Vegetable soup, bread, water.

Saturday

Breakfast: French toast, syrup, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Baked macaroni, boiled kale, chocolate pudding, bread, water.
Supper: Sliced cheese, apple sauce, bread, water.

Sunday

Breakfast: Eggs, corn flakes, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Roast pork, mashed turnips, gravy, bread, water.
Supper: Navy beans, bread, tea.

Monday

Breakfast: Fried bologna, oatmeal, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Meat cakes, boiled turnips, boiled kale, bread, water.
Supper: Vegetable soup, bread, water.

Tuesday

Breakfast: Hominy grits, syrup, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Sphaghetti, tomato sauce, cole slaw, bread pudding, bread, water.
Supper: Creamed potatoes, ginger bread, bread, water.

Wednesday

Breakfast: Hot cakes, syrup, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Beef stew, bread, water.
Supper: Meat cakes, stewed apples, bread, water.

Thursday

Breakfast: Oatmeal, syrup, bread, coffee.
Dinner: Sliced bologna, sweet potatoes, boiled kale, bread, water.
Supper: Lima beans, bacon, bread, water.

Signed: ——— ———,
Steward.

Approved: ——— ———,
Superintendent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee dealing with the District of Columbia appropriations I want to congratulate the other members of the committee for their devotion to duty in connection with administering the finances of the District of Columbia. It is not altogether a thankful job; there is not any reward to be received by a Member for devoting

himself to his duty on this committee; nevertheless it has to be done and my observation of the other members of the committee was that they put in their time wholeheartedly and unreservedly in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia.

The local newspapers have been filled with criticism of congressional committees dealing with the District of Columbia, in the recent past, but I do not think that on the whole the criticism is justified. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], chairman of the legislative committee on the District of Columbia, and his committee have given hours and days in hearings to local citizens and officials and have performed an excellent job and deserve the plaudits of all patriotic citizens.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

Mr. COFFEE. The District of Columbia, on the whole, is a well-run government. Contrary to what I had previously conceived to be the case, I found in contacting the various public officials in the District of Columbia that they are a superior set of officials. Mr. Walter Fowler, the budget officer, I regard as a man exceptionally qualified to perform his duties. I do not want to burden the time of the Committee with any elaborate discussion of the problems confronting the committee in dealing with the District of Columbia, other than to direct attention to the fact that the committee saw fit to include an item of $7.500 for a consumers' counsel for the District of Columbia. There has been legislative authorization for this item for many years, but in recent years the committee saw fit not to include an item providing for the salary of a consumers' counsel. The people of the District of Columbia have no one directly concerned with representing them in connection with rate hearings before the Public Utilities Commission in fighting the battle for reduction of rates, or to contend for reduction of insurance premiums, and in behalf of the consumers generally; we in the committee, in response to the insistent requests of the District of Columbia Improvement Associations, included an item for the salary of the District of Columbia consumers' counsel.

All four daily newspapers in Washington editorially have urged that that be done. We also took off the ceiling which had heretofore been imposed on allowances for the needy, which was limited to $24 per couple, plus $6 per each dependent, giving to the Welfare Board the authority to adjudge each case on its individual merits to insure that no hardship would be imposed on the needy.

I found that the District of Columbia Commissioners were capable men, deserving of our respect and meriting our sympathetic support; that they were putting in their time faithfully in the interest of the people; that the chief of police, Major Kelly, is an excellent man and doing a splendid job as superintendent of police; that the fire department in the city of Washington is one of the finest fire departments in the Nation, standing fourth highest of the major cities of the country in holding down fires; that we have a fine series of public hospitals operated by the District of Columbia dealing with the needy, the unemployed, the aged, the mental unfortunates, and the defectives; that the public school system here is of the highest quality; that the District has an exceptionally high standard imposed on the officials having charge of these hospitals. I found that the Librarian of the District of Columbia is a woman of remarkable capabilities and that the library executives are running their public library and their branches here with special emphasis, and are, according to the citizens generally, courteous and fair dealing.

I found that the city of Washington, D. C., because of its peculiar climatic conditions, is more susceptible to the inroads of pests of various kinds, such as the danger of malaria-carrying mosquitoes, than most cities, but that in recent years that menace has been reduced almost to negligible proportions, although up to a few years ago it was very common for many citizens living in the lower regions abutting the rivers and creeks to be afflicted with malaria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, my experience as a member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations has been an enjoyable one. I have had experience in being counsel for a city of over 100,000 in connection with some of the municipal problems which arise, and as a lawyer specializing in municipal corporation law; but in no contact that the committee made with any of the officials, with one or two minor exceptions, which are inconsequential in character, did I find that the officials who handle the recondite problems of the District of Columbia had been negligent or were incompetent to do their job.

There is one thing that has been evident in the District of Columbia government. That is the difficulty that the officials are having in securing priorities for critical material in connection with repairs for the city water and city sewer systems, general repairs, and for the schools. It seems to me that our Federal Government agencies have not dealt with the District of Columbia as fairly as the conditions would justify. The great city of Washington, the Capital of the Nation, it seems to me, is deserving of more generous consideration on the part of the War Production Board and other agencies in allowing this city government to secure adequate critical material with which to carry on.

I appreciate the fact that the newspapers in the last few weeks have referred to the committees dealing with the District of Columbia in a much friendlier way and have spoken of their work with approval. My experience in connection with the work done by the committee dealing with the District of Columbia has been that the members of these committees are motivated solely by a desire to cooperate with a people who are not given the right to vote, who have no representative in Congress, and who have no direct contacts with Uncle Sam except through these committees listening to them. It seems to me that we the members of the committee should go to considerable length in trying to make up, insofar as we may, for that lack of representation under which the people of the District of Columbia must struggle. So in conclusion, while I do not want to go into any of the details of the bill unless some of the members of the Committee of the Whole interrogate me on the subject, I think the committee has done a good job. The government of the District of Columbia is demonstrably well run. We need have no apprehension in passing the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I have been looking over the record of the police department, as found on page 325 of the hearings. I have heard some criticism of the police department and also the fact that we have granted several increases in policemen. I have heard that criticized to some extent. I wish the gentleman would tell us what he thinks of the police department from the hearings.

Mr. COFFEE. The police department of the city of Washington has an unusual duty to perform. It polices the National Capital as well as a city of a population of 900,000 to a million; a city which has increased in population more rapidly than almost any other city of similar character or proportion. The police department here is inadequately staffed because there is imposed upon them the duty of safeguarding the embassies and guarding a great many governmental agencies which normally they would not be called upon to do in any other city.

The committee saw fit to approve an appropriation for 125 additional policemen, primarily because the Superintendent of Police brought out in his testimony that in the outlying districts—that is in the residential areas—these policemen have to cover a beat involving 70, 90, to 100 square blocks which is too much for them to do adequately. We therefore at their request, and they wanted 200, allowed them 125 and brought in a recommendation for 125 so as to cut down the number of blocks which each individual policeman would be required to cover in doing his job of patroling residential neighborhoods, thus providing greater safety for citizens.

We have a large colored population in Washington, about 30 percent of the total population. We have a character of crimes which may be attributable to the fact there is some race feeling here in the District. Though I am a friend of the colored people, and I do not want to have anything I say construed as reflecting upon the colored people, there are certain crimes which due to the peculiar situation of Washington makes the police department's job an especially difficult one in connection with sex crimes and in connection with race feeling that has been developed. Therefore, I can say in answer to the gentleman from Arkansas I believe the whole police department

is doing a good job here, and if they get extra help they will do a better job.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman. I just noticed there were 37 rape cases in the District for 1942, which is an increase over the previous year and in addition to that there were 27 assault cases with intent to rape, which also I think is an increase over the previous year.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct.

Mr. NORRELL. I am satisfied with the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. COFFEE. One of the reasons ascribed for that is that we in Washington, as a National Capital, are the cynosure of all the crackpots in the Nation. Everyone who has a scheme for the solving of the world's ills or some financial panacea for the currency problems of the United States comes to Washington and camps at the doors of the Senate and House of Representatives. Those people are aberrated mentally one way or the other and crime ensues as a result of their obsessions. This factor is one of the reasons for our trouble. We have people seeking redress from the Government, and they have been brooding on it for years, to such an extent that it sometimes affects their mental capabilities. Though they may not be incarcerated in institutions, they are susceptible to criminal tendencies. Hence we have a higher proportion of crime here than we would otherwise have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time on this side. There are other pieces of legislation that are supposed to come before the House this afternoon. May I ask my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] if we cannot now agree on limiting debate?

Mr. STEFAN. I think we can agree on some limit. I may say that I have requests for about 35 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. On the bill?

MR. STEFAN. I do not know. However, the gentleman understands that debate has not been confined to the bill.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. Can we agree to close debate in 35 minutes?

Mr. STEFAN. I suggest that it be made 40 minutes, in case there is some colloquy.

Mr. MAHON. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate conclude in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

WASHINGTON NOT TOO "HEALTHY"

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and the ranking Republican member and all members of the committee for the valuable and thankless service they render the voteless people of the District, as they give of their time and energy to the consideration of the vexations and multitudinous problems growing out of appropriating money for running a city of a million.

However, were I to sit here and listen and not say a word I might be considered to assent to the suggestion they make that Washington is the healthiest city of its size in the world. That is not so.

The late United States Senator Carroll S. Page, from Vermont, was the president of a very prosperous bank, which he advertised as the greatest bank in any village of its size in the world, which was true, but Hyde Park was a small village, and the bank was not the richest to be found, though strong for its size.

So Washington, D. C., is the healthiest city of its size, among unhealthy cities, that are as big as it is and as unhealthy, which does not mean a thing, except that the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, which is investigating health conditions in the District, has made a report which my friends of the committee now presenting this bill might read with profit, for they certainly are altogether too proud of a situation which obtains, of which I know they would be ashamed, were they fully advised.

The D'Alesandro report will shock a lot of people into a realization of the facts made apparent as a result of the subcommittee's investigation, not dependent upon reports made as alibis by those responsible to some extent for a condition which, as evidenced by the facts, the complaints, the reports of groups of citizens, is not what some people would like to have you think and believe.

I appreciate what has been done in the clean-up campaign, but am of the opinion still that much more remains to be done before the eulogy of my friend Representative STEFAN in re health conditions in the District will be any more than a dream, superinduced by the hypnotic influence of the officials in charge of the health situation in the District.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to praise very highly the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He handled the hearings in a most efficient manner. I also wish to compliment the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], as well as all the other members of the committee.

I was impressed during the hearings with the high caliber of the District Commissioners. It seemed to me that with no exception they are trying to do a good job for the District of Columbia. They are businessmen. They are able, honest, and efficient. That is true also of the heads of the various departments.

The government of the District of Columbia has a lot of things to do in managing the operations of the District. In fact, it has not only the responsibilities which ordinarily are imposed on a city government but many of those which are imposed on a State government. In a sense it is a State. Almost every activity a State has the District of Columbia has also.

I was especially pleased to note that the indebtedness of the District is so small. The one question I raised in the committee was, Why not pay it all off as quickly as possible so that when this terrible war is over there will be a more favorable disposition to appropriate more money for buildings and improvements in the District, which will give employment to the boys coming back from the war and to other people who will naturally be looking for employment at that time? The total indebtedness of the District is at this time approximately $11,000,000. The District Commissioners have intimated to the committee that they wish to pay off over half of this indebtedness this year, to which suggestion the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has agreed most heartily. I think that in the next fiscal year they should make an attempt to pay off just as much as can possibly be paid off so that, as I said, we can then feel more justified in appropriating money to take care of these needed improvements.

I am glad to say that no new improvements are being carried on at this time in the District of Columbia. The District is, of course, keeping up the repairs to buildings, the roads, and the streets, which is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee it has been extremely interesting for me to attend the hearings and observe the inner workings of the municipal government of our National Capital.

Every member of the committee and every speaker here today has commended the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, and the ranking Republican on the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska, for the splendid work which they have been doing during the past several years, not only this year, in handling this rather uninteresting appropriation bill.

I was impressed by the fact that, although considerable newspaper publicity and criticism in Washington has been directed against the various municipal activities—and, of course, in a city of this size it is only natural that there should be opportunity occasionally to make some criticisms of the municipal government—the three Commissioners of the city of Washington are doing a most efficient job. The various witnesses who appeared at the hearings, representing civic organizations and groups in Washington, were almost unanimous in their commendation of the Commissioners and the administration of our municipal government in Washington.

There are no controversial issues in this bill. At this time I desire to call your attention for just a couple of minutes to the item of public welfare. The bill calls for a total of $8,118,328, a slight reduction from the current year, and $127,665 under the Budget estimate submitted for this particular bill.

If you have paid any attention to the measure before the House, you will recognize that there are more than a dozen

activities under the heading of public welfare—various homes and institutions for providing relief for the needy and indigent and those who are afflicted in various ways.

We all recognize that that is an obligation and function of governments, and in Washington, as much as in the various States of the Union; but during the hearings, I observed when comparing the sums for public welfare with the amounts appropriated for this purpose during various years in the past decade, that notwithstanding the fact that there has been a decided improvement insofar as prosperity is concerned in the city of Washington, and notwithstanding the stimulus provided by this war, and the essential manpower requirements which make it possible for every man, woman, boy, and girl who need work to secure employment, nevertheless we find about the same amount necessary for 1944. I point out that, back in 1934, when we were supposedly in the depths or in the reaction from the depression, the appropriation for public welfare totaled $5,845,295, with a deficiency of $88,000, or a total of something less than $6,000,000, in the fiscal year of 1934. In 1935, about $8,000,000 was required, and in 1936 less than $8,000,000. There was something of a drop in 1938 to about $7,000,000 and about 7,500,000 in 1940, and a similar amount in 1941. In the fiscal year 1942, there was a total of $8,151,158, with a slight deficiency appropriation later; and in the current fiscal year the total for public welfare amounted to $8,335,-245. I call attention to this because it has seemed to me that the Commissioners should recognize at this time that it is incumbent on them to make such plans, retrenchments, and curtailments which will make it far more advantageous to face the post-war conditions that will confront the Capital City in a very few years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. What is included in that public welfare—what different types of relief?

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is for the upkeep of various institutions and training homes—hospitals, industrial schools, National Training School, Receiving Home, St. Ann's Infant Asylum, and so on—the ordinary organizations.

Mr. CURTIS. Does it include relief to individual citizens—direct relief?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes, there is less than half a million in that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

In conclusion, may I make this observation that several times there has been mentioned the contribution of $6,000,-000 by the Federal Government, and if you will read the hearings you will see that the tax rate is $1.75, which is among the lowest enjoyed by any city in the United States. In addition to that, having an income tax and various other methods of raising revenue, one will undoubtedly reach the conclusion that there is no justification under existing circumstances for increasing the Federal contribution in excess of the $6,000,000. If you will follow the reports issued monthly by the United States Civil Service Commission you will have observed that the pay roll of nearly 300,000 Federal employees in the city of Washington is almost $60,000,000 monthly. I believe that this is a compensating benefit received by the city of Washington because of the fact that our National Capital is located here. So I make this concluding observation, that I have been impressed as a member of this subcommittee with the fact that the Federal Government need not contribute more than $6,000,000 to the upkeep and administration of the municipal government in the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has again expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. I do this to point out that the public debt of the District is in extremely good shape. Some question was raised about it. At one time the debt amounted to a good many million dollars. I call attention to page 5 of the report, which points out that the repayment of the public debt this year will be $6,850,000, which will leave a public debt of only $4,482,504, or a sum of money which could be cleaned up within 1 year. That is an extremely favorable situation in any municipality, and I think the residents of the District would be much interested in that. Turning to page 566 of the hearings you will see there is additional money earmarked for improvements, but withheld, due to the fact that certain types of public improvements have not been made. There is $1,059,000 in one part, and $1,-018 000 in another. I think enough money has been withheld so that if the city wished to do so, it could possibly wipe out its entire public debt. I do not think it would be wise to do so, and I think the Commissioners are to be commended upon the way in which they have handled this matter, and in being able to pay off two-thirds of the public debt, leaving only $4,500,000 approximately remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I think it was Ben Franklin who said that any poor government is good government, and, inversely, sometimes, when too much money is available, in any municipality, it goes in the opposite direction. I have had to depend upon what I could glean from the hearings, which have not been available too long, to ascertain what the facts are in the operation of Washington as a city. On the 5th of April I contacted the Commissioner's office, for which there has been much compliment here today, and asked that they submit to me, because I pride myself in being at least familiar with the operation of the municipality, an appropriation measure in detail, itemizing the expenses and what it is to be used for in the District of Columbia for this coming fiscal year. I have not received it to date.

There are a few comparisons I can make with experiences I have had in the city from which I come, which represents about one-third the number of people there are in the District of Columbia. For instance, the police operation in my home town as compared with that in the city of Washington—we have a lower crime expectancy than you have in the District of Columbia. We have one policeman representing nearly 2,000 persons. In Washington I find you have a policeman for each 700 persons. We find that the average per capita cost for police in the city of Washington is something in excess of $2,500, whereas it is less than $2,000 in the city from which I come.

I find in addition there is a habit here of paying high compliments for what might be considered ordinary duty. I had occasion to sit in the District Committee, of which I am a member, when two superior officers and another officer were brought in and they were paid high compliments for having apprehended a man for snatching a woman's purse. She had given a complete description, and the policemen going to the scene of the crime came upon a person running along the street, who answered the description. They stopped him and found the evidence upon him which proved that he was the guilty culprit. They arrested him, for which they received high compliment. If that is extraordinary duty, I would like to know just what to expect of the police department.

With reference to the fire department, for which a great many kind things have been said today, I had occasion to go to the back end of the House Office Building, in which I am quartered, recently, when the George Washington Inn was on fire. I was there when the fire department rushed up in great numbers and it appeared to me in much confusion. A line was attached to a pumper and carried up to the fourth or fifth floor where the fire was. When they got up there the man at the end of the hose was yelling for water, and then they found they had attached the hose to a valve on the pumper that would not work. They had to detach it and 7 or 8 minutes were lost, at some considerable expense to the owner of the property.

I do not say these things to be critical of the District of Columbia, but I revert to what I said at the beginning, sometimes when too much money is afforded a municipality it gets away from good economical government.

Much has been said about the reduction of the bonded indebtedness against the District of Columbia. I would call attention to the fact that as the bonded indebtedness goes down and the appropriation measure keeps going on, it affords more money for expenditure. If it is piling up in funds to be reserved for post-war application, that is one thing, but if it is expended just because it is available, that is another thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROWE. I may be supercritical in my first appearance concerning matters relating to the District of Columbia, but I felt as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia that if I applied to the Commissioners for some information in order to understand what their problems are, and it has been refused me, the only thing I could do was to get up here and give my honest opinions. I could say much more from the viewpoint of the present, but I shall reserve that until I get some consideration from the Commissioners' office. I not only want to know what you have in the appropriation measure coming here as the product of one subcommittee of the Congress, removed from the legislative group that sets up expenditures for the District of Columbia, but I think this disassociation misses much that should be sound economy. If I am supercritical I ask that I be excused but at least these are my honest and sound conclusions.

I want the information in that appropriation measure. When I get it and get a chance to make an analysis of it, I will attempt to clarify what I have been saying here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Members and the minority and majority leaders to the fact that we may be placing the President in a very embarrassing position by our legislative actions.

The President has asked all to assist in keeping the inflation line. He has asked for an equality of sacrifices by all groups. He is quoted as saying that the Bankhead bill would cause a vicious inflation spiral, and he vetoed the bill on that account. He has, through Mr. McNutt, frozen the wages of 27,000,000 wage earners of the land. This not only includes the people receiving 30 cents per hour in industry but also the farm employees who, in some States, received from $26 to $35 per month, without board, in 1942. We are also advised that the miners in the John L. Lewis organization cannot expect a pay increase to offset the increased cost of living because of the effect it would have upon inflation.

Now, if we pass this conference report on the civil-service bill and give an increase in salary of $609 per year to people who happen to be working for the Government and obtaining from $5,000 to $9,000 per year, what will be the inflation picture? Should we pass legislation to provide people in Federal positions receiving $5,000 to $9,000 a year an increase in salary when the salaries of people receiving similar amounts in private industry are frozen?

A bill to raise the salaries of people in the lower income brackets who are working for the Government most assuredly should be passed without fear of inflation. However, a bill that gives an $800 per year employee a $168 increase in salary to meet the cost of living and gives a $9,000 employee a $609 increase just does not make sense. Should we ask the President to sign a bill which provides an increase of $609 per annum in the salaries of one group, which amount is more than the total yearly wages received by a large group in private industry and on the land and whose annual salaries of from $350 to $600 have been frozen by Mr. McNutt?

How can we expect to have the War Labor Board with its four public members receiving $10,000 per year sit across the table from Mr. John L. Lewis and tell Mr. Lewis that it will cause inflation to give the miners an increase in salary of from $25 to $50 a month to men receiving $125 to $175 per month and when we legislate to provide over $50 per month increase in salary to groups receiving $9,000 per year or $750 a month? In other words, if the wage increase to low-income groups will cause inflation and if the Bankhead bill, which would provide less than an average of $50 yearly per farmer, will cause inflation, what influence on inflation can we expect if we provide $609 increases in salaries for $9,000-a-year Federal employees?

It must be borne in mind that the total sum involved for these Federal employees would be $600,000,000 to $700,000,000 a year to less than 2,500,000 people, while the Bankhead bill would not involve half as large a sum and would be distributed to 6,000,000 other people.

We should not place the President, with his many responsibilities, in this position and we should not be a party to any such unfair legislative programs. We can expect to receive many repercussions if this proposed legislation is agreed to by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. I am just wondering how in the world he or any other man who voted for the bill giving $300 a year to postal employees is going to justify a different position with respect to the other employees.

The facts are as I have stated them before, that this Congress authorized payment to postal employees of straight time for any time beyond 40 hours a week. That is 20 percent. That applies to postmasters and to other employees getting $9,000 a year or less, just as does the bill on which we have a conference report and which probably will be called up tomorrow, applies to employees outside the Postal Service.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] voted on a roll call vote for that bill. It gives 14 percent more money to the postal employees than this bill gives to those outside the Postal Service. I just want to put the House on notice that when any gentleman takes that position I am going to call attention to it, because I believe in treating everybody alike as far as we can. The truth about the matter is that this conference report does not do as much for the one and a half million employees it covers as we have already done on a roll call vote for the postal employees, and as we have done by permanent legislation for nearly a million employees who work in the arsenals and navy yards for the Government.

It gives them less than actual straight time. We have increased the hours of these employees from 39 a week to 48, which is a 24-percent increase in their working time, and we propose to pay them 21.6 percent more for the work they do—less than straight time. There is an exception made for the lower paid employees, who are given a minimum increase of $300 per annum, but no one can be paid more than 25-percent increase.

Mr. STEFAN. We are indeed pleased to see some distinguished visitors in the press gallery, some newspapermen from Argentina. To them we say, "Nosotros estamos muy alegre. Vengan otra vez."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if I did not feel so deeply on the subject to which I will direct your attention this afternoon, I certainly would not detain the House at this time as I realize there are other bills to be considered. At the outset may I say that I am sick and tired of receiving complaints from constituents to the effect—using the vernacular—that they are being pushed around by employees of Government agencies. The people who send me these complaints are, after all in most cases, the taxpayers, or to put it another way, actually the employers of the people in the various agencies to whom they must turn for information.

Recently I had an experience of my own here in Washington that perhaps causes me to be even more sympathetic to other people's problems along the same line. Last January I leased a house here in Washington and, without going into any detail, will simply say that there was a misunderstanding about the amount of fuel oil that was then available for the balance of the year. The result was that a few weeks ago we ran entirely out of fuel oil. My wife went to her local rationing board to secure information as to just what forms were necessary to submit for additional oil. She stood in line for 45 minutes and then had to leave to keep an appointment. While standing in line she was shocked at the treatment received by many of those who were being interviewed by the clerks in this ration board office. For example, one of the clerks seemed to take great delight in bawling out an Army general. It seems that the general's wife had made an error and used some coupons that should not have been used. Certainly such a mistake did not justify the clerk for publicly reprimanding this distinguished gentleman.

The next day I tried to call the manager of that particular board but the clerk who answered the telephone stated that the manager could not do anything for me that she could not do. When I insisted that I wished to speak to the manager, I was told he was busy but that she would take my number and the manager would call me back, "if he wanted to." In all fairness, I should say at this point that that situation has been corrected and there are some new employees in that office today. In fact, just last Thursday I was told by a friend in that same ration board area that the whole atmosphere was much different.

Frankly, I believe that Mr. Prentiss Brown is trying to do a good job in administering O. P. A. It is going to be a difficult problem to sell to the American people, as none of us like any form of regimentation, even in time of war, but Mr. Brown is not going to be successful in his efforts until he gets rid of a lot of the inefficient help that he inherited when he was named Administrator.

Now, to go into conditions in my own particular congressional district. I spent last week end in my district. Last Saturday afternoon I received a telephone call from a lady residing there. She explained to me that she had taken her four ration books belonging to the members of her family to her office when she went to work that morning. She stepped out of the office for a few minutes and, during her absence, her books were stolen. This particular person is trying hard to operate a small manufacturing business in Hartford County, doing war-contract work. Unfortunately her father died 5 months ago and her brother, who was active in the business, is now serving with the Army in Africa. This lady was naturally upset at the loss of her books and went straight to the Hartford War Price and Rationing Board, which is located 7 miles from her office, in an effort to secure new ration books. She explained her story to the clerk who interviewed her and was finally given an application to fill out. She asked if she could complete and sign the form right there, inasmuch as she had already stood in line for over a half hour, but she was told she would have to take it out to have it notarized. This required going out in a downpour of rain, locating a notary public, filling out the blanks, and then returning to the same office—all of which she did. After standing in line a second time, she finally presented her application, only to be told it was incomplete and improperly filled out and was only for sugar rationing—even though she had already explained that all her books had been taken. She was given the other blanks to fill out and told she could mail them all in, as it was not necessary to bring the forms in personally, due to the fact that it would be at least 10 days before new books could be issued. This indeed was startling news as she had pointed out to the clerk that she was about to observe certain religious holidays, starting the following Monday—I believe she had reference to the Passover—the proper observance of which required certain foods which are now rationed. She asked if there was not someone to whom she could appeal and was curtly informed that that office was in full charge of the rationing for the city of Hartford.

With that remark the lady lost her patience, tore up the application she had had notarized, and left it on the counter. She then went to the State office of O. P. A. but could not see the Administrator, Mr. Chester Bowles, but did tell her troubles to a Mr. Slute, and her story to me was that she received absolutely no cooperation from him. In fact, to use her own language, she was very definitely insulted. Right now I want to say that in my opinion Mr. Chester Bowles is trying his level best to administer O. P. A. fairly in the State, and I am hopeful that when the situation of which I am now complaining is brought to his attention he will take steps to correct the bad situation existing in the city of Hartford.

After listening to my constituent's story, I talked at quite some length with the chairman of the Hartford board, and after much discussion and explanations with emphasis on the fact that religious holidays were involved in this matter, I was finally told that I could inform the lady in question to return to the office on Monday as an exception would be made under the circumstances, and her books would be issued to her, although it is customary to wait 10 days.

Monday afternoon I received the following quoted telegram from my constituent:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My ration books were not at local board this morning as per telephone conversation with you on last Saturday. Board informs me that because of my attitude that I must wait 60 days for new books. Hoping that I am not trespassing upon your kindness and valuable time. Do something for me. I would appreciate immediate attention. There is much that can be said in a wire. Thanking you. Wire by Western Union collect.

I immediately called the chairman of the Hartford board, only to be informed she was out of the office. Finally, about 7 o'clock Monday night, I completed the call. The information given to me in the telegram was practically confirmed and the chairman of the board declined to tell me how long the applicant would have to wait for her books, but she did tell me that if the lady in question had come in Monday and apologized for her unreasonable attitude, or had submitted a written apology, the books would have been issued that day. When a patriotic and law-abiding citizen is told by an agent of the Government that she must either apologize for her attitude or wait 60 days for her ration books, I wonder if this is a democracy. As a matter of fact, I am quite certain that my constituent is being punished because she had the audacity to dare contact her duly elected Representative in Congress. My colleagues, this situation is mighty serious.

When rationing first was inaugurated, the loss of a book meant only the loss of sugar. Now a great many necessities of life are being rationed, and I believe that before long all of our food supplies will be rationed. Under such conditions no citizen should be expected to go without food for 10 days, let alone 60 days. The attitude of far too many employees of O. P. A. seems to be that they are dealing with a group of crooks, none of whom wants to cooperate with O. P. A., and none of whom actually wants to aid in winning the war. This attitude is all wrong. I do not believe there is one person in a thousand here in the United States who will falsely swear to having lost a ration book. Certainly the legal penalties for taking such false oaths are sufficiently severe to prevent that from becoming prevalent.

So long as I am the duly elected Representative of the people of Hartford County, I intend to raise my voice loud and long whenever conditions of this nature are brought to my attention. I am submitting this case to Mr. Prentiss Brown, today, in the hope that he will find it possible to issue the necessary order to have lost ration books replaced without a delay of 10 days, let alone 60 days.

The chairman of the Hartford County board informed me that she was not a Government employee, she was a volunteer worker. That being so, it seems to me that the system is all wrong. Certainly the administration of O. P. A. in a city of more than 165,000 population should be under the direction of a paid employee. We all realize how difficult it is to maintain discipline among volunteer workers.

This is not the only complaint I have received from constituents in Hartford. As a matter of fact, over a week ago I submitted a similar complaint to the chairman of the Hartford board, and up to this time I have not even received the courtesy of a reply. I see nothing but trouble ahead if these situations are not properly and promptly straightened out. I am not unmindful of the excellent service rendered by many fine citizens who have volunteered to help, not only in rationing, but also in selective-service work, but that is decidedly a different proposition than having a volunteer fill what is really an executive position. Then, too, when a volunteer feels he is a law unto himself, for the good of all concerned, proper replacement should be made.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and to the ranking member the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the other members of the committee for the splendid work they have done and the efforts they have made to bring to the floor of this House an appropriation bill that will take care of the necessary expenditures for the great Capital City of Washington and the District of Columbia. They have done a good job. I congratulate each and every one of them. I realize that it is not a popular thing for a Member of the House to take the floor and offer suggestions as he thinks might be worth-while especially if such suggestions provide for the payment of additional taxes, in order to equalize the tax load.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for an appropriation of $54,789,434 to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year. I shall not question the items of expenditure. Personally, I think the District, and the city of Washington, should have all the funds that are necessary to carry on its many and difficult functions. I would like to call attention, however, to the very favored situation that is given the District and the taxpayers in Washington by reason of the low tax rate on their real estate, their personal property, and their income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that $6,000,000 shall be taken out of the general funds of the Treasury to help pay the expenses of this great city. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is fair to the people of this country for the property owners in the city of Washington to be favored with a tax rate that is less than half of the rate provided for communities and cities of a comparative size and even smaller. As a matter of fact, the tax rate of $1.75 per hundred is much less than the average rate throughout the country. Certain individuals will tell you that Washington property is assessed at its full value but that in other places such is not true. A very careful survey of this matter was made by an independent and competent agency about 2 years ago. It was found that taking all of these matters into consideration that Washington still has a tax rate of about one-half of the average rate of other cities throughout the country. Look at your own tax receipt from your own city or community. You will find that it is much higher than the tax rate paid here. If this House had the courage to raise the rate here only 25 cents per hundred, it would not have to ask the taxpayers of your State and mine to help pay the expenses of the District, and still the property owners in Washington would be favored with a total tax rate of only $2 per hundred.

I realize that there are a good many functions taken care of in the District that we do not have in other places, but I still say that people who own property in Washington ought to be willing to pay taxes on a basis along with other people. The income tax for the District of Columbia is lower than any State income tax that I know about. Gasoline taxes are lower than the average throughout the country, and the District is favored by having no sales tax at all. Over against that, Mr. Chairman, you will find that property rents are much higher than in other localities, except perhaps in a few places where there are war industries. Food is much higher than in most places. All business concerns in Washington are doing a thriving business, and profits are high. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to keep the record straight. I want our fair city to have all the advantages that can be given it. Washington is the greatest city of all; the eyes of the people throughout the world are focused on our great Capital, and so I repeat that I want it to have all the advantages, and even more than are granted to other cities, but I do not think it is quite fair to the people of your district and mine that this Congress should ask or permit the people in our various districts to pay more taxes to support the communities in which they live, and at the same time contribute $6,000,000, so that the citizens of our Capital City may be favored in their taxes by that amount.

Mr. Chairman, I really believe that the people of Washington, generally speaking, want to pay their fair share of taxes, and if given a chance, should be glad to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the question of franchise for the residents of the District of Columbia has been mentioned. I think the residents of this great metropolis ought, in some way, to be permitted representation in Congress. They are entitled to the right to vote. I think the present city management is doing a good job, but in all fairness, it would be a whole lot more satisfactory if the people who live here, and own property here, were permitted to have a voice in the management of its affairs. It ought to be done.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the section be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will not object if it is understood that amendments may be allowed at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York may include that in his unanimous consent request if he so desires.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman include in his request that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be considered read, and that it be not in order to raise points of order or to offer amendments?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I so modify the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman. I wish to interpose a point of order:

Page 10, beginning in line 1, with the word "Provided", and point out that matter to the end of line 9, is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore subject to a point of order.

The paragraph referred to follows:

REGISTER OF WILLS

For personal services, $79,056.

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, telephone bills, printing, contract statistical services, typewriters, photostat paper and supplies, including laboratory coats and photographic developing-room equipment, towels, towel service, window washing, streetcar tokens, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto, and purchase of books of reference, lawbooks, and periodicals, $13,120: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein and hereafter for the Office of Register of Wills shall be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States only on requisitions approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia disbursed by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia upon vouchers previously audited and approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia, in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia revenues are disbursed and expenditures thereunder audited.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. May I ask the gentleman to state again just what language he is referring to?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is the language of the section pertaining to the registrar of wills which attempts to take certain functions that are in the Federal Government and place them under the District Government.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order against certain language enumerated. The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order, against the language on page 10, beginning in line 20 with the word *"Provided"* and running through to the end of the paragraph, in line 3 on page 11, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The paragraph referred to is as follows:

RECORDER OF DEEDS

For personal services, $116,730.

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, including telephone service, printing, binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; typewriters, towels, towel service, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto; books of reference, lawbooks, and periodicals, streetcar tokens, postage; not exceeding $100 for rest room for sick and injured employees and the equipment of and medical supplies for said rest room, and all other necessary incidental expenses, $13,900: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein and hereafter for the Office of the Recorder of Deeds shall be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States only on requisitions approved by the Commisisoners of the District of Columbia and disbursed by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia upon vouchers previously audited and approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia, in like manner as other appropriations of District of Columbia revenues are disbursed and expenditures thereunder audited.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

Mr. BENDER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I rose at the same time as the gentleman from Oklahoma seeking recognition to make the same point of order as he has just made.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] is conceded by the gentleman from Texas. The point of order is sustained.

Are there further points of order against the bill? If not, are there any amendments to the bill? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2513, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, fiscal year 1944, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, in one to include an editorial on the Farm Security Administration, and in the other to include an editorial on the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor this afternoon and to insert therein certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks on the bill today a menu.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PREVENTING THE PAYMENT OF EXCESSIVE FEES OR COMPENSATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE NEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 206.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1900, to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I know he will explain the rule fully as intelligently as any Member of the House can, and more clearly than I myself shall have the time to do.

I fully appreciate that some of the Members have very important appointments they desire to keep this afternoon, so I shall not take much of the time.

This rule makes in order the consideration of a bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs which covers excessive brokerage fees and other fees charged in connection with securing or negotiating contracts not only with the Navy and the Army but with other departments as well. It is timely legislation and aims to protect the rights and interests of the Government. There should be no opposition to the bill. The only objection, if there is objection to it, is that the committee could not see its way clear to make it still broader than it is, because we want to reach these leeches who have been feeding upon the Government these past few years and obtaining tremendous brokerage fees.

Mr. Speaker, I shall digress for a minute or two to call to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means the fact that I still believe my original tax-forgiving proposition is the fairest of all the plans which have been submitted or advocated. If there must be some provision for tax forgiveness, it should apply equally to the poor as well as to the rich, exempting or forgiving the tax on all incomes up to $2,500 for the year 1942. I think the Democrats as well as the Republicans can subscribe to that proposition without going into percentages and without giving more time to it. By adopting that proposition, I think the country will be satisfied and everybody will be taxed fairly, justly, and equitably. It should meet with general approval, and especially of those small wage earners who are finding it difficult to pay the taxes provided in the present law due to the increased cost of living.

I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will finally come to the conclusion that a tax exemption of $2,500 income would be the solution of the situation, and I trust that the broad and liberal-minded Republicans who believe in timely and fair legislation will agree to it, so that we can bring in a bill this week. We can pass it and then take the time for a much-deserved few weeks rest at home.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who can always explain any bill better than anyone in the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind words and I shall not attempt to do anything other than explain the rule, which is the function of the Committee on Rules.

This rule makes in order the consideration of this important bill. It permits the House to discuss the matter for 2 hours in general debate. At the conclusion of the 2 hours the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure my distinguished friend from Michigan, when he says the rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, has in mind the thought that the able and outstanding chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs does not intend to use 2 hours.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, in his usual apt and alert manner, has guessed what I was going to say. I can amplify this by saying that at the hearing before the Committee on Rules, which was rather extensive, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, made it clear that this bill was so right and so just and so important that I do not want to take another minute of time on the rule. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia will convince us all in a very few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do, however, want to compliment the Naval Affairs Committee on its energy, courage and tenacity in bringing to book these unconscionable profiteers who operate between the manufacturers of the munitions of war and our Government officials who purchase these things for the Government. The committee report contains a sample list, naming some of the individuals whose conduct requires this legislation and showing their profit on Government contracts for the years 1939 to 1942, inclusive. Pursuant to the permission given me, I include a part of the committee report in these remarks. It is as follows:

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

In hearings just concluded before the House Naval Affairs Committee, which were in effect a continuation of hearings held early last summer on the same subject, considerable evidence was presented to the committee which demonstrated the unconscionable profits being realized by numerous manufacturers' agents or "war brokers" in connection with the procurement of Government contracts.

Several of these agents appeared before the committee and testified at length. Their fees and commissions, based upon a percentage of Government business obtained, were so excessive as to become scandalous and shocking to the public conscience. It was revealed that the incomes of these selling agencies, comparatively modest in pre-war years, in many instances had skyrocketed well into six figures in 1941 and 1942. Potential and projected earnings were indicative of even more astronomical figures for 1943.

Warned by the earlier hearings before the committee, several of these agents had canceled their commission arrangements, and had agreed upon a fixed salary in lieu thereof. However, since many of them represented a large number of manufacturers, it was evident in most instances that their aggregate compensation was still excessive—far greater than could be justified by any services actually being rendered.

It was shown that the amounts being paid to these agents in selling commissions and fees in respect to subcontracts were at least as great as the amounts being paid in connection with prime contracts. All of this expense, of course, must ultimately be borne by the taxpayers.

Each agent was questioned regarding the nature of his services. It was developed that these services consisted primarily of ordinary salesmanship, although in some cases they were of a more technical nature. Most of them performed certain functions in addition to the obtaining of Government contracts—they secured necessary priorities, discussed changes, expedited payments, and generally "serviced" the contracts. Even in these cases, however, the agents were seldom more than intelligent conveyors of detailed information. They seldom performed engineering services in the strict sense; indeed, they usually were not qualified, either by education or experience, to do so. Many of the agents only opened their offices and began business in Washington at the beginning of the emergency period, attracted by the rich possibilities of making large profits in connection with the tremendously increased volume of Government business.

It cannot be said that these agents' services were entirely without value. Generally speaking, they were useful in bringing Government and business together, and sometimes they have assisted in adapting peacetime enterprises to war production. There is nothing in the proposed legislation which would prevent small manufacturers from availing themselves of the services of representatives of this character. It is recognized that many of them cannot afford to have a direct representative in Washington, and there is an advantage in being able to share the expense with other manufacturers. However, the commissions and fees of these agents were almost uniformly disproportionate to the value of their services, measured by any reasonable standard, and it is at the excessive amount of their compensation, both from individual companies and in the aggregate that this legislation is directed.

Notwithstanding earlier warnings from this committee and the passage of a bill by the House at the last session of Congress prohibiting the payment of contingent fees (which bill failed of enactment in the Senate), no real effort has been made by these agents to voluntarily adjust downward their excessive fees and commissions. So also strong pressure, and in some cases definite action on the part of the War and Navy Departments, likewise failed to make a marked impression. Strong resistance to any voluntary adjustments was noted, not only on the part of the agents, but also on the part of certain manufacturers who appeared before the committee. They felt little concern over the payment of such huge fees, particularly since the cost would ultimately not be borne by them but by the Government.

There follows a list of agents, selected from among those investigated by the committee, which shows gross earnings for the years 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942. In most instances the 1942 figures represent earnings for only the first 7 months, figures for the entire year not being available. The figures for these 7 months, however, added to the amounts potentially due, are sufficiently startling. The list is illustrative of the fact that the evil has grown in direct proportion to the steadily mounting volume of wartime procurement.

This list is representative only, and does not attempt to encompass the many hundreds of persons located in Washington and throughout the Nation who have been receiving excessive commissions in connection with Government purchasing. The total figure, if it could be determined, would stagger the imagination.

Amounts of retainer fees, reimbursements of expenses, salaries, and commissions paid to and due certain manufacturers' agents, 1939–42 [1]

	1939	1940	1941	1942 [2]	
				Received	Due [3]
Associated Manufacturers, Inc.			$17,529.89	$47,797.19	$75,073.21
Baker, W. Lester	$27,957.71	$81,015.39	184,471.76	[4] 261,947.00	[5]
Belzer, Dana	14,215.00	15,083.00	13,954.00	24,607.00	[5]
Booher, Howard	27,688.84	30,200.00	24,750.00	38,175.00	[5]
Bradley Co., The	49,221.83	69,881.94	100,688.36	72,765.33	18,575.00
Brady, John B	17,035.59	16,616.18	67,308.66	104,808.59	10,944.24
Brew, Altiery & Wesely, Inc.			7,634.61	[4] 49,332.35	[4] 64,841.48
Bolton, Luther Mathew	2,175.00	17,194.19	68,784.83	[4] 123,604.55	[4] 16,000.00
Brown, Charles E., Jr.	10,354.00	14,022.00	22,170.00	17,936.00	[5]
Brown, Lewis H.		2,000.00	20,613.52	20,426.96	[5]
Commercial Engineering Co.	13,653.51	19,443.36	33,478.61	42,319.33	141,200.00
Cunneen, F. J.	18,380.00	40,970.00	64,082.00	47,373.00	[5]
Davenport, B. A.	2,100.00	2,600.00	10,500.00	22,500.00	[5]
DeFord, Allen V., Co.	21,655.13	45,928.63	28,937.92	26,057.46	[5]
Dunn & Jones			84,718.32	98,016.01	[5]
Eaton, Samuel W.		7,221.15	21,788.34	28,081.33	[5]
Ettenger, E. Lloyd	6,675.45	10,359.20	13,810.42	21,676.84	24,792.42
Ferguson, Moir C.	3,300.00	4,600.00	6,400.00	12,875.00	[5]
Flood, R. J.			20,600.00	24,597.70	[5]
Frankel, G. S.			26,000.00	35,000.00	[5]
Gibson, S. Douglas	6,809.00	21,400.44	83,958.73	138,796.01	34,744.22
Goodloe, E. S.	3,072.66	9,072.73	20,542.52	49,764.43	40,863.89
Gose, John H.	633.98	3,672.15	25,121.41	12,000.00	[5]
Graham, William S.	23,525.21	19,538.50	18,958.08	18,267.29	4,922.94
Grant, Harry L.	16,900.00	32,412.98	60,358.37	51,037.31	[5]
Gray, George A.	6,570.48	16,690.00	36,946.52	60,656.30	44,440.96
Hanes, Earlton	2,749.43	5,438.24	18,290.15	19,289.65	35,085.46
Headden, C. W.	15,055.00	19,333.00	57,281.00	67,728.00	[5]
Jondreau, Russell	7,339.70	15,684.00	22,260.00	29,000.00	5,000.00
Joralemon, L. D.	42,573.53	63,496.01	103,312.72	64,088.06	[5]
Leyde, Glen H.			9,000.00	30,250.00	46,511.30
Lindquist, Gustaf and Raymond	60,861.55	39,114.32	24,104.92	21,208.88	[5]
Luther and Wood	4,330.71	6,257.76	38,440.26	40,937.99	44,425.39
Lynn, George H.	325.00	272.93	16,778.67	32,992.05	[5]
MacIntosh and Sheridan	38,935.04	39,532.77	124,186.38	123,352.92	47,933.27
Mashbir, Sydney F., Inc.	12,499.69	19,316.85	40,737.98	19,401.48	15,440.47
McDorman, L. K.	12,349.00	12,133.00	13,047.00	24,637.00	[5]
Meaney, Joseph A.	6,520.70	7,680.00	14,725.60	12,849.54	[5]
Meeks, S. J.	13,460.00	14,608.00	28,452.00	39,755.00	56,799.00
Meleney, George L.	13,721.23	15,627.53	23,509.03	34,877.63	80,650.90
Milburn & Brady, Inc.		34,550.00	52,176.00	48,000.00	4,400.00
Mullin, Leo F.	15,062.42	33,427.63	33,773.32	36,311.01	9,375.00
Nichols, J. R.	8,161.60	8,624.90	35,660.00	23,500.00	35,034.31
Orr, John J. [6]				16,571.39	35,627.32
Pack, M. R.			17,150.00	27,460.00	9,141.98
Powell, Benjamin A.	12,597.35	13,849.08	35,350.49	[4] 89,343.96	[4] 78,466.63
Randall, Henry D.	4,056.22	5,758.20	30,652.31	14,645.48	18,160.75
Richtmeyer, A. L.			10,986.37	20,393.49	2,610.19
Rubel, Charles & Co.	68,901.75	102,493.84	203,529.61	287,553.26	[5]
Stock, Edward L.	8,837.12	11,198.30	21,449.65	27,199.64	[5]
Shirley, Olcott & Nichols [6]	67,072.78	165,944.96	609,899.43	[4] 1,104,844.09	[5]
Scrimgeour, William & Sons [6]		214,053.20	613,799.69	[4] 516,049.11	[5]
Stone, Alexander H. (Stone & Stone Co.) [6]				[4] 125,371.29	[5]
Sweeney & Bishop	10,833.56	31,559.38	48,372.61	49,660.65	[5]
Taylor, R. E.		750.00	5,925.91	25,325.83	141,591.68
Thumm, C. A.	53,039.33	46,888.36	212,754.11	[4] 144,232.47	[4] 188,836.30
Ward, Horace [6]			103,296.85	[4] 179,315.88	284,499.73
Washington Engineering Co.	60,644.61	74,944.24	310,177.05	253,193.76	[5]
Weiler, Edward W.	1,361.54	2,711.42	15,268.86	38,753.42	66,219.23
Whitehead, Edward	2,929.39	5,555.15	22,128.40	58,438.95	[5]
Total	816,150.64	1,490,733.91	4,000,583.24	5,095,949.86	1,682,207.27

[1] In some cases, amounts include payments on commercial business.
[2] As of approximately August 1942 (see footnote 4).
[3] Represents amounts due and to become due.
[4] As of Dec. 31, 1942.
[5] Not determinable.
[6] Agents who previously appeared before committee.

It must not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that it is of little moment to the manufacturers if these large commissions are paid, because it is the taxpayer who foots all these bills. This is the important point.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the Naval Affairs Committee and the rule was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. There is no further demand for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees for

services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1900, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) (1), as amended, of the act of June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,' is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to limit the amount which may be paid as compensation for services in connection with the negotiation or securing of any contract with the Secretary to such amount as the Secretary determines to be reasonable."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the first sentence of section 403 (a) (5) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The term "subcontract" means (i) any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract or (ii) any contract or arrangement (other than a contract or arrangement between two contracting parties, one of which parties is found by the Secretary to be a bona fide executive officer, partner, or full-time employee of the other contracting party), (A) any amount payable under which is contingent upon the procurement of a contract or contracts with a department or of a subcontract or subcontracts thereunder, or determined with reference to the amount of such a contract or subcontract or such contracts or subcontracts, or (B) under which any part of the services performed or to be performed consists of the soliciting, attempting to procure, or procuring a contract or contracts with a department or a subcontract or subcontracts thereunder: *Provided*, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed (1) to affect in any way the validity or construction of provisions in any contract with a department or any subcontract thereunder, heretofore at any time or hereafter made, prohibiting the payment of contingent fees or commissions; or (2) to restrict in any way the authority of the Secretary to determine the nature or amount of selling expenses under subcontracts as defined in (ii) herein, as a proper element of the contract price or as a reimbursable item of cost, under a contract with a department or a subcontract thereunder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 403 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in each subcontract described in subsection (a) (5) (ii) and in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 described in subsection (a) (5) (i).'

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 403 (c) (6) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) This subsection (c) shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, unless (i) final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract was made prior to April 28, 1942; or (ii) the contract or subcontract provides otherwise pursuant to subsection (b) or (i), or is exempted under subsection (i), of this section 403; or (iii) the aggregate sales and amounts payable to the contractor or subcontractor and by all persons under the control of or controlling or under common control with the contractor or subcontractor, under contracts with the departments and subcontracts thereunder (including those described in clauses (i) and (ii) of this subsection (6), but excluding subcontracts described in subsection (a) (5) (ii)) do not exceed, or in the opinion of the Secretary will not exceed, $100,000, and under subcontracts described in subsection (a) (5) (ii) do not exceed, or in the opinion of the Secretary will not exceed, $25,000, for the fiscal year of such contractor or subcontractor.'

"SEC. 4. Section 403 (e) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'in an aggregate amount in excess of $100,000.'

"SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall be effective as of April 28, 1942."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for the second time within the course of a year, I wish to direct the attention of the House to an evil which, despite the glare of public hearings, the prompt action of this House at the last session, and the increased vigilance of the War and Navy Departments, has continued to flourish until it has reached such proportions that it threatens to become a public scandal.

I refer to the enormous amounts in commissions and fees which are being paid to manufacturers' agents, or war brokers, in connection with the procurement of Government contracts. After extended hearings just completed before the Naval Affairs Committee, which were in effect a continuation of hearings held early last summer on the same subject, the committee, by unanimous vote, has favorably reported H. R. 1900, with amendments. The bill in its present form is designed to control the excessive profits being received by these agents, by defining their arrangements with their principals as subcontracts under the renegotiation statute. The proposed legislation will permit the departments to give direct and over-all consideration to their profit situations—providing their annual incomes from Government business exceed $25,000—and to renegotiate downward any excessive profits they are receiving, permitting them to retain only that part of their incomes which represents a fair return for their services.

You will recall that the bill which passed the House last session—H. R. 7304—sought to outlaw altogether the payment of contingent fees in connection with Government procurement. The bill was passed by the House on July 20, went to the Senate, and was referred to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. There it met with considerable opposition. Huge industries, particularly those dealing in textiles, foods, and machine tools, sought to demonstrate that the bill was too drastic, arguing that it would interfere with their long-established custom of selling on a commission basis, and would disrupt orderly Government purchasing, particularly in these fields of procurement. The net result was that the House bill died in the Senate committee. The House Naval Affairs Committee, in reconsidering the subject, gave attention to the objections raised to their previous proposal, and this time reported out a bill designed not to prohibit contingent fees, but to control the excessive profits of these agents resulting from the greatly stepped-up procurement program.

Perhaps no legislation would be necessary if these agents had heeded earlier warnings from the committee and from this body and had made a real effort to adjust downward and voluntarily give up a reasonable portion of their excessive fees and commissions. Unfortunately, the contrary is true. Strong pressure from the War and Navy Departments likewise failed to make a marked impression. Testimony before the committee evidenced a considerable resistance to any adjustments on a voluntary basis not only on the part of the agents but also on the part of certain of the manufacturers. They felt little concern over the payment of huge fees, since the cost would ultimately be borne not by them but by the Government.

Even where, at the insistence of the Departments, certain of the agents who were called in the earlier hearings have gone over to a salary basis, their resulting incomes are still entirely disproportionate to the actual value of their services, particularly when it is considered that each agent represents a number of manufacturers, sometimes as many as 30 or 40. His aggregate compensation, even after an adjustment over from a contingent fee to a fixed salary, is still unconscionable.

For example, Shirley, Olcott & Nichols had an income of $1,104,844.09 in 1942; this almost entirely represented contingent fees from some 50 principals. Toward the end of the year, however, this firm had largely converted over to a salary basis. They were able to line up 43 of these manufacturers, who agreed to pay them salaries totaling $502,000 a year; in addition, they will also receive an undetermined amount, still coming to them under contingent-fee arrangements which they were not able to adjust. I venture to say that, in spite of all the unfavorable publicity this firm has received, including an indictment in the Baltimore Federal court, they will still receive in 1943 around six or seven hundred thousand dollars unless their over-all profit situation can be renegotiated under this proposed legislation.

Shirley, Olcott & Nichols is by no means the only example of excessive profits. In its report the committee lists firm after firm with 1942 profits well over $100,000. The Scrimgeours go to over half a million. And in every case their potential earnings, if permitted to remain unchecked, will go even higher.

In pre-war days, the earnings of all of these agents were comparatively reasonable. Shirley's firm made only $67,-

000 in 1939, contrasted with over a million in 1942. Others were not even in business before the emergency period. For example, Alexander Stone, who made $125,000 in 1942, was a Government employee in 1940, at a salary of $4,200. Nearly all of these agents have seen their incomes skyrocket in direct proportion to the rapid increase in Government requirements. As the war has progressed, so have their incomes, until now many of them have gone well into six figures. Many of them have admitted that at the time that they made their original arrangements for representation, they had no idea that their business would grow to such enormous proportions. In fact, their money has come in so fast during these last 2 years they haven't had time to count it. In one instance, the agent was actually receiving more in commissions from a certain concern than the entire profits of the manufacturer whom he represented. In most cases, the agents' fees exceeded by far the income of the highest paid corporate officer; usually they were higher than the aggregate compensation of all of the corporate officers, including those responsible for the factory's administration and war output.

The committee's report includes a list of companies, showing the earnings of some 60 of these war brokers for the years 1939 through 1942, inclusive. The list is representative only; it does not attempt to include the many hundreds of persons located in Washington or near other procurement centers, such as navy yards, naval bases, air fields, and ordnance districts. Neither is it inclusive of the huge amounts which have been received in connection with the obtaining of subcontracts, the cost of which also must ultimately be borne by the taxpayers. The total figures, if they could be determined, would stagger the imagination. But look at this list of 60 companies. It shows a steady increase in commissions beginning with a total, in round numbers, of $800,000 in 1939; $1,500,000 in 1940; $4,000,000 in 1941; and $5,000,000 for the first 8 months of 1942. Based upon projected and potential commissions, there is no question but that 1943 will be even higher, unless something is done to stem the tide.

It must be remembered that these profits have been realized with very little real effort on the part of these agents. With the Government eager to obtain necessary war materials, practically no selling is required. Any concern which can manufacture something the Government needs has little difficulty in obtaining war order. This is true, even where plants have had to be converted to war production. The Government has been ready to expand plants, supply necessary machinery and equipment, and advance funds whenever it felt a particular company was capable of supplying some of its vital war needs. What selling is necessary in such a situation as this? Agent after agent who appeared before the committee admitted that little, if any, selling is required in these days. This is particularly true on repeat orders. Once a company has demonstrated its ability to produce, order after order keeps coming in, until even its expanded capacity is taxed, and there is a huge backlog which it will take months and even years to complete. And it must be remembered that appended to all this are contingent fees, mounting, ever mounting, as the war program expands.

I am not prepared to say that in peacetime, and even at the beginning of the emergency, some of these representatives may not have served a useful function. They may have helped bring together Government and business, by persuading manufacturers that they could make something needed in the war program, and convincing Government officials to give them an opportunity to show what they could do. They may have made some suggestions for the adaptation of peacetime production to war requirements. Now that the war program has gotten under way, however, there is little left for them to do. They may help with priorities, they may expedite payments, they may generally service the contracts, but all this is certainly not worth anything like the huge sums they are receiving. Scarcely ever do they have a technical engineering background or experience. Hence they cannot perform engineering services. That is done by the engineers and designers in the services, and the engineering departments of the contractors. In short, they act as nothing more than intelligent conveyors of information between their principals and the Government departments.

For the most part, they were employed in the first place because of their "know how" in Washington. They know their way about the various procurement offices, and can call or go to see the right official. I am aware that the intricacies of Government procurement may seem a bewildering maze to the small businessman. And do not think that these war brokers have not done all that they can to build up this "bogey man" of Washington red tape. A number of letters written by these agents were read at the hearings, which emphasized the difficulties of Government procurement, and claimed an experience in dealing with the many problems to be met before orders could be obtained. Some of them even insinuated a certain influence with Government procurement officials. I am convinced that many of these agents have ingratiated themselves with Government officials, by entertaining them and getting on a friendly basis with them. However, the committee found no evidence of actual impropriety, although the ability of these agents to have specifications written around their particular products, thus eliminating competition, is perhaps subject to some criticism.

There is nothing in the proposed legislation which would prevent small manufacturers from availing themselves of the services of one of these agents. I realize many of them cannot afford to have a direct representative in Washington, and I see the advantage in their being able to share these selling expenses with other manufacturers. One thing which this bill will do, however, will be to prevent the agent from making too much profit, from the viewpoint of his over-all Government representation.

It may be felt that the departments already have sufficient weapons with which to combat this evil. Unfortunately, this is not the case. True, there is the warranty clause, included in every Government contract. The contractor warrants that no person has been employed to secure the contract on a contingent fee or commission basis. Breach of the warranty permits cancelation of the contract or deduction of the fee. However, the warranty contains an exception, making it inapplicable to bona fide established agents. All of these war brokers claim that they come within this exception. The departments have not always agreed with them, but the exception is quite ambiguous, and extremely difficult in its interpretation and application. The problem was rendered even more difficult by a decision just handed down by the local district court, interpreting the clause adversely to the Government, and giving the exception extreme and unexpected breadth. Many sheep will be able to go through the fence. Because of its uncertainty, the warranty clause is entirely inadequate to handle this contingent-fee situation.

Both the War and Navy Departments have endorsed the bill now before you. So have the Treasury and the Maritime Commission. All of these Departments feel that their present efforts to control this situation will be greatly strengthened by the enactment of this law, which will give them additional authority to handle the excessive profits of these agents by over-all, direct renegotiation.

The bill is designed to eliminate an abuse which has grown up in connection with the war effort. No Member of this House would begrudge the spending of a single dollar, where that expenditure would result in the quicker delivery of a needed weapon to our armed forces. At the same time we are all conscious of the need of so husbanding our resources that our tax dollars are actually spent for the items that are so badly needed, and not wasted in the payment of excessive commissions to war brokers, who play but a minor role in the flow of war materials from the factory to the front.

It must be remembered that this bill does not outlaw the payment of contingent fees or commissions. The legitimate agent, who is content with a reasonable fee, and who is willing to carry his fair share of the war effort without being made a millionaire, has nothing to fear from it. It is only the war profiteer, the man who is only willing to play his part on the home front if there are exorbitant profits in it for him, who will balk at this bill. All that is proposed is to provide the Departments with authority to keep these profits within reasonable bounds. At a time when millions of our citizens, both men and women, are being called upon to leave their homes and occupations and to risk their lives, without compensation other than their pay as soldiers, and the inner satisfaction of fulfilling their obligation to our country,

this does not appear to be an unreasonable limitation.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. Does this necessarily mean that from $25,000 it does not fall within those regulations respecting that amount?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not fall within that regulation.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Do I understand that the language between lines 9 and 13 of the amendment is meant to exclude from the operation of this law entirely any full-time employee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. We did that with a purpose.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That would include a sales manager.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes, a representative of the company, who is on full-time pay. For instance, the vice president or the president can come down to Washington and represent his concern, and not fall within this class, due to the reason that we have the right under the general provisions of the renegotiations law to renegotiate the manufacturer's contract. The manufacturer in that instance is the prime contractor, and all salaries can be looked into to see if they will be allowed as costs under the contract.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. This would also include the typical sales manager who spends all his time working for the company?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He would be excluded?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; because we already have the right to renegotiate the entire contract, including the allowability of his salary.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman referred to a similar bill passed last year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman will recall, I presented an amendment calling for the statute of limitations not to apply, as far as this bill was concerned, and the amendment was accepted. Is that included in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The statute of limitations now under the general renegotiation statute is 1 year, and all matters under the Renegotiation Act have to be considered within 1 year from the close of the fiscal year in which the contract was completed. This falls within that, because he is a subcontractor.

Mr. BENDER. Here is the point, that in the event of any fraud, prosecution can be had at any time and that no statute of limitations will apply?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; under the general renegotiation statute, the statute of limitations on commencing renegotiations is 1 year. Industries are entitled to be heard in a given period of time, and the entire question of renegotiation should not constantly be held over the head of industry. Therefore, it is highly important that a limit be placed on the time within which renegotiation may be initiated, so that the company may know where it stands.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What would be the effect when a man has collected fees from 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942? Would there be any recovery of those already paid by the Army and the Navy contractors?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope so. I do not know whether we will be able to accomplish it or not. I can only say this, that in respect to fees previously paid, as a result of renegotiation, some $3,000,000 have been paid back voluntarily since our last exposure.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understood that, and the purpose of this bill will be limited pretty largely to the fees that have not been paid?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; it will also include those which have been paid within the 1-year statutory period.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does the committee contemplate any amendments to the bill as amended by way of committee amendments?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There are committee amendments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does the gentleman contemplate any amendment on the floor?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the committee stands on this bill as presented here.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As amended?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. And I may say that this bill was prepared by our own staff and by our general counsel, a most outstanding lawyer, Mr. Kline, and by the legal staffs of the Army and the Navy Departments.

Every word in this bill has been carefully weighed, and we know exactly what we are seeking to accomplish by this phraseology.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I assume, by reading the title and from a cursory reading of the bill that it applies to the War Department?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. To the War Department.

Mr. BROOKS. And how about the other departments of the Government?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The word "department" in this bill applies to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Treasury Department. You will notice it is an amendment of the Renegotiation Act.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As the gentleman knows from his appearance before the Rules Committee, I favor his bill. On the other hand, does not the gentleman feel that the Navy Department and the War Department could have prevented much of this and that his legislation is not going to be worth while unless they are very, very diligent to prevent a recurrence of the things that have been going on?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I grant you that the place to stop evil is at the source. Probably a great deal could have been accomplished when the contracts were negotiated. But it is sometimes difficult to ferret out all of the hidden things that take place in connection with negotiating a contract. Therefore, it might have been possible for some things to have slipped in. But it does not make a particle of difference whether the Navy Department was at fault; it is an evil that should be corrected by the Congress now.

Mr. COLMER. But it is going to require diligence.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is going to require vigilance.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In the bill passed last year to which the gentleman has referred, there was some question raised by one of my constituents about the effect on real-estate brokers and on commissioned representatives of textile mills dealing with the Government. What, if any, change has been made in this bill to relieve that situation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is nothing in this bill that prohibits any broker or manufacturer's agent approaching any department of the Government and offering to do business with them. We simply say, "If you do that, and your total income from Government business is more than $25,000 for a fiscal year, you are classified as a subcontractor, and we have a right, under this bill, to renegotiate and to pay you that sum of money which we think your services justify you to receive."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to get that point straight right there. From reading the bill it seems to me that a person might make $25,000—as I understand it does not affect contracts over $25,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not affect commercial business at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not affect business when the contracts provided for are below $25,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Provided his total fees for the fiscal year do not exceed $25,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is exactly the point I want to get. Does it go to the individual or does it go to the contract and the compensation he gets out of a particular contract?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It goes to the partnership, it goes to the individual, it goes to the association or whatever type of agent represents the manufacturer. If his total gross income is not $25,000 from Government business, we will not fool with him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is, regardless of the number of different firms he may represent?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Irrespective of how many he may represent, one or a hundred.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. In instances where retainers are paid, for instance, to a lawyer, who might represent three or four different concerns, the total of which exceeds $25,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We can reach him through renegotiation, because it will be considered as a charge against the cost of the article.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Do I understand you correctly, then, that it would be possible for a man to include his wife and 8 or 10 children and all of his neighbors in an organization, each drawing $25,000?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no. The total amount of the organization cannot exceed $25,000 before we classify him as a subcontractor.

Mr. NORRELL. Could they not individually?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. In subsection 6, why do you set the date April 28, 1942?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the date the original renegotiation statute became a law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are no other questions I think the committee thoroughly understands what this bill is about. Its sole purpose is to bring these war brokers under the jurisdiction and scrutiny of the renegotiation statute by classifying them as subcontractors. This practice should be scrutinized by competent men. Those people who represent manufacturers should only receive that to which they are entitled, and not excessive fees like they are receiving now.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I have offered a bill which is now before the Committee on the Judiciary, where it goes back to a bill that was considered in 1928, the registration of lobbyists or agents, or what not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We had that thought before the committee. I do not agree with the gentleman that that is the way to approach it. The committee did not agree that that was the proper way to approach it. We think the way to approach it is in the manner set out in this bill.

Mr. ROWE. My question is that if they were registered and there made a declaratory statement, would it not be amplification of what you want to find out by what you refer to as vigilance?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. I think that would be merely propaganda and advertising to industry, that here is a man registered in Washington who has the know-how.

It would be just playing into the war brokers' hands and help them get more manufacturers to represent.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I will merely make the statement that this bill was thoroughly considered in the committee and was unanimously reported.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment; I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) (1), as amended, of the act of June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to limit the amount which may be paid as compensation for services in connection with the negotiation or securing of any contract with the Secretary to such amount as the Secretary determines to be reasonable."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the first sentence of section 403 (a) (5) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The term "subcontract" means (i) any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract or (ii) any contract or arrangement (other than a contract or arrangement between two contracting parties, one of which parties is found by the Secretary to be a bona fide executive officer, partner, or full-time employee of the other contracting party), (A) any amount payable under which is contingent upon the procurement of a contract or contracts with a Department or of a subcontract or subcontracts thereunder, or determined with reference to the amount of such a contract or subcontract or such contracts or subcontracts, or (B) under which any part of the services performed or to be performed consists of the soliciting, attempting to procure, or procuring a contract or contracts with a Department or a subcontract or subcontracts thereunder: *Provided*, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed (1) to affect in any way the validity or construction of provisions in any contract with a Department or any subcontract thereunder, heretofore at any time or hereafter made, prohibiting the payment of contingent fees or commissions; or (2) to restrict in any way the authority of the Secretary to determine the nature or amount of selling expenses under subcontracts as defined in (ii) herein, as a proper element of the contract price or as a reimbursable item of cost, under a contract with a Department or a subcontract thereunder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 403 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'in each subcontract described in subsection (a) (5) (ii) and in each subcontract for an amount in excess of $100,000 described in subsection (a) (5) (i).'

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 403 (c) (6) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) This subsection (c) shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, unless (i) final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract was made prior to April 28, 1942; or (ii) the contract or subcontract provides otherwise pursuant to subsection (b) or (i), or is exempted under subsection (i), of this section 403; or (iii) the aggregate sales and amounts payable to the contractor or subcontractor and by all persons under the control of or controlling or under common control with the contractor or subcontractor, under contracts with the Departments and subcontracts thereunder (including those described in clauses (i) and (ii) of this subsection (6), but excluding subcontracts described in subsection (a) (5) (ii)) do not exceed, or in the opinion of the Secretary, will not exceed, $100,000, and under subcontracts described in subsection (a) (5) (ii) do not exceed, or, in the opinion of the Secretary, will not exceed, $25,000, for the fiscal year of such contractor or subcontractor.'

"SEC. 4. Section 403 (e) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'in an aggregate amount in excess of $100,000.'

"SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall be effective as of April 28, 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1900) to prevent the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiating or securing contracts to furnish articles, materials, and supplies for the Navy, pursuant to House Resolution 206, reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1900) was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made on the bill just passed a part of the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation giving certain information about the transportation of oil. I find that the letter will cost quite a little bit above the estimate allowed for

the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding this it be printed.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the gentlewoman state the amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. One hundred and thirty-five dollars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION OF THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 159.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas various and sundry legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives and particularly that embodied in House Joint Resolution 47, H. R. 784, H. R. 1018, H. R. 1019, H. R. 1248, and H. R. 1393, with special reference to the political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico; and

Whereas the President has submitted a recommendation to Congress embodied in House Report No. 126, Seventy-eighth Congress, and relating to political affairs affecting Puerto Rico; and

Whereas an inquiry and investigation into and a study of the political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico are material and necessary to the proper performance by Congress of its legislative functions and duty relative to the legislation hereinbefore mentioned and for the purpose of guiding and assisting Congress in the introduction and passage of such other or further legislation as may be found necessary or advisable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Insular Affairs, acting as a whole, or by a subcommittee or subcommittees, appointed by the chairman, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico.

The committee shall have the right to report to the House at any time the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee or subcommittees thereof, are authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as it deems necessary whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

In the event the committee transmits its report to the Speaker at a time when the House is not in session, as authorized herein, a record of such transmittal shall be entered in the proceedings of the Journal and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House on the opening day of the next session of Congress and shall be numbered and printed as a report of such Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes, under the rule, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], the author of the resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, during the last year the press of the country and many magazines have been filled with stories, articles, and comments, upon the condition of affairs in Puerto Rico, one of our island possessions. As most of you know, the island of Puerto Rico is one of the most densely populated parts of the globe. During the last year or more conditions arising from the war have cut down the number of ships visiting the island. Puerto Rico is not self-sustaining insofar as food and many other things are concerned. It is necessary to ship into the island large quantities of food to sustain the life of the people on that island. They must ship in lard, fish, beans, rice, and other commodities in order properly to sustain life in the limited way they have always been accustomed to living it. There have been complaints during the last few months, during the last year, that many people on the island are in dire distress. They are not getting enough food down there; economic conditions in the island are in a very bad state. There have been many complaints from the people of the island upon not only the economic conditions but upon conditions of a social and economic nature. A number of bills have been filed in this House seeking to remedy conditions which exist there, a number of bills affecting not only the economic life but reaching right down into the political and social life of the island as well.

Not long ago the President of the United States presented a message to the House asking the House to consider the question as to whether or not the people of Puerto Rico should be permitted to elect their own Governor. At the present time, as you know, the Governor is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

In view of the widespread distress, the dissatisfaction, the apparent disagreement among large sections of the people as to what ought to be done, these matters were discussed by the Committee on Insular Affairs, and it was voted by that committee, and I think there was no dissenting vote, to instruct me as chairman of the committee to file this resolution asking the House to approve an investigation of the social, economic, and political affairs of the island with a view to informing the membership of the House as to what the real conditions are down there, so that we may more wisely legislate for the benefit of the island and for the benefit of the people of the United States.

I would like to point out that we have an interest in those islands. In the first place, they are a burden, they are our islands, and it is our duty to do all we possibly can to bring about in those islands the very best living conditions for the people who are there and, second, we have an interest in those islands because they are at the present time military outposts and we owe it to the people of the United States to see that those military outposts are in all respects secure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman referred to the fact that this resolution was introduced by him in response to action by the committee. I want to inquire of the chairman if the action of the committee was not unanimous and that there is no member of the committee who opposed this resolution.

Mr. BELL. There was no member of the committee who opposed it. I think there was one member who voted "present," perhaps, but did not cast any opposing vote.

Mr. COLE of New York. And so far as the gentleman knows, does he recall or have any information of any kind that the House has directed its Committee on Insular Affairs to undertake a study of conditions in Puerto Rico such as is contemplated by this bill?

Mr. BELL. I know that is true during the 8 or 9 years I have been a member of this committee. There has been no investigation of the affairs of Puerto Rico, there has been no visit as a committee to Puerto Rico by the membership. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the ranking minority member, has been a member of this committee for 17 or 18 years and I think I have heard him make the statement that during all of the long years of his membership on this committee the committee has never visited the island to study at first hand the conditions existing on the island.

I may say to the gentleman from New York and to the House that it is the duty of this committee and the duty of the House, in my opinion, to see to it that the committee goes down there to view the island and to talk to the people on the island, to their officials, and to the people on the street, to find out what the actual conditions are in view of these conflicting reports. I think that a prerequisite to any proper action on any given question is a knowledge of the actual facts. This committee should go down there and it ought to carry on an investigation here within the States, take the testimony of people who are familiar with the islands, and thus inform itself and in turn report to the House so the House may be informed as to what ought to be done concerning these numerous bills that have been filed, concerning the message that the President has sent to the House, and all matters concerning the island.

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the fact that the record apparently discloses that the House has not undertaken a serious study of conditions in Puerto Rico for over a decade, does not the gentleman feel that if conditions down there are bad and if conditions are so bad it requires our attention and requires something to be done, some responsibility for those conditions must rest on the Congress itself for its failure to have fulfilled its responsibility?

Mr. BELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. COLE of New York. To these people who are citizens of our Government.

Mr. BELL. And I think it is up to us to fulfill that responsibility by first finding the facts.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. This resolution which authorizes the Committee on Insular Affairs to investigate the political, economic and social conditions of Puerto Rico, was carefully considered by the Committee on Insular Affairs and unanimously reported. The resolution will serve a good purpose, and I hope there will be no hesitancy on the part of the House in passing the resolution.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing in a resolution to provide that a standing committee of the House perform this work which is obviously in the field of that standing committee, and I also would like to reiterate what I said heretofore concerning my own belief that a great many more things of this character should be done by standing committees instead of creating special committees for that purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have seen in the public press where some 2 or 3 weeks ago a similar investigation had just been concluded by the membership of the Senate Insular Affairs Committee. I wish the gentleman would explain why another investigation by a similar body is necessary. If it is, I will be glad to support the gentleman's resolution, but I would like to have his reaction why within a space of 2 or 3 months we must have two separate investigating committees make the trip and study the same problem.

Mr. BELL. I will be very happy to answer the question of the gentleman. In the first place, our Government has a two-house legislative body. The House of Representatives has its responsibility as well as the other body. In order that the membership of this House may be informed, and I think it is entitled to have a committee from the House go down there and learn at first hand the situation there, is one reason why this resolution should be passed. May I say to the gentleman that the passage of this resolution is in no manner a reflection upon the splendid work done by the committee from the other body. I have read some of the testimony and have discussed the matter with the chairman of the distinguished committee that did a splendid work. I know that the chairman of that committee welcomes this investigation by the House as an adjunct and in addition to the investigation made by the Members of that body. This resolution authorizes a broader investigation than the Senate resolution authorized. The Senate resolution authorized only investigation of the social and economic conditions in the island. This resolution authorizes an investigation of the social, economic, and political affairs of the island. I think that after the Senate resolution was passed the President of the United States sent a message to the House recommending certain changes in the political framework of the island government, and I think that is another reason why in its broader form the House should pursue this resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, the author of this resolution, has explained very carefully, and I think very intelligently, just what is contemplated by this resolution. Hearings were held by the Committee on Rules. It was the understanding of that committee that this resolution had the support of the Insular Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman from Missouri is chairman and the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is the ranking minority member.

There does not seem to be a lot of interest in the resolution now before us. No requests have been made on this side for time for debate. It was announced earlier in the day by the majority leader that this resolution was on today's agenda, so everybody had notice that it was coming up today.

I do not desire to take any additional time. If there are no requests for time on this side, I yield back the remainder of the time assigned to me.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGÁN].

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to support the resolution. It provides for an inquiry and investigation into and a study of the political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico. The findings and report of the Committee on Insular Affairs or of the subcommittee to be appointed would be very useful, and really it is necessary as an authorized source of information and inspiration on the general conditions of the Territory of Puerto Rico and about the aspirations and aims of my people. Such report would be very helpful to Congress, to the administration, and to the Puerto Rican and continental American people.

An official survey and general report on conditions in Puerto Rico was made way back 44 years ago, in 1899, at the time of the American occupation of Puerto Rico. Henry K. Carroll, a special commissioner appointed by President McKinley, directed the investigation and made a very good report on the population, government, political parties, commerce, industries, production, roads, schools, tariff, currency, and social conditions. This has been practically the only official general report on Puerto Rico.

Since 1899 to 1943 great changes have taken place in Puerto Rico, under the guidance of the Federal administration and of the Congress of the United States.

THE UNITED STATES BECOMES A WORLD COLONIAL POWER

The acquisition of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, as a consequence of the Spanish-American War, and the annexation of Hawaii about the same time opened, as you know, a new chapter in the history of the United States. For the first time the expansion of this great Nation was extended off-shore, and oversea countries became Territories or possessions of the United States. New governments for these oversea Territories and possessions were established by Congress. Trade relations and all the economic set-up of these islands were affected. The American flag brought another language and new institutions and ways of living. Those islands looked forward to a new life, a new era of development and progress. All cherished hopes and expected that the change was for good and for their advancement under the American Commonwealth.

The United States became one of the world colonial or territorial powers, and it was a test for American wisdom and ability to handle the new situation and to rule or guide other peoples.

ADVANCEMENT AND PROGRESS OF PUERTO RICO UNDER THE UNITED STATES

Somebody has said that the United States has failed in the enterprise. I strongly deny that. As the elected spokesman of the Puerto Rican people, I say that the United States has not failed. I shall state today on this floor, to the Congress, to the American people, and to the world, that the American rule or administration in Puerto Rico has been beneficial to Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican people, through their association with the continental United States, have received much material assistance and have taken great strides in advancement of all sorts. The United States has accomplished a great constructive task in Puerto Rico.

During the last 44 years, under the American administration, the Puerto Rican people have achieved great progress. In 1898 we had only 152 miles of public roads; now we have more than 2,000 miles of highways and public roads. In 1898 we had less than 400 public schools, with a total school attendance of less than 30,000 pupils, and with appropriations for public education amounting to about $150,000; now we have more than 4,000 schoolhouses scattered in all the cities, towns, villages, and hillsides, with an enrollment of more than 300,000 pupils, and yearly appropriations of more than $8,000,000. Illiteracy has been reduced from about 80 percent in 1898 to less than 20 percent now. In 1898 the expenses in public health were $50,000; now we spend more than $4,000,000, with a fine health service, and splendid medical centers and hospitals scattered throughout the island. In a similar proportion to our progress in public roads and in health and educational facilities, we have improved the housing and all living conditions of the people.

Our progress in agriculture and industry has been enormous. The index of our trade balance has been raised about twentyfold. Our total trade figures in 1898 were less than $15,000,000; and in 1940 they increased to nearly $200,000,000, which speaks for the advance in our production and income and the growth of the purchasing power of the people. In 1900 the total income of revenues for the Government was less than $2,000,000; and in 1940 the Government revenues exceeded $40,000,000, by which a great expansion of improvements and public services has been accomplished. General standards of living and social conditions have greatly improved. Wage

and hour standards, and other labor legislation have improved the living conditions of the workers.

In the matter of individual rights, the people of Puerto Rico enjoy all the blessings of the most democratic and advanced nations of the world. Puerto Ricans have freedom of speech and expression, freedom to assemble, freedom to worship God as they please, universal suffrage with no limitations of sex, color, tax, property, or literacy; and they live under a system of law, the best of the old Spanish and of the modern American, which guarantees all human rights, their personal liberty, their property, their homes, and the free pursuit of happiness.

I wish to say that as an answer to those in America or abroad that may like to indict the American Government or the American people for their treatment to Puerto Rico. Most of the progress in Puerto Rico has been achieved, of course, by the efforts of the Puerto Rican people, but it has been possible and encouraged under the American rule, under the guardianship of the United States. The Congress of the United States has been generous on many occasions giving assistance to Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rican people know that they have nothing to fear, looking ahead toward the future, in their relationship and association with the Government and with their fellow citizens of the United States.

PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICO

We have in Puerto Rico, of course, as many countries have, our problems and difficulties, we have our aspirations and aims. That is what the resolution of the distinguished chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee tends to inquire and investigate and report. We have problems, due to many causes. Puerto Rico, as you know, is a small island, about 100 miles in length, and about 35 miles wide. Over there we have an overcrowded population of nearly 2,000,000, about 550 persons per square mile. The island is mainly agricultural, but, out of a total area of over 2,000,000 acres, only about 800,000 acres are tillable. Processing of sugarcane and its byproducts are our main industries. We have no mineral resources of consideration. We lack important manufacturing industries. The crops harvested in these 800,000 acres, and the sugar and rum industry mainly, have to yield for the support and the income of the 2,000,000 people who strive to survive under decent standards and who are aware of the comforts and aspirations of civilized life.

We have unemployment, we have poverty. During the last few years, and especially after the entrance of the United States in the war, conditions in Puerto Rico have been seriously aggravated. The shipping shortage, due to the war situation, has been a real calamity. The normal shippings of foodstuffs and merchandise which we bought in the mainland United States in an amount of about 120,000 tons monthly, was abruptly reduced to about 30,000 tons. Our exports were greatly reduced. Thousands of tons of our sugar remained unshipped in our warehouses and docks. Other agricultural crops and processed products could not be shipped. Agriculture, industry, and trade were seriously affected. Unemployment has increased.

THE CALAMITY OF DR. TUGWELL

In addition to that, and what has been the cause of much trouble, unrest, and irritation in Puerto Rico, is that we have there as Governor, wielding tremendous powers over the Puerto Rican people, the notorious Rexford Guy Tugwell. To all the problems of the normal conditions of Puerto Rico, and to the dislocations due to the war situation, we have added the calamity of Dr. Tugwell, who has not had the ability and tact to handle the Puerto Rican people, who has tried to rule over Puerto Rico disregarding and really kicking the majority of the Puerto Rican people.

I do not need to say to you who is Dr. Tugwell. You all recall how he once wrote a poem—a poor poem, indeed—in which he stated that he was going to roll up his sleeves and remake America. His theories and his plans have been very costly here. In his endeavors to remake America he wasted millions and millions of the taxpayers money of the United States. This prophet went through the so-called Resettlement Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the office of the Under Secretary of Agriculture. He had power in his hands and much money to spend. He had chances here to experiment on his plans, and he spent millions of dollars. But he did not remake anything for good. His crackpot plans failed everywhere. Up and down stairs he was kicked several times by the administration. Finally he was of no use to the administration, and had to go out. Then he went to the city of New York as head of a planning commission. Readers of the New York newspapers know how his plans were thrown to the wastebasket, know how he also failed in New York City. Then, after he had failed in Washington, failed in New York City, when he evidently was of no use here in the mainland, this wandering prophet went to Puerto Rico.

He fell there in Puerto Rico as a thunderbolt. He thought that his appointment was something like one of those charters granted in olden times by the Crown of England to royal friends and favorites, to settle and establish the so-called proprietary colonies in America, controlled and ruled over by one person, the proprietor, who was practically an absolute viceroy.

The will of the Puerto Rican people, as expressed at the polls in last election, means nothing to Governor Tugwell. The political party that won the majority of the votes has no voice in the Tugwellian democracy of Puerto Rico.

I do not want to bother the House with the long and bitter story of the many blunders and reckless abuses of Governor Tugwell. But I want to state that he made public remarks threatening the Puerto Rican people to establish there the martial law if they criticized him. Messages against him through the telegraph lines, government-controlled, were suppressed. Newspapermen and political leaders who opposed him have been assaulted and beaten in the streets by agents of the Government acting practically as storm troopers.

The leading newspaper in Puerto Rico, El Mundo, an impartial and independent daily, that occasionally criticizes Tugwell's policies and has requested his removal, was threatened by Governor Tugwell in a public speech. Tugwell flatly stated that El Mundo would go out before him. Vacancies in elected city councils, which should be filled by the Governor with persons belonging to the party that won the offices, are filled arbitrarily by the Governor, without any regard to the will of the people as expressed in the polls. Vacancies in the elected insular legislature are filled by the Governor with appointees from far-away representative districts, in open violation of the organic law. He also refused to fill a recent vacancy in the insular senate, because the man nominated according to the organic law had criticized him. The supreme court had to order the appointment, to avoid the Governor's attempt to corrupt representative government. The opposition to Governor Tugwell is so great that he has created an office of information in the executive mansion, a sort of ministry of propaganda, to defend the Governor and fight the opposition. This office or ministry of propaganda costs the taxpayers of Puerto Rico about $50,000 yearly. As the office of Goebbels in Germany, this ministry of propaganda through radio broadcasts fills our air with all kinds of distorted information and lies. A few weeks ago Governor Tugwell and his minister of propaganda were convicted for criminal slander by one of our insular courts. Later they were acquitted on appeal. The court was presided over by a handpicked judge, appointed by Governor Tugwell, who refused to summon or hear the leading witnesses against the defendants.

Someone has said that all the trouble against Governor Tugwell in Puerto Rico is a local political squabble. It is true that Governor Tugwell is bitterly opposed by political parties which represent more than two-thirds of the voters of Puerto Rico. I think that you will agree with me that in a democracy the will of the majority of the people should mean something. Governor Tugwell has openly and barefacedly affiliated himself to a local minority party, and he is playing local politics all the time. I think that you all agree also with me that the Puerto Rican Governor, appointed by the President, should not meddle in local politics. He should be the umpire in the local political game. So was conceived and suggested by President Roosevelt himself when he stated in a message to Congress in 1933 the following referring to a Territorial Governor:

> It is particularly necessary to select for the post of Governor a man of experience and wisdom who will be regarded by all citizens of the island as one who will be absolutely impartial in his decisions on matters as to which there may be a difference of local opinion.

Governor Tugwell evidently has not stood to the measure outlined by President Roosevelt of an impartial Governor.

But, Mr. Speaker, what worries more my people in their struggle against Governor Tugwell, is the government set-up that he is trying to establish in Puerto Rico; a type of government which is clearly totalitarian. Congress has provided through our Organic Act, that new government departments should not be established in Puerto Rico in addition to the departments created by Congress. Governor Tugwell, side-stepping the Organic Act, has been successful in creating many more departments, with the name of commissions, boards, authorities, and so forth. To afford the money to pay these new departments, which really duplicate and overlap the regular departments, the taxpayers of Puerto Rico have been overburdened with extravagant and unbearable taxation, which have increased the government pay roll with thousands of brain trusters, advisers, planners, theorists, and bureaucrats and crackpots of all sorts, which have increased the government expenditures more than one-third the normal budget. Millions of dollars are wasted to pay these useless bureaucrats. The Insular Treasury, with a budget which is insignificant in comparison with the huge national budget of the United States, pays salaries to these bureaucrats ranging from $5,000, $6,000, $8,000, and even $15,000. Some salaries are as high as those of the members of the President's Cabinet, and others are even higher than the salary paid to the Governor of Puerto Rico and to many Governors of States here.

That bureaucracy controls and has under its thumb the private industry, agriculture, commerce, trade, and labor. Governor Tugwell is a sworn foe of free enterprise. He is making an experiment, taking Puerto Rico as a guinea pig. Everything is being regimented there—industry, agriculture, commerce, labor.

I have here at hand resolutions adopted in mass conventions against Tugwell and his policies by the association of Puerto Rican farmers, by leaders of industry, by chambers of commerce, by labor organizations. These resolutions contain long and specific charges and grievances against the administration of Governor Tugwell. Our agriculture, our industry, all our economic structure are on the verge of being wrecked. An exodus of enterprise is taking place, going out from Puerto Rico to other places. Unemployment has reached unprecedented figures.

Formerly Puerto Rico was the best market for the American farmers and factories. We bought from the mainland here more commodities and manufactured goods than any other country in the Western Hemisphere from Rio Grande southward. Puerto Rico alone bought from the farmers and manufacturers of the United States more than Mexico, more than Brazil, more than the Argentine Republic, and more than any country, as I said, of the Western Hemisphere, except Canada. All this market is vanishing, and the businessmen and industry are practically scared. We have a real economic panic.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, in a recent convention held at St. Louis, adopted a resolution proffering charges against Governor Tugwell, requesting his prompt removal. Governor Tugwell has encouraged the organization of a new labor group, troublemaker, of communistic tendencies, against the insular branch of the American Federation of Labor and the Puerto Rican Federation of Labor. This new Tugwell's labor organization is always fostering strikes, against the agreement of the other bona fide labor organizations which have banned all strikes during the duration of the war. This Tugwell's labor organization is responsible for recent unnecessary strikes and bloodshed in Puerto Rico. The American Federation of Labor, in a convention held recently at Toronto, also adopted a resolution of grievances against Governor Tugwell, requesting his prompt removal.

I think it is not necessary to say that the grievances of the Puerto Rican people against Governor Tugwell are not grievances against the Government of the United States or against the Congress or the American people. The Government and people of the United States are not held responsible for what Tugwell is doing in Puerto Rico. They simply have not known all the facts.

GOVERNOR TUGWELL SHOULD BE REMOVED NOW

I support this resolution because it may be helpful to bring the facts. Looking toward the association and relationship of Puerto Rico with the Federal Government and the American people, I think that the investigation on conditions in Puerto Rico would be better, light could be seen more clearly upon the Puerto Rican situation, if the investigating committee did not have the side issue of Governor Tugwell. The bitter opposition of the overwhelming majority of the Puerto Rican people is so evident, the opposition of industry, agriculture, commerce, and labor has been openly so vigorous, that it would be proper and it would be justice to my people to remove Governor Tugwell right now. Then the investigating committee could make a better job. Without the side issue of Tugwell, the investigating committee could more easily go into the conditions and cast more light on the basic problems of Puerto Rico.

THE AIM OF PUERTO RICO

The problems of Puerto Rico have a solution. We do not believe in government management of industry, business, and agriculture; we believe in free enterprise. We have studied our conditions. Puerto Rico could be made self-sustaining. If business had the proper encouragement, if we could expand our industries, if our farmers could raise all the crops our island is fitted to produce, if we had the transportation and trade facilities, the economic structure of Puerto Rico could be greatly strengthened. Our production and income could be doubled. We could expand and continue our trade with the mainland United States, selling here the commodities which we are fitted to produce, in exchange for the foodstuffs and manufactured goods that we usually buy to farmers and manufacturers of the United States. We would not need any aid or relief from the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, we are a proud people, we do not like to be beggars. We are striving to make Puerto Rico a self-sustaining country, to raise our income and our standards. And we want to continue the relationship and association with the American Government and the American people, hoping that some day Puerto Rico will have the glory to be admitted as a sister State of this great Nation.

I hope that the resolution will be approved.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that it becomes necessary on this occasion to take the valuable time of Congress to refute certain unfounded charges and remarks made against the character, honor, and reputation of one of my friends by a Member of this House.

I would not impose upon my colleagues nor would I consume this time, were it not for the fact that one of my colleagues has attacked on this floor the integrity of one of the best friends I have. I am sure this House wishes fairness in all things, and, therefore, I have asked the opportunity to defend my friend's name and establish beyond any doubt that the remarks of my colleague were without any foundation whatsoever.

On March 9, the Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON, Congressman from the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana, obtained unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These remarks had no relationship to any matter of interest before the Congress of the United States. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was used in this instance to give publicity to similar statements, pamphlets, and newspaper articles which the gentleman from Louisiana has uttered and made from time to time in Louisiana against the Honorable W. Prescott Foster, which statements, pamphlets, and newspaper articles have been legally condemned as slanderous, libelous, and without foundation.

Mr. Foster is a man who is held in high esteem, and is one of the outstanding citizens of my State. He is loved, respected, and admired by all who know him. Mr. Foster has held various high public and civic posts, including the chairmanship of the Louisiana State Highway Commission, and comes from a pioneer Louisiana family. His father, the late Murphy J. Foster, was elected Governor of Louisiana in 1892, and in 1900 was elected to the United States Senate, where he served until 1912.

The gentleman from Louisiana brought to the floor the charge and accusation that Mr. W. Prescott Foster received a

$30,000 bribe in connection with a compromise settlement between the Louisiana Department of Highways and the Kansas City Bridge Co.

When the charges were originally made by the gentleman from Louisiana and published in his newspaper known as the Farmers' Friend, officials of the Louisiana Highways Commission, through Mr. Foster, called the matter to the attention of the district attorney for the parish of East Baton Rouge, La., and demanded an investigation by the grand jury.

The grand jury shortly thereafter convened and summoned the gentleman from Louisiana and various officials of the State government named by him and representatives of the Kansas City Bridge Co., who came from Kansas City voluntarily to testify.

Before this grand jury the gentleman from Louisiana stood on his constitutional rights and declined to testify to the charges made by him and in no single instance did he offer any facts or evidence in substantiation of these charges.

After complete investigation the grand jury rendered the following report:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 13, 1941.*

We, the grand jury of the parish of East Baton Rouge, have thoroughly investigated certain published charges that Hon. W. Prescott Foster, director of highways of the State of Louisiana, received a bribe of $30,000 in connection with the compromise settlement between the department of highways and the Kansas City Bridge Co., and we are firmly convinced that said charges are absolutely without any foundation in fact.

Respectfully submitted.

L. J. PERSAC,
Foreman of the Grand Jury.

Filed March 13, 1941.
[SEAL] MYRTLE R. MAYER,
Deputy Clerk.

Two days after the Baton Rouge grand jury hearing, the charges and accusations made by the gentleman from Louisiana were considered by the district attorney for the parish of Orleans, where the newspaper of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Farmers' Friend, was published. The district attorney convened the grand jury for Orleans Parish and summoned all of those who had been called before the East Baton Rouge Parish grand jury. Again the gentleman from Louisiana declined to testify. He was so flagrant in his refusal that he was taken before the court and fined $100 for failure or refusal to answer the questions which were propounded to him by the court and the grand jury of Orleans Parish.

The Orleans Parish grand jury returned three true bills against the gentleman from Louisiana, indicting him for criminal libel.

Whereupon the gentleman from Louisiana, to the charge of criminal libel entered against him, urged a plea to the jurisdiction of the court, claiming that the newspaper which had carried the charges was not published in Orleans Parish.

The gentleman from Louisiana was given every opportunity before the Baton Rouge Parish grand jury and the Orleans Parish grand jury to substantiate the charges which he created and made against Mr. Foster. He refused to take advantage of this privilege, and he similarly refused to urge the truth of his statements against the charge of criminal libel preferred against him by the Orleans Parish grand jury based upon the statements which he made in this instance. Therefore, I cannot help but condemn the fact that here in Washington, far from the scene where he refused to defend his own accusation, he takes advantage of congressional immunity and personal privilege to repeat charges which are untrue, and which the court and the grand jury heretofore mentioned have found to be untrue.

If the gentleman from Louisiana believes that there is a scintilla of truth in these statements of his against Mr. Foster, or if he believes that he can in any manner substantiate them, I now call upon him to waive that immunity which is granted to him as a Member of Congress, and to adopt all of these charges as his own publicity outside of the Halls and publication of this Congress.

I cherish and respect my congressional rights; I never wish or intend to abuse them. I do not even like to bring up this matter today, and I would not have done so were it not for the purpose of fairness and justice to a man who does not have the right to stand in this House and defend himself. I cannot allow such charges, which I know to be unfounded, remain unanswered. Mr. W. Prescott Foster is my friend, and I admire him not only as a sincere friend but as a high class and useful citizen who has served his State and Nation faithfully and efficiently.

I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the grand jury of East Baton Rouge Parish completely exonerating Mr. Foster of the charges made. This document speaks for itself.

CONGRESSMAN MORRISON'S REPLY TO AN ATTACK ON HIM ON THE FLOOR BY CONGRESSMAN DOMENGEAUX

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I did not think the day would come when I would be called upon to wash the dirty linen of Gov. Sam Houston Jones, of Louisiana, on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, but since the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has asked for it, I am going to accommodate him and see to it that not only this Congress but everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will know the true situation about the Kansas City Bridge Co. and the Prescott Foster deal.

My remarks, which were extended previously in the RECORD and to which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] refers are entitled "What Hypocritical Gov. Sam Jones Left Out of His Article in the Saturday Evening Post." In that article the Governor criticized another administration for many of its shortcomings. It was brought out by me in these remarks that the Governor of Louisiana should clean up his own house before he decided to go afield and attack other administrations.

There seems to be a great deal of emphasis put on this matter, but as you will note I made these remarks March 9 of this year and that more than 1 month has now elapsed. At this late date the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has seen fit to bring before this House a prepared statement, which I do not believe he prepared.

To get down to the facts in the case, the Kansas City Bridge Co. had a contract with the State of Louisiana to build a bridge across the Mississippi River at Baton Rouge. The contract provided that unless they finished that bridge in the specified time they agreed to pay $1,000 a day to the State of Louisiana for every day of delay beyond that time. They were 307 days late in finishing the bridge. The department of highways very rightly and properly held up the payment of that $307,000. Then the Kansas City Bridge Co. filed suit. The attorney for the Kansas City Bridge Co. went to two previous Governors, and tried to settle this suit. One of those Governors said that it is against the law, and against the Constitution of the State of Louisiana, to compromise anything of this nature, and refused to compromise the suit, stating that if they did as the Kansas City Bridge Co. wanted them to do, they would all end up in jail. Two previous Governors failed to enter into this compromise, but when Governor Sam Jones—and remember he was a so-called reformed Governor—went in there he appointed as chairman of the highway commission a man named Pres Foster and, lo and behold, after this appointment it then came out that the case had been settled, and that the State of Louisiana lost $225,000, and that the Kansas City Bridge Co., instead of paying $307,000, had paid only $82,000 to the State of Louisiana. I have the Constitution of the State of Louisiana here, and it is so plain that a sixth-grade pupil can understand the language, and it clearly shows that a compromise of this nature is forbidden by the Louisiana Constitution. It says in section 12:

> The funds, credit, property, or things of value of the State, or of any political corporation thereof, shall not be loaned, pledged, or granted to or for any person or persons, associations or corporation, public or private.

Also section 13 says:

> The legislature shall have no power to release or extinguish, or to authorize the releasing or extinguishment, in whole or in part, of the indebtedness, liability, or obligation of any corporation or individual to the State or to any parish or municipal corporation thereof.

In other words, the chairman of the Louisiana State Highway Commission, Mr. Prescott Foster, did what the constitution says the legislature of the State cannot even do.

How much do you think the State of Louisiana would have lost if this case had gone through the courts in an orderly manner? It would have lost time; but, after all, the State of Louisiana had

the money and they were not without the money, because they had not paid out $307,000, which was withheld according to the contract. So by no stretch of the imagination, by no rhyme or reason, can it be shown that the State of Louisiana would have lost one dime if this case had been allowed to go through the courts, as prescribed by the constitution. They settled a $307,000 case for $82,000; and when that was done, one of the newspapers that was not influenced at that time by Governor Jones came out and said that Prescott Foster got a $30,000 bribe. It says that Foster takes $30,000 in a crooked bridge deal. Now, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, the State of Louisiana lost $225,000 in this crooked compromise or deal with Prescott Foster as chairman of the highway commission. If Foster did not get $30,000, as you say, how much did he get?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. No; I will yield later and answer any and all of your questions. This paper I hold here is known as the Farmer's Friend, it is published by the Louisiana Farmers Protective Union, R. W. Singletary, president; Allen Dunnington, business manager; and Kenny DeMar, circulation manager. Immediately after this paper stated that Foster had been paid off in this crooked bridge deal I was told that the Jones administration went "up in the air" and said, "JIMMIE MORRISON must be railroaded." I then was summoned before a grand jury in Baton Rouge, where Governor Jones was all powerful at that time. I said, "Me indicted? I did not steal the money. I did not make the compromise. I did not violate the constitution, you have got the wrong party," and then I began to think back, that once I had opposed Governor Jones when I was a candidate for Governor myself, and I had been opposed to some of Sam Jones' dictatorial policies. I began to realize that perhaps they were going to try to unjustly "railroad" me. Gov. Sam Jones had then been inaugurated several months before that, and he was up there in all of his splendor, and he boasted how he controlled the courts of the State of Louisiana. Well, I went before the grand jury. It is supposed to be secret, that is, what goes on in the grand jury. I do not know whether it was Prescott Foster or not who prepared that statement that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] just read, but he did not get the right "dope," and I, as a good citizen, will not violate my oath and say what went on in the grand jury. The next thing I knew I was summoned to New Orleans to a grand jury down there.

As a matter of fact, I was told by the district attorney through one of his assistants that, regardless of what came or went on, that regardless of the evidence, I would be indicted. They kept me in that court until 11 o'clock that night so that I could not take an appeal to the Supreme Court for a writ, and lo and behold, what do you think happened? They came down with a phony indictment and charged me illegally for contempt of court. But I say this, that when the case came to the Supreme Court it was so ridiculous in every sense of the word, and so illegal, and it was so obvious a frame-up, and so directly against the law that the Supreme Court threw it out, lock, stock, and barrel. Incidentally the judge who tried to have me railroaded and kept me there until 11 o'clock at night had just been elected by Sam Jones' administration, immediately after Sam Jones became Governor of the State of Louisiana.

I went all over the State and I said on every stump in Louisiana that Prescott Foster had been in a crooked bridge deal. I said he had violated the constitution. I said he had gotten a payoff and nothing was done about it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only deal that smells to high heaven that Prescott Foster was involved in. While he was chairman of the highway commission he refused to give his records to the State auditor, according to Louisiana law. The law says you cannot have any records kept from the public in Louisiana. What did he do? Instead of showing those records to the State auditor, as the law provides, he refused to do it. Last June 1942 he was arrested in Baton Rouge as chairman of the highway commission, and to my knowledge that charge is still pending against Prescott Foster.

Now, let us look at the Kansas City Bridge Co. and see how clean their skirts are and see how they do business. I know of one proposition that I have been told about that reeks with graft and corruption. It is an $80,000,000 deal that the Kansas City Bridge Co. made to do some work in Alaska. That deal is so rotten and it reeks with so much graft and corruption that one colonel in the United States Army has been removed and I understand that a general will be removed on that account. They were supposed to build roads and bridges in Alaska. They made such a bad job of it, there were so many irregularities, that I understand the work has not been done as yet.

Now we will come a little closer to my home State of Louisiana. I know this from my own personal observation. I could not go to Alaska, but I could go to Louisiana. The Kansas City Bridge Co.—mind you, they are a bridge-building concern—gets a contract to build, what do you think, in Louisiana? They got a contract to build barges. Where do they go to build those barges? There is a ship concern by the name of the Pelican Shipyards located at Plaquemine, La. They have a shipyard there that has been in operation for over 20 years. They have the personnel. They have the equipment. They have the engineers. They have everything necessary to build barges. They were approved by the W. P. B. in Washington. The Pelican Shipyard then went to Philadelphia and tried to get a contract. Did they get a contract? No. Who did get the contract? The Kansas City Bridge Co. got the contract, not for the number of barges that they were qualified to build, which the W. P. B. said, 20 barges, but they got a contract to build 39 barges. Do you think they had a shipyard to build those barges? Oh, no. Do you think they agreed to build these barges at a stated price? No. Out of 33 contractors, they were 1 of 3 who got the contract on a cost-plus basis.

They had to go down there to Plaquemine, La., and take United States Government money to build a shipyard. They bought a low place where they had to put in a lot of piling. Today they are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money building a shipyard, driving down piling, using Army trucks, using Army engineers, for what? To build a shipyard so they can build some barges. Yet the irony of the whole thing is here is a shipyard not 1 mile away that is completed, is ready and willing and wanted to do the job, namely, the Pelican Shipyard, which was refused a contract, which was not on a cost-plus basis. Yet the Kansas City Bridge Co., without any equipment, without any shipyard, without anything, got a contract on a cost-plus basis for 39 barges, and they had to build the whole shipyard with Government money and equipment, and they have not produced a single barge yet. Yet if the Pelican Shipyard had gotten a legitimate contract on a legitimate basis they would have already been producing these barges.

I leave it to the Members of this House and I leave it to the people of the United States how do you think the Kansas City Bridge Co. got that cost-plus contract? I told a general here in Washington and I told others that this cost-plus contract was crooked. It smells to the high heavens. Either it was given out through gross incompetence or it was given out through a pay-off by the Kansas City Bridge Co. As far as the taxpayer is concerned, one is just as bad as the other, and looks like another Prescott Foster, Baton Rouge Bridge deal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I told this general, who is an active member of the Army, it was either by gross incompetence or it was by a pay-off by the Kansas City Bridge Co., and one is as bad as the other as far as the taxpayers' money is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Bridge Co. took $225,000 that was the lawful property of the State of Louisiana. They did it in violation of the constitution. The sole man who gave them that right, who gave them that authority to defraud the State of Louisiana of $225,000 was none other than Prescott Foster, chairman of the Louisiana Highway Commission and Governor Jones' right-hand man.

I want to say to you Members of this House and those people in my home State of Louisiana, that I publicly denounced this crooked bridge deal all over Louisiana and made it an issue in my congressional campaign. Any statement to the contrary as made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]

is untrue. I have come out on the stump and I have come out on the radio in the State of Louisiana, I have shown the graft and the corruption of the Jones administration. I have charged Prescott Foster on countless occasions with just exactly what happened in this Kansas City Bridge Co. deal. The gentleman from Louisiana knows and knows well that Prescott Foster made him go into my district when I was running for Congress, to campaign against me.

It was my good fortune that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] campaigned against me, because everywhere the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] spoke in my district I carried the precinct 4 to 1. What more proof do I need as to who is telling the truth and who is not telling the truth?

There are many more serious charges that have been made against the Jones administration. In a newspaper which I hold in my hand the headlines read:

Gov. Sam Jones' officials face disgrace and prison.

Are these "birds" of reform or "birds" of indictment?

Are these the "birds" that Governor Jones picked to lead his reform government? Do "birds" of a feather still flock together?

Here is a picture of Jerome Hayes, supervisor of public accounts, indicted for stealing.

Here is a picture of Eugene Stanley, Jones' attorney general, indicted for conspiracy to defraud.

Here is a picture of Steve Alford, head of the State police, indicted for intimidation of voters. All of these men are close friends and associates of Governor Jones and the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman DOMENGEAUX.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that people who live in glass houses should not try to throw stones. Governor Jones went in office as a reform candidate, but, Mr. Speaker, the graft and corruption in the State of Louisiana is so great today and smells to high heaven to such a degree that the people of Louisiana are sick, tired, and disgusted with the Jones so-called reform administration. In this National House of Representatives today there are eight Congressmen from Louisiana. Governor Sam Jones can lay claim to only one of these Congressmen, and he is the gentleman from Louisiana who read the prepared article about me a few minutes ago, namely, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], and I want to say this to Prescott Foster, and I want to say this to Sam Jones, to the attorney general who is indicted and stands indicted at this minute: If they do not like what I say or what I do let them crack their whips. I ran for Congress and they spent $250,000 in my district to try to defeat me. I ran on pennies, peanuts, and hamburgers with the generous aid of the working people and the farmers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 additional minutes.

WAGING WAR ON WASTE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the House a letter I received this morning from Kapfhammer's restaurant, 1506 S. Shelby St., Louisville, Ky. It is along the line of the things I have been talking about, waging the war on waste, for the last few weeks. I think it is good sense and that is why I want to read it into the RECORD. It reads as follows:

KAPFHAMMER'S,
Louisville, Ky., April 17, 1943.

Representative GROSS,
State of Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: I read in the papers of your activities with respect to stopping food wastes I have herewith some additional information which might help you in your campaign to stop further waste. It has to do with meats such as steaks served in restaurants. It is a well known fact that anyone with money can still purchase a nice large juicy steak in a restaurant, such steaks weigh as much as 16 to 20 ounces. As a restaurant operator for 19 years I think this is entirely wrong for any person to eat such amount of steak when many people are going without meat. There is another angle to the matter and that is restaurant operators are allowed just so many rationing points for meats; now then these restaurant men are showing big increase in business, especially those operating in the downtown area. All they have to do is show the O. P. A., figures substantiating their claim for increased business and they can get more rationing points. I know personally, that many restaurant operators are concentrating on selling more steaks and other meats and are making no effort to sell other nonrationed foods. My plan is to put into effect Nation-wide a maximum steak size of 6 ounces to a customer or no more than 6 ounces of any kind of meat per dinner or meal order. Where T-bone steaks are served 2 ounces should be allowed for bone, or a total of 8 ounces for bone steaks. In this way, every customer dining at restaurants would be served enough meat to satisfy his body requirements. The present system of serving steaks and meats of various sizes ranges from 4 ounces to 20 ounces; the glutton gets it all and many don't get any at all because when a restaurant sells his meat in large portions he is out of it entirely and consequently cannot serve any more until he obtains additional rationing points from O. P. A.

The plan is to standardize on meat portions not to exceed 6 ounces per order and one order to a customer with a ceiling price not to exceed 12 cents per ounce depending on grade and cost of meat. This selling price is sufficient to enable the restaurant to make a reasonable profit. For example, let's say choice sirloin steaks cost 60 cents per pound, or 3¾ cents per ounce, or 22½ cents per 6-ounce piece; the gross profit is 49½ cents, which makes a food cost of 32 percent, which is plenty good for any restaurant, as the usual food cost for restaurant operation should not exceed 45 percent; over that amount you lose money. I believe that you can bring about enough pressure to force Office of Price Administration to put into effect a Nation-wide limit of 6 ounces per meat order served in restaurants.

If you should think kindly toward this plan, I would be glad to give you any further information you might desire.

Yours truly,

PAUL KAPFHAMMER.

P. S.—The above food costs example is based on gross profit, which does not include other overhead costs, such as salaries, light, heat, gas, water, taxes, etc.

P. K.

This is the most constructive suggestion I have received since I declared war on waste and since I coined that slogan, "Lick your platter clean," which is now being talked of all over the country. I hope that the restaurants all over the country will take notice of this and see to it that these portions are cut down before we compel them to cut them down or before it is impossible to get meat on that scale.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCCORD, for 2 weeks, on account of illness in family.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. HUGH PETERSON, is unavoidably detained because of important public business and was unable to be present when the vote was taken on the Cannon amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill today. Had he been present he would have voted for it.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 212. An act to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service;

to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 351. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 693. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 805. An act for the relief of William D. Warren; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, approved May 7, 1942; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

345. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of inlets and outlets to Lake Hendricks, S. Dak. and Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

346. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

347. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter informing the Congress that since 1943 there has been no lands, by lease or otherwise, effected pursuant to its authority; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

348. A letter from the Secretary of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the annual report of the directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

349 A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State hospital at Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

350. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2539. A bill to amend section 2901 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2540 (by request). A bill to regulate the possession, control, maintenance, and use of carrier pigeons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2541. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2542. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Claims.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution relative to the post-war planning and reconstruction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nelle Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Bessie Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. Res. 217. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. John J. Ward; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

599. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs. Irving Haight and 59 other residents of Stanfordville and Dutchess County, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 2082, stating that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food, materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

600. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph A. Johnston and 38 other residents of Middletown, Orange County, N. Y., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, and stating that the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization would reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

601. Also, petition of Mrs. Grant Atkins and 20 other residents of Pine Bush, N. Y., in

behalf of the passage of House bill 2082, stating that by its enactment untold amounts of money, food, materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

602. Also, petition of Elwood P. Brooks and 20 other residents of Fort Montgomery, Orange County, N. Y., in behalf of the passage of House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

603. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Lynbrook, Rockville Centre, Hewlett, Oceanside, Jamaica, Valley Stream, Richmond Hill, Inwood, Woodmere, Long Island, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

604. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oyster Bay, Long Island, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

605. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by D. W. Hopkins, of Metropolis, Ill., signed by himself and 19 other residents of Metropolis, petitioning the Congress to immediately pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

606. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 23 of the State of California relative to memorializing the War Production Board to rescind its revocation of the order to reconstruct the Albion River Bridge; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

607. Also, Senate Resolution No. 104 of the State of California relative to the grazing of cattle on or adjacent to national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God of the Nations, under whose favor our Republic was created, its free institutions have been developed, and upon which it must depend for enduring greatness, we acknowledge with thanksgiving our providential blessings.

Forbid that during this Holy Week the pressure of official duties should dim our vision of the Patient Sufferer, or the call of many demands should make us deaf to his invitation, "Follow Me." If envy or vanity, doubt or greed, prejudice or pleasure, or any other folly of the world has lessened our power to live at our best, grant that these sacred days may visit upon us their corrective wisdom and their restoring mercies.

Hear our confession, O Lord. We have too long neglected Thy word, Thy altars, and Thy day. We have trusted too much in our own feeble strength rather than in Thy great power. We have been satisfied to grope in the dimness of our own knowledge rather than walk in the light of Thy wisdom. For our indifference and forgetfulness we seek Thy forgiveness, Thou Christ of the five wounds.

Equip us for the duties of this day, our Heavenly Father, through sympathies shared with the Man of Sorrows, and by following His course through a gate that is narrow and along a way that is straight. We offer our prayer in the name and for the sake of the Redeemer of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include therein a bill and certain testimony and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the ship construction in 1943 to April 1, and further to extend my remarks on the subject of the Coast Guard in War and to include therein an article by Bainbridge Crist which appeared in the Sunday Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEWIS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the April issue of Equity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek entitled "I Confess My Faith."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PAY-AS-YOU-EARN TAXATION IN CANADA

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, while many in this Government seem to be interested in imitating what Canada is doing, and while I think we should do what we think to be right regardless of what other nations do, permit me to read you a brief paragraph from a bulletin of the National City Bank, entitled "Canada Adopts Pay-As-You-Earn":

> Meanwhile, as the long-drawn-out controversy over pay-as-you-earn has been raging in Congress, Canada has gone ahead and adopted such a plan, which went into effect April 1. Under the plan, the taxes on the second half of 1942 income would be canceled in the case of earned incomes, while in the case of investment income the liability will be deferred until the death of the taxpayer. This plan is expected to increase revenues by $284,000,000 because of the earlier application of higher taxes to the rising national income. Thus benefits accrue to both taxpayers and Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the addresses delivered last evening in Mexico by the President of Mexico and the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

"ST. WAPNI"—KEY TO PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman this question: This is the so-called

stabilization fund bill that the gentleman desires to bring up at this time?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true.

Mr. FISH. It was reported unanimously by the committee after a certain amendment was accepted?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true.

Mr. FISH. This bill does not carry with it any implication that you are supporting the proposition suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury to loan our gold to create a world-wide bank?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I think the amendment the committee has incorporated in the bill prevents any such action on the part of any administrative body without coming to the Congress.

Mr. FISH. That is why I raised the question. If it did, then I thought the bill should be debated and brought up under a rule in the orderly and usual procedure.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I quite agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will not call up the bill until he has advised the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the minority members, when the bill will be brought up, so they will have an adequate opportunity to be on the floor?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I believe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] is on the floor at the present time. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] understood that I was going to ask unanimous consent at this time for the consideration of the bill. I expect that he will be here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He simply wants to be on the floor when the bill is taken up. He has no objection to the request for its consideration. The gentleman is not taking up the bill at this time?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That was my intention.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is taking it up ahead of the other legislation that is coming on today?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it would be better if the gentleman would wait until the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] comes in. I understand he is for the bill, but would like to be on the floor when it is considered.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has come into the Chamber. Does the gentleman from New York desire to renew his request.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I renew the request I made a few moments ago, to take up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the Stabilization Act may be exercised.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(c) All the powers conferred by this section shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended and the operation of the stabilization fund terminated."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That subsection (b) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof passes from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) All the powers conferred by this section shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended and the operation of the stabilization fund terminated.'"

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 30 minutes of debate be assigned to this bill, one-half of that time to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, S. 991 extends for 2 years the authority creating the stabilization fund. This authority originated in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. On three occasions since then we have taken similar action in extending it. Hitherto, however, we have always extended the authority to further devalue the dollar. It will be recalled that when the dollar was devalued the administration still had the right to devalue it further about 9 percent on the original value of the dollar, and 16 percent on the new value. In asking for this extension and granting it, we have, however, eliminated that authority to further devalue the dollar. The dollar today, with the passage of this bill, cannot be further devalued. There might be a possibility that between now and June 30, when the act expires, the administration would see fit to devalue the dollar. I think our committee went into that with the Secretary of the Treasury rather thoroughly, and we are assured that he has no such thought in mind.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that on the point of the administration exercising its power to further devalue the dollar under the law before it expires, that before any action of that kind would be taken, the Secretary would come before the proper committee of the House and confer with that committee on the subject.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. The gentleman is correct. The Secretary of the Treasury has definitely stated on more than one occasion before the committee that before taking any such action he would come before the proper committee of the House. In this act as it came to our committee, there was nothing in it which stated that it would not be possible for the administration to utilize this stabilization fund in the organization of an international bank, a matter which has been under discussion for some few weeks. Consequently, the committee inserted the following amendment:

Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof passes from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

I would like the House thoroughly to understand that in amending this bill in that manner the committee does not go on record as disapproving of an international bank. It simply states that that matter was not under consideration, and that this stabilization fund, established to prevent minor fluctuations in exchange, should be used only for that purpose and should not be used for an international bank, unless authority was granted by the Congress so to do.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Since there is no authority for such in the present law in regard to the establishment of an international bank, it would require separate legislation for that purpose, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Definitely it would; yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does this measure look toward revaluation as well as preventing further devaluation of the dollar?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. It does not look toward but it does permit revaluation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I interrogate in this manner? Does the gentleman distinguish between an international bank which extends credit for expansion and reconstruction purposes and a mechanism or organization of some kind, a corporation, we will say, designed specifically for the purpose of stabilizing international currency? If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is now directing his remarks toward, we will say, the latter plan I have in mind.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Definitely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And in connection with what we discussed a few days back?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Yes. If this stabilization fund is to be put to any authority broader than that already granted, then we feel that the administration should come to the Congress for that authority.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that some of the legal authorities in the Treasury Department have indicated that they might hold that the stabilization fund could be used as our contribution to an international bank.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Secretary of the Treasury told the committee that it did not intend to use the fund for that purpose, but as an additional safeguard the committee decided to adopt this amendment which prohibits the use of the money in the stabilization fund as a contribution to an international bank.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is the understanding of everybody on the committee?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is the understanding of all on the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the understanding of the Secretary of the Treasury, that he will not attempt to use that money for that purpose, nor will he attempt to make any contribution on the part of the United States into this international group before he comes to Congress for additional legislation.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that clarifies the purpose of this amendment. I have but one further statement to make. Our committee is unanimous in recommending the passage of this bill. We are also unanimous in complimenting the Secretary of the Treasury on the manner in which he has handled this stabilization fund. I am very pleased to report to this House that it is one of the financial agencies of the Government that shows a profit. We have today established a profit of $30,000,000. Consequently, since our committee is unanimous I trust the House will see fit to accept this bill without further amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures urge the support of the pending measure. In 1937, 1939, and 1941, we registered our opposition to similar legislation. On those occasions the bill, then under consideration, contained a section authorizing the President, in his discretion, to further devalue the dollar from 59 to 50 cents under the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. This we deemed, not only a dangerous delegation of constitutional authority but a clear abdication of the rights and duties of Congress. The present bill contains no such provision, and if enacted will, I believe, amount to a recovery by Congress of its constitutional authority "to coin money and regulate the value thereof."

The pending measure continues the exercise of the stabilization fund until June 30, 1945. This fund of $2,000,000,000 was established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. The money was obtained from the increment accruing to the Treasury from the decrease in the weight of the gold dollar and the increase in the dollar value of gold held by the Government. Its purpose is to stabilize the exchange value of the dollar. When the original bill was passed in 1934, it provided that the life of the stabilization fund should expire in 2 years unless extended by the President for 1 additional year. This he did in January of 1936, thus extending its operations until June 30, 1937. That year Congress extended it until 1939 and subsequently by successive acts of Congress it has been extended to 1941 and 1943. It will, however, die a natural death on June 30 of this year unless this or similar legislation is enacted by Congress. The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures is unanimously of the opinion that the fund should be given a new lease on life, particularly in view of the post-war problems that will necessarily arise when trade and commerce will be resumed with nations now engaged in war and with those isolated from us because of hostilities in which they are not parties.

The Treasury is now considering some of these problems. Recently Secretary Morgenthau appeared before a joint meeting of three of the committees of this House and outlined a plan that he expects to propose to 34 nations now engaged in the war against the Axis. The plan calls for the establishment of some sort of an international bank to clear trade balances. To accomplish this end it is proposed that an international stabilization fund of possibly $5,000,000,000 be acquired to which each of the member nations shall contribute a share. The fund will be managed and controlled by a council or board composed of representatives of each of the contributor nations. The vote of each nation on such council or board will not be equal, but proportional to the amount such nation has contributed to the common fund. It has been estimated that the share this Nation will be called upon to contribute—if the plan is adopted—will be approximately $2,000,000,000, the amount now standing in our own stabilization fund. Under existing law these funds might be so diverted by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President. The Secretary has assured your committee, however, that no such action would be taken by him without first obtaining the approval of Congress. From our past experiences with that official, we, of the committee, have confidence that he means what he says. We feel, however, that as Members of Congress the responsibility is ours. We realize the uncertainty of political tenure and, indeed, the uncertainty of life. When action of the character contemplated by the proposed plan is taken, some other person may be Secretary of the Treasury and his deeds will need only the approval of perhaps some other occupant of the White House. It would be ironic, indeed, perhaps sometime in the not-far-off future, for Congress to lock the door after the horse was gone. The plan of the Department of the Treasury may be all that is desirable. It is now only in its formulative stages. Its feasibility or advisability were not considered by your committee. It was not our function so to do.

The participation of our Nation in such an enterprise should not be undertaken except upon the careful consideration and due deliberation of the people's representatives. If approved by the Congress, sufficient funds for the effective operation of the plan will undoubtedly be appropriated. Until then, the present stabilization fund should be kept intact. Its custody and its control under existing law is in the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. It should not be permitted to pass from their safekeeping or their directing influence and into the management of any foreign nation or group of nations except by Act of Congress.

Your committee has therefore unanimously approved an amendment to subsection (b) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act which provides that—

> Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof passes from the President and Secretary of the Treasury.

The adoption of this amendment will in my judgment preserve the integrity of the fund; it will insure its use for the purpose for which it was intended and will retain in Congress the ultimate consideration, so far as the United States is concerned of the post-war problem of creating a sound stable monetary policy among the nations of the world. I trust that the bill as amended will pass.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As the ranking Republican on this committee, the gentleman assures the House that this amendment, if adopted, will provide that the power of the President to devalue the dollar will expire on June 30, 1943?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The power of the President to devalue the dollar will expire on June 30, 1943, unless some legislation is passed by the Congress, other than this, which extends that power beyond the date of its expiration.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is nothing in this act that will authorize the use of this stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000 of gold, except to stabilize exchange, as has been provided in the law?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. In view of the interest in the current question of an international banking system, I believe the House might be interested to know that none of the restrictive amendments which the committee placed in that bill will preclude further discussion of this Nation with other nations in arriving at some sort of an international agreement on banking.

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. It simply means that before such plan is adopted the President

and the Secretary of the Treasury must secure approval of the Congress?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said a moment ago that the power of the President to devalue the dollar would expire on June 30, 1943, unless the act was extended by Congress. That is right; is it not?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But that still leaves in the hands of Congress the right to devalue the dollar, as Congress may see fit?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct, under the Constitution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This power to devalue the dollar will expire June 30 unless the Congress takes some further action?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Following the expiration of that power, is there anything in existing law which will authorize the President to revalue the dollar? He is authorized, as I understand it, under existing law to devalue further up to about $41. He devalued from $20.67 to $35. Do we, by neglecting to continue this power, freeze the value of an ounce of gold at $35?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan, it is the opinion of all authorities that the President may revalue the dollar upward at any time. He cannot devalue it, but he can revalue it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand, the power by which he could revalue was found in this same section. He was given the power to manipulate the gold content of the dollar and value the gold. He saw fit to exercise that power, believing that prices would rise proportionate to the devaluation of the dollar. In other words, if he increased the value of an ounce of gold from $20.67 to $35, the price of commodities would rise proportionately. Now, he has authority under that to reduce that—to revalue it back to $30 or $25 or back to $20.67. If we do not extend that power, does he still have the right to revalue back to $20.67?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is my understanding.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Under section 8, he would have that power, because that section provides that with the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, with any direct obligation, and so forth, at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem advantageous to the public interest.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That provision still remains in the act?

Mr. REED of Illinois. That provision still remains in existing law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I make just this observation, that the Warren and Pearson theory that the price of commodities would follow the price of gold has been completely repudiated in practice. Otherwise, it would be the President's duty to stabilize prices at the present time by revaluing gold. I think the committee has done a splendid service to this Nation in taking the attitude they have with respect to this revaluation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan makes one error. The price of commodities is regulated by the price of gold in circulation, but all gold is taken out of circulation now, and prices are regulated by the volume of currency in circulation, multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not understand me as having advocated that the price of commodities follows the price of gold, after we have left the gold standard. That is the fallacy of the Warren and Pearson theory. After we went off the gold standard there was little affiliation between our dollar and gold, and there was practically no affiliation between the value of gold and other commodities.

Mr. RANKIN. That theory would have held good if gold had remained in circulation and we had remained on the gold standard.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my point exactly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 991) was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have interrogated the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, in regard to the amendment unanimously agreed to by the committee, and which appears in S. 991, as follows:

> Such fund shal' not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof passes from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

So the record may show a clear and definite intent from Congress that the stabilization fund is not to be used for the contribution of the United States to any international monetary organization, or for any purpose different from those for which said fund was used prior to April 21, 1943. There can be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the amendment. Secretary Henry Morgenthau, speaking for the President and the Treasury, has agreed that he will not use the stabilization fund as the United States share or contribution to any international monetary organization, and that he will appear before the proper committees in Congress for legislation before he commits our country to any financial obligation in connection with any international organization dealing with monetary matters. The members of the committee have confidence in Secretary Morgenthau and his promise. However, to protect him and his successor, and in order to avoid any misunderstanding as to the intent of Congress, your legislative committee adopted the amendment which appears in the bill, as an additional safeguard to protect this $2,000,000,000 fund so that no part of it will be used contrary to the intent of Congress.

At a later date, I hope to discuss the various proposals now being offered for the creation of an international monetary organization. Our Treasury and Great Britain have submitted proposals for discussion and conference. Plans are going forward for the holding of an international monetary conference, and I am positive that whatever is done with this matter, the United States will play an important role. With respect to such a conference, and since we will be called upon to consider legislation for the part our country is to take in the world organization, I believe it our duty, as representatives of the people, to become fully informed of all agreements and doings of the delegates represented at the conference. I do not favor secret covenants or understandings. In order that the House of Representatives may be fully informed as to the deliberations of the conference, I have introduced a resolution for the creation of a House committee to attend all sessions of the monetary conference. We have a big stake in the outcome of such a conference, and we must be informed if we are to legislate with understanding and intelligence.

The passage of this resolution without continuing the power in the President to fix the value of money, is the first great victory for Congress to recover its constitutional power. For more than 10 years Congress has delegated tremendous powers to the President. The result has been the creation of a gigantic bureaucracy which now threatens to rule our country by decree and edict. The refusal of Congress to permit the President to have the power over money is the first important step taken by Congress to restore itself in the confidence of the American people. Congress must continue to recover other delegated powers if we are to save our form of Government. The people will rejoice in what we have done today, to recover the power over fixing the value of money, as provided in the Constitution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund

may be exercised has been favorably reported by a unanimous committee. I believe these powers to be necessary in wartime, and I am glad that the minority supports the Treasury's request under the circumstances. The amendment to subsection (b) of section 10 is assurance to the Congress that no international currency stabilization plan, whether it be the White or the Keynes plan, or any other plan, can be set up with this $2,000,000,000 without congressional approval. Any international stabilization program should be thoroughly debated before the proper committees and upon the floor of this House before any action is taken on it.

I should have liked to offer an amendment to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, but refrained from doing so in view of the urgency of this legislation. I do not think the current bill should be encumbered with extraneous matter, although it is my firm belief that the Silver Purchase Act ought to be repealed at the first opportunity. I can see no sense in digging silver out of the Rocky Mountains, in having the Federal Government buy it for more than the going market price, transport it across the country, and then burying it again at West Point.

I am supporting the stabilization-fund extension in the form in which it has been reported from the committee, and I trust that the bill will pass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 215.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Joint Resolution 113 extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days. One hour general debate is allowed on the bill under the rule.

The Committee on Rules originally refused to grant a rule waiving points of order against section 2 of the joint resolution which provided for an additional appropriation. The rule which was finally granted does not waive points of order and, therefore, section 2 may be stricken out on a point of order. However, it will not be necessary for such motion to be made as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means assured the Committee on Rules that he, himself, will make the motion to strike out that section. Thus, the joint resolution will provide only for an extension of the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act for a period of 120 days, without provision for an appropriation.

The joint resolution was agreed to by a nearly unanimous vote of the Ways and Means Committee and it comes before us because that committee did not have the time to fully consider several other bills that are pending before it on that subject. I myself feel, Mr. Speaker, that our action in authorizing the creation of this Commission in 1937 resulted in the bringing of order out of chaos and helped hundreds upon hundreds of small coal operators who were in desperate financial straits. It has also aided the miners of our country who, though engaged in the most hazardous work, have received the lowest wages of any organized wage workers in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, due to the cooperative efforts of all those coming under the jurisdiction of the act and to the powers granted to the Coal Division today, peace and harmony and good will prevail, notwithstanding the action of one gentleman who is trying to disrupt it. I recall that in 1917, due to the fact that we had no control over the coal situation, there was a tremendous shortage of coal, and prices went up as much as two or three dollars a ton, especially in the East. This Commission, let me say, has worked out a plan by which a similar situation has not and cannot arise again, and although I realize that the people are obliged to pay from 25 to 30 cents more a ton for coal, yet I find them willing to do it to help the 800,000 miners who have been working under the most unfavorable labor conditions in the United States. Furthermore, this act has resulted in bringing about an improvement in mine inspection in many mines that has resulted in the saving of many lives. The record of today shows that the loss of life in coal mines has been tremendously reduced. For this I am thankful.

Mr. Speaker, while some gentlemen have directed attention to the cost of administration of the Coal Division, I feel that they are not familiar with the fact that there is no cost to the Government. I desire to point out that the law provides for a levy of 1 cent per ton of the bituminous coal which is mined, which takes care of all expenditures and leaves to the Government a surplus annually amounting to $3,000,000 which, as I have stated, provides for the administration of the act.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we will shortly consider a conference report and the important bill providing for the construction and conversion of auxiliary vessels for the Navy. Consequently, I shall not take up the further time of the House in order that these important matters of legislation may be considered today.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Though I am desirous of obtaining early action, I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. This is merely a 120-day continuance of the act having nothing whatever to do with the merits of the controversy. It is, I understand, a permanent continuance of the Bituminous Coal Commission Act.

Mr. SABATH. This is an extension of the act for 120 days to allow the Commission to carry on while the Ways and Means Committee works out the problem in greater detail.

Mr. RAMEY. But it is not a permanent matter on the merits of the issue, merely 120 days' continuance.

Mr. SABATH. The matter has not been concluded; the committee did not have time to go into it. This is a temporary proposition, a resolution to give the Ways and Means Committee time to take the matter up as soon as they have finished in their efforts to agree on a revenue bill, which I trust will be today. I hope the members of that committee listened to what I had to say on that score yesterday, and that they will agree to forgive up to $2,500 of the taxes on 1942 income to the rich and to the poor alike. In this way we ought to be able to get together and I cannot see how any Democrat or even a Republican can object to such forgiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule brings before the House the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 and involves an extension for a period of 120 days in order to give the Ways and Means Committee further time to recommend permanent legislation.

The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 was more or less of an experiment. In fact, there is nothing just like it today in the Government service. The soft-coal industry at various periods has sunk into chaotic conditions and for that reason the Congress thought it advisable to write a law, contrary to all other legislation, because it sets a minimum rather than a maximum price, which is the policy of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this particular legislation; at least I believe so because of an editorial in the New York Times today denouncing the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 and asking for its defeat. Although the New York Times is largely a Democratic newspaper, in my opinion it is one of the very best newspapers in the Nation and contains the most reliable news. I do not always agree with its editorials. Today's editorial went out of its way to denounce the continuance of the so-called Guffey Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 and asked for its defeat on the basis that it only provided for minimum prices.

The fact is that under the law maximum prices may also be established and the O. P. A. prices that were recently set,

the maximum prices under which the soft-coal industry is operating, were recommended by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior and the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. It was upon their findings and upon their recommendation that the O. P. A. set its ceiling prices on bituminous coal, and to that extent the Coal Act of 1937 was responsible for both the minimum and maximum prices in the soft-coal industry.

When this proposed extension bill came before the Committee on Rules I was inclined to be opposed to it without further information which at that time was lacking. I am compelled now to ask the chairman of the Committee of Rules if it is not a fact that the entire section 2, involving appropriations, has been stricken from the bill?

Mr. SABATH. It is. As the gentleman will recollect, the Rules Committee refused to grant a rule because of the authorization in the bill as it came before us on the theory that we objected to legislative committees appropriating or going outside of the sphere and authority granted them and we did not want to violate the rule which would permit Members to make points of order, so we refused to act. Then the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee assured us, and others representing that committee, that that section will be stricken out and upon that assurance that they will move to strike Section 2 out, we granted the rule.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, then as I understand it, all of section 2 is out of the bill.

The SPEAKER. No, that is not correct. The Chair may say that the bill comes up under an open rule. Under an open rule section 2 is subject to a point of order. There has been no striking of it out as yet, but it can be stricken out because it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed by the Ways and Means Committee that the members of that committee will move to strike out section 2.

The SPEAKER. No one has to move to strike it out. All a Member has to do is to make a point of order that it is not germane to the bill, that the committee has no authority under the law to report it.

Mr. FISH. I want to thank the Speaker for giving this information to the House because I was not properly informed. I understand now that any Member may make a point of order against section 2 as it provides for appropriations not proper in a bill of this kind.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that has cleared up the situation. Some Members on the minority side have asked me about section 2. I was not at the Rules Committee meeting when this rule was reported, and I had previously objected to section 2. It will be in order now for the gentleman from New York, if he is recognized, to make a point of order against it as carrying an appropriation on a legislative bill, and, therefore, the section will be stricken out.

Mr. Speaker, there is some information in regard to this legislation that I want to take this opportunity to submit to the House, which might not otherwise be presented, and that is that there is a tax of 1 cent on every ton of bituminous coal, paid by the producers, which amounts to a total of $5,043,000 a year. This tax was set by the Congress in order to pay for the maintenance of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, and Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior, but they have required and have expended only $3,220,000. So the Government actually benefits, as this bill does not cost the Government 1 penny. Actually, the Government profits to the extent of about $2,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Up to December 31, 1942, $5,500,000 more had been paid in taxes than were paid out to operate this agency to carry out this act.

Mr. FISH. Even last year, we made a net saving for the Government of $2,000,000 in 1 year. It is an unusual type of legislation. The Government pays nothing for it and gets a benefit to the extent of $2,000,000 annually.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the consumers' counsel claims that he has saved in the last 18 months to the consumers approximately $40,000,000, that he has made certain recommendations to the Bituminous Coal Division, which acts in a sort of semijudicial capacity, which involved this saving. And may I say right there that the provision for a Consumers' Counsel is something that does not exist in any other legislation. We have a Consumers' Counsel appointed by the President and he is only responsible to the Congress and he has the authority and duty to represent the interests of the consumers. He claims that due to his recommendations the consumers of the Nation have been saved $40,000,000 in the last 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an able and concise letter from the Consumers' Counsel addressed to me, which presents certain facts and largely answers the editorial appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this letter from Mr. Luther Harr, Consumers' Counsel, is highly informative in regard to the Government's operations under the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. It reads as follows:

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1943.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I read the editorial in this morning's New York Times concerning the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. I have the greatest respect for that newspaper. However, I believe the writer of the editorial was not entirely conversant with the factual background leading up to the need for the passage of the Coal Act.

During the last World War a million workers were forced into idleness because of the coal shortage. Thousands of homes were heatless and coal prices skyrocketed. After the war the bituminous coal industry underwent a period of price cutting which temporarily led to cheaper prices of coal to the consumer but which threatened to wreck the coal industry and which in the long run would have greatly harmed the consumer. The Coal Act was designed to bring order into the industry and to prevent a return to such ruinous conditions in the future. The act will get its real big test when this present conflict ends and when it can be used as the vehicle to prevent chaotic conditions in the industry. That's why a vast majority of the producers of bituminous coal recognize the need for stabilizing their industry and are in favor of the renewal of the act.

The consumers of bituminous coal are well protected under the act. The act does not, as the editorial charged, place an extra cost on consumers everywhere for the benefit of a special group.

Under the act there was set up the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel which is the only Government consumers' agency with independent status established to protect the consumer and, we believe, has thus far well protected the interests of the bituminous coal consumer.

From results that can be measured statistically, it is estimated that the Office of the Consumers' Counsel has saved the coal consumers at least $20,000,000 in the 14 months from November 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942. Since October 1, 1940, the Consumers' Counsel has saved the consumer of bituminous coal at least $33,000,000.

Because of his independent status the Consumers' Counsel has the right to intervene whenever he believes the bituminous coal consumer is being harmed.

The Coal Act has not been a financial burden to the Government. It is estimated that the tax collections from the coal producers for the fiscal year 1943 will be $5,543,000. The combined expenses of the Bituminous Coal Division and the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel will be $3,220,000—showing a profit to the Government of $2,323,000. For the period May 17, 1937, to June 30, 1942, the profits totaled $4,248,000.

Bituminous coal today is the backbone of our Nation's industry. Coal alone will not win the war but we cannot win the war without it. The Coal Act has been a means of stabilizing this most essential industry. Had the industry been permitted to continue, as in the years immediately preceding the Coal Act, this Nation would not be turning out the guns, tanks, planes, and ships in such quantities so necessary to win the war.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER HARR,
Consumers' Counsel.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand, the rule the gentleman is discussing makes in order the consideration of House joint resolution 113. It is my information and I notice from the reading of the joint resolution that it merely extends the Bituminous Coal Act in its present form until August 23, 1943.

May I call the gentleman's attention to this language in the resolution on the question of appropriations:

The appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior and the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, contained, respectively, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, are continued available—

Further it states that—

in addition thereto the sum of $950,000 for such Division and $20,000 for such counsel are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,

Mr. FISH. The gentleman evidently was not here or was not listening to my remarks, or to what the Speaker had to say a few minutes ago, or to my colleague from New York, who is going to make a point of order against section 2. Of course, this provision is not germane to the bill and will all be stricken out on a point of order.

I was inclined to oppose this bill when it came before the Committee on Rules, but after having looked into it I have changed my mind and now believe it is essential to pass this measure extending the Bituminous Coal Act for a period of 120 days, in order to give the Committee on Ways and Means, which has had other important legislation before it and still has, an opportunity to bring in permanent legislation.

We are not waiving any of our rights by extending the act 120 days. We just carry that legislation forward that length of time. It does not cost the Government one penny. As I have pointed out repeatedly, we benefit to the extent of $2,000,000 annually. In addition it is claimed that the consumers have been saved $40,000,000 in the last 18 months. So I do not see how we lose any rights by extending this act for 120 days.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I do this, Mr. Speaker, because I agreed to dispense with a rule for the consideration of the stabilization-fund bill. It should have come in in an orderly way, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules knows, under a rule. This is important legislation. It went through just now in half an hour, practically by unanimous consent. If it had come in under a rule in an orderly way, the question of what is being done with the $22,000,000,000 or $23,000,000,000 worth of gold, a large part of which is buried in the ground in the State of Kentucky, would have been raised and debated. This gold for which we paid $35 an ounce, a large part of it produced in South Africa at $18 an ounce is one of the biggest New Deal follies. It was dug out of the ground in South Africa, for which we paid twice the cost of production for it, brought over here, and buried in the ground again in the State of Kentucky, where it is serving no useful purpose, where it feeds nobody, clothes nobody, or puts nobody to work. It does not help the war effort or aid in winning the war. There it is, the height of all New Deal follies, still buried in the ground in the State of Kentucky.

I think it would have been a mistake to let that stabilization-fund bill pass without making some reference to it. Therefore, I have taken this time to refresh the memory of the Members of the Congress as to the fact that we have expended all this good American money to dig gold out of the ground in Africa, transport it over to America, and return it to the ground in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I agree with the gentleman, and have said many times that in my opinion it was one of the greatest follies our Government has ever committed.

Mr. FISH. I said it was the greatest New Deal folly. The gentleman goes beyond that and includes the last 154 years. I think I agree with him.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. May I say that the gold in Kentucky is safe.

Mr. FISH. When the Republicans get into power we will put it to work, and the safer it is now, the better.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We will put it to work. It will be right there and we will use it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York, I merely want to point out that the reason gold has flowed to the United States in recent years has been primarily that we were operating under the idea that you get rich by exporting more goods than you import. The gold that was imported into this country represented an attempt on the part of the American Nation to sell vastly more commodities than we imported into this country. The gold shipments represented the balance. Therefore anyone who subscribes to a high tariff policy or to the idea that it is important to sell more than you buy must himself take a portion of the blame for the flow of that gold. However, the answer to that problem must be found in a balanced international trade situation and can be found in no other way, in my humble opinion.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the New England area who have been discriminated against and who have suffered severely by reason of the shortage of fuel are intensely interested in an opportunity to have a hearing with respect to this matter, of which opportunity they have been deliberately deprived. This resolution, after the point of order is made, will solely guarantee them the opportunity to be heard. That is all that is asked. That is fair and decent and right. As I see it, no man who would be decent and fair and right can vote against it if he knows what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, in saying this I reserve the right to vote as I see fit, for or against any recommendations or any report which the Ways and Means Committee may make after it has held full, fair, and free hearings for all parties in interest, respecting the continuation or the completion of the functions and activities of the Bituminous Coal Division.

But the fundamental law is not at issue today. The issue confronting us is found in the fact that we in New England and elsewhere have been deprived of an opportunity to be heard.

We in the northeastern area need fuel oil and coal. We may or may not mind paying a cent a ton in order to know that we can get it. That is not at issue. We are more concerned about getting coal or some fuel from somebody, somewhere, sometime, and to know that we can get it, than we are about paying a cent a ton for such satisfaction.

Just now we are demanding that we have a right to be heard and that you folks who live among the oil wells or in a mild climate or near the coal fields should not be so inconsiderate and so penny-wise and pound-foolish as to deprive us of an opportunity to be heard.

New England is all-out for national defense, and it is supplying a tremendous amount of vital and necessary materials. It must have coal and oil in order to continue to produce. We will demonstrate these facts, if you do not already know them, if we can only get an opportunity to be heard.

If, after hearing, it is demonstrated that the particular law which is involved should be repealed or amended or modified, or that there should be another setup, you will find us assenting to anything which will guarantee us fuel in order that we may fight to live.

Why should we be frozen to death by your denial of our right to be heard? That is not fair play.

I reiterate that the policy heretofore pursued is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It does not look toward unity to win the war. This, the Ways and Means Committee in reporting this resolution has unanimously, but belatedly, recognized. House Joint Resolution 113 should be unanimously adopted.

My concern is an adequate supply of fuel for New England in order that she may continue to carry on to win the war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time by direction of the

Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to discuss a very important jurisdictional matter concerning the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

There is now pending on the Speaker's table Petition No. 8, which has for its purpose to bring about the discharge of the Rules Committee from further consideration of House Resolution 29, which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

I want, from the very beginning of my remarks to make it plain that this jurisdictional controversy did not originate in the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which is the senior pension committee of the Congress and was established in 1813 as a Committee on Pensions and Revolutionary War Claims.

Shortly after the *Panay* incident in the early part of the Chinese-Japanese War, the Committee on Invalid Pensions began a study relative to the payment of pensions to those that were disabled during active service in our armed forces under conditions simulating war. As this study progressed the *Reuben James* and the *Greer* were destroyed during the so-called shooting war on the Atlantic prior to our entry into the war. This study covered a period of more than 1 year, and the committee was ably assisted by the Departments of War, Navy, United States Coast Guard, and the Veterans' Administration, and as the result thereof I introduced in the House H. R. 6009 on November 12, 1941. This bill has for its objective the payment of wartime rates for disabilities resulting from an injury or disease received in line of duty, first, as a direct result of armed conflict, or, second, while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or third, while the United States is engaged in war.

I need not tell the Members of this House what happened on December 7, 1941. The next day the Congress declared war, and on the very next day, December 9, 1941, the House passed my bill, H. R 6009, which was subsequently acted upon by the Senate and approved by the President on December 19, 1941, and is now known as Public Law 359, Seventy-seventh Congress. This is the pension law for the present war. If a member of our armed forces is injured in line of duty today, he will receive pension under the provisions of this law, and if he is killed his dependents will receive benefits under this law and no other law considered by any other committee of this House.

There are, as you know, three committees of the House having jurisdiction over pensions for veterans and dependents of veterans of our armed forces. Insofar as the subject matter of my remarks are concerned, I will deal with the jurisdiction of only two committees—the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is outlined in the Rules of the House under the provisions of rule XI, clause 24, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is outlined under the provisions of the same rule, clause 40. The House rules, insofar as they refer to the Committee on Invalid Pensions under the provisions of rule XI, clause 24, is as follows:

To the pensions of all the wars of the United States and peace-time service, other than the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and World War—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

I wish particularly, however, to call your attention to the fine print that appears beneath clause 24 of the rule. It states:

This committee was first established in 1813 as a Committee on Pensions and Revolutionary War Claims. Its name and jurisdiction have been changed to suit varying conditions.

That language refers to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which according to clause 24 has jurisdiction over "the pensions of all of the wars of the United States and peacetime service other than the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and the World War." The fine print beneath this rule also states:

The rule was amended on January 3, 1939 (76th Cong., 1st sess.), increasing the committee's jurisdiction so as to include the pensions of all the wars of the United States and peacetime service other than those stated in the rule.

The House rules insofar as they refer to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation under rule XI, clause 40, is as follows:

To war-risk insurance of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and other persons in the military and naval service of the United States during or growing out of the World War, the United States Veterans' Bureau, the compensations, allowances, and pensions of such persons and their beneficiaries, and all legislation affecting them other than civil service, public lands, adjusted compensation, and private claims—to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The fine print beneath the rule as to the historical background of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is as follows:

This committee was established January 18, 1924 (68th Cong., 1st sess.), and its jurisdiction was enlarged so as to include the pensions of World War veterans and their beneficiaries on January 3, 1939 (76th Cong., 1st sess.).

The legislative jurisdiction of the two committees is, therefore, plainly set forth in the House rules, and I was indeed as were other members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions much surprised that just 3 days after the House approved my bill providing the monetary benefits for our veterans and their dependents of the present Global War, to learn that our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation had introduced House Resolution 387, Seventy-seventh Congress, on December 12, 1941. The very fact that this resolution was introduced is of itself a recognition of the fact by the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation that jurisdiction over the Global War did not then nor does it now exist in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The Congress of the United States has defined the beginning and the ending of the World War insofar as it refers to pension and compensation; it covers a period from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, except that as to service in Russia the ending date is April 1, 1920. The law further provides that if a veteran enlisted on or after November 12, 1918, and prior to July 2, 1921, and had prior service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, it is to be considered World War service for compensation and pensionable purposes. The present Global War by no stretch of the imagination can be considered World War service; the adversaries are not the same and the theater of activities is not similar. The World War was mostly fought in a European theater of war, whereas the present Global War is what its name signifies—globular in nature—and its theater of operations extends to all parts of the globe.

After the introduction of House Resolution 387 during the Seventy-seventh Congress, I immediately called an executive session of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and the members expressed themselves very keenly, concerning this attempt upon the part of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to infringe upon the established jurisdiction of the committee which rightfully had jurisdiction over the present Global War and for which it had already provided monetary benefits for our veterans and their dependents.

The outcome of this executive session was that a subcommittee of the Committee on Invalid Pensions drafted a resolution which I introduced in the House on January 28, 1943, and same was numbered House Resolution 424, Seventy-seventh Congress. I was instructed by the committee to ask for a hearing before the Rules Committee on House Resolution 424 and that distinguished committee gave us a hearing on the resolution, and, at the same time, a hearing was also held on House Resolution 387, which was sponsored, as I have heretofore stated, by the Chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. After the hearing in February of 1942, I was informed by the Chairman and several members of the Rules Committee, as were other members of my committee who accompanied me when we appeared before the Committee on Rules, that neither House Resolution 387 nor House Resolution 424 would be reported because the House Rules as promulgated by the Rules Committee and amended on January 3, 1939, were plain and that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has jurisdiction as to the pension legislation of the present war as well as all other wars of the United States except as specified in the rule, namely, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, and the World War.

A member of the Rules Committee, however, suggested to former Representative Secrest, of Ohio, who was then a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions and who has since resigned from Congress and is now on active duty in the Navy, that the name of the Committee on Invalid Pensions was a misnomer under present times and the name of the committee should be changed. The name, Committee on Invalid Pensions, had its origin by reason of the fact that it was created to handle pension claims based upon service rendered during the Revolutionary War, and, at that time, pensions were paid only to those who were invalids, as the result of service-incurred disabilities during that war. As the result of this suggestion by one of the members of the Rules Committee, former Representative Secrest introduced House Resolution 439, Seventy-seventh Congress, on February 12, 1942, which proposed to change the name to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The matter of the committee's jurisdiction laid dormant for quite some time, and when it again became a matter of discussion in regard to certain legislation that had been introduced near the close of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I, by direction of the committee, introduced another resolution, House Resolution 579, which incorporated the change of the committee name.

I reintroduced the resolution this Congress on the opening day, and it was numbered House Resolution 14. I, and other members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, appeared before the Rules Committee on March 2, 1943, and hearings were held on both my resolutions—House Resolution 14—and House Resolution 29. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no final action taken by the Rules Committee on either House Resolution 14 or House Resolution 29 to date. I will say, however, that we were very courteously received by the Rules Committee and were given a very fair hearing. It is, I suppose, because of the fact that the Rules Committee has not taken action on either one of these resolutions that there is now pending on the Speaker's table Petition No. 8 which would discharge this very influential and distinguished committee of the House from further consideration of House Resolution 29, which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Since Petition No. 8 has been pending on the Speaker's table, I have been deluged with letters from State officers of the American Legion in my State, as well as officers of the local posts in my congressional district. I have been informed by other members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that they have been likewise deluged with letters and telegrams. The very tone of the letters and telegrams disclose that the writers have not been presented with a complete picture as to the purposes of House Resolution 29, and that they have been given much misinformation. House Resolution 29 will not, as they appear to believe, segregate all of the pension legislation in one committee, nor will it insure the consideration by one committee of all legislation dealing with veterans' problems. It simply provides that insurance, compensation, allowances, and pension legislation for members of the armed forces and their dependents of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, as the resolution designates the present Global War, shall be referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and it specifically exempts all legislation with reference to civil service, public lands, and adjusted compensations.

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was established at the beginning of the Sixty-eighth Congress, on January 18, 1924, at the insistence of leaders of those who participated in the World War, supported by their friends both in and out of Congress. Likewise, after the Spanish-American War, and with the organization of Spanish-American War Veterans their legislation was handled by a specific committee, the Committee on Pensions.

Prior to the establishment of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in 1924, legislation affecting World War veterans and their dependents was handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Military Affairs, as well as several other committees of the House. Since the establishment of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, it has been primarily concerned with amending basic laws.

It is well at this point to consider what committees handled some of the very important legislation for our World War veterans and their dependents. For instance, the adjusted compensation of World War veterans was handled by the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the original insurance legislation for World War veterans. The legislation giving preference to World War veterans and their dependents was handled by the Committee on the Civil Service, and the original rehabilitation bill for the World War veterans was handled by the Committee on Education. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds handled the original legislation with reference to the veterans' hospitals and facilities, and other committees have handled legislation of great benefit to World War veterans.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that those writing the letters that are now being received by Members of the House, asking that they sign Petition No. 8, do not clearly understand the situation, and, in my opinion, do not have the authority to speak for those who are now defending this Nation.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that those now participating and who will hereafter participate in this Global War will form an organization and ask that their legislation be considered by a specific committee. The Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the honor of being chairman, is amply staffed and able to take care of the veterans' legislation at this time for the present war. When this war is over and the victory is won and if our veterans should demand their own committee, that will be a matter for a future Congress in its wisdom to determine.

I, therefore, appeal to the Members of this House, not only in fairness to those young men who are in our armed forces at the present time, but those splendid young ladies who are serving in the WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES, and the members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions who are thoroughly familiar with the problems of the veterans and their dependents, and among its present membership are past officers and members of all the leading veterans' organizations, that the status quo of the present pension committees of the House be retained and that you do not support this attempted infringement upon the senior pension committee of the House, the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. Speaker, this jurisdictional controversy resolves itself down to a singleness of issue—Shall the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the senior pension committee of the Congress, retain jurisdiction over pension legislation for a group of veterans and their dependents for whom they have already provided the present monetary benefits? In fairness to all concerned, the Committee on Invalid Pensions should retain this jurisdiction for the duration of this Global War.

In the opinion of the members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, Petition No. 8 and House Resolution 29 are unethical, and a direct attempt to invade the established legislative jurisdiction of the committee. In order that there should be no further controversy, however, in regard to this most important matter, I respectfully urge the favorable consideration by the Committee on Rules of my resolution—House Resolution 14—and when same is reported to the House, I appeal to you, my colleagues, in behalf of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to approve my resolution.

I thank you.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 113, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 113, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the joint resolution will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. House Joint Resolution 113 provides for the temporary extension of the Bituminous Coal

Act, which expires by its own terms on April 26, for a period of 120 days. There are pending now before our committee two bills on this subject, one introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], providing for an indefinite extension with some amendments, and one introduced by myself providing for an extension of 2 years beyond the termination of the war. Owing to the press of other very important matters, our committee has not yet had time to give the attention to this proposal which we think it deserves. There is a widespread interest among the producers and consumers of bituminous coal in this act, and your committee feel that the importance of the matter makes it a duty for us to have the act temporarily extended until we can give opportunity for both sides to be heard. This extension of 120 days is not intended to be a commitment on the part of your committee in any way either for or against the legislation. It is done without prejudice. I myself want to look into the matter and hear the matter discussed and get all the facts before I make any decision in respect to it. We do feel that it is a matter of sufficient importance that the act should not be permitted to expire before those interested may be given an opportunity to be heard by your committee. The provision in the bill for an appropriation of $970,000 will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Coming from a coal district, I am very much interested in legislation affecting that district, and the only thing that I am concerned about now is to get a clear understanding, which I think I already have, but I want to verify it by the chairman of the committee. The effect of this resolution, if adopted, will be particularly to continue the original act in its present form until August 23 of this year, and to simply provide additional time for hearings on the measure. That is the purpose of the resolution, and the only purpose, so far as I know. That is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. In advocating adoption of this resolution and the extension of the bituminous-coal legislation for a limited period, the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means do not want it to be understood that they favor the principle or that their action at this time will in any way bind them as to their future attitude. We consider this resolution as an emergency measure, to the end that our economy will not be disturbed until such time as the committee may have opportunity to look into the operation of the act and the further need of it. We approve of the extension of the act for the period of 4 months. Among other things that we propose to look into and consider is the extravagance and waste that has been practiced by this Bureau during its operation. In any scheme of Government economy we ought to have in mind the efficiency of the Bureau, the number of employees, and the way they discharge their duties. I have been appalled by the reports I have received of the number of employees that are in this Bureau and the salaries that they have been receiving. We propose to inquire into and consider the further need of the Bureau, but for present purposes, and under existing circumstances, we feel that the pending extension should be granted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that many of these employees are expert inspectors and that they have been inspecting these mines and have brought about safety to miners during the duration of the Commission?

Mr. McLEAN. What is an expert depends a great deal upon the person who is the judge of the expertness, and this Bureau has probably created a lot of experts according to its own standards. Probably the qualifications of such an expert have something to do with his affiliation back in his home district and his expertness in activities that come in the fall of the year.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has confused Federal mine inspection with price ceilings on coal. The Bituminous Coal Commission's job is to establish prices, and when the gentleman refers to mine inspection, that is a matter coming under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does any of the rate structure set up by this Commission govern the price of coal at the present time?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. But, as I understood it, the prices are above the minimum in every case at the present time. They have not established maximum prices. Is that correct?

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman will yield, the O. P. A. has established maximum prices on the recommendation of the Consumers' Counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE.]

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the committee said a few moments ago and as the distinguished minority member has just said, the resolution provides for the temporary extension of the Bituminous Coal Act. It does not go to the merits of the operation of the act. I think it should be extended so as to give the Ways and Means Committee time to study the operation of the act and reach a determination as to its permanent continuance after it has had opportunity for full and complete hearings.

The act was established in 1937 for the purpose of stabilizing the bituminous coal industry, which for many years had existed in a state of depression and demoralization. Statistics show that after 1927 the industry showed a profit in no year, even during the peak boom years of 1928 and 1929, until after the Bituminous Coal Act was passed.

It is an industry that has a close relationship to the stability of our whole industrial and economic system because of its importance, and while I do not wish to discuss the merits of the act at this time, my personal feeling is that the Bituminous Coal Act has rendered a great service not only to the industry but to our economic system, and without the service which it has rendered this great industry would have been in such a state of demoralization that it would have weakened our defense system. In my opinion its continuance would be justified, if for no other reason, by the benefits to national defense by giving the Government some supervision of the production and marketing of coal and close contact with representatives of the industry and all persons engaged in the production of coal.

I am informed that we are the only great coal-producing Nation that has no controlled or subsidized coal-mining industry. I think under this act we have found a happy solution by which the Government comes into closer relationship and closer supervision of the industry, and still its operation remains in the hands of private industry. It is a means by which the industry in America can be saved from such measures as subsidies and nationalization.

I am glad that the committee has seen fit to ask for this temporary extension until it can reach a determination on the merits of the question.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman also feel it is necessary for the coal industry, as well as the war effort, that this be extended for 120 days, until these matters can be gone into?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I think so, and I think the Bituminous Coal Division should be set up on a permanent basis. I do not mean to indicate by that that I approve of all the actions of the Division in connection with the administration of the act, because I do not have full information, but, on the whole, I think it has really done a good job and deserves the commendation of the Congress.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know that the coal industry pays the cost of operating the Bituminous Coal Commission and that not 1 penny is expended by the Federal Government?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That is true. As the gentleman from New York said a moment ago, there is a profit to the Government of something over $2,000,000 a year, which now amounts to over $5,000,000. It is about the only office which I know that costs the Government nothing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Although the set-up is self-sustaining, I was wondering if the gentleman could explain the reason for the increase from $3,250 to $5,500 for additional vehicles at a time when we need to be saving rubber and gasoline on these automobiles?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That provision, as I understand, goes out of the bill, being a part of section 2, but in fairness to the Division, my information is that it only has one automobile in the District of Columbia, which is seldom used. How that provision got inserted in the bill I do not know.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FISH. That, of course, was for the purpose of renting automobiles where inspectors go around in the coal fields. That is the mystery of the thing. Everybody now denies they had anything to do with putting it in. It is not needed. It was not needed, and now nobody sponsors it. It is going out anyway, but I would be interested in knowing who put it in, because nobody sponsors it.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Probably it got in there on the same theory that Jiggs got into his trouble. According to the story, he came in early in the morning. His face was bloody and he was generally disheveled. Maggie said, "Jiggs, what is the matter? What have you been doing?" Jiggs said, "As I came home this morning I jumped through a glass window." She said, "My goodness, Jiggs, how did you come to do a thing like that?" Jiggs said, "Well, I don't know, but as I was coming home after the party, feeling pretty good, I stopped and was looking in a window and I just jumped through it. I don't know why, but at that time it seemed like the right thing to do."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I was just wondering if that would not be a pretty good price for one automobile, $5,500?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I understand there is no limitation in the act at this time, so this is in the nature of a limitation, but in any event it goes out. I have a letter from the coal producers which I would like to include as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must secure that permission in the House.

COAL PRODUCERS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1943.

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Coal Producers Committee is composed of 2,437 bituminous coal operators, who produced 332,698,705 tons of bituminous coal in 1942. These operators have authorized us to say that they are strongly in favor of extending the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. The expiration date of this act is April 26, 1943.

The Coal Producers Committee is supporting H. R. 1454, which has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Because of lack of time in which to hold hearings on this bill, Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced House Joint Resolution 113 to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days. This interim extension was proposed in order that full and complete hearings could be held on the extension and amendment of the Coal Act.

The Bituminous Coal Act has stabilized the bituminous coal industry.

We believe that the Coal Act is necessary for the most efficient conduct of the war. The act has maintained in operating condition many properties that would now be out of business if the law had not been in effect. This fact alone justifies the continuation of the law because it has enabled the industry to supply ample quantities of coal needed for the defense and war programs. The requirements of this most vital war material have been supplied to all consumers. The increased coal requirements of the country from January 1, 1941, to January 1, 1943, amounted to 119,000,000 tons. A further increase in production of 20,000,000 tons in 1943 has been asked by the Office of Solid Fuels Coordinator for War. Provided the necessary transportation is made available, the industry feels confident of its ability to produce this additional tonnage.

The act has provided Government with the information and statistical data necessary to plan and take care of all requirements for metallurgical and special-purpose coals for vital war industries. It has provided complete and accurate data on costs and prices for administration of the Emergency Price Control Act. It has provided complete data on coal distribution to the different areas of the country and thus furnished Government with essential information regarding location of mines and quantities of coal available to new war plants.

The Coal Act is unique in legislation because the entire expenditure for its administration has not cost Government a single penny. In fact, collections of the special tax of 1 cent per ton from the producers have exceeded expenditures by approximately $5,500,000 up to December 31, 1942, thereby returning a surplus to the Federal Government. The present rate of tax collections exceeds expenditures by approximately $2,350,000 per year.

The act will be absolutely necessary following the war to prevent the industry from returning to chaotic disorder, strikes, lockouts, poverty, and bankruptcy, such as were its principal characteristics prior to the enactment of this law by the Congress.

The administration of the act by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior has given a greater degree of satisfaction to the industry than its supporters hoped to achieve. As will be noted by the tonnage represented by our committee, the law has a greater measure of support from the coal producers of the country than ever shown before in the many coal bills that have been before the Congress.

We respectfully request that you vote for the resolution to extend the act for a period of 120 days so that there will be sufficient time for the House and Senate committees to hold full and complete hearings on the bill to extend and amend the act.

Yours very truly,

H. B. Baird, Pittsburgh, Pa.; D. T. Buckley, Boston, Mass.; W. G. Crichton, Charleston, W. Va.; J. D. Dickson, Wellesville, N. Y.; H. L. Findlay, Cleveland, Ohio; R. S. Graham, Norton, Va.; J. A. Hunt, Mount Hope, W. Va.; J. E. Johnson, Lexington, Ky.; Herbert E. Jones, Charleston, W. Va.; Fred S. McConnell, Cleveland, Ohio; E. C. Mahan, Knoxville, Tenn.; D. H. Morton, Charleston, W. Va.; Charles O'Neill, New York, N. Y.; G. W. Reed, Chicago, Ill.; Arthur B. Stewart, Baltimore, Md.; R. D. Stockdale, Columbus, Ohio; W. P. Tams, Jr., Tams, W. Va.; J. N. Terrio, Washington, D. C.; D. A. Thomas, Birmingham, Ala.; Ezra Van Horn, Cleveland, Ohio; J. William Wetter, Philadelphia, Pa.; L. E. Woods, Huntington, W. Va.; R. A. Young, Sr., Fort Smith, Ark.; William Bailey, secretary, Coal Producers' Committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite generally agreed that the Committee on Ways and Means is fully justified at this particular time in asking for a temporary extension of the Bituminous Coal Act, because of the tremendous amount of other and immediately pressing work before the committee at the present time.

Over and above that, on the basis of merit, it may be said in behalf of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 that if it were not extended at this time the functions of this important agency of Government would cease and the agency would naturally be liquidated. The coal industry and other industries indirectly would thus become disorganized and put in a chaotic state. It might be interesting for the members of the Committee to know that originally I was not one of those who favored passage of the act, but after insisting that the interests of the consumer particularly be protected fully by an independent consumers' counsel, I was willing to go along together with the present distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the late Mr. Buck, of California. The three of us having come from districts that consume great amounts of bituminous coal, but produced none, changed our votes in committee, though naturally the pressure against the bill was very great and emanated from people who feared the result of the legislation at that time. I am glad to testify here and now that from all of the sources that have been opposed comes word of approval, of commendation; retailers, producers, and even consumers attest to the fact that they have benefited by the provisions of the act.

The application of the act at the outset has been a little stormy, somewhat spotted, but the Coal Administration faced a most difficult unprecedented task in formulating and arriving at fair and workable schedules. There were some three and one-half million different variable schedules which had to be worked out and carefully prepared, and for the longest time it looked as though the Commission was worthless and not worth its salt; but after having prepared the way they have now stabilized the industry in every respect; there is orderly development and exploitation of the coal resources; there are better working conditions, there is a reasonable price level, there is a protection of the profit incentive; the interest of the workers is protected, and during this wartime when our war effort and our industry are hitched to and geared with the production of coal this act has proved of inestimable value; and it might be said for the consumers generally and in the northeastern part of the United States particularly and throughout the New England States, where the shortage of oil has been so acute, that if it had not been

for the Bituminous Coal Act the situation would have been indescribable. Furthermore I wish to recall to the memory of some of the Members what the situation really was in the New England States during the last war. The coal volume was woefully insufficient and I am told that the price increase to the consumer at the time was anywhere from 50 to 100 percent, yet coal was not available. During World War No. 2 almost entirely through the efforts and planning of the Bituminous Coal Commission and with the cooperation of the able and industrious independent Consumers' Counsel, of whom I am proud because originally and consistently I sponsored his independent existence, jointly they have done a splendid job and have provided well for the needs of the Nation at this most critical time.

We are merely asking for a breathing spell on the part of the committee rather than on behalf of the agency in order that we may reexamine the work of the Commission and before the expiration of these 120 days of additional life for the agency the committee intends to hold hearings at which time the consumer, producer, worker, any interested party may come before the committee and present his objections or offer his suggestions in connection with the further extension of the life of the Commission. I personally am of the opinion that the act when presented should not be made permanent. I think it is a good thing for Congress to peer into the functioning and the actions generally of this agency every 2 years; I think it is a wholesome and a salutary practice on the part of the Congress, and we can, if justified, extend the life of an agency each time we examine the matter. It is a question of common sense. I grant you that sometimes it is burdensome and difficult for us to proceed on that basis, but on the whole it is a very splendid thing to be able to bring this agency back here before the House every 2 years so that everybody may know just how it is operating.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. Has the gentleman's investigation also disclosed that irrespective of how the miners and the operators may disagree on some subjects, with respect to this matter they are in absolute and practically unanimous accord on the continuance of this agency?

Mr. DINGELL. I think, beyond question, the statement of the gentleman is correct. There may be some disagreement among a fractional portion of the producers and there may be even some workers who are not altogether satisfied, but it is not the fault I take it of the administration or of the act itself.

Mr. CRAVENS. By and large they are unanimous.

Mr. DINGELL. I should say almost unanimous.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand, the purpose of this resolution is merely to extend the life of the agency 120 days without any change in the act itself.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right; there is no change of the act involved. The Commission is continued in accordance with the original act.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will recall several years ago during the hearings the large coal operators were satisfied, but the small operator, the fellow who mines less than 50 tons a day, was critical of the act, claiming he was penalized by the act. Since then, however, the Bituminous Coal Commission has worked out a program whereby the small operator benefits from the act.

Mr. DINGELL. I think that the regional management provided under the act has worked out a system of cooperation which has been very helpful to the little fellows. I would not want to be understood as saying that there is absolutely no objection.

We have had one particular individual, I remember, who claimed that he spoke for a large segment of the small producers. He was a processor who benefited by the work of the little fellow, but he did not get very much sustenance, that is, very much support, for his contention.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to make this observation: A few days ago, during a meeting of the Committee on Mines and Mining, I was privileged to offer a motion that this act be extended for a period of 60 days in which to make further studies. I am very pleased that the Rules Committee has extended this time to 120 days. I want to let the Members of the House know that the Committee on Mines and Mining is unanimously in favor of further study of this matter.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say that the cost to the industry amounts to 1 cent per ton, but that the benefit to industry, to the worker, and to the consumer has been beyond estimation. Moreover, the amount of money that comes in by way of taxation is $2,000,000 or so in excess of the cost of the administration of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Congress in 1937 enacted what is known as the Bituminous Coal Act. This has been renewed every 2 years by the Congress. The last renewal was on April 26, 1941, and it will therefore expire on April 26, 1943.

A number of bills have been introduced and have been referred to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration and report. Some of these bills favor amending this act and others provide for making this act permanent. Some Members of the House and Senate, as well as the people of the Nation, and especially those from and residing in non-coal-producing States, are opposed to any extension of this act.

The Ways and Means Committee is the committee of the House that considers legislation of this character. The committee has been so busily engaged with the tax bill and other pressing matters that it has not had time to hold hearings on the bills that have been introduced and investigate the record that has been made by the Bituminous Coal Division in administering the Bituminous Coal Act, and therefore this committee has submitted to the House for its consideration House Joint Resolution 113. This proposes to extend the life of this act for a period of 120 days, or until August 23, 1943.

This resolution also seeks to appropriate $970,000 to carry on the activities of the Bituminous Coal Division for that period, and it also changes the limitation on the amount to be paid for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles. It is admitted that section 2, carrying this appropriation and limitation on the amount to be paid for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles is subject to a point of order. This point of order will be made, and section 2 will be eliminated from the bill, and therefore the only question before us will be the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act for 120 days, or until August 23, 1943.

We strongly urge this extension of time. The Ways and Means Committee has assured the House and the country they will within that period of time investigate all the questions raised relative to the Bituminous Coal Act and the activities of the Bituminous Coal Division, and make their report to the House, and the House will then have an opportunity either to extend the life of this act, or amend it, or permit this act to expire.

I favored this legislation from the beginning. I have consistently supported it. If the Bituminous Coal Division has, as is charged, overmanned this activity, and has more persons on its pay roll, or has incompetent persons, or is engaged in practices that should not be tolerated, I am sure this investigation will disclose these, and corrections will be made.

The purpose of this legislation was to stabilize the coal-mining industry. In the beginning it was favored by at least 80 percent of the coal producers of the country, and even a larger percentage of the miners. While the bituminous coal industry is one of the most essential industries, it had been through the years one of the most hazardous as to the life and health of the workers and as to the stability of investments. For many years, between 1925 and 1939, on account of the low price of coal, the miners were not receiving adequate compensation and their employment was of an intermittent character, and for that same period of time the coal business itself was in a bad way generally. Thousands of bituminous coal producers were either forced into bankruptcy or were operating at a loss, and during this time the country witnessed cutthroat competition in the industry itself that made it impossible for this great industry to prosper or to pay to the workers a decent wage.

During a great part of the year there was a surplus of coal. Each operator trying to dispose of his products found

himself in active competition with hundreds of other coal producers attempting to do the same thing. They were forced to dispose of their coal at less than it actually cost to produce it. This resulted in financial distress for them and the cutting of wages for the workers.

Furthermore, transportation concerns consumed about 25 percent of the coal produced. A great deal of favoritism developed. Persons who furnished coal at prices agreeable to the transportation managers received favorable consideration in securing cars to ship their other coal. In this way the transportation agencies forced the operators to sell their coal below cost. I mean the coal that was consumed by the transportation agencies. If the operators came out even or made any profit on their investment they had to charge a greater price to the general consumers of coal. This, of course, was unfair to these consumers, and then there were other unfavorable conditions developed by reason of the lack of stability in this industry.

The Bituminous Coal Act cut out all of this favoritism and required all consumers, both large and small, of coal to pay the same price for the same quality and kind of coal. It gave to the authority created under this act the power to fix prices on bituminous coal throughout the Nation, at such a sum as would enable the coal producers to pay their workers a decent wage and give to them a fair return on their investment.

The act further provides there should be levied a 1-cent tax on each ton of coal. Out of the tax collected from the coal producers themselves all the expenses incident to the carrying on of these activities have been paid by the coal producers themselves, and on December 31, 1942, when the last report was made, this tax had not only paid the expenses of this activity but there was a balance of approximately five and a half million dollars. It is the only agency of the Government I know anything about that has paid its way fully and provided a surplus for the Treasury.

The question arises in your mind as to whether this has been a burden or a benefit to the consumers of bituminous coal. I am thoroughly convinced this act has proved to be helpful to the producers of this coal, to the miners, and to the consumers as a whole. It has saved hundreds of coal producers from bankruptcy, it has provided better wages for the workers, and has saved millions of dollars annually to the consumers.

The average price of bituminous coal in 1918, during the First World War, was $2.58 a ton. The average price of bituminous coal during this war is approximately $2.25 a ton, a saving of 33 cents a ton to the consumer, and at the same time it has provided a steady flow of coal.

In 1920 and 1921 the price of bituminous coal went as high as $10 or more at the mines. The prices I have quoted per ton mean f. o. b. at the mines. These enormous prices led thousands of large and small coal mines to be opened and this condition flooded the coal market, and thousands of large and small coal producers either failed or went out of business, so that during the 1930's our coal production had fallen to less than 350,000,000 tons per annum, and for part of the time coal miners received as low as $1 per day. If there is any group of workers who deserve good wages it is the coal miners. Their work is not only dangerous to their lives but dangerous to their health. Few persons realize what it means to go into the muck, mud, and water of coal mines and get out the coal. Falling rock and slate and explosions add to the hazards and dangers of this work. Producers of coal have not received a very large increase since we entered the war. It is not comparable, I understand, to the increases granted to practically every other industry. The miners themselves have not had an increase in wages since their contract dated April 1, 1941, except a few captive mines, and these captive mines had their increase in November 1941, before the war.

It is difficult to say what might have happened but for the intervention of this act and the cooperative efforts of the coa producers themselves. If we had continued I am afraid our coal industry would have been in very bad shape. As it is we will produce about 600,000,000 tons of bituminous coal this year and we certainly need it very much.

According to the reports submitted by the agencies of the Government and others, the coal industry in 1941 made a margin of profit of 7 cents a ton, and for the first 9 months of 1942 a margin or profit of 9 cents a ton. There is no complete report for the last 3 months of 1942.

According to the Social Security Year Book of 1941, the wages of those engaged in producing bituminous coal for the year 1940 amounted to $536,829,000 and there were about 430,000 persons employed. In that year, 1940, 460,722,000 tons were produced.

Our petroleum and gas production is very great. The wages paid in the production of petroleum and gas in 1940 amounted to $318,197,000 according to the Social Security Year Book of 1941.

This is a great industry. It provides the means by which we secure heat for our homes, schools, and so forth, light for our towns and cities, and furnishes the power for our industries. What would happen if the production of coal would be stopped for even a short period of time. It is one of the great key industries of our Nation and an industry that makes it possible for us to build ships, planes, bombers, guns, tanks, and other munitions of war, and not the least among its great benefits are the byproducts from the coal that provide us with necessary healing remedies, our very best dyes, and explosives.

This industry should be stabilized, not only for the benefit of those who have investments in it or who work in the mines, but for the welfare of the people of the entire Nation, and those who have their money invested in this industry are entitled to such a price as will enable them to run their business successfully and make a fair return on their investment and pay to their workers a decent wage in accordance with the labors they perform and the dangers and hazards they encounter.

ACTIVITY APPROVED GENERALLY

The results of this activity have been approved generally by the producers, large and small, and the miners, and the Consumers' Counsel connected with this activity and whose duty it is to look out for the interest of the consuming public has stated over his signature the great savings that have come to the consumers of bituminous coal under this act. When the legislation was first passed many of the small producers of coal insisted that this act was for the benefit of the large producers. The Bituminous Coal Division has worked out a policy that places the small producers on an equal footing with the large producers. I have hundreds of these small producers—truck mines, and so forth—in my district, and they all favor the objectives of this act and more than 99 percent of their reports to me indicate that they favor the continuation of this act.

In order that we may see how unstable the coal industry was before this act, I call your attention to 1920. The bituminous-coal industry, after the payment of Federal taxes, had left $173,143,816. In 1921 this had dropped to $18,329,750. In 1925 there was a loss of $26,830,554, and the bituminous-coal industry, according to Government reports, lost millions of dollars annually in 1925 and on down through 1939. In 1933 this loss was $48,578,000. In 1938 it was $32,183,000. In 1940 there was a profit after payment of Federal taxes of $4,209,000. While we do not have the exact figures, we are advised that there was an increase in profits in 1942, and there was a larger tonnage and there is likely to be some increase in profits in 1943, but under this act there can be no profits such as were made in 1917 through 1924, but we express the hope, under this act, the coal industry will continue on a sound financial basis and that the miners will continue to receive a real living wage, and the consumers will likewise benefit in a cost per ton at the mines less than was paid in World War No. 1, and we have every reason to hope that economies will be effected in the future in carrying on the activities under this act by the Bituminous Coal Division.

Our bituminous coal mines as well as the anthracite mines must be kept going, and the American people should be willing to pay such a just and fair price for coal as will keep the mines sound financially and provide proper and just wages for the miners. Without coal our defense plants and other industries will shut down, our railroads will stop, our cities will be in darkness, our homes, schools, hospitals, and offices will be without heat, and our country will run short of dies and of explosives.

Let us bear in mind that this is one agency of the Government that pays its own way and has brought into the Treasury more than five and one-half million dollars since it was created. If this condition continues, these taxes should be reduced, or other benefits come to the producers and the miners. There is no good reason why the coal industry should pay more into the Treasury than is actually necessary to

carry on this activity in an efficient manner.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We of Massachusetts are very much interested in this. Many of our coal bins are today empty and if something is not done to relieve the shortage of coal, as well as the shortage of oil, our fate next winter will be even worse than it has been during the present winter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I appreciate the problem presented by the gentlewoman of Massachusetts.

Our mines are not running to their fullest capacity. This is due to a shortage of manpower and the securing of critical materials and machinery for the mines. Tens of thousands of miners have enlisted in the armed forces of our country and others have been induced to leave the mines and take jobs in defense plants, where they are receiving more pay than they received in the mines and are in much less danger to their lives and their health.

Transportation also has much to do with the shortage of coal in sections of our country remote from the coal mines. If we could have the men and the transportation facilities, there would be no necessity for any shortage of coal in the good State of Massachusetts or elsewhere in the Nation. The Ways and Means Committee has announced that they will explore this whole subject thoroughly within 120 days, and all those who are in favor and those who are against this activity or desire to see some change in the law, we are assured, will be given an opportunity to be heard fully. If this activity is based on sound economics and is for the best interests of the people of this Nation, it fill bear investigation. If it is not, its defects can and will be disclosed and the Congress and the American people ought to know about it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, unless we take action the Bituminous Coal Act will expire next Monday. If we permit that to happen, in my opinion the coal industry will be in a chaotic condition.

As we all know, the Committee on Ways and Means has not had an opportunity to make a thorough study of the question. Legislation is pending before that committee. All this resolution will do is extend the life of the act for 120 days, in order to give that committee an opportunity to make a thorough study and bring in a proper bill.

In my opinion, the Committee on Ways and Means, after going into the question, will decide that the Bituminous Coal Act should become permanent. For years the coal operators furnished fuel to this Nation at a loss.

The condition of the operator was deplorable, and the saddest part of the whole picture was the fact that the plight of the operator was reflected back to the miner in a pauper wage. The condition of the miner was not only deplorable—it was unbearable. The sad state of the operator and miner alike brought about the coal legislation, which, in my opinion, has gone a long way toward stabilizing the coal industry I am not saying that the legislation is perfect; I am not saying that it does not need to be amended; but I am saying that it would be a great mistake to let the act expire before the Ways and Means Committee has had ample time to make a thorough study of the problem.

I hope it will be the pleasure of this committee to extend the act and give the Committee on Ways and Means an opportunity to go further into the matter. If this is done I believe the committee will bring in permanent legislation that will be fair to the operator, the miner, and the consuming public.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this act has been in effect a long time. Every time these people came up to the Committee on Appropriations for money it was agreed that the next time they should not have any. They have always been able to dodge by in one way or another. It is about time we put an end to this thing and have it over with. I cannot support a continuance of this procedure any longer.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this resolution extends the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days. There are pending before the Committee on Ways and Means measures designed to set up a permanent organization for the maintenance of the coal industry of this country on a basis profitable both to the operators and to their employees. This act has been of great benefit to the coal industry, to the men who mine the coal, and to the people who use it. The coal industry is a basic one, without which we could not heat our homes and without which we could not operate our steel mills and countless other industries that are now producing essential munitions of war.

I can remember when the coal industry of this country was the sick industry of the Nation. The truth of it is that the courts in my district, which is a coal-mining district, are in a sense cemeteries in which have been deposited the broken remains of countless coal companies.

I know that from time to time thousands of men who wanted to work in the coal mines were unable to get work at a living wage or at any wage at all because of the sick condition of the industry.

I supported the extension of this act 2 years ago and shall support this resolution to extend it for a period of 120 days. I shall support any reasonable measure designed to keep our coal industry on its feet and to give the splendid men who mine the coal permanent work at a living wage. I hope this resolution is unanimously adopted.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, this resolution calls for an extension of the Bituminous Coal Act for 120 days. The Committee on Ways and Means has before it for consideration the continuance of the so-called Guffey Coal Act, but as you well know, that committee has been burdened first with the tax question, and following that on its schedule was the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which likewise is about to expire.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in its opinion that the merits of this act should be tested, and that an opportunity should be given for all parties to be heard. That simply could not be done in a week from next Monday, when this act expires. Therefore, it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that by joint resolution the life of the act should be extended 120 days, which would afford ample opportunity for hearings.

While there has been some talk about the number of employees required in connection with the operations of the Commission, it may be said in frankness and candor that the industry itself pays the freight on this act. No money is taken from the Treasury for expenses in connection with the operation of this Commission. This money is paid by the industry itself.

There has been some question as to abuse and abuses. You may be sure that the Committee on Ways and Means, if this joint resolution is passed, will give a full hearing to all parties in interest, and you may be further assured that a report will come back to you that will be both thorough and comprehensive.

In the interest of this industry and in the interest of our national defense, I urge you to pass this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) section 19 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (relating to termination of the act) is amended by striking out "April 26, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 24, 1943."

(b) Section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of the bituminous coal taxes) is amended by striking out "April 25, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 23, 1943."

SEC. 2. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior and the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, contained, respectively, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, are continued available for carrying into effect the provisions of law extended by section 1 (a) of this act for the period of such extension, and in addition thereto the sum of $950,000 for such Division and $20,000 for such counsel are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be merged with such respective continued appropriations and to be available for the same respective objects of expenditure: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount of the appropriation for such Division which may be expended in connection with motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles is hereby increased from $3,250 to $5,500.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against section 2 and to make a statement. When this matter was before the Committee on Rules it was understood that this section would go out, and that was with the approval of the Rules Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the leadership. Therefore, I make the point of order against section 2 that it is a violation of section 4 of rule XXI, being an appropriation on a legislative bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears that section 2 appropriates $970,000 for the continuance of the Bituminous Coal Commission. The resolution is reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means, which committee does not have jurisdiction over appropriations. Section 4 of rule XXI forbids this, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. BLAND having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 113, and pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was engrossed and ordered to be read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 99, noes 6.

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a speech he made before the American Taxpayers Association in New York City April 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Also, Mr. Speaker, that the same gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] may have permission to extend his remarks and include a letter in the New York Daily Mirror.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in three particulars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. Morrell, president of the Independent Oil Dealers Association, praising Mr. Prentiss Brown for his efforts to bring order out of chaos, in the rationing of coal and oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COLONEL WARING

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Waring, commander of the National Legion, who has recently returned from north Africa, is to make an address tomorrow night at Constitution Hall at 8 o'clock. Any Members of the House who desire to attend may receive admission tickets from myself or from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], and from some others.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Merely to say that I made that statement to the House yesterday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the special committee of the Committee on Appropriations investigating un-American activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial resolution from the Legislature of the State of Florida pleading for the rezoning of gasoline rationing in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT OF 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act shall apply to all civilian officers and employees (including officers and employees whose wages are fixed on a monthly or yearly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, except those in or under the Government Printing Office or the Tennessee Valley Authority) in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that this Act shall not apply to (a) elected officials; (b) judges; (c) heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies; (d) officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; (e) employees whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose; (f) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed; (g) officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; and (h) individuals to whom the provisions of section 1 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes', approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law Numbered 17, Seventy-eighth Congress), are applicable. As used in this section the term 'elected officials' shall not include officers elected by the Senate or House of Representatives who are not members of either body.

"SEC. 2. Officers and employees to whom this Act applies and who are not entitled to additional compensation under section 3 shall be paid overtime compensation computed on the same basis as the overtime compensation which was authorized to be paid under Public Law Numbered 821, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, that such overtime compensation shall be paid only on the portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation not in excess of $2,900 per annum: *And provided further*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid on such portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation notwithstanding the fact that such payment will cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of forty-eight hours in any administrative workweek, the heads of departments, establishments, and agencies may in their discretion grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty.

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c), officers and employees to whom this Act applies and whose hours of duty are intermittent or irregular, officers and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches (except those in the Library of Congress, or the Botanic Garden, and per annum employees in or under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol who are regularly required to work not less than forty-eight hours per week) to whom this Act applies, and, subject to the approval of the Civil

Service Commission, officers and employees whose hours of work are governed by those of private establishments which they serve and for whom on this account overtime work schedules are not feasible, shall be paid, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized under section 2 of this Act, additional compensation at the rate of (1) $300 per annum if their earned basic compensation is at a rate of less than $2,000 per annum, or (2) 15 per centum of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,000 per annum if their earned basic compensation is at a rate of $2,000 per anum or more.

"(b) Any officer or employee to whom this Act applies and who is entitled to no additional compensation under subsection (a) or subsection (c) for a pay period, shall be paid for such pay period, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of $300 per annum, unless his overtime compensation under section 2 for such pay period is at least equal to such additional compensation.

"(c) Any officer or employee to whom this Act applies and whose hours of duty are less than full time, or whose compensation is based upon other than a time period basis shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this Act, additional compensation at the rate of 15 per centum of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum.

"(d) In no case shall any officer or employee be paid additional compensation under this section for any pay period amounting to more than 25 per centum of his earned basic compensation for such pay period.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this Act shall apply to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees.

"SEC. 5. The Act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law Numbered 450, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 4 of the Act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law Numbered 46, Seventy-seventh Congress), as amended, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this Act is in effect.

"SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall not operate to prevent payment for overtime services in accordance with any of the following statutes: Act of Februarv 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 261 and 267); Act of July 24, 1919 (41 Stat. 241; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 394); Act of June 17, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450, 1451, and 1452); Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1467; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 109a and 109b); Act of May 27, 1936, as amended (52 Stat. 345; U. S. C., title 46, sec. 382b); Act of March 23, 1941 (Public Law No. 20, Seventy-seventh Cong.): *Proviaed*, That the overtime services covered by such payment shall not also form a basis for overtime compensation under this Act.

"SEC. 8. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find that within the same Government organization and at the same location gross inequities exist, to such extent as to interfere with the prosecution of the war, between basic per annum rates of pay fixed for any class of positions under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the compensation of employees whose basic rates of pay are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, the Commission is hereby empowered, in order to correct or reduce such inequities, to establish as the minimum rate of pay for such class of positions any rate within the range of pay fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the grade to which such class of positions is allocated under such Act.

"SEC. 9. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of coordinating and supervising the administration of the provisions of the foregoing sections of this Act insofar as such provisions affect employees in or under the executive branch of the Government.

"SEC. 10. Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and committee chairmen, on or before the tenth day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

"SEC. 11. The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this Act, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress such information as the Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the first day of each quarter, require for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the thirtieth day after the beginning of each quarter, determine the number of employees so required, and any personnel of any such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released at such times as the Director shall order. Such determination shall be reported to the Congress each quarter. Sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall cease to be applicable to the employees of such department or agency unless the head thereof shall certify within thirty days from the effective date so prescribed by the Director that the number of employees of his agency does not exceed the number determined by the Director to be required for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions. Any determinations and directions made by the Director under the authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, are hereby continued in effect until modified by him. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments and agencies any employees released pursuant to this section whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies, and the services of these employees are to be utilized by the departments and agencies before additional employees are recruited

"SEC. 12. Amounts received as overtime compensation or additional compensation under this Act shall not be considered in determining the amount of a person's annual income or annual rate of compensation for the purposes of paragraph II (a) of part III of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or section 212 of title II of the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1932, as amended.

"SEC. 13. This Act shall not apply to civilian employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States or to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and such employees may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

"SEC. 14. This Act shall take effect on May 1, 1943, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

"SEC. 15. This Act may be cited as the 'War Overtime Pay Act of 1943'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Managers on the part of the House.

JAS. M. MEAD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
WILLIAM LANGER,
HARRY F. BYRD,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the conference agreement is the same as section 1 of the House bill with the following exceptions:

(1) The conference agreement extends the act to officers and employees whose wages are fixed on a monthly or yearly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards, except those in or under the Government Printing Office or the Tennessee Valley Authority. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill.

(2) The conference agreement excludes from the operation of the act officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation and officers and members of crews employed through the War Shipping Administration. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill.

(3) Under the conference agreement the term "elected officials" is stated not to include officers elected b the Senate or House of Representatives who are not members of either body. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill.

Section 2 of the conference agreement provides for the payment to officers and employees to whom the act applies of overtime compensation for work in excess of 40 hours per week at the rate of time and one-half. The overtime compensation is paid only on so much of the basic compensation as does not exceed the rate of $2,900 per annum, but is to be paid notwithstanding the fact that the payment will cause the aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of $5,000 per annum. The heads of departments, establishments, and agencies are given discretion to grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of 48 hours in any workweek. Except as respects the "$5,000 ceiling" and the authority to grant compensatory time off, the provisions of section 2 of the conference agreement have the same effect as the provisions of section 2 of the House bill.

Section 3 of the conference agreement provides for the payment, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of (1) $300 per annum if the earned basic compensation is at a rate of less than $2,000 per annum, or (2) 15 percent of so much of the earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum if the earned basic compensation is at a rate of $2,000 per annum or more, except that officers and employees

whose hours of duty are less than full time or whose compensation is based upon other than a time-period basis are to receive in lieu of overtime compensation additional compensation at the rate of 15 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum. The classes of officers and employees to whom section 3 of the conference agreement applies are substantially the same as those covered by section 3 of the House bill. Section 3 of the conference agreement also provides that if the overtime compensation under section 2 is at a rate less than $300 per annum, the employee shall receive additional compensation under section 3 at the rate of $300 per annum. In no case is any officer or employee to be paid additional compensation amounting to more than 25 percent of his earned basic compensation.

Section 3 of the conference agreement differs from section 3 of the House bill in that (1) the House bill contained no $300 minimum; (2) the House bill contained no 25 percent over-all limit inasmuch as such a limit was unnecessary where the additional compensation was computed on a straight 15-percent basis; and (3) the House bill contained a $5,000 ceiling.

Section 4 of the conference agreement applies the provisions of section 3 to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill.

Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the conference agreement are the same as sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the House bill.

Section 9 of the conference agreement is substantially the same as section 9 of the House bill, except that the authority of the Civil Service Commission under this section is to be exercised only with respect to sections 1 to 8, inclusive, of the bill and only to the extent that such sections affect employees in the executive branch of the Government.

Section 10 of the conference agreement is the same as section 10 of the House bill.

Section 11 of the conference agreement is the same as section 8 of the House bill with the exception that the information required to be presented by the heads of departments and agencies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress is required to be presented not less frequently than the first day of each quarter. Under the House bill this information was required to be presented only in January and July of each year.

Section 12 of the conference agreement provides that the benefits under the act are not to be considered income or compensation for the purposes of laws which provide for forfeiture of pensions for a non-service-connected permanent and total disability and which provide for forfeiture of retirement benefits of emergency offices when the income of the beneficiary from other sources reaches a certain amount. There were no corresponding provisions in the House bill.

Section 13 of the conference agreement provides that the act is not to apply to civilian employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army on vessels operated by the United States or to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill.

Section 14 of the conference agreement provides that the act shall take effect on May 1, 1943, and terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe. This section is the same as section 11 of the House bill.

Section 15 of the conference agreement is the same as section 12 of the House bill.

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the Federal employees' pay bill which was passed on the first Monday of this month under suspension of the rules.

The Senate struck out everything after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted their own bill, so that there was only one amendment on the part of the Senate, and, therefore, the bill comes back rewritten by the conferees.

This bill is to give additional pay to a million and a half employees of the Government who are not covered by other pay legislation. They are divided into two groups. Those who work on an hourly basis are given a pay increase for the hours worked beyond 40, at practically straight time. In other words, they work 48 hours a week and they get 21.6 percent more pay for that additional 1 day per week, which is 20 percent more work. As a matter of fact, it is approximately 24 percent more work than most of them were doing before the war, because, as you know, most of the Government agencies worked 39 hours a week prior to the war. They are now working 48 hours. So that it is practically payment of straight time for additional work on the part of most of those employees.

However, there is another group covered by the bill, including the employees of the Senate and the House, employees in our own offices, who do not work on an hourly basis, many of whom work more than 48 hours per week.

In taking care of those employees we have made a division. Those who get $2,000 and less get a flat $300-a-year increase. Those who make $2,000 per year and more get a 15-percent increase. No person under this bill, no matter what his salary is, gets any increase on any part of his salary that exceeds $2,900. It does not matter what his salary may be; if it is $8,000, he does not get any increase on that part of his salary that exceeds $2,900. So that the highest amount any employee can get under this legislation is $628 per year, for which he will work an additional 9 hours per week, 52 weeks per year.

There are two further groups of employees in the Government service who are paid under other legislation. One group works in the navy yards and arsenals and does industrial types of work. They are paid under permanent legislation which is on the same basis as the wage-and-hour law. If they work over 40 hours, they get overtime at time and a half, on the same formula used in the wage-and-hour law, which gives them a 30-percent increase for a 48-hour week. That is 8.4 percent more than we give the people covered in the conference report.

The Congress has recently passed a bill for postal employees, which supplements legislation passed more than a year ago and which provides for about a 31-percent increase in the pay of postal employees, because all of them got a $300-a-year bonus, even including three postmasters in the United States who make $12,000 a year. This Congress gave them $300 a year, and every other postal employee gets that bonus. In addition to that, the postal employees, with the exception of the first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, also get paid overtime for any hours worked beyond 40. That is the second group.

Now we are dealing with a third group who, as I said, prior to this emergency, worked 39 hours a week. We are putting them on a 48-hour week and we are paying them practically straight time, in some cases less than straight time. Those who worked 39 hours per week get 21.6 percent increase for 24 percent more work. Now, that is what this bill does.

As the bill passed the House it contained a ceiling, as we called it, which provided that no person making $5,000 per year could get any increase. The Senate bill did not have that ceiling and the conferees have agreed to the Senate provision, or at least a majority of them did. Therefore that ceiling is out. The bill does not cover any elected officials except those we elect in the House and Senate. It does not cover any Senator or Representative, or any Cabinet officer, or head of any department or agency of Government. It does cover the other employees who are not covered by the pay legislation dealing with the skilled mechanics in the Government or the Postal Service.

This bill covers approximately 1,499,000 people who work under the categories I have discussed. It includes the people in the executive branch of the Government in Washington and the people throughout the United States and the world who work in clerical capacities and executive positions in everything except the Postal Service or the skilled mechanics who are paid under Wage Board procedures.

Mr. MURPHY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY of Tennessee. Does this bill cover custodial employees of the Postal Service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; they are covered in the postal bill.

Mr. MURPHY of Tennessee. Has that bill been passed?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That bill has been passed and signed by the President.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have had considerable complaints about compensation received by postmasters whose compensation depended upon stamp sales.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill does not deal with them; they are covered in the bill that was passed earlier this year by the House giving fourth-class postmasters a 15-percent increase in pay. They are not in this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Their increase is based upon stamp sales?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the salary ceiling above which this increase does not apply?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill applies to everybody except postal employees, mechanics in navy yards and arsenals, employees of the Government Printing Office, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing who are paid under wage-board procedure, elected officials such as Members of Congress or the heads of departments and agencies. Otherwise there is no salary limitation in the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. No salary limitation whatever?

Mr. RAMSPECK. But they get no pay on any part of their salary above $2,900 a year, no matter what their salary is; they get no increase except on $2,900.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the point I was trying to bring out.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. This bill proposes to replace the temporary pay-increase bill that was passed last fall, does it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand that in the application of this bill there is no change in the rates under the various civil-service classifications, but this sum is added to that rate so that when an employee is said to rate a certain classification and a certain pay scale he receives this 15 percent in addition to that? Am I correct?

Mr RAMSPECK. That is correct; it does not change the basic pay.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I should like to ask the gentleman how many people will be embraced under the present bill as it comes to us from the Senate. How many people are affected?

Mr. RAMSPECK. About 1,499,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman tell us how many people were affected by the bill as it left the House with the $5,000 ceiling?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is a difference of 18,000 people; there are 18,000 people who get $5,000 a year, or above, who are affected by this bill.

I want to cite one or two illustrations. This House passed the post-office bill by a roll-call vote with only four Members voting against it. I have had some complaint because the conferees agreed to the elimination of the so-called ceiling. I think some of those did not understand what was brought out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] a moment ago; that notwithstanding what their salary is they do not get any increase above $2,900. I just want to point out to you that a $2,100 post-office clerk under the legislation that this Congress has enacted, if he works 48 hours per week, will receive an increase in pay of $656, or 31 percent plus. Under this bill a clerk in the same community working in a different branch of the Government whose pay is $2,100 will have $454 increase, although he works the same number of hours the post-office clerk does.

Let us take an instance in the higher brackets, the case of a $4,900 postal employee. He would be a supervisor. Under the legislation this Congress has enacted—and for which everyone of us voted, including myself, except four—that postal employee making $4,900 per year base pay would get $833 in overtime plus the $300 bonus, or a total of $1,133.

The same salaried employee in another branch of the Government, working in the same town, under our bill that we are asking you to vote for today, would only get $628. If there is anything unfair about the bill I do not know it. As a matter of fact, we are not doing as much for these employees as we have done for the other two groups I have described, and we are not doing as much for these employees as we force the private employer to do for his employees, who are working on Government contracts and paid with tax money.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I have been very much interested in preserving the Little Steel formula. Will the gentleman say whether there is anything in this bill affecting Government employees that would violate the spirit of the Little Steel formula, or would actually violate the formula insofar as it affects increases in salaries?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is not, because under the Little Steel formula you are permitted to increase the base wage, or the hourly wage rates, 15 percent since January 1, 1941. These employees have not been so increased. On top of the 15 percent increase in hourly rates under the Little Steel formula you pay 30 percent for overtime, so that if a person works under the Little Steel formula and is making $1 an hour, or was making that prior to January 1, 1941, he may receive now almost 50 percent more money under the Little Steel formula, whereas we are giving these people an increase of 21.6 percent as compared with practically 50 percent under the Little Steel formula.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER As I understand the gentleman, the 18,000 additional people who will be affected by the bill as it comes to us from the Senate, will be those who are receiving $5,000 or more in salary per annum?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman think and does the gentleman feel that those who are receiving $5,000 or more salary per annum should participate in the increase or bonus which is given to these employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I think so, because we are only giving them $628 a year for about 468 hours additional work.

Mr. SPRINGER. This bill as it comes to us from the Senate will give this increase to those who are receiving as much as $10,000 a year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. To the few who are receiving it and who are not heads of departments it will, but they only get $628 because it is figured on the $2,900 limit.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is an increase to that extent?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Most of the Federal agencies began working last fall on the 48-hour basis; is that true?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman tell us why instead of a commensurate reduction in the Federal pay roll to offset the longer workweek we have had a continuous uptrend during the winter months so that on February 28 the total number of civilian employees reached 2,943,919? Why have not these rolls been reduced because of the longer workweek?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad to advise the gentleman that under the legislation we passed last December and under which they were supposed to work on a 48-hour week, the Budget Director has ordered separation of some 41,000 employees. The reason for the increase, as given to me and my committee, and as the gentleman knows we are looking into that and trying to hold it down and reduce it, is that the Army and Navy are expanding. The Army and Navy employ 64 percent of all the Federal employees. I think the gentleman will agree with me that we have to be rather careful in separating employees from the Army and Navy. He does not want, and neither do I or any other Member, to interfere with the war effort.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We must recall that at the peak of the First World War in November 1918 the total number of civilian employees was only 918,000 approximately.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct. I am not defending the number of employees we have. I am simply pointing out, and I think the gentleman and myself can agree, that neither one of us wants to interfere with the war effort, therefore we cannot operate on them with an ax. We have to be careful.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Except in view of the serious and critical manpower situation, certainly the Federal Government should not be charged with sabotaging the war effort.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct about that. He will not find me disagreeing with him in any effort he makes to get rid of unnecessary employees. I am just as much for that as anybody else.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman explain the meaning of paragraph (b), section 3, which relates to 25 percent of the earned basic compensation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That was put in there, I may say to the gentleman, to keep dollar-a-year men from getting an increase of $300 a year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What does the gentleman mean by a "dollar-a-year-man"?

Mr. RAMSPECK. We have a good many dollar-a-year-men in the Government service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This is to protect them?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If we did not have that limit in there they would get $300 a year increase.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They will only get a 25 cents a year increase?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is all they will get.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. What effect will this bill have on Federal judges and members of the Supreme Court?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not have any effect on them at all.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Will this bill provide $300 extra in wages for those single or unmarried men now in the Government service who ought to be in the armed forces of our country?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman knows that is a question that my committee does not deal with. It will provide $300 for anybody to whom the act applies. I am just as much in sympathy with getting rid of draft dodgers as the gentleman from New York, and I will be glad to cooperate with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. What effect will this bill have on inflation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think it will have any, because we are paying for extra work. The authorities who deal with inflation claim—I do not claim to be an expert on that—that where you pay for extra services and do not pay a premium, and we are not paying a premium in this bill, why, then, you do not create inflation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am in favor of this increase, but I think the gentleman made a statement a few minutes ago in regard to post office employees that should be clarified for the benefit of the Members of the House. The bill H. R. 1366 provided for a $300 flat increase to all postal employees above the custodial grade. This $300 flat increase would have amounted to a 14-percent increase to the $2,100 clerk. That $300 had nothing to do with whether or not he worked overtime, and that should not be given as a 31-percent increase because it is on his base pay. In the case of an employee who made $4,900, the $300 increase would have been only about 7 percent minus.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not believe the gentleman and I differ. I was pointing out a comparison of the way the Congress has treated the postal employee and what we are asking be done here. All we are asking you to do in this bill is what you did for the postal employees before you passed the $300 bonus. The $300 bonus was added to an act already passed for the postal employees, similar to the act we are asking you to pass now for other employees.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact in connection with the postal employees that regardless of why or how, they do get a substantially larger increase than any of the other governmental employees as a result of the legislation that has been passed by this Congress within the last 6 months or a year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I hardly think the gentleman's comparison is proper because no postal employee gets as much as $9,000 a year.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is mistaken. There are three postmasters in this country who get $12,000 per year.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct, but our bill before dealt 99.9 percent with the employees throughout the United States who are on a very small salary, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The average postal employee gets $2,100 per year. I agree with the gentleman that that is true.

Mr. NORRELL. That is the impression I am trying to leave.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Let me point out to the gentleman, however, the difference between that employee and a similarly paid employee under this bill. The post office clerk gets $656 per year increase in pay. An employee getting the same salary in another branch of the Government under this bill would get only $454.

Mr. NORRELL. I do not see why the Congress should at this time increase the larger salaries of governmental employees. Personally, I cannot do it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We are asking you to give them an increase on $2,900. Is that a large salary?

Mr. NORRELL. Not $2,900, but when you increase a man who is receiving $9,000 to that same tune, I say it is a large salary.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The maximum amount the man gets is $628 per year.

Mr. NORRELL. But you add $628 per year to the $9,000 per year the man already has.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true, but there are very few $9,000 men in the Government service. They have to pay income taxes on their larger salaries, and they have to pay the increased cost of living just like everybody else. They are hard to keep in the Government because private industry, paying them out of the pockets of the taxpayers, is willing to pay them more money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not the conference report increases the amount of money expended over the House bill, and, if so, by how much?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it does, by $19,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. During the World War something was done for the Federal employees to help them meet the increased cost of living.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true. They were given a bonus amounting to $240 a year, I think.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, taxes will take quite a good deal of this increase.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Referring again to the postal employees, they get no time and one-half for overtime, they just get straight pay for the overtime they work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right, and that is what we are giving these people.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Therefore, they get nothing other than what they actually earn in overtime except the $25 a month provided under the bill H. R. 1366.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, and all we are asking you to give these people under this bill is what the postal employees already had before you gave them the $25 a month.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there not this difference, that unless the postal employee works the overtime he will not get the additional compensation, whereas the other Government employees under the pending bill will get the compensation stated in the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; unless they work the overtime they can get $300 a year, but that is all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The postal employee gets $300 a year, too, if he does not work overtime, so we have tried to make it apply as equally as we could.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The postal employee will not get the additional overtime unless he actually works it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true of both groups.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of the groups in this bill, too?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unless they work more than 39 hours?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. They have to work over 40 hours to get any overtime.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If they work 40 or more hours, do they get the compensation provided in this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They will get it only for the hours they work. If they work 44 hours they get half as much increase as they do if they work 48.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unless they work more than the 39 hours they now work in many of the departments they will not get any increase at all?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel certain that the conference report on this bill evens up the matter of pay boost so as to make it comparable to the pay of the postal employees, thus treating other Federal employees as fairly as we have postal employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not. It does not give them as much as the postal employees make for the same number of hours.

Mr. BISHOP. Is this bill for the duration?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is limited by the terms of the act to June 30, 1945, or any earlier date that Congress may prescribe by resolution.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this bill that might affect the farmers of the country one way or the other?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think so, unless they work for the Government?

Mr. FULMER. I may say to the gentleman that they have been working for everybody in this country.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We all are.

Mr. HERTER. I am told that the total cost of this will be about $19,000,000 more than the House bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HERTER. How much of that is due to the lifting of the ceiling to $300?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Eleven million three hundred thousand dollars for lifting of the ceiling, and $6,396,000 is for the $300 minimum for the lower-paid employees.

Mr. HERTER. Eleven million dollars for lifting the ceiling, and $6,000,000 approximately on the bonus.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But about 70 percent of the postal employees are not people who work overtime.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is a question that I do not want to get into debate about. They are now working 48 hours a week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this being a conference report, it is a compromise between the House and the Senate bills. There are a few observations that I should like to make with reference to the report, and especially with reference to the problem of the civil-service employment. We are dealing with a great number of individuals in this bill. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], has made a very clear explanation of the legislation before the House.

The chairman has just suggested that we now have about 3,000,000 employees on the Federal pay roll. We are dealing with 2,700,000 of them in this bill because there are about 300,000 in the postal group that are not included under the terms of this measure. Many more, undoubtedly, will be added within the next 12 months.

When the question of overtime pay was considered by the House Committee on the Civil Service a year ago, it was done with a view of providing a little more pay to those who were in the lower-salaried brackets. The suggestion at that time was that employees who received as much as $2,400 or less ought to have some increases. Then there was the further suggestion that since employees were going to be asked to work on a 48-hour basis rather than 40 hours, salaries should be increased accordingly. So a resolution was adopted that provided for a 21.6-percent increase for those who were employed for 48 hours, and a 10-percent flat increase to all employees who were not necessarily extended to a 48-hour work period. The 10-percent increase was to be paid on the first $2,900 but not to be paid to those who received $5,000 or more. The House bill submitted a few days ago increased the 10-percent raise to 15 percent. There were some other changes that have been explained.

The Senate bill had a provision similar to that of the House with reference to the 21.6 percent increase for the additional hours employed above the regular 40 hours. In other words, the two measures were similar in that respect. The Senate bill, instead of the 15-percent provision for increases to those not included in the above rate, provided for a straight bonus increase of $300 per year. This treated all employees alike, whether they received $5,000 more or less. The Senate bill also had a provision that would not let a union in government exclude membership of individuals because of race or color.

We have before us a compromise by which the 15 percent increase stays in the bill and will apply to all salaries up to $9,000 and applies to all salaries instead of being limited to $5,000. The conference report also provides a minimum increase of $300 per year. We do not have the exact figures on the cost of this legislation. The cost of Public Law No. 821 on an annual basis was estimated at $563,780,000. The cost of overtime on salaries above $5,000 per year is estimated somewhere between twelve and fifteen million dollars. There is an additional cost on the minimum increase of $300. In other words, the additional cost of the House measure over the resolution that passed the House some time ago was about $5,000,000. The conference report has added, in my judgment, about $20,000,000. There has been a great deal of persuasive argument that everybody employed in the Government ought to have higher salaries, including those who receive seven, eight, or nine thousand dollars per year. There is some foundation for this argument as it applies to certain individuals of technical experience and training, and whose services are invaluable to our Government.

I appreciate the fact that we do have a number of employees in our Government who are underpaid. We also have some undoubtedly that receive more than they really earn. Generally speaking, I think Government employees are loyal and want to do their part in the prosecution of the war effort and want to earn their pay. Personally, I think there should be a general overhauling of our Government employment structure. The manner in which we pay our employees is really too much of a patchwork hodgepodge affair. I expect sometime in the near future to introduce a measure that will provide for a committee composed of representatives from the House and from the other bodies as well as from the Budget Bureau. It may be some other group or two should be included. That, of course, has nothing to do with the measure presently before us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is estimated there are about 52,000,000 people who are classed as wage earners; about half of them are engaged in war industries. Then we have a farm group and we also have several million so-called white-collared workers, as well as others employed in various services indirectly associated with the war effort. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last World War there were 918,000 people employed under civil service. That number was reduced for awhile. It was down to 500,000 in the early 1930's. By 1940 we had 1,000,000 employees, now we have almost 3,000,000. This bill affects about 2,700,000 of them, so we do have a very important piece of legislation under consideration. The total cost of civil-service employment is something over $6,000,000. About 60 percent of them or more are either directly or indirectly connected with the War and Navy Departments. I want to call your attention to the further fact that we are taking on new employees by the thousands. It is estimated we will have about 3,600,000 within a year; it may run to 4,000,000. In view of the shortage of manpower it is likely that the Government will not be able to secure quite as efficient employment as it needs, but I am sure every effort will be made to employ people who are as well qualified as may be secured. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that a little overhauling in our Government employment would help reduce the number of employees in a good many of our departments. Some effort is being made in that direction but a whole lot more could be done. Mr. Speaker, let me say again, this is not a partisan matter. I suggest that you cast your vote in the manner you think is right under the circumstances.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Take a man making $5,000 a year, will the gentleman state whether he receives his increase of 15 percent on the $5,000, or does he receive 15 percent on $2,900?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The increase is on $2,900.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Then his increase would amount to 15 percent of $2,900?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. And what happens to the employee getting $1,000 a year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He is increased 25 percent. He gets $250 under the terms of this bill.

Mr. POWERS. And not $300?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If wages are to be increased whenever the cost of living goes up, and salaries of Federal employees are to be increased every time the cost of living goes up, what does every class contribute toward the war effort?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman will have to answer his own question and reach his own conclusion on that point.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe I understood the gentleman to answer my colleague from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to the effect that the increase took effect on only the first $2,900?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct, for an employee who gets more than $2,900.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understood from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that the maximum increase was something over $600. Is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No person can get over $628 increase in pay.

Mr. HINSHAW. How does that accord with the statement made to the gentleman from California in answer to his question? I do not understand it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Such employee would get 15 percent on $2,900.

Mr. HINSHAW. How does that work out as between the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MASON. They will get 15 percent on the $2,900, which is a little over $430. Then if they work extra time, their extra time may make it amount to $600; but 15 percent on $2,900 does not make $600. It makes a little over $430.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. If he works extra time, he may get as high as $628, and no more.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and former ranking minority member of the Civil Service Committee of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman agree with me that a vast majority of the Government workers are only too glad to work overtime? I know last evening one of the CAF's was talking to me at 10 minutes of 7. It seems to me it is justice to give them overtime pay as long as they get straight overtime; not time and a half.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I think it is generally understood that the great majority of Government workers are loyal and want to do their part. As I suggested a few minutes ago, however, this whole civil-service-employment business needs working over. It should have been done a long time ago. It needs it now more than ever. This has been done by patches. It is sort of a put-together situation. There are thousands, in my judgment, in the Federal service who do not get as much compensation as they really earn, and there are also a good many who are getting more money than their services are worth, and more than they would be paid in other employment. Of course, that is not involved in this bill today.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On page 2 there is a provison that in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of 48 hours in any administrative work week, heads of departments may in their discretion grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty. How much would that amount to?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall refer you to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That simply permits the agency, if a man works more than 48 hours a week, he can give him time off next week in lieu of paying him additional overtime.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just wonder if the passage of this bill will make possible the granting to many of these boys who are within the draft age in these departments which the Costello committee investigated the other day, and which you will find so numerous, $600 a year more for being in Government service, when they are now drawing six, seven, or eight thousand dollars a year in these Government positions?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's comment on that problem. It is one that is not involved directly in this legislation, but one that ought to have the attention of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, in most conferences between the House and Senate, every conferee does not agree with every provision of the conference report. I signed the conference report after making a statement to the other conferees that I did not agree with some of its provisions, although I did feel it necessary to have legislation continuing approximately the temporary pay-raise measure that expires April 30, 1943.

The provision of the conference report, which I oppose, is the lifting of the $5,000 ceiling—in fact, I offered to the House conferees an amendment putting the ceiling down to $3,200, but it was rejected. I also opposed the $300 straight bonus for those getting less than $2,000, but rather favored the 15 percent, which the original House bill called for.

Those are the two main provisions to which I am opposed, and I think my views generally coincide with those of my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and as a member of the conference, I thought it would be well to make this statement for the RECORD.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE].

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Civil Service Committee, I take this occasion to rise against this report.

We had a hard time getting out a bill in the Civil Service Committee. We thought it took care of the situation as best it could be done. It raised the total sum to $4,000,000. The result of this conference report would raise the cost $22,000,000. It is perfectly obvious. There are two provisions here which in my humble judgment are objectionable. First, the elimination of the $5,000 ceiling, over which men can receive an increase in pay; and, second, the minimum $300 bonus.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALE. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. I understood the gentleman to say the cost is increased $22,000,000. Is that over the bill that was adopted by the House?

Mr. GALE. Over the temporary pay bill which was passed last December.

Mr. McKENZIE. How much does this bill cost the Government in total?

Mr. GALE. Roughly speaking, about $22,000,000, as proposed by the conference report. This is in addition to the cost of the bill passed last fall.

Mr. McKENZIE. You have 2,700,000 employees, at an average of $300 a year, which is more than $810,000,000, not counting the overtime. It is a billion dollars for a bunch of desk jockeys, yet you take $567,000,000 away from the farmers. You can't reconcile it, gentlemen.

Mr. GALE. I repeat again that I am opposed to the House report; it is not what the House committee intended in the beginning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 58, noes 78.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 157, nays 162, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—157

Abernethy	Green	Poage
Allen, La.	Gregory	Powers
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hall, Leonard W.	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Harris, Ark.	Rabaut
Beall	Harris, Va.	Ramey
Beckworth	Hart	Ramspeck
Bell	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Hays	Richards
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	Rivers
Brooks	Holifield	Robertson
Bulwinkle	Hope	Robinson, Utah
Burch, Va.	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Burchill, N. Y.	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson, Kans.	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Chapman	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rowan
Chenoweth	Johnson, Luther A.	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sauthoff
Clason	Kerr	Scanlon
Cochran	Kilday	Schuetz
Coffee	King	Scott
Cole, Mo.	Klein	Shafer
Cooley	Lane	Sheppard
Cooper	Lesinski	Sheridan
Costello	Lewis	Sikes
Cravens	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Lynch	Slaughter
Cullen	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Davis	McCowen	Snyder
Dawson	McGehee	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	McGranery	Sparkman
Dingell	McMillan	Spence
Domengeaux	McMurray	Steagall
Doughton	Manasco	Sullivan
Douglas	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	May	Thomason
Eaton	Merrow	Tibbott
Eberharter	Miller, Pa.	Towe
Ellison, Md.	Morrison, La.	Troutman
Englebright	Morrison, N. C.	Van Zandt
Fenton	Mruk	Vinson, Ga.
Flannagan	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Murphy	Walter
Forand	Norman	Ward
Ford	Norton	Welch
Fulbright	O'Brien, Ill.	Wene
Furlong	O'Brien, Mich.	White
Gavin	O'Leary	Willey
Gerlach	Pace	Winstead
Gillette	Patman	Wolcott
Gordon	Peterson, Fla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gorski	Pittenger	Woodrum, Va.
Graham	Poage	Wright
Grant, Ala.	Powers	

NAYS—162

Andersen, H. Carl	Day	Howell
Andresen, August H.	Dewey	Hull
Andrews	Dirksen	Jeffrey
Angell	Ditter	Jenkins
Arends	Dondero	Jennings
Auchincloss	Dworshak	Jensen
Baldwin, Md.	Ellsworth	Johnson, Anton J.
Barrett	Engel	Johnson, Calvin D.
Bates, Mass.	Fellows	Johnson, Ward
Bender	Fernandez	Jones
Bennett, Mich.	Fish	Jonkman
Bennett, Mo.	Fisher	Judd
Bishop	Fulmer	Kefauver
Blackney	Gale	Kinzer
Boren	Gallagher	Kleberg
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	Knutson
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Kunkel
Bryson	Gearhart	Landis
Burdick	Gifford	Lanham
Busbey	Gilchrist	LeFevre
Butler	Gossett	Lemke
Camp	Griffiths	McGregor
Cannon, Mo.	Gross	McKenzie
Carson, Ohio	Gwynne	McLean
Carter	Hagen	McWilliams
Case	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maas
Chiperfield	Halleck	Mahon
Church	Hancock	Mansfield, Mont.
Clevenger	Heidinger	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Herter	Martin, Mass.
Colmer	Hess	Mason
Compton	Hill	Michener
Cox	Hinshaw	Miller, Conn.
Crawford	Hobbs	Miller, Mo.
Culkin	Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.
Cunningham	Hoffman	Mills
Curtis	Holmes, Wash.	Monroney
Mundt	Rizley	Talle
Murray, Tenn.	Rockwell	Tarver
Murray, Wis.	Rohrbough	Taylor
Newsome	Rowe	Treadway
Nichols	Russell	Vincent, Ky.
Norrell	Short	Vorys, Ohio
O'Connor	Simpson, Ill.	Wadsworth
O'Hara	Smith, Maine	Weichel, Ohio
O'Neal	Springer	West
Ploeser	Stanley	Wheat
Poulson	Stefan	Whitten
Pracht	Stewart	Whittington
Rankin	Stockman	Wickersham
Reed, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Reed, N. Y.	Sumners, Tex.	Woodruff, Mich.
Rees, Kans.	Taber	Worley
	Talbot	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—115

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Mott
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Myers
Arnold	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	O'Konski
Barden	Guyer	O'Toole
Barry	Hale	Outland
Bloom	Hare	Patton
Bolton	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Bonner	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Boykin	Hébert	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Phillips
Brehm	Hendricks	Plumley
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Price
Buffett	Horan	Randolph
Burgin	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Calif.
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rolph
Canfield	Kean	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Sasscer
Capozzoli	Kee	Satterfield
Celler	Keefe	Schiffler
Courtney	Kelley	Schwabe
Creal	Kennedy	Smith, Ohio
Curley	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	Kirwan	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	LaFollette	Stearns, N. H.
Dilweg	Lambertson	Stevenson
Disney	Larcade	Sundstrom
Durham	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	LeCompte	Tolan
Ellis	Luce	Vursell
Elmer	McCord	Wasielewski
Elston, Ohio	Madden	Weaver
Fay	Magnuson	Weiss
Feighan	Maloney	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Marcantonio	Wilson
Folger	Merritt	Winter
Gavagan	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gibson		

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Gillie against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Elmer against.

Mr. Curley for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

General pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Schwabe.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Outland with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Gavagan with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Weiss with Mr Canfield.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Elston of Ohio.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Monkiewicz.

Mr. Price with Mr. Schiffler.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Vursell.

Mr Randolph with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Madden with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. SIKES and Mr. EATON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. LEMKE, and Mr. FISH changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The Clerk announced the vote as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

UNITED STATES NAVY AUXILIARY VESSELS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 141.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 1563, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committe on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

THE HONORABLE FRANK E. HOOK

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD of April 20, page 3608, contains a statement by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] to the effect that Mr. Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, had been offered a position as regional director of the O. P. A. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio that that is a misstatement, that Mr. Hook has not been offered such a job, and that he would not accept it. I hope the gentleman from Ohio withdraws his words.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial by Generoso Pope, publisher of the Il Progreso Italo-Americano, which was reprinted in the New York Times of April 12, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Times-Dispatch, of Richmond, Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT], may extend his remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Tell the Sheriff," from the Pike County Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and received unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article, the estimate on which is two and a half pages and the cost $112.50. I ask unanimous consent to extend this article in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] may have a leave of absence for 2 days, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a canner in our district setting forth the farmer's problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES NAVY AUXILIARY VESSELS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the rule under consideration would make in order a bill dealing with auxiliary vessels for the Navy. I am not going to take time by discussing the merits of the measure. These bills are always ably presented by the legislative committee which I am sure will do so in this case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY].

Mr. MCGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY].

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday afternoon I called the attention of the House to what I considered to be a horrible spectacle being enacted in the State of Pennsylvania. I do not know whether all the Members present today were present on Friday afternoon or not, but for the benefit of those who were not present at that time I might say that they have introduced a reapportionment bill in the State Legislature of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania was reapportioned last year by agreement of both parties, Republican and Democratic. Now a new reapportionment bill has been introduced, which bill has been sanctioned by the leadership of the Republican Party, and is designed to take away from Pennsylvania its constitutional representation of five Democrats.

I said that that spectacle was horrible. I have since been holding my ear to the ground and I find that there are rumblings of reprisals here and there. If the gentlewoman from Illinois will pay attention, I will tell her what these rumblings are.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGRANERY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thought the gentleman said "Rumlings."

Mr. MCGRANERY. I may say to the gentlewoman, and I thank her for her contribution, it has the same odor as the "Rumlings." Now to get back to my statement. As I said, in this situation I have had my ear to the ground and I ponder what the possibilities are with respect to States where the Democrats are in control? This reapportionment of Pennsylvania comes from the high command, the National Republican Committee, and by them designed to gain control of the House under its present set-up. Do you think the Democratic Governors and Democratic legislatures are going to sit idly by and have the will of their people thwarted? I do not think so. I want the record to show clearly now that the Republican Party, even though we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle for our very existence, place their party above their country. I want the record to show that this is a political war to gain control of the House, come what may, that it had its origin not in the State of Pennsylvania, in my opinion, but in the high command of the Republican Party. The record must be clear now and then, let the chips fall where they may. The responsibility is fixed on the Republican Party. I know decent Republicans who are highly patriotic will resent this with all the fiber of their being, and they will tell Governor Martin that they want to promote unity; that he must exercise his high office both as Governor and the titular head of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania toward the end that is best for our country.

I should like to see some of my good Republican friends tell the American people that they will have no part in a political fight when our boys are sweating, bleeding, and dying on the battle fronts throughout the world.

I say to you this is a very solemn hour. I say to you with all the vigor and sincerity that I can command that this is a very dastardly thing, a foul blow to our democracy. Let our good Republicans rise from their places not to defend this action but rather to warn and beg their less enlightened brethren to turn their course in the direction of unity of action and purpose for an early and complete victory over our common foe.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain reports on the monetary situation in India and the proposal of Mr. Stettinius on the granting of money metal to the British Empire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue further the subject that has been so ably presented to the House by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY]. I do not think that even the people of Pennsylvania realize what is taking place in the legislature in Harrisburg. This attempt for a second congressional reapportionment is I believe without parallel in the

history of the United States. Certainly and definitely it has never been done before in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Last year after the census Pennsylvania, in common with other States in the Nation, had a reapportionment measure passed by both Houses of the legislature. That act is now in force. Now we have the spectacle of our legislature, because the Republicans have control of both branches of the legislature, considering another bill, a gerrymandering measure, a vicious political proposal that is, I repeat, without parallel in history.

I read the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and I read the news report of the statement of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] in reply to the remarks of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY and Mr. EBERHARTER]. To me, they were both weak statements and an attempt to defend something which is indefensible.

My good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] undertook to give the House a lecture on the patriotism of the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. That was his reply to what is going on in Harrisburg. No one assailed the patriotism of our Governor. His record as a patriot would never be assailed by any Democratic Member of this House, and there was no need for the gentleman from Pennsylvania drawing a red herring across the trail by speaking of the Governor's patriotism.

The distinguished minority leader said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] that if the Legislatures of Tennessee and North Carolina would refrain from similar proceedings he would attempt to do something about Pennsylvania. The situations in Tennessee and North Carolina are not analogous, and he knows it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I say to the gentleman that North Carolina has never attempted a second reapportionment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is what I understood. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly think the record in Tennessee does not show that there has been gerrymandering of any district in order to try to make any district Democratic that was Republican.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I understand that the States of Tennessee and North Carolina had but one reapportionment, and that they were just and equitable measures.

Of course, reapportionments, legislative and congressional, are nothing new in the history of Pennsylvania insofar as gerrymandering is concerned. I am not shocked or surprised, because in the days when the opposition to the Republican machine was all centered within its own party through different factions the Republican bosses would, on occasion, gerrymander various factions out of office.

I know that I and other Democratic Members of Congress from Pennsylvania have incurred the displeasure of powerful interests in the State of Pennsylvania, men of great wealth, who really direct and control the Republican Party. We know that the orders have gone out to the Legislature of Pennsylvania that some of us must be removed from the scene here in Washington, so this gerrymandering legislation will no doubt be passed because, as the Republican gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] says, they have the votes and they are not much concerned about the decencies.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY.]

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I confess that I know little or nothing about the congressional reapportionment of the great State of Pennsylvania. I have never heard of any reapportionment bill that was entirely satisfactory to the minority party. Generally, if any benefit was derived, the majority party derived some slight advantage. But I do not understand the great excitement of the Democratic Representatives from Pennsylvania and their great alarm and axiety because, if I see the handwriting on the wall correctly, there will be few, if any, Democratic Representatives elected in 1944 from the State of Pennsylvania.

They seem to be worrying about an alleged discrimination in a reapportionment bill when they should be concerned over the attitude of the voters on the continuation of the New Deal and the fourth term.

Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. EBERHARTER, and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. FISH. I want to leave those issues entirely in the hands of the electorate, and they will decide what is best for America. I do not want to be involved over the apportionment bill because I know nothing about it. I am speaking only my own opinion of public opinion in the future. I do not propose to yield to get involved in any controversy over a reapportionment in Pennsylvania. Later I shall yield time to some minority Member from Pennsylvania to discuss the merits of the proposition, which I admit is a little beyond my ken.

I desire now to speak upon the bill whose consideration is made in order by this rule.

The bill authorizes the construction of auxiliary vessels for the Navy in the amount of $1,238,000,000. It comes with a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules, and I presume also with a unanimous report from the Committee on Naval Affairs. It calls for the construction of different types or categories of ships—auxiliary aircraft carriers, ammunition ships, refrigerator ships, miscellaneous auxiliaries, cargo ships, mine sweepers, tankers, transports, evacuation transports, airplane transport ships, rescue tugs, landing craft and tank landing ships. Most of them are large, probably 200 feet or more. I assume every Member of Congress is in favor of this legislation as a part of the war program. The report says that 27 auxiliary vessels have already been sunk in the war up to February 20, 1943, involving 118,000 tons. I do not suppose it would be proper to ask what has happened since that time, but it is very evident that many of these ships will not be constructed for a year or a year and a half, and therefore, it is safe to assume, and properly so, that we are preparing for a war that will continue beyond a year or a year and a half. I am reminded when I rise to support this bill of what some Members of Congress had to say before Pearl Harbor, when they were urging us to get into the war. They said that if we entered the war we would defeat the Japanese Navy within 2 weeks and take Tokyo within 30 days.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish the gentleman would tell me what Member of Congress said that.

Mr. FISH. It was said by a distinguished Member of the other body.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I knew that I had never heard such a thing on the floor of the House.

Mr. FISH. And that was repeated all over America through the press. He wanted to take us into the war before Pearl Harbor—that all we had to do was to go into the war, and that within 2 weeks we would destroy the entire Japanese Navy and take Tokyo within 30 days. We have been in the war for over 16 months and we are still 3,000 miles from Japan. It is true, as has been stated by the Secretary of the Navy, that our Navy today is far stronger and more powerful than it was at the time of Pearl Harbor; and he goes on further to say that we have seven fleets confronting the enemy, and yet we apparently are no nearer defeating that Japanese Navy than when we declared war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes more. I believe, as I always have believed, that we have the greatest and most efficient Navy in the world, and I believe we had that at the time of Pearl Harbor, and I believe that we can defeat the Jap Navy ship for ship, gun for gun, and man for man, every time we meet them. Of course, we are all going to vote for this bill, whether the ships are built a year or a year and a half from now, and if it is required we will vote for additional ships in order to continue to have the best Navy in the world and to defeat the Japs as soon as

possible. I wish we had some guaranty in this bill that by merely voting for it and talking for it it would bring the war to a glorious and a victorious conclusion in the near future. Naturally, we have no such guaranty, and we are voting for this bill because it is urged by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the Naval Affairs Committee. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the greatest expert and friend of the Navy in the United States. He informed us that these auxiliary ships are needed and that being so it is our duty to provide them by legislation. We hope before they are constructed that the war will be over, but we are not taking any chances at the present time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman made the statement that politics should not enter into the consideration of this particular measure.

Mr. FISH. Certainly not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman made the statement that politics should not enter into the consideration of the measure.

Mr. FISH. And I know of none that has entered into it. Of course, I reserve the right at all times to discuss the conduct of the war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think that it is proper in advancing the unity of the country for a State legislature to inject politics and political consideration in an attempt to gain control of the House of Representatives, which will have a vital effect on important legislation to be considered by the House of Representatives, affecting the entire country.

Mr. FISH. All I can say to the gentleman is just what I feel about it. I have nothing to do with the reapportionment bill in the State of Pennsylvania, but I want to go on record squarely and without evasion as hoping that all the Republican candidates will be elected to Congress from the State of Pennsylvania in 1944 for the good of the Nation and the best interests of the American people.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And if the Republicans or the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania have their way, that is what will happen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a very happy occasion for me to listen to my colleagues, of whom I am very fond, to hear them get up here and concede that Philadelphia and Pittsburgh will go Republican in the next election. That is encouraging to us because we have said all along that we would, and I am glad to have such gallant confirmation from the other side of the aisle. If the gentlemen from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh will persuade the minority in the legislature of Pennsylvania to forego their filibuster, which is delaying the war bills proposed by our able and excellent Governor, General Martin, we can go on with the war up in Pennsylvania, too.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think it is proper in a county that has 100,000 majority of Democrats, to be represented by practically all Republicans in the National Congress?

Mr. SCOTT. I think it is a tribute to the good judgment of the voters if they should elect all Republicans.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We have a majority of at least 100,000 Democrats in 1 county, but the Republican legislature is trying to fix the thing so that there are no Democratic representatives here in the National Congress. I submit to the gentleman that that is contrary to the intent of the Constitution and it is a violation of democracy and republicanism also. This spectacle that the Republican legislature and the Governor are enacting——

Mr. SCOTT. I refuse to yield further. The gentleman is making his speech and not mine.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. In just a moment. I will never criticize the good judgment of any constituency, whether previously designated as Republican or Democratic, which will send to this Congress a Republican Representative, regardless of how they may heretofore have been represented.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The condition which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] speaks of is a condition that we have dreamed of but never hoped to realize, but it looks as though we may realize our ambition. At last, Pennsylvania is again going to be represented by a majority of Republicans.

Mr. EBERHARTER. God save the country if that happens.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I note that the gentleman made no attempt to justify what is being done in Harrisburg. Neither did my other good friend who rose to make his contribution. I take it they realize that what is going on up there is indefensible.

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I have found it impossible to justify so much of the ripper legislation during the Earle administration, when the gentleman's party was in power, when they ripped out 11 able, sitting judges in Philadelphia for political reasons, in order to put their own henchmen in as judges. I thought that was horrible. They ripped out so many long-established, efficient State offices that the session got the name of "the ripper session."

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. We really now have got the answer to it all. My good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] said he has been dreaming, as you all have. Wake up. Wake up and save America. Stop your political bickering and take your politics out of that program in Pennsylvania and carry on the war program. It is a disgraceful thing to witness in the greatest industrial State of the Union, this political fight.

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the gentleman if they will call off the filibuster up there we will make a lot of progress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand it, the reapportionment has been made necessary by shifts in population?

Mr. SCOTT. Precisely. There has been considerable shift in population. They are going back substantially to the old reapportionment of 2 years ago, except where they have to compensate for population shifts. Of course, I personally regret the loss of a seat in Philadelphia, but the bill is a better bill than the makeshift one it repeals.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I cannot feel very sorry about this condition which has arisen. Your boys have held our noses to the grindstone for a long time. I think the public knew what it was doing in giving Republicans an opportunity to participate in the responsibility of government.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I would like to call the attention of the House to one thing, and that is that the Democratic Party in Congress, when it had an opportunity, did take one seat away from the State of Michigan to which it was entitled, and by reapportionment for political reasons saved a seat in Arkansas. I do not think it comes with very good grace from the same party to protest what is being done in the Legislature of Pennsylvania which, after all, is the only forum which has jurisdiction of this reapportionment bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. PLUMLEY] may have permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] informed us that the Honorable Frank Hook, a former Member of Congress, was not offered the job

of O. P. A. director in Ohio, and that should he be offered the job, he would turn it down. I was glad to hear the gentleman's remarks.

The gentleman indicated that on yesterday I made a misstatement on the floor regarding this matter. Not at all; I merely quoted from my local newspaper, which carried the report that Mr. Hook was to receive this appointment. Now, if the newspaper is in error, I am sure the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] corrected the error. Since this subject of politics is being discussed, let me call your attention to the Saturday issue of the Cleveland News, the issue of April 17. I quote from the column of Jack Kennon:

Equally accurate was the word that Birkett Williams is through as Office of Price Administration head here. Eventually, the Washington shake-up of regional Office of Price Administration offices may reach as many as 50 percent of present personnel, according to reliable word from the New Deal citadel. The shake-up of Office of Price Administration in Ohio stems from Ohio democracy's dissatisfaction with Federal patronage in this State. Buckeye Democrats long have been hollering because too many Republicans hold key jobs in war agencies. They've been bucking on the F. D. R. fourth-term drive. The New Deal will try to appease now in replacing Republicans with Democrats—even lame-duck Congressmen—in this State.

I could also quote an editorial from the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard paper, which expressed the hope that no change be made in O. P. A. management in my State.

I do not want to be unfair to Mr. Hook. I do not know of a man who has served the New Deal more consistently than did he on the floor of the House. If any man is entitled to consideration from that standpoint he is, however much I might disagree as to the gentleman's qualifications for this particular job.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, with Mr. CRAVENS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill presents the question, whether the Navy shall have control over the design, construction, and delivery of naval auxiliaries. The decision of that question will have a decisive effect upon the strength and striking force of the Navy. Your Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously recommends that full control be given to the Navy.

The bill authorizes the acquisition and conversion, or construction of 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels for the Navy. The purpose of the auxiliary vessels is primarily to service and maintain the combatant fleet. They include auxiliary aircraft carriers, ammunition ships, refrigerator ships, miscellaneous auxiliaries, cargo ships, minesweepers, tankers, transports, evacuation transports, airplane transport ships, rescue tugs, landing craft, tank-landing ships.

There is no controvery as to the need for these auxiliaries. The Navy and the War Shipping Administration agree to the immediate and urgent necessity for 910,000 tons of such vessels.

Of this 910,000 tons, only 64,828 tons are authorized under unassigned balances of previous authorizations. Accordingly, 836,172 tons out of the million tons proposed to be authorized by the bill represent known, immediate, and urgent needs, and the balance of 163,828 tons will be available to provide for contingencies, including losses.

The types of auxiliaries differ widely, both one from another, and also from standard commercial types. Even in those most like commercial types, about all of the standard type that can be used is the hull and propulsion machinery. They must be built to special designs and specifications for the naval duty they are to perform.

These auxiliaries play a vital part in all fleet operations. They enter combat areas, and some of them operate in the vicinity of advanced bases and fleets for long periods of time. Some war plans and operations are largely dependent upon the number and capacities of the available auxiliaries. The fitting of tenders and other auxiliaries for their work, and the stocking of them with the special supplies, spare parts, and own supplies required to enable them to do their proper work with the fleet over extended periods of time, is one of the major problems of the war.

There are three basic reasons why the additional tonnage is needed—

First. To cover the auxiliary aircraft carriers being built for the Navy by the Maritime Commission.

Second. To provide for servicing the rapidly expanding combatant Navy.

Third. To meet the requirements brought about by the distances and the types of operation involved in the war.

The cost of these auxiliaries, including armament, is estimated at $1,238,100,000. The Navy Department furnished to the committee in executive session a breakdown of the use the Navy plans to make of them. These plans are necessarily subject to change with changes in war developments, and this may result in changes in the categories to be acquired and converted or built, as well as in their use. For obvious reasons, the matters developed in executive session should not be discussed here, but the committee unanimously believes that the authorization of this tonnage is an urgent and vital war necessity.

On this, no executive agency disagrees.

The only disagreement is as to who shall buy and convert, or build, these auxiliaries. The Bureau of the Budget decided that the War Shipping Administration should do so. It decided tnat this was how the Navy should get these vitally needed auxiliaries.

Your committee is unanimously opposed to the Budget Bureau's decision. It believes the Congress, and not the Bureau of the Budget, has the responsibility and the power to decide. The question is not a mere financial one, on which the Budget Bureau's views would be entitled to some consideration. The question goes much deeper, and vitally affects battle plans and operations. Your committee believes the Bureau of the Budget has no proper authority or competence on that subject. We urge the Congress to assume and to discharge its own responsibility, and we most earnestly recommend that the Congress place the control of this work of acquisition, conversion, and construction in the hands of the agency which is responsible for determining what auxiliaries are required and how they shall be employed, the agency that needs them and will use them, namely the United States Navy.

For this purpose, your committee inserted in the bill a new section—section 2—which provides that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any vessel intended for operation by the United States Navy, the construction or acquisition and conversion of which has been or is hereafter authorized for the Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, or any other agency of Government, shall be subject to the approval of the Navy Department in all matters of design and construction or conversion, and the control, custody, and sole right to possession of such vessel shall be transferred to the Navy Department on the completion of construction or conversion.

This is no new declaration of policy. It is the well-founded, time-tested policy on which our Navy has been built and maintained. Your committee believes that to change this policy, and conform instead to the decision of the Bureau of the Budget, would be a catastrophic mistake.

It would make it impossible for the Congress to discharge its constitutional duty of providing for the Navy in an orderly manner, that is, by enacting appropriate authorizations followed by appropriations for the same purpose. It would prevent the Naval Affairs Committee from being informed as to the authorized composition of the whole Navy. It would, by division of authority and legislation, tend to obscure from the view of the Congress the naval program

in its entirety, and make it difficult for the Congress to legislate intelligently on naval matters.

It would make the Navy a pensioner of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration. Under the long-tested policy, and under existing congressional authority and appropriations, auxiliary vessels are built under complete control, or are built by the Maritime Commission to Navy designs or Navy designs, contracts, inspection, and Commission designs satisfactory to the Navy. The Navy obtains congressional authority and appropriations, and controls design and contract performance, and thus can be assured it will get suitable auxiliaries.

In the procedure the Bureau of the Budget has proposed and which this bill would put a stop to, no congressional authority or appropriations will be granted the Navy, but the Maritime Commission will build auxiliary vessels for the Navy from its own funds.

The Navy will become a dependent of the Maritime Commission unless the Congress puts its foot down on this new Budget Bureau scheme. The auxiliary-ship program will be but a part, and a relatively small part, of the Maritime Commission's program. It will at the same time be the most particular, the least standardized, part of that program. It will be the part which the Maritime Commission is not doing for itself. It is utterly unreasonable to suppose that if the Maritime Commission's program should become involved in difficulties or delays, the part it is doing for the Navy in building naval auxiliaries would not be involved in such difficulties or delays. It is utterly unreasonable to suppose that the Maritime Commission, having its own great responsibilities to discharge, would readily subordinate them in case of difficulty to the naval program which the Bureau of the Budget would place in its charge. The Maritime Commission could not do this without being recreant to its own enormous responsibilities.

It is reasonable to expect that in such a case the Navy would find itself in the position of waiting its turn at a time when delayed delivery could mean disaster.

Fighting ships cannot perform the tasks for which they are designed without the requisite auxiliaries. In the planning and execution of naval operations and in the whole far-flung strategy of naval warfare, auxiliaries are as vital as combatant ships. The measure of the Navy's capacity to destroy the enemy is determined by the whole force at its command. Auxiliaries are an integral part of that force, just as much as guns and planes and armor.

In order to perform their functions properly, it is imperative that auxiliaries shall be converted or constructed to the special designs which fit them for their intended naval service, and it is just as imperative that they shall be delivered, complete with proper design, fittings, and equipage, when and where the plans and exigencies of naval war demand. Substitutes will not do, and delays may be fatal.

There are many other objections to this Budget Bureau scheme of giving over to the Maritime Commission the naval auxiliary conversion and construction program. The Navy Department would not have control over conversions and could not be satisfied that naval requirements and standards were met. Many conversions are required for a particular operation. The Navy could not count on the vessel being fit and ready on the date required.

The War Shipping Administration would not be responsible for conversion to the satisfaction of the Navy. Under the scheme, it is to make and pay for the initial conversion only. If further or improved conversion work were required, the Navy would have to do this, and in order to obtain funds for that purpose would have to go through the usual Budget and congressional channels There would be no legal responsibility on the War Shipping Administration to carry out the Navy's requirements as presented.

The outfitting of auxiliaries with spare parts and equipage would lead to difficulties. Naval auxiliaries must be outfitted in excess of, and in many ways different from, the outfitting of commercial vessels. But under the proposed Budget scheme no provision is made to meet these requirements, and the outfitting is left with the War Shipping Administration.

Even maintenance of these ships is to be a function of the War Shipping Administration, if the Bureau of the Budget's decision is to stand. It is proposed that this be done by transfer of war-shipping funds to the Navy, a useless complication that could easily lead to difficulties and misunderstandings between the two war agencies concerned, with resulting inefficiency and delay.

No matter how excellent the cooperation between the Maritime Commission and the Navy the scheme of the Bureau of the Budget is basically and vitally wrong in removing from the control of the responsible agency, the Navy, the responsibility for providing itself with the ships it needs, and their outfits. It is basically and vitally wrong in placing the Maritime Commission in charge, because the Maritime Commission is not charged with the Navy's responsibility. It divides responsibility and will inevitably lead to all its weaknesses, including duplex efforts and misunderstandings and resulting inefficiency, delay, and possible vital failures. Such a condition would be a continuing invitation to possible disaster. Your committee recommends that these difficulties and hazards be eliminated by the Congress, and therefore urges that the bill as amended by the committee do pass.

This issue was before the House upon the consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1943. The House then passed an amendment limiting the availability of War Shipping Administration funds, in keeping with the purposes of the present bill. This amendment was stricken from the bill by the Senate, and the action of the Senate having been agreed to by the House conferees, the first deficiency appropriation bill, as enacted, did not contain the House amendment. The action of the Conferees was taken, and the House thereafter accepted the conference report, upon the understanding that the issue would be presented by separate legislation for the purpose. Section 2 of the present bill, therefore, is now presented upon the basis of that understanding, as the proposed legislation which would be presented for the purpose.

The combatant fleet cannot operate unless the fleet auxiliaries are efficient, are in proper number, and under the absolute control of the same authority as the combatant fleet. The Navy cannot effectively prosecute the war unless it is put in a position where it is assured that proper auxiliaries, correctly fitted for the job and efficiently manned, are available when and where required. The proposal of the Bureau of the Budget does not allow this. It makes the war effort of the Navy dependent on the Maritime Commission, while that body is independent of the Navy and is not responsible for the Navy. It places the Navy in a wholly untenable position for executing its mission in the war. Your committee strongly recommends that the Congress abolish this unwise, unnecessary, and dangerous policy and therefore recommends, unanimously, that the bill H. R. 1563, as amended by the committee, do pass.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. For my own information, I would like to know if the Maritime Commission is claiming any authority in this matter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. There is no controversy between the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission. It arose on account of an edict of the Director of the Budget, and I may say it was submitted by the Budget in January to a higher authority and has not yet been approved by the higher authority; therefore, when we do this we are following the procedure and the program heretofore adopted. May I say that we have no objection to the Maritime Commission building all of these ships for the Navy, but I think that we should follow the same procedure that has been established from time immemorial of the Congress authorizing the ships for the Navy and letting the Maritime Commission build them if the Navy sees fit to utilize the Maritime Commission, whose services in fact are used to a large extent in building its auxiliaries.

Mr. BLAND. I take it that these are ships designed primarily for use of the Navy and not designed primarily for commercial purposes, subject to change?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. If we followed the policy of the Director of the Budget, we would run into this kind of a condition: The Navy would say that they wanted so many auxiliaries. Then they would have to go to the Maritime Commission and get what the Maritime Commission had, then we would have to convert them for Navy use and it would therefore cost a

great deal more money and a great deal of time would be involved. When this matter was before the House in connection with an appropriation bill I offered an amendment, to which the House agreed. But when the bill went to the Senate I had the amendment stricken out, because I wanted to approach it in an orderly way, which we are doing here. So the only issue is whether the Congress shall provide for the ships of the Navy or the Budget shall tell the Navy to go over to the Maritime Commission and get what it possibly can out of the Maritime Commission. Bear in mind the higher authority has not sanctioned the edict of the Director of the Budget, so we have nothing left to do but follow the usual procedure that we have followed in the past.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand the gentleman's statement, which is quite clear, there remains approximately 64,000 tons that have not as yet been obligated?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under prior authorizations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under prior authorizations, as I was about to say. According to the report on the pending bill, there is an urgency for at least 900,000 tons?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And an authorization of a million tons here will provide for contingencies over and above the 900,000 tons?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. We have to make allowances for losses. We may lose ships, but we have a leeway of 160,000 tons, 60,000 tons under previous legislation and approximately 100,000 tons under this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the course that is often pursued by the gentleman's committee is not pursued in this bill, and I agree with the gentleman, because it would not be wise to state the number and type of vessels?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. We have here a complete break-down showing every type of ship proposed to be built, and, I may say as a matter of fact some of them have already been built for the Navy by the Maritime Commission, but for military reasons we do not desire to put the number and type and in the bill as we do in normal times.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I concur with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. BLAND. And the funds would be appropriated by the Congress to come out of construction funds to be appropriated?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. And they would be in the control of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. The Congress must know how many ships we have so the Appropriations Committee will know how much money to appropriate for the personnel. We have to assign the personnel on every ship, and we must know and keep constant tab on the number of ships so that we will know how much personnel we must have to man them.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Referring to the edict of the Budget Director, if his position prevails, do I understand that the authorization legislation or, let me put it this way, would there be any authorization legislation at all?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. If so, does the gentleman mean that would come from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; it would not come from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It would come out of a lump-sum appropriation for the Maritime Commission. The merchant marine has not even provided for it, the Committee on Naval Affairs would not provide for it, and the Congress would not have any control except to make a blanket appropriation of so many million dollars for the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission. The only way to proceed is for the Congress to continue to follow the beaten path that it has followed from time immemorial in order to know what we are doing and not delegate the authority to the Director of the Budget to say where the Navy shall get its ships.

Mr. BLAND. I may say on behalf of the Maritime Commission that there has been no suggestion on the part of the Maritime Commission to that effect.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not the least in the world. The Maritime Commission did not ask for it, and there is no friction between the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department. The Budget is seeking to do it on the theory we can have one concentrated place to build this type of ship. That is the theory on which they go.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman mean the authorization comes out of lend-lease?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; lend-lease does not have anything to do with it.

Mr. CHURCH. The bulk authorization comes from where?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am trying to get the authorization from the Congress. The Maritime Commission having received money from Congress, can use all of that money in building ships. They do not have to itemize and say what type of ships they desire to have built.

Mr. Chairman, I think this explanation is sufficient to have the Committee understand thoroughly what we are seeking to do here. If there are no further questions, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, in a good-will advertisement which appears today in the Washington Daily News I find the following paragraph:

> Today the Government is spending over $600,000,000 on its Buna-s program. Six rubber plants are in operation. By the end of 1943, completed plants will have a capacity of 705,000 tons per year, or more than the entire normal peacetime rubber requirements of the United States.

I may add, as you will recall, that this Congress has by statute authorized the planting of 500,000 acres in guayule, a plant from which natural rubber can be extracted; that many millions of dollars have been appropriated to develop this desert plant, with its high rubber content within the United States.

The necessity for emergency action by the United States to supply rubber synthetically became apparent to the American people before the crash of the last aerial bomb that was dropped at Pearl Harbor had died away. From the 7th day of December 1941, the sources of natural rubber, upon which we had so long depended, were closed to us. Everybody knew it. Everybody knew an emergency had arisen. Everybody was anxious to get under way with our synthetic-rubber program at the earlist possible moment.

Amazing though the revelation was, 7 months and 22 days after Pearl Harbor, on July 29, 1942, to be exact, the State Department announced that a reciprocal trade agreement with Peru had been completed, an agreement in which India rubber was found on the free list. One year and sixteen days after Pearl Harbor the State Department completed the negotiation of a reciprocal trade agreement with the United Mexican States, and in that equally amazing agreement guayule rubber was also found on the free list.

Everyone knows that the international rubber monopolists can lay down natural rubber in San Francisco for from 3 to 4 cents a pound. Everyone knows we cannot produce synthetic rubber in the United States for less than 10 to 15 cents per pound. In the light of these cost figures, it becomes quite apparent that the State Department has deliberately sabotaged and effectively destroyed for all practical purposes our synthetic rubber industry. The State Department has deliberately used the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act for the purpose of bringing an abrupt end to the manufacture of synthetic rubber and the manufacture of guayule rubber the instant that peace returns to the world insofar as the United States is concerned.

We are going to be called upon in a few days to pass upon a bill, the object of which will be to extend the power of the President to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements for an additional 3 years. I have heretofore denounced the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act on the ground and for the reason that the authority has been too often used for power politics and not for the purposes recited in the act; on the

ground that it has been used for the purpose of accomplishing ends which the American people abhor. Need I point out to you that they have in the two agreements to which I have just referred used the authority for the purpose of destroying projects for which we as legislators have authorized an expenditure of nearly $1,000,000,000 to develop?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. There are some amongst us who will rise to say that no such ignoble purposes were ever in the minds of those who negotiated these agreements. In order to substantiate my considered opinion that raw India and raw guayule rubber were in those two agreements bound on the free list for the purpose of destroying our synthetic-rubber industry and making the United States again dependent upon the far corners of the world for its supply of the rubber which the American people must have, I am going to read just a few lines from an article that was written by Vice President WALLACE, an article which was published in the New York Times magazine of July 12, 1942, and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13:

> Officials of the Rubber Reserve Company predict that this country within 18 months will be producing more rubber synthetically than she used to import from the Far East. All this will be done on the basis of a contract which provides that when the war comes to an end the Government will have the right to acquire the plants. This clause was put into the contract because President Roosevelt believes that the power of government and the emergency of war should not be used to build up vested interests which, after the war, would be sitting on the doorstep of Congress clamoring for a tariff.

If we are going to leave this blanket authority in the irresponsible hands of the Henry Wallaces, the Cordell Hulls, the Rex Tugwells, the Harry Hopkinses and the Drs. Doyle we might just as well make up our minds to kiss good-bye forever this billion-dollar investment of the American people in the manufacture of synthetic and guayule rubber within the United States. If this reciprocal trade agreement authority is going to be extended, there must be protective amendments adopted which will make certain that these starry-eyed, crackpot crystal-gazing internationalists are not permitted to destroy this billion dollar rubber industry upon which so much depends. If they have their way, hundreds of thousands of Americans will lose the opportunity to earn their living in these industries within the United States and we will have again exposed our country to a rubber shortage which might well be in another war emergency the cause of our destruction as a nation of free people. If we permit that to happen, we will indeed have been untrue to the trust the American people have reposed in us. As for me, they simply shall not pass. America must not in this way be sold down the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to prolong the debate over Pennsylvania's party warfare, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested in his last statement that the presence of seven Arkansas Congressmen here rather than six represented some political maneuvering. I am sure I shall be pardoned for reminding the gentleman that there was no political maneuvering involved in the change of the formula by which Arkansas retained its seven Members and Michigan failed to gain an additional Member.

The debate should be clear in the minds of the Members of the House who were here. I was not one of them, but my memory is fresh as to what took place in the Senate when this matter was debated. I say this solely to avoid Arkansas being drawn into the fight. At the time the matter came up in the Senate the debate was over the question of the formula referred to as equal proportions as compared with that known as major fractions. It will be recalled that without the support of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] Arkansas' position would not have been sustained, and the matter was determined on a nonpartisan basis altogether.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman was not in the House at the time, but if he will check up he will find that that same matter was determined in the House entirely on a partisan basis. As the chairman of the committee well knows, you had the majority and you voted it.

Mr. HAYS. But it could not have gone through the Senate had it not been for the merit of the Arkansas position, as supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], a member of the minority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be now read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels of such size, type, and design as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.
>
> SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 7, strike out "national defense" and insert "the prosecution of the war."
>
> Page 1, at the end of line 8 insert the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law any vessel intended for operation by the United States Navy, the construction or acquisition and conversion of which was heretofore or is hereafter authorized for the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, or any other agency of the Government, shall be subject to the approval of the Navy Department in all matters of design and construction or conversion, and the control, custody, and sole right to possession of such vessel shall be transferred to the Navy Department upon the completion of such construction or conversion."
>
> Page 2, line 11, strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "3."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRAVENS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1563, and, under House Resolution 141, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of good neighbors and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 30 minutes.

RECENT REPORTS, NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly a year and a half since Pearl Harbor. America's Navy has avenged in large part the infamous Japanese attack of December 7, 1941. In every quarter of the globe, the United States Army is either fighting the enemy with heroism and steady success or standing guard over Allied bastions. That the day of victory will come we know. When it will come even military men do not predict; and certainly none of the rest of us can do so. It remains simply for every American to do his full part to make that victory as early and as complete as possible.

The Congress has obvious duties connected with the war. Some of us wish those duties were greater than they are

or else more intimately related to the actual fighting of the war.

But there is one duty which belongs particularly to us, the duty of preparing for the future after victory shall have been won.

In this connection it has, as the House knows, been my earnest appeal for years that we create a committee or a commission of the Congress to undertake the particular task of working out the answer of the Congress to the problems that will follow the coming of the peace. And just as the Senate of the United States is perhaps more concerned with the international aspects of that problem than with the domestic ones, so the House, as the body closest to the people of our country, might well concern itself primarily with the domestic part of it.

It is most earnestly to be hoped that, since the Senate has already set up a Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, the House will, within the immediate future, take similar action.

It is our duty, as I see it, to examine with unprejudiced care every sincere proposal for the solution of the problems of conversion to a peacetime economy and the assurance of economic and political health to our own Nation after the war.

Therefore, I wish at this time to discuss with the House the recent reports of the National Resources Planning Board. Particularly do I want to discuss that portion of the reports which deals with expansion of the social-security system of the country, because I believe that is a matter for immediate attention by the Congress.

Before I come to that phase of the Board's report, however, I wish to make one or two comments on other things the Board has to propose with regard to the post-war period.

HOW SHALL FULL HOME MARKET BE ASSURED?

I shall quote three significant statements from the Board's general report and comment on each of them. The first such statement is:

> Fear of inadequate market for goods and services has compelled various restrictive policies to be adopted by producing groups in industry, agriculture, labor as defense mechanisms. This fear must be removed. * * * Government can and should underwrite effective demand for goods and services.

I agree heartily with that last sentence. But I want to point out that this can lead to a number of different methods of accomplishing the result.

First. The extent to which governmental action may be necessary to make good such a guaranty of a full market will depend in greatest part on what private industry itself does.

Real encouragement is, I believe, to be taken from a report recently published in News of Industry of the work of the committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce of which Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, president of Studebaker Corporation, is chairman. Here is what this report said:

> The theory under which the Committee for Economic Development's markets group is proceeding, is that if employment can be maintained at a level of 56,000,000 workers, 10,000,000 more than were employed in 1940, peak peacetime markets will be assured. Most previous business thinking on production and employment has been in the following orthodox pattern: Sales must determine production, production must determine employment.
>
> Breaking away from this, Committee for Economic Development suggests that each industrial group fill a certain employment goal; employment will determine the industry's production; and sales, because of full employment and pay rolls, will automatically follow.

This statement by this important committee of American businessmen is to me most encouraging. For it follows the central principle of a bill called the Monopoly Control Act, which I introduced some years ago. And to the extent that American industry of its own effort does maintain balanced employment in all fields and thus assures a market for all types of goods in the pay rolls from other industries it will render governmental action very much less necessary or important.

Second. But at best, modern industry never has and, I believe, never can distribute purchasing power equivalent to the total selling price of its products. The reasons for this are easily demonstrated, but I shall not have time to give them in this speech. I have done so heretofore. Now, if some governmental action is required to make good such an "underwriting of effective demand," is it to be accomplished mainly by public works employment or by a system of old-age pensions and social security payments based on a flexible method of raising the funds for these purposes? There will be the same economic effect on the flow of consumer buying power in either case. Some public works will be desperately needed after the war and we shall have at least the social-security system we have now. But the question is which method is to be a main reliance, a front line of defense in case unemployment threatens?

Third. Finally, if such a governmental underwriting of consumer demand for goods and services is to be made effective, does it necessarily imply a continuous operation of deficit financing and a continuous increase in the public debt.

I believe it need not do so. And I believe if it does do so it will not be likely to succeed. I believe there are other and better ways, which I shall discuss later in this speech.

WHAT KIND OF "ASSISTANCE"?

The second statement from the Board's report that I wish to quote reads as follows:

> For the longer-range development of an expanding economy after the war, our free-enterprise system and economic freedom for the individual will demand constant assistance from Government and a renewed sense of vigilant responsibility on the part of all citizens.

What does the word "assistance" mean in this case?

Does this mean the end or even the decline of free enterprise? Does it mean increasing governmental controls? I believe not. I believe it does mean that it is a primary duty of Government to see to it that there is in constant active circulation a total volume of consumer demand sufficient to afford a full market at home for the output of our farms and factories. No more and no less than that. But that function can be performed without governmental controls or regimentation of the economy save only in the case of monopolies, where very different treatment is required anyway, than in the case of truly free enterprise.

HOW DEAL WITH MONOPOLY?

Most controversial perhaps of all the statements in the Board's report is the following:

> Government is already taking considerable part in the management of the many war industries which have been greatly expanded by the use of Government funds. Consideration should be given to the desirability of various types of partnership. * * * Government has a direct responsibility and should participate in the decisions as to what areas and what concerns should continue to operate in these industries.

Now what does this mean? I would not agree to having Government decide to keep a concern out of a line of business. But I would agree to having Government decide to help keep enough concerns in an industry to prevent monopoly.

Now, certain it is that it will be one obligation of the Congress to see that the public interest is protected when the time comes to make disposition of the vast industrial plants which, to win the war, have been constructed with the people's money. There must be no dumping of this multibillion-dollar public property into the hands of favorites of powerful governmental figures when that time comes.

Now, this partnership business of the Board's is something I would very much be opposed to where competition is possible but something which I believe must be faced up to and honestly considered in monopoly industry fields. For there are two methods of protecting the public interest—one is the method of free-enterprise competition, the other the method of direct assertion of the people's rights in cases where monopolistic control appears inevitable, unavoidable, or much more efficient.

Where a field of industry is marked or can be marked by real competition and a considerable number of small as well as large independent units—there the Government need not and must not enter except to provide rules of law which will prevent the big fish from gobbling the little ones by unfair methods. This is why neglect of small business, domination of many branches of W. P. B. by big-business representatives has been and is one of the greatest dangers to the future of free enterprise in America.

For what of a situation such as will pertain in these lines of industry where government—or rather the American people—have poured hundreds of millions of dollars to build at public expense large expanded plant facilities? In

some of these industries monopolistic control will exist to an even greater extent than before the war. And none of the advantages of freedom of enterprise, no encouragement to the taking of risks, nor any opportunity for new companies or individuals are possible in any field of industry where monopoly exists.

Indeed, it has been truly said that private monopoly is the very antithesis not to say the nemesis of a democratic or a free society and nation.

Hence, we shall have two duties, not one, when the war is over.

The first will be a far more vigorous and sincere enforcement of anti-trust laws than we have yet seen, together with measures for the reconstituting and restoration of the small enterprises that have been casualties of this war.

But the second will be to protect the people as a whole, small enterprise as a whole, agriculture as a whole, against the power of monopoly. Two things monopoly must not be allowed to do—the first is to artificially restrict the output of needed goods and the second is to artificially keep prices at an unjustifiably high level. One way to prevent these things is by government yardsticks like T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and so forth. But another method that might well prevent monopoly abuses and a method altogether logical might be to have a representative of the public sitting as a member of the board of directors of monopolistic corporations—particularly those whose economic power has been vastly increased by the expenditure of public funds during the war. At least the American people have a right to know what is going on behind those closed doors.

SOCIAL-SECURITY EXTENSION NOW IMPORTANT

I now come to the discussion of that portion of the National Resources Planning Board report that deals with social security. There is a factor in this war which may in the end prove a decisive one. That factor is hope for the future. No war in all history has ever really been won unless the people winning it had in their hearts a hope and belief that the future for their children could be brighter than their own past. It is with their spirits quite as much as with their weapons that people fight successfully against their enemies. From this standpoint it is strange that when the report of the National Resources Planning Board was sent to Congress that portion of it dealing with a program of security against the hazards of old age, sickness, unemployment, dependency, and accidents was not quickly recognized by the Congress as a challenge to action which cannot be brushed aside. I have been profoundly concerned to hear a number of speeches ridiculing the whole idea that it is possible for America to establish a more solid and firm society than the one which went to pieces in 1929. For that can, must, and will be done. And if this Congress fails to take important steps in that direction it will be neglecting its greatest duty next only to providing for the war itself.

It must be remembered that one great and all-important group of Americans will, when this war has finally been won, be profoundly concerned about what the future has in store for them and will have a peculiar right to demand that that future hold forth hope and opportunity. The group I speak of is those men now fighting this battle for freedom and justice in all parts of the world in the American armed forces. Consideration of this whole program therefore should begin with a frank facing of the necessity of meeting the just demands of men who are in the armed forces today.

MEASURE OF JUSTICE TO MEN IN ARMED FORCES

I have accordingly introduced three bills which I desire to bring to the attention of the House on this occasion. The numbers of these bills are H. R. 756, 757, and 758. I should like to discuss first H. R. 757. It is a very brief bill and can be described in a couple of sentences. It provides that money shall be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration which is to be used for one purpose and only one. That purpose is to make educational grants to any person who shall have served for 6 months or more in the armed forces of the United States, during this war period, or who shall have been discharged for disability incurred in line of duty and who shall have an honorable discharge. Grants are to be in the amount of $500 per year per person and as many as three such annual grants can be made to the same individual. The purpose of this legislation is obvious. By act of the Congress, a large number of young men have been called from their studies in the universities and colleges of America and sometimes even from the high schools of our country to serve in the armed forces. America will need to have these young men continue with their education and training when the war is over. This bill makes it possible for them to do so, and establishes the equal right of those not able to finance such education with those who can. The justice of such a measure will, I am sure, recommend itself to all. Its practical importance to the future of our country hardly needs emphasis from me.

H. R. 756 is a bill to extend the benefits of unemployment insurance to veterans of the Second World War. Briefly this bill would provide 26 weeks of full coverage to any person whose period of military service consists of not less than 90 days during the war period. The benefits are at the rate to which a man would be entitled if he were earning approximately $30 per week. His eligibility will continue until he has used up the 26 weeks of benefits no matter how long this is and thus he would have opportunity to become eligible for regular unemployment insurance before his benefits were exhausted under the terms of this bill. It is, of course, no solution to any problem of unemployment which might arise as to the veterans of this war, but it would be a means of providing a substantial measure of security for them during the period of adjustment and while they are getting back to that real challenging job to which every one of them will be entitled.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are there age limits placed on the men in the service?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not any.

H. R. 758 again is a very simple bill. What it does in effect is to say that military service between October 1, 1940, and a date 1 year after the termination of the war shall be considered to be covered employment under the terms of the Social Security Act for the purpose of establishing entitlement to old-age annuity. In other words, a man serving in the armed forces between those two dates would be accumulating for himself in the same manner as though he were employed in some private covered employment entitlement to future old-age annuities after he reaches the age of 65. This, of course, will have no immediate beneficial effect, but it is a step in the direction of extending the rights of the Social Security Act to that group which is entitled to such rights more than any other single group.

In presenting these three bills, however, it is not my intention or my thought that they constitute by any means the extent to which Congress should go along these general lines. These bills constitute only a first step, but I believe a very logical first step along a road which I hope this Congress will take and which will ultimately lead to the establishment of a genuine system of national old age pensions and of other types of provisions for the security of our people which can be foundation stones for the building of a condition of sustained economic health in our country. The House will know full well that I do not believe that a system of social security is anything like a complete answer to the economic problem of a machine and power age. For I would insist that the first necessity in bringing such an answer is the establishment of a monetary system which will free the Nation as a whole from the necessity of going into debt every time it is entitled to an expansion in its monetary supply.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY WOULD FIT NEEDS OF WAR PERIOD

The main point which I wish to make today is that a proposal for a sound national insurance program for America is not something which this Congress can afford to treat lightly. On the contrary, a part of the job of this Congress is to find a solid basis for the future hope of our people. Furthermore, it so happens that the extension of our social-security program is the sort of thing that can be undertaken at this moment without in the slightest degree interfering with the war effort, which is our first and primary concern. Indeed, the expansion of the social-security program can be made to operate as a counter-inflationary measure for the present, and, what is perhaps even more important, as a measure which will help to insure us against deflation after the war shall have been won. For by the introduction of an expanded program in which all the people of the Nation might share, instead of only half of them, we could readily provide that the collection of necessary taxes could begin in the immediate future and that benefits to be derived by various groups

in the population could, as was the case with the original introduction of the Social Security Act, be somewhat delayed. In this manner, the effect of our action would be to operate as an additional means of bringing into balance the available buying power of the people today with the supply of consumer goods, and, on the other hand, assuring a fuller flow of buying power after the war has been won in order to more certainly sustain a full production of consumer goods at that time.

This is no proposal that flies in the face of the war needs of our Nation, but, on the contrary, a proposal which can supplement the need of our Nation for more spiritual strength and at the same time fit perfectly into the economic pattern of what we need to do.

Many have attacked the report of the National Resources Planning Board on the ground that it would lead to a great increase in the power of Government over the lives of the people. It is, I believe, the opinion of most thoughtful people that to the greatest extent consistent with the basic solution of our problems, the powers of government should be restricted.

GOVERNMENT CANNOT GIVE SECURITY; PEOPLE GAIN IT FOR THEMSELVES

In this connection, it should be said at the outset that no government, any place, any time, can give its people social security. It is the people who must always provide that security for themselves. All the government is able to do is to pass a law providing for the levying of certain taxes and for the use of a portion of its revenues in order to assure to all the people that they will not again become dependent upon charity or relief in cases of accident, sickness, death of the family's breadwinner, unemployment, or old age. Ultimately it is the people themselves who must decide how much they think such security is worth and how much of their tax revenues they are willing to have devoted to its maintenance.

HOW TO FINANCE IT

First then, let us discuss briefly the proposals of this report as to the financing of a social-security program. The report makes it very clear that while for certain types of social insurance, pay roll and similar taxes are wise and proper, nevertheless the most important thing to be remembered is that social-security payments must be regarded as one of the means of combatting unemployment and depression and maintaining the economic health of the Nation. And if this is to be done, then "increased attention must be paid to the utilization of social-security measures as vehicles for the carrying out of national monetary and economic policies." And here is where, in my judgment, the report should have emphasized the importance of changes in our monetary system to make possible the use of a scientifically determined amount of governmentally created debt-free credit or money as a means of securing the expansion of buying power which the national economy may need in any period. This point the report, however, does not make. But it does point out that we cannot secure the best results from a social-security program if it is financed entirely by taxes which come from the very groups whose purchasing power it is desired to increase. And, therefore, the report recommends that a portion of the cost of a sound social-security program should be met out of some sort of general taxes levied on an ability-to-pay basis.

This is the plan adopted in New Zealand, where a 5-percent gross income tax finances about two-thirds of what is probably the best social-security program in the whole world, but where the other third of the cost is met out of taxes levied in accordance with the principle of ability to pay.

A true social-security system must in my judgment include provisions for a dynamic monetary system—one in which it will no longer be necessary for the Nation to go into debt in order to bring into circulation the necessary flow of purchasing power to support full employment and a full market for the goods of industry and agriculture. As the American economy develops after the war, we should not have to resort to deficit financing in order to make certain that that expansion can be continuous and healthy. But we should assert our right as a people to put into circulation debt and interest free, an amount of money each year which will correspond to the expansion of our production. This point is not covered by the report, but I put it here in order that my own position may be clear.

A METHOD OF CONTINUOUS, SUSTAINED DISTRIBUTION OF BUYING POWER

It is nevertheless necessary, however money comes into circulation, that there be a Nation-wide system whereby fair, just, and adequate distribution of buying power can be assured among all groups in the population, and notably, to such groups as cannot or ought not to be regularly employed. This, as I see it, is the basic purpose of a system of social security. And the first and most important group in such a consideration are those who through the years have borne the burden and heat of the day, but who have passed the time of life when they can expect employment in this highly industrialized society.

The report quite properly lays first emphasis on full employment, and states that this is our first need in the post-war period and the condition upon which all our other hopes should rest. It then says that stabilization of the income flow through a social-insurance system must be our second objective. But these two things cannot be separated from one another. They are part and parcel of one another. In the introduction to the report the following very significant paragraph is included:

> It is easier to make these changes when employment is high and it is easier to keep employment high than to lift it once it has declined. Furthermore, we cannot be blind to the fact that national morale is mightily influenced by consideration of what will come when a warring world will be replaced with one once more devoted to the arts of peace. Shall that period be a return to the inequities of the past or a forward movement toward the promise of the future?

There can be only one right answer to that question.

Whether or not a person agrees with all the points made in the report, and I will state frankly that I do not agree with all of them, no one can say that its approach is not a constructive one. For example, in the section on the Character of the Problem we find this statement:

> It follows that every constructive measure aimed to secure fuller and more essential utilization of our productive resources, to rectify the present maldistribution of our national income, and to improve the health of our people will reduce the need for public aid as such.

In other words, we cannot look upon a social-security system simply as an end in itself, but must realize that the more complete such a system can be the less need there will be for such things as relief or departments of charity.

CENTRAL IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM

I shall not consider here in any detail those portions of the report which deal with measures to be taken to assure work for those groups in the population who should have, and take advantage of, the opportunity to have and to hold a worthwhile job. Instead, I shall confine my discussion to the recommendations in the report regarding the social-security system itself. In this connection, and because I consider it one of the most significant passages in the whole report, I quote the following:

> The case in favor of extending the social-insurance type of security can be briefly stated. First, there is growing evidence that our people highly prize the privilege of receiving a form of socially provided income whose amount is specified in the law and not related to need, thus avoiding the necessity of undergoing a minute examination of resources or coming in contact with a relief system which still has obnoxious associations. Second, the fact that the right to income in certain contingencies has been introduced through contributory insurance systems offers the financial advantage of securing at least part of the cost of these benefits from prior contributions from the beneficiaries themselves. Third, it seems likely that once routines are established, the administration of a system of benefits provided as a right will prove less expensive than one in which each individual payment involves minute investigation of each separate case and the exercise of considerable official discretion.
>
> Great importance must be attached to the social advantages of a system which minimizes the degree of official discretion in matters which closely affect the private life of the citizen. These advantages assume even greater importance as the numbers of persons affected increase, and as technical and economic considerations appear to point to a continuous extension of the activities of government. We believe that the vast majority of our people, including those at any time on relief, can be trusted to make the best use of whatever funds are given them and to manage their own lives in an intelligent and orderly manner.

This argument clearly leads to the conclusion that the ideal system is one in which as many people as possible who belong to those groups who cannot or should not be employed are included in

a system of national insurance without the requirement of a pauper's oath or anything of that character. In this respect the report agrees with those of us who through the years have advocated a national old-age pension system supported by taxes which all would pay and yielding pension payments in the later years of life in which all would share. In all honesty, I must say, however, that it is disappointing to me that the report does not lay greater emphasis than it does, especially in view of the statement which I have just quoted, upon the immediate importance of making the old-age annuity system Nation-wide throughout America and providing a fair and just minimum below which no payments would fall. The report implies perhaps that this should be done, but I am frank to say that had I been writing it, I should have made it the first point and would have stressed it over and over again.

DISABILITY AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED NOW

The report calls for the immediate establishment of a system of disability insurance so as to take care of the problem which visits so many millions of families every year. This is a sound proposal and should be carried out.

DOES AMERICA WANT CRADLE-TO-GRAVE SECURITY?

But one main emphasis in the report is stated as follows: "Assurance of a decent minimum of economic security for all citizens." The report proposes a category of general public assistance to care for the needs of all people who do not fall into any of such special groups as those beyond the retirement age, widowed mothers with little children, the unemployed, the sick, or the disabled. The broad appeal of this approach of the report will be clear to all. But what we want in America is not public assistance but the provision of means whereby a steady flow of consumer buying power in the Nation can be assured and thus full employment guaranteed.

Indeed, I question very sincerely whether the American people really want what has been dubbed "crade-to-the-grave security." And I wonder about the acceptability in this country of the idea of a category of general Federal public assistance covering people in the working years of life who do not fall into any of the groups just mentioned.

WHAT THE SOCIAL-SECURITY SYSTEM OF AMERICA SHOULD COMPRISE

My own conception of the sort of social-security system which we should strive for in the United States and of the basic principles thereof is briefly as follows:

I believe such a system should include a general national old-age pension provision applying to all persons who have passed the age where employment in industry in normal times can be reasonably expected. I believe it must also include provision for mothers and little children in families where the father or the breadwinner thereof has been taken from them by death or some other circumstance. I believe it should include insurance against ill health, accident, and disability. And I believe it should include insurance against unemployment under provisions mainly calculated to maintain the purchasing power of unemployed people during the periods of transition from one job to another. I believe it should include a Nation-wide school lunch and penny milk program so that we will never again call any farm crops "surplus" so long as a single American child is undernourished.

THE BASIC PURPOSE: MAKE SOCIAL-SECURITY SYSTEM A DYNAMIC FACTOR FOR PROSPERITY

Social-security provision for the groups just mentioned should, I believe, be Nation-wide and as nearly uniform as possible throughout the country. But I think it most important to emphasize that such a social-security system can be a dynamic force directly sustaining consumer purchasing power from year to year and decade to decade, and thus contributing in a very marked degree to the maintenance of a full market for the goods of industry and agriculture, and hence to full employment.

How can this be done?

It is, of course, true that at a time when depression threatens there is need for some means of having more money go out into circulation through the hands of consumers than is taken from them in taxes. And there is also, in my judgment, need for a continuous increase from year to year in the volume of money in active circulation if we are to have an expanding production economy. This, however, does not need to mean variable payments to the groups covered by social security which would have decided disadvantage. The adjustment can be made on the side of the picture where the money is raised. For example, in periods of prosperity all the money could be raised by taxation to support the social security program, whereas in periods of threatened depression those taxes should and could be reduced, particularly where they bear most heavily on the general population, and in place of these tax revenues funds could be provided out of new national credits created by an agency of the Congress upon the principle of maintaining a balance between the volume of money and the potential productive power of the Nation. In this manner a social-security program limited in its application to groups who cannot or should not be employed and thus in no way destructive of the morale of any of our people, and in no way tending to eliminate the healthy risks of life which have probably been one of the sources of strength of the American people, could be made sufficiently flexible to meet some of the necessary objectives pointed out in the Board's report. Those objectives center about the need for making the social-security system fit into national economic and monetary and fiscal policies designed on a broad scale to assure a full market and full employment.

It is true, of course, as the report states, that the main objective of an economic program is to make certain that there are jobs for all those who can, should, and desire to have them. This, of course, includes the vast majority of the population, and the report properly emphasizes the necessity that if such jobs are not privately forthcoming, they should be made possible on such public works as can be justified financially and from other standpoints on their own merits. But it is my belief that wise measures in the field of monetary and fiscal policy and in the building of a dynamic social-security system can be a first line of defense against unemployment and can achieve very nearly full employment without the necessity of huge public-works programs. The essential thing is that the power of groups who cannot or should not be employed to purchase goods should not be withdrawn, but that, on the other hand, they should be able to share as consumers in the economy in a fair and equitable way, even though they are not currently employed. This is what a social-security program should do.

In concluding this speech, I wish to ask one question. What will it be which the men who are now fighting this war will be most concerned about when they return from the victory which eventually will be theirs? Probably two things. First, whether or not we here at home have laid the groundwork for a lasting peace in order that their sons may not have to go through the hell that they have had to face. And second, how they will be able to catch hold again in civilian life—that is whether or not a challenging job with real opportunity will be awaiting them.

Unless these two tasks are done by us the ghost of every man who dies in this war will rise to haunt those who have attempted to condemn every decent proposal for human betterment as a "social reform" and who have mistakenly believed that they have thereby buried it from further consideration and dashed the aspirations and hopes that went with it.

POWER OF GOVERNMENT NEED NOT AND SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED

Proposals for extension of our social-security system, if properly carried out, need not add one jot or title to the power of Government, or to that much discussed group of people known as the bureaucrats. Governmental power becomes dangerous when it gets beyond the laws passed by the people's elected Representatives. Governmental power becomes dangerous when governmental officials hold the decision in their hands of the fate of individual citizens. Such power does not reside in a system where security comes to all citizens as a right extended to them by means of definite and specific law supported by their own taxes and set forth fully and in detail by the legislative branch of Government. In such a case economic power resides not in Government, but is passed on to the people of the Nation, as it should be, in a regular and orderly fashion.

Either we shall take this path—the path of establishing a dynamic monetary system which will provide an even and dependable flow of buying power, the path of a full system of social security which will provide a steady and continuous distribution of that buying power, or else we shall face one of two alternatives. The first of these will be the necessity of accepting emergency recommendations for a huge stop-gap program

submitted in the hour of need and crises by the Executive. Or we shall make another futile and childish attempt to return to normalcy, as was done after the First World War when the price of farm commodities was allowed to drop to half what it had been in the space of 7 short months; to a normalcy which means inordinate power for monopoly interests, unemployment for returning soldiers, continuing death to small enterprise, disaster for agriculture.

Nor can I conclude without pointing out that in the case of the submission of the so-called Beveridge report to the British Parliament, the New York Times ran an article under date of December 5 which included these very significant paragraphs:

Berlin evidently regards the report as a formidable weapon in psychological warfare, to judge by the effort made by the German press and radio to destroy whatever favorable impression it may have made upon German minds.

The Nazi reaction to this plan for social reform is easily explained. They have sought to persuade the Germans, and later Europe, that the "plutocratic democracies" were hopelessly decadent and so burdened by capitalistic privileges that incurable unemployment was the inevitable lot of the masses.

Consequently, when the democracies take measures to safeguard the worker or to improve his standard of life, they strike at what the Nazis regard as one of their chief claims to the dominion of Germany and of Europe. Such measures undermine the Nazi contention that the democracies stand for reaction, while the Fascists are revolutionaries creating a better world.

The Nazis seem almost as much disturbed by Sir William's statement for social insurance as by Prime Minister Churchill's threat to destroy the cities of Italy if Italy did not make peace.

It should therefore be evident that the extension of our social-security program can be made an effective weapon in the war effort itself. And we should begin to see much more clearly than I am afraid we do that the task of this great democracy is not only to prove by military victory that a free people are always superior to an enslaved one but also to demonstrate to the world that that same free people can meet, without loss of liberty, the economic problems of this technological age, can abolish unnecessary poverty, can assure a continuous full home market for its farm and factory products, and can in short make machines and money and finance and all things else the servants of mankind and not its master.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MALONEY, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for today, an account of official business.

To Mr. LESINSKI, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for 1 day, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on Thursday, May 6, to consider H. R. 85, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and H. R. 1905, a bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

351. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Snake River and tributaries, Wyoming, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

352. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cuyahoga River and its tributaries, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

353. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of January 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures. S. 991. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised; with amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 2482. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2047. A bill to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2547. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the establishment of scales of rates, according to zones, for the transportation of property by common carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2548. A bill to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2549. A bill to reduce time to plead and to regulate service of process in proceedings to cancel naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. R. 2550. A bill to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2551. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the relief of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota on account of losses arising from floods; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2552. A bill to provide for lump-sum payments for accumulated or current accrued annual leave, or both, due to Government employees at death; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2553. A bill directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2554. A bill to include veterans of the present war and their dependents under the provisions of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans' regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2558. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 514); to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2559. A bill to provide for the readjustment and rehabilitation of veterans in the present war, during the post-war period, by the extension of compensation after honorable discharge from the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2560. A bill to provide pension for veterans and dependents of deceased veterans of any war, campaign, military occupation, or expedition, insurrection, uprising, or revolt on a parity with pensions for Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. Res. 218. Resolution creating a select committee to obtain certain information which employees of the Office of War Information were not permited to make available to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2555. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGHEE:

H. R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Burton S. Radford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Frank N. Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

608. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to see that a permanent post office is provided for the city of Central Falls, R. I.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

609. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to have enacted into law House bill 997 and Senate bill 216, to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

610. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their earnest efforts to oppose the bill now pending in Congress, H. R. 1012, regulating intrastate air traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

611. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Yakima and Selah, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

612. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ziliah, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

613. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pomeroy, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

614. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Clatie C. Hurt, county chairman, Home Economics Association, Hill County, Hillsboro, Tex., favoring grade labeling on canned products and women's rayon hosiery; to the Committee on Agriculture.

615. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Rev. Gordon D. Everett, of La Salle, Mich., and 68 other residents of Monroe County, urging favorable action on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

616 By Mr. PLOESER: Memorial of the General Assembly of Missouri, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act so as to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

617. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Ethel C. McBee and members of the adult department of the church school of the First Baptist Church of Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

618. Also, petition of C. R. Watson, secretary, Railway Mail Association of Grafton, W. Va., endorsing and favoring the passage of Senate bill 277 and House bill 988, and urging the adoption of the amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act as represented in these measures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

619. By Mr. WALTER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania urging Congress to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God within the shadows, in this black night of the world's agony as again the eternal Christ climbs new Calvaries with the cross that ne'er turns back, by the dire needs of our own anguished hearts we are driven to that Strange Man lifted up from the earth. As we come to the place called Calvary may we remember that not a nail touched His truth, that not a sword severed the secret of His power, that not even a cross could impede His cause. In that hour of terror we would listen again to the Conquering Victim as He declares, "He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword." As we face foes cruel and vindictive, who callously put brave men to death, may we still remember the forgiveness and mercy of that One who, hanging there, prayed for those who did the wrong.

As crusaders in a holy cause may we conquer by that sign which forever is the emblem of joy through sorrow, strength out of weakness, triumph out of failure, song through sacrifice, gain through loss, and life through death. In that faith grant us of Thy mercy a valiant heart, that we may tread the unknown road with head uplifted, with a smiling face, greeting the unseen with a cheer, knowing that the "third day" cometh. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1943.*

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint ELBERT D. THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 19, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument;

H. R. 1025. An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a board of legal examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg.;

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1573. An act relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts;

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2197. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes;

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2437. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks, city delivery carriers, and railway postal clerks interchangeably;

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Utah) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAND ACQUIRED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT BY LEASE OR OTHERWISE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected in accordance with authority vested in the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

JANUARY 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential loan report of the Corporation for the month of January 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR EXERCISE OF STABILIZATION FUND POWERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof pass from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) All the powers conferred by this section shall expire June 30, 1945, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended and the operation of the stabilization fund terminated."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the motion may be proper, but I should like to have some explanation of the nature of the amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. The House of Representatives passed the bill just as the Senate passed it, except for an amendment which, in effect, provides that no transfer may be made of the stabilization fund, to say, an international bank without the approval of Congress. That is, in effect, the amendment, and to it, of course, I agree, as I think we all do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator give us the specific language which covers the point he has just disclosed?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I have it before me.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator defer until we have an opportunity to read the language?

Mr. WAGNER. I am willing to do that, or I will read the language now. I think it is very simple.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. WAGNER. The amendment adopted by the House of Representatives reads:

That subsection (b) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence.

This is the new language:

Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof pass from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

In other words, the stabilization fund may not be used for any other purposes except those specifically provided in the act itself. There is a direction that the fund may not be transferred to any other agency, such as an international agency, without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From the language, it would seem as if all the authority rested exclusively with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury rather than with the Congress.

Mr. WAGNER. That is not so according to the language which reads:

Such fund shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof pass from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

They now control this particular fund for the purposes provided by the Stabilization Act itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that interpretation could be put upon the language, and I hope it is the correct interpretation.

Mr. WAGNER. The House adopted the amendment unanimously, and that was the explanation made in that body.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield to me?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. After everything is said and done, what the House really has done is to emphasize the word "custody" in the amendment; has it not?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; and the word "control."

Mr. DANAHER. To the end that no part of the stabilization fund may be transferred to an international fund, thereafter to be used to sustain the currencies of other nations until and unless some program to effectuate that end is brought back to us for consideration?

Mr. WAGNER. Until it is brought back to the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. And it is the purpose of the Senator in explaining it so to us that we will be advised in due course of the nature and scope of any international fund; that legislation to effectuate an international fund will be required; and that nothing in the extension of the stabilization fund program, as contained in the House bill, shall be deemed to authorize any other action than the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 provided for.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator has stated it much better than I could have done.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I say——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before the final vote is taken, as I think it proper that other members of the committee should be present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bone	Hill	Radcliffe
Brewster	Holman	Reynolds
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Moore	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	Wiley
Gillette	Murray	Willis
Green	Nye	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business as a member of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on official business for the Government.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained in a committee meeting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the pending question. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT. The question is on concurring in a House amendment, which reads:

> Such funds shall not be used in any manner whereby direct control and custody thereof pass from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

I take it that the intention is that the money in the stabilization fund shall not be subjected to the control of an international body of any kind. I have not studied the language, and I do not know whether it would accomplish that purpose or not, but it would seem on its face to be such a provision as would.

Mr. WAGNER. Representatives of both the House committee and the House stated that was the purpose, and in my opinion there is no question that is the intent.

The Senator will recall that when Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the joint meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking and Currency, in executive session, he stated that he would not so use the fund, and it seems to me the law would not permit him to do so anyway.

Mr. TAFT. I think it might be said that when Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the combined membership of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Banking and Currency, he stated that he had been advised by some lawyer that he could, without further legislation, set up the international stabilization fund as outlined by him that day. He stated, however that he did not intend to do so, and that he would not set up such a fund without coming back to Congress. I assume that the House desired to have not only the statement made by the Secretary, but to have the question definitely settled in legislation, so that the legal advice which the Secretary said he had received could not be followed by any subsequent Secretary. I rather think the language proposed would accomplish the purpose, and if the Senator thinks the provision will prevent the control of the stabilization fund by an international body, I am ready to agree that it would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Too much emphasis cannot be put upon the statement which the able Senator from Ohio has just made, namely, that the Secretary of the Treasury did categorically assert to the joint meeting of the two Senate committees that he would not proceed with the establishment of his international program without coming back to Congress, in spite of the fact that some of his lawyers had advised him that he might thus be authorized to proceed independently. I wish to add that it is immensely to the credit of the Secretary of the Treasury that he takes this unique position among his own administration colleagues.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Michigan, and I should think the Senate should concur in the House amendment, without taking the time to send the bill to conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Kentucky Aeronautics Commission, protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to regulate intrastate air commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 450, relating to compensation to civilians; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MAYBANK on April 19, p. 3539, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Central Pennsylvania Dental Society, seventh district, favoring the prompt enactment of pending legislation to establish a pharmacy corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution signed by officers and members of the Bataan Relief Organization, Albuquerque, N. Mex., favoring the prompt sending of all necessary men and implements of war to the southwest Pacific, China, and other areas in the Pacific so as to counter the Japanese menace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The petition in the form of a resolution of the faculty of the University of Puerto Rico, praying that the United States recognize the right of the people of Puerto Rico to decide the final form of government for the island; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Women Graduates of the University of Puerto Rico, recommending that any change in the educational system of Puerto Rico be based upon scientific experiments; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to extend the effective date of the act providing for suspension of assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including Alaska, to July 1, 1944

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did, by chapter 294 of Public Law 542 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, provide for suspension of assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including Alaska, to be effective until July 1, 1943; and

"Whereas conditions in the mining industry in the whole of the United States which made such legislation necessary have not improved since passage of that legislation and give no promise of improving before July 1, 1944; and

"Whereas the stability of the internal economy of the State of California is to a large extent dependent upon the welfare of the mining industry; and

"Whereas there has heretofore been introduced in Congress House Resolution No. 334, which proposes to extend the suspension of such assessment work to July 1, 1944: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That Congress is hereby respectfully memorialized to extend the suspension of assessment work to July 1, 1944; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate immediately cause a copy of this resolution to be dispatched to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Whereas the United States of America, Office of Price Administration, in establishing the eastern gasoline- and oil-ration zone, placed all that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River in said zone, which zone extends along the Atlantic Ocean, from and including the State of Maine to and including all the State of Florida east of the said Apalachicola River;

"Whereas in establishing the Gulf States gasoline- and oil-ration zone, the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and that part of the State of Florida west of the Apalachicola River, was placed in said zone; and

"Whereas the entire State of Florida, because of its location and proximity to the said States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and to the inland waterway extending along the Gulf coast, logically and rightfully belongs in the said Gulf States gasoline- and oil-ration zone instead of the eastern gasoline- and oil-ration zone: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States, the Office of Price Administration of the United States, and all national officers, boards, and agencies having any relation to the administration of the gasoline- and oil-rationing program, be and they are each hereby requested and urged to transfer that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River from the eastern gasoline- and oil-ration zone to the Gulf States gasoline- and oil-ration zone, where it logically and rightfully belongs; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from this State, to the President of the United States and to the National Office of Price Administration.

"Approved by the Governor April 16, 1943."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the sale of excess Army and Navy supplies by ex-service men after the termination of the present war

"Whereas after World War No. 1 the Government of the United States had on hand a large amount of Army and Navy clothing and supplies for which it had no use; and

"Whereas these supplies were disposed of by sale to the highest bidders, who in turn disposed of them to the general public through so-called 'Army and Navy Stores' and through other sources; and

"Whereas such method of disposal made large fortunes for a comparatively few individuals and resulted in no benefit to ex-service men; and

"Whereas after the termination of the present war there will be many ex-service men, especially disabled ex-service men, who will be struggling to establish themselves in business and adjust their lives to civilian activities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled*, That we memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact such laws or prescribe, such regulations as may be necessary so that after the termination of the present World War all surplus Army and Navy supplies will be disposed of by the United States Government only to ex-service men, with the first preference in their disposition to be given to disabled ex-service men, to the end that these ex-service men may establish themselves in business and be better enabled to earn a livelihood and adjust themselves into civilian life and activities after the termination of the war; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each of the Members in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

"Approved April 17, 1943.

"HAROLD E. STASSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House resolution requesting Congress to pass the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution

"Whereas our country is presently engaged in a global war to insure to our people a lasting peace and a continuance of our democratic form of government; and

"Whereas in this struggle we fight shoulder to shoulder with England, Russia, China, and other United Nations; and

"Whereas, there appears to be uncertainty as to our course of action in the matter of cooperation with other of the United Nations with respect to post-war preservation of world peace; and

"Whereas a resolution has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, commonly known as the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, urging this Government to take the initiative in bringing the United Nations together for joint action on current economic, political, and relief questions and for post-war preservation of the peace by armed force; and

"Whereas the passage of such resolution will indicate a course of action for our Nation to follow and will greatly strengthen the morale of our allies and of the men and women in our armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to pass the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that copies thereof be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Members of Congress from the State of Maryland."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 32

"Resolution memorializing Congress to use their good influences to the end that sufficient metals be allocated to build and equip enough factories to produce at least 1,000,000 annual tons of synthetic rubber

"Whereas with 92 percent of our normal supply of rubber in control of the Japs, the Baruch rubber study committee recommended that America should manufacture 1,106,000 tons annually of synthetic rubber in order to supply our necessary military and civilian vehicles with tires during this motorized war; and

"Whereas Rubber Director William M. Jeffers has made every effort to follow the instructions of the Baruch report and get synthetic tires into production, but factory capacity has been cut to 43 percent of what the Baruch investigation said was necessary to keep America's essential motor vehicles rolling; and

"Whereas the transportation of freight and employees to and from Michigan war factories would be tragically crippled if more tires are not made available; and

"Whereas the farms of America and the petroleum industry can produce abundant supplies of grain alcohol and petroleum products, and our chemical, rubber, and other industries are well able to transform these basic ingredients into synthetic rubber: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Michigan Sixty-second Legislature of 1943 hereby expresses its full approval of Mr. Jeffers' efforts to keep the American military machine and civilian economy on wheels; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Michigan Legislature memorializes the Members of the United States Congress to use their good influences to the end that sufficient metals be allocated to build and equip enough factories to produce at least 1,000,000 tons annually of synthetic rubber; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, majority and minority leaders of both the Senate and the House, all Michigan Congressmen and United States Senators, Rubber Director Jeffers, War Production Board Chairman Nelson, Economic Stabilization Director James C. Byrnes, Office of Defense Transportation Director Joseph Eastman, and Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss Brown.

"Adopted by the senate March 25, 1943."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Concurrent resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 450 regarding compensation to civilians

"Whereas the United States is engaged in a total war and many civilians are patriotically contributing their services in such necessary activities as civilian defense work; and

"Whereas many of these civilians, including the civilian defense workers, may be injured and become burdens on their families or society unless provision is made to protect them from financial loss caused by such injuries; and

"Whereas the members of the Senate of the State of Michigan believe that the Federal Government should make provision to protect these citizens rendering invaluable service to our country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact Senate bill 450, introduced by Senator PEPPER, which provides for compensation to civilians, including civilian defense workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and the Representatives from Michigan.

"Adopted by the senate, March 26."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of War to name the air field located near Albuquerque, N. Mex., now designated as the A. D. T. S., or the Oxnard Field, the Capt. Virgil Lusk Field

"Whereas the late Virgil Lusk, during his lifetime a captain in the United States Army Air Force, was a lifelong resident of the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas during the time he served with the United States Army Air Force in north Africa, he conducted himself with honor; became an ace, and is looked upon as a hero by the inhabitants of the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas Captain Lusk gave his life in the service of his State and country; and

"Whereas the many friends of Captain Lusk in the State of New Mexico lament his passing, cherish his memory, and desire that some fitting action be taken to preserve his name for posterity; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Mexico has been informed that one of the flying fields located near Albuquerque, N. Mex., now designated as the A. D. T. S. Field, or the Oxanard Field, has never been officially named: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States, and Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War be, and they hereby are memorialized and petitioned to designate the name of the above-mentioned air field the Capt. Virgil Lusk Air Field; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, certified under the great seal of the State of New Mexico, be forwarded forthwith to His Excellency the President of the United States, the Right Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Right Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States; and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, SAM RAYBURN; to the Secretary of War of the United States, the Right Honorable Henry L. Stimson; to the Senators of New Mexico in the Senate of the United States, to wit: The Honorable CARL A. HATCH and the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ; and to the Representatives of New Mexico to the Congress of the United States, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ.

"Approved this 9th day of April, 1943.

"JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
"Governor of the State of New Mexico."

Two joint memorials of the General Assembly of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States relating to livestock grazing

"Whereas the present World War has created a food situation that is becoming more serious as time passes, and farmers and stockmen are being urgently requested to produce to the limit, such foods, meats, and wool as they are capable of producing; and

"Whereas the stockmen of Sandoval County, N. Mex., are being hampered in their efforts to increase their production of livestock and wool and do their part in helping to relieve the present meat and wool situation by departmental restrictions and regulations.

"Now, therefore, the stockmen of Sandoval County, N. Mex., respectfully represent and submit that the livestock production of this county is seriously being curtailed by the refusal of the Santa Fe National Forest to grant us additional grazing permits over and above what we now hold, that the Soil Conservation Service, under their land-purchasing plan, have deprived us of grazing privileges which we formerly held within the area that they now control, that the United States Government in their land-purchasing plan have purchased large tracts of land in Sandoval County, and have restricted grazing thereon to the Indians, that under the Taylor Grazing Act the large stockmen have been able to lease and fence large tracts of lands and further reduce the grazing area formerly used by the small stockmen, we are, therefore, being curbed in our efforts to produce to our full capacity, and we urgently recommend and petition that these restrictions be modified and that we be permitted to increase our herds of livestock and contribute our part to the war effort; be it further

"Resolved, That a bill be passed whereby an increase of 25 percent more grazing be allowed and also a change be made so that grazing permits for sheep could be exchanged for grazing permits for cattle, or vice versa; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of the Congress of the United States, and that copies hereof be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"Approved this 12th day of April 1943.

"JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
"Governor of the State of New Mexico."

House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States, urging that appropriate action be taken to reinstate certain property upon the tax rolls of Harding County

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the Federal Government has purchased approximately 70,000 acres of land in Harding County, N. Mex., referred to as Mills Resettlement Project, and has removed all such lands, with improvements thereon, from the tax rolls of that county, and as a result thereof, the State and county suffers a tax loss of thousands of dollars each year.

"Now, therefore, the Legislative Assembly of the State of New Mexico respectfully requests and petitions Congress to pass without delay appropriate legislation, whereby such lands and improvements shall be restored to the tax rolls as privately owned lands, or that the United States annually compensate the State and county for the tax loss sustained as the result of the Federal ownership of such properties; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and that copies hereof be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"Approved this 12th day of April 1943.

"JOHN J. DEMPSEY.
"Governor of the State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1943, further amending Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1935, as amended by Act 23 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1937, Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1939, and Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1941, by extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1943, further amending Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1935, as amended by Act 23 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1937, Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1939, and Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1941, by extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1945.

"SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 12th day of April A. D. 1943.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 215

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their earnest efforts to oppose the bill now pending in Congress (H. R. 1012) regulating intrastate air traffic

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States bill H. R. 1012 which, if adopted, will prohibit the regulation of intrastate air traffic of any description by any State or regulatory body thereof; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island a bill authorizing the public utility administrator to regulate such intrastate air traffic; and

"Whereas the bill now pending in the Congress of the United States, if passed, would violate the rights of the State or any regulatory body thereof to control intrastate air traffic within its borders: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this general assembly respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to oppose the passage of the bill, H. R. 1012, now pending in the Congress of the United States insofar as it proposes to interfere in any manner with the rights of the State of Rhode Island to regulate intrastate air commerce; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Rhode Island be authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to General Solicitor John E. Benton, of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and to every State commission or regulatory body having jurisdiction over said intrastate air commerce."

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 911

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to have enacted into law House bill 997 and Senate bill 216, to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress House bill No. 997 and Senate bill No. 216, to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

"Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceutics which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

"Whereas at the present time there is no law providing for the creation of such a pharmacy corps: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Con-

gress be, and they hereby are, requested to put forth every effort to see that House bill No. 997 and Senate bill No. 216 are enacted into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Resolution 226

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to make every effort to see that a permanent post office is provided for the city of Central Falls

"Whereas there is now at the city of Central Falls merely a branch post office, a substation of the Pawtucket post office, which substation is entirely inadequate for the purposes of a city the size of Central Falls, approximately 25,000 people, with a possible prospect of the closing of this branch office in the near future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are earnestly requested to make every effort to see that a permanent post office is provided for the city of Central Falls; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the postmaster general."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Burden, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTION BY THE JAPANESE OF AMERICAN FLYERS—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by the President of the United States announcing the execution of members of our country's armed forces by the Japanese Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a feeling of deepest horror, which I know will be shared by all civilized peoples, that I have to announce the barbarous execution by the Japanese Government of some of the members of this country's armed forces who fell into Japanese hands as an incident of warfare.

The press has just carried the details of the American bombing of Japan a year ago. The crews of two of the American bombers were captured by the Japanese. On October 19, 1942, this Government learned from Japanese radio broadcasts of the capture, trial, and severe punishment of those Americans. Continued endeavor was made to obtain confirmation of those reports from Tokyo. It was not until March 12, 1943, that the American Government received the communication given by the Japanese Government stating that these Americans had in fact been tried and that the death penalty had been pronounced against them. It was further stated that the death penalty was commuted for some but that the sentence of death had been applied to others.

This Government has vigorously condemned this act of barbarity in a formal communication sent to the Japanese Government. In that communication this Government has informed the Japanese Government that the American Government will hold personally and officially responsible for these diabolical crimes all of those officers of the Japanese Government who have participated therein and will in due course bring those officers to justice.

This recourse by our enemies to frightfulness is barbarous. The effort of the Japanese war lords thus to intimidate us will utterly fail. It will make the American people more determined than ever to blot out the shameless militarism of Japan.

I have instructed the Department of State to make public the text of our communication to the Japanese Government.

VETERAN LEGISLATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a speech on the subject of veterans' legislation made by me before members of the Second Division and of the American Legion of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., April 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I highly appreciate the invitation to speak before the members of the Second Division and of the American Legion of the District of Columbia upon the question of veterans' legislation. The question of proper legislation to protect the rights of veterans is important not only to the men and women who served their country in the First World War, but to the present members of the military and naval forces of the United States during the present World War.

In order to give protection to the members of the military and naval forces of the first World War, Congress, on April 6, 1917, enacted the War Risk Insurance Act, which provided compensation for injury or disease contracted while in the service. The word "compensation" was advisedly used. The service men and women were to be compensated for their disabilities much the same as civilian employees are compensated for disabilities contracted while engaged in commercial enterprises under the workmen's compensation acts. The relation under the first act was contractual in nature, as such rights are under the workmen's compensation acts of the various States.

This viewpoint as to compensation obtained until the so-called Economy Act of March 20, 1933, was enacted, then, for the first time since the World War, the veterans were to be given a gratuity, not compensation, for their disabilities. This brutal and uncalled-for act, enacted on the pretense that the country was bankrupt when we owed about $19,000,000,000, destroyed the rights of many ex-service men and women, and, for the first time since the World War, placed veterans and their dependency on a charity basis, whereas the act originally giving them the rights was under the able draftsmanship of Judge Julian Mack, the author, was contractual in nature, and the word "compensation" was advisedly used so that the Nation was paying for disabilities incurred in line of duty much the same as industry pays for disabilities under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

I strongly resent an innuendo that veterans who suffered injuries as the result of their service are charity patients, yet that is the true intent of the Economy Act which called compensation a pension, and attempted to destroy contractual rights under the insurance contracts, which repeal was, of course, promptly held by the United States Supreme Court to be unconstitutional, in the Lynch and Wilner cases.

I am glad that after the passage of this so-called Economy Act that the Congress of the United States passed legislation over a Presidential veto restoring many of the rights to the veterans of the World War and their dependents.

There are still many injustices to be removed. I had hoped that we might be able to get Congress to extend the statutes of limitation in war-risk-insurance cases so that hundreds of veterans who have just claims but are now barred by the statute would be able to have their day in court. To this purpose I introduced a bill in Congress to extend the statutes. I also wanted to place the trial of war-risk-insurance cases upon the same basis as other civil litigation in the courts, by providing for the recovery of costs, and expenses of litigation and interest on judgments from the date rendered. The United States Supreme Court held that under the original War Risk Insurance Act of 1914 insuring merchant vessels before we got into the First World War, and that the Standard Oil of New Jersey could recover costs on their insurance policy when they obtained judgment, but a serviceman bringing a suit on an amendment to that act could not recover costs. The distinction to my mind, and to many lawyers has not been apparent. It seems to me that if a great corporation was entitled to interest and costs, that a poor veteran permanently and totally disabled ought to be entitled to the same rights. I had this in mind when I prepared the bill which I introduced last year.

Many persons feel that the Veterans' Administration has not been as liberal with its decisions in the matter of compensation as it should be. In fact, there comes to my attention, numerous cases where it seems to me that they have not only decided the cases despite the evidence in the folder, but contrary to the evidence, administrative bodies should not ignore evidence and make their own law where the law has been laid down by Congress. This attitude on the part of the Veterans' Administration has been greatly apparent since October 1940, when there was slipped through Congress a clause in an act making their decisions final and conclusive and not subject to a review by the courts. I feel that any American citizen, and, above all, veterans who have served their country, should have a right of review of any administrative decision rendered contrary to the law and the evidence. This was permitted prior to the enactment of the Economy Act of March 20, 1933. Prior to that time, in many instances, where mandamus actions were filed against the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in fact, all such cases, the decisions were reversed without a court trial because they knew that such arbitrary decisions could not be defended. Finally the Administrator decided to defend a case in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and refused to pay a judgment without a set-off, and he asserted that his decision was final and conclusive on the set-off, and no court could review it, even to the extent of adding up the figures or amount which he claimed should be set off, but the court of appeals held in *United States* v. *Hines* (105 Fed. (2) 85) that no person in the United States Government ever had such authority, and that the judgment must be paid without the set-off. It was when this decision came down that it was decided to ask Congress to give him absolute authority to decide all questions, in fact making a dictator in an allegedly democratic form of government. So instances of this kind must be avoided in the future. No man in America should be so absolute that he is above the jurisdiction of the courts. It is ironical to be fighting to destroy dictators when we are in effect establishing them at home. Yet that seems to be the exact situation in this country today as far as rights

of veterans and their dependents are concerned in compensation and pension matters.

I have also considered the action of the Veterans' Administration in holding that the rights of veterans may be forfeited under the acts of Congress. In this respect, the Veterans' Administration has gone far astray. Rights of insane veterans have been forfeited because of some simple statement which may have been made which was not strictly true, and these veterans have been thrown upon public relief or their relatives for their support. When compensation is once forfeited, the veteran loses all rights and benefits. He cannot even get into a hospital for service-connected disabilities. I am told of a man who went through the war with the Ninth Infantry of the Second Division. You men of that division know what hell those men went through—your past national commander, Hanford MacNider, now a brigadier general, was colonel of that regiment. This man, I am told, was wounded and gassed; all of the disabilities were service-connected. He made an application for compensation, and signed statements prepared for him by the Veterans' Bureau officials. He signed a paper containing a statement which was not absolutely true, and as the result thereof he received about one to two dollars a month more compensation than he should have received. The Veterans' Administration forfeited all of his compensation on this account. He cannot work; he cannot get into a hospital; and he is thrown upon charity. It is one of the most brutal and inhuman cases that I have ever heard of. The veteran haters of the Pardon Division of the Department of Justice even refused him a civil pardon. They could recommend pardons to bank robbers, kidnapers, income-tax evaders, and other criminals, but for a man who had never committed a crime, and had been injured on the battle front in France, they had no compassion. Some day, and some time, the persons connected with this brutal and unjust decision will have their day of reckoning.

I shall introduce a bill to restore the rights to these veterans who have had their rights destroyed by arbitrary, unjust, and capricious decisions.

The national executive committee of the American Legion has passed a resolution to the effect that the present veterans are entitled to the same compensation and benefits as the veterans of the First World War. In this I concur. A bill has just been enacted and signed which restores these benefits to the members of the military and naval forces, except as to insurance benefits.

The War Risk Insurance Act enacted in October 1917 was continued by amendment and was later supplemented by the World War Veterans Act. All persons in the military or naval service during the First World War could continue their insurance. The World War Veterans Act was also available to any person joining the armed forces after the World War ended. Thus a person who enlisted in the Army prior to October 1940 could apply for insurance, and be granted insurance against death, permanent and total disability, and total disability, all of which paid benefits. In 1940 the Draft Act was passed, and then the bureaucrats in Washington decided that the insurance issued to the service men and women of the First World War was too good for the men being drafted, although it was all right for the peacetime soldier who served prior to October 1940, so they asked that a new insurance law be enacted. They knew that they could never get it through the World War Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives, so they attached it to a tax bill, of all things, in the Finance Committee of the Senate so that it would go with the tax bill to the Committee on Ways and Means—probably the only committee in the House where they could get a quick report on an unjust, discriminatory insurance law. This new act is a monstrosity. The insurance is good for life insurance only. It covers about 50 percent of what the insurance contract granted to World War soldiers and peacetime soldiers to October 1940. No one seems to know just who prepared the new Insurance Act. Certainly it was someone who thought little of America's fighting men. I will illustrate what I mean. A man enlisted in the Army in April 1940 and applied for $10,000 insurance. He got protection against death and permanent and total disability benefits in the amount of $57.50, payable so long as he remains permanently and totally disabled. He pays a premium of $6.70 at his age, 29 years. Another man is drafted into the Army in 1940. He can only apply for national service life insurance. He pays a premium at the age 29 years of $6.70, and he receives no protection for himself. The first man may designate any beneficiary he desires. The second man may designate only his closest relatives. If none survives, no benefits are payable. If a beneficiary survives but dies before receiving benefits, her estate collects nothing; the insurance payments escheat to the United States. In certain instances, while an insured may pay premiums on $10,000, only about $4,200 is payable.

Under the National Service Life Insurance Act premiums may be waived in cases of total disability, but the decision as to the total disability is made by the Veterans Administration, and their decision is final; no court can review it. Applications under the first War Risk Insurance Act of October 6, 1917, were made in the company headquarters, one was insured from the moment that the application was signed. Under the new act, the policies must be issued, in many instances the applicant for the insurance died before the application reached the Veterans Administration; there is no waiver of premiums except on application; a man becomes insane in the service, and makes no application; he wanders away from his outfit on account of his insanity; he has no insurance. There are so many injustices and discriminations against the present-day soldiers and sailors that it is impossible for me to enumerate them in the time allotted to me. Sufficient to say, that two men may be fighting side by side on the African front, one has the good insurance granted to him as a peacetime soldier in 1939; the other man was drafted in 1941 for service; both have the same amount of insurance, and both are paying the same premiums, and both are hit by the same shell, with the result that both are permanently and totally disabled. One man, the peacetime soldier, or rather who enlisted during peacetime, gets $57.50 a month under his policy, and the other man, drafted, although similarly disabled, gets nothing. Furthermore, if the peacetime soldier had paid a small extra premium he could have had insurance against total disability, which would pay him $57.50 a month additional, making a total payment of $115 a month, while the man torn away from his home, his family, and his business, and compelled in many instances to make great sacrifices, gets nothing.

I intend to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate of the United States at an early date. I see no reason for the unjust and discriminatory legislation. When a soldier pays the same amount out of his meager pay, he ought to get the same protection, particularly when the same insurance company is issuing the policies. I call upon all of you to help me in this fight for the under-organized members of the present armed forces. Help me see that they get justice. This country was founded upon liberty, and with justice for all. I intend to see that justice is done. I shall not rest until these men and women of our fighting forces receive just treatment.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter received by me from Charles J. Muller, of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., in behalf of the Farm Security Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLEN ULLIN, N. DAK.,
April 5, 1943.

DEAR SENATORS LANGER AND NYE, Washington, D. C.: We have seven boys in the United States Army. If it had not been for the Farm Security we would not have a place to keep our seven children now at home. We are raising hogs and sheep, and poultry and cattle.

My boys want a place to come to if they ever come back. Farm Security has helped a lot of farmers in our country.

We want you to know the truth. Everybody will tell you the Farm Security is good, ask anybody.

Yours truly,

CHAS J. MULLER.

EDUCATIONAL ADVANTAGES FOR YOUNG PERSONS AFTER THE WAR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a letter received by me from Theodore Becker, Jr., an 18-year-old boy, residing at Gorham, N. Dak., together with replies to letters written by me in respect to the matter referred to in Becker's letter, from J. W. Studebaker, Commissioner, United States Office of Education, and Maj. Gen. J. A. Ulio, The Adjutant General of the Army.

There being no objection, the letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORHAM, N. DAK., *March 1, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am a farm boy, born and raised on a farm in western North Dakota. I am experienced in almost any kind of farm work. I will be 18 years of age March 24, 1943. I am taking high-school work by supervised correspondence study through the department of correspondence study, State College Station, Fargo, N. Dak. I will graduate from high school in June 1943.

I have heard that a law has been passed which provides that young men in the armed forces will be given $200 and loaned $600 a year by the Government to attend schools and universities after the war. However, due to the shortage of farm labor, all experienced farm workers are encouraged to stay on the farm. Will young men who remain on the farm be given the same educational advantages as the men in the service? I am satisfied to remain on the farm if I will be of the most help to the war effort here, and if I would be given the same opportunities as servicemen after the war.

If this law does not provide these opportunities for young men who remain on the farm, I feel that some such provision should be made for them I'm sure there are many other farm boys who feel the same as I do concerning this matter.

Yours truly,

THEODORE BECKER, Jr.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, March 29, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is in reply to your letter of March 12 with which was enclosed a copy of a letter from Mr. Theodore Becker, Jr., dated March 1.

The problem which Mr. Becker's letter raises is a very serious one and deserves, in my opinion, the consideration of the Congress. When the Congress passes a law requiring that a certain class of young men to accept deferment and thus forfeit the advantages of participation with the armed forces in the war, the boys so deferred will in many cases feel as Mr. Theodore Becker feels. In my opinion, there should be established some system under which men deferred on the occupational classification basis should be given the status of soldiers in order that legislation affecting veterans after the war might be made applicable to them.

Not only are farm boys in this category, but other boys deferred for war industries and for college training are in a like situation.

If the thought expressed above seems to you sound, and if there is anything that the Office of Education can do to assist you in going further into the matter, please feel free to call upon us.

Very cordially yours,

J. W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner.

MARCH 26, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Further reference is made to your letter of March 12, 1943, to the Secretary of War, with which you enclosed copy of a communication from Theodore Becker, Jr., Gorham, N. Dak., concerning educational opportunities provided by the Government for young men finishing high school this year.

This office has no knowledge of a law which provides that young men in the armed forces will be given $200 and loaned $600 a year by the Government to attend schools and universities after the war. An act of Congress approved March 6, 1943 (Public Law 7, 78th Cong.) amends Public Law No. 435, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved February 6, 1942, to read as follows: "That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter and notwithstanding other provisions of existing law, personnel of all components of the Army of the United States may be detailed as students at technical, professional, and other educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, and all necessary expenses incident thereto shall be payable from any appropriations available to the Military Establishment."

A uniform preinduction examination designed to indicate educational qualifications for the college-training programs of the armed forces will be given at thousands of high schools and colleges throughout the Nation on April 2, 1943. The following student groups will be eligible to take the examination: 1. High-school and preparatory-school graduates who will have attained their seventeenth and not their twenty-second birthdays by July 1, 1943. 2. High-school and preparatory-school seniors who will be graduated by July 1, 1943, provided they will have attained their seventeenth and not their twentieth birthdays by that date. 3. Students who will have attained their seventeenth and not their twenty-second birthdays by July 1, 1943, who do not hold certificates of graduation from a secondary school but who are now continuing their education in an accredited college or university. Facilities for the examination will be available at all high schools and colleges where there are applicants.

The Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 647, 77th Cong.), approved July 2, 1942, provides for loans to students whose technical or professional education can be completed within 2 years to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance, and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized thereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor. It further provides that loans thereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month and not exceeding a total of $500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities, or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. It also provides that indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled.

Very respectfully,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

CHARITY AND WORKS OF FORMER MISS KATHARINE DREXEL

Mr. LANGER. Also, Mr. President, I ask that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed an article entitled "Gave Away $1,000 a Day for 52 Years," published in American Weekly. The article tells how the former Miss Katharine Drexel, daughter of the late Francis A. Drexel, partner of J. Pierpont Morgan in the banking house of Drexel, Morgan & Co., has been living on 41 cents a day, or $150 a year, while she has been devoting her life to charity. The article is as follows:

GAVE AWAY $1,000 A DAY FOR 52 YEARS

For 52 years the former Miss Katharine Drexel, beautiful daughter of the late Francis A. Drexel, partner of J. Pierpont Morgan in the banking house of Drexel, Morgan & Co., has been living on 41 cents a day, or $150 a year.

For those same years she has been giving her income of $1,000 a day to the institutions she heads as Mother Katharine, foundress and superior general of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Colored People.

And this year, Mother Katharine will be 85 years old, proving, perhaps, that a life of asceticism and stoicism and devotion to a cause is good for the body as well as for the soul.

Miss Drexel's personal fortune was $6,000,000 in the late 1890's, and that was thought of as even more money then than it is today. That personal fortune is today only a part of the vast estate that has grown up.

Scattered throughout America are schools, convents, houses of social service, community houses, retreat houses, and institutions like the $2,000,000 Xavier University of New Orleans, all devoted to the education and advancement of Negroes and American Indians.

St. Elizabeths Convent, the motherhouse for nuns of the order, a school for Negro children, and a score of other buildings on the gently sloping acres at Cornwells Heights, Pa., not far from Philadelphia, are worth, conservatively speaking, about $2,000,000.

An idea of the size of the estate can be gained from that fact that, in Louisiana alone, Mother Katharine has built and is financing the maintenance and operation of the university at New Orleans, a college, a preparatory school, five grade schools, and a score of rural schools.

Miss Drexel renounced all worldly possessions when she took the vow of poverty on February 12, 1891, in the convent of the Sisters of Mercy at Pittsburgh. Born in Philadelphia in 1858, she was the second of three daughters of the Drexels. Elizabeth, who became Mrs. Walter George Smith, died in 1890, and Louise, who became the wife of General Morrell, lived simply and comfortably on an estate adjacent to the Drexel homestead.

The three Drexel girls were influenced by their governess, Miss Mary Cassidy, the well-educated daughter of an impoverished Dublin family. A devout Catholic, Miss Cassidy inspired her charges with reverence for the faith in addition to a knowledge of Latin, French, and the classics

One day each week the girls received the poor in their ultra-fashionable Philadelphia home. They were presented to society and did attend a few parties, but it was noticeable that their chief interest was in charity and the downtrodden.

After Custer's last stand, General Grant, then President, and a close friend of the Drexel family, launched his famous peace policy, which encouraged missionary work among the Indians.

Father O'Connor, later Bishop of Omaha, sent two missionary priests with an appeal to the Drexels. With her sisters, Katharine accompanied Bishop O'Connor on a tour of the wild Indian Territory. On her return to Philadelphia, she gave $150,000 to establish missions among the Indians and engaged an architect to draw up plans for boarding schools on Indian reservations.

There were many difficulties in taming the wild Indian. Grant agreed that the Government would pay $125 a year for each Indian brought into a school. Katharine set up a number of schools. Then she set about getting teachers, priests, and nuns who would dedicate themselves to getting the red men to come to the white schools.

Katharine Drexel began establishing schools for Negroes as well as for Indians. When it became increasingly difficult to find teachers who would volunteer to give their services, Katharine Drexel decided to found an order of teachers who would be devoted to the amelioration of conditions among colored people.

Then her father died and willed his estate of upward of $15,000,000 in trust to his three daughters, reserving $2,000,000 for his own favorite charities The will also states that if the three daughters die childless, the money is to be divided among certain charities which he specified.

The result is that when Mother Katharine dies, the vast network of institutions which she has created will not be able to benefit from the estate her father left, for her sister, Mrs. Smith, as well as Mrs. Morrell, died without children.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—EXPLANATION OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL proceeded to address the Senate in regard to petitions heretofore presented by him, and was interrupted by—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, have we completed the routine morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business has

not been completed. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further petitions and memorials to be presented, reports of committees are in order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am reporting on certain petitions.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, reports on petitions are not permitted to be presented in that fashion. Petitions may be filed, and an explanation may be made of them after the close of the routine morning business. I have many times insisted that the rules of the Senate be followed. The Senator from Texas knows my position in that respect. Two or three times I have had to caution him about the matter. Petitions, memorials, and reports may be submitted, and explanations of them may be made later. I insist on the regular order of business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point made by the Senator from Oregon is well taken.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I shall be glad to complete my statement at any time. I thought my explanation was in order at this time, because it relates to the correction of the RECORD in respect to petitions presented in connection with liquor sales around Army camps. I shall be glad to continue my statement at the proper time.

(Mr. O'DANIEL'S remarks appear entire elsewhere in today's RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order has been asked for. If there be no further petitions, reports of committees are in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 14 relating to the Republic of Panama. The measure was passed by the Senate at the last session, but was not passed by the House. It now has been passed by the House in form identical to that in which it originally passed the Senate. At the earliest opportunity I shall ask that the Senate proceed to its consideration

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution placed on the calendar.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments; without amendment (Rept. No. 201).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 885. A bill to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 202).

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I report back with amendments from the Committee on Appropriations House Joint Resolution 115, providing for deficiency appropriations, which I hope we shall have opportunity to dispose of before the day is over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKELLAR), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 203).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 755. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; without amendment (Rept. No. 204).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—SHIPBUILDING AND SHIPPING (PT. 8 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I submit an additional report of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, on the subject of shipbuilding and shipping. The report is submitted with the approval of the committee and in the hope that it will be read very thoroughly by Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this is the twenty-second report submitted to the Senate by the so-called Truman committee. It indicates not only the vast amount of work which has been accomplished by this committee but it also indicates the enormous savings which have resulted from the committee's work.

Mr. President, I submit the report for printing, and I trust it will receive the attention of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report submitted by the Senator from New York will be received and printed in report form.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1019. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Joseph M. Schmitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 1020. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Arthur A. Matsu; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1021. A bill to authorize the presentation of the Soldier's Medal to Lt. Col. Eugene H. Valle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1022. A bill extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the First World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1023. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri) introduced Senate bill 1024, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1025. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1026. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1027. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons deferred from military service for occupational reasons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1029. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. STEWART introduced Senate bill 1030, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1031. A bill to incorporate the Navy Mothers' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. J. Res. 48, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading)

(Mr. WILEY introduced S. J. Res. 49, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL LIFE INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself I introduce a bill to provide for additional life insurance protection for the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and ask that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD in connection with its receipt and proper reference.

The bill (S. 1024) to provide additional life insurance protection for members of the land and naval forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

The title of the bill is to provide additional life insurance protection for members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

The bill provides that all persons now in active service in the land and naval forces, and all persons who hereafter enter upon such service, shall be considered as having applied for an amount of national service life insurance to bring their total Government insurance up to the maximum amount allowed—that is, $10,000.

The bill provides that disbursing officers carrying the pay accounts of persons assumed to have applied for national service life insurance shall withhold payments to such

persons of a sufficient amount to pay the premiums until the person states in writing that he has had explained to him the national service life insurance system, and that he does not desire to be issued any such insurance, or any additional insurance, as the case may be. Unless such statements are made within 120 days, disbursing officers shall forward amounts retained for payments of premiums to Veterans' Administration and shall thereafter forward monthly to Veterans' Administration sufficient amounts, to be checked against the person's pay, to pay premiums until such time as the policy is canceled. The average monthly premium charge on a $10,000 policy is about $7.

Senator WALSH, in explaining the bill, stated that the reason for introducing this measure was because of the large number of men in the armed forces who either did not know of the benefit to be derived from taking out national service life insurance, or failed if informed, to make out the long and involved questionnaire required before any insurance policy was issued.

Another feature of the bill is to permit persons now in the service who have only a small amount of insurance to take out additional insurance.

In an explanation of the need of this legislation attention is called to the fact that evidence has been presented to a subcommittee of the Finance Committee to the effect that approximately 15 percent of persons in the service of the Navy have no insurance and that approximately 25 percent of the Army personnel have not taken advantage of the national service life insurance benefits, and that only a few thousand dollars of insurance is now held by a large number of those in the service. This is probably due largely to the fact that the pay to enlisted men at the time they took out their insurance was very much less than has been allotted through recent legislation.

ZONE RATE SCALES FOR RAILROAD FREIGHT

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and to make a statement on it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. STEWART. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the establishment of scales of rates according to zones, for the transportation of property by common carrier by railroad. This is a companion bill to one introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday by Representative PATMAN, of Texas. I shall have more to say about the bill at a later date.

The bill (S. 1030) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the establishment of scales of rates, according to zones, for the transportation of property by common carriers by railroad, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO DR. JAMES EDWARD WEST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a gold medal to Dr. James Edward West, Chief Scout of the Boy Scouts of America, in recognition of his services to the youth of the Nation.

Mr. President, Dr. West has served as the chief scout executive of the Boy Scout movement for 32 years. During 3 decades Dr. West has been a vital factor in the growth of the Boy Scouts of America from a few scattered troops to a Nation-wide movement affecting the lives of nearly 11,000,000 Americans. There are active in America more than 1,500,000 boys and adult leaders in every city and in almost every town and hamlet in the United States and its possessions.

The life story of James E. West is a remarkable human document. Placed in an orphan asylum in his native city of Washington, D. C., at an early age, he became afflicted with an illness which left him crippled.

He was determined to obtain an education and live a life of usefulness to others. He made his way forward and by his personality, his force, and his perseverance, overcame extraordinary handicaps and obtained an education. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in the District of Columbia. President Theodore Roosevelt appointed him a member of the Board of Pension Appeals, and later as an assistant attorney in the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

His interest in the youth of the Nation constantly dominated his work. He organized a citizens' committee and induced Congress to give Washington a juvenile court. He promoted the Washington Playground Association and obtained from the Congress an appropriation sufficient to put the whole playground movement on a permanent basis.

He organized and served as secretary of the National Child Rescue League, which placed more than 2,000 homeless children in childless homes through a campaign conducted in the Delineator magazine.

He interested President Theodore Roosevelt to call, in 1909, the First White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children, with Dr. West as organizer and secretary. "But for you there would have been no conference," said Theodore Roosevelt afterward. "I have always thought well of you, but now I feel that you are one of those disinterested and patriotic citizens to whom this country stands under a peculiar debt of gratitude."

Dr. West served as secretary of the conference, conducted all the preliminary work in connection with it, and carried the conference to a successful conclusion. He has been actively connected with every White House Conference on Youth that has been held since.

Mr. President, Dr. West is recognized as an authority on conditions affecting youth throughout the Nation. He participated in President Harding's Second White House Conference, and in President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. In connection with the latter, he was chairman of the committee on youth outside the home and school and cooperated in the development of the children's charter. In 1939 and 1940 he served as a member of the planning committee of the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, and the National Citizens Committee.

In 1910 the executive committee of the newly incorporated Boy Scouts of America urged him to accept the position of executive officer in the young organization. Dr. West agreed to leave his legal practice because of the possibilities in this new program for youth.

In 1926 he received the Silver Buffalo for distinguished service to boyhood, awarded by the Boy Scouts of America with the following citation:

> James E. West, lawyer, identified with the organization of the playground movement, juvenile court of Washington, National Child Rescue League, secretary of the Roosevelt White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children, Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America since January 1, 1911.

He was awarded the Silver Wolf for distinguished service by the British Boy Scouts Association. His services have also been recognized by other foreign Scout organizations. He is a member of the international committee, a group of nine men who have the responsibility of directing the Boy Scouts International Bureau and of passing upon international Scouting problems in the intervals between international conferences.

Dr. West was largely responsible for the development of the Scout program as it has been adapted to conditions in the United States. The twelfth Scout law, "A Scout is reverent," is due in large part to his conviction of the need on the part of youth today for the strengthening of the influence of the church.

Another activity to which he has given his personal leadership and support is a reading program for the youth of America. Dr. West is editor of Boys' Life, the official magazine of the Boy Scouts of America.

Dr. West has written a number of books. These include the Lone Scout of the Sky; the Boys' Book of Honor; He Who Sees in the Dark, with Peter Lamb; and the Scout Jamboree, with William Hillcourt. He is also the author of many magazine articles and pamphlets, and is a well-known public speaker on all phases of activity concerning youth.

As jamboree camp chief, Dr. West took a leading part in the planning, programming, and promotion of the national Scout jamboree, which brought together 27,232 Scouts and leaders at Washington, D. C., from June 30 to July 9, 1937, for 10 days of camping along the banks of the Potomac River.

The United States Flag Association has awarded him its Cross of Honor.

The National Institute of Social Sciences awarded to Dr. West its gold medal for distinguished services to humanity.

The Parents' magazine presented Dr. West its annual medal for outstanding service to children.

Dr. West has received the following degrees: LL. B., and LL. M., National University, 1901; LL. B., Kalamazoo College, 1928, and Hamilton College, 1941; M. H., Springfield College, 1928.

Dr. West married Marion Speaks, of Washington, D. C., in 1907. They have

two daughters, Marion and Helen, and two sons, Arthur and Robert, both of whom were Eagle Scouts. Their home is at New Rochelle, N. Y.

On Dr. West's sixty-fifth birthday anniversary, May 16, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, of which he has been an active leader for many years, paid Dr. West this tribute:

During these perilous times I am more conscious than ever of the patriotism of our Boy Scouts and the strength of their leadership. To you belongs much of the credit for the effectiveness of Scouting in this country. I desire, therefore, to take this means, on your birthday, and on your thirtieth anniversary as chief Scout executive, to tell you how much we appreciate your accomplishments in behalf of American boyhood.

Your service to Scouting over the years emphasizes the effectiveness of the American way of providing equal opportunity to youth. You have, through your work, rendered your country great service.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to James Edward West, chief scout of the Boy Scouts of America, in recognition of his services to the youth of the Nation.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 647. An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; and

H. R. 2197. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 1025. An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a board of legal examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1900. An act to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1573. An act relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; and

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2437. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks, city delivery carriers, and railway postal clerks interchangeably; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2481 An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 822) to amend the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The amendment proposes to amend the Bituminous Coal Act in connection with the renewal now being sought.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 142), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution 247, agreed to June 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 4, after line 4, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"War Training Service (Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status): Pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status, while undergoing training or during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 3 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE LAW OF RHODE ISLAND—ADDRESS BY GOV. J. HOWARD McGRATH

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by His Excellency J. Howard McGrath, Governor of Rhode Island, delivered recently at the wartime health and welfare conference held in Providence. This address is a report of the progress being made by the State of Rhode Island toward the objective of freedom from want—now. This speech shows how the State of Rhode Island, through the general public assistance law enacted in 1942 has virtually abolished extreme poverty. The new law provides, in effect, that any person who is in need is eligible to receive general public assistance. In other words, persons are not declared ineligible because they lack residence, or are aliens, or are employable or unemployable, or because they have some income.

In Rhode Island the same standards of assistance are used regardless of whether a person may be receiving old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, or general public assistance. This practice eliminates the inequalities and injustices which occur when old-age assistance is granted on one level, aid to blind on another, aid to dependent children on a third level, and general relief on a different and usually lower level. The effect of adopting the same standards for all programs has been to increase considerably the level of assistance for that group which generally receives the most inadequate care; that is the general public-assistance group. Inasmuch as the greatest proportion of the general public-assistance recipients are sick or handicapped persons, there appears to be no justification for regarding their needs as being less meritorious than those of persons in other categories.

The average payment per case on general public assistance in Rhode Island in November of 1942 was $37.64, the highest in the country, exceeding the national average during this month by $13.07. It might be assumed that the policy of assisting all persons in need in accordance with a single adequate scientifically established budget standard would be enormously expensive. As a matter of fact, the contrary is true. For example, for the month of November 1942, the average expenditure in Rhode Island for all types of public assistance was 49 cents per inhabitant; in the nearby State of New York it was 67 cents; in Massachusetts it was 96 cents,

and for the country as a whole it was 59 cents.

The elimination of all eligibility requirements with the exception of the requirement of need has made it possible to dispense with a vast amount of red tape and permit the development of a rehabilitation program which makes possible a great reduction of assistance costs at the same time that more adequate care is provided.

On January 11, 1943, I introduced a bill, S. 281, which provides for some comprehensive amendments of the Social Security Act, including the extension of the public assistance program to provide grants-in-aid to States for general public assistance. Rhode Island now has a general public assistance program, and it has gone a long way toward securing "freedom from want—now." I am inserting this speech by the able and socially minded Governor of the State of Rhode Island, not to advertise the accomplishments of one State, but as an illustration of what may be accomplished in all States when Congress amends the Social Security Act so as to enable all States to establish an adequate general public assistance program.

There being no objection, the address was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Taft, and members of the Wartime Health and Welfare Conference, it is an honor and a privilege to be able to welcome to Rhode Island such a distinguished public official as the main speaker this evening, Mr. Charles P. Taft, the Assistant Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. The work of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services is of vital importance to the whole war program. I think it particularly appropriate that Mr. Taft should come to Rhode Island at this time because our State is now so deeply concerned with the problems with which his office has been established to cope.

We know that defense is not just a matter of planes, guns, and tanks. We know that the defense of civilian health and social welfare plays an important role. We in Rhode Island set great store by the dignity of man. We believe fundamentally in people. We believe that their lives, their health, their welfare and happiness are an important consideration in the successful prosecution of the war. There arise out of the war, or are intensified by the war, many serious problems created by what our whole war effort does to people—problems of care for the children of working mothers, of juvenile delinquency, of recreation, of public health, of social protection, of justice to aliens, and of family adjustments due to wartime conditions.

The welfare division of the State council of defense, under the leadership of Judge Luigi De Pasquale, has done some very fine work in recognizing and grappling with these problems. With the help of that division we are just now beginning to realize how serious the problems are, and we are looking to Mr. Taft to give us some direction in our efforts to meet them.

We are indebted to, and I wish to congratulate, the Providence Council of Social Agencies and the Department of Social Welfare for their vision in arranging for this conference which should be an effective means of focusing the attention of the people of Rhode Island on the importance of developing adequate solutions of welfare problems in wartime.

We know from the experience of England, that in total war, all the people fight, and that the morale of the people on the home front is important, as well as the morale of the people in the fighting forces. In fact, the two are inextricably interwoven. We know that such questions of standards of assistance and effectiveness of social services have a direct relationship to the morale of our Rhode Island men in the armed services. We know, for example, that the high morale of a man fighting in the Solomons is dependent in some degree upon the fact that his pregnant wife is receiving satisfactory medical care.

It has been part of the policy of this State to cooperate fully with the Federal Government in matters which relate to the care of civilians. Not long ago I made available a revolving fund to be used for civilian war assistance purposes in order that payments might be made promptly and adequately with respect to civilian needs arising out of enemy action, or needs arising from accidents or illness incurred in line of duty by volunteer civilian defense workers.

I would like to take this opportunity to report to Mr. Taft that the State of Rhode Island has already put into practical application some of the thinking and recommendations of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. For example, in September of 1941 the family security committee of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services published a Brief in Support of Recommendations in Favor of a Category of General Public Assistance To Be Added to the Social Security Act. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, has introduced into Congress bills which would establish the type of program which has been recommended by the family security committee. The Legislature of the State of Rhode Island has already put into effect, insofar as the State of Rhode Island is concerned, the recommendations for a general public assistance program without any residence or settlement requirement. Thus we now have in Rhode Island, in effect, the type of program which your family security committee has recommended for the country as a whole.

We have not looked upon the third freedom—freedom from want—as an objective to be met after the war and solely by the Federal Government. We in Rhode Island believe that the cities and towns and the State have some responsibility for making this freedom a reality now.

Through the enactment of the General Public Assistance Act of 1942 the State of Rhode Island has exhibited some leadership in working toward that goal. We have provided for 70-percent reimbursement of local general public assistance costs, and I doubt if any other State has done more to make the third freedom a reality. In practical operation we have found the program recommended by your committee to be sound and practical. You will be interested in some of the results of its adoption. These results will show how important welfare is to the maintenance of morale and also to the mobilization of manpower.

First. Because statistics show that most of the persons now receiving general public assistance are persons with some physical or mental disability, we have provided in our assistance appropriation funds for the medical attention which will enable many to become self-supporting and to find their places in the war effort. All persons receiving this form of assistance are eligible for complete physical examination and for whatever treatment is necessary in the hospital, in the physician's or dentist's office, or at home. Uniform standards, procedures, and fees have been established with the help of the Rhode Island Medical Society, the Hospital Association of Rhode Island, as well as the individual hospitals who have formally entered into a standard hospital agreement, the Rhode Island Dental Society, the Rhode Island Pharmaceutical Society, and the nursing agencies.

Second. Restoration to good health, or relatively good health, does not alone solve the problem for those persons who have been unemployed for years or never employed. It is essential that their potential skills and their interests be determined in order that their contribution to the community and their own contentment may be realized to the fullest extent possible. As a result of an experiment in the use of testing methods conducted by the city of Providence and the State Division of Public Assistance, a full-time testing service has been established, providing a basis or appropriate placement in jobs which cry out to be filled and restoring to many individuals self-confidence and satisfaction with their usefulness to themselves, their family, and their country.

Third. To develop the potential skills and to reawaken or redirect the old skills of our assistance recipients the training programs of the division of rehabilitation in the State department of education, the bureau for the handicapped, the Work Projects Administration, and the local school departments offer their facilities. In these programs the "valley is filled, and the mountain and hill are brought low," and the students march forth to take their positions in industry's all-out effort.

Fourth. Medical rehabilitation, determination of skills, and training make a man ready for work, but do not actually get him the job. Puzzled by the inability of many assistance recipients to obtain employment through the regular channels, we sought and found an explanation. Many of our people were not yet sure enough of themselves to face an employer or personnel manager, and many could not satisfactorily set forth their qualifications. To overcome these and similar difficulties, the division of public assistance and the United States Employment Service jointly planned the full-time assignment of a social worker to the Employment Service office, with the result that the placement through that office of assistance recipients has increased about tenfold.

Fifth. The four programs just mentioned were found to be so effective as magnets to attract hidden manpower and so fruitful to those who availed themselves of them, that the coordination of them, as a service unit of the division of public assistance, was deemed advisable and soon an accomplished fact. The rehabilitation clinic, as it is called, is managed by a board composed of the heads of the special programs and representatives of the division. The clinic has already discovered and referred for treatment physical conditions which had not been known to exist. It has helped to make employable and to place persons whose handicaps had previously condemned them to the task of merely existing.

Sixth. Because our alien group was unable, in discouragingly great numbers to derive full benefit from the provisions which I have mentioned, it was necessary for us to find ways and means of bringing to an end the alien status of all who had, by their own effort, been unable to do so. With the very active and practical cooperation of the international institute, the Work Projects Administration, and the State department of education, many obstacles were overcome and industry's doors were opened to the new citizens.

Our General Public Assistance Act brought to an end discrimination against those in need who just did not happen to be living in the right place at the right time. As I have said elsewhere, Rhode Island experience indicates that the supposed advantages

of settlement and residence restrictions upon eligibility for assistance are completely fictitious. It has been contended that if a State has high relief standards and does not have settlement restrictions, persons will move into that State to be eligible for relief. We have found this contention to be false.

The general public assistance standards in Rhode Island are probably the highest in the United States; but to this date we have not been able to locate a single family, or individual who has moved into Rhode Island in order to avail himself of Rhode Island's high general public assistance standards. Many workers have moved into the State to obtain work, and Rhode Island's war industries have been strengthened by this migration. A small proportion of these have needed assistance. We do not begrudge them this assistance. We think that any State should expect to take the bitter with the sweet, and that any area whose resources are strengthened by migration should expect to assume responsibility for the relatively small relief burden which is incident to the migration.

We do not know exactly how many persons are now receiving assistance in Rhode Island who would not have been eligible had our settlement law not been abolished. We do not know because the whole, expensive, time-consuming, administrative work involved in determining settlement has been eliminated, resulting in a very substantial streamlining of the relief administration process. We are pretty certain that the cost of assisting these persons is not nearly as great as the administrative costs which were necessitated when settlement was a necessary condition to eligibility. Even if it were much more costly to provide for them, it is absurd for us, in these days when we are feeding many nations and planning to feed hungry peoples throughout the world, to draw the line for specified periods of time on Americans in our own States and communities.

If a State is to remove the artificial restrictions to migration, as is so very important to our whole war program, it is not enough for it to abolish its settlement laws. Rhode Island has gone beyond this and has provided that any person receiving assistance who wishes to move out of the State may do so and continue to receive assistance as long as his need continues. The necessity of taking this step was made apparent by a situation arising directly out of the war emergency. In one defense area certain work very vital to the whole war program has been seriously handicapped because of the fact that it is simply impossible to find additional housing facilities for war workers. Certain recipients of old-age assistance had expressed a desire to more from this overcrowded area in order to live with relatives in other States where there was less congestion, and where there might be greater security. The only obstacle to their moving was that under existing policies these persons would forfeit their rights to old-age assistance when they would be absent from the State for more than 3 months.

The 3-months restriction has now been eliminated. Their freedom of movement being no longer restricted, these assistance recipients have made the move which they so desired, and in some instances the quarters which they vacated have been utilized by badly needed war workers. The cost of this policy has been small compared with the advantages to the community, to the war industry, and, most important, to the happiness and contentment of our senior citizens who have received a greater freedom and security.

In the last analysis, the quality of all welfare work depends upon the training and competence of the personnel engaged in providing assistance and service to people who are in need of such assistances and services. In the field of welfare we have had in Rhode Island the basic problem now faced by other States, too, of how to maintain and develop a high quality of social service in wartime, as many well trained and capable workers are leaving the fields of social work for other activities.

This problem is one of the utmost importance not only in terms of present problems but also in terms of the post-war problems of social adjustments, which we know are going to be many and difficult. For this reason any step which can be taken to improve the quality of the performance of persons engaged in social work in Rhode Island is important. In service training, programs have been effectively strengthened and extended, but basic training should be a prerequisite for them. In Rhode Island we have been under somewhat of a handicap due to the fact that there is no recognized graduate school of social work in the State, and it has been necessary for Rhode Island young people to go to other States in order to secure adequate professional education in this field.

I am very happy to be able to report to you that within the past month there have been established in Rhode Island facilities for providing a high grade of professional education for persons in the social-work field, or preparing to enter it; that, due to the splendid cooperation received from the Boston College School of Social Work, a Rhode Island division of the school has been established which provides graduate training in social work for people in Rhode Island. I have been so much impressed with the need for professional education in social work that I am making available from my contingency fund certain funds which will enable social workers who are working for the State to obtain educational leave in order that they may receive professional training.

A 5-year plan has been worked out by the division of public assistance which will afford an opportunity for practically all social workers in that division to secure a master's degree in social work during the next 5 years. I believe that it is fair to say that if this program continues over a period of years there will be no State in the Union where public-welfare services are administered by people with better qualifications and professional training than in Rhode Island. Although this program was conceived in the first place primarily to meet the needs of more adequate professional training for persons in the public agency, the school planned to admit other candidates, and many members of the staffs of private agencies in Rhode Island are availing themselves of the opportunities created through the new Rhode Island division. There is no doubt but that over a period of years this will make a fundamental contribution to the quality of social work in Rhode Island.

In conclusion, may I ask that we who are pledged to a program of welfare in wartimes meditate upon our sacred obligation to those who are dying for us on the battle fronts of the world—our obligation to preserve the objectives for which they fight—and in the immortal words of our Abraham Lincoln, "to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON COMMODORE PERRY

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the Commodore Perry program, delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ AT LAUNCHING OF STEAMSHIP "BENITO JUAREZ"

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator CHAVEZ upon the occasion of the launching of the steamship *Benito Juarez* at Houston, Tex., on April 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Thomas Jefferson delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at Springfield, Mass., on April 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, before the Committee for Economic Development, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY JAMES W. GERARD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. James W. Gerard, former United States Ambassador to Germany, on April 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WEEKLY RADIO ADDRESS BY LOTHROP STODDARD ON WORLD AFFAIRS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on world affairs, delivered by Lothrop Stoddard on Sunday, April 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPONGE IRON—ADDRESS BY H. A. BRASSERT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of sponge iron, delivered by H. A. Brassert, at Hartford, Conn., March 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD—THE DECIDING ISSUE—EDITORIAL BY JAMES H. McGRAW, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject Food—The Deciding Issue, by James H. McGraw, Jr., published in the McGraw-Hill publications, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Roosevelt Does It Again; Congress Should Try It," published in the Philadelphia Record of April 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. EDEN'S GOOD ADVICE—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Eden's Good Advice—To Us," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN THE GOOD OLD AMERICAN WAY—SONG BY JOHN W. CLEATON

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a song entitled "In the Good Old American Way," written by John W. Cleaton, of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPRESSION OF LIQUOR AND VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

[Mr REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Tampa Ministers' Association, relating to legislation to protect the armed forces from liquor and vice traffics, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW MEXICO BOY'S PRAYER ON BATAAN—ARTICLE FROM ALBUQUERQUE (N. MEX.) MORNING JOURNAL

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Mexico Boy's Prayer on Bataan Wins Praise," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Morning Journal of April 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials dealing with America's part in the peace program following the war, which appear in the Appendix.]

DRAFT BOARD HEADACHES—EDITORIAL FROM ARIZONA DAILY STAR

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Draft Board Headaches," published in the Arizona Daily Star of April 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR OPPORTUNITIES — ARTICLE FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. KILGORE) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Post War Opportunities," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I believe it was on Monday that we had an understanding that the calendar would be called today, commencing with Order of Business No. 1.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was not present at the time when the understanding referred to by the Senator from Oregon was arrived at. I understood that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, would ask to have the Senate consider several bills which are on the calendar. I did not understand that the entire calendar would be called. Was that the understanding?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that was the clear implication and the understanding of the Senator from Oregon. I objected to the taking up at that time of the measures on the calendar, since notice had not been given. Consequently we took up the calendar beginning with Order of Business No. 150. I think it was understood—at least it was understood by the Senator from Oregon—that the calendar would be called today beginning with Order of Business No. 1 and continuing to Order of Business No. 150.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama was not on the floor at the particular time referred to by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Alabama was advised that the procedure for today would be for the Senate to dispense with the calling of the calendar, and to take up a deficiency appropriation bill, and that thereafter the Senator from North Carolina would move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain bills which he was interested in having passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I would not agree to that procedure at all. I do not know why I should do so. A joint resolution making appropriations has just been filed; and it is open to serious consideration and debate because of the amendment attached thereto by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada. I would not agree to having the call of the calendar dispensed with and then having the Senate revert to a consideration of a few of the measures on the calendar, to accommodate a distinguished Senator, much as I should like to do so. The measures on the calendar are open to consideration by every Member of the Senate. I should object to the procedure suggested, unless opportunity for consideration of all the measures on the calendar is open to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to have the unanimous consent of the Senate for the consideration of four bills, to which I referred the other day. One of them relates to the power of the President to requisition property. Another provides relief for disbursing officers of the Army in cases of lost documents. Another one, in which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I are interested——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall object, as I stated, and for the reasons I stated. I shall not agree to permit one Senator to have a program of his own, grant unanimous consent to him, and overlook the other 95 Members of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should be willing to have an understanding that the Senate consider all the measures on the calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. McNARY. To that I agree.

The motion was agreed to.

TOLL BRIDGE AT ASTORIA, OREG.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read by its title.

The bill (H. R. 1114) to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg., was read twice by its title.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me make a brief observation and comment. The bill passed the House on Friday. On Monday a companion bill passed the Senate. The two bills are identical. In order to place the bill in such position that it may be engrossed and sent to the President for final action, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1114) to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

The bill (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent today. He has sent me a note asking me to request that this bill go over until the next call of the calendar, or some other day when he can be present, probably Monday. For that reason I shall have to object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 218) to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 220) to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such paymen'ts, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHEELER. I make the same request with respect to this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—EXPLANATION OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the statement will

be limited to 5 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, on April 8 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of petitions received from various localities endorsing Senate bill 860. In this tabulation, 10,000 petitions were listed as coming from Raymondville, Tex. My attention has been called to the fact that Raymondville is a city of less than 10,000 population. In explanation I wish to state that the communication regarding these petitions came from Raymondville and was signed by Milton E Cunningham, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Raymondville.

He was reporting as moderator of an organization known as the Lower Rio Grande Baptist Association, representing 10,000 Baptists which in conference at Mercedes unanimously voted approval of Senate bill 860. To conserve space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have heretofore refrained from asking consent to have inserted in the RECORD all the letters received on this subject, such as the letter from Milton E. Cunningham, and have not even asked to have all the names of petitioners inserted. Instead I have inserted only brief analyses giving the number of petitioners and names of places from which they were sent. Complete files containing letters, resolutions, names, and addresses from which these analyses were made are open to inspection by any Senator who may be interested.

I cannot overlook this opportunity, Mr. President, to make known that this garden spot of the world known as the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, of which Raymondville is but one of its many beautiful cities, has a total population of approximately 250,000 people. The whole magic valley is almost as one large city, connected with smooth, wide streets, bordered on either side by stately palm trees swaying in the gentle, temperate sea breezes. The whole gorgeous setting is interspersed with almost limitless acres of beautiful orange and citrus groves, which bear the finest fruits in the world. Naturally the favorite drink of the people in that land of paradise is Texas's delicious and refreshing orange and grapefruit juices.

While on the subject, Mr. President, I might explain how my attention was called to 10,000 petitions coming from a city of less than 10,000 population. It was an article published in a paper known as Tap and Tavern. This paper seems to be very alert and very diligently looking after the interests of the liquor industry, and seemed to be under the impression that it had uncovered a gross inconsistency in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since this organ of the liquor industry seems so interested in the matter, I believe it might be well to quote further from the letter of Milton E. Cunningham, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Raymondville, and moderator of the Lower Rio Grande Baptist Association, because it seems that this association really went further than merely to urge the enactment of Senate bill 860, which is the bill to abolish all liquor from Army reservations. Let me quote further from that letter, as follows:

> It is preposterous to think of rationing the actual necessities of life and permit the manufacture of alcohol that will sabotage our Army, Navy, Air Corps, and wreck the morale of our people as a whole. The powerful few engaged in this pernicious business deserve no special consideration. They have been given privileges not granted to any other business in these stressful days.

As previously stated, Mr. President, in order to conserve space, I have refrained from putting into the RECORD all the letters received on this subject, but since Tap and Tavern asked for it, here it is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

THADDEUS C. KNIGHT

The bill (S. 414) for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the said Thaddeus C. Knight a captain in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the same longevity and rank on both the relative and promotion lists as the said Thaddeus C. Knight would have attained had he not been separated from the service.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 403) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 439) for the relief of Perkin's Gins, formerly Perkin's Oil Co. of Memphis, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the report indicates that in 1940 the Attorney General expressed the view that this bill involves simply a question of legislative policy. However, he points out that if the bill were to pass, and if suit were permitted to be brought on the type of claim represented by it, there would remain some 220 contracts on which suit has not been brought. The claim dates back very many years and, of course, that is what is involved in the request to suspend the operation of the statute of limitations.

I objected to the bill when it was called on the calendar 2 or 3 weeks ago, but I have not since had an opportunity to study it to the extent which I should like. I think, Mr. President, we ought to bring the report of the Attorney General down to date, and not act on a report dated January 30, 1940.

That explains my reasons for objecting to consideration of the bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HOMER C. CHAPMAN

The bill (S. 617) for the relief of Homer C. Chapman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, while my attention was temporarily diverted, order No. 43, Senate bill 617, was called and action was taken upon it by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered and that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 617 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 675) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who is necessarily absent, I ask that the bill go over for today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, with respect to Order No. 67, Senate bill 675, as objection has been made the bill will have to go over, but I wish to serve notice that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar I expect to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 675.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of Calendar No. 75, Senate Joint Resolution 19; Calendar No. 76, Senate bill 168; Calendar No. 77, Senate bill 409; Calendar No. 80, Senate bill 670; Calendar No. 81, Senate bill 445, and Calendar No. 82, Senate bill 23, for the reasons stated on the last call of the calendar, concerning which Senators have been put on notice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution and bills will be passed over.

The joint resolution and bills passed over at the request of Mr. DANAHER are as follows:

> The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An

act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

The bill (S. 168) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States.

The bill (S. 409) authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 670) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States.

The bill (S. 445) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States.

The bill (S. 23) authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma subsequently said: Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that six bills reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs remain on the calendar. They have been postponed now for a few sessions, which is perfectly agreeable, but sometime soon I hope those bills may be reached so that they may be considered by the Senate on their merits. Similar bills heretofore have been passed by the Senate, some as many as three times, but, for reasons unknown, they have failed of passage in the other body. At some convenient time, perhaps some time next week, if agreeable, I hope to call them up and have them considered on their merits.

HOSPITALIZATION OF DEPENDENTS OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 785) to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that Calendar No. 111, House bill 1936, which is similar to the Senate bill, was, at the time of the last call of the calendar, substituted for the Senate bill, and amended. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of House bill 1936.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1936) to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1936) was read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 785 will be indefinitely postponed.

OPERATION OF PLANTS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on page 2, beginning with line 18, I move to amend by striking out sections 2 and 3.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this is a rather important measure. I doubt if it can properly be considered under the 5-minute rule, and therefore I suggest it go over for the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator from Oregon that it is an important measure. I am very anxious to secure action upon it, and I have been assured by the majority leader that it will have early consideration by the Senate. I hope the Senator from Oregon will consider the matter, because it shall be my purpose at the first opportunity to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I might be very agreeable to the provisions of the bill, although I am not very conversant with them. For my own part I shall be glad to assist the Senator in obtaining consideration of the bill some day next week. The Senate will be in session during a part of the week at least.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

SALE OF HORSE MEAT OR FOOD PRODUCTS THEREOF IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after 30 days after the date of enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to sell or offer for sale within the District of Columbia to any person any horse meat or food product thereof unless such meat or food product is plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be, or, in the case of any horse meat or food product thereof which is sold or offered for sale to any consumer at a hotel, restaurant, or similar establishment, unless such consumer is notified that the food which he receives contains horse meat or food products thereof.

SEC. 2. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation prescribed thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 205) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear and render judgment upon claims for damages resulting from the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 367) for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of services of merchant sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that for the present the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 22, 1943, it stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, May 3, 1943.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2238. An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; and

H. J. Res 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115 making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we are now confronted with the request of the able Senator from Arizona that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115. I am informed that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has an amendment which will necessarily require the suspension of paragraph 4 of rule XVI. It carries, as I understand, an appropriation of $3,500,000. I am not familiar with the amendment, but I have sufficient knowledge of it to believe that I favor its general objective. Some Members of the Senate are not familiar with the joint resolution at all; indeed, it has only been considered by the Appropriations Committee. In view of that circumstance, and as it is an appropriation measure which should be considered by the Senate with great care, I think it should go over today. I should not object to taking up the joint resolution on Monday when there will be a session of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I submitted a unanimous-consent request, being aware that the joint resolution was presented to the Senate only a little while ago, and that it was not entitled, under the rule, to be considered today. So it may go over a day. I had hoped that we might dispose of the joint resolution, because it contains items which are urgent, but, under the rule, it should go over until Monday, and I give notice that I will call it up on Monday.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate may be in session tomorrow, and the joint resolution could then come up in the regular order.

Mr. McNARY. I had not expected a session on Friday; I knew it would be necessary to hold one on Monday, and I thought it would accommodate the greater number of Senators to meet Monday and omit a session tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I think it necessary to have a session tomorrow because of the bill extending the Guffey Coal Act. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Arizona advises that it will be satisfactory to him to consider the appropriation measure on Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; I thank the Senator. Am I correct in understanding that there will be no session tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. That is not the understanding, for the chances are there will have to be a session tomorrow, because, as I have said, of the bill to extend the Guffey Coal Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that he expects to pass the Guffey Coal Act extension bill tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. The Committee on Interstate Commerce is meeting this afternoon at 2 o'clock. Of course, until that committee shall act, it will not be possible for the Senate to take any action; but it might be necessary to meet tomorrow if for no other purpose than to enable the committee to submit some kind of a report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My understanding is that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] proposes to submit an amendment, that hearings are necessary on the extension act, and that there would not be the remotest possibility of a report from the committee by tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I cannot answer that question, but I know there will be a committee meeting this afternoon at 2 o'clock to consider the matter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. The Guffey Coal Extension Act, as it is called, is an extension for 120 days and not an extension of the Act permanently. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if his amendment goes to the extension proposal or does it relate to the enactment of a new bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only time opportunity is afforded to amend the Guffey Coal Act is when it is proposed to extend it. It seems to me proper that before action is taken on the proposal to extend it, that an amendment to the Act should be considered. I have only one amendment, but there are two or three others. I understand there is now a question as to whether it was understood that nothing important would be taken up this week. I thought that was understood by many Members who have left the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator intimating that the Guffey Coal Act is important?

Mr. TAFT. I think a proposal to modify the Guffey Coal Act is, naturally, an important question. I do not know how its importance is modified by being extended for only 4 months.

Mr. McNARY. As to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, I wanted to know whether it would apply to the bill proposing to extend the Guffey Coal Act for 4 months, or whether it would carry over for a number of years. That was the reason for my inquiry.

With regard to the point as to there being an understanding concerning the business of the Senate, let me say there was some conversation to the effect that there would be but little business transacted this week, but there was no understanding to that effect, and there was nothing to embarrass the Senate. What I want to do is to act in accordance with our general understanding. I had thought, from a conversation over the telephone with the Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. RAYBURN] that the proposal would be here by 1 o'clock, and we might act on it today or decide not to act on it. In any event, I object to taking up the appropriation and joint resolution today or at any time before Monday.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Oregon, and to the Senate, that the bill proposing to extend the Guffey Coal Act came over from the other House this morning. When I heard that it had passed the House, I called a meeting of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee for 2 o'clock this afternoon. We may not be able to meet at 2 o'clock, but sometime this afternoon. The representatives of the coal miners have come to me this morning and said definitely they wanted to be heard on this proposed legislation. The policy of the committee has always been to give anybody who was interested a hearing upon any piece of legislation pending before the committee, and I told them, so far as I was concerned, I would give them a hearing. I did not expect the hearing to cover a long period of time, but that I would probably set it down for hearings, if the committee agreed, possibly tomorrow forenoon. What the action of the committee will be, I do not know, but I do want to advise the Senate what the situation is. Let me say to the Senator there is opposition.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the able Senator from Montana, would there be any objection to omitting a session tomorrow and taking up the Guffey Coal Extension Act on Monday next?

Mr. WHEELER. Not the slightest, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GUFFEY. I think the act will expire in the meantime.

Mr. WHEELER. It will expire Monday, I understand.

Mr. GUFFEY. It will expire on the 25th, which will be Sunday.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the able acting leader, I call attention to the fact that tomorrow will be Good Friday. That is the one day in the year when all the Christian world pauses in reflection on the greatest sacrifice ever made in the many centuries of history. It is the day around which all Christianity centers. If the Senate were meeting every day, and the occasion demanded a session every day, perhaps the question would not be raised so strenuously, but the real fact of the matter is that the Senate adjourns over Friday week after week and meets only about twice every week. It seems to some of us that on this one day, the outstanding day in the Christian world, the Senate of the United States, not being called upon to meet every day, could indeed with propriety adjourn over until next week and not meet tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I share with him the sentiments and the feelings which he

has expressed. However, the Senate finds itself in this situation: The House has passed the bill to which attention has been called, and it was messaged over from the House just a few moments ago. Of course, the bill will have to be considered by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. The author of the existing act, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], is of the opinion that the act will very likely die on Sunday unless it shall be extended. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the Senate very likely will have some other business today, and that we will proceed a little while, and if there is any way of avoiding a session tomorrow, an effort will be made to that end.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the position taken by the acting leader, I respectfully suggest that instead of meeting tomorrow, we meet Saturday, even at an early hour. If it is merely a question of the committee reporting the particular bill under discussion, I call attention to the fact that very frequently by unanimous consent bills are reported without the Senate actually being in session.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to confer with the Senator from Nevada before the Senate shall adjourn today.

EXECUTION OF TREATIES WITH PANAMA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14, relating to the fulfillment of certain obligations under treaties with Panama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Let the joint resolution be stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say, in explanation, that the House joint resolution is a measure relating to the adjustment of certain matters with the Republic of Panama. At the last session of Congress the Senate passed a measure in the identical form in which this joint resolution is now presented, but it was not passed by the House. At the present session the House has passed the joint resolution, and it is now in the Senate. My request for immediate consideration is predicated upon the fact that the national Congress of the Republic of Panama is now in session, and will adjourn on the 30th day of April, and it is desirable that before its adjournment the Congress of Panama shall have an opportunity to pass upon certain executive matters connected with our own Government in connection with the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall that a similar measure was before the Senate in December 1942 and it was stubbornly contested, 29 votes being cast against it, and I think 40 for it. That indicates to me that there is some objection to the joint resolution, too much objection, indeed, to justify permitting it to go through by unanimous consent. Therefore I shall have to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in connection with the matter to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has referred, I present minority views, as expressed by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on House Joint Resolution 14, authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1935 with Panama, and other commitments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed as part 2 of Report No. 201.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 675, Order of Business No. 67.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 675) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Green	Moore
Brewster	Guffey	Reynolds
Burton	Hawkes	Taft
Bushfield	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Holman	Tydings
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Chavez	Langer	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Walsh
Connally	McCarran	Wheeler
Danaher	McFarland	Wherry
Davis	McNary	Wiley
Ferguson	Maloney	Wilson
Gerry	Maybank	
Gillette	Mead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair.) Forty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to interrupt the call of the roll to make a brief statement, and to submit a request to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It having been determined that a quorum is not present, the Senate cannot transact any business. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. A motion to vacate the order for a call of the roll is always in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It having been determined that a quorum of Senators is not present, and the result of the call of the roll having been announced, such a motion is not in order.

Mr. McNARY. Has such an announcement been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. BALL, Mr. BONE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILLIS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators having answered to their names, a qorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 675.

Mr. VANDENBERG. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand the motion is not debatable. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to present a suggestion to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no interest one way or the other in the pending bill. The able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has. He is unable to be present today for reasons beyond his own control. My sole purpose in objecting to the motion is to protect his rights. I am sure that upon reflection the able Senator from Colorado, who is one of the most considerate Members of the Senate, will agree that if it satisfies the rest of us to take up this bill the first time the Senator from West Virginia is on the floor, which will be the first of next week, he will be willing to withdraw his motion to proceed to its consideration at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator's surmise is correct. After the nice statement he made about me, I could not do anything else very well. However, I do not want to be confronted with an objection, when I do move to have the Senate consider the bill, that there is some sort of an agreement that the bill is more or less controversial in nature and that therefore

its consideration by the Senate should be deferred.

With the understanding that no such allegation will be made, I am very glad to defer to the request of the Senator from Michigan and to wait until some time when the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is present. I understand that he will be present on Monday. Therefore, I withdraw my request for present consideration of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me state that when consideration of the bill was formerly requested, I objected because of the absence of the Senator from West Virginia. I can assure the Senator from Colorado that there is no conspiracy to prevent the bill being considered. The Senator from West Virginia was called away because of matters beyond his control. When he is present, I shall have no objection to consideration of the bill.

THE NEGRO IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, 13,000,000 American Negroes are doing their part in our world-wide struggle against fascism. They are active in every sphere of the war effort. They realize that every gain they have won since the Civil War is at stake.

A Hitler victory would mean reenslavement of American Negroes. It would mean the extinction of Negro organizations. It would mean the end of labor unions which number half a million Negroes among their members. It would mean systematic terrorism and wholesale massacres like those the Nazis perpetrate on the Jews of Poland.

It is because of their understanding of the consequences of a Hitler victory that American Negroes are giving wholehearted support to the war effort. They are doing this despite the fact that discrimination still exists, because they are aware that only through active support of the war effort can they retain their present opportunity to work for a larger share of the benefits of our American democracy.

As a matter of fact, great improvement in the status of the American Negro has taken place during the period of our defense program and the war effort. Spurred on by President Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802, reaffirming the national nondiscrimination policy with regard to employment of Negroes, considerable progress has been made in the integration of Negro manpower into war industries. In aircraft plants, ordnance factories, shipyards, and in all other phases of war production, Negroes, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers—despite certain employment barriers—are helping us to win the battle of production. At the close of 1942 fully 1,000,000 Negro Americans were working in the plants which are producing the guns and the planes and the tanks which are making America truly an arsenal of the democracies.

Included among these millions of Negro war workers are an increasing number of Negro women war workers. A recent survey by the War Manpower Commission in 64 important war plants in 18 States revealed Negro women working as electricians, welders, sheetmetal workers, machine-tool operators, drill-press operators, and in a variety of other skilled and semiskilled capacities.

These women are proving their worth, too. In Baltimore one war plant announced that a new Negro woman employee had set a record in assembling gun parts. Negro women compose the majority of a crew in a large ordnance plant in Ohio which established a record of crating 3,000 cases of explosives in a single day, and then broke its own record last month by crating 4,200 cases in a single day.

In our armed forces Negroes have performed outstanding feats of heroism and are serving in all branches of the Army. On February 3, 1943, the Navy Department awarded the Navy and Marine Corps medal to Elvin Bell, a 20-year-old Negro orphan youth from Jamaica, N. Y. His citation for distinguished heroism declared:

> His courageous initiative and utter disregard for his own safety were in keeping with the highest tradition of the United States naval service.

This young Negro mess attendant worked tirelessly on a repair crew during the time that the aircraft carrier Lexington was sinking in flames. He volunteered to rescue three men trapped below the flames, going through long passageways down several flights of steel steps into the vast and heated hold. He came back bringing three trapped white sailors with him.

One of the first American bluejackets to distinguish himself at Pearl Harbor was Dorie Miller, a 23-year-old American Negro from Waco, Tex. Miller manned a machine gun for the first time in his life, and brought down four Jap planes before he was bombed and burned on the deck of his ship. He was awarded the Navy Cross by President Roosevelt.

In the Asiatic theater recently Pvt. Mack B. Anderson, another Texan, won the Silver Star combat decoration for bravery in action. When Japanese Zero fighters attacked the airfield where he was stationed, Private Anderson manned a machine gun until it went out of action, and then centered the Japanese attack on himself by continually firing his automatic pistol at the attacking planes.

The broad picture of Negro contribution to the strength of our Army is strikingly impressive. Although Negroes constitute only 9.8 percent of the total United States population, Negro selectees and volunteers constituted 10.1 percent of all persons inducted into the United States Army by selective service by October 1, 1942. Negro personnel in the Army totaled more than 450,000 at the end of February. More than 60,000 of those Negro Americans were on active duty outside the continental United States. Approximately 10,000 were stationed in north Africa with General Eisenhower. More than 25,000 were with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the far Pacific. The participation of Negro troops in first American offensive retaliations in the New Guinea area was recently praised by General MacArthur.

Our country has had long experience with the valor of Negro soldiers and sailors. Their contributions to our armed efforts date back to before the Revolutionary War. In the Boston Massacre of 1770, a Negro, Crispus Attucks, was in the leadership of the protest and was killed in that conflict, along with three of his companions, fighting for the cause which triumphed in 1776. At the Battle of Bunker Hill, Peter Salem, a former slave, fired the first shot, killing the English Major Pitcairn. For this act he was given a contribution from the Army and was presented to General Washington. More than 6,000 colored soldiers fought with the Continental Army. A former slave, Mark Starlin, was praised for his service as a commander on an American warship, the *Patriot*.

In the War of 1812 almost one-seventh of the sailors were Negroes. In one of the chief incidents which precipitated the War of 1812, the American frigate *Chesapeake* was seized, and four men were taken off. Three of them were colored. Two battalions of Negro troops served with Andrew Jackson at New Orleans and won his high praise for their efforts. Commodore Perry said of his Negro sailors that while "America has such tars, she has little to fear from the tyrants of the ocean."

During the Civil War more than 200,000 Negro soldiers fought for their freedom. They were not granted equal pay with white soldiers, and other discriminations against them existed, although 75 Negroes served as commissioned officers. They made a major contribution to the winning of the war. Lincoln said:

> Take from us and give to the enemy the hundred and thirty, forty, fifty thousand colored persons now serving us as soldiers, seamen, and laborers, and we cannot longer maintain the contest.

In the Spanish-American War a Negro regiment from North Carolina was commanded by Col. James H. Young, a Negro, and the Eighth Illinois Regiment was commanded by Col. John R. Marshall, a Negro. The Tenth—Negro—Cavalry distinguished itself by coming to the rescue of Theodore Roosevelt and his Rough Riders in the Battle of San Juan Hill. During the World War 400,000 Negro soldiers were recruited, and the service of Negro combat troops was paid high tribute by General Pershing, who said:

> I cannot commend too highly the spirit shown among colored combat troops, who exhibit fine capacity for quick training and eagerness for the most dangerous service.

Considerable criticism, however, was made of their treatment by the armed forces during the First World War. Their leaders estimated that three-fourths of the 200,000 sent to France were used only as stevedores and laborers. In many instances their officers were unsympathetic, and in some cases even prejudiced. In many branches of the service in World War No. 1 there were no Negroes.

Tremendous strides have been made during the present war in giving Negroes full opportunity in every branch of our

armed forces. Last year, for example, the Navy opened its ranks to Negroes for service other than that as mess attendants, to which they had been limited in recent years. Thousands of Negroes are being trained at Camp Robert Smalls—a camp named for a Negro Civil War hero—at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station. About 450 Negro bluejackets a month are entering 2 Navy service schools for advanced training as radiomen, signalmen, aviation mechanics, gunners' mates, yeomen, quartermasters, cooks, and bakers.

In the Army large numbers of Negroes are being trained as officers, and a policy of training both Negro and white officers at the same school has established a new landmark of democratic progress. Negroes are also being admitted to the WAAC's, and 10 percent of the first group of WAAC officer candidates were Negro women. Unfortunately, the Navy has not yet permitted the enlistment of Negro women as WAVES, but it is to be hoped that this will be one of the next steps.

Among the outstanding Negro officers in our Army today are Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis and his son, Lt. Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., a West Point graduate and one of the commanding officers of the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron at Tuskegee, Ala. Another outstanding officer is Col. Chauncey W. Hooper, who commands a crack Negro antiaircraft unit in the Hawaiian Islands. At Fort Huachuca, Ariz., is stationed the largest all-Negro medical unit, operated under the direction of one of Chicago's most eminent physicians, Col. Midian O. Bousfield. Second in command to Colonel Bousfield is Maj. D. Haven Hinkson, who formerly was the first Negro commanding officer of the station hospital at Tuskegee, Ala.

The present war has also seen the admission of Negroes to the Air Force for the first time. The training program for Negro combat flyers is now being expanded to include the formation of a new group composed of one squadron now being trained and two new ones now in the process of organization. Negroes are already being trained throughout virtually the entire technical training command of the Air Force, as well as at the Air Force Officers' Training School at Miami, Fla.

Mr. President, at this juncture I should like to present a letter written by Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson with regard to the question of opportunity for Negroes in the Air Force. The letter was written on March 23, 1943, to Mr. Wilbur La Roe, chairman of the Washington Federation of Churches' Committee on Civic Affairs. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LA ROE: I have your letter of March 13, in which you request replies to a number of questions on the matter of alleged discrimination against Negroes in the Army Air Forces.

I appreciate your sincere interest in the welfare of Negroes in the Air Force, as well as the success of the Air Force as a whole.

Your questions are answered as follows:

1. It is the policy of the Army, as required by the Selective Training and Service Act, to have a proportion of Negroes in the Army in proportion to the Negro population of the country. The present ratio of induction is 10.6 percent and is based on registration figures.

2. Negro organizations are being established in each major branch of the service, combatant as well as noncombatant. Assignment to the Air and Ground Forces must be in the same proportion as stated above.

3. The same modern facilities have been provided at the Tuskegee Air Force Flying School for the training of Negro pilots as are provided at the schools which train white pilots. At the Officers' Candidate School and the technical schools Negroes attend the same schools as white candidates.

4. The Army follows the general principle that it can attain its maximum strength only if its personnel is properly placed in accordance with the capabilities of individuals. All enlisted men on their entry into the service are graded by the Army general classification test and the mechanical aptitude test. Because of the proportionately larger number of highly technical duties required of enlisted men in the Air Force, War Department policy provides that 55 percent of them qualify by passing the general classification test with a grade of 100 or better. The remaining 45 percent assigned to the Air Forces who do not meet this qualification are assigned to comparatively unskilled jobs. Experience to date shows that while about 47 percent of all white enlisted men meet this qualification, the same minimum standard is met by less than 10 percent of the Negroes inducted. As a consequence, in order to absorb the same proportion of Negroes as exists in the total population, a small percentage of them who enter the Air Corps are qualified for entrance into the technical schools, and the large majority must be assigned to unskilled tasks.

5. It is true that Negroes are so far being given the opportunity for training on single engine pursuit ships. It was believed wise to start by training a fighter group, where only one airman per plane is involved, namely the pilot. To train a heavy bomber group, it is necessary to train in addition to the pilot, a navigator, a bombardier, an aerial gunner, a radio operator, an additional mechanic and several other technicians. Because of the technical and other features present in flying, it was decided to proceed toward the formation of more complicated units after having gained experience with the simpler units.

6. While white officers have charge of the training at Tuskegee, Negroes will be given command duties as soon as they qualify for them. Examples are as follows: One fighter squadron, that has been fully trained, is completely officered by Negroes; Negroes command some of the headquarters squadrons and aviation squadrons (separate) at the school; and there are administrative officers who have definite administrative responsibilities. As Negro officers become qualified, they will be advanced according to their ability.

7. There is one officers' mess at Tuskegee to which all officers are eligible. However, it is customary for the white officers, when they do not eat at home, to use the facilities that are provided by the post exchange. These facilities are available to all the military personnel on duty at the post.

8. The reason for the establishment of aviation squadrons (separate) are given in paragraph 4. They provide a place for men in the Air Forces who do not have the qualifications for more technical work. The duties they perform are to a large extent labor and housekeeping jobs that have to be done at every Air Force base. While there are no white units actually named "Aviation Squadron (separate)" there are many white headquarters squadrons which perform the same type of duties at Air Force installations.

9. A sufficient number of qualified Negro applicants to be weather officers have been secured and are in training to support the Negro fighter group now in training. When new Negro units are organized there will be opportunity for additional weather officers.

10. No Negroes qualified to be service pilots have yet been used by the Air Forces. To date there have been very few applicants for this duty, but this number will increase as individuals who are now attending school become qualified. The use of qualified Negro service pilots is now under study.

11. Until February 1, of this year, Negro medical officers at Tuskegee were not in residence at the school of aviation medicine at Randolph Field; but since that date, Negro medical officers have been assigned to residence study there. This schooling was originally covered by extension courses and by commutation to Maxwell Field, as a comparatively small number were involved. When this matter was brought to the attention of the air force headquarters, the change was made in order that Negro medical officers could have the same opportunity as the white medical officers.

12. The air forces is now bringing the Negro fighter group to strength, including the ground crew personnel, and will train them to carry out their combat mission. The question of training additional units, including a bomber group, is now under study. The air forces will continue to use aviation squadrons (separate). These squadrons will be constantly screened to secure personnel for technical training. The units above described will not fill the complement of Negro personnel allotted to the air forces. In addition to the units being supplied to the air forces by the arms and services, others are being organized into air base security battalions, which are trained by the ground forces. These battalions have the important tactical duty of guarding air bases. They will perform this duty not only in continental United States, but also in overseas theaters.

13. You may be assured that the War Department will exert every effort to safeguard the interests of white and Negro personnel alike to the end that full use will be made of the capabilities of each individual in furtherance of our war effort.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Continuing, let me say that the Negroes not only are taking advantage of their new opportunities, but they are winning new friends by the high caliber of their service.

Mr. President, before concluding this brief account of the Negro's contribution to our war effort, I should like to refer to the work of the Negro on the all-important home front. Here, as on the battle front and the production front, there has been enthusiastic Negro participation.

Throughout the country Negroes have responded to the call for volunteers by the Office of Civilian Defense. Typical of this response are the activities of Negro civilian defense workers right here in the Nation's Capital. Fifteen of the 66 civilian defense areas in the District of Columbia are directed by Negro deputy wardens. Negro inspectors serve in air raid warden control centers, in the air raid headquarters, and on the staff of the chief air raid warden. Negro volunteers are well represented in the auxiliary fire and police

forces, medical services, transportation units, first aid, and public works projects.

In carrying out this volunteer work, these American citizens are doing more than preparing our Capital against enemy attack. They are guarding the American people from a more vicious attack—that of enemy propaganda. As O. C. D. Director James M. Landis declared recently:

> Every time an American works side by side with another American of another race or color he gives the lie to Hitler's racial nonsense. This war will be lost if it is won by or for one creed, one race, one color. If it is a war for democratic ideals and democratic freedoms, it must be waged in this united manner both abroad and at home.

American Negroes realize this and their activities show it in every field of war endeavor. Despite the fact that employment barriers have prevented many of them from obtaining war jobs and increasing their incomes, Negroes have answered every call for bond purchases. In the past 6 months Negroes in Chicago, for example, have purchased more than $3,500,000 in War bonds at special rallies. This did not include the regular bond purchases by Negro workers through monthly pay-roll plans. In New York City they have approached and I believe exceeded this splendid record.

In presenting a few of the contributions of Negro Americans in our war effort, I wish to emphasize the fact that these contributions are based on the understanding of Negroes of their stake in the war effort. They are fighting hard and working hard to prevent Hitler domination of America, because they know what a catastrophe that would be for them and their fellow Americans. In the process of making their great contribution they are winning new opportunities for participating in American economic life which can and should be expanded in the all out mobilization of manpower of all creeds and colors in our war effort.

In reaffirming the Government's nondiscrimination policy, President Roosevelt declared:

> The democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders.

Under the courageous leadership of President Roosevelt opportunities are being made for Negro Americans to give that help and support. They are responding on the battlefield, in the production lines, and on the home front with outstanding effort, devotion, and achievement.

OBLIGATIONS OF A LEGISLATOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments on the subject of the obligations of a legislator. I do this at this time because of considerable correspondence which has come to my office. The people back home, of course, are very busy with their own problems on the farms, in the manufacturing plants, and in their businesses. They are concerned over their boys on the 27 fronts on which we are engaged. They are concerned over the very many intimate problems which they individually and collectively confront. Consequently it is very apparent that at times they become confused about the functions of a legislator.

There are many aspects to the obligations of a legislator, the first of which in war must be obviously to do everything in his power to win as complete and as expeditious a victory and as just and lasting a peace as is possible.

This, however, does not limit the legislative branch merely to standing by the side of the road while the Commander in Chief functions in his executive capacity. The legislative branch has a definite obligation to continue, in wartime as in peacetime, as the representatives of the people.

This does not mean that the Congress should encroach on the constitutional authority and power of the Executive, but it does mean that Congress has not only a right, but an obligation, to function as a channel of the expression and the will of the people so that Congress may serve to formulate and crystallize the opinions of the people, and subsequently translate those opinions into legislation where necessary and recommendations where the matter comes within the province of the executive branch.

In considering the obligation of a United States Senator at this time, each of us must bear in mind that while this is a government of, by, and for the people, it is a government set up in a peculiar manner; it is a republic, a representative republic, and a Senator is a representative of the people. This Nation is not a democracy, it is a republic. The people speak through their representatives; and while under the basic law—the Constitution—the Commander in Chief has control of the Army and the Navy and is the executive head, in waging a war, a Senator has a peculiar responsibility. He is not simply a legislator. He is the people's representative, and must voice the hopes, ambitions, and desires of the people in the forum provided for that purpose, which is this Chamber. How far should a Senator of the United States go in expressing ideas relative to the conduct of the war on the battle front, on the psychological front, on the home front, and on the production front? He must proceed cautiously, yet courageously, recognizing that he, too, is a soldier in the service of the Republic, handling the ammunition—or the dynamite—of ideas. Ideas are indeed powerful weapons. Knute Rockne, the great coach of Notre Dame, said, "The idea is the thing." Long before that someone said "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." As a nation thinketh in its heart, so is it. We, as legislators, are feeding that ammunition to the ranks, for better or for woe.

Fighting a war realistically means that every legitimate and honorable weapon should be used to win through to victory. When one of those weapons consists in taking action which will tend toward liberation of a great people who are enslaved by our enemy, there should be no hesitancy in using such a weapon.

In looking toward victory we must not overlook an ally which has fought our common enemy, Japan, for a generation. I mean Korea. She is a nation of 23,000,000 fanatical enemies of Japan. The provisional capital of Korea is in China, at Chungking. Here Korea has an army of seasoned troops. This is the headquarters of the Korean independence movement, the center for Koreans who are resourceful and courageous, daring to do anything for liberty.

Mr. President, ordinarily the question of recognizing a people or recognizing a portion of a country which is under subjection to another country would be a matter for the State Department. I am saying that the question of the larger strategy is for the Congress of the United States to think through and also to talk through.

In Washington there is a Korean Commission. Its program is to seek admittance to the United Nations, obtain military supplies and aid under the lend-lease agreements, and to be recognized by this country as the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea. Koreans are ready to fight and die for their independence.

Last Friday we heard a speech by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] in which he stressed the importance of recognizing, first, that we have a first-class war on our hands in the East, and second, the need of getting adequate supplies, men, and matériel to all the fronts on which we are engaged—in Alaska, in Australia, in the islands of the southeast, and in China.

To those who plan the war, the Senator from Kentucky said in substance, speaking of what some call the planners' strategy, do not ignore the suggestions and wants of our generals and our men who are on the fighting fronts. They know whereof they are talking, better than those who sit in Washington.

There can be no question about that. There is an old saying that those who are on the ground know the facts. I do not intend to discuss that issue, but I think it is relevant to what I am discussing.

Mr. President, those who are not in the "planning groove" may, nevertheless, have ideas worthy of adoption in this battle for the liberation of all peoples who are now competent to rule themselves. An example of such an idea is the utilization of the help of other peoples, such as the Koreans, who are fit to rule themselves.

We followed such a policy in the Spanish-American War. We cooperated with the Cubans. We followed the same policy in the Philippines. In Korea there are 23,000,000 people, among them many brilliant minds, with a background of 4,000 years of history. What are we doing to utilize that striking force? We know that the problem in this war is transportation. We could use some of the bottoms which we are employing to transport men in the transportation of

munitions, and we could utilize manpower wherever it is available. A vast reservoir of manpower, fanatical in its hatred for the Japanese in Asia, and for Hitler in Europe, already exists. Mr. President, if we could utilize it we would be using horse sense, common sense, and, incidentally, we might save thousands, and even hundreds of thousands, of our own men.

I do not need to go into the matter of what the submarine has been doing. It is now becoming common knowledge. In the closing months of last year a million tons a month in shipping were lost, together with the production and matériel in those holds. In the subsequent months, January, February, and March of this year, the total has gone up so much that great minds are now questioning our ability to transport the men whom the Army and the planners say we can transport. That goes back to the question of how large an Army we should raise, and whether we should sap other parts of our economy in order to build up an Army to be maintained on the continent of America.

KOREA SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED

Mr. President, the world looks to us with hope and expectation. It is a friendly look. In one part of Mr. Willkie's book, One World, he graphically pictures how all the oppressed peoples of the earth look to America to save them. It is a friendly look, I say. Why? Because this Nation has pioneered great constructive—not destructive—works, deeds, and thoughts throughout the world. It has sent forth great men who have performed great, constructive deeds; and those men have been the exponents of great, hopeful, living, dynamic ideas. So the world looks hopefully toward America.

We have no sinister purpose in this war. We are the real champions of personal and national liberty.

We know that there is no infallibility in war planners, any more than there has been in our peacetime planners. No human being is infallible.

Right public opinion, based on realism and idealism, is imperatively necessary in meeting the problems of this hour. Our first problem is to win the war.

In Korea there is another front, where 23,000,000 souls are longing to strike for freedom, where we can do a tremendous job for ourselves and advance the cause of freedom. It might be well for us to pause a moment and ask ourselves something about Korea and its people, 23,000,000 of them, more people than live in California, Texas, and New York. They are the only people who ever defeated Japan. Many wars have been fought between the Koreans and the Japanese. It was in 1592 that the Korean Admiral Yi Soon-Sin invented ironclad warships and annihilated the Japanese invading fleet.

After this defeat Korea remained at peace for 300 years. On February 23, 1904 Japan forced a treaty upon Korea. In that treaty Japan guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean Empire and pledged to evacuate her troops from Korea as soon as the war with Russia was over.

After the Russians were defeated, Japan violated her treaty, seized Korea, and made her a puppet state. An appeal by Korea to the powers of the world received no response, and in 1910 Japan annexed Korea—took it over, lock, stock and barrel. This was the beginning of Japan's victorious march toward a Japanese owned and dominated Asia. The seizure of Korea gave Japan the entering wedge to the mainland of Asia. From then on, Korea has lived under a Japanese gestapo. Under Japanese rule freedom disappeared.

The Japanese took over the economic life of Korea, monopolized all the industries, fisheries, and commerce and took nearly three-fourths of the Korean land. The harvests which have been raised by the Korean farmers have been taken over and exported to Japan, and the Koreans are rationed on the stale, left-over grains, or inferior millet and rice. This action truly interprets what the Japanese mean by Asiatic coprosperity. We had a sample yesterday in a press release of the kind of people we are dealing with when we confront the Japanese. They violated the military code of the nations; they were incapable of recognizing the bravery of our flyers who wore the uniform of the United States and who were proceeding according to the military code; but tried them and shot them—not in heat or passion but months after our men had performed their valiant deed. Well, in 1905–10 the Japanese subjugated more than 23,000,000 people of Korea, who feel today as we feel about the Japs.

I ask you, Mr. President, are we going to lose the cooperation and assistance of 23,000,000 Koreans or are we going to avail ourselves of the opportunity their friendship and services afford? The Koreans have never recognized the right of Japan to rule Korea. They are ready to fight; in fact, they have been fighting all these years. The time has come for us to say, "Korea, you shall be free again." The time has come for us to recognize the importance to us of a free Korea. The time has come for us to recognize the importance to us of a are fighting the same enemy, having in mind the accomplishment of the same purpose—the defeat of Japan.

Japan has used Korea as a military base for her Asiatic expansion. Make Korea free and never again will Japan have an opportunity to repeat her dastardly deed.

Mr. President, this war has opened the eyes of America to the character of the Japanese. The incident which was revealed yesterday by wire and through the press has indelibly impressed upon the minds of the people of America the fact that we must utilize every legitimate instrumentality which exists on the globe in order to bring about the defeat of the Axis. Prior to Pearl Harbor we were asleep. We must sleep no longer. It has been estimated that there are in Manchuria, Siberia, and other portions of China about 2,000,000 Koreans who are ready to fight. The 23,000,000 in Korea are eternal enemies of the Japanese. If given an opportunity, they will rise and deal a deadly blow at their ancient foe. We must accept Korea as a fighting ally. To do so would be not only strategically wise but would be common sense.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] said about the fight in the Pacific area, we must be prepared to take the initiative. How better follow that course than to ally 23,000,000 Koreans with our cause, especially when our cause is just and we want to bring liberty and democratic values to a people who had liberty for over 40 centuries before Japan enslaved them.

The Koreans are asking for a chance to fight for freedom. Their enemy is our enemy; their objective is liberty; our objective is to preserve our liberty, and aid all liberty-loving people of the earth. We are partners in arms. We both oppose the ravisher of international agreements, the violator of the military code, and, I may say parenthetically, there is no difference between what the Japanese did to our boys, when in cold blood, after they had been captured, they killed the men who flew to bomb Tokyo, and what they did when, without declaring war, they pounced upon Pearl Harbor. These people know no law but what is decreed by their war lords. We must be awake to the fact that we are not simply fighting a people; we are fighting an idea—an idea that would turn back the clock of civilization a thousand years, subjugate the world, and make America, and other nations, slaves of the Japanese. We must join hands with Korea and march together to victory.

Mr. President, a few more remarks about the Korean people and I shall be through. The record of the struggles of the Korean people for liberty is one of extraordinary heroism and dauntless determination. It began 50 years ago when they first sensed Japan's intention to enslave and exploit them. It has continued to the present day; it will continue tomorrow and every day of the future until they have obtained their freedom.

Ah, they are calling to us, Mr. President; they are reaching toward America, stretching out their arms, and, what is more, they are reaching out with their hearts and their minds and saying, "Help us."

I do not know much about the provisional government that has been spoken of. It was born in the blood of Korean patriots nearly a quarter of a century ago. It has endured ever since, because the flame of liberty never dies; the martyrdom of thousands of Korean men and women, at the cruel hands of their Japanese masters, is a beacon which can never be extinguished. Korea was a land of liberty and plenty, with but one neighbor ever to disturb her peace, and, as I have said, that neighbor was Japan.

Geographically and strategically Korea was the sentinel of Asia. The savage Japanese began an invasion not once but many times, and every time it was the

Koreans who bore the brunt of the attacks and were able to beat the would-be conqueror back into his islands. The Koreans have a love for their native land which is exceeded only by their hatred of the foe who finally succeeded in desecrating their dear land. Against him the patriotic Korean has sworn eternal vengeance.

Mr. President, I desire to bring a little history into this picture at this time, because I think it is very important. The American Government has an inescapable obligation to the people of Korea, and this body, the Senate, shares that obligation. We were the first western power to cause Korea, then known as the Hermit Kingdom, to break with the past and forsake her self-imposed isolation of centuries. With a visiting admiral and gunboats we persuaded Korea in 1882 to relinquish her faith in isolation and place her trust in the sanctity of a treaty. That treaty was ratified by this body, the United States Senate, on January 9, 1883, and proclaimed by President Arthur on June 4, 1883. It would seem that that was an unhappy day for Korea in the light of what followed and what is happening today. The first paragraph of that treaty, which, incidentally, has never been abrogated, provides:

> If other powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either government, the other will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case to bring about an amicable arrangement.

Mr. President, that treaty has been invoked on the basis of that particular clause. It has been invoked by the Koreans and has been acted upon once by our State Department. This happened in the days when treaties were considered sacred, not since the days of the Axis regime, when treaties are considered merely scraps of paper.

Our State Department sent a peremptory warning to Japan, which then was dealing unjustly and oppressively with Korea, and Japan heeded that warning. The action, need I say, was taken at a time before we began to coddle and nurture the Japanese, long years before the viper was to turn upon and strike us.

During the interval between the time when this incident took place and Pearl Harbor, we fed into Japan thousands upon thousands of tons of scrap iron and war material, material which is now destroying our own boys in the Pacific. But nurture and coddle the Japanese we did, and we are paying for it today with the blood of our sons. It was our flaunting the Korean-American treaty that permitted Japan to occupy and enslave Korea in 1905 and 1910.

Thus perished an independent Korea, with a people whose history reaches back, not 400 years as does ours, but 4,000 years. And today we talk of the "four freedoms."

In this manner began America's fatal policy of friendship toward a nation which knows not the meaning of the word save as a mask for treachery. We have been both blind and unhearing. We have not listened to the warnings of our Korean friends when they have told us of Japan's ultimate war aims, and we know the history. We know how a few years ago, through the channel of a Korean, Japan's war aims were disclosed to the world, and in 1939 and 1940 those war aims were presented to the Committee on Naval Affairs and other committees of the Senate, and then hushed up. Our blindness continued after the last war when we allowed the Japanese to obtain countless invaluable aerial and naval footholds throughout the Pacific. And we saw not the future when we agreed, as we did in 1921, to scrap American warships and to enter into a ratio that kept our Navy weak and left Japan unchecked to build its navy secretly.

In 40 years there was but one Secretary of State in American history who recognized the character of the Japanese people, and that was the present Secretary of War, then Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson. At this time I pay homage to his wisdom and foresight. He was right, but we failed.

I have sufficient faith in the American people and their sense of justice and fairness to know that, once they are familiar with the picture, they will insist that in this war we utilize every instrumentality that is just and honorable, to the end that we may win through to victory, and not only preserve our own liberty, but give back to the ancient Korean people, 23,000,000 of them, the liberty which our present foe, the Japanese, took from them in 1910.

Korea shall live again, as a free nation, among the nations of earth!

Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a joint resolution, which I request to have appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) to provide for the recognition by the United States Government of a provisional government of the Republic of Korea, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the Government of the United States recognize a provisional government of the Republic of Korea.

TWENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDATION OF THE TURKISH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, tomorrow will be the twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Turkish National Assembly.

Twenty-four years ago today, representatives from nearly every part of Turkey came to Ankara at the invitation of the late great Turkish leader, Kemal Ataturk, and laid the foundations of a new Turkey—the young, vigorous, and progressive Turkey of today.

In the years that followed, the National Assembly, under the leadership of Ataturk, effected a veritable social revolution by sweeping away antiquated institutions, customs, and habits, and adopting some of the best western methods and ideas. And this social revolution, as a distinguished American observer pointed out—this remarkable revolution—was brought about without Fascist badges or uniforms or mass hysteria. It was achieved without attacking any other country.

Thus Turkey today, under the leadership of President Ismet Inonu, the worthy successor of Kemal Ataturk, is a true national state, throbbing with life and energy.

Mr. Wendell Willkie, who last year included Turkey in his round-the-world tour, writes, thus of modern Turkey in his popular new book One World:

> One's feeling that the Middle East is stirring and changing finds conviction in Turkey. * * * Turkey is a new republic; it celebrated its nineteenth birthday last fall. * * * In spite of being young * * * and comparatively small, Turkey looked good to me. It looked good because it was quite clearly determined to defend its neutrality with every resource at its command. It looked good because it had set its face toward the modern world and was building hard and fast. It looked good because I saw a great many tough and honest faces, some in uniforms and some not, on people who, quite obviously, had a future to fight for. Finally, it looked good to me because I thought I saw in Turkey a nation which had found itself.

Thus spoke Mr. Willkie of the new Turkish Republic, which rose phoenix-like from the ashes of the old Ottoman Empire.

Turkey today hopes to remain at peace and continue its national policy of reconstruction and progress. But Turkey stands astride the route to the oil riches of the Middle East; in fact, it is the key to three continents. Therefore, oil-hungry Hitler and deflated Mussolini have been casting covetous eyes in Turkey's direction. But Turkey's astute leaders, President Ismet Inonu, Prime Minister Sukru Saracoglu, Foreign Minister Numan Menemencioglu, and the marshal of Turkey, Fevzi Cakmak, have alertly kept the Turkish Army mobilized. The Turkish marshal's armies now stand guard along that short frontier beyond which the Germans and Bulgarians have their forces. Small but efficient air and naval forces support the Turkish land armies. Both Great Britain and the United States have been helping to strengthen those services, and in general to bolster Turkish defenses.

Turkish military observers recently visited Allied fronts and exchanged opinions with American and British military commanders. A Turkish mission under Gen. Salih Omurtak, composed of 12 prominent military and political figures, recently conferred with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and other high American and British officers in Tunisia.

After an inspection tour of the African front, General Omurtak openly expressed the view that the Allies are much stronger than the Axis in every way, in armament and industrial production.

He said in conclusion:

> I am extremely well pleased with my tour and very much impressed with the Allied war effort. Best of luck and victory to the Allies.

Another demonstration of Turkish friendship for the United States and the United Nations was given recently by the

newly elected Turkish National Assembly in a most enthusiastic and unequivocal way, when Turkey's very able Premier Saracoglu referred to congratulatory statements by my colleagues, the senior Senators from Texas, Kentucky, and Florida, and Representative May. According to Associated Press reports, a 5-minute enthusiastic ovation greeted the Turkish Premier's reference to these statements by American legislators. "Turkey's love and respect go to the democratic and republican people of America," said the Turkish Premier.

Mr. President, this resolute attitude of Turkey is of great value to the cause of freedom. The sight of the gleaming Turkish bayonets has certainly kept the German wolf and the Roman jackal at a respectful distance. For this and other services the United Nations are grateful to Turkey.

On this twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Turkish National Assembly, we send to the chosen representatives of the brave Turkish people our heartiest felicitations and best wishes for the continued success of their efforts in behalf of new Turkey.

AMERICAN FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have been quite concerned lately with respect to some press releases which I think were rather unwise. Perhaps the persons who were quoted were not at fault.

Production has been our aim ever since the war began. Ever since Pearl Harbor, and before, the cry has been "Production and more production." This applies especially to the products of industry, to ships, planes, tanks, guns, and so forth. At the time we were increasing our production of war material it happened that we were the possessors of a tremendous surplus of the ordinary farm crops, the crops which go to make up the main part of the food of the Nation. We had at that time what has been called the ever-normal granary, which at the moment, is not quite so normal. It was the surplus which worried us. We even became so worried about the surplus that we paid ourselves to reduce our food production. We figured that we were short of planes, but not short of grains. It was in that sort of an atmosphere that the War Production Board came into being. It was set up to obtain for us the tools of war, not necessarily the food which is always necessary to win any war, and it was generally assumed that the W. P. B. was organized for that purpose, rather than for anything which concerns the farmer.

Mr. President, I think it is well to note that where it was within his power to do so the first thing Hitler did when he took possession of any of the small countries as well as larger countries which he has overrun, was to pick up all the material that was available, machines and equipment for war, but more especially food.

I think it is time that we in this Nation begin to realize the importance of our food program. We know that we cannot win without the production of planes and other tools of war, but I fear we have not realized the truth of the statement that we cannot win the war without food. No nation whose food supply is exhausted or whose food supply even approaches a low point can win a war. To win the war we must outproduce the enemy. We must outproduce in order to overwhelm him.

Industry and labor have done wonderfully well in building up their production. They have performed miracles. Today in practically every country of the world where the war is being fought—and it is being fought in nearly all of them—American planes, American tanks and guns, in fact, all sorts of machinery for war, are in evidence and in good quantity. We have our own ships on practically every sea.

While we were doing all this the supply in our food larder was running low. During the time we were building up the machines of war there were no ceilings on material or labor, and we really did the job required to be done. We built up the war industries which were needed in order to perform the miracle of production of planes, ships and tanks which we needed. There were also no ceilings on farm crops during that period, because the large surpluses we had tended to keep down the prices. Now we are approaching the time when there is no great surplus of food, in fact we are threatened with a shortage, and price ceilings, rationing, and priorities are the order of the day.

I think we are all agreed concerning the objectives of the program for keeping down the cost of living, but we must keep in mind that we do not want to prevent the production of food. If we do we will lose the war. Neither farmers nor other groups can continue to produce at less than the cost of production. Hogs selling today at 15 or 16 cents in Chicago are high enough, but the price is not excessive at that level. I deplore the effort which is frequently being made to reduce the prices under that level. I deplore it for the one reason that it will reduce production.

This morning there came to my desk a farm newspaper published at Greenville, Ill., called the Equity Union Exchange, of date April 21, 1943, in which there is an editorial which covers this point admirably. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point. It shows very plainly that farmers cannot afford to continue to produce at less than the cost of production.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM SITUATION

The strongest form of government is that form which is built upon a sound and intelligent agriculture that solves its problems along cooperative and self-help lines. This great government must also have industries and labor working upon a sound basis. When these are all tied in together a government can function at its highest state of efficiency.

Industrial nations need a strong agricultural army which can furnish plenty of wholesome food products, and we are coming to a day when all elements in this great country of ours recognizes that they must give due consideration to agriculture if we are going to continue as a great and a free country.

Farmers cannot afford to keep on producing at less than the cost of production. We believe that we see abundant signs of a better understanding in regard to agriculture and this better understanding and the cooperation of every citizen of our country will go a long way toward winning the present war and doing a good job of it.

It requires skilled labor to successfully operate a farm and this must be recognized everywhere. The idea seems to prevail that just anybody can farm, but it is a highly specialized business and the average farmer must know a lot of things well in order to operate his farm successfully. It must be remembered that it is not possible to take green hands into the country and train them for efficient work on the farm. It takes years of study, work, and observation to become a good farmer.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with my opening remarks, I shall read at this point a news release which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. It bears the title "Live Hog Prices Held Too High by at Least $1." The article goes on to say:

Food Administrator Chester C. Davis yesterday told livestock producers and packers from several States that a ceiling price will have to be set for live hogs unless the market price is adjusted downward immediately.

Although prices have fallen from $16 to approximately $15 per hundredweight since Davis upped the price of corn and ordered live hog prices down 10 days ago, they still are at least $1 too high, he told the group.

The conference was called to discuss details of administering such a price-ceiling program if and when one is established.

Caught between ceilings on pork and uncontrolled prices on live hogs, slaughterers have complained they are being squeezed out of existence.

Hog producers, on the other hand, have argued that additional try-outs should be given to marketing control and wholesale ceiling programs.

Mr. President, the result of that publicity will cause reduction to the extent of hundreds of millions of pounds of pork, because right there is a threat to the American farmer, that while his feed costs and his labor costs are going up, the cost of his product, meat, is going to be pushed down.

I attempted to reach Mr. Davis on the telephone when I read this article yesterday morning. He was in an important meeting, and he went from one meeting to another. To answer my call he had a gentleman in his office call me up to explain—quoting the gentleman who talked to me—that Mr. Davis did not make the statement. However, the article I just read begins with the words:

Food Administrator Chester C. Davis yesterday told livestock producers and packers—

The Washington Post was called and asked where it got the material for the article. I think that all Members of the Senate are sufficiently well acquainted with the representatives of the press to know that they would not take an article from anyone whom they might meet on the street, and quote a gentleman of such importance and influence as is Mr. Davis, without at least the authority of someone who was supposed to speak for him. I propose to follow the matter

through until I find out who is the father of the article, if it did not originate in the office of Mr. Chester Davis. Let me say frankly that I admire Mr. Davis very much and want to cooperate with him so far as I can. I do not think he personally made the statement. They promised me that they would have a denial printed in either last evening's or this morning's newspaper. I have searched the newspapers from cover to cover but am unable to find any such statement. As I have said, the publication of the article is going to result in the shipment of tens of thousands of sows which should be kept in farrow.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD a few short letters and excerpts from letters and telegrams, so as to show the Senate exactly how serious the matter is in the producing areas. One letter is from a gentleman at Ogallala, Nebr., who claims he is as patriotic as anyone else is—and I know he is, because I know him very well—and who says that when the shippers stand to lose the price of their feed and labor, and very likely a part of their investment in the cattle and hogs, they are not likely to increase the number of cattle and hogs they feed.

Another letter comes from Denver, Colo., under date of April 13, 1943, and includes the following statement:

Livestock markets have been pretty much upset this week at all points, the result of news emanating from Washington, D. C.

In a telegram addressed to me by one of the largest livestock feeders, perhaps not only in Nebraska but in the entire country, there appears the statement:

Haven't been able to buy one car of corn during the past week. Situation critical. Something must be done immediately or feed yards will start liquidation soon.

The man who sent the telegram also operates a good many supply stations and takes care of hundreds of other livestock feeders and producers. His telegram is dated April 19.

Mr. President, I submit the letters and telegram for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEARLE BROS. RANCH,
Ogallala, Nebr., April 15, 1943.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am mailing you a letter which I wish could be gotten to the heads of the Office of Price Administration, as it very clearly shows the situation out in this country.

I would have sent it direct but did not think it would ever reach the right parties.

I am very patriotic, as the letter suggests, and all the cattle folks are, but when we stand to lose the price of our feed and labor and very likely a part of our investment in the cattle, we don't feel like pitching.

Yours very truly,

A. L. SEARLE.

UNION STOCK YARDS,
Denver, Colo., April 13, 1943.

DEAR SIR: Livestock markets have been pretty much upset this week at all points, the result of news emanating from Washington, D. C., most of which came out of the Office of Price Administration and from the new Food Administrator, Chester Davis. The advance of 5 cents per bushel in the price of corn, ordered by Mr. Davis along with his drastic crack-down threats of different things that were being considered to lower the price of beef and pork, naturally has made livestock growers and livestock feeders more uneasy than they have been for some time, and justly so. To raise the price of grains and lower the price of livestock cuts pretty sharply into the bank accounts of our meat producers at the moment.

It is our opinion that the well-being of the Nation is jeopardized seriously by these intermittent announcements, having to do with meat production and all of which for 8 or 10 months have resulted in a curtailment of production, whereas the needs of the Army, the needs of Lend-Lease, and the needs of the civilian population of our country demand that more meat, not less, be produced.

We feel that the tinkering going on by men who are not familiar with livestock production problems will only result eventually in a condition that will have to be remedied in some way, or else meat, so sorely needed, simply will not be available.

Having an abiding confidence in the intelligence of the American people as a whole, it is our opinion that necessary corrections will be made as time goes on, with the result that more experienced and practical folks will be at the head of our gigantic factory of meat production in the United States, therefore we feel like assuring producers that anything working against their interests will be temporary; do not get alarmed; stay in there and pitch; run your plant to capacity, and figure that you are simply doing your part in the interest of the country that we love, even though hampered by rules and regulations not at all practical and not serving the public interest the least bit.

MORRILL, NEBR., *April 19, 1943.*

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Satisfactory to leave present ceiling at Omaha and west coast also Denver and western Nebraska remain in effect but permit us to purchase corn at any surplus producing point either in Colorado or Nebraska both in area A and area 7 at price which will not exceed our delivered ceiling. Elevators and subterminals in Colorado and western Nebraska will not purchase corn at price which exceeds west coast ceiling unless needed for immediate consumption in intermountain territory. This plan would work and no elevators or terminal markets would be injured. Haven't been able to buy one car corn during past week. Situation critical. Something must be done immediately or feed yards will start liquidation soon.

JOHN R. JIRDON.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the liquidation from the feed yards of the Central West has already started and is well under way because of the tendency to reduce the prices at the terminal markets and at the same time increase the prices for the grain the farmer must use for feed.

A few days ago the Office of Price Administration or those advising them thought it was advisable and necessary to place a ceiling on the price of corn. A temporary ceiling was placed a few weeks ago. Later with a few changes, they made the ceiling permanent. They were not satisfied to fix at the terminal markets of the country a figure which automatically would determine the price at which corn would be traded at the interior points; but they chose to go to the interior points and establish the price at which the farmer could sell his corn, thinking that thereby the dealer would retail it or wholesale it at a price reflecting a fair profit above the price thus fixed. However, what they have done has completely stopped the movement of corn, and the situation becomes more serious daily. I have taken up the matter with those in the Office of Price Administration who are presumed to have charge of the placing of ceilings. Personally, it is my feeling that when a price at which meat can be sold is fixed there is no necessity to disturb the market on grains which are used as feed in producing the meat; because there was a time when plenty of grain was moving—and at a price approximately 20 cents a bushel under the price being asked today—after the attempt to control the price has been made.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of a letter received from a farmer at Wolbach, Nebr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOLBACH, NEBR., *April 14, 1943.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the way the farmers are taking the treatment that they are getting. There is no other class that is getting the kind of deal the farmer is at the present time.

I have 22 gilts bred for June farrow, and I am going to sell them before they show to piggie and that is the way the most of the farmers in Fair Dale precinct are going to do. I am the assessor, victory leader, and committeeman of this precinct. I have contacted 90 farmers in the last 3 days, so I know how they feel.

Most anybody can go to Grand Island and make from $10 to $18 a day in the plant and labor is impossible to get. Everybody but the farmer gets paid on a cost-plus basis. Farmers' pay is based on a parity that dates back to the time when wages of labor were far less.

I wish I had the time to write you a long letter, but this is what is going to happen. In about 6 to 8 months they are going to wonder where all the meat is that farmers signed up to raise. If the bunch that is running this show wants grain instead of meat, that is just what they are going to get.

* * * * *

I am,
Yours very truly,
WOLBACH (NEBR.) FARMER.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the headlines of, and excerpts from, a few of the articles which have appeared in the daily newspapers and in the market journals. The articles have originated at Omaha, Chicago, and other western and central-western livestock markets.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 15, 1943]

SCARING FARMERS—NOT BOOSTING PRODUCTION

If the Government really wants capacity meat production, why doesn't it encourage farmers instead of scaring them every few weeks? As a result, a lot of unfinished cattle have been marketed and the beef tonnage produced has been cut far below what it might have been.

Difficulty in buying corn has been putting pressure on men who had fat cattle in their lots for some time.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 16, 1943]

SOME BRED SOWS ALREADY BEING SOLD FOR SLAUGHTER, STOCKMAN SAYS—TOO MUCH UNCERTAINTY AND GRIEF IN BUSINESS NOWADAYS

If the Government doesn't quit fooling around with unfavorable price ceilings, it's due for some disappointments in livestock and meat production.

Farmers have stood for a lot of shoving around, but if the pressure on them gets too strong, they may just quit. In fact, I'm not sure but what some of them already are doing just that on hogs.

One feeling we have here is that the Government is working against us, and against the very results it says it wants to get.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 16, 1943]

PRICE BREAK ADDS TO FEEDERS UNCERTAINTY

Each new announcement out of Washington is followed by an unfavorable turn in prices, and an increase in the general nervousness of producers.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 17, 1943]

WEEK'S DECLINE ON CATTLE MOST SEVERE SINCE LAST SUMMER—LOSS SHARED BY FEEDERS

Losses on killing classes were reflected in the feeder market, too, as the trade in general developed a bad case of jitters brought on by a combination of ills that included talk of ceilings on livestock, revised ceilings on some classes of retail beef.

[From the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of April 16, 1943]

FIGURES LIVESTOCK THREATS WILL RESULT IN SELLING OF UNFINISHED ANIMALS

More real scares might bring such a flood of unfinished animals that it would greatly reduce the later meat supply.

[From the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of April 19, 1943]

REPORTS POOR LUCK WITH HIS PIG CROP: NEEDS HIRED MAN

Widespread poor luck with the spring pig crop is the report.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 19, 1943]

FARMERS FEEL THEY ARE OVERREGULATED—COMPLYING WITH RULES TAKES TIME AND MONEY—FEEL UNCERTAIN ABOUT FUTURE

Not only does regulation make the farmers feel pretty uncertain about the future, but it means a tremendous waste of time and money.

[From the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of April 20, 1943]

FIGURES CATTLE FEEDING OUTLOOK NOT TOO GOOD

Costs of feeders are rising while the Government and packers talk of the necessity of getting fat cattle prices down, the result being a narrower margin for the farmer.

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 15, 1943]

NO USE PLANTING CROPS THAT CAN'T BE TENDED, WESTERN NEBRASKANS FEEL

What's the use of putting in a crop that can't be tended properly or harvested?

[From the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman of April 16, 1943]

FEARS LOWER CEILINGS WILL CUT LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

Just recently, I've seen some bred sows, due to farrow soon, being sold to packer buyers. If there's much of that, we'll be a long way short of our anticipated increase in the pig crop, because up to now, farmers haven't had too much luck with their pigs. * * * It's the same way with cattle. These steers I have here today will bring a little money, because I bought them as calves and grew them out before feeding them much grain. But they would have brought $10 a head more a week ago than they are selling for now. That sort of thing doesn't encourage a man to replace.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at this moment meetings are being held at the Department of Agriculture, in the Office of the Food Administrator, to decide whether they will place ceilings on prices for live animals. If an order placing such ceiling prices is issued, I think we shall have utter chaos in the production of meat in this country. The farmer is well satisfied today with the prices he is receiving for livestock in the central markets. If he can be given assurance that the prices will not vary too much from the present levels, he will continue doing his utmost to produce the meat necessary to be supplied in order that we may win the war. I see no use in having any department of Government try to settle the quarrels which exist between different packers or different classes of slaughterers. War is war. At the very best it cannot be a pleasant enterprise. I am satisfied that if we would allow nature to take its course, instead of trying to regulate all retail prices of meat, as well as the wholesale prices, we would be far better off. There is no reason why any slaughterer, no matter how small may be the output of his plant, cannot comply with the regulations and receive the services of the Federal inspectors, and thereby be able to make sales to the Army, the Navy, and the lend-lease and purchasing agencies, and have the same chance for purchasing that the larger packers have.

Again, Mr. President, let me say that the farmer does not care to see run-away prices. He does not want to see prices advance above what they are, and he does not care if they decline slightly below what they are now, so long as he is given assurance that he will not continually be bothered by situations arising from statements such as those appearing in yesterday's newspaper.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask that an editorial entitled "Better Think Twice on Hog Price," appearing in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of April 19, 1943, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THINK TWICE ON HOG PRICE

Light marketing of hogs last week, the result of the sharp price break, reveals that such hogs as are available are held in strong hands. Farmers feel that hogs are worth all they were bringing before the break, by any comparison. Those having hogs in the feedlot are not under any pressure to sell. The hogs, most any hogs, can be carried along, for there is no discount against weight now. The guess is that hogs are likely to work back to where they were, once this price flurry passes its peak, based on what has happened in the past and the conviction that hogs were well worth all they were bringing.

The belief that hog producers are being penalized in order to placate Mr. Lewis and his coal miners may not be so far from the mark. That wage demand is a thorn in the side of the administration. Instead of meeting it head-on, and settling it, the strategy seems to be to take the props out from under it by reducing the price of meat, at a cost of some millions of dollars to the hog producers of the country. Feeling that way about it, farmers are in no mood to go along, but rather are disposed to lock their gates and let the country wait for its pork. Much that same effect will be seen, of course, should a ceiling price be set on hogs. Not only would farmers hold back their hogs, but a feeling of discouragement and uncertainty as to the future would result in a let-down in production effort.

The farmer is not unpatriotic, and he is not a profiteer. But he does ask and expect a square deal, and he rightfully feels that he is not getting that when he is made to foot the bill to help pull the administration's wage chestnuts out of the fire, and that he would be unjustly discriminated against were a live hog ceiling to be set at a figure that might very soon become unprofitable at a time when costs are rapidly rising.

In toying with the hog price business, on the basis of current action and discussion, the administrators are placing in some jeopardy the future supply of as vital a war material as is produced—pork.

FAILURE OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TO UTILIZE FACILITIES OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, recently innumerable protests of one kind or another have come to me from the people of South Carolina relative to the treatment accorded them by the War Production Board. The main protest has been that the people of South Carolina desired to cooperate in the production end of the war effort so that they might rightfully take their place in the production of the necessary things needed in carrying on the war, as they have taken their place in the armed forces through the large numbers of volunteers from South Carolina, and through the men taken from South Carolina by the Selective Service System.

On each of these occasions I have taken the opportunity to discuss the matter with those who are supposed to be in charge of the War Production Board in Washington, but I must say that the discussions have been held, and that has been the end of it.

Last December, the War Manpower Commission reported a great surplus of labor in certain sections of South Carolina. At that time I called to the attention of the War Production Board and of Mr. Nelson the fact that not one war industry had been placed within certain sections of South Carolina, and that apparently it was not desired to utilize the labor of the people or the natural resources of South Carolina. Mr. Nelson said he had no explanation.

Time has gone on, and I rise in the Senate today only to express the hope that some consideration will be given to

the utilization of the natural resources and the labor of South Carolina, in order that the people of that State may patriotically, honestly, and consistently do their part.

The War Production Board has what is known as a regional office in Atlanta, Ga., where most things stop. From there one goes to a district office in North Carolina, and then to the Columbia, S. C., area office. On April 19, 1943, Mr. T. K. Legare, area manager of the South Carolina area office, wrote to Mr. J. E. MacDougall, district manager, W. P. B., Charlotte, N. C., who, in turn, must report to Atlanta, Ga., which office, in turn, must report to Washington, D. C. The subject of the letter was "Contract placements in Columbia, S. C., area."

Columbia is the capital of South Carolina. It is a large city, where factories and other industries exist. The letter is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD AREA OFFICE,
Columbia, S. C., April 19, 1943.

Mr. J. E. MACDOUGALL,
District Manager, War Production Board, Charlotte, N. C.

Subject: Contract placements in Columbia, S. C., area.

1. For the past month and a half no contracts that I know of have been placed in the Columbia area in connection with the smaller war plants program, and for 7 consecutive weeks we have had to report "None" on contract placement report, form SWPD-5. I am sure that you are not responsible for this condition and no criticism of anyone is intended; however, I consider it my duty to again call attention to this matter.

2. The delay in utilizing the unused available facilities in the Columbia area is not only working a hardship on the distressed plants but is also handicapping the war effort by not securing materials and products so urgently needed by the Government.

This is one Government representative writing to another Government representative.

3. During the past 3 months a number of our manufacturers have submitted bids on various items but have received no information regarding the disposition of their proposals. This office has recommended or certified many manufacturers who in our opinion are distressed plants, but they have never been requested to submit bids on products for which they were recommended and we have received no notice that these plants are not acceptable or that the information furnished regarding them is not sufficient. As a result of this situation some firms in this area are becoming disgusted and are no longer interested in submitting bids through War Production Board.

4. There are not a great many varieties of distressed or unused available facilities in the territory covered by the Columbia War Production Board area, but we have recommended plants for the manufacture of the following products: Boxes, lockers, tool chests, crates, ammunition and shipping crates, barrels, baskets, and similar wooden products; small wooden parts for other assembled products; furniture of all kinds except upholstered; sheet-metal products; steel and iron products and structural fabricating; items produced by gray iron foundries and machine shops; mattresses and mattress covers; burlap bags and wrappings; tents; assemblies for Liberty ships; ventilating ducts; wood cargo truck bodies; and trailers.

5. If this office has not properly interpreted the instructions and procedures furnished us, or if there is any way in which we can assist in rectifying the present situation, or in other words do our part to secure results, we will appreciate being so advised, and wish to assure you that we are anxious to render the best possible service in this connection.

T. K. LEGARÉ,
Area Manager.

Mr. President, from time to time, when individuals who were desirous of helping in the war effort protested and came to Washington, wrote letters, or sent telegrams as to the conditions existing in that section of the United States, I did not bring the matter to the floor of the Senate, because I did not believe that was the proper place. I went from office to office. I wrote first to one and then to another. I talked first to one and then to another, hoping that some effective action might result. However, when the situation reaches such a point that one representative of the Government writes to another representative of the Government that the office is there and is completely ignored, no attention being paid to it, I suggest that if the office is not needed, and the War Production Board does not intend to have any association with the office, the office should be closed. On the other hand, however, I hope that some effort will be made by the War Production Board to utilize the available resources and manpower of South Carolina. Through the office, which has a most excellent director, and who desires to help his country, the manpower situation has been certified to by the War Manpower Commission.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937

Mr. RADCLIFFE obtained the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have been asked to yield for a moment to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I gladly do so.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce I report favorably, with amendments, House Joint Resolution 113, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate Commerce amended the joint resolution in line 5, by striking out "August" and inserting in lieu thereof "May"; and made the same amendment at the beginning of line 10, so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) section 19 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (relating to termination of the act) is amended by striking out "April 26, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 24, 1943."

(b) Section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of the bituminous coal taxes) is amended by striking out "April 25, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 23, 1943."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the joint resolution was messaged to the Senate early in the afternoon. I merely wish to inquire from the able Senator from Montana, who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, whether the committee met and recommended the amendments.

Mr. WHEELER. The committee met at 2 o'clock, and recommended the amendments. The joint resolution was unanimously reported by the committee with these amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of that statement, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "August" and insert in lieu thereof "May"; and at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "August" and insert "May."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 30 days."

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 22, 1943, it stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, May 3, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Speaker of the House called me this morning, and earlier today the minority leader. I told him that in view of the legislative situation in the Senate, and the unfinished business which should receive our attention, I thought I could not concur with the House in according the same privilege to the Senate. Consequently, the concurrent resolution comes over applying only to the House. The adoption of the resolution does not mean, of course, that the Senate can obtain any rest. I think that if the House feels that its work has been accomplished for the present and wishes to take a recess, it should have that privilege. I made that statement to the Speaker of the House. Therefore, I shall not object to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, very likely the Senate will shortly adjourn until Monday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive a message from the House relative to House Joint Resolution 113, extending the so-called Guffey Coal Act, and that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], as Acting President pro tempore, be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, at this moment I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to the acting leader of the majority [Mr. HILL], as well as to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], for the fine effort which has been put forward today to the end that the Senate may not have to meet tomorrow, Good Friday.

At this time, when the world is engaged in the greatest struggle of history, I think it very appropriate for Christians to pause on the anniversary of the Crucifixion, because it was at the foot of the cross that more freedoms were guaranteed to mankind than have ever been won by all the armies of the world. I think it is to the credit of the able acting leader and, indeed, to the credit of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which held a hurried meeting this afternoon to the end that the Senate should not be obliged to meet tomorrow. I, for one, express my sincere gratitude to Senators who made it unnecessary for the Senate to meet tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator also add to those whom he has so kindly named the name of the able minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who cooperated wholeheartedly in the matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. He knows that I extend that word to him because he has been looking me right in the eye ever since I took the floor. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICES OF MERCHANT SAILORS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 178, House bill 2281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors, reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the calendar was called I objected to the consideration of this bill because of the absence of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If he will make a statement which justifies his request I shall not object.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I shall be very glad, indeed, to attempt to do what the very able Senator from Oregon requests.

When this bill came up on the calendar a few days ago certain objections were raised to its consideration. Since then the objections have been looked into carefully and they have all been withdrawn. So far as I am advised at this time, there is no objection to the bill from any source whatever.

Mr. President, the bill proposes to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors. Very properly the Government issues medals and other forms of insignia to members of the armed forces in recognition of their status in our armed forces, and also in appreciation of special services rendered, or injuries sustained.

It is highly important and certainly most appropriate that similar recognition should be accorded to members of our merchant marine. We know that the duties which they render are of incalculable benefit. We know they are subjected to gravest hazards and dangers. We know that their mortality list has been very heavy. We must do many things successfully before we win the war into which we have been forced. Nothing is more important than that we keep open at all times our lines of communications and transportation in all the oceans of the world and in most of the seas. To do this we must have enough ships. We also must have a sufficient number of officers and sailors to man them in voyages as hazardous as history has ever known. It is to the everlasting glory of our merchant marine that this magnificent result is being accomplished in spite of the deadly menace of the submarine and other hazards. This matter has been considered very carefully and as a result a plan has been proposed and embodied in this bill which calls for awarding and wearing of various forms of insignia, such as medals, buttons, and various other kinds of devices. For instance, there is provision for insignia to be given to every member of the merchant marine who serves during the war. He would receive also a special form of insignia if he serves in the war zone. There is also a special type of bar given to any sailor who is a member of the crew of a ship which has been attacked. A star is added to that bar if the seaman has had to abandon the ship because it has been torpedoed, or otherwise attacked by the enemy. There is a star for each additional instance of that kind. There is likewise a design in the nature of a medal awarded to those who are wounded while in the service. There are also provisions in the bill with regard to service flags and other forms of insignia for seamen, or members of their families, which I shall not attempt to describe or even mention at this time.

Mr. President, this subject has been studied very carefully. The program as outlined in this bill is a very reasonable one. It is a very worthy one. A special argument for the passage of this bill arises from the fact that seamen, although rendering hazardous and indispensable service in the war, wear no uniform and therefore have no such badge of service. The carrying out of the program is in the hands of the War Shipping Administrator. It seems to me most clearly, most definitely, and most unmistakably that the passage of this bill would fit into and supplement wisely the program which the Government has already adopted of awarding insignia to members of the armed forces.

If there be any specific questions in regard to the program to which I have referred, I shall be very glad to try to answer them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of services of merchant sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 3, line 19, after the words "but only if", to strike out the word "he" and insert "the Secretary of War shall consent thereto and the Administrator."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors."

FAILURE OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TO PROMOTE PRODUCTION OF ESSENTIAL METALS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I would not on this occasion hold the Senate for any great length of time. The thoughts I shall attempt to express have come to me by reason of the attitude assumed by the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. Undoubtedly he made some very justifiable complaints as to the treatment which his State has received at the hands of the War Production Board. I think I may, with propriety, refer to that same statement as applying to a great section of the country which has in the past, does now, and can in the future produce all of the metal necessary in any particular to sustain this war. An attempt has been made on the part of some of us who represent the great intermountain West to bring to the attention of the War Production Board the necessity of setting up within that Board a group or division which would have as its primary object and purpose the promotion and welfare of those who in the industry of mining are ready, willing, and able to produce the essentials for this war.

Mr. President, there are two things which are indispensable for the success of our armed forces. One is food; the other is metal and fiber. This is a mechanized war; this is a war that requires mechanism in every form and under many conditions. We cannot successfully prosecute this war without food for our civilian population and likewise food for our armed forces. Furthermore, we are now bound to supply food and mechanism for the armed forces and the civil populations of those who fight on the same side as do our armed forces.

It seems to me to be a short-sighted policy when the War Production Board, headed by Mr. Nelson, ignores the fact, brought to its attention time after time by a group of the Senate of the United States, that by merely organizing within the Board a division composed of men who will bend their efforts toward assisting the miners of America to produce more metals, encouragement can be given to the hundreds of thousands of men throughout the length and breadth of the land, and especially in the great mining regions of the West, to produce more and more war-essential materials.

What are those materials, Mr. President? It is a rather strange thing that in this war one metal has come out prominently that in times past was regarded as one that belonged only to the monetary systems of the world. Today industry is calling upon silver to supply a demand which was never known before. Industry is calling upon silver to supply a demand from our armed activity and our martial array.

How is silver secured in America? Whence does silver come? There are those who believe that silver comes in ledges, that it is produced by mere manual effort, that it is taken out of the ground as metal. Let me say to those who do me the courtesy to listen this afternoon that today in America silver is produced primarily as a byproduct of war-essential metals. Were it not for the copper mines, the zinc mines, and the lead mines of America we would produce scarcely sufficient silver for common, ordinary currency and common, ordinary use.

Let me refer to the fact that in 1942 the mints of America used in making coins, which were demanded by the American people, 85,000,000 ounces of silver; while in 1942, the same year, all the mines of America produced only 54,000,000 ounces of silver. So it is manifest that the demand for silver money in America far exceeds the present-day American production of silver.

What else is there in connection with that metal? I have told the Senate that silver is produced almost entirely as a byproduct of other war-essential metals. Those war-essential metals are copper, lead, and zinc. The greatest quantum of silver comes from copper. In other words, if we close down the copper mines of America, we will produce little silver; and, vice versa, if we reduce the price of silver we will produce little copper, because the copper mines of America today are absolutely dependent upon the byproduct of silver in order to maintain their running costs.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was not particularly pertaining to silver but more especially to call attention to the fact that the War Production Board, instead of lending encouragement to the miners of America to produce war-essential metals, has discouraged the production of war-essential metals. Copper, lead, zinc, manganese, mercury, chrome, all these metals, can be produced in America in quantities sufficient to supply our war needs; but the War Production Board has called into its midst too many dollar-a-year men who are interested in private industry, in their principal vocations, which, to a large extent, are those which have engrossed their attention for years past and which are now paying them their salaries. They receive a dollar a year from the Government of the United States but they are receiving handsome salaries from industries they represent.

If the War Production Board would but do what the mining group of this body is urging them to do, formulate within the War Production Board a mining division seeking to promote the production of war-essential metals, we would not lose the shipping that is being lost on the Caribbean, for that shipping is carrying ore coming from South America. We would devote our shipping to other uses, because we would be able to produce right here in America all the essential metals which are necessary. Failure to take such a step redounds to the discredit of the War Production Board, and, indeed, I say now to the discredit of Mr. Donald Nelson because he has promised us time and again that he would set up in the War Production Board a group that would represent in reality the mining industry of America. I am wondering why Mr. Nelson always changes his mind after he leaves a conference with Senators who are members of the mining group. He conferred with the mining Senators on March 12. He promised then to be back within a month with a plan and a program along the lines suggested at that conference. The month was up 10 days ago and Mr. Nelson has not come back to us with any plan or program.

Time after time he makes the promise, and time after time he breaks his promise after he goes back to his Board. I can tell the reason if anyone desires to know it. It is because after Mr. Nelson goes back to his Board he confers with the dollar-a-year men who represent certain interests on that Board and who are not willing to set up within the Board a group that would promote greater production of war-essential metals within America. If anyone doubts that statement, let him come before the group of the Senate of the United States which has repeatedly called Mr. Nelson, and to which group Mr. Nelson has just as repeatedly made the promise that he would set up such a section within the War Production Board.

Mr. President, it is time that Mr. Donald Nelson either keep his word with essential industry in the United States, or resign, because America must win the war, Donald Nelson to the contrary nothwithstanding, if it need be put that way. It is time Mr. Nelson turned his ear to those who are willing to produce the things which will win the war, rather than lend his ear to those who seem to turn him after he gives his promise.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 47.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 47) providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Whereas the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-three marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has set aside the year 1943 as a year of celebration of this important event by appropriate ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Congress has created the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas Thomas Jefferson is revered as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, for his services as a citizen of Virginia, as President of the United States, as a man of abiding passion for human liberty and the sacred rights of the common people, and as one who, throughout his entire career, remained preeminently and above all a farmer, devoted to the cultivation of his farms and the improvement of agriculture; and

Whereas he was one of the leading farmers of his time in the United States and was profoundly interested in the sciences related to agriculture and more than any other one person can be regarded as the father and patron of the scientific agricultural developments since his time; and

Whereas he practiced rotations of crops and diversified farming; introduced and improved the breeding of domestic animals and plants; contributed to the improvement of farm implements, such as the plow; encouraged the growing and use of fruits, vegetables, and other domestic products; encouraged research as to methods of control of insect pests; practiced and advocated control of soil erosion, and stood for the conservation of agricultural resources; and

Whereas as the founder of the University of Virginia, he made provision for a professorship of agriculture and helped start a train of events which led to the creation of agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and the research, educational, and other services of the Federal Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas, in his first administration as President of the United States, the national domain was enlarged by the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory, a great farming area

which gave us a leading position in the agriculture of the world and enables us to serve as a source of food for our fighting allies; and

Whereas throughout his whole social philosophy runs a theme which recognizes the dignity of the agricultural way of life and a deep appreciation of the satisfactions which accrue, through science, education, and faith, to the farm family and the rural community; and

Whereas he recognized the importance of the perpetuation of a sound agriculture as a paramount factor in the development of the economy and the permanence of our national institutions; and

Whereas by reason of his contributions to agricultural philosophy, science, education, farm management, and practice, he is recognized as one of the great leaders among the farmers of this country, who are now engaged in a vital part of the war effort; and

Whereas as a figure, against the background of the soil of the land he loved, he stands as a symbol of its values, democracy and freedom, for the preservation of which the American farmers and all connected with the industry of agriculture are now contributing their maximum effort; and

Whereas it is appropriate that his services to agriculture should be duly recognized and brought to public attention in this anniversary year; and

Whereas many public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families are anxious to participate in activities in recognition of our great debt to Jefferson as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, statesman, and educator and leader in scientific agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there be created, under the auspices of and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.

The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

National farm organizations.

The agricultural press.

Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.

The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the agricultural aspects of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, and so forth, information about Jefferson and to otherwise cooperate with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say that the joint resolution was introduced by me at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. It provides for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee, to function in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson. It carries no appropriation.

The purpose is to call to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture, and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the agricultural aspects of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Jefferson.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the proposal anything to do with Jefferson's statement that when Washington tells us when to plant and when to sow and when to reap we shall go hungry?

Mr. BYRD. I was about to say that I hope the adoption of this measure will induce the Department of Agriculture to follow the teachings and principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to say, for the benefit of the senior Senator from Michigan, that next Monday I shall offer for the RECORD discussions and extracts from letters Thomas Jefferson wrote in his many years of correspondence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the advice. I rather suspect that I need to read those documents less than does the Senator from Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTION OF AMERICAN AVIATORS BY JAPAN

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the newspapers of yesterday evening and this morning carried a story of the execution by the Japanese of some American airmen who were captured in April 1942 when that distinguished aviator, Gen. James H. Doolittle, conducted a raid on the islands of Japan, in particular over the cities of Tokyo and Yokohama. Reading from the New York Times briefly an account of this story, I find it stated:

> The Japanese Government has barbarously executed some of the eight American aviators captured from Maj. Gen. James H. Doolittle's raid on Japan April 18, 1942, on the grounds that they intentionally bombed nonmilitary installations and deliberately fired on civilians. The exact number is not known here.
>
> This was announced by President Roosevelt today in a statement issued from the White House "with a feeling of deepest horror." The feeling "will be shared by all civilized peoples," the President stated.

Earlier in the day the statement of the President on this subject was placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, early in this session I introduced a bill, Senate bill 779, which was entitled "A bill to provide for the taking into custody, during the continuation of the existing war between the United States and Japan, of any or all Japanese residing in or found in the United States." The preamble of the bill reads as follows:

> Whereas all Japanese born in the United States are considered, under the laws of Japan, to be citizens or subjects of and to owe allegiance to Japan; and
>
> Whereas Japanese are of a race or nationality ineligible to become naturalized citizens of the United States.

A bill of the same type was introduced late in the last session. It was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Immigration of which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and I were members. Late in the session the bill was reported favorably, but, because of lack of time, and for other reasons, it was not pressed, at the comparatively late hour when it was reported.

Senate bill 779 is substantially the same as the bill introduced at the last session. In hearings which were held on the bill last year an old report, probably 40 years old, at least many years old, which had lain for many years in the State Department, was dug up by the committee. In that report—a report made by a committee which had been appointed to investigate conditions in the Hawaiian Islands, as I recall, with respect to the presence of Japanese there—the type of cruel treatment imposed upon the white people of those islands, and all others there, by the Japanese, was shown. The type and character of the Japanese in the islands was specifically mentioned in the report, and in the proof on which the report was based, demonstrating that they maintained a system of constantly spying on all others except those of their own race, the system being extended to the servants who worked in the households of American citizens in the islands.

When I made an address on this floor last year in behalf of the bill I introduced at that time, which, as I have said, was largely the same as Senate bill 779, which I have introduced at this session, I stated that the Japanese were a race so utterly different in all their characteristics from the people of the United States of America that the very thought of them becoming citizens of the United States or being by any sort of hook or crook accorded rights of citizenship, was to my conception not only absurd, but utterly out of keeping with the ideas of Americanism and of American citizenship. The Japanese are not an assimilable race. Their ideas of religion, their ideas of government, their social ideas, are all utterly

different from those of the people of the United States.

It was my hope, at the time the bill was introduced, and it is still my hope in the introduction of Senate bill 779, that it might bring about a review by the courts of a law on this subject, to the end that certain cases of the past, especially the leading case in the past which, under the fourteenth amendment, conferred American citizenship on Japanese born in this country, might be reversed, and that they might not be allowed the rights of citizenship.

In my judgment, they are inherently a kind of people who are not and can never be in any sense of the word honest. Today the news which is carried in the newspapers concerning the execution of helpless prisoners of war confirms that statement The words which the President of the United States used in stating that the people of America read this news with the feeling of the deepest horror are mild indeed.

A few days ago Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, who as commanding general of the western defense command conducted the evacuation and relocation, was quoted as declaring:

> A Jap's a Jap. It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not. * * * The west coast is too vital and too vulnerable to take any chances.

Mr. President, I applaud those words and endorse them. I believe them. I believe that the history of the Japanese race has proven to the absolute satisfaction of every American citizen—and when I say "American citizen" in my own mind I exclude the Japanese—that the Japanese are utterly dishonest, that they are constitutionally deceptive. I do not believe there stands today upon the free soil—if I may call it so—of the United States of America one single solitary person with Japanese blood in his veins who will not stab you in the back. Show me a Jap and I will show you a person who is the embodiment of treachery and deception.

Mr. President, the statement made by General DeWitt was criticized by the Washington Post in an editorial on the 15th day of April, purely on the ground that it was intemperate, because it was critical of people who, by reason of their birth, had a right to claim American citizenship. I go back to the case, Mr. President, which is styled United States versus Wong Kim Ark, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States 45 or 50 years ago. In that case a dissenting opinion was written by the Mr. Chief Justice Fuller, and concurred in by one or two other members of the Court, which to my mind was basically sound, and which should have been the majority opinion. But by a divided Court, citizenship in that case was accorded to an oriental. So I go back to that case. I think the decision in that case, so far as it concerns the Japanese of today, was one of the great mistakes which has been made by the courts of America. I believe that a review of that case today—and, of course, it could be reviewed if the courts were presented with a case which would justify a review—would result in a reversal, and that citizenship would be taken away from the Japanese. By reason of their presence here our very freedom is at stake. They have proven, as I have said, that they do not think along the lines Americans think. They have proven themselves to be utterly unworthy of any of the rights which our constitutional Government affords to its citizens and to others.

I quote from an editorial in today's New York Times which comments upon the horrible thing which was reported in yesterday's newspapers:

> In defiance of every law of civilized warfare the Japanese Government has murdered in cold blood some of the American flyers who bombed military objectives in Tokyo and other centers of war production. To this brutal act of a government whose thin veneer of modernism covers a primitive savagery the only possible answer has been made by our State Department. We shall hold personally responsible those who were guilty of this crime, however high or low their station, and we shall in due course bring these evil men to justice. We shall hold equally responsible any officers of the Japanese Government who may be reckless enough and bestial enough to commit such crimes in future.

Also in today's Evening Star is published an editorial entitled "Murder in Cold Blood." I read a portion of the editorial:

> It has been perfectly evident for a long time that the Japanese are not to be measured by any civilized standard of decency. Nevertheless, the official announcement that they have put to death some of the American aviators who fell into their hands after the raid of last April comes as a sickening shock.
>
> The State Department, in a communication to the Japanese Government, has characterized the execution of these men—their number and identities remain unknown—as murder in cold blood. And this Government has threatened the guilty Japanese with appropriate punishment when the war is won. But let us not deceive ourselves.
>
> Neither threats nor the strongest of official condemnations will have the slightest influence in Japan. For 10 long years the Japanese have piled murder upon murder, outrage upon outrage, and nothing that we may say is going to change their character. As a class the men who dominate Japan are barbarous and depraved, but they are also tough and determined. They will not be won over by kindness, nor intimidated by promises of punishment. There is but one thing for us to do, and that is to destroy them.

Mr. President, I endorse that editorial 100 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator referred to the favorable report of the bill made by the Committee on Immigration. I should like to ask the Senator whether the subcommittee reported unanimously to the committee on the measure.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, it did.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was not a dissenting vote, as I remember, in the full committee.

Mr. STEWART. The subcommittee reported the bill unanimously to the full committee, and as I recall, the full committee reported the bill unanimously to the Senate, and it was placed on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should also like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is not true that the subcommittee studied the report which was made by General Summerall about 20 years ago, which went into many details in describing the horrible conditions which at that time existed in Hawaii, and which in some instances practically warned us at that time of what was coming?

Mr. STEWART. That is entirely correct. I have forgotten the number of years ago the report was made. I think I referred to it as 40 years ago, but it was some 20 or 30 years ago that the report was filed by General Summerall, who later, after he retired, became the head of one of the schools in the Senator's State in South Carolina, the Citadel, if I am not mistaken. I believe he was Governor General of the islands at the time the report was made, but at any rate he figured in the report, and it was called the Summerall Report, as I remember. The Senator is correct in his statement. I think the words of that report, as I stated at the time the committee reported the bill to the Senate, were absolutely true and they were strangely prophetic of what later occurred.

Mr. President, the Japanese Government says that it executed some of our airmen on the ground that they intentionally bombed nonmilitary installations, and deliberately fired on civilians. Under what claim of authority do the Japanese execute citizens of any country for firing on anybody, women, men, children, defended or defenseless? The Japanese bombed the open city of Manila. They stabbed America in the back at Pearl Harbor. I say that where there is one drop of Japanese blood there is absolute Japanese treachery. I hope to God that the Congress of the United States will enact the proposed legislation, or some other legislation which will take away from these yellow devils their right of claim of citizenship in a country which boasts of the patriotism of its people and of the liberties they enjoy. The Japanese have no right to it.

Mr. President, one more word and I am through. Some persons might say that the men at the helm of the Japanese Government are to blame for this war and the cold-blooded act recited in today's newspapers, and that the common run of the Japanese are not to blame. I have no patience with that philosophy. The men at the helm of the Japanese Government are the same as the Japanese who occupy the lowliest positions. I have no patience with the statement or feeling or philosophy that only the ones at the head of the Japanese Government are to blame, they are all to blame alike because they are all alike. I believe—and I should like to emphasize this point—that "once a Jap, always a Jap." It shall be my purpose to urge the enactment of Senate bill 779, to the end that it or some similar legislation shall be placed upon the statute books.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Fred W. Jandry, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul; and

Austin R. Preston, of New York, Foreign Service officer of class 4 and secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be a consul general.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment in various States of the Union and in the Washington office, all under the War Manpower Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—HOLMES B. SPRINGS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Holmes B. Springs to be State director of selective service for South Carolina.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations made by the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 22, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

William Gordon Ennis, of Connecticut, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Hartford area office.

James Asbury Downey, Jr., of Alabama, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Birmingham area office.

Harry Hardie, of Maryland, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office.

William Harry Barron, Jr., of Missouri, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office.

Ben Alvin Barnard, of California, to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Los Angeles area office.

Dale Yoder, of Minnesota, to be Chief of the Planning Division in the Bureau of Program Planning and Review, at $8,000 per annum, in the Washington office.

Chester A. Smith, of Minnesota, to be principal administrative analyst in the Office for Field Management, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Henry K. Arneson, of Arizona, to be area director for Arizona, at $4,600 per annum, in the Phoenix office.

Richard H. Abbott, of Ohio, to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at $5,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Mary E. Miller Dewey, of Connecticut, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Waterbury area office.

Harold Philip Redden, of Massachusetts, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Springfield area office.

Vincent DePaul Murphy, of New York, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Utica area office.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Holmes B. Springs to be State director of selective service for South Carolina, with compensation at the rate of $5,600 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Everett Clifton Hayden

To Finance Department

First Lt. Charles Burnham Milliken
First Lt. William Edward Sievers

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Robert Gardner Baker

To Infantry

Second Lt. George Rayens Grant

To Air Corps

Maj. John Porter Kidwell
First Lt. Joseph George Focht

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Charles Lewis Clifford to be colonel, Cavalry, with rank from March 30, 1943.

Oscar Otto Kuentz to be colonel, Corps of Engineers, with rank from April 1, 1943.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE COMMODORES IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Oscar Smith to be commodore, while serving as commander, Special Task Force No. 1, United States Fleet, to rank from April 12, 1943.

Lee P. Johnson to be commodore, while serving as commander rear echelon, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet, to rank from April 12, 1943.

Robert G. Coman to be commodore, while serving as commander, Service Force, Seventh Fleet (South West Pacific Force), to rank from April 12, 1943.

Lawrence F. Reifsnider to be commodore, while serving as commander transports, Amphibious Force, Third Fleet (South Pacific Force), to rank from April 12, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Robert Lane Colvin, Dubach.

NEW JERSEY

Rose B. Sokolowski, Alpha.
Philip L. Fellinger, East Orange.
Mildred Mullen, Oceanport.
Theresa O'Farrell Wood, West Long Branch.

PENNSYLVANIA

John B. Newhart, Alderson.
J. Arthur Walter, Claysburg.
Wilmer F. Sowers, Green Lane.
Wilmer S. Knipe, Horsham.
Edwin W. Henry, Jr., Hulmeville.
Nora J. Brendlinger, New Florence.
James W. Hatch, North Girard.
Peter Renaldo, Roseto.
Milton E. Spahr, Shepherdstown.
Wave L. Blakeslee, Spartansburg.
George D. Arner, Weissport.

TENNESSEE

Vola W. Mansfield, Dunlap.
William P. Stone, Lynchburg.
Lois Caruthers, Whiteville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thine only begotten Son, our Saviour, comes to the portal of death to tread the wine press alone—all for us, all for us. We would not implore Thee to withhold Him from the valley of pain, but pray, have mercy upon us as grief for His fate lies deep in our breasts. In the garden, beneath a sky palled with tragedy, He weeps alone, bearing the iniquity of us all. In the tearful gloom we thank Thee that His suffering is destined to become a glorious harvest for all humanity. Today in the valley of sorrow inspire us to rise to the mount of humble prayer to praise Thee that Thou art the shadow of every noble soul; in every garden of grief weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. As every life has its Gethsemane, O help us to learn its lesson, acquire its discipline, and kiss the chastening rod which smites us. In our days grant that the angels which comforted our Saviour may minister unto us courage and peace. He who knocks at the door of our hearts and gave blessing; the One who stretched His

arm when we were burdened, saying, "Come unto me"; the One who stood by us in every dark hour when the waves were high and the day was dark—O this is the Christ who shall be our King and our Lord, and in the radiance of His presence we shall dwell forever. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ESTATE OF JOHN J. WARD

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 217, Rept. No. 377) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. John J. Ward, widow of John J. Ward, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to 6 months' salary compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said John J. Ward.

The resolution was agreed to.

STUDY OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 219, Rept. No. 378) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 159 incurred by the Committee on Insular Affairs, including expenditures for the employment of legal services, accountants, experts, and clerical, stenographic assistants, together with incidental and traveling expenses of such committee or any member of a subcommittee thereof and of any agent, assistant, or employee of such committee or subcommittee, as well as any witness or witnesses subpenaed to appear before the committee or any subcommittee thereof, not to exceed $25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or by any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman wish to speak to the resolution?

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to talk about this insular investigation and some other investigations of a similar nature.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, but before doing so permit me to say that the House day before yesterday passed a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Insular Affairs to make an investigation into the political, economic, and social conditions existing in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is a long ways off; the Members cannot walk there. This resolution is to provide money for the expenses of the investigation that the House has already authorized. I may say that the sum is small in comparison with some of the resolutions that have been passed for other committees. Both the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs felt however that it was sufficient. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE BRUTAL MURDER OF OUR AVIATORS BY JAPAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the news given out at the White House on yesterday of the brutal murder of our brave aviators by the savage Japanese ought to convince the maudlin sentimentalists in this country that in fighting the Japs we are fighting a bunch of beasts, not a nation of human beings. That ought to warn these misguided "uplifters" who are trying to scatter the Japanese all over this country, that they are planting a poison that will harass our people and their children for generations to come.

I agree with General DeWitt: "Once a Jap, always a Jap."

I was on the investigating committee that went to Hawaii in 1937, and when I came back I told the Members of this House, as best I could, just what we were up against with reference to the Japs.

While we were conducting that investigation a high-ranking Japanese official came into the Royal Hawaiian Hotel in Honolulu, and the Japanese working in the hotel, who had been born in Hawaii, and probably their parents before them had been born there, bowed before him until their heads touched the floor.

But they are sending these Japanese down South where we do not want them, and where nobody would trust one of them as far as you could see him.

The other day a Japanese officer that had been captured by our men on Guadalcanal was sent to one of these concentration camps in the South, and whenever he approached them the other Japanese, although they were born in Hawaii, California, Oregon, or Washington—American born, if you please—they bowed until their heads touched the ground.

They are loyal to Japan and to Japan only, and I warn you now that not one of them could be trusted at any time, anywhere.

I am glad the administration is waking up. I wish a couple of Cabinet officers had woke up before Pearl Harbor and had had the Hawaiian Islands patrolled for a thousand miles around; then we would have had no Pearl Harbor disaster. But I am telling you now that General MacArthur is right in appealing to us for all the help we can give now. Our boys on Guadalcanal, in Australia, and throughout the whole Pacific area, are giving their lives to protect this country against these savage apes; and it is our duty to recognize the fact that Japan is our greatest menace, our permanent enemy, and to send all the help we can at once.

Japan must be destroyed.

If we delay until Australia is overrun and her white women and children murdered by these ruthless barbarians, we are likely to lose this war.

Let us put a stop to these maudlin sentimentalists in key positions trying to jam these Japanese down the throats of our white people.

Let us realize that we are in a war with the most dangerous, the most dastardly, and the most brutal enemy that ever attacked the United States of America, or ever threatened the white man's civilization in any quarter of the globe, and send our brave fighting forces in the Pacific area everything necessary to wipe this loathesome menace from the face of the earth.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting here a speech which I made on this subject more than a year ago. In it you will find an excerpt from an opinion of the late Chief Justice Fuller of the Supreme Court of the United States to the effect that these Japanese are not and cannot become American citizens.

God speed the day when we will have a Supreme Court that will follow that opinion of Chief Justice Fuller and save our country forever from the Japanese peril.

The speech referred to follows:

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Monday, February 23, 1942.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my insistence that the Japanese in this country, in Alaska, and in Hawaii be placed in concentration camps at once.

In an Associated Press article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning we find the following significant statements:

[From the Washington Post of February 23, 1942]

"SIX THOUSAND ALIENS ROUNDED UP ON WEST COAST—MANY JAP RESERVE OFFICERS AMONG THEM; ARMS CACHES FOUND

"SAN FRANCISCO, February 22.—Raiding from Canada to the Mexican border, the Federal Bureau of Investigation scored the first triumphs of the war in the Pacific Coast States.

"Since February 2, its swiftly moving agents have questioned at least 6,000 Japanese, German, and Italian aliens, and seized sufficient numbers of these enemy nationals to have comprised a menacing force of spies and saboteurs.

"Some of those rounded up were reserve officers in the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy, and members of Japanese secret societies directed from Tokyo.

"*Many firearms taken*

"Federal Bureau of Investigation men have confiscated more than 80,000 rounds of ammunition, hundreds of firearms of all kinds, and various explosives capable of causing extensive destruction.

"In the hands of enemy aliens the agents have found strange items—American naval signal flags, military uniforms, an oddly built therapeutic treatment machine capable of sending short-distance radio messages.

"And they have discovered, according to California's attorney general, strange and possibly sinister coincidences—Japanese using the citizenship of their American-born children to control land completely surrounding California aircraft plants, and Japanese purportedly making a living by farming in military areas on ground that obviously couldn't provide them a livelihood.

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation agents have pounced on aliens and contraband in the vicinity of such vital areas as the Bremerton (Wash.) Navy Yard; the Mare Island Navy Yard, near Vallejo, Calif.; the United

States Naval Training Station at San Diego, Calif.; Army Air Corps and blimp base at Sunnyvale, Calif.; and Terminal Island naval and shipbuilding area in Los Angeles Harbor.

"Use of surprise tactics

"In this drive against potential fifth columnists, the 350 Federal Bureau of Investigation men on the west coast, backed by local enforcement officers, have utilized the element of surprise, keeping enemy aliens guessing at where they will strike next.

"Launching the raids in northern California early this month, Nat J. L. Pieper, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, San Francisco office, explained:

" 'We're doing this on definite suspicions of espionage.'

"The latest coast-wide mass sorties this week end, resulting in apprehension of hundreds of aliens after thousands were grilled, apparently were to effect a final clean-up before Pacific coast military areas are placed under strict Army rule by virtue of a new Presidential decree."

Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper also carried the following Associated Press story with reference to the Civil Liberties Union:

"CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION PROTESTS REMOVAL ORDER

"NEW YORK, February 22.—The American Civil Liberties Union today protested as 'unprecedented and founded on no specific evidence of need,' President Roosevelt's Executive order establishing military areas from which citizens or aliens may be removed."

This Civil Liberties Union has long been regarded by many as a communistic and un-American organization. Recently the head of this Civil Liberties Union is quoted as having stated that "the unhappy people of Japan are our brothers."

Well, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to become "our brothers' keeper" for the duration of this emergency by putting them every one in concentration camps until the war is over then shipping them back to Asia and never permitting another one to come to this country to live.

I wonder how it sounds to our boys in the service who are offering their lives for this country to read where this Civil Liberties Union is protesting against our trying to protect the American people from these treacherous Japs. It is about time the Government looked into this Civil Liberties Union, and put a stop to its attempts to stir up race trouble along the Atlantic seaboard, here in Washington, and throughout the Southern States. It would be interesting to know how many of its members belong to an organization that is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

It is well-known that Hawaiian-born Japanese, who claim the protection of the American flag, were giving information to Japan by radio, telephone, flashlight, and other signals prior to and during the Pearl Harbor attack, and have been doing so since—just as these American-born Japs are now doing along the Pacific coast.

Unless we drive the Japanese entirely out of Hawaii, they are going to drive us out. While the Germans and Italians are attacking us in front, these treacherous Japs, who have sponged on our generosity for their very existence, are now driving the dagger in our backs, and at the same time their racial cohorts are undermining and sabotaging us up and down the Pacific coast and throughout the Hawaiian Islands.

We should round up and confine every German and every Italian in this country about whose loyalty there is the slightest question. We cannot afford to take chances with them. And when it comes to the Japanese, we should make it unanimous. Once a Jap, always a Jap We cannot afford to trust any of them. The leopard cannot change his spots.

You will note also that these American- or Hawaiian-born Japs are using their alleged American citizenship to help destroy this country.

This is war. Our country, our homes, our civilization, our way of life are threatened on every hand. We cannot afford to take chances.

The Civil Liberties Union says the President's action in going after these Japs is "unprecedented and founded on no specific evidence of need."

How much more specific evidence of need does the Civil Liberties Union want us to have than Pearl Harbor and the revelations that have been uncovered relative to these Japs since the Pearl Harbor attack? As for such action being unprecedented, let me remind these newcomers to our shores that Andrew Jackson was accused of acting without precedent on a similar occasion more than a hundred years ago, when he moved certain Indian tribes in order to avoid further trouble. We should follow Andrew Jackson's example now.

Japanese fifth columnists have been stirring race trouble in this country for a long time. I am told that they have been so successful among the Negroes in Harlem, New York, that the city authorities have entirely lost control and have called upon the State of New York to help maintain law and order. They are working through such organizations as this Civil Liberties Union and associations for the advancement of the colored races. In my opinion, they are behind this drive to try to stir up trouble between the whites and the Negroes here in Washington by trying to force Negroes into hotels, restaurants, picture shows, and other public places. They know that, if they can start race riots in Washington and throughout the country, it will aid them in their nefarious designs against the people of the United States.

A news item from Tokyo on November 29, 1941, under the heading "Japs see United States color problem," we find the following striking statement from Yoshichi Nagatani, who is referred to by the Japanese press as a "prominent businessman and expert on America," in which he is quoted as saying:

"When it becomes plain that America is going on the rocks, 20,000,000 Negroes, 10,000,000 Americans with Axis antecedents, 10,000,000 unemployed, and 5,000,000 members of labor unions, and numerous Communists will rise in revolt and create chaos."

Nagatani goes on to refer to President Roosevelt as a "buffoon," and predicts that the first Japanese victory "will result in confusion throughout the United States."

Remember this statement was published just 8 days before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. I do not know who led this Japanese spy to believe that all the American Negroes could be deluded into such a trap. If these agitators will let the Negroes alone, we will have no trouble with them. The white people of the South who have always been the Negroes' best friends, and who know the Negro problem, will have no trouble with the colored race if these fifth columnists and the flannel-mouthed agitators throughout the country will let them alone.

It is silly and stupid for the Japs, or any other enemy, to expect support from the patriotic laboring men and women of this Nation, and, so far as their Communist cohorts are concerned, it is high time that everyone of them who agitates trouble of any kind in this country was taken in hand.

It is being argued in some quarters that we do not have the constitutional right to handle the Japanese who are born in this country. They take the position that these Japanese are American citizens and entitled to the same rights as are the descendants of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. I most emphatically deny that assertion. These Japanese are not citizens of the United States and never can be. The clause of the Constitution upon which this argument relies reads as follows:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

My contention is that these Japanese do not come within that provision of the Constitution. Their parents could not become citizens of the United States under our laws, but remained citizens of Japan. Legally they were mere visitors to our shores, and when their children were born they became citizens of Japan; and being citizens of Japan their children also took the same status. While born in the United States, they did not become citizens because they were not subject to the jurisdiction thereof, but were subjects of Japan. I know that a different position was once taken by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark* (169 U. S. Reports, p. 649), in the face of a powerful dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Fuller. I believe that Judge Fuller was entirely correct in his dissenting opinion, and that if this matter were put before the Supreme Court today the decision of the Court at that time would be reversed, and Chief Justice Fuller's position would be sustained. I know the American people would sustain him.

In that dissenting opinion Chief Justice Fuller said:

"I cannot concur in the opinion and judgment of the Court in this case.

"The proposition is that a child born in this country of parents who were not citizens of the United States, and under the laws of their own country and of the United States could not become such—as was the fact from the beginning of the Government in respect of the class of aliens to which the parents in this instance belonged—is from the moment of his birth a citizen of the United States, by virtue of the first clause of the fourteenth amendment, any act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The argument is, that although the Constitution prior to that amendment nowhere attempted to define the words 'citizen of the United States' and 'natural-born citizens' as used therein, yet that it must be interpreted in the light of the English common-law rule which made the place of birth the criterion of nationality; that that rule was in force in all the English colonies upon this continent down to the time of the Declaration of Independence, and in the United States afterward, and continued to prevail under the Constitution as originally established; and that before the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the adoption of the constitutional amendment, all white persons, at least, born within the sovereignty of the United States, whether children of citizens or of foreigners, excepting only children of ambassadors or public ministers of a foreign government, were native-born citizens of the United States.

"Thus the fourteenth amendment is held to be merely declaratory except that it brings all persons, irrespective of color, within the scope of the alleged rule, and puts that rule beyond the control of the legislative power.

"If the conclusion of the majority opinion is correct, then the children of citizens of the United States, who have been born abroad since July 28, 1868, when the amendment was declared ratified, were, and are, aliens, unless they have, or shall on attaining majority become citizens by naturalization in the United States, and no statutory provision to the contrary is of any force or effect. And children who are aliens by descent, but born on our soil, are exempted from the exercise of the power to exclude or to expel aliens, or any class of aliens, so often maintained by this Court, an exemption apparently disregarded by the acts in respect of the exclusion of persons of Chinese descent.

"Obviously, where the Constitution deals with common-law rights and uses common-law phraseology, its language should be read in the light of the common law; but when the question arises as to what constitutes citizenship of the Nation, involving, as it does, international relations, and political, as contradistinguished from civil status, international principles must be considered, and, unless the municipal law of England appears to have been affirmatively accepted, it cannot be allowed to control in the matter of construction.

"Nationality is essentially a political idea, and belongs to the sphere of public law. Hence Mr. Justice Story, in *Shanks* v. *Dupont* (3 Pet. 242, 248), said that the incapacities of femes covert, at common law, 'do not reach their political rights, nor prevent their acquiring or losing a national character. Those political rights do not stand upon the mere doctrines of municipal law, applicable to ordinary transactions, but stand upon the more general principles of the law of nations.'"

In this dissenting opinion, Justice Fuller quotes from Vattel, one of the world's greatest authorities on international law. In that connection, he says:

"Before the revolution, the views of the publicists had been thus put by Vattel: 'The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens. As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those children naturally follow the condition of their fathers, and succeed to all their rights. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to his children the right of becoming members of it. The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent. We shall soon see whether, on their coming to the years of discretion, they may renounce their right, and what they owe to the society in which they were born. I say that, in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen; for, if he is born thereof a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country' (book I, ch. 19, No. 212). 'The true bond which connects the child with the body politic is not the matter of an inanimate piece of land, but the moral relations of his parentage. The place of birth produces no change in the rule that children follow the condition of their fathers, for it is not naturally the place of birth that gives rights, but extraction.'"

In concluding his dissenting opinion, Chief Justice Fuller says:

"It is not to be admitted that the children of persons so situated become citizens by the accident of birth. On the contrary, I am of opinion that the President and Senate by treaty, and the Congress by naturalization, have the power, notwithstanding the fourteenth amendment, to prescribe that all persons of a particular race, or their children, cannot become citizens, and that it results that the consent to allow such persons to come into and reside within our geographical limits does not carry with it the imposition of citizenship upon children born to them while in this country under such consent, in spite of treaty and statute.

"In other words, the fourteenth amendment does not exclude from citizenship by birth children born in the United States of parents permanently located therein and who might themselves become citizens; nor, on the other hand, does it arbitrarily make citizens of children born in the United States of parents who, according to the will of their native government and of this Government, are and must remain aliens."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that since these Japanese could not become citizens of this country, but remain citizens of Japan, their legal status was that of visitors to our shores and their children became subjects of Japan and not citizens of the United States, and that their children's children assumed the same status.

The truth of the business is that these facts have been recognized by Japan from the beginning, and by these Japanese themselves. When these children are born, their names are registered with the Japanese consul, who sends them in to Tokyo, where they are registered as Japanese citizens entitled to all rights as such, just the same as if they had been born on Japanese soil. They never can become Americans. There is a racial and a religious difference they can never overcome. They are pagan in their philosophy, atheistic in their beliefs, alien in their allegiance, and antagonistic to everything for which we stand.

This is one of the most momentous questions that has confronted our people in a thousand years, and I for one am in favor of meeting it squarely and deciding it in our favor by declaring that no Japanese can ever become a citizen of the United States, but that they are aliens in our midst and should be deported at the earliest opportunity.

Let us save America for Americans!

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNTIL MAY 3, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 22, 1943, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, May 3, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House has completed the program that is pressing and that the tax bill which is now in dispute will be taken up for consideration on May 3?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, on Monday, May 3.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement setting forth the activities of the National Youth Administration in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute to the flag.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WARD JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement made by me before the select committee conducting a study and investigation of the national defense program and its relation to the small business of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GAVIN?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the execution of certain American flyers by the Japanese has no parallel in civilized warfare for sheer brutality and savagery. It comes close home to us in Massachusetts because five flyers from that State were on General Doolittle's flight, two from Arlington, a city in my own district. One of those brave men is back in this country and one is missing.

There is one thing that this teaches us, and that is that we shall not rest for one instant until their death is avenged. We must see to it that every measure of war, every measure of preparedness and attack, is followed through with lightning speed. I have warned steadily since coming to Congress against Japanese methods and the Japanese war lords.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on May 4 I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include brief articles with each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SOLANUM TUBEROSUM

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, certainly the pictures on the front page of yesterday's Washington Daily News did not boost the morale of our people very much. Everywhere in the country for the past 2 weeks or more, it has been impossible to buy a single potato, and the future prospects are not very bright.

Perhaps the new definition of Irish potatoes published in a recent Federal Register by the Food Distribution Administration, who are now in charge of our food supply, has something to do with scaring potatoes off the market. I am sure all of us who like potatoes will be interested in their modern description of this important item of our daily diet:

The term "Irish potatoes" means any and all varieties of the edible starchy subterranean tuber of an American plant of the species solanum tuberosum.

This would be amusing were it not so serious. Can it be possible that the shortage of Irish potatoes in our markets is due to the generosity shown our enemies? I believe in humane treatment for all prisoners certainly, but something must be really wrong when we supply potatoes for our enemies at the expense of our own citizens.

I sincerely suggest to the Members of this House that we cease referring to this now extinct food, which has been very common on our tables heretofore, as potatoes or spuds or Murphys—with my apologies to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOE O'BRIEN—and place their next orders for solanum tuberosum.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the attitude of the Farmers' Union on the agricultural appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reports came to us, yesterday, respecting the tragedies of war, and that the Japanese have ruthlessly put to death several of our soldiers who have fallen into the hands of the Japanese Army as prisoners of war. This is a frightful violation of every policy of the law of war, and the Japanese, who so flagrantly violated these laws, must be held to answer for those ruthless and inexcusable violations.

General MacArthur has been doing a fine job in the Pacific, taking into consideration the tools and equipment of war which he has at his disposal. He is greatly limited in his equipment; he needs tanks, fighting and bombing planes, guns and ammunition; he needs more men. While those in charge of this war appear to have an abundance of war materials and supplies to send to Great Britain, Russia, China, and other nations, yet General MacArthur, with his small army of men in the Pacific, is doing a fine job with the equipment he has, but he needs more equipment, and he needs more materials of war—he needs more men and more supplies. We must not permit the Japs to further dig in and fortify themselves on the many and numerous islands in the Pacific, because they will be much harder to dislodge. We must give General MacArthur the help he needs, and we must give him that help now—and he will, with his brave army, go forward in his offensive against the ruthless foe and prevent them from further fortifying the islands upon which they have landed troops.

Let us give this great military genius the help he now needs, before his mission is made harder because of the delay in delivering the essential equipment to him. Let us give MacArthur all of the help he needs now, and thus hasten our victory in the Pacific over those who so viciously attacked us at Pearl Harbor and thereby caused our immediate involvement in this terrible war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I recently issued regarding the investigation of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written from somewhere in Africa by Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl Ryan to the Honorable Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Superior Court in Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. R. L. Woolley, of Hermiston, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Arbor Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EASTER SERVICE, CAPITOL STEPS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday morning, April 25, for the first time in the history of this Government, an Easter morning service will be held on the main steps of the Capitol. These services are being sponsored by a committee of Senators and Representatives and the Capitol Fellowship Forum. I take this opportunity of inviting all Members of Congress and their families who will be in town on Easter to join us in these services which are also open to the public. They are to be strictly nonsectarian in character.

Through the cooperation of the Speaker, the wartime ban with respect to holding large public gatherings on the Capitol Grounds during this crisis has been modified for this occasion. The services will begin at 8:30, and Capt. Robert D. Workman, the Chief of Navy Chaplains, will be the principal speaker. The Navy Band will play a musical prelude beginning at 8 o'clock. We hope this special service will help in its small way to demonstrate that what has become of necessity the wartime capital of the world is also the best and most unselfish hope of all humanity that this conflict will be followed by an era of peace, good will, and Christian brotherly love.

I ask unanimous consent to include the program with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

EASTER SERVICES

United States Capitol steps, 8:30 Sunday morning, April 25, 1943

(Congressman KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, presiding)

Musical prelude—United States Navy Band
Lt. Charles Brendler, director

America—Entire assembly

Invocation—Capt. John F. B. Carruthers, C. S. M. F.
Chairman, Christian Commission

Statement of purpose—George H. Kendall
President, Capitol Fellowship Forum

A Toast to the Flag—The Telephone Glee Club
Robert Davidson, director; words by John Jay Daly

The American's Creed—Entire assembly
Led by John Page, eldest son of the author of the Creed

Address—Capt. Robert D. Workman
Chief of Navy Chaplains

Boston Commandery (Carter)—United States Navy Band

Gloria in Excelsis (Mozart)—The Telephone Glee Club

Benediction—Glenn E. Wagner
President, Washington Bible Institute

The Star-Spangled Banner—Entire assembly

Musical postlude—United States Navy Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the appointment of George J. Burke as chief counsel for the O. P. A. and include a newspaper article and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the production of butter and cheese.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the vote was taken on the conference report to increase the salaries for Government employees I was confined to the Naval Hospital suffering from an attack of ptomaine poisoning, where I had been since last Saturday. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes" on the conference report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Globe-Democrat, of St. Louis, of last Sunday's issue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the conference committee on the pay-increase bill. Its purpose is to meet increased living costs during the war. I was unavoidably absent from the House and, in fact, had not anticipated a roll call yesterday on the conference report. I was a member of that conference committee and signed the report. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." I believe the House will later change its position and act affirmatively on this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution sent to me by Mrs. William Sahud, president of the National Council of Jewish Women, Chicago section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement from the pageant We Will Never Die.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made a while ago on the Japanese situation and include a speech I made in this House on February 23, 1942, and also certain excerpts from an opinion by the late Chief Justice Fuller of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUML-CARLSON PLAN

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the speech made in New York City by your colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. It appears in this morning's RECORD. I have read many speeches on this subject. I consider these remarks the most informative, the most clearly stated, and the most fairly stated of all the speeches and articles that I have read. I desire to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

BERYLLIUM

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. REECE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 3, after disposition of other matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter of testimony.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by Hon. Tom Clark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection,

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO PRIORITY APPLICATIONS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 381) on House Resolution 185, from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report and the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report (Rept. No. 381) to accompany House Resolution 185.

The Committee on Military Affairs to whom was referred House Resolution 185, requesting the President to transmit certain information with respect to the approval or disapproval of priority applications, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do not pass:

"The report of the Secretary of War and Chairman of the War Production Board answers and clarifies all the questions contained in said resolution, and has already made a survey of the area mentioned in said resolution on the subject of facilities available both for pressing civilian clothes and military uniforms, and has also found that the necessary commercial laundries and dry-cleaning facilities are available in the communities mentioned in the resolution and that the War Department does not establish or maintain laundries or dry-cleaning equipment in competition with private industry where adequate and sufficient facilities privately owned and operated are available."

House Resolution 185

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, answers to the following questions:

1. Has approval been given by the War Production Board since August 26, 1942, to any request or application for priority for steam clothes-pressing machines?

2. If the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, were the machines released by such approval to be used, in whole or in part, for the pressing of clothes for civilians?

3. Has the War Production Board since August 26, 1942, approved a request or application for a priority for steam clothes-pressing machines where the machines so released were for use exclusively for the pressing of uniforms or clothing for officers and soldiers of the United States Army?

4. Since August 26, 1942, has the War Production Board approved any request or application for priority for steam clothes-pressing machines for use, in whole or in part, in the pressing of clothes for civilians in the District of Columbia?

5. If the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, how many such machines were released by such approval?

6. Since August 26, 1942, has the War Production Board approved any request or appli-

cation for priority for steam clothes-pressing machines for use exclusively in the pressing of uniforms and clothes for officers and soldiers in the United States Army within a radius of 50 miles of Victory, Pa. (formerly Transfer, Pa.)?

7. Since August 26, 1942, has the War Production Board approved any request or application for priority for steam clothes-pressing machines for use, in whole or in part, in the pressing of clothes for civilians within a radius of 50 miles of Victory, Pa. (formerly Transfer, Pa.)?

8. If the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative—

(a) How many such machines were released by such approval?

(b) To how many individuals, firms, or corporations was such approval granted?

(c) At how many different locations were the machines released by such approval to be operated?

(d) What was the approximate distance in miles from Victory, Pa. (formerly Transfer, Pa.), to the place or location at which each of such machines was to be operated?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 193.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1364, a bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Allen, Ill.	Cannon, Fla.	Elston, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Capozzoli	Englebright
Arends	Celler	Fay
Arnold	Chiperfield	Feighan
Baldwin, Md	Clark	Fernandez
Baldwin, N. Y.	Crawford	Furlong
Barden	Creal	Gavagan
Barry	Culkin	Gibson
Beall	Curley	Gifford
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Gillette
Bloom	Dies	Gillie
Bolton	Dilweg	Goodwin
Boykin	Dirksen	Green
Brehm	Dondero	Gross
Brooks	Drewry	Guyer
Buckley	Durham	Hale
Buffett	Elliott	Hare
Burgin	Ellsworth	Harness, Ind.
Butler	Elmer	Heffernan
Hendricks	McWilliams	Rolph
Hess	Madden	Rowe
Hinshaw	Magnuson	Sadowski
Hobbs	Maloney	Schiffler
Howell	Mason	Schwabe
Johnson, Ind.	Merritt	Shafer
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Monkiewicz	Short
	Mott	Simpson, Ill.
Kearney	Myers	Smith, Va.
Kee	Nichols	Smith, W. Va.
Keefe	O'Konski	Smith, Wis.
Kelley	O'Toole	Starnes, Ala.
Kennedy	Outland	Steagall
Keogh	Peterson, Ga.	Stevenson
Kilburn	Pfeifer	Talbot
King	Philbin	Taylor
Kirwan	Phillips	Thomas, N. J.
LaFollette	Plumley	Treadway
Lea	Price	Vursell
Lesinski	Rabaut	Ward
Ludlow	Richards	Wasielewski
McCord	Rivers	Weaver
McGranery	Rockwell	Weichel, Ohio
McGregor	Rodgers, Pa.	Weiss
McLean	Rogers, Calif.	Wheat

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 301 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings, under the call, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and, pending that, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I realize that we are all more or less in a hurry to dispose of this matter, and I shall make my remarks very brief.

This rule is an open rule making in order H. R. 1364, which is a bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended. Briefly, it would do four things:

First. It would permit the members of the naval forces known as the WAVES to serve on shore duty abroad but not on board ship, even as the companion or sister organization, the WAAC, is now permitted to serve overseas.

Second. It would raise the ranks to permit the members of this Reserve to become commanders and would give them a certain equality with other members of the Navy as to certain benefits such as death benefits, and so on.

Third. It would make the organization a permanent part of the Navy.

Frankness compels the admission on my part that when this organization was set up by the Congress I was not very enthusiastic about it, but the more I have observed the workings of this organization, the more I have seen able-bodied men in these departments performing duties that could just as well be performed by these intelligent women, the more I realize the acuteness of the manpower situation facing the country, the more I have realized the necessity, or at least the good services, that this organization performs.

The rule, as I say, is an open rule. I shall not discuss the merits of the bill further. I hope the rule may be speedily adopted and that we may go into a consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that we may require the whole half-hour because there are a number of Members who want to be heard before the House takes a recess over Easter.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill and it has the unanimous support of all the committees that have dealt with it and probably all Members of the House on both sides.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. To keep the record straight, I must say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the Naval Affairs Committee could not reach a unanimous vote on this bill.

Mr. FISH. I am very surprised at that, and, of course, I am always glad to be corrected. This bill is an important one. It provides that the members of the Women's Reserve, the so-called WAVES, shall be permitted to attain the rank of captain and shall be permitted to serve abroad and shall qualify for benefits under the law provided for male officers and enlisted men. Like my good friend from Mississippi, I was one of those doubting Thomases, but we do not have to apologize, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi, because there were many others, including high-ranking officers of the Navy who at the outset were very doubtful of the advisability of creating the so-called WAVES or members of the Women's Reserve Corps. But the Women's Reserve organization has rendered a real service and has received a great deal of praise from all sides, including the high-ranking officers of the Navy. Today there are only 14,000 of them. I was under the impression there were many more. In fact, I think there ought to be many more because they are replacing men in the Navy who can go to the front, who can serve on warships, and help carry the war to the enemy. The WAAC's, I am informed, number 50,000, with an authorized limit of 150,000 to replace men in the Army who might well go into combat service. Inasmuch as both of these bills which will come up today provide for the replacement of men in the Navy and in the Army for combat service, I would like again to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that there are 850,000 men in Government jobs under 38 years of age who should be in the armed forces of the United States, who should be put into uniform without any further delay.

I have repeatedly called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there are literally scorces of thousands—I do not know the exact number—of unmarried men, single men, holding safe jobs in the Government service. I propose to continue this fight until we get all these slackers and all these employees on the Federal pay roll hiding in Government bombproofs out of the bombproofs into the uniform of the Army or Navy.

I am going a little further. I have been urging the nondeferment of unmarried men holding Government jobs. But what about the married man who

has a wife drawing a fat Federal salary and who is in the Government service, too? They are both drawing more money than they have ever received in their lives before in the Government service. From now on I am going to include not only the single men who ought to be in the armed forces but the married man who has a wife in the Government service and who is under 38 years of age.

We, the Members of Congress, have a duty to perform. We voted to declare war. Are we going to remain silent and let these slackers make use of the Government service to escape serving ' the Army and Navy in the greatest war in our history? We have a responsibility, having declared this war. We talk about going out and looking for more manpower. What right have we got to talk or look for additional manpower when 850,000 men are now holding jobs in the Government service under 38 years of age?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman, of course, is not referring to the husband and wife who are both in the military service?

M FISH. No; certainly not. I am referring, as I have said repeatedly in the House and will continue to do so, particularly to the unmarried men under 38 years of age. They can easily be replaced by older men, by physical disqualified men, or by women. I would not make one single exception or grant deferment for anyone except for physical disqualification. I would put them all in uniform and if they are urgently needed send them back to do a specific job, such as chemists, airplane designers, engineers, and so forth. I feel that the Congress is somewhat remiss in its duty when it talks about seeking more manpower and looks for that manpower elsewhere when we have 850,000 men of draft age in the Government departments, bureaus, and agencies.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman know how many younger officers there are in the departments, both the War and Navy Departments, who are doing work that could be done by people who are not qualified for service aboard ship or in the field?

Mr. FISH. I do not know the exact number, but I do know there are far too many right here in Washington. There are thousands of them under 35 years of age holding down safe jobs in Washington.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true also that in the Navy Department, because men doing certain duties there have not been sent in for indoctrination or training on the ships, are sent out without training and the women who go into the WAVES can take their places and allow them to be trained? It is a very bad situation.

Mr. FISH. The only answer I can give to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is to commend her for being the sponsor of this type of legislation for the creation of the WAAC and the WAVES. They have already replaced thousands of men to go into combat service where they belong.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to take a minute to speak on the latest Japanese atrocity, the murder of American officers and enlisted men of our air force by the Japanese. The American people were shocked and horrified by the execution, against all principles of international law, of American officers and men who had been captured by the Japs. It is nothing else but sheer murder. It is the most shocking event that has happened so far in a cruel and barbarous war, and is the greatest atrocity of this war. There is only one answer to it and that is to speed up the war in the Pacific. Let us get on with this war. Let us give General MacArthur more troops, more ships, more tanks, and more airplanes. Let us start a major offensive against Japan, let us carry the war to Japan. Let us bomb the Japanese cities. Let us get on with the war against Japan and defeat them as soon as possible. Talk will not hurt them; what we want is action in the air, on the sea, and on the land by invasion of Japan; that should be our only answer to these barbarous murderers of our officers and men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] such time as he may require.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram and a brief statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, unlike the gentleman from New York who preceded me, I favored this legislation originally. I think it will serve as an incentive to those who will be included under its beneficial provisions, the same as officers and men in the various branches of our armed service. My colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], a member of the Committee on Rules, who presented the rule, has been interested in the establishment of the organization and favors the enactment of this legislation. Therefore, I am indeed pleased that it is his privilege to call up this resolution It is legislation in the right direction and should pass without undue consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] stated that when we return after the deserved recess of a few days the Committee on Ways and Means will be ready to report the revenue bill. Ever since that bill has been under consideration I have advocated certain forgiveness of 1942 taxes to all, but not full forgiveness of taxes to the war profiteers and those whom Mr. Ruml represents. I believe we should forgive even them on equal terms with those who most deserve it, namely, the white-collar worker, the small businessman, the farmer, and the wage earner. They should be forgiven a small tax amount, namely, up to an amount of $2,500, of their income and not on a percentage basis as has been advocated by some.

I have read the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], and I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MILLS] a few days ago with respect to the enormous profits that brokers, manufacturers, representatives, and others who represent large corporations are reaping. Their profits run into the millions, and their taxes would be forgiven to the extent of nearly $1,000,000 under the Ruml banker's plan. I ask for forgiveness of the taxes of those who will not be able to and cannot pay their taxes, due to the high cost of living. I urge that the wage earner, small businessman, the farmer, and especially the white-collared worker, whose income is small, be considered and that the House and the Committee on Ways and Means give consideration to the plan I have submited, to forgive taxes up to the income of $2,500 of all. If we do not, it will be impossible to collect from most of the little fellows, from the small storekeeper, the farmer, and the wage earner, because they will not have the money to pay the tax, and it will cost us more endeavoring to collect than the amount we will finally collect.

Many of your Republicans ask what we Democrats will do on this or that proposition. In past years you have charged us with being rubber stamps. Today I ask you Republicans what you are going to do to relieve the people with small incomes, the small farmer in whom you claim you are interested, the wage earner, the white-collar man, and the small businessman. I hope that you will not permit the bankers, war profiteers, large-fee brokers, and others with large incomes, recipients of bonuses and dividends, to influence and dictate the measure of your relief for these deserving classes. I appeal to you not to be rubber stamps and tools to the most avaricious money groups who are behind the plan to forgive all of the 1942 taxes or to submit, as it has been rumored, in agreeing to some percentage basis plan, which would inure to the benefit of these monied groups and to the detriment of the little fellow and our Government. I ask that you reassert yourselves and to insist, demand, and vote for the plan I have been advocating which will actually

relieve those who are in need of tax relief and not those in the higher income brackets who are seeking to get from under in paying taxes on the income derived in the most profitable year in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the membership will have about 10 days to think this tax matter over. If they will permit their conscience to guide them they will return to the House and support and vote for tax forgiveness on $2,500 income of all taxpayers. It will not cost the Treasury much because from reports which I have noted from revenue collectors in practically every section of the country they are finding a large number of small taxpayers have failed to file returns, and many who have filed returns have indicated they will be unable to pay the full tax. Therefore, as I have stated, if the imposition of the present tax is maintained and some forgiveness not extended, it will require the employment of an army of collectors and a large clerical force at an expense of millions of dollars to the Government to collect the taxes which, in the end, would not equal the additional expenditures made for collections.

Therefore, in the interest of the Treasury and in the interest of justice and fairness I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to bring in a bill on the 3d of next month with a proviso to forgive taxes on the incomes of all taxpayers up to $2,500. Thereafter we can go home and face the people and say we are not legislating only for those who are everlastingly seeking to shirk their responsibility to the country. I refer to those who can best afford to pay the tax and carry the burden of Government expenses instead of inflicting it upon the poorest of the poor.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] such time as he may desire.

THE MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago the great municipal airport at Omaha was 3 feet under water. Think of it—the airport at Omaha, one of the principal stations on the principal transcontinental air route across the country. I do not need to say anything about the critical importance of that airport to the transport of the country in these times. The cause was a flood of the Missouri River.

A week before that, Mr. Speaker, the flood marooned Pierre, the capital of my own State, South Dakota. The main east-and-west highway leading into the capital was 4 feet under water and the flood crest was lapping dangerously near the top of the railroad bridge, sole remaining ground communication between two large military installations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could bring to the Congress an adequate picture of what those things mean. I have mentioned only two points on a river that was flooded for more than a thousand miles, flooded for a greater distance than the entire length of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo, flooded for a greater distance than the Tennessee from its mouth to Knoxville.

In the wake of that flood, thousands of people are homeless, hundreds of farm homes have been isolated, perhaps millions of acres of farm lands have been under water, and nobody knows how much livestock has been destroyed.

The other day during the debate on the agriculture appropriation bill, when we were talking about crop insurance, someone said there should be insurance to protect farmers from flood losses. And someone else said crop insurance was needed to aid the farmers of the Dakotas when the grasshoppers and drought came. Mr. Speaker, I said then, and I repeat it now, the kind of insurance needed in that Northwest country is a series of reservoirs on the Missouri River. They could protect the farms downstream from flooding and the farms upstream from drought and the grasshoppers whose destruction is disastrous in dry years.

It is hard for the average person in the East to realize what a long river, the old Missouri is. The other day I ventured the offhand remark that the distance between Fort Peck, Mont., where the one upstream reservoir is located, and Sioux City, Iowa, the point where control and improvement begin, was greater than the entire length of the Ohio or Tennessee. Later I checked with the office of the Chief of Engineers, and find that statement was correct, fantastic as it may sound.

The Missouri, from Fort Peck, Mont., to Sioux City, Iowa, is 1,060 miles. The Ohio, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to where it empties into the Mississippi, is 980 miles. The Tennessee, from its mouth to Knoxville, is 650 miles. Imagine the Ohio and the Tennessee, if you can, without one single dam, without flood-control works throughout their entire length, and you will have some idea of the picture on the Missouri.

And then remember that after the accumulated uncontrolled flood waters that have gathered in 1,060 miles, the river rolls on a hundred miles to Omaha and hundreds of miles to the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico.

The problem of controlling the flood waters of the Missouri River is not a local problem in the northwest. It is a national problem. It is water from the upper Missouri that makes flood problems on the lower Mississippi. It is water in the Missouri, properly harnessed, that can maintain navigation between Sioux City and Kansas City.

We can build dams on the upper river, use the water for irrigation and power, cure the floods, and turn over to the central and southern States water to carry commerce. That is the logical thing to do.

Now, I know these are wartimes, and I am not proposing that we stop the war to build dams on the Missouri. But I am suggesting that we cannot overlook the damage to the Nation's war effort when an airport like the one at Omaha is put out of commission for several days and when thousands of acres of food crops are destroyed or severely damaged.

Studies of the Missouri have been under way for years by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Three years ago last month, I left my work here and went out to Pierre, to be present when the then Col. William Hoge opened hearings on a study directed by a resolution which I had presented to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The war came and Colonel Hoge went on to other work, including the building of the Alaska Highway.

He has a most worthy successor, however, in the person of Col. Lewis A. Pick, present division engineer, who has been directing one of the greatest Army construction programs in the whole country. With the first let-up in that construction program, Colonel Pick turned his attention to completing the Missouri River study and has been giving the matter his personal attention for several weeks.

And when the big flood came 2 weeks ago, Colonel Pick threw himself into the fight and went for days and nights without sleep. Today he is up high on the river making a personal investigation of the flood's damages while the marks are fresh. I hope to meet him in South Dakota next week, and when I return, I hope to bring the Congress a first-hand report of the conditions that have been determined and some idea of what can be done to meet the immediate situation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce that I have introduced a bill which will double the allotments of servicemen's children from $12 to $24 per month for the first child of a veteran, and for the second child and each remaining child of servicemen from $10 to $20 a month.

I am acting for this reason. Unless some action is taken before very long, while married men are being drafted, you will see the children they have left behind them subsisting on inadequate money and unable to be fed properly on the $10 a month they now receive.

I hope the House will give serious consideration to proposals of this kind. I ask that a great deal of study be given by the Committee on Military Affairs to this question. It is all very well to let the soldier's wife go along with $50 a month because she is able to supplement her income by getting a defense job or something of that kind. However, it is not physically possible for a little child to live on the $10 or $12 a month that is allotted to him at present.

I ask that something be done for these young children who are going to be left behind in increasing numbers. They will be thrown upon the public welfare agencies for support. Before very long millions of fathers will be drafted, so that some arrangements must be made for the children in the families they are leaving behind. I hope the Congress will consider this question very seriously, and before long.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LET BOMBS BE THE ANSWER TO THE JAPS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, all of the civilized world is horrified by the announcement that the Japanese have murdered some of General Doolittle's American flyers who were captured by the Japs after the raid on Tokyo. This procedure is in violation of the rules of warfare of all civilized nations. It brings us to the realization that in fighting the Japs we are fighting a band of barbarians to whom decency and honor have no appeal. It is clear now the answer must be an all-out offensive against the Japanese in the entire Pacific area. These wily, crafty, barbarous enemies of civilization can only be impressed by the full force of our air, land, and sea forces brought home to them in Tokyo itself and the rest of the Japanese homeland. The longer we delay the more American fighting men will be subjected to the cruelties of this barbaric nation.

Robert T. Bellaire, a former United Press Tokyo bureau manager, was in a prison camp in Tokyo at the time General Doolittle and his companions returned the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor by the bombing of Tokyo. He has said that he saw the raiders hit Tokyo and that the American bombers swept over the city at a maximum of 60 feet and that the Jap pursuit planes unsuccessfully attempting to dive upon the American bombers missed their objectives, and most of their machine-gun fire hit the streets. From the hilltop prison in which he was held he saw the American bombers hit the military and factory districts, and he states that the Japanese with whom he talked admitted that their own planes diving on the bombers were responsible for the civilian deaths. He further states that the execution of the American airmen was consistent with the Jap warning given during the first week of the war that all prisoners of war, especially flyers and parachutists, would be executed if captured in Japan, regardless of the consequences or provisions of international law. This is a part of their program to terrorize the enemy flyers and an endeavor to keep them from bombing the Japanese mainland.

Bellaire states that the Japs have slaughtered more than 10,000,000 human beings in the past 6 years and have made 100,000,000 homeless, and have enslaved 500,000,000 more. He concludes:

> Mass incendiary and demolition bomb raids on Japan now may halt this barbarism. Bombs are the only way of impressing them.

Mr. Speaker, those of us representing Pacific coast areas for a long time have been deeply concerned over the war operations in the Pacific. We have been urging a more vigorous prosecution of the war in the Pacific. These atrocities of the inhuman Japs and their successes in the Pacific make immediate offensive action imperative. Unfortunately, we are engaged in the prosecution of two major wars at one and the same time—the Battle of the Atlantic and the Battle of the Pacific. As disclosed by major operations, it may be said that the strategy being pursued is to concentrate upon the European and Atlantic conflict and relegate the Pacific to second place. No one with full knowledge of the facts will minimize the necessity of prosecuting with unrelenting energies the great struggle that is going on in the European area, to a successful termination, with complete and full victory. In doing so, however, we cannot overlook the magnitude and importance of the conflict in the far-flung Pacific, extending from Australia and the Solomons to the Aleutians and Alaska. We know that the Japanese for more than two decades have been scheming, preparing, and marshaling their resources for this all-out conflict in which they are now engaged, with the one objective in mind—to become the masters of the Pacific. They are realistic, clever, resourceful, unrelenting, and effective in the prosecution of this great endeavor. It must be admitted that in the year and a quarter of their activities since the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor, they have made much progress. They are girding themselves for a long war. Their operations in the Aleutians, their effective blow at Pearl Harbor, the capture of the Philippines, of Singapore, and of the Dutch East Indies, and much of the South Pacific, have given them an opportunity to dig in and gain control of strategic materials and outposts where they are gradually building and perfecting bases, marshaling critical war materials and building up war industries which, if permitted to continue, will make our problem of dislodging them tremendously more difficult and costly in lives and equipment.

Senator CHANDLER, who heads a congressional committee investigating our defenses and operations in the North Pacific, brought to the attention of the Congress and the country last week the seriousness of the Pacific problem and the necessity that we awake to the fact that it is a major war activity and cannot be put on ice for future consideration after the European and Atlantic war is disposed of. If we permit the Japanese to strengthen their hold in the Aleutians and in the South Pacific, we are playing with fire and are endangering our success in the Pacific conflict. The Chandler committee reports that despite our repeated bombings of Kiska and Attu, the Japs are succeeding in building adequate air fields and base installations from which to initiate bombing raids on the Alaska mainland and our Pacific coast cities and war industries so vital to our operations. I quote from the committee report:

> The longer we delay offensive action against them the more expensive it is going to be in men and material to dislodge them. There is no question in our judgment of the extreme importance of the Alaskan Territory and Siberia as strategic points to any offensive against Japan, and, likewise, for Japan to use against us.

Senator CHANDLER said to the Senate:

> If the recommendations of the committee had been followed, we would have blasted the Japs from American territory at Kiska, and they would not now be there. We feared that a loss of time and a failure would result in greater cost to the United States in men and materials and would permit the Japs to have an opportunity to do just what they have done; that is, dig in and improve their position on those islands.

Eight months have elapsed since the committee made its recommendations. The Japs are still there. Without further delay the Japs should be blasted out of the Aleutians and this northern gateway for Jap bombers to the American continent protected.

The warning given by General MacArthur, that outstanding warrior and strategist, who did such a heroic job in the Philippines and Bataan with so little, cannot go unheeded. He said that if we lost mastery of the air in the South Pacific our Navy will be of no avail. His plea for planes and equipment must not be denied. Immediate and adequate help to General MacArthur, and also effective aid to China must be given. Our hearts swell with pride and grateful appreciation for the heroic acievements of MacArthur, Doolittle, and Kelley, and the millions of their fellow officers and men in the ranks. Their final victory is in the hands of the high command upon whom we must depend.

Our air strength in the South Pacific and in the Alaskan and Aleutian area must be brought to full strength to permit successful offensive operations so that the Japs may be blasted once and for all from these areas and not permitted to entrench themselves so that it will be a long, bloody, and almost impossible job to dislodge them. We must then strike with the full force of bombers at Tokyo and the heart of Japan.

Let us weigh the facts. Let us be realistic. Let us not view the war in the Pacific through rose-colored glasses. It is a major war. The Japs will not wait until we call the signals. We should not need another Pearl Harbor to arouse us to action in the Pacific.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we be advised as to the subject the gentleman proposes to discuss?

Mr. JUDD. The situation in the Pacific with regard to the execution of American boys.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as has been said by so many others here today, American hearts are shocked and hurt and angered by the events that have just been revealed by the President, the cold-blooded execution of our aviators who were forced down in occupied China and captured by the Japanese. Yet I wonder why we should be so surprised. Surely what the Japanese military has done to our boys is no different from what it has been doing for years to all those peoples of Asia who have had the misfortune to fall under its blight.

I think the most common misunderstanding that has prevailed in America regarding the situation in the Pacific has been this, that it was just another war. And when we used that word "war," I think what ordinarily came up in our minds was the idea of a struggle between armies; because that was what our wars were. There was a time, as you remember, when wars were merly struggles between men. One tribe selected its best warrior, Goliath, for example, and another tribe sent out its warrior, David, and the two representatives fought it out for the tribes. The tribes accepted for themselves the verdict of the struggle between their respective delegates.

Then society moved along and became more complex, tribes merged into nations and it was too precarious to entrust the fate of a whole nation to just one man. So our forefathers gradually developed the technique of delegating the war-waging function to groups of men, which they called armies. They, too, were selected, whether by volunteering or by draft, from the young healthy males—those considered best able to stand the rigors of war. They were trained, disciplined, and hardened, put in uniforms different from those of the enemy so that each side would have no difficulty in knowing which were the proper targets it was supposed to shoot at, and then they were sent out to fight against each other. When men's emotions were hyperstimulated, violence inevitably spilled over onto those who were too close to the battlefield. Nevertheless each army went out with the primary task of finding, defeating, if necessary destroying, the enemy's army. The rest of the enemy's population was largely exempt.

That is, we had what I think one can rightly call gentlemen's wars. We had some codes, some rules, some regulations, even for warfare. They were always violated more or less, in the heat of battle, just as the rules of football are violated in every game. Nevertheless in a football game each eleven contends as the representatives of a whole student body, against the other eleven representing its college. The teams wear different uniforms, and they play on a designated field under mutually agreed-upon rules. The rest of the students are spectators.

So it was with our wars. But this struggle in Asia is not that kind of thing at all; and if that is what we mean when we use the word war, then we must find some other word to describe that which has been going on for almost 6 long years.

In essence it is this: We in the west with our great inventive and industrial genius have produced weapons of destruction far more deadly than any the world had ever known before, but with which we had developed at least some inhibitions and restraints—I think largely as the result of centuries of contact with at least the humanizing influences of the Christian religion. We had a long heritage of knighthood and gallantry; we had elaborate codes for duelling and for waging war, gentlemen's war. Now we have taken our western weapons, but without our western restraints, have put the weapons into the hands of a military clique in Japan, which unfortunately, and through no fault of its own, had not been conditioned by contact over a period of centuries with any humanizing religion. It is utterly logical, not sentimental. And it is not in the least under the control of the Japanese people, else there would be nothing to fear.

In America we common people elect the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. He is usually a civilian. He appoints the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, also usually civilians. We send our armed forces out; we call them back. Our Army and Navy are arms of the Government and we are in control of our Government.

In Japan, however, by the very provisions of her constitution the situation is utterly different. One can rightly say that there the government is merely an arm of the Army and Navy. The Army appoints a jingoistic general as the Minister of War. The Navy appoints an admiral as the Minister of the Navy. If the government elected by the people does not agree with the Army and the Navy ministers, they resign and the cabinet falls and a new one has to be formed that will agree with them.

The military is a self-glorifying, self-perpetuating clique, entirely out of control; and it set for itself this goal, in the words of the Japanese Prime Minister in July 1937:

To beat China—

Not the Chinese armies; that would be the way we fought in the west—

To beat China to her knees until never again can there be any spirit of resistance.

Now, if that is the militarists' goal, and if they are logical, not sentimental, and if they believe that attacking, for example, unarmed civilians will be more effective in breaking will to resist than attacking men in uniform who can fight back, then, of course, they would be plain fools to allow themselves to be hampered by codes. Every man here understands that. If he has been trained and disciplined to give his life for his country he can take a lot against himself that he perhaps could not stand up under if the same thing were being done to his wife and child. So in this war against China, Japan's primary attack has consistently been against groups which in wars as we fought them were largely exempt. We could have learned, if we had been willing to, what Japan had in store for us, by observing what she did to others.

Some weeks ago, when I spoke here on the Pacific situation, I said that one of the most important procedures doctors have for learning is the autopsy. Well, there is another procedure equally valuable, and that is the "biopsy." A new growth is developing and we do not know exactly what it is. We do not let it go until it has grown into something that anybody on the street can diagnose. We try to take care of it before it gets to that point because the thing that makes a cancer bad is not its size or its location. It is just as bad when it is the size of a peanut as when the size of a grapefruit. The thing that makes it bad is the lawless way in which it encroaches on neighboring tissues that do not belong to it. So we do a "biopsy"; we take out a tiny piece and examine it under the microscope to observe how its cells behave. If they are lawless, we do not need to examine the rest; we know the whole thing is vicious and we dare not temporize.

Now, we have seen since 1895 what Japan's military did to the Formosans. That was our "biopsy." We have seen all this century how Japan treats the Koreans. Did we need more information as to what kind of malignant growth her military caste is? We have seen what it did to the Manchurians, beginning in 1931, and what it has been doing to the Chinese for the last 6 years. Did we think it would suddenly become benign when dealing with us? Did we think that it would treat us any differently, whenever the proper moment came, than it had treated everyone else? As a matter of fact, had we a right to expect anything different from what we are getting today?

Let me give some further illustrations, more biopsy studies. I was in Hankow, the great Chicago in the central part of China, in 1937, when the first Japanese air raid took place. The planes came over about 4 o'clock in the afternoon and circled around until they got their bearings. Then they dropped their missiles. Where? That was the instructive part. Not within 2 miles of the air field, where there were dozens of planes parked; not within a mile and a half of the Hanyang Arsenal, the largest in all of China; not within half a mile of any railroad station or yards, any barracks, any power plant, any major factory. They dropped them all in the heart of the slums of Hankow, where the population is most heavily congested, where at 4 o'clock in the afternoon there would be no able-bodied men at home, where the houses are so poorly constructed that the explosion from a 500-pound bomb just flattens them out in a circle half a mile in diameter. In short, they dropped the bombs where they could do the maximum damage with the minimum risk to themselves, because naturally the Chinese had not thought to put their few antiaircraft guns out in the slums.

Now that has not been the exception; that has been the steady rule for over 5 years. We sent notes to Japan protesting against what we naively called wanton indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations. But no one could have watched those bombings and machine-gunnings of civilians and called them indiscriminate. On the contrary, they were very discriminate.

The Japanese Foreign Office sent back courteous answers which said, "Our aviators are very careful not to attack anything that is not a legitimate military objective." Most Americans contrasted the words with the deeds and concluded that the Japanese are just hopeless liars. But that is not the correct answer. The answer is this, that

the Japanese military does not define its military objectives according to our rules, the rules of gentlemen's wars. To them every Chinese is a military objective. That is a brand new thing under the old name of "war."

Take the treatment of wounded soldiers. They used to be exempt in our kind of war. The mission hospital in which I worked in China was just inside the city wall. When the Japanese shelled the city for 5 hours one February day in 1938 and eventually broke down the wall until they could scale it, they, with over 20,000 men, captured the city from its 475 Chinese defenders. There were many wounded Chinese soldiers up on the wall. One Chinese with a gunshot wound through his thigh, a fractured femur, had rolled down the sloping inside of the city wall into our own compound, perhaps 150 yards from the back door of the hospital. After the battle was over, I went out with a big American flag and a Red Cross flag and white hospital clothes on, to identify myself as something different before they opened fire. I had with me hospital attendants and a stretcher to get this wounded man who lay in our yard. Then, of course, I planned to get all other wounded men wherever they were and of whichever army. It never entered my head I could not get them. Why that was precisely what the Red Cross was organized for in the first place, was it not?—to take care of the wounded in time of war. But not in this war. After all, if you have gone to a lot of trouble to produce a wounded man, is there any sense in allowing the Red Cross to come along and patch the same man up again? So to my astonishment the Japanese guard drove me back in with his fixed bayonet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's cancer reference. I think it is a very powerful contribution. I would like to say, if I understand the gentleman correctly, if we and England, for instance, as well as other nations, had stepped in and stopped the invasion of Manchuria, do I infer that the gentleman feels we could have prevented the growth of this cancer which has enveloped the world?

Mr. JUDD. That is my judgment.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the same thing in Ethiopia?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the same thing in the Ruhr?

Mr. JUDD. Right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a great contribution. In other words, under the policy that we adopted for the past 20 years, thinking it was one of peace, it was nothing but an inverted warlike policy, unknowingly and unintentionally, which has contributed to this tremendous catastrophe that confronts us today.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; we did not want war, and we assumed that to do nothing, to wait and see, was the way to keep out of it, was playing safe, was being conservative. But a doctor knows that when you are dealing with a lawlessly growing cancer, even if it is only in the toe—or far-away Manchuria or Czechoslovakia—to do nothing, to wait and see, is not really playing safe. It is, in fact, the most dangerous policy, the most radical policy that can be followed. Yet that is what we mistakenly did for 10 years. I am not saying this to condemn. I am saying this to try to understand what we are up against today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand. As we look back we can see. I congratulate the gentleman on making that contribution. It certainly has taken away the mist from my eyes, because the gentleman has made it clear that if we all had done the things we could have done, we would have averted this catastrophe, and not doing them has contributed toward the world being in the great pain it is today.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. The only reason I am going over it today is so that we can learn from the past and not make the same sort of mistake again.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that Secretary Stimson did protest but the British would not agree?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. FISH. We protested but England objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not criticizing.

Mr. FISH. I simply want to get the facts straight.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a contribution to show that if we had prevented certain isolated incidents from happening at that time we could probably have prevented this world catastrophe.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, and when tomorrow comes, if we win this war, which we must, and lawlessness breaks out anywhere in the world, Americans, in their own self-interest, must see that it is checked early, because if we do not check it early by preventive means, as was possible in the case of Japan, then we have no other means ultimately except rivers of American blood.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That means America must always be strong in all branches of our armed services.

Mr. JUDD. That is one of the conclusions that it seems to me must come from it, unless we are able now and after the war to evolve with other peace-loving nations other methods that will give us even greater security.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not also a fact that when Mr. Stimson was Secretary of State in 1931 and Japan first invaded Manchuria, Japan would have been stopped then and there if Great Britain had kept her promise to the United States through Sir John Simon that she would back up Secretary of State Stimson?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that is the truth, but it is not all the truth. There were certain other reasons why Britain did not go along. One was because she was not sure that Mr. Stimson's position would be backed up by the American people. She made some agreements once with President Wilson and he was repudiated by America. Britain, therefore, could not be sure if she did go along with us in sanctions against Japan, that the Americans would not pull out and leave her holding the sack alone. I believed then and I believe now that she committed her greatest error of this century in not going along, but I think there was some blame on both sides. Many Americans also strongly opposed Mr. Stimson's policy.

Mr. BUSBEY. Assuming that what the gentleman says is true why did Sir Simon, speaking for Britain, make the promise to back Stimson up?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know that he did make any promise except the general blanket promises of the League of Nations covenant and so forth, to come to the aid of any member nation being attacked.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield this once more but I hope I may be allowed to proceed without further interruptions. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I do not want to have the impression prevail that all the guilt is on Britain's side. I believe the gentleman will correct me if I am mistaken, but as late as 1938 we were supplying Japan with about 53 percent of all war material in this country. Am I correct in that?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; over 54 percent of all her imported war materials, and as late as 1940. Britain was in such a situation with Hitler right there on her doorstep, that she feared any action that might possibly get her into trouble with Japan. We were thousands of miles away. However little justification there was for Britain's appeasing Japan, there was even less for our appeasing Japan.

And now if I may proceed with the report on Japanese treatment of Chinese wounded soldiers. I thought when they refused to let us treat wounded men and bring them to the hospital it was because the first guards were a little jittery, since there still was some sniping going on throughout the city. I thought when they changed the guards and things were a little quieter I would try again. So I did that evening with the same result. Chinese civilians tried repeatedly to get food and water and bedding to the wounded. They too were turned back. The high command of the Japanese Army set up a guard over each wounded Chinese soldier or group of them, and they had to lie where they had fallen until they died.

I saw an occasional guard looking down upon these wounded Chinese with unmistakable compassion in his face. But, you see, it did not make any dif-

ference how he as an individual human being might feel. He had nothing to say as to how Chinese soldiers were to be treated. He was under orders. That was a strategy worked out long in advance and it was intended to be a warning to Chinese boys, and now to American boys, as to what would happen to them if they were so foolish as to resist the armies of His Imperial Majesty, the Son of Heaven. If soldiers knew in advance that if wounded this would be their fate, Japan hoped that maybe they would not take such a chance by resisting; maybe they would break, run, flee, and the Japanese could win their victories more efficiently, more cheaply, and, doubtless they argued, even more humanely than if they followed western codes.

Another illustration, the Japanese attack upon the women of China. I dislike mentioning this, but you have all read about it in a dozen American magazines and it is one of the most illuminating as to the nature of this new kind of war. I found that most Americans divided themselves into two groups. Some concluded that it was the same old propaganda stories just like the atrocity stories that came out of Belgium in 1914. Others decided that if the Japanese soldiers really were doing such things, then they all must be just beasts. Both of those conclusions were largely wrong.

In the first place, the stories were true, and one-tenth has never been told, and never can be told. Not just in Nanking, but everywhere. And not just the day of the battle and a few days after. Months after the fighting was over it went on day in and day out, night in and night out. It was true; but it was not because the Japanese are some sort of peculiar, congenital sexual beasts. It was true because they were ordered to do it as a perfectly logical, carefully thought out military strategy. Apparently the high command of the Japanese Army had sat down before its problem and asked, "Now what is the single most vulnerable spot in the Chinese armor? That is the place to attack." Anybody who knows anything about the Chinese knows that the single most vulnerable spot in their armor is their love of home.

We say in the democracies that the state exists for the individual. The totalitarians say that the individual exists for the state. We are inclined to assume that all sensible peoples would, of course, organize their lives around one or the other of those two poles. But not so. The oldest nation in the world believed for 5,000 years that both state and individual exist for the family. The economic unit in China was the family, the social unit was the family, the unit of local government was the family, the religious unit—their basic religion was ancestor worship—was the family. Everything in China centered around the home. And around whom does the home center in any country? The woman, of course. That is why there has been in this war, as in no other war man has ever fought of which we have any record, this unceasing, calculated, diabolical attack upon the women of China as a cold-blooded military measure.

If it were just the evidence of aroused animal appetites, it would be one thing. The Chinese are a very realistic people. They say, "We understand human lust. We know that in every army, including our own, there always have been, and doubtless always will be, disorderly individuals who will take advantage of the confusion incident to battle to do that kind of thing. That always happens in war, more or less. We were prepared for that. We were not, however, prepared for these other things." This kind of thing, to mention the only one that I can mention here, the mildest: the seizing of the male members of a family, the father, the husband, the son, binding him up and making him be present in the same room, or even out in the open courtyard in the broad daylight, while it happens repeatedly to his own wife, his own mother, or his own daughter. The indignity of it, the intolerable public humiliation; it just kills a Chinese soul. Of course, that is precisely what it was designed to accomplish, to kill his soul, so that maybe he can be forced to cry, "I can't stand it any longer. Chiang Kai-shek, give up, sue for peace. Go in with the puppet governments. Make the best terms possible. We would rather accept political and economic slavery for a hundred years under Japan if by that we can get stopped this invasion of the sanctity of our homes. Let us get peace at any price. Let the Japanese fight it out with America. We Chinese held the line for years while America made the money. Why not let the Americans hold the line a little while?"

Fortunately for us, Japan's treatment had the exactly opposite effect on the Chinese, just as it would on us. The Chinese have not yet tried to buy peace for themselves with other people's blood.

Now, we make a mistake if we assume Japanese conduct toward Chinese or ourselves is the result of some peculiar savagery inherent in the Japanese character. The men who do these things are not men running amok, out of discipline; they are men under rigid discipline fighting a new kind of coldly logical war.

And it will not do any good just to indulge in violent hatred of all the Japanese people. I knew some of them who committed suicide rather than do the things they were ordered to do. The enemy is not just Japan. That is too simple. The enemy is uncontrolled, totalitarian Japanese militarism. Not just because it is Japanese; that is not why it is an enemy. But only because it is uncontrolled, totalitarian militarism. The more one loves the good things in Japan, as many of us do who have spent considerable time there, the more one hates that military cancer which we saw years ago was destroying Japan—not as bloodily as yet, but just as surely as it was destroying China, and has now destroyed those American flyers.

Let me discuss a little further the treatment of prisoners of war. In our wars a man fought until he was surrounded and saw that his position was hopeless, whereupon he dropped his gun, held up his hands, surrendered, was captured by the enemy, taken to the rear, fed until the end of the war, and then released to return to his native land and his family. Wasn't that nice? But it was based on sentiment, not logic. If Japan's purpose is to beat a nation to its knees until never again can it have any spirit of resistance, then naturally she will not indulge in anything that would encourage its men to resist. Thus I have never yet seen a Chinese prisoner in Japanese hands.

I refused at first to believe reports of Japan's refusal to take prisoners, slaughtering them instead. Some crippled Chinese soldiers are dead today as the result of my refusal to believe.

And almost 3,000 young Americans lost their lives at Pearl Harbor before we could believe that Japan could do that to us. We knew she did it to others. But, surely, not to us. I suspect Japan is genuinely astonished at our expressions of surprise and horror and revulsion at the execution of a few American prisoners. After all, we aided and abetted her for 4 years, did we not, while she was doing it to Chinese soldiers, hundreds of thousands of them? How, she doubtless wonders, did we expect her to treat ours?

We may be sure that Japan's treatment of American prisoners of war will be based on her militarists' estimate of our national character. If they believe that we are soft and cannot stand up under such terrorism, then Gold help any Americans, male or female, that fall into their hands. But on the other hand, if they find that we are tough, and that such treatment of our men only steels us to fight harder, with greater unity and cold determination, until Japan's military is utterly destroyed, then I think we are likely to have better treatment of American prisoners in their hands.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that there have been two schools of thought in Japan as to the best way to break our will to resist. They have sent up numerous trial balloons in the effort to test us out. This execution very probably is one, at least in part.

Just before Pearl Harbor America was engaged in a great internal debate on foreign policy. Japan naively hoped Pearl Harbor and Manila would split us apart. Apparently she forgot that members of a family frequently disagree among themselves but unite against an outsider. A Japanese admiral announced that Japan would defeat America because Americans had a spoiled-baby complex—that we would not be able to take it.

So Japan would not issue lists of prisoners in her hands, would not let the Red Cross or neutrals visit prison camps, kept us in suspense.

I had a patient last year whose son was at Bataan. She heard he was wounded and had been evacuated to Corregidor. Nothing more. To this day she has had no further word. I feared for a time she would lose her mind. She would ask, "Why won't they let him send me word? Or at least let me know how and where he is. If only I knew even that he was dead and not

being tortured or starved, it would be less unbearable." Well, why should they, being logical, let her know? Why should they ease her mind? Exactly what they want to accomplish is to keep her and thousands of other mothers and wives in constant turmoil and anguish until maybe they will lose their nerve and begin to say, "Let us have done with this war. Let us get peace. After all, we have no obligations to the Filipinos to justify sending thousands of American boys to such a fate, sacrificing billions of American dollars, eating up our own livelihood in taxes, lowering our own standards of living. Let us be practical and negotiate a peace with Japan to stop all this barbarism." Surely no American can ever be fooled again into believing that we can get peace with a cancer just by putting a poultice on it; or that yielding to blackmail ever does anything except make the ultimate settlement all the more difficult and costly.

When the reaction to Japan's original treacherous onslaughts was the opposite from what most of her militarists expected, and Americans united as never before, some Japanese concluded that after all barbaric treatment might only stiffen our will, as it had with the Chinese, and that therefore another approach might be more effective in weakening us. So we had an apparent softening of Japanese attitude—a few orisoner lists issued, permission for a few letters and supplies to be sent, exchange of some American civilians on the *Gripsholm* in return for Japanese here, many of whom were military and naval men in civilian clothes, and had a lot of military and industrial and political information about us that Japan wanted. We heard more American prisoners talking over the short-wave radio on Sunday afternoon saying: "I'm all right, mother. I have plenty to eat and am well taken care of. Everything's O. K. But I wish the war would end soon and I could come home." It was hoped that the mothers would begin to say, "Well, these Japanese don't seem to be so bad. They're treating my boy very well. After all, why should we be fighting each other? Surely there are no problems between us that require warfare to solve. Why can't we get together around a table, divide our spheres of influence, live and let live, work this all out somehow, and get my boy home?"

Japan would do almost anything, whether by threatening or wooing, to get a so-called peace at this time—a breathing spell in which to consolidate and organize and exploit her gains—the greatest conquest in so short a time in all human history—so that she could then strike us suddenly and directly and with such overwhelming strength we could not escape a defeat that would mean our total destruction as a nation and unspeakably cruel enslavement as a people.

More recently Japan has witnessed things in America that strengthened the terrorist school of thought, signs that seemed to her to indicate our morale was none too good. Naturally, she judges not by the great mass of Americans who are faithfully but quietly doing their utmost. She judges by the things that make the headlines.

She notes a renewal here and there of the struggle of various individuals and groups to use the war to improve their respective positions. A threatened strike of coal miners for higher wages; jurisdictional disputes between unions to the point of stopping work in war factories; farmers by and large getting the best prices for years for many of their commodities and some of them demanding still further increases; industrialists in some instances taking advantage of cost-plus Government contracts enormously to improve their plants out of public money. It means to Japan that Americans are not against any and all gouging of their Government but only against not getting their full share of the gouge.

Japan sees the failure of many Americans to cooperate faithfully in the various rationing or anti-inflation measures, the black markets, the bootlegging, the confusions. You and I know about the inequities of administration here and there, that have led to protests by the public. Japan merely notes the results, the griping, the squabbling, and the chiseling that make the news. She observes women almost rioting in the markets the day before meat rationing began. Out in China I have seen starving dogs fighting over a bone in the street. I never supposed I would see American women, mostly well fed and well dressed, crowding and pushing each other in a grocery store in order to get just one last juicy steak, one last Sunday roast, while clean American boys on a dozen fronts go through such hell as no person who has not watched the Japanese Army at close range can ever imagine.

Japan witnesses the United States Congress—I hope, Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned for saying this—one of the few remaining free legislative bodies in a crumbling world, unable after months to devise and enact a tax bill that will really mobilize our dollars and reduce the extra purchasing power that threatens to burst all price ceilings. She sees the pressures on Congress from persons in all groups—rich, middle class, and poor—to make the tax bill stiff, but not for them. If, when the struggle has hardly started, we are not willing to discipline ourselves voluntarily, forego everything except bare necessities for the duration, how will we be after 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of steadily increasing strains and sacrifices? Japan smiles confidently.

And then she observes how our leaders hand out the good reports in big quantities and the bad reports in delayed, diluted, divided doses. We hear about the gains the day after; we hear about the losses, in this case of the Tokyo raid, a year after—and even then, as Mr. Davis said yesterday, only because it was learned the Japanese were going to announce the whole story and it would be a little too raw to let them be the first to tell the American people that we lost every plane that participated in the raid.

No American desires any announcement of information that would in the least aid the enemy. On the other hand, he does not want announcements that are deliberately misleading.

The Army communique 2 days ago said:

> The preoccupation in bringing American flyers to safety was a principal reason why no detailed statement was issued after the raid.

I believe every person agrees with that. But the Japanese announced last October the names of the aviators they had captured and all the others save two had long been accounted for. Was there any good reason for withholding from us for 6 months longer those facts about the fate of the planes which could not possibly be of military value to the Japanese, and which I am willing to predict they already knew perfectly well—their espionage system in China has been at least half as good as in America?

The New York Times on May 20, 1942, reported from the President's press conference:

> Although President Roosevelt said that the bombing group had left its undisclosed base to attack Tokyo "with the apparent certainty of being forced to land in enemy territory or to perish at sea," General Doolittle said that not one plane had been shot down and that "none was damaged to an extent that precluded its proceeding to its destination."

It is this sort of ambiguous, misleading official announcement that is both indefensible and dangerous, I believe, in a democracy in which the Government depends for its support solely upon having the people's confidence.

We did not need or want a "detailed statement" right after the raid. But, on the other hand, we did not want a statement that carefully gave to 99 percent of its readers the impression that every plane got to its assigned destination, when, as a matter of fact, not a single one of them did. If an untruth consists in leaving the other person with the wrong impression, then such a statement, no matter how cleverly worded or literally correct, is, nevertheless, thoroughly dishonest. It is because I believe that any government is playing with dynamite when it tricks its own people that I rise in protest. I beg whoever is responsible for news releases, whether military or civilian, not to trifle with the confidence of the American people. If it is not wise to tell us all the truth, then say so and it will be all right. But do not lead us to believe something that is the opposite of the truth.

We are eager to know the tremendous success of the raid in destroying Japanese war plants; but we want equally to know our own losses. Does it build confidence or demonstrate to Japan that our will is strong, to have to wait until a Senate investigating committee finally tells us yesterday that our shipping losses last year were 12,000,000 tons and more than was constructed? After all, this is our country, our men, our ships our money, our war. We do not want soothing syrup; we want to be treated as grown-up free men and women. When there is tough meat to chew, we are sorry; but do not fool us. Let us have it to sink our teeth into, and we will work all the harder. We will buy twice

as many bonds, not half as many. There will be infinitely less complaining, and we will be a far happier, busier, steadier, stronger people.

I believe some at the top have gravely underestimated the intelligence, the loyalty, the stamina of the common people of this land. The leaders know the difficulties, the failures, the dangers, and they do not give up. But they seem to fear that if word of the hard things got out among the people somehow they would falter or weaken. Ah! they have lost touch with this people. Johnny Doughboy in Guadalcanal or Tunisia knows what he is up against. He does not quit. Does somebody think his old dad and mother back home are softies? No, indeed; not if they know what Johnny is going through and how they can help to strengthen him and supply him and back him up to the last dollar and the last working hour.

I believe we have hardly begun to tap the real resources of America in manpower, in materials, in brains, in physical endurance, in moral courage, in cool, steady, staying powers. We are doing things the hardest way here at home until we fully mobilize all those resources, and we cannot achieve that with sugar-coated pills. Furthermore, we are inviting disaster for our men in Japan's hands. Japan can understandably conclude that our morale must be very low, our unity very shaky, and our will to endure very feeble, if our high command cannot trust us with the bad news. That encourages her hard-headed militarists to be even more terroristic in the hope it may force us to fold up.

That is, I believe Japan's barbarous execution of American prisoners is aimed not so much at them as at our home front. I think she knows full well by now that the American soldier cannot be terrorized or cowed by brutality to him. She hopes to be able to undermine our war effort by breaking down our will here on the home front.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. To approach the thing from a different angle, Japan's militarists know that all the victories they have won thus far have been won by air power. And they know perfectly well that when they call that tune we can dance their legs off—if we are given adequate time and opportunity to build up our air power. They know they can seize the Philippines, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies, but that they cannot possibly hold them if America's full air strength is developed and brought against them soon. Therefore, Japan knows that in order to win she must destroy either our ability to resist by air or our will to resist, or both. That has been Japan's double-barreled strategy all along.

First, she simply must, if possible, prevent our reaching the airplane production goals set by the President. Most considerately, from her point of view, and thoughtlessly from our own, we put our greatest plane factories in a total area of only a few dozen square miles near three cities right on the Pacific coast. I suspect that when the whole truth of the Midway Battle is known, it will be found that the Japanese task force which our naval forces fortunately intercepted was headed for bigger game than Midway. A fleet with four carriers was far more than would ordinarily be needed or risked for that objective.

We saw pictures last December of what 108 planes, mostly obsolete and one-engined, could do in a very few moments one Sunday morning to our proud Pacific Fleet. What could not 250 or 300 later model planes have done to these great plants near Seattle, Los Angeles, San Diego—if that force could have slipped undetected between Hawaii and the Aleutians to within a few hundred miles of our coast during the early summer fogs? They might have set our plane production program back a year, and given Japan 2 years to make her new empire all but impregnable. Never have 30 men done more for their country than did those of the squadron which destroyed those carriers, and all but one of themselves.

Furthermore, I am sure Japan's typically dogged building of air fields on the rocks of Kiska and Attu, where our allwise experts said it could not be done, is not just to defend Japan against raids from us, or to divert a lot of our strength from other areas. Japan attacks. She must continue to move heaven and earth in the attempt to get some suicide squadrons of bombers over at least the Boeing plants at Seattle from which come the flying fortresses she knows will otherwise be eventually bombing Tokyo.

If, with the first barrel, she can strike crippling blows to our air production, to give her even months of extra time, she believes that China will be gradually forced, however reluctantly, to give up effective resistance, and that then America cannot conquer Japan, or that we will not be willing to pay the price of conquering her—a price of not less than a million American lives, with many thousands of them meeting the same cruel fate which befell those lads whom we mourn today. That is the second barrel of her strategy—to try to break our will to resist.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to cry out in hot anger at the foul deeds of Japan's military. It is not enough just to call names, even if there were words adequate to describe the crime.

It is our more important duty to recognize in sorrow our own partial responsibility for their deaths through our failure to demonstrate here at home the unity, the self-discipline, the willingness to sacrifice that you and I know we are capable of, but which somehow we have not yet achieved. This failure is understandable, but not forgivable. Our cities have not been bombed. The casualty lists are just beginning to grow. The war still seems far away and unreal to millions. Somehow it must still be just some bad dream from which we will soon awaken. It has not really penetrated into our deepest consciousness as it has to the Chinese, the British, the Russians, that this is not just a temporary interruption in our ordinary living. This is life or death, not just for Norway or the Philippines, but for America. This is not just a temporary restriction of our liberties; this is the end of our liberty, unless we rise to greater heights than ever in our whole national history and make it the beginning of a far better era than yet dreamed. Which it will be depends on us now.

Japanese have said openly for years, "You Americans have money and resources, but we Japanese can beat you because we have spirit." We have uttered plenty of big words and loud boasts, but we fooled no one except ourselves. Japan respects power and spirit—and nothing else.

Whenever by actual performance we show Japan's leaders that their savagery galvanizes us to action rather than intimidates or weakens our will; whenever we actually find the way to get help to China, which we promised over 2 years ago, and to our scattered and beleaguered forces under MacArthur; whenever we make it unmistakably clear that we intend with calm, cool, hard resolve to destroy utterly those men who perpetrated this and other crimes, and the military system which produced them, then and only then can we expect Japan to give a thought to obeying the rules of war.

As long as she thinks she will certainly win, or at least that we will certainly lose through internal softness, what reason is there for her to fear or try to avoid our wrath? Whenever we make it clear by our deeds that we can win, and, further, that we will win, cost what it may and no matter how long and bloody the road, and that there will be a day of terrible reckoning for Japan's militarists, then and only then will we get respect from them and a modification of their terrorism.

May I quote a paragraph from a letter I received just yesterday from one of the greatest heroes of this war. He is now on active duty, and for obvious reasons I cannot give his name. He says:

> Most of the time I am eaten with a feeling of frustration. But I presume the feeling would be more intense if I were not actively engaged in the war. As in the days before the war came I could see the pattern it would take with uncanny clarity, so now I can see how it should be fought. And yet, I am as impotent now as I was in the pre-war period. There are two factors which modern military leaders do not seem to understand or prefer to ignore. One, that comfort and personal convenience are not consonant with the conduct of military-naval operations against an alert and tenacious enemy; two, that men are inspired to fight with all that is in them only by leadership based on merit, a profound knowledge of the reasons why they fight, and the conviction that the things for which they fight are worth fighting for. We will win because of our economic strength, but the sacrifice in men and treasure will be out of proportion to our effort and far beyond what it would be if we as a nation had learned that there is no smooth road to freedom. Failure to recognize these facts on the part of men who otherwise give evidence of possessing ability and intelligence is beyond my comprehension. It distresses me beyond words to express. And this is not criticism of the men themselves but of the system which produced them.

Mr. Speaker, let us be done with playing at this war. Let those of our military leaders who are still wedded to yesterday's ideas and methods, and whose orthodox notions and plans have proven utterly inadequate for the unorthodox enemy we face, forget about prestige and get down to realities, or make way for those who can and will.

And for us here at home, we ask that our leaders give us the plain hard facts; lay the cards on the table. We want to get our feet squarely on the ground and get going.

Sometimes I hear an American bemoaning in self-pity, "Why did these things have to happen to me? Why was I born in a time like this?" Well, I wonder if it would have been too bad to live in George Washington's day? or Abraham Lincoln's? Those times, like our own, which try men's souls, when we find out what we ourselves are made of, when those who look much alike in ordinary comfortable times are sifted out, some sinking to the level of cravens, and millions of others rising to the stature of giants.

I am sorry there is such a world as this, but inasmuch as there is, let us be glad that we live in it and have a chance to determine the destiny of our Nation for generations. Let us resolve to do our utmost to bring America back to those essential things which gave her the true greatness she has had and without which her future cannot be assured.

Mr. Speaker, on this sad day, I pray that all Americans and especially that we in this Congress into whose hands have been entrusted so great a heritage from the past, and such sobering responsibilities for preserving that heritage for our children, will not be found wanting.

If the execution of these American aviators has at last blasted the scales from our eyes and forced us to see and understand more clearly both our enemy and ourselves, then tragic as are their deaths, they will not have died in vain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this week when we had the District of Columbia appropriation bill under consideration I took occasion to ask some questions with reference to young men being on the police force in Washington. I think you will bear me out if you have been over town recently that there are many young men, very young men, on the police force in this city.

I do not want anything that I may say here to be interpreted as a criticism of the Washington Metropolitan Police force. I think it is a great organization; that they are great men. It has a splendid record. I am for it. I will support it fully. But what I have to say is with reference to these young men.

This morning I received a letter through the mail which is unsigned. It comes from a policeman, who would not sign it, and I can understand his reason. It would not be good for him, perhaps, but I have shown this letter to the inspector of police of the city, and I am going to read it to you now. I think it bears out everything that I said, and bears out my fears and bears out what some of the rest of you have said. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Relative to your recent statement that "there are too many young fellows on the police force" and "they have no more right to be here from the draft than any other young men," may I say that us older members of the Police Department share the same sentiment you do. A majority of us served in the last war and were quite proud of ourselves until we were tied up in this haven for draft dodgers. Some of these young single men, and others married without children, openly brag that the only reason they are on the police force is for deferment and the duration of the war, and that it is better to be a 1,000 to 1 shot that you won't be shot at than a 1,000 to 1 shot that you will be shot at in the Army. It is not understood why our Commissioners of the District of Columbia are so anxious to have these young draft dodgers, who have had only a short period of training, deferred, whereas during the last war it was not found necessary to defer policemen, but instead the department was augmented by a body of citizens called the home defense guards. Feeling that your opening shot of getting rid of these draft dodgers has not been in vain, but will gather momentum from the other Members of Congress, I remain

Respectfully,

JUST AN OLD-TIME POLICEMAN.

Not only does this situation apply to the police department—and let me say again that this is no criticism of the police department—but too many young men are in other agencies who ought to be in the service. I have the utmost respect for men on the force, but when I walk through this town, when we Members of Congress, especially those who have boys in Africa, in England, or in the Pacific, go through this town and see men on the police force, young fellows, standing around, younger than our boys, we do not like it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. FISH. What does the gentleman propose to do about that? Why cannot we get some action? We are always talking about it; why do not we get some action in Congress about it?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I think the Costello committee is doing some very good work.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that the House Military Affairs Committee is investigating that thing down to the ground. We have already disclosed a vast amount of information that is in the report to be released next week.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman going to bring in legislation?

Mr. MAY. We want to get at all of the facts so that we can.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate that I have no criticism of the police department, but I do want to put the young men in the services, where they belong. My boys and your boys are "over there." They are no better than your boys and mine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1364) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1364, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

Section 502, strike out "That there shall not be more than one officer in the grade of lieutenant commander; nor more than 35 officers in the grade of lieutenant; and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers: *And provided further*,".

Section 504, strike out "shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and."

Strike out sections 506 and 508.

Section 507, change "SEC. 507" to read "SEC. 506."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Section 502, change to read as follows:

"SEC 502. Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, not above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this title may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve."

Section 504, strike out the words "shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and."

Strike out section 506 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 506. Members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, or their dependents shall be entitled to all allowances or benefits provided by law for male officers and enlisted men with dependents of the Reserve components of such

services. This section shall be effective from July 30, 1942."

Strike out section 508.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives by our distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] and I will ask at this point that he use his time to explain the bill to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is made necessary because of a change in the situation and in developments since the enactment of the original Women's Reserve Act. At that time it was not realized that there would be such a manpower shortage and that the necessity for women to replace men would become so acute. It was not anticipated that the Women's Reserve in the Navy would become so extensive as it is now apparent it will have to in order to meet the requirements of the situation.

This bill accomplishes four things. First, it removes the restriction upon where Women Reserves may serve. At the time the original bill was enacted a Senate amendment restricted them to duty within continental United States. Since that time we have had to develop relatively large administrative and overhead forces in such places as Hawaii, the Caribbean islands, Bermuda, England, and so forth. It is just as essential that large numbers of men, both officers and enlisted, in such places, who are physically qualified and militarily trained for combat duty should be released for actual combat service, as it is in the United States proper. Of course, it is not intended, nor will it ever be, that women will be used in the combatant branch of the Navy. They will not go to sea on our naval vessels and they will not be assigned to our combat bases.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. Referring to section 504, where you strike out the restriction on foreign service, will that apply only to those who become members of this organization after the passage of this act, or will it also be applicable to those who have voluntarily gone into this organization on the existing basis?

Mr. MAAS. No. It will apply to all alike. But I will say to the gentleman that as a matter of administrative policy, the Navy will not order any of the women who enrolled prior to the passage of this act, to overseas duty without their own consent.

Mr. CRAVENS. Would the committee have any objection to having that written into the law?

Mr. MAAS. I do not see any objection to writing it into the law, but I do not think it necessary to put it in the law. It is a matter that ought to be administrative. After all, they are in the service and they are not going to be sent into actual combat areas. It means that they can serve in a place like Bermuda or England, and most of them desire that service. I have talked to hundreds and hundreds of WAVES, and everyone who has talked to me about it has asked for an opportunity to serve outside of continental United States.

Mr. CRAVENS. That is undoubtedly true, but there are a great many on the other hand whose parents have consented to their going into this branch of the service in view of that very protection which you are now eliminating.

Mr. MAAS. I would have no objection to an amendment to make it clear that those who enrolled prior to this time could not be sent without their own consent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not a fact that we have enlisted men who have enlisted in certain classes of the Navy Reserve, and in that classification their duties are prescribed to come within the confines of a naval district, and their services cannot be used outside the confines of that naval district.

Mr. MAAS. No, not in time of war.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Class B–4.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is clearly in error. Any man in the Navy can be used anywhere the naval authorities see fit to use him. They can take him out of one naval district and put him in another, or they can use him any place they see fit, where his services are necessary.

Mr. MAAS. In time of war that is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understood that with respect to the WAAC's, the WAAC's would all have to be reenlisted under the legislation which is pending, to take them fully into the Army. Is not the same situation true as to the WAVES?

Mr. MAAS. No.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In that they will have to reenlist or be reenrolled?

Mr. MAAS. No, no. The WAVES, by the original act, are made a part of the Navy. They are a component part of the Navy now. It was merely that there was a restriction placed upon them that was placed upon no other class in the Navy. I want to point out that the WAAC's, even though not an active part of the Army, are permitted to go overseas and there are actually hundreds of them overseas now.

The women's auxiliary in the Red Cross goes overseas; the women in the U. S. O. go overseas; Navy nurses serve overseas, and there is no reason why these women of the Navy should not serve overseas.

Mr. RIZLEY. But in the classes the gentleman has mentioned foreign service has been voluntary upon the part of these women while, if we pass this bill, these women can be taken overseas whether they want to go or not?

Mr. MAAS. They could be under the present wording of the bill but I am perfectly willing to see the bill amended to make it clear that those who have heretofore enrolled cannot be made to serve overseas without their consent.

It has been said that this bill would lessen enrollment. In my opinion the passage of this bill will stimulate enrollment, not slow it down.

The only disputed issue in this bill is as to whether these women should serve overseas—that is, by overseas, meaning outside of continental United States. I want to say to the House that there are thousands of officers and enlisted men in the Navy who are physically qualified for combat duty, who are trained for combat duty, who are required now to perform administrative and clerical duties in places like Hawaii, in England, in the Caribbean bases, and in Panama. They could be released for active sea duty just as they have been from Washington and the continental United States.

If the legislation is sound in the first place, then it is equally sound to permit these women to serve outside of continental United States where they can perform the purpose for which the legislation was originally designed, that of releasing men who are qualified for combat duty to perform combat duty.

Another change that is brought about by this bill is to remove the present restrictions which is a great handicap upon the Women's Reserve; that is, the limitation of rank. The present law authorizes only 1 lieutenant commander, 35 lieutenants, and the balance must be distributed in the grades of lieutenant, junior grade, and ensign. One difficulty as an illustration that has arisen that we had not anticipated is that of enrolling women doctors. There are many fine women physicians in the country who would like to enroll in the Women's Reserve and who could perform great service, but we cannot expect them to come in as ensigns; they simply cannot do it; and yet with a restriction of 35 lieutenants—those vacancies are filled—we cannot offer these competent and many times distinguished women physicians a rank anywhere near commensurate with the duties to be performed or their responsibilities.

Under the proposed legislation women could be permitted to hold ranks up to and including the rank of captain. In England the head of the WREN's, the women's auxiliary of the Navy, is a rank corresponding to rear admiral. The head of the ATS, the women with the Army, the top rank corresponds to that of major general. The head of the WAAF's of the air force, is an air marshall. We do not propose in this legislation to permit them to become admirals. Personally I have no objection to permitting a woman to be eligible to be an admiral. That should be an administrative matter for the Navy. If the Navy should want to confer the rank of admiral upon a woman it would be perfectly all right for me to see a woman

become an admiral. Some of the men have not done so well in the rank.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Upon the passage of this bill WAVES will then be eligible for foreign duty. Is that clear?

Mr. MAAS. Duty outside the United States; that is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. For duty outside the United States?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the committee take into consideration the situation where perhaps some young lady enlisted in the WAVES and not anticipating foreign service she is now about to be made eligible for foreign service but no right has been given her to withdraw from the WAVES to go back to civilian life?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I yield to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina and to the committee that it was stated by Admiral Jacobs that none of these women under any conditions would be sent abroad without their consent or approval irrespective of when they enlisted.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, foreign service would still be on a voluntary basis so far as the WAVES are concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me when we had some of these other draft bills up for consideration that same matter was before the House and we were advised that if you left to the discretion of the enlistee or the commissioned officer the right as to where he or she would serve you would absolutely destroy the discipline in the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is not left to the enrollee, it is not left to the WAVE, it is left to the discretion of the officer in ordering a person to a certain military duty. Of course, that does not apply to the enlisted man or the officer. But we have a distinct understanding with the Navy Department that if a woman does not desire to accept an assignment abroad she will not be required to go over her objection. Of course, the Department would have the military authority to force her, if it saw fit to do so.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the whole thing.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are not going to force her.

Mr. DINGELL. Then they ought to stay home.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the whole situation, and that is a different thing.

Mr. COOLEY. The statement has just been made that these women ought to be subjected to foreign service if in the wisdom of the Navy Department they might be needed there. The point I am raising is they went into this organization purely upon a voluntary basis, they went into it with a very definite understanding regarding foreign service. I do not think they ought to be subjected to foreign service except upon a purely voluntary basis.

Mr. MAAS. I agree with the gentleman insofar as those who are already enrolled are concerned and I think that matter should be clarified. From now on, if this bill is passed, the enrollees will know that they are liable for service overseas.

Mr. COOLEY. That will be entirely different.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not a military expert like the gentleman is.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. But for the life of me I cannot imagine more chaos in an organization than to have a group of WAVES, WAAC's, WOWS, or whatever they are who might on their own volition determine whether they will go where the commanding officer says they should go.

Mr. MAAS. That is not the situation, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan. We will have 10 times more applicants for overseas duty than they can possibly send, and the gentleman need not have any apprehension on that score whatever.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would the gentleman who now has the floor, the ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the chairman of that committee and other members of the committee object to writing into this bill the very thing that the gentleman states, to make it voluntary for those who have already entered the service?

Mr. MAAS. I have no objection to that and if such an amendment is proposed I will recommend its being accepted.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How would the chairman feel about that?

Mr. CRAVENS. I have such an amendment now at the desk.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, if it would clarify the atmosphere I have no objection, and it is all right to put in there that it only applies to those who enlist hereafter, not to those already enlisted.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Or it applies to those who have already enlisted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is the other way around. Those who are already enlisted did so with the distinct understanding they could not be ordered abroad.

Mr. MAAS. The amendment will provide that those who have heretofore enlisted cannot be sent out without their own consent. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. MAAS. As author of the bill, I will accept it, and I am sure the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will accept such an amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the provision ought to go a little further. If you want the discipline in the Navy applicable equally to men and women, you ought to make it so that these women, if they are ordered to go overseas, and I refer to those who have been in the service heretofore under the original arrangement, and they refuse to go, then they ought to be given the right or ought to be compelled to resign.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, no. This is a war. They have enlisted in the service for the duration of the war. Their services can be used at home and we will need them at home. We are going to use them. I would be very much opposed to any such proposition.

Mr. DINGELL. I am opposed to coddling.

Mr. COOLEY. These young ladies enlisted in the WAVES upon a voluntary basis.

Mr. MAAS. That is true.

Mr. COOLEY. And with a very definite understanding regarding the scope of their activity; that is, with regard to the place where they might be sent.

Mr. MAAS. Only one restriction; that is, it would be within the continental United States.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say for the benefit of the gentleman and the House that the Military Affairs Committee will soon present a bill which does not have the difficulties which exist at the present time in the bill now under consideration for the reason that their bill provides for a reenlistment. When the period of reenlistment expires any person now in the WAAC who is temperamentally unfitted or for some other reason they want to go out, she can retire voluntarily and get an honorable discharge.

Mr. MAAS. They are not in the Army now.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. MAAS. They have to enlist to become a part of the Army. That is a different situation. These women are already in the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in the time remaining that there are several other provisions in the bill. I have explained the necessity for removing this rigid restriction on rank. It is easily foreseeable that we may have 150,000 or 200,000 WAVES and, of course, it is ridiculous to limit their rank to one lieutenant commander and 35 lieutenants. Already from the commanding officers of the various naval stations that can utilize WAVES have come requests for over 120,000, showing you how these old hard-shelled seadogs feel when they found the work that these women can do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman feels that Commander McAfee and the WAVES have performed excellent service. I talked this morning with Admiral Denfeld, who is the assistant in charge of personnel, and he said for me to state that the Navy was 100 percent for this bill; that they did not want it in the beginning, but

they are convinced that the WAVES release manpower. Manpower is deeply needed, and the WAVES are needed.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the gentlewoman. Many of these women are performing jobs that they can do more efficiently than the men could.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In regard to the highest rank prescribed in the bill for the WAVES, that of captain, is it intended by the bill that there may be more than one captain, or that the highest rank shall be captain and that there shall be but one captain?

Mr. MAAS. No, there can be more than one captain. What we are striking out of the original act is the provision that there shall be not more than one officer of the grade of lieutenant commander. The new provision states that they may be distributed in grades as the Secretary may determine, but not to exceed the grade of captain.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman think there should be more than one captain?

Mr. MAAS. It is quite possible there might be the necessity for a dozen or two dozen of them if we have 200,000 WAVES. The purpose of the law is to replace men. If we find that there are jobs that are being done by captains in the Navy, as the war goes on, that can be performed by women captains, the Navy should have the discretion to place women in those billets.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am just a little fearful that if there are a dozen captains eventually in the WAVES, then the Department will come back to Congress for authority to increase the rank to commodore or rear admiral so that the highest officer of the WAVES may have a grade above any other officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. MAAS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Personally I am hoping that will happen. I think that if we get up to 150,000 or 200,000 the administrative head of the WAVES ought to be a commodore or rear admiral, so I would have no objection to that if it gets to that point However, I think the gentleman need have little apprehension that the Navy will propose that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is somewhat confused with reference to the testimony. The testimony was that the rank would be that of captain and there would be but one captain in the whole organization, corresponding to one colonel in the WAAC.

Mr. MAAS. That is what the bill says. The bill says:

> Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, none above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

That strikes out a section which states that there shall be not more than one officer in the grade of lieutenant commander. There is no such restriction left in the legislation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be true, but the Department advised the committee that it was their intention to have one person with the rank of captain, and that is all that is contemplated in the organization.

Mr. MAAS. That may be the policy. The gentleman from New York asked me about the legislation. I think it is quite true that the Navy has no intention, certainly at this time, of having more than one officer above the rank of commander. That is quite true. However, this bill does not prohibit it, nor should it, in my opinion.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman was coming to the rest of the bill but had not gotten to it. For fear the gentleman's time may expire before he gets to it, may I ask this question. Do I correctly understand that this is by this bill made into permanent legislation?

Mr. MAAS. Yes. I shall be very glad to jump ahead to that subject right now. Under the original legislation, the women's organization of the Navy would expire 6 months after the war. This would permit the organization in peacetime of a women's reserve, not women in the Regular Navy but a reserve the same as the men's reserve. If there is a need in time of peace for a naval reserve of men, officers and enlisted, to provide a trained reservoir for wartime, and if in time of war we have found there is a need for women in the Navy, then there is equally a need for a women's reserve in time of peace to train women to be available when war comes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly approve of that provision.

Mr. MAAS. I am glad to have the gentleman's support.

It will also be a considerable incentive in the meantime for these women to know that they can carry on their interest in the military the same as the men do in a reserve in time of peace, so that we may not have to go through all these growing pains if we have another war.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The bill further prescribes that these members of the WAVES may receive the same benefits that are now payable to the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Navy Reserve.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct. That is what I started to discuss. Unfortunately the Comptroller's decision was contrary to the intent of the committee, and I think of the Congress, in the initial legislation. I was the author of that bill, and I thought I had drawn it broad enough to cover that point. I stated in the bill that the women would come under exactly the same provisions as the men did, as to pay, and so on. I do not know how the Comptroller arrived at his decision, but for some reason he has made this distinction with the women in the Reserve, and has denied to the women the benefits that men have, who are replaced by women. For instance, take the matter of dependents. We may have a WAVE who has a dependent mother, and she should be able to receive the benefits. If these women perform men's duties, they ought to get the benefit that the man whom they displace receives.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It might be well to state that after the war is over, and these women have received honorable discharge, they will be entitled to the same benefits that a veteran receives who served in World War No. 2.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct for all practical purposes. If they are going to perform the work that a man performs, then they should receive the same pay and benefits that a man whom they displace is eligible to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to amend the act creating the Women's Reserve of the Navy. The act creating the Reserve made it a part of the Navy, but prescribed certain limitations which then appeared to be desirable. We had never before had a Women's Reserve in the Navy, and although we knew there were many fine women who wanted to serve, and expected they would perform a valuable service, we did not know how successful this new organization would be. For this reason, certain statutory limitations were prescribed, including one which excluded the Women's Reserve from the death or disability benefits of all other Reservists, and placed them, in that regard, on the same basis as civil-service employees.

The time has come to remove this discrimination and certain other limitations in the law establishing the Women's Reserve. The WAVES have more than justified the hopes of the Congress. They have been doing a magnificent job. They have proved their worth to the Navy. Your Committee on Naval Affairs has recommended, by a vote of 12 to 2, that the bill, as amended in committee, do pass.

At the beginning of this month, the WAVES had replaced 1,202 officers and 1,982 enlisted men of the Navy who were then sent to sea for combat duty. There were then 4,579 WAVES appointed and in training for officer ranks and 14,551 enlistments in enlisted ratings. At the end of the calendar year 1943 it is expected that there will be 6,400 officers and 41,000 enlisted personnel in the Women's Reserve. The women's component of the Marine Corps Reserve is also authorized

by the act creating the Women's Reserve. By the first of 1944 the Women's Reserve of the Marine Corps will have 750 officers and 12,000 enlisted women. In June 1944 the prospective program calls for 8,100 officers and 60,000 enlisted in the Navy, and 1,000 officers and 18,000 enlisted marines.

The ratio of women officers to enlisted women is not necessarily the same as the male proportions in the Navy. The number of naval officers to enlisted men ashore has always been at a much higher ratio than afloat. This is chiefly due to the numbers of staff corps officers who are assigned on shore. The original idea was to commission qualified officer WAVES to release officers for combat duty. The acute manpower shortage has increased the need for WAVES to numbers greatly exceeding the original expectations.

The bill makes the following changes in the act:

First. It eliminates the restriction on the number of WAVES officers, and increases the highest rank from lieutenant commander to captain.

Second. It eliminates the provision that the WAVES shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the United States.

Third. It puts members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, on a parity with men of the Reserve components of these services and their dependents as regards their allowances and benefits.

Fourth. It eliminates the provision that would automatically disband the WAVES after the end of the war and makes them a permanent part of the Navy.

The bill will leave in effect the following special limitations applicable to the Women's Reserve:

First. That military authority of commissioned officers may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve.

Second. That members of the Women's Reserve must be at least 20 years of age.

Third. That Women Reservists shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft, and shall not be used to replace civil-service personnel employed in the Naval Establishment, but shall be composed of women trained and qualified for duty in the shore establishment of the Navy to release male officers and enlisted men for duty at sea.

The changes made by the bill are all paralleled by the legislation now before the House relating to the WAVES and the SPARS.

The original limitation upon the rank and number of officer WAVES is out of keeping with the size of the organization now planned. The proposed top rank, that of captain, will correspond to the rank of colonel which is now authorized for the WAAC.

The removal of the restriction against sending WAVES outside the continental United States conforms to the existing situation in the Army. It will permit WAVES to be assigned to duty at shore stations at Pearl Harbor or the Canal Zone or the Caribbean or elsewhere abroad. The Navy expects to use this authority with caution, but there will be cases in which qualified Women Reservists can perform valuable duty on such assignments and by releasing men for sea duty will add to the combat strength of Navy personnel.

Under existing law, if members of the Women's Reserve suffer death, disability, or injury while in service, they are not entitled to the benefits provided for other classes of the Naval Reserve, but to the benefits provided for civil employees of the United States. The benefits to which women personnel should be entitled follow as a corollary to the duty which may be assigned them. Your committee feels that if they are eligible for duty beyond the seas in a manner similar to that for other naval reservists, the same benefits should be applicable to members of the Women's Reserve. This will authorize retirement pay in case of disability, and payment of 6 months' gratuity to their dependent relatives in case of death.

The present law terminates the Women's Reserve, as a branch, prior to 6 months after the war. The WAVES have proved their value as a permanent reserve. Maintenance of this branch in peacetime, with the remainder of the Naval Reserve, will be necessary in the interests of the country in order to effect a quick and orderly mobilization of women in case of emergency.

The Women's Reserve was created by law as an integral part of the Naval Reserve. It was the intention of the Congress that all laws relating to the Naval Reserve should apply to the Women's Reserve except where specifically provided otherwise. In other words, WAVES were to receive the same pay and allowances as male members of the Naval Reserve of like rank or rating. However, the Comptroller General recently ruled that an officer WAVE is not entitled to rental and subsistence allowance for a dependent mother. Therefore, your committee has amended the present law to leave no doubt that members of the Women's Reserve receive the same allowances and benefits as provided by law to male members of the Naval Reserve. That is the new section 506. By regulations of the Secretary of the Navy, no woman with children under 18 years of age can become a member of the Women's Reserve. Allowances for dependents would therefore be limited to other dependent relatives.

This bill will add permanent strength to the Navy by making the Women's Reserve permanent. It applies equally to the Navy and Marine Corps. It will recognize the fine work the Women's Reserve is doing and strengthen them in their service in the present war.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble with our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] is that from the very beginning of this legislation he has been very hostile to it. He is opposed to grouping together these patriotic women of the country to serve in a military capacity. He is not only opposed to the WAVES, but he is opposed to the WAAC; he is opposed to the SPARS; he is opposed to the marines; and, of course, it is natural that when one is opposed to something, he oftentimes tries to belittle it, to ridicule it. But I want to say here and now that this organization, while there might have been doubt in the minds of a great many when it was first created, has merited the respect and the confidence of every official in the Navy and the Army, the Coast Guard and the marines, who has come in contact with them. Let us be serious and let us not try to belittle these women who want to serve the country. What was the object and purpose of this bill? What was the genesis of it? It was to replace men so they could go to the front. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. That is all right. I agree with the gentleman that it is a fine thing to replace able-bodied men for service where they can be of more value, but is it necessary to go into all this training, uniforms, lipstick kits, and all these things to get a lady in a position to take over a telephone job or something?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; you have got to get a uniform upon a person who is in the military service. I consider they have done the right thing and I think, fortunately—and this is a thing that has always disturbed my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], the designers have selected a very fine uniform for all of the organizations.

What was the purpose of this legislation in the first place? It was to replace virile, able-bodied fighting men who were doing desk work. Nobody opposed that. Who was to replace them? There is a shortage of manpower in this country. You could not keep the men at the desks and send them to the front at the same time; so they brought these women into the service to take the place of them so they could go to the front—could go and fight. Now, let us see how many have been replaced, how many have been released here in the city of Washington.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The statement has been made that the uniform cost $250. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think it is $200.

Mr. COOLEY. It is an allowance for equipment, is it not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is it exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. Not for one uniform.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is it exactly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the House would like to know, if they do not already know, that the daughter of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is a WAVE, a very fine one.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And, of course, there are a great many others.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; but I have only 15 minutes and there are some things I want to say. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The replacement of manpower in the Government agencies in Washington has been made and, of course, could be made by women, whether they were in the WAVES, the WAAC, or these other organizations. Is not that true?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It certainly is; but you cannot place them in certain military positions unless they have some military control over them.

In other words, they cannot afford to put a civilian in certain military positions when they cannot exercise military discipline and control over that person. They have replaced 1,202 officers and 1,982 enlisted men down here in the Navy Department. Four thousand five hundred and seventy-nine WAVES have been commissioned and there are a total of 14,551 WAVES in the service.

What does this bill propose to do? It proposes to let them serve abroad if the military necessity demands. When we first passed the bill, the Department did not think the military necessity would require some of them to go to London, to the office of Admiral Nimitz at Pearl Harbor, or to the Panama Canal Zone. I want to impress upon you the fact that the Navy Department would administer this with a great deal of caution. It is not the desire of the Navy Department to send these women out of the country unless there is a greatest military necessity for them to go to some billet where it is imperative that they have a Navy personnel to administer it.

Mr. Chairman, some of them will go and some of them will not go, and for those who came in with the understanding they would not have to go, I have no objection to accepting an amendment giving them the opportunity to volunteer their services for duty outside the continental limits.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. In the testimony before the committee, did not the Navy tell us that it would be a voluntary service abroad?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. HÉBERT. It would be the same as men in submarines or aboard ship.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. HÉBERT. So they will not have to go if they do not want to go?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. The gentleman from Kentucky referred to the fact that up here in New York a training program is taking place.

Now, what are the facts? Let us get the complete picture. You have to have some central place to send all of your enlisted men and all of your enlisted women to indoctrinate and train them for the naval service. You have seven different stations throughout the United States where the male enlisted personnel must go to get what is called, in the language of the service, the "boot" training.

They have a college in New York for which they pay $800,000 in rent, and they also pay some $200,000 for the rent of some apartment houses for them to live in. The Navy Department decided that it was far more economical to have one central place, even though it cost a million dollars, than to have two dozen places all over the United States where these people are brought in. I do not think by the testimony given to the committee that there can be any criticism of the Navy for having a central place for giving the WAVES their preliminary training.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. For what period of time does this rental contract cover?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. One year.

Mr. NORRELL. Eight hundred thousand dollars for a year?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Eight hundred thousand dollars a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman as one who did not vote for the original bill I think the women have demonstrated that this organization has made good in every way.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I ask the gentleman a question in reference to this rent. Did the committee go into the report that some hotels in Washington, one in particular, where a great many WAVES are now located, are charging four times the amount for apartments as they charged Members of Congress and others who live at the same hotel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A WAVE gets so much for rental allowance, and that is what they are paying in these hotels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman a Member of Congress who lives at the hotel tells me that in one place four girls are living, that is in one apartment, and paying $450 for their apartment while the one next to it rents for $125.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman may be misinformed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I hope I am.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Unless they are all officers they are paying it out of the allowance which the Government gives to them, their rental allowance.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman tell us how many WAVES this college in New York will accommodate in a year?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. At the present time between five and six thousand every turn-over. Let me tell you about the program. These girls volunteer all over the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

If women from your district want to get into the WAVES, they will go to the procurement center in that section to enlist. They may have educational qualifications that will permit them to make an application for an officer's commission. They may only have a certain educational qualification which will not permit them to apply for commissions. Therefore, they go into the service in an enlisted status. They are trained, and the bulk of them are stenographers and typists. Remember that the highest rating they are getting is seamen second class, carrying with it a pay of about $50 a month. It is a patriotic effort on the part of these women because they could make far more money back home or in some industrial plant. They are rendering an outstanding service, and I am grateful to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who was somewhat doubtful at first, now that he can see the great services that these women are rendering.

Let me tell you something else: Down here in the Navy Department we have 17,000 civilian employees. I had a check-up made to see how the civil-service employees were working. On a Saturday about 1,600 of the 17,000 were out and on Friday about 1,500. The civil-service situation has become so acute that it has become necessary to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Navy to utilize 2,000 WAVES to help out because they cannot get civilian employees.

The reason they need them is that there is so much absenteeism, so much sickness, and so much annual leave being taken by civil-service employees in the Navy Department. Think of it. On the 13th day of March, a few Saturdays back, I checked up and there were some 1,600 employees out of the Navy Department. Every one of them was a civil-service employee. That does not happen with these WAVES. They are officers and enlisted personnel, and they do not get off on sick leave or on annual leave like the civil-service employees.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. In checking up on the absenteeism, I wonder if the gentleman has any information that substantiates my understanding that perhaps at least one-third of the time of these persons in the Army and Navy is taken up in saluting each other.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman apparently has been misinformed.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Can the gentleman from Georgia give the Members any idea of what the additional cost will be if this measure is passed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The additional cost will be the difference in the rank. A commander gets about $5,000

and a captain gets about $,500, including allowances. This will vary, depending upon the length of service.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will there be any additional cost to the taxpayers because women will be filling positions that would ordinarily be filled by men?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There would be more officers under the pending bill than under the old law, and that is the only additional cost.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Has the gentleman any figures on the cost to the Government of pensions after this war is over?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that most of the WAVES that I have seen here are very healthy-looking women.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that when a member of the WAVES is accepted by the Navy she has to be practically physically perfect?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They have to pass the same examination anyone else has to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the statements made by the gentleman from Kentucky, a distinguished member of the committee, were quite interesting and might have been a contribution to the subject except that every statement he made was in direct conflict with the known facts. For instance, he talked about the Navy Medical Center being filled with WAVES. At the present time there are exactly 44 WAVES at the Navy Medical Center, and the capacity of that hospital is 1,000.

He also mentioned that the WAVES have been used to displace civil-service employees in Washington. No WAVE has been used to displace any civil-service employee. That is not permitted. I think we may have to come to using some WAVES in cases where civil-service employees cannot be obtained, and that will be done then only if the Civil Service Commission certifies that there is no one to fill the job. Women were not recruited into the WAVES for that purpose and are not being used for that purpose. The gentleman from Kentucky knows or ought to know that if he wishes to discuss the bill.

I take direct issue with the gentleman from Kentucky that it is ever degrading for anyone to don a uniform to defend this country. The insinuation that it is degrading to put women in uniform is insulting not only to the women of America but to the American people generally. The women have as much of a stake in this country and have as much patriotism and as much love for and desire to serve this country as the men, and they have the same right to do so. We must realize that this is a war, and men and women must contribute their part wherever they can best serve. As long as women are willing and able to replace competent fighting men so that those men can go to MacArthur to help him fight the Japs and not stay in Washington, then let us make every facility available for women to replace the men so that we may get on with this war and get it over with. MacArthur needs more than the mere wave of his hand that the gentleman from Kentucky is giving him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, all time has expired. I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"Section 502, strike out "That there shall not be more than one officer in the grade of lieutenant commander; nor more than 35 officers in the grade of lieutenant; and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers: *And provided further,*".

"Section 504, strike out 'shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and.'

"Strike out sections 506 and 508.

"Section 507, change 'SEC. 507' to read 'SEC. 506.' "

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Section 502, change to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 502. Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, not above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this title may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve.'

"Section 504, strike out the words 'shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and.' "

"Strike out section 506 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 506. Members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, shall be entitled to all allowances or benefits provided by law for male officers and enlisted men with dependents of the reserve components of such services. This section shall be effective from July 30, 1942.'

"Strike out section 508."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAVENS: Page 2, line 14, after the words "Section 504", strike out the remaining words in lines 14, 15, and 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft, provided that the members of the Reserve who became such prior to the enactment of this act shall not, without their voluntary consent, be assigned to duty outside the continental limits of the United States."

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, the law as now written, at which my amendment is aimed, and on the basis of which law a great number of the present members of this particular force have gone into the service, reads as follows:

Members of the Women's Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only, and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft.

As I understood the gentleman to state a while ago, the Navy has adopted a policy whereby they would not send any of the members of this organization beyond the continental limits of the United States, without their consent, and the sole purpose of the amendment which I propose is to write that policy or that construction of policy into law, so that we may be sure that the Navy will not change its mind about such a policy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr CRAVENS. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then the members of the WAVES would be at the tender mercy of the admirals in the Department?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is true.

Mr. MAAS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's purpose, but I am afraid he will have to perfect the language of his amendment because looking at the gentleman's amendment, it strikes out section 504, which eliminates the restriction from the original act, and you must retain the language of the original act.

Mr. CRAVENS. The gentleman mistakes the wording of my amendment.

Mr. MAAS. You substitute in lieu of this section of this bill, but what you will have to do is to put it after section 504 of the original act.

Mr. CRAVENS. That is what I am doing. I am leaving out of the original act, that which restricts members to the continental United States, so that those who come in after passage of this new act may be sent abroad without their consent, but adding a proviso to the effect that if they have already gone in to this organization under the existing arrangement, they may not then be sent abroad without their consent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This applies only to those already in.

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then I accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAVENS. Those that come into it now or in the future may be sent anywhere, because this act puts them on notice that they may be subject to that type of service. The purpose of my amendment is to protect those already in the service who came there under a guar-

anty, so to speak, that they would not be sent to foreign service. In other words, to prevent a change in the rules of the game in the middle of the game, and tell them that they have to serve on an entirely different basis.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman's amendment limited it to combat vessels. We may have transports in which women are being transported, and we might want to send women doctors to serve in those combat transports.

Mr. CRAVENS. The reason I put that in there——

Mr. MAAS. You said "vessels of the Navy."

Mr. CRAVENS. I followed the exact wording of your bill, left it written as you have it written in this proposed amendment to the law. The only thing I struck out is the foreign service part. I followed your amendment and then added a proviso that those who are already in this branch of the Service cannot be sent outside the continental United States without their consent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman that I trust the committee will adopt this amendment. I think it is a clarifying amendment. It was practically what the Navy Department would have done by regulation.

Mr. CRAVENS. I thank the gentleman. It really puts the Navy's policy into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand this is an amendment to the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman from Arkansas? We are dealing with a committee amendment and this would be an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But it is a committee amendment that is being considered by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might state that at the request of the gentle- from New York [Mr. COLE] unanimous consent was granted to consider the committee amendment as an original bill. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: "Amend the amendment by striking out lines 14, 15, and 16."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, the issue is not made as clear as it possibly could have been if the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky had offered his amendment in the first instance, but I think the Committee can clearly understand the situation. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky would be that the Navy Department could not order them abroad. The Navy Department says they have some need for them. They say they are going to administer the law with a great deal of caution. The effect it will have on the organization relates to morale more than anything else. The WAAC's have permission of Congress to serve abroad; the WAVES do not have that permission by the bill that we enacted into law. Probably there may not be as great a material need as some may think, but there should certainly be some uniformity in the services.

It does not make a particle of difference to me whether they go abroad or do not go abroad. I think the House understands the issue clearly. If you think there is any military reason why the Navy can use them abroad, they ought to go. If on the contrary the Committee thinks the Navy has not any justification for sending them abroad, then you should vote for the gentleman's amendment. I think a happy solution would be the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under the present law, are the WAAC's permitted to go abroad?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; the WAAC's are permitted to go.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How about the women serving with the Marine Corps?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the marines and the SPARS are in the same fix as the Navy because the same legislation covers the three organizations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What special reason would there be to send the WAAC's and not the WAVES, or exclude the WAVES and not the WAAC's? Is there any good reason?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; there is no good reason. They have use for some of these people over there. I think, therefore, in the interests of orderly procedure, the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas would clarify the situation and be along the right line.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. What does the Navy say about whether they needed them or not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Navy stated that they could use a very limited number in England in Admiral Stark's office and a very limited number in Admiral Nimitz' office.

The House should realize one thing: There is not going to be any wholesale sending of them abroad. It has more effect on morale and recruiting than anything else, this privilege of sending them abroad. The WAAC's have the consent of Congress now to go abroad.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out the fact that in his statement the gentleman from Kentucky complained that the WAVES took up a lot of shipping space and hospital room. This is sheer nonsense. These women are only going to replace men; so if there is not a WAVE on a ship going to Honolulu or England there will be a man on it. If one of them gets sick and is hospitalized it will only be because some man is not sick in the hospital. Now, if we are going to get on with this war, every able-bodied qualified man has got to be on the fighting front, and this legislation is designed merely to replace those men wherever possible with women.

If we would accept the Cravens amendment I believe it would be a good solution to the problem. I think it is a happy compromise, and that we will be performing a valuable service to the war effort to make women available to release more physically fit men for actual combat duty.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true of the Navy that before one person, whether enlisted or commissioned, leaves the continental limits of the United States for foreign duty he has to submit to a thorough physical examination, have his eyes tested, his teeth fixed, and be 100-percent physically before they are accepted for duty abroad?

Mr. MAAS. Certainly, with all their inoculations and everything else they can possibly give them to insure their safety and health.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have given this right to the WAAC's. The WAVES now want it. If we give it to the WAVES what about the SPARS and the marines?

Mr. MAAS. They will automatically get it. This legislation covers the marines.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Ought it not to cover all of them?

Mr. MAAS. It covers the Marines and the Navy. The SPARS are covered by different legislation. The women of the U. S. O. go overseas. They take movie actresses to the front. The Navy nurses go overseas; the WAAC's go overseas. There is no reason why those WAVES who can be of service to release physically fit men should not serve in places like Honolulu and England.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It may interest the Committee to know that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have reported out a bill that would give the same privilege to the SPARS that this bill gives to the WAVES if it becomes a law.

Mr. MAAS. I am glad to know that. They ought all to be treated alike.

Mr. BLAND. I may say the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries originally reported a bill to that effect.

Mr. MAAS. I am glad to have that information, and I am sure the House is, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, from time immemorial the civilization of any race or nation has been judged by the manner in which it has treated its women. The Anglo-Saxon race has been a race of fighting men. Your pioneer fathers were men who could whip their weight in wildcats. We have never up until this time proposed to bring our women to the fighting front and have them do our fighting for us. Someone will say that we are not going to put them up on the fighting front, but every one of us here knows that in these times of modern bombing planes anywhere within a range of many miles of a fighting front is really at the fighting front.

I voted for the bills which provided for the organization of these various women's services, because I believed at that time that women could do a great deal of good on missions of mercy, the doing of clerical work, and in many tasks that it was explained to us they would do here at home in order that more men might be sent into battle, and I have been for that, but I am not for forcing any young woman to go overseas to help do the fighting. If we do that, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have our hospitals filled with returning women. The physical make-up of a woman is different from that of a man. From time immemorial men have been of a different nervous make-up; they are temperamentally and physically fitted for, and have been trained to do, the fighting of nations. Women are differently constituted. They are brave as any man, but they are physically weaker. Of course, they can do a lot of things better than men can, but there are some things that they are not fitted to do. I do not think they ought to be put out on these fighting fronts. Shame on you who would send them there.

Personally I am going to vote against any bill which seeks to draft women or even to lead them by ballyhoo into those fighting fronts. It would be a disgrace to the manhood of this Nation to do it. It would be a mistake. I know some women are even now returning mental and physical wrecks, because they cannot stand the noise and the racket of the bombings, the stark horror of the things that even try the souls of strong men, that they are bound to face over there. I would be ashamed to tell my sons or the people of my family that I had voted for a bill to send the young women of our country to a foreign front to help fight the battles of this country.

I am proud of the armed forces of this country, I am proud of the stalwart men who have fought the battles of America, and I say that today the men of this country are a breed of fighting men. I do not think that the boys in our armies want the young women of our country exposed to shot and shell, the scream of dive bombers, and the things they are going to have to face if we send them over to the fighting front. I like to think of a woman as the purest and the holiest thing that God ever created, and this brings to my mind a little poem somebody wrote about the time of the last war, as follows:

Ah, Bohemia's honey is sweet to the sip,
And the song and the dance are luring,
And the mischievous maid with the mutinous lip,
Has a charm that is very enduring.
But out from the smoke-wreaths and beauty and lace,
Of that world of the tawdrily clever,
There floats the rare spell of that pure little face
That has chased away folly forever.
And I drain my last cup ere I go to my rest,
Oh, fortunate earth, to possess her,
To the dear tender heart in the pure white breast,
Of the woman that is good, God bless her!

Mr. Chairman, let us keep the women here at home and let the men do the fighting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I disagree with the distinguished chairman of my committee. I usually support him in all naval matters before the House. May I say also I do not agree with everything the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky said about the WAVES. In my opinion, he has been just a bit too severe in his criticism of the Navy Department and the WAVES. However, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky and the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] have a great deal of merit.

It would be altogether unjust to these women whose parents have consented to their entry into military service to be suddenly placed in a situation where they are compelled to go abroad when that was not in their initial contract. I am a father; I have two young girls approaching womanhood. I served in the First World War, and I am sure that any Member of the House who served overseas in the First World War is well aware of the temptations which young women would encounter far from the influence of their own homes and their own firesides. We see what is taking place here in the city of Washington with these girls of teen age who come here to work in these Government departments. As the father of a young girl of 19 and another one 21, I certainly would hesitate to give consent to my daughters going overseas, to be far from the spiritual influences of their own family and family life.

I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, and if that is defeated I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]. If both of these amendments are defeated, or perhaps if only that offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] is defeated, I will be justified in refusing to support the bill if it still contains the section striking out the provision that the WAVES shall only be used within the continental limits of the United States. There is no justification for this. There are altogether too many officers here in Washington and in all the other cities of the United States. Let them send them abroad first, and then, if they need more men or women, let them call upon the WAVES. But until we take these young men who are wearing the Navy uniform out of Washington and out of the other large centers of the United States, there certainly is no justification for exposing our young American women to dangers and temptations on foreign soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York as a substitute amendment for the Cravens amendment: In section 504, after the words "continental United States", insert a comma and the following, "its Territories and insular possessions."

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. This amendment is an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to the fact that this amendment is offered as a substitute to the Cravens amendment and not to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that perhaps this suggestion might offer a common ground on which those who are interested in sending women abroad to help the naval forces, and those who are interested in seeing that the women are retained at home to help the naval forces here, may unite.

If this amendment is adopted, it will mean that the members of the Women's Reserve may be sent to Honolulu, Alaska, the Panama Canal, and Puerto Rico, where we have established naval activities, where they might be able to serve on duty with comparative safety.

I confess that when this proposal was before the committee I felt as does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], a sentiment which has been very admirably expressed by the gentleman from Missouri,

but the Navy Department has indicated a military need for the services of the women in those establishments in Hawaii, Panama, and Puerto Rico, and I feel that we who are interested in preserving the femininity of our women even in time of war can feel reasonably safe in permitting them to go to these Territorial possessions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have gotten very much excited here about a matter that really is not so important after all. This bill merely attempts to do for the members of the Naval Women's Auxiliary what the Congress has already done for the Army Auxiliary. I do not see any reason for the discrimination. If it is wrong to send the girls in the Navy over, then it is wrong to send those in the Army over.

I do not see anything to get excited about in this matter. It has been testified that there will not be many that will go. I dare say that there are now in Honolulu alone over 2,500 American girls working in the war effort for the Navy. The only point is that they are not in uniform. So why all this hubbub about it? If you are going to keep the forces of the one at home, then you ought to keep the forces of the other at home.

I favor the Cravens amendment. I hope the Committee will agree upon the Cravens amendment.

I was interested in the remarks of my distinguished friend from Missouri about the womanhood of the country. I come from much farther south than does the gentleman. I come from down where we hold the mockingbird music sweet and womanhood on a high pedestal. But we are fighting, as Dr. JUDD told us this morning, not a war of sentiment; we are fighting a war of reality. If these women can be used to a good purpose to take the place of the men who are behind the desk in the communication centers and who are running the typewriters, and so on, whether it be in England, Honolulu, or wherever it may be, why should not their services be used for that purpose?

I think, if you are going to cut out this portion of this bill, you ought also to cut out the same provision that now exists in the law of the land for the Women's Auxiliary of the Army, where they have more than 50,000 members as against some 4,000 in the Navy. I do not see any reason why we should get excited about this matter. I think that the happy solution is to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cravens amendment and in opposition to the two other amendments that have been offered.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has so well stated the proposition that there is little I can add to what he has said. I do want to say this with reference to some of the arguments that have been made here about taking these women to the front. As has already been stated, for some time we have been taking women nurses to the front. Not so long ago we saw pictures of women nurses on Guadalcanal attending the sick and the wounded. As far as I know, there was no great complaint that went up about the use of those women there.

Only a few days ago this House passed a bill making it possible to send women doctors right out to the very front lines, and not a single voice was raised against it either in this House or in the other body. The bill passed by unanimous consent in both Houses and has been signed, and is now the law.

With this Cravens amendment, I cannot see that there is any objection, because no girl will be sent abroad except upon her own option.

Just a few days ago a young lady from my district made application to the State Department for a job in London. She was accepted and is now getting ready to go to London. Has there been any complaint against her going there? Has there been any complaint about her going there? Why should there be a complaint, then, if that same girl had joined the WAVES, and had asked for an assignment in London, provided there was need for her there? A question has been raised about the need. I do not know what the need is. I do know that we have far-flung naval bases, that we have one in New Zealand, that we have one at Pearl Harbor, and that we have them in other places all over the world, carrying on this war, and I do know that the testimony before our committee was that the experience of the WAAC's has been that every girl that had been sent out to the field had replaced, on an average, one and a quarter men. I want to say this, that the time is fast coming when we are going to experience a very serious condition with reference to the utilization of our total manpower resources. I believe that this country has not realized what total war means. Total war means using everything that we have, and yet this Congress has pulled back on practically every single measure that has been presented toward mobilizing our resources. This bill is simply another measure in that program of using our total resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, we in California who have lived and worked with the Japanese have believed for years that the Japanese were preparing for a war. While a member of the California State Legislature, I was a coauthor of a bill to eliminate the Japanese alien fishermen from our coasts and harbors after we had received confidential information from the naval intelligence that many of these fishermen were officers in the Japanese Navy and that they were obtaining valuable data which could be used against us. We also knew of the Japanese ability and of their capacity to work and accomplish their objectives.

Therefore, today, we of the Pacific coast are definitely fearful that unless more attention is paid to this Pacific war we will be years in regaining our lost territory and in defeating the Japanese in their strongholds. We are still maintaining that we have not had our share of airplanes in the South Pacific, that we have not been paying enough attention to the Alaskan situation.

Anyone who has studied Japanese history will know that the Japanese have pursued in all their past wars the same tactics which they are employing today. They have been ruthless, and their strategy has been that of patiently waiting to catch the enemy off guard and then to make a surprise attack. In 1894, when they struck at China, Japan had been talking peace and even had the other nations thinking that war was improbable. With that great advantage of a surprise attack she was able to defeat China. Then, we are familiar with the story of the Japanese-Russian War, when Tojo, the great Japanese naval commander, pulled a surprise attack on the Russian Navy and annihilated the same. To show you the thinking of the people in that time, a London editorial writer in the spring of 1904 stated:

> There is no justification for all of the excitement. Japan and Russia will not fight. Neither one is in a position to carry on war.

We all know the story of the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and likewise on the Aleutian Islands. We must avert any more such embarrassing surprises.

Again I say we on the Pacific coast are fully aware of the seriousness of this Japanese war, and while we are 1,000 percent in sympathy with the actions in the Atlantic, we claim that the Pacific war should not be overlooked.

Now, with this horrifying and atrocious execution of our Tokyo air raiders by the Japanese, we find an enraged America has finally awakened to the seriousness of this Pacific war. But, let me add, there is a strange coincidence of another incident which happened within a few hours after this news was released. Mr. Churchill, who has definitely sold our leaders on the idea that we should spend the greatest amount of our energy on the European battle front, called the newspapermen to his office after midnight to make a statement that he had received reports that Hitler is making preparations for using poisonous gas against the Russian front. This may be true, but we must not let our attention again be entirely taken away from the Pacific war by the statement of Mr. Churchill. We have two enemies, each of equal strength, and we should realize this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for 3½ minutes

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Missouri did not wish to seem to attack the character of women in uniform, and to say that their character might not stand up well, if they wore the uniform of their country but it sounded that way. Women in uniform would have a right to resent that. Women in uniform honor

that uniform—they respect it—it is a protection. It is what you are, not where you are, and it seems to me that if anyone had a temptation not to be of good character, the fact that one wore the uniform of the United States would give strength. I wonder if Members realize that we had during World War No. 1 serving overseas, not actually a part of the Army, but near the Army, just as near as these WAVES would be, some 22,000 women. There were 2,000 women that we borrowed from the British to serve with our Services of Supply overseas, because they were needed to do the confidential work, work that civilians could not be entirely trusted to do. At present much of the Navy work is of a confidential nature. My own opinion is that very few of those WAVES will be sent overseas. But I do feel that we are fighting the most horrible and most far-reaching war in all history. If the Navy has expressed a wish and expressed the importance of making it possible to send some of these WAVES overseas, I feel that it should be done. Today the Red Cross has many women serving overseas. I do not believe in blocking the war effort in this way. The Navy does not wish women to fight. You have all seen hundreds of women nurses who have been with the Army and the Navy for years. They have been in danger zones. You know of the nurse who flew that terribly wounded man back for miles over the Pacific at high altitude and the courage which it took. If anyone here had seen, I am very sure they would know she is not less ladylike, not less gentle, not less good because she was near the armed forces, rather that she had more of these qualities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the amendment, because I do not believe we have reached the time in America when we must call upon the women of this Nation to fight our battles.

I have three sons in the armed forces of this Nation. I know that one of the things they look upon as almost sacred is that mother back home and that little kid sister. We say these women are not going into the battle zones, but the entire world today is a battle zone. While we realize that excellent work is being done by the WAVES and the WAAC's, I think however that the Army made a serious mistake in sending them overseas. And one wrong does not right another. I have been taught to look upon women, as the gentleman from Missouri stated, as something almost akin to holy. I feel that the one thing we must hold sacred in America is that respect which we were taught to have for womanhood.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman realize that we women come from a race of fighting American women; that in the part of the country where I come from and where my ancestors have lived for over a hundred years, our women used to put out the flames of their burning houses with the bloody shirts of their dead husbands; that the pioneer women of this country always were and always will be fighting women. As a matter of fact, a national heroine, Molly Pitcher, was the first WAAC.

In the South during the great War between the States, had the southerners not had their women to back them up as these WAAC's and WAVES are going to back up our men at the front lines they would have lost the war much sooner and we would have been much longer winning ours. We have always been fighting women and never afraid to do our part.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I appreciate the lady having made her speech, but my people landed in this country at Jamestown in 1635 and they have been taught from that time until today that women are to be revered and protected and not to fight our country's battles.

Mr. WORLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. After all, this is not a question that concerns the patriotism or bravery of WAVES, is it?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Absolutely not. It is something we are trying to preserve, the sanctity of the American home. After this war thousands of dads will look back through the years and remember a curly headed baby boy that once crawled across their kitchen floor, and who sacrificed his life upon the battlefields of Europe in this fight for freedom. There will be crepe on a million doors in America before this war is won, but I do not want one to be placed in memory of an American girl that had to face an enemy because some man stayed home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, of course I appreciate the futility of attempting to defeat any legislation which the very able gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of this committee, sponsors. It seems to be an unwritten rule that because of the very high respect, exceptional ability, and the fair way in which he presents legislation, that the House just as a matter of course says, "When bills come from his committee we must take them." I have heretofore with some misgiving, and I may say frankly against my better judgment, supported every one of these measures so far which have set up and made effective these so-called women's auxiliaries to the different branches of our armed forces. I say I have done so with some misgivings. Some of us were rather skeptical about some of these bills as they came up from time to time, but we were assured as the legislation progressed that it was only for the purpose of assisting our armed forces in this country and to make available men for combat duty, who otherwise would be retained here in the service.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sorry. I do not have time. But like many other things we see now just what some of us were apprehensive of at the time the original bill was passed, that they would soon be endeavoring to send them overseas to do the fighting alongside of the men. I observe the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts is shaking her head, as if to say "No," but that is exactly what this legislation provides for. Not only that, in another section of this bill, if it is passed, as we take these women into the Army, their men are entitled to the same allowances and allotments now provided for the dependent wives of our fighting soldiers.

Pass this legislation and their husbands at home are entitled to allowances as now provided by other legislation. Just where are we going to stop this thing? My friend from New York said that I was just a little too old-fashioned. Well, it may be I am old fashioned, but I think I can speak without prejudice because in my house there are four boys and three girls. Two of the boys are in the Army now. Of course, no one contends the boys are more patriotic than the girls. That is not the point. No one questions the patriotism of the women of America. Some of us do question the valor of having them do our fighting while we stay home and receive allotments from Uncle Sam. I certainly take issue with the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] in the appraisal she has made. And may I say to her: Yes; our women have been fighting women, too, but they fought on the home front and believe it is just as patriotic and just as important to keep the home intact, and maintain the hearthstone and fireside, as it is to put on a uniform. They still think that the old American custom of letting their men go to the front to do the fighting is a pretty good one.

That is what we ought to do in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1364, to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.; and

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives from April 22 to May 3, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; and

H. J. Res. 113 Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 991. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised

RESIGNATION FROM BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 22, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the necessity that I go to Nebraska on official business during the recess of the House I find it will be impossible for me to attend to the business of the official Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy. For that reason I tender my resignation as a member of the board.

Very sincerely yours,

KARL STEFAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] may have until midnight tonight to introduce a tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Committee on Ways and Means may have authority to file reports on bills or joint resolutions ordered reported by that committee and that such reports be referred to the appropriate calendars of the House and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House that the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolution passed by the two Houses and duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 133 to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 120 days, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "August 24" and insert "May 24."

Page 1, line 16, strike out "August 23" and insert "May 23."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 30 days."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in two instances in the RECORD, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Francis Biddle before the Swedish Colonial Society at Philadelphia, Pa., on Saturday, April 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I delivered on last Saturday at a meeting for the protection of the foreign-born.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CURTIS and Mr. LARCADE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. SIKES asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the action by which H. R. 1860 was on yesterday rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter the motion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, then I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a friend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will in a few days engage the attention of the House. This measure expires on June 12 and the question recurs as to whether it shall be extended for another 3-year period.

Tariff has played an important part in the economic development of the United States. Deeply seated in our traditions, it is easily the oldest and one of the most important political issues in our history.

If this Congress decides to treat tariff as a political issue we shall have the same controversies which prevailed in 1940, when a spirited attempt was made to defeat the resolution extending the operation of the act. Efforts will be made again to require the same ratification for future trade pacts as are accorded treaties, and if such a course is followed we shall have a complete end to the trade-agreements program. Since ratification of a treaty—in which class the agreements would be placed—requires a two-thirds majority, any tariff lobby which could log-roll with other blocs to make up a one-third vote would be able to stop the inauguration of a trade pact. Some gentlemen will raise once again the point that the act is clearly unconstitutional, despite the fact that the courts have repeatedly upheld the delegation of authority such as is given to the State Department to negotiate these agreements under the executive power to raise or lower tariffs 50 percent. There is every indication that opponents of the measure will be stronger than they have been since 1934, when the law was first enacted. A large number of those who are in opposition are disciples of economic isolation. They feel that this country is self-sustaining, that Americans can provide for each other all the things they need.

Those who are proponents of the act occupy a position of great advantage. To support their advocacy of trade agreements they can cite with telling effect the unhappy experience of not only the United States but the rest of the world as well during those distressing years from 1929 to 1934, inclusive. It was in that period that the basis for international misunderstanding was largely laid—when Fascist mobs were kept from storming the Chamber of Deputies in France only by force, when Germany was in her early beginnings of rearming, and when in a little while the world was to be given a surprise that somehow, sadly enough, did not quite surprise: The tearing up of the Versailles Treaty and the occupation of the Rhineland. In those days the radio, newspapers, periodicals, and special writers were busily engaged in telling the people of this country the story of tariff barriers. Press and radio were, with great care, explaining to the citizenry of this country the reasons for retaliatory tariffs. I venture the assertion that never were Americans more conversant with the subject of tariff than they were during this period. The Halls of Congress rang with denunciation and approval of the Hawley-Smoot bill, and nations beyond the seas kept pace with the gait of tariff schedules imposed by the United States upon their products. With each advancing tariff barrier here at home against importation, we found an accompanying barrier overseas, which always somehow contrived to be a little higher—until retaliation was the controlling passion of that unhappy era.

Permit me to give just two examples:

In those days truck producers in Florida, Alabama, and southern Georgia were growing tomatoes through the winter months. This was a money crop, and trade with Canada covering a number of years had made the venture exceedingly lucrative. The lack of trade agreements or the failure to employ some other tariff system than that which was in effect lost that market. Despite the fact that Canadians were fond of a red and ripe tomato in the heart of winter, the spirit of retaliation, induced by our lack of vision and the erection of tariff barriers against the importation of Canadian goods, brought about a situation wherein our southern farmers soon learned the startling fact that the costs to transfer a carload of tomatoes across the Canadian line were nearly as much as their selling price.

Overseas American automobile plants had been built in distant countries where these vehicles could be manufactured within those countries and thus avoid the rigors of retaliatory tariffs. The condition was so intolerable that something had to be done.

Experience has taught us that in this country the difference between prosperity and a depressed economic front is clearly shown when great quantities of goods and agricultural products are not exported. To enrich us our surpluses must be disposed of. Our foreign markets were rapidly disappearing, and to increase them we passed, in 1934, this act.

Those who favor trade agreements have another position of advantage, for they may vouch the record. Our foreign trade in 1929 was $9,640,000,000; in 1932 it had fallen to $2,934,000,000. Between these years foreign trade dropped nearly 70 percent, national income 43 percent, cash farm income 58 percent, wages and salaries in manufacturing industries 53 percent. In 1933 our total exports had fallen to $1,675,000,000; in 1937, 3 years after the first enactment of the trade agreements measure, they had risen to $3,349,000,000. In the same period our imports rose from $1,447,000,000 to $3,083,000,000.

Thus the issue is sharply drawn. Shall we return to a strict economic nationalism, and thus begin to lay the ground work for another war, or shall we continue a program which has proven itself in an unbalanced world? We have had 8 years of trade agreements. Shall we now demolish a system which has been directly responsible for the disappearance of barriers to trade and for the appearance of understanding in the field of trade?

Perhaps it is as easy to misread history as it is being made as it is to misinterpret the chronicles of a more distant past. Some of us are surely misreading history when we say that these trade agreements were a contributing factor in bringing Germany to her decision to make war upon us. On the evening of March 10 last, the German radio undertook to tell the American people to forget about the Trade Agreements Act. If I had ever entertained any doubts as to the soundness and effectiveness of this combination of policy and method, such a statement from our enemies would immediately resolve my doubts in favor of such a program. I can well understand the attitude of some of my colleagues who cling tenaciously to some past theory of tariff, for I am not prone to leave well-trodden paths and to adventure in untried fields. But the breaking down of isolation is so complete and lasting that we must remember that during the last 50 years the world has undergone far-reaching changes which have outmoded formulas which were simple and effective in the Victorian era.

Our future tariffs must protect us, but that protection is needed now on a front so wide that those who sat here in this body at the turn of the century would be amazed could they envision the changes which the turn of events in the world has brought about. Future tariffs must be an earnest of the sincerity of our announced program as set out in article VII of our Mutual Aid Agreement with the United Kingdom, entered into on the 23d day of February 1942, wherein the following stipulation is to be found:

> In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the United Kingdom in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 12, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

The smaller the export market for our goods the greater becomes the problem of idle capacity and idle men, bringing with it the demand for increased Government intervention. I do not believe

that Members will disagree with that statement. To establish a healthy foreign trade it is necessary to maintain a proper balance between exports and imports. To have a healthy foreign trade and a healthy domestic economy we must be willing and anxious to receive goods and services in exchange for exports. We shall be looking for markets when the fighting stops. Discrimination against our products and tariffs walls are the last thing we wish to encounter as we undertake the Herculean task of post-war reconstruction.

I shall never forget the words of Mr. Hoover as he spoke to the farmers out in Des Moines, Iowa, in 1932. He said:

> The very basis of safety to American agriculture is the protective tariff on American farm products.

There is no disposition to criticize that statement, but the irony of it was that at the moment of his speaking wheat was bringing 52 cents a bushel and hogs 4 cents a pound. He forgot—and I am sure that many of his hearers forgot—that what the farmer or any producer wants is not a protected market but an adequate market. And the farmers' market had never become a protected one until it had been tethered so securely by the protective tariff that it was beyond any help from that quarter. In those days after the crash of the New York Stock Exchange in 1929, when there was a sudden cessation of American foreign loans, prices and production fell rapidly and the world entered upon a depression of unparalleled scope and intensity. Sagging currencies everywhere, together with our tariff barriers, led France to swat us with a quota system and Italy to tell the world that Italy would defend herself in her own way—she would make purchases only in those countries which bought her products. The British Commonwealth of Nations entered into certain trade pacts of preference with constituent units of the Commonwealth, and even the long, withered fingers of a dying League of Nations pointed in our direction as it made the charge that the Hawley-Smoot tariff had deepened the world depression.

By the time we got around to 1932 we had received, pressed down and overflowing, a good measure of all that we had been asking for. We found isolation an uncomfortable garment; it was lined with hair, and many were our irritations as we confidently began to enjoy it with the rest of the world. Free trade was dead; the night had come. It was not the end of the play, for another act remained to be performed. Shangri-La could not long remain an idyllic place, what with its citizens clad in hair suits which steadfastly resisted all efforts of the wearers to soften the texture of the inner lining. The more we tried to protect, the more uncomfortable we became, until at long last it dawned upon us—as citizens of a world where the impact of other peoples upon us and of our ideas upon other peoples were of inestimable importance to the development of civilization—that there must needs be a substitution of economic cooperation for economic warfare in our relations with other countries if the way was to be opened to a healthy increase in our foreign trade as a whole. We realized as never before that foreign trade could not be a one-way proposition. We could not export unless we were willing to import, and we could do neither unless we were willing to give as well as receive.

These lines in Maxwell Anderson's play Valley Forge come to mind:

> There are some men who lift the age they inhabit * * * till all men walk on higher ground in that lifetime.

If then the trade agreements program has proven a contribution to such an end, and I think it has, we owe a debt of gratitude to one who was the first to recognize the fact that the hundred years' war between free trade and protective tariffs was over and that something else was badly needed to take their places. For 30 years Mr. Cordell Hull has with unremitting patience and tenacity pursued the idea that the United States policy of big tariff worked a grave injustice upon our Nation as a whole. For his vision and perseverance we are indebted.

I am for the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, and I am of the opinion that that amendment, other than the clarifying amendment, to the act will jeopardize the entire program. After the Hawley-Smoot Act it used to be said—and, I submit, with very good reason—that a legislative assembly was incapable of writing a sound tariff law. Congress has followed the wisest course since 1934. Tariffs have become so complicated that tariff making is a task for experts. It would be humanly impossible for Congress or a congressional committee—considering their many tasks—to examine all the details that must be studied. The act introduces flexibility into the system which it lacked heretofore.

No longer ago than February of this year the Honorable Herbert Morrison, the British Home Secretary, made this significant statement:

> It is as certain as daylight that, at the end of the old road of economic nationalism, there lies one more bitter and bloody lesson for humanity by one more period of poverty and depression * * * where there could be enrichment and prosperity. Internation trade on a nationalist, competitive basis is economic war * * * economic war leads to military war; attempts at economic domination will be resisted like attempts at military domination, and will divide the world into warring camps.

The earlier post-war years will bring us stringencies and shortages, but beyond that belt a favorable and bright future awaits us—provided we can dispel the dark shadow of an aggressive economic nationalism. What is needed now is prevention and not correction later. Trade agreements offer the only solution.

Those of us who must carry the full responsibility of the acceptance or rejection of reciprocal trade agreements must weigh the advantages or the disadvantages from the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole. We have never been able to devise a tax plan, not even in the days of colonial tariffs, which were chiefly for revenue, which avoided inequities and did not require correction and adjustment. There is, however, a direct relationship between the prosperity of one section of the country and that of the country as a whole. Foreign trade is an important factor in the prosperity of my State. Total exports originating in Virginia fell from $101,135,000 to $45,015,000 between 1929 and 1933. As the demands for Virginia products declined, prices fell, and purchasing power throughout the State was reduced. The total income of individuals in Virginia fell from $996,000,000 in 1929 to $337,000,000 in 1932, and cash farm income declined from $169,000,000 to $70,000,000 between the same 2 years. Your State needs foreign markets for the products of its mines, its farms, forests, and its factories.

Tobacco and its byproducts, apples, textiles, and their manufactures, lumber and wood manufactures, and paper products are examples of the important products of Virginia for which expanded and more stable market outlets have been obtained in trade agreements.

Growers and manufacturers of tobacco benefit from the concessions obtained in agreements with 11 countries, including reductions in duties or other mitigations in customs treatment by 5 countries. In addition, through the agreement with the United Kingdom, 16 colonies reduced the margin of Empire preference on many types of tobacco. Producers of fruits and vegetables in my State have been benefited from the concessions obtained in agreements with 25 countries for fruits and preparations and in 21 countries for vegetables and preparations. Of particular interest to Virginia farmers and exporters are concessions obtained in trade agreements with 20 countries for fresh apples, and with 8 countries for dried apples, and with 11 countries for fresh or canned tomatoes or tomato juice.

Among the important groups of concessions on these products are those obtained in the agreements with Canada and the United Kingdom. Canada lowered its duties and removed the 3-percent excise duty on a long list of fresh, canned, and dried fruits and vegetables, reduced the advanced valuations used in calculating regular and special duties, and reduced its in-season charges on fresh vegetables and fruits. The United Kingdom reduced or bound its duties on a wide range of vegetable and fruit products, and provided in the agreement for freer access to British colonial markets.

Textile-factory owners, workers, and exporters of Virginia benefit from concessions obtained in agreements with 17 countries for textile manufactures. These concessions include reductions in duty or other mitigations in customs treatment on cotton manufactures obtained in agreements with 8 countries, on silk manufactures in agreements with 9 countries, and on rayon manufactures in agreements with 4 countries.

Virginia's producers of timber and wooden manufactures benefit from expanded foreign markets resulting from the concessions obtained in agreements with 17 countries. On various kinds of lumber and timber, 12 countries reduced their duties or granted other mitigations

in tariff treatment, and 5 countries bound the existing duties against increase. Five countries reduced the duties or granted other mitigations in tariff treatment and 6 countries bound the duties on certain wooden manufactures. In addition, through the agreement with the United Kingdom, the margin of Empire preference was reduced by 9 colonies, 6 of which are in the West Indies area.

Manufacturers and exporters of paper and paper products benefit from the concessions obtained in trade agreements with 14 countries, 12 of which reduced the rates of duty or modified other trade barriers.

In addition to the direct concessions obtained, there is a most-favored-nation provision in each trade agreement which automatically extends to American products reductions or limitations on tariff rates granted by the agreement country to countries other than the United States. For example, lower tariff rates on some 600 items formerly extended by Canada to France but not to the United States, now apply also to American commodities. Among these Virginia benefits from reductions on oysters, fresh and canned fruits and vegetables, jams, jellies, peanut butter, textiles and manufactures.

Eight years ago we took the right fork in the road. There is no rhyme nor reason for us to retrace our steps. We have adopted a policy and set up a method of dealing with the tariff situation which reiterate the principles of international cooperation enunciated so clearly in the lend-lease agreements. We have found it unprofitable to withdraw into our shells. We must do our best to make terms with other governments to get along in a bitter world. We must avail ourselves of all the advantages that mutual understanding can engender. We have promised to promote mutually advantageous relations directed to the expansion of production and the exchange of goods, and to avoid discrimination. To fulfill that promise requires of us statesmanship of a high order, it requires fortitude and understanding on the part of the people of the United States. Thus far, as a people whose lives are dedicated to freedom, we have demonstrated to the peoples of the earth that we are more than ready to assume our responsibilities in time of war. We cannot afford to follow a course which our friends elsewhere in the world will regard as a clear indication that we are unwilling to carry our share of the burden when peace comes again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GEARHART, for 3 weeks, on account of the illness of his mother.

To Mr. ELLSWORTH, for April 22, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2238. An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2238. An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages; and

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on Thursday, May 6, to consider H. R. 85, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and H. R. 1905, a bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are

hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

354. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to suspend during the national emergency the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, in cases of certain vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

355. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 2468. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rep. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 629. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refugee purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgrow; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 376. An act for the relief of C. Y. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1335. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decisions of the Court of Claims in two suits instituted by H. B. Nelson (doing business as the H. B. Nelson Construction Co.); without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2454. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Robert N. Bickert with amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Andrew Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wolozin; with amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 563. A bill for the relief of Joe Koor; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Delores Lewis; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2528. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. Res. 185. Resolution requesting the President to transmit information with respect to approval or disapproval of priority applications (Rept. No. 381). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2561. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, relating to the insurance of deposits of public funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2563. A bill to establish an Army Agricultural Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr NORMAN:

H. R. 2564. A bill for the relief of the allottees and their heirs holding allotments in the Quinaielt Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2565. A bill to establish the salary of firefighters in the employ of the War Department of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2566. A bill authorizing the dredging of the boat basin at the mouth of the Apalachicola River at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2567. A bill to create a temporary national hospital survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2568. A bill to improve practices of Government procurement agencies with regard to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio:

H. R. 2569. A bill relating to checking and quarterly payment of appropriations to the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2570. A bill to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2571. A bill to grant certain persons an opportunity to ascertain whether or not they are physically qualified for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 220. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Invalid Pensions to investigate the program of the Federal Board of Hospitalization with the view of determining whether such program is being carried forth efficiently and expeditiously to meet the requirements for medical, tuberculosis, and mental hospitalization for the wounded and sick veterans of the global war; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 2572. A bill relating to the status of Oswald K. Yeager on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2573. A bill for the relief of Theodore C. Gault; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2574. A bill for the relief of the Pittman Bros. Construction Co., a partnership, T. A. Pittman, president; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2575. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. R. 2576. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

620. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 89 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

621. Also, petition of 59 members of the Plain Grove United Presbyterian Church, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

622. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Jannie E. Van Horn, president, Women's Auxiliary to Des Moines Post, No. 738, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and 50 other members of the same organization, urging Congress to support House bills 801 and 1744; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

623. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Frank L. Wagner and 49 other residents of Schenectady, N. Y., urging passage of House bill 2082, because of its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

624. Also, petitions signed by Harold Brown and 117 other residents of Gloversville, N. Y., petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH BRYSON, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of necessary materials for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

625. Also, petition signed by Mabel E. Schuh and 21 other residents of Gloversville, N. Y., urging that House bill 2082 be enacted, whereby untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

626. Also, petition signed by Henry L. Amos and 49 other residents of Gloversville and Johnstown, N. Y., urging that House bill 2082 be enacted, whereby untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

627. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Greene County and Columbia County, State of New York, petitioning the Congress to enact into law House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

628. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by the Lawrence Central Labor Union, of Lawrence, Mass., requesting a congressional investigation of the activities of Capt. Edward V. Rickenbaker; to the Committee on Rules.

629. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Legislature of California regarding Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, memorializing Congress to extend the effective date of the act providing for suspension of assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including Alaska, to July 1, 1944; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living, and of the living dead: From the beauty of the lilies, in the afterglow of Easter we come girding ourselves with its deathless message as we take up our daily tasks again, "feeling through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness." In our own risen lives, seeking those things which are above, enable us to challenge with the conquering truth of Easter all tyrants who, denying it, deal in war and death and chains and who suppress, exploit, and degrade the holy temple of human personality. Steady our hearts and steel our wills to pay the price for its coming, knowing there is no way to dawn except by dark, no way to light except by night, no way to Easter except by Calvary.

Make us worthy of those who day by day are making the supreme sacrifice that the flag of our dear country may become a symbol of peace on earth and of the brotherhood of man. May we face whatever the future holds, calm and confident in the assurance that—

"There lives the beauty that man cannot kill,
Yea, that shall kill all ugliness at last;
And Christ in love's white vesture moveth still among us.
May we hold that faith, and hold it fast."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

During the last adjournment of the Senate a message was received from the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Senate stating that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 30 days, and also that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Utah).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SENATOR McNARY'S STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask that a statement made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] endorsing renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with an amendment to empower Congress to veto any trade treaty by a majority vote within 60 days be printed in the RECORD. I heartily approve the stand of the Senator from Oregon on this matter, and I believe it reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the Middle West, particularly the great farming population.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I read with surprise and disapproval the statement of some of the New Deal leaders that the war effort of the United Nations might crack if Congress changed one word in the present Trade Agreements Act.

That implication is unworthy of our allies. We have been told, and many of us believe, that they are fighting to liberate mankind. Therefore, it is inconceivable that Russia, England, and China would desert us and their high objectives because the people of America, speaking through the Congress, ask that the trade agreements be ratified before becoming effective.

A sound and sane argument can be made for the present renewal of the act, and for that reason I am persuaded that an extension of the act, with a slight modification, is desirable. It may be argued that it is distinctly undemocratic to prohibit Congress from expressing the popular will. Consequently, an amendment might well be written into the resolution to extend the act giving Congress the right to veto by a majority vote any treaty within 60 days following its submission.

If an agreement of that kind could be reached with the State Department, it is my opinion that the act would be extended with the absence of prolonged political debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental

estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Senate, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $10,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 32)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $110,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENT OF CHARGES WITHIN INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (3), War (3), Navy, and Agriculture, National Housing Agency, and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winfield, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REGULATION OF AIR COMMERCE—RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT LEGISLATURE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. DANAHER] and for myself, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, and with it a resolution memorializing Congress concerning the bill H. R. 1012 and the bill S. 246 affecting air commerce.

There being no objection, the letter, with an accompanying joint resolution, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, SENATE,
Hartford, April 20, 1943.

Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: The enclosed copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 154 memorializing Congress concerning House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce was passed by this general assembly on this date.

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE F. BALDWIN,
Clerk of the Senate.
SEARLS DEARINGTON,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Senate Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution memorializing Congress concerning House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill H. R. 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part of civil aviation and private flying and fixed-base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the State their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed-base operations; and

Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, if necessary, and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time, and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty, and

Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future development and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Legislature of Connecticut respectfully requests that no action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Congress and to each of the Connecticut Senators and Representatives in Congress.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE OF PEACE—RESOLUTION OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF BARNARD COLLEGE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the representative assembly of Barnard College, endorsing the so-called Ball resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The representative assembly of Barnard College hereby offers its wholehearted support of the Ball resolution, recommending a strong United Nations organization for wartime collaboration and peacetime security.

As members of the generation which is fighting this war for a just and stable peace, we feel that the proposal embodies the minimum principles to which the United States must be committed before the peace settlement.

The nonpartisan character of the resolution is a guaranty that the peace terms will be based upon national welfare rather than politics.

Its acceptance by the Senate will assure our allies that this Nation will not again shirk its responsibilities in the post-war world.

Broad principles of peace must be shaped now while the sacrifices and aims of the conflict are still uppermost in our minds.

We therefore urge the passage of the Ball resolution as a surety that future generations shall not be imperiled by the threat of another war.

EDUCATION IN POST-WAR PLANNING—PETITION

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, through its seminar on post-war issues, has forwarded to me a petition praying that the Congress consider international educational issues in connection with post-war planning. I ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Minnesota will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the National Republican Club of New York City at a special meeting held on April 8, 1943, adopted a resolution endorsing Senate Resolution 114. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB,
New York City.

At a special meeting of the club held on Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 8:30 p. m. at 54 West Fortieth Street, New York City, the following report of the national affairs committee was duly adopted by the club:

"Whereas the adoption of the nonpartisan Ball-Hatch-Burton-Hill advisory resolution by the United States Senate would carry to the whole world knowledge that the United States intends to take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization with authority to assist in the prosecution of the war against the Axis; to establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas as these are occupied by United Nations forces; to administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation; to establish machinery for peaceful settlements of disputes; and to provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation; and

"Whereas said resolution further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement:

"*Resolved*, That the National Republican Club endorses the Ball-Hatch-Burton-Hill resolution of advice and urges its prompt adoption by the United States Senate, but of

necessity without prejudice to the right and duty of the Senate, under the Constitution of the United States, to give or withhold consent to any and all definitive treaty provisions negotiated by or under authority of the President."

RESOLUTION OF ST. LOUIS COUNCIL, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I present a petition from the St. Louis Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, containing certain very constructive suggestions as to the obligations of selective service boards in that area. Due to the fact that the petition is very short, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution defining the aims, purposes, and ideals of the St. Louis Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, containing its views and remedial suggestions pertaining to (1) evasion of military service, (2) misconduct of local industries, and (3) necessity for "occupational deferment office" in St. Louis, Mo.

This resolution, unanimously adopted, is not a criticism of selective-service boards, but is intended wholly to assist such boards in the meritorious work they are now doing, within the State of Missouri:

"Whereas it is notoriously apparent that there are now employed in industries in the city and county of St. Louis, Mo., numerous men between the ages of 18 and 37 years, and it is common knowledge that many of them are so employed for the purpose of evading military service to our country in this time of peril; and

"Whereas it is virtually a public scandal that such conditions exist, and those in charge of local industries have not been making any visible attempt to replace such men with other capable men above draft age, but, to the contrary, are still employing young men and encouraging them to evade military service, thereby hindering our war efforts and provoking justifiable criticism of all right-thinking citizens; and

"Whereas the prevailing practice of the Selective Service System in Missouri is to concentrate all of its operations in Jefferson City, Mo., thereby necessitating war industry contacts on occupational and deferment questions by telephone, motor or railroad to and from Jefferson City, Mo., while at the same time, our Government is urging that all travel and use of long-distance telephone lines be minimized, we believe that it is not in the best public interest to have concentrated in the center of Missouri all officials administering the Selective Service Act; and

"Whereas we are informed that there are more than 500 war, or associated war industries located in the city and county of St. Louis, Mo., which is a majority of such industries located in Missouri, we believe that it would best serve our war efforts to have branch headquarters of the Selective Service System of Missouri located in St Louis, and an occupational office be opened in St. Louis for the purpose of handling questions of occupational deferment between the Selective Service System and war industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the St. Louis Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting assembled, do hereby request the director of the Selective Service System at Jefferson City, Mo., to present this resolution to the proper authorities in Washington, D. C., recommending and requesting that such an office as 'occupational deferment office' for Selective Service, in charge of an officer with authority, with adequate personnel, be promptly established and located in the city of St. Louis, Mo., for the purpose of prompt ruling of such questions, to eliminate the bottle-neck or congestion that now exists in both travel and long-distance telephone calls so that our war efforts may be more efficient, with less confusion, with less loss of time, less expense, and in greater conformity with the requests of our Government to eliminate unnecessary travel and unnecessary long-distance telephone calls; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies of same be forwarded to Col. Claude H. Earp, State director of Selective Service; Gov. Forrest C. Donnell; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, national director of Selective Service; the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, national director of the War Manpower Commission, the United States Senators from Missouri, the St. Louis Representatives in Congress, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Industries, the St. Louis press, the State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 981. A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. MCNARY, from the Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources:

S. 74. A bill to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 206); and

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 207).

CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—MINORITY VIEWS AND AMENDMENTS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 180)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, as members of the Judiciary Committee I submit minority views on Senate bill 575, to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution. The bill is commonly known as the McKellar bill. I ask unanimous consent that these views be printed at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the minority views submitted by the Senator from Wyoming for himself and several other Senators will be received, printed, and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I also submit amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself to Senate bill 575, above mentioned, which I ask may lie on the table, be printed, and printed in the RECORD together with the minority views above referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minority views, together with the amendments referred to, are as follows:

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES (PT. 2 OF REPT. 180)

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following minority views to accompany S. 575:

It will be observed from the heading of this minority report, which has been adopted from the majority report, that this bill undertakes to require Senate confirmation for both officers and employees of the United States within a certain category. This it does on the theory that it will make effective the purposes of the Constitution as set forth in the second clause of section 2, article II. A glance at the Constitution will show, however, that the drafters of the bill are in error. The Constitution does not deal with employees. It deals only with officers, and it does not even require the confirmation by the Senate of all officers.

The men who framed the fundamental law directed the President to submit to the Senate the names of Ambassadors, public ministers and consuls, and Judges of the Supreme Court. It is true that they also provided for concurrence by the Senate in the appointment of all other officers, for which other provision was not made in the Constitution itself, but recognizing that the country would grow and that the number of officers required to administer its affairs would increase, they provided a means of relieving the Senate of the task of examining into the qualifications of all officers by authorizing the Congress to "vest the appointment of such inferior officer, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." This they did because they foresaw that the time would come when it would be unnecessary to have the Senate confirm all officers.[1]

Congress in many laws and over a long period of years has taken advantage of this provision of the Constitution and has authorized the appointmen of countless inferior officers without Senate confirmation. Now, however, this bill would require Senate confirmation, not only for inferior officers, but for thousands of employees who do not come within the class mentioned in article I, section 2.

To demonstrate this, it is only necessary to compare the Constitution and the bill before us. The Constitution deals only with officers. The bill deals with offices and positions. The Constitution provided the means whereby the field in which Senate concurrence should be required could be narrowed. The bill provides the means whereby it may be broadened.

Surely the drafters of the Constitution who did not think it would be necessary for the Senate to confirm all officers did not at any time contemplate that the time and attention of the Senate should be given to the selection of employees. That has been the view of the

[1] Article II, section 2, "The President * * * shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

Supreme Court which has held that there is a difference between officers and employees. That, too, has been the judgment of the Congress and the people, who for more than 50 years have endorsed the principle of a civil service based on merit alone. The bill before us destroys that concept, reverses the whole principle of the merit system, and places the selection of fully 30,000 inferior officers and employees within the political sphere. It is a step backward which the Congress should not take.

The sound principle of government administration is that those officers whose duties are primarily political, that is to say, policy forming, should be selected in the political manner—that is, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. By this means the people can bring about an effective change of Government policy whenever they desire. Administrative officers and employees whose functions are nonpolitical because not policy forming should, on the other hand, be selected by the merit system and placed within the permanent civil service.

When S. 575 came to the Judiciary Committee it covered all officers and all employees receiving more than $4,500 per year, whether policy forming or not. An attempt was made to bring it into harmony with the principle of the merit system by making it apply only to officers exercising policy-making functions. Accordingly, the standard of salary was stricken and an attempt was made to define policy-making positions. At the last moment, however, the committee, having adopted broad policy-making definitions, so that emergency officials exercising great war powers over the lives of the people should be subject to the supervision of the Senate as to their qualifications, returned to the original concept of including employees and restored the salary standard almost in its original terms. As a result, the last form of the bill is worse than the first, because it has the effect of requiring the confirmation of officials who come within the broad policy-making definitions even though they receive less than $4,500 as an annual salary.

The minority, therefore, believing that officers who exercise real policy-making functions should properly be confirmed, but that mere employees, no matter what their salaries, should not, recommend that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"That (1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any civilian office to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office until his successor is appointed and qualified or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943.

"SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, the following persons in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) shall be deemed to be officers of the United States and the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to the office held by each of them.

"(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

"(b) The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

"(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

"(d) All persons whose duties include the determination of provisions to be included in rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

"(e) Any persons whose duties include participation in conferences or discussions with persons from other departments or agencies or with persons from other bureaus, divisions, or sections of their own departments or agencies (other than with their own superiors), held for the purpose of determining the policies to be followed in administering any of the functions of any department or agency or any bureau, division, or section thereof.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

"(a) In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing, at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period, or in the case of any person who, having left the service after so acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status, is or has been reinstated in the service with restoration of such status; or

"(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

"(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House Office in the Executive Office of the President."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.
HOMER FERGUSON.
WILLIAM LANGER.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 1032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert P. Horrell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1033. A bill to include veterans of the present war and their dependents under the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans' Regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1034. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1035. A bill extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to persons deferred from military service for occupational reasons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1036. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; to the Commitee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1037. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on April 2, 1943, I introduced Senate bill 953, to establish the Urban Redevelopment Agency and to provide financial assistance to the municipalities and urban areas of the United States for their development in accordance with plans therefor, and for other purposes, and asked that it be referred to the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning because the bill dealt with the blighted areas in cities and was a post-war planning bill. I have been informed by the majority leader that bills should not be referred to the Special Post-war Planning Committee. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 953 and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

CEILING PRICE OF OIL

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution and request that it lie upon the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 143) was ordered to lie on the table.

Whereas oil is a military necessity; and

Whereas the present demand for oil is some 4,000,000 barrels per day; and

Whereas we are now consuming four times as much oil as we are discovering; and

Whereas to develop new oil fields in harmony with the increased demand for oil there must of necessity be new fields discovered; and

Whereas the records show that it requires some 700 test wells on the average to discover 1 new oil field; and

Whereas there is available existing drilling equipment and ample manpower for making tests for oil; and

Whereas the Government must have oil and is willing and anxious to cooperate with oil producers in the location and discovery of new fields and pools; and

Whereas the failure to prospect for oil and to discover new oil fields is due to the present low price of oil; and

Whereas there has been no increase in the price of oil during the past 5 years, save in isolated instances; and

Whereas the present price of oil ranges from 85 cents to $1.40 per barrel—the average price being $1.17 per barrel; and

Whereas the present low price for oil is forcing the so-called little oil producers and operators to sell their properties and discontinue their efforts in locating and producing oil; and

Whereas this policy is resulting in oil properties being concentrated in the ownership and under the management of the so-called big companies; and

Whereas the present low price for oil is forcing the owners and operators of so-called stripper wells to close such wells, thus not only decreasing production but destroying the wells themselves; and

Whereas the present low price of oil is not sufficient to permit companies to install and maintain secondary recovery policies; and

Whereas the present low price of oil makes it impossible to secure finances with which to prospect and drill for oil, thereby preventing the so-called wildcatting in an effort to locate new oil fields; and

Whereas the costs of prospecting and drilling for oil have materially increased due to (a) increased wages, (b) increased costs of machinery and repair parts, and (c) increased costs of drilling due to the deeper drilling necessary to test and explore prospective oil areas; and

Whereas as a guide for the establishment of a new and proper ceiling for oil, the following facts should be taken into consideration:

(1) The price of oil during World War No. 1 was some $3.75 per barrel;

(2) The average price of oil during the 10-year period of 1919 to 1929 was $1.88 per barrel;

(3) The general price level during the same 10-year period was on the average 100;

(4) The general price level at this time is 103.5;

(5) To give the producers of oil a parity price with industry and labor the 1919 to 1929 average or base price should be increased to 103.5 percent of such base price or to the sum of $1.95 per barrel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal agencies having control of price ceilings should take immediate action to raise the ceiling price on oil to such a point as will be instrumental in promoting oil exploraton, development, discoveries, and production of sufficient oil to serve the war effort as well as the necessary domestic needs of our people.

FORESTRY RESEARCH—LETTER BY DEAN CHRISTENSEN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we hear much discussion about economy. I am in favor of it, as a general rule. I feel, however, that a great mistake has been made in the House of Representatives by reducing the appropriations with relation to forestry research, particularly in relation to reducing the amount which is necessary to prevent forest fires sweeping forest areas. I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from Mr. Chris L. Christensen, dean of the college of agriculture of the University of Wisconsin. In the same connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. E. J. Vanderwall, conservation director of the Wisconsin department of conservation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 22, 1943.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: You are aware of the fact that nearly half of the area of Wisconsin is better suited for timber production than for the growing of farm crops. This applies not only to large areas of the cut-over region in the northern half of the State, but also to an aggregate of many hundreds of thousands of acres on portions of operating farms throughout the State that are too steep, too stony, or for some other reason unsuitable for crop production.

The university has cooperated with the Lakes States Forest Experiment Station of the United States Forest Service in conducting research for the purpose of learning improved and more effective methods of growing forest trees on these nonagricultural areas of Wisconsin. The funds available for this research have been very limited, but the results secured have been highly beneficial. The regret has been that we could not carry forward the many investigations that have been requested by residents in the different parts of the State where the soils and climatic factors make it necessary to gather field information locally before detailed timber management practices can be worked out to fit the specific local conditions.

One of the most important of these forest research projects has been under way for about 4 years in Richland County, and has for its major objective the development of improved methods of managing the steep hillsides so prevalent throughout the unglaciated western part of our State. You know that these steep hills are a large contributing cause of the serious erosion losses occurring on the cultivated portions of the farms on which these steep hills are a part. Excellent results are being secured in this Richland County study, and we are expecting that the findings will be useful throughout the western half of the State.

We are now advised that the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for the coming fiscal year carries a drastic cut in the funds for forestry research, and that if the act passes in its present form, we will have no Federal cooperation in such projects as the one now under way in Richland County. This would be most unfortunate because it would cut off in midstream a highly important ing our potential forest acres contribute their expended, and before it is possible to draw final conclusions. You can appreciate that when research deals with trees it is manifestly impossible to obtain convincing and complete evidence except over a period of several years.

The State of Wisconsin has a large potential resource in its millions of acres of timberland. At present these acres are relatively unproductive. Next to the protection of these timberlands from fire, their most essential need is for research that will provide the new information on which sound management practices must be based.

It is my conviction that the Congress would not approve the wrecking of this highly important research in forestry if the Members of Congress knew what was at stake. I truly hope that you will do all that you can to insure that the cut in appropriations for forestry research is restored. The amount involved is very small in comparison with the other costs of government, but I truly believe it has importance and value of a very high order. In helping Wisconsin to build up its post-war economy there are few enterprises which mean so much for this State as does timber production. We need the aid of the Federal Government in finding the investigation on which much effort has been answers to urgent problems involved in makutmost to the economic life of the commonwealth.

Sincerely yours,
CHRIS L. CHRISTENSEN,
Dean and Director.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, April 19, 1943.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have written to you before on the subject of the need for maintaining Federal aids for forest protection. H. R. 2481 had carried an appropriation for the next fiscal year of nearly $4,000,000 for this purpose in cooperation with the States. The House Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee has eliminated $1,500,000 from this 1944 Clark-McNary request.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail about the importance of fire control for the timberlands of the Nation. You are fully aware of this matter. Timber and other forest products are on the highest priorities as essential and critical materials.

It is our undivided opinion that the original sum recommended in H. R. 2481 should be restored and that your support of this position is needed. It would seem little enough to appropriate for the protection of a basic and great national resource. I can assure you that the full appropriation can and will be expended by the United States Forest Service in cooperation with the States, with good results. I hope you can support our recommendation in this respect.

Sincerely yours,
E. J. VANDERWALL,
Conservation Director.

SALE OF WAR BONDS AND STAMPS BY WEAVER HIGH SCHOOL, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Frank H. Burke, principal of the Weaver High School, in Hartford, Conn., a letter under date of April 21, whose inspiring message is such that I intend to read it for the information of the Senate:

WEAVER HIGH SCHOOL,
Hartford, Conn., April 21, 1943.

Senator JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may be interested in a brief report of the outstanding record of participation of students and faculty of Weaver High School in the purchase of United States War bonds and stamps, culminating in the special drive staged during the scholastic week ending April 16.

Beginning in January, we decided to make a special effort to increase the weekly sale of bonds and stamps. We increased our sales to a point where the amount ranged between $1,500 and $2,300 per week. On Friday, April 9, in special brief assemblies, we asked the school to purchase $10,000 worth of bonds and stamps during the coming week to signalize Weaver's participation in the national second war loan drive. We felt at the time that we were setting a goal which might be difficult of attainment. A week later, Friday, April 16, the weekly report showed that we had sold in this school, in a period of 4 days, War bonds and stamps to the value of $42,402.35. Thus, in 1 week, purchases in this school had almost equaled the quota of $50,000 which we had set for the entire school year. The previous sale of bonds and stamps in this school from September 1942 up to April 9, 1943, had totaled $22,388.60. We have, therefore, sold to date this year in Weaver High School War bonds and stamps amounting to $64,790.95. Our enrollment is 1,330 pupils.

I am presenting this report to you because I believe that you will take pride in the fact that a high school in the State which you represent has established a record which will, I am confident, bear favorable comparison with that achieved by any other similar institution in this country. Much of the credit for the success of our undertaking is due to Mr. William R. Waring, commercial instructor at Weaver High School, to whom I delegated responsibility for promoting, organizing, and administering the continuing campaign.

I know, too, that you will be pleased to learn that this achievement is the result of extracurricular activity; it has in no way interfered with instruction or impaired the scholastic standards of Weaver High School, in fact, this practically patriotic enterprise has served, I believe, as a stimulating and

motivating factor in all our normal programs.

The pupil participation in our special weekly drive reached 99.8 percent; we have, of course, been running well above 90 percent for a long time—a fact which is evidenced by the United States Treasury Flag flying just below the Stars and Stripes at Weaver High School.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK H. BURKE,
Principal.

Mr. President, the magnificent record of achievement of Principal Burke and the faculty and students of that great high school in Hartford, Conn., most assuredly is deserving of the congratulations and felicitations of all of us. Their record is most inspiring, and one which I most assuredly applaud.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL AT VICTORY RALLY

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on the Metropolitan Opera Victory Rally program on April 24, which appears in the Appendix.]

CREATION OF A WAR COUNCIL—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, urging the creation of a war council, delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, on April 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

USES OF COAL—ARTICLE BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Coal's New Horizons," written by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and published in the April edition of Coal Age, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM GREEN AND ARTICLE BY EVELINE M. BURNS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Social Insurance," written by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and published in the April issue of the American Federationist, and also an article from the same magazine entitled "Toward Security," by Eveline M. Burns, of the National Resources Planning Board, which appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter adddessed to Senator DAVIS by Miss Ruth Neal, corresponding secretary of Business and Professional Women's Club, of Clearfield, Pa., relative to Senate bill 637, the so-called Federal aid to education bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREE PRINCIPLES OF JEFFERSON—EDITORIAL FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Free Principles of Jefferson," published in the Witness, of Dubuque, Iowa, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE—ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ernest Lindley entitled "What Is an International Police Force?" which appears in the Appendix.]

REAL AND SECRET DEMOCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK EVENING POST

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Real Democracy and Secret Democracy," printed in the New York Evening Post of April 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF LIVESTOCK TOWARD WINNING THE WAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Bottineau Courant of April 14, 1943, relating to the contribution of livestock toward winning the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTEEN INTREPID AIR PILOTS—POEM BY LT. COL. BEN GREENE, JR.

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "The Saga of Fifteen Intrepid Air Pilots," written by Lt. Col. Ben Greene, Jr., of Anderson, S. C., published in the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail of April 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. The next order of business is the call of the calendar under rule VIII.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised, and it was signed by the Vice President.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiences in certain appropriations.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the appropriation bill, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	Mead
Austin	Ferguson	Millikin
Ball	Gerry	Moore
Bone	Gillette	Murdock
Brewster	Green	Murray
Bridges	Guffey	Nye
Buck	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Burton	Hill	Pepper
Bushfield	Holman	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capper	Langer	Reynolds
Caraway	Lodge	Robertson
Chandler	McCarran	Scrugham
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	Maybank	Truman
Tydings	Wagner	Wiley
Vandenberg	Wheeler	Willis
Van Nuys	Wherry	Wilson

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business as a member of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on official business for the Government.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution, as reported to the Senate, carries appropriations of $3,746,700, an increase of $835,000 over the amount carried in the joint resolution as it passed the other House. The principal item was

one of $2,900,000 for the Public Health Service. The size of the appropriation is due to activities relating to the war. The House was so much impressed with the necessity for the appropriation that it even went above the Budget estimate. The only other item carried in the joint resolution as it passed the House was an appropriation of about $11,700 for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The largest of the items added by the Senate Committee on Appropriations is one for the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, Division of Disbursements, $550,000. The principal part of that item relates to additional funds required to handle the increased volume of work necessary to defray the costs resulting from the decentralization of the Social Security Service Division.

There are appropriations of $57,000 and $190,000 relating to the District of Columbia for street cleaning and for the disposal of garbage.

I have stated the principal items in the joint resolution. An amendment will be offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], by direction of the committee, after we have disposed of the committee amendments. The amendment relates to compensation for men who have been undergoing training under the civilian pilots' program.

I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment was, under the heading "Legislative", on page 1, after line 5, to insert:

LEGISLATIVE

SENATE

Senate restaurants: For payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with the act approved September 9, 1942 (Public, 709, Seventy-seventh Congress), fiscal year 1943, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President," on page 2, line 9, after the words "binding, and", to insert "not to exceed $14,000 additional or a limit of", so as to read:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP

Notwithstanding section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation to the Office of Censorship contained in such act shall be available in an amount not to exceed $165,000 for printing and binding, and not to exceed $14,000 additional or a limit of $175,000 for traveling expenses; and in addition such appropriation shall be available for the payment of living and quarters allowances (including heat, fuel, and light) to personnel stationed outside the continental limits of the United States in accordance with standardized regulations dated December 30, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Tax Court of the United States", on page 3, line 8, after the word "expended", to insert "not to exceed $2,000 additional or a limit of", so as to read:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, there may be expended not to exceed $2,000 additional or a limit of $18,000 for travel expenses from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

For an additional amount for dust prevention, sweeping and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $57,000.

For an additional amount to enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, and so forth, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $190,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State," on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOREIGN INTERCOURSE

Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers: Effective March 25, 1943, the appropriation "Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers," contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be available for salaries of Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua, at the rate of $10,000 per annum each.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what interpretation may be placed on this proposal?

Mr. HAYDEN. The rank of the Ministers to the seven countries mentioned has been increased to the rank of Ambassador, but their pay remains as heretofore.

Mr. McNARY. Why is it proposed to increase the rank?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is in response to the desire of the countries named, which have raised their Ministers to the United States to the grade of Ambassadors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Treasury Department", on page 4, after line 13, to insert the following:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Division of Disbursements, salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, $550,000.

SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For an additional amount for "Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes", fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, $28,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, copy of which is at the desk, and is offered under a notice of a motion to suspend the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

War Training Service (Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status): Pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status, while undergoing training or during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 3 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the question on the motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President; it is not necessary, I think, to move to suspend the rule.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. After hearing the amendment read it has occurred to me that a suspension of the rule is not necessary. In any event I should object to a suspension of the rule if the amendment involved legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not think the Senator's amendment, however, comes within my objection against legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think so.

Mr. McNARY. But if the Senator from Nevada desires to be doubly cautious, and should seek a suspension of the rule, of course such a motion would be entirely proper.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if it is his purpose, after the rule shall have been suspended, to move the adoption of a substitute amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me understand the proposal. The Senator from Nevada has offered the amendment which is printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that is correct. After a further study, however, and in conference with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I shall propose, after the Senate proceeds to consider my amendment, to offer a substitute for the language of the printed amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I wanted to point out to the Senator, if I may, Mr. President, is that it is unnecessary to move to suspend the rule unless the point of order is made that legislation is involved.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator submits his amendment, and he can modify it in any way he wishes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Nevada has submitted an amendment and that no point of order has been made with respect to it. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit as a substitute for the printed amendment certain language, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to modify the amendment previously offered so as to read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

War Training Service: Pay at the rate of $50 per month to persons, not on active service or training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States, who are undergoing flying training under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service, or who have successfully completed any such course of training and are awaiting order or assignment to advance courses under the direction or supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or to active service or training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States, fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think a word of explanation should be made at this time. The language just read by the clerk has been suggested to the author of the amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator from Massachusetts is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this amendment, and was also in the full committee when it considered the amendment. Extensive hearings, at least sufficiently extensive, were held by the committee on this amendment, in which the able Senator from Massachusetts took a very active part. Therefore I believe that the language just read is preferable to the language which I offered in the original instance.

Along about July or August of 1942, the Army called upon the Civil Aeronautics Authority to train a group of men, some of whom had been rejected for military service, and others of whom were in a status which precluded them from going into military service directly. Pursuant to the request of the Army, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which had been and is now in fact training those who are going into pilot training for the Army, and which is training nearly all the pilots for the Army, sent out public notice by radio and other means calling upon men between certain ages to make themselves available for training in aviation. The Authority promised this group of men that if they would make themselves available for training, when their training was completed they would be given employment.

Mr. President, these young men were invited and requested to submit themselves to the nearest place where they could receive training in aviation, and they were promised that when their training had been completed they would be given places as reservists in the military status, employed by the Army for cross-country flight, for instructors' work in aviation, or for other lines of work to which the Army might call on them. They were all given public promise that if they took the training, and persevered in it, and completed the courses assigned to them by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, they would be absorbed into the Army in various lines of work.

Approximately 25,000 responded to the call. Many of these young men gave up their businesses, left their dependents, their families, and their homes, and went to the nearest places where they could receive this training, and submitted themselves to the training. During the course of training orders were issued by reason of which there was in many respects a suspension of the training. But these young men had already submitted themselves, and were in the centers where the training was being given.

One reason for the training not going forward as it should have gone was the lack of equipment, the lack of planes with which to give the training in the various stages, as the young men submitted themselves and were ready for training. About half the number who submitted themselves for training completed the course, and have been taken into the armed services in various capacities. Some of them have been taken for cross-country flights, some for liaison work, some for training pilots themselves. About half of them, or approximately 12,000 or 13,000, are now in the military service. About 13,000 of them are not in the service, but are either waiting to proceed with the course, or are in the process of taking it. Many of them are not able to go on with the course, although they are held and are not able to engage in permanent employment of any kind, for they may be called upon any day to proceed with their training. Many of them are standing by, marking time. None of them have been paid anything while they were taking the course. There are today, as I have said, about 13,000 of the 25,000 who are simply either marking time or waiting for training or taking the course of training in some particular stage. They have gone as far as they can go with their own finances. Most of them have borrowed money. Many of them have sold their businesses and have put what they could get our of their businesses into their necessary expenses while they were being trained. All of them who are not now being trained are simply waiting, hoping that they may go into training. The Army says it wants all those men. Representatives of the Army came before the committee and stated that the Army needs them. The course of training which was specified for the trainees has now been suspended. There will be no further training in that particular class. But 13,000 of those boys are waiting for something to happen to give them the employment and the emoluments they were promised.

General Arnold authorized a statement to be made before the committee. The Senate will find the testimony on page 69 of the hearings. General Harper appeared before the committee. The testimony was as follows:

Senator MCKELLAR. And how you are connected with it.

General HARPER. Yes, sir. As Assistant Chief of Air Staff Training for the Army Air Forces, I am concerned in the training given by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in view of the fact that they have been training under an agreement with the Army Air Forces, so that we receive their product. They assist us in training in the college training program, as well.

Then he said:

I had a discussion with General Arnold just before coming here, and he asked me to express his views, as follows:

That the Army Air Forces has no objection to the payment by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive duty who are undergoing training with the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service civilian pilot training program; that the Army Air Forces is now working with the Civil Aeronautics Administration to clear up the hump existing in the present civilian pilot training program, which now approximates 14,000 reservists.

General Arnold desires to clear up this group as rapidly as possible, and upon completion thereof does not desire to further use the Civil Aeronautics Administration in an extension of the civilian pilot training program.

Senator HAYDEN. Let us see if I get that correctly. There are 14,000 men now who were enlisted in the Army and then sent into the Reserve, for the purpose of undergoing this training.

General HARPER. That is correct, sir.

Those are 14,000 of the 25,000 who were first called into that service. The others have already gone through the training and are now employed by the Army in various capacities.

The same kind of training was afforded the same type of men by the Navy, and the Navy has been paying its trainees since the 15th of December 1942. But the members of the group trained by the Civil Aeronautics Authority at the request and direction of the Army have never been paid anything, although they have offered themselves, have been giving their time, expending their own money, taking the training as best they could get it, and have been anxious to go into the service of their country in the capacity in which they would be called by the Army. They have been acting at all times under the direction of the Army, awaiting Army orders in every respect. The amendment proposes to do for the trainees who are training for the Army side of our military forces exactly what has been done for the same class of trainees who have been training for the naval side and who have been paid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the fact that there have been made in behalf of this particular group some other suggestions which go considerably further than does the Senator's amendment. I confess that I have been rather deeply impressed

with the equity of the demand. Is the Senator satisfied that the proposal which he submits goes as far as it should go toward dealing fairly with this group of perfectly willing but stymied patriots?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question let me say that certain elements of the naval trainees are receiving $75 a month, but in fairness, taking the matter all in all, if the trainees we are discussing receive $50 a month from the 15th of December, that being the date at which the naval trainees received their pay, until they have concluded their course and are absorbed by the Army, I think the treatment will be reasonably fair, at least about as fair as we can hope to have it at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am willing to take the Senator's judgment on the subject. Certainly he is proposing the minimum action which the Senate should take.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think that is true.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been interested in this question, as has the Senator from Nevada, and I should like to add a few words of explanation regarding it. When the war came, both services were anxious to increase their pilot training. The Army retained under its own program the training of combat pilots, but it entered into an agreement with the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the training of service pilots, transport pilots, and glider pilots. It is to the latter service that the amendment relates. Men entering that service did so voluntarily and at their own expense; and men who possessed the physical and mental qualifications needed for aviation-cadet training were refused admission to the other type of training. So the men who were enrolled in that type of training were over 27 years of age, with families, and men who could meet the class 2 physical requirements for flying.

In order to insure that the personnel would be permitted to complete the training, arrangements were made to enlist both students and instructors in the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve, to be retained on an inactive status until their training was completed, or until they ceased being civilian pilot-training instructors, or else until the exigencies of the military situation required that they be called immediately to active duty. In that way those men were removed from availability under the Selective Service System, and, of course, they were removed from availability under enlistment in the Navy.

At the present time no additional members are being enlisted. The Army Air Force estimates that it will take several months to eliminate the group now in training; and the group in the pool will be discharged or called to active duty. Both elements of that group will be rescreened in the hope that certain of its members may be found to be qualified as aviation cadets for pilot training, and that others may qualify for training as bombardiers and navigators.

The number of men affected by the amendment will probably be small, since only individuals rated after the physical examination as class 2 were admitted to the civilian pilot training. It may be possible to utilize the remainder in other nonflying jobs in the Army. A large number will probably have to be turned back to civilian life, to be reinducted as the selective-service boards call for men.

I think it is clear that the men have a claim on our sense of justice, and I believe that the language which has been proposed as a substitute meets the needs of their situation, without at the same time opening doors which could cause us a great deal of trouble. I think we must be on the lookout so as not to take a position in favor of making payments to reservists who are not on active duty. The minute we start making payments to reservists who are not on active duty we open up a door so wide that it is hard for the mind to comprehend its extent. At the present time we are doing a great deal with reservists on an inactive status. The Signal Corps has a great many reservists who are undergoing courses of instruction but who are not on active duty while they are doing so.

The Medical Corps and the medical administrative branch of that corps are, of course, doing a great deal in training young men to be doctors. While undergoing training they are reservists, but they are not on an active-duty status while that is going on.

I believe the amendment now before the Senate meets the needs of the present situation and that, in conference with the House, it can lead to the result which we all wish to achieve.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, this particular type of case is singularly to be separated and divorced from that of the enlisted reserve on an inactive status in any other category. I think we can better appreciate the peculiar classification of this group if I cite a typical instance. I cite the case of a young man who was formerly an assistant secretary in my office. He worked in the Senate Office Building, and is known to a great many of my colleagues. His experience is briefly stated in a letter which he wrote to me, in which he said:

> I understand that Senator McCARRAN will propose a rider to some bill now before the Senate for the purpose of providing pay to the men who are in the Enlisted Air Corps Reserve taking training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its War Training Service branch. As you know I enlisted in the Air Corps Reserve last July when I couldn't get into the Army as an aviation cadet. At the time we enlisted we were assured that there would be no delays during the program and that we would be graduated and get paid within 6 months. We were told that we would be placed on active service either as an instructor or as an officer in the Ferry Command.
>
> After I finished what they call in this program the elementary course at Washington, I waited approximately 3 weeks before I was assigned to the secondary course. After completing the secondary course early in December I was not assigned to the next course (cross-country) until April 5, a 4-month wait without any pay. This wait would not have been so bad except that regularly every 2 weeks I was assured that I would be assigned within the next 2 weeks. As a result it was impossible to get any good job, and in the last 4 months I did everything from working as a helper in a Hartford coal yard to raking leaves in an effort to get a little income.
>
> There are 45 men now assigned here, and each one of them has had a similar experience. It seems to me that a very real injustice has been done, and I hope that you will take whatever steps seem fair to you to help correct it.

Mr. President, I agree with the young man's conclusion. A very real injustice has been done. It is seldom that we have such an opportunity, in so simple a way, to do such complete equity. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] if he has given consideration to the amendment which I have proposed. Under my amendment section 3 would read:

> SEC. 3. After the date of enactment of this act, each member of the Army Air Corps Enlisted Reserve who is receiving training at any time under the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, shall be deemed to be on an active-duty status, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances during such training as any other member of such Reserve who is called to active duty and who has a similar rating.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I knew that the able Senator from Wisconsin was interested in the subject. I wish to be frank with the Senator. I did not see his suggested amendment. However, language such as I have just heard the Senator read was discussed in the committee. It was also discussed with the Legislative Counsel, with the clerk to the committee, and with others, with the idea of trying to do justice to this group without opening the flood gates for a great many other groups.

So while I think that the Senator's thought and action have been in this direction, I respectfully suggest that the language now before the Senate will accomplish the results which we wish in this particular. I would not wish to accept other language lest perchance something might be accomplished which we do not wish to accomplish.

Mr. WILEY. The letter which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut read sets forth rather graphically the case of his young former secretary. That is only illustrative of many other situations. Can the Senator tell me the difference between the language in my amendment, "shall be deemed to be on an active-duty status," and $50 a month from December last?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to answer the question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I think that when the Senator uses the words "active-duty status" he confuses the issue and brings in a number of other considerations which do not belong in this discussion. These young men have a real appeal to our sense of justice, because they were given to understand certain very special things which normally no reservist is given to understand, and because they are the victims of a distinct misunderstanding between the War Department and the Commerce Department, a misunderstanding which I hope will not occur again.

The minute we say that they are deemed to be on an active-duty status, we raise the whole question of reservists in the Signal Corps and reservists in the Medical Corps, whose situation is not the same. We raise the question as to whether or not we are opening any other doors. That is why I believe it is better to deal with these men separately, on the merits of their own case—and their case has merit—rather than to open the doors wide to many other individuals who do not make the same sort of appeal. That is my objection to that particular phrase.

Mr. WILEY. Let me ask the Senator what the difference would be in pay and allowances. Let us make it concrete.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know.

Mr. WILEY. My amendment provides that they "shall be deemed to be on an active-duty status, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances during such training as any other member of such reserve who is called to active duty and who has a similar rating."

My question to the Senator from Nevada was as to the difference between $50 a month from December last and what they would receive under the terms of my amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I cannot answer exactly, because I have not the figures before me, nor do I know what the regular pay for the group to which the Senator refers is. The committee worked on the matter for several days. At one time we thought of a different pay. The Navy had been paying a certain group $75 a month, and others were receiving nothing at all. We rather thought that the pay of $50 a month during training and until such time as they were taken into the regular service would be at least a step in the right direction, toward the rendition of a fair degree of justice. That is the whole story.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if I may trespass for a moment on the Senator's time, can he inform me whether or not any department head has passed upon the merits of the respective amendments?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not know of any amendment except the amendment which the Senator from Nevada has offered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, perhaps I can explain the situation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was an amendment to a legislative bill which passed the House and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Commerce. This proposal was taken up in the Committee on Appropriations as the result of a hearing held by the Senator from Nevada on the annual Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which he handled. The amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin offered was not referred to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct in that respect, but I am informed that the matter has been referred to certain departmental heads. I wondered if that question had been discussed before the subcommittee of which the Senator from Nevada is chairman.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may be the custom of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, when a Senator submits an amendment to a legislative bill, to refer the amendment to the department for report, but such report would not come to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

As to the other question, it is my understanding that the pay of a private in the Army is $50. After a time he becomes a private first class, and so on up. That is what puzzles me about the Senator's amendment, when he speaks about the ratings, as though one man could go into the service to be a lieutenant, another to be a sergeant, and another to be a corporal. As a practical matter, it seems to me that, if they enlisted, they all ought to go in as private soldiers, and should be paid the base pay of a private, which is $50 a month.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Referring further to the inquiry made by the able Senator from Wisconsin, I can testify to these facts: As the Senator from Arizona has indicated, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The Committee on Commerce appointed a subcommittee, of which the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is chairman, to consider the substantive legislation which is there pending, and to consider also the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin. That committee has not as yet started to function because the reports have not been received from the departments to which they were referred.

The passage of this measure, with the appropriation, would not necessarily interfere with a more thorough-going and fundamental exploration of the whole subject by the Commerce Committee. As a result of some experience and contact with this problem, as well as some contact with the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin—which I heartily approve and which I urged him to press—I am frank to say that I have been driven to the conclusion that this rather perplexing and complicated subject is best handled by the prompt answer and immediate response which is proposed in the pending appropriation measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTION OF CERTAIN TREATY OBLIGATIONS TO PANAMA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14, commonly known as the Panama joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the joint resolution on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it is on the Legislative Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator is not debatable. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to consume much of the time of the Senate in explanation of this measure. It is identical with a joint resolution which was passed by the Senate on November 25, 1942, and further amended and approved by the Senate on December 4, 1942. A measure similar to this was passed by the Senate at the last session, but it was not enacted by the House. Because of that fact, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations did not wish to consider the matter until the House had acted.

In the meantime the pending joint resolution was introduced in the other House, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, as I am informed, unanimously reported it favorably, and it then passed the House. It then came to the Senate and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, by an overwhelming majority, voted to recommend that it be passed.

As I suggested a moment ago, the joint resolution as passed by the House is in the identical form of the measure which the Senate passed at the last session.

As to the details of the joint resolution, it may be pointed out that we have several treaties with the Republic of Panama relating to ownership of property within Panama by the United States, as well as to a variety of other matters. These treaties, particularly those of 1903 and 1936, are the ones which would be affected by the proposed legislation.

The importance of this matter at the present moment is this: As Senators know, the Republic of Panama sits astride the Panama Canal, which, of

course, is of vital naval and strategic importance from the standpoint of the security of the United States. In anticipation of what we now propose to do, Panama has already given to the United States approximately 80 sites which are located within the Republic of Panama, for the installation by the United States of military and naval instrumentalities, such as airfields, searchlights, range finders, naval establishments, and military posts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator quite correct in saying that Panama has given them to us?

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean that Panama has placed them at our disposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On a nominal lease basis.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. When I said that Panama had "given" them to us I probably used an inaccurate term. I meant that at the request of the United States Government, Panama had permitted the installations to which I have referred on, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, a lease basis, which, with one exception, is nominal. The rental is nominal except in one particular case.

All the stock of the Panama Railroad is owned by the Government of the United States. The Panama Railroad Company for years has owned certain rental property, such as houses and lots, within the city of Colon, and probably some within the city of Panama. This property is not at all necessary for the operation of the railroad as such. For many years Panama has insisted that for another government to own within the boundaries of Panama private property which the foreign government leased and from which it secured rents, as well as other situations of that nature, was in derogation of her sovereignty.

So the pending joint resolution proposes to vest in the Republic of Panama title to the particular rental properties within the cities of Colon and Panama. Under the treaties we also have an arrangement with Panama for supervising the sanitary and sewerage installations in the city of Colon. It is provided that such installations shall be turned back to the Republic of Panama, the United States, however, retaining the right to supervise control to the extent of seeing that their operation shall not result in any harmful effects to the Canal and our own interest in that quarter from a sanitation standpoint.

One other item which is affected is a highway, which the Senator from Michigan will probably discuss. A so-called defense highway was built somewhat in cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Panama. The pending joint resolution provides for the reimbursement of Panama her outlays on that highway thus making it practically our own for military uses.

Mr. President, the chief consideration for this measure is not in the form of a direct trade with Panama for these 80 locations, but somewhat in compensation of Panama and in recognition of her long-continued demand that the United States divest itself of the private ownership of certain properties in Panama. Whatever may be said, we must recognize that the Panama Canal and the Republic of Panama, sitting astride the Canal, are vital to the defense of the United States, and especially in this period of war it would be most unfortunate if we should do anything or pursue any course which would cause irritation or dissatisfaction.

It may be said that we are generous to Panama in the joint resolution. Mr. President, we are generous to Panama, but Panama has also been generous to us. She did not wait, she did not demand the dollar "on the barrel head," she did not demand a hard-and-fast bargain when our Government informed Panama that we wanted the 80 sites for military and naval installations. Without hesitation, Panama granted them, and we have been using them and employing them for the safety of our own country, and, of course, also for the safety of Panama. The Panama Canal is our lifeline as it were, and I am prepared, as I am sure the Senate is prepared, not to haggle with Panama with respect to matters of this kind, but to assume an attitude of generosity. The Canal traverses the Republic of Panama; it cuts it in two. Panama has given us something of her sovereignty by agreeing to a perpetual lease of the territory within the Panama Canal Zone proper.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will act upon the joint resolution favorably and will act upon it promptly. The reason for promptness at this particular time is that the Congress of Panama is now in session; it will adjourn, by constitutional operation, on the 30th day of April, and it is desirable, from the standpoint of Panama, that the Congress of Panama approve not this legislation as such, but approve certain acts of the Executive of Panama in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am curious about one matter. Does the Canal Zone take in any part either of Colon or of Panama City or are they outside the Canal Zone in their corporate limits?

Mr. CONNALLY. The city of Panama and, I am sure, Colon, are outside our jurisdiction. The line between Panama and the Canal territory belonging to us is the middle of a street; the Republic of Panama is on one side of the street and we are on the other. It is practically a continuous area in its settlement and its activities, but there is a boundary.

Mr. BONE. Some parts then of what might be called the metropolitan zone of Panama City project over into the Canal Zone?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. On the canal side they have hotels, residences, and all sorts of activities, and it is almost a continuous city.

Mr. BONE. The government of Panama, as I understand the Senator's statement, does not want to divest itself of ownership even of property within the Canal Zone?

Mr. CONNALLY. This is territory outside our leasehold or the Canal proper.

Mr. BONE. I suppose Panama would have a perfect right to demand that our Government not own property in another republic?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly her point and it has been one of her points for many years. We now have an opportunity to satisfy Panama in that respect, and, at the same time, acquire all these leases which are vital to our military and naval defense and that of the Republic of Panama.

I shall not take up more time of the Senate unless Senators desire to ask questions. I shall be glad to have the Senate hear from other members of the committee. As I recall, there were but two votes in the committee against the joint resolution.

Mr. NYE. There were four.

Mr. CONNALLY. Four, two of whom were present and two were absent. I did not recall the absentees; I did not see them. At any rate, out of a membership of 23 there were only 4 votes against reporting the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I desire to state, in anticipation of what the Senator from North Dakota may possibly say, that certain interests appeared before the committee and objected to the passage of the joint resolution on the ground that the State Department had not prosecuted with sufficient vigor certain private claims against the Republic of Panama. Those claims, however, were not connected with this legislation except, as I view it, in the most imaginary way, especially one particular case. The State Department replied that there were two such claims, one of which the Department is prosecuting and is collaborating with the proponent of the claim. The other claim has not as yet been established with the State Department to such a point that the Department is prepared to prosecute it. The committee's further view was that, since these claims in no way pertained to this proposed legislation, it was not a valid ground of opposition to the measure that because the State Department did not do something with regard to a wholly unrelated matter the joint resolution ought to be killed. We are not passing this legislation in behalf of the State Department, though the Department is very much interested in pressing the measure, but we are passing the joint resolution in the interest of the people of the United States, and even had the State Department been derelict in some other matter with reference to the prosecution of some private claim which had no connection with the joint resolution that would be no ground on which to urge opposition to the enactment of the pending measure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator tell me, approximately, how much, in dollars and cents, we are releasing to Panama? Can the Senator estimate the amount?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will have to check the exact figures, but it is approximately several million dollars.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator approximate for me the value of what we have obtained in the 80 sites?

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be very difficult to do so, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that. I merely ask for an approximation.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NYE. The chairman of the committee has evidently overlooked the fact that the State Department, testifying recently before the committee, revealed that the 80 sites have been increased to something more than a hundred sites now. There has been 20 or more additions since we last acted on legislation similar to this.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was speaking of the original presentation of the measure; the Senator may be correct about that.

It is very difficult, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, to place a money value on these sites scattered all over the Republic of Panama, many of them in isolated sections, some in the hills and in forests. I am not prepared to state their value.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will state frankly to the Senator, if he will permit me, that the committee's attitude was not one that was based purely upon matching dollars. We realize that the action we propose is probably more generous than it would be if we were sitting down across the table with some hard-boiled trader with regard to some matter that was not vitally connected with our defense and was not vitally connected with the maintenance of good relations and cordial conditions of life between the people of the United States and the people of Panama.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I can appreciate that, in these times particularly, we cannot be picayunish; we cannot think in terms simply of dollars and cents. There is another question that comes to my mind. I remember the last time this matter was considered by the Senate the question arose whether any provision was made to protect the property rights of American citizens. To me that is an important aspect of the issue. We are releasing to the Government of Panama certain property rights which belong to our Government, but at the same time we are apparently turning over rights which belong to our citizens. I should like to know what has been done in that connection.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not quite understand what the Senator means when he says we are "turning over rights which belong to our citizens." The properties we are turning over by the joint resolution are all Government properties.

Mr. WILEY. I understand that, but if my recollection is correct, a number of American citizens are interested in leasing some of this property.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be.

Mr. WILEY. And if we turn the property back to Panama, we hope at least the leases will be valid. We know something about the South American situation. I presume the whole matter is a part of the good-neighbor policy and a matter of the defense of the Canal. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. It has principally to do with the defense of the Canal. Of course, we are all interested in maintaining cordial relations with the countries to the south of us, particularly with Panama. If there should be any discrimination as between the countries of South and Central America, I think it would be perhaps of paramount importance that we keep the good will of Panama.

Mr. WILEY. Probably the Senator is right in that view. The conclusion I have reached, after talking with people who know Central and South America, is that we gain nothing by constantly damaging the rights of our own citizens. I am not saying we do so by this proposal. We must realize that there have been two policies in our Government. One was inaugurated by a Roosevelt, called the "big stick" policy. The other one was inaugurated by a Roosevelt, and is the "good neighbor" policy. The second one has been interpreted to mean Santa Claus in a good many respects.

I think it is well for us to be realistic in approaching this matter. Toward South America particularly we want to be friendly, but friendship cannot be obtained by a country being always the giver. There should be mutuality, there should be give and take, and, as I have before stated on the floor of the Senate, it is important to establish in South America the Anglo-Saxon concept of a contract and the validity of a contract.

Too often the trouble has been that we have not observed American rights. We have let American citizens go to other countries and spend their millions, and then we have not backed them up, which might have been thought contrary to the "good neighbor" policy. But is it a "good neighbor" policy to let the other fellow think one is a plain "sucker"? That does not apply to the present case, but it applies to a good many cases in South America.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Of course, I subscribe to the general doctrine that we are against being "suckers." We are all for the Ten Commandments, but we have to judge each case on the particular facts and circumstances surrounding it.

I think the Senator is in error in intimating that the pending joint resolution in anywise undertakes to discriminate against American citizens. Let us suppose that this property in Colon has been rented by citizens of the United States, and we transfer the title to Colon. The contracts would be respected, whatever they were, but the parties have no vested interest in a continuing contract on the terms of their rental.

No one is here protesting in that respect. The only protest we had was that of the members of some union, who asserted that certain properties they thought were covered by the joint resolution had been erected for the use of railroad employees or some such employees. But upon an examination it was found that that question was not at all involved. That was the only protest made by any American citizen, so far as I recall, indicating that the joint resolution in anywise transgressed any of their rights or interfered with any of their privileges.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. For instance, let us take the sanitary arrangements. I will read a part of the message of the President in submitting this matter to the Congress:

> It will be recalled that the interest of the United States in the sanitation of the Canal Zone, together with that of the cities of Panama and Colon, has been of outstanding importance.

The Senator will recall that when we went into Panama the sanitary conditions were deplorable. The Senator remembers the work of Dr. Gorgas in connection with the control of yellow fever through elimination of mosquitoes, and similar beneficial activities. As a part of that program, we entered into arrangements with the Republic of Panama with regard to sanitation, and matters of that kind. I quote the President again:

> Concurrent with the construction of the Panama Canal, through agreement with Panama, the United States installed water and sewerage systems in the cities of Panama and Colon, and throughout subsequent years has been responsible for the operation and maintenance of these systems and for the sanitation of the two cities.
>
> I now propose to the Congress that, since in accordance with article VII of the Canal Convention of 1903—

A treaty by which we are bound—

> the "system of sewers and waterworks shall revert to and become the properties of the cities of Panama and Colon," in the year 1957, it authorizes the Government to convey all its right, title, and interest in the Panama and Colon water and sewerage systems to the Republic of Panama; provided, however, that the Republic of Panama shall pay quarterly a rate of B/.0.09 per 1,000 gallons or a reasonable rate to be agreed upon by both Governments to the appropriate Canal Zone authorities for water supplied at the Canal Zone boundary; and provided, also, that the turning over to the Government of the Republic of Panama of the physical properties of the water and sewerage systems and the administration thereof, including the collection of the water rates, does not in any way modify the existing arrangement for the responsibility for the public health services of the cities of Panama and Colon as specified in the second paragraph of article VII of the Convention between the United States of America and Panama, signed at Washington, November 18, 1903, which reads as follows—

I shall not quote that convention. We now have a convention with Panama with regard to the sewerage and sanitary systems, by which in 1957 they will revert to and become the property of Panama. The joint resolution proposes that instead of waiting until 1957, title shall be conveyed at the present moment, we retaining our right, however,

as guaranteed under the Convention of 1903, to see in a general supervisory way that the systems are so operated as to conform to sound sanitary rules and regulations.

Cannot the Senator see that the government of a foreign country has some feelings of pride, especially as to its sovereignty, and would not like to have another government own the sanitation systems and the sewers and the water works within one of its own cities? It is not necessarily a government function, certainly not one that is recognized from an international standpoint. That is one of the things for which Panama has been contending for many years, and the same thing is true with reference to the rental properties.

Mr. President, knowing that other Senators who are members of the committee desire to discuss the subject, I shall leave it with the Senate, with the hope that there will be favorable action on the joint resolution, and that a prompt vote may be had.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has afforded indication that I was planning to dwell upon the matter of the private claims which were involved in conjunction with the consideration of the joint resolution. I had no plan, and I have no plan, to dwell upon those claims in the slightest degree, but in refraining from doing so I am not in any manner closing my eyes to the merits resting with those who have contended that we should demand of Panama a settlement of American claims before we divest ourselves of practically all we have left in the Republic of Panama.

Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may be planning to be away for luncheon in the next few minutes, I feel under obligation to give notice that after brief remarks I shall move that the consideration of House Joint Resolution 14 be postponed to a later date when Members of the Senate shall have returned from their homes. Last week very definite assurance was given in the Senate that nothing of a controversial nature would be brought up in the Senate for decision without giving the absent Senators notice that the issue was arising, and I think it would be only fair play that this matter be delayed until Senators can be here in larger numbers than they now are.

Mr. President, if the Senate adopts the theory which our diplomats have proposed for our consideration in connection with House Joint Resolution 14, if the Senate truly feels that the defense of our vital war interests in Panama is jeopardized by our failure to be Santa Claus to the Republic of Panama, then, of course, the Senate will hurry the passage of the pending measure. But let the Senate do this deed with its eyes open to the facts which are involved and to the further fact that in acting on the pending measure the Senate does so ignoring completely its obligation to require that the subject matter of this joint resolution be treated in treaty form.

Let it first be recognized that there have been absolutely no hearings upon House Joint Resolution 14.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator does not mean that there were not extensive hearings held last year?

Mr. NYE. No; I said there have been no hearings held upon House Joint Resolution 14.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is fair to state at this point that with respect to the original measure, which was identical with the pending measure, and which was passed by the Senate in identically similar form——

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I was about to make a statement with respect to hearings held on that proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. At the last session we appointed a subcommittee which held extensive hearings, at which everyone who wanted to appear had an opportunity to appear, and when the matter came before the full committee the full committee, I know, again held hearings for 2 or 3 days, in addition to the hearings held by the subcommittee. I think it is fair to the committee to say that.

Mr. NYE. All of which is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NYE. There has been a considerable change in personnel in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States since that last test of strength on this isue. Since that change, and since the convening of the new Congress, no hearings have been held in the House of Representatives or in the Senate on this joint resolution. Last October and November, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has recited, the Seventy-seventh Congress did consider a similar measure. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations conducted extensive hearings then, and early in December the Senate itself favored passage of the joint resolution, then identified as Senate Joint Resolution 162, and adopted it by a vote of 40 to 29. The measure died in subsequent weeks by reason of failure of the House to act before the Seventy-seventh Congress adjourned. The failure of the House to act came about in spite of the persistent effort made to cause Congress to believe that dire results might follow in Panama if we did not legislate the gifts and powers to Panama which the joint resolution proposes.

So far as has appeared to the eye, our relations with Panama, since failure of the proposed legislation last December, have continued harmonious and cooperative, with never an interruption in our efforts to extend and expand military operations at this great key station of our Military Establishment. Since the failure of the proposed legislation in the last Congress, Panama has leased us many additional sites for use in our military program during this emergency, and, so far as we know, has given us access to such sites without hesitation—without delay.

Two and a half months of the present Congress passed without any word of urgency concerning the passage of legislation such as the last Congress permitted to die. Then, suddenly, came great urge and need to pass the legislation before the last day of April. Again it appeared that embarrassment and dire things were in store for us if Congress should not expedite passage of House Joint Resolution 14, this time introduced only in the House. Whereupon the House Committee on Foreign Affairs produced what are entitled "Hearings on House Joint Resolution 14," the alleged hearings being conducted on March 16. The print of what is alleged to be the hearings does not carry the name of a single member of the committee. It does not even reveal that there was a call of the committee. It does not reveal that there was a hearing, or anyone present at a hearing. There may have been an executive hearing or an executive meeting of the committee, but the alleged hearing is merely the print of prepared statements by two agents of the State Department in support of the joint resolution. The committee reported the joint resolution to the House on March 22 and the House passed it on April 13.

Mr. President, it can be fairly stated that the House gave the joint resolution only slight consideration, and, according to word which came to me, the House committee refused the request of at least one person who desired to be heard in opposition to the joint resolution. That individual insists that he was given faithful promise that he would be heard when the joint resolution was taken up for consideration.

On April 21 the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations received House Joint Resolution 14 for consideration. That committee felt that the extended hearings afforded by it on a like measure last fall foreclosed the need for additional hearings and by a divided vote reported the joint resolution to the Senate. Through the whole consideration there prevailed the urge to secure enactment of the joint resolution before the Panamanian Congress adjourned on the last day of this month.

Why we must act before the Panamanian Legislature adjourns is anything but clear to me. There is no action whatsoever required by that legislative body to complete the deal which is involved between our country and Panama. Possibly there is desire on the part of politicians in Panama to send the boys home with word of the gift they wiggled out of Uncle Sam. Such politicians may be anxious that the folks in Panama should know how they succeeded in getting on the "gravy wagon," if you please. Beyond that I fail to see any possible reason for hurried action on our part in passing the joint resolution.

Mr. President, many Members of the Senate are away by reason of understanding arrived at here to the effect that for a certain period no controversial matters would be taken up by the Senate without adequate notice being given the absent Senators. For that reason I should hope that the Senate might now see fit to postpone consideration of the joint resolution until a larger member-

ship of the Senate can be present. After all, the vote on the question last fall afforded a margin of only 11 votes in favor of the joint resolution, and since then there have been sizable changes in Senate membership. Certainly the issue before us is controversial, to say the least. More than that, I should like to suggest that the absence of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who spoke at length on the subject when the Senate considered it in December, suggests, I should think, the propriety of a postponement of consideration of the matter, though the Senator from Maine has not asked for it. The senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], equally interested as I am, is unable to be present today, indisposed as he is. I am inclined to move, Mr. President, and I do now move, that further consideration of the pending joint resolution be postponed until 2 weeks from today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from North Dakota advises that he invokes the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and yet he states that the Senator from Maine has made no request for postponement. I always sympathize with absent Senators; but, after all, the question is whether absent Senators should run the Senate or whether present Senators should do so.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I am sure that the Senator recalls, irrespective of the matter of individual Senators who may be absent, that the majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], gave assurance a week ago today that there would be no controversial matters arising—nothing that absent Senators might feel would be at all embarrassing—and that if anything of a controversial nature arose they would receive notice in ample time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I do not recall other than that the understanding applied only to last week.

Mr. NYE. But there was carried with that an understanding that last week's understanding would be carried forward into this week unless the absent Senators were notified.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the Senator's understanding that if it were desired to bring forward a legislative matter we would have to notify all absent Senators and would have to wait until they could get here before we could do business? Is the Senate of the United States so impotent that Senators present have no influence until Senators who are absent return?

Mr. NYE. I should like to inquire of the present occupant of the chair how many Senators answered to the quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators answered to their names.

Mr. NYE. Then, Mr. President, a considerable number of our membership have absented themselves in accordance with the understanding to which I have referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree to the Senator's statement of the understanding. I do not remember it offhand; I should have to consult the RECORD. However, I recall that when the House sent to the Senate a resolution under which it proposed to take a recess for 2 weeks, it was the Senator from Oregon who suggested that the Senate not take a recess. If the Senate is not going to take a recess, what is it going to do? Are the Members of the Senate simply to come here every morning and count their toes and see how many toes they have, and count their fingers and see how many fingers they have, and smoke a cigar, and say, "Good morning. How are you?" What are we going to do? Are we going to transact business, or simply stand still and stall?

Mr. McNARY rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no particular inquiry to make, other than to state the understanding had on April 19. If I should be required to vote on the joint resolution I would vote against it, as I did before However, I think I know what occurred on last Monday, because the colloquy which ensued on that day was between the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself. I have the RECORD of that day's proceedings before me—inasmuch as reference has been made to the colloquy which then occurred—and I should like to refer to it. I do not think it can be said, as stated by the able senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], that assurance was given or an understanding reached that what might be called controversial matters would not be considered. At that time the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated—as appears on page 3558 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—after making a general statement about the work of last week:

> So I am making this statement in order that Senators may know the legislative situation for the remainder of this week, at least, and it may be for next week, depending entirely upon the progress of the tax bill through the House of Representatives and through the Committee on Finance.
>
> I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.
>
> Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am very glad that the able majority leader gives no assurance beyond this week.

That was last week.

> The information which I have is that possibly the tax bill may be here early in the week, and it is probable, in my judgment, that it may be reported to the Senate for action next week.

Then I stated:

> I am only adding a word of caution to that which has been spoken by the Senator from Kentucky, that while Senators may well provide for their absences this week—

Last week—

> I do not think we can give any assurance relative to next week, because we are all anxious to have prompt action on the tax bill.

That was the remark I made.

On the same page of the RECORD, we find the following statement by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]:

> I appreciate the Senator's—

That is, my own—

> words of caution supplementing mine on the subject. In other words, to be concrete, I think that if Senators desire to absent themselves from the Senate after today for the remainder of this week, they may feel at liberty to do so.

I felt at that time, as I feel now, that we were discussing what would happen last week. When the resolution came before the Senate at our session last Thursday concerning the adjournment of Congress for what might be called Easter holidays, I stated distinctly that I thought the Senate should go forward with the passage of all necessary legislation; that I had no objection to concurring in a resolution by which the House might adjourn; but that there were on the calendar measures which I was anxious to dispose of, and that I was anxious to have the Senate adjourn in midsummer, if that could be arranged.

I do not know whether the able senior Senator from North Dakota was misled by the colloquy which I then had with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from North Dakota may have been misled by it. However, let me say that I felt all the time that we were dealing with last week, not this week. Not knowing whether it would be an accommodation to the Senator to move an adjournment, I should support a motion of his to postpone consideration of this matter for 1 week or 2 weeks.

In that connection, I wonder if the able senior Senator from Texas, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], would not agree to take up the matter a week from today, in order that there could be no question whatsoever about the understanding referred to.

I interject that sugestion only in the nature of a compromise, so that if any Member of the Senate has misunderstood the understanding to which reference has been made, no advantage might be taken of him. Personally, I am here ready to legislate; and there was no understanding that we would defer legislation until after this week. The only understanding which was had referred to last week. However, it may be that some of the Members of the Senate misunderstood the nature of the colloquy which occurred and have absented themselves from the city. I do not know as to that. That may have been the impression.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; but I have not the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I followed the reading by the Senator from Oregon of the colloquy which occurred in the Senate a

week ago today, and I can see that perhaps I did misunderstand; but I note now that the Senator from Kentucky made reference in the following words to absence for a period longer than last week:

> If they are absent longer than this week, they should hold themselves ready to return at once upon notice by the Senate that a tax bill is ready for consideration.

I readily acknowledge that I misunderstood. I derived the impression that unless a call was issued to the absent Senators, nothing of a controversial nature would arise this week. I do not know how many other Members of the Senate drew the same conclusion which I know I did.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], and, I am certain, all other members of the committee who were present at the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations last Tuesday when the committee voted to report favorably the pending measure, will recall a lengthy discussion on the very question which is now before the Senate. They will recall that a motion was made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and seconded by myself, that the measure be favorably reported, and that all members of the committee present, with the exception of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], voted that the motion be agreed to. At that time notice was given by the Senator from Texas, as I recall, that he intended to call up the measure at the earliest practicable date. The Senator from North Dakota then gave notice that if attempt were made to bring up the measure last week he would raise the point he is now raising—that to do so would be in violation of the so-called gentlemen's agreement. The agreement was not a unanimous-consent agreement or an agreement of the Senate, but it was a gentlemen's agreement between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and acquiesced in by all other Senators then present. The agreement simply was—and I think it was so understood by all Members of the Senate then present—that, except for 1 week's time, the matter would be called up for consideration at the earliest practicable date, for the all-sufficient reason that, although there is no time limit on it, it is desirable that the joint resolution be acted upon without delay, if for no other reason than that under its constitution the Congress of the Republic of Panama must adjourn sine die on April 30, and it is very desirable to have the matter cleared up before that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Ordinarily I would totally sympathize with the request made by the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Oregon, but it seems to me that this afternoon we confront a condition, and not a theory. So far as I am concerned, there is very little in the joint resolution which I could inherently approve. I voted against it before. Under normal circumstances I would vote against it again. But these are not normal circumstances. These are distinctly abnormal circumstances which we confront, particularly in the Panama strip, with respect to war hazards at this particular critical moment. It is for that reason that I am yielding my opposition to the joint resolution. It is not a treaty, I am sorry to say; I wish it were. It is for that reason that I am yielding my opposition to the joint resolution, because if the thing is to be done at all, it should be done in a fashion which will yield to us our maximum opportunity for advantage from the action which we take. For that reason I shall support it. It is doubly necessary, on that theory of approach—namely, that we are seeking the maximum advantage which we can get out of this new movement in the direction of pan-American cooperation—that the action be completed prior to the 1st of May, prior to the adjournment of the Panamanian Congress, and prior to the time when the Panamanian Government wishes to conclude the entire record with a ratification by the Panamanian Legislature.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that in respect to the motion of the able Senator from North Dakota, we are confronted with this choice, which should be the controlling factor: Should we concede that the absence of certain Members of the Senate justifies a postponement of decision, or should we concede that if this thing is to be done at all it should be done within the time limit necessary to produce the effect which our Government desires to produce, and which is obviously desirable and necessary in connection with the war effort? Therefore it seems to me, Mr. President, that we have no alternative except the latter, and I shall have to oppose postponement of the decision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan. In his usually clear and cogent fashion he has put his finger on the importance of action at the earliest possible date.

As suggested by the Senator from Missouri, it was well known in the committee at the time we had this matter under discussion and voted on it, that I proposed to move to take it up at the first moment I could obtain recognition. The Senator from North Dakota knew that. If any Senator is absent because he thought that this particular matter would be called to his attention, he had notice then; and the Senator from North Dakota had notice then to advise absent Senators to return to the city and be present.

Mr. President, 65 Members responded to the last quorum call, a much larger number than usually responds to a quorum call.

So, for the reasons stated by the eminent Senator from Michigan, if we are to do this thing it ought to be done now. The Senate is already on record. We passed this measure once. The House has passed it by a practically unanimous vote. The measure was reported to the House by unanimous vote. All members of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, struck hands.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, the Senator now speaks about the necessity of immediate action. I did not know until a moment ago that immediate action was necessary. That places a different light on the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was not present during the earlier part of my remarks, when I stated that it was necessary to act by the 30th of April.

Mr. MCNARY. Probably because of the confusion in the Chamber I did not hear the distinguished and eloquent Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I believe we are ready to vote on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] to postpone action on House Joint Resolution 14.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, to repeat, I cannot for the life of me understand the urgency for action upon the joint resolution by the 30th of April. The Panamanian Congress can do nothing about this matter after we shall have passed the joint resolution. We propose to make a gift to Panama. Panama does not have to do a thing about it. It is hers after we act. But, as I have said, I suppose there are politicians in Panama who do not want their legislators to go home without being able to demonstrate how adequately they got on the "gravy wagon" during the present session of their congress.

I now address myself exclusively to the import of the proposals in the joint resolution.

House Joint Resolution 14 would alter the terms of treaties between the United States and Panama. It is a subject which could be properly before us only in the form of a treaty. But for the moment I would call to the attention of the Senate the details of the gift which this resolution proposes.

Under House Joint Resolution 14 we would, first, surrender to the Government of the Republic of Panama the physical properties and the responsibility of administration of the water and sewerage systems installed by the United States in the cities of Panama and Colon; second, convey to the Republic of Panama in whole or in part all of its right, title, and interest in and to lands belonging to the United States and located in the cities of Panama and Colon; and, third, assume the indebtedness of the Republic of Panama to the Export-

Import Bank covering loans which the Export-Import Bank made to Panama to cover that country's share of the construction of a certain highway in Panama.

But House Joint Resolution 14 involves only part of a contract proposed last May between the United States and Panama. A second agreement connected with the pending proposal involves the leasing by Panama to the United States of areas intended for defense installations, aviation requirements, and other military purposes. For a year previous to the signing of the formal agreement, Panama has permitted our military authorities to take such measures in the use of these areas as were necessary for our common defense, in keeping with the provisions within our treaty of 1936 with Panama, provisions which leave unnecessary any further bargaining for defense sites in Panama. So there exists a degree of cooperation which is not in anywise letting delay in the pending legislation interrupt the program found necessary of pursuit in this war emergency. Moreover, that part of the May arrangement involving the leases of lands for defense purposes is not before Congress, has not been submitted to Congress, is not, according to our understanding, even contemplated being presented to the Congress for consideration, and is not yet an accomplished agreement, since it must await ratification by the Congress of the Republic of Panama.

The minority of your committee—meaning the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself—quite agrees that every step proper to take should be taken to remove possible sources of irritation and misunderstanding in the relationships between our country and the Republic of Panama. But irritation is a condition that can prevail on the part of the United States as well as upon the part of the Government of Panama, and we feel that there is substantial ground for irritation because of the manner in which the agreements undertaken between our country and Panama are, and are not, submitted to the Congress of the United States. The failure to submit the subject matters of agreements to the Congress of the United States constitutes an attempt to guide the foreign policy of the country by Executive agreements, without consultation with Congress and without the approval of the people of the United States, whose representatives the Senate and House of Representatives are. It seems exceedingly dangerous to grant that the President may make Executive agreements even though those agreements are not legal, because foreign governments do not make that distinction.

The Constitution contains no provisions relative to Executive agreements such as that which relates to treaties. Congress cannot ignore these trends if our constitutional government is to endure. We cannot too jealously guard against encroachments upon constitutional and representative government.

TREATY INSTEAD OF RESOLUTION

Why should not the Congress of the United States be consulted and advised with, and its consent obtained for, such a policy as has been pursued by our Government in Panama in connection with these agreements, these undertakings of May of last year? The people of Panama, through their Congress, are of necessity being consulted with respect to at least a part of the May agreements. It would seem to me, that in this day of our leadership in the cause of preserving democratic ways, we are being outdistanced in example, at least, by Panama itself. The Congress of the United States is ignored in this particular agreement and told, in effect, that Congress is no longer of any force or effect in agreements which its Government may enter into internationally, while those governments with which we make the international agreements are under requirement to submit them for ratification to the representatives of the people.

The fact that we are enjoying full measure of cooperation in Panama so far as our war needs are concerned, and the further fact that the Panamanian Congress has not yet ratified the so-called agreement of last May, is ample cause for us to be less solicitous about speeding these contracts to a conclusion without thorough deliberation. Good will and good neighborliness are not in any wise or degree at stake if we would seem to move slowly in our consideration of what has been done and in doing what we are asked to do by passing the pending joint resolution.

It is all very nice for the executive branch of our Government and for the Congress to do the big-brother act, and to give, give, and give of those things belonging to the people of the United States. But one of these days there will be nothing left to give, nothing left with which to try to buy good will.

Surely good neighborliness and this military emergency are not resting upon our enactment of this resolution, however much some would have us believe that to be true. Surely the Government of Panama, the people of Panama, all are fully aware of the emergency confronting the world; are sufficiently well aware of their own interests and the degree to which they are at stake. Surely they are not nailing their future to any decision we make here on the question of a few dollars of debt and immediate possession of certain property. Panama has given whole-hearted cooperation to us in the prosecution of the war. She will continue to give it, and we are sure will do nothing but respect us the more if we will entertain some respect for ourselves and deal in a businesslike and courageous way. Those who would entertain another view of Panama, its Government, and its people, are but saying in effect that good neighborliness and cooperation with Panama can be had only by purchase with dollars, that principle or this present terrible emergency, means nothing to them. Panama could properly, and probably does, resent even insinuations of motives so cheap as that.

Senator Norris, on April 20, 1921, stated:

> We cannot afford to buy the friendship of any country. We want the friendship of all countries; but if we are going to establish the precedent that we will pay $25,000,000 for the good will of Colombia, how much ought we to pay for the good will of Great Britain; how much to France; how much to Brazil? And mark you, we are not only paying $25,000,000 to Colombia, but we are obligating ourselves to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in the years that shall come in the maintenance of this canal for her benefit and the benefit of the balance of the world.

Let us not deceive ourselves. By the pending joint resolution we are definitely jeopardizing the holdings and interests of Americans who are property owners in Panama only because they had assurance of the United States of the joined interest of the United States. Are we fair to these Americans or to the nationals of other countries when we run out on them as we do by this proposal? Many of these people must, under this proposal, deal with new landlords and with tax collectors who will levy all and more than the traffic will bear, sometimes, perhaps, with a view actually to driving some people out of business in favor of some others who can win the smiles of the new landlord.

AMERICAN OWNERSHIP INVITED INVESTMENT

The lands in the city of Colon, which under this resolution we are asked to give to Panama, are lands which under ownership by the United States have in large instances been leased to tenants who have constructed many improvements upon their reliance in our ownership of the lands. Should the United States now transfer these lands to Panama, Panama could pass confiscatory laws and all of these tenants who have made their investments under American leases would be at the whim of an Panamanian administration which might legally, under any law they might pass, take over their investments without paying for them, or take them over for the most nominal kind of consideration, under the theory of eminent domain.

It has been argued by the representatives of the State Department that in the event of difficulties arising out of this new ownership, a national who had interests in the land could invite the hand of his own government in straightening the matter out. But we all must know how difficult, if not impossible, would be the attainment of fair play in certain instances that can be imagined, even in the lifetime of present holders of property upon these American-owned lands in the Panama Canal Zone. There are a great many citizens of the United States who are occupying improvements upon these lands leased from the United States. It would seem to me that we are in honor bound to protect one and all of those who have invested upon the strength of American ownership of these lands, and that prior to the expiration of our lease upon and rights to these lands, we are without moral right to divest ourselves of ownership.

BLANK-CHECK ROAD BUILDING

House Joint Resolution 14 provides that we are to construct an undetermined number of roads or highways in Panama and to maintain them indefinitely. These roads are to be given to Panama without any cost whatsoever. We are not told if all of the roads which

are proposed to be constructed are for military purposes or are otherwise necessary for the protection of the Canal Zone. No estimates of the cost of these highways have been given to the committee, but we are asked to give a blank check for their construction. Our blank check would also cover the construction of defense sites, airfields, barracks, hangars, bridges, and underpasses or overpasses at each end of the Canal, and all of these are to be presented to Panama without cost at the end of the war with no provision for our use of them subsequently without payment to Panama. Some of us insist that it is our right to be fully advised upon all of these matters before we agree to appropriate more of American dollars at a time when the burden of appropriation is already reaching the breaking point of American ability to afford and pay.

RENT PRICES HIGHER

Under the arrangements entered into with Panama by the Executive in May of last year, the United States is required to pay rent on privately and governmentally owned Panamanian land which we wish to use for defense sites and airfields. As revealed before the committee, the rentals specified for some of this land would seem to be most excessive when figured on an acreage basis. In some instances the testimony reveals the rental being asked was twice as much per acre as prevailing land prices per acre. The committee has not been advised as to the total amount of the land to be leased by Panama to the United States for military purposes, so that we are entirely without the faintest idea of the sum necessary to pay the total rentals that may be involved.

The committee was informed that the afore-mentioned defense sites and airfields will require the construction of buildings and other structures by the United States. At the termination of the war these improvements are to be turned over to the Republic of Panama without any consideration in the way of payment for these improvements. There is no way, seemingly, to determine how many millions of dollars may be necessary or planned for expenditure in this construction program. We know that we can use the buildings and sites for the duration of the war only.

It was also brought out before the committee that a part of the land which was being leased to our Government by the Republic of Panama consisted of parts of the land owned by the claimants and which the Republic of Panama had expropriated.

RESPONSIBILITY WITHOUT CONTROL

House Joint Resolution 14 further proposes that the water and sewage systems in the cities of Colon and Panama be transferred to the Republic of Panama. The treaty of 1903 provides that these systems shall become the property of the Republic of Panama at the expiration of a specified term, during which period the cost of the systems would be amortized. That specified term does not end for 15 more years. What can be the justifiable ground for surrendering these utilities, upon which the very health of Americans residing in Panama and Colon is dependent, before the expiration of the period of amortization, particularly since there is no provision within the law that would let the United States repossess these utilities and operate them in the event Panama failed to live up to its agreement and maintain these essential health services? Under the terms of this joint resolution, the United States holds itself responsible for the maintenance of these utilities, but without even so much as provision for deducting operating expenses should the United States be compelled to take them back. At a time such as this, the sanitary conditions at Panama are a vital key in our defense. It would be much easier to exercise the responsibility we allegedly retain if ownership and control of the sanitary systems were ours to the degree that they have been in the past. It requires no particular stretch of imagination to see what friction—which we now strive to avoid—would prevail in the event our Government found it necessary to repossess and operate the water and sewer systems. It is doubtless true that there has been much progress in Panama since those days when we rid the Zone of its infections and its disease breeding grounds. No one doubts that the people of Panama are much more capable now of affording and maintaining sanitation than they were back in those days. But, Senators, nevertheless, the large fact remains that the United States has never been quite so dependent upon sanitation and health in the Panama Canal Zone as it is today, and it would seem to me to be a serious mistake to divest ourselves of any possible control we might maintain over the sanitation facilities at this all-important crossroads in a time such as this.

VALUE OF GRANTS TO PANAMA

During the course of the debate questions have been asked regarding the value of the grants we are making to Panama. It is difficult to estimate the total dollars and cents values involved in the grant which this proposed legislation would make to Panama. Any statement which may be made at this distance is only an estimate. Suggested estimates vary greatly. The only accurate measurement which can be afforded involves alone our assumption of the debt owed to the Export-Import Bank of the United States by Panama, which is, in round figures, $2,700,000. Perhaps this amount of dollars is no longer deserving of consideration. In this day when money is thrown to the winds it is perhaps true that $2,700,000 is mere chicken feed, undeserving the slightest solicitude by a government that seems to think it is making itself "wonderful" in the eyes of its neighbors by its easy spending practices. But still, there may be some Americans who do count this, even yet, a time calling for reasonable business practices and economies, and who would dare let $2,700,000 be weighed in a business practice scale. Certain it is that the time will come again when this amount of money will be considered worthy of weighing, even in the United States, and I am not inclined to let this proposed assumption of Panamanian debt go unnoticed or unchallenged. Panama is undoubtedly receiving, and will continue to receive, large benefits of the road being built and for which Panama was to pay a part of the cost, that part for which we were ready to loan them money through the Export-Import Bank. It does not seem to me that any such transaction as this cancelation could possibly be required in the name of seeming neighborliness and cooperation at a time such as this.

The value of the land in Panama and Colon which it is proposed now to give to Panama, the value of the sewage system and the water system and the value of the defense sites and the permanent buildings which will be erected thereon are variously estimated at all the way from $25,000,000 to $100,000,000. Add to this the uncertainty of the extent of our planned defense construction in Panama, and there is no limitation of the extent of our gift to Panama.

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The proposal involved in House Joint Resolution 14 definitely sets a precedent that is dangerous, for there are other countries which could aptly demand in this hour of emergency like treatment with respect to money that has been loaned to them and property involved in the defense effort. More than that, it would seem very definitely to set a price upon friendship, neighborliness, and cooperation, and make these splendid purposes seemingly subject, at least in some degree, to purchase. If we are to embark upon any policy which seems to find us fixing a price on friendship and good neighborliness, what would we pay, or what might we be asked to pay, for the continued assistance of all of our allies in this present tremendous war undertaking? We dare not embark upon such a course of action, and we believe that Panama would be the last to ask us to embark upon any such course.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS AND ADVANTAGES

The United States, Mr. President, has a very definite right and duty in this hour to maintain the advantages it has built for itself and for its allies in this war. We can ill afford to divest ourselves of any of these advantages at a time such as this. We have, too, the duty of providing for the continued protection of Americans and their rights wherever they may exist. We have no right to be surrendering the machinery necessary to the continued guaranteeing of those rights. And, finally, when it comes to altering treaties of another day, we have every right to demand that the alteration be brought about by treaty rather than by Executive authority and pronouncement. It is not understandable to me that the Republic of Panama would fail to understand our purpose in demanding that the whole subject matter of House Joint Resolution 14 be returned to the Executive for renegotiation in treaty form, to a point where Panama would question our desire for an ever-increasing spirit of good neighborliness and cooperation with that Republic whose attitude we genuinely appreciate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that from the views of the minority submitted by the Senator from California and myself to excerpts under the subheads "Subject deserves dignity of treaty" and "Reversionary interests" may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts from the views of the minority are as follows:

SUBJECT DESERVES DIGNITY OF TREATY

We submit that this joint resolution involves a subject not properly dealt with in a legislative bill. All contracts and agreements between independent nations are, according to legal and constitutional definition, treaties. The joint resolution before us is a subject of a treaty nature under that definition. Indeed, the title of the joint resolution describes its subject matter as being a treaty insofar as it declares that the joint resolution authorizes "the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama." Surely an instrument to supplement a treaty can be of no less dignity than the parent instrument itself, and if a further supplemental agreement is to be made with Panama, it must be with the dignity of a treaty and must come before the Senate in that form. Under the Constitution we cannot properly act on the proposed bill except in the constitutional way, in the way provided by the Constitution itself. The bill should be referred back to the Executive who is empowered under the Constitution to negotiate treaties and after a treaty has been negotiated by the Executive, it is then proper that it be presented to the Senate for its advice and consent. We are in honor bound to abide by the procedure provided for in the Constitution.

We believe that the Senate should insist that matters involved in Senate Joint Resolution 14, which should properly be in a treaty, be handled as a treaty. The founding fathers felt that the matter of assuming obligations or making promises to do something in the future for foreign nations was of sufficient importance to require that the proposal have the support of two-thirds of the Senators elected to the Senate.

A further point is properly raised with reference to the title of Senate Joint Resolution 14, which reads as follows: "Authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments." It is pointed out that neither the treaty of 1903 nor the treaty of 1936 provided for the transfer of real estate as set forth in section 2, nor the cancelation of Panama's debt, covered by section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 14, and in the case of the transfer of the water and sewer systems did not make this effective until 1957, despite the fact that the title of the measure before the Senate flatly states that this measure is merely "authority to the Executive to carry out certain obligations" under the previous agreements. We object to this language as an attempt to mislead the Senate and House into the impression that they are merely carrying out existing obligations—contrary to fact.

REVERSIONARY INTERESTS

House Joint Resolution 14 proposes, among other things, the transfer to Panama of the fee titles to the lands acquired by the Panama Railway Company under the 99-year lease from the Republic of Granada, now the Republic of Colombia. The Republic of Panama in its treaty with us of 1903 did attempt to convey the fee titles of the land covered by the 99-year lease to the United States, but the question arises to plague us—Did Panama have the fee titles to pass? This joint resolution presumes to give this land back to Panama as though it belonged to Panama in the first instance, which it never did. The fact remains that the Republic of Colombia may still entertain a reversionary interest in the land covered by the 99-year lease, and so long as that question is a pending one, the United States cannot make a transfer of the land to Panama without assuming the responsibility of having a claim to the land involved in the lease made by Colombia. If we agree to the transfer of the fee titles to Panama as proposed now, we may well anticipate a demand upon us to transfer the fee titles to Colombia when the 99-year lease shall have expired. Voices within our own Government in the years gone by have rather definitely given to the Republic of Colombia the ground and the doubt upon which Colombia could well be expected to lay her claim.

In his August 13 letter to Congress in support of House Joint Resolution 14, the President of the United States pointed out that the leases proposed to be transferred were acquired from Colombia with the reversion in favor of Colombia accruing in August 1966. The President further states that the reversionary interest of Colombia was transferred to the United States by the Republic of Panama after creation of the latter republic as a consequence of a revolution against the Republic of Colombia. Subsequently, Colombia settled certain grievances arising out of the part of the United States in the Panamanian Revolution of 1903 and was paid $25,000,000, but at the time of the ratification of the Colombian Treaty numerous Members of the Senate freely observed that the treaty did not dispose of Colombia's reversionary interest in these properties (this was in 1921 and '922), but left that question to ultimate disposition when Colombia's right of reversion accrued in 1966.

We believe that any attempt of the United States to transfer these properties to Panama is a fraud upon Colombia and a deception to Panama, since the United States does not have title to make the transfer to Panama and is obligated by the agreements of 1850, 1856, and 1867 to deliver back these properties to Colombia in August 1966. The opponents observe that this can only create rather than eliminate "friction and misunderstanding" not only with the Republic of Colombia, which is entitled to the lawful ownership of these properties, but also with Panama to whom the United States purports to give fee title.

The proponents of the measure argue that by her revolution Panama cut off Colombia's reversionary rights. It is plain that the revolution of Panama, resulting in a treaty of sovereignty between Panama and Colombia, merely determined the question of sovereignty but did not determine the separate question of title, and that this question will remain unsettled until either Colombia effects a waiver of her rights or her rights are duly respected—an issue which will haunt the United States at least not later than August 1966.

Going back to consideration by the Senate in another day on this subject of the reversionary rights of Colombia in Panama, large interest is found in the 1921 debate in the Senate when the $25,000,000 settlement with Colombia was pending. It was then forcefully argued that the settlement then made with Colombia was not in any sense a settlement of Colombia's reversionary rights. At pages 431 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1921, Senator Cummins expressed himself as follows:

"When this treaty is ratified Colombia will have against us precisely the same claim which she has now, and we will be compelled either to arbitrate or to compromise it. It is idle for anyone even to suggest that this treaty settled or adjusts this, the only claim which Colombia can in good faith make against the United States. Why it was not introduced into this treaty so that we might reach an end of the controversy I do not know. But so far as I am concerned I do not intend to be put in the position of paying the claim twice, or paying Colombia $25,000,000 with the knowledge that the next day she can assert again precisely the claim which she has been asserting for the last 17 years. How anyone can do it is a mystery to me and beyond my power of understanding."

This expression by Senator Cummins was shared by many other Members of the Senate who spoke on the subject at the time.

Mr. NYE. As related in the views of the minority, Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I believe in a policy of good neighborliness and cooperation. I also believe in the maintenance of the rights and interests of American citizens. I do not believe that neighborliness requires us to act blindly on any proposition which involves the interest of any American citizen or group of citizens. I do not believe in involving the taxpayer in uncertain obligations, either as to amount or failure to safeguard the interests of his country, and we are his trustees. I believe in the maintenance of the Constitution and regularity in the formation and ratification of treaties. I believe we owe a duty to ourselves as the representatives of the people to maintain the duties and obligations which rest upon us under the Constitution, which we have sworn to uphold. I believe that the pending measure is not in its entirety in the interests of the American people, and I believe that before acting upon the bill we should be given full information so that we will be able to act intelligently upon it. It is upon these principles that some of us believe the bill should be returned to the Executive with a request for full information and that it be presented to the Senate in treaty form.

I must repeat, Mr. President, I cannot feel other than regret that opportunity could not be afforded in this new Congress for the whole Senate to act upon this matter, particularly in light of the fact that the House of Representatives, which has already approved the measure, gave it so little consideration, and even denied itself access to the information which witnesses who asked to be heard might have afforded. I should like to believe that, even with the limited number who are present in the Senate today, House Joint Resolution 14 might be defeated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Because I think it is very necessary for the RECORD I wish to refer to a portion of the minority views, which the able Senator from North Dakota has just inserted in the RECORD without reading, because I think it would be very unfortunate if it should pass without official challenge. I am, therefore, calling it particularly to the attention of the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

If the Senator from Missouri will permit me——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to have the Senator from Michigan proceed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Texas will recall that fee titles to the lands involved in some of the transfers came originally to the Panama Railway Company from the Republic of Granada, now the Republic of Colombia. The Republic o. Panama, in turn, in its treaty with us in 1903, after the Panamanian Revolution had severed the two countries, undertook to transfer the fee titles to us. We assume now to have them under a 99-year lease which normally would expire in August 1966.

The minority views set up the premise that Colombia will retain a reversionary interest in these lands after August 1966, when the original lease made between the Panama Railway Company and the Republic of Granada expires. Indeed, the minority views go so far as to say:

> We believe that any attempt of the United States to transfer these properties to Panama is a fraud upon Colombia and a deception to Panama.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am reading from page 5 of the minority views.

> We believe that any attempt of the United States to transfer these properties to Panama is a fraud upon Colombia and a deception to Panama, since the United States does not have title to make the transfer to Panama and is obligated by the agreements of 1850, 1856, and 1867 to deliver back these properties to Colombia in August 1966.

Mr. President, the situation is further complicated, and rendered more hazardous as a possible cause of future friction with Colombia, by the fact that the minority views also refer to the debates in 1921—and I now refer to page 6 of the minority views—when the Colombia treaty was ratified, under which a $25,000,000 settlement was made with that Republic. The minority views point to the fact that Senator Cummins in that debate suggested that Colombia still had this reversionary right, and would one day be in a position to enforce it against us.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear what the position of the Government of the United States is in this respect. It is perfectly clear what the attitude of the State Department is, it is perfectly clear what the attitude of the majority of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is. That attitude is that the Republic of Granada, subsequently the Republic of Colombia, parted with all right, title and interest in this land when Panama successfully conducted her revolution and established herself as an independent sovereignty on this earth, and that the transfer to us subsequently was a legal, total, complete transfer, that there is no reversionary right in Colombia, none can ever be justly asserted, and none is ever going to be recognized by the Government of the United States.

I ask the Senator from Texas, in his official capacity, if I am correct please to reassert that doctrine, because I do not want this thing to plague some future Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Michigan is correct. We acquired every right originally held by Granada, subsequently Colombia, then by Panama.

I wish to say to the Senate, on the question as to whether the Republic of Colombia might assert, as against the United States, a right to reversionary interest in lands proposed to be transferred to Panama, that an examination of the correspondence leading up to the conclusion of the treaty of 1914 between the United States and Colombia, and the treaty itself, shows conclusively that there would be no ground for such an assertion. The correspondence and the treaty show that the purpose of the treaty was to set at rest, once and for all, the differences that had arisen between the two governments in connection with the question of the "proper reparation for the losses, both moral and material, suffered by the Republic of Colombia by reason of the circumstances accompanying the acquisition of the rights now enjoyed by the United States in the Isthmus of Panama."

That particular description covers the right now in question. The treaty itself recites in article 1 that the title to the interoceanic canal and the Panama Railway "is now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any incumbrances or indemnities whatever."

Colombia was given certain rights with respect to transportation over the Canal and railway, and was paid $25,000,000 by the United States as a monetary settlement.

The reversionary rights which Colombia previously had had, as the grantor and the sovereign of the territory, under the concession contracts with respect to the railway properties here in question had been transferred by Panama to the United States by articles VIII and XXII of the convention of 1903 between the United States and Panama, relating to the construction and operation by the United States of the Panama Canal, and so forth. It was the claim by Colombia to these reversionary rights, among other things, that the treaty of 1914 between the United States and Colombia settled.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his valuable contribution. He has made it entirely clear that any rights which were originally possessed by Granada, which then passed to Colombia, and which then passed to Panama, were acquired by us in the absolute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to have the speediest possible action on this important joint resolution, and I shall detain the Senate for only a moment or two. In view of the statement made by my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], I feel that a few explanatory remarks should be made on behalf of the proponents of the joint resolution.

I think it will not be denied that I am as jealous of the rights of the United States as a nation, or the rights of individual Americans, as any other Member of this body could possibly be, and I am as reluctant at any time to surrender any American property or any American rights to anybody without a definite quid pro quo, as any other Member of the Senate could possible be. But, Mr. President, this is a peculiar situation. The pending joint resolution goes to the very heart of the President's good-neighbor policy in dealing with the great republics to the south of us, both in Central and South America as well as in North America. I undertake to say, Mr. President, that the tremendous improvement which has been brought about in our relationships with our sister republics to the south under the good-neighbor policy, is the greatest achievement of this administration in the field of foreign affairs, and, indeed, one of the very greatest achievements in administration in our entire history. In the present struggle, when we are fighting for our lives around the world, our happy relationships with our sister American republics is the great safeguard to the welfare and safety of this country.

Our relationship with Mexico, Brazil, and other nations is of very great importance, but I undertake to say that our relationship with Panama is of more vital importance to the safety and well-being of this Republic than our relationship with any other Central or South American republic, because the Panama Canal, the very jugular vein of our existence, runs through the Republic of Panama.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When this matter was pending at a previous session, the able Senator from Missouri, like myself, voted against the proposal. I think we then had in common a great many objections to its details, and we have now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And if we were in the position of being wholly free agents, unembarrassed by the necessities of war, we probably would still be opposed to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But we confront today a totally different situation, and if I correctly assess the attitude of the Senator from Missouri, it is the same as mine, namely, that since this has to be done—and obviously it has to be done—and since the situation is critical, it were better that we acted promptly and graciously, and get what we can out of a bad bargain.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has adequately stated my position, with this exception, that in view of the situation at the present time I am not now convinced that it was a bad bargain originally. I say that for the reason that the defense of the Panama Canal is at least as vital to the defense of the whole United States as is the defense of any part of the United States. The defense of the Panama Canal is absolutely vital

to the whole defense of the United States, to the utilization of our armed forces, to the proper defense of the Nation. The Republic of Panama—and it cannot be too strongly emphasized—has dealt very generously and in a very ungrudging fashion with the people of the United States and the Government of the United States in the preparation for our defense of the Panama Canal.

It is a very fortunate thing, Mr. President, a most fortunate thing, that we do enjoy at the present time the very best relationship with the Government of Panama. I think it is a very fortunate thing that we are able to deal with Panama, not on a basis of strict consideration, not on a basis of strict quid pro quo for everything, but that we are and have been able to go to the Republic of Panama and ask them for anything we wanted, anything we considered necessary for the defense of the Panama Canal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may suggest to the Senator from Missouri that the granting of sites for military installations within their own country is something that is almost unheard of with respect to other nations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. We would not tolerate for a moment permitting another nation to have military or naval installations within our own boundaries. So that Panama is going to the length of making available to us a hundred different localities within her sovereign territory for the installation of our own military instrumentalities has gone as far as a nation can possibly go to make her interests our interests.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Texas is eminently correct in that respect.

Mr. President, I could not undertake to enumerate, because I do not have sufficient information, and of course I would not enumerate if I did have the information, what Panama has actually given us, but Panama has given us scores and scores of sites for installations, placements, listening posts, airfields, artillery positions, all over the Republic of Panama where her sovereignty is absolutely unquestioned. Panama has given us positions we had no right to demand, and Panama has done it generously and ungrudgingly. Panama has given us anything we asked for. It is the attitude of the Republic of Panama that it will continue to give us anything we ask for which we consider necessary and desirable for the adequate and complete defense of the Panama Canal.

Therefore I say in response to what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] said, Mr. President, that I think it is fortunate that in the grants which we are making to Panama in the pending joint resolution we have not set them up as considerations for what Panama has done for us. This is not strictly a question of quid pro quo. Panama has given us generously what we asked for. We simply propose to give to Panama some things which we can well afford to give her. We have no reason for not giving them to her, but they are not set up as considerations for other things. I think that is very fortunate.

Therefore I say, Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from North Dakota has said that in this great national crisis, with all the vast advantages we have had in our happy relationship with Panama, we ought not to attempt to scrutinize in any penny-pinching way, dollar for dollar, or acre for acre, or installation for installation, what we are giving Panama by this joint resolution.

Mr. President, we are giving Panama something not in consideration of any particular thing that Panama has given us, because that would make the consideration limited. We are giving Panama these things simply in pursuance of our general friendly relationship with Panama, which is such a valuable asset to the United States. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has well said, if we are going to do it, we ought to do it now, without unnecessary delay.

The Panamanian Congress has not ratified the treaty upon which this joint resolution is based. The reason the Panamanian Congress has not done so is that it is waiting for us to act to effectuate the matter. The Panamanian Congress will adjourn on the 30th of this month by constitutional limitation, and as the Senator from Michigan said, if we are going to pass this joint resolution, as I think no one questions we will, we ought to do it speedily, we ought to do it in the most generous and friendly manner possible, for the purpose of bringing about as much improvement as possible in the friendly relationship existing between the United States and our vitally necessary friend to the south of us, the Republic of Panama.

Therefore I think we are not justified in postponing consideration of this matter at all, and we ought to pass the joint resolution as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bone	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Reynolds
Bridges	Holman	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wheeler
Danaher	Moore	Wherry
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to point out to some of our colleagues that this subject was fully debated in the last week of November and early in December of 1942. The very earnest attention which the Senate then gave to the question of whether the Congress by the joint action of the Senate and House was to modify a treaty which had been surrounded, as this one had been, with all the sanctity attendant upon its acceptance in the first place, led to the conclusion that this course should not be followed, and justified many of us, we felt, in voting against the pending resolution. It is my recollection that the vote on December 4, 1942, was something like 40 to 29. That statement is substantially accurate, in any case.

I should like to know, Mr. President, if any members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are able to advise us that there has been a change of some sort in the situation in the past 4 months, as compared with that which existed when this question was last debated. Let me ask any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Has there been any change factually in the situation from that which prevailed late in November and early in December 1942? If so, it may have a very great effect on our attitude at the present time. However, I see nothing in the record before us to justify us in abandoning the principle which was then argued.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator uses the word "factually." Let me say that so far as the general situation is concerned, it is pretty much the same as it was last fall, except I am advised that in the meantime Panama has made available to us something like 20 more sites in addition to those which were involved in the original plan.

I recognize that the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators probably contend that the joint resolution is in essence a treaty, and that therefore it ought to be ratified. As a matter of fact, it really proposes to carry out, in a sense, the treaties which are already in existence, rather than to make a new treaty. I will say to the Senator that it lacks the elements of finality and certitude, give and take, and so forth, which inhere in a treaty. There is no specific declaration that what we are doing is in consideration of or in payment for the voluntary and generous actions of Panama heretofore in making available to us all these sites.

However, for many years Panama has been resting under a feeling of inferiority, and the feeling that her sovereignty was being invaded by the existence of private properties in Panama owned by the Government of the United States. Realizing that that has been a

cause of comment for many years, our Government, like that of Panama, is acting in a generous spirit in undertaking to remove that objection by conveying the properties to the Republic of Panama. So I do not think it can be claimed that this is in effect a treaty. It is simply a generous action upon our part, not because there is any agreement in writing. There is no agreement that Panama should give us the sites, and no agreement on our part that if she gave us the sites we would give her something. So I do not think that in any sense it can be contended that it is a treaty.

As suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, the measure was thoroughly debated at the last session. The Senate passed it. I think the Senator is fairly accurate in his statement as to the size of the vote. There was a difference of 10 or 12 votes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We did not need any treaty with Panama to give us all the defense sites we have in Panama. Why should we need a treaty to give to Panama some old waterworks?

Mr. CONNALLY. The question answers itself, of course. We needed sites for eighty or a hundred installations. We needed them for war purposes. We needed them for the defense of the Canal. We needed them for the defense of the Republic. We could not wait for the negotiation of a treaty. We could not wait for a great mass of diplomatic correspondence and protocols. Panama said, "If you need these sites, here they are. Take them. We make them available to you. We do not demand that you tell us now that you are going to pay us for them, except for a nominal sum in the way of lease money." Panama made no demand that we obligate ourselves to pay her any fixed sum for the enjoyment of the sites which she made available to us. On the other hand, our Government, responding to that gallant and gracious action, said, "Panama has been complaining for years about the ownership by the United States, within its own Republic and in derogation of its sovereignty, of certain sanitary arrangements, and city lots which have been rented to private citizens. Why not convey them?" That is exactly the attitude now.

It was stated before the Committee on Foreign Relations by representatives of the State Department that there was no categorical bargain. There was no explicit understanding. It was stated that at most there was a sort of general understanding that we would carry on in the future as we have in the past, as good neighbors, in order that the relations between the Republic of Panama and the Republic of the United States might continue on an even keel, on the basis of harmony and unity. We are both interested in the defense of the Panama Canal, because that means not alone the defense of our interests but it means the defense of the interests of Panama, because her life is tied up in the Canal. If the Panama Canal were seized by some aggressor nation, there would be no Panama, because the Republic of Panama would be absorbed.

So this relationship is not like the relationship which might subsist between the United States and some other nation. It is a peculiar relationship, brought about by a peculiar situation. Nowhere else in the world, so far as I know—at least with respect to our own Government—does a similar relationship exist.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be happy to yield later. Is the Senator willing to withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I merely wish to make the point that there is a distinction between a treaty and the proposals of the joint resolution, a point which I think is well understood.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish the Senator would withhold his suggestion for a moment. The Senator may recall—although I grant it has been some time ago—that I asked the Senator from Texas a question seeking to elicit some factual information. I wish to know what change, if any, has occurred factually, between the situation prevailing last November and the situation existing at the present time.

The answer so far is to the effect that there is no factual change surrounding the treaty itself, or the proposed modification, insofar as the joint resolution would modify the treaty. There is no factual change to alter the question of principle which was then debated. I take it that the Senator from Utah intends to speak briefly—or perhaps at length—upon that point. I would not foreclose the Senator from Utah from speaking as long as he wishes to speak.

However, let me say that when we had this question before us last fall we found that the United States had a treaty which had been ratified, with respect to which the Senate had advised and consented, and which was entered into with every degree of sanctity which our Constitution and laws would admit. That treaty was entered into in 1903.

Out of that situation rights accrued. American citizens were justified in expecting that those rights thus accruing to us and to them would subsist at least over the period called for by the treaty itself.

Now Congress comes along, and by the joint resolution proposes to say, "We are going to modify those rights. It does not make any difference whether American investors relied on the expectation that those rights would continue for the full life of the treaty. We claim in the Congress the power to relinquish to Panama some of the rights which we gained by the treaty between Panama and the United States some 40 years ago."

Mr. President, that is an important point. It raises an important question of principle. It does not in any way turn on what the equities, attitude, and spirit of fairness in the United States ought to be as a result of yielding by Panama to us of sites now to be used for defense purposes. We should pay for those sites, and do everything we reasonably and properly can to compensate Panama. There is no question whatever on that point, Mr. President. We should do everything which is inherent in what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have said with reference to Panama's generous cooperation with us at a time when we oppose a common foe. But that is not involved at all in the question or principle of whether we shall by joint Congressional resolution seek to modify a treaty. Nothing has been said to alter the question of principle involved in that statement of the situation.

I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] if there is something he chooses to say at this point.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, my remarks are simple, and they deal entirely with the question of whether the proposed action should be by a treaty rather than a congressional act.

The treaty of 1936 did modify the treaty of 1903. The modification of the treaty was done by treaty action.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Allow me to make my statement, and then I shall be through because I am not arguing but merely trying to explain that one point.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Under the Constitution of the United States, treaties become the supreme law of the land. To use the treaty technique whenever we should make a legislative change under a treaty in our agreements with Panama would be to weaken the great strength and great sanctity which is placed upon treaties entered into between the United States and other nations. All that is proposed to be done by the pending measure could be done under and in accordance with a treaty.

The point is being made that somebody would lose a right by a change made in a treaty by an act passed by Congress. Somebody would surely lose a right by a change made in a treaty, because the last treaty becomes the supreme law, and it becomes a binding law. But under our system of government by legislation, when we perform an act through legislation we perform a simple act, and that act alone is all that is done. Therefore the act is limited by what is stated in the act itself, ordinary legislation. In our agreements with Panama the treaty agreements are over-all. The important thing, of course, is the thing which we are doing here today. If it be true that claimants who feel that as a result of this legislative act their rights in Panama would seem to be put in hazard, they would surely be put completely in hazard by a treaty action. Such claimants would be very much better off by simple legislation than by changes made in a treaty.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah.

After all, he suggests a question of policy, I raise a question of principle. The Senator from Utah concludes that claimants would be better off with reference to any claims which would be raised if their rights are made to depend on joint congressional action and not a treaty. I seriously question it. I seriously doubt it. If that were a fact, why, in 1936 did we go through the usual procedure of adopting a further treaty modifying the treaty of 1903? It seems to me that every objective that properly can be accomplished under the joint resolution can and should be accomplished by a treaty without impugning the status of treaties and the sanctity which should surround them.

Mr. President, there is one other phase of the situation which a treaty would protect, and which a congressional act would not. If we had a treaty, it most assuredly would be a subject of the agreement that American claimants who lose rights—should there be any—or who suffer loss—should there be any—may present their claims for damages to a government—to an entity—which is a party to the treaty, under the terms of the treaty, because of the modification which results in the loss. In that way the rights of the claimants would be protected from the outset. But there is nothing of that nature in this resolution, and were any claimants to present claims—if there be any—they could not sue Panama or the United States unless we gave them consent to do so. They will have to come in and file some sort of a claim before the Claims Committee.

Mr. President, that is a serious matter, or it would be. Does any Senator contend that we have a right, by joint congressional action, to modify the toll rates of the Panama Canal where the toll-rate schedule has been established by treaty with other nations who are signatory to it with us? Surely, no one would so argue. So, Mr. President, the only question before the Senate at this moment stems from the claim that since the United States entered into a treaty on the basis of which rights have accrued, the Congress by joint action of the Senate and the House may now modify that treaty and the rights accruing under it. I deny it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, just one word and then I shall be through.

The Senator from Connecticut insists that this measure would mean a change in the treaty. We are not being asked at all to change the treaty. By the treaty of 1936, it was recognized we had certain property rights in Panama, and the reason for this joint resolution is that under the Constitution the Congress of the United States is the only agency which can divest the Government of property rights. So, therefore, we are asked to pass this joint resolution conveying those properties to Panama because that is the only constitutional way in which it can be done. Whenever we secured those titles they became ours to do with as we please, even though they may have been acquired under a treaty. After we get them they are ours, and it does not require any further treaty action as to how they shall be disposed of. Mr. President, I hope we can now have a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The House joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. McNARY asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. It is my understanding that the junior Senator from Tennessee, if present, would vote "yea," and the junior Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay." I am at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on official business for the Government.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on official business.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained on official business.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business as a member of the Senate Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels in Certain Areas West of the Mississippi River.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—37

Austin	Green	O'Mahoney
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bone	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hill	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	
Gillette	Murray	

NAYS—19

Aiken	Langer	Robertson
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	McNary	Wherry
Butler	Millikin	Willis
Danaher	Moore	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
Holman	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—40

Andrews	Barkley	Byrd
Bailey	Bilbo	Chavez
Bankhead	Bridges	Clark, Idaho
Barbour	Brooks	Downey

Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
George	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Glass	Overton	Tydings
Gurney	Reed	Wallgren
Hatch	Reynolds	Walsh
Hawkes	Russell	Wheeler
Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead	White
Kilgore	Smith	
La Follette	Stewart	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) was passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to express my great sense of appreciation of the efforts of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in properly presenting and pressing this matter before the Senate. I wish also to express a high sense of appreciation of the efforts of minority Senators, who have looked at this matter, as I view it, in a very broad, statesmanlike, patriotic manner, and who have aided us in securing the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign the joint resolution during the recess the Senate will take from today to Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I made reference to several Senators who had participated in the debate on the joint resolution relating to Panama. I wish to add that I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not mention further the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who, though he did not participate in the debate today, served the Committee on Foreign Relations as chairman of a subcommittee which held extensive hearings on the joint resolution, which gave it exhaustive consideration, and which ably presented it before the committee. I wish to testify now to the outstanding services of the Senator from Iowa, in the committee and outside the committee, in connection with the successful presentation and consideration of the Panama joint resolution which the Senate passed a little while ago.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, after the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] shall have secured action on a small bill, it shall be my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next. With that purpose in mind, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it shall adjourn until Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama that at the conclusion of the session today the Senate stand adjourned until Thursday next? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DIFFICULTIES OF FIXED INCOME GROUP

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, with the coming of the war years, the cost of living has increased tremendously, notwithstanding all the efforts of the administration and the Government to bring such costs into proper regulation and control. Consequent upon this inflationary trend, there has developed a serious and threatening problem in America. It is a problem which bids fair to bring tragedy and want to a great number of our citizens who, during their productive years, labored long and diligently at their tasks and sincerely and wholeheartedly sought to provide for themselves in their old age.

These people, who were frugal with their earnings, determined that they would never become public charges, and that they should always be able to maintain themselves at a reasonable standard. They invested definite portions of their lifetime earnings in retirement schedules, annuities, and in various types of pension plans which were designed to assure them a reasonable living in their later years. In so doing, they made the very type of provision which the American Government, and nearly every other American organization, has urged its people to make for themselves. Such far-sighted provision would, indeed, have been adequate during normal times, but these are not normal times.

Not only has the cost of living increased tremendously, but numerous other demands, far heavier than normal, have been placed upon the incomes of these people. The tragic result has been that these retired and provident people are utterly unable to maintain themselves on the comparatively meager allotment which their retirement benefits provide. Their income is fixed and it is not adequate.

I have received hundreds of letters on this particular subject from people in all sections of the country. They all point to the serious and difficult times which these people are experiencing in attempting to maintain themselves at a level of barest necessity.

We have made provision for increased earnings for all those who are now engaged in productive work. In every way possible we have attempted to permit income to keep abreast of rising prices. But we have overlooked, until very recently, the fact that those whose incomes are fixed cannot keep step with the increased costs of living.

As an indication of the seriousness of these problems, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two forthright letters which I have received from persons in this fixed-income group, and I ask that these communications be referred to the Committee on Civil Service, which is now considering Senate bill 878, a bill designed to afford necessary relief to a portion of this particular group of our citizens. I trust that this bill, as well as all necessary similar bills, shall be speedily approved in committee and adopted by this body, so that proper and necessary provision will be made for this group, the group to which I have referred, who having made what ordinarily would be ample provision for themselves in their old age, now find that the costs of living have attained such heights that they, through no fault of their own, are unable to cope with the situation in a satisfactory manner.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOVER, PA., *April 6, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: We, the undersigned, represent retired Federal postal employees, seek your aid in providing for us the bare necessities of life. None of us receive more than $1,200; all of us have reached that age in life when we no longer have the physical strength necessary for manual labor, and although "we lick the platter clean" we are in need of assistance to provide the necessities of life to which we feel we are entitled.

Our friends have introduced the necessary legislation in Washington to give us this relief. A bill, S. 878, has been introduced in the Senate, and a companion bill, H. R. 2195, has been introduced in the House. We understand these bills have been referred to the Civil Service Committees of the Senate and the House, and we now appeal for your aid to have them brought on the floors, passed, signed, and made laws.

The amount of our annuity was established under normal conditions; we were provided a decent living, but as it is a known fact that the cost of living has increased—and we believe will continue to increase—we think we are in order to seek the necessary relief to offset this increase in the cost of living for which we are in no way responsible. We do not wish to become a burden to our Government, but since we complied with the demands of our Government when we established our retirement fund; we now feel that the Government should keep faith and give us the respectable living in our old age, which was promised to us.

Any favors extended in our behalf will be appreciated and reciprocated; we feel confident you will not let us down, so will carefully watch the papers to learn your attitude, your interest, and your action. However, an increased monthly check will be proof that you are our friend and laboring for your constituents at home. Thanks, and we hope to remain,

Confidently yours,

Jacob R. Barnhart, Hanover, Pa., chairman; William D. Kinsell, Hanover, Pa.; Austin S. Slaty; George W. Slaybaugh; Harvey F. Lillich; H. Van Waltersdorf; Harry F. Hellman; Harry E. Bair; Robert L. Mehring.

HARRISBURG, PA., *April 20, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter to get your support on S. 878 as introduced by Senator LANGER.

On account of the high cost of living, I see no reason whatever we retired men should be considered less unworthy of being taken care of than the others.

I had 41 years 9 months and 3 days service in the Railway Mail and was forced out under the Economy Act in 1932, after having been granted a 2-year extension.

We retired men being too old to do any real worth-while work are barely existing on

what is now only a pittance with the cost of living mounting all the time.

Won't you please get behind this S. 878 and work for its enactment so we, too, can live a little more like human beings?

Thanking you for all the support you can bring to the end that the bill becomes a law, believe me,

Very cordially yours,

J. HARRY STEELE.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN MORTGAGORS IN THE MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Order of Business No. 206, Senate bill 755, a bill proposing an amendment to the National Housing Act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection to the immediate consideration of the bill, but before final action is taken on the question of the consideration of the bill this afternoon I wish the Senator from Maryland would state something about the objectives of the bill, and whether the whole committee voted to report it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this bill was reported by a unanimous favorable vote, of the entire committee, and I shall be very glad to explain it.

Mr. President, it is certainly not necessary for me to explain the operations of the Federal Housing Administration. It rests upon the theory that a mortgagee, under certain conditions, receives protection other than that arising under the mortgage, and that that protection comes from insurance given by the Federal Government. We know that the protection given under the Federal Insurance law is made effective by the issuance by the Federal Government of debentures to the mortgagee. After the foreclosure of property insured under that act, the Government, under certain conditions, issues debentures for the amount of the principal and interest unpaid, less what is received under foreclosure proceedings.

In the computation of the amount due under such debenture plan, under the original act the amount of interest and insurance premiums to be computed dated from the time of the institution of the foreclosure proceedings and not from the time of default under the mortgage. Since then, a law has been enacted, as we all know, called The Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act, growing out of the war, which does several things. One of its objects is to provide relief to members of the armed forces whose homes are threatened with foreclosure because mortgage payments are in default.

That act provides that if a property insured under the F. H. A. comes up for foreclosure, and the court is satisfied that the mortgagor is not able to meet the obligation, that inability shall be a bar to proceeding with the foreclosure at that time. In other words, this provision is to prevent the foreclosure of property of men in the armed service.

Furthermore, there is provision in that act that, if foreclosure proceedings are instituted, even though they may not be pushed, that when the final settlement comes under the debenture plan, the interest shall be computed from the time of the institution of the foreclosure proceeding, the continuation of which was delayed under the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

Of course, that act is very helpful, but it does not give all the relief that is necessary. Consequently Senate bill 755 has been drafted with the objective in mind of further relief. This bill provides that when the computation for debentures shall be made that even though mortgage payments go into default during the service in armed forces, that the period of time of such defaults during which the man is in the armed forces shall be included in the bases for debentures without even the institution of foreclosure proceedings being made. In other words, it will not be necessary for the mortgagee to even start foreclosure proceedings, but during the period while the man is in the armed forces the computation which is the basis of settlement by debentures will include the period of time of default while the men are in such service.

Obviously such protection is very desirable, because it would be quite embarrassing for a mortgagee to institute foreclosure proceedings against a man who is serving in the armed forces. On the other hand, the mortgage should not be expected to be losing his interest during such period of the mortgagor's service. This bill would obviate the necessity of even instituting foreclosure proceedings to secure debenture protection; on the other hand, the mortgagee is fully protected in regard to the interest period without even the institution of such proceedings. During the whole period a man is serving in the armed forces, plus 3 months thereafter, the computation for the debenture will include the mortgage payments and the insurance premiums which accrued during that period and unpaid.

This provision, supplementing the protection under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, would put a man who is in the armed services in a much better situation. It really would protect him fully from even the need of institution of foreclosure proceedings. It would also protect the mortgagee from the necessity of instituting proceedings in order to protect his right to collect later on accruing interest and insurance premiums. It would also spare him the necessity of doing what would be very distasteful to him, namely, the starting of proceedings against someone serving in the armed forces.

The bill is of advantage to and is very helpful both to the mortgagor and to the mortgagee. It is a very reasonable, equitable, and patriotic one. It is a very proper and deserved step to take to afford protection during the war to men in the armed forces, so that their ownership of property would not only not be jeopardized while they were in the service, but that also they would not even be subjected to the humiliation and trouble of taking steps to stay such foreclosure proceedings. The fact that they are in the armed forces would also make in many cases the taking of such steps to delay foreclosure difficult, if not impossible, for them.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may ask the Senator a question, does the bill provide any particular time after the soldier has returned within which action must be commenced?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No, it does not; but foreclosure proceedings would have to be instituted within 3 months after he returned. If the mortgagee should postpone his foreclosure proceedings beyond that period, he would lose the protection of the debenture for that period.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the right based on the return of the soldier, or is it based on the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Upon the cessation of hostilities, provided the mortgagee in question is still in the armed services.

Mr. President, it is not possible to estimate in any definite way that is satisfactory what this measure would cost the United States Government. We know that up to the end of last March there were 1,388 properties on which there was default, where the ownership of which was in members of the armed forces.

Of course that is a very small percentage of existing mortgages. It is about 1,388 out of over 1,000,000 mortgagees. It is quite natural that that amount of 1,388 will be increased from time to time. How much is purely a matter of sheer speculation. On the present basis the maximum amount which this bill would cost the Treasury is probably less than $150,000 a year. Even that is assuming that the foreclosure proceedings would not be sufficient in any of these cases of subsequent foreclosures to produce amounts which would satisfy the mortgagee in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 204 (a) of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages to which the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, apply and which are insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Administrator finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during any part or all of the period

of such military service and 3 months thereafter."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 604 (a) of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages to which the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, apply and which are insured under section 603 of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Administrator finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during any part or all of the period of such military service and 3 months thereafter."

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it was my purpose today to move the consideration of Senate bill 675 to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, by providing for the extension of the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors, which is order No. 65 on the calendar, but the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] advises me that there is some likelihood that an amendment of a more or less controversial nature may be offered to the bill, and since several Senators who are interested in the particular amendment which the Senator from Alabama has in mind are not present, he would like to have the bill go over until a week from today. I do not want to work a hardship on any Senator who is not present, and since the amendment has not been presented, and since Senators have not had any opportunity to know anything about the proposed amendment, they are of course entitled to the courtesy of not having the bill considered until they have a chance to be present and know something about the amendment to be proposed. So I have complied with the request made by the acting leader, and I shall expect to ask again for consideration of the measure a week from today.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on the 19th of April the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 42, which provided for the extension for 1 year of the provisions of a former act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, which was approved May 7, 1942. At the time the joint resolution was passed by the Senate the House passed House bill 2370, which made the same provision, with one exception. The Senate bill provided for a 1-year extension. The House bill provided for an extension "until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress." That is practically the only difference between the House measure and the Senate measure. I, therefore, request, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2370.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The bill (H. R. 2370) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, was read twice by its title.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is that a House bill which has been messaged to the Senate today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the House bill came to the Senate last Thursday and that on the same day the Senate passed a similar measure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not clearly understand the Senator's request. I thought he asked for consideration of a House measure without reference to the Senate bill, and I should object to that. If the Senate has passed a similar bill——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, the Senate has passed a similar bill.

Mr. McNARY. The House bill is in all respects identical?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The measures are in all respects identical with one exception. The House bill makes the effective time the period of the war, and of course the object of the proposed legislation is to give a moratorium on assessment work during the war because of manpower shortage. The House bill goes all the way, and instead of providing a 1-year extension of the moratorium it makes the moratorium extend for the duration.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator from Colorado want the moratorium to extend for 1 year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. The members of the Mines and Mining Committee are perfectly satisfied with the House bill, and we would like to have it passed as the House passed it. For that reason I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2370.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I appreciate the necessity at times of such a moratorium as the one in question. We have had such moratoriums during times of depression, but I do not believe that they have been for a longer period than 1 year. The proposed moratorium seems to be for the duration of the war. Is that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; for the duration. The moratorium would expire at 12 o'clock meridian on the first day of July after the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is not usually the language employed in measures of that kind. I do not know when the hostilities will finally cease if we bind ourselves to fight in a considerable portion of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have not concluded my statement with respect to the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I believe in the purpose of the bill, but may I ask what objection there is to having the time specific for these moratoriums?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We want to have the measure enacted at least by the first of July. If we accept the House version and pass the measure now, we will have the whole matter behind us. If we wait for the House to act upon the Senate measure I do not know when the House will act, or how long it will take them to pass the measure. The matter might be delayed. I will grant that there is no particular reason why the bill should be passed today, but since the House has acted on the measure, and since there is no objection on the part of the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate to the House version, I make my motion that the Senate adopt the House version of the measure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say to the able leader of the minority, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], that the Senate bill which passed some days ago was authored and sponsored by the senior Senator from Nevada. When I introduced the measure I had in mind the declaration of the President when he signed a similar bill some 2 years ago that he would not again sign such a bill. In the meantime, we have been drawn into war. It is utterly impossible to get powder, steel, and other materials with which to perform the assessment work in mining claims. We do not know when it will be possible to get such materials. The House has passed a similar bill to the one I introduced. My bill would have limited the moratorium to 1 year, in keeping with the bill passed last year. The House passed its bill limiting the moratorium to the duration of the war and for a short period thereafter. It seems to me in all fairness that the House bill, which is much more sweeping, and covers much more territory, so to speak, is the proper bill to pass at this time if the President will sign it.

Mr. McNARY. Has the Senator from Nevada any doubt about that?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should rather not commit myself on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In reply to the Senator's question I will say that I have no information on that subject either. I will say in addition to the point raised by the Senator from Nevada that our miners are denied priorities; that they are not permitted by the War Production Board to be furnished with any of the materials they need to perform the assessment work during the war, especially if the claims happen to be called silver claims. As to materials necessary to be had in order to do work on claims for some of the baser metals—zinc, lead, and copper, for instance—it is likely that priorities could be arranged. However, many of the claims are for gold and silver and other precious or rare metals; and during the war prospectors are stopped from doing any work on them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am conscious of the difficulties experienced

by the operators and the mine workers in these times. The doubt I have is first of all as to the wisdom of a policy on the part of the Senate of passing a bill which goes beyond the time which usually has been prescribed, and extends until July 1 after the cessation of hostilities in the present war. The able senior Senator from Nevada inspires me with the thought that the bill might be vetoed. I am sure that if the Senate provides for 1 year there will be no difficulty in getting the extension for the next year or perhaps the following year, so long as the present conditions obtain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, my fear was inspired by the Senator's silence. If the bill should be passed and sent to the President for his signature, and if he should veto it, the Senate already has a joint resolution of its own pending in the House. I do not know of any way by which the Senate can get the House to act upon its joint resolution. We are in a sort of stalemate. We have passed a joint resolution of our own, and the House has passed a bill of its own. But if the House bill were passed by the Senate, and if the President were to veto it, I am sure the House would immediately act upon the Senate resolution which is pending before it at the present time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am willing to subside and to let the bill be passed as it was passed by the House, if my particular friends from the West are willing to assume the responsibility entailed by taking the gamble.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very grateful to the Senator.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2370) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill H. R. 2370 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not the purpose or the intent to have the Senate take up the War Department civil-functions appropriations bill this week. It is understood that the bill will not——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the bill has been reported from the subcommittee, has it not?

Mr. HILL. It is understood that the bill wil not come up this week. I wish to say that the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which subcommittee has jurisdiction over the bill, wanted to have consent to report the bill during the contemplated recess or adjournment of the Senate, with the distinct understanding that it would not come up this week at all for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. McNAPY. Mr. President, I have found difficulty in arranging time in my convenience to attend the meetings held by the subcommittee. I think the measure is still before the subcommittee; it has not been acted upon by the committee as a whole. I think it is a little too early to provide for consideration of the bill by the Senate. I should object to any such arrangement at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Austin R. Preston, of New York, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred W. Jandrew, of Wisconsin, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I move that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations made this day by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, April 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26, 1943:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William H. McDonnell, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois. (Mr. McDonnell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1943.)

Chester S. Dishong, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida. (Mr. Dishong is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1943.)

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

William F. Gow, from the State of Alabama, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

James W. Reinhardt, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Canton area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Eugene J. Ronan, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

John M. Baker, from the State of Ohio, to be a ea director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cincinnati area office of the War Manpower Commission.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Winfield Chapple Scott, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from November 4, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from April 19, 1943

Lt. Col. Earl Landreth, Infantry (temporary colonel).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Walter Leland Richards, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 12, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Roland Glenn, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Philip Palmer Green, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 16, 1943.

Lt. Col. Claude DuVall Holmes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 19, 1943.

Lt. Col. Francis Carrillo Tyng, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 22, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Stephen Culpepper, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 27, 1943.

Lt. Col. Hertel Philip Makel, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Eanes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 31, 1943.

Lt. Col. Henry Edgar Keely, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 31, 1943.

To be major

Capt. Francis Patrick Kintz, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 4, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. Fratis L. Duff, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 19, 1943.

First Lt. Leon Donald Beddow, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 20, 1943.

First Lt. Warren Jackson Barker, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 30, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Chauncey Edmund Cook, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 24, 1943.

To be captain

First Lt. Edwin Joseph Sunderville, Veterinary Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 31, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Albert Kingsbury Mathews, United States Army, with rank from May 28, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Capt. Walter K. Kilpatrick to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of July 1942.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Glenn B. Davis, September 17, 1942.
Theodore E. Chandler, October 23, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:

Clarence L. C. Atkeson, Jr
Donald S. MacMahan

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Kenneth J. Sanger, December 16, 1941.
Gerald L. Christie, January 1, 1942.
Herbert von A. Burkart, March 1, 1942.
Sherman "E" Wright, Jr., April 1, 1942.
Henry A. Romberg, April 13, 1942.
Ernest W. Humphrey, May 1, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

William H. Davison	Daniel J. Wallace, Jr.
Robert H. Wood	Paul G. Adams, Jr.
William T. Sawyer	Stanley E. Hindman
David S. Bill, Jr.	Clement T. Latimer
Gustave A. Wolf	William R. Laird, Jr.
Frank M. Culpepper	Howard A. Thompson
John L. Arrington 2d	John P. Seifert
Lawrence R. Geis	William W Gentry
Saxe P. Gantz	Norman Bennett
Donald J. O'Meara	Valentine G. Holzapfel
James McI. Robertson	Abe F. Cohen

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John T. Mitchell, February 17, 1941.
Robert E. Kelly, May 26, 1941.
Eugene Bifulco, March 18, 1942.
Cecil C. Collins, Jr., March 12, 1942.
Daniel H. Mathers, March 12, 1942.
Bert A. Kanwit, March 12, 1942.
June U. Gunter, March 12, 1942.
Stephen H. Tolins, March 12, 1942.
Allen Y. Delaney, March 12, 1942.
Joseph E. D. Humphries, May 6, 1942.
William H. Wheir, May 6, 1942.
Loran P. Moore, Jr., May 6, 1942.
Charles H. Eaton, May 6, 1942.
James J. McCoy, Jr., May 6, 1942.
Dexter E. Guernsey, May 6, 1942.
Kenneth B. England, May 6, 1942.
William S. Cole, May 6, 1942
Verne L. Schlaser, May 6, 1942.
Roy J. Stokes, May 6, 1942.
Wayne W. Waters, February 20, 1943.
Franklin L. Ashley, February 20, 1943.
Alexander J. Bankhead, February 20, 1943.
James D. Murphy, February 20, 1943.
William L. Hoon, February 20, 1943.
Samuel H. Horton, Jr., February 20, 1943.
John B. Trible, February 20, 1943.
August R. Buerkle, February 20, 1943.
Norval F. Kemp, February 20, 1943.
Robert F. Christoph, February 20, 1943.
John M. Hundley, February 20, 1943.
Harold E. Muller, February 20, 1943.
Charles R. Duncan, February 20, 1943.
James B. Black, Jr., February 20, 1943.
John F. Maloney, February 20, 1943.
Jack W. Revere, February 20, 1943.
William H Harris, Jr., February 20, 1943.
Gerald J. Duffner, February 20, 1943.
Frederic W Bradshaw, February 20, 1943.
William P. Mulford, February 20, 1943.
Hugh Crawford, February 20, 1943.
Prescott Jordon, Jr., February 20, 1943.
George W. Westin, February 20, 1943.
Henry F. Smith, February 20, 1943.
Karl M. Lazarski, February 20, 1943.
Rudolph D. Jacob, February 20, 1943.
James R. Oldham, February 20, 1943.
Gordon F. Robertson, February 20, 1943.
Leo J. Brown, February 20, 1943.
Harold R. Stowe, February 20, 1943.
George W. Russell, February 20, 1943.
Julian A. White, February 20, 1943.
Richard R. Hoffman, February 20, 1943.
Homer J. Moore, February 20, 1943.
James P. Dean, February 20, 1943.
John S. Cheredes, February 20, 1943.
Edwin C. Bebb, Februar 20, 1943.
William C. Cantrell, February 27, 1943.
Warren Z. Lane, March 9, 1943.
Clifton G. Aycock, March 11, 1943.
Raymond H. Barker, March 12, 1943.
Ralph D Ross, March 12, 1943.
Owen C. Berg, March 14, 1943.
Frellsen E. McCarty, March 16, 1943.
Faheam Cannon, March 17, 1943.
Raymond T. Anderson, March 26, 1943.
Jack R. Anderson, March 28, 1943.
Fred P. Thomas, April 5, 1943.
J. Blair Pace, April 6, 1943.
Stanley W. Burwell, April 7, 1943.
Francis M. Whittaker, Jr., April 7, 1943.
William Burrows, April 10, 1943.
Virgil J. P. Lundquist, April 10, 1943.
James H. Lyons, April 10, 1943.
Ralph W. Coltharp, April 11, 1943.
Roy H. Baskin, Jr., April 11, 1943.
Worth M. Gross, April 13, 1943.
Joseph L. Pace, April 14, 1943.
John G. Morrison, April 17, 1943.
Robert O. Bill, May 18, 1943
Robert C. Walden, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Joseph M. Straughan, May 19, 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Richard L. Geiger, November 7, 1940.
James T. Hughes, November 7, 1940.
James F. Waters, Jr., November 19, 1941.
Simon L. Cohn, November 19, 1941.
Paul V. Moffat, Jr., November 19, 1941.
Howard S. Hyde, November 19, 1941.
Elmer T. Browne, November 19, 1941.
Nelson R. Combs, November 19, 1941.
James G. Bowie, November 19, 1941.
Lamar D. Patton, November 19, 1941.
Phillip S. Twombly, November 19, 1941.
Louis C. Brooks, November 19, 1941.
James M. Brogan, November 19, 1941.
Charles E. Wood 3d, November 19, 1941.
Allan B. Zerfoss, November 19, 1941.
David D. Ryus 3d, March 23, 1942.

Assistant Paymaster Daniel J. Carrison to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

Ensign Fletcher S. Hamilton, CEC–V(S), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 20th day of February 1943.

Carpenter Ralph E. Carmack to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26, 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Austin R. Preston to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Fred W. Jandrey to be a consul of the United States of America.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

Faber A. Bolinger to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Harry H. Hansborough, Jr., to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Louisville, Ky., area office.

Wallace D. Holden to be regional representative at $6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Thomas L. Gaukel to be area director, at $6,500 per annum in the St. Louis area office.

Leo Kogan to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Bernard Sless to be senior occupational ment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, in the York regional office.

Fay William Hunter to be head employment specialist, at $6,500 per annum, in the agricultural division in the Washington office.

Patrick Thomas Fagan to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Pittsburgh area office.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Kirby J. Smith, Burt.
Pearle A. Mace, Moville.
Albert H. Gray, Sergeant Bluff.

LOUISIANA

Van J. Harry, New Iberia.
Elias C. Leone, Zwolle.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary T. Huber, Fingal.

OHIO

Claude S. Coyle, Batavia.
Eva M. Tipton, Bloomingdale.
Grace G. Copeland, Bristolville.
Jessie K. Dilworth, Cortland.
Daniel L. Pokey, Lakeside.
Susan M. Ramsey, Loveland.
William Ransom Shaw, McDermott.
Urban B. Menker, Maria Stein.
Daniel P. Miller, Montgomery.
Ira Q. Rhoten, Mowrystown.
Jean E. Holden, Pierpont.
Clara B. Dix, Prospect.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, hope of the souls that seek Thee, strength of the souls that find Thee, grant to all our spirits the refreshment and renewal which shall make us adequate to serve the present age. As the chosen servants of the Commonwealth, pushed and pressed by grave questions and vexing problems so vitally affecting national welfare and world concord, we would bow first of all at this daily altar dedicated to the far look. We seek Thee as Thy saints have sought in every generation.

Before our eyes may there tower those lofty and eternal verities that outlast the strident noises of any day. The

world about us is full of wild commotion, the clamor of the violent, the dark deeds of the ruthless, and the agony of uncounted hosts of Thy children haunted by nameless dread, and ground in the dust of tyranny. We cannot adequately face such a world without and make our humble contribution to the healing of its tangled, tragic state unless our faith in Thy power to make even the wrath of man praise Thee and in the victory of Thy purpose is kept untarnished. Give to us peace in our time, O God. To our stricken generation may there come peace with honor, with human dignity vindicated and social justice the canopy of all the nations. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on April 22, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 899) to amend the act approved January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITION OF LANDS TO UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER WILDLIFE AND FISH REFUGE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REFUND OF EXCESS AMOUNTS COLLECTED BY FOREST SERVICE IN UTILIZATION OF NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 19 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of June 26, 1934 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 (77th Cong.), for the period from January 1, 1943, to March 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF LAW PROVIDING COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SUFFERING INJURIES IN PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (2) and Agriculture (2); Federal Works Agency (2), and the War Production Board which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the calling at the present time of meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of such nations with specific and limited authority looking to the solution of post-war problems; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Puerto Rico Statehood Association, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Tydings bill granting independence to Puerto Rico, and also endorsing the efforts of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] directed toward intensifying teaching of the English language in the island; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to immediately launch an investigation into the administration of the Federal rent control program in California as requested in House Resolution 51 presented by the Honorable THOMAS ROLPH, Representative of the Fourth California Congressional District

"Whereas the Federal program for the control of residential rents has been placed in effect in many communities in this State for several months past; and

"Whereas a reasonable period of time has elapsed to permit fair and equitable administrative policies to be adopted; and

"Whereas widespread complaint of administrative policies has arisen on the part of both landlords and tenants in many communities; and

"Whereas unfair and inequitable administrative policies may seriously affect the tax yield from real property which contributes primarily to the support of local government in this State; and

"Whereas many communities of California are vital war industry centers wherein fair and equitable administration of a rent control program which will not unduly antagonize either landlords or tenants is an important factor in obtaining unity of effort in the conduct of the war: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to adopt House Resolution 51 introduced into the Seventy-eighth Congress by Hon. THOMAS ROLPH, Representative of the Fourth California Congressional District, in order that immediate investigation may be made into the administration of the Federal rent control program throughout the Nation and particularly in the important centers of war industry in this State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Secretary of State of the United States to request the Bermuda Refugee Conference to allow the Joint Emergency Committee for European Jewish Affairs to appear before it and present its program

"Whereas the Bermuda Refugee Conference is now in session at Hamilton, Bermuda, for the expressed purpose of exploring the questions of the release of prisoners of war and of their evacuation and feeding; and

"Whereas the Joint Emergency Committee for European Jewish Affairs has not been invited to said conference; and

"Whereas said committee has prepared a 12-point program for the rescue of Europe's enslaved Jews, and desires an opportunity to present said program to the conference: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Massachusetts memorializes the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to request said conference to allow said committee to appear before it and present its program: And be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from Massachusetts, and to the Secretary of State.

"In senate, adopted April 20, 1943."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States, proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

"Whereas the people of the State of New Hampshire are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the thirty-first day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said thirty-first day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"'SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States, and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each New Hampshire Member thereof.'

"ROBERT O. BLOOD,
"*Governor.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Resolution looking toward the establishment of peace on earth and good will toward men in the world following the war in which we are now engaged

"Whereas it is the hope of every American that out of the suffering, the destruction, and the horror of this war, there shall rise the foundations of a lasting peace, affording to all peoples of the world freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, and to the minorities everywhere protection of those inalienable rights which should be the heritage of every human being; and

"Whereas there can be no lasting peace unless rampant and unrestrained nationalism and economic and military aggression are forever eliminated from all the nations of the world; and

"Whereas a lasting peace can only be established upon the foundation of the dignity of the spirit and soul of man, and to assure such requires the opportunity for a reasonable measure of prosperity and welfare for all people; and

"Whereas such aims can be achieved only by an international organization of nations, wherein each will surrender some of its sovereignty in order that the protection and welfare of all may be secured: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"(1) That it is hereby declared to be our profound conviction that an international organization of all nations to achieve these results must be an essential condition of the peace which is to come.

"(2) That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end.

"(3) That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943."

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorializing Congress to pass pharmacy-corps bill

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled:*

"Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

"Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

"Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competence and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

"Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Florida State Legislature now in session goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943."

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the Senate of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 246

"Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products

"Whereas the food situation grows more acute daily, this being particularly true of the milk supply necessary to meet the requirements of our greatly increased population; and

"Whereas dairy farmers are going out of business at an alarming rate owing to the shortage of skilled farm labor, feed, fertilizer, and farm machinery, and to inadequate prices to meet the increased cost of production; and

"Whereas some immediate action must be taken to remedy this situation and give encouragement to our remaining dairy farmers to carry on in this grave national food crisis: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Rhode Island respectfully requests the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Price Administrator, and all other governmental agencies involved in the production and distribution of food to take immediate action to eliminate the existing shortage of milk by establishing price ceilings that will make it possible for Rhode Island dairy farmers to meet production costs and to continue in business; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Price Administrator, and the Rhode Island Members in Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 86

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress in order that one of the newly constructed ships of the United States Navy or of the American merchant marine may be named for Capt. Robert Gray, of Tiverton, R. I., the first American, in 1787, to carry the American flag around the world

"Whereas Capt. Robert Gray, of Tiverton, R. I., was the first American, in 1787, to carry the American flag around the world and was the discoverer of the Columbia River, in 1792, through which the United States laid claim to the present States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and part of Montana; and

"Whereas the deeds of Captain Gray are recorded upon a column 125 feet high in Astoria Park, Oreg., the dedication of which took place July 22, 1926, the Northwest and the United States as a whole thus showing appreciation and honor; and

"Whereas it is therefore fitting that a ship of the United States Navy or of the great American merchant marine should bear the name of this redoubtable and intrepid navigator: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby requested to use their best efforts to arrange that one of the newly constructed ships of the United States Navy or the American merchant marine shall be named for Capt. Robert Gray, of Tiverton, R. I.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Navy and to the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors and also to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION—DRAFTING OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN FOR WAR EFFORT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kansas Commission on Interstate Cooperation, on April 15, 1943, disapproving the drafting of women and children for the war effort, and viewing with "disapproval and disfavor any proposal

emanating from the Congress or other Federal authority, for the drafting of women or children as proposed by the Austin-Wadsworth bill now pending before Congress."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2

Resolution disapproving the drafting of women and children for the war effort

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the members of this commission that there are now ample supplies of able-bodied men available for the war effort, through the present authorized agencies of government; and

Whereas a further extension of the drafting authority might seriously endanger the home front, particularly the essential morale and morals of home and family life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Commission on Interstate Cooperation, That we view with disapproval and disfavor any proposal emanating from the Congress or other Federal authority, for the drafting of women or children as proposed by the Austin-Wadsworth bill now pending before Congress, or any similar measures which might be introduced; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the permanent records of this commission, and that a copy be forwarded to the executive director of the Council of State Governments, and copies also sent to the members of the Kansas delegation in Congress and to Mr. Paul V. McNutt at Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION—LEVY AND COLLECTION OF SALES TAXES BY STATES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, copy of a resolution adopted by the Kansas Commission on Interstate Cooperation, of which Lieutenant Governor Jess C. Denious is chairman, just received by me, directs attention to an issue which will be before the Congress before the present session ends.

That issue is the imposition of a Federal sales tax.

The Kansas Commission on Interstate Cooperation, in its formal recommendation to the Council of State Governments, while not opposing the Federal sales tax as a war measure, expresses itself very firmly against the Federal Government permanently going into the general sales tax field for revenue. With that position I heartily agree.

The Kansas commission makes two major recommendations in regard to a Federal sales tax.

First, that if a Federal sales tax is levied, it shall expire 6 months after the end of the war.

Second, that the Federal Government, instead of setting up sales tax collection agencies in the States, use existing State agencies to collect the Federal tax and turn the collections into the Federal Treasury. It strikes me that is also a sound recommendation. I now present and ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Resolution requesting the Council of State Governments to make certain recommendations to Congress relative to the levy and collection of taxes upon sales

Whereas it has been rumored that the enactment by the Congress of a Federal sales-tax law is imminent; and

Whereas many of the States have sales-tax laws in force at the present time and the facilities for the collection of such a tax in operation, and the remainder of the States could enact similar legislation; and

Whereas the levy and collection of a sales tax is intimately connected with individual intrastate transactions; and

Whereas the sales-tax field of revenue lends itself peculiarly to State operation; and

Whereas States' rights would be needlessly invaded by the Federal Government if it should proceed directly to levy and collect a sales tax; and

Whereas use of existing State facilities and machinery for collection of a sales tax would expedite economic administration thereof, and conserve manpower: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Commission on Interstate Cooperation, That the Council of State Governments recommend to the Congress of the United States, in the event funds for defraying a portion of the costs of the war should be raised by a tax levied upon sales, that such law provide for the levy of such tax by the States directly, and not by the Federal Government; that the States collect all sales taxes, both State and Federal, and that the cost thereof be deducted from the proceeds, and that the States remit to the Federal Government such portion of the remainder thereof as may have been collected for the benefit of the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That any sales tax which might be imposed shall terminate not later than 6 months following the cessation of hostilities; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the permanent records of this commission, and that a copy thereof be forwarded to the executive director of the Council of State Governments for its consideration, and copies also sent to the members of the Kansas delegation in Congress.

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION—PAID ADVERTISING TO PROMOTE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Miss Jeanne R. Brennan, secretary of the Connecticut Editorial Association, Hartford, Conn., advising me of the resolution adopted by that association at its spring meeting held on Saturday, April 24, in Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
April 26, 1943.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Connecticut Editorial Association, I am sending herewith a copy of the resolution proposed and passed unanimously by this association at its spring meeting on Saturday, April 24, in Hartford, Conn.

The resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Connecticut Editorial Association goes on record as in favor of the United States Government using paid advertising to promote all those projects deemed essential to the war effort."

Any use or publicity which you would care to make of these sentiments of the association, representing the weekly publishers of the State of Connecticut, would be appreciated by us.

Yours truly,

JEANNE R. BRENNAN,
Secretary.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN—ADMINISTRATION OF CIVILIAN SUPPLY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also present with the request to have printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a letter which Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This letter expresses the approval of the American Federation of Labor on the principle of S. 885, and I offer it for the record because the American Federation of Labor was not represented at recent hearings on the bill. A representative of the Committee for Industrial Organizations did appear in favor of the measure at that time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I understand that your committee is completing its hearings on S. 885, sponsored by Senator MALONEY.

The American Federation of Labor is deeply concerned in the administration of civilian supply and assurance that such civilian production and services as are necessary to sustain the maximum war effort are fully safeguarded in the formulation of the over-all procurement and production policies. As you know, the American Federation of Labor seeks and urges unification and coordination in the planning and administration of the several phases of war mobilization. It is our view that the responsibility for the planning of production, manpower, civilian supply, and reconversion to peacetime production and employment should be unified in an over-all board of strategy which could guide and unify the basic policies of all agencies concerned.

We feel that the Maloney bill is a step in that direction. It is our considered judgment that, in the procurement and direction of production, the authority should rest in a requirements board in which the requirements of civilian supply would be given the full status of a claimant equal to that of the War Production Board and of other claimant agencies.

I trust that your committee will give cognizance to our support of the principles of S. 885, and will give full consideration to the foregoing views, which I submit on behalf of the American Federation of Labor.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTIONS OF ROTARY INTERNATIONAL ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH DISTRICT CONFERENCE—A FIFTH FREEDOM: ECONOMIC FREEDOM

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions together with an accompanying statement

of the Rotary International one hundred and ninety-sixth district conference at Boston, Mass., which, with the accompanying statement, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 3

Whereas the board of directors of Rotary International has recently issued a statement which said in part, "By word and deed Rotarians should continually present sound and effective arguments for the reestablishment of private enterprise when the war emergency ends"; and

Whereas it is clearly evident from the foregoing statement that Rotary International is cognizant of the fact that the reestablishment of private enterprise is a prime requisite in connection with any plans which are in the process of formulation toward a just and enduring peace settlement, and for the postwar reconstruction of the world; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1942, stated that we seek "everywhere in the world" the four old freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the consensus of opinion of the Rotarians of District No. 196, in conference assembled in Boston, Mass., this 20th day of April 1943, that a fifth freedom—namely, economic freedom, which does not mean going back to past abuses of such freedom—should be included with the four old freedoms as absolutely necessary and essential in connection with the restoration of peace throughout the world, and for the reestablishment of private enterprise in a new world order; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be, and they hereby are, ordered sent to the president and the board of directors of Rotary International, for their serious and thoughtful consideration with a view to the ideas expressed therein being incorporated in the program of Rotary International, and if such action be taken thereon, that such part of the program be communicated forthwith to the President of the United States, and to both branches of the Congress of the United States, and further than this to the heads of all the nations associated with the United States in the present war.

STATEMENT OF WALTER C. CONROY, CHAIRMAN OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, WHICH THE CONFERENCE VOTED BECOME AN APPENDIX TO THE RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE INCLUSION OF A FIFTH FREEDOM, NAMELY, ECONOMIC FREEDOM, WITH THE FOUR OLD FREEDOMS MENTIONED IN THE SAID RESOLUTIONS

I believe that Rotary International has its greatest opportunity right now for constructive service to mankind, by initiating at this time such steps as may be necessary to crystallize the public sentiment of the peoples of the world, on the fact that the reestablishment of private enterprise, with economic freedom as its basis, is of primary importance in connection with the post-war reconstruction of the world, and that plans to that end should be developed now in order that there may be no valuable time lost in righting the wheels of progress when the present World War ends.

It is urged that such plans be developed now without delay, together with other plans for the peace of the world, in order that liberty-loving people everywhere may feel assured that this war is not being fought in vain by the United Nations.

It is also urged in connection with such plans that a fifth freedom, namely, economic freedom, be added to the four old freedoms: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—enunciated to the world by the President of the United States on January 6, 1942.

That leads to the question as to what is economic freedom. I will endeavor to answer that question as briefly as I can. The best answer I can give briefly is to say that economic freedom is the kind of freedom which has led to the enormous growth of our own country's business and industrial structure and out of which has been realized the highest standard of living of any people in the world. When I give that answer I do so with a full realization that in that gigantic development of our industrial structure there were serious abuses of economic freedom by individuals and corporations, which have had to be remedied from time to time. But by and large up until recent years a very large measure of economic freedom was always retained by the individual, thereby enabling him to continue to use his own initiative freely, and as someone else has aptly stated it, "He was free to plan his own life, and free to dare in his own venture."

Economic freedom means freedom of business and industry from unnecessary Government regulation. Economic freedom would eliminate the dangers of Federal bureaucracy, which Wallace B. Dunham, dean, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, in a book published in 1932, describes as follows:

"Bureaucratic control over industry, no matter how set up, whether by Government or by private board authorized by law, would certainly destroy a large part of individual opportunity and tend to stratify our society into unprogressive castes."

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY TWELFTH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS AT BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LODGE also presented resolutions adopted at the Parker House, Boston, Mass., by the Twelfth Annual Encampment, Department of Massachusetts, of Jewish War Veterans of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. THE WAR AND OUR SERVICEMEN

1. We pledge to our President, as Commander in Chief, and to all our servicemen and servicewomen our complete and undivided support in the prosecution of the war and commend the loyalty, devotion, and effort of the American people in the present crisis.

2. We ask all the people to demonstrate the same service and sacrifice that is being evidenced by the service of our armed forces on the battle fronts of the world and to that end we believe:

(a) To win this total war, labor and industry, agriculture and government, and all civilians on the home front must make complete contributions and sacrifices.

(b) Persons, groups, and organizations must not be permitted to profit financially from this war and that war profits should be regulated and restricted.

(c) We condemn religious prejudices, racial or national antagonisms as weapons of our enemies.

3. Strengthen veteran preference laws of Federal and State Governments, and extend veteran preference to all positions where Federal or State funds are used in whole or in part.

4. For an adequate vocational rehabilitation training program.

5. We reaffirm our faith and confidence in the "four freedoms" for America, as well as for the rest of the world.

II. THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE JEW

6. We urge the Congress of the United States to find ways and means of mitigating the lot of the conquered peoples in Nazi-occupied lands, and protesting the barbarism of Nazi Germany in its announced plan of annihilating the Jews in occupied countries. We are grateful to the New Jersey State Legislature for adopting a memorial to Congress to that end.

7. Subject to the maintenance of national security, Great Britain should be asked to provide for receiving a reasonable quota of the victims escaping from Nazi-occupied territories and to provide for their accommodation for the duration.

8. We urge all the United Nations to modify such administrative regulations that now make immigration under the law extremely difficult and to endeavor under existing immigration law to find temporary havens of refuge for an agreed number of refugees.

III. FOR THE NATIONAL FRONT

9. For the preservation of our democracy and our American way of life, we should strengthen our Federal Bureau of Investigation, and we commend its untiring efforts in whittling down the subversive elements at the home front.

10. We commend the President of the United States and the Congress for their post-war planning and for the security of the veteran on his return home from the battlefields of the world, and to that end we ask the Congress of the United States to give careful study and consideration of the so-called cradle-to-the-grave message of our President.

11. That the postal laws be strengthened and enforced barring vicious, un-American literature from our mails.

12. We recommend the naming of a United States destroyer after Haym Salomon for his assistance to General Washington in the founding of our country.

IV. WINNING THE WAR AND WINNING THE PEACE

13. A united people, with a single purpose, standing steadfast with absolute confidence in the efficiency and might of our armed forces, and the valor and integrity of our allies, assures a spirit for victory which will win this titanic struggle for the survival of our way of life.

14. As a nation we are committed to a program, world-wide in scope, which means leadership is needed now as never before in world affairs. Our own future destiny as a free people depends on the kind of world order we build following the war. It is to our interest and the interest of posterity that the world be organized for peace and that we make our appropriate contribution toward such a world order. If this war is won and the peace is lost, the sacrifices will all have been in vain. Another generation will have to face another war on a vaster scale. We must highly resolve that those who die in this war shall not have died in vain. American public opinion must support the Government in winning the peace as well as the war. The responsibility rests upon every citizen who values his heritage of freedom and who wants his children to be free from war and fear of war.

15. We favor the establishment of a sound procedure and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations; to provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt of military aggression by any nation.

V. OUR OWN ORGANIZATION

16. We favor our so-called service membership and support our national commander's efforts to raise $100,000 in helping service members, in enlarging our organization, and to accommodate service members during and after the war.

17. We invite all men and women in uniform to come to us for aid, for legal and

other assistance as we may best render, and to them we offer our sincere desire to help them and extend to them our hands of friendship and of assistance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 364. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims; with an amendment (Rept. No. 208);

H. R. 328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska; with an amendment (Rept. No. 209);

H. R. 1896. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park; without amendment (Rept. No. 210); and

S. Res. 134. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to national monuments, national forests, Indian reservations, and national parks; with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 33. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical materials which are essential to the national defense; with amendments (Rept. No. 211).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 26, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; to the Committee on Claims

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1039 A bill for the relief of John Bloomenthal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1040. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved June 11, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 1041, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1042. A bill relating to the reduction of indebtedness of certain borrowers to the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1043, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1044. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to place the various States on an equal basis with respect to contributions of employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1045. A bill to grant certain persons an opportunity to ascertain whether or not they are physically qualified for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 1046. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1047. A bill to regulate the possession, control, maintenance, and use of carrier pigeons; and

S. 1048. A bill to require a witness seeking immunity from prosecution under certain acts to claim his privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1049 (by request). A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of M. E. Caferata and John Granata, of Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr BREWSTER:

S. 1051. A bill providing for the transfer of certain property from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Department of the Interior for national-park purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of the Missouri Telephone Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1053. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to John H. Worst for his services to the State of North Dakota and to the Nation for his contribution to agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to John H. Worst; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the taxation of capital without apportionment among the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

USE OF OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AS COLLATERAL FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce for proper reference a bill entitled "A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes." The bill involves a rather intricate question, so I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, and that an explanatory statement in reference to the bill also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1041) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1943" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1945."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bill is as follows:

IMPORTANCE OF AUTHORITY TO USE GOVERNMENT SECURITIES AS COLLATERAL FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The authority of the Board of Governors to permit the Federal Reserve banks to pledge direct obligations of the United States as collateral for Federal Reserve notes is indispensable to the fulfillment of Federal Reserve responsibilities in connection with prosecution of the war. At no time since Congress granted this power on a temporary basis in February 1932 has it been more essential to the effective functioning of the banking system. Then it was a matter of making it possible for the Board to ease credit conditions so as to encourage business recovery from a severe depression; now it is a matter of enabling the Federal Reserve System to perform its functions in helping to finance the war.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING RESERVES AND COLLATERAL

Under the terms of the Federal Reserve Act the Federal Reserve banks are required to hold a 40-percent reserve in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation, that is, against Federal Reserve notes that the Reserve banks have paid out to the public. They are also required to hold 100 percent collateral against Federal Reserve notes, although gold certificates used for collateral may also count as reserves.

The provision of the Glass-Steagall Act, which is at present under consideration for renewal, does not change the 40-percent reserve requirements in any way or reduce the amount of collateral required for Federal Reserve notes. It merely authorizes the inclusion of direct obligations of the Federal Government as a part of the collateral pledged against Federal Reserve notes. Previous to the enactment of this provision in 1932, only gold and eligible paper, which includes in addition to commercial and agricultural paper member-bank notes secured by United States Government securities, were acceptable as collateral.

The Federal Reserve banks must also hold a 35-percent reserve in gold certificates or lawful money against their deposits and a 5-percent redemption fund in gold certificates with the Treasurer of the United States for such Federal Reserve notes as are not covered by gold certificates.

THE USE OF DIRECT OBLIGATIONS AS COLLATERAL

At the time the Glass-Steagall provision was enacted, a terrible deflation was sweeping the country with devastating effects on our economic life. Banks were heavily in debt to the Reserve banks and were losing gold to foreign countries and currency to the American public, which was withdrawing its deposits from the banks. In these circumstances the Federal Reserve banks, even though they had $1,400,000,000 of gold in excess of legal reserve requirements, were unable adequately to assist the member banks by open-market operations, because a large part of this gold had to be held as collateral for Federal Reserve notes.

After Congress passed the Glass-Steagall Act on February 27, 1932, the Reserve banks

were enabled to engage more freely in open-market operations. Their open-market purchases greatly relieved the situation, contributed to monetary ease, and were a factor in assisting the recovery movement.

From May 28, 1938, until recently, the amount of gold certificates held by the Reserve banks and due from the Treasury was so much in excess of the amount of Federal Reserve notes outstanding that the Reserve banks were able to pledge gold certificates in lieu of direct obligations as collateral security without impairing their reserves against deposits or restricting necessary open-market operations.

As the result of the steady increase of money in circulation and of Federal Reserve bank deposits that has accompanied the rising volume of war activity, however, it has now become necessary for some of the Federal Reserve banks, in the discharge of their wartime obligations, to pledge direct Government obligations as part of their collateral for outstanding Federal Reserve notes. As of April 21, 1943, six Reserve banks had pledged a total of $525,000,000 of such securities. So long as this situation remains true only of some of the Reserve banks and not of the System as a whole, adjustments within the law will be possible, such as the sale of Government securities by one Federal Reserve bank to another or interbank borrowing; they would be burdensome, however, and would not be conducive to efficiency of service. But the time is now approaching when, in the absence of authority to use United States Government securities as collateral, the 12 Federal Reserve banks as a whole will be short of the collateral necessary to meet the growing demands of the war.

The position of the Reserve banks as a group with respect to gold certificates available for use as reserves and collateral in the absence of the authority to pledge Government obligations as collateral may be judged from the following figures derived from the combined condition statement of the 12 banks as of April 21, 1943:

	Millions of dollars
Gold certificates available as collateral [1]	15,713
Federal Reserve notes outstanding (also the amount of collateral required)	13,491
Eligible paper pledged as collateral	7
Gold certificates required for collateral if Government securities were ineligible	13,484
Excess of available collateral over requirements	2,229

[1] The figure for gold certificates available as collateral was obtained by deducting from total cash reserves ($20,669,512,000) the 35 percent reserves required for deposits ($4,956,699,300). Since practically all the Federal Reserve notes would be secured by gold certificates, requirements for the redemption fund would be negligible.

Were it not for the authority to pledge Government obligations as collateral for Federal Reserve notes, the Federal Reserve banks would have a margin of only 2.2 billion dollars with which to meet the expanding need for gold certificates that will arise both from the growth of deposits and from the expansion of note circulation. Currency in circulation has been expanding at a rate of $400,000,000 a month and may be expected to continue to expand in response to increasing military and industrial activity. The amount of eligible paper available for collateral is so small that virtually all the 100 percent of collateral would have to consist of gold certificates. If Government securities could not be used as collateral, the margin of 2.2 billion dollars would soon be exhausted by additional currency requirements alone. Some of this margin will be needed also to meet expansion in the Reserve banks' requirements for reserves against their deposits, which will increase as holdings of United States Government obligations increase.

The Federal Reserve authorities have undertaken to see that member banks have reserves which will be adequate for the necessary private and governmental war financing that is required of them Although they are vigorously cooperating with the Treasury's efforts to finance Government war borrowing with as little recourse as possible to the banking system, the Federal Reserve authorities have the responsibility to keep member banks in a position to furnish such credit as the Treasury may require of them. The Reserve banks, therefore, must from time to time make substantial purchases of Government securities in the open market or otherwise. These purchases result in additions to member-bank deposits, in their reserve requirements, and in their reserve balances with the Reserve banks. Against these balances the Reserve banks must hold 35 percent reserves.

In view of the double demands on Reserve banks for collateral against rapidly expanding Federal Reserve note circulation and for reserves against a growing volume of deposits, the margin of 2.2 billion dollars of available gold certificates would be too narrow to permit these banks to discharge their wartime obligations. It is for this reason that the Board of Governors urges the renewal of the power to use Government securities as collateral for Federal Reserve notes.

DISCRIMINATION IN ENLISTMENT OF NAVY WOMEN'S RESERVE.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the organization known as the "WAVES," and I wish to make a short statement regarding the bill.

Investigation discloses that up to the present time no colored girls have been accepted for appointment or enlistment as members of the Women's Reserve of the United States Naval Reserve, commonly known as the WAVES. The WAAC has accepted colored girls, and is accepting them now. Under the law creating both the WAAC and WAVES, colored girls are eligible and colored girls have been accepted in the WAAC, but not in the WAVES, and the bill I am introducing would put an end to discrimination against colored girls on the part of those administering the WAVES.

I wish to add that scores of colored girls are anxious to enlist in the WAVES, and it is hard for them to comprehend why they have been barred. With the WAAC's and the WAVES fighting for the four freedoms all over the world, how strange it is that there should be the necessity here in the United States for a bill of this character.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1043) to prohibit discrimination because of race or color in the appointment and enlistment of members of the Women's Reserve of the United States Naval Reserve was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOLMAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 55, after line 19, insert:

"Emergency forest fire control: For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with the various States, to intensify and augment forest fire prevention and suppression measures in critical areas on National Forest, State, county, municipal, or private lands, including the operation and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, necessary fire prevention printing without regard to Section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed $25,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $7,829,490: *Provided*, That in cooperating with a State the Secretary of Agriculture may advance funds from this appropriation to such State for expenditure by the State in carrying out said forest fire prevention and suppression measures, subject to the requirement that the State shall render accounting therefor as the Secretary of Agriculture may require and shall refund to the United States any of said funds remaining unexpended at the close of the fiscal year"; and

On page 60, line 1, strike out "$2,492,210" and insert "$4,000,000."

WAR IN THE PACIFIC—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHANDLER

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the war in the Pacific, delivered by Senator CHANDLER on April 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEATERS OF WAR AND THE BATTLE AGAINST WARS—ADDRESS BY CHESTER H. SMITH

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Theaters of War—the Battle Against Wars" delivered by Chester H. Smith, professor of law at the University of Arizona, April 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIZE ORATIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL ORATORICAL CONTEST

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the prize oration of John F. Monroe, Jr., of Milwaukee, Wis., and the prize oration by James J. Rathbun, of Webster, S. Dak., in the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Oratorical Contest, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Hull's False Start," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of April 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARMER—POEM BY BARBARA WHITNEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "The Farmer," written by Mrs. Barbara Whitney, of Washington, D. C., and published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR WITH JAPAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from James R. Young of Hollywood, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PRODUCTION—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "Manufacture of Synthetic Rubber From Grain Might Have Avoided Current Priorities Row," which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL WORK BY PENSIONERS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pensioners May Work in Agriculture," published in the General Welfare News-Advocate of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE—EDITORIAL BY JOHN BORG

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Fortunes and Our Sacred Honor," written by John Borg and published in the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

RACE AND RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS — ARTICLE BY WILLIAM A. CALDWELL

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by William A. Caldwell and published in the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of Berkeley, Calif., member of the California State Board of Agriculture, and two quotations accompanying the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE SILVER PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Silver Senators May Be Due Vote of Thanks," written by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR IN THE PACIFIC—COMMENT BY EARL GODWIN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD radio comment by Earl Godwin on the address by Senator CHANDLER in the Senate relating to the war in the Pacific, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST EASTER SERVICE ON THE CAPITOL STEPS—POEM BY H. C. CARLISLE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "First Easter Service on the Capitol Steps," by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS — EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Facts To Be Faced," from the Wall Street Journal of April 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRAINING OF GIRLS FOR WAR PRODUCTION BY NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the activities of the National Youth Administration in training girls for war production, written by Pearl Strachan and published in the Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine Section, April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLISH QUESTION

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Again the Polish Question" published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 796, which is a bill to provide authority for the Government to take over and operate, until they can be returned to their owners, any plants in which strikes or labor disturbances impede or delay the production of any articles necessary for the national defense. As I understand, the motion is not debatable. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass on the Senate, but I desire to point out that Senate bill 796 was reported by the Judiciary Committee by a practically unanimous vote. A similar bill was passed by the Senate in 1941 as an amendment to the draft act, but the House refused to concur, and therefore the bill was not enacted. It passed the Senate by a vote of 67 to 7 originally. It has been revised and improved after careful study, and after exhaustive hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill provides that whenever production in a war-labor plant or a mine is held up by a labor strike or jurisdictional dispute, the Government may step in, take possession, and operate such plant or mine until it can be returned to its owners, and the direction of the bill is that it must be so returned as soon as it can be successfully operated in the national defense.

Mr. President, in April 1942, I had pending a motion that the Senate consider this bill. At that time the President of the United States was negotiating with William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., and John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, with reference to a no-strike agreement for the duration of the war. The President had a program of seven points he was then working out, and upon his personal request the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill was not pressed, because it was hoped that the no-strike agreement, and the other points in the President's program, would meet the situation.

Because of lack of time I cannot go into any detailed discussion of this matter, but I hold in my hand the report of the hearings before the Truman Committee at which Mr. John L. Lewis, of the miners' organization, appeared and testified that he was a party to the no-strike agreement and yet that he did not regard it as necessarily binding. He took the position that if he thought in any case that the War Labor Board did not do equity, then the agreement was not binding and that he was under no compulsion and no obligation whatever to observe it. Later in the debate, when the bill comes before the Senate, I shall be glad to point out in particular the whole situation.

Mr. President, in the United States the time has come to determine whether or not the Government of the United States, and its boards and agencies set up specifically for determining labor disputes, shall rule. The question is, Is the Government of the United States to conduct the national defense and to control production, or is a dictator to defy, and, with contempt, override and overrule the constituted authorities of this Government?

The people of the United States are looking to the Congress to put into the hands of the Executive the necessary power and authority to make their will known, and to make the interest of the American people paramount in the tragic era in which we now live.

Mr. MEAD and Mr. MCNARY addressed the chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. Those in favor——

Mr. MCNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCNARY. I do not intend to address myself to the provisions of the bill, but to the parliamentary situation, which I have a right to do.

When the motion was made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Texas, it occurred to me that the bill referred to was a very important measure, which probably would intimately affect our social and economic structure, and should be considered by the full membership of the Senate.

I supported this measure when it was before the Senate in June 1941, and I see no reason for changing my course of action when the time shall come to cast my vote. Without discussing the merits of the bill, however, in view of the absence of the distinguished leader of the majority, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and some other Members of the Senate who may have left the city because of colloquies which have taken place in the Senate, I have no objection to the motion that the bill be made the unfinished business, provided it is agreed that it shall not come up before Monday of next week.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I realize the force of the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon. I regret that the majority leader is not present, and that he is suffering from an illness. The Senator from Oregon and other Senators will recall, however, that some days ago the Senator from Kentucky indicated in the RECORD that he would have no objection to my securing consideration of this bill at an early date. Certainly I should much prefer that the Senate proceed at once to its consideration; but if the Senate will make it the pending business and proceed to its consideration, I shall not object to a vote on the bill, or further action, going over to Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the point of order has been practically covered by my observations. I stated a moment ago that while no motion is debatable between the hours of 12 and 2 o'clock, when the Senate reconvenes after an adjournment, any parliamentary question may be raised at any time, so long as the Senator who raises it does not discuss the provisions or merits or objectives of the bill. I have confined myself particularly and solely to questioning the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] if he would not permit the bill to go over until Monday. Therefore I was within my rights so far as parliamentary procedure is concerned.

I am willing, Mr. President, of course, that the bill be made the unfinished business provided its consideration shall go over until Monday of next week.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to make a point of order?

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I wish to ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes, as did the proponent of the bill, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I wish to speak in opposition to taking up the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the reason I think the bill should not be made the order of business is that it purports to deal with the mine situation, but, in my opinion, it does not deal with the mine situation now prevailing. The only penalty it proposes is that the President shall have the right to seize the mines. So far as we know John L. Lewis wants the President to seize the mines. Seizure of the mines would constitute no penalty applied to persons who direct any opposition against the ruling of the National War Labor Board. If we are going to deal with that situation we should provide remedies against labor as well as against capital.

In the second place, the bill provides that after the mines or the plants are taken over, a new board shall be established to fix wages, to supersede the National War Labor Board, which has general jurisdiction. The bill was prepared at a time when there was no National War Labor Board, and that question did not arise at all. In other words, Mr. President, the bill does not suit present conditions, nor does it deal with the present emergency situation, and I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate were put on record on the John L. Lewis situation by the action which it may or may not have to take on this particular bill.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be very unwise to make this bill the general order of business. If we are going to deal with the mine situation, a comprehensive bill should be drafted to deal with that situation, and one directed toward the emergency we have to meet.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Holman	Reynolds
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Burton	Lodge	Shipstead
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Gillette	Nye	Wilson
Green	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on official business for the Government.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committe to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business as a member of the Senate committee to investigate production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Will the Senator from Texas restate his motion?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the motion is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 796. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] expressed willingness that the motion be agreed to, provided that action on the bill were deferred until Monday. I prefer, of course, to go on with it now, but I accede to his suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry? The motion is not debatable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I merely wish to make an inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Colorado continuing?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator has not specified any definite time. He might speak all day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to make a brief statement before the motion is voted upon. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. About 10 days or 2 weeks ago I moved to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 675. At that time the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was not present, and I was asked to let the bill go over until he returned on last Monday. On that day I again moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill, and there was objection to considering it at that time. I was asked to postpone the motion until next Monday. I agreed.

Now I see that my bill is to be displaced. I realize that the bill in which the Senator from Texas is interested is of extreme importance and great current interest. The measure which I had in mind is not that kind of a measure. It is of interest, but it is not of great current interest, and it could very well be set aside. I merely wish to make the record clear, that it was the understanding in the Senate that Senate bill 675 was to come up on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of

the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], which was made on the 22d instant, to strike out sections 2 and 3 of Senate bill 796.

PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE, 1919

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, 2 or 3 years ago I made inquiry in the Senate regarding the publication of the documents in connection with the 1919 Paris peace conference. Today events in the world are beginning closely to parallel those of 25 years ago, and I think it becomes of increasing importance that the publication of documents indicating the activities of representatives of the various governments which participated in the Paris peace conference of 1919 should not be interrupted.

I have before me a letter from Dr. Herbert Wright, who has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 13 years. For the past 10 years he has been chairman of the committee on publications of the Department of State of the American Society of International Law. This society includes among its members all individuals of consequence in the United States who are interested in the promotion of international law. One of its vice presidents is our distinguished colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Among its vice presidents and former presidents are Hon. Charles Evans Hughes and Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Dr. Herbert Wright was editor for the American delegation to the London Naval Conference of 1930, and special lecturer at the United States Naval Academy postgraduate school in 1936 and 1937.

I consider it of primary importance that at this time we understand clearly what went on at the Paris peace conference, because we must soon face—at least I hope we shall soon face—the necessity of settling many of the vexatious problems which confront the civilized world.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Dr. Wright to me, dated April 26, 1943, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1943.*

The Honorable HOMER T. BONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BONE: You will perhaps remember that in the early part of June last year I wrote you a letter, in which I reminded you that about 5 years previously you had somewhat impatiently asked on the floor of the Senate, "When is the Department of State going to publish the 1919 Paris Peace Conference documents?" and that you had pointed to the fact that other nations were printing portions of these documents which amounted to ex parte defenses of their activities at that conference, whereas the United States was exceedingly slow in publishing the records of the conference giving the complete picture of the conference and the role played by the United States therein.

As a result of your own interest and the interest of many others in the publication of these important documents, the Congress authorized and the Department of State embarked upon their publication and has made considerable progress. Volumes I and II, covering the period between the signing of the armistice and the first meeting of the Council of Ten, were published during the past year. Volumes III–X will cover the minutes of the Plenary Sessions of the conference, the Council of Ten, the Council of Four, the American Commissioners Plenipotentiary and documents concerning the activities of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. Of these eight volumes, volumes III and IV are now in page proof; volumes V, VI, part of VII, and all of VIII are in galley proof; the manuscript of volume IX is in the hands of the printer; and the material for volume X has been compiled and is being edited. Some work has also been done in the compilation of volume XI and following volumes.

But now its continuance, as well as the continuance of the publication of the regular volumes of Foreign Relations, has been jeopardized, in my opinion, by the action of the House Committee on Appropriations (which was left unchanged by the House itself) in reducing the item for printing and binding in the Department of State in H. R. 2397 from $288,000 (the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget) to $248,000. This item has always been very modest. In fact, almost 2 hours of the single-day meeting of the American Society of International Law last April were devoted to a discussion of the importance of the publications of the Department, in the course of which several members of the society criticized me, as chairman of their committee on publications of the Department of State, for not requesting a more expanded publication program. I defended myself on the ground that, however desirable and useful an expanded publication program might be in itself, nevertheless during the war we should ask for only those publications which we considered indispensable, even from the standpoint of economy.

It is true that the total allowed by the House for this item is still a little higher than the amount last year, but the increase allowed is chiefly for printed supplies and forms and for the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals (the so-called blacklist) which is printed every 6 months, with monthly supplements. The House committee, however, "denied the Department's request for $40,000 for the printing of three volumes of Foreign Relations for 1931 and four volumes of the 1919 Paris Peace Conference volumes. Although recognizing the need for these publications, the committee is of the belief that this expense might well be deferred until after the war." (Report No. 343, p. 6.)

But is this really an expense which "might well be deferred"? If your complaint was justified in 1938, and no one seriously doubts that it was amply justified, it would be doubly justified now, when we are engaged in another catastrophic world conflict with the prospect of many of the same problems arising in the peace conference that is bound to come. How are we to avoid the pitfalls of the Paris Peace Conference, which many, rightly or wrongly, believe left the way open for the outbreak of the present war, unless we know exactly what transpired there, unless we know precisely the role played by the delegates of each nation participating in that Conference? The documents and records of that Conference should prove of inestimable value in the conference to come. But if they are to be available then, their publication must not be interrupted now.

The importance of the publication of the proceedings of the Paris Peace Conference at this time cannot be stressed too strongly, since world events are manifesting a close parallel to those of 25 years ago. When one considers that even now numerous agencies, both official and private (including the George committee in the Senate), are engaged in considering peace aims and post-war reconstruction, the bearing of this publication now on a just and effective solution of the problems is obvious. The compilation and publication of these volumes are at best time-consuming jobs and, while commendable progress is being made by the Department's Division of Research and Publication, now is the time to push this program even more vigorously, if the volumes are to be of maximum utility in the present post-war planning and the peace conference that is to come.

With regard to the regular Foreign Relations volumes, may I respectfully point out that, inaugurated in 1861, they have weathered the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and even the World War. At present, through no fault of the Department of State, there is a 15-year gap between the date of the published volumes and the date of the documents contained therein. The Department, under constant urgings of the Congress, has been making every effort to cut down this gap. Three 1928 volumes have just appeared and there is good prospect that three 1929 volumes will also appear during the present calendar year, thus cutting down the gap to 14 years. A suspension now would aggravate a situation now in process of being corrected. The specific volumes upon which the House cut would fall would be those for the year 1931, containing the important and illuminating documents relevant to Japan's embarkation upon her imperialistic spree.

Resolutions in urgent support of the above publication program of the Department of State have been adopted in recent years by the following scientific and professional organizations, in the interest of making the public more reliably informed of their Government's activities in international affairs and the reasons therefor: American Bar Association, American Branch of the International Law Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, American Society of International Law, Conference of Teachers of International Law and Related Subjects. Copies of these resolutions will be furnished upon request.

If the Government desires to retain the confidence of the people of the United States in the battle for the survival of democracy, surely now is not the time to take any steps that could justly be considered as a suppression of the record of its activities in the international field or as a reversion to the extremes of secret diplomacy. Therefore, as chairman of the Committee on Publications of the Department of State of the American Society of International Law, may I respectfully request that the item of $40,000 for Foreign Relations which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget be restored by the Senate.

Any substantiation or amplification of the above points which you might desire will be cheerfully furnished upon request. For your information, may I identify the other members of our committee: Prof. Kenneth W. Colegrove, Northwestern University; Prof. Walter H. E. Jaeger, Georgetown University School of Law; Prof. Philip C. Jessup, Columbia University; Prof. Charles E. Martin, University of Washington; Mr. George Rublee, lawyer; Mr. Stanley C. Smith, lawyer; Prof. Graham H. Stuart, Stanford University; Mr. Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States; and Mr. Lester H. Woolsey, former solicitor of the Department of State. The undersigned has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 13 years. Copies of our annual reports for 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942 are sent herewith for your convenience.

The above information has been communicated to Senator MCCARRAN and Representative RABAUT, who doubtless will be members

of the conference committee on H. R. 2397, but I would appreciate it if you would have this letter inserted in the RECORD during the morning hour, so that it may be made available to all of the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

Very respectfully,

HERBERT WRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Publications of the Department of State, American Society of International Law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to observe with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Washington in connection with the publication of the reports of the Paris peace-treaty meeting, that that very matter is now before the Committee on Appropriations, and I am hopeful that sufficient money will be appropriated to continue the publication.

Mr. BONE. I hope the Senator from Nevada will be successful in that venture.

ABSENTEEISM IN WAR PRODUCTION PLANTS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a result of my experience in the investigation of war-production plants as a member of the Truman committee, I have been able to make a study of the subject of absenteeism.

For the past few months the subject of absenteeism in our war-production plants has occupied important news space in our home-front news. The emphasis now placed upon the subject, which has been a problem of long standing in industrial operations, coupled with the rather obvious attempts to point the finger of blame at labor, prompts some reasonable doubt as to whether patriotism or prejudice—at least in some cases—motivates a great deal of the present talk about absenteeism.

Mr. President, we must bear in mind that many war plants are working overtime, and we must likewise bear in mind that a number of war-production plants are closing down to a workweek as limited as 4 days a week. In those instances the employees are clamoring for a longer workweek. We know from observation that on the railroads men are doubling up to the extent of 84 hours a week because the work is there, and because it is available for them, and because they realize they are making a direct contribution to the war effort.

From discussions here and in the press, readers at times might well get the impression that millions of workers in our industrial army are loafing, lagging, and liquoring; that they are lying down on the job of supplying our boys at the fighting fronts the arms and the equipment which they so desperately need, and that they are living generally in affluent idleness due to exorbitant wages and short hours. That such statements or implications are false is readily revealed by the records of attendance and of wages in thousands of our war-production plants.

Let us not forget that absentees did not produce one and one-half million dead tons of merchant ships delivered in February 1943. (Source: Victory, March 10, 1943, issue.)

Bear in mind that absentees did not produce the 5,500 planes turned out in the month of February 1943. (Source: Assistant Secretary of War Patterson, March 4, 1943.) Or 7,000, according to Donald Nelson, in April.

Let us remember that absentees did not produce the 70,000 half-ton aircraft bombs supplied by our war plants in the month of January of this year. (Source: Mr. Patterson, March 4, 1943.)

Absentees did not produce 26,000 units of machine tools turned out in the month of January of this year, of a value of $117,000,000. (O. W. I. release of March 8, 1943.)

Absentees did not handle 65,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight moved in November 1942, as compared with 51,000,000,000 tons moved during the previous November.

Absentees did not achieve the record of the present war production rate of $6,000,000,000 a month as compared with $2,000,000,000 a month only a year ago.

In a yesterday's newspaper, Mr. President, I read that the warplane production for this year will approximate 100,000 planes, or that the production of planes in America will exceed the combined production of all the remainder of the world.

These things, Mr. President, were accomplished through the sweat, energy, patriotism, and loyalty of millions of men and women who toil, and who have not wasted their time in indolence, idleness, or for frivolous purposes. They offer the best proof to the soldiers, sailors, and marines in the fighting service that their parents, their brothers, and their sisters on the industrial front at home are not loafers, work slackers, or duty dodgers.

I would not, of course, keep from our citizens, in or out of the service, factual information about important defects or omissions in our production program. There are a number of these, but I maintain that the broadcasting of distorted stories of wholesale shirking, and wage greed on the part of industrial workers on the home front, is a sure way by which to impair the morale of our fighting forces on the battle fronts, and to dishearten our army of war workers on the home front.

Amazing, Mr. President, as our war production is, unquestionably it could be better. We have not yet made the fullest possible use of our men, our machines, or our material. There are still maladjustments to be corrected in the supply and distribution of materials. There is still considerable jockeying for post-war competitive advantage on the part of management. There remains still too much bickering and contention by certain groups within organized labor. A great deal has been done and is being done to rectify, to improve, or to eliminate these draglines on production.

Without question there is a definite problem of absenteeism in this country. It is not a new problem, but in view of the urgency of our war needs, it has a far greater significance than heretofore. That is precisely why, until recent months, only a scattered few of the 90,000 plants now working on war orders kept any records whatsoever of absenteeism, or made any specific attempts to analyze the causes, and correct them.

That management is fast becoming aware of the problem of absenteeism, and, in some instances, at least, taking intelligent action, is revealed by several hundred reports which I have recently examined. These data, incidentally, are not surveys which express the ideas or notions of a researcher, but are the frank opinions and realistic experiences of management officials who deal face to face with personnel relations in our war industries. Though coming from widely separated and varying industrial operations and though influenced by greatly differing local conditions, these comments, nevertheless, show an astounding degree of uniformity of opinion, both in respect to the cause and in the approach toward correction of the absentee nuisance. An analysis of these plant reports sheds a great deal of light upon this subject. Standing out prominently are these facts:

First. The single greatest cause of absenteeism is sickness, either of the worker or in his family.

Second. Accidental and occupational disabilities, including those incurred off the job, constitute a major cause of the absenteeism. Because of its importance I shall later mention this phase of the question.

Third. It is revealed that transportation difficulties, fatigue due to speed-up and long hours, inadequate and improper food, awkward shift arrangements, lack of recreational facilities, and unavailability of medical service, are among the more common contributory factors.

Fourth. Finally, it appears without question that the absentee rate among women employees is generally higher than that of men, and this is rather logically attributed to the fact that women, and particularly married women, have greater home responsibilities and obligations requiring more frequent absences from work. The rationing of foodstuffs and the point system have something to do with that particular type of absenteeism. It is sometimes necessary for women to make journeys quite distant from home and at hours inconvenient to them in order that they may be able to keep the home larder at least fairly adequately supplied.

So often in recent weeks, Mr. President, have we been regaled with stories about Monday-morning hang-overs of war workers that it comes as something of a surprise that none of these informers thought this as of sufficient importance to make note of it as a serious factor in absenteeism. I may point out that among the reports analyzed were reports from shipyards, aircraft plants, steel fabricators, and practically every important industrial classification, and in many instances the mention of Monday-morning hang-overs was left entirely out.

Most significant and revealing is the complete agreement among these practical observers that the remedy—or at least the most effective treatment—for the absentee affliction lies largely in local cooperation efforts of management and employees.

Now, as to the important question, "What is the extent of absenteeism?" no one at this time has the answer, and for several good reasons. First, as I have already pointed out, it is only within the past few months that our industrialists have to any appreciable extent attempted to assemble absentee records, and thousands of the war contract plants still have no absentee records of any kind. In the second place, there is still no commonly accepted definition of the term itself, and the reports which I have examined show many varied interpretations and methods of recording absenteeism. However, those industries having the longest experience in analyzing the problem usually classify as absent any worker who, for any reason, fails to appear upon a scheduled shift. This, of course, includes sickness, disability from accidents on or off the job, personal reasons, transportation difficulties, and so forth. The absentee rate, therefore, in the most widely accepted view is the total actual attendance of employees on the pay roll in relation to the total possible attendance.

We have heard much about 10-percent absenteeism in aircraft and other war plants. Of the numerous records I have seen, including several aircraft and shipbuilding, not one reported greater than 6-percent absenteeism, and an overall average did not exceed 4 percent or 4½ percent. It is the opinion of most persons with industrial experience that this represents approximately the normal peacetime absenteeism. It is true that in one or two instances the reports indicated that a year ago the absentee rate had been as high as 10 percent, but, by dint of serious attention to the problem and by setting up suitable control measures, the percentage was reduced below 5 percent. From this direct evidence I am wholly convinced that if any plant today suffers a 10-percent absentee rate, it is due largely to management failure. This failure may not be conscious negligence, and, as a matter of fact, in most instances, probably is due to lack of knowledge and information as to what can be done and how to go about it.

Mr. President, it seemed to me and to many others that the recent analysis of the absentee problem by the Secretary of Labor in her testimony before a congressional committee was eminently sound and comprehensive. Moreover, the Secretary pointed out a simple, realistic program for the solution or alleviation of the absentee problem. Practically every experienced industrialist who has spoken on this subject agrees with the Secretary of Labor that absenteeism cannot be corrected by "work or fight" slogans, by legislative enactments, or by Executive mandates. Practically all agree that it is essentially a personnel-management problem, and not a policing or legislative job. Nevertheless, the Government definitely does have a responsibility in the matter, and, unfortunately, has not met it in a constructive way. When the Department of Labor recently presented to the House Appropriations Committee a practical plan whereby concrete and effective service could be supplied to thousands of war contractors in correcting absentee causes, and asked for a modest budget to carry on the program, an appropriation was not forthcoming. I regret to say that a subsequent request to the Senate committee again met a similar fate. If the Government itself, which has most to lose through production interruption, continues in this fashion to ignore its responsibility and to reject opportunities for constructive contributions to the problem of absenteeism, we cannot expect an early solution. Certainly we will not find a solution in outbursts against labor, in denouncement of labor laws, and the revival of time-worn appeals for individualism, whatever that may mean.

The matter of Government responsibility brings up again one of the major causes of absenteeism, namely, industrial accidents. In 1941 deaths and disabling injuries through work accidents caused the almost unbelievably staggering time loss of 250,000,000 man-days. Although the accident score for 1942 has not been completely tabulated, it is now estimated that accident deaths increased 7 percent and the number of fatal work injuries 14 percent. Here is real absenteeism. More than 19,000 American workers will be absent from their jobs forever. Fully half of the 100,000 permanently crippled workers will never return to full production jobs. One and a half million workers who sustained temporary injuries were absent from work for an average period of 16 days each. Experienced industrial engineers generally assert that from 90 to 95 percent of these accidents could have been prevented. In view of this, the Government, and particularly the Congress, cannot escape a share of responsibility for this colossal time loss.

Although well fortified by proof of an effective accident-prevention program through direct service to war industries, the request of the United States Department of Labor for 2 successive years for sufficient funds to combat this scourge has met with only a fraction of the needed appropriation. Last year, the insignificant sum of $150,000 was allotted to carry directly to war plants, numbering many thousands scattered over the entire United States, the tested knowledge and techniques of accident prevention by which to keep men and women on the job and out of the hospitals and funeral homes. In the same period, considerably more than $2,000,000 was granted by the Congress in 1942 to control insects. It appears that our fight against grasshoppers and the Mormon cricket alone cost in excess of a million dollars, or eight times the amount supplied by the Government to wage a battle against work accidents, constituting one of the two major menaces to war production. (See p. 13, first deficiency appropriation bill, H. Rept., No. 170, Feb. 24, 1943.) According to the House report, estimated losses to crops from grasshoppers last season totaled $14,000,000. According to the National Safety Council's estimate, the direct money loss from work accidents in 1942 was $900,000,000, to say nothing of the human suffering involved and the still greater tragedy of millions of production days squandered—precious time that cannot be evaluated in terms of money.

Labor, of course, cannot escape a measure of responsibility for absenteeism both in terms of organization leadership and the individual worker. Insofar as organized labor is concerned, the facts will show that whenever management has in good faith requested aid of labor through accredited group representation or through plant labor-management committees, the assistance has been forthcoming in every instance. There is plenty of evidence growing out of recent experience showing that an organized labor unit in a plant is one of the most potent instruments in combating avoidable absenteeism.

It is apparent, however, that a powerful minority group within management still harbors the hope of wiping out the whole framework of labor legislation fabricated by the present administration. It would do this first by discrediting organized labor, and then by attempting to show that labor laws and regulations impede war production. That is what actually prompts all this nostalgic talk about a return to the old-fashioned individualism and "those good old days" when every worker's wage reflected merely the employer's bounty instead of collective bargaining agreement. Like many thousands of Americans I hold great admiration for individuals who perform heroic feats on the field of battle. The exploits of Captain Eddie Rickenbacker in the First World War have long been a source of national pride. It is therefore with keen regret that one observes his championship of the old deal in labor relations. It would seem that this great ace of the air has, unwittingly perhaps, become an ace up the sleeve of labor baiters whose object is to slip the knave card to organized labor as responsible for absenteeism, slow down, and wage profiteering in war production. In the effective utilization of her battle heroes to stimulate workers on the industrial front, England has given us an example worth emulating. There, soldiers from the front are sent into the war plants to inspire and encourage workers to greater effort, but they do this through a realistic portrayal of the need for and use for fighting equipment; of the intimate relationship of every individual employee to the battle front, and, through emphasis upon each worker's importance, to a nation in peril. It is significant that in this psychological approach England's heroes do not indulge in tirades against unionism, against labor laws, and against social reforms, all of which are well represented in Great Britain, and all essential features of which are maintained under war conditions.

Under the exigencies of war the Government has the right to expect the utmost effort of every able-bodied worker on essential production. There should be no coddling of individuals or groups among workers or among management.

At the same time, let us not seriously accept for one minute the grotesque idea that pillorying of labor unions, the abandonment of labor laws and regulations, and the abolishment of social security, will speed the day when our sons and brothers can be brought back from the horrible exposures and experiences of war. What will surely delay that hour is the continued persistent efforts to discredit labor and everything that is done in its behalf, for there can be no better way to spread discouragement, discontent and dismay among the millions of men and women on our industrial home front.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree in general with what the Senator from New York has said, but I believe the Senator might be incorrect insofar as Captain Rickenbacker is concerned. As I understand the attitude of Captain Rickenbacker, he is not a labor baiter, but is a friend of labor. What he objects to is what I should object to as a friend of labor, that is, I would not criticize labor on account of absenteeism when criticism is not justified; I would not criticize the laws which Congress has passed for the benefit of labor; but labor cannot before any American, whether he be in the armed forces or in private enterprise, labor cannot before the American public, which is patriotic and is willing to go the limit to win the war, justify insistence on the part of some labor leaders that it is necessary for one to belong to one particular group of laborers or another group of laborers before he can work in a war factory.

In order to make myself clearer, an Army air base is being constructed, for which all the taxpayers are paying their proportionate share. Still, the son or the brother of someone from my State who was captured by the Japanese cannot work in that factory unless he belongs to a particular labor group. I think that is unfair under our way of living. I wish to see preserved all the gains labor has made legitimately; I desire to protect labor in every instance; but I do not think labor is fair in the particular to which I have referred, and that is what is bringing about the complaints.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, Mr. President, the character of my dissertation today was one which embraced the subject of absenteeism. Our distinguished colleague brings up the subject of the attitude of labor leaders, which is a matter other than that which I was discussing in my remarks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. MEAD. If I may proceed, I do not know where the tragic incident to which the Senator refers occurred; but we are going into other fields. For instance, labor was indicted for refusing to unload ships in the south Pacific, and Admiral Halsey was quick to make an emphatic denial of the indictment, and to say that it was made out of the whole cloth. We know that a letter was circulated about the country regarding a soldier on Guadalcanal writing to the employees in an airplane factory, and that letter was read to us here. The letter afterward was proved to be a fake; yet it was circulated all over the United States. I am merely pointing out now that there have been many indictments brought against labor, and, as I pointed out, psychologically that is not the way the subject is treated in England.

There is hardly a family man, a father, in the war plants of America, who has not a stake in our armed effort; who has not a son or a daughter or some close relative in the service; and who is not just as much interested as is anyone else.

With reference to the World War ace whom my distinguished colleague has mentioned, I can only say that having been adrift on a raft with a man who carried a card in a labor organization, I am told, he would have done better had he come home and worked with labor rather than criticized labor. From the story which comes to us of the meetings he has attended and the very nature of the speeches he has made, it appears to me, and it appears generally to those friendly to labor outside the Congress, that Captain Rickenbacker went out of his way to lay the burden of the criticism on labor, and it was unfortunate that he approached the matter in that manner. That is my opinion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My idea is not to criticize labor. As I stated, the only thing that counts is the record, and I am willing to put my record in regard to legislation beneficial to labor against that of any other Senator in this body. However, I still insist that the main thing to be considered is the American interest, pure and simple, and I do not think I can be called unfriendly to labor because I insist that once in a while labor leaders make mistakes.

Mr. MEAD. As one familiar with the record of my distinguished colleague, I can perhaps with greater emphasis than he has employed say that he has been a true friend of labor, and that his advocacy of reform has been consistently on the side of labor. We merely disagree, perhaps, in the approach taken by the distinguished ace mentioned, which is unfortunate, in my judgment, and that has been brought out because in many instances labor has refused to attend his meetings, and in other instances where he addressed legislative bodies a controversy has developed because of his apparent unfriendliness. I merely say it was unfortunate that he did not approach the question as it is handled by the heroes in England, who have returned to pay tribute to labor, justifiable tribute, and at the same time to exhort labor to greater efforts. That has paid dividends there, and it would pay dividends here. I merely regret Captain Rickenbacker's approach.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have no desire to comment on the speech of the very able Senator from New York, except to call attention to an editorial appearing in a newspaper published in my city, the Tacoma News-Tribune, the issue of Monday, January 4, 1943. It is headed "Shipyard Patriotism." The editorial describes a survey which had been made a short time prior to its being written. The editor says that the survey should remove one of the misconceptions popular in some circles, namely, that everyone working in a shipyard or war industry is there for a pecuniary reason. The survey covers the Seattle-Tacoma shipyard, so-called. It indicates that almost every employee working in the Seattle-Tacoma shipyard on the tide flats has at least 1 relative in the armed services of the Nation; that 1 out of every 10 employees has a son in the armed forces and at least 1 out of every 4 has a brother there.

The results of the survey reveal that the Seattle-Tacoma shipyard employees have 25,181 relatives in the armed forces, of whom 22,823 are in military service, including 2,002 sons, 5,190 brothers, 160 fathers, mothers, or sisters, 15,471 uncles, aunts, and close relatives.

There are approximately 4,500 shipfitters in the Seattle-Tacoma yard. The survey shows that 3,240 of them have relatives serving in the Army, Navy, and marines, with a total of 5,828 in all the various branches of the service.

The survey shows that among approximately 3,132 welders, there were 101 who had children in active military service and 956 who had brothers there.

Among the 1,366 sheet-metal workers there were listed 201 with children in active military service and 406 with brothers in the service, with a complete survey total for this group of 2,012 relatives in the armed services and other defense units. Electricians of the Seattle-Tacoma yard who made 1,562 survey returns showed a total of 1,912 relatives in the armed services, among them 194 children, 451 brothers, and 14 fathers, mothers, or sisters.

Many close relatives of the Seattle-Tacoma employees are now prisoners of the Axis. Many who served at Bataan, Corregidor, Wake Island, and on every front where American forces are engaged have given their full measure of devotion to the cause of their country.

The editor suggests that it may be well to recall these figures the next time one hears someone complaining that all shipyard and defense workers are not doing what they should in the war effort.

Mr. President, there are undoubtedly isolated cases, and many of them, to which criticism of a meritorious kind will apply, but I think, by and large, organized labor and labor in our defense plants has its fair quota of its own flesh and blood in the service of this country, as do Members of this body.

INTERFERENCE WITH THE WAR EFFORT BY STRIKES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, during the last year the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation to freeze prices and wages. In the legislation and Executive orders that followed, authority was given to adjust substandard living conditions, and authority further was given to study and act upon unfair discriminations.

The United States is engaged in a total, all-out war effort. However, some persons apparently do not seem to appreciate the dangers, the hardships, and the long struggle which lie ahead.

Recent newspaper statements have attributed to John L. Lewis the threat to call a complete strike among the miners of the United States who are affiliated with the unions he represents. This has been a source of regret, and has caused much resentment among the people whom I represent. In my opinion, and in the opinion of those I represent, strikes at this time are considered traitorous to the welfare of our boys on every battlefront in the world. Further, it is my opinion that the executive branch of the Government, which is clothed with every authority of law with respect to wages and ceilings, should under no conditions permit any strike of any nature regardless of what extreme methods it may have to use.

Ceilings have been placed on the products of the farmers, and certainly their standards of income in many instances are far below those of war workers, according to Government statistics.

The workers in my section of the country are bitterly opposed to strikes. The workers in the textile industry, the largest industry of South Carolina, labor long and labor hard. There have been no strikes nor threatened strikes in this industry in South Carolina, which has produced for the armed forces many of the necessary textiles used by the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, Lend-Lease, and our allies. Certainly these faithful and loyal workers in the textile plants, whose income in the main is smaller than in many war industries, deserve every commendation for their work and their patriotism. As an example of the feelings of these people, let me read a telegram which I received yesterday along with many others:

Why raise John L. Lewis' and his workers' wages while my fellow workers and I have our wages frozen?

The people of the United States are standing by, and in nearly all instances, in addition to the work they are doing, are investing in war bonds, and carrying out the requests of the Government in every way possible.

Let me quote from another telegram to show how these people feel:

We will give our last dollar for defense, but not one penny as tribute to Lewis.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I trust and hope and feel certain that in the interest of the United States and the boys of the armed forces the executive department of the Government will not give way to the demands of John L. Lewis at this time, but will demand of John L. Lewis the same respect for the laws and orders of this country that is demanded of the humblest citizen of the United States. Even the threat of a strike at this time is in my opinion uncalled for, unreasonable, and will lead only to confusion and delay in our war effort. Let us hope that those who strike or create trouble in this grave hour will be properly punished by those who are in charge of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to read an editorial embodying an article by an unknown writer, which was published in the Charlotte (S. C.) Observer of last week:

A BOY DIED LAST NIGHT

A boy died last night. It doesn't make much difference now about his name. The important thing is that he died, in poignant and awful loneliness, out somewhere on a waste of sand, out in a starless silence, 10,000 miles from home.

"Missing in action," read an obscure line in this morning's communique. That was all. Now he lies there, crumpled beside the twisted wreckage that yesterday was his ship, riding high in the sunlit heavens. The fine head and the shining face and the broad shoulders remain only in a picture that looks out upon a quiet living room on a shaded street an eternity away.

Last night, in those agonizing hours of unspeakable isolation, he went through a thousand deaths without the one thing that might have helped a little—the sound of a familiar voice, the pat of a friendly hand. Many people died last night in their beds at home, surrounded by those who cared. Last night he died in utter desolation, in an unimaginable loneliness.

The pain was terrible enough. But then there had to be that dreadful burden of thought in those endless last hours. Mom and Pop. The flowers blooming again in the back yard. The good old roadster in the driveway. That last sweetheart kiss at the station. Those dances last summer. That half-finished letter in his blouse. All those plans for the future. Buddies back at the field, 5,000 miles across water, wondering. Couldn't somebody find him please? The wracking pain again.

Too much for you, all this? But it really happened last night, just like that. If people could only understand it, if they would just grind deep into their thinking the stark, terrible reality of it, every petty, selfish interest would be swept away. They would sacrifice anything and everything just to make themselves worthy of that boy. They would hasten to forge an instrument of revenge that would wipe from the earth the traffickers in war.

If people who have basked and prospered and walked secure in a land that has felt no more than the shock of a Fourth of July firecracker since 1865 would understand about this boy, they would wait no longer for Government promulgations and the urging of rallies. There would be no one left to think any more about what the war might do to his mere personal interest tomorrow or the next day.

People would rise up and demand that their Government take anything, exactly everything needed, make them walk, feed them the commonest fare, black out every city, take away every last penny of profits, and all privileges of hours or wages, render uncertain every common-place comfort and easy security—just to avenge that boy.

He died last night, you see. There's no way to get around that.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES STRIKES—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON COAL MINING CONTROVERSY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that the clerk be directed to read a copy of the President's press release given to the press of noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, the release will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 29, 1943.

The President today sent identical telegrams to John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America, Biltmore Hotel, New York City, and Thomas Kennedy, secretary-treasurer, United Mine Workers of America, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, the text of which follows:

"The controversy between the United Mine Workers of America and the operators of the coal mines has been certified to the National War Labor Board for settlement.

"The officials of the United Mine Workers were invited by the Board to recommend a person for appointment to the panel charged with investigating the facts. They ignored the invitation. The Board then appointed Mr. David B. Robertson, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, to represent the employees; Mr. Walter White to represent the operators; and Mr. Morris L. Cooke to represent the public.

"The personnel of this panel assures an impartial investigation of the facts to be used by the Board in its determination of the controversy, in accordance with the law.

"The officials of the United Mine Workers of America have ignored the request of the Board that they present their case to the National War Labor Board panel, and likewise have ignored the request of the Board that the strikers be urged to return to their work. I am advised that many thousands of miners are out on strike and strikes are threatened at many other mines which now are in operation.

"The procedure that has been followed in this case by the Board is, I am assured, in exact accord with that followed in all other controversies of this character.

"In view of the statements made in telegrams to me from some members of the United Mine Workers that Office of Price Administration price regulations have been disregarded and that the cost of living has gone up disproportionately in mining areas, I have directed Office of Price Administration to make an immediate investigation of the facts and wherever a violation of the law is disclosed by that investigation, to see that the violators of the law are prosecuted.

"The strikes and stoppages in the coal industry that have occurred and are threatened are in clear violation of the 'no strike' pledge.

"These are not mere strikes against employers of this industry to enforce collective bargaining demands. They are strikes against the United States Government itself.

"These strikes are a direct interference with the prosecution of the war. They challenge the governmental machinery that has been set up for the orderly and peaceful settlement of all labor disputes. They challenge the power of the Government to carry on the war.

"The continuance and spread of these strikes would have the same effect on the course of the war as a crippling defeat in the field.

"The production of coal must continue. Without coal our war industries cannot produce tanks, guns, and ammunition for our armed forces. Without these weapons our sailors on the high seas and our armies in the field will be helpless against our enemies.

"I am sure that the men who work in the coal mines, whose sons and brothers are in the armed forces, do not want to retard the war effort to which they have contributed so loyally and in which they with all other Americans have so much at stake.

"Not as President—not as Commander in Chief—but as the friend of the men who work in the coal mines, I appeal to them to resume work immediately and submit their case to the National War Labor Board for final determination.

"I have confidence in the patriotism of the miners. I am sure that when they realize the effect that stopping work at this time will have upon our boys at the front, they will return to their jobs.

"The enemy will not wait while strikes and stoppages run their course. Therefore, if work at the mines is not resumed by 10 o'clock Saturday morning, I shall use all the power vested in me as President and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to protect the national interest and to prevent further interference with the successful prosecution of the war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the whole, and particularly in the concluding paragraph, in the press release of the President is found much encouragement to those who want to see our country's progress in the war effort uninterrupted by strikes, lock-outs, and labor disputes and disturbances. The President says that he will use his full power.

The purpose of the bill which has been made the unfinished business is to give the President more power in the handling of this very situation. It may become necessary for the President of the United States to take over the mines and to afford military protection to those who want to return to work, as against the interference of those who may not be so minded. It has been said that the President already possesses such power. The original Selective Service Act, approved September 16, 1940, in section 9 provides that the President may place orders for war munitions with any factory or plant and the production of such materials is made obligatory and shall have priority over other contracts. Then in the same section it is further provided that whenever the employer fails to produce the materials, the President is authorized to take over the plant and operate it until such time as it can be returned to the owner.

But, Mr. President, so far as I have been able to ascertain, unless it is contained in some other of the war powers acts——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I hesitate to disturb the distinguished Senator, but it occurred to me that the President's powers might have been expanded in the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is possible; I have not consulted it. It may be that the President's power was broadened under the Second War Powers Act, which I do not have before me at the moment. However, irrespective of that, the bill now pending simply gives to the President the added authority, wherever production is delayed or suspended by reason of labor disputes, to take charge of the plant, and to operate it for such period of time as may be necessary until the President determines that the plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

Mr. President, this authority has been used in the cases of several employers. It was used for the first time in California, in an aircraft factory. Within a very few days the strike was broken, employment was resumed, and control of the plant was turned back to the private owners.

The authority was again employed in New Jersey in a shipbuilding operation. Within a very few days the strike was broken and the plant resumed operation.

Only a few days ago, in the Celanese situation, the mere statement by the President that, if conditions should warrant such action, he would use some similar power, resulted in the return of the workers to the plant and the resumption of production.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take up much time of the Senate, but I wish to remind the Senate that the time has now come for this issue to be met by the Government with courage. The United States has set up agencies for fixing wages, providing for hearings and for mediation, as set forth in the President's statement. Is the authority of the War Labor Board to obtain with reference to every other industry and calling in the United States, but when it comes to the mine workers, under their present leadership, is some other standard to be employed? If it is good for other industries, other plants, and other factories, it ought to obtain as to the mine workers of this Nation.

It has been said that the War Labor Board has prejudged the present issue. The American people have prejudged the issue; and their prejudgment is that there shall be no strikes which will interfere with or interrupt the prosecution of the war and the production of the implements, arms, and munitions necessary to its successful prosecution

Mr. President, the issue is clear-cut. The administration must meet it. It must not flinch. It must not retreat. The whole program of stabilization of wages and prices is in the balance. If John L. Lewis can break the line at this point, it will be broken in other places. The time has arrived to decide whether Government authority is to control. The Congress must determine whether we are to tolerate strikes in war plants. The time to meet this threat is now.

Mr. President, Mr. John L. Lewis testified before the Truman committee that he was present at the meeting in the fall of 1941 with the President of the United States, Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., and that he was a party to the agreement among all of them that there should be no strikes in war industries for the duration. I interrogated Mr. Lewis on that question. I wish to read briefly from his testimony:

Senator CONNALLY. You say that the agreement that you made with Mr. Green and the President and Mr. Murray and all the others, not to have a strike, is not necessarily binding. I don't know just exactly what you mean by the qualification of "necessarily." You mean that under some circumstances it might be binding, and under other circumstances it would not be binding; is that right?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I don't mean that. I mean that one can always elect to decide how long he will bear an injustice, and as long as he bears it, he doesn't necessarily resist it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact also, as shown in the report of the Truman committee, that during the 2-year period about which there has been so much discussion, the weekly earnings of the coal miners, with the increase which they received 1 or 2 years ago, and with the 6-day week, have been increased by 50 percent?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I cannot be categorically accurate as to the exact percentage, but I know that the main fact is that their wages, taking into consideration the factors which the Senator mentioned, were very greatly increased compared to what they were receiving 2 years ago.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought the Senator had in his hand a copy of the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am reading from the hearings.

Mr. BREWSTER. The report pointed out that there had been a 50-percent increase in the weekly earnings of coal miners during that period.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in short, the contention of Mr. Lewis before the Truman committee was that the no-strike agreement was not binding on him if the Board did not act with equity; and yet he was to decide what was equity and what was inequity.

Continuing with the interrogation:

Senator CONNALLY. But when you inject the theory of equity—that is the point I am coming to—on your side or industry either, for that matter, whether in individual cases or a general flat standard, would that not leave the gate open for them to say, "Well, that is not equity," and thereby make the agreement absolutely meaningless and without any force and effect whatsoever?

Mr. LEWIS. Of course, everyone takes his own chances in an equity court, Senator.

Senator CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. LEWIS. But I call to your attention the perfectly astounding situation in this country we would have at this time if all the equity courts were to say that during the period of the war and for the duration, we will just hand out 40 percent equity instead of complete equity.

Senator CONNALLY. The point I am getting at is, what does an agreement amount to, after all, no matter what it is about, if either party is to thereafter retain the right and privilege of saying that "Well, this action that they took is not equitable and therefore I won't abide by it?" So it really nullifies the whole agreement, doesn't it?

Mr. LEWIS. You see, the War Labor Board has no power of enforcement of its decisions upon free Americans. It is supposed to crystallize the facts and assemble them and give them to the public to look at and give the public some ground on which to form their conclusions. It is a fact-finding agency with opinions expressed, and, of course, that in itself constitutes a powerful compulsion upon the litigants in that court, especially in time of war.

Senator CONNALLY. A moment ago I asked you if under that agreement the War Labor Board should take up your particular controversy and decide it, would you regard that as being binding, and you said it would if the Board in its action had gone according to equity. Is that right? Was that your answer?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; and may I point out that my position in that was sustained in 1941 by the President, who wrote a letter to the War Labor Board instructing them to review a previous decision which obviously was not equitable.

Senator CONNALLY. I am not questioning that. The point I am trying to get at is that according to your construction of the no strike agreement, it left either party the right to not abide by it on the contention that the Board had not acted according to equity; is that right?

Mr. LEWIS. That is right, and that was the President's position in 1941.

Senator CONNALLY. Regardless of the President's position, I am trying to get your position. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, in April of 1942, it was believed by the Senate and by the country that the no-strike agreement, if lived up to and respected by those who solemnly made it and signed it, would have the result that perhaps there would be no occasion for legislation of this particular type; but that agreement has been repudiated. It has been stricken down by one of the men who made it. So far as I know, the leaders of the American Federation of Labor and of the C. I. O. have made an effort to respect that agreement.

So, Mr. President, the Senate, the country, and the administration are face to face with this issue. It must be met head on. I wish to do all I can to strengthen the hand of the President, to give him encouragement, and support him in order that he may use all the powers of the President of the United States and all his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to see that no strike occurs in the mine fields of this Nation.

The committee reports and hearings are replete with proof of the fact that the industrial sections of the United States are absolutely dependent upon the production of coal in order to maintain their activities. The armies in the field yonder facing the enemy are likewise dependent upon the continuous production of war supplies, munitions, and instrumentalities. Are these efforts to be paralyzed by the edict of a single man in the United States, dominating and controlling his organization and defying and flouting the Government of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I hope that early on Monday we may secure a vote on Senate bill 796.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. From all the evidence we have received in the Truman committee, in view of the 10,000 cases which it has been impossible for the War Labor Board to decide and in view of the factor of rising costs as well as other factors, is there any one of the labor organizations in the country which would not be equally justified in going on strike? Would they not be as justified in taking such action as is Mr. Lewis in taking the position which he has taken?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if Mr. Lewis is correct in his contention that he is at liberty to reject and defy a ruling or decision of the War Labor Board on the ground that, according to his mind, it is not equitable, then any other union in any other activity in the United States could with equal justice, equal reason, and equal logic, say to the Board, "No; we will not abide by your decision because, according to our notion, it is not equitable."

Mr. BREWSTER. As we have seen from the evidence of various labor leaders, would not that result in overwhelming pressure being exerted against them within their own organizations by the men saying in effect, "If Mr. Lewis can do it for his crowd, you will have to do it for us"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Green, of the A. F. of L., and Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., have said that if this situation is permitted to go on they will be overwhelmingly pressed by their own membership on the ground that if Lewis and his mine workers are allowed to go on strike, other unions should have the same privilege. The argument is unanswerable that if one may defy the Board, others may do so.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why we should judge all the labor men in the United States by one standard, by one measurement, by one pattern, and set up a modern Buddha, as it were, and measure him in accordance with a different standard; not according to a standard fixed by the Government, but according to the standard which he, in his imperial will, seeks to fix and force the Government of the United States to abide by.

DECADENT PHILOSOPHY OF THE JAPANESE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the recent revelation by this Government that the Japanese have executed a number of the American airmen who took part in the military raids over Tokyo and other Japanese military centers has very deeply shocked the citizens of America. It has also aroused them to a pitch of anger and resentment never before approached in our history. This reaction is only to be expected, for during all its history the American Nation has abided by every international agreement and protocol to which its signature has been affixed. Moreover, the American Nation has extended to all aliens—loyal and disloyal—the full protection of constitutional law and procedure. We have never debauched ourselves or our institutions by wanton discrimination, or illegal punishments and reprisals.

The action of the Japanese Government in this case is nothing more than typical. Japan's whole history reads like a haunting novel of slaughter, debauchery, and treachery. The Japanese have shown a complete disregard for every civilizing influence that has come into the world in their time. But despite the atrocities which the Japanese have committed—and these extend from Manchuria across China, into Burma, Singapore, the Philippines, and every other outpost which the Japanese hordes have overrun—the American people should keep before them those ideals of decency, legality, and progress which have served them so well over the years.

The policies which we have adopted and followed with respect to aliens, both in war and in peace, have served us well. The policies which the Japanese have adopted have availed them nothing. They have only drawn inexorably nearer the day of their final and complete military destruction.

For the American people now to resort to the Japanese technique would constitute a grave and tragic loss, a loss of that high plane of morality upon which America has conducted all its relations thus far. This is a loss which we should never permit the Japanese to inflict upon us, regardless of the barbaric depths into which they themselves have sunk, and in which they dwell in utmost comfort.

When the inevitable military defeat of Japan shall have been accomplished, the American nation and the American people will bring to full account every Japanese official, military commander, and governmental representative who had a hand in the outrageous deed which was recently perpetrated against our American airmen. Justice will be meted out in accordance with recognized law and procedure, and it will be as final as it will be proper.

Despite all the threats and protestations of the Japanese Government, raids on Tokyo and every other center of Japanese militarism will be conducted on an ever-increasing scale until the force and fury which shall be heaped upon them from the heavens will blast the very core of Japanese militarism, and completely destroy it.

Nor shall we be alone in this. Our British comrades-in-arms are most anxious to join with us in this urgent military project. There can be no doubt that the Chinese, the Koreans, the Filipinos, and all the other races who have suffered repeated indignities at the hands of the repulsive Japanese will participate with us in this undertaking to the fullest possible extent. This concerted action will continue until the Japanese militarists shall have been taught a lesson which they and the world will never forget. This shall be the ultimate fate of that curious and diabolical clique which worships at the shrine of violence and deals in the death-blow of the sword. The lesson which their fate will carry to the world will not be a lesson of barbarism, of inhuman cruelty, or of Oriental injustice. It will be a lesson of the righteous power, might, and indignation of free-thinking and liberty-loving peoples—a lesson which will repel and destroy the very elements of the decadent Japanese philosophy, and make clear for all time to come that barbarism and aggression have no place in the world of man and the principles of men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Friday, April 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remember Pearl Harbor?

Remember the Philippines?

Remember the Japanese barbarities at Bataan?

Remember Wake Island and Guam?

Remember the Japanese entrenched in the American territory of the Alaskan islands?

Remember the American airmen cruelly and illegally executed?

Remember Yamamoto's promise to dictate peace in the White House at Washington?

Will we avenge these insults, or do we complacently choose to forget these outrages, these disasters, these imminent dangers?

Are we men or are we mice?

Are we Americans or burrowing moles, blind to the light of fact?

Must we wait until the Japanese have actually invaded our homeland and wreaked their barbarities on ourselves, our women, and our children?

The war in the Pacific is the World War, the war of Oriental races against Occidental races for the domination of the world.

Our leaders at Washington threaten to punish the Japanese war lords for their illegal execution of the heroic American aviators who bombed Tokyo.

A threat is an ineffective thing compared to action—in any situation.

How especially feeble and futile it is in the face of our neglect of General MacArthur and his brave fighters—our defenders in the South Pacific.

The tragedy of Bataan is being repeated.

Our defenders' cries for help—for reinforcements, for ships, and planes, and bombs, and guns—are being answered with empty words—with promises unfulfilled.

Like our legions sacrificed at Bataan, our defenders in the South Seas scan the skies for aid.

Let us give it to them in the full force required to avenge the murder of our airmen.

Let us talk less and act more.

Let us make fewer futile threats, but send the ships and planes to cut the way to Tokyo.

To skin a rabbit you must first catch the rabbit.

To punish the Japanese war lords, we must first defeat their war forces, demolish their defenses, drag them from their strongholds, and line them up in front of a firing squad.

Threats will not do this.

Ships and planes in the hands of our great general will.

Let us not wait until, like at Bataan, hope is gone and all is lost.

Let us act now.

FREEZING OF WORKERS IN ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the recent Executive order issued by the War Manpower Commission, designed to freeze all men who work in essential industries in their respective jobs, and carrying with it serious and heavy penalties for any infractions of the rules laid down by that order, has been the basis of a great wave of disillusionment, doubt, and recentment in the ranks of American labor, both organized and unorganized.

This action by the War Manpower Commission is but another step in the administration's patch-work effort of compulsion, discrimination, and regimentation to which it has resorted in handling the various war programs which now concern the Nation. The rigidity and untempered restriction which lie behind this order are absolutely out of place in the American scene. The achievements which have been made by labor in this all-out effort at war find ill reward and ill recognition in this latest step by the administration. The order gives no consideration to the tremendous cooperative capacities which American labor has manifested in every emergency. Moreover, it gives no consideration to the very basic tenets of free enterprise and democracy which it is said we are now fighting to preserve.

Small wonder, then, that American labor is dissatisfied with this latest step toward regimentation. Small wonder that American labor, the greatest productive force in all the world strikes out against the heavy hand of compulsion—the same hand which dragged the peoples of Europe and the peoples of Japan down into an abject and miserable slavery.

On the farm, in the factory, in the mines, and in the mills, the American workman has achieved records of production which amaze the world—records of production which have made inexorably clear that the United Nations will achieve the final victory in this great military struggle in which we are now engaged.

We have stood up in all our might and promised freedom to all the people of Europe who are oppressed by the Axis—freedom from fear and want, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. But what do we hold out to that vast group of patriotic Americans who represent the backbone of our united strength? What do we hold out to them in their long hours of labor, and in their high resolve to produce the means and implements of war? We hold out to them compulsion—stark, real, and undeniable compulsion—the same force, the same instrument, which paved the way to regimentation and slavery in the downtrodden countries of Europe. This latest edict of the administration can be interpreted in no other light. What difference does it make if such an edict is clothed with patriotic phraseology? What difference does it make if this edict is handed down as an essential instrument in the winning of the war? The fact remains that it is an instrument of regimentation. It is an instrument which may very well serve to remove the last vestige of democracy and individual effort from the American system of free enterprise.

I have received countless communications from men who labor in the great production centers of Pennsylvania, and they are one in denouncing both the intent and purpose of this regulation.

They are one in demanding that the voluntary approach to all these problems be adhered to, and that grand schemes of compulsion and regimentation be abandoned. Labor has shown great respect for the administration. It has cooperated to its full capacity in the various undertakings of our Government, and I submit that the American workman is entitled to a richer reward than that which the War Manpower Commission has recently handed down to him; namely, a sharp ultimatum that henceforward the freedom of the laboring man in America is gone, and that his traditional right to sell his services to the highest bidder and to perform his labor under the most desirable conditions shall exist no longer, but rather that he shall submit to the dictates of bureaucracy and to do only what those in authority bid him to do.

This instrument will achieve nothing in the way of increased production. It will achieve nothing in the way of further cooperation in the war effort. Compulsion, no matter in what form it may appear, no matter in what garb it may be dressed, will be resented and repelled by the American people, who cherish above all things individual right and freedom of enterprise.

Mr. President, as an indication of the tremendous reaction that has appeared in the circles of American labor against this latest edict of the administration, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement issued by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in which he submits that such stringent and compulsory measures are not only absolutely unnecessary but that they are destructive of the very goals which America seeks to attain in this war. I urge upon the members of the War Manpower Commission and the leaders of the administration to take heed of these objections and to turn again to the principles of volunteerism—the principles which have made possible the great productive ability of American labor, and the principles which will carry us through this crisis with complete and thoroughgoing success.

There is little doubt that the entire question of manpower is a grave and serious one, and it devolves upon labor and management and the Government to cooperate fully in this matter, in the light of best serving the public interests, but the policy should be the result of a voluntary cooperative understanding among all the groups concerned. Policies should not be formulated, dictated, and executed by any Executive order, which has been independently arrived at by some governmental agency, without regard for, or consultation with, the very groups whose cooperation and support are so vital to the success or failure of the program concerned. I ask that Mr. Green's statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Federation of Labor will seek a modification of the President's freeze order as set forth in section 3 of Executive Order 9328 and the regulations for the enforcement of this order as issued by Chairman McNutt on April 16.

This conclusion was reached after a careful study of the scope, meaning, and implications of the Executive order and the prescribed enforcement regulations.

The rigidity of the regulations officially promulgated by Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission establishes the fact that the President's order relating to employment is truly all that job freezing implies.

We fear that the application of such a frozen, rigid, inflexible plan will seriously affect morale, lower individual efficiency, and arouse resentment among the industrial workers of the Nation.

An appraisement of the manpower situation indicates strongly that both the job freezing section of the President's Executive order and the enforcement regulations issued by Chairman McNutt are uncalled for and unnecessary at the moment. Surely such an assault upon the exercise of freedom by working men and women and of their right to sell their labor under the most advantageous conditions and to exercise all their rights under our free enterprise system, could well

be postponed until no other solution was possible. The right of an individual to seek employment, to fight for and secure for himself decent wages, to render service under the most advantageous and satisfactory conditions, is inherent and fundamental in the American way of life.

All of these rights should be preserved and protected in order to influence the workers of the Nation to "hold the line" and to "voluntarily and willingly serve to the limit of their ability and endurance" in order to win the war. They can do this if they are permitted to enjoy the benefits of free labor rather than to be reduced to the status of forced labor.

The penalties provided for in the regulations prescribed by Chairman McNutt are tremendously offensive, drastic, and represent "a character of punishment which in no way fits the crime."

It is our deliberate judgment that both the President's Executive order and the enforcement regulations issued by Chairman McNutt should be changed and modified so as to make them reasonably acceptable and satisfactory to the workers of the Nation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, while I am speaking of the War Manpower Commission, I feel impelled to bring to light another development which has taken place in that organization which bodes ill for its continued success and proper functioning. I have reference now to the recent resignation of Pennsylvania's Louis Raycroft. His resignation as regional director of the War Manpower Commission for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware has recently been accepted. I am informed that his resignation was brought about through political pressure, despite the fact that Mr. Raycroft's record as regional director in this district has been both outstanding and meritorious and despite the fact that he has enjoyed the full cooperation and support, not only of organized labor but of organized industry as well.

In calling this matter to public attention I wish to urge upon the members of the War Manpower Commission that they realize the gravity and seriousness of their calling and that they submit to no political pressure whatever in the prosecution of their legitimate undertakings. For if politics enters into the picture of manpower—its allocation, regulation, and use—we shall behold a great and terrifying tragedy here on the home front—a tragedy no less severe than that which would occur if politics were permitted to dominate military strategy and military operations. For the manpower at home is the backbone, the very substance of our united war effort; and if political considerations are to take precedence over practical and strategic considerations, then this entire program will collapse, and in its collapse will bring every portion of our military effort down in resounding defeat. So in protesting the resignation of Mr. Raycroft, a resignation which I am informed was brought about through political pressure, I call upon the War Manpower Commission to cease to give credence or recognition to any political bickerings and to keep its house in order so that it may proceed in the proper light and with the proper efficiency to the solution of the great tasks which lie ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of a telegram sent to Mr. Paul V. McNutt, under date of April 16, 1943, by Mr. William M. Leader, president of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Branch 1, in which he protests Mr. McNutt's acceptance of Mr. Raycroft's "pressure" resignation and urges Mr. McNutt to retain Mr. Raycroft in the position which he has filled so effectively and well.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 16, 1943.*

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with deep regret that we read of your acceptance of the "pressure" resignation of L. B. F. Raycroft as Regional Director of the War Manpower Commission of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

As one who participated in the formation of the manpower idea in this district over 2 years ago, along with yourself, Sidney Hillman, James Casey, and a joint Congress for Industrial Organizations, American Federation of Labor, and Railroad Brotherhood committee, and as one who, as the head of a union, has seen the manning tables being worked out in a fair manner toward labor, and as one who as a member of the selective-service draft appeal board, taking in the 85 boards in Philadelphia, has worked along with Mr. Raycroft, I have watched him cooperate with Colonel Rhodes, representing General Hershey and Colonel Hafer, State director, and set up a model manning table plan that is practical and fair to all in its manner of releasing men for the armed forces.

In view of all this, it is hard to understand why you accepted his forced resignation. I believe the region here will suffer great hardship while someone is endeavoring to attempt to fill Mr. Raycroft's shoes.

I feel sure I speak for thousands in the labor movement and thousands of others in this area when I respectfully ask you to have Mr. Raycroft withdraw his voluntary resignation and let him continue on his man-sized job and give out to the public the "pressure" reasons that may have led you to believe no one was in back of Mr. Raycroft.

Knowing without a doubt you will be fair in this matter, I am,

WILLIAM M. LEADER,
President, Branch 1, American
Federation of Hosiery Workers,
Philadelphia, Pa.

TESTS OF STEEL PLATE AT IRVIN STEEL WORKS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire now to conclude my remarks by referring to certain charges involving the Irvin Steel Works.

Last week end I visited my home State and met many people who inquired about the charges made by the Truman committee against the management and workers of the Irvin Steel Works. In view of the widespread public concern, I decided to visit the mills personally, to consult with the workers and management and to review for myself all the circumstances surrounding this particular matter.

On Saturday, April 24, I secured the necessary permit and contacted the workers, representatives and officials of the local United Steel Workers Union, as well as the principal representatives of plant management. I then made a very thorough review of all the processes and relative factors involved in the production of steel plate at the Irvin Works.

After reexamining the charges made by the Truman committee, of the so-called faking of physical tests for steel plates at this plant, I have come to the conclusion that there were many mitigating circumstances bearing upon this particular case: These are wartimes, and there is unprecedented demand for increased plate production. There is a relentless pressure on both worker and manager to produce more and more steel plates in order to meet the ever-increasing demands of our tremendous shipbuilding program. Under such heavy pressure, the experienced employees of this particular company set aside the technicalities entailed in the testing of steel plate, in favor of increasing the production of such plate. They did this on the basis of positive knowledge, born of past experience, which knowledge showed that the quality of the steel plates concerned came within the specified range of suitability for ship construction.

I offer no excuse for the failure of the employees concerned to carry out the required physical tests and to make and maintain the proper recordings of such tests. This they certainly should have done. But I want to make it unmistakably clear that the employees concerned were motivated by no ulterior purpose in their failure to make the proper tests. They were concerned with one thing only—increased production of steel plate to aid in the war effort.

A careful reading of the Truman committee's report on this matter will show no evidence that any officer, inspector, or anyone else concerned, anticipated or derived any profit from the so-called faking. The facts revealed by this report do not in any way indicate that the company, the workmen, or anyone else, profited by this failure properly to record the figures which were lost in the haste to increase production. I have found nothing in this report to prove that the plates were actually substandard. The report shows only that the records had been made by guessing at the figures, because the original records, I was informed, had been completely destroyed by processing the plates in question.

Now, as an old steelworker I can very well understand these circumstances; and I do not believe that any useful purpose will be served by trying to place the brand of traitor on those men who labor, and are now laboring, to produce the steel necessary for America's war effort, for this omission on their part came only from the desire to increase the production of that very vital commodity.

The records which the steel industry has attained throughout the years do not warrant the implications of a criminal case, nor do they warrant the charge of an attempt to supply substandard steel for ship-construction purposes.

The charges to which I refer emanate from the as yet unexplained breaking asunder of the S. S. *Schenectady*—the only announced failure among all the innumerable ships built in this period

of unprecedented ship construction—a period of ship construction that has seen the steel industry honored with the presentation by our Navy of a considerable number of Army-Navy E awards for outstanding accomplishment in war production.

I have great respect for the very able men who comprise the Truman committee, and I know that they have rendered an invaluable service to the Nation in the various investigations which they have carried out with respect to the war effort; and I wish to commend the committee for the outstanding work it has done. But in reviewing this particular case, I feel that if all the Senators on that committee had had the opportunity, which I have had, of personally inspecting this matter, the entire question might have been cleared up to the satisfaction of all parties concerned without recourse to legal proceedings.

I am certain that when the public becomes acquainted with all the facts concerned, the great confidence which they have shown in the workers and management of the steel industry will be completely restored, and that the Irvin Works and its employees will be fully vindicated, and their names properly cleared.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from H. G. Batcheller, Director, Iron and Steel Division of the War Production Board, together with a general letter from the same office, and a copy of the minutes of a meeting held in that division on April 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the letters and minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1943.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: In accordance with your request I am attaching hereto a copy of the digest covering the Special Industry Advisory Committee meeting held April 8, 1943, for the purpose of hearing the report of the officials of the United States Steel Corporation and Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation in connection with the charges made by the United States Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, concerning plate testing at the Irvin Works. Also attached is a copy of Dr. Zimmerman's report which is referred to in the digest.

Inasmuch as you will probably be interested in a copy of Mr. Nelson's telegram of April 15, to all plate producers as well as a copy of my letter to all steel companies, of April 15, I am attaching copies of that correspondence.

Very truly yours,

H. G. BATCHELLER,
Director, Steel Division.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1943.

DEAR SIR: A meeting of the Iron and Steel Industry Advisory Committee was held in Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1943, to hear a report by officials of United States Steel Corporation and Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation on the charges made by the United States Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program (Truman committee), concerning plate testing at the Irvin Works. You will find attached hereto a copy of the minutes of the meeting relating to this subject.

Your careful reading of these minutes is urged, particularly the comments made by Mr. Donald M. Nelson, which, in my opinion, stresses a phase of this problem as it affects our entire steel industry.

We all appreciate the tremendous burden on the steel industry and the necessity of producing steel in unprecedented quantities. This case is illustrative of the need for increased diligence with respect to the inspection of materials. A copy of a telegram which Mr. Nelson sent to all plate producers is attached for your information.

The problem is not a simple one, and I want to take this opportunity to urge you and your entire organization to try with every ounce of power for maximum production, as well as exert the diligence and technical skill of which you are capable that will result in unquestionable quality of all products your company manufactures.

Very truly yours,

H. G. BATCHELLER,
Director, Steel Division.

MEETING OF IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, APRIL 8, 1943, ROOM 5109, SOCIAL SECURITY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Government presiding officer: H. G. Batcheller, Steel Division, War Production Board.

Present: Representing industry (members): W. F. Detwiler, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; B. F. Fairless, United States Steel Corporation, New York, N. Y.; E. G. Grace, Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; Elton Hoyt II, Picklands Mather & Co., Cleveland, Ohio; H. Edgar Lewis, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Henry A. Roemer, Pittsburgh Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. L. Ryerson, Jr., Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.; W. S. Tower, American Iron & Steel Institute, New York, N. Y.; R. J. Wysor, Republic Steel Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio.

Representing industry (others): G. R. Fink, Great Lakes Steel Co., Detroit, Mich. (alternate for Ernest T. Weir, National Steel Corporation of Pittsburgh); W. B. Gillies, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio (alternate for Frank Purnell); J. L. Perry, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; N. B. Randolph, Granite City Steel Co., Granite City, Ill. (alternate for Hayward Niedringhaus); W. W. Sebald, The American Rolling Mill Co., Middletown, Ohio (alternate for Charles R. Hook); R. E. Zimmerman, United States Steel Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Representing Government (War Production Board): D. F. Austin, Steel Division; E. H. Catron, Legal Division; M. W. Cole, Steel Division; James Cooley II, Legal Division; L. E. Creighton, Steel Division; N. Foy, Steel Division; H. J. French, Steel Division; O. Fulton, Steel Division; G. G. Gries, Steel Division; C. Halcomb, Steel Division; J. Honeycutt, Steel Division; C. King, Steel Division; J. Clauss, Steel Division; C. Longfield, Steel Division; C. Meyers, Steel Division; Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board; John Lord O'Brian, Legal Division; E. L. Parker, Steel Division; James Rowan, Steel Division; H. J. Ruttenberg, Steel Division; P. F. Schucker, Steel Division; P. B. Weymouth, Industry Advisory Committees; R. Wolcott, Steel Division; Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman, War Production Board.

Representing Government (others): Gen. L. D. Clay, United States Army; Admiral E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy; Commander E. C. Forsythe, United States Navy; Commander W. F. Kerfuss, United States Navy; Admiral S. M. Robinson, United States Navy; Maj. D. C. Roth, United States Army; Admiral Vickery, Maritime Commission; A. J. Walsh, United States Treasury Department; Commander Weldon, United States Navy; Capt. A. J. Wellings, United States Army.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

The meeting was held primarily to consider a report by officials of the United States Steel Corporation on the charges made by the Truman committee concerning plate-testing procedures at the Irvin Works.

DISCUSSION OF THE IRVIN WORKS INCIDENT

Remarks of Mr. B. F. Fairless

The findings of the investigation concerning testing procedures at the Irvin Works were as startling to officials of the United States Steel Corporation, Mr. Fairless declared, as to the country at large. The employees concerned have admitted falsifying records and the corporation has dealt with the facts accordingly. To the best of its knowledge, the entire situation has been corrected. Necessary changes in the organization have been made and a report outlining the corporation's findings and explaining the changes made has been submitted to the War Production Board.

Although the corporation in no way condones the falsification made by its employees and will make no attempt to justify their misrepresentations, it regrets that information from employees within the organization on irregularities of plate testing which reached the Truman committee as early as October of last year were not then made known to the management of the company. Had the facts been brought to management's attention then, the necessary steps to clear up the situation could have been taken promptly.

Admittedly, Mr. Fairless said, there is little defense for employees who have made affidavits to the effect that records were deliberately falsified by them. But officials of the steel companies concerned, in attempting to go beyond the mere statements of these employees and ascertain the true motives for their action, have asked these questions: Would inspectors have anything to gain financially from inspecting and releasing more tonnage? Would management be prompted by a monetary incentive to issue instructions that plates below the specifications be released for shipment? Would rejects accrue in the plant without a market?

Inspectors do not receive a bonus on the tonnage they release or inspect; they are paid according to the position they hold and on an hourly or monthly basis. Management likewise could not profit financially by encouraging the shipment of faulty material; its wages would not be raised. Plates of all tensile strengths are greatly in demand; they can be disposed of quickly and easily for a variety of purposes. The only motive, Mr. Fairless concluded, that these employees could have had was to get out the plates as quickly as possible so that ship construction could continue uninterruptedly. While the means chosen to attain this objective were wrong, the employees concerned were motivated by an earnest desire to maintain the pace of the war production program and nothing more.

Irregular as the practice may have been in testing the plates at the Irvin Works, the charges that the safety of the ships and the lives of men have been jeopardized by the inclusion of a small proportion of product which fell below the specified minimum tensile strength by approximately 5 to 6 percent, cannot be justified on the basis of engineering analysis, metallurgical knowledge, or experience in shipbuilding. The charges made are principally concerned with the chemistry and physical properties of the steel.

One fact to be borne in mind, Mr. Fairless said, is that the Irvin Works was never built

to make plates. The plant, completed in 1937, was originally constructed to manufacture tinplate and sheets, but, because of the urgency for plate, was rapidly converted to production of this product. Inability to secure the necessary materials and the lack of time prevented making certain changes in finishing facilities that should have been made to accommodate the manufacture of plates. While the plant was designed to turn out a maximum of 50,000 tons a month of the products it was equipped to make, output climbed to 80,000 tons a month when the shift to plate production went into effect. This taxed finishing capacity to a point where the material had to move rapidly or the mill would have been forced to shut down. Inspection could not keep pace with production. Because the materials involved were so critically needed, shipments were made before receipt of final inspection records. But in every case where materials were subsequently examined and, in the opinion of inspectors, were unsuitable for the intended end use, the customer was always so notified prior to receipt of the shipment. Records verify this procedure.

The misrepresentation of the inspectors at the Irvin Works was totally unnecessary, Mr. Fairless maintained, stating he firmly believed that, if the officials of the agencies concerned had been presented with a heat of steel showing the minor extent of the departure from the original specifications, they would have approved the material for shipment.

It would be contrary to reason, Mr. Fairless believed, that the employees guilty of irregularities would resort to anything so obvious as the letter "F" to designate that the inspection records had been "faked." Surely, this would not be the method employed by anyone attempting to do a dishonest job, or a procedure handed down by management. Cleverer ways of deception could certainly have been found.

In all meetings with the War Production Board, emphasis has been placed upon the critical need for plates. The watchword has constantly been production, and, Mr. Fairless said, his company applied every pressure to accelerate the output of more and more ship plates. The corporation admits that the Irvin Works incident is one to be condemned. But what has happened so far in bringing the occurrence to light will not help produce more ship plates or solve the big problem of combating ship failure, which is occurring in cases where steel from plants other than those operated by Carnegie-Illinois has been used. Something more fundamental than the falsification of records by employees at the Irvin Works is responsible for the cracking of certain welded ships, Mr. Fairless brought out. Attention is called to this fact not with the thought of justifying the Irvin Works disclosure but merely to indicate the need for determining whether the steel now being produced in accordance with the present specification is suitable for the intended end use.

Report by Dr. Zimmerman

Dr. Zimmerman, chief metallurgist for the United States Steel Corporation, discussed the properties of steel as related to its performance in welded ships and stressed the need for a careful evaluation of existing specifications.

Failure of a particular tanker on the west coast resulted in widespread apprehension through various circles that defective and substandard steel had jeopardized the integrity of numerous welded ships, Dr. Zimmerman said. Disclosure of the Irvin Works incident further intensified a storm of comments, from both those technically qualified and unqualified to judge. He deplored the situation which has arisen as a result of comments by those who have unfairly charged steel with the responsibility for the failure of the tanker steamship *Schenectady*. The broader aspects of the whole problem, Dr. Zimmerman suggested, might be discussed from a more rational standpoint, weighing the evidence and appraising the situation not only on the basis of the quality of steel, but considering other pertinent factors entering into the construction of welded ships.

Dr. Zimmerman read a detailed report entitled "Steel Plates for Shipbuilding," which presents evidence substantiating Mr. Fairless' earlier claim that the failure of the tanker steamship *Schenectady* cannot be attributed to the irregularities of plate testing at the Irvin works. The report also points out that 100-percent precision and reproducibility are rarely attainable in the testing of steel and that, even in the opinion of the services, there is room for the exercise of reason and judgment; that there is always the question of how much material is accurately represented by the samples chosen for test; that, since complete uniformity in steel is hardly attainable because certain factors operate toward a degree of nonuniformity, the need arises for a practicable range in the specification of properties; that in the matter of producing steel best suited for the construction of ships by welding there is a conflict of principles among the naval architect, the welding engineer, and the metallurgist; that such conflict suggests that there must be some give and take in arriving at the best compromise as to the specification for the desired physical properties; and that in the light of recent developments it is not unlikely that a renewed understanding of what the specifications should set out is needed. In times of unparalleled pressure for maximum output, it is important that the steel maker know whether specifications are specifying the properties actually required for the intended use.

The complete text of Dr. Zimmerman's statement is attached.

COMMENTS BY WAR PRODUCTION BOARD OFFICIALS

Remarks of Mr. Donald M. Nelson

The steel industry, under Mr. Batcheller's leadership, has done a magnificent job, Mr. Nelson declared, but much work still lies ahead. While the Irvin Works incident could conceivably have happened in any one of the other companies within the steel industry, the disclosure has been disturbing and it is unfortunate that such a situation should have occurred. He expressed hope that the steel industry will do what it can to avoid repetition of similar incidents.

Under normal conditions of peacetime, industry deals with individual customers other firms in business, and is primarily interested in maintaining relations with a relatively small number of people. Under a wartime situation companies are no longer concerned only with individual customers or stockholders, but are actually dealing with 130,000,000 stockholders—the people of the United States.

It is not enough, Mr. Nelson said, to think in terms of what was done during peacetime; present-day business is endowed with the public interest. Not only should there be no wrongdoing on the part of industry, but even the appearance of questionable behavior is to be avoided. With all industry rests the obligation of perpetuating the public trust and confidence. Companies engaged in war work are not only serving the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and Lend-Lease, but the entire Nation. As Mr. Nelson described it, the American people are peering over industry's shoulder, watching what it does at all times. One offense is apt to overshadow all of the good that an industry, an agency, or an individual member of an organization may have previously contributed.

Mr. Nelson urged the industry to assure itself that whatever it does will reflect a responsiveness to public interest. Not only do members of the steel industry have a real obligation to themselves but they also have an obligation to American industry as a whole, he emphasized. Malpractices known to officials of an organization should be corrected immediately; and even after this is done, management at the top must follow through to make certain that all policies laid down are being carried out.

The steel industry has done an amazing job to the extent of fulfilling almost impossible demands. In fact, American industry as a whole has accomplished magnificent results; business as usual with the country today is war business. The War Production Board holds no criticism of the work the steel industry is doing, Mr. Nelson said, but urges that each company stop and think about what is best for the common good, remembering that its business is surrounded by public interests not present before the war. Industries are operating under conditions far different from before; they are making basic materials to be used in weapons of war. Realizing that the lives of those who will use these weapons are at stake, the anxiety of the people of the country as a whole can readily be understood.

While the problem raised of changing specifications should be looked into, Mr. Nelson reminded the group that living up to the present specifications and making every effort to meet them is one problem, while the question of whether these specifications may be entirely suitable for the intended use is another. Both problems must be treated separately.

Plate situation as presented by Mr. Batcheller

The Steel Division, in its eagerness to satisfy as far as humanly possible the plate requirements of claimant agencies, may have overpressured the steel industry, Mr. Batcheller admitted. However, we have no intention of relaxing that pressure and the effort to push production of ship plates must continue if the demands of the war program are to be met. But the industry must take every precaution not to endanger the safety of the product it is making, regardless of the speed with which it must be done.

Platemaking capacity in the steel industry before the war was about 500,000 tons a month; in March 1943, production soared to a monthly output of 2,200,000 tons. This extraordinary increase in plate production, Mr. Batcheller said, has largely resulted from the conversion of the continuous sheet mills, which were never intended to be used in the production of plate, but were converted to meet an emergency situation. Recognizing that these converted sheet mills could not operate indefinitely on heavy products, the steel expansion program provided for a substantial increase in plate-making capacity in the way of properly designed plate mills. New plate mills under construction were expected to yield an additional 175,000 tons per month. This expanded capacity was scheduled to come into production during the spring and summer months, and the bulk of the increase was expected to come from two mills now under construction, one at Provo, Utah, and the other at the Homestead Works.

The Provo project, originally anticipated to come into production early in June, will not under present conditions be ready until the first part of 1944. Mr. Batcheller explained that completion was delayed because of the up-rating of other projects, principally in connection with the increased production of aluminum. In permitting the aluminum project to take precedence over the Provo project, the Steel Division was largely influenced by the fact that in June the Homestead plate mill would be ready to operate and provide some 60,000 tons a month. Unfortunately, it now appears that the Homestead project must likewise be delayed for the

same reason and that increased plate production from this source cannot be expected until November or December of this year. Besides the loss of this anticipated tonnage from the Homestead and Provo projects, another alarming situation has developed. A slabbing mill in another plant of the United States Steel Corporation has been so overloaded that it may have to shut down for extensive repair and rebuilding, which would mean a loss of 80,000 to 90,000 tons a month. Although it clearly recognizes the importance of the aluminum program, the Steel Division, Mr. Batcheller said, believes that a curtailment of plate production to the extent that now appears necessary would create an extremely dangerous situation. The Division is doing everything within its power to alleviate this condition and will submit a report on the situation, recommending a policy decision by the chairman and executive vice chairman.

Comments by Mr. Charles E. Wilson

Mr. Wilson said he did not believe that there is any reason for the War Production Board to lose confidence in the steel industry on the basis of its actions to date or anything that it might conceivably do in the future. As a result of the Irvin Works incident, however, the steel industry must square itself with the American public and allay any existing fear that similar practices are being followed. Mr. Wilson said that he had absolute faith in management's ability to regain the people's confidence.

His primary interest in the industry, Mr. Wilson said, lies in the production phases of its problems. It is unthinkable that there should be any shrinkage in the plate production which the shipbuilding program is depending upon. At the time that the expansion of aluminum production was pushed at the expense of the completion of the Provo and Homestead projects, Mr. Wilson said, he did not realize how serious a situation would subsequently develop. But he assured the industry of his awareness now that something must be done to overcome as much of the delay as possible in completion of the two plants and minimize the shut-down time of the mill that may have to close for repairs. The seriousness of the plate situation takes on added significance in view of the sudden 20-percent jump in the Maritime Commission program.

The components situation with respect to the shipbuilding program is much improved, Mr. Wilson announced. Planning is organized to a point where the War Production Board feels it knows where the necessary component parts for ships will come from and when. Scheduling is so arranged that hundreds of manufacturers are beginning to meet their schedules exactly on time. That a lack of plates will prevent continuation of the progress made thus far is hardly a thought that either the steel industry or the War Production Board can afford to entertain, Mr. Wilson declared. He assured the committee that the War Production Board will do everything possible to see that the new facilities are expedited and help where it can to make industry's job somewhat easier. Perhaps it will be possible to improve both the aluminum and steel situations at the same time, he suggested.

Additional remarks by Mr. Fairless

Mr. Fairless pledged that the United States Steel Corporation's full resources would be put forth in an attempt to keep the Edgar Thompson plant in operation as long as possible. He voiced appreciation of the expression of confidence in the steel industry and promised that all companies affiliated with the United States Steel Corporation would continue to produce plates to the best of their ability.

COMMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SERVICES

Remarks of Admiral Vickery

Admiral Vickery agreed with Dr. Zimmerman that the whole problem of specifications should be carefully reviewed. Although the tests of the steel at the Irvin Works fell slightly below the specification, the material would have been accepted, he said, had the deviation been reported to the Maritime Commission. Probably a combination of circumstances, principally with respect to welding stresses, caused the failure of the tanker, steamship *Schenectady*. Admiral Vickery further said that he was in agreement with the report of the technical committee of the American Bureau of Shipping (referred to in Dr. Zimmerman's report) as to the cause of the ship's failure.

When the war first started, the move from riveted to welded ship construction was at a much slower pace than it is now. After a while it became apparent that ship production could be accelerated by going to a straight welded structure. Welders, admittedly, have not been as fully experienced as they should be and an excessive labor turnover has added to the further difficulty. The quality of some of the welding rods being used is open to question. The experience of management has likewise been limited. The Maritime Commission is trying to correct failures in welding by insisting upon better-trained supervisors and the exercise of closer supervision over welders at their work.

Remarks of Admiral Robinson

The Navy Department is greatly concerned over the effect of a loss of plate production upon the shipbuilding program, Admiral Robinson said. There must be no let-down in production if the Nation is to get ahead with the war program, he emphasized. Admiral Robinson expressed confidence that the Maritime Commission will be able to work out any of the necessary changes in welding techniques, and urged the steel industry to make every effort to prevent the plate situation described by Mr. Batcheller from holding up the Navy's production schedule.

Statement by General Clay

The Army continues to hold the utmost confidence in the steel industry, General Clay said, and hopes to receive its continued support in meeting the demands of the war program.

Remarks of Admiral Cochrane

The Navy's entire shipbuilding program has progressed on the basis of implicit trust in the steel industry, Admiral Cochrane asserted. The loss of that confidence cannot afford to take place now. In drawing up its specifications, the Navy must follow some measure of conservatism and yet not be overconservative. Naval architects do not attempt to design to the exact stress, but, by means of an elaborate series of calculations, attempt to compare the design of a previously successful ship with the design at hand. No steel company should attempt to interpret specifications or read into them a particular problem, Admiral Cochrane said, but he pointed out that the Navy is perfectly willing to discuss specification problems with any representative from the industry.

Quality control: Question about whether the Steel Division has any responsibility for the quality of steel being produced has not come up recently, Mr. Batcheller said. The Division has been concerned about whether it has applied undue pressure upon the steel industry. On the other hand, the claimant agencies have been increasingly insistent upon greater output. The quality of steel, he felt, is a matter for consideration between steel-producing companies and inspectors and specification writers of the claimant agencies. The Steel Division has no staff or facilities for specifying how companies will make their steel to meet specifications or for policing their methods of production or inspection.

Mr. Fairless believed that two things should be done to safeguard quality: (1) That inspection pratcices be tightened up to make for the closest kind of cooperation between the producing units and the Government agency's inspectors, and (2) that present specifications be completely reviewed by those technically qualified to judge what revisions may be necessary.

Changes in specifications, committee members agreed, should originate with those who have a complete knowledge of naval architecture and ship construction. It is a company's responsibility, when presented with a set of specifications, to live up to its contractual obligation, Mr. Grace said. Many specifications have already been revised and new steels are being made to serve different needs. But two separate problems are involved in maintaining quality to meet existing specifications and revising such specifications if they are not entrely suitable. Mr. Grace expressed satisfaction with the attitude displayed by representatives of the Government and pledged that the industry would carry on effectively and efficiently.

Although agreeing that companies should not take it upon themselves to make the necessary changes in specifications, Mr. Fairless suggested that the industry might appropriately call the attention of the services to a need for revision. If the steel industry feels that specifications should be reviewed, it should so suggest to the Steel Division, Mr. Batcheller, said. The War Production Board will attempt to implement the industry's suggestions by acting as liaison between the industry and authorities of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission and other agencies. A program developed under the sponsorship of the services can then be carried out by the industry.

Dr. Zimmerman was hopeful that out of the whole discussion at the meeting will eventually come a more rational interpretation of specifications. He called for a more clear-cut understanding between the steel-making companies and the Government agencies on the principal test to be used as a basis for acceptance or rejection of ship-plate steel. Determination of whether the specifications are really designed to assure the proper performance of steel in welded ships is also needed. The stronger the steel, the greater will be the difficulty encountered if welding practices are not of the very best. It may be a mistake, Dr. Zimmerman suggested, for those drawing up specifications to insist upon higher tensile strength when present welding practices are such that the integrity of the ship would be enhanced if the tensile strength were lowered.

Dr. Zimmerman's report, it was generally agreed, would be invaluable in laying the ground work for review of present specifications with the intention of harmonizing them with the true requirements. Dr. Gibbs, head of the War Production Board Shipbuilding Division, will be called in to confer with Mr. Tower and work out a concrete program for later submission to the full committee.

APRIL 6, 1943.

STATEMENT READ BY DR. R. E. ZIMMERMAN, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF RESEARCH, UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION

STEEL PLATES FOR SHIPBUILDING

The situation arising from recent investigations, hearings, and consequent publicity regarding the use of steel in welded ships calls for a further pertinent discussion at this time. Insofar as we know, the effective prosecution of the war continues to demand, as

heretofore, the production of a maximum amount of steel for many purposes, which in turn requires the undiminished efforts of every member of the industry. Cooperation and collaboration on the part of users of steel are equally important factors in arriving at the best end results.

Unfortunately we are passing through a period in which the serious cracking of a certain welded ship, or ships, has inspired a vast amount of uninformed comment, and attempts have been made to throw suspicion from one underlying cause to another. There have been evidences of runaway judgment, elaboration of false premises, and a spreading of apprehension through wide circles that defective and substandard steel has jeopardized the integrity of numerous welded ships. Attempts have been made to lay primary responsibility for the failure of a tanker upon steel which was alleged to be approximately 5 percent below specified tensile strength. Without weighing the evidence or appraising the facts, spokesmen have declared opening that lives have been endangered and the war effort impaired by the furnishing of steel which was totally unsuited to the purpose of shipbuilding.

This is a regrettable situation, not only because improper deductions are being drawn from erroneous or partial statements, thus diverting attention from the significant factors involved, but also because of the tendency it brings to subordinate reason and judgment to protection against inquisition.

Among the notions which are now abroad we refer, first of all, to the one which charges steel with the responsibility for the failure of the tanker steamship *Schenectady*. According to specifications, the minimum tensile strength of the plates in this ship should have been 58,000 pounds per square inch. The particular sheer strake plate in which the crack started o January 16, furnished from the Homestead works, was tested shortly after the casualty by an outside investigator, Prof. S. H. Graf, of Oregon State College, who reported values averaging 55,350 pounds at a temperature of 60° F. and 58,600 pounds at 20°, the atmospheric temperature prevailing at the time of the ailure Additional samples from the same plate, subsequently obtained and tested at room temperature in the laboratories of Carnegie-Illinois as well as by an independent commercial laboratory, gave the following results:

Homestead Laboratory, standard 8-inch specimen, 59,140 pounds per square inch.

Pittsburgh Testing Laboratory, standard 8-inch specimen, 59,570 pounds per square inch.

Still another specimen tested in New York under the auspices of the American Bureau of Shipping showed a tensile strength of 56,880 pounds.

These data, which are not in full agreement, indicate at least that the unit tensile strength of the steel in question was not more than 4.6 percent below the specified minimum, if only for purposes of argument we accept the lower figures reported by Professor Graf. Now it is hardly necessary to point out that naval architects do not design ships with a margin of safety which would be seriously impaired by any such departure from specified strength. For the important strength-members in a vessel the calculated maximum stresses are related to the specified minimum tensile strength of the steel in the ratio of approximately 3:1 to 4:1. In the case of the steamship *Schenectady*, for example, this means that if the steel were actually 2,650 pounds per square inch below the specifications, such defection would have subtracted approximately one-fifteenth of the extra allowance for safety. Surely some factors other than the one under discussion must be held responsible for the sudden failure of the tanker, or similar failures elsewhere. Moreover, with respect to the practical bearing of those irregularities in the testing of plates at Irvin, Works, recently disclosed and condemned, we assert, that, unethical as the practice might have been, the safety of ships and the lives of men have not been jeopardized by the inclusion of a small proportion of product which fell below the specified tensile strength by approximately 3,000 pounds, that is, between 5 or 6 percent. Such a charge cannot be justified on the basis of engineering analysis, metallurgical knowledge, or experience in shipbuilding.

In the specification of steel for ships, all parties at interest recognize the value of a set of designated figures, based upon tests, by which to classify the material produced for use as acceptable or otherwise. Some persons would construe the results of tensile tests, for example, as precise values representing the properties of every part of a prescribed lot of steel, to be applied rigidly and not subject to interpretation or modification. We do not in any way belittle the value of tests or the maintenance of standards, but wish to point out that 100 percent precision and 100 percent reproducibility are rarely attainable in the testing of steel and that there is room for the exercise of reason and judgment. One of the services, recognizing the principle, approves the acceptance of material averaging within the specification, even though single samples may show results 5 percent below the lower limit. It is unlikely that if this departure were considered critical the material falling on the low side would be accepted. As indicative of an official attitude, we quote the following from a letter of instructions issued early in 1942:

"It must be recognized, not only by inspectors but by the building yards whom copies of this letter are being furnished, that under present circumstances early completion of serviceable ships is of greater national importance than the high measure of perfection required for full durability in peacetime."

"As regards the number of physical-test specimens and the number of chemical analyses that are made for all grades of plates procured under the subject specifications the Bureau authorizes the inspectors to reduce or waive such tests when, in their opinion, delivery can be expedited and the serviceability of the ships for the present emergency will not be adversely affected. * * * The Bureau is very earnest in its desire to facilitate the manufacture of steel but desires also to guard the necessary quality of ships upon which some naval action or service may depend."

The precision of tensile testing is affected by such factors as the inherent accuracy of the machine itself, by the speed of testing or rate of application of the load, and by the degree of perfection in eliminating minute notches in the edges of specimens prepared for test. Duplicate and quadruplicate samples are used to guard against some of these influences which may affect the results by thousands of pounds. Then there is always the question as to how much material is accurately represented by the samples chosen. An immense amount of work has been done to rationalize this feature, yet provision is made in many cases for retesting so that satisfactory steel may not be arbitrarily rejected. Applying the most rigid interpretation, one may say that the results of a tensile test, within the limitations of accuracy of the test itself, measure the properties of only the material in the specimen tested. This is an extreme view, but throws some light upon the problem.

Complete uniformity in steel is highly desirable, yet there are factors which operate toward a degree of nonuniformity, despite the most meticulous efforts in the making, rolling, and heat treatment of steel. Thus arises the need for a practicable range in the specification of properties. Segregation of the nonmetallic element in large ingots, such as are used in the production of plates, is not entirely avoidable, and consequent differences in chemical composition lead to the development of differences in tensile properties. The rate of cooling of all parts of a plate after rolling is not entirely uniform, and this, too, is a well-known factor in affecting strength and ductility. Oftentimes the metallurgist and the inspector ask themselves how much of this material logically should be rejected because of the indications of a test on a necessarily small sample?

You in turn may now ask the question, Why not travel away from the lower side of the specified range and produce material in the upper reaches, safe from falling below the minimum? The answer is that the allowances of the range are already used and that material at or slightly beyond the upper limit may be more undesirable than that which falls below the lower line.

In the matter of producing steel best suited for the construction of ships by welding there is a conflict of principles. The designer or naval architect wishes high strength, which means high alloying elements, and the metallurgist along with the welding engineer desires good weldability attended by minimum alteration of physical properties, which means low alloying elements. Undoubtedly there must be some give and take in this proposition to arrive at the best compromise. Let us not be so sure that the presently specified physical properties are the one best compromise, especially in view of the accelerated pace at which welded ships are being constructed, with the employment of many technicians whose experience is necessarily scant and limited. Considering the margin allowed in ship design between calculated stresses and the tensile strength of steel specified, it is more than probable that dependability in the welded structure would be enhanced, rather than impaired, by the use of steel of somewhat lower tensile strength. This is particularly pertinent to cases in which anything but the very finest welding technique and procedure are used, and there certainly is room to raise the question. In this connection we repeat the earlier remark, that the safety of ships and the lives of men have not been jeopardized by the inclusion of a small proportion of steel plates which fell below the specified tensile strength by approximately 3,000 pounds per square inch. With welding conditions as they are, there are those who might logically favor the use of plates of lower tensile strength.

The conflict of principles, to which reference was made in the preceding paragraph, is involved again in the matter of the thickness of plates. For example, to set up the specified strength in a relatively thick plate requires more alloying element, such as carbon, than in a thin one. Yet in welding a thick plate there is a relatively drastic subsequent cooling effect, due to the mass of surrounding metal, and a consequent greater hardening effect. In other words, a 1¼-inch plate ordered to 60,000 pounds tensile strength will carry a higher percentage of carbon than a ½-inch plate ordered to the same strength, and when welded will show much more alteration of the metal near the weld than will the thinner plate. One may say that these are metallurgical niceties, but they are related to specifications and to the performance of steel in welded ships, and thus concern all of us because of the situation with which we are dealing. Such considerations raise the question as to whether the shift from riveted to welded construction has been made without giving full weight to metallurgical features, safeguards in welding practice, and an interpretation of specifications to harmonize them with the requirements of currently feasible procedures.

In the light of what is happening, and the irrational furor in various quarters about the properties of steel as related to its performance in welded ships, it is not unlikely

that we need a renewed understanding of what specifications should specify, and how they should do it. With respect to structural steel for ships, assuming that the design is the same, is the range for tensile strength, 60,000–72,000 pounds as specified by the American Society for Testing Materials and the Federal specifications the correct one, or the 59,000–70,000 pounds of the American Bureau of Shipping, or the 58,240–71,680 pounds of Lloyds? Again, is the proper yield point simply one-half the value of the tensile strength or one-half the value but not less than 33,000 pounds? Features of ship design may cancel out these differences, but the steel maker would still like to know, especially in times of unparalleled pressure for maximum output, whether specifications are really specifying actually required and optimum properties for the intended use. There is a community of interest here and it is intensified by the determination to do the utmost on behalf of the war effort.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO ALL STEEL-PLATE PRODUCERS

APRIL 15, 1943

It is vitally important to the war program that inspections and tests on steel plate be applied in such a way as to meet two essential objectives—that the plates meet the specifications and tolerances set by the procurement agencies, and that the volume of plate produced and shipped be maintained at the highest possible level.

I am, of course, aware that since the recent disclosures at the Truman committee hearings, both industrial and Government inspectors in every plate mill in the land have been more than usually vigilant. It is proper that they should be so, of course, and I have complete confidence that there will be no repetition anywhere in the industry of the kind of thing disclosed before the Truman committee. But it is equally important that the volume of steel plate produced and shipped be maintained, and over-rigid inspection practices could easily defeat that end.

The Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Department, and the War Production Board fully realize that 100 percent uniformity in steel is rarely attainable. Minor variations will frequently be found in steel plates which can be used for ship construction with complete safety, since the naval architects' specifications are invariably drawn so as to leave an ample margin above the maximum stresses which are to be expected in actual service. It would be disastrous if serviceable plate should be rejected in such volume as to diminish the quantity which can be delivered to the yards.

With the enormous and increasing pressure of our shipbuilding program, it is absolutely necessary that sober good judgment guide the entire testing and inspection process. If, to avoid all appearance of laxity, we stand up so straigh that we lean over backward, we shall simply delay the whole shipbuilding effort—with possibly ruinous consequences. It would be quite as bad to be too rigid as to be too lax.

What we all want is plate from which serviceable ships can be made—plate which the builder of a cargo carrier or a cruiser can put into his vessel with full confidence in its dependability. That in general is what we have been getting during the past year; the inspection practices which gave us that kind of plate should be continued. It is perfectly possible to cut plate production so sharply as to cripple the whole program, simply by insisting on the rejection of plates because of minor variations which do not affect the serviceability of the plate in the slightest; it is also possible, however, to maintain the proper safety standards while recognizing the customary, accepted margins for error.

Honest good judgment in testing and inspection is the basic need. By all means, let us make sure that the plate sent to the yards will give us ships which deserve the confidence of seamen and the Nation itself; but by all means, also, let us avoid the danger of delaying the entire program by a blind, unthinking insistence on unattainable perfection.

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciated the Senator's kind words regarding the Truman committee, its work and its report, but I regretted the suggestion that there was no indication of any profit to anyone by reason of the faked reports of tests in the Irvin Steel Works. Of course, if the steel had been rejected as below specifications, which was admitted to be the case, the corporation involved would have suffered, because it would not have sold defective plates, so that there was very definite evidence of profit to the concern.

Mr. DAVIS. I have read into the RECORD the report of the hearings of April 8, and the statement there was that there was no profit to anyone in that particular. With reference to the steel itself, I raised the same question the Senator raised, when I went through the steel works, and it was said that there was not one of the plates which they could not have sold, perhaps at a higher price than that at which they were then selling to the Government; so there could not have been any loss to the company itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. We had no evidence of that kind before the Truman committee from any of the company officials concerned. If they can sell defective plates at a better price——

Mr. DAVIS. As I have already stated, if the committee had taken the time I took to go through the mill, and could have seen the records as I have seen them, the probability is that the committee would have arrived at about the same conclusion I reached.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is familiar with the very great difficulties which the committee encountered in its investigation because of the refusal to permit the investigators to go into the mills.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; I pointed out to the management that they should have received the committee, and, as I recall, they informed me that when the representatives of the committee came they merely stated that they wanted to go through the steel works, and did not in the first instance show their credentials. After they presented their credentials, the company officials were very happy to take them through the mills and to present every phase of the production process to them. As I recall, there was no member of the Truman committee there the first time they made their inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. The investigators made it entirely clear that they were the authorized representatives of the committee, and they still had great difficulty in getting access to the records which were being handled—I will not say tampered with, but handled—at the time, and I am sure that the Senator does not wish anyone to infer that he would justify marking records so as to fake them.

Mr. DAVIS. No; I would not; and I say that those who did it deliberately should be punished.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not take a position different from that taken by the president of the corporation, Mr. Fairless, who denounced these practices before our committee, said he was amazed at them, and that it was a case of very poor management?

Mr. DAVIS. If the Senator from Maine had paid attention to the remarks I made today, he would have heard me denounce the practices, though perhaps not in such language as that employed by the president of the steel corporation.

Let me say that in the report which I am putting into the RECORD appears the testimony of Mr. Fairless, the president of the concern, who said that those responsible should be punished, and the statement and newspaper clipping I submitted to the able Senator from Maine a few days ago, before I presented it for the record, carried the story of Mr. Fairless with reference to those employees who were negligent, if it may be said that they were negligent in their duty.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator realizes fully, does he not, that there has been a very carefully concerted campaign in certain sections of the press undertaking to undermine and discredit the report and the evidence of the Truman committee, at the same time that the grand jury is in session in Pittsburgh determining whether it will indict some of the men responsible in this case, and calculated to create an atmosphere which might perhaps lead the grand jury to hesitate?

Mr. DAVIS. If the Senator from Maine had been attentive he would have heard me say that I thought that if the committee had gone through the steel mills, as I did, and secured the facts, the committee might not have reached the conclusion it did reach.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator have any impression that the speech which he has made today, or perhaps garbled portions of it, will not be used to carry on further the campaign of attack on the Truman committee which has thus far prevailed?

Mr. DAVIS. I hope it will not, because my purpose has been to make a statement putting into the RECORD the hearings of the Iron and Steel Division of the War Production Board of April 8, which has been held back for some reason or other, and came out only the latter part of last week. I would have put them in the RECORD last Monday had I had the opportunity to do so.

I should not want the Senator in any way even to think for a moment that I would say anything on the floor of the Senate for the purpose of influencing a grand jury. I know the Senator does

not mean I would make a statement for that particular purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was very careful not to say that. I stated that some of what the Senator said here, or perhaps garbled portions of it, will be used in that endeavor, by the same forces which have been carrying on the other campaign.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator's committee has a newspaper bureau, I presume, to follow up all the newspapers publish on this particular subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; it does not.

Mr. DAVIS. They do have some way of getting clippings, and if anything of the nature the Senator has stated is brought to my attention I shall be glad to clarify it.

The Senator told me a few moments ago that the grand jury now in session at Pittsburgh will report tomorrow. If they do, then they will never see these remarks, and no doubt their minds are already made up as to what they will report.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania was to put into the RECORD last week the minutes of April 8. I thought the Senator was to do that, and it was entirely agreeable so far as the committee was concerned. I am sure no one will challenge the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania as the authority in the United States Senate on steel and a long-time champion of the interests of all the workers in the steel industry.

Mr. DAVIS. I presume the committee has the report I am today putting into the RECORD, because it was given out to the press and to the general public, and the newspapers already have published a part of it, so that would not be any news to those who read the newspapers.

What I have said is merely my own personal opinion as to what I have seen as I have traveled through the steel mill in which I spent the earlier part of my life helping produce the material which has resulted in this new plate-producing machine which can be seen in the Irvin works at Irwin, Pa. I might state to the Senator that, while I do not wish to be held to the particular figures I am about to give—I have sent for the correct figures—the mill I visited produces more in an hour than the mill in which I used to work would produce in a day of 8 hours.

Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that we had men in the United States who were skilled and who had sufficient vision to build the modern machine and develop it to its present state of efficiency, we could not win the war today, because we could not produce sufficient steel. In America today, one company is producing more steel than Germany, Italy, and Belgium combined. We have two steel companies which are producing more steel than France and Great Britain combined. In fact, we are producing more steel today than is produced by practically all the steel makers of the world combined, with the exception of Russia, and it may be possible to include Russia as well. The modern machine in America has made this possible.

Mr. President, while we deplore the fact that in the beginning many men were forced out of work because of the introduction of modern machinery, yet we find that as the result of the introduction of modern machinery nearly, if not as many men are eventually hired to work, and they become more skilled and proficient.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to say that there is one thing that could be improved by those who control the modern machine. I made the same statement in a speech I delivered some time ago. I am informed that, as compared to the old hand method of manufacture, $17 a ton is saved in the production by modern machinery of every ton of sheet steel plates for automobiles and tins, from the time the ore is mined until the steel goes into the automobile or tin can.

The financial benefit resulting from the introduction of the modern machinery, which threw thousands of skilled men out of work, went to the producers, the automobile makers and to the public generally, but not one dollar of all the money thus earned by the new machine was set aside for the men who were deprived of their jobs, some past the age of 60 years, many of whom were unable to obtain work at other places. In fact the companies who had control of the machines failed to make any provision for the men who were thrown out of work by their introduction.

Mr. President, I do not in any way uphold fraudulent practices. I was taught as a young law student that fraud vitiates everything it touches, and if there has been any fraud in the present case those guilty should be punished.

Mr. President, I do not like to see a great number of men who are giving all they have, every ounce of their strength, every dollar they possess, sacrificed for another purpose than that alleged, which I expect to discuss on the floor of the Senate before the present session is ended.

I am glad that the Senator from Maine interrupted me, thus giving me this opportunity, and I now yield the floor to my distinguished friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I promised him I would take only 15 minutes, and I have taken considerably more time than that.

INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION—PHOSPHATE ESSENTIAL OF A FIGHTING SOIL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for weeks now the people of this country have been told that our great Nation is threatened with a shortage of vitally needed foods. We have been warned that we face a deficit in the one war material for which no synthetic substitute can be invented and for which no change in military strategy can relieve the need. We must have more food. We must have more food for the nourishment of men in battle, whether they fight on ships, or in the air, or on the ground. We need more food for the men and women who labor on production lines, no matter what weapons or implements of combat they may be making. We need more food to nourish our civilian population, and we must produce a surplus for the hungry people of the world. That is the problem we face this year, and the next and the next. For the need of abundant production of food will not be ended on the day our armies triumph. World security cannot be guaranteed in the face of world starvation. To turn our victory into lasting peace we will need to produce more food than we have ever produced before.

THE INCREASED PRODUCTION OF FOOD IS NOT SIMPLY A PROBLEM OF MANPOWER—ESSENTIALLY IT IS A QUESTION OF LAND POWER

In committees and on the Senate floor we have listened to estimates of requirements and forecasts of production. Already it is admitted by some that the goals of food production required for 1943 are almost hopeless of realization. Reduction of the potential deficit has been presented to us as a problem of engineering and organization, of transportation and machinery, of prices and manpower. Remedies and palliatives have been proposed. Already legislative measures for relief have been adopted. We have done what we could on the advice of high authority. Yet, in my judgment, we have not touched the fundamental barrier to increased food production. We have not yet considered a basic remedy. We have forgotten that the ultimate source of food production is neither the labor of men nor the power of machines. The world's supply of food will not increase progressively forever as more manpower is made available. It is not primarily a problem of rationing, of transportation, or of parity in farmers' income. It cannot be controlled by prices and priorities alone. When all these factors are adjusted the problem will be with us still. It will be with us until we recognize the truth, until we face this fact: The basic problem of food supply is a problem of land power.

Let us not delude ourselves that more than a fraction of the problem has been solved by the deferment of farm labor from military service, although that must be done to meet the crisis which our years of blindness have created. Let no one think that mobile units of farm labor will solve it, no matter how skilled they may become or how wisely they are located. Higher payment for farm labor and priorities for the repair and purchase of farm equipment will not remove the threat of hunger if victory is postponed, nor will special payments as incentives to production bring an end to apprehensions. These remedies may provide relief from the results of declining soil efficiency. Some of them are essential as measures of justice to farmers. All together they may help to meet our food production goals this year. But they obscure the fundamental problem, and they are only substitutes for a fundamental remedy. Unless we face this truth at once, we are headed for disaster.

Unless the basic problem is relieved, there will come a year, and in the not

too distant future, when all these remedies and palliatives will not be sufficient. Then every farm boy might be summoned home from battle to take his place at work on the land, yet the total production of food would be almost wholly unaffected. We might raise his wages to a sum undreamed of, we could make farm machinery abundantly available and at low cost—these bright incentives to production, however, would not avert catastrophe. Unless we do something to prevent it now, the power of our land itself will have failed for the future. It is failing now. This very year thousands of men deferred from military service to work on farms will be devoting all their energies to soil which in spite of their best efforts will produce less than a third as much as it could. It is a shocking waste of manpower in a war.

MANPOWER IS WASTED WHILE A DEMONSTRATION OF INCREASED PRODUCTION ON MORE THAN 40,000 FARMS IGNORED. THESE FARMERS PUT PHOSPHORUS ON THEIR SOIL

It is a shocking and a needles waste of men and machines in the face of a scarcity of both. We must suffer it this year, perhaps, but I shall not suffer such a waste in silence. I raise my voice in protest against the blindness, and the antiquated methods which up to this late date have prevented the fertilizer industry from profiting by the experience of 42,000 farmers scattered over this country. Production on the farms of the 42,000 farmers will surpass the goals established for war food supply this year, and that without more manpower or more machinery. These farmers did it last year. They will do it this year and the next. They are located in 29 different States in every part of the Union. Their soils and their climates differ. Their problems and their habits are not the same. One bond only they have in common. These farmers have departed from the practices of the past as they fertilized their soil. They have peacefully revolted from the shackles of tradition and the domination of the industry through which plant food has been made available to the land in the past. They have put the precious mineral phosphate on their soil, the energy preserved in fossils from the prehistoric seas.

Mr. President, those farmers, 42,000 of them, have participated in a demonstration program which had its origin in Government facilities located at Muscle Shoals, in Alabama. The program was begun by T. V. A. in 1935 to test out the new plant foods developed in the laboratories of the Authority located in my State. It has been carried out in cooperation with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States. It has expanded during the past few years until today a total of 41,951 farms of over 6,000,000 acres in 29 States have been enrolled. On those farms production of war foods—meat and eggs and dairy products—has already been increased by an average of more than 30 percent, with no additional machinery and without any increase in manpower. No farm labor has been imported for those farms; no men have been called home from factory or from camp. On the same land the same men, with the same equipment, increased production by an average of a little over 30 percent. They did it by putting P_2O_5 on their land.

P_2O_5 is phosphoric pentoxide, usually referred to as phosphoric acid, or phosphorus, the life-giving elements made available to the farmer in phosphatic plant food. The average use of P_2O_5 on those demonstration farms was 17 pounds on every acre devoted to crop and meadow and pasture. That was the average use which resulted in an average production increase of more than 30 percent.

On the most successful farms in that demonstration program, production of the foods we need today soared more than 60 percent over the previous maximum, but likewise without the use of more machinery, and without more manpower. On those farms as much as 30 pounds of the mineral were applied to every cleared acre.

Compare that use of phosphate and those production results with the average use of that mineral on the rest of the farms of the country, where conventional and obsolete fertilizing practices are permitted to prevail. The average use of P_2O_5 in the country as a whole is only 2 pounds per acre of crop and meadow and pasture land. That is the average use when fertilizing materials made available by private companies are employed. In the midst of war, this matchless builder of soil fertility is withheld from the farms of our Nation while men and machines are released to make up the deficit in food production, and complicated ration systems control the distribution of our restricted food supply. Nothing at all is being done about the basic problem. Nothing at all is being done to remove the mineral deficit which limits food supply, and to substitute the power of the land for man-hours of toil.

NO EFFORT IS BEING MADE TO INCREASE PRODUCTION OF FOOD BY MORE ABUNDANT USE OF PHOSPHORUS ON THE REST OF THE FARMS OF THE COUNTRY

Mr. President, in the face of this record of production gains on over 40,000 farms, and in the face of mounting estimates of needs, not one step has been taken on a national scale to increase the average use of P_2O_5 from 2 to 17 pounds per acre on the rest of the Nation's hungry soil. Instead, we talk in terms of planting larger acreage, of using more machines and more man-hours of work. We are blind to what has been accomplished on more than 40,000 farms where the same acreage, the same men, with the addition of only a different plant food, have already raised production above our wartime goals. Nothing is being done by the fertilizer industry or, so far as I can discover, by the Food Administration to urge the industry to expand capacity to produce the needed element more generously in order that the use of 30 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre with a potential increase in food production of 60 percent might be our national goal—a goal to be achieved without more manpower, without more machinery. Yet just that increase in food supply could be accomplished in just that way if the records of 42,000 farms may be taken as a guide. The work would be done by the increased power of the soil, not by the additional labor of men or machines. This is a tremendous discovery in increased soil efficiency.

Think what a noise is raised when a man builds a ship in less than record time, when the plant efficiency of one war industry is raised, when each man-hour of work is more productively employed and the total output is greater than before. Remember the censure of those practices of labor which some men blame for limitations of the effective use of manpower in war industries. Yet no public attention at all is attracted when more than 40,000 farmers alter their farm managements so as to increase, by more than a third, production of those very foods which are today a basic war necessity, the foods of which we have a shortage. And to this date, no committee room has echoed in protest because the marketing policies of a private industry and the blindness or subservience of a few officials in a Government department combine to let millions of acres of land produce less than their potential capacity and to require the labor of men of military age to be partially wasted.

THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY REPORTS A SURPLUS CAPACITY TO PRODUCE P_2O_5—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY DISSENTS AND RECOMMENDS EXPANDED USE

Instead of inaugurating a national policy to encourage other producers of food to follow the methods and achieve the results those farmers have accomplished, instead of demanding construction of capacity for the increased production of P_2O_5 which such a national policy of expanded use would require, we are complacently informed through the organ of the fertilizer industry that the supply of P_2O_5 is more than adequate in this country, and that there is now a surplus of capacity for the production of phosphorus beyond the estimates of use for this year. Nothing is being done to get existing plants to operate at the boasted full capacity, or even to get their stock piles out on the land. Yet P_2O_5 is the answer to our problem of increased food supply, unless the reported and documented experience of 42,000 farmers cooperating in the T. V. A. program is to be completely discarded as unworthy of notice.

Mr. President, that surplus capacity to produce P_2O_5 reported by the industry and confirmed by one official of the Department of Agriculture would be no surplus at all if the need of the land for vitality to produce its limit of food were to measure the demand. It would be no surplus at all if the efficient use of manpower on farms were given a consideration. That capacity is surplus only if traditional policies with respect to encouragement of the use of phosphorus on the soil are permitted to prevail. It is a surplus capacity only if we freeze forever in the fertilizer industry a vested interest in soil exhaustion. There is no surplus at all if we go back to the land as a source for our estimates of the need for P_2O_5. On the contrary, if we do that, we will discover that we are facing in this country a critical shortage in our capacity to produce the amounts of P_2O_5 which

the production of food for war requires, and which the efficient use of manpower on farms demands. One Federal agency has taken that step, has recognized what seems to me the basic problem. One agency asserts that more P_2O_5 should be used on the land, more than we now have capacity in this country to produce.

Over 18 months ago the Tennessee Valley Authority recommended that additional capacity for the production of P_2O_5 should be constructed. Nothing has happened to increase capacity since that recommendation was made. No effort has been made to increase the use of P_2O_5 on the land, although, in the meantime, claims of abundance have changed to admission of deficits in our food supply. Nothing has happened since that recommendation was made, except the rationing of essential food for civilians, except recommendations that farm labor be deferred from military service, except arrangements to import farm labor from neighboring countries, and proposals designed to give money incentives to increase production. Nothing has happened except a series of desperate efforts ignoring the real problem, avoiding the basic remedy, and keeping public attention focused on the relief of symptoms. Nothing has been done to remove the real barrier to abundant food supply, to provide more phosphorus for the soil.

A PUBLIC PLANT FOR THE PRODUCTION OF P_2O_5, A NEEDED WAR MATERIAL, HAS BEEN BLOCKED, AND THE RESULTS OBTAINED ON MORE THAN 40,000 FARMS IGNORED

Mr. President, I have a program to propose, a remedy for the fundamental barrier to production; but, first of all, I want to tell the Senate a story, the full details of which I have learned only the past few weeks—a story of blindness which must challenge all of us. I am no farmer. I am not an agronomist, or a chemist. In those fields I am accustomed to take the advice of experts. But like every other Senator in this Chamber, I have been desperately concerned about the problem of food supply, and the situation on the farms in my State and in the Nation. What I considered a special circumstance in my State was brought to my attention, and I made an independent investigation. I was disturbed to learn that farmers in Alabama who were participating in the T. V. A. demonstration program, to which I have referred, might have their supply of T. V. A. fertilizer restricted, as the Authority's capacity to produce plant food at Muscle Shoals had been curtailed in order that some of the facilities might be diverted to the production of elemental phosphorus needed by the War Department. Phosphorus, of course, has military uses aside from its value as plant food. It is used for incendiaries and smoke screens, tracer bullets, and like implements of war. The process T. V. A. uses to produce its highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizer likewise produces phosphorus for war. That is not true of the process generally used by the fertilizer industry in making superphosphate. I was naturally concerned about any curtailment in the supply of T. V. A. fertilizer because of the effect on my own State, where I knew the product had been used with great success in a program of education since 1935.

I knew, of course, that for more than 2 years the T. V. A. has had plans to build a new phosphorus plant, that the plans have been approved, and that money for construction of the plant was appropriated by Congress last year. I had been informed that designs for the plant had been completed, and I knew that the purchase of a site near Mobile, in my State, had been concluded. I had understood that completion of the plant at Mobile would permit the facilities at Muscle Shoals to be devoted wholly to the production of the plant food which the people in Alabama want to use in larger quantities. And I knew that T. V. A. had been prevented from starting construction of the plant because the War Production Board has been unwilling to release the essential critical materials such a chemical plant requires. So production of T. V. A. fertilizer at Muscle Shoals continued to be reduced.

I was deeply concerned, therefore, Mr. President, about the delay in starting operation of the phosphorus plant at Mobile. I wanted to find out when activity there might be expected to begin. I began my inquiry principally concerned about the personal fortunes of the Alabama farmers who would be affected if restriction in T. V. A.'s production of fertilizer were to continue. I must confess I had not appreciated the extent to which that demonstration program had grown in Alabama. I did not realize that since 1935, 5,000 farmers had been enrolled in my State and that more than 2,500 are now participating. I was not aware of the extent of their achievements, and I did not appreciate the full relation of their demonstration to the problem of our food supply for war. What I discovered has astonished me. The implications of the program are staggering in importance.

I call attention to the demonstration program, with high hopes today, for I believe that the new Food Administrator will be heartened by this record which has been so blindly overlooked by all of us to date. Chester Davis is a proven friend of the T. V. A. program. I know of my own knowledge that in the past he has rendered services of great help to the program. I am sure that Chester Davis will have the courage and the vision to face the fundamental barrier to increased food supply. I trust he will be free from those advisers devoted to the practices of fertilizer use dishonored by history. To those traditional practices the worn-out lands of the South and the Dust Bowl are monuments enough. A shortage of food for war should not be exacted from this Nation as a last intolerable tribute.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO FOOD PRODUCTION IN ALABAMA AND IN OTHER STATES AS A RESULT OF USING P_2O_5

I want every Senator to know what has happened in my own State as a result of using P_2O_5 in the demonstration program. North Alabama was cotton country when T. V. A. started its agricultural program—when the plants at Muscle Shoals, idle since the First World War, began to turn out P_2O_5. We were not producing the kind of food we need today. There was little livestock. Even 5 years ago there was no dairy industry in those 13 counties. A few scattered farms produced a small supply of bottled milk for consumption in adjacent towns. That was all. Today in that same small area, as a result of the T. V. A. program, there are five cheese plants. They buy 100,000 pounds of milk a day from the farmers who are putting P_2O_5 on their land. There is a new butter plant in the town of Cullman. Those six plants buy the surplus after the whole demand for fluid milk in all the nearby towns is satisfied. A miracle has come to pass in my State in 5 years.

When I read those summaries of results in Alabama of course I was stirred. As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I had listened to testimony describing the shortage we are facing in meat and dairy products. I had been reminded that beef and milk and cheese and butter are as essential as gunpowder in war. So I realized I had stumbled on something of vast significance. I asked for reports from other areas, for I knew the program was not confined to the South alone, and I wanted to know if the results in Alabama were due to purely local causes. I found reports from Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and New England. The program has been going on in 29 States. I have read letters from farmers themselves in many States and reports of county agents and State directors of extension. I have examined the records of T. V. A. The story was there. It had been reported.

Mr. President, a little later I want to read excerpts from a few of those reports and letters. At this point, let me simply say that the records are all alike. They vary only in degree. In the seven States of the Tennessee Valley, where the demonstration program has been intensified, and where the use of P_2O_5 has been most generous, results are almost unbelievable. But everywhere, in 29 States, in every important farming area of the country, participating farmers report more production on the same land without more manpower. They maintain more animals on the same acreage, and that is not the end of the story of expanded food production. Those farmers get more milk from each cow, more eggs from every hen. Their livestock weighs more. Their families consume more food on the farms, but at the same time their cash income rises from increased sales of the surplus. Their reports show a definite trend toward the full and efficient use of every resource of the farm, every acre, every animal, every machine, and every man. That is the way the land and the farms of the country can be totally mobilized for total war. There is no doubt about it.

WHY IS THIS PROGRAM NOT EXTENDED TO THE WHOLE COUNTRY, AND WHY IS PLANT CAPACITY NOT INCREASED?

Yet the committees of this Congress have not been advised of the results of this demonstration by any of the experts who have come before us to recommend the methods through which our war food requirements can be met. I cannot understand why they are not promoting the use of P_2O_5 on every acre, why the results of this plant food are not broadcast to every farmer. I have tried to find out why this major issue of an increase in soil efficiency is not the one we are asked to consider by those responsible for the supply of food for war. I wanted to know, when I started my investigation, why construction of the T. V. A. plant at Mobile, which would produce 46,000 tons of P_2O_5 a year, had been blocked. To such questions I have not yet found an acceptable answer.

Certainly there is nothing speculative about the results which have been accomplished by the use of the products of the public plant in operation at Muscle Shoals. Scientific caution is not the reason why the extension of such a program as a national war policy has been avoided during the past year. Those are not test-tube and check-plot results I have been studying. Those were not phantom farmers working on imaginary acres. The farmers are real men and women. I can give you their names. On their farms pounds of P_2O_5 have been translated into pounds of beef and gallons of milk and tons of feed. Here is a sequence which has been proved, in terms of income, in terms of labor, in terms of food consumed.

Nor can promotion of such a program be rejected on the ground that it is impractical to expect average farmers to change their practices or habits, and to begin to use more P_2O_5 on their soil. Mr. President, those 40,000 farmers have done it. So have their neighbors. Already the benefits of phosphate use have spread from the participating farmers who get their P_2O_5 from T. V. A. to their neighbors who have bought it from commercial sources. In the reports I find many references to neighborhood contagion. Later I shall refer to some of them. The use of phosphate and the production of food appear to have increased in familiar ratio on the adjacent farms where observations have been reported, although the results have not been tabulated and reported. No vast organization has been set up to get this program under way, no elaborate administrative machinery has been created. That is not the reason why this program has failed to be expanded as part of a national war policy. Only a few people have been added to the Federal pay roll to accomplish those results. The farmers have done the work themselves.

THE MARKETING POLICIES OF THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY AND THE UNACKNOWLEDGED LIMITATIONS OF COMMERCIAL CAPACITY ARE THE ONLY BARRIERS TO INCREASED USE OF P_2O_5 AND INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION

There is no obstacle to wide extension of the program, so far as I can discover, except that our national food production policy has not yet included a vigorous program of encouragement in the use of phosphorus, and except that the supply of phosphatic fertilizer in this country is limited. But the latter barrier to expanded use of P_2O_5 and full production of food is not admitted. On the contrary, construction of a public plant has been impeded while the fertilizer industry claims a surplus of capacity above that required to fill the expected demand for P_2O_5. The industry and men in Government service who represent their point of view have deliberately ignored that remedy for the fundamental problem, and prefer to meet the new crisis with outworn methods. They will not turn to a new but tested tool.

That is my sober conclusion. I have buried myself in agricultural reports the past few weeks. I have struggled with the symbols of chemistry and mineralogy, with the relation of soil minerals to the production of needed proteins, carbohydrates, and fats, with the mysterious laws of nature and the ultimate sources of the energy of men. I shall not relate to the Senate those belated explorations. I shall rest my case upon my examination of the demonstration program. Any layman can understand those results. Before I refer to the detailed reports of its accomplishments in various States, the records of the achievements upon which I base my opinions, let me go back a little and describe for Senators who may not be aware of it, how the program originated and how it has been carried out.

THE TEST DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM WAS DEVELOPED TO TEST NEW FERTILIZERS WHICH T. V. A. WAS DIRECTED BY THE CONGRESS TO PRODUCE AT MUSCLE SHOALS

When T. V. A. was created in 1933 one of the things Congress directed it to do was to develop new and cheaper forms of fertilizer at the old nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, a heritage from the First World War, and to test those new plant foods on the land. The Board of the Authority determined to direct its efforts toward the development of more highly concentrated and cheaper phosphatic plant foods, instead of undertaking to improve the quality of the mixed fertilizer upon which the agriculture of the country was then and is now largely dependent.

Mr. President, there was nothing revolutionary about the selection of an improved phosphatic plant food as T. V. A.'s objective. It was no secret that 80 percent of our Nation's soil was limited for production by a phosphorus deficiency. The Board of T. V. A. acted on the advice of leading soil scientists, some of them connected with the Department of Agriculture, who had long advocated the increased use of phosphate on the land, advice which had, however, never been reflected in the marketing practices of the fertilizer industry. For, in spite of the fact that the first commercial fertilizer plant in this country was built to make phosphatic plant food, over the years a demand had been built up for mixed fertilizer. When T. V. A. was organized in 1933, most of the high-concentrate phosphate produced by the fertilizer companies was released to farmers as only one element in the mixed materials. The phosphatic fertilizer then commercially available under the name of superphosphate carried only about 16 percent of P_2O_5. In each ton the farmer purchased at an average cost of $20, 84 percent of the material on which he had to pay the freight and charges of handling and bagging was without substantial value to his land. Twenty dollars was a lot of money to pay for a ton of plant food which carried only 320 pounds of a single remedy for land that was sick and old. Like an ailing patient, the soil was given in preference a single dose of a cure-all, represented to provide the tonic it needed for continued production. Rural America was educated to love patent medicines.

Dr. H. A. Morgan, formerly president of the University of Tennessee, and probably the most distinguished agricultural scientist of the South, had been appointed to the Board of T. V. A. For all his adult life he had preached the doctrine of the importance of the use of phosphate, and the work which was immediately undertaken was to make a reality of his dream of soil restoration and land use in the South.

Early in 1935, less than 2 years after T. V. A. had been created by the Congress, technicians in the laboratory announced that the new electric-furnace process had been successful and that a plant food containing 46 percent of P_2O_5 was ready to be tested in actual farming operations. It had been relatively easy for scientists to discover what the new product would do to increase production under conditions ideally controlled, on check plots, for example, and on experiment station farms. To carry out its statutory obligations, however, T. V. A. had to go further. The product had to be introduced into the operations of actual farms, under ordinary farming conditions. The Authority had to arrange for its extensive use on land which had to provide a livelihood for the farmer and his family at the same time that the new plant food was tried out. To accomplish that demonstration, the best farm-management advice had to be made available to the farmer.

THE PROGRAM HAS BEEN CARRIED ON IN COOPERATION WITH THE EXTENSION SERVICES OF THE SEVERAL STATES

Had T. V. A. decided to do the job alone, a great increase in the number of its employees would have been required. And to do it alone would have violated a principle upon which the administration of the Authority has been founded—the principle of using, so far as possible, the facilities of local agencies when their objectives are kindred with the national policies entrusted for execution to that Federal corporation. The Authority determined, therefore, to use existing organizations to carry out the program which would test the new plant food for the benefit of the farmers of the Nation. Contracts were entered into with the extension services of the land grant colleges of the seven valley States where the program was inaugurated. It was agreed that those trusted institutions should take on the job of dealing with individual farmers, and that T. V. A. would provide money for the additional

administrative expenses, would furnish the fertilizer to the farmer, and would give over-all direction to the demonstration.

So, Mr. President, the program started something like this: The county agent called together the farmers in his area, and explained the program to them. If they agreed to join, one of their number was selected by the group to be the test demonstration farmer. T. V. A. furnished the fertilizer without cost, but the farmer paid the freight and handling charges, and he bought the lime and other minerals that were added with the phosphate to the soil. He agreed to change his farming practices and to continue the program for at least 5 years, although he was free to withdraw at any time if progress was not apparent or if his circumstances changed. The whole relationship was voluntary. There were no penalties and no compulsions. The demonstration farmer took a risk. He built fences, if they were needed; sometimes he began at once to purchase livestock. He started to keep books, and agreed to let his neighbors profit by his experience.

In the seven valley States, 6,415 farmers entered the program when it began in 1935. They were the pioneers. What they learned has been the basis of extension of the program to new regions. Their experience is now available to the Nation. It was a program of education for the county agent as well as for the farmer. For the county agent had to learn a new approach. The demonstration was different from the experiments of the past. Those experiments had generally been confined to individual problems. A new plant food, a new process, or a new crop might be tried out on one acre, perhaps, and compared with another plot untreated or unplanted. The T. V. A. test was to be different. This time the whole farm management was the unit of demonstration—not a pasture, a crop, or a meadow. The demonstration was to show how the use of the new plant food could change the total productivity of the farm. It was to show how fertility could be restored to impoverished acres, how erosion could be prevented, while at the same time the cash income of the farmer was increased.

The problems encountered were substantial. The easiest one of all presented for solution was the one in the customary experiment station practice; that is, the problem of learning how to use a new plant food on the soil. There were tougher nuts than that to crack in an area where the farmer's cash income had been low for generations, where there was no margin of reserve to let worn-out acres be unproductive for a time. Soil-conserving practices had to pay dividends promptly. Obstacles to full production had to be conquered one by one. Community refrigerators and cold-storage lockers were developed to remove a climatic barrier to the maintenance of livestock; a quick-freezing process for fruits and vegetables released the farmer from dependence on a wholly seasonal market and permitted more acres to go to their planting. New and inexpensive farm equipment was perfected—an electric hay drier, for example, and a seeder that could be handled by only one man. Gullied hillsides were covered with trees, as new uses for forest products were discovered. By contracts between T. V. A. and technical schools of the South, men of science devoted themselves to the practical question of how every barrier to total production could be removed. A multitude of processes, designs, and inventions, all perfected to meet specific problems as they arose in the beginning of the program, are now available for general use.

Mr. President, most of those developments are not required in other agricultural areas where the problems are fewer, where economic barriers are not there to buttress soil deficiency so stoutly, where the agricultural income is always higher, and where changes in farm practices can more readily be introduced. In many areas the use of P_2O_5 alone or with lime will remove the only limitation on the soil's deficiency as farmers prepare to produce more beef, more milk, and more eggs. Whatever local conditions may be, in 834 different counties of the United States the county agent knows, and at least 1 farmer is prepared to show his neighbors how phosphate can increase the productivity of the soil, how it can raise the farmer's income, how war food goals can be achieved with less labor and fewer machines.

From the beginning of its agricultural program, through June 30, 1942, T. V. A. had produced a total of 485,559 tons of those high-concentrate fertilizers. Since 1937, 240,198 tons have been purchased from the Authority by A. A. A. and distributed in benefit payments to farmers. Our Food Administration knows what that accomplished. About 60,000 tons of T. V. A. fertilizer have gone to Britain under a lend-lease agreement, most of that in the last half of 1942. A small amount has been used on Government land under the Authority's management and by the experiment stations in 47 States, where the product is tested on local soils and its effects compared with the results obtained by commercial superphosphate. One hundred eighty-four thousand nine hundred and thirty-six tons have been distributed to farmers in the test demonstration program. The use of that tonnage has been supervised and the results reported. Those are the records I have examined. Those extraordinary results are the ones I am reporting to the Senate.

The records of the increased production of beef and vegetables and dairy products support me when I solemnly assert that every pound of P_2O_5 produced by T. V. A. and used on the land of this country is just as vital to our Nation's victory as are the tons of munitions and explosives which are flowing from ordnance plants and Army arsenals. P_2O_5 is the basis of a fighting soil.

PHOSPHATIC FERTILIZER IS A WAR MATERIAL: ITS PLACE IN A WAR FOOD PROGRAM WAS PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS IN 1935

That fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals should be regarded as a military resource, and the expanded use of its product should be recognized as a military necessity of first importance. If T. V. A. had done nothing more than to produce this plant food, we should salute it as a major war industry.

In 1935 I was a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs. I shall violate no confidence or offend no legislative propriety if I mention that the majority of the committee was notably hostile to T. V. A. Senators will remember that at that time the constitutionality of the T. V. A. Act was being attacked in the courts. One of the many contentions was that the operations of the Authority could not be justified, as the original development had been, on the ground that it promoted the defense of our Nation.

Amendments to the T. V. A. Act were under consideration in 1935. One of the skeptical committee members at the hearing asked Dr. Harcourt Morgan what T. V. A. was preparing to do for the protection of the country in the event of war. It was not a friendly question. A few highly paid lawyers and a good many utility executives hoped that Dr. Morgan would be trapped into an indiscretion. This is what happened: We had a blackboard and chalk and a pointer in the committee room. With these familiar classroom props, Dr. Morgan commenced a lecture on phosphate. Formula followed formula on the blackboard, erased in rapid sequence to the committee's confusion and the reporter's despair. Circles were drawn and connected. Lines ran from one side to another to make diagrams and symbols. It was at once terribly obscure and wonderfully clear. He began at the beginning to explain how in wartime, soil like much of the soil of the South would be a military liability. Like the schoolmaster he was, Dr. Morgan drew the cycle of life. He told us how men's energies for peace or war must come from air and water and soil, how the energy of the sun was translated into the vitality of man through the crops men planted and reaped. He reminded us of the mineral elements that must be present in the soil in proper balance for the nourishment of man—phosphate, potash, nitrogen, and lime. With his pointer, he gestured to emphasize that whenever one of these minerals is not present because of Nature's inattention or when it has been taken out by cropping or erosion, it has to be supplied or replaced in order that abundant production of nourishing food may continue.

Dr. Morgan reviewed the agricultural history of the South to the Committee. Like every adult Southerner, I was fairly familiar with that distressing cycle, although I had not considered it especially from the standpoint of a military problem. Economic conditions were such that on much of the land of the South farmers were encouraged to grow cotton for their cash crop. It was not wholly our good fortune that the climate permitted cotton to be grown even on thin land with fair success as to income, particularly when the supply was limited and the price was good. Cotton took the

WHY IS THIS PROGRAM NOT EXTENDED TO THE WHOLE COUNTRY, AND WHY IS PLANT CAPACITY NOT INCREASED?

Yet the committees of this Congress have not been advised of the results of this demonstration by any of the experts who have come before us to recommend the methods through which our war food requirements can be met. I cannot understand why they are not promoting the use of P_2O_5 on every acre, why the results of this plant food are not broadcast to every farmer. I have tried to find out why this major issue of an increase in soil efficiency is not the one we are asked to consider by those responsible for the supply of food for war. I wanted to know, when I started my investigation, why construction of the T. V. A. plant at Mobile, which would produce 46,000 tons of P_2O_5 a year, had been blocked. To such questions I have not yet found an acceptable answer.

Certainly there is nothing speculative about the results which have been accomplished by the use of the products of the public plant in operation at Muscle Shoals. Scientific caution is not the reason why the extension of such a program as a national war policy has been avoided during the past year. Those are not test-tube and check-plot results I have been studying. Those were not phantom farmers working on imaginary acres. The farmers are real men and women. I can give you their names. On their farms pounds of P_2O_5 have been translated into pounds of beef and gallons of milk and tons of feed. Here is a sequence which has been proved, in terms of income, in terms of labor, in terms of food consumed.

Nor can promotion of such a program be rejected on the ground that it is impractical to expect average farmers to change their practices or habits, and to begin to use more P_2O_5 on their soil. Mr. President, those 40,000 farmers have done it. So have their neighbors. Already the benefits of phosphate use have spread from the participating farmers who get their P_2O_5 from T. V. A. to their neighbors who have bought it from commercial sources. In the reports I find many references to neighborhood contagion. Later I shall refer to some of them. The use of phosphate and the production of food appear to have increased in familiar ratio on the adjacent farms where observations have been reported, although the results have not been tabulated and reported. No vast organization has been set up to get this program under way, no elaborate administrative machinery has been created. That is not the reason why this program has failed to be expanded as part of a national war policy. Only a few people have been added to the Federal pay roll to accomplish those results. The farmers have done the work themselves.

THE MARKETING POLICIES OF THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY AND THE UNACKNOWLEDGED LIMITATIONS OF COMMERCIAL CAPACITY ARE THE ONLY BARRIERS TO INCREASED USE OF P_2O_5 AND INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION

There is no obstacle to wide extension of the program, so far as I can discover, except that our national food production policy has not yet included a vigorous program of encouragement in the use of phosphorus, and except that the supply of phosphatic fertilizer in this country is limited. But the latter barrier to expanded use of P_2O_5 and full production of food is not admitted. On the contrary, construction of a public plant has been impeded while the fertilizer industry claims a surplus of capacity above that required to fill the expected demand for P_2O_5. The industry and men in Government service who represent their point of view have deliberately ignored that remedy for the fundamental problem, and prefer to meet the new crisis with outworn methods. They will not turn to a new but tested tool.

That is my sober conclusion. I have buried myself in agricultural reports the past few weeks. I have struggled with the symbols of chemistry and mineralogy, with the relation of soil minerals to the production of needed proteins, carbohydrates, and fats, with the mysterious laws of nature and the ultimate sources of the energy of men. I shall not relate to the Senate those belated explorations. I shall rest my case upon my examination of the demonstration program. Any layman can understand those results. Before I refer to the detailed reports of its accomplishments in various States, the records of the achievements upon which I base my opinions, let me go back a little and describe for Senators who may not be aware of it, how the program originated and how it has been carried out.

THE TEST DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM WAS DEVELOPED TO TEST NEW FERTILIZERS WHICH T. V. A. WAS DIRECTED BY THE CONGRESS TO PRODUCE AT MUSCLE SHOALS

When T. V. A. was created in 1933 one of the things Congress directed it to do was to develop new and cheaper forms of fertilizer at the old nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, a heritage from the First World War, and to test those new plant foods on the land. The Board of the Authority determined to direct its efforts toward the development of more highly concentrated and cheaper phosphatic plant foods, instead of undertaking to improve the quality of the mixed fertilizer upon which the agriculture of the country was then and is now largely dependent.

Mr. President, there was nothing revolutionary about the selection of an improved phosphatic plant food as T. V. A.'s objective. It was no secret that 80 percent of our Nation's soil was limited for production by a phosphorus deficiency. The Board of T. V. A. acted on the advice of leading soil scientists, some of them connected with the Department of Agriculture, who had long advocated the increased use of phosphate on the land, advice which had, however, never been reflected in the marketing practices of the fertilizer industry. For, in spite of the fact that the first commercial fertilizer plant in this country was built to make phosphatic plant food, over the years a demand had been built up for mixed fertilizer. When T. V. A. was organized in 1933, most of the high-concentrate phosphate produced by the fertilizer companies was released to farmers as only one element in the mixed materials. The phosphatic fertilizer then commercially available under the name of superphosphate carried only about 16 percent of P_2O_5. In each ton the farmer purchased at an average cost of $20, 84 percent of the material on which he had to pay the freight and charges of handling and bagging was without substantial value to his land. Twenty dollars was a lot of money to pay for a ton of plant food which carried only 320 pounds of a single remedy for land that was sick and old. Like an ailing patient, the soil was given in preference a single dose of a cure-all, represented to provide the tonic it needed for continued production. Rural America was educated to love patent medicines.

Dr. H. A. Morgan, formerly president of the University of Tennessee, and probably the most distinguished agricultural scientist of the South, had been appointed to the Board of T. V. A. For all his adult life he had preached the doctrine of the importance of the use of phosphate, and the work which was immediately undertaken was to make a reality of his dream of soil restoration and land use in the South.

Early in 1935, less than 2 years after T. V. A. had been created by the Congress, technicians in the laboratory announced that the new electric-furnace process had been successful and that a plant food containing 46 percent of P_2O_5 was ready to be tested in actual farming operations. It had been relatively easy for scientists to discover what the new product would do to increase production under conditions ideally controlled, on check plots, for example, and on experiment station farms. To carry out its statutory obligations, however, T. V. A. had to go further. The product had to be introduced into the operations of actual farms, under ordinary farming conditions. The Authority had to arrange for its extensive use on land which had to provide a livelihood for the farmer and his family at the same time that the new plant food was tried out. To accomplish that demonstration, the best farm-management advice had to be made available to the farmer.

THE PROGRAM HAS BEEN CARRIED ON IN COOPERATION WITH THE EXTENSION SERVICES OF THE SEVERAL STATES

Had T. V. A. decided to do the job alone, a great increase in the number of its employees would have been required. And to do it alone would have violated a principle upon which the administration of the Authority has been founded—the principle of using, so far as possible, the facilities of local agencies when their objectives are kindred with the national policies entrusted for execution to that Federal corporation. The Authority determined, therefore, to use existing organizations to carry out the program which would test the new plant food for the benefit of the farmers of the Nation. Contracts were entered into with the extension services of the land grant colleges of the seven valley States where the program was inaugurated. It was agreed that those trusted institutions should take on the job of dealing with individual farmers, and that T. V. A. would provide money for the additional

administrative expenses, would furnish the fertilizer to the farmer, and would give over-all direction to the demonstration.

So, Mr. President, the program started something like this: The county agent called together the farmers in his area, and explained the program to them. If they agreed to join, one of their number was selected by the group to be the test demonstration farmer. T. V. A. furnished the fertilizer without cost, but the farmer paid the freight and handling charges, and he bought the lime and other minerals that were added with the phosphate to the soil. He agreed to change his farming practices and to continue the program for at least 5 years, although he was free to withdraw at any time if progress was not apparent or if his circumstances changed. The whole relationship was voluntary. There were no penalties and no compulsions. The demonstration farmer took a risk. He built fences, if they were needed; sometimes he began at once to purchase livestock. He started to keep books, and agreed to let his neighbors profit by his experience.

In the seven valley States, 6,415 farmers entered the program when it began in 1935. They were the pioneers. What they learned has been the basis of extension of the program to new regions. Their experience is now available to the Nation. It was a program of education for the county agent as well as for the farmer. For the county agent had to learn a new approach. The demonstration was different from the experiments of the past. Those experiments had generally been confined to individual problems. A new plant food, a new process, or a new crop might be tried out on one acre, perhaps, and compared with another plot untreated or unplanted. The T. V. A. test was to be different. This time the whole farm management was the unit of demonstration—not a pasture, a crop, or a meadow. The demonstration was to show how the use of the new plant food could change the total productivity of the farm. It was to show how fertility could be restored to impoverished acres, how erosion could be prevented, while at the same time the cash income of the farmer was increased.

The problems encountered were substantial. The easiest one of all presented for solution was the one in the customary experiment station practice; that is, the problem of learning how to use a new plant food on the soil. There were tougher nuts than that to crack in an area where the farmer's cash income had been low for generations, where there was no margin of reserve to let worn-out acres be unproductive for a time. Soil-conserving practices had to pay dividends promptly. Obstacles to full production had to be conquered one by one. Community refrigerators and cold-storage lockers were developed to remove a climatic barrier to the maintenance of livestock; a quick-freezing process for fruits and vegetables released the farmer from dependence on a wholly seasonal market and permitted more acres to go to their planting. New and inexpensive farm equipment was perfected—an electric hay drier, for example, and a seeder that could be handled by only one man. Gullied hillsides were covered with trees, as new uses for forest products were discovered. By contracts between T. V. A. and technical schools of the South, men of science devoted themselves to the practical question of how every barrier to total production could be removed. A multitude of processes, designs, and inventions, all perfected to meet specific problems as they arose in the beginning of the program, are now available for general use.

Mr. President, most of those developments are not required in other agricultural areas where the problems are fewer, where economic barriers are not there to buttress soil deficiency so stoutly, where the agricultural income is always higher, and where changes in farm practices can more readily be introduced. In many areas the use of P_2O_5 alone or with lime will remove the only limitation on the soil's deficiency as farmers prepare to produce more beef, more milk, and more eggs. Whatever local conditions may be, in 834 different counties of the United States the county agent knows, and at least 1 farmer is prepared to show his neighbors how phosphate can increase the productivity of the soil, how it can raise the farmer's income, how war food goals can be achieved with less labor and fewer machines.

From the beginning of its agricultural program, through June 30, 1942, T. V. A. had produced a total of 485,559 tons of those high-concentrate fertilizers. Since 1937, 240,198 tons have been purchased from the Authority by A. A. A. and distributed in benefit payments to farmers. Our Food Administration knows what that accomplished. About 60,000 tons of T. V. A. fertilizer have gone to Britain under a lend-lease agreement, most of that in the last half of 1942. A small amount has been used on Government land under the Authority's management and by the experiment stations in 47 States, where the product is tested on local soils and its effects compared with the results obtained by commercial superphosphate. One hundred eighty-four thousand nine hundred and thirty-six tons have been distributed to farmers in the test demonstration program. The use of that tonnage has been supervised and the results reported. Those are the records I have examined. Those extraordinary results are the ones I am reporting to the Senate.

The records of the increased production of beef and vegetables and dairy products support me when I solemnly assert that every pound of P_2O_5 produced by T. V. A. and used on the land of this country is just as vital to our Nation's victory as are the tons of munitions and explosives which are flowing from ordnance plants and Army arsenals. P_2O_5 is the basis of a fighting soil.

PHOSPHATIC FERTILIZER IS A WAR MATERIAL: ITS PLACE IN A WAR FOOD PROGRAM WAS PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS IN 1935

That fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals should be regarded as a military resource, and the expanded use of its product should be recognized as a military necessity of first importance. If T. V. A. had done nothing more than to produce this plant food, we should salute it as a major war industry.

In 1935 I was a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs. I shall violate no confidence or offend no legislative propriety if I mention that the majority of the committee was notably hostile to T. V. A. Senators will remember that at that time the constitutionality of the T. V. A. Act was being attacked in the courts. One of the many contentions was that the operations of the Authority could not be justified, as the original development had been, on the ground that it promoted the defense of our Nation.

Amendments to the T. V. A. Act were under consideration in 1935. One of the skeptical committee members at the hearing asked Dr. Harcourt Morgan what T. V. A. was preparing to do for the protection of the country in the event of war. It was not a friendly question. A few highly paid lawyers and a good many utility executives hoped that Dr. Morgan would be trapped into an indiscretion. This is what happened: We had a blackboard and chalk and a pointer in the committee room. With these familiar classroom props, Dr. Morgan commenced a lecture on phosphate. Formula followed formula on the blackboard, erased in rapid sequence to the committee's confusion and the reporter's despair. Circles were drawn and connected. Lines ran from one side to another to make diagrams and symbols. It was at once terribly obscure and wonderfully clear. He began at the beginning to explain how in wartime, soil like much of the soil of the South would be a military liability. Like the schoolmaster he was, Dr. Morgan drew the cycle of life. He told us how men's energies for peace or war must come from air and water and soil, how the energy of the sun was translated into the vitality of man through the crops men planted and reaped. He reminded us of the mineral elements that must be present in the soil in proper balance for the nourishment of man—phosphate, potash, nitrogen, and lime. With his pointer, he gestured to emphasize that whenever one of these minerals is not present because of Nature's inattention or when it has been taken out by cropping or erosion, it has to be supplied or replaced in order that abundant production of nourishing food may continue.

Dr. Morgan reviewed the agricultural history of the South to the Committee. Like every adult Southerner, I was fairly familiar with that distressing cycle, although I had not considered it especially from the standpoint of a military problem. Economic conditions were such that on much of the land of the South farmers were encouraged to grow cotton for their cash crop. It was not wholly our good fortune that the climate permitted cotton to be grown even on thin land with fair success as to income, particularly when the supply was limited and the price was good. Cotton took the

minerals out of the soil and the South exported them for cash. But the cash was never enough to buy the staggering amounts of minerals the farmer needed for replacement. Modern notions of crop rotation and a balanced farm management were not at that time reasonable practices for the average farmer to follow. They had not been possible in the South for generations. The cattle tick had invaded our farms in the distant past, and had made the situation hopeless for many individual farmers to repair. It had destroyed our livestock, so there was no economic return from cover crops, and instead of using cottonseed—itself a byproduct of cotton lint production—as food for animals, it was dumped into streams and bayous. Even this part of the minerals removed by production of cotton was never returned to the soil. The cycle of destruction was further accelerated by the fact that cotton production requires a relatively long period of clean cultivation and leaves little debris on the land.

From the beginning, then, large areas on which cotton was produced not only were subject to erosion in summer, but lay barren and leaching during the open winter months. Much of our land was sloping, and rainfall was heavy. The circumstances altogether were fatal to the well-being of an area whose economy was based on agriculture. Our land was dying. It was not uncommon for a farmer to wear out two or three farms in his lifetime. Of course, corrective measures had been tried, but they never were very effective in the face of the pressure on the farmer to increase the acreage he planted to cash crops and to refrain from going into livestock and dairying. Farmers were using enormous quantities of fertlizer in the South, but they had to use it on their cash crops. There was no money left over to buy plant food for pasture, to put it on land that should have been given the protection of cover. If the rate of soil exhaustion continued, and unless their mineral resources were renewed, those farms would never be able to take their share of the Nation's load of food production in the event of war. They would have to be listed as casualties before hostilities began, acres not available to fight.

HARCOURT MORGAN EXPLAINED IN 1935 HOW THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY PROGRAM WOULD PREPARE THE LAND FOR WAR—HOW IT WOULD RELY ON NATURE'S SUPPLY OF NITROGEN AND RELIEVE THE BURDEN ON THE COMMERCIAL SUPPLY

That is the story Dr. Morgan told the Military Affairs Committee in 1935, and he described what T. V. A. proposed to do about it as a measure of national defense. He explained why phosphate was the key to the problem. He described how it would save our soil, how it would restore the minerals lost, how it would permit the lands of the South not only to support a slowly rising economic level in time of peace, but to raise their food production sharply in time of war. He went back to his list of minerals needed in the soil for the abundant production of food.

Those circles were drawn on the blackboard again—nitrogen, phosphate, lime and potash, elements which must be returned to the soil when removed by crops for the nourishment of man. He pointed out that the need of the soil for nitrogen is always greater than the amount supplied by fertilizers. Everyone agrees about that. He emphasized that in war there is bound to be a further limitation on nitrogen supply because the facilities of its production are then required to turn out explosives. He explained that, in war years under customary fertilizing practices, this bottleneck in nitrogen would limit the supply of mixed fertilizer and therefore limit the rate and degree at which soil minerals removed at unaccustomed speed could be restored. There would be enough lime and potash. Facilities for P_2O_5 could be provided but the lack of nitrogen would keep all the elements from the soil if historical methods of fertilizing were permitted to continue. He reminded us what the First World War had done to our land. He prophesied that in the event of another war the lack of nitrogen for our soil would be a vital shortage once more, just as it had been in the last war when nitrate plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals was built to meet the deficit and to relieve this country from its substantial dependence on the importation of nitrates from Chile.

The construction of that plant in 1918 was considered a notable advance in military self-sufficiency. In 1935, Dr. Morgan pointed out a further advance to be taken. He explained that there are two major ways of getting nitrogen back into the soil from which crops have removed it. One is by buying it as an element in commercial fertilizer, whether it comes from abroad or is produced in this country by the labor of men and machines. The other method is to take it straight out of the air through the planting of leguminous crops, to grow it back.

While the commercial supply of nitrogen will always be limited, even in time of peace, and doubly restricted for soil use in time of war, there is an inexhaustible supply of nitrogen provided by nature. Above every square mile of land in the world 30,000,000 tons are waiting to be used. The difficulty is that nitrogen can be captured from the air for use in the soil only by phosphate, used with other minerals, and when it is combined with the planting of legumes. Apparently the dynamos are put to work to draw nitrogen from the air to the soil only by that combination—by treating the land with phosphate, using lime in addition on most soils, and then by planting legumes—clover, alfalfa, beans, and such plants. In that way nitrogen can be restored to the land without dependence on the limited commercial supplies.

Dr. Morgan's formula was this: Every pound of P_2O_5 properly applied to the soil and combined with the planting of legumes would capture 3 pounds of nitrogen from the air and reduce by that amount the burden on our commercial nitrogen production facilities. That was not the end of the story. His chalk talk and his blackboard showed how, by the mysterious chemical changes from plant to animal protein, those legumes would make their contribution to the arsenal of war, whether they were harvested or plowed back to enrich the land. If they were used to support livestock, a single pound of P_2O_5 would ultimately create a production of 35 pounds of milk, for example, or 4 pounds of beef, under ideal conditions. He ventured the estimate that under average farming conditions 20 pounds of milk or 2½ pounds of beef would result from every pound of P_2O_5 applied to the soil. So he called T. V. A.'s program to introduce the wider use of P_2O_5 on the farms of the Nation a program of national defense.

Of course, I was greatly interested. I could see that if phosphate on the land meant a rich cover crop, it would mean a new life for the South. It would mean that our soil would no longer run to the sea with the river's current. It would mean an opportunity to begin the introduction of livestock into the farm economy of the area. That was clear to me. It sounded fine. I respected Dr. Morgan very highly. I knew he was scientifically correct. And yet I wondered why, if the remedy for soil exhaustion was so easy, P_2O_5 had not been made available long before from regular commercial sources. Dr. Morgan insisted that a farmer in the South could live as well or better with half his acreage put in his cash crop and that he could sow the rest to cover, provided we changed our farming methods as those methods could be changed by the use of the phosphate T. V. A. was even then producing, and if the phosphate were used with lime and legumes.

The general practices then being inaugurated by the Authority in its demonstration program were summarized to the committee. They contemplated, first, reducing the acreage devoted to row crops as far as possible, while increasing hay and meadow and pasture land, and treating it with phosphate. Dr. Morgan pointed out that on much land legumes would come up without seeding when the phosphate, combined with lime if needed, was applied, but that on many acres supplementary legume seeding would be required. Then these new and improved pastures would, by improving the nutriment of their feed and increasing the grazing season, reduce by at least 50 percent the number of acres required to carry each animal. Livestock would pay, for T. V. A.'s electricity program would break down the barriers remaining to this change of farm management. At the same time, as pastures were built up for livestock, and to hold the income upon which the farmer and his family depended, the formula of phosphate and legume use would permit the smaller acreage devoted to row crops to give more abundant production.

Dr. Morgan pointed out that with the application of phosphate, legumes could be grown as winter cover and nitrogen would be restored to the soil by the normal sequence of the seasons. Or the acres could be rotated and a legume crop planted instead of a row crop every 3 years. He predicted that corn production following legumes would be stepped up more than 100 percent as fertility was restored to the impoverished soil supporting corn production in the South. In

my part of the country, many acres devoted to its cultivation in 1935 were producing only 12 or 15 bushels. Under the new procedures a yield of from 30 to 50 bushels was forecast. T. V. A. was basing its whole land-use program on the belief that P_2O_5 and legumes, whether consumed by livestock or turned back into the soil, would promote the total productivity of every farm.

This was Dr. Morgan's illustration. He pointed out that in the past if a farmer had 20 acres, 10 of good land and 10 of poor, he might grow corn. The 10 good acres without fertilizer would yield 25 bushels on every acre and the 10 poor acres with a lot of fertilizer would yield 15 bushels. His total production would be 400 bushels with all his acreage planted. Under the revised system which T. V. A. was introducing in 1935, the 10 poor acres would get phosphate and would be set aside for pasture, and by intensive cultivation of the 10 good acres, likewise with the application of liberal quantities of fertilizer there, the total yield of corn on the farm would be the same—400 bushels. With half the cultivation, the farmer would produce the same amount of corn and have the pasture extra. His labor costs would be reduced, while his total farm, supporting livestock, would have a larger total food production.

He went even further. The corn the farmer used as feed for his livestock would become more valuable under this program. Combined with legumes grown on richly phosphated soil, corn becomes a more nourishing feed than when it is used alone. It becomes a part of a balanced diet. That richer feed, those more fertile acres, would mean that the farmer's income would be better in a world at peace; in time of war he could contribute more to essential food production.

A PROPHET WAS WITHOUT HONOR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—RESULTS IN ALABAMA

To call the program outlined by Dr. Morgan an activity of national defense seemed a little farfetched in 1935 to many members of the committee.

Today, the record shows that Dr. Morgan was right. After the biggest crops in our history, at great cost in money and man-hours of work, we are rationing food today. We are full of fears about our next cropping season. Our hopes for needed increases in production are based on estimates of larger acreages planted and on another season of extremely favorable weather. Yet we would have no fears if the T. V. A. program and methods had been more widely adopted. If Dr. Morgan's analysis had been recognized and accepted as the basis for a broad national program, if the fertilizer industry had considered the need of the soil for P_2O_5 as a demand which it must satisfy, we would have our food problem licked now and for the future. Dr. Morgan's estimates of food increase have turned out to be exactly right. Under actual farming operations, each pound of P_2O_5 means an increase of more than 20 pounds of milk, or a gain of at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of beef. His dream of a fighting soil that provides more food while it releases fighting men and relieves the facilities of nitrogen production to turn out more explosives—that dream is coming true in the limited areas where it has been accepted as a reality. It is coming true in my home State.

We are just now seeing the full picture which Dr. Morgan saw when he talked in 1935 about phosphate and what it could do to mobilize the land. He meant those cheese factories I saw in Alabama the other day. He meant that butter plant. He meant the 56,000 acres of pasture land that has been treated with phosphates in north Alabama since 1936. He meant the accomplishments of almost 5,000 farmers in my State who have been enrolled in the demonstration program. Their land has gone to war armed with P_2O_5 from T. V. A. at Muscle Shoals.

WHAT ONE ALABAMA FARMER AND ONE COMMUNITY HAVE DONE TO INCREASE WAR-SCARCE FOODS BY USING P_2O_5

In going over reports from Alabama farmers, I came on one which I want to use as a simple illustration. It relates the experience of Mr. D. R. Lowery, who lives in De Kalb County. This is a section which has always produced cotton and very little else. In 1938, before Mr. Lowery became a test demonstration farmer, he grew about 40 acres of cotton and corn, he had $9\frac{1}{2}$ acres of unimproved pasture, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres of hay crops. He used no phosphates on his pasture and hay crops, and carried only 4 units of productive livestock. A unit of livestock, we are told, means one cow or her equivalent in other animals—7 sheep, for example, or 10 pigs, or 100 chickens. Beginning in 1938, Mr. Lowery made a liberal application of phosphate and lime on his feed crops and on his pasture, and as a result, 4 years later, in 1942, he had tripled the number of productive units of livestock carried on the farm, in spite of the fact that in the meantime he had increased his annual sales of meat animals, milk, and eggs from a total of $112 in 1938 to $679 in 1941 season. But Mr. Lowery did not give up growing cotton to do that. His farm produces as much cotton as it did before. Nor did he use any additional farm labor to accomplish the gain of 300 percent in livestock now maintained and with a substantial surplus marketed in the period. He used phosphate. He joined the T. V. A. program.

It happens that I know of a neighbor of Mr. Lowery who operates a farm of approximately the same size, having the same soil types, and with the same amount of labor. This neighbor is also a good cotton farmer. In 1938 he and Mr. Lowery were running neck and neck. Unlike Mr. Lowery, he did not choose to begin the program of phosphating his pasture and hay crops. What are the comparative results? During 1941 his sales of livestock amounted to only $62 as compared with Mr. Lowery's $679. But that does not mean he is maintaining more stock on his farm. He has the same number of units now as he did in 1938. He cannot add to the war supply of milk, eggs, and meat products. That difference between neighbors is not a matter of patriotism or ability, of labor or of machines. That difference is a matter of P_2O_5 applied to the land.

Let me tell the Senate about the record of Whitesburg community, organized as a test demonstration area in Madison County, Ala. There the number of units of livestock carried on the farms was increased almost 100 percent in 3 years, between 1937 and 1940, while in the 3-year period the sales of livestock increased almost six times, from $1,280 to $7,434, without any measurable increase in the amount of labor on the farms. Whitesburg community exceeded the food-production goals established by the Secretary of Agriculture for last year, and the phosphates which have accomplished the increase in livestock production have at the same time so enriched the soil of those farms that the community is now preparing to expand production still further. They will overshoot the goal.

There are 27 such communities, comprising 2,010 farmers, engaged in the same type of work and achieving similar results in 13 north Alabama counties. In addition, there are 544 individual test-demonstration farmers like Mr. Lowery located in every part of the State. In Alabama that phosphate has turned to beef, to milk production and cheese, and eggs. The farms in north Alabama know how they can reach the war-food goals. More than 40,000 farmers and their neighbors know it now all over the country.

The country did not pay enough attention to Dr. Morgan in 1935 when he showed the part phosphate would play in war. The situation is urgent today. I want to do what he did then, only I am reporting results, not outlining expectations. I want the Senate to know what has happened. Let me give the totals first.

WHAT THE TOTAL T. V. A. PRODUCTION OF P_2O_5 HAS ACCOMPLISHED ALREADY IN TERMS OF WAR-SCARCE FOODS

Since 1933, as I have pointed out, and up to July of 1942, the T. V. A. had produced 28,713 tons of P_2O_5, which has already been made available for use on the land in the form of phosphatic plant food. Let me translate that into terms of nitrogen and food. Those figures mean that the production facilities of T. V. A. have already provided for this war crises, first, a supply of the equivalent of 87,000 tons of nitrogen in commercial fertilizer or 550,000 tons of nitrate of soda. By this amount of nitrogen taken from the air the burden on limited plant capacity to produce one essential element of plant growth has been relieved. Further, in terms of actual experience on those farms, by this amount of P_2O_5 the production of war-scarce food has been increased to the extent of 150,000,000 pounds of live weight of beef, or 180,000,000 pounds of live weight of pork, or, if you prefer, 1,200,000,000 pounds of milk containing 40,000,000 pounds of protein and 48,000,000 pounds of butterfat.

These are not laboratory conclusions, remember. No one can call me an impractical scientist. This is not 1935. I

am telling what has happened. Actual phosphate has been applied on actual farms, from 17 to 30 pounds of P_2O_5 an acre. Hay and clover have been grown and eaten; real milk and cheese and eggs have been consumed. In the light of such tested conclusions, can we go into war-food production tolerating an average use of 2 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre per year on the lands of the rest of the country? There is no question about the value of the demonstration, no doubt about the effect of phosphate use. Why is not our whole war-food production planned on the basis of this scientific knowledge and this practical demonstration?

WAR FOOD PRODUCTION REQUIRES MORE P_2O_5—THERE IS NO SURPLUS CAPACITY—THERE IS A DEFICIT

I asked the agricultural specialists of T. V. A. to tell me how much P_2O_5 would be required to extend to the whole country the use of phosphates found so admirably adapted to our present war needs in the results achieved by the test demonstration program. That was my question. My idea was to propose, if price is keeping the commercial product out of use, that the Government should subsidize a program of production as an emergency war measure. The reply to my inquiry indicated that my education was incomplete and that my enthusiasm should be confined within the limits of the conclusions of scientific men.

First of all, it was pointed out to me that, so far as T. V. A. scientists are concerned, in their opinion, the effectiveness of the use of P_2O_5 in a semiarid agriculture has not yet been sufficiently well established to draw conclusions, although experiments in its use on pasture land in Texas have been very encouraging. In a moment I wish to read to the Senate the reports of those experiments so modestly described as "encouraging, but not yet conclusive." A man of business, not of science, would call them overwhelmingly successful and would blanket the grazing plains with the material. A business enterprise trying to increase its market for P_2O_5 would be telling about them on the radio and in popular magazines. P_2O_5 would be advertised like a face cream.

But I accepted the commendable scientific spirit. I was willing, temporarily at least, to drop areas and soil where the effect of P_2O_5 has not been well established and where methods for its use are not yet considered adequately developed. Of course, I would drop areas such as the central basin of Tennessee and the bluegrass region of Kentucky, where its application is not needed, where the original bounty of nature and the practices of farmers have not induced a shortage. I would confine my request strictly to the so-called humid areas, approximately 50 percent of the country, limit it to regions where phosphate is needed and to areas where it might reasonably be supposed, as a result of the program which has been carried out on more than 40,000 farms, that similar results might be obtained if reasonably similar methods were practical to inaugurate.

IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT P_2O_5 WILL ACCOMPLISH THESE RESULTS IN FOOD PRODUCTION THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY DOES NOT EVEN CONTEMPLATE CAPACITY PRODUCTION

This is the information I received. I was advised that to inaugurate such a limited program, to increase the use of phosphate in those selected areas from the present average of 2 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre to the average of 17 prevailing on demonstration farms, a minimum annual supply of 3,400,000 tons of P_2O_5 would have to be distributed through commercial sources. So I turned to check on the industry. In the issue of the Fertilizer Review for October-November-December 1942, in the article entitled "The Fertilizer Situation and the War," to which I have previously referred, I discovered this remarkable statement:

> These data show that there will be an abundant supply of phosphoric acid. This will be achieved without capacity production by the industry as it has a rated capacity of 1,712,000 tons P_2O_5.

A minimum need of at least 3,400,000 tons, and a maximum capacity of 1,712,000. That does not make an abundant supply to me. That makes a minimum deficit of 1,688,000 tons, according to my arithmetic. The reader is referred to table 3 for demonstration. Table 3 indicates that it is estimated that only 1,108,000 tons of P_2O_5 will be distributed in 1943. That is how they get a surplus of about 600,000 tons, simply by the assumption that there will be no increase in demand for P_2O_5 to meet our mounting need for food. They get a surplus by acknowledging that no effort is being made to create a larger demand for the product, by admitting that all our calculations for war-food production are based on the assumption that this mineral deficiency will be tolerated as a continued barrier to production. The capacity is kept surplus by making up for lack of soil fertility by the excessive use of manpower, by ratifying in war planning the dubious wisdom of the historical policies of the fertilizer industry.

FARMERS THIS YEAR WILL HAVE MONEY TO BUY MORE P_2O_5 THAN THE INDUSTRY WILL MAKE AVAILABLE

A chart accompanies the article to which I have referred, written by Mr. F. W. Parker of the Division of Soil and Fertilizer Investigations, Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, and published in the Fertilizer Review. It shows the estimates of fertilizer consumption and relates them to farm cash income. The chart demonstrates, wonderful to relate, that in general the use of fertilizer on our farms follows the line of the farmer's income. Only once since 1923, in 1933, did the timid, broken line of fertilizer consumption rush ahead of the bold, black line of income. A very curious thing will happen in 1943, according to this chart. The farmer's cash income will rise, and a black line called probable demand for fertilizer tags right along, but the halting line that represents the estimated consumption straightens out. I suppose that means that the farmer would have the money to pay for the fertilizer if it were available, but that the supply will be short, according to this chart, by about 1 inch and $175,000,000 of the farmers' purchasing power. So there is a lag between the estimated consumption and the probable demand.

The truth is, of course, as the article points out, that it is the supply of nitrogen that threatens to be short. That is to be expected in time of war. It is exactly what Dr. Morgan explained to the Committee on Military Affairs in 1935. The truth is that the fertilizer shortage is simply a shortage of the nitrogen produced by men and machines and purchased by the farmer as the major element in the mixed fertilizer he buys. Nature's supply of nitrogen is not affected by the war. Why has not the farmer been told that he should spend for phosphate that margin between the estimated supply based on the capacity of the industry and the probable demand based on his income? Then he would get his nitrogen from the air. Why have not all farmers been advised about the experience of more than 40,000 and urged to adopt the methods they have used?

I note an optimistic footnote to the article. It says:

> Since this estimate of nitrogen supplies for 1942–43 was prepared, the outlook for supplies of chemical nitrogen for fertilizers has materially improved. If imports of Chilean nitrate of soda are maintained, nitrogen supplies for the 1943 season will be very satisfactory—much better than seemed possible a few months ago.

THIS SURPLUS CAPACITY IS LIKE THE FORMER POWER SURPLUS, POWER RATES, AND RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

I do not think much of such charts in time of peace. I do not think the supply of commodities and services for which there is a basic hunger should be tied to a demand based on the current income of any group of consumers. I keep returning to memories of my experience in the House. At the very hearings in 1935 which I have already mentioned, I heard a similar exposition. Then it was with respect to power. The private companies were charging that the money being appropriated to expand the power-producing facilities of T. V. A. would create a tremendous power surplus in the South. It was the same kind of surplus capacity as the surplus for making P_2O_5 that is now reported for the fertilizer industry. The power surplus was a surplus only if the private companies' doctrine of high price and limited use prevail, if their then current marketing policies were to be held final.

Mr. Lilienthal, then director, now Chairman of the Board of T. V. A., testified on this point. He propounded a marketing theory at variance with that of the private companies. He stated that if prices were reduced, demand would rise and there would be no surplus of capacity. He mentioned the slow rate of electrification of farms as an evidence that the rural market had not yet been tapped, that one potential demand was not yet satisfied. Experts for the private companies replied that farm in-

come in the South would not support a larger program of rural electrification. T. V. A. retorted that the remedy for that obstacle was for the industry to lower its rates and take a risk. Mr. Lilienthal contended that if the farmer were served with electricity at reasonable rates, then his income would rise and so would the company earnings. The farmer could alter his farm management, introduce devices for labor savings, and be a customer for major electric appliances. With electricity, he could diversify his farming and build up his soil. Increasingly, he would use more current. He would pay larger electricity bills. The spiral of use and earnings would turn upward.

In the Congress and the courts, T. V. A. won the fight to introduce new practices of power marketing. Which set of estimates and charts proved to be right? Our rates for residential service in the Tennessee Valley went down from 5 to 2 cents a kilowatt-hour when T. V. A. took over the job of power supply. Our use of power and the revenues of T. V. A. went up. Private companies in the neighboring areas put down their rates as the results of T. V. A.'s marketing policies were demonstrated. The same thing happened in their territories. The prosperity resulting was not the exclusive experience of the Government. More kilowatt-hours were sold by private companies. A larger number of dollars came back to their treasuries. As to farmers, this is the record: In 1933 only 60,000 farmers in the 7 States of the Tennessee Valley had electric service. By the end of 1941, more than 405,000 had electric service. Of these, more than 132,000 rural customers, including almost 80,000 farmers, were getting their power directly from the T. V. A. system. They were served by the capacity those private managers predicted would be an idle surplus. A larger number, 273,000, were buying the energy they used and were paying their money to the very companies which called them poor prospects for profits only 7 years ago.

The estimates of power use, paraded by the private companies before the Congress, the courts, and in the press when the utilities were fighting T. V. A., have been folded away, and the marketing policies which created them are by way of being abandoned. The utilities have learned, in some parts of the country at least, a fundamental lesson in business management.

I went through that experience, so I distrust charts like this one on phosphate. I do not believe this chart makes sense. I contend that this "surplus" of capacity for the production of P_2O_5 is the same kind of surplus the power companies showed. I believe that these estimates of the use for P_2O_5 are valid only if the present marketing policies of the fertilizer industry are to be held sacred and are forever permitted to limit use. They are accurate only if the land is to be restricted to the supply of nitrogen available from commercial sources, if the story of phosphate is kept a secret, and if the farmer's income is to be stabilized on the basis of the mineral deficiencies of his soil.

Perhaps if it were peacetime I should not weary the Senate with a lengthy discussion of the problem. Perhaps I should say to myself: "The fertilizer companies will learn in time, just as the power companies did." They would learn in time that there are new ways to earn a profit. They would ultimately learn that what is good for the soil will be good for the farmer, and that in turn will be good for them. Perhaps I would be patient if this were peace, and wait while a demonstration by the Government removed whatever risk to profit would be involved in a change of the marketing practices of the fertilizer industry. Perhaps I would wait while the industry made plans to provide P_2O_5 to the farmer with a maximum of profit and a minimum of inconvenience to its management. I hope not. I hope that I should not have failed the farmers of Alabama and the Nation.

I know what I must do in time of war. I must demand today and tomorrow and in the future that every pound of P_2O_5 up to the limit of capacity production, be made available for use on the soil, at once, no matter what the habits, the desires, or the fears of the industry may be. The question before us today is not how to save our fertile soil for future generations. It is not how to raise the income level of the farmers. To both those problems the program I am discussing has given at least a partial answer. The question before us today is how to produce more food for war with the fewest men and the smallest wear and tear on machinery. The solution of that dilemma, to my mind, is to increase land power to make effective use of manpower. And this is one way to do it.

THE T. V. A. DEMONSTRATION HAS NOT INJURED THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY—IT HAS BENEFITED THE PRIVATE COMPANIES THAT MARKET PLANT FOOD

Mr. President, actually, insofar as this modest demonstration of the use of the products of a public plant has had any influence on the revenues of the fertilizer industry, it has been beneficial. Since T. V. A. began its operations in 1933, the demand for all kinds of fertilizer has steadily increased. I am not suggesting that the Authority's operations are responsible for that. The increased demand for fertilizer now, as always, responds to one major condition—the gradual depletion of soil fertility. The trend of fertilizer use has been steadily upward since 1865, limited always, it is true, by limitations on the amount of money the farmer has to spend. Farm income has risen and soil depletion has been more widely recognized since 1933, so fertilizer consumption has been increased.

But this is what I should like to call to the industry's attention, and to the attention of the officials in the Department of Agriculture who are concerned with the industry's problems. The use of fertilizer from commercial sources has increased most of all in the Tennessee Valley, where the test demonstration program has been most intensively promoted, where more than 35,000 farmers have been getting their P_2O_5 from a Government plant. There, since 1936, the rate of increase in the use of P_2O_5 purchased in commercial fertilizer has been almost 5 times that of the rate of increase in the country as a whole. In the country as a whole the price of all fertilizer materials has gone up. In the Tennessee Valley, too, the prices of all fertilizer materials have gone up, save one, but they have not risen as rapidly as in the rest of the country, and one has gone down. That one is commercial superphosphate, the plant food which is less concentrated, and more costly, but which carries P_2O_5 just as the T. V. A. product does. Taking 1935 as a base year—that was the year the test demonstration program was getting under way—in 5 years the cost of commercial superphosphate went up 4.9 points in the country as a whole. In the Tennessee Valley, on the contrary, it went down 7.7 points, and there the use increased most of all. The industry must have learned a little about meeting a demand—not much, but a little—just as the power companies have learned.

The fertilizer companies must have learned that the farmer will buy phosphate in larger quantities as soon as he sees its value demonstrated. He will buy more as the unit price is reduced, as each ton carries a larger percentage of P_2O_5. In 1933 the industry offered a product carrying 16 percent of the mineral in every ton of plant food. Today the farmer can buy a commercial product with 20 percent of P_2O_5 in every ton. That is still a low concentrate and costly, for the freight and handling charges are high on material which must be compared with the first T. V. A. product of 46 percent and with its later calcium metaphosphate which is a concentrate of approximately 62 percent. But it shows that in its timid way the industry is profiting a little from the Government's pioneering.

The following comments from a report of the director of the Virginia Extension Service illustrate what happens when the results of phosphate use are known. There, in Virginia, when the A. A. A. began in 1937 to distribute T. V. A. fertilizer as a grant-in-aid, the counties where the test demonstration program was intensified demanded the largest amounts of the material. They knew its value. In 1939 and through 1941 these counties, representing only 9 percent of the counties of Virginia, used 30 percent of the total distributed by A. A. A. in the State. The report, which I quote, reads further:

> In the beginning, only the demonstrators used phosphate, that supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Then, as their results were observed, other farmers began to buy phosphate from dealers. Soon the Agricultural Adjustment Administration made phosphate available for soil-conserving practices, and quantities were obtained through that agency. Commercial purchases continued. One concern, which has six affiliated stores in the valley area, sold 60 percent more superphosphate during the 1937–40 period than during the preceding 4 years.

The same report comes from North Carolina. In the 64 counties in the State participating in the program in the period from 1936 to 1940, 41,000 tons of phosphate was used in addition to the amounts supplied by T. V. A. It was used

by neighbors of the demonstration farmers, I suppose, bought at the local feed store, or supplied by A. A. A. In the remaining 51 counties of the State where no demonstrations had been carried on, only 2,500 tons were used during the same period.

So phosphatic fertilizer will move from shelves and out of warehouses on a profit basis as the results of its use are observed. At the same time, perhaps I ought to point out that the program apparently has promoted—it has not diminished—the sale of the more familiar mixed fertilizer. In the same report from Virginia, I find this comment:

> The careful planning which the demonstrators do with their county agents also leads to greater use of mixed fertilizer. For example, a group of test-demonstration farms in three representative southwest Virginia counties purchased 52 percent more mixed fertilizer in 1940 than in 1935. In the same period fertilizer sales the country over increased only 25 percent, and in the State only 10 percent.

The fertilizer industry need not be alarmed that its well-known products will not sell if the secret of phosphate is more widely revealed. The truth is exactly the same as in the case of power. There is an almost unlimited demand for the right product at a reasonable price.

Mr. President, it is a discouraging reflection on the business genius of the industry that it has not already made full use of the experience of T. V. A., that it did not begin 2 years or more ago to urge the farmer to use phosphatic fertilizer as the makers of vitamin pills began to urge their consumption by individuals.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO T. V. A.'S RECOMMENDATION THAT ADDITIONAL PLANT CAPACITY BE PROVIDED TO PRODUCE P_2O_5

Mr. President, let us look at the record with respect to the Mobile plant. In April 1941 the T. V. A. Board determined to recommend to Congress that money be appropriated for its construction. T. V. A. could see proof that its theories had been sound and that the product it had developed would accomplish the desired objectives in actual farming operations. It had moved quietly and carefully. Its program was a program of education of agronomists, of farmers, perhaps some day of the industry. T. V. A. wanted to extend its demonstration program to take in a larger variety of farming areas, and to intensify and accelerate the work already under way. Likewise, it wanted to continue furnishing P_2O_5 to the A. A. A., as it had done since 1937. But already, and before Pearl Harbor, two war developments threatened the continuance of the program even on the then existing level. First was the demand for phosphate from Britain to help build up the fertility ruthlessly drained from her soil these past few years, to release the island from its dependence on food importation, and to reduce the number of ships required to carry food from this country. Second was the War Department's demand for the production of elemental phosphorus at Muscle Shoals. As I have pointed out, T. V. A.'s method of producing phosphatic fertilizer is not the same as that used by private industry. At Muscle Shoals the production of elemental phosphorus for military purposes is possible with the same basic facilities that produce the high-concentrate plant food. As early as the spring of 1941 that military demand was foreseen and for more than a year now the T. V. A. has been delivering phosphorus to the War Department, thereby reducing its potential production of plant food.

These considerations prompted T. V. A. to ask for authority to provide more capacity for production, so that its demonstration program could be maintained at the same time military requirements were met. After the war the total plant capacity would be available for an expanded program of soil use. Perhaps approval of the plant would have been more swift if that advantage of the proposed investment to the public had been concealed.

The request for funds to build the plant went to the Bureau of the Budget in regular routine, where it was supported by a communication from the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army. The Chemical Warfare Service wanted the Mobile plant built as a safety factor in the event its estimates of requirements for elemental phosphorus should have to be revised upward. The record of the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations discloses that in his testimony, Mr. Neil Bass, chief conservation engineer of the Authority, reported that the Secretary of Agriculture had attended a conference of the T. V. A. and the Director of the Budget and had agreed with the Authority that the additional capacity for the production of P_2O_5 was desirable. That record of the hearings also includes a letter from Mr. T. E. Milliman, Chief, Agricultural Chemical Unit, Price Division, Office of Price Administration, a portion of which I should like to read. It is addressed to Mr. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Board of T. V. A. It is dated January 6, 1942. Listen to these prophetic words, months before a shortage of food was officially admitted to be possible:

> This letter is written in behalf of the proposal to establish at Mobile, Ala., a plant for the production of phosphorus and high-analysis superphosphate. As phosphorus is becoming a more important material in the prosecution of war, so is superphosphate becoming more important in the production of vital foods such as milk, vegetables, dry beans, and others. The war needs come first and the extent to which phosphorus is diverted to munitions creates a corresponding shortage in an already too small supply of superphosphate for farmers.
>
> Farmers have been asked to produce on a scale which measurably exceeds any previous highs on a large number of crops, including the very foods mentioned above, for which superphosphate is most needed. I am compelled to reach the conclusion that farmers will call for between 10 and 20 percent more superphosphate than can be made available for them in 1942 and the failure to obtain this vital mineral plant food will correspondingly cut down their production in 1942, and especially in 1943.
>
> As measured from the standpoint of national total war by the United States of America and its allies and by the standpoint of agricultural necessities, the establishment by Tennessee Valley Authority of a superphosphate plant at Mobile, Ala., is a primary national need. It will not come even close to supplying the national deficiency in superphosphate, but it will be of material and measurable help to the winning of the war and the production of the right kind of foods from the day it begins to operate.
>
> I make these statements in positive manner because for 15 years I have been a student of the superphosphate situation, during all of that time having served as the fertilizer manager of America's largest farmers' cooperative. Much of my study on superphosphate has been devoted to the public health, milk-production, and meat-production angles. The mere production and distribution of superphosphate as a business has been incidental to the broader needs of the people. No mineral and no fertilizer compares with the importance of phosphorus to the well-being of the American people.

So the bill, providing the appropriation for the Mobile plant, passed the House and the Senate, and funds were made available on June 7 of last year. By that time, critical materials had become increasingly scarce. Repeated requests for priorities have been refused, or postponed. The chemical experts in W. P. B. have not yet agreed to recommend its construction. And this is vital. Food is the final basis upon which a long war will be won, and peace will be assured to the post-war world. Those who must be responsible for food supply should be fighting for their fair share of critical materials. I am asking, and shall insist that the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration pound at the doors of the War Production Board to get this plant under way. Those responsible for war food production must show the War Production Board the obvious relationship between the Mobile plant and food supply. They must show the necessity for the immediate construction of the Mobile plant.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE MOBILE PLANT IS BLOCKED, EVEN THOUGH A FERTILIZER SHORTAGE IS ADMITTED BY THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD, THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY

Mr. President, we know that the Department of Agriculture and the fertilizer industry have worked with W. P. B., and that the fertilizer shortage—that is, the shortage of nitrogen, is acknowledged by all three agencies. According to the Fertilizer Review, the industry and the Department cooperated to write W. P. B. Order No. M–231, issued on September 12. I have read it. It may be a necessary order. Its purpose is to conserve nitrogen by making certain that it is used on essential crops. Was it never mentioned in the conferences out of which the order came that the supply of nitrogen could be substantially increased if the existing commercial plants to produce P_2O_5 were operated to capacity and the product used with legumes to get nitrogen from the air? The application of T. V. A. for materials to build the Mobile plant was pending before the War Production Board when the conservation order was drafted. Did no one in those conferences point out that approval of that plant would relieve the need for nitrogen from commercial sources?

EFFORTS TO INCREASE PHOSPHATIC ANIMAL FOOD DO NOT INCLUDE PLANS FOR THE INCREASED USE OF P^2O^5 ON PASTURES

Mr. President, a representative of a chemical company told me recently that

he understood the Department of Agriculture was endeavoring to get private business to develop more phosphatic animal feed. He had heard that T. V. A. had developed a process which might be made available. I volunteered to find out about it. That is what I discovered on that subject.

I found that a recent report of the national feed industry reveals a critical situation with respect to the relation of feed supplies to national food goals. I found reports that dairy herds are being slaughtered for lack of the proper feed for their continued maintenance. It is apparent that the Department of Agriculture is trying to increase the supply of phosphorus feeds, partly because of the reduction in the amount of bone meal customarily imported from Argentina. The estimated requirement for bone meal in 1943 is approximately 275,000 tons. The supply in sight is 110,000 tons. There is an admitted shortage of 165,000 tons of this product alone, and a recent release jointly issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and the chairman of the feed industry council states with respect to all high-protein feeds that "the demand is far beyond our present supplies." So naturally Government agencies and the feed industry are urging T. V. A. to divert a part of its plant capacity from the production of P_2O_5 to be used in fertilizer in order to supply phosphorus for feeds deficient in this element.

One of the three processes developed by the Authority for the production of phosphorus can likewise produce a desirable material for animal feeding. If this is done, of course, there will be less P_2O_5 for the land, although the shortage of high protein feeds would be diminished if more phosphate were applied to the soil. To feed animals minerals in commercial feed is in large part necessary to make up the deficiency in their pasture nutriment. It is exactly what Senators do when they eat a badly balanced diet, or tolerate a badly adjusted machinery of assimilation, and then make up the deficit in nutriment by swallowing an alphabet of vitamins. It is probably a commendable practice with animals and Senators just as long as there is no better way available, and the supply of high protein feeds and vitamin pills is unrestricted. On many of the farms of this country there is a better way. And high protein feed is critically limited. On some farms of the country the T. V. A. way could be followed. The pasture could be treated with P_2O_5. The livestock would harvest their mineral from the land themselves. No machines, no labor, no bags, no transportation would be required to provide their feed with phosphorus, to make certain that the food production of each animal would be increased.

Mr. President, I am not complaining about efforts to increase the production of animal food high in mineral content. I approve it. I am sure it is necessary. But I am complaining because that surplus capacity for the production of P_2O_5 is not put to work and more nourishing pastures are not proposed and provided as one remedy.

AN INVESTIGATION IS REQUIRED TO DISCOVER WHY THE INCREASED USE OF P_2O_5 IS NOT A PART OF WAR-FOOD PLANNING

I want the committee, of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is chairman, to investigate phosphate, the P_2O_5, and food and feed situation. First of all, I want him to find out why the full-rated capacity of the industry to produce P_2O_5 is not being now employed, why its peak production is not applied to the land for this growing season. Would the use of that additional supply be too revealing to the millions of farmers who have not seen what 42,000 of their fellow workers have accomplished when phosphate was applied to the soil? Would the subsequent changes in fertilizer practices be too fundamental for a habit-bound industry to face? Is the demand for P_2O_5 deliberately being held down, or is it simply blindness? I want to know. Second, I want him to find out if this modest increase in public plant capacity proposed by T. V. A. for construction at Mobile alarms the fertilizer industry. I find this sentence in the article in the Fertilizer Review, to which I have previously referred:

> The post-war period will present agronomists with the reverse of our war nitrogen problem. Under the impetus of war the country's capacity for producing synthetic ammonia is being vastly increased. Our total capacity will be more than twice as great as our maximum pre-war consumption of nitrogen for all purposes. There will be synthetic ammonia plants in 10 or more States.

Is there a man in the Department of Agriculture who thinks first of measures to protect the vested interest of the industry in the fertilizer habits of the post-war world at the cost of manpower, at the risk of soil exhaustion? Is the industry concerned with providing a market for those new nitrogen facilities, competitors of nature's abundant supply? Is that why the Mobile plant is blocked? Is that why the experience of more than 40,000 farmers is not being used in our national war-food planning? Will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] get answers to these questions? Will he find out why this way of assuring more meat, more milk, and more eggs next year and in the future is not promoted?

THE PROBLEM OF FOOD SUPPLY WILL NOT END WITH THE WAR

Mr. President, world food supply, as I stated earlier, will not be a responsibility of the vanquished to provide but of the victor. In a few weeks a conference on the problem is scheduled to be held. The conferees must face the fact that P_2O_5 will be required when hostilities have ended even more than it is needed now. Today the land of Europe is worn and exhausted. Two years from now, or three, our own soil will have lost some of its power to the needs of war, because we will have taken out more mineral than we can restore. Let us look at the world situation then. This is what we know about phosphate use in the world:

We know that prior to the war, according to our standards, enormous quantities of P_2O_5 were being applied to the soil of European countries. As long ago as 1928 records show that Holland was using an average of 40 pounds per acre, Denmark 20 pounds per acre. Neither used as much as New Zealand, in the Pacific, where farmers specializing in the production of butter treated their land with an average of 65 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre. With the use of phosphates they made New Zealand a grass country like the bluegrass region of Kentucky or the central basin of Tennessee.

We know that in the 4-year period just preceding the war, from 1935 to 1938, the use of phosphates on the lands of the world went sharply upward. The figure rose from a consumption of 9,713,000 to 12,124,000 metric tons—a metric ton is 2,204.6 pounds. The United States exported approximately 6,000,000 long tons of phosphate rock and superphosphate, or slightly more than 1,000,000 tons annually during those years. Germany and Japan were our two best customers, these two countries taking 26 and 20 percent, respectively, of our total exports in the years 1935–39. Those two nations, at least, recognized that phosphorus was a war material. In 1940 there were no exports of phosphate to Germany, and very little to other European countries except Great Britain, which received a large quantity, 68 percent of the European total. It was in 1940 that Britain learned this was not a phony war. England was fighting for her life. In that year more phosphate was sent from the United States to the British Isles than in the entire preceding 5-year period. One shipload of phosphate is as good as seven shiploads of food. Every shipload of phosphate we send to Great Britain will save us later from sending seven shiploads of food. Outside of Europe, Japan and Canada continued to take large quantities of American phosphate in 1940.

There we can see the cycle of the relationship of P_2O_5 to war. Germany and Japan were building up their soils on phosphate rock exported from the United States, largely from Florida. Britain, when the weight of war fell on her soil, struggled to make up the deficit which had not been so apparent to a country previously depending on the importation of vast quantities of food for sustenance.

Let us see what the situation will be when war is ended, what the need for phosphate is likely to be if the world is to be re-created on a basis of security. For the use of phosphate is a peculiar responsibility of the United Nations. The total world reserve of phosphate rock of good quality is estimated at a minimum of 17,000,000,000 tons, about 40 percent of which is in the United States, and over 90 percent of which is now in the hands of the United Nations. Russia has large deposits, and so has north Africa. We know that much about the location of raw material.

I have described in a general way what we know about pre-war consumption. We know the soil of Europe, particularly the dairying countries, was completely dependent for its food production on abundant use of phosphorus. We know those soils are not getting phosphates this year. They are not getting it from Russia, from north Africa, or from the

United States. The land, as well as the men and women of conquered nations, is being starved to death.

Now that result is not imaginary. We know it will happen if phosphate is denied. We have seen it in the United States. Here in a new country, in terms of agricultural life, we have seen the Dust Bowl, we have seen what happened to the soil of the South. There are reports of declining soil fertility from every part of the country, where minerals have been taken from the land and not restored. So we know what must be happening in Europe; in a swifter cycle than we have seen it here. Likewise, we know now for the first time from practical experience in the United States what happens when the spin to starvation is reversed.

We know how the lands of Europe can be restored when victory has ended warfare. But we know what scanty food production there will be the first growing season. At the end of the war, immense quantities of food will have to go from the United States until the vitality of the land has been renewed. Can we send that food to starving people if in the next 2 years we continue the blind course we are following today? Can we do it if we permit plant capacity for producing P_2O_5 to remain idle? Can we do it if our only formula for increased production is to employ more men and more machines to plant more acres? We ought to be feeding our lands phosphate as never before to be ready for the strain. At the same time, we ought to have surplus stock piles of P_2O_5 to send to recaptured countries where we know its use would rebuild fertility and increase local food supply.

A NATIONAL STOCK PILE OF PHOSPHATE WAS PROPOSED AS A CONSERVATION MEASURE IN 1937

The suggestion of a national stock pile is not a new one, although so far as I know officials in charge of the rehabilitation program have not yet proposed it as an essential of their program. Back in 1937, Harcourt A. Morgan, on behalf of T. V. A., advocated such a stock pile as a matter of national policy. Since 1933, as a Federal official, Dr. Morgan has had a steadfast record. He has urged the increased use of phosphate unceasingly, not only for national security in time of peace, but for the defense of our country in war. He analyzed the problem in a confidential memorandum submitted in that year to the Government officials primarily interested in agriculture and international relations.

He pointed out the necessity of increasing the use of phosphate in the United States for the permanent benefit of our land. That was the basis of his discussion. Second, he outlined nature's distribution of phosphate reserves in this country and the efficient use that distribution should prompt. There are extensive undeveloped deposits in the West. There are smaller deposits in Florida and Tennessee. These Southern States are the locations where the rock is being mined today. In 1937, over 1,000,000 tons were exported, and largely from Florida. Dr. Morgan suggested that further exportation should be halted unless such shipments were essential for the advancement of specific objectives in international relations. Parenthetically, I call the Senate's attention to the fact that Germany and Japan at that time were getting the lion's share.

Dr. Morgan proposed that to compensate for restricting the owners' markets by embargo, the Government should buy, unmined, the amounts the companies would normally export, and hold the tonnage as a conservation measure until the time a readjusted agriculture in the South would provide a market able to absorb the whole southern output through the regular channels of an awakened trade. After only 2 years, in 1937, the T. V. A. demonstration program already showed that it would not be long before farmers in the South would demand the total output of the extensive phosphate mines in Florida. Dr. Morgan further proposed that an experimental Government plant should be established to use the raw materials of the deposits in the West. Designs and processes could be developed at Muscle Shoals, and the product of that western plant could be made available to the interior of the country at a lower cost in freight charges than could the product from the plants in the South.

If that program had been adopted, we would be better prepared for war today and for the post-war years. As usual with programs involving P_2O_5, nothing was done about it. The then Secretary of Agriculture, Vice President WALLACE, agreed about the importance of the program. The President dispatched a message to the Congress requesting a study of the problem. A congressional committee was appointed, but no national policy was established. T. V. A.'s program was endorsed in the report of the Joint Congressional Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of the Phosphate Resources of the United States. A plant for the West was recommended, but nothing was done about it. Somewhere obstacles were encountered, and no action was taken.

Nothing at all has been done about phosphate except by T. V. A. T. V. A. is discharging its statutory responsibilities. It has developed a highly successful product and has carried out a demonstration program which is to me entirely convincing. But T. V. A. is not entrusted with the problem of war food supply. And somewhere the recommendations of the President, of the Congress, and of Secretaries are forgotten or ignored and the results on 40,000 farms are disregarded. The industry which offers minerals to the farmers on a profit basis is loath to change its ways.

THE RESULTS ACHIEVED BY USING P_2O_5 ON ACTUAL FARMS THAT HAVE TAKEN PART IN THE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

I want to give a few examples of specific accomplishment on individual farms to illustrate what has been going on on more than 40,000 farms. I shall read a few quotations from letters from these farmers who have increased production in the way I have described, and I shall read excerpts from a few reports from county agents and directors of extension services.

I wish every Senator could read the reports and letters I have read. They tell a fascinating story. They testify to the total effect of the program. They tell of buildings painted and repaired, of income gains, of houses and barns wired for electric service. They testify to the growth of community feeling which these area programs have promoted—men of a neighborhood joining together to foster the building of a road or a school or a recreation hall. Because of the time limitation I shall have to leave out reports of the increased leisure which P_2O_5 has made available for war work by farmers' wives, and stories of scrap-collection campaigns and War bond sales jointly undertaken.

Neither have I selected for quotation discussions of the differing results of comparative methods in the use of P_2O_5. I shall not explain the different treatment of the southeast pasture and the northwest woodlot, nor the results obtained with varying quantities of lime. I shall not divert my colleagues with the quoted complaint of the lazy farm hand who lamented that each load from the treated fields grew heavier. I shall read only the paragraphs which show what was undertaken and what was accomplished to increase the food supply we need for war.

These reports are from the farmers who are using P_2O_5. They are using it with lime. They are using mixed fertilizer on their farms, too, and in abundance. Many of their practices are common to all similar farming areas. I have already pointed out, and I want to emphasize, that the only thing that sets them apart from all the other farmers in America, the one practice that makes them different, is that in addition to their common purchases and their common habits, these men are using an average of 17 pounds of P_2O_5 on every cleared acre of land every year, while their fellow farmers use only 2. They are the men who have increased their food production over previous years by 30 percent on an average, with no more land, no more manpower, and little additional machinery.

WHAT HAPPENED ON THE DEMONSTRATION FARMS IN ONE WEST VIRGINIA COUNTY

About 200 of the farmers participating in the program in 1942 live in West Virginia. There, last October, one of the county agents asked the test demonstration farmers of Preston County to describe in their own words the results of the demonstration program on their farms. I have selected for quotation excerpts from a few responses:

Ralph Smith, of Albright, W. Va., writes:

In 1938 I was keeping 5 cows; now I am keeping 9; and with the program I now have, thanks to the Tennessee Valley Authority fertilizer, I think within the next 2 years I can keep 12 where I kept 5 in 1938.

I would say that my pasture has been increased as much as 150 percent, hay about 50 percent, but could tell hardly how much gain to small grains.

Fred Stemple, Aurora, W. Va., says:

When I bought this farm I found, first of all, that there was very little clover growing, and the first year that I sowed clover it failed

to come. My pastures also were of a quality that would not pasture much livestock or provide proper food value for what I did pasture. The first year I treated part of my pasture, and such an improvement was noted that I continued until all my pasture land has been treated. I can now pasture from 10 to 15 head of cattle and do it better than I did 4 or 5 years ago. I do find that the lime requirement must be met before the best results can be obtained. My pastures now have plenty of white clover, and this came in without seeding any whatsoever.

H. D. Moyers, Brandonville, W. Va.:

I used Tennessee Valley Authority high-grade phosphate on pasture, which changed its quality so very much that I now pasture 15 percent more cattle on the same pasture, and they get much fatter and better than they did before.

I left untreated some strips in pasture, which showed so much inferior that I can say I don't know how to estimate the value of the treatment.

S. F. Messenger, Terra Alta, W. Va.:

I have never written a story or tried to but I can say metaphosphate 65 percent has helped me. I have increased the fertility of the soil greatly by using the 65 percent phosphate and raw limestone. I am now keeping 10 to 12 head more of cattle than I did before using it. I also tried it on meadow. Staked off a small piece and did not apply any. According to our figures and estimates the piece that got no phosphate did not make as much hay by 1,100 pounds per acre as the part that was fertilized. Also, better crops grow where it has been used.

From Collins Brothers, Terra Alta, W. Va.:

We feel that the 5-year farm unit demonstration in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority has been of great benefit to our farm. This farm was in a run-down condition when we purchased it. We broke up one field of 70 acres, after farming it 2 years, in which time it had two applications of lime, it was treated with a pasture mixture. The following year it was treated with 150 pounds of 65 percent superphosphate. The previous owner was only able to care for 20 cows. We have been able to care for 45 cows and their calves since treating this pasture.

The treatment on meadows and small grain has had a very good effect. This season we made approximately 80 tons of hay, which is more tons than we were able to make at the beginning of this project. We are keeping 25 head more cattle the year around now than when we started the project.

A. W. Fike, Terra Alta, W. Va.:

In regard to your request for a report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, I marked off a ring 3 feet in diameter, which contains 9 square feet. I weighed the hay in this ring and the same amount in other places where I used the Tennessee Valley Authority. It yielded one-half pound more, which, when figured, will make 2,317 pounds more per acre. Before I used this Tennessee Valley Authority, 40 bushels of oats was a good yield. Last year my oats averaged 55 bushels, this year 61. My buckwheat in the last 5 years has gone from 20 to 35 bushels per acre.

As to pasture, there is no way to tell what the improvement is, but I feel sure the greatest improvement is in pasture. I am sure I can pasture twice the stock I could before I top-dressed my pasture, and they come off pasture fat and slick now, where before they were rugged, and by my top dressing some of my neighbors have top dressed their pastures. I was just walking over Mr. Pennington's this morning and was more than surprised to see the wonderful change in his farm since he uses lime and fertilizer. I will be glad at any time to show anyone the wonderful change in our farm.

F. A. O. Kelly, of Bruceton Mills, W. Va., entered the program in the spring of 1939. He writes:

This year 1942 has produced more feed than was ever on this farm—3 barns full of hay and straw; two 10 by 35 foot silos full at time of filling and 2 big ricks of hay in field and a ton load to a neighbor. (Remember there is today a critical shortage of feed.) My fields look and are greener than ever. I have a good lot of clover instead of wild grasses. * * * My neighbors can tell the improvement without telling them. The same fields fed 20 head of cows and heifers this past summer and before only 12 or 15, and the cattle look better and grow larger.

NINETEEN FARMS IN ONE COUNTY IN ARKANSAS OUTSTRIP PRODUCTION OF THEIR NEIGHBORS

The same thing is happening in other sections of the country. There were 300 demonstration farmers in Arkansas in 1942, whereas 22 first enrolled when the program began in 1937. In 1938 a demonstration was begun in Washington County, on the farm of Roe Stokesbury. By 1940 there were 19 such farms in the county, and a survey which compared the production on those farms with the farms of the county as a whole looks like this:

[Period covered 1940–42]

	Test demonstration farms, increase	Farms of the county as a whole (including demonstration farms), increase
	Percent	*Percent*
Food crops	30	20
Feed	25	15
Beef cattle	10	5
Dairy products	25	15

The margin between the demonstration farms and their neighbors is even greater than these percentages reveal, because the increase for the county as a whole includes the increase on demonstration farms. Does not this checked report give a hint how war-food production can be met?

DEMONSTRATIONS IN TWO COUNTIES OF TEXAS REPORT THEIR INCREASED SUPPLY OF FOOD AFTER USING P_2O_5

The Texas Gulf coast is another section known as phosphorus poor. There, for the past 5 years, the Extension Service has been cooperating with the T. V. A. in demonstrating the value of phosphate applications, and under this program in 1941, 312 tons of T. V. A. triple superphosphate and 348 tons of T. V. A. calcium metaphosphate were distributed to 377 farmer-demonstrators in 25 Texas counties.

In Rusk County demonstrators had 69 percent of their farms under the plow when they started in the program; today the figure is 48 percent. Is it not seen how that reverses the ordinary notion that the way to increase production is to use more men and more plows? Yet the income per acre, adjusted to give account to the higher farm prices, has increased from $2.78 to $11.40 in Rusk County; and the average value of livestock per farm in the county has increased from $1,762 to $2,600; and the value of products produced and consumed on the farm—fruit, vegetables, meat, and so on—likewise increased from $266 to $406.

Let me read a few sentences from a letter from one of these Rusk County farmers. Isaac Stein writes:

In my 10-acre pasture I applied the Tennessee Valley Authority superphosphate on 90 percent of the land endeavoring to leave out 10 percent strip. Where the phosphate was applied my grass and clover made (during the present growing season) more than 100 percent gain in growth and where fertilized has dark green color compared with scant growth and pale color of grass where no phosphate was applied. My cattle and horses are better fed from the same pasture this year than last.

We have had more and richer milk since using Tennessee Valley Authority phosphate.

Fred Compton says this:

After my first year of experiment with Tennessee Valley Authority phosphate I am proud to say that it has set me on the right track toward pasture improvement. Although my cows stayed on this pasture all the time, I noticed that they hardly ever ate off the check plot. Also, since I started the demonstration, my milk and butter have a better color and better taste due to the richness of the grass. And, too, since I turned my livestock on this pasture, it seems as if they stay in better condition with less eating than before. Yes, I can justly say I am greatly pleased with Tennessee Valley Authority phosphate.

Tom Bridges writes to summarize what has happened since he entered the demonstration program in 1938. He had purchased his farm in 1936. To quote him: "It would barely keep 12 cows in flesh at the time," and "Gullies and ditches were everywhere." He describes his difficulties, and the problems he encountered when he began to treat his land with P_2O_5 from T. V. A. But this is his summary for 1941, his third year in the program:

At the present time I have 60 head of cows and calves on this pasture and I believe it would carry 10 more until frost. * * * My cows are in better flesh than they have ever been at this time of year and for the second year in succession I have a 100 percent calf crop.

In Washington County, the percentage of land under plow dropped from 41.7 to 39.8, while the income per acre, adjusted as for Rusk, rose from $9.95 to $13.32. There, too, as pastures grew more nourishing and able to support a larger number of animals, the livestock inventory likewise increased. It went up from $1,290 to $1,370 in Washington County, while the value of products produced and consumed on the farm increased from $470 to $685.

The totals of this county bear illustration, too. Here is what three farmers report. From C. B. Schroeder I quote this paragraph:

This year I planted corn on land that had had clover planted on it and was fertilized with phosphate 3 years ago. My yield on this corn was 35 percent more than the check plots. On my pasture that has been treated with superphosphate I find that the clover is spreading and growing much faster. My grass is showing a good deal of improvement

as well. I am now running one animal unit on each 2 acres of pasture. Three years ago I needed 6 acres per animal unit.

Arnie Gregor reports:

A great deal of difference could be seen on the clover and cowpeas that received triple superphosphate in comparison with the adjoining check plots which were not fertilized. Crops following legumes turned under that were fertilized with phosphate show a great deal of improvement. My corn yield per acre has been increased by 10 bushels per acre since I began using superphosphate on my farm. My meadows produce about one-half ton per acre more than the meadow did before fertilizer was applied.

And we have the same story from F. H. Bosse, of Brenham:

This year I applied my triple superphosphate to permanent pasture which has a native bur-clover base. The results obtained on the fertilized acres were excellent. The adjoining check plot really proved the worth of fertilizing acres with superphosphate. I had nearly twice as much grass for grazing than ever before and much finer cattle were produced. I plan to build up 10 more acres of my permanent pasture with my next allotment of triple superphosphate.

Such results are reported from all over the country—a county here, a county there. Under conditions greatly varying, the results are everywhere the same. With fewer acres, no more manpower, and no more machinery, production of the food now critically needed is increased.

ONE FARMER'S RECORD SHOWS WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE DEMONSTRATION FARMS IN MISSOURI

For example, in the great State of Missouri, where Alabama farmers buy good mules, Mr. J. W. Vomund, who lives in St. Charles County, is one of 265 demonstration farmers. Missouri was one of 4 States outside the Tennessee Valley which joined the 7 valley States in 1936 to promote this program. Mr. Vomund has just completed 5 years' work as a test demonstration farmer. In 1937, when he started out on this program, he was carrying 18 dairy cows on his 120-acre farm. By 1941 the size of his herd had increased from 18 to 30 cows, and the startling fact is that the milk production of each cow had doubled during the period. There is no mystery about the cause. Mr. Vomund converted a large part of his row crops to pasture and meadows. And he applied phosphates at the rate of 20 pounds of P_2O_5 an acre each year.

WHAT ONE INDIANA FARMER HAS ACCOMPLISHED SINCE HE JOINED THE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM IN 1940

I want to turn now to the State of Indiana, which was late in coming into the program. The demonstration started there in 1940. Sixty-one farmers are now enrolled. I should like to summarize the experience of Mr. Harry Bainter, who lives in Elkhart County. He operates the old family farm which he purchased some years ago, and which he dedicated as a demonstration farm in 1940. It is only a 120-acre place, but since he has participated in the program, the use of phosphates has built up soil efficiency until the same farm is now producing 1,669 feed units more than it was producing in 1938 when the Extension Service surveyed his farm and started him on record keeping. A feed unit, by the way, is a quantity of feed equivalent to the feeding value of one bushel of corn. This increase in feed production has been reflected in an increase in his milk production. That has gone up from 80,420 pounds to 96,412 pounds, while production of butterfat has risen from 3,886 to 4,889 pounds. Milk per cow has increased from 5,687 to 7,022 pounds annually. During this time Mr. Bainter has even started a new enterprise, the growing of feeder pigs. To accomplish these results, the pasture has been increased from 27.6 to 53.9 acres, and production of alfalfa has gone up from 8½ to 25½ tons a year. It works out in Indiana just the same as in Alabama.

THE TEXAS EXPERIMENT STATION CONDUCTS AN EXPERIMENT IN A SEMIARID REGION

On the famous King Ranch in south Texas, where cattle growers have for years grappled with the problem of a semiarid section, the Experiment Station of Texas A. and M. has conducted a demonstration of the use of phosphate from T. V. A. It reports that well-phosphated areas of dry pasture land produced twice as much beef as did unphosphated sections of the same pasture. Yet, as I mentioned earlier, T. V. A. restrains itself and points out that it has not yet sufficient data to say that its product will be generally effective in such semiarid areas. Twice as much beef from the same pasture acreage is convincing enough for me.

IN LOUISIANA DEMONSTRATION FARMERS MORE THAN TRIPLE THE EFFICIENCY OF THEIR PASTURES

Let me skip to Louisiana. It is the same story. Two hundred and sixty-nine farmers in thirteen parishes have joined in the program there. From Beauregard Parish I find this typical report: There, while it takes 6.5 acres of pastures not treated with phosphates to support one cow, only 1.8 acres is required if the pasture has been treated with P_2O_5. Hay production on the farms of that parish was tripled by the use of phosphates, with a saving of manpower and machines. These farmers added that it was generally observed that the phosphated pastures were far better able to withstand the seasons of drought.

RESULTS OF THE USE OF P_2O_5 ON 2,700 FARMS IN TENNESSEE ARE PUBLISHED

In Tennessee some 2,700 farm families in two-thirds of the counties of the State are participating now in the program which was begun in the spring of 1935. In these counties the production of meat and dairy products has increased just twice as fast as in the remaining third of the counties in the State. In a publication issued just last month by the extension service of Tennessee results were summarized. The introductory page of the report states:

As early as the spring of 1936 neighbors began to see certain changes coming about on these unit-test demonstration farms. They noticed that the application of lime and phosphate resulted in the thickening of ground cover which aided in water run-off control. They noticed that yields of hay and pasture were increased. They noticed that taproot types of legumes, such as alfalfa, red clover, and sweetclover, could be grown on soil types previously considered not adapted. They saw livestock leave unfertilized pasture to grow high while closely grazing phosphated and limed portions of the same fields. They noticed additional vigor in livestock and increased production of milk, eggs, pork, beef, mutton, and wool.

The interest and information developed on farm unit test demonstrations led to the undertaking of test demonstrations in which the community, rather than the individual farm, was the unit of test and demonstration. By January 1, 1943, 173 organized communities containing 1,154,980 acres of land had been approved for fertilizer testing in the valley counties of Tennessee. Approximately 6,770 farmers were cooperating in this work.

Fews Chapel Community, Humphreys County, came into the program in April 1939. Here is a comparison of the production record in 1939, the year the program started, with that of 1942, 3 years later:

Three hundred and twenty-eight acres produced 8,365 bushels of corn in 1939. In 1942, with P_2O_5 and lime, 287 acres produced 10,045 bushels. In 1939, 3 acres produced 3 tons of red clover. One ton an acre was the yield. It had more than doubled by 1942. Then 13 acres produced 27 tons. In 1939, 18 acres planted to oats yielded 71 bushels. In 1942, 10 acres produced 286 bushels, more than four times as much as 18 acres had yielded before. The acreage planted to wheat was slightly reduced in the 3-year period. It went down from 66 acres to 64½. But total production went up more than 500 percent. It rose from 478 bushels in 1939 to 2,443 in 1942. There were no alfalfa or barley crops in Fews Chapel Community in 1939. In 1942, 44 tons off alfalfa were grown on 19½ acres and 2,275 bushels of barley were the yield of 42 acres.

The report adds, and underscores the point I am making:

Livestock are being increased in keeping with more grain and roughage. The number of dairy cattle increased from an average of five and one-half to the farm in 1939 to eight and one-half in 1942.

In Garrett Community of Decatur County a man named Ruble Tanner is one of the three test demonstration farmers. The report quotes his record. It says:

Ruble Tanner said lime and phosphate deserved the credit for enabling him to increase his output of hogs and beef cattle by at least eight times in 5 years. Records show he had 1 milk cow and 1 brood sow when set up as a demonstrator in 1938. By 1942 he had 5 Hereford brood cows and 4 heifer calves, sold 31 top hogs from 3 brood ows and had his meat hogs and 27 shoats left.

Rally Hill Community in Maury County has been a test demonstration area for only 2 years. In 1940 those farmers made an inventory as a basis to check their progress in the demonstration program. In 1942, after 2 years' experience, they made a similar survey. I picked out of their report the record of

increased production in livestock and in a few other items:

Item	1940 inventory	1942 inventory
Dairy cows and heifers	265	344
Beef cows and heifers	35	61
Beef steers	17	38
Brood sows	45	59
Other hogs	232	353
Ewes	97	166
Hogs killed for home use	99	134
Chickens	1,998	3,730
Fruits, vegetables, meats, etc., canned for home use (quarts)	4,786	9,463
Irish potatoes for home use (bushels)	330	476
Sweetpotatoes for home use (bushels)	198	438

The Extension Service adds this comment on the Rally Hill demonstration:

According to farmers' estimates, row crop yields increased one-seventh (14 percent) between 1939 and 1942, small grain yields one-fourth (25 percent), pasture and hay one-third (33 percent). Milk production per cow increased 18 percent.

In Bird's Community of Sevier County, work was undertaken in February 1939. The soil was thin in this area, and in 1939 an inventory of the land, undertaken by experts, disclosed that of the 2,486 acres owned by 29 farmers, only 750 acres, or less than a third, were suitable for cropping. Of that third, it was said that half of it ought not to be turned more than once in every 7 to 10 years.

As the report of the Extension Service now points out, the strength that was lacking in the soil was abundant in the people. They went to work. Bird's Community was organized. It joined the T. V. A. program as an area demonstration. Quoting from the Extension Service report:

A total of 223,500 pounds of test-demonstration triple superphosphate had been used up to October 1, 1942. Of this, 115,900 pounds had been applied to 813 acres of hay crops; 93,400 pounds to 427 acres of pasture; and 14,200 pounds to 37½ acres of garden.

This is the result:

The number of milk cows increased 70 percent from 43 head in January 1939 to 73 in the fall of 1942. Most of the increased production is being marketed, since the majority of families were already supplying home needs.

The number of beef cattle and veal calves marketed annually from the community has at least doubled during the last three years. * * * In addition, there has been a substantial increase in poultry and hog production for home use.

* * * Observation and yield measurements would indicate an increase in hay yields of from one-third to one-half where phosphate with lime was used as against no phosphate. This would generally mean from 700 to 1,000 pounds more to the acre and a better quality. The phosphate and lime used on pastures has at least doubled their carrying capacity. This extra pasturage has enabled farmers to increase cattle population an average of 3 head for every 10 acres of treated pasture land.

In Hamilton County, a Negro community organization was approved as a test demonstration area on August 26, 1940. Here the soil was low in fertility. Corn yields, for example, averaged only slightly better than 10 bushels to the acre. Prior to 1941 no phosphate had been used on legumes and grasses, and only 10 tons of lime were used in the whole community in 1940. In 1941, however, 10 farmers used 10,600 pounds of calcium metaphosphate and the use of lime was increased from 10 to 166 tons. In 1942, 28 farmers used 17,700 pounds of calcium metaphosphate and 165 tons of lime were used.

As the result of the limited time, since August 1940, these are the results reported by the president of the group last autumn:

The community made 8 times as much hay in the fall of 1942 as was formerly made in a season. * * * Furthermore, it was good lespedeza rather than the coarse pea and bean hay and corn tops customarily used for roughage. Ten to 12 bushels of winter cover-crop seed—crimson clover, vetch, oats, and rye—were planted in the fall of 1942. There had been no winter legumes seeded before 1941 and then not over 100 pounds.

The number of milk cows in the community has been increased from 8 to 35, workstock from 9 to 18, brood sows from none to 4, hens from 190 to over 600.

ON 94 TYPICAL FARMS OF TENNESSEE MANPOWER WAS REDUCED WHILE PRODUCTION OF MEAT AND DAIRY PRODUCTS INCREASED 32 PRECENT

These are only examples of the experience of individuals and communities. They are wonderfully heartening to me. But I am told that studies of the results of larger samples are more impressive to scientific men. Let me report, therefore, a recent study made of 94 demonstration farms in Tennessee which were selected by the extension service of the State as representative of the farms in more than 60 counties of the State in which demonstrations were being carried on. The results of using P_2O_5 on these farms have been subject to thorough tabulation and precise analysis. An average of 1 ton of T. V. A. fertilizer had been used on each farm each year—that is, 900 pounds of P_2O_5 had been annually applied to the crops and pastures of every farm. Those farms were employing less labor in 1941 than when they entered the demonstration program, but the production per farm had increased by about 32 percent. For each ton of concentrated phosphate applied each year, there was a production gain over the maximum produced before of 256 gallons of milk, 123 dozen eggs, 3 hogs, 2 beef animals, 550 pounds of cottonseed, and a miscellaneous assortment of additional fruits and vegetables.

In terms of manpower, the labor of each farm worker on these demonstration farms increased the annual production of milk by more than 1,300 pounds, almost twice as much as resulted from the labor of each farm worker on all the farms of the State. Egg production was increased by 77 dozen for the labor of every worker on demonstration farms, and meat animals by over 900 pounds above the previous levels. On the farms of the State as a whole, in contrast, the increase in egg and meat production was less than a third as much per farm worker. It was only 22 dozen, in the case of eggs, and in meat animals slightly over 300 pounds. An additional man on each of these 94 farms would have had to labor for half a year to produce this increase in food under conventional farming practices. It would have been impossible without phosphate.

THE DEMONSTRATION FARMERS OF VIRGINIA JOIN TO PUBLISH THE RESULTS OF USING P_2O_5

Mr. President, 9 counties in southwest Virginia lie in the Tennessee Valley. These 9 counties joined in the T. V. A. program first, and following their leadership 50 more counties have now come in. In 1935 approximately 200 farm units were enrolled as participants in the program. That year they used some 700 tons of concentrated superphosphate as the basis of their farm adjustment. Seven years later, in July 1942, there were 554 farm-unit demonstrators active in the 9 original counties, whereas 200 had started, and there were 1,409 area demonstrators in 24 communities. There were 771 farm-unit demonstrators scattered through 50 other counties. Through the years these demonstrators have used a total of nearly 33,800 tons of phosphate.

Recently those farmers published a bulletin report on their progress. They call it Building a New Dominion. They say in the foreword:

As demonstrators, we feel it is our obligation to tell what has been accomplished by this work.

They report a call from Director John R. Hutcheson, of the Extension Service, urging all Virginia farmers to adopt the practices found beneficial by these demonstrators. In this call, and as proof that the practices were sound, Director Hutcheson cited a study of records kept by 46 representative farmers who came into the program in 1935, and who also had figures on their 1934 production to use as a check. Let me quote the text:

The study shows that in 5 years, average receipts (gross income) per farm increased steadily from $2,989 to $3,574. Since these figures are adjusted by price indexes, they represent a proportionate increase in production, chiefly in beef and dairy cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry.

For the 46 farms, the average crop yield index, covering feed crops largely, rose from 117 to 158, an increase of 35 percent. This means that, on an average, an acre of corn, hay, and small grain on these farms produced a third more in 1939 than in 1934. "If all farms could increase yields a third," Director Hutcheson says, "our war job would be easy."

Nearly 4 acres of pasture were needed for an animal unit (a full-grown cow or horse, 7 sheep, 10 pigs, or 100 chickens) at the beginning of the program; only 3 when the study was made. Also the length of the grazing season has increased nearly 2 weeks in the spring and 2 in the fall.

At the same time that a greater quantity of feed and food products was being produced and marketed, both the quantity and quality of items consumed on the farm increased substantially.

There were slightly less than 40 animal units per farm in 1934; more than 47 in 1939, an increase of 24 percent. The value of the livestock inventory increased 27 percent, from $2,696 to $3,437, according to figures adjusted to price indexes. Likewise, the feed and seed inventory went from $824 to $1,453.

Mr. Hutcheson points out that thousands of farms within the influence of the demonstrations, but not participants,

have been affected. Dairying has greatly increased in southwest Virginia. I quote three paragraphs from the Extension Service report:

The condensing plant supplied by the valley test-demonstration counties received twice as much milk in 1941 as in 1935, and a third as much again in the first 6 months of 1942 as from January to June 1941. In May 1942, this plant was buying more than 200,000 pounds of milk a day. The manager says he is confident that pastures improved with phosphate and lime are responsible for much of this increase.

Records of test demonstrators show that they are carrying more cows on the same land and getting more milk of higher butterfat content and at lower unit costs. By the agricultural census, there were 5,000 more dairy cattle and over 5,000 more beef animals in the 9 Tennessee Valley counties in 1940 than in 1935.

Those who have gone in for cow-and-calf herds are generally the larger farmers. It used to be that these farmers bought feeder cattle from other sections, fattened them on grass for 2 seasons, and sold them as big beef in northern markets. Now they raise their own replacements and sell them as feeders or finish them on grass. The improved, more nutritious pastures they have developed put weight on the stock more quickly and economically than before improvement. In 1935 Russell County, for example, bought 5,000 stock and feeder cattle; produced only 500 at home. But this year Russell County bought only 500, produced 7,000 at home. The number of commercial cow-and-calf herds in the valley counties has increased 300 percent.

The report concludes that since the program was undertaken, three-fourths of all the farmers in the nine counties have treated approximately half the pasture land in this valley area.

The farm of J. H. Box, in Smyth County, is cited in the report as one of the test demonstrations:

Of its 246 acres, 186 are open farm land, most of it suitable for pasture, some for cultivation. Its 71-year-old owner has been working this land for nearly 30 years, producing livestock, truck, and feed for sale, and rearing a family of seven.

* * * * *

Eighty-eight acres of this farm were being cropped in 1934 when Mr. Box and his county agent began to work out better use of the land. Several years later only 39 acres were being cropped, 49 steep acres, having gone from cultivation into water- and soil-holding sod. Fields and fencing were changed to match soils and slopes.

Though the Box farm now carries twice as much livestock as it did in 1934, not all of the pasture land has yet responded to phosphate. About half or the pastures are on sandstone and shale slopes and are in need of liming before bets results will show. The owner is liming most of his fields this fall. Pasture on limestone soils has responded to phosphate so well that animal units have increased from 21 to 41.3. Some of the luxuriance and grazing capacity of early cattle-country days have returned to these boundaries. * * *

The number of hogs, poultry, and workstock on the farm have remained about the same over the 6 years. The big increase has been in cattle. All animals have improved in quality. Mr. Box bought a purebred bull, for he reasoned that with an abundance of nutritious pasture and hay he could readily maintain quality animals. The numbers of sheep have actually decreased, but production has kept up and the income from lambs and wool has increased considerably, because of better feeding and breeding as well as of better prices.

* * * * *

His records show an average increase of 20 bushels an acre of corn and 8 of small grain and an increase of 4 tons of cabbage. Mr. Box grew 30 tons on 5 acres in 1934, 40 tons on 4 acres in 1941. Tobacco, grown on this farm only since 1937, yields well above the county average. The total crop index has risen from 115 in 1934 to 191 in 1941.

Improvements are, of course, reflected in total receipts—from $1,795 in 1934 to $3,485 in 1941, while total expenses have remained fairly constant at approximately $1,500 a year. The increase has been about equally divided between crops and livestock.

The total investment in land, buildings, feed, and supplies has varied little, but the livestock inventory has steadily risen from $1,211 in 1934 to $2,837 in 1941.

The same thing goes on in other counties. The report continues:

During the past 5 years the people of Belfast Mills community in Russell County have doubled feed and food production. They have twice the number of beef and dairy cattle now as in 1937. They have 24 percent more sheep, 13 percent more chickens, and 31 percent more brood sows. These increases grew largely out of the community's activity as an area test demonstration.

A development which itself grew out of the example of one test demonstration farm enrolled in the program 3 years earlier.

The Belfast Mills farmers started keeping records and most of the 45 original demonstrators have complete records for the 5-year period, 1937-41, inclusive. Analyzed by an extension division farm management specialist, they constitute a valuable measure of progress.

For example, it was found that Belfast Mills farmers have reduced the nearly 6 acres needed for an animal unit in 1937 to less than three and a half for 1941. Thus, pasture yield nearly doubled. What happened to crop yields?

In 1941, crop yields were half again as large as in 1937. The story is told by crop yield indexes for the different years. At the beginning of the area demonstration, the crop yield index for Belfast Mills was below the average for southwest Virginia. It was 94, while 100 is average for the section. Then it increased consistently to 124, to 139, to 149, and to 166 in 1941.

Other changes are brought out by inventory taken early in 1942 for comparison with the 1937 inventory. This is the record of increase: In beef cattle, from 220 to 511; in dairy cattle, from 106 to 215; in sheep, from 1,606 to 1,990; chickens, from 4,205 to 4,877; brood sows, from 48 to 63.

* * * * *

The raising of feeder calves bought in other States has given way on the larger farms to the home production of calves and on the smaller farms to dairying. Only Bryan Robinson and Clarence Ratcliffe were selling milk in 1937. Now they are among nearly two dozen farmers who supply a processing plant.

* * * * *

To January 1, 1942, demonstrators in Belfast Mills had applied 401 tons of concentrated phosphate, sometimes called triple superphosphate, furnished by the Tennessee Valley Authority. They paid the freight from the fertilizer works at Wilson Dam, Ala.—$5.50 a ton. An additional $1.50 a ton went to cover hauling costs and toward meeting expenses of the Russell County Soil Conservation Association.

From Nottoway County a test demonstration farmer writes:

Five years ago I had 40 head of cattle with hardly enough feed for them; today I have 80 head of cattle and still have plenty of feed. I have gotten 100-percent increase by using phosphate and lime on pasture and hay crops. My young cattle have grown out and developed better, and my milk production has increased greatly. My cattle not only look much better but are much healthier since the beginning of the project. I feel that this program has been worth over $1,000 to my farming operations.

In conclusion this report from Virginia states:

Studies of 500 test demonstration records in the Valley area, that is, of Virginia, show: The more successful farmers have a larger percentage of their investment in livestock and receipts per animal unit average one-third higher. They get higher yields and are at least 25 percent more efficient in the use of labor.

* * * Animal units have increased by 17 percent. Land in pasture and hay has increased 20 percent. Hay production has increased 40 percent. Pasture provides 24 to 30 more days of grazing a year. Decrease in acreage of row crops has averaged 49 percent. Grain yields have increased an average of 3 to 7 bushels.

IN KENTUCKY FARMERS IN 24 COUNTIES REPORT INCREASED PRODUCTION BY USING P_2O_5

Let us look at the record for Kentucky, which has the good fortune to lie partly in the watershed of the Tennessee. In that State, 713 farms in 24 of the 120 counties of the State were participating in the program as of March 1 this year. In all, since the beginning of the program, 113,047.45 tons of T. V. A. concentrated fertilizer have been shipped into Kentucky. Almost 9,000 tons have gone directly for use by these 713 test demonstration farmers, while more than 100,000 tons were distributed by A. A. A. as benefit payments under its soil-conservation program.

This is what happened: Statistics by the Extension Service show that the yield of wheat on lands treated with phosphates averaged 24.1 bushels per acre, or 88 percent more than the 12.8 bushels per acre on untreated land. The yield of oats went up 62 percent, from 20.9 to 33.9 bushels per acre, barley 98 percent, from 18.8 to 37.3 per acre, rye 96 percent, from 9.7 to 19 bushels per acre; and corn 51 percent, from 33.9 to 51.3 bushels per acre.

The increases in yields of various types of hay were even more striking: Lespedeza increased 150 percent, from a half ton per acre to one and a quarter tons; alfalfa, 163 percent, from eight-tenths of a ton to 2.1 tons; red clover, 129 percent, from seven-tenths of a ton to 1.6 tons; and red top, 120 percent, from a half ton to 1.1 tons on every acre.

In terms of livestock production, as measured by increased grazing capacity per acre, the Extension Service figures likewise show striking results. On the average, these figures show that in that area 3.77 acres of grazing land untreated by phosphate or lime is required to sustain 1,000 pounds of livestock. On pastures treated with T. V. A. phosphates and with lime, however, the grazing area required per 1,000 pounds of livestock

was reduced in 11 counties, on which figures have been compiled, by an average of 47 percent. Now it is 2, not 3.77, acres. The smallest reduction was more than 20 percent, while in the most successful county the acreage was reduced 63 percent, from 4.4 to 1.62.

Results on one of the test demonstration farms in Marshall County were summarized thus by J. Homer Miller, assistant county agent:

The number of livestock has more than doubled since the beginning of the demonstration 4 years ago. More hay and improved pastures are being produced at the present time. The acreage of corn has been reduced one-third, but increased fertility has given the same yield at less cost and less labor.

Do not Senators see the refrain? Increased production on fewer acres, less cost, less labor, a higher income for the farmer.

ANIMAL UNITS PER FARM HAVE DOUBLED IN THE GEORGIA DEMONSTRATION

Mr. President, the same story comes from Georgia, where the demonstration program began in 1935. By the beginning of 1941, in the 9 Georgia counties lying in the Tennessee Valley and in 37 counties in other parts of the State, more than 2,000 test-demonstration farms were participating. I wish to quote a few paragraphs from a report made last October by the director of the Georgia Extension Service:

On 103 farms where records have been kept since the beginning of the program, cotton yields have increased from 275 to almost 400 pounds per acre. Corn yields have been boosted from 20 to 30 bushels per acre. Acreage of soil building crops per farm has jumped from 10 to 35. Animal units per farm have doubled.

Each year more and better records are kept, and each year more neighbors are becoming demonstrators.

For instance, J. W. Wilson, Fannin County demonstrator, says: "I have lost the check plot for my farm. For 7 years I have measured progress by a neighbor who did not believe in lime and phosphate. But this year he is following a land-improvement program himself.

"What is happening in my community is happening all over our county. Corn acreage has been reduced but we are growing more bushels than ever before. Pasture acreage has increased by leaps and bounds and land already in pasture is much improved."

In addition to these things, last year, with 23 acres of apples, Mr. Wilson had an income of over $12,000.

* * * * *

W. F. Kimsey, Towns County demonstrator, has raised his cash income from less than $200 per year to over $900 since the beginning of the program. He now keeps a flock of 400 chickens, raises 50 bushels of corn per acre where he formerly got only 10, and has increased his acreage of soil-building crops from 3 to 24.

* * * * * *

Homer Akins, Union County, grows 65 to 70 bushels of corn per acre now and does not have any bottom land. When he came to the farm 40 years ago it would average about 5 bushels per acre. J. C. Hunt, Union County, has only a little more than 20 acres in cultivation, yet last year he cleared around $1,000, enough to buy a War bond of that size. R. H. Bandy, Catoosa County, says phosphate and lime on legumes have doubled the corn yields on his farm.

FOURTEEN DEMONSTRATION FARMERS IN OHIO INCREASE PRODUCTION OF MILK AND EGGS AND MEAT BY 40 PERCENT ON THE SAME LAND WITHOUT MORE MANPOWER

This is the way it goes in every State. More pounds and bushels per acre, more animal units maintained. It happened in Ohio. This is what the survey showed in Ohio.

In Huron County, 14 test demonstration farms have increased their production of milk and eggs and meat by 40 percent in 3 years. The total acreage of their farms was not increased. Even more remarkable, only one-third of the increase in the production of milk, or eggs, or meats on these 14 farms was accomplished by increasing the number of cows, or sows, or ewes, or hens maintained. Fully two-thirds of the increase was accomplished through the increased production of milk per cow, eggs per hen, pigs per sow, and lambs per ewe. And both the increased production per animal and the increased numbers of animals maintained came from the same cause. P_2O_5 was the cause. The total increase was the result of improvements in the quality and amount of feed produced on the farms themselves, for the quantities of feeds purchased by these 14 farmers were negligible. It was less than 2 percent of the total feeds consumed in both 1938 and 1941. Farm operating expenses did not rise beyond the rise in costs of the same goods and services in different years. Those demonstration farms show a record of increased production without more labor or more machinery.

THE EFFECT OF FOOD PRODUCTION IF P_2O_5 WERE PRODUCED AT THE REPORTED PEAK CAPACITY OF COMMERCIAL PLANTS

Yet, in spite of such reports from all these farming areas where the demonstration has been undertaken, nothing is being done to increase the use of P_2O_5 on the rest of the farms of the county. An average use of 2 pounds an acre a year is tolerated in the face of war-food goals admitted to be almost impossible to attain under conventional farming and fertilizing practices. Nothing is being done to achieve comparable production results by using 17 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre throughout the country. Nothing is done to operate the commercial plants at peak capacity, and construction of a public plant is blocked. A shortage of nitrogen is admitted, as well as a desperate deficit in certain types of phosphorus products for animal feeding. No effort is made to put this surplus capacity at work to produce the product which would, by generous use, reduce both shortages admitted.

Let us calculate just what would be the difference in our food supply if capacity operation of P_2O_5 were undertaken by the industry, and if the total available supply were distributed to the farms which need the mineral. We ought to know by what amount production of food required for war is diminished, not by the inexorable pressures of global conflict, but by the obsolescent practices of a private industry. Approximately 600,000 tons of P_2O_5 capacity is called surplus by the fertilizer companies. No effort is made to use it. If that capacity were put into production, and the product used, not under ideal experiment station conditions, but under just such conditions as have prevailed on these demonstration farms, and if what is actually happening on those farms were repeated, this is what that idle surplus could produce. First, 24,000,000,000 pounds of milk. That is 20 percent of the total milk production goal set by the Food Production Administration for 1943. An increase of 24,000,000,000 pounds above last year's milk production is a greater increase than the Secretary of Agriculture has called for. In fact, the use of only one-tenth of the total potential production of that idle capacity would be needed to accomplish the percentage of increase in milk required for 1943 if the production records on these demonstration farms were duplicated on the land of their neighbors who last year used only 2 pounds of P_2O_5 an acre.

So much for the increase in milk required. If that idle capacity for production of P_2O_5 should be used to increase the amount of beef alone, if it were used as it has been used on these demonstration farms and if similar results were achieved, it would produce 3,000,000,000 additional pounds of beef. That is approximately 27 percent of the total beef production goal for 1943. That is the sort of record P_2O_5 would make if it were used to reach these goals. Yet the commercial plant capacity remains idle, while the food problem is presented to the country as a problem of manpower, of machinery, or of income alone.

A PROGRAM TO PROMOTE THE USE OF PHOSPHORUS ON THE LAND

I propose that while the committee of the Senator from Missouri is finding out why that private-plant capacity has been kept idle—and we should know now and for the future—and why construction of the Mobile plant has been prevented, the Senate should come forward to recommend a program for immediate adoption.

First. If the pricing policies of the fertilizer industry keep unused that surplus capacity to make P_2O_5, let the Government undertake to buy the product for distribution, just as we buy planes, guns, and ships for war. It is a war material. I am advised that at current prices it would require an expenditure of about $50,000,000 to buy the total amount of phosphate fertilizer which would result from the production of 600,000 tons of P_2O_5. Let the Department of Agriculture purchase the surplus output of these commercial plants, supervise its distribution to the critical production areas, and determine the way in which its potential production can be most fully realized. I would trust the judgment of the men in the field with respect to its efficient use. The same county agents who have supervised the T. V. A. program might take on the job. They know how these results have been achieved on actual farms. No one would lose in such a transaction, for the potential milk production of that amount of P_2O_5 is worth $780,000,000 at current prices. The

farmer could pay the Department back. He would save on labor costs. He would make money. Everyone would profit.

Second. I propose that construction of the Mobile plant be begun at once. Next year, while the low-concentrate fertilizer produced by the total capacity of the private industry is distributed near the sources of supply—and I am informed these are critical areas—the products released by the combined capacity at Mobile and Muscle Shoals can be distributed by low-cost water transportation throughout the Mississippi Valley, from Minnesota to Alabama and Louisiana. The Mobile plant will produce 46,000 additional tons of P_2O_5, to be directly used in fertilizer or by relieving the facilities at Muscle Shoals from the burden of producing elemental phosphorus to increase plant-food production there.

Third. I suggest, as the special committee appointed by Congress has previously proposed, that designs should be prepared for the immediate post-war construction of Government plants to use the large deposits of phosphate rock which are to be found in the West. This will permit farmers in important agricultural areas to begin a program similar to the one now under way under the auspices of T. V. A. It will not satisfy the need of the land for the mineral. There will still be a substantial margin of supply for private industry in the future, when the risk has been removed, when phosphatic fertilizer is used as much as it should be on the land of this country. A total capacity of something like 10,000,000 tons could safely be provided as soon as the results of this demonstration program are known, as soon as the use of 20 or 30 pounds of P_2O_5 an acre is common agricultural practice. The history of the Tennessee Valley would be repeated all over the country. With experience in use, and demonstration of results, consumption would increase. With increased use, costs would be lowered. The revenues of the private companies would rise.

This is the way to increase our production of food for war within the limits of our slender reserve of manpower. This is the way to prepare for the rehabilitation of the starved and devastated areas of the world. This is the way to save our soil. For 9 years, T. V. A. has talked phosphate to the agricultural world. Promises and forecasts were made in the beginning. They had the estimates of scientists to guide them. They now report achievement in terms of hay, beef, milk, and cheese. They know now how these results can be accomplished by ordinary farmers working on average soils. The magic of P_2O_5 is no longer a professional secret. T. V. A. has reported this program annually to the Congress. These accomplishments have been presented in conferences with other agencies of Government. Based on the record of these achievements, new capacity has been requested. But what happens to these reports and recommendations? They are ignored.

Men in the War Production Board—honorable and able men, no doubt, but conditioned by association with the chemical industry, and not trained to take a long look at the public interest—deny priorities for the plant expansion recommended by T. V. A. This country has no new plant at Mobile, although Congress acted almost a year ago to approve the Authority's recommendation. A few men in the Department of Agriculture—honorable and skilled, I am sure, but trained too long to accept as final the marketing policies of the fertilizer industry—announce there is no shortage but a surplus of existing capacity to produce P_2O_5 and make no effort to put that surplus to work or to make the benefits of the T. V. A. experience available to the country.

How long, I ask the Senate, shall we tolerate this blindness to experience, this obsolete approach to the problem of food supply? How long shall the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Production Administration be handicapped by such advisers, technicians devoted to outworn methods, bureaucrats who are timid in the face of change? This is an old story, the last of a sorry sequence. Can we forget how technical advisers, representing the view of private industries, assured the men in charge of war production that this country had adequate supplies of power, of aluminum, and steel, and that new capacity for their production was not required? We know that record. And this time it is our supply of food that depends on their opinions. Our food supply is threatened and only palliatives are offered as solutions.

The fundamental limitation on the capacity of our soil is unacknowledged. One basic remedy is ignored. Parity and priorities, prices and labor—these are the questions brought to our attention. And we must meet emergencies which the basic maladjustment has created. We must relieve the symptoms. We cannot do that in good conscience unless at the same time we demand that the basic limitation on increased food production be removed. We must not be silent while new and less productive land is opened up for cultivation, while once again the evil cycle of exhaustion is invited, and acres which should never have been broken are doped, like horses entered in a race too swift, to yield their scanty minerals in a brief display of bounty to be followed by collapse. Our food-production program must be organized no longer around concealment of a basic soil deficiency.

That deficiency must be removed. It cannot be accomplished in one season or two. But we can make a beginning. We can reverse our direction. We can change our food-production policies. We can start to relieve the shortage of P_2O_5 in the soil. We can begin to do it this season, with the products of the idle plant capacity of private industry. We can produce more meat and more dairy products as we build fertility back to our soil. We can meet our war food production goals at the same time that nitrogen, and men, and machines are released for battle duty. While manpower is deferred from military service, we must not postpone the mobilization of our potential land power. We must restore a fighting mineral to a fighting soil.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Marine Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Capt. Walter K. Kilpatrick, July 28, 1942;
Glenn B. Davis, September 17, 1942, and
Theodore E. Chandler, October 23, 1942; and
Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

William Embry Wrather, of Texas, to be Director of the Geological Survey, vice Walter C. Mendenhall, retired; and

George Abild, of South Dakota, to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak., vice Fred S. Minier.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are on the calendar a few routine nominations of postmasters alone. As in executive session, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1943, at 12 oclock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29, 1943:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942:

George R. Stallings, a citizen of Georgia.
Edward P. Dupras, Jr., a citizen of Rhode Island.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942:

Edward J. Doyle, a citizen of New Jersey.
Meade Whitaker, a citizen of North Carolina.
Sherman W. Parry, a citizen of New York.
Robert H. C. Johnston, a citizen of Ohio.
Philip R. Freeman, a citizen of South Carolina.
William C. Esterline, a citizen of California.

Sgt. Richard H. Mickle, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942:

George F. Vaughan, a citizen of North Dakota.

James B. Peeso, Jr., a citizen of New York.

George H. Shackelford, a citizen of Virginia.

Paul H. Bratten, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Winfield S. Haltom, Jr., a citizen of Arkansas.

Royal E. North, a citizen of Mississippi.

Anthony Caputo, a citizen of New Jersey.

Robert H. Lage, a citizen of Iowa.

John F. Ross, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December 1942:

Robert V. Ruhe, a citizen of Illinois.

Richard W. Akeley, a citizen of Maine.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942:

Alex W. Wall, a citizen of Louisiana.

Alec M. Sim, a citizen of California.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of February 1943:

Howard C. Steffens, a citizen of Minnesota.

Dennis D. Nicholson, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.

Bernard J. Favaro, a citizen of Idaho.

Joseph C. Fegan, Jr., a citizen of California.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943:

George E. Moore, a citizen of Tennessee.

Harold V. Warner, a citizen of Indiana.

Gerald L. Eagleburger, a citizen of Missouri.

William D. Moody, a citizen of Illinois.

Martin M. Calcaterra, a citizen of Michigan.

John J. Jachym, a citizen of New York.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of February 1943:

Platoon Sgt. John D. Case

Corp. James C. Bradhurst

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of February 1943:

Lyle S. Whitmore, Jr., a citizen of Illinois.

Newton MacLeod, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Chambers, a citizen of Georgia.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of March 1943:

Platoon Sgt. Robert E. Dawson

Platoon Sgt. Edward R. Healy

Corp. David Applebaum

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of March 1943:

Lowell T. Keagy, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Richard Harte, Jr., a citizen of West Virginia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29, 1943:

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

C. Alton Beck, Aspen.
Bert O. Benson, Heeney.
Ada Killin, Kiowa.
Mary Winifred Laube, Rico.

MICHIGAN

Walter J. Grace, Carson City.
Helen M. Kucera, Cedar.
Clara E. Burnett, Dimondale.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Truett Carr, Heidelberg.
Oscar T. Davis, Ocean Springs.
Rebecca B. Quinn, Prentiss.
Herbert A. Robertson, Sallis.
James F. Howry, Sardis.
Hermine D. Lamar, Senatobia.
Myrtle D. Baker, Wiggins.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Margaret M. Hildreth, Bethlehem.
Florence G. Taylor, West Swanzey.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts. Without the inner strength which Thou alone canst give we are but fainting and frail human creatures, insufficient for these terrific days. Beset by determined and fanatical foes who defy the Father of all mankind, betray the hard-earned liberties of the people they suppress, and who deny before God the equality of every race and color, we would register a new vow in heaven that we will lift the vindication of all that America symbolizes above every other loyalty of our lives. In this day of desperate danger and crisis grant us a patriotism so pure and undefiled that we shall put the right above our rights, the common good above our material goods. May personal advantages be scorned and hardships gladly borne that the soldiers of freedom may have the weapons for complete victory.

We would face the challenge of these days in the spirit of Thy servant, who so long ago, thinking of his own ravished land, exclaimed: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning; let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I prefer not thee above my chief joy." In Thy presence we solemnly pledge,

"O land of lands! To thee we give
Our love, our trust, our service free;
For thee thy sons shall nobly live
And at thy need shall die for thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on April 29, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 991) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Austin	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chavez	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Gillette	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE COAL STRIKE—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States last night on the coal situation, which was broadcast over the various broadcasting systems.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am speaking tonight to the American people and in particular to those of our citizens who are coal miners.

Tonight this country faces a serious crisis. We are engaged in a war on the successful outcome of which will depend the whole future of our country.

This war has reached a new critical phase. After the years that we have spent in preparation, we have moved into active and continuing battle with our enemies. We are pouring into the world-wide conflict everything that we have—our young men and the vast resources of our Nation.

I have just returned from a 2 weeks' tour of inspection on which I saw our men being trained and our war materials made. My trip took me through 20 States. I saw thousands of workers on the production line, making airplanes, guns, and ammunition.

Everywhere I found great eagerness to get on with the war. Men and women are working long hours at different jobs and living under difficult conditions without complaint.

Along thousands of miles of track I saw countless acres of newly plowed fields. The farmers of this country are planting the crops that are needed to feed our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. Those crops will be harvested.

On my trip I saw hundreds of thousands of soldiers. Young men who were green recruits last autumn have matured into self-assured and hardened fighting men. They are in splendid physical condition. They are mastering the superior weapons that are pouring out of our factories.

The American people have accomplished a miracle.

However, all of our massed effort is none too great to meet the demands of this war. We shall need everything that we have and everything that our allies have to defeat the Nazis and the Fascists in the coming battles on the continent of Europe and the Japanese on the continent of Asia and in the islands of the Pacific.

This tremendous forward movement of the United States and the United Nations cannot be stopped by our enemies.

Equally, it must not be hampered by any one individual or by the leaders of any one group here back home.

I want to make it clear that every American coal miner who has stopped mining coal—no matter how sincere his motives, no matter how legitimate he may believe his grievances to be—every idle miner directly and individually is obstructing our war effort. We have not yet won this war. We will win this war only as we produce and deliver our total American effort on the high seas and on the battle fronts. That requires unrelenting, uninterrupted effort here on the home front.

A stopping of the coal supply, even for a short time, would involve a gamble with the lives of American soldiers and sailors and the future security of our whole people. It would involve an unwarranted, unnecessary, and terribly dangerous gamble with our chances for victory.

Therefore, I say to all miners—and to all Americans everywhere, at home and abroad—the production of coal will not be stopped.

Tonight, I am speaking to the essential patriotism of the miners and to the patriotism of their wives and children. And I am going to state the true facts of this case as simply and as plainly as I know how.

After the attack at Pearl Harbor, the three great labor organizations—the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railroad brotherhoods—gave the positive assurance that there would be no strikes as long as the war lasted. The president of the United Mine Workers of America was a party to that assurance.

That pledge was applauded throughout the country. It was a forcible means of telling the world that we Americans, 135,000,000 of us, are united in our determination to fight this total war with our total will and our total power.

At the request of employers and of organized labor, including the United Mine Workers, the War Labor Board was set up for settling any disputes which could not be adjusted through collective bargaining. The War Labor Board is a tribunal on which workers, employers, and the general public are equally represented.

In the present coal crisis, conciliation and mediation were tried unsuccessfully.

In accordance with the law, the case was then certified to the War Labor Board, the agency created for this express purpose with the approval of organized labor. The members of the Board followed the usual practice which has proved successful in other disputes. Acting promptly, they undertook to get all the facts of the case from both the miners and the operators.

The national officers of the United Mine Workers, however, declined to have anything to do with the fact finding of the War Labor Board. The only excuse that they offer is that the War Labor Board is prejudiced.

The War Labor Board has been and is ready to give the case a fair, impartial hearing. I have given my assurance that if any adjustment of wages is made by the Board, it will be made retroactive to April 1st. But the national officers of the United Mine Workers refused to participate in the hearing when asked to do so last Monday.

On Wednesday of this past week, while the Board was proceeding with the case, stoppages began to occur in some mines. On Thursday morning I telegraphed to the officers of the United Mine Workers asking that the miners continue mining coal on Saturday morning. However, a general strike throughout the industry became effective Friday night.

The responsibility for the crisis that we now face rests squarely on these national officers of the United Mine Workers, and not on the Government of the United States. But the consequences of this arbitrary action threaten all of us.

At 10 o'clock yesterday morning the Government took over the mines. I called upon the miners to return to work for their Government. The Government needs their services just as surely as it needs the services of our soldiers, sailors, and marines—and the services of the millions who are turning out the munitions of war.

You miners have sons in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps. You have sons who at this very minute—this split second—may be fighting in New Guinea or in the Aleutian Islands or Guadalcanal or Tunisia or protecting troop ships and supplies against submarines on the high seas. We have already received telegrams from some of our fighting men overseas, and I only wish they could tell you what they think of the stoppage of work in the coal mines.

Some of your own sons have come back from the fighting fronts, wounded. A number of them are now here in a hospital in Washington. Several have been decorated by their Government.

I could tell you of one from Pennsylvania. He was a coal miner before his induction. His father is a coal miner. He was seriously wounded by Nazi machine-gun bullets while he was on a bombing mission over Europe in a Flying Fortress.

Another boy, from Kentucky, the son of a coal miner, was wounded when our troops first landed in north Africa 6 months ago.

There is still another, from Illinois. He was a coal miner—his father and two brothers are coal miners. He was seriously wounded in Tunisia while attempting to rescue two comrades whose jeep had been blown up by a Nazi mine.

These men do not consider themselves heroes. They would probably be embarrassed if I mentioned their names over the air. They were wounded in the line of duty. They know how essential it is to the tens of thousands and ultimately millions of other young Americans to get the best of arms and equipment into the hands of our fighting forces—and get them there quickly.

The fathers and mothers of our fighting men, their brothers and sisters and friends—and that includes all of us—are also in the line of duty—the production line. Any failure in production may well result in costly defeat on the field of battle.

There can be no one among us—no one faction—powerful enough to interrupt the forward march of our people to victory.

You miners have ample reason to know that there are certain basic rights for which this country stands, and that those rights are worth fighting for and dying for. That is why you have sent your sons and brothers from every mining town in the Nation to join in the great struggle overseas.

That is why you have contributed so generously, so willingly, to the purchase of War bonds and to the many funds for the relief of war victims in foreign lands. That is why, since this war started in 1939, you have increased the annual production of coal by almost 200,000,000 tons a year.

The toughness of your sons in our armed forces is not surprising. They come of fine, rugged stock. Men who work in mines are not unaccustomed to hardship. It has been the objective of this Government to reduce that hardship, to obtain for miners and for all who do the Nation's work a better standard of living.

I know only too well that the cost of living is troubling the miners' families and the families of millions of other workers throughout the country as well.

A year ago it became evident to all of us that something had to be done about living costs. Your Government determined not to let the cost of living continue to go up as it did in the First World War.

Your Government has been determined to maintain stability of both prices and wages—so that a dollar would buy, so far as possible, the same amount of the necessities of life. And by necessities I mean just that—not the luxuries and fancy goods that we have learned to do without in wartime.

So far, we have not been able to keep the prices of some necessities as low as we should have liked to. That is true not only in coal towns but in many other places.

Wherever we find that prices of essentials have risen too high, they will be brought down. Wherever we find that price ceilings are being violated, the violators will be punished.

Rents have been fixed in most parts of the country. In many cities they have been cut to below where they were before we entered the war. Clothing prices have generally remained stable.

These two items make up more than a third of the total budget of the worker's family.

As for food, which today accounts for about a third of the family expenditure on the average, I want to repeat again: Your Government will continue to take all necessary

measures to eliminate unjustified and avoidable price increases. We are now taking measures to "roll back" the prices of meats.

The war is going to go on. Coal will be mined no matter what any individual thinks about it. The operation of our factories, our power plants, our railroads will not be stopped. Our munitions must move to our troops.

Under these circumstances, it is inconceivable that any patriotic miner can choose any course other than going back to work and mining coal.

The Nation cannot afford violence of any kind at the coal mines or in coal towns. I have placed authority for the resumption of coal mining in the hands of a civilian, the Secretary of the Interior. If it becomes necessary to protect any miner who seeks patriotically to go back and work, then that miner must have and his family must have—and will have—complete and adequate protection. If it becomes necessary to have troops at the mine mouths or in coal towns for the protection of working miners and their families, those troops will be doing police duty for the sake of the Nation as a whole, and particularly for the sake of the fighting men in the Army, the Navy, and the Marines—your sons and mine—who are fighting our common enemies all over the world.

I understand the devotion of the coal miners to their union. I know of the sacrifices they have made to build it up. I believe now as I have all my life, in the right of workers to join unions and to protect their unions. I want to make it absolutely clear that this Government is not going to do anything now to weaken those rights in the coal fields.

Every improvement in the conditions of the coal miners of this country has had my hearty support. I do not mean to desert them now. But I also do not mean to desert my obligations and responsibilities as President and Commander in Chief.

The first necessity is the resumption of coal mining. The terms of the old contract will be followed by the Secretary of the Interior. If an adjustment in wages results from a decision of the War Labor Board or from any new agreement between the operators and miners, which is approved by the War Labor Board, that adjustment will be made retroactive to April 1.

In the message that I delivered to the Congress 4 months ago, I expressed my conviction that the spirit of this Nation is good.

Since then I have seen our troops in the Caribbean area, in bases on the coasts of our ally, Brazil, and in North Africa. Recently I have again seen great numbers of our fellow countrymen—soldiers and civilians—from the Atlantic seaboard to the Mexican border and to the Rocky Mountains.

Tonight, in the face of a crisis of serious proportions in the coal industry, I say again that the spirit of this Nation is good. I know that the American people will not tolerate any threat offered to their Government by anyone. I believe the coal miners will not continue the strike against the Government. I believe that the coal miners themselves as Americans will not fail to heed the clear call to duty. Like all other good Americans, they will march shoulder to shoulder with their armed forces to victory.

Tomorrow the Stars and Stripes will fly over the coal mines. I hope every miner will be at work under that flag.

REPORT OF JUVENILE COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the Juvenile Court during the fiscal year 1941–42.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1943.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON USE OF TRAILERS

A letter from the general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, reporting, pursuant to law, on receipts and expenses in connection with the use of trailers at Murphy and Fontana Dam, N. C., and Douglas Dam and Camden, Tenn. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AVOIDANCE OF FORFEITURE OF CIVIL SERVICE ELIGIBILITY BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending the enactment of legislation to amend section 2 (b) of the act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1211), relating to forfeiture of eligibility conferred by the act of November 26, 1940, in the case of persons in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 33)

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Cong.) requesting reports for certain months concerning transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service, information relating to transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service covering all reports received by the Commission through April 16, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Post Office (15), and Navy; and the Executive Office of the President which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the city of Duluth, Minn., favoring continuation of the National Youth Administration, or some other worth-while youth-training program, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC UNTIL DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES—PETITION

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by numerous citizens of Lewiston, Idaho, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, being House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Idaho will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION OF HARTFORD COUNTY (CONN.) LAUNDRY OWNERS—ORDERS OF W. M. C. AND O. P. A.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a petition which Mr. Donald F. Francis, president, Hartford County Laundryowners Club, addressed to His Excellency, Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of the State of Connecticut, the members of the Connecticut delegation in Congress, and others concerning the serious situation confronting the operators of laundries in Connecticut as the result of recent orders of the War Manpower Commission and the Office of Price Administration.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTFORD COUNTY LAUNDRYOWNERS CLUB,
Hartford, Conn., April 15, 1943.

To the Honorable Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.; the Honorable John A. Danaher, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Francis T. Maloney, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Thomas J. Spellacy, Mayor of Hartford, Hartford, Conn.; the Honorable William J. Miller, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable John D. McWilliams, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Ranulf Compton, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Joseph E. Talbot, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; the Honorable Boleslaus J. Monkiewicz, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Joseph A. Smith, Regional Director, War Manpower Commission, 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Chester Bowles, director, Connecticut Office of Price Administration, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. William G. Ennis, Director, United States Employment Service for Connecticut, 122 Washington Street, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Director, War Manpower Commission, Washington,

D. C.; Mr. Prentiss Brown, Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Donald Nelson, Director, War Production Board, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Joseph Weiner, Director, Office of Civilian Supply, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Earl Crockett, Office of Civilian Supply, 119 Ann Street, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. William H. Davis, Director, War Labor Board, Washington, D. C.; Mr. James J. Coughlan, Hartford Agent, War Labor Board, 15 Lewis Street, Hartford, Conn.; American Institute of Laundering, 2480 Sixteenth Street, N W., Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned respectfully submit the following petition to those addressed, requesting that immediate relief be given if the residents, war workers, military units, doctors, dentists, restaurants, hospitals, etc., are to continue to receive laundry and dry-cleaning service in Hartford County—the bulk of which is listed as a No. 1 critical labor area.

"FACTS

"1. The help drains to war plants and selective service are still continuing even though they reached the point approximately 5 months ago of being so severe that most plants were unable to supply the service needed.

"2. Productive capacity in many plants, because of the shortage of help, has slumped to the extent that they are not only unable to serve adequately the public, but are operating in the red because of reduced volume. Two important plants have had as much as a 25-percent reduction in volume.

"3. It now takes from 1 to 3 weeks to have a laundry bundle processed in the city of Hartford—1 to 4 weeks to have an article dry cleaned.

"4. Customers are now being turned away from nearly all laundries because of a help shortage. Several laundries are abandoning territories ordinarily serviced.

"5. Help turn-over for 1942 in one of Hartford's largest laundries was slightly in excess of 200 percent. The number of productive employees is dropping rapidly in all plants.

"6. This industry was declared essential to the war effort March 1, 1943, in this critical labor area by Joseph A. Smith, regional director of the War Manpower Commission.

"RESULTS

"(a) Opened offices of United States Employment Service to us. However, results have been nil not because of management of the employment agency but due to practically no help being available to send, and those sent on the whole were of little use.

"(b) More consideration for supplies, repair parts, etc., has never been a critical problem, at least in comparison to the manpower condition. Identification pins are, however, a serious problem. We have been unable—still are unable—to secure them, and they are vital to laundry operations. These pins are used over and over, but they wear out. Other means of identification require additional manpower, which we do not have and cannot get. The amount of material used in the manufacture of these pins is trivial.

"(c) It forestalled wholesale quitting of men under 38 years of age following Paul V. McNutt's edict to work in an essential industry or fight.

"(d) Actually an immense amount of time and expense were spent to secure essentiality, but it has only partially solved our problem.

"7. Wages and prices are frozen. These are almost unsurmountable obstacles, and we believe unnecessary in our industry because of its very nature. Excessive prices as a result of too high wages or greed for profit would kill any laundry or dry-cleaning plant. Generally speaking, wages are too low in comparison to those paid in war plants to hold help, and prices are little, if any, higher than those charged before the war.

"8. All Government agencies have been contacted one or more times for relief. They sympathize with us and treat us very courteously, but are forced to refer to the regional offices or to Washington, which inevitably makes for delay. We suggest more power be given to State and local offices of the different agencies to expedite things.

"(A) Wages: Requests for increases are slow coming through.

"(B) Prices: We cannot urge too strongly that the Office of Price Administration State office be given power to act upon price increases. Unfamiliarity with local situations has caused injustice and hardship on laundries in Waterbury, Fall River, Buffalo, etc., through 'area' pricing, which was forced on the above localities by Washington.

"SEVERAL LAUNDRIES IN WATERBURY ARE ABOUT READY TO CLOSE THEIR DOORS

"9. No one, no matter how critical the position he may hold in a laundry or dry-cleaning plant, is by Washington orders eligible for deferment. You cannot operate any organization, even a laundry, and have key individuals taken by selective service. The manpower situation is so bad in Hartford that even unskilled help is vital, because replacements cannot be secured. We are at the mercy of the local draft boards, although those of us who have had dealings with them admit that on the whole they have tried to help.

"10. (a) Lack of adequate laundry service is one of the largest sources of absenteeism in war plants. A woman doing the family wash will and must take 1 or 2 days off a week.

"(b) War workers (almost 100 percent) and others not owning home equipment or living in small quarters with no place for facilities are totally dependent upon commercial laundry service.

"11. Further curtailment of service, will, we are certain, be a serious cause and source of contagion.

"PROPOSALS ALL NEEDED NOW, IF BASIC CLEANING REQUIREMENTS ARE TO BE SUPPLIED

"1. Allow us to pay a sufficient wage to retain our present employees and to secure new help.

"2. (a) Allow an increase in prices to cover the additional increase in labor costs.

"(b) Or remove us from Office of Price Administration regulations. The price increases needed would not be inflationary. Competition among plants and with housewives would preclude run-away charges.

"3. Freeze all help in their respective positions for the duration in No. 1 critical labor areas.

"4. At least in the critical areas, allow deferments for the following key positions in laundries and dry cleaning plants. The need is grave now.

"(a) General manager or proprietor, (b) office manager, (c) salesmanager, (d) production manager or superintendent, (e) route superintendent, (f) route supervisors and all other supervisors, (g) head washman and head cleaner, (h) spotters, (i) engineers and master mechanics, (j) routemen—because of long training period, handling substantial sums of money and inability to secure replacements, (k) rough machine pressers, (l) adjustment manager.

"5. Enable us to secure more rapidly and in some cases such as identification pins, secure supplies, parts, etc., essential in our operations.

"PREDICTION

"Unless immediate relief is given on manpower (all tied in with our other proposals), there will be a wholesale collapse of the laundries and dry cleaners in this area."

HARTFORD COUNTY LAUNDRYOWNERS CLUB,
DONALD F. FRANCIS, *President*.

P. S.—In order to conserve manpower, we have taken the liberty of making photostat copies of our original letter.

P. S.—While copies of this petition were being made, Mr. Paul McNutt's order freezing help in essential industries was issued. The original order, we believe, would have helped us considerably.

However, an order since then stating help can still move to better paying jobs, which if true, places us in exactly the same position we were in before.

Mayflower Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Pinney Katz, president; Sanitary Laundry Co., Hartford, Conn., Milton Bromberg, president; H. & E. Laundry, Inc., Hartford, Conn., William Elliott, president; Eagle Dye Works Co., Hartford, Conn., Myer Ellovich, vice president; New England Laundry Co., Hartford, Conn., Arthur C. Stevens, secretary; Pilgrim Laundry Co., East Hartford, Conn., Samuel P. Sharnik, secretary; Hartford Apron & Towel Supply Co., Hartford, Conn., Matthew J. Brady, treasurer; Empire Laundries, Inc., Hartford, Conn., Donald S. Francis, treasurer-manager; Superior Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Harry B. Miller, owner; Swiss Laundry, Rockdale, Conn., Emmanuel Kloter, partner; Paul's Three-Hour Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Paul E. Leuthold, owner; New Model Laundry, Manchester, Conn., George Willard, treasurer; Connecticut Laundry Owners' Association, Hartford, Conn., Wm. B. Van Dine, secretary-treasurer; Connecticut Laundry Owners' Association, Hartford, Conn., Arthur L. Sage, president; Home Laundry, New Britain, Conn., Joseph A. Fitzgerald, senior partner and owner; Powers Laundry, East Hartford, Conn., Roy R. Powers, president; Family Service Laundry, Glastonbury, Conn., Henry J. Carini, owner; Eastman Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Ely Waxman, owner; White Rose Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Frederick A. Bailey, treasurer; Rainbow Laundry, Wethersfield, Conn., Conrad Rothammer, manager; Latimer Laundry, New Britain, Conn., Milton Bromberg, president; Colonial Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Samuel P. Sharnik, president; New Method Laundry Corporation, Hartford, Conn., G. W. Williams, president; Spector's Ideal Laundry, East Hartford, Conn., Samuel B. Spector, owner, Mary Antos, attorney; Union Laundry Co., New Britain, Conn., O. B. Bennitt, president; Victory Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Frank A. Champ, owner; Royal Laundry, Windsor Conn., A. H. Miller, secretary and treasurer; Sunshine Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Harry C. Lydiard, president; Charter Oak Drive-In Laundry, Hartford, Conn., E. J. Staib, owner; Laurel Laundry, Hartford, Conn., Michael Plant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 215. A bill to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contracts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 212); and

S. 919. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; with an amendment (Rept. No. 213).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records, transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1054. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1055. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, with respect to the creation of national monuments; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1057. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1058. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to correct the military records of Herbert A. Magley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1059. A bill to amend the laws relating to the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve, with respect to allowances for dependents; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1060. A bill to provide expert assistance and to cooperate with Federal, State, and other suitable agencies in promoting the conservation of wildlife by promoting sound land-use practices, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 144), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Vernon L. Talbertt, son of William B. Talbertt, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think it cannot be gainsaid that no American in the last World War rendered more brilliant, more patriotic, and more invaluable service to this Government in the prosecution of the war than did Bernard M. Baruch. I think it is to be very much regretted that Mr. Baruch's luminous and valuable report as Chairman of the War Industries Board has not been studied to greater purpose by everyone connected with the present war effort, from the very highest to the very lowest. It has not been studied to the same advantage realized by our enemies, the Germans, in the setting up of their war industrial production.

It may be said that while Mr. Baruch does not have the same wide and extensive authority in this war that he had in the last, he has rendered extremely valuable services in the present struggle. I think it is to be regretted that at the conclusion of the last war Congress did not recognize Mr. Baruch's outstanding service by giving him a Congressional Medal, and I hope that mistake will be rectified at the conclusion of the present war for the valuable services he has been rendering.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a very valuable and informative tribute to Mr. Baruch published in the Chicago Herald-American.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERNARD M. BARUCH HOLDS UNIQUE PLACE IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE

Some weeks ago the President of the United States followed the precedent of five of his predecessors by calling upon the great wisdom and wide experience of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch to clear up the muddle about rubber.

The next day reporters found Mr. Baruch and his two eminent associates, Dr. James B. Conant, of Harvard University, and Dr. Karl Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, conferring on a park bench in Washington's Lafayette Square—"Hardly distinguishable from near-by persons feeding pigeons," as one newsman wrote.

"It's a good place to meet, isn't it?" Mr. Baruch replied to questioners, shooing them away.

In due time the famous "Baruch report" on the rubber situation was handed the President and became the basis of the present national program for conserving and reclaiming old rubber and developing new sources and supplies of synthetic rubber.

It was a task typical of the assignments Bernard Baruch has received from six Presidents, and his fulfillment of it was typical of services he has rendered the American Government in many national emergencies, including two World Wars.

Mr. Baruch, financier, statesman, and philanthropist, and now nearly 73 years old, has a distinction rarely achieved in America.

He is accepted and honored as an "elder statesman" in a land having little sentiment for the phrase, a land that puts much more emphasis on youth and enthusiasm than on age and experience, and he is thus exceptional among his countrymen.

President Roosevelt was not the first to rely on Bernard Baruch for advice in an emergency.

Shortly after the turn of the century it was a fixed rule among industrial and financial operators to "see Bernie" about their problems.

Mr. Roosevelt was certainly not the first President to "see Bernie." Mr. Baruch was consulted on Government matters as long ago as the Taft administration. President Wilson "saw Bernie" in 1916 by appointing him to the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense. When the First World War was in its decisive stages in 1918, Mr. Baruch was made chairman of the powerful War Industries Board, with executive authority making him a virtual industrial czar.

After the war, Marshal Von Hindenburg, of Germany, said in indirect tribute to him: "The war was won in the American industrial centers. They understood war."

And after the war, President Wilson took him to the Versailles Peace Conference, as an American member of the Supreme Economic Council and the Reparations Commission.

We already know the disposition of the Government in this war to "see Bernie" in matters requiring experience and vision—of which the rubber study is but part of a passing parade.

However, the appraisal of Mr. Baruch's respected and unique place in our national life is not complete without refutation of any thought that might arise that he is a "yes man" to those who consult him.

While he has contributed much to the New Deal, there has never been sharper and more devastating criticism of the New Deal than on the many occasions when Mr. Baruch has discerned its faults and dangers.

In 1938, when the depression policies of the New Deal were undermining the foundations of the American system of free business and industrial enterprise, he told a Senate committee:

"We have to distinguish between monopoly (which is such control of price and production which exploits the public) and mere bigness which, through mass distribution and mass manufacture, has been one of the greatest blessings in low price, cheap service, increased production, and better standards of living."

In 1941, condemning the failure of the New Deal to provide safeguards against inflation, he told Congress:

"Except for human slaughter and maiming and all that goes with them, inflation is the most destructive of the consequences of war.

"It might double or more the cost of the war; it imposes the severest hardships on our people and, through inevitable deflation that follows, burdens the future with a constantly increasing debt and a long period of painful and bitter readjustment, destroying the confidence of people in themselves and their government, leaving them open to all the old and new isms.

"Nor is inflation a danger which will hold back and wait for a formal declaration of a shooting war. With pay rolls soaring and shortages developing, more money bidding for less goods, the danger of an inflationary price rise is imminent. If it is not taken firmly in hand in time, it may get beyond the possibility of control."

Mr. Baruch pleaded vainly with the New Deal. Subsequently he was reputed to have said ironically that only half a ceiling had been put over price and wage structures, that the policy of the administration seemed to be to try a half ceiling first and then perhaps to try a ceiling over the half ceiling, and a

roof over the ceiling, and an awning over the roof.

Few men have ever served the Nation with greater distinction, or with less consideration of personal reward, than has Bernard M. Baruch. Governments and Presidents have consulted him to their high credit and great gain. It has been to their usual and uniform loss and discredit that they have heeded him less often than they have consulted him.

PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the War Council of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on Thursday, April 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAN-AMERICAN IDEAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Pan-American Ideal," delivered by him before the Pan-American Club of the Young Men's Christian Association, Washington, D. C., on April 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDATIONS OF A DURABLE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him in Boston, Mass., on April 29, 1943, at a United Nations meeting sponsored by the Joint Council for International Cooperation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CREATION OF INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE—GALLUP POLL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of May 2, 1943, ving the result of the Gallup Poll on the question of creating an international police force after the war to keep peace throughout the world, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN L. LEWIS AND THE COAL STRIKE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news release by him relating to John L. Lewis and the coal strike, prepared by him April 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.;

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the present order of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 2 o'clock the Senate will automatically resume the consideration of Senate bill 796.

Mr. McNARY. I express the hope that we may proceed with it at this time, and I suggest to the able Senator from Texas, in charge of the bill, that he make a motion to that effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is my desire that the Senate continue consideration of the bill, and I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 796 at this time.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to strike out sections 2 and 3.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the purpose of the Senator to explain the bill at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator from Texas yield to permit me to modify the pending amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 2, line 6, after the word "investigation," I move to insert the words "and so proclaims," so the clause would then read, "whenever the President finds, after investigation, and so proclaims, that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance", and so forth. At that point I further move to amend by striking out the words "or other cause." I thank the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut now pending deals with sections 2 and 3. The one he has just proposed deals with section 1.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say for the record that my purpose was simply to acquaint the Senator from Texas with the full import of the thought I had in mind. My idea was that in any discussion which might follow, the Senator might choose to make reference to the suggestions contained in the amendment I propose to offer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that my present thought is that I would have no objection to the proclamation part of his amendment, but I am not prepared to agree to strike out "or other cause." It is true the phrase is a very general one, but it was inserted with the idea that other situations might unexpectedly arise which would make it necessary for the Government to take action. So I prefer to leave in that general phrase, but will discuss it later.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to offer a perfecting amendment, which I will ask the clerk to read, and which I will then explain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 3, with line 4, and ending on page 5, with line 3, it is proposed to strike out all of section 3, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 3. When possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, or a majority of the employees of such plant or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall upon approval of the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to substitute the War Labor Board for the board as proposed in the bill, because of the fact that the War Labor Board has general jurisdiction over these matters. At the time the bill was originally drawn, the War Labor Board was not in existence, and therefore a board was proposed to be set up. But it is felt by the friends of the bill that it would be wiser and better to provide that the agency which shall arbitrate or consider these matters shall be the War Labor Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly, the Senator's amendment improves the bill. I have discussed with him on several occasions the effect of the bill as it now is drawn setting up a new board, which in effect would abolish the War Labor Board. That grew out of the fact that the bill was drawn originally before the War Labor Board was established. Since the establishment of the Board, another step has been taken, which has come to be known as the establishment of the so-called Little Steel formula. The general language of the bill as originally drawn would also abolish that formula by giving the board, which the bill as originally drawn proposed to set up, the right to fix wages as it might see fit.

What effect would the Senator's amendment have on the so-called Little Steel formula?

Mr. CONNALLY. Frankly, I will say to the Senator I do not think it would have any effect, because, under section 2, whereas the conditions of labor and wages and things that existed prior to the strike would be continued by the agency taking the plant over for the time being, it is further provided in section 2: "Except as provided in section 3." So that section 3 really controls section

2, and upon the taking over, both the employer and the employee would then have access to the War Labor Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator construe his amendment to mean that after the War Labor Board has been given or takes jurisdiction of a dispute where the property has been taken over it could grant an increase in wages beyond the 15 percent which is the basis of the Little Steel formula, or does the language of the Senator's amendment, which I only heard read from the desk, and which I think carries out the idea that the order shall not be in conflict with any order issued by the President preserve that situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. The theory upon which I wrote the amendment is that such order may not be in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder, and I have also inserted the language that the order must be approved by the President of the United States before the agency is required to observe it. That language is:

Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval of the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant.

The Little Steel formula, as I understand, is merely the policy of the Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that it has any legislative or statutory authority, or Executive authority in the form of an Executive order. It is merely a policy of the Board.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that the President's so-called hold-the-line order issued recently may have had the effect of giving the Little Steel formula the force of law. I am not certain about that. I am simply, so to speak, thinking out loud here about that. I should like to study the amendment a little further.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad if the Senator will do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that it was not my purpose to interfere in anywise with any policy or regulation of the War Labor Board, but simply use that Board for adjudication or settlement of any disputes which may arise, since that is the Board which is functioning. I do not want to disturb any present set-up in that regard. That is the theory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator give me his thought on this general question? What power does the bill give to the President which he has not already exercised in the present situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that that is a question about which there is some doubt. I have had an investigation made of the statutes and authority under which these things may be done. The original Draft Act, as the Senator will recall, provided that in the case of manufacturing plants the President, or the Government, could make demands upon employers for the production of materials, and so on, and if they did not comply, that the President might take over the plants. The original bill which the Senate passed as an amendment to the Draft Act extended that same power in the case of labor disputes, but the House of Representatives did not agree to that proposal. I then drew this bill, which was considered by the committee a little over a year ago. There is no explicit and definite provision in any statutory enactment authorizing the taking over of plants on account of labor disturbances. The authority heretofore exercised has been the general power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and such subsidiary powers as were derived from the War Powers Act. The Second War Powers Act carries a clause with regard to condemnation, under which the Government may take over temporarily any plant or property, but even that does not carry the specific authority. It was my thought that, regardless of the legal technicalities involved, it would be a wholesome thing for the Congress of the United States specifically, and in direct language, to authorize the President to do these things, and to confirm and ratify, if necessary, what the President has done and let the country know that the Congress is squarely behind the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I see the distinction the Senator draws. Let me change my question so that I may fully understand what is involved. Let me put this question to the Senator: Would the passage of the proposed act empower the President to do anything more than he has already done?

Mr. CONNALLY. If some amendments which I propose to offer a little later should be adopted, it would.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As it stands, does the measure empower the President to do anything he has not already done?

Mr. CONNALLY. Categorically, I am not prepared to say that it does, except for the fact that it sets up a method of procedure and arbitrament by the War Labor Board which is not specifically set forth in the President's order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point merely for a suggestion as to procedure?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment offered by the Senator very materially changes his original bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Senators have not had an opportunity to read the amendment. I do not know how the Senator feels about whether he wants to have his bill passed today, nor do I know whether there are other amendments to be offered. I should suggest that if the debate is to run on all afternoon, it would be wise to have the amendment printed for the availability of Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant that. Mr. President, of course, I am anxious to get the bill through, but I want every Member of the Senate to give the bill consideration, and I want no Senator to be cut off from the right to offer an amendment. If the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] will withhold his motion to strike out sections 2 and 3, I shall be very glad to withhold this amendment or to proceed with the discussion of other amendments which may be offered, simply for the information of the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I am perfectly willing to cooperate with the Senator from Texas to the end that the matter be put squarely before the Senate. In view of the fact that we are proceeding along these lines, and that the Senator has in mind, as he already has in very large part met, the objections which occurred to me with reference to section 3, at any rate, I am perfectly willing to withdraw both amendments in order that the whole matter may be before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. He is very reasonable, logical, and agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] are withdrawn. The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], beginning on page 3, line 4, will be withdrawn as a pending amendment, and lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is one clerical amendment which I should like to have agreed to at the present time. On page 1, line 12, the word "equipment" appears. The word should be "equipped." That was purely a mistake of the printer, because in the original bill the word was "equipped." I offer the amendment and move that it be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have one other amendment, to which I think there will be no objection. I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following new sentence:

Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield, and I shall yield the floor if the Senator desires to have it.

Mr. AUSTIN. No. Mr. President, I think that the very next sentence following the sentence which has been inserted by the amendment of the Senator from Texas should be adapted to the present times. The Senator's bill was presented before the declaration of war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Originally it was.

Mr. AUSTIN. It contains the same language it then contained and which was adapted to the national emergency. Therefore, for the purpose of adapting it to the present times I move the following amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the words "existence of the," strike out "unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27,

1941," and in lieu thereof insert "state of war declared to exist by joint resolutions of the Congress, approved December 8, 1941, and December 11, 1941, respectively (Public Laws Nos. 328, 331, 332, 77th Cong.),".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Vermont whether the effect of the language which he proposes to insert would confine the operation of the bill to the war period exactly, so that the moment the war is terminated these powers would terminate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. I think that other language contained in another part of the bill carries with it cases that had commenced during that period.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, but what I had in mind was that after the war comes to a sudden end, as we hope it will, it might be desirable, if the Government is in possession of any of these plants, to continue the authority for 6 months, let us say. I should suggest to the Senator that he insert the words "a period of 6 months after the termination of the war." If that insertion were made, I would have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I accept that amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator reform his amendment so as to carry out that idea.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after the insertion of the sentence offered a moment ago by the Senator from Texas, it occurred to me that purely as a matter of grammatical construction we might strike out the period after the word "therewith", and strike out "Such power and authority", because it is a repetition of what we have just put in, and then insert the word "and".

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator refer to the words "Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency," and so forth?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, so that the language will read, "and may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence," and so forth.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I then move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the amendment providing that "Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency." If my motion is agreed to, I shall have no objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider the vote by which his amendment was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. The result of adopting my suggestion would be that after the word "therewith," we would insert a comma and strike out the words "Such power and authority" and insert the word "and."

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator offer that amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I offer it. I move the following amendment, based upon the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Texas which is now under consideration, and purely as a matter of trying to avoid the repetition of the same words: Strike out the period in line 3, which will come after the Senator's new amendment, and strike out the words "Such power and authority", and insert the words "and" in lieu thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the able senior Senator from Vermont for an interpretation of his amendment. As I heard his amendment read, it would tie the life of this measure to the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. I desire to inquire whether the 6 months runs from the cessation of hostilities or from the signing of the peace—two dates which will be totally different, as the Senator will readily understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not like to answer the question on the basis of a curbstone opinion; but I should say that a 6 months' period would commence on the cessation of hostilities. In the event of an unconditional surrender that would fix the date beyond any question. In the event of an armistice that would fix the date beyond any question. I can now hardly think of a situation which would leave the date in doubt. At any rate, I should like to have it clear that my intention in offering the amendment is that the life of the act shall be for the duration of the period of hostilities and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Six months after the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that interpretation is very important; because, for instance, in World War No. 1 the peace did not follow for 2 years; and in the present complicated situation we might not achieve a formal peace until after a period even longer than that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. A similar situation existed after the Revolutionary War.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the power of the President is predicated upon the happening or occurrence in a plant or mine of something which interrupts or interferes with the national defense. What is the pertinency of continuing the act for any given length of time after the actual cessation of hostilities?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not the author of the 6 months' provision. I cannot give any other reason than that it would allow an opportunity for readjustment under the control of the Government. If the President were in possession of a plant or plants, a 6 months' period would be afforded in which to make the necessary changes to place the property in private operation. That is the only reason I see at this time. My original amendment did not contemplate an additional 6 months.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that this language would give the President power, for a period of 6 months after the actual cessation of hostilities, to take possession of a plant if there should be an interruption in the operation of the plant as the result of a strike or other labor disturbance, or other cause. It seems to me that the amendment is not well considered, if I may make the suggestion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it seems obvious to me that the bill must be written on the floor of the Senate. The amendments which have been proposed, and others which are to follow, would so indicate. I believe that this amendment should go over, with other amendments which are to be offered, and amendments which have been offered, until we may have an opportunity to study them. Let us have an understanding that no action will be taken today on any of these amendments other than clarifying amendments. I am somewhat in agreement with the able Senator from Georgia as to the necessity of this amendment.

Secondly, it is my interpretation that this amendment would be effective from the declaration of peace, and not the cessation of hostilities. The question is rather important. I believe that this amendment, like all others, should go over for the day, so that it may be printed and we may have time to study it. We can meet tomorrow and dispose of the bill, if possible. I make that suggestion to the able Senator. I believe that is the wish of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I have already indicated, I have no disposition to press this matter hastily. The reason I suggested 6 months to the Senator from Vermont was that it occurred to me that we might face the case of the Government already having charge of a plant and operating it. To say that it must be chopped off the instant the war comes to an end might create a very serious situation.

Mr. GEORGE. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that this language would not chop off the operation of a plant already possessed by the Government. It relates to the authority of the President to take over another plant 3 months or more after the war is ended.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not read in detail the amendment offered by the Senator. I heard him state it. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I have drawn an amendment which I had intended to offer. At the end of the bill I propose to add the following new section:

SEC. —. The provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

I have no desire to continue the taking over of plants after the termination of the war. I am not in disagreement with the Senator on that point. If it will contribute to the understanding and smoothing out of the situation, I shall be very glad to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon and not insist on a vote on any of these important amendments today, if that is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is the wise course. Senators can only hear the amendments read from the desk today. They cannot obtain copies of them until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think there ought to be the further understanding that Senators who desire to offer amendments should offer them promptly and have them printed, because it will not do any good to have the bill and my amendments understood if we do not understand other amendments which may be offered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. If I should cause to have printed the amendment which I have already proposed, would the Senator be willing to withdraw the suggestion of a 6-month extension and allow the amendment to stand as originally presented?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will withdraw the suggestion of an additional 6 months, but the amendment will have to be readopted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as originally offered, what effect would the amendment have on the situation mentioned by the Senator from Texas, in which the Government might be in actual possession of a plant and operating it on the day when hostilities ceased?

Mr. AUSTIN. It would not have any effect on that period at all. It seems to me that another amendment, to which the Senator has just called attention, would guard the interests of everybody during that period.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that it would be expected that as soon as practicable all plants in the possession of the Government at the termination of the war would be turned back to their private owners; but there may be a period of a few weeks during which it would be necessary to adjust the relationship. The law ought not to be so rigid that the Government could not, for a little while after hostilities cease, continue to operate a plant which it had already seized, so as to restore it to the possession of its owners without embarrassment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is a valid suggestion; but I think it is to be taken care of in another manner in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I do not think the point is involved, because this section applies solely to the power to take immediate possession.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are merely stopping the power to take immediate possession.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in order to keep faith with the Senate, I submit an amendment, which I ask to have printed. I do not care to offer it at this time, but I should like to have it printed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it would be interesting to have the Senator suggest to what part of the bill his amendment applies, and have it read by the clerk.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) Whenever any business establishments, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein, or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit another amendment for the consideration of the Senate, which I desire to have printed, and which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will be good enough to permit me to propound an inquiry or two I will clear my mind on the subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of whom does the Senator wish first to inquire?

Mr. REED. I wish to inquire first from the Senator from Texas.

The first amendment just offered by the Senator from Texas defines the offenses, and the second amendment would permit the district courts of the United States to enforce the law. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. REED. Let us confine ourselves to these two amendments as I understand them, and to plants which may actually be taken over by the Government. If the Senator will pardon me, I have been away for a couple of weeks on business of the Senate, and have just returned.

I have had in mind precisely the facts the Senator has written into the amendments, but I do not want the Government of the United States to take over any more businesses than is found to be absolutely necessary. So I have in mind proposing an amendment to the Senator's amendment, or perhaps a separate amendment, which would extend protection to all plants engaged in an essential war industry during the state of war.

The Senator shakes his head, and I presume he does not agree with that statement. Very well. I should like to ascertain from the Senator if the degree of protection which he is proposing to extend, and the amount of authority which he proposes to repose in the courts, are confined only to those plants the operation of which may be taken over by the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator desire that I answer?

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad to have the Senator's answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I would not favor the idea which he has advanced with reference to giving the proposed legislation application to all plants. My theory is that after the Government has taken over a plant it becomes a Government plant, just as though it were an arsenal or shipbuilding plant directed and operated by the Government. We would therefore be authorized to say that this is a Government plant, that it is being operated by the Government, and that no one, whether a union man, or anyone else, has any right to interfere with or induce anyone to abstain from working, or in any way impede or hinder the operation of the plant.

By the amendment which may be submitted by the Senator from Kansas, he would spread that authority to any plant which might be manufacturing war materials. Most of such plants are under private management. They are engaged in making profits I do not think the Senator's amendment could ever pass the Congress, and I wish to see something proposed that will pass. I am interested in results rather than in any other considerations.

Mr. REED. What I am trying to do is to obtain a degree of protection during wartime for the plants which are engaged in essential war production, whether the Government operates them or whether they are operated by private business. I realize the importance of the scope of this subject, and I cannot see any good reason for not doing what I propose. Over the years we have extended a great many favors to organized labor, and I have been in favor of doing so. If I had

been in the Senate at the time the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed, I would have voted for it, as well as for other similar acts. But we are now in war. We are not in peace. We must produce, whether in private plants or Government plants.

The Senator's amendment, which caused me to propound the question, would authorize the courts to restrain violations or threatened violations of the act, which applies of course, only to Government-operated plants. It is equally important that the proposed authority be extended to privately operated plants engaged in essential war production, so that they may continue to operate without interruption. During the period of the war, all the proposed exemptions should, in my opinion, be removed. The thoughts which I have expressed have been prepared by the drafting department in the form of an amendment, and, with the permission of the Senator from Texas, I should like to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be printed in the usual form, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REED is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REED to the amendment (relating to jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act) of Mr. CONNALLY to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense viz, before the period at the end of the amendment, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That upon a finding by the President, or certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the production of or service rendered by any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is essential to the war effort, any such court shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility as such court would have under this section, if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States," so as to make the section, as amended, read as follows:

"SEC. —. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act: *Provided*, That upon a finding by the President, or certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the production of or service rendered by any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is essential to the war effort, any such court shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility as such court would have, under this section, if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, were in the possession of the United States."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas completely change the character of this bill and certainly lend strength to the suggestion that it go over at least until tomorrow.

The difficulty which I see with the procedure the Senator is now proposing to set up is that there is no provision for a hearing before anyone. So far as I can see, the President would be empowered to take over the plants merely by saying that he wished to do so and labor leaders who did not comply with his orders and order their men to work at once would become immediately subject to various penalties.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; that is not correct.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that long ago Congress itself should have dealt comprehensively with this situation. Congress never created the National War Labor Board. The National War Board should be set up as a body, as a court, if you please, to determine labor controversies, and the employees and employers should be required to submit their disputes to that board. Today the President is helpless, except to take over the mines, because there is no provision of law which requires the United Mine Workers to submit their controversies to the National War Labor Board, and they have refused to do so. They say that they are not bound by promises made by some representatives of labor. I do not know the merits of the dispute, but it seems to me that if we are to deal comprehensively with the situation we should establish by law the National War Labor Board. We should define its jurisdiction, and give miners or other workers the power to appeal to that board. We should ourselves determine the principles by which the fixing of wages may be established. The President has arbitrarily said that no wages will be raised more than 15 percent over those prevailing on January 1, 1941, although the cost of living has gone up 22 percent. Is Congress going to say that the authority charged with the decision of that question shall be bound by that rule, or is Congress going to leave it open, or shall it establish a more liberal rule, and perhaps limit any advance in wages to the increase in the cost of living?

The bill now proposed by the Senator from Texas would put it absolutely in the hands of the President to take over any plants and deal with labor in any way he sees fit, and subject them to fine and imprisonment if they did not comply with the order. It seems to me that this constitutes a complete abdication by Congress of the duty to set up under the law a proper authority to deal with a problem so serious as this.

The bill as now proposed, with the amendments, puts a premium on the seizure of plants by the Government, because that is the only way the Government could deal with labor situations if we should pass the bill. It gives full authority, and the first requisite under the authority is to seize the plants, control the mines, and nationalize every industry in the United States. There are many Communists in labor organizations who would welcome that nationalization and would be glad to stir up labor disputes to that end. The legislation we are now considering must necessarily lead to the temporary nationalization of many industries.

So I think we ought to go back and set up by legal authority the National War Labor Board, define its powers, and then consider the question whether we will impose penalties for failure to abide by its orders. Certainly the Railroad Labor Act already provides that railroad workers must submit to the jurisdiction of the Railroad Labor Board, and we can make similar provision as to the National War Labor Board. When it comes to determining whether penalties shall be imposed for refusing to abide by the decisions of the National War Labor Board, rendered under law in accordance with the acts of Congress, we can consider that question. If that is the only remedy, I am willing to go that far; but I certainly think that first we should provide for a proper decision by a legally constituted body in the extremely complicated and difficult labor questions now facing the country. We cannot assume that labor will refuse to comply after a fair hearing.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no quarrel with the contention of the Senator from Ohio that this matter is something we should have given attention to 2 or 3 years ago. That, however, does not answer the question. Two or 3 years ago have gone; we cannot retroactively go back and do something 2 or 3 years ago, nunc pro tunc, and make it effective. We are now living right in the present, on May 3, 1943, at 1 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that the action of the President in taking over the coal mines was legal under the Second War Powers Act, section 2, which, incidentally, was passed since the pending bill was first drawn? What is the deficiency in section 2 of the Second War Powers Act?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator refers to the clause providing for condemnation, does he not?

Mr. TAFT. The section provides for the "condemnation, any real property, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, together with any personal property located thereon or used therewith, that shall be deemed necessary for military, naval, or other war purposes."

I do not quite see why authority to take over the mines, which is what the President has undertaken to do, is not covered by that act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator, however, that one of the requirements of that act is that there must be a petition filed in some court and regular condemnation proceedings instituted before that particular clause is applicable.

Mr. TAFT. The act provides:

Upon or after the filing of the condemnation petition, immediate possession may be taken and the property may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this act, notwithstanding any other law.

So, while it is necessary to file a petition, the Government can walk in the same day and take over the property.

Mr. CONNALLY. The purpose of that act was to permit speed in the condemnation of real estate for camps and other

premises. It might be construed to cover the present case, even though, as I construe it, the President would have to file a petition against every coal operating company in the country before he could invoke that particular section.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I wish to ask the Senator whether there is any provision in the bill giving the War Labor Board the right to subpena witnesses? I have read it pretty carefully and find no such provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. I supposed the Board had that authority.

Mr. WAGNER. No, it has not. That was one of the difficulties which recently confronted them, for Mr. Lewis refused to appear and attend the meetings of the Board because there was no power to subpena him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to have the Senator make a suggestion on that point.

Mr. WAGNER. I have prepared an amendment which I intend to offer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest that the Senator have the amendment printed and lie on the table until tomorrow.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well, but I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from New York will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 4. The National War Labor Board, by its chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio, who seemed to express some doubt as to the efficacy of taking over defense plants and who seemed to fear that everything would be socialized, I know that there has been much mud thrown at this bill during the period it has been considered. I know that it has been said that it will not accomplish any good result; that it will not be efficient, that it will take the property of private owners away from them, and all that sort of thing; but the experience of the Government so far, under the clause of the Selective Training and Service Act which empowers the President to take over plants in certain cases, has been that in seven significant instances strikes have been settled and the property promptly turned back to the owners. I shall cite the cases.

In June 1941, the Army took over the North American plane plant at Inglewood, Calif. Troops were used to effect the seizure. The plant was returned to its owners July 1, 1941, so in 3 weeks from the day the plant was seized, the strike was settled, and the plant turned back to the owners, and production resumed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator, please, help my thinking at that point by telling us under what authority the President seized that plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that my own thought is that probably it was seized because its owners were not producing, either on account of a strike or for some other reason; but, on the theory that they were not producing, the President assumed to exercise his powers under the original Selective Service Act which provided that when orders were placed with a plant and the plant did not promptly deliver them, the President might act. I assume that to be so; but I do not think the point suggested by the Senator from Connecticut constitutes a valid argument. If the President has not the authority, and did not have it then, we are trying to give it to him now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I am not questioning whether the President did or did not have the authority then; I am not saying whether we now are validating an act which he performed then; I simply wish to know, for the enlightenment of all of us, and certainly myself, whether or not the Senator takes into consideration what was then the source of the authority on which the President asserted the right to take over anyone's plant on June 9, 1941?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume it was under the clause in section 9 of the original Selective Service Act.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. On October 31, 1941, the Bendix, N. J., plant of Air Associates, Inc., was seized by the Army. It was returned to the owners on December 29, 1941, or in a little less than 2 months. A strike was on in the plant; it was tied up; it was not operating and not producing. The Government stepped in and took control of it, and, in a little more than 30 days, turned it back to the owners, and they continued to operate and produce.

On August 19, 1942, the Army seized the S. A. Woods Machine Co., of South Boston, Mass. Seven truckloads of armed troops took possession of the plant. It was turned over to new management on October 12, 1942, or in about 2 months. A reorganization, as I understand, with a new management was involved, but the necessary result was accomplished.

In the case of the Navy, on August 23, 1941, the Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., of Kearny, N. J., was seized. That company had large naval construction orders. It was returned to the owners on January 6, 1942.

On April 18, 1942, the Long Island City plants of the Brewster Aeronautical Co., producing various types of planes, were seized. The property was returned on May 20, 1942.

On August 14, 1942, the strike-bound Bayonne, N. J., plant of the General Cable Corporation was seized. It was returned to the owners on August 20, 1942.

On October 13, 1942, the Elkton, Md., plants of Triumph Explosives, Inc., were seized. They were returned to the owners on February 27, 1943.

Mr. President, I approach this matter from the production standpoint. What is the primary interest of the Government? The primary interest of the Government is to continue the operation of the plants. I know other Senators think that a proper remedy is to have prosecutions of individuals, and all that sort of thing. That may be a proper course, but I have no desire to undertake to cover the whole field and to present a cure-all. I have undertaken to reach this one thing, which is the paramount necessity of the Government that a plant shall continue operations and production. Our experience is that this method has worked. Every case in which it has been employed by the Government has resulted in the reopening of the plants, in continuing production, and in the settlement of the dispute.

A few days ago the men who were working at the Celanese Co.—I do not recall at the moment where it is located—walked out; they were on a strike; but the mere threat there that the Government would step in and take charge, influenced the men to return to work; they did return to work, and the plant resumed production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that whenever the Government has taken over a plant, as has been done in the past, the management has remained the same and there have been no damages of any kind to the owners of the plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I think that is true in every case except, probably, one where the management was in turmoil and the Government went in and effected a reorganization.

Mr. ELLENDER. I meant in most cases. I had in mind the case to which the Senator refers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except for that one case, I think the management was the same, the property was returned to the owners, and nobody was damaged, and, so far as I know, no compensation was paid to the owners for any damages.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, under the recent seizure of the coal mines the management will not be changed to any extent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so understand. I shall not take more of the time of the Senate now, because Senators desire to consider the amendments, but it does seem to me that the power and authority and sovereignty of the Government of

the United States are so comprehensive that when we are engaged in war and a plant is not producing, we can take it over, and that when we do take it over, it is a Government plant, just as much as if we had a fee simple title to it, because we are in charge; and that anyone interfering with the operation of the plant, or inducing another to interfere with its operation, should be amenable to the courts. There is no other way in which we can proceed. Are we to sit down, when our soldiers are dying on the battlefield, and turn over the control of a great industry or a great plant to those who are not seeking to cooperate with the Government and to advance the production program?

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form, and lie on the table an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill. The adoption of the proposed substitute amendment would render unnecessary action on the several amendments I have suggested earlier in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by the Senator from Texas, will be printed in the usual form, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. CONNALLY is as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. CONNALLY to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause; that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption; and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant in the interest of the national defense: *Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this paragraph, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and the authority to operate any such plant under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.'

"SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3 hereof, in any case in which possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, such plant, while so possessed, (a) shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant was so taken, or (b) in the event operation of such plant is interrupted or stopped at such time; shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at such plant immediately preceding such interruption or stoppage.

"SEC. 3. When possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, or a majority of the employees of such plant or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval of the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant.

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere or continue to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein, or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 5. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, except as to offenses committeed prior to such date."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to have in the RECORD a letter I have received referring to the particular matter now pending, to follow the statement of the Senator from Texas.

In view of the large number of amendments which have been offered to the pending bill, I, of course, do not know what my position on the measure may be until after I have had an opportunity to study it as it may be amended. However, I have today received a letter from Mr. Martin H. Miller, representing the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, with reference to the bill. Of course, when he wrote the letter he did not know about the amendments, and the amendments may or may not correct the matters he has brought forward, but I should like to have the clerk read the letter, which is very short, so that it may go into the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
UNITED STATES LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1943.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is opposed to the Connally bill, S. 796. We do not believe it will serve any useful purpose in the war effort of the Nation.

The amendment to section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, empowering the President to take immediate possession of any plant equipment for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith is, in our opinion, unnecessary. The President has ample powers to do such things and has very recently used such powers, as is well known to all.

We oppose the creation of the Defense Wage Board, another war agency to deal with the question of wages of workers. The Railway Labor Act contains ample provisions for the handling of wage controversies affecting railroad employees, and the National War Labor Board should be sufficient to handle such matters for other workers. This is no time to establish a new war agency, which would, at best, only cause delay, confusion, and misunderstanding, with resultant loss to our war effort.

We believe that Congress could well devote itself to serious study and correction of the ever increasing living costs, which have caused and will continue to cause wage controversies. American workers must maintain their economic standing with regard to wages and war prices, if we hope to achieve full utilization in our war effort.

Legislation such as S. 796 will not aid in our national effort, it will only delay and confuse the real issues. We trust that the Senate will immediately tackle one of the real problems on the home front, that of the ever increasing cost of living.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN H. MILLER,
National Legislative Representative.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Texas intimated that he was in accord with the objective I had in mind in suggesting that in line 6, on page 2, after the word "investigation," there be an amendment to read "and proclaims". I should like very much to press for action on the amendment, to the end that the record may be complete in that particular, and that we may dispose of this one item.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I move that after the word "investigation" in line 6, on page 2, there be inserted the words "and proclaims".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have a communication from the Bureau of Labor Statistics containing statistics and a statement relating to strikes in both the United States and Great Britain. I think these statistics may be very useful to the Members of the Senate at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that the communication be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS,
Washington, May 1, 1943.

The Honorable ROBERT WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: In answer to your telephone request I am listing below strike information for the United States and Great Britain. I am also enclosing an excerpt from the order of the British Minister of Labor, issued in July 1940.

Strikes in the United States and Great Britain

Year	United States			Great Britain		
	Strikes	Workers	Man-days idle	Strikes	Workers	Man-days idle
1939	2,613	1,170,962	17,812,219	940	337,000	1,360,000
1940	2,508	576,988	6,700,872	922	299,000	940,000
1941	4,288	2,362,620	23,047,556	1,251	360,000	1,080,000
1942	2,968	839,961	4,182,557	1,281	455,000	1,530,000

If we may furnish you information at any time, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

A. F. HINRICHS,
Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

[Enclosure.]

STRIKE LEGISLATION IN GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA

GREAT BRITAIN

Conditions of employment and national arbitration order came into operation in July 1940:

"On the ground that disputes should as far as possible be settled by the joint machinery of the employers' organizations and the trade-unions, the order strengthens the existing machinery, and it almost makes it obligatory upon employers in every district to observe terms and conditions which have been settled by collective agreement or arbitration for the trade concerned in the district, thus minimizing the causes of disputes. Strikes and lock-outs are prohibited unless the difference has been reported to the Minister of Labor and has not been referred by him for settlement within 3 weeks from the date on which the difference is reported to him." [1] He may refer disputes either to existing local machinery or to National Arbitration Tribunal. Decisions rendered by National Arbitration Tribunal (or other reference) are binding.

PLANNING FOR PEACE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have sometimes been critical of my colleagues who have introduced other subject-matters when a particular question was pending, but in view of the fact that the subject under discussion will not come to a decision today I have no reluctance in addressing the Senate on another matter.

"America can win the war and lose the peace." That statement, Mr. President, has been used so much and in so many ways during the past few months as to have become a trite expression, so abused and so hackneyed that it has largely lost its original value and effect. It now means no more than any specific user of the expression desires it to mean in the connotation and relationship in which he chooses to use it. I have risen to discuss an important matter in the light of another well-worn expression which more particularly answers my purpose in what I shall say. As old as our literature itself is the expression, "In time of peace prepare for war." This expression has proven its basic truth scores and scores of times. I wish to paraphrase or rather rephrase that expression in a way which I believe carries equal or greater truth—"In time of war prepare for peace."

Because of their firm conviction of the wisdom of the suggestion contained in those words, millions of our citizens during recent months have been discussing various proposals, plans, and suggestions looking to the world's peace security after the present war is over. Recognizing that the detailed lines, shades, and colors of the post-war picture cannot be drawn or even envisioned at this time, every American citizen who gives thought to the situation knows that after hostilities have ceased, immediate action will be necessary looking to the solution of a host of problems covering every phase of international relationships — political, economic, financial, sociological, and commercial. They further know that it is possible to take some limited action now, while hostilities still rage, looking to a mitigation of the difficulties and dangers of post-war planning and post-war adjustments.

It is with this conviction firmly in my mind, that in time of war we should make every possible preparation for peace, that I wish to discuss one step which I am convinced ought to be taken now, and to express the further conviction that failure to take such a step could and might bring irremediable disaster to our post-war efforts.

Whenever and however and wherever this war stops, each and all the nations concerned will and must be parties to a treaty of peace. Whether this compact is imposed or negotiated, its provisions will most certainly outline the pattern for war adjustments, and its form must be approved under the methods and systems provided by the various signatories. No nation will have a greater stake in the provisions of this peace treaty and its supplemental compacts than the United States of America.

Are we prepared for the consideration of such momentous international agreements? As one American citizen I am firmly convinced that we are not.

I yield to no one, Mr. President, in my admiration and almost reverence for that immortal document of our fundamental and organic law, the Federal Constitution. I realize fully the truth of the oft-repeated statement that our Constitution was not intended to be a governmental strait jacket, that it is not a static thing but wholly dynamic in that its cardinal principles can, by wise, judicious, and judicial interpretation, be applied to the changed and changing needs of a great people. But there are certain provisions in our Constitution which were adopted to meet the exigencies and conditions then extant, and that do not and cannot properly meet and solve all the varying problems that more than a century and a half of phenomenal development of our country has posed.

The fathers of the Constitution recognized this and provided slow but very certain methods for change and amendment. In the way they provided we have met the demand for discarding most of the cumbersome machinery of the original conception of the electoral college. In this way we have discarded the original methods for selection of United States Senators. In this way we have discarded the unwieldy machinery for the assmbling of the Congress, which while meeting the needs of a century ago became senseless and burdensome as the Nation and its means of communication and transportation developed.

But, Mr. President, unless we initiate action soon this country of ours will find itself face to face with the necessity for consideration of the most vital treaty agreements which ever have been, and perhaps ever will be, presented to our Nation, and, at the same time, find the means and methods for such consideration designed for conditions and situations of a century and a half ago. In addition, we must consider that even that antiquated machinery was based on conceptions and conditions which have long ceased to exist. We shall find also that even that machinery was a compromise design adopted in the attempt to reach an accord on strongly held and strongly contended viewpoints. We shall find further that as a consequence of the compromise the machinery developed such faults that over the years interpretations have been made by sufferance

[1] Source: International Labour Review, October–November 1940, pp. 252–253. Order of Minister of Labor, July 1940, setting up National Arbitration Tribunal.

rather than clearly accepted decision and conclusion. We shall find that some of the most eminent thinkers of the Nation in the judicial and legislative branches have had divergent views as to the proper interpretation of the constitutional treaty provisions. We shall find that in all too many instances treaty pacts and agreements of tremendous importance and great potential value to the Nation have been rejected, amended, or allowed to lapse because of the absence of clear interpretive understanding.

We have repeated historical instances of various Presidents abandoning treaties which have been negotiated after long and careful preparation, as the result of their disgust or chagrin over delays and changes or failure of approval, rather than continuing efforts to renegotiate them or to present them for reconsideration.

We could not fight and win this war today with the ox teams, the muskets and the sailing vessels of the wars of the Revolutionary period, and we cannot easily secure the goals of our peace efforts through use of the antiquated tools provided in 1787 for the negotiation and ratification of international pacts and agreements.

Let me be more explicit. It is somewhat startling for us to realize that a treaty of peace or a treaty of accord and cooperation could conceivably be rejected by 17 Members of the United States Senate. It is by no means probable that this would occur, but it is mathematically possible. Forty-nine Members of this body constitute a quorum with full authority to consider a treaty submitted to it, and 17 of the 49 could prevent approval by two-thirds of those present as required by our present constitutional provision. It is even more startling to realize that 17 Senators could be Members representing States which under the 1940 census have no more than approximately one-twelfth of the Nation's population. I say, Mr. President, that such a situation is extremely improbable, but again I say that it is mathematically and constitutionally possible that the Senators representing but one-twelfth of the population of the United States could prevent the exercise of the will and judgment of the other eleven-twelfths of the population as reflected in its representation here, and let us further consider that the judgment of eleven-twelfths of the population would be thwarted even when coupled with the will, the wish, the decision and the purpose of the executive department represented in a treaty presented to the United States Senate for ratification.

I have just directed attention to the obstructive force of a minority based on population. How much more dangerous and destructive would be a situation where all the efforts of our executive department and the will and wish of two-thirds of this body, less one, could be thwarted by a small group of Senators who were offensively partisan, or by a similar small group of arbitrary radicals, or by a similar small group of hard-headed reactionaries, or by any other group, small and compact, motivated by partisan antagonisms, political prejudices, or personal antagonism and ill will against an Executive, based on the resentments which found their genesis in campaign contentions, patronage distribution, or equally unworthy situations. I do not think so meanly of any of my colleagues in this body as to believe that they would be actuated by any such despicable motives, but I cannot close my eyes to the record of our national history, and I am convinced that we should not approach the parlous period following the cessation of hostilities without making every effort to clarify beyond the peradventure of misconstruction and misinterpretation the provisions of our Federal Constitution relating to the negotiation and ratification of treaties.

Mr. President, with this particular situation in mind, and with the thought of making every possible preparation for peace in time of war, I introduced some 2 months ago three alternative proposals, purposing to amend the Federal Constitution dealing with the treaty-making powers. I have a fourth proposal ready for submission which I have couched in the language presented to a former Senate by a former eminent Member of this body, Senator Owen, of Oklahoma. The proposals which I have introduced were referred by the Senate to the Judiciary Committee and further referred to a subcommittee by the eminent chairman of that committee, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS]. The chairman referred the proposals to a subcommittee of three Members of the Senate who are all lawyers of training, prudence, and patriotism—the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. Before I take my seat I wish to allude to the time element which must necessarily enter into the question of constitutional changes by amendment, but prior to doing that I believe that it would not be an imposition on the Senate if I should present a very brief outline of some of the historical concepts and conditions which contributed so heavily to the adoption and interpretation of the present provisions of the Federal Constitution relative to treaties.

What were some of the reasons for the anomalous treaty provisions of our Constitution? Why did the framers depart from the almost unbroken record whereby the handling of international compacts among sovereign nations had been for centuries wholly an executive function? Why did it become, under our procedure, a joint executive and legislative function? When it thus became a joint function, why was it that the legislative relationship was limited to the Senate alone? What were the reasons for the very unusual requirement of approval of treaties by two-thirds of the Senators present?

Answers to all these questions are readily furnished when we review the debates of the Constitutional Convention on this subject matter. First, we should recall that at the time of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the colonists were impelled to that drastic action in large measure, at least, by bitter resentment against the British monarch. This bitterness was directed almost wholly against the executive branch of the British Government, and it will be recalled how large a portion of the Declaration of Independence was devoted to an enumeration of the injustices by George III and the encroachments on the rights of British subjects by the King. Some of the members of the Constitutional Convention, 13 years later, were even reluctant to admit the necessity for a national executive of any kind. They planned, rather, for the exercise of such central powers as were necessary by a national Congress of the sovereign States. Even some of those who admitted the need for a national executive officer insisted that the powers to be conferred on such an officer must be few indeed. Some of the first drafts proposed for a Federal Constitution reflected this deeply rooted suspicion of and antagonism to a powerful executive.

Then it also should be recalled that few indeed of our revolutionary leaders considered that they were setting up a new nation. On the contrary, they believed that they were establishing independence for 13 sovereign nations whose association as a group was to be limited to matters essential to mutual safety from foreign aggression.

Consider, Mr. President, the specific language of the Declaration of Independence:

> These united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

Again:

> That as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

On the accepted concept, then, that Senators are ambassadors of foreign states, with full rights in those states to determine war and peace, is there any wonder that there should have existed such strong antagonism to the thought of a central or national executive clothed with treaty-making power?

As a matter of history, some of the early drafts of proposals for the Constitution gave the almost exclusive treaty-making authority to a Senate. The Pinckney draft, introduced almost at the beginning of the discussion, lodged all but complete control of foreign affairs and international relationships in a Senate. Under that draft the only powers in the foreign field to be exercised by a President were to receive the ministers of foreign nations and to correspond with "the executives of the different States."

I have just tried to direct attention to the prevalent concept of 13 independent States at the time of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. Let us direct our thoughts to a period 2 years later, when the Articles of Confederation, covering the purpose for the union of those States, was adopted. I quote from the Articles of Confederation:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

By the same document those express delegations of power to the central authority, while providing for the determination of peace and war and conferring authority to enter into treaties and alliances, were made, not to an executive authority, but to Congress. The delegation was made in Article 9 but was under the specific restriction that no treaty of alliance or declaration of war could be made without the assent of nine States. All voting was by States, each State having but one vote. In that provision we shall see, Mr. President, the first presentation of the two-thirds concept. War and peace and the making of treaties with foreign nations were to be functions of the representatives of the Confederation in Congress assembled; and probably through a resurgence of the fear that the more powerful States in the alliance might encroach on the prerogatives of the weaker States, the provision was made that nine of the States must assent through their representatives in the Congress. Nine of the States constituted two-thirds of the group.

It is especially to be noted, then, that when the Constitutional Convention met a decade later, the framers of the Constitution were accustomed to a central Congress in which the States themselves, as sovereign and independent entities, voted as such on a complete equality of voting strength and with a requirement that more than two-thirds of those sovereign States should concur in the negotiation of all treaties with foreign nations. Congress was the sole organ of government. There was no executive; there was no national judiciary. Every treaty, then, had to be negotiated and adopted by the specific ambassadors of the associated governments, appointed by them respectively, and responsible to the agency which had selected them and from which they derived their power.

The records of the Constitutional Convention and its debates further disclose the interesting fact that the first proposal for vesting the control of foreign affairs in an executive came from that arch advocate of a strongly centralized Federal Government, Alexander Hamilton. It is recorded that on June 18, 1787, Hamilton arose and pleaded for a strong executive, and suggested the English kingship as a model. He praised the hereditary principle, but, in deference to existing antagonism, suggested the election of a President for a life term. He also suggested that the Senate should have the sole power of declaring war, but that the President should be clothed with authority to make all treaties, with the advice and approbation of the Senate.

More than 2 months later, a committee of 11 made a report to the Convention and again made provision in its recommendations that the power to make treaties and to appoint ambassadors should be lodged in the Senate. At the time of this report, Mr. Madison stated that the Senate represented the States alone, and it seemed to him proper that the President should be at least an agent in the making of treaties.

The first full debate on the subject took place on the question of the ratification of treaties by both branches of the Congress, and, Mr. President, one of the measures I have introduced is presented on the basis of that proposal. Considerable discussion was had as to the inconvenience of requiring that negotiators trying to formulate a treaty with a foreign nation would have to contact Members of Congress both before and throughout the negotiations. Once more Mr. Madison took the initiative, with the suggestion that treaties should be divided into two categories—peace treaties and those pertaining to other subjects—and that the different types should have different consideration and ratification machinery.

The whole subject matter of treaty making was then referred to a committee of five. That committee reported on the fourth of September, and its report contained the provision which finally went into the Constitution, clothing the President with power to make treaties with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. A few days later, Mr. James Wilson moved that the advice and consent of the House of Representatives should also be required, but Roger Sherman insisted that the needs for secrecy and dispatch in the formulation of treaties were paramount, and that they would be seriously hampered by such a provision as the one Mr. Wilson proposed. The convention supported the viewpoint of Mr. Sherman by a vote of nine States to two States.

Mr. Madison shortly after offered an amendment to carry out his idea of differentiating between the types of treaties. He moved to authorize a concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate to make treaties of peace, without the concurrence of the President. He gave it as his opinion that a President might derive so much power from a state of war that he might be tempted to impede the negotiation of a treaty of peace. That proposal of Mr. Madison was defeated on a roll call vote—seven States to two States.

Shortly after that vote, Mr. Rutledge and Mr. Gary offered an amendment to require the approval of two-thirds of all the members of the Senate in order to rality a treaty. They were outvoted—eight to three. Mr. Sherman then offered a motion that no treaty should be ratified without a majority of the whole number of the Senate. It is an interesting fact that the debate on that proposal, which has come to use by way of reports of the Convention, consists of two lines, as follows:

> Mr. Williamson stated: "This will be less security than two-thirds, as now required." Mr. Sherman replied: "It will be less embarrassing."

The proposal to limit the number required to ratify a treaty to a majority of the whole membership of the Senate was defeated 5 votes to 6. So it will be noted, Mr. President, that the provision now found in the Constitution came after the presentation of a welter of opinion and contention, and then was adopted by a majority of only 1 vote. Had the representatives of the 2 other States been present, or had one of those present changed his vote, we should now have in the Constitution a provision for the ratification of treaties by a majority of the whole membership of the Senate rather than a section which is now a part of the Constitution and which became a provision of our Federal Charter by a vote of a majority of 1, and which, as the record shows, was based on the concept of an association of sovereign States with equal vote and equal authority.

Former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels termed the present treaty-making paragraph of the Constitution "archaic." Former President Wilson expressed the opinion that the treaty-making power could better be called the "treaty-marring power." The learned former Secretary of State, John Hay, termed this constitutional provision "the irreparable mistake of the Constitutional Convention."

But, Mr. President, in my opinion, whether the action was a mistake or whether it has proved to be a mistake in the light of subsequent experience, in either event the mistake is not irreparable. The Founding Fathers provided the machinery for making in our basic document the necessary changes that changing conditions and full experience might indicate. It is to that end that I have taken the initial step necessary to effectuate a change in the provisions relative to treaty-making power by the introduction of the several alternative amendatory proposals to which I shall allude in a very few moments.

I have already referred to some of the dangers and incongruities of the present provision. I wish to refer to still another incongruous situation that pertains to our present method which I feel we might consider ridiculous if it were not for its tragic implications. Most, if not all, our authorities agree that the Senate has full power under the Constitution to amend and change any treaty laid before it for consideration. Up to the year 1901 the Senate had so amended and changed between 80 and 90 treaties which had been placed before it, and because of amendments adopted by the Senate to these proposals almost one-third of them failed entirely or were abandoned.

In the following 25 years 58 proposed treaties were changed by the Senate, and of this number almost 40 percent were definitely abandoned or discarded because of these changes. Without attacking in any way this right of amendment and change by the Senate, let us call to mind that these amendments or any amendments can be adopted by a majority vote of a working quorum of the Senate. In other words, the Senate can amend, change, emasculate, mutilate, or completely destroy a treaty proposal by a majority vote, but cannot give it approval in any form except by a two-thirds vote of assent.

It might be interesting to recall at this point two or three historical instances of the expression of irritation on the part of some of our Presidents as the result of senatorial attitudes toward pending treaties which were before the body for consideration. President George Washington came before the

Senate in person pursuant to the provision providing for seeking advice and consent of the Senate before the actual negotiation of the treaty. He concluded this personal visit to the Senate floor in a frame of mind which former Senator McClay described in this way:

> Had it been other than the man whom I wish to regard as the first character in the world, I would have said he left with sullen dignity.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt in 1904 abandoned entirely, because of his displeasure over Senate action, nine treaties of arbitration which had been negotiated with certain European powers. Former President Taft took similar action on somewhat similar treaties because of the changes which the Senate had made by majority vote and which the President thought destructive of any value in the proposals.

Mr. President, to initiate action for constitutional amendment by the Congress, a resolution must be introduced and adopted by two-thirds of both Houses of the Congress and be submitted by them to the States for approval by three-fourths of the States, either by action of their legislatures or by special convention action as provided in the resolution itself. I have heretofore stated that I have introduced in the Senate four alternative proposals for consideration as amendments to this portion of the Constitution. I tried in this way to bring several phases of the problem before the appropriate committees. I am not concerned as to particular language, but I am more than concerned as to results which I deem to be essential to the Nation's welfare. I want my country to be prepared for peace and for peace proposals. These resolutions were introduced on February 25, 1943. Senate Joint Resolution 36 proposes an amendment providing for the concurrence of a majority of the Senators, in lieu of the present provision requiring two-thirds of the Senators present.

Senate Joint Resolution 38 suggests an amendment providing for the concurrence in support of a treaty of a majority of both the Senate and the House. Personally, I do not favor such a proposal. In my opinion, all of the arguments against a similar proposal presented at the Constitutional Convention still pertain, and other cogent reasons have developed in the light of national change and development. But many thoughtful citizens do not share my viewpoint, and I have offered the proposal along with the others so that it may be before the committee for consideration.

The proposal which former Senator Owen introduced in 1920 and which I have introduced today, provides for the concurrence of a simple majority of the Senators present, rather than a majority of the whole Senate, as suggested in Senate Joint Resolution 36.

The greatest change from the present provision is represented by the proposal of Senate Joint Resolution 37, which attempts to clarify and amplify executive treaty-making power by the terse provision that the President shall have power to make treaties, but that no such treaty shall be operative until it has been approved by a majority of the Senators. It will be noted that this proposal would remove all question of Senate participation under the present advice-and-consent provision prior to the negotiation of a treaty and its presentation to the Senate. It would clothe the Executive with plenary power to negotiate and make the treaty and simply provide that it does not become operative until it has received the Senate approval indicated.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the learned and distinguished constitutional lawyers to whom these resolutions, as well as the entire subject matter, have been referred will proceed to the consideration of this most vital problem with as much expedition as their arduous duties and tasks will permit; and if they share in any degree my own view of the urgent importance of the matter, I hope that some proposal may soon be before the Congress and be by the Congress submitted to our people through their State agencies so that America can be fully and adequately prepared with the best possible machinery for formulating and adopting such post-war compacts, treaties, and agreements as may best serve and conserve the peace of the world and the happiness, welfare, and security of our own United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator for his timely, comprehensive, and clear-cut statement on this very vexing subject. I hope he may be successful in securing action on his resolution. I am wondering, however, what he thinks about the chances of having the resolution passed by Congress submitted to the States, and ratified by the States in time to be of force and effect in the present very great world emergency which is facing us.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator for his very kindly reference to the presentation I have just made.

In reply to the further suggestion, let me say that there is no question that the machinery provided is slow and cumbersome. It is difficult to put into effect. However, the proposal is of such urgent importance I feel we should start it on its way. If it fails of being submitted by a majority of two-thirds of each House, or if three-fourths of the States do not ratify it, of course it fails. I am extremely hopeful—and I know the Senator from Colorado shares my hope—that long before this could be accomplished this war will be over and a treaty of peace will be negotiated. However, there is the possibility—which God forbid—that that will not be true. We certainly cannot take these steps toward amending the Constitution unless the action is initiated. With that in mind, I introduced the alternative proposals.

LABOR CRISIS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this morning I read a very interesting and compelling newspaper article which I feel might well be called to the attention of the Members of this body, and of the American people, as well.

In considering the phenomena which have led to the rise of nonconstitutional and dictatorial governments in other lands, one is struck by the fact that such developments have always been preceded by a disregard for the representative institutions of democracy and a tendency to entrust all powers of Government to one department, one agency, or one officer in the Government. This trend has brought chaos into the world. It has brought dictatorial government to many lands where democracy once flourished; and it has brought slavery to all the peoples of those lands where dictatorship has gained the ascendancy over democratic representative government.

In the words of Dr. William M. Leiserson, former member of the National Labor Relations Board, there is a—

> recent tendency in the labor movement to distrust the Congress of the United States. * * * It now * * * looks to the executive department for the ends which it seeks * * *. European labor movements had reason to regret the growth of a similar sentiment in their own ranks.

Mr. President, this trend which has been outlined by Dr. Leiserson is fraught with great implications which may well exert a profound influence on the future course of democratic government in America.

On Friday last, when I spoke before the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at Harrisburg, Pa., I outlined this entire trend. I pointed out the fact that labor in America would do well to adhere to the principles of American constitutional government and to place its full faith in all of the several branches of the Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—rather than to aline itself with any single party, branch, or officer of the Government; for, by so respecting the basis of representative constitutional government, labor can assure itself a continued and progressive development in a truly democratic system, whereas, an adherence on its part to one party, one branch, or one officer in the Government may very well serve to bring about certain developments in America, which would prove tragic, not only to the American labor movement, but to the form and philosophy of our constitutional representative government, as well.

Mr. President, because I feel that this article, which I read this morning in the Washington Post might well be called to the attention of the American people, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the article by Mark Sullivan, entitled "Labor Crisis," which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR CRISIS

(By Mark Sullivan)

POLITICAL MOTIVES

It is common to say, and it is true, that the coal crisis is "a chicken come home to roost" on President Roosevelt's desk. When people say that they have in mind the personal relation between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. John L. Lewis. It is true that the two were once

political allies and personally close; that Mr. Lewis had, in the Washington phrase, "the run of the White House"; that Mr. Roosevelt helped Mr. Lewis found the Congress of Industrial Organizations; that Mr. Roosevelt did about anything Mr. Lewis asked; that Mr. Lewis contributed some half million dollars of union funds, in gifts or loans, to the Roosevelt campaign of 1936; and it is true that Mr. Lewis subsequently broke with Mr. Roosevelt and opposed him in the 1940 election. All this about intimacy followed by enmity is quite true, and it is true that the personal feelings thus engendered have a large part in the present crisis.

But the crisis is a chicken come home to roost in a larger and more ominous sense. The crisis is a consequence of a wish, tenaciously held by the President, to keep labor relations in his own hands, to prevent Congress from legislating on it. Again and again, when Congress was on the point of passing legislation which would have covered the present coal situation, and probably have averted it, Mr. Roosevelt has intervened. On occasions, after the House passed such legislation by votes of more than 2 to 1, and with more than half the Democrats voting for it, Mr. Roosevelt used influence with party leaders in the Senate to prevent that body from acting.

What is the motive? We are almost obliged to assume that the motive may include politics. Keeping labor matters in his own hands tends to strengthen the President as a political leader of labor, tends to make labor dependent on him, and, because he usually favors labor, grateful to him. It is part of the picture tersely painted by one of Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet, Attorney General Biddle, when he said, "The New Deal is a political party tied up with the labor movement under an able political leader."

Preventing Congress from passing laws gives immunity from law—both to labor and to the President. It leaves the President free to decide issues, and take positions, in his personal discretion. It gives him opportunity to exercise this discretion, if he likes, in the interest of political purposes, including personal ambition. It leads labor to look upon the President as protecting them from Congress. It tends, in the minds of labor, to elevate the President above Congress. It causes labor to think of government as government by a man, not by laws. It causes labor to distrust Congress.

That this has gone on is shown, and deplored, by a scholar in the field of labor, and a friend of labor, Dr. William M. Leiserson, recently member of the National Labor Relations Board. Writing of dangerous trends in labor, Dr. Leiserson says:

"Another trend is the recent tendency of the labor movement to distrust the Congress of the United States. * * * It now * * * looks to the executive departments for the ends it seeks * * * And when a labor movement begins to distrust the representative institutions of a democratic country, and turns to executive power, it is time to take thought."

It is time to take thought, not merely by labor but by all of us. What we have in America is the President teaching labor to look to him instead of the Congress, and labor following that course. Whenever, in any country, considerable groups are led to turn away from the legislative body, and look toward the executive—especially when the groups are large, well organized, and politically strong, as labor is—we have the beginning of one-man government, totalitarian government. It is the beginning of the loss of liberty, for labor and for everybody. That is what Dr. Leiserson means when he warns: "Some European labor movements had reason to regret the growth of a similar sentiment in their ranks."

America faces an internal danger of the utmost seriousness. The danger can be averted only by the public insisting that labor policy no longer be left in the discretionary hands of the President and those about him; that labor policy be written into law by Congress.

PROGRAM TO PREVENT INFLATION MEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we all commend the efforts of Prentiss M. Brown, Federal Price Administrator, to hold down the cost of living in the fight being made against inflation.

Speaking over a Mutual Broadcasting system network on April 30, Administrator Brown announced that he had instructed his staff to put into effect—

without delay, to the limit of our powers, the following four-point program:

First, to extend price control across the board to every important commodity.

Second, to roll back those prices which have got out of hand. The prices of meat, fresh and canned vegetables, coffee, among others, will be rolled back.

Third, to establish specific dollars-and-cents prices for foods, so that all may know—sellers and buyers alike—what the legal price is. These prices will be printed in small booklets which the housewife can put in her handbag when she goes to market, and will be otherwise displayed.

Fourth, to bring the chiseler, the racketeer, the black-market operator to justice. These parasites feed not only upon the consumer but upon the overwhelming majority of businessmen, who are eager to abide by the law and our regulations under the law. I propose with your help to enforce these ceiling prices and to exterminate these criminal operators of the illegitimate markets.

Commenting upon this four-point program, and especially the second point, which has to do with rolling back the price of meat, I may suggest to the Price Administrator that he has left out two very important controls. They are the production and allocation of meats to the various segments of the meat industry.

As a member of the Small Business Committee I have been privileged to hear the evidence adduced from the various segments of the meat industry as to the causes which have dealt primarily with the increased cost of meats to the consumer, and the indisputable evidence is that there is demand for more than the farms are able to produce; and that the allocation of meats because of price ceilings has developed a black market that is uncontrollable.

Nebraska is a meat-producing State. We not only produce the live animals, but we feed them. Indisputable evidence in the hearings is that the cattle feeders and the producers of meat, the farmers and the feeders alike are not being paid more in the months of 1943 than they were paid in the corresponding months of 1942, and there is only a slight increase over 1941, so that the increased cost to the consumer has not been reflected to the meat producer in Nebraska and other midwestern States, at the time when, the evidence discloses, the cost to the producer and feeder has increased tremendously, as indicated by increased cost of labor and feed.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that there has been an increased consumer cost, but this has not been because of the price the legitimate retailer charges for meat, but it has come about because of the prices obtained by the black market in meat. If increased consumer costs are to be rolled back, as is suggested by Price Administrator Brown, it must be done by rolling out of existence the black market which has sprung up because of ceiling prices and freeze orders of O. P. A. which have inflicted upon the legitimate retailer limitations which have not been adhered to, and of course the black market has been the result. This responsibility is definitely one of the O. P. A., and unless the black market is eliminated it will mean increased cost to the consumer, and no benefit will accrue to the one who produces the meat in Nebraska and the other midwestern States.

There are two ways to control inflation of meat prices. One is by setting the ceiling price and enforcing it, and protecting the legitimate dealer; the other is by increasing the production where the cattle are produced and fed. Because of the narrow market in the production of beef and the increasing cost of labor and feed, hundreds of cattle feeders, according to the testimony, are going out of the feeding business.

What provision does the Office of Price Administration make in this four-point program to encourage the production of meat? The production of meat will help to control inflation and the ever-increasing cost to the consumer so far as meat is concerned.

The question of production has reached an alarming stage in the cattle-producing States. On Saturday I wrote the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration a letter calling to his attention the fact that proper steps might be taken, and I ask unanimous consent to embody in the RECORD as a part of my remarks this letter written to the Price Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In your program to prevent further increases in the cost of living you announce four points, the second one of which is as follows, and I quote: "* * * to roll back those prices which have gotten out of hand. The prices of meat, fresh and canned vegetables, coffee, among other things, will be rolled back."

I think this point with reference to meat should have further explanation. Does this mean that you expect to roll back the price so that the producer and feeder of livestock will be on lower levels for the coming months, or does it mean, Mr. Brown, that you will roll back retail prices, including the black market, that has grown up in this country?

Hearings before the subcommittee, of which I am a member, reveal that the producer, especially the cattle feeder, is receiving now approximately the same price for his cattle on the hoof that he received in any corresponding month of 1942, and yet in some spots in this country the retail price of meat has practically doubled.

We all agree that the No. 1 problem in this country is the production of food. What effect will the rolling back of prices have on increasing production?

I come from Nebraska—a meat-producing State. The rationing program that has been put into effect and the freezing orders of your Department have resulted in the volume of retail sales within the State of Nebraska being reduced 30 percent and has reflected a lower trend in the livestock meat prices in our market centers.

This can have no effect other than to decrease the feeding of livestock in the coming months. Certainly the outlook is not encouraging. Evidence introduced before our subcommittee shows that the feeders' costs have nearly doubled; especially is this true with labor, and because of the increase in the cost of feeding and the fact that the feeder is confronted with the narrowest margin in the history of feeding cattle, we are facing an alarming situation.

What we want is more production and we are capable of that production in this country if we will adopt an economy of plenty instead of an economy of scarcity.

Let me restate to you that I am wholeheartedly in support of your program to roll back the high cost of meat to the consumer, but in rolling it back, what effect will that have on the producer and the feeder of cattle in the production of meat? Isn't it a question of rolling black markets out of existence? Isn't that where the trouble lies? Today it is not bootleggers of liquor but it is bootleggers of meat who have gotten out of control and in the endorsement of your four-point program it occurs to me that something should be done that will encourage the production of livestock in this critical period that is now confronting us.

Cordially yours.

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

Mr. WHERRY. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me state once again that if retail prices are to be rolled back—as I hope they will be—we must roll out of existence the black market, and if we are to help control inflation, we must get a larger production of meat, and then, with proper allocation, we can eliminate the black market, with all its evils and continue the legitimate retailer in business, who will strictly adhere to the price ceilings set by the O. P. A. Let me reiterate that I subscribe to the program which has been initiated by the O. P. A., because we want to roll back the increased cost to the consumer, and I also wish to point out that in order to accomplish the second point of the Administrator's program we need increased production of livestock, and therefore the producer should be protected, and when the meat has been produced, then it is the job of O. P. A. to see that the meat is properly allocated through the legitimate channels, so that the black market can be eliminated and the retailers of meat preserved as they should be preserved as a part of our economic structure.

RENEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on April 28, 1943, while I was out of the city, I received two letters, one from the Under Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson; and the other from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal. Both letters concerned the renegotiation of contracts and the results of the operation of the law relating to that subject.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have the clerk read the two letters for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1943.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your foresight in sponsoring the statute providing for the renegotiation of war contracts should be recognized and appreciated. War profiteering has been one of the scourges of almost every war—certainly of every war in which this country has participated. Troubled by war profiteering, George Washington wrote to a friend in March 1779 asking: "Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?"

As a result of the passage of this act and as a result of the character of the vast majority of American businessmen, the question which George Washington asked can be answered "No" so far as World War No. 2 is concerned.

The war contract renegotiation statute has been in effect for 1 full year—since April 28, 1942. Because of your sponsorship of the act, you will be interested in the progress which the War Department has made in the renegotiation of war contracts since the law went into effect.

To the end of March 1943 price reductions and cash refunds totaling $1,527,000,000 have been effected by the War Department. Of this, $560,000,000 represents cash refunds and $967,000,000 represents price reductions.

These reductions and refunds resulted from renegotiations by the War Department Price Adjustment Board and Sections and by the contracting officers of the Supply Services and the Army Air Forces, Matériel Command. The existence of the statute providing for renegotiation has also been responsible for closer pricing on new contracts awarded since the date of its enactment, and particularly in the last few months, but no reasonably accurate estimate can be made of this effect.

War contractors are showing increasingly a disposition to cooperate fully and voluntarily with the War Department Price Adjustment Board, as illustrated by corporate advertisements appearing in daily newspapers and by statements made in stockholders reports.

Better understanding of the purposes, principles, policies, and interpretations of the Renegotiation Act is resulting in rapid acceleration of the work of opening renegotiation and reaching final settlements. This better understanding has been facilitated by adoption and publication of policies followed jointly by the Price Adjustment Boards, by numerous addresses made by authorities on price adjustment before business groups, by articles in the public press, and by educational institutions which have inaugurated seminars on the subject.

The Renegotiation Act is providing a means for buying material for war economically, for combating inflation, and for guarding the system of private enterprise against the charge of profiteering at the expense of the taxpayers and men in the armed forces.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 28, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: A year ago today the statutory authority to renegotiate contracts, which you so foresightedly sponsored in the Senate, became law. On this anniversary you might like to know what the Navy has accomplished under the legislation which always will be identified with your name.

The Navy Price Adjustment Board, acting under the renegotiation law, has been able to reduce by more than $1,000,000,000 the cost to the Government of contracts which it has renegotiated. The figures for the entire year ending today are not available yet, but through the end of March price reductions and cash refunds arranged by the Navy Price Adjustment Board already had amounted to more than $950,000,000. This total does not take into consideration the very substantial amount which will be saved through the lower prices which will prevail on future business. Furthermore, as you know, other reductions and refunds have been negotiated by the War Department and the Maritime Commission Boards.

These price reductions and cash refunds have all been agreed to voluntarily by the contractors in recognition of the fact that without these adjustments their companies would have realized excessive profits. These contract reductions have not injured business. On the contrary, they have, in general, left the companies with a dollar amount of profits, both before and after taxes, which compares very favorably with earnings during peacetime.

The Navy estimates that it will be called upon to renegotiate about $35,000,000,000 of contracts. By the end of March proceedings had already been started with companies holding almost $29,000,000,000 of contracts, showing that the work is well advanced. Furthermore, the companies who have already completed renegotiation or who are in the final stages of renegotiating held contracts amounting to $13,000,000,000 or more than one-third of the total anticipated volume. I think there is no doubt about the ability of the Navy to complete its task under the law. Incidentally, you might be interested in knowing that the Navy has told 240 contractors, whose contracts amount to about $500,000,000, that their profits are not excessive and need not be renegotiated.

In my opinion, one of the most significant facts about the first year's operation of renegotiation is that all agreements have been reached voluntarily. I think this accomplishment is due to the good fortune of the Navy and other departments in assembling what the Truman committee called "an unusual group of able, conscientious, and patriotic lawyers, accountants, and businessmen as administrators of renegotiation." In other words, the law which you sponsored has been used by farsighted businessmen, both within the Government and outside, in order to handle the explosive problem of war profits in a manner mutually satisfactory to private business and to the public interest. I think you can be justly proud of this chapter in your long and fruitful public career.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make a few remarks in view of the letters which have just been read from the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy concerning the savings effected under the act providing for the renegotiation of contracts. I do so for the pur-

pose of taking issue with the writers of the letters, certainly not for the purpose of questioning the desirability of excess profits taxes in war upon any of the grounds stressed by President Washington when he spoke of the war profiteer. I do so, Mr. President, because these letters exemplify one thing very clearly, and that is that when once any Government agency is given some authority it never wishes to relinquish the authority, and it becomes a propagandist for the order or the law under which it holds its authority. It not only becomes a propagandist, but it becomes a publicist. The Under Secretary of War has spoken with commendation of the fact that throughout the country public men in various addresses and so forth have commended the public contracts act and its administration.

Mr. President, I regret that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is not in the Chamber at the moment, because he does deserve credit for the passage of the act. At the time of its passage we had no wartime excess profits taxes. It was recognized, of course, that in view of the disclosures which were taking place before committees of the Senate and of the House, something should be done immediately to prevent the making of exhorbitant profits out of war contracts. But now we have an excess-profits-tax act, Mr. President, which provides for a tax up to 90 percent, with only a 10-percent credit to be paid back after the war period.

According to the Under Secretary of War his renegotiations of contracts have resulted in a saving of $1,527,000,000. According to the Under Secretary of the Navy the action of his contract renegotiation board has resulted in savings to the Government of something over one billion dollars. He points out that he is not able to give the exact figures. But roughly two and one-half billions of dollars have been saved by the War Department and the Navy Department under the contracts renegotiation act.

Mr. President, if we were to apply the 90-percent excess-profits tax to the amount in question we would save $2,250,000,000, because all that the War Department and the Navy Department have recovered have been excess profits. By applying that tax to the amount in question we would have abolished at one stroke two big agencies, the members of which are undoubtedly conscientious and honest and trying to do a good job, and no doubt are efficient. We would likewise have saved untold headaches to American industry, the very industry which is producing in the effort to meet our war needs and war demands.

Both Under Secretaries, I think, have committed themselves to very damaging admissions, because they say that they have obtained closer pricings by other contractors. How, Mr. President, if the procurement offices of the War Department and the Navy Department are not negligent in the first instant, has the administration of this act resulted in closer pricings on the part of other war-contract bidders? What they say is a confession that they were doing a loose job, or might be doing a loose job but for the Renegotiation of Contracts Act.

The Under Secretaries say that a great many contractors have voluntarily cooperated. Voluntarily. Mr. President, the use of the word itself reflects no great credit upon the Under Secretary of War, who is an eminent lawyer, nor upon the Under Secretary of the Navy, who is certainly a man of very great ability. Voluntarily. Is it voluntarily, when the Government officials can determine what is a reasonable profit or an unreasonable or an excessive profit, without regard to any standard, and when the Government officials can bring in a contractor and say to him, "You know what power we have. You sit over there and say how much of this money you can give back to us."

Mr. President, it is coercion, complete coercion, or may be employed as a coercive means. Indeed, it is not even conceivable that there can be a completely voluntary act upon the part of a contractor, whose very life is at stake when he is called in before a board which has no standards to govern it, which publicly announces that it proposes to take back what it regards as unreasonable profits, without regard to taxes due by the contractor. In other words, all their renegotiation is done before taxes are paid, or before taxes.

The Under Secretary of War in his letter points out that the War Department has recovered $560,000,000 in cash, and has had the contractors write off $967,000,000, making a total of $1,527,000,000. What did the Department do with the $560,000,000 in cash which it got back? Did that money go into the Treasury, or did it go back into the War Department to be used without an appropriation from the Congress? Is that sort of short-circuiting of the legislative branch of the Government to be commended, when all their proclaimed savings, except $250,000,000 out of $2,500,000,000, would have been taken back anyway under the Excess Profits Tax Act, which has been passed and which is now in effect?

Furthermore, Mr. President—and this is a very important consideration—it is impossible for the Treasury to know what its tax rates will yield when boards in Washington may themselves determine what is a reasonable profit, without any legislative standard, and take back what they think is unreasonable or excessive. They evolve all their standards out of a mere vacuum and apply them to business transactions, and, possessing that power, they say that the contractors are perfectly willing to come in and voluntarily meet the suggestions which they make.

The Treasury cannot accurately forecast the fiscal affairs of the Government, it cannot accurately estimate the yield of a tax rate, so far as it applies to corporations or individuals engaged in Government work, and the Government is now at least 50 percent, probably 60 percent, customer for everyone in the United States, because under the Renegotiation of Contracts Act even after the concern has reckoned its profits, its taxes, perhaps distributed its income to its stockholders, or paid it out in wages, the Government can still renegotiate the contract.

The Under Secretaries of War and Navy called attention to the fact that they have joined in recommending that contracts involving less than one-half million dollars be excepted from renegotiation or from the power of the boards to renegotiate.

Mr. President, I may be incorrect in this statement, but my information is that there are nearly 80,000 contracts which remain for scrutiny by the various renegotiation boards. I know that the number is very large. It will take them 10 years to renegotiate the contracts at the rate at which they are now proceeding. If there can be eliminated from consideration all the contracts of a half million dollars or less under the amendment which has been included in a bill, of course, they can relieve themselves of quite a deal of work.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that 90 percent of the asserted savings made by these two agencies of the Government, to wit, two and a half billion dollars, will be covered into the Treasury, where it ought to go, and, then, go out under an appropriation by the Congress. If the Renegotiation of Contracts Act were now amended, it should be amended so that when a contract is completed and settlement is made by the Government, that would be the end of it and no further liability would exist upon the part of the contractor except his liability for taxes, and it should likewise be left in the hands of the procurement agencies of the Army and Navy and Maritime Commission to do all the contract negotiations that they wish to do.

But, Mr. President, I am amazed that high public officials will come before the Congress commending an act of this character upon the ground that it has enabled them to obtain closer prices, to make certain economies, and to make savings on contracts which have never been renegotiated, because, as I have said, that claim can be based only upon the failure of the procurement officers to know what they are doing when contracts are made and their indisposition to save the Government in the first instance. Full power of direct negotiation should be retained by them.

At an early date in this war period, when contractors were called upon to produce articles which they had not previously produced, there was some reason for renegotiating the contracts which had already been entered into. That was particularly true when the highest bracket in our excess-profits tax went no higher than 65 percent, but when it goes to 90 percent, as under existing law, there is little reason for it, and the possible adverse effect upon the financing by the Government is even more pronounced than I have here undertaken to indicate.

Mr. President, I wanted to make these statements in view of the fact that the

letters have gone into the RECORD. I do not want those in the War and Navy Departments to spend their time renegotiating contracts; I want them to spend their time winning this war. Surely, between the Congress and the Treasury and capable boards that, in the first instance will make contracts, we can handle the ordinary business side of our enormous war program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not intend to reply to the statements made by my distinguished friend from Georgia at this time. I was absent from the Chamber for a while, and, unfortunately, did not hear all his remarks. I will read them in the RECORD. I do not think, however, that the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy are spending their time on this job. They have employed experts for that purpose, as I shall explain tomorrow, if I have an opportunity.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION—FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the people of the Northwest, and particularly the farmers, are greatly interested in the continuation of the Farm Security Administration. I have before me a telegram which reads as follows:

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

WM. LANGER:
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We farmers demand your support for appropriations as promised by the United States Department of Agriculture, President Roosevelt and others. Preserve agriculture via unbiased democracy.

J. H. MOE.

I have received another telegram which reads as follows:

CENTER, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WM. LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Oliver County farmers aroused over recent House action on agricultural appropriation bill. Imperative that Senate amend this appropriation bill and give adequate support to present agricultural program.

ALVIN L. ANDERSON.

Another telegram addressed to me reads:

GLEN ULLIN, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WM. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight for the preservation of Farm Security Administration Agricultural Adjustment Administration crop insurance regional agricultural Credit Corporation.

MIKE STOLTZ.

Another telegram reads as follows:

CENTER N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urged Senate amendment to House agricultural appropriation bill to provide more liberal funds for important Department of Agriculture activities.

H. P. HENKE.

I read another telegram, as follows:

CENTER, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of Oliver County feel that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program is proving itself of great service to our county in our wartime food-production effort, so we urge Senate support for retaining present set-up.

JOHN N. ORGAARD.

Another telegram reads as follows:

CENTER, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask you to fight for the continuation of the Farm Security Administration and Agricultural Adjustment Agency. We want rehabilitation, not relief, to the family-type farmer.

Business Men of Center, N. Dak.—C. J. Enders, E. H. Johnston, Robert Dunn, M. J. Staigle, H. I. Leinius, E. F. Mutchler, George Harris, Security State Bank, C. J. Rapsavage, E. G. Borchardt.

I may say that Mr. Mutchler is a former State senator, and Mr. Rapsavage is one of the leading editors in North Dakota.

I have another telegram which reads as follows:

CENTER, N. DAK., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to amend appropriation bill for United States Department of Agriculture and support established program which was designed to help American agriculture.

FRANK J. BELINSKEY.

DENIAL OF MAILING PRIVILEGE TO CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention a matter of extreme importance, so important that I am today submitting a resolution directing the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to conduct an investigation of the Post Office Department for excluding matters from the mail under section 334 of title 18 of the United States Code and to report to the Senate such remedial legislation which may be recommended by the committee.

I am making reference to the case of the present censorship of periodicals as conducted by Frank Walker, Postmaster General of the United States. Since May 1942, Postmaster General Walker has denied the second-class mailing privilege to more than 70 periodicals, despite the fact that their contents adhered to the standards previously set by the Post Office. These magazines were denied their mailing privileges in undemocratic and arbitrary procedures, following so-called hearings which were in fact a mockery of justice. These hearings were intended to show cause why these periodicals should not be deprived of their second-class mailing privileges.

Today we are fighting a global war for the purpose of protecting our God-given privileges as cited in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. Our boys on every front are dying so that we at home may enjoy freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion which constitute the American way of life. It is cruel to think that here at home these freedoms are threatened.

I am in entire accord with the theory that no publication carrying truly obscene matter should be admitted to the United States mails. However, under our democratic form of Government the method used to determine whether magazines are obscene or not should not be entrusted to a biased group of judges. If a committee of experts were to be appointed which could determine, based on the edicts of morality as we know it today, what is and what is not acceptable, I am sure that every fair-minded publisher in America would favor its criticism and abide by its ruling.

Frank Walker has cited various magazines which had heretofore been mailing not only in accord with the regulations of the Post Office Department, but with its full approval as well. So thorough has been the method of various publishers in seeking advice from the Post Office Department, that no picture would be considered for publication until it had first been voluntarily submitted to the Post Office Department and had met with its entire approval.

The procedure of ruling on matter prior to publication had been conducted successfully for a period of 4 years prior to Frank Walker's action.

In May of 1942 publishers were notified that the Post Office Department would no longer rule on the mailability of matter in advance of publication, but would withhold its ruling until the publication had been deposited in the mails. The letter to publishers stated that a sense of decency and good morals should aid in determining what should or should not be published. One publisher seeking further assistance was advised by a postal authority that if he continued to print matter similar to that carried previously, there would be no difficulty. Nevertheless, though most publishers took definite steps to modify their past policies, actions for the suspension of second-class mailing privileges were started after the presentation of three issues of the particular publisher's magazine.

Hearings were scheduled in which publications were to show cause why their second-class mailing privileges were not to be suspended. Although the majority of publishers brought reams of evidence proving the acceptability of their publications in order to defend their stand, most of that evidence was not admitted into the testimony. On the other hand, the Post Office Department censors not only presented their case, but ruled upon it as well.

The judges in the case, Smith W. Purdum, Second Assistant Postmaster General, Jesse M. Donaldson, Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, and Frank J. Buckley, Deputy Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, could hardly be considered unbiased, since they were all employees of the Post Office Department and acted under the direct and specific instructions of Postmaster General Frank C. Walker.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that if the policy of censorship is permitted to continue, there is nothing to prevent the Postmaster General, who is also chairman of the National Democratic Committee, from using the second-class mailing privilege as a political plum. Frank Walker has already used his power to grant or revoke a mailing privilege as an

instrument of intimidation of the press. The Postmaster General's activities have been arbitrary, capricious, and clearly erroneous. Frank Walker has exercised a secret censorship in complete violation of the law passed on March 3, 1879. It specifies that in order for a magazine to enjoy a second-class mailing privilege it must be originated and published for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to the arts, sciences, or a special industry, and must have a legitimate list of subscribers.

As a specific example, I cite the case of the National Police Gazette, one of the oldest and best-known magazines to fall under the ax of Post Office Department censorship. That magazine, which was established in 1845, was one of the first to be granted the second-class mailing privilege, and enjoyed it consistently up to the time when Frank Walker saw fit to revoke it. Upon examination I find that that publication conforms in every detail to the second-class law which I have just cited. Yet the constant efforts of the publisher to meet with the fantastic suggestions of the Postal Department have been of no avail. The publisher has repeatedly sought to abide by all the criticism put forth by the postal authorities, even when their suggestions were obviously unfair, since he desired to have his privilege restored, not for any mercenary reason, but for the purpose of prestige. However, after eight issues, the privilege has not yet been restored.

I find that each and every one of those eight issues of the Police Gazette has met with the approval of the Watch and Ward Society of New England and the National Organization for Decent Literature, and is one of the few American publications to be permitted to circulate in Canada. Still there is no indication that the privilege will ever be restored by Frank Walker. That publication in every way meets the requirements of the Classification Act of March 3, 1879, as amended.

In spite of the fact that during the years the Police Gazette has been maligned and, like Henry Ford's automobile when it first originated, has repeatedly been made the object of jokes, the indisputable fact remains that it did a tremendous service for the youth of America. Forty years ago, I, as a young farm boy, and my young associates not only saw it in barber shops but the paper had a large circulation on the farms. It was in that paper that I first learned about the value of athletics, that I first heard of boys at Columbia, Yale, Harvard, and of other young college boys gaining honors on the athletic field. Few other newspapers in those days were boosting athletics, and very few pictures of athletes were published. The Police Gazette had pictures of young men high jumping and broad jumping and throwing the discus and playing college games. It advocated clean living and condemned the use of cigarettes by young boys and athletes. It argued in favor of having the men playing baseball organize a union so that they could get decent pay from the club owners. Certainly the pictures of actresses that were shown were neither lewd nor lascivious but were similar to pictures of young ladies in other newspapers.

Some of the young men with whom I associated at that time and a few years later have become outstanding in their chosen vocations; and they were at that time, and I believe they still are, clean morally and mentally. To forbid that newspaper to circulate through the mails is just as outrageous as to stop the mailing of some of the detective-story magazines which were the favorite reading of former President Woodrow Wilson. What man who has read the magazine Argosy, published by Frank A. Munsey & Co., would say that that monthly magazine was obscene? I know that many of us have spent pleasurable hours at home at night reading detective stories from the Front Page Detective Monthly, True Life Detective Cases, Revealing Detective Cases, and other detective-story books, which in the main consist of true write-ups of real detective cases that actually happened; and most of us are familiar with the fact that within the last year a United States Senator, now serving upon this floor, prepared one of the most illuminating articles on current events ever written by any Senator. I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Certainly those magazines would not be published if there was not a demand for them by the American people. A magazine cannot build up a circulation running into hundreds of thousands and millions unless the people of America like it. If any Senator doubts the accuracy of that statement, let him establish a newspaper and see how far he gets with it if it is not popular.

The Post Office Department's banning action has reached such tremendous proportions that many American newspaper and magazine publishers are today definitely intimidated.

I further wish to relate the case of the Police Gazette, which, after its loss of the second-class mailing privilege, had made every concession and attempted to follow to the letter and conform to the personal concepts laid down by the Postmaster General. The publisher of that publication was led to believe that additional concessions would, in time, restore his privilege. But as yet the privilege has not been restored. That unfair stand must have been based purely on personal prejudice and animosity toward the individual concerned, because he was the only one who dared carry on the fight for his constitutional rights.

I have carefully read the testimony set forth in the so-called hearings, and have come away with the firm opinion that the Post Office Department will stop at nothing to ban a magazine.

The most ludicrous case of all was that in which the post office objected to a picture and article concerning a criminal. It apparently objected to the desire of the publisher to aid the F. B. I. in tracking down a criminal, since the picture and the copy were obtained from a regular Federal Bureau of Investigation "wanted" circular. Copies of such circulars are sent to all publishers in the hope that their reprints will aid in the capture of escaped criminals.

Other objections set forth in the hearings were almost as ridiculous and unfounded. Yet, the Post Office Department judges in every case ruled in their own favor. After the perusal of the testimony, I have failed to find one case in which anyone but the Post Office emerged victorious. It is virtually impossible to conceive that more than 70 publications, freely circulated prior to banning activities, could be 100 percent wrong. The inference, therefore, is that the decisions in all cases were arrived at prior to the trial, and the trial was merely an act put on in order to satisfy those who would undoubtedly call a decision without a hearing undemocratic. To prove my point, I cite the case of a publisher who was called upon to state why his second-class mailing privilege was not to be revoked. After gathering the necessary documents, he forwarded them to the post-office officials, only to learn that the ruling against him had been handed down before the receipt of this vital information.

To prove the absurdity of the charges of obscenity leveled against magazines, I wish to quote a paragraph from the letter sent by the Post Office to the publishers on May 21, 1942:

> The postal obscene statutes in question are criminal laws, and one must, of course, accept full responsibility for depositing any matter in the mails which is in violation thereof.

The fact that no criminal charges were made against a single one of the publications cited and claimed obscene by the Postmaster General's office to be obscene proves conclusively that there was no actual basis for the charges of obscenity.

EDITORIAL WAVE OF PROTEST

Fortunately in a free country such arbitrary action does not pass without comment. Frank Walker's actions elicited an editorial wave of protest from newspapers throughout the Nation severely criticizing his abuse of his powers. I believe that Frank Walker was obviously guilty of permitting his personal feelings to interfere with his official duties, and therefore was negligent in the performance of those duties. He has, I believe, practiced scandalous discrimination and has used his office for the purpose of political censorship by the intimidation of American publishers through the threat of revocation or denial of their second-class mailing privilege. Frank Walker, I believe, has denied the right of expression of political views. No American publisher can tolerate it, and no fighting American publisher will.

There is no limit to the widespread and all-embracing power assumed by Frank Walker. The Post Office has exceeded its constitutional powers to the extent of not only denying the mails to publications, but making the suppression complete by advising the Interstate Commerce Commission to prevent the distribution by truck or express of magazines whose privileges have been revoked.

As the Akron, Ohio, Beacon-Journal so aptly puts it in an editorial dated September 27, 1942:

If we were Postmaster General Walker, we should be hesitant about assuming the duties of a morals censor. Censorship is dangerous. If a Post Office official is to be entrusted with the power to bar magazines from the mails on moral grounds, the next step is political censorship.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE CENSORS

Despite many criticisms, the Post Office Department is going to continue to suppress undesirable magazines by revoking their second class mail privileges. Thirty-nine magazines, deemed salacious, have been barred in the last 4 months.

No person with any taste or discernment would offer defense for an obscene publication. Perhaps the Police Gazette and True Confessions are salacious. Nevertheless, if we were Postmaster General Walker we should be hesitant about assuming the duties of a morals censor.

The law provides that second-class-mail privileges may be extended to a publication devoted to the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, the arts, or some special industry. When the Post Office Department receives a complaint from a Congressman, church official or someone else that a certain magazine is filthy and therefore does not measure up to the specifications mentioned, the department conducts a hearing and generally rules against the accused publication.

The punishment does not stop with revocation of the second class permit. To make sure that suppression will be complete the Post Office Department has an understanding with the Department of Justice and Interstate Commerce Commission that they will prevent the magazine's distribution by truck or express.

Post-office officials are not very consistent in their new policy. An unidentified monthly magazine whose cartoons have been the subject of many complaints is being saved from oblivion only because it frequently contains articles of "an educational nature" written by famous writers. If this is reasonable, what is to prevent the editor of a lewd magazine from evading the censor by publishing a page of quotations from the Bible in every issue?

Censorship is dangerous. If a post-office official is to be entrusted with the power to bar a magazine from the mails on moral grounds, the next step is political censorship.

If Postmaster General Walker is keeping a scrapbook, he can add this to his collection of critical comments.

Mr. LANGER. The Hanover (N. H.) Dartmouth reaffirms this opinion in its editorial of September 25, 1942:

The action of postal authorities in denying the Police Gazette mailing rights is important because it illustrates one major form of coercion that Government authorities can apply to the press.

The way Mr. Walker went about acting against the Police Gazette is no model of justice. The Post Office Department has banned a number of magazines lately, all on the same charge. In this proceeding it barred from the hearing records a letter from the blue-nose Watch and Ward Society of Massachusetts approving an issue of the Police Gazette.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial by Frank Knox entitled "Exit the Police Gazette," published in the Chicago Daily News of September 23, 1942. It refers particularly to the Police Gazette and some of the other magazines.

Without objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXIT THE POLICE GAZETTE

The Post Office Department has barred the Police Gazette from the mails, on the ground that the magazine has been profitably pandering to the lewd and lascivious.

GASLIGHT PERIOD FAVORITE BARRED

That mouth-filling phrase means printing supposedly daring pictures with captions like "Ruined young girls * * * Lured maidens to his home, he gave lavish gifts," or "Love perfume clinging for hours like lovers loath to part."

As a matter of fact, the Police Gazette these days is no more daring or risqué than numerous other publications. Its heyday was before the safety razor was invented. Back in the pregay-nineties gaslight era, American men had either to shave themselves with the old straight-edge razors or let the barber do it, and millions of them preferred to leave it to the barber. Every barber who knew his business subscribed to the Police Gazette, so that the customers could get vicarious Peeping Tom thrills out of its woodcut pictures of Lizzie the Beautiful Murderess in Boudoir Where She Slew Lover, and so forth.

Nowadays, plenty of magazines features expertly taken and printed photographs of ladies' legs, more or less veiled chests, and so forth, and the Police Gazette is no novelty. Important, however, for the purpose of the Government in barring it from the mails, the Police Gazette hasn't much money and can't put up much of a fight. Nor will great numbers of prominent liberals and defenders of civil liberties flock to the dear old roue's defense.

DICTATORIAL NECESSITIES

Napoleon III, following the coup d'état which made him Emperor of France in 1852, stated that no dictator could tolerate a free press. He proceeded to suppress out-and-out opposition newspapers, and to corrupt the rest of the French press.

France later became a republic again; but the French press never got over being a collection of venal newspapers singing the politicians' tunes to order and selling alleged news space to any and all buyers, including Hitler agents from 1933 to the fall of France.

THE PRESS IN DANGER

The barring of the Police Gazette from the mails fits into a pattern.

Last July, the Government procured indictments of 28 persons on charges of conspiracy to impair the morale of the armed forces. Among these were various publishers and editors of small screwball publications which may or may not have been subversive but which certainly were not rich or powerful.

A couple of weeks later, the Government asked a Federal grand jury in Chicago to indict the Chicago Tribune for having printed a detailed analysis of Japanese naval strength at the Battle of Midway. The grand jury refused to indict—something almost unheard of, since grand juries usually indict practically at the drop of the prosecuting attorney's hat.

A week after that, the Government brought an antitrust suit against the Associated Press, which clearly is not a monopoly. The Government previously had been bringing pressure to bear on the Associated Press to give Marshall Field III's new Chicago newspaper an Associated Press franchise in violation of the Associated Press membership rules. The Associated Press bent, by modifying its membership rules, but it did not break, and Field's application for a franchise was turned down by a vote of 684 to 287. Then the Government started this lawsuit.

The barring of the Police Gazette from the mails is the latest in this chain of related incidents.

WHO'S NEXT?

From said chain of incidents, it is plain that the Government has it in for the freedom of the press as Americans have known it since the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution.

The process is beginning with these attacks on small, weak, poverty-stricken publications which the Government does not like; or on big publications on allegedly patriotic grounds on which it is hoped the grand jury will not dare to refuse to indict.

The next step will be for the Government to take all publications which disagree with it on fundamental policies.

Having taken those publications, the next logical step for the Government will be to take publications which disagree with it only on details of policy.

After the Government has taken these latter publications, freedom of the press in the United States will be only a memory, and all that the papers will take will be orders from the Government.

If the press does not fight this trend now, and fight it successfully, that is what it can look forward to.

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Many Sides," published in the Charleston, W. Va. Mail of October 4, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Mail of October 4, 1942]

MANY SIDES

For our part we could wish that such questions as the Post Office Department raises in banning the Police Gazette just wouldn't come up. They are so complicated, and they always find us in the full possession of our faculty for seeing both sides of a question.

In the case of the Police Gazette, if you grant that the publication is obscene, then the Post Office Department's case is persuasive. It does not deny the right of publication to the Gazette. It simply withdraws its second-class mailing privilege, the argument being that the privilege is something of a subsidy and that the Government has no just interest in subsidizing obscenity. It so happens, of course, that the Police Gazette cannot remain in business without the privilege of using the mails. In effect, then, the Post Office Department censors it out of existence, an act which may be construed to interfere seriously, not only with mailing privileges, but with the rights of the press.

On the other hand, what is obscenity? The Post Office Department says the Police Gazette. The American Civil Liberties Union says maybe and refers the Department to the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure which held in 1940 that "obscenity is largely a question of judgment which often may require a broad sociological expertness." That dictum, while it may recommend a procedure for defining obscenity, is hardly a definition itself.

And so it goes. Should the Post Office Department, risking freedom of the press, undertake to outlaw obscenity, even though it is hard put to say what obscenity is? Or should it, for lack of a definition, risk a measure of support to what may be ob-

scene, but preserve intact the freedom of the press? It is a big problem, you can see, one overlaid with ticklish decisions in morals and politics, and life might be easier if it didn't present itself. It has not just two sides, but many.

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Tonsorial Come-back" published in the Chicago, Ill., News of October 17, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News of October 17, 1942]

TONSORIAL COME-BACK

Barber shops are to be mobilized for service as first-aid dressing stations by Office of Civilian Defense—another instance of wartime return to first principles. Originally the barber and the surgeon were the same, and as the practice of medicine was mostly a matter of ridding the patient of humors, usually by bleeding him, the barber was a doctor when the doctor was a leech.

Many millions of extant Americans remember when the barber shop was still the first-aid station for gentlemen with shiners, emerging from frustrated fisticuffs. A barber shop with a glass jar of thirsty leeches was usually to be found within a few paces of the combatant saloon. In Strawberry Blonde, James Cagney underwent repairs at a barber shop dressing station equipped with leeches, monogrammed shaving mugs, and copies of the Police Gazette.

Perhaps the return of the barber shop to martial tempo calls for the lifting of the post office ban on the Gazette. No one can deny that it would lend an atmosphere of authenticity to the thing.

Since the last suppression of the old pink sheet our attention has been called to the issue upon which the official guillotine fell. We find that, even in its most questionable stories, sin always earns the wages of death, and vice is always repaid with shame, even if virtue may not always triumph glamorously, as in the Lincoln J. Carter melodramas that set the style of happy ending when the barber shop journal was at its zenith.

By the standards of Greenwich Village intellectualism, the Gazette, born on the old Bowery, was downright rustic, and even puritanical, on the day of its recent demise, which will probably turn out to be merely another hibernation, to judge from previous exaggerated reports of the journal's death.

With the barber shop returning to its former functions on battle fronts we like to believe that the whole shooting match will come back—the tenors, the quartets, the gilded mugs, and the pink thriller, too.

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Civil Liberties Union Protests Magazine Ban," published in the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette of September 20, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION PROTESTS MAGAZINE BAN—ELMER RICE URGES SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES TO PROBE POSTAL DEPARTMENT EDICT

NEW YORK, September 27.—The American Civil Liberties Union protested today that action of the Post Office Department in revoking the second-class mailing privileges of a number of magazines on grounds of obscenity.

Playwright Elmer Rice, chairman of the organization's national council on freedom from censorship, urged an investigation in letters to the Post Office Committees of Senate and House.

The council charged that in the last 4 months the Post Office Department had banned from the mails almost two score magazines, naming among them the Police Gazette, College Humor, Film Fun, Real Screen Fun, Real Detective, and Front Page Detective.

Contending that the Post Office Department had ignored the recommendation of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure which in 1940 held that "obscenity is largely a question of judgment which often may require a broad sociological expertness," the council urged that the Department consult with experts to obtain their opinions.

Heretofore, the council said, the Post Office Department had been "reasonably tolerant" in administration of laws against obscenity to the extent of even reviewing copy in advance of publication, but that this system had been stopped "evidently because of complaints that even as censored the magazines were objectionable to certain interests."

"These interests are represented chiefly by the National Organization for Decent Literature, of which Roman Catholic Bishop John F. Noll, of Fort Wayne, Ind., is chairman," the council said. "That organization has been conducting a Nation-wide drive against the distribution of magazines which do not square with its private conception of morality."

The council said that while it was the right of any citizens' organization to make representations to authorities, "it is contrary to public policy that those authorities should base their action on the concepts of a particular group."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the American Civil Liberties Union, according to an Associated Press dispatch dated September 28, 1942, contended that the Post Office Department had ignored the recommendation of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure which in 1940 held that "obscenity is largely a question of judgment which often may require a broad sociological expertness." The council urged that the Department consult with experts to obtain their opinions.

An editorial in the New York Daily News of September 23, 1942, reprinted in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, the Ottawa (Ill.) Republican-Times, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, proved that the barring of the Police Gazette from the mails falls into a pattern, and cites specific instances of the invasion of the freedom of the press by this administration.

My careful examination of the contents of the National Police Gazette leads me to believe that if the mailing privilege of this magazine can be revoked, then no newspaper or magazine today can be safe from similar action. There is nothing in the Police Gazette which is not included in most current periodicals. The banning of such publications is merely a token of what can be accomplished should the Postmaster General decide to take more widespread action and carry his censorship activities on to the large circulation groups. I could cite countless instances of the rank discrimination in the exercising of this arbitrary form of banning, but I can cite no case in which a publication was given a fair, just, and American way of defending, either consciously or unconsciously.

It is indeed a sad day when the Bill of Rights begins to rock on its foundation due to the dictatorial efforts of a public servant. It is high time that definite steps be taken to arrest these actions, which threaten the freedom of the press. We must prevent this arbitrary postal censorship, because if it is permitted to continue and spread, there is no telling what end it will reach.

Mr. President, only a little more than 4 years ago in the State of North Dakota a little magazine called the Leader was published once a week. The Postmaster General conducted an investigation costing thousands of dollars. First agents came to the town where the magazine was published and obtained the mailing list. Every person in the United States to whom that little weekly was being sent received a little green postal card asking whether he had subscribed or whether the paper had been presented to him. Every subscriber received such a card. Finally, that publication was barred from the mails. Its second-class mailing privilege was revoked, and it became necessary for me to come to Washington to see the then Postmaster General. I spent many days in Washington in an effort to have the second-class mailing privilege restored to that little publication, which was fighting the administration.

Finally, Postmaster General Farley very kindly consented that if we would put up $1,000 in cash to insure that there would not be any future violation, we would be given back the second-class mailing privilege. No sooner had I returned to North Dakota than they forfeited the entire $1,000. It necessitated another trip to Washington, and, finally, they very generously returned the sum of $800 to that little weekly in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of magazines, together with the names of their publishers, which have been barred from the mails.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLICATIONS AND REQUESTS FOR REENTRY—SECOND-CLASS MATTER DENIED AND SECOND-CLASS ENTRIES REVOKED AFTER ISSUANCE OF CITATIONS SINCE MAY 1, 1942

TITLE, FREQUENCY, OFFICE OF PUBLICATION, AND PUBLISHERS

Real Screen Fun, quarterly, Louisville, Ky., Tilsam Publications, Inc.; Spark, monthly, Mount Morris, Ill., Sparkling Publications, Ken Crossen; Squads Riot, bimonthly, Louisville, Ky., Fawcett Publications, Inc.; Keen, monthly, New York, N. Y., Albert Publications, Andrew Albert, Gerald Albert; Flynn's Detective (detective fiction), monthly, New York, N. Y., additional entry, Dayton, Ohio, Red Star Magazines, Frank A. Munsey Co.; Amazing Detective Cases, bimonthly, Dunellen, N. J., Crime Files, Inc., David Goodman;

All Story Love (formerly All Story Love Magazine), monthly, New York, N. Y., additional entry, Dayton, Ohio, Red Star Magazines, Frank A. Munsey Co.; Broadway Parody Songs, monthly, New York, N. Y., Song Parodies, Inc., A. I. Wactlar, A. R. Kaplan, S. R. Kunkis; Exclusive Detective, bimonthly, Chicago, Ill., Current Detective Stories, Inc., A. Goodman; Sleek, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Close Up, Inc., Harold Hammond; Gripping Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Close Up, Inc., Harold Hammond; College Humor, quarterly, New York, N. Y., Collegian Press, Inc., N. L. Pines; Front Page Detective, monthly, Dell Publishing Co., Inc.; Headline Detective, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Dell Publishing Co., Inc.; Film Fun Monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Dell Publishing Co., Inc.; Argosy Monthly, New York, N. Y., additional entry, Dayton, Ohio, Red Star Magazines, Frank A. Munsey Co.; Play Monthly, Mount Morris, Ill., Play Magazine, Inc., Renee F. Buse; Stocking Parade, monthly, New York, N. Y., Arrow Publications, Inc., Michael Estrow, Frank Armer, G. Donenfeld, J. E. Wasserman; Feature Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Magazine House, Inc., Arthur Bernhard, M. Latzen.

Spotlight Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Albert Publications, Andrew I. Albert; Rare Detective Cases (formerly Stirring Detective Cases) monthly, New York, N. Y., Sparkling Publications; Broadway Parody Songs, monthly, New York, N. Y., Song Parodies, Inc., A. I. Wactlar, S. R. Kunkias, A. R. Kaplan; Laff, monthly, New York, N. Y., Volitant Publishing Corporation, Adrian B. Lopez, M. I. Pierce, Anna Goldstein; Smiles, quarterly Springfield, Mass., Comic Corporation of America; Snap, bimonthly, Dunellen, N. J., Snap Publishing Co., Inc., David Goodman; Sensational Detective Cases, bimonthly (formerly monthly), New York, N. Y., Histrionic Publications, Inc., Adrian B. Lopez, M. I. Pierce, Anna Goldstein; National Police Gazette, monthly, New York, N. Y., National Police Gazette Corporation, L. Roswell; Pictorial Movie Fun, monthly New York, N. Y., Crestwood Publishing Co.; Real Screen Fun, bimonthly, Louisville, Ky., Tilsam Publications, Inc., P. H. Sampliner, N. Donenfeld; Uncensored Detective, bimonthly, Chicago, Ill., Hillman Periodicals, Inc., Alex Hillman, Rita Hillman; Tru-Life Detective Cases, monthly, New York, N. Y., Trysack Publishing Corporation; Revealing Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Harold Hammond, Close Up, Inc.; Army Post, monthly, New York, N. Y., Et-Es-Go Publishing Co., Inc., Esther Temerson; Sir, monthly, Mount Morris, Ill., Sir. Reg., Inc., Adrian P. Lopez, Anna Goldstein; Stocking Parade, monthly, New York, N. Y., Arrow Publications, Inc., Michael Estrow, Frank Armer; Jest, bimonthly, Chicago, Ill., Jest Publishing Co., David Goodman; Song Parodies, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Parody Publishing Co.; Real Story, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Hillman Periodicals, Inc.; Hit-Picture Pageant, monthly, New York, N. Y., Winston Publication, Inc.

Stocking Parade, monthly, New York, N. Y., Arrow Publications, Inc.; Crime Confessions, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Hillman Periodicals, Inc.; Romantic Story magazine, monthly, Louisville, Ky., Fawcett Publications, Inc.; Special Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Magazine House, Inc.; She, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Transradio News Feature, Inc.; Sir, monthly, Mount Morris, Ill., Sir Reg., Inc.; Secret Detective Cases, monthly, New York, N. Y., Starlike Publication; Headquarters Detective, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Headquarters Detective Inc., Hillman Periodicals, Inc.; Intimate Detective Stories, monthly, Chicago, Ill., Detective Stories Publishing Co., Triangle Publications, Inc.; Spotlight Detective Cases, monthly, New York, N. Y., Creston Publications, Inc.; Graphic Picture News-Magazine, biweekly, New York, N. Y., Newsbook Publishing Corporation; Scoop Detective Cases, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Magazine House, Inc.; Close-Up, bimonthly, New York, N. Y.; Close-up, Inc.; Nifty, monthly, Mount Morris, Ill.; Par Publishing Co.; Judge, monthly, Mount Morris, Ill., Republic Publishing Co.; Speed Detective, monthly, Chicago, Ill., Trojan Publishing Corporation; Cheers, bimonthly (formerly Khaki Wacky—monthly), Springfield, Mass., Comic Corporation of America; Speed Adventure Stories, monthly, Chicago, Ill., Trojan Publishing Corporation; All-Story Love, monthly, Chicago, Ill Popular Publications, Inc.; Flynn's Detective Fiction, monthly, Chicago, Ill., Popular Publications, Inc.; Famous Fantastic Mysteries, monthly, New York, N. Y., Frank A. Munsey Co., C. W. H. Corporation; Gay Love Stories, bimonthly, Holyoke, Mass., Columbia Publications, Inc.; Real Romance, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Hillman Periodicals, Inc.; Romance, quarterly, Chicago, Ill., Popular Publications, Inc.; Dan Turner Hollywood Detective, monthly, Trojan Publishing Co.; Complete Detective Cases, monthly, Dunellen, N. J., Postal Publications, Inc.; Youngs Realistic Stories, bimonthly, New York, N. Y., Phil Painter Publication, Inc.; Rare Detective Cases, monthly, New York, N. Y., Creston Publications Corporation; Argosy, monthly, New York, N. Y., Popular Publications, Inc.; New Love Magazine, bimonthly, Fictioneers, Inc., Popular Publications, Inc.; Speed Mystery, monthly, Chicago, Ill., Trojan Publishing Co.; Street and Smith's Love Story Magazine, True Confessions, Peek, Fawcett Ideal Publications.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Senators who have read the memoirs of former President Woodrow Wilson will recall that some of the very detective stories mentioned in the list are those which he said he took pleasure in reading at night when he sought refuge from the arduous duties of the office of President. I ask every Senator to read the list of magazines which I have had printed in the RECORD, because I am certain that each and every Senator will be familiar with one or more of the magazines which have been barred.

Mr. President, I move that Frank Walker be divested of the authority to which I have referred, and I move that the right of postal censorship be granted to a qualified committee able to judge right from wrong with no undue bias or prejudice. I shall be the first to raise my voice in protest against the granting of a mailing privilege to any publication which a qualified committee deems obscene. And I shall be the first to defend, to the letter, the right of a publication, which abides by the rules applicable to the second-class mailing privilege, to enjoy this privilege.

Particularly I wish to call attention to the fact that we have full, complete, and adequate criminal laws dealing with this subject. If any racketeer or publisher of any lewd magazine uses the mail to send dirty filth to the people of this country, the criminal laws are adequate to take care of such person or company and to put any guilty individual or officers of a guilty company in the penitentiary. As I have said, not a single one of the publishers named in the list has been indicted or arrested. But, on the contrary, the Postmaster General has substituted himself for the court and jury, and this man, who is also the chairman of the Democratic Party of the United States, has said to a company which, for instance, has as many as 54 magazines, "I have barred 2." The other 52 are still in the mails but above the heads of the publishers hangs the sword of Damocles, and Senators can readily realize how careful the publishers will be not to offend politically the chairman of the Democratic Party in the coming campaign for fear that the remaining 52 magazines may be stopped and the publishers suffer a tremendous financial loss. Certainly neither the Postmaster General nor any other man should have the authority to intimidate, scare, and threaten the entire publishing industry of the United States of America. If the Post Office Department can bar a magazine, it can bar a book or a newspaper. So it is self-evident that the nearer the campaign approaches the more menacing, either consciously or unconsciously, the attitude of the Postmaster General can become.

If I can be instrumental in having the Senate adopt the resolution I am about to submit, I shall indeed be proud, for I can say to every soldier fighting for liberty abroad that I have helped to defend it at home when it was tottering under the yoke of despotism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit and to have referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be directed to inquire into the methods and policies pursued by the Post Office Department in excluding matter from the mails under section 334 of title 18 of the United States Code and to report to the Senate such remedial legislation as may be recommended by the committee.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 145) was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RESIGNATION OF LOUIS RAYCROFT AS REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, April 29, 1943, I found a statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] in the following language:

Mr. President, while I am speaking of the War Manpower Commission, I feel impelled to bring to light another development which has taken place in that organization which bodes ill for its continued success and proper functioning. I have reference now to the recent resignation of Pennsylvania's Louis Raycroft. His resignation as regional director of the War Manpower Commission for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware has recently been accepted. I am informed that his resignation was brought about through political pressure, despite the fact that Mr. Raycroft's record as regional director in this district has been both outstanding and meritorious and despite the fact that he has enjoyed the full cooperation and support not only of organized labor but of organized industry as well.

In calling this matter to public attention I wish to urge upon the members of the War Manpower Commission that they realize the gravity and seriousness of their calling and that they submit to no political pressure whatever in the prosecution of their legitimate undertakings. For if politics enters into the picture of manpower—its allocation, regulation, and use—we shall behold a great and terrifying tragedy here on the home front—a tragedy no less severe than that which would occur if politics were permitted to dominate military strategy and military

operations. For the manpower at home is the backbone, the very substance of our united war effort; and if political considerations are to take precedence over practical and strategic considerations, then this entire program will collapse, and in its collapse will bring every portion of our military effort down in resounding defeat. So in protesting the resignation of Mr. Raycroft, a resignation which I am informed was brought about through political pressure, I call upon the War Manpower Commission to cease to give credence or recognition to any political bickerings and to keep its house in order so that it may proceed in the proper light and with the proper efficiency to the solution of the great tasks which lie ahead.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire from the Senator from Delaware on what page the remarks to which he has referred may be found?

Mr. TUNNELL. They will be found on page 3777 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do not know whether there was any political pressure put upon Mr. Raycroft to resign. I think there should have been. I know something about his appointments in my State; and if a Democrat has been appointed in Delaware through this gentleman, I do not know about it. Not only that, but I have understood that he is a very active member of that distinguished nonpolitical organization, the Union League Club of Philadelphia.

However, on Saturday of last week I read the following article in the Philadelphia Record:

RAYCROFT QUITS WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION POST HERE—DEPUTY WILL TAKE CHARGE UNTIL SUCCESSOR IS APPOINTED

Louis B. F. Raycroft yesterday relinquished his office as regional director of the War Manpower Commission for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

He was succeeded by his deputy, Wesley T. Englehorn, who will be acting director until a new chief of the office is named.

CHANGES PLANS

Raycroft originally announced his resignation on April 15, stating, however, that he would remain in office until a successor was appointed.

Yesterday he dramatically told the convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at Harrisburg that he was stepping out at once.

GOING BACK TO OLD JOB

On Monday he said he will be back on his old job as industrial and public relations director of the Electric Storage Battery Co.

Raycroft said his resignation was entirely voluntary and made for personal reasons. He will continue in a consultant capacity at the specific request of Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, he said.

In view of the charge that this man was removed for political reasons, I thought his statement to the effect that his resignation was entirely voluntary should go into the RECORD. So far as I know, there was no reason for making a false statement in the Philadelphia Record. I take it for granted this statement is correct. I have heard no contradiction of it. At any rate, the statement of Mr. Raycroft as published in the Philadelphia Record is entirely contradictory to the statement made on the floor of the Senate.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk which I should like to offer to the pending bill to the end that it may become the pending question. I shall not ask for action upon the amendment at this time. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 8, of Senate bill 796, it is proposed to strike out the words "or other cause."

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe most Senators are familiar with my attitude toward the activities of labor-leader racketeers in this Nation and the way they have been seriously retarding the war effort. I am therefore greatly pleased to see that an effort is now being made in the Senate to enact legislation which may prove beneficial in stopping these racketeers from their nefarious work. I understand the bill sponsored by the Senator from Texas will come before the Senate again tomorrow, and I hope that it will receive the serious consideration of all Senators and will result in a piece of legislation of which we may all be proud.

Along that line, I wish to call attention to the fact that there are other disturbances taking place in this Nation besides the one in the coal mines. I wish to read a telegram I have received from Sikeston, Mo., which bears upon the building of the large pipe line for the transportation of oil and gasoline from Texas and the Southwest to the eastern sections of the United States. I believe that the telegram will be of interest to all Senators, and to almost every citizen in the United States. The telegram, which is signed by Mr. Garfield Crawford, Idanha Hotel, Cape Girardeau, Mo., reads:

Blood will run like water in southeastern Missouri Scott and Girardeau Counties unless Government steps in at once Monday to rid labor racketeers from interference with peaceful construction of 24- and 20-inch oil and gasoline pipe lines from Texas to eastern seaboard. Goon squad of American Federation of Labor gathered at Cape Girardeau and Illmo, beating up peaceful truckers delivering 24-inch pipe line; two serious fights already April 30 in railroad yards at Illmo, and April 28, in dining room of Marquette Hotel, Cape Girardeau. Officers of law, former railroad unioneers at Illmo, evidently in league with goon squad as town marshal unarmed contractor C. H. Dunn's two guards telling guards to quit railroad yards and he would protect workers; as soon as guards left goon squad moved in and almost killed three of Dunn's men. O. B. Young, of Odessa, Tex., Dunn's employee, in St. Francis Hospital, fractured skull, probably die, and no arrest made as yet.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that, according to the St. Louis Globe Democrat, the other two men who were injured in this fight were Robert Nickel, 38, of Odessa, Tex., and Samuel Goodrum, 24, of Tyler, Tex. These gentlemen from Texas are protected from treatment of this kind so long as they are within the State of Texas, but they are lending their efforts in this war effort to have the pipe lines constructed by taking their time and going into other States in order to help build the pipe lines, and there they have been grossly mistreated.

The telegram continues:

No dispute as to wages, hours, or working conditions; only question of forcing Dunn's men to join against their will. Same situation exists with Oil States Construction Co. pipe-line laying contractors; none of Dunn's men belong to union and refuse to join.

Union racketeers have brought on three strikes in Bolz Dredging Co., laying river loop of big inch line across Mississippi from Grays Point, Mo., to Thebes, Ill. All this work is under War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation, a child of Jesse Jones' Defense Plant Corporation, a branch of Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Here is a statement George C. Bolz, president of Bolz Dredging Co:

"I have contracts to lay three pipe lines across the Mississippi River as links in the war emergency pipe-line system. I have personally supervised all work to cause a minimum of delay. We have been faced with extreme weather conditions of high water in the river, strong winds, and heavy ice, and yet I pressed on with the work and approximately 60 percent of the work was carried on 24 hours per day. I have been 100 percent American Federation of Labor union contractor for many years. Regardless of my sincerity in performing this much-needed work and faithfully following union principles, union leaders have stopped operations and called their men away from the job at three critical periods of the work—April 2 and 6, April 9 to 11, and the last, which has not been ended, from April 28. Work on the part of our union employees has been considerably below par during this entire period from April 2 to the present time. My job is stopped because other contractors in nearby sectors of the war pipe line operate open shop, not because of any quarrel with my organization. Minutes count much, delays in vital war work as the transportation of oil and gasoline are disastrous and should not be tolerated.

"GEO. C. BOLZ,
"Geo. C. Bolz Dredging Co."

This is the message too. This is a copy of a wire from C. W. Cromley, assistant traffic manager for War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc., to C. Hobson Dunn, Cape Girardeau:

"Now, 27 cars pipe at Morely, Mo.; none unloaded since April 27; total of 70 cars there and en route. When will these cars be released? Must have action."

I saw these cars with pipe rusting; demurrage is piling up against contractor, $4 per day per car. Strike delaying construction; responsible for loss of 1,148 feet of extra-heavy 24-inch pipe, causing loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to Government. Why has not Washington given this important defense work police protection like it has other defense work? This is Ickes' job and he does not give protection. Dunn's men and Oil State Construction Co. now trying to put through 20-inch line to carry high-octane gasoline from Southwest oil fields to eastern seaboard. Subchasers, airplanes to get this fuel to carry on war in Africa and Europe. All work suspended, but upon request of War Emergency Pipe Line, Inc., Dunn must unload cars. Lives of Dunn and two guards threatened by "goon" leaders. "Goon" leaders have long criminal records; getting this for you. Chief of police of Cape Girardeau supplied me with police record of

Joseph Edward Newell, St. Louis labor racketeer and heading "goon" squad. Sending you clippings from papers by mail to hotel. This is serious; help is needed and needed quick. Information given me by district attorney, Cape Girardeau County. Every day's delay means loss of 250,000 barrels high-octane gas per day to fighting forces and more than 300,000 barrels daily of crude for eastern refineries and defense factories. Texas refineries standing idle due to slowdown here.

GARFIELD CRAWFORD,
Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a newspaper article published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 1, 1943, which bears on the subject under consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEAL TO DONNELL AFTER PIPE-LINE FIGHT INJURES THREE

An appeal to Governor Donnell for help in the labor dispute that has shut down the three companies building the Government-financed oil pipe line near Ilmo, Mo., was made yesterday by Mayor G. T. Dorris of Ilmo after three men were hospitalized and several others slightly injured in a gang fight that raged through the town's railroad yards.

The battle was a new flare-up in union attempts to organize employees of the Oil States Construction Co., which holds a contract for a 62-mile section of the line.

Mayor Dorris said a mob estimated at 100 men attacked six or seven employees of the Dunn Bros. Construction Co., who were unloading pipe in the yards to be trucked to the Oil States property.

Those hospitalized after the fight are O. B. Young, 33, of Millersview, Tex.; Robert Nickel, 38, of Odessa, Tex., and Samuel Goodrum, 24, of Tyler, Tex. Their condition was not serious.

Dunn Bros. holds the contract for moving pipe from the rail yards to the Oil States property, and Mayor Dorris said it halted work after the attack. About 200 employees of the Bolz Dredging Co., building pipe line across the river, stopped work 3 days ago, reportedly on orders of Joseph (Buck) Newell, business agent of the American Federation of Labor Hoisting Engineers' Union in St. Louis, to force Oil States to submit to unionization.

Oil States halted work Thursday after armed guards stood off about 40 American Federation of Labor members who sought to organize its men. Wednesday night three Oil States watchmen and four American Federation of Labor men engaged in a fist fight in the dining room of a Cape Girardeau hotel.

Late yesterday the three properties were under guard, and Mayor Dorris said steps would be taken to prevent further violence.

PATROLMEN ON GUARD

Governor Donnell, he reported, said he would ask Sheriff John Hobbs of Scott County to deputize a sufficient number of citizens to preserve order, but Hobbs last night said he had received no word from the Governor. Seven or eight State highway patrolmen are on guard, however, he added.

In Cincinnati, B. E. Hull, head of War Emergency Pipeline, Inc., which supervises the project, termed the dispute plain intimidation of the workmen by organizers who have been offered work and have refused it.

"The organizers insist," he said, "that all they want is union dues."

Mr. O'DANIEL. I place this information in the RECORD, Mr. President, merely so that Senators may determine whether it is possible to amend the bill which is under consideration so as to take care of instances of the kind referred to, which are retarding the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on page 2, line 8.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Charles E. Kemper, of Columbus, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind. (reappointment).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Chester S. Dishong, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida; and

William H. McDonnell, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, additional position.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Donald S. Shaver, to be postmaster at Ely, Nev., in place of Alfred Tamblyn, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Legislative Clerk read the nomination of William Embry Wrather, of Texas, to be Director of the Geological Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Legislative Clerk read the nomination of George Abild to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the President be notified immediately of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Egypt, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt.

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5, to act as minister resident and consul of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Brennan, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. Reappointment.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following senior surgeons to be temporary medical directors in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Marion R. King
Walter G. Nelson

The following passed assistant surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Austin V. Deibert
Herman E. Hilleboe

The following surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Lee C. Watkins	Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
John A. Trautman	Ivan W. Steele
John R. Heller, Jr.	John R. McGibony
Otis L. Anderson	

The following passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Waldo B. Edwards
Robert A. Hingson

The following assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Richard K. Winston	Ralph R. Nix
I. Ray Howard	Trawick H. Stubbs

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

James Lloyd Elliott
Lloyd Frederic Summers

The following senior dental surgeon to be temporary dental director in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

William T. Wright, Jr.

The following passed assistant dental surgeon to be temporary dental surgeon in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from May 1, 1943:

Edwin M. Short

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Clinton A. Johnson, from the State of Nebraska, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Lincoln area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph H. Louchheim, from the State of New York, to be principal administrative analyst in the Office for Field Management, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Will S. Denham, from the State of Missouri, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Floyd W. Sharp, from the State of Arkansas, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Little Rock area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Alfred Mack, from the State of Massachusetts, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Francis Xavier Powers, from the State of Massachusetts, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Worcester area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Harold Field Kellogg, from the State of Massachusetts, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Arthur M. Cochran, from the State of Massachusetts, to be senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Milton G. Young, from the State of Oklahoma, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Oklahoma City area office of the War Manpower Commission.

George Melvin Dunlap, Jr., from the State of Kansas, to be assistant regional chief of labor utilization, at $4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City Regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

John Francis Daly, Jr., from the State of Connecticut, to be senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, in the Hartford area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Guy Doane McKinney, from the District of Columbia, to be principal information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washton regional office.

Gerald L. Arnett, from the State of Illinois, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Moline area office.

John D. Talbott, from the State of Kentucky, to be senior manpower field representative, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Nathan H. Gowing, from the State of Virginia, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Hampton Roads area office of the War Manpower Commission.

George D. Haskell, from the State of Iowa, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Des Moines area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Russell A. Rasco, from the State of Florida, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Miami area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph T. Flakne, from the Territory of Alaska to be senior placement specialist at $4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Harold Ladd Pierce, from the State of California, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Los Angeles area office of the War Manpower Commission.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Brig. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Surgeon General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. James C. Magee, the Surgeon General, whose term of office expires May 31, 1943.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. Sumner Yale Andelman, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. William Clark Doak, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. George Sharpe, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Gerhard Thurston Shearer, Medical Corps Reserve.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles M. Yates, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commandant, naval operating base, Oran, to rank from the 26th day of April 1943.

Capt. George B. Wilson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of October 1942.

Capt. Ralph S. Wentworth, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commandant, naval operating base, Iceland, to rank from the 24th day of April 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William F. Killough, Alpine, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARKANSAS

Scott L. Kirkpatrick, Forrest City, Ark., in place of A. D. McDaniel, retired.

Harold M. Austin, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of H. M. Landers, resigned.

Robert L. Slaughter, Sheridan, Ark., in place of G. A. McMillan, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Rena M. Rinaldi, Randsburg, Calif., in place of R. O. Evans, resigned.

COLORADO

Louis M. French, Norwood, Colo., in place of W. T. Hutt, removed.

Leah M. Kesecker, Redcliff, Colo., in place of R. A. Palmer, resigned.

DELAWARE

Lillian Heller, Odessa, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Theodore W. Palmer, Jr., Rehoboth Beach, Del., in place of D. G. Conant, resigned.

FLORIDA

Harry C. Green, Englewood, Fla., in place of M. W. Green, resigned.

GEORGIA

Eldon A. McCollum, Baconton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Royce D. Power, Vienna, Ga., in place of T. A. Adkins, deceased.

ILLINOIS

John W. Williams, Benton, Ill., in place of J. W. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Evelyn A. Cook, Chadwick, Ill., in place of C. C. Miller, deceased.

Edwin J. Heiligenstein, Freeburg, Ill., in place of E. J. Heiligenstein. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John W. Foster, Toluca, Ill., in place of J. W. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James Wheeler Davis, Troy, Ill., in place of J. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Neal E. Gregg, Wenona, Ill., in place of A. M. Wilson, resigned.

Ernest V. Giehl, Wood River, Ill., in place of Z. G. Stoecklin, deceased.

INDIANA

Glenn R. Woods, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Richard C. Herrick, Hillsdale, Ind. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

John B. Cogan, Vincennes, Ind., in place of W. S. Kensler. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1942.

Paul G. Smiley, Washington, Ind., in place of Henry Backes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence E. Jones, Yorktown, Ind., in place of O. M. Shively. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

IOWA

Marion E. Daries, Armstrong, Iowa, in place of F. W. Daries, resigned.

Opal V. Stevens, Bayard, Iowa, in place of O. V. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leo D. Flannery, Bondurant, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

KANSAS

Alvin M. Johnson, Canton, Kans., in place of A. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Herman D. Cornelsen, Hillsboro, Kans., in place of Ferdinand Scharping, retired.

Albert Earl Elias, La Crosse, Kans., in place of H. T. Fish, resigned.

Hugh W. Clemmons, Wadsworth, Kans., in place of T. A. Hand, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Thomas A. Spalding, Bardstown, Ky., in place of T. A. Spalding. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charlie Lawrence, Centertown, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John S. Hollan, Jackson, Ky., in place of J. S. Hollan. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Leo G. Muenninghoff, Shively, Ky., in place of M. K. Diersing, retired.

MICHIGAN

Dorothy F. Seiferlein, Fraser, Mich., in place of F. M. Meier, resigned.

Worthy M. Logan, Ottawa Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Ralph Reeds, Scottville, Mich., in place of J. J. Cox, retired.

MINNESOTA

Edward T. Gibbons, Sherburn, Minn., in place of E. T. Gibbons. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Loretta M. Harper, Worthington, Minn., in place of L. M. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

Ola Chandler, Braxton, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James O. Waldrop, Newton, Miss., in place of W. C. Mabry, removed without prejudice.

Robert A. Dean, Okolona, Miss., in place of R. A. Dean. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

R. Ben Linn, Pickens, Miss., in place of R. B. Linn. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

MISSOURI

Helen K. Bridges, Arbyrd, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEBRASKA

David W. Way, Syracuse, Nebr., in place of F. H. Reuter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Norris G. Nordstrom, Wausa, Nebr., in place of W. C. Peters, removed.

Catherine M. McIntyre, Winside, Nebr., in place of M. M. Morrow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Elizabeth H. O'Neil, Groveton, N. H., in place of L. A. Warren, deceased.

Evelyn C. Earley, Nashua, N. H., in place of J. D. Hallisey, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Henry G. Roberts, Bay Head, N. J., in place of H. G. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

Louis A. Reilly, Newark, N. J., in place of J. F. Sinnott, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

OHIO

Clyde M. Bartlow, Felicity, Ohio, in place of C. M. Bartlow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Oscar H. Stillwagon, Ambler, Pa., in place of O. H. Stillwagon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marvin F. Birely, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa., in place of M. F. Birely. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Martin A. King, Clarks Summit, Pa., in place of M. A. King. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Stanley C. Croop, Hunlock Creek, Pa., in place of S. C. Croop. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Stephen J. Geriach, McAdoo, Pa., in place of S. F. Payer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Carroll F Hockersmith, Shippensburg, Pa., in place of J. E. Blair, retired.

Mary H. Bard, Slippery Rock, Pa., in place of H. A. Bard, resigned.

Mary L. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of J. W. Doyle, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ollie W. Bowers, Central, S. C., in place of O. W. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George E. Hagen, Armour, S. Dak., in place of G. E. Hagen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ella Skorr, Colman, S. Dak., in place of A. M. Kaufmann, transferred.

TENNESSEE

William J. Long, Bethel Springs, Tenn., in place of M. F. Ramer, resigned.

TEXAS

Fountain Pitts Shrader, Frisco, Tex., in place of F. P. Shrader. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

J. O. McBride, Leander, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Vernon E. Newman, Tolar, Tex., in place of A. A. Baker, transferred.

UTAH

A. Carlos Schow, Lehi, Utah, in place of A. C. Schow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert P. Leatham, Wellsville, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

VERMONT

Ethel B. Wilkins, Reading, Vt., in place of D. B. Hufnail, resigned.

Cecelia S. Joslyn, South Hero, Vt., in place of C. S. Joslyn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Irving E. Bronson, Swanton, Vt., in place of I. E. Bronson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942

VIRGINIA

Lois Tuck Long, Virgilina, Va., in place of W. R. Slagle, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Easton L. Mudgett, Coupeville, Wash., in place of E. L. Mudgett. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Emma C. Atkinson, Langley, Wash., in place of E. C. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter W. Lindley, St. John, Wash., in place of W. W. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Marion L. Taylor, Ansted, W. Va., in place of M. L. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Virgil Y. Given, Clendenin, W. Va., in place of V. Y. Given. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942

Joseph V. Emig, Wellsburg, W. Va., in place of J. V. Emig. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Frank Hanley, North Freedom, Wis., in place of Frank Hanley. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

John Gertsch, Jr., Scandinavia, Wis., in place of C. R. Hanson, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3, 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

William Embry Wrather, to be Director of the Geological Survey.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

George Abild, to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Walter K. Kilpatrick
Glenn B. Davis
Theodore E. Chandler

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be commanders

Clarence L. C. Atkeson, Jr.
Donald S. MacMahan

To be lieutenants

Kenneth J. Sanger	Sherman "E" Wright, Jr.
Gerald L. Christie	
Herbert von A. Burkart	Henry A. Romberg
	Ernest W. Humphrey

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

William H. Davison	Paul G. Adams, Jr.
Robert H. Wood	Stanley E. Hindman
William T. Sawyer	Clement T. Latimer
Davis S. Bill, Jr.	William R. Laird, Jr.
Gustave A. Wolf	Howard A. Thompson
Frank M. Culpepper	John P. Seifert
John L. Arrington 2d	William W. Gentry
Lawrence R. Geis	Norman Bennett
Saxe P. Gantz	Valentine G. Holzapfel
Donald J. O'Meara	
James McI. Robertson	Abe F. Cohen
Daniel J. Wallace, Jr.	

To be assistant surgeons

John T. Mitchell	Robert F. Christoph
Robert E. Kelly	John M. Hundley
Eugene Bifulco	Harold E. Muller
Cecil C. Collins, Jr.	Charles R. Duncan
Daniel H. Mathers	James B. Black, Jr.
Bert A. Kanwit	John F. Maloney
June U. Gunter	Jack W. Revere
Stephen H. Tolins	William H. Harris, Jr.
Allen Y. Delancy	Gerald J. Duffner
Joseph E. D. Humphries	Frederic W. Bradshaw
	William P. Mulford
William R. Wheir	Hugh Crawford
Loran P. Moore, Jr.	Prescott Jordon, Jr.
Charles H. Eaton	George W. Westin
James J. McCoy, Jr.	Henry F. Smith
Dexter E. Guernsey	Karl M. Lazarski
Kenneth B. England	Rudolph D. Jacob
William S. Cole	James R. Oldham
Verne L. Schlaser	Gordon F. Robertson
Roy J. Stokes	Leo J. Brown
Wayne W. Waters	Harold R. Stowe
Franklin L. Ashley	George W. Russell
Alexander J. Bankhead	Julian A. White
	Richard R. Hoffman
James D. Murphy	Homer J. Moore
William L. Hoon	James P. Dean
Samuel H. Horton, Jr.	John S. Cheredes
John B. Trible	Edwin C. Bebb
August R. Buerkle	William C. Cantrell
Norval F. Kemp	Warren Z. Lane
Clifton G. Aycock	William Burrows
Raymond H. Barker	Virgil J. P. Lundquist
Ralph D. Ross	James H. Lyons
Owen C. Berg	Ralph W. Coltharp
Frellson E. McCarty	Roy H. Baskin, Jr.
Faheam Cannon	Worth H. Gross
Raymond T. Anderson	Joseph L. Pace
Jack R. Anderson	John G. Morrison
Fred P. Thomas	Robert O. Bill
J. Blair Pace	Robert C. Walden, Jr.
Stanley W. Burwell	Joseph M. Straughan
Francis M. Whittaker, Jr.	

To be assistant paymasters

Richard L. Geiger	James G. Bowie
James T. Hughes	Lamar D. Patton
James F. Waters, Jr.	Phillip S. Twombly
Simon L. Cohn	Louis C. Brooks
Paul V. Moffat, Jr.	James M. Brogan
Howard S. Hyde	Charles E. Wood 3d
Elmer T. Browne	Allan B. Zerfoss
Nelson R. Combs	David D. Ruys 3d

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Daniel J. Carrison

To be assistant civil engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Fletcher S. Hamilton

To be chief carpenter

Ralph E. Carmack

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this surging world with its load of pain and curse of wickedness, bow low to hear our humble prayer. We thank Thee for America and pray that she may ever be grateful for her bountiful blessings. While the wheels of tyranny are grinding away the hard-won liberties in many lands, we remain free with bread enough and to spare. Hearken, Lord, the hour is tremendous; our need was never greater. It calls for temperate speech, for true servants free from political bias, laboring for a democracy which is destined to be mightier than the one we now know.

Today the blood of our slain is holding the gates of inhuman oppression, whose rule is murder and massacre. O let us not go forth unwarned of the rocks and shoals on which other eras have perished. We pray for a force which is stronger than the cruel thirst for power. Give our country deliverance from all who would pour into the hopper of their selfishness and prejudice the sacred institutions of our homeland; O free us from those who seek to build on the wrecks of a false and a degrading liberty, and grant that the aroused patriotism of a free people may shatter their plans and machinations. For those toiling hearts which labor in the depths of the earth in darkness, loneliness, and peril we pray do Thou increase the security of their comfort and peace. Blessed Lord God, be with our President and may the throbbing soul of our great land respond in unyielding loyalty to the cause of freedom and human rights as exemplified in the teaching of our Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 16, 1943:

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

On April 19, 1943:

H. R. 1785. An act for the relief of the Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co.;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; and

H. R. 1787. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.

On April 24, 1943:

H. R. 401. An act for the relief of James W. Kelly;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford; and

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 30 days.

On April 26, 1943:

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 1522. An act for the relief of Morton Fiedler;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers; and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the refund by the War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages.

On April 29, 1943:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Douglas R. Muther;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of R. E. Cotton Co.;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of Fred Taylor;

H. R. 1238. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Klein;

H. R. 1845. An act for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan;

H. R. 1893. An act for the relief of George H. Crow;

H. R. 2020. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes;

H. R 2238. An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; and

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 755. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had on April 26, 1943, appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. National Housing Agency.
6. The National Archives.

The message also announced that the Vice President had on April 29, 1943, appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 15, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Federal Works Agency.
4. War Production Board.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on April 22, 1943, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, for a period of 30 days.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on April 22, 1943, he did on April 23, 1943, sign the enrolled joint resolution of the House, House Joint Resolution 113, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, for a period of 30 days, and the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 991, to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund may be exercised.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I expect to make during the consideration of the bill H. R. 2570 and include certain tables and statistics to which I expect to refer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore entered for today with relation to the Polish Constitution, be postponed until 4 o'clock today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with respect to the call of the Private Calendar tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain exhibits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Las Vegas Evening Review Journal on the subject of Magnesium in Nevada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday I received a telegram signed by a large number of constituents in my district, reading as follows:

We loyal citizens of the United States and Texas are disgusted with the action of certain leaders of the coal miners. We want action now to end once and for all strikes and threatened strikes against the security and welfare of America. Our boys in the Army are sacrificing all to preserve our freedom and every single civilian at home should be required to work or fight.

The words contained in that telegram express the views of myself and those whom I represent, and I am hopeful that the coal strike crisis may result in legislation for which I have so long contended, and sought to have enacted, making it a penal offense to strike against the Government of the United States in time of war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter that I have addressed to the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXCESSIVE FEES IN SECURING CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, also, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address I delivered over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Cincinnati Times Star of Thursday, April 29, 1943, under the title "Takes On a Little More Power Each Day."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Stephen Leacock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on three subjects and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, can it be that the coal miners who are now out on strike have placed their loyalty to John L. Lewis above their loyalty to the United States of America? Can it be that they have placed their loyalty to Mr. Lewis even above their loyalty to their own sons who wear the uniform? I hope and trust that this cannot be so.

There can be no doubt about the conduct of Mr. Lewis himself, the leader of these striking miners. He has defied the Government and the flag. He would leave defenseless a million American soldiers who are hazarding their lives across the sea, some of whom will die this very day. In order to satisfy his lust for power he has in effect repudiated our Government and joined the forces of Hitler. He has broken his pledged word to the President of the United States.

Shall Lewis prevail in free America? I hope not. This latest act of aggression against the United States fully vindicates those of us who for many months have pled for legislation by the Congress and firmer action by the President against all enemies from within, including those who would strike against the Government in time of war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THREATS AGAINST MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Ira E. Zimmerman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, history will undoubtedly record John L. Lewis as the No. 1 saboteur of America's war-production program of 1943. At the behest of Lewis more than half a million miners were idle the past week-end. The manufacture of our vital sinews of war was retarded and the national interest was put in grave peril. Hitler and Hirohito can point to that strike and rightfully boast of their greatest triumph in months. For them, Lewis' strike and the possible recurrence of it constitutes more of a victory than would be the sinking of a battleship, the bombing of a factory, or the winning of a battle.

John L. Lewis, in causing that strike, flatly refused to submit to peaceful, orderly, unbiased arbitration, and boldly and defiantly struck against the Government of the United States. He has challenged the Government's fight against inflation. He has struck against our men in uniform and gambled with their lives. He has put selfishness above patriotism and has betrayed the cause of labor in which he claims such a great interest.

The President is to be commended for making use of his wartime powers in taking over the mines in his effort to hold down further obstruction to our war program. Those who do not return to work at once should, as they are subject to the selective-service laws, be immediately inducted into military service and either used as combat soldiers or sent to the war areas in labor battalions. In addition, Congress should immediately pass legislation to protect us against a recurrence of such a shameful spectacle. There are a number of anti-strike bills now pending in committee which would accomplish that purpose. Such disputes should and can be settled, under law, by peaceful, orderly, unbiased mediation. The time to act is now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., on April 22, 1943, entitled "Full Retribution."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at two places and to include other material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

THOUGHTS ON GOOD FRIDAY

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein a statement on Good Friday by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CLEVELAND LABOR LEADERSHIP DEMONSTRATES RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, these days, with the coal strike and John L. Lewis on every tongue, labor leadership is facing a new crisis. People are asking the question, Can labor govern itself? Can our labor leaders be counted on to place the interests of our country above all others?

I am happy to say that in my home community of Cleveland, labor leaders have demonstrated their position as responsible American citizens within the past few days. Last Thursday, the streetcar operators went out on strike in Cleveland. Thousands of war workers were either delayed in reaching their factories or were forced to stay at home. It appeared that a serious and lengthy strike was inevitable.

Within 18 hours after the strike began, it was ended. And it was ended because the responsible leaders of Cleveland's labor organizations insisted that it end. Tom Lenehan, John Rohrich, Bill Finegan, Matt DeMore, leaders of Cleveland labor, told the strikers that they were striking against the Nation, against their sons on the battle front, against their own interests.

This is the kind of labor leadership our people want. Certainly it must look out for its own needs, but when the showdown came, when the issue was labor against war production these men gave the answer Americans want to hear. Let us have more leaders like them, and we will get the war over more quickly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when I address the House today on the bill H. R. 2570 I may have the privilege of extending my remarks and include certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Appendix.]

HON. RICHARD N. ELLIOTT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in the Washington Star of April 25, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDISTRICTING CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would prohibit any State from redistricting its congressional districts or reapportioning its Representatives in Congress more than once in any one decennial census period.

The purpose of the bill is to prevent reapportionment by States under control of one party from making repeated reapportionments solely for the purpose of gerrymandering out of office Representatives in Congress from the other party. We all know this is now being perpetrated in Pennsylvania where redistricting was made last year, and the only purpose of repealing that redistricting and accomplishing another one is to rip out of office five Democratic Members of Congress.

If my bill is enacted into law, it will prevent what may become a vicious practice of reprisals on the part of both parties in the gerrymandering of congressional districts which would wipe out the true and proper representation in Congress of the will of the voters.

The United States Supreme Court will have an opportunity to pass upon the question of whether or not the framers of the Constitution intended that State legislatures could thwart the will of the people by capricious and repeated and unnecessary redistrictings such as is now being attempted in Pennsylvania. That attempted redistricting will be taken to the courts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, from about 275 of as fine citizens as there are in the United States I have just received this wire:

MAXTON, N. C., *April 29, 1943.*

J. BAYARD CLARK,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Sons and daughters of Robeson are serving and fighting on every front both at home and abroad to preserve the liberties of the American people. Their parents, relatives, and friends are paying taxes and purchasing War bonds to the limit of their ability to sustain them. We have talked with many such parents, relatives, friends, and men faced with armed service under the Selective Service Act and believe the citizens of this county of all races would have you as our Representative in Congress deal effectively with John L. Lewis. If existing law is inadequate effectively to control both employers and employees engaged in all war work, we would have you try to repeal and try to put through effective laws for that purpose. Farmers are penalized for violating rules of Farm Administration, merchants are indicted for Office of Price Administration violations, individual citizens are punished for tax evasion, all of which is right. We ask that such like justice prevail in the seats of basic war industries.

Two hundred and seventy-five signatures.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the Bermuda Conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Los Angeles Times on the Jap question in California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein remarks by Mr. Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THESE DAYS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OUTLAW STRIKES IN CRITICAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to pass legislation which will outlaw all strikes in critical industries essential to the war effort. In my opinion, any strike or stoppage of work which retards the production of war materials, borders on treason. It is unthinkable that American workers will go on strike when MacArthur and his men are begging for planes and other fighting equipment to defend themselves against the Japs. When the lives of millions of American men are in jeopardy and the very freedom of our country is at stake, labor leaders should use and abide by legal methods for settling grievances instead of stopping work to give aid and comfort to Hitler and the Japs.

The coal miners' strike is an outrage. It is sabotage of the worst kind against our country in its greatest emergency. Congress is not worthy of being called the representatives of the people, if it does not take action at once to halt the destructive activities of labor dictators who are hell-bent on causing an early defeat of our country in the war.

I am convinced that a large percentage of the men engaged in the mining of coal are loyal and patriotic Americans. Many of them have gone into the armed forces and are ready to make the supreme sacrifice for our country. They buy bonds and pay taxes, and I believe that most of the miners want to continue working in the production of coal, so necessary to win the war at the earliest possible time. But, they have been misled by their leaders in the present strike, and the time has come for a showdown. The administration has failed in its effort to settle the coal miners' dispute in a legal manner, and it is, therefore, up to Congress to take prompt action for the enactment of a law which will outlaw all strikes in critical industries for the duration so that the war may be successfully prosecuted to an early conclusion.

The truce in the coal mine strike is no solution of the work stoppage problem in critical industries. We are gratified that coal mining will be resumed tomorrow and that negotiations will be reopened for a settlement of the wage dispute. However, if we are to win this war there must not be a recurrence or threat of strike in any essential industry, and therefore, Congress should act to deal with the entire problem of work stoppage and strikes for the duration of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very fine radio talk by Baukhage on the taking out of life insurance by the service men and women.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include two editorials from the American Machinist.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram sent to my State which sets forth my opinion on the present coal strike.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a memorandum on the life of Louis Silo Gottlieb.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: One that I be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sermon by the Reverend Clifford E. Barber, of Knoxville, and the other that I be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the father of a soldier in Australia and an excerpt of a letter from that soldier to his father.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today, but, due to the fact that we are to discuss the tax legislation and that this is also Polish Constitutional Day, I shall not claim my time today, but ask unanimous consent that my time be transferred to Thursday next after the disposition of the legislative business for the day. At that time I propose to talk again on the question of compressed foods.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection. it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARRETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech I made last Saturday night at New Haven, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]?

There was no objection.

CANCELATION OF FEED AND SEED LOANS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I introduced a bill in reference to the cancelation of feed and seed loans in the Dust Bowl area. That bill did not receive the approval of the Department of Agriculture. I have worked out a new bill that has their approval which I am introducing today and I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the first bill from the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

STOPPAGE OF STRIKES IN ESSENTIAL WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all persons who conspire together to slow up or to stop work in an essential industry in time of war should be declared by congressional act to be guilty of a penitentiary offense and punished accordingly. The people of this Nation are demanding that the Congress do something now to stop these strikes in essential war industries.

Any Member who desires to obtain early consideration of a bill for that purpose may assist by signing the petition that is on the Clerk's desk to force consideration of H. R. 147 which will effectively stop strikes in essential war industries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

WILL THE CONGRESS ACT?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on the important events of the last few days. The coal mines, according to John L. Lewis, have a new ownership. Let us hope it will not be for long. The miners were apparently told that they should not trespass on the coal owner's property, so that no strike needed to be called. Things that are equal to the same thing or that have the same result are equal to each other.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] just stated, it is high time that

some legislation be passed. I trust that the representatives of the people will now have hearts of oak. If it will so appear, I salute you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement on reciprocal trade agreements by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Times under date of April 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I expect to make this afternoon on H. R. 2570 and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from Public Opinion which I think has merit and is worthy of consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three topics and to include in one a letter from a constituent, in another a letter from the Nation, and in the last an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a statement I issued on last Saturday and also an editorial in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BECKWORTH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour to tell the truth and the facts about the coal strike, and to advocate a raise for the miners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 192)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1941–42.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1943.*

ISSUANCE OF A DEVICE IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF MERCHANT SAILORS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of the merchant sailors, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out "he" and insert "the Secretary of War shall consent thereto, and the Administrator."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. BLAND. They are very simple. The title of the bill as it passed the House contained the words "issuance of a device," whereas to be grammatically correct the language should be "issuance of devices." That amendment was made.

The other amendment is to this effect. Section 5 of the bill contains this language:

In approving any design under this section, the Administrator may approve the design approved by the Secretary of War—

The amendment adds the words—

if the Secretary of War shall consent thereto, and the Administrator.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is in favor of the amendments?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from California has concurred in the request I am making now.

Mr. WELCH. The amendments do not change the text of the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this keep the amendment I put in the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Those are the only two amendments. The text of the bill as it left the House is not changed except by these amendments that were adopted.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN SEAMEN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed and to include therein certain excerpts from reports and an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the heroic deeds of the men of the American merchant marine have written a stirring chapter in American history. They have preserved and continued the splendid spirit of American seamen from 1607 to 1943.

The sentiment of the American people toward the bill (H. R. 2281) providing for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors was eloquently expressed in the following editorial, which appeared under date on April 24, 1943, in the New York Times:

EMBLEMS FOR SEAMEN

Not often does Congress pass a bill that pleases everybody. The measure authorizing the War Shipping Board to furnish and issue to merchant seamen insignia denoting their deeds and experience is a bill that Americans will unanimously favor. Anybody who has served in the merchant marine since Pearl Harbor is to be entitled to an emblem denoting that fact. Another sort of device will be awarded to a seaman who has served in the war or combat zones. A special honor bar will be given to a seaman who has served on a ship that has been attacked by the enemy. If the attacked vessel had to be abandoned on account of the attack, a star will be added to the bar. If a seaman has been injured, wounded, or subject to dangerous exposure,

a medal and ribbon with a rosette will be worn.

Thus, a scale of honors, each with its definite and separate significance, is provided for these men who face death every day, wear no uniform, make no complaints. They are without the gold lace that we are apt to consider a mark and prerogative of fighting men. From books, too, we know that a sailor's life has been one of the hardest of lots. Yet on the old sailing vessels storm, wreck, fire, mutiny were the worst, but only occasional, enemies. Compared with our men of today, those of Clark, Russell, and Conrad had soft berths.

The deathsman under the sea is always lurking for the sailors of today. You see them struggling in the water, facing hunger and thirst on a raft, fighting off sharks. You see them helping or rescuing others. If they survive one torpedoing they go out for another one. Not infrequently they get it. "The red vintage of the sea" now has a far other meaning than was in the poet's mind. We all like sailors with far more reason now than ever before. When they get their insignia we can read their proud history visibly displayed.

When reporting the bill favorably to the Senate, Senator RADCLIFFE, of Maryland, said:

By Public Law No. 524, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942, provision was made for the award of medals to each person in the American merchant marine who, on or after September 8, 1939, has distinguished, or during the war should distinguish, himself by outstanding conduct or service in the line of duty.

Under the authority of that legislation, there have been 15 presentations (3 of which were posthumous awards) up to and including March 15, 1943. The list of the recipients, with a brief summary of the service for which each award was made, will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 23, 1943 (pp. 2304, 2305, and 2306).

That recognition, however, is not sufficient. Figures submitted by the Navy Department of casualties in the merchant marine show that, as of February 23, 1943, there were 509 dead and 3,108 missing.

A report (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A1365) by Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator, earlier in the year shows a toll of nearly 4 percent dead and missing during the first year of America's participation in the war, while, as emphasized by Admiral Land in that report, the casualties of the armed services during the same period amounted to less than 1 percent of their total number. Attention should be called to the fact that the casualty rate of the merchant marine does not include injuries. The percentage in the merchant marine list exceeded any armed service.

When reporting the bill to the House on March 29, 1943, Congressman JACKSON, who reported the bill, said:

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

There was considered in the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill (H. R. 7548), introduced by Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, whereby it was provided that the Secretary of Commerce was directed to cause to be prepared suitable emblematic devices which should be bestowed upon the officers and members of the crews of merchant vessels sailing in war zones, with further provision that no award of said devices shall be made to any person until sufficient evidence of his deserving shall be furnished and placed on file under such regulations as might be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce.

Hearings were held on the bill so introduced, and numerous suggestions were made. The patron of the bill, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, an officer in the United States Naval Reserve, after a service of 6 months with the naval forces in the present war, appearing in support of the bill, said:

"This is not a novel idea. The merchant marines of other nations have awarded their sailors similar devices. It was my experience to see and talk with many merchant sailors during the 6 months that I had the privilege of serving in our naval forces during the present conflict, and perhaps that has made me very sympathetic, but no one can meet these men and talk to them and see the burns they received on vessels that have been torpedoed which compelled them to swim in seas aflame without feeling that our Nation ought to award them some sort of distinctive device.

"Now, in addition to that, we are going to experience more difficulty every day in manning our merchant vessels not only because of the large number of vessels that are going over the ways every day but because men are just a little bit hesitant about engaging in this very hazardous vocation.

"It seems to me that the least our Nation can do is to give them some sort of a device which they can wear as a mark of distinction. This is not an award for meritorious service but it is a device that will take the place of the uniform that other men in the service wear, and the wearer won't be compelled to explain why he is not in uniform. I feel that the men who would be entitled to wear this device are performing services as dangerous and praiseworthy as those being performed by the men in the armed forces."

Numerous witnesses appeared in support of the proposed bill (H. R. 7548). Thereafter the bill was referred to the Maritime Commission for report, and Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and Administrator, War Shipping Administration, submitted a report dated December 22, 1942, a copy of which is appended to this report. There was submitted with the report the draft of legislation proposed by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, and on January 6, 1943, the chairman of this committee introduced that draft of H. R. 132, a copy of which is appended to this report and follows the report of Admiral Land, Chairman and Administrator above referred to.

Under date of February 1, 1943, Chairman Land submitted a further report, which is appended hereto and follows the reports above cited.

Subsequently hearings were held on the above bill (H. R. 132) and, while there was unanimity of opinion among the members of the committee as to the propriety and desirability of reporting favorably legislation to carry out the general purposes of H. R. 132, diverse suggestions were made with the result that a special subcommittee of members, consisting of Messrs. JACKSON (chairman), CAPOZZOLI, KING, BRADLEY, and VAN ZANDT, was created to consider all suggestions made and prepare an appropriate bill which would meet the views of the War Shipping Administration, the Maritime Commission, and the committee members. The subcommittee, after careful consideration of the various proposals and suggestions, unanimously agreed upon H. R. 2281, which was then introduced by the chairman of the committee. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has considered the bill (H. R. 2281) and report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill (H. R. 2281) carries out the purposes graphically and eloquently presented to the committee by Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, when he appeared before the committee in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

By Public Law No. 524, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942, provision was made for the award of medals to each person in the American merchant marine who, on or after September 8, 1939, has distinguished, or during the war should distinguish, himself by outstanding conduct or service in the line of duty.

Under the authority of that legislation there have been 15 presentations (3 of which were posthumous awards) up to and including March 15, 1943. The list of the recipients with a brief summary of the service for which each award was made, will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 23, 1943 (pp. 2304, 2305, and 2306).

That recognition, however, is not sufficient. Figures submitted by the Navy Department of casualties in the merchant marine show that, as of February 23, 1943, there were 509 dead and 3,108 missing.

A report by Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator, earlier in the year shows a toll of nearly 4 percent dead and missing during the first year of America's participation in the war, while, as emphasized by Admiral Land in that report, the casualties of the armed services during the same period amounted to less than 1 percent of their total number. Attention should be called to the fact that the casualty rate of the merchant marine does not include injuries. The percentage in the merchant marine list exceeded any armed service.

The report of Admiral Land referred to in the preceding paragraph will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. A1365 and A1366). Moreover, about three-fourths of the offshore seamen are always at sea. Theirs is the first line. They have pledged that the ships shall sail, and ships are sailing to far-flung outposts in all parts of the world. That pledge is being kept to the letter and with the fidelity of a sacred oath.

The devices provided by this bill are but slight recognitions for the splendid work of the men of the American merchant marine. The intrinsic value of each device is small, but it should prove an heirloom of great value—a badge of honor and of glory.

Mr. Speaker, supplementing what Mr. Jackson had to say in his report, I may add that the intrinsic value of each device may be small, but it should be a rich heirloom of honor and glory for generations yet to come. It is an heirloom of honor and of glory, which those receiving should cherish throughout life:

And, dying, mention it within their wills,
Bequeathing it as a rich legacy
Unto their issue.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Arnold	Culkin	Gibson
Barden	Dies	Gilchrist
Bates, Mass.	Dirksen	Gillie
Bradley, Pa.	Ditter	Gossett
Burch, Va.	Drewry	Guyer
Carson, Ohio	Elmer	Hagen
Case	Feighan	Hart
Chenoweth	Fellows	Hays
Creal	Furlong	Hoeven
Crosser	Gearhart	Hope

Izac	O'Konski	Sumner, Ill.
Jackson	O'Toole	Talbot
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, N. J.
Kunkel	Phillips	Treadway
Lambertson	Pittenger	Van Zandt
Lanham	Rockwell	Wadsworth
Lemke	Rogers, Calif.	Weaver
McGehee	Rowe	Welchel, Ohio
Magnuson	Sadowski	Wene
Maloney	Sasscer	Whelchel, Ga.
Marcantonio	Schwabe	White
Morrison, La.	Sheridan	Willey
Mott	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson
Mruk	Slaughter	Winter
Newsome	Somers, N. Y.	Wolverton, N. J.
Norton	Steagall	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address made here in Washington by Hon. Roan Waring, National Commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address made recently in Brooklyn, N. Y., by James A. Farley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from New York?

There was no objection.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT BILL OF 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed until 4 o'clock today and consume not to exceed 2 hours tomorrow, that the debate be confined to the bill, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2570, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, a little over a month ago our Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House a bill which provided for the collection of taxes at the source and contained a method whereby taxpayers, desiring voluntarily to do so, might become current in their tax payments. As a complete substitute for our committee bill, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], offered a revised version of the Ruml plan, about the fourth version, calling for the complete forgiveness of 1 year's taxes. These two propositions, after being fully discussed, were rejected by the House and our committee bill was recommitted for further consideration and action.

We interpreted this action on the part of the House as a mandate to our Committee on Ways and Means to report back a bill which avoids so far as possible the features of these two bills which the House objected to. If I understand the temper of the House, our committee bill was rejected because it did not go far enough toward making taxpayers current in their tax payments, and the Carlson-Ruml bill was rejected because it provided too large an amount of forgiveness. The mandate to us, then, was to prepare and report a new bill which would make taxpayers as nearly current as reasonably possible, but which would not contain the evil of forgiving completely 1 year's taxes as provided in the Ruml-Carlson bill. Our committee realized fully its obligation and duty to meet this objective and has endeavored to do so as expeditiously as possible. I believe the bill which we have reported meets the objections which led to the rejection of the previous bills and, I believe, if understood, will be found satisfactory and acceptable to the House and the taxpayer.

The difficulties of the problem which confronted our committee are now apparent to every Member of this body. It is impossible to achieve any satisfactory degree of currency without making the current tax burden too heavy unless the 1942 tax liabilities are materially reduced, or spread over a long period of time, or canceled. I have expressed my views on the complete forgiveness of a year's taxes, and a majority of our committee and the membership of this body have demonstrated their opposition to complete forgiveness. There were, then, two other avenues left open to us, namely, a partial cancelation of 1942 taxes or a spread of these liabilities over a number of years. There are many cogent reasons why the 1942 liabilities should not be spread over too long a period of time, the most important of which is that this tax money should be collected while the current of incomes caused by our war spending program is at full flood. To collect the entire 1942 liabilities over a short period of time would prove too burdensome. Therefore, it seemed to us that the best solution of this problem, in view of the recent action of the House, was to cancel a portion of the 1942 liabilities and to collect the balance over a comparatively short period with the administrative authority to extend the time further in cases of hardship.

Having arrived at this conclusion, it was necessary to select a measure of partial cancelation which would apply with equity and fairness to the various classes of taxpayers and to determine the period over which the remaining tax liability for 1942 should be discharged by the taxpayers without subjecting them to an unbearable burden.

The 1942 act, providing greatly reduced exemptions and very substantially increased rates, was not enacted until late in the fall of 1942. Seven million new taxpayers, thus, had no previous notice that they were taxable on their 1942 incomes until almost 10 months of the taxable year had passed. Moreover, persons who were already subject to income tax were unable to ascertain the increase in their 1942 burden under this act until the bill finally became law in the latter part of October. We all recognize that taxpayers are entitled to be forewarned of their tax obligations by being given reasonable notice so that preparation can be made to meet their increased burden. This is especially true when the rate increases and exemption decreases are as great as those provided in the 1942 act. We are now convinced that the retroactive application of the 1942 act was a mistake, as I had realized for some time. Honesty and consistency impel anyone to admit and rectify a mistake as soon as it is discovered.

In the light of these considerations, it was decided that the best solution of this perplexing problem and one which is fully justifiable is to eliminate for 1942 this increased burden upon those taxpayers already subject to income tax and to cancel it entirely in the case of the 7,000,000 new taxpayers brought in by the 1942 act. By removing this unanticipated burden for the year 1942 we will have relieved taxpayers of tax obligations totaling almost $5,000,000,000, or one-half of their 1942 tax burden. What measure of partial cancelation could be fairer than the rates and exemptions which would have been applicable for 1942 had the Revenue Act of 1942 not been made applicable to that year? The 7,000,000 new taxpayers will be relieved of their total liability for the year and the old taxpayers will be relieved to the same extent and in the same manner as the 1942 act increased their burden. The increases under the 1942 act were much larger in the lower and middle brackets than in the upper brackets. This was true since the upper bracket rates were already about as high as we could safely go. Consequently, in applying the 1941 rates and exemptions to 1942 incomes, less will be taken off in the upper brackets where the least increase was made by the 1942 act, and more will be taken off in the lower brackets where that act made the greatest increases. In other words, our measure of cancelation of 1942 liabilities is in direct ratio to our measure of increase in the 1942 rates over those applicable for 1941.

Under the bill, the uncanceled portion of 1942 liabilities is spread over a 3-year period. In the case of a calendar year taxpayer, one-third is payable on or before March 15, 1944; one-third on or before March 15, 1945, and one-third on or

before March 15, 1946. Thus to the current tax liabilities for each of the years 1943, 1944, and 1945 will be added one-third of the uncanceled portions of the 1942 liabilities. Amounts already paid in 1943 on account of the 1942 liabilities will be credited against the liabilities for 1943. These amounts may be prepaid if the taxpayer so elects. If he discharges the entire uncanceled portion of the 1942 liabilities by March 15, 1944, he is given a 6 percent discount and if he pays up in full by March 15, 1945, a 2-percent discount. If, on the other hand, these payments are not made on their due date, 6 percent interest is payable on the unpaid amounts.

This bill places all taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis, as nearly as possible, for 1943 and subsequent years. It does this by two methods. First, withholding of tax at the source at the rate of 20 percent on all wages and salaries in excess of credits and exemptions allowable. It should be distinctly understood that this withholding is not an additional tax but only a means of collecting existing taxes. These withholding provisions are identical with those contained in our previous bill and in the Ruml-Carlson bill. Of the 44,000,000 taxpayers, about 30,000,000 derive practically all of their income from wages and salaries which do not exceed the first surtax bracket. This group will be made current, or as nearly so as possible, by the withholding provisions, since practically all of their tax will be deducted from their pay.

Secondly, the remaining 14,000,000 taxpayers, which includes the self-employed, persons receiving income from property and other nonwage income, and those with wage and salary incomes extending beyond the first surtax bracket, are placed on a current basis by requiring them to declare their estimated income near the beginning of their taxable year and to make quarterly payments on that basis throughout the year.

The withholding provisions were fully discussed in our previous considerations and, I am sure, are so well understood as to require no further explanation here. I shall explain in broad outline, however, the provisions of our bill which place the self-employed and the larger wage earners on a pay-as-you-go basis, and will outline the methods by which the uncanceled 1942 liabilities are to be discharged.

For convenience in discussion we may divide our taxpayers into two general classes, the first of which consists of persons whose incomes are solely from salaries and wages and do not extend beyond the first surtax bracket; and the second of which is made up of individuals with incomes from salaries or wages which extend into the second surtax bracket, or higher, and persons who are self-employed or who are the recipients of income from property, such as dividends, interest, or rents. With respect to the 30,000,000 taxpayers in the first class, withholding at the source alone will accomplish full pay as you go.

All other persons fall into the second class and are required to declare their estimated income on March 15 of each year. Of course, they are also subject to withholding if they receive wages or salaries, just as are those persons in the first class. Their tax liability, as disclosed by their declaration, to the extent that it is not collected at the source, must then be paid by them in quarterly installments on March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15. On March 15 of the next year, then, they will make, as must also those taxpayers in the first class, a final return for the year which will disclose the correct final tax payable for the year.

If during the year it develops that the estimates which the taxpayer made in his declaration on March 15 are erroneous, a corrected estimate may be made either upward or downward and the subsequent tax payments are increased or reduced accordingly.

These provisions place the small wage earner, the large wage earner, the self-employed, and the recipient of income from property on a substantially comparable basis by requiring each of them to pay currently.

The situation of our farmers is substantially different from that of any other class of income-tax payers. His income is never realized until his harvest and the sale of his crop which, generally, is in the latter part of his taxable year. To require farmers early in their taxable years to attempt to estimate their income and tax liability would, we believe, impose an undue hardship. Consequently, for this class of taxpayers, the bill provides a special treatment under which no declaration of estimated tax payment is required until the last month of the taxable year. This treatment is limited to persons 80 percent or more of whose gross income comes from farming.

The provisions of the bill thus require some increases in payments until the uncanceled 1942 tax is discharged. We feel, however, that this is completely justifiable. The reduction of the 1942 tax liability will make the extent of the increased payments relatively slight. The amount of cancelation ranges from 100 percent in the lowest income group to about 10 percent in the highest group which will be further increased if the taxpayer takes advantages of the discounts allowed under the bill. A married man with a $1,500 income will have no increase. A married person with a net income of $5,000 will pay an additional amount of $119.20 a year for each year of the 3-year period. A $10,000 man will pay an additional amount of $430.64 for each year of the 3-year period, while these increases may cause the uncanceled 1942 tax, plus the current liability, to exceed 1 year's income in some of the higher brackets, it should be remembered that the tax is paid out of several years' income and that most of the taxpayers in the higher brackets have accumulated savings to pay these taxes. In such cases there is no increased burden whatever. Moreover, the taxpayer can pay this tax in three installments without interest, the first installment not being due until March 15, 1944, which should give him ample time to prepare to meet this obligation. If payment of any installment will result in undue hardship, the Commissioner may grant additional time, not to exceed 3 additional years, upon the payment of 6-percent interest. These increased payments are believed justifiable at the present time because of the great need for increased revenue and the desire of the taxpayer to become current in his tax payments. Of course, any increase of tax payments should be taken into account in determining whether it is necessary or advisable to further increase the individual tax burden.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What happens to the taxpayer who has paid one-half of the 1942 taxes? Will he be given 3 years for the payment of the last half?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Whatever is paid in 1943 will be credited against 1943 tax liabilities. The uncanceled portion of the 1942 tax liability is payable one-third in 1944, one-third in 1945, and one-third in 1946.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to that statement which the gentleman from North Carolina has just made, if my friend from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] pays his 1942 tax liability on March 15, 1944, in full, he gets the 6-percent discount.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He gets the 6-percent discount, just as any other taxpayer would.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the payments we made on March 15, and the ones that we will make on June 15, next month, will, under the gentleman's bill, apply on the 1943 tax liability?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then our withholding tax July 1 to December 31 will also apply on our 1943 tax liability?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And thus as of December 31 we will be current, as far as 1943 is concerned.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You will be current just as far as you can anticipate, and final settlement will be on March 15 of the next year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And in further reply to the gentleman from Michigan, by the end of 1943, of the 44,000,000 American taxpayers, 30,000,000 will become current by collection at the source.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; for a question.

Mr. McLEAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] says that under this statement, by the end of 1943 all taxpayers will be current. I am sure that he did not mean that, because he does not take into consideration the 1942 unpaid taxes, which you undertake to collect in 1944, 1945, and 1946.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman from Tennessee is speaking of the 30,000,000 who discharged their full liability by having 20 percent of their income collected at the source.

Mr. COOPER. Of course these deferred payments are not due until 1944. The first payment on that is not due until 1944.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, for a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course the House should remember——

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, if the gentleman wants to make a speech, I do not yield.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOUGHTON. For a question.

Mr. McLEAN. I would like to further understand the gentleman from Tennessee in his statement that your bill seeks to make the taxpayers current at the conclusion of the tax year of 1943.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It will make him just as current as any other bill will. There never will be a bill that will make every one of the taxpayers absolutely current. It is a humbug to say that you can make every taxpayer current, and nobody knows it better than the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not want to excite the gentleman. I simply want to understand about the matter.

Mr. COOPER. Allow me to state it in this way. By the end of 1943, of the 44,000,000 income taxpayers, 30,000,000 will become current by paying their taxes through the withholding of tax at the source.

Mr. McLEAN. What portion——

Mr. DOUGHTON. I decline to yield further.

Mr. McLEAN. What portion of that tax——

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman is talking in my time, and I decline to yield.

Mr. McLEAN. If the gentleman does not want to clarify it now, we will clarify it later.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, the gentleman need not lose his head. He had better keep cool. There is no use losing your head. That is a sign of a lost cause when you lose your head. I do not yield further. I will yield to the gentleman if he will ask me a question, but I will not yield for him to get into a colloquy with the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not think that would be helpful at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina declines to yield.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I decline to yield because I do not have time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I said I would yield for a question. He wants to make a speech, and I do not yield for that purpose. The gentleman can make his own speech in his own time, if he has any speech to make.

Mr. McLEAN. May I ask a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not now. You lost your time for that. I am not going to have my time taken up by a filibuster.

I hope I have made a satisfactory explanation of our bill. If not, I will say that we will not vote on this until tomorrow, and if the explanation I have made is not sufficient, I suggest that the Members read the committee report. It contains a full explanation of what our bill proposes to accomplish, and what it will accomplish if it is adopted and enacted into law.

Now I come to the latest version of the Ruml-Carlson plan, which I never saw until this morning.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask one other question? How many of the 44,000,000 taxpayers liable under the 1942 act as now calculated, will be eliminated from any tax liability on 1944 income by reason of applying the 1941 rates and 1941 exemptions and credits?

Mr. DOUGHTON. About 7,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. About 7,000,000 of the 44,000,000 will be canceled out completely, without even having to pay any kind of a tax?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Their liability is entirely abated, yet it is said that our bill is one that is harder on the weak than on the strong. My objections to the Ruml-Carlson plan previously rejected by the House are well known, as they were stated in my remarks on the floor when the previous bills were under consideration. However, I feel that I should summarize the fallacies and the heterodoxy of this iniquitous tax policy.

Its adoption would be unjustifiable at any time, but at this time when our Nation is fighting for its very life, when taxpayers are enjoying the largest incomes, wages, and salaries since the foundation of this Government, to forgive anything like an entire year's tax, in my judgment is not only unjustifiable but is absolutely unthinkable. I cannot understand why anybody can urge that such a course should be pursued at a time like this.

Among the many reasons why I oppose this legislation are the following:

First. The Ruml plan, which the minority has taken to its bosom, would grant complete tax forgiveness to all taxpayers for 1 year's taxes. In effect, it would repeal the income-tax law for 1 year and collect only 1 year's taxes out of 2 years' income, at a time when taxpayers are or have been enjoying the largest income in our history and the Government is in its direst need of revenue.

In other words, it would repeal the income tax for 1 entire year, for one of the years 1941, 1942, or 1943, all war years, when incomes are larger and salaries and wages are higher than in all the history of this country; and that cannot be successfully disputed. Of course, they have a little dope in there—

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not yield to my distinguished friend. We only have 2 or 3 hours today and 2 hours tomorrow.

Second. Its adoption would be seriously injurious to the morale of our people, especially those in the armed forces, since it would result in economic gain rather than sacrifice on the home front. It would cause taxpayers to think the payment of taxes is not an important matter but one to be treated lightly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman at this point please tell the House just how much revenue the Treasury will lose under the Ruml plan this year, next year, and the following year?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, how much will you lose in all? How much will the taxpayer gain? How much will the taxpayer be forgiven? How much will they never pay? If you forgive any year's tax, then will it ever be paid? If it is never paid you know the Government loses.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the Treasury estimate is that for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 the Treasury will lose more than three and one-half billion dollars under the Carlson bill as compared with the committee bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. That statement is not true.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, it is true.

Mr. COOPER. It is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EATON. Just as a confused layman, I am puzzled to know if you forgive a year's taxes in the committee bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We cancel that part of the tax, attributable to the increases made by the 1942 act, of which the taxpayers had no knowledge until that act was passed late in 1942. We do that because the House had said by its previous votes on this subject that it thought there should be some measure of forgiveness. That is all the forgiveness one can possibly justify, and it can be justified on the ground that a taxpayer is entitled to know as early as possible what he has to pay.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman tell me why it is all right to forgive half of the taxes and wicked to forgive all of them?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman knows himself that there is a difference between paying a tax that you have knowledge of a year ahead and paying a tax that is imposed on you at the end of the year of which liability you had no knowledge and could have had no way of making preparation to pay. I am sure the gentleman understands it; I know he comprehends it, that he realizes it and appreciates it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I cannot yield; time for debate is very limited on this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to find out about that $3,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman can find out about that from some of his associates.

Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the Ruml plan when I was interrupted and had got down to the antiwindfall provision. The new version of the Ruml-Carlson plan contains a so-called antiwindfall provision, but Mr. Chairman, that is a superficial treatment of a fundamental evil.

Third. The Ruml plan will produce an unjustifiable windfall to persons in the higher brackets, especially those making unusual profits during the war years, enriching them at the expense of their Government and fellow taxpayers. The cost of these windfalls must eventually be borne by persons in the middle and lower brackets and by future taxpayers, many of whom will be our returning soldiers, sailors, and marines.

The added windfall provision of the latest version of the Ruml-Carlson plan is a delusion and a subterfuge. The big windfall, and the one which our committee bill avoids, is the total forgiveness of one full year's taxes, whether it be for 1941, 1942, or 1943, all years in which extra profits were made and increased wages and salaries received on account of the war. The treatment given in the substitute bill as to added windfalls is but superficial treatment of a fundamental evil or difficulty. It is the creation of a blister to cure a cancer. It is the straining at a gnat and the swallowing of a camel. It is the loss of a dollar by the collection of a dime or a cent.

Fourth. Its greatest benefits would go to those least deserving them and its greatest burdens would fall upon the backs of those least able to bear them. The 60 taxpayers with incomes of $1,000,000 would each receive an unjust enrichment of at least $854,000. At one stroke, the Ruml plan would add to their wealth more than they would save in 6 years if they saved every cent of their income after taxes. I cannot too strongly emphasize that if this tax subsidy is granted to the strong and able, the weak and less able will have to foot the bill.

Fifth. It is a delusion to those in the lower and middle brackets who do not realize that such a tax forgiveness will have to be borne by them in increases in the subsequent years. This burden will also fall heavily upon the new taxpayers, who will receive no benefit at all from complete cancelation of a year's taxes and may in future years receive no increased income on account of the war, but may receive much less income.

There are a hundred valid reasons why the Ruml-Carlson plan should not be adopted, and not one single sound reason justifying its adoption: And I trust that it will be overwhelmingly rejected and killed so dead that it will never again be resurrected.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is the difference between swallowing a camel and swallowing a crow?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman is an expert on asking questions that a philosopher could not answer and that he does not know anything about himself. This is a discussion of a tax question about which honest men may differ. In my original statement when the other bill was under consideration I said that I did not question the sincerity or honesty of the minority members of my committee, and I do not now. I do question the philosophy and the soundness of their position; but here is what they say about us, here is what they say about the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee:

> The majority members of the Ways and Means Committee not only have strenuously resisted our efforts to bring about the enactment of the Ruml-Carlson plan, but have sought, by a campaign of misrepresentation and demagogy, to discredit it in the eyes of the Congress and the people.

And then over on the next page of the report, not satisfied with that, they repeat the same thing:

> Rejection of the Ruml-Carlson plan by a narrow margin at that time can be traced almost solely to the unprincipled assault by the Democratic majority, which was based, not on fact or appeal to reason but on specious and demagogic premises.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, they say our bill is very difficult to understand, to explain, to comprehend. I ask the Clerk to read from page 9 of the minority report, beginning with subsection (b), the explanation of a portion of the Carlson plan, and after you listen to it I ask you what you think of that explanation. If our bill is complex and difficult to understand it will be absolutely impossible to understand the Carlson bill. I ask the Clerk to read, and if you can understand it I wish you would get up and tell me what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> (b) Taxpayers with substantial income whose 1942 and 1943 incomes are substantially greater than 1941 income: Section 2 (c) of the substitute contains a special rule for the case in which both the 1942 and 1943 incomes are more than $5,000 in excess of the 1941 income.
>
> The following example explains this provision and illustrates how it will operate:
>
> Example: Taxpayer whose income as a result of the war has increased to $1,200,000: John Smith, single, had a surtax net income for 1941, 1942, and 1943 as follows: 1941, $100,000; 1942, $1,200,000; 1943, $1,000,000. Thus both his 1942 and 1943 income are greatly in excess of his 1941 income of $100,000. His 1943 war profits will be taxed as part of his 1943 income at the existing rates, and the tax thereon will be paid currently in 1943 out of his 1943 income. If any of his 1941 income represented war profits, that was taxed under the 1941 law, and the tax thereon paid out of 1942 income, but the 1941 tax so paid was small in relation to the income of 1942 out of which it was paid. Section 2 (c) of the substitute is designed to prevent the abatement of the 1942 tax from resulting in the abatement of taxes attributable to his war profits in 1942, which have borne only a small tax burden in relation to the 1942 income. Section 2 (b) has already added to his 1943 tax the amount by which his 1942 tax exceeds his 1943 tax, so the portion of his 1942 income to which such excess is attributable is already taxed under section 2 (b) of the substitute. Hence the only portion of his 1942 income which thus far under the substitute has not borne its just tax burden is the portion thereof which is greater than the 1941 income and not greater than the 1943 income, with an allowance of $5,000 for reasonable fluctuations in income. This portion is the excess of $1,000,000 (the part of the 1942 income which is not greater than the 1943 income) over $105,000 (the 1941 income plus $5,000), or $895,000. Under section 2 (c) this $895,000 is taxed at the regular normal and surtax rates, resulting in a tax of $762,740, which is added to the 1943 tax computed under existing law and section 2 (b) of the substitute. The taxpayer may get an extension of time not exceeding 3 years to pay this additional amount.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The taxpayer will need that additional 3 years to understand that explanation.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the minority report; that is the reason.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; that is it; it was not meant to mean anything; it does not mean anything. Nobody on earth can understand it; you cannot explain it in 3 years so the average man can understand it. Then they talk about gifts to the taxpayers and the committee bill being complicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Here is some more inconsistency. On page 3 of the minority report it is stated:

> While the committee bill soaks the rich it also soaks most of the rest of the taxpayers, as is apparent from the burden tables which appear in the appendix to this report, to which we invite careful attention.

It says that the committee bill soaks the rich. Now, turn over to the next page of the same minority report where it is stated:

> This discount plan would be of benefit to few, if any, of the taxpayers in the lower-income brackets, to whom the payment of a single year's taxes in a given year is already a serious financial burden. On the other hand, it would amount to a lush bonus to the wealthy or fortunate few.

We "soak" them, and we give them a "lush bonus," according to which page of the minority report you happen to be reading. Now, the gentlemen will explain that.

That, Mr. Chairman, is an example of the inconsistency, the ridiculous inconsistency, of this minority report from one end to the other. But it is the very best they could do. I do not accuse my friends of being demagogs. They have brought back here practically the same bill that was defeated before, which is almost in contempt of the House. We did not bring back the same one. I believe we have obeyed the mandate of the House and in obeying the mandate of the House we have brought out the

fairest and the most equitable one to both the taxpayers and the Government that could possibly be evolved.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following letter from Mr. Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury Department:

GENERAL COUNSEL,
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 3, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In considering the tables of estimated income-tax liabilities sent to you today, it may be helpful to have before you in simple form a comparison of 1942 tax liabilities under present law, under H. R. 2570, and under the latest Carlson variation of the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan. Tax liabilities with respect to 1942 incomes total $9,315,200,000 under present law. The special exclusion treatment for incomes of the armed forces under both H. R. 2570 and the Carlson plan would reduce liabilities by $363,900,000 for the calendar year 1942, leaving $8,451,300,000 tax liabilities after allowing for such exclusion.

Under H. R. 2570 the remission of 1942 income-tax liabilities amounts to $4,671,600,000 of the total $9,451,300,000. Under the Carlson plan the whole $9,451,300,000 is remitted, but this remission is offset to the extent of $916,400,000 by two special provisions, one estimated to yield $455,900,000 and the other estimated to yield $460,500,000, a total of $916,400,000. The net remission under the Carlson plan is thus $8,534,900,000.

In terms of tax liabilities remaining after remission, H. R. 2570 leaves subject to collection a 1942 tax liability of $4,779,700,000, while under the Carlson plan the amount subject to collection would be $916,400,000. These figures do not take into account the discounts provided in H. R. 2570 for prompt payment.

The above figures may be tabulated in summary form as follows:

	Millions of dollars
Individual income tax liability, 1942, present law	9,815.2
Reduction in liability due to exclusion of $3,500 service pay of armed forces (H. R. 2570 and Carlson plan)	363.9
Remaining 1942 liability	9,451.3
Remission under H. R. 2570	4,671.6
Subject to collection under H. R. 2570	4,779.7
Remission under Carlson plan	9,451.3
Offsets:	
Where 1943 income is less than 1942	455.9
Where 1942 and 1943 incomes are greater than 1941	460.5
Total offsets	916.4
Net remission Carlson plan	8,534.9
Subject to collection under Carlson plan	916.4

I will be glad to furnish any further information that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

RANDOLPH E. PAUL,
General Counsel.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated that he did not question the integrity or good intentions of the minority group of that committee. I want to return the compliment. The majority group is made up of honest, hard-working, sincere men, and far be it from me to question their sincerity. I merely question their good judgment.

The bill that was brought out, and I am speaking now of the majority bill, is a most confusing document. I do not wonder that it confused the Secretary of the Treasury and the general counsel of the Treasury. The author of the bill himself is confused over just what it means as was shown by the colloquy that took place a few moments ago. I shall not attempt to explain the majority bill because, in common with others, I do not fully understand it. By compromising principle, the majority attempts to do an impossible thing, and I know the people are bitterly disappointed in the product that they have brought to the floor for your consideration today.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the extensive debate on this subject which was held a few weeks ago anything more that may be said upon the subject would of necessity be more or less repetitious except as it might deal with changes in the present committee bill over the previous committee bill and with the modifications which have been made in the Ruml-Carlson plan which will be offered by the minority as a substitute for the present bill at the proper time.

In their previous bill the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee turned their backs on the pay-as-you-earn objective and reported to the House a makeshift bill which made no taxpayer current except by paying 2 full years' taxes in 1 year. That measure it will be recalled was overwhelmingly rejected by the House on March 30. At that time, however, the House came within a few votes of adopting the Republican-sponsored Ruml-Carlson plan as a substitute for the committee measure, notwithstanding the specious and demagogic criticism of the plan made by the majority members of the committee.

It is to be hoped that the House in reconsidering at this time the issues at stake will be permitted to resolve the question solely on the basis of fact and merit.

While the previous action of the House on this matter failed to settle the issue, at least some progress has been made. No longer is there any question of whether personal income taxes for 1943 and subsequent years shall be collected currently. The majority of the committee, in reporting their new measure to the House, has conceded that point. Thus the committee bill, insofar as it applies to 1943 and subsequent years, now has exactly the same provisions as the Ruml-Carlson plan. The only difference between the two measures is with regard to the treatment of the 1942 tax liability.

In deciding between the two measures, the House needs to determine only two matters:

First. Whether the transition to a current collection basis shall be accomplished without added burden to the taxpayers, as provided in the Ruml-Carlson plan, or whether it shall involve the payment of more than 1 year's tax in a given year, as provided in the committee bill; and,

Second. Whether collections shall become fully current immediately, as provided in the Ruml-Carlson plan, or at a date several years hence, as would be the case under the committee bill.

The bill which the majority of the Ways and Means Committee has presented is an attempt to compromise on a question of principle. It was written under duress. The majority had previously taken a stand in stubborn resistance to any abatement of the 1942 assessment in connection with shifting to a current collection basis. After their position had been repudiated by the House, and I may say by an overwhelming majority of the American people, they were under pressure from all sides to bring the matter of pay-as-we-earn legislation back to the House for reconsideration.

I can understand, and you gentlemen on our side should sympathize with, the predicament in which the majority members of the committee find themselves. They have heard from home. The letters they have received were not altogether laudatory or commendatory. I received a number of carbon copies of letters that were addressed to the majority members of the committee, so I know whereof I speak.

The majority's present bill is not the product of reason. Rather it is a hybrid measure representing a compromise between stubborn adherence to an unsound position on the one hand and political expediency on the other.

The majority have gotten themselves into their untenable position by viewing the question of the abatement of 1942 assessment as if it necessarily involved a complete loss of revenue to the Treasury, which, of course, it would not, since it would be offset by moving forward by 1 year the time for the 1943 assessment and all future assessments to be paid. The Treasury will collect $3,000,000,000 more revenue under the Carlson plan than under existing law.

I do not think even the gentleman from North Carolina would attempt to dispute that statement. So it follows that, instead of the Treasury losing revenue under the Carlson plan, it will gain $3,000,000,000 by moving the tax clock forward 1 year.

The fact is that if 1943 taxes are made payable currently, then the collection of all or any part of the 1942 assessment is just that much additional burden on the taxpayers, and it is in this realistic and practical light that the Republican minority have viewed the question. This explains the diametrically opposed viewpoints of the Republican and Democratic Members regarding the abatement question and makes clear why these viewpoints cannot be reconciled or compromised.

Under the committee bill, it is proposed to abate approximately $4,400,000,000 of the $9,800,000,000 1942 assessment, which means that the remaining

$5,400,000,000 of the 1942 liability will have to be paid in addition to current taxes.

You will recall how the majority Members referred to the Carlson bill in very uncomplimentary terms and one dear brother went so far as to call it sinful. Since then the majority have compromised with sin and they have gone halfway. It must be that they think there are different grades of sin—big sins and little sins. In my reading of the Scripture I have never found any passage where sin is graded like grain or cotton or some other commodity, but evidently the majority feel it is a relative matter, and they have gone halfway. Of course, that is encouraging, because it shows that the majority not only have heard from home but they are opening their eyes. It is to be regretted that they saw fit to bring in a bill that no one understands, not even the Treasury Department. I do not know whether the Treasury experts drafted the bill or not, but if they did, they have not come forward to claim the credit, and I do not blame them.

It reminds me of the story Bill Nye used to tell. He was traveling on a train through Indiana. The train came to a little town and stopped. A couple were standing out on the platform. They kissed each other good-bye and the lady got on the train. In a little while she came over and sat down beside Mr. Nye and started to talk to him. She said, "That was my husband I just left at the station." And Bill said, "If that had been any relative of mine, I would gladly refrain from saying so."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman what provisions in the Ruml-Carlson bill——

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will explain his bill. I am analyzing the committee bill, and it is a hard job, because I gave up criminal practice a long time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Under the committee bill, the unabated portion of the 1942 liability would be collected over a period of 3 years, in addition to current taxes for those years. This would result in the addition of approximately $1,800,000,000 annually to the personal income-tax burden during this period. In other words, there would be that much doubling up each year for 3 years.

The abatement of the 1942 liability under the committee bill is not on the same basis for all taxpayers. Some would receive an abatement of as much as 100 percent and some as little as 10 percent. Thus the committee bill would discriminate unfairly between taxpayers, and would require the greatest degree of doubling-up where, under the progressive rate schedule, the burden is already the greatest.

The committee bill involves an even more retrogressive scale of abatement than is embraced in the so-called Robertson-Forand plan, which heretofore has been criticized by some of the stanchest supporters of the committee bill because of this feature. In the upper brackets it will result in an outright capital levy by taking over 100 percent of the taxpayer's income each year for 3 years. On page 7 of the minority report there is a table showing the additional burden by various income levels. That table discloses that the point at which the committee bill would take over 100 percent of the taxpayer's income for each of the next 3 years, is somewhat below the $250,000 level. On a $250,000 income a $10,000 capital levy is imposed in addition to taking 100 percent of the current income for each of 3 years. On $500,000 the tax exceeds the income by $57,000 for each of the next 3 years. On a million dollars it exceeds the income by $144,000 each year. Even at the $50,000 level, 70 percent of the current income would be taken for taxes each year over a 3-year period. I hold no brief for those in the upper brackets, but if this be a democracy all should be treated fairly

If the committee bill does not amount to a capital levy in the upper income brackets, I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to explain to the House just what it does do.

Mr. COOPER. It certainly does not do that. The gentleman said that neither he nor anyone else understood the committee bill, so how is he prepared to analyze it?

Mr. KNUTSON. Because there are patches that are lucid, especially the provisions relating to doubling up. When I said that nobody understood it, I meant that the bill as a whole is so involved and so interwoven and everything else that even the distinguished chairman of the committee could not answer some of the questions that were asked him when he had the floor.

Heretofore, the only people who have stood for capital levies are the Communists, the Nazis and the Fascists. These groups are no doubt pleased to have the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee join their ranks.

The majority members of the committee attempt to defend their abatement plan by saying that they are reducing the 1942 tax to the extent it was retroactively increased under the 1942 revenue bill. This contention may offer them some face-saving solace in retreating from their previous position in opposition to the abatement of any part of the 1943 assessment. However, the fact is that while they would, in effect, recompute the 1942 liability on the basis of the 1941 rates and exemptions, they would nevertheless require taxpayers to pay this reduced liability in addition to current taxes over the next 3 years, which means a substantial added burden on taxpayers.

Under the Ruml-Carlson plan all taxpayers will be made immediately current without any doubling-up in their tax payments. But under the committee bill most of the present taxpayers could only become current by a substantial doubling-up in their payments during the next 3 years, and they could only become immediately current by paying 2 year's taxes in 1 year—the 1941 tax applied to 1942 income, plus the 1943 tax. Would not that be a doubling of taxes? Surely it would, and that is what we Republicans are seeking to avoid.

Not only does the committee bill pile an additional tax burden on the already overburdened taxpayers during the next 3 years, but by deferring until March 15, 1946, the time within which most taxpayers would be fully current in their payments, the committee bill defeats the main objective of a current collection system, which is to relieve taxpayers of any overhanging income-tax debt.

We should not forget that the compelling motive for placing income-tax payments on a current pay-as-you-earn basis has been the necessity of preparing for the day when the war ends and millions of taxpayers will be jobless or on reduced incomes. If the income tax is not then on a fully current basis millions of persons, mostly in the lower income brackets, will have hanging over them a full year's tax liability at a time when they may have nothing but relief checks out of which to pay it.

Unless the majority can say definitely that the war will continue until 1947, then they have failed to meet this problem, since it will not be until then that taxpayers will be fully current under their plan.

The majority recognize this inherent weakness in their plan when they offer liberal discounts if taxpayers discharge in advance the additional tax burden which is imposed upon them by the committee bill. However, this discount plan would be of benefit to only a relatively few well-to-do persons, who may have sufficient funds on hand to pay more than 1 year's taxes in 1 year. These well-to-do persons will get their 6-percent interest under the committee bill, but the great masses of the taxpayers, who are mostly in the lower income brackets and who are already having a difficult time meeting their present tax liability, will be unable to avail themselves of any such advantage unless they choose to borrow the money from loan companies who in some States charge as much interest as 3 percent and 3½ percent per month.

Aside from the fact that the committee bill's discount provisions would be a bonus to the wealthy, they may be criticized from the further standpoint that they would require the Government to pay 6-percent interest for the use of money it could otherwise borrow for 2¼ percent or less. Also their plan is a direct invitation to taxpayers to cash in their War bonds to take advantage of the 6-percent interest allowed for prepayments of the installments on the additional tax burden under the committee bill.

As contrasted with the simplicity of the Ruml-Carlson plan, both in its essential features and its operation and administration, the committee bill would entail numerous administrative complications. Simplicity was obviously

thrown out the window when it was drawn. As is stated in the minority report:

Recomputation of the 1942 tax assessment on the basis of 1941 rates and exemptions, plus a 3-year spread of this overhanging liability, plus the discount features, plus the fact that some people will be partially current, others wholly current, and some not current at all during certain stages in the tax melee, can only lead to the conclusion that in the committee bill we have the tax lawyer's dream and the loan shark's "seventh heaven". The latter, especially, will do a rush business when hard-pressed taxpayers discover that the Democratic majority's bill "to provide payment currently of individual income taxes, and for other purposes" has actually raised their taxes by nearly five and one-half billion dollars or 50 percent.

Now, may I say a few words in regard to the parliamentary situation that will probably develop. I should like to have the attention of the Members so that they may know what to look for and not be taken by surprise as they were on March 30. I think this is quite important, and I beg the indulgence of the House for just a few moments while I call attention to it.

Only one substitute proposal will be offered by the minority, and that is the Ruml-Carlson proposal as modified, copies of which are available at the desk in printed form. The issue here is between our proposal and the committee bill, and Members may just as well face that fact when they cast their votes tomorrow.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I do not believe the gentleman should leave the impression that that will be the only substitute offered, because the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I still have a substitute which we hope to offer. We feel confident the Ruml-Carlson bill will be defeated and we shall have an opportunity to offer our substitute.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will recall, he had his substitute ready on March 30, and a parliamentary situation developed that left so many of your Members hanging on the end of a limb that it was necessary for you folks to report out a new bill in order to get them back onto terra firma.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman will admit that the motion to recommit without any further consideration was made on the Republican side, will he not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, but our motion was not made until the Speaker was about to put the question on the final passage of the committee bill. We did not foreclose you from offering your motion. That was done by your Democratic colleagues when they moved the previous question on the committee bill. That same situation might conceivably develop again, and if it does we must act accordingly.

Mr. FORAND. You assume the responsibility.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether or not a motion to recommit is expected to be made on this bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. That depends upon what is before the House on the question of final passage. If the committee bill is the only choice, then, of course, we would offer the Carlson substitute as a motion to recommit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman mean to inform us that should the Ruml-Carlson substitute fail of adoption, a motion to recommit will probably be offered?

Mr. KNUTSON. If the Ruml-Carlson plan is not adopted, we will offer a motion to recommit, but I do not anticipate that it will be defeated, so this discussion is more or less academic.

Beginning on page 8 of the minority report, there appears a full and detailed explanation of the revised Ruml-Carlson plan. Time will not permit me to discuss its various provisions. Other members of the committee, particularly the able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the equally able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] will do so in their remarks.

The main features of the plan are well understood by the House, and it is not necessary for me to explain it further.

In offering the Ruml-Carlson plan, the Republican minority are simply attempting to make good the previous assurance given by the Treasury and the Democratic majority last winter that they would join with us in enacting a plan to put personal income taxes on a current pay-as-we-earn basis this year.

The Democratic majority chose to ignore the pledge, therefore it was necessary for the Republican minority to bring in a bill to make their promise good; and this we have done by offering the Ruml-Carlson proposal. Our sole objective is to make taxpayers current, so that they will not be called upon, when they lose their jobs or suffer a reduced income, or die, to pay a fat year's taxes in a lean year. Under our plan they will pay their tax as they earn the money rather than 1 year afterward, when in most instances the money has been spent.

The Ruml-Carlson proposal is not just a temporary expedient. Rather, it would substitute for the present antiquated collection system a current collection system which is designed not only to give taxpayers a method of meeting their present high burden with a minimum of hardship and a maximum of convenience, but to put the income tax on a more sound basis so far as the Treasury itself is concerned. It would set up a modern, streamlined collection system which would endure as long as the Republic stands.

To those who felt that the former Ruml-Carlson bill did not make sufficient provision for recapturing so-called windfalls and war profits, let me say that the Ruml-Carlson substitute for the committee bill, which will be offered tomorrow, has been modified to bring the antiwindfall provisions down to the $5,000 taxable income level and to tax at the full rates any swollen war income in the year which would otherwise be abated under the plan. In other words, there will be no abatement under the modified Ruml-Carlson plan on that portion of any income which represents over $5,000 of swollen war profits. Also, where the taxable net income exceeds $5,000, the tax for 1943 will be based on whichever of the 2 years' income—1942 or 1943—is the higher.

These provisions are fully explained in the minority report on page 8. The committee bill, I might point out, has no such provisions against "windfalls" or the escape of war profits from their fair share of the tax burden.

During the consideration of the previous legislation on this subject, much was said about the benefits that would accrue under the Ruml-Carlson plan to "the 60 families," meaning, of course, the 60 wealthiest taxpayers. As I recall, the President estimated it would be in the neighborhood of $50,000,000. In order to set their minds and consciences at rest, let me say to the squeamish Democratic majority that any benefit which those 60 families might receive under the Ruml-Carlson plan would not occur until the death of the taxpayer, and then the Federal estate tax, which embraces returns up to 70 percent, would recapture any benefit which might then accrue.

For fear of benefiting 60 taxpayers, the Democratic majority are willing to punish 37,000,000 other taxpayers, the overwhelming majority of whom are made up of farmers, factory workers, office workers, small businessmen, and professional people, with incomes in the lower brackets.

How does the attitude of the Democratic majority on this matter square with their breast-beating declarations throughout their history as a party, that they favor the "greatest good for the greatest number"?

All this talk of "forgiveness" under the Ruml-Carlson plan is a misnomer. If it has any application at all, it is only in an accounting or bookkeeping sense, since the abatement of the overhanging 1942 liability is simply to clear the way for advancing by 1 year the time within which the 1943 liability, and that for all future years, must be paid.

In brief, what the Ruml-Carlson plan does is simply to change the basis of 1943 tax payments from the 1942 income to 1943 income. The Ruml-Carlson plan would actually bring in $3,000,000,000 more revenue to the Treasury this year than would the present law, since it would collect 1943 taxes on the basis of the $13,000,000,000 1943 assessment, rather than on the $10,000,000,000 1942 assessment.

We did not lose any sunshine when the President turned the clock ahead 1 hour, and we will not lose any revenue if the tax clock is turned ahead 1 year, so that taxes will be paid currently instead of in the year after the income is earned.

The revenue will continue to flow into the Treasury without interruption. Thus, under the Ruml-Carlson plan, the

Treasury in the next hundred years would continue to collect 100 year's taxes, and in a thousand years it would collect a thousand year's taxes. The only difference would be that when the Treasury closes its books at the crack of doom, it would still have as an uncollected and uncollectible item a year's tax liability owing from the people if the present year-behind collection system is continued. Whereas, under the Ruml-Carson plan it would not. Of course, under the circumstances stated, this book asset would have no value anyway.

In the final analysis the abatement under the Ruml-Carlson plan would merely be a bookkeeping transaction, which has been very aptly illustrated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN JOHNSON] who likens the situation to a string of boxcars of indefinite length each containing 1 year's tax receipts, one of which will be unloaded at the Treasury each year. The whole question boils down to whether the first boxcar shall be numbered 1942 or 1943. It is as simple as that.

In the debate on the previous Ruml-Carlson plan, the Democratic majority not only shuddered at the thought of any abatement of the 1942 liability, but called it sinful. Since then the Democratic majority have swallowed their qualms and embraced sin. They now think it is all right to be 50-percent sinful, which is quite a concession to popular demand and the imperative need of the Treasury. If the abatement of the 1942 liability is wrong in principle, then the majority's present bill is indefensible, because it involves an abatement of $4,400,000,000. But if it is right in principle to abate half the 1942 assessment, then it is right to go the whole way, particularly when no loss of revenue is involved, and when by so doing there is no doubling up in anyone's tax payments.

Considering the statements the Members of the majority have heretofore made with reference to the question of abatement, I feel I must compliment them on at least having gone as far as they have in the matter. To use a common expression, they have had to eat a lot of crow.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Canada, where income taxpayers have heretofore been on what is tantamount to a 50-percent current basis, the Government has recently taken action to abate the remaining half of the 1942 liability, so that 1943 taxes can be collected on a current basis with no doubling up.

In proposing the change to the Canadian Parliament, the Finance Minister said:

> The adoption of the pay-as-we-earn plan, together with the other changes associated with it, will increase our revenues in the next fiscal year and in subsequent years. It may seem strange at first sight that a rearrangement which involves canceling some tax liabilities and making no increase in tax rates could somehow increase our tax revenues. The reason is that we replace the canceled liabilities by bringing forward the taxes to be paid in all future years.

Nowhere in the Finance Minister's full statement was there any suggestion that the abatement of the remainder of the 1942 assessment would in any way threaten the solvency of the Canadian treasury, or discriminate unfairly as between taxpayers.

Canada has in effect adopted the principal of the Ruml-Carlson plan 100 percent. Since we in the United States are a full year behind in our collections, we must abate the entire overhanging tax liability of 1942 as provided in the Ruml-Carlson plan in order to accomplish the same end with no doubling up.

In this country two of our States, Washington and Wisconsin, have made the transition to a current basis without requiring taxpayers to double up in their payments.

The committee bill is neither a satisfactory nor a straightforward method of achieving currency in tax payments.

The Ruml-Carlson plan is the only plan which will give the people a real pay-as-you-earn tax system, and they will not be satisfied with anything short of it.

The Ruml-Carlson plan is based on reason and common sense. It is as sound as it is simple.

It accomplishes the objective of placing taxpayers on a current pay-as-you-earn basis immediately, and not at some distant time.

It involves no doubling up in payments.

It treats all taxpayers equitably, and is the only plan which abates the 1942 assessment on the same progressive principle by which it was imposed.

It is easy to understand, and easy to put into operation, and to administer.

It is the only plan which meets every problem squarely, openly, fairly, and honestly.

At the first opportunity, a motion will be made to substitute the Ruml-Carlson plan for the committee bill, and I feel sure that it will receive the approval of the House.

It will be supported by practically 100 percent of the Republican membership, and I am confident that there will be a substantial vote in favor of the substitute on the Democratic side. I understand that a strong appeal has been made to the Democratic majority to present a solid front in favor of the committee bill, but this is a matter of such vital concern to so many people, that I cannot believe such an appeal will have any effect, at least among the more enlightened and less partisan members of the majority, who put welfare of country above party loyalty.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would much prefer not to have any forgiveness of outstanding tax liability at this critical time of our Nation's struggle for existence, but I realize that pay-as-you-go tax legislation is desirable, and in order to accomplish that objective, it is apparent that some measure of compromise is necessary.

The element of compromise enters into the consideration and enactment of almost all important legislation, and this is certainly true of tax legislation. It has been my privilege to participate very actively in the preparation and the passage of every tax bill for the last 12 years, and I know that every one of those measures has finally been enacted into law as a result of compromise. The law as it stands today, enacted last year, includes many provisions that I opposed in committee and fails to include some other provisions that I favored. Tax legislation is always the result of compromise of views.

The bill H. R. 2570 is now under consideration by the House as a result of a compromise of the conflicting views of a majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means. When viewed from a practical standpoint, I believe it presents the fairest and most equitable method of accomplishing the objective of placing individual taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis. The title of the bill states:

> To provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

As a member of the committee it will be my purpose to follow my usual custom of endeavoring to explain the provisions of the bill, and after I have done so briefly, I shall be glad to yield to questions on the bill as far as my limited time will permit.

Forty-eight of the 60 pages of the bill are the same as H. R. 2218, and the Carlson bill, which were recently considered by the House. From page 1 to page 46 are the provisions for withholding and collection at the source. The last 2 pages cover the special tax treatment for members of the armed forces. These provisions are the same in the committee bill and the Carlson bill, and there is no controversy about them. So, certainly, my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] should have had no difficult in understanding 48 of the 60 pages of the bill, as they are exactly the same as were contained in the two bills recently considered by the House and as in the present Carlson bill. The remaining 12 pages, from page 46 to page 58, of H. R. 2570, constitute the new part of the bill covering the transition period from the present income tax system to a pay-as-you-go. This is accomplished by applying the 1941 rates and exemptions to the 1942 income and canceling the difference, which amounts to about one-half of the 1942 liability, or about $5,000,000,000.

Let me give you a simple example to try to illustrate clearly the effect of this provision. Let us take the case of a man with $2,500 of net income. That is getting down where you find a great many people of this country. When you fully analyze and understand what a program will do for the small man, you can have a pretty clear understanding as to how it will apply all along the line. We take a man with a net income of $2,500, which is $100 more than $200 a month, or $50 a week, and as I say, there are a great many in that group in this country. Under the 1942 tax law, that $2,500 man will have to pay a tax of $232.

Mr. DONDERO. Single or married?

Mr. COOPER. A married man with no dependents. Under the 1941 rate and exemptions he would have to pay a tax

of $90. That man understands the difference between $232 and $90. There is not any doubt that he will understand. He is forgiven $142 under this committee bill, and he will understand that. It means that instead of being called upon to pay $232 under the present 1942 act, he will be called upon to pay only $90, and is forgiven the debt of $142, or in other words, he is forgiven 61.2 percent of his 1942 tax liability. This is a fair and equitable method of dealing with this problem. It takes it off by rates and brackets just as it was put on. It will be remembered that in 1941 we were called upon to raise three and a half billion dollars additional revenue. That resulted in the 1941 act. In 1942 we were called upon to raise $7,000,000,000 additional revenue, which was just double the amount that we were called upon to raise the year before, and the request of 1942 resulted in the enactment of the 1942 revenue act.

By adopting this method of applying the 1941 rates and exemptions to the 1942 income, 7,000,000 new taxpayers will be entirely let out. It will be recalled that in 1942 we reduced the exemptions from $750 for a single person and $1,500 for a married person to $500 for a single person and $1,200 for the married person. That reduction in the exemption brought in 7,000,000 new taxpayers who had no way of anticipating or knowing that they would be required to pay any income tax, and, remember, that meant a single person making $10 a week and a married person making $23 a week, and required them to file an income-tax return. The committee bill allows those 7,000,000 under the very low brackets income taxpayers to be let out. The 1942 bill was enacted on October 21, 1942, and was made retroactive to January 1. The small taxpayers had no way of knowing that they were to be included and required to pay a Federal income tax, and many other taxpayers had no way of knowing what the increase would amount to. Therefore, it is felt by the members of your committee supporting this bill, H. R. 2570, that this is the fairest and best way that this difficult problem can be approached.

The remaining part of the 1942 liability is amortized over 3 years, or longer, if necessary, to prevent hardship. Three equal payments—the first, March 15, 1944; the second, March 15, 1945; and the third, March 15, 1946—without any interest. There is a discount of 6 percent provided for the 1942 deferred liability if it is paid by March 15, 1944. A discount of 2 percent if the 1944 one-third payment is made, and also if the taxpayer desires to pay the remaining other two deferred payments. Take the example of the $2,500 man which I used a few moments ago. See how it applies to him. He has $142 of his 1942 tax liability canceled. That means that $90 is all that he has to pay for his 1942 tax liability. If he wants to pay that $90 by March 15, 1944, he gets the discount of 6 percent. On the other hand, he can pay $30 on March 15, 1944, $30 on March 15, 1945, and $30 on March 15, 1946, without any interest at all.

It does seem that that is fair treatment, because that means after he is forgiven $142 of his 1942 liability, he only has $90 remaining and has 3 years within which to pay that, if he wants to pay one-third each year. There is no doubling up for the year 1943 in this committee bill. Not a penny of doubling up, as far as the year 1943 is concerned, under this committee bill, because the first one-third of the deferred 1942 liability is not due and payable until March 15 of next year.

So this year of transition, the most important year to the taxpayers of this country, when we are trying to shift from our present income-tax system to a pay-as-you-go basis, is the most important. It is the most important year of transition. There is no doubling up for any taxpayers during this year of 1943.

Taxpayers will not have to be bothered by calculations. A formula is included in the bill for use of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and he will mail the taxpayer a statement. The taxpayer does not have to bother about recalculating his tax on 1941 rates and exemptions and applying it to the 1942 income. The formula included in the bill is for the use of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He makes the calculation and simply mails a statement to the taxpayer of what the adjustment is.

The withholding of 20 percent on wages and salaries to begin July 1, 1943, is the same in the committee bill, in the Carlson bill and the same as were in the two bills recently considered by the House. There is no controversy about them.

With respect to current payment on tax not collected at the source, I would like to point out that persons receiving wages subject to withholding, in the amount of $2,700 if single and $3,500 if married, will have substantially their full tax liability discharged by collection at the source. H. R. 2570 provides the means by which all other persons also are placed upon a current basis. Persons deriving wages and salaries in excess of the amounts noted, and all other persons with incomes subject to tax, except farmers, receiving at least $100 of such other income, are required to declare their estimated tax on March 15 of each year and to pay the estimated tax in quarterly installments or earlier. The estimated tax is the estimate of the income tax and Victory tax liability after allowing for the estimated credit for collection at the source, if any. Provision is made for the taxpayer to revise the declaration of the estimated tax each quarter and to ratably increase or decrease the remaining installments. A special rule applies to farmers whose estimated gross income from farming is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources. In their case the declaration of the estimated tax may be made at any time on or before the 15th of December. Farmers are not required to pay in installments, but they may voluntarily elect to do so.

In order to protect the Treasury against undue estimates of taxes, persons other than farmers are required to pay currently at least 80 percent and farmers at least 66⅔ percent of their final tax liability. Where current payments fall short of these percentages a penalty of 6 percent of the excess of the final tax over the estimated tax paid currently is added.

Now, I am sure we will readily see that this plan as embraced under the committee bill provides a method for all of the 44,000,000 taxpayers of this country to be paying their Federal income tax currently by the end of 1943. Thirty million of those 44,000,000 taxpayers will be made current by reason of the withholding and collection at the source.

It might be of interest if I would take a moment to try to explain the way that we understand this method is to operate. In effect, it means that the beginning of the calendar year, or up to March 15, just as the old system has always provided, a Federal income taxpayer is required to file his income-tax return. That means that an extra sheet will probably be added to the form. On that extra sheet he will make out his estimate of his income for the calendar year. Using his own methods of arriving at whatever that estimate may be, he will provide on that one sheet of the form his estimated income for that calendar year, and based on his own estimate, he will pay that tax to the Government quarterly during that calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. He may revise his estimate or his declaration at any quarterly period that he wants to, either raising it or lowering it, during the taxable year. But by December 15 he must have paid not less than 80 percent of his estimated tax.

Bear in mind what we are starting out to try to accomplish is to get people current; get them on a pay-as-you-go basis. That means you have to pay as you go along during the current calendar year. So that by December 15 of that calendar year the taxpayer is supposed to have estimated and paid not less than 80 percent of his income tax for that year. The remaining 20 percent he pays by the following March 15.

So that in the case of all taxpayers other than farmers and other than those whose liability is fully discharged by the withholding and collection at the source, they make their own estimate and pay their tax quarterly along during the year.

In the case of the farmer, we realize that conditions obtain with respect to agriculture that do not obtain in other lines of business; so we have a special provision for farmers. It is to a great extent along the lines of the Canadian system and it means in practical effect that the farmer may pay any time any amounts he wants to along during the calendar year but by December 15 of that calendar year he must have paid at least 66⅔ percent of his tax for that year; then he pays the remaining one-third by the following March 15.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman tell us the effect of the bill on those in the higher brackets who have had added every year for 3 years this added tax? It will take more than their entire income of those years to pay it, will it not?

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. GIFFORD. Explain it. The gentleman explained the $2,500 case. Now explain just as fully the case of the man who pays $50,000. Let us not dodge that now.

Mr. COOPER. I am not dodging at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman spoke of the $2,500 man. It is not fair to drop it there. Take the $50,000 case and explain it just as fully.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman does not state it correctly. If the gentleman will examine the committee report, he will find tables that show in plain figures how it operates.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is there, yes; but it is very convenient to take the $2,500 case and say nothing about the $50,000 man. Explain that.

Mr. COOPER. The $50,000 man pays $25,328 under the 1942 act; he pays $20,439 under the 1941 act; he is forgiven $4,889 under the committee bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that very connection I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are dealing with taxes for 2 years, 1942 and 1943. As long as the aggregate of those taxes is less than the aggregate of the income there can be no such thing as a capital levy; is not that true?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If the gentleman will look at the tables in the report he will see that it is absolutely true.

It should be borne in mind all the time that the taxpayer has 2 years of income.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield for this further question in that connection; then, with respect to a capital tax is it not true that under the substitute bill supported by the minority there will be an increase in the assets of every taxpayer of 1 year's taxes, which is a capital gain?

Mr. COOPER. That is true; there is no doubt about that.

FULL FORGIVENESS A SUBSIDY TO THE HIGH-INCOME GROUPS

Since the discussion of pay-as-you-go taxation started many weeks ago I have listened to innumerable arguments on whether it is equitable to forgive a whole year's tax for everyone. On one side of that argument have been those who said that to cancel a larger percentage of tax for one taxpayer than for another taxpayer would be intolerable and class legislation. If the taxpayer with the smallest income has a year's tax canceled, this argument went, then every other taxpayer, from bottom to top, must have a year's tax canceled. If a taxpayer with a $1,000,000 income is to have only one-fifth of his tax canceled, then, it was claimed, no other taxpayer could in fairness have any more than one-fifth of his tax canceled. Only in this way, it was claimed, would the principle of our progressive tax system be carried into effect in the forgiveness.

On the other side of the argument have been those who pointed to the fact that a taxpayer with a $1,000,000 income would have forgiven him $854,000 while a taxpayer with a $3,000 income would have forgiven him a tax of $324. Is it fair, they asked, for one taxpayer to be forgiven more than another? Should not the Government, when it makes gifts to people, give equally to all, or at any rate, not more to the higher income groups than to the lower-income groups? As a matter of fact, I did not hear anyone seriously argue this way before our committees, but the argument appeared in press stories and editorials in exaggerated form in the course of bitter criticism of anyone who did not agree that the fair way to forgive is to forgive all a whole year's tax, large or small.

To me the issue of what is fair to forgive is the heart of this whole problem. In my opinion the advocates of complete forgiveness have been the victims of an error in thinking—a very understandable error, but nevertheless a very serious error. That error has arisen because they have thought of a man's actual income as his gross salary or other amounts which he receives. They have failed to grasp the fact that while this is the apparent income it is not the actual income. Under our tax laws a salary of $10,000 does not mean that we have $10,000 to spend or save as we see fit. Before we have any right to call that income our own we must pay the income taxes which the very act of receiving the money has made us liable for. My own State of Tennessee does not have an income tax; if it did I would have to deduct that tax from my apparent income before I arrived at my actual income. The Federal Government does have an income tax. I must deduct that tax before I arrive at the figure of what my actual income is. On the basis of 1942 tax rates a single man with $10,000, disregarding deductions, is liable for $2,390; his actual income is $2,390 less than his apparent income. The income which he has within his control to spend or save is not $10,000 but $7,610. A married man with no dependents with the same $10,000 income is liable for a Federal income tax of $2,152; his actual income is $2,152 less than his apparent income; the income which he has within his control to spend or save is not $10,000 but $7,848.

Now, let us see what this is at other income levels. At $2,000 the married man with no children owes 1942 tax of $140 and has actual income under his control of $1,860.

At $5,000 such a man is liable for $746 tax and has an income under his control of $4,254.

At $50,000 his tax is $25,328 and the income under his control is $24,672.

At $100,000 his tax is $64,060 and the income under his control is $35,940.

At $1,000,000 his tax is $854,000 and the income under his control is $146 000.

You will recall that this same effect of taxes on income came up in the discussion of the $25,000 salary limitation. A person to have $25,000 income under his control would have to receive in 1942 an apparent income of $67,200 so the limit on salaries was not $25,000 but $67,200.

If we want to see the effect of tax forgiveness, we must level on these incomes after taxes, these real incomes, which the taxpayer controls and can spend or save. For 30 years there has been no such thing as an income above exemptions without its accompanying tax liability. The only exception is that special tax-exempt income from State and local governments that has been a matter of debate before this House on many occasions. For all other incomes the tax liability comes into existence along with the income. When we consider tax forgiveness we cannot properly make a comparison with income before taxes, because ever since 1913 the very existence of income has always created a tax liability. It is the income after tax, not the income before tax, that is the proper basis of comparison.

This basis of comparison puts the matter of forgiveness in its true light. If we cancel a tax of $10,000 for a person who had income after taxes of $20,000 we would be increasing his income by one-half. We would in effect be putting 6 months' income in his pocket.

Now, the trouble with forgiving a year's taxes is that it does not forgive 6 months' or 1 month's or any other amount of actual income for each taxpayer. It treats different taxpayers very differently.

The $2,000 man, whose actual income after tax is $1,860, would have $140 added to his $1,860, or slightly less than 4 weeks' actual income.

The $5,000 man, whose actual income after tax is $4,254, would have $746 added, or slightly less than 9 weeks' actual income.

The $10,000 man, whose actual income after tax is $7,848, would have $2,152 added, or nearly 14 weeks' actual income.

The $50,000 man, whose actual income after tax is $24,642, would have $25,328 added, or a little more than 1 year's actual income.

The $100,000 man whose actual income after tax is $35,960 would have $64,060 added, or about 20 months' actual income.

And the $1,000,000 man whose actual income after tax is $146,000 would have $854,000 added, or about 6 years' actual income.

Here is the real test of equity. This has nothing to do with war profits. Even if every vestige of favoritism to war profiteers could be removed from the Carlson bill—and I am sure that cannot be done—but even if it could be done, the forgiveness of a year's tax would give 6 years or more actual income each to about 60 taxpayers in this country while it would give less than 1 month's actual income each to about 26,000,000 taxpayers in this country. That is what the Ruml plan does; that is what the Carlson bill does. That, to my way of thinking, simply means that the forgiveness of a year's tax is grossly unfair and discriminatory

against the mass of low-income taxpayers.

Exactly the same discrimination is present if one-half of a year's taxes is forgiven to all taxpayers from top to bottom. The 60 taxpayers would then be forgiven an amount equal to 3 years' actual income each, while the 26,000,000 taxpayers would be forgiven an amount equal to less than 2 weeks' actual income each.

H. R. 2218, the first committee bill, did not forgive any portion of the 1942 tax. The House rejected that bill, the Ruml plan, and all other plans and the committee set itself to work out an equitable method of placing all taxpayers on a current basis. This I believe your committee has done in H. R. 2570. That bill forgives a substantial portion of the 1942 tax—approximately half—but it does so in an equitable manner, by reestablishing in effect 1941 rates and exemptions with respect to 1942 incomes. Hardships are avoided by spreading tax payment over 3 years or longer if need be. Windfall gains to those in the upper brackets are not unconscionable, being less than 20 percent of the tax for those with incomes above $50,000. Small taxpayers receive substantial relief—100 percent of the 1942 tax for the 7,000,000 smallest taxpayers.

Large taxpayers, even under H. R. 2570, will receive dollarwise important relief as compared to the small man—the million dollar man would have about $121,000 added to his income—about 6 weeks' income; the married man with $1,500 would save $48, or about 1½ weeks' income.

Nevertheless, H. R. 2570 succeeds in placing the taxpayer on a current basis with less inequity and less of a windfall than any of the other plans which would place all taxpayers on a current basis and is therefore nearer to a fully desirable measure than any other which has come before this House.

COLLECTION AT SOURCE ON WAGES UNDER H. R. 2570

H. R. 2570 provides for collection at source with respect to wages. I do not need to point out to this House the importance of collection at source. As to that we are all in agreement. The procedure contained in the bill is essentially the same as that which was reported favorably by the committee in connection with H. R. 2218. This procedure is briefly as follows: Collection at source or withholding would apply to all wages and salaries—other than wages paid to farm or domestic help and to men in the armed forces—and would begin on July 1 at a rate of 20 percent. This rate consists of 3 percent for the Victory tax, and 17 percent for the income tax, and applies only to the excess of the total wage above exemptions and allowance for deductions. The Victory-tax exemption will remain at $624 for all individuals The exemption for income-tax purposes will be the regular $500 for a single person, $1,200 for a married person, and an additional $350 for each dependent, if increased by 10 percent to allow for average deductions. The tax withheld at source will be allowed as a credit against income tax and Victory-tax liability for the year and any withholding in excess of these taxes is refundable. The effect of this provision is that all persons receiving wages subject to withholding in the amount of $2,700 if single and $3,500 if married will have substantially their full tax liability discharged by collection at source.

In the case of wages subject to withholding, employers would be obliged to withhold at the source the appropriate amount each week or other pay period. In order to simplify employers' work in withholding, special tables have been provided. These tables will indicate the total income and Victory tax to be withheld for each wage bracket according to the exemption status of the employee. Thus, employers will not find it necessary to make any computations for any given wage. An employer need only to locate the bracket into which the amount of the wage falls and read off the corresponding amount to be withheld.

In order to enable the employer to determine the amount of tax to be withheld, the employee is, under H. R. 2570, required to furnish a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his marital and dependency status. If there is a change in status, the employee may file an amended certificate to take effect for future pay periods. If, however, no certificate is furnished to the employer, no allowance for personal exemption and dependents is made in computing the amounts to be withheld.

The employer is required to furnish each employee with respect to his employment during the calendar year a written statement showing the wages paid during the year and the amount withheld. If the employee's services are terminated before the close of the calendar year, the receipt is required to be furnished on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, except that an extension of 30 days may be granted by the Commissioner. In lieu of the present information return with respect to wages, the employer is required to attach copies of those receipts to his final quarterly return so that they may be checked against the returns filed by the individual wage earners. Amounts withheld by employers are to be turned over the Treasury on or before the last day of the month following the close of the quarter.

EFFECT OF THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLAN IN H. R. 2570

Under the provisions of H. R. 2570 44,000,000 American taxpayers would be paying currently before the end of 1943, of whom 30,000,000 will have their full liabilities collected at the source.

The bill would cancel all the 1942 taxes for 7,000,000 taxpayers and would greatly reduce the 1942 taxes for many millions more. For a married person with no dependents the reduced tax is 37.1 percent of the unreduced tax at $2,500 net income. At $5,000 it is 48 percent, at $10,000 it is 59.9 percent, at $25,000 it is 74 percent, at $100,000 it is 82.3 percent, and at $1,000,000 it is 85.8 percent. Thus the cancelation is substantial at the lower levels of income but is not a very high percentage of the highest levels of income.

While all can now reasonably be expected to prepare for continuing increases in taxes so long as the war continues, it may well be that the public was not adequately prepared for the rates and exemptions in the 1942 act, especially in view of the fact that that act was not passed until late in the year—October 21, 1942. Your committee has considered these possible hardships and has accordingly recommended that the 1942 tax be reduced to 1941 levels and making it payable in three installments, namely, on or before March 15 of each of the years 1944, 1945, and 1946. Your committee recognized, however, the desirability of placing as many taxpayers on a fully current basis as soon as possible, and that many taxpayers can afford to and wish to get on a fully current basis at the earliest time. Accordingly, there is provided in H. R. 2570 a discount for reduced 1942 taxes paid on or before March 15, 1944, or on or before March 15, 1945. If the reduced 1942 tax liability is paid up in full by March 15 1944, a 6 percent discount is granted. If paid up in full by March 15, 1945, the discount is 2 percent.

From the revenue standpoint, H. R. 2570 forgives approximately one-half of 1942 liabilities. As has been noted, however, the relief is proportionately most substantial where the need is greatest, namely, in the lowest income classes. They do not have tax anticipation notes or special bank accounts or savings accounts or other savings available for tax payments. Specifically, total individual income-tax liabilities for 1942 are estimated at $9,500,000,000, after allowing for exemption of most members of the armed forces as is provided for under section 22 of H. R. 2570. Reestablishment of the 1941 rates and exemptions for 1942 incomes is estimated to reduce 1942 taxes by $4,700,000,000, leaving a reduced 1942 tax liability of $4,800,000,000, or three installments of $1,600,000,000 each. These installments, added to the current payments over the next 3 transition years, will materially help the Federal revenues, although, of course, the amounts involved are obviously not anywhere nearly adequate to meet the Federal Government's revenue and fiscal requirements. However, viewing the President's request for $16,000,000,000 in additional taxes, it may be noted that if H. R. 2570 is enacted without any increase in existing tax rates, the receipts for fiscal year 1944 will be increased by approximately $3,000,000,000 over the receipts estimated under present law, H. R. 2570 is therefore more desirable than the Ruml plan in two immediate ways. First, it places taxpayers on a current basis in an equitable manner, granting greatest relief where it is needed most; and secondly, it does so at approximately half the cost to the Treasury of the Ruml plan. The amount canceled is less than $5,000,000,000 under the bill and nearly $10,000,000,000 under Ruml.

In view of the vast increase in savings the great bulk of taxpayers will be able

to pay more than 1 year's tax during the next few years.

One of the arguments advanced by the proponents of full cancelation has been that the great majority of the 44,000,000 taxpayers of the country will find it impossible to pay more than 1 year's tax at a time. I do not believe that this is true.

Savings of individuals throughout the country reached the unprecedented figure of $28,900,000,000 in 1942. This is almost three times the amount of individual savings in 1941, and almost eight times the figure for 1940. It is nearly three times the tax liability on 1942 income.

The great increase in savings arose from the largest national income, $120,000,000,000, in our history. This income was paid out to individuals in increased salaries and wages and to a greater number of persons—unemployment practically nonexistent. These increases were distributed widely with the lower-income groups enjoying huge increases. Since price control held down the cost of living and rationing and the unavailability of many items, such as automobiles, restrained the amount of purchases which might have been made, a great part of the increased income found its way into savings. This year income will be even higher and the volume of consumers' goods and services smaller. There will be tens of billions of dollars of income above taxes that cannot be spent. A part of this increase can be put to no better use than to wipe out the tax debt that so worries the Rumlites.

For 1943, savings, it is estimated, will reach $40,000,000,000 after payment of 1942 tax liability. In practically every income group this will mean savings many times greater than the tax that must be paid. Much of the savings is highly liquid. Some of it is in a form that frees the ordinary family's budget. Currency and bank deposits in 1942 increased $11,000,000,000. The volume of consumer debt declined $3,400,000,000. There is now outstanding a total of over $8,000,000,000 of War bonds, series E. These three items themselves are almost large enough to finance payment of 2 years' taxes without any drain upon this year's income. Out of savings that have already been made, and out of the unprecedented incomes that are being received this year, the American public, with some exceptional cases, can obtain the funds to take advantage of the committee's offer. I, for one, believe that the taxpayer with assets can properly be asked to use them to pay his debt to his Government.

It may be argued that in the higher brackets it is impossible to pay more than 1 year's taxes in any year. That is wrong. It may not be possible to pay more than 1 year's taxes out of 1 year's income, but, with few exceptions, persons in the higher brackets have assets they can use to discharge debts. Further, H. R. 2570 grants reductions in tax all along the line by reestablishing 1941 rates and exemptions. In addition, payment is permitted in three installments extending to 1946, and longer, if necessary.

If some War bonds are turned in, that may be unfortunate, but since the proceeds are used to pay taxes, the national debt becomes that much less. A dollar obtained from taxes is better than a dollar obtained from borrowing. However, I feel that redemptions will be small, that whatever doubling up taxpayers choose to do, or will be required, will come primarily out of unprecedented incomes now being received by the American public. Those incomes cannot be spent in full—without ruinous inflation—because adequate goods do not exist. There is no better use for this money than extinguishing the tax debt.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE REVISED CARLSON BILL RELATING TO WINDFALL GAINS ARE INADEQUATE

The revised Carlson bill, as I understand it is to be presented, makes two provisions to meet the criticism that forgiveness confers a windfall. One provision is that for income over $5,000 the tax forgiven is in effect the lower of 1942 or 1943 taxes. The other provision is that where 1942 and 1943 incomes exceed 1941 income a special tax is imposed. The tax is on the excess of 1942 or 1943 income over 1941 income plus $5,000. This excess is taxed as if it constituted the entire taxable income after all credits for the taxable year 1943, or in other words, at the lowest rates applicable.

In the first place the year of reference, 1941, represents an unfortunate choice. The year 1941 was a year of special wartime profits. We all know that during that year there were numerous cases of large salaries, of large war incomes and profits based on American and foreign war contracts and contingent fees, and other large incomes incidental to these contracts. There were also large dividends from corporations doing wartime business. In view of the fact that 1941 was in itself an abnormal year the use of such year for the basis of forgiveness is hardly the means for removing the special wartime windfall of forgiveness. Yet this is the way that the Carlson bill would attack the problem of windfall gains. And as may be expected it results in allowing large amounts of wartime profits to escape tax-free.

I do not need to state to the Members of this House how strongly we all feel that no one should profit from the tragedy of this Nation. It was precisely this feeling that caused so much agitation by Members of this House for a tax on excess incomes of individuals to parallel the excess-profits tax on corporations. It was argued in 1940 and later that unincorporated businesses should not escape the tax to which corporations were being subjected on their war profits, and also that executives should not be permitted to retain huge salaries that were made possible only by wartime earnings.

Why was no special tax placed on the war earnings of individuals? The answer is found in our present income-tax structure. These individuals, we believe, would be subject to high surtax rates so that in practice they would retain net after taxes very little of their increased profits. If the individual is subject to a 70, 80, or 90 percent rate on the highest dollars of his income, he is being quite effectively taxed on his war profits, and there is not much more that is needed to be done. His tax is quite in line with that imposed on corporations. But now we come face to face with the Carlson bill which would forgive 1942 taxes generally and impose even on windfall gains what is in fact in many cases only a token tax. I am certain that no Member of this House would propose that corporations be relieved of most of the tax on their war profits for 1942. Similarly, I maintain that no one should defend allowing individuals profiting from the war to pay only a token tax on their profits.

None of us knows what incomes in 1943 will be, but we do have figures comparing 1940, 1941, and 1942 incomes. I think it might be illuminating to see how certain individuals would be affected by the Carlson bill. The attached table shows the salaries paid by certain corporations as reported to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I have taken 13 cases in which remuneration has increased substantially. I do not mean to be personal and I am not criticizing these individuals, and I am not objecting to the salaries paid. I am criticizing, however, the proposal to free these individuals from substantial portions of the tax on their 1942 salaries. This table shows, for example, that the so-called antiwindfall provisions would be completely ineffective with respect to D. O. Thomas, of the Bendix Aviation Corporation, whose remuneration was $60,000 for 1942, even though his income in 1942 was 173.2 percent of his pre-war—1940—income. In the case of Charles Marcus of the same company only $177 in tax would be payable on a 1942 income of $77,043. J. D. A. Morrow, of the Joy Manufacturing Co., would, under the antiwindfall provisions, pay only $283 on an income of $55,577, and J. W. Frazer, of Willys-Overland Motors, would pay $4,722, or 3.8 percent of his $123,184 income for 1942, even though this income was 205 percent of his pre-war—1940—income. These cases are taken from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1358.

The very fact that the proponents of the Carlson bill have inserted into their bill the so-called antiwindfall provisions evidences the fact that they too realize the inequity of permitting wartime profits to escape just taxation.

Under the original Ruml plan these inequities were entirely overlooked in a feverish haste to obtain wholesale tax forgiveness. When the inequities were pointed out a revised Ruml plan called H. R. 2245 was produced which contained a gadget which promised to provide forgiveness for all except those who profited from the war. Only 2 of the 13 persons in the table which I have introduced would have been affected by that gadget, and those only in a minor way. The other 11 would have had the tax on all of their profits forgiven. So the hodgepodge was stirred again, and H. R. 2245 has given way to the present Carlson bill. But upon examination we find that, though the voice be Jacob's, the hand is Esau's—persons with large 1942 war profits still remain substantially free

from tax on those profits. This is not surprising because no gadget designed to winnow some income for forgiveness and leave others in for taxation can work. For every partial success such a gadget must have substantial failure and add many cases of discrimination.

In the Carlson bill, however, we are in effect asked to set the official seal of congressional approval on this obviously inadequate measure with respect to war profit. We know these profits are derived in many instances directly at Uncle Sam's expense through war contracts. Shall we confirm their recipients in their possession in return for a token-tax payment? To do so would be in effect to tell these profit receivers to go with our blessing, expressed in a handsome tax bonus. The Committee on Ways and Means has correctly refused to do this and expressed its approval for H. R. 2570 under which recipients of large war profits are treated the same as recipients of other types of income equal in amount, thus placing upon all 1942 taxable income their fair tax load.

Amount of remuneration 1940, 1941, and 1942; increase of 1942 over 1940; and tax on 1942 income under present law, H. R. 2570, and H. R. ——

Name	Employer	Remuneration			Increase in remuneration, 1942 over 1940	Tax on 1942 income [1]		
		1940	1941	1942		Present law [2]	H. R. 2570	H. R. —— [3]
Reese, Clarence	Continental Motors Corporation	$16,604	$40,903	$58,027	$41,423	$31,071	$25,263	$3,432
Beech, Walter H	Beech Aircraft Corporation	12,450	19,356	65,299	52,849	36,430	29,765	20,052
Wells, T. A	do	6,602	9,615	41,016	34,414	19,213	15,195	10,825
Gaty, J. F	do	5,746	9,615	41,016	35,270	19,213	15,195	10,825
Marcus, Charles	Bendix Aviation Corporation	40,893	71,110	77,043	36,150	45,414	37,308	177
Thomas, D. O	do	34,663	56,160	60,050	25,387	32,528	26,488	
Wallace, Duane L	Cessna Aircraft Co	5,400	16,620	89,852	84,452	55,664	45,815	39,614
Wallace, Dwight S	do	2,325	16,032	89,852	87,527	55,664	45,815	40,055
Salter, Tom	Cessna Aircraft Co	3,030	9,704	32,531	29,501	13,748	10,575	6,035
Morrow, J. D. A	Joy Manufacturing Co	7,333	49,098	55,577	48,244	29,307	23,775	283
White, W. King	Cleveland Tractor Co	15,300	26,604	51,167	35,867	26,133	21,077	6,933
Hill, James A	Illinois Zinc Co	14,750	21,667	50,283	35,533	25,523	20,599	9,197
Frazer, Joseph W	Willys-Overland Motors, Inc	60,000	103,093	123,184	63,184	83,742	68,645	4,722

[1] Under the provisions of H. R. ——, the 1942 tax is canceled. The tax shown as the tax on 1942 income under H. R. —— is, under the terms of the bill, an addition to the tax on 1943 income.

[2] Tax under Revenue Act of 1942 is based on the assumptions that the exemption in each case is that of a married man without dependents and that income from other sources is equal to the taxpayer's deductions, such as taxes, interest, contributions, etc.

[3] Assuming that the income in 1943 will be the same as that in 1942.

Source: Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A1357.

CANCELATION OF THE FULL TAX ON 1942 INCOME FOR ALL TAXPAYERS WOULD DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE MILLIONS OF TAXPAYERS WITH SMALL INCOMES; H. R. 2570 WOULD NOT

The amount of 1942 taxes canceled will have to be collected from incomes in 1943 and following years. By allowing 1942 incomes to be tax-free, we compel ourselves to impose greater burdens than would otherwise be necessary on incomes received in 1943 and subsequent years. It is here that we observe the gross inequities that would result from full cancelation. Since rates on higher incomes are already so high that they cannot be sufficiently increased to make up for the loss from cancelation, the increased burden must of necessity fall on the middle and lower income classes. Simply stated, cancelation of 1942 taxes would shift billions of dollars of the cost of the war from persons with large incomes to those of only moderate means and those in the lower income groups. H. R. 2570 avoids this problem, in the main, because the forgiveness in the highest brackets is small. If large amounts are forgiven for the lower income taxpayers, it will be those same taxpayers who will be called on to make up the loss through higher rates on their subsequent years' incomes. There will not be added to their burden, however, the amount of revenue which would be lost through full forgiveness of tax to those whose rates cannot be further increased.

The Carlson bill would discriminate against the small taxpayer. The forgiveness of a year's tax to those persons who in 1942 had little or no tax liability means nothing. To a man with a million-dollar income in 1942, the saving is $854,000. This large-income taxpayer has probably saved for his taxes. He may have bought tax anticipation notes. He may set up a special bank account. He may have done any number of things to prepare for the payment of the tax. If the Carlson bill were enacted, this tax would never become due, and these people would realize a real immediate saving. This saving is not one which is deferred until Judgment Day, or until death. It is real and actual in the year 1943, a year when ostensibly we are calling upon all America to share in the financial burdens of the war.

Large taxpayers are already upon a pay-as-you go basis. They may not pay the taxes over to the Government until they are due, but each taxpayer in his way may accrue his tax over the year so that his 1942 liability in effect has been paid out of his 1942 income. For such taxpayers forgiveness of a year's tax is nothing more or less than the presentation to them of that amount of money at the expense of taxpayers generally.

TREATMENT OF THE 1942 TAX

The major controversy in the House with respect to pay-as-you-go has revolved around the question of the treatment of 1942 taxes. The supporters of the Ruml plan would forgive the 1942 taxes in full. H. R. 2570 provides for substantial relief where it is most needed, namely, in the lowest-income brackets. Under the bill, the 1942 tax liabilities are reduced in accordance with a schedule which in general has the effect of restoring for 1942 incomes the rates and exemptions imposed by the Revenue Act of 1941.

In order to facilitate payment of this tax along with taxes on current income, the bill provides for payment of the reduced 1942 tax in three installments, one-third by March 15, 1944, one-third by March 15, 1945, and one-third by March 15, 1946. If the entire amount of the reduced 1942 tax is paid by March 15, 1944, a discount of 6 percent of the reduced tax is allowed. If one-third is paid by March 15, 1944, and the balance by March 15, 1945, a discount of 2 percent is allowed. In hardship cases, the commissioner is authorized to grant extensions for any installment of the reduced 1942 tax for a period not in excess of 18 months, and, in exceptional cases, for a further period of not in excess of 18 months.

It is my conviction that H. R. 2570 affords the best and fairest method of accomplishing desired results and should be enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is of impelling urgency that 44,000,000 Federal individual income taxpayers be relieved from an outmoded method of assessing and collecting their income taxes. The tax load has become so heavy within so short a time that unless certain defects and weaknesses in the present individual income-tax collection system are corrected the burden cannot be borne by millions of persons without financial disaster to them and an ultimate financial loss to the Government.

The Carlson bill is the only proposal so far submitted to the House which will cure the defects in the present system, from which millions of income taxpayers now suffer, and of which they justly complain.

What are some of the defects and weaknesses in the present income-tax collection system? Under the present law personal income taxes are assessed against the past year's income. Thus,

the collection of the tax is always 1 year behind. It is obvious, therefore, that under the present method of collecting the income tax on income 1 year after it is earned, the taxpayer is always in debt to his Government for his income tax.

Why is it more dangerous now to continue under the present 1-year-behind tax collection system than it has been during the past 30 years? One of the answers is that when the individual income-tax load was light, because of very low rates, it made but slight difference to the taxpayer whether or not he paid last year's tax out of this year's income; but now that Federal income taxes have been increased nearly fivefold since 1941, the taxpayer is under a constant threat of being plunged into insolvency. It is not alone the rapid increase in the burden of the tax load that endangers the solvency of millions of taxpayers, but the vicious practice of imposing retroactive taxes, such as was done in 1942. This extra and unexpected load of taxes caught millions of salary and wage earners unawares and unprepared. A survey last November—1942—showed that 75 percent of the taxpayers had made no provision whatever for paying their 1942 taxes. I admit that there are many wealthy persons who can, without the slightest inconvenience, pay increased taxes, whether the taxes are doubled up or made retroactive. This is not the case, however, with those millions of families who find it necessary to budget to the last nickel. The proper adjustment of the tax load presents a problem of legislative responsibility to those patriotic persons who only ask, in return for their willingness to do their full part in winning the war, a fair and honest program of tax collection by which they can shoulder and carry the tax load without the loss of their homes and without ruin to themselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the gentleman see in the press about the middle of March a statement by the vice president of the Morris Plan Bank to the effect that possibly 5,000,000 Americans would have to borrow the amount of their first income-tax payment this year?

Mr. REED of New York. I saw that and several other reports along the same line.

It is not an unreasonable request for sovereign citizens to make of their Government.

The reasonableness of the request for a more just method of handling the collection of a terrific tax burden can be readily seen by presenting the figures showing the increase in Federal income taxes from 1941 to 1943, inclusive, and the estimated burden for 1944:

(a) 1941	$7,607,000,000
(b) 1942	12,799,000,000
(c) 1943	22,976,000,000
(d) 1944 (estimated)	33,081,000,000

These figures do not include pay-roll taxes for old-age insurance from 1937 on. They do not include the $16,000,000,000 increase requested by President Roosevelt in his Budget message. Furthermore, this prospective tax load of $49,081,000,000 does not include the $10,000,000,000 State and local taxes, which if included brings the load up to one-half the national income.

The present Federal income-tax collection system, as well as the system now proposed by the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, shifts and shuffles the tax load so that the method and the time of collection of the tax violate sound principles of taxation. Among the principles so violated are these:

> Every tax ought to be levied at the time, or in the manner in which it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it.

Also:

> Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and to keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state.

The people are fully aware that the present Federal tax collection system threatens millions of taxpaying citizens with ultimate insolvency. Why? To continue to collect income tax on income the year after it is earned will prove financially disastrous to the taxpayer who has a reduction in income, or loses his job, and equally disastrous to the average taxpayer's widow when he dies.

There are millions of men and women whose future will be placed in jeopardy unless taxpayers are made current by the adoption of the current Carlson pay-as-you-earn proposal. It is the only plan that has been presented which in the event of a reduced income, loss of a job, or death, will meet the financial problem of the taxpayer.

Millions of taxpayers are now fully aware and greatly alarmed as to what will happen to them if required to pay out of a reduced income an income tax based on the higher income of the previous year. Thus, while the income tax is supposed to be based on ability to pay, the present method does not actually gear the tax payment to the amount of current income, out of which it is paid.

Moreover, when the taxpayer's income is completely cut off by loss of job, retirement, or death, the past year's income-tax liability becomes a great burden, since there is no current income out of which it may be discharged. This debt for last year's income tax may be great enough to wipe out every asset that millions of taxpayers now possess. A system so cruel, so relentless, and so destructive to those who must bear the financial burden of this war is neither a safe nor a sound one to adopt.

Millions of taxpayers now know the advantages that will accrue to them by changing from the present year-behind or debt-hang-over tax-collection system to a current, pay-as-you-earn basis in collecting the income tax. These millions of loyal, patriotic taxpayers wish to discharge their respective income-tax liabilities as earned, and thus avoid the danger of the debt hang-over when they either retire, lose their jobs, or when they die.

Those who are urging the enactment of the Carlson plan feel that if they suffer a reduced income, their current tax payments should be reduced to conform to the lower income, which is not the case under the present noncurrent system of collection.

The Carlson plan is so well known, both in principle and purpose by the taxpaying public, that a discussion of its details is almost unnecessary. The contrast between the Carlson bill, which squarely meets and solves the defects of the present collection system, and the democratic committee bill, which retains and adds to the defects of the present collection system, makes it worth while to present in a few sentences the provisions of the Carlson bill.

The Carlson bill is a system of current tax collection. It is not a revenue-raising measure, as is the committee bill. Tax rates are not changed by it; neither is the burden changed. It applies to individuals, not to corporations. It is a current pay-as-you-earn tax-collection system instead of the present year-behind, collect-after-it-is-spent system.

It puts taxpayers on a current pay-as-you-earn basis by the abatement of the 1942 tax liability, and then provides for the discharge of the 1943 tax liability out of 1943 income. It does not double up the 1942 and the 1943 taxes.

There is no loss of revenue to the Government under the Carlson plan. Under it the Treasury will gain more revenue, not less. The flow of revenue into the Treasury under the Carlson bill will begin 1 year earlier; it will be greater; it will be certain, and the taxpayer will not be in debt to his Government for a year's taxes at the beginning of a new year. It meets the issue of inflation squarely by capturing the taxes before they can be spent by the taxpayer for other purposes. It keeps the farmers current in their Federal income taxes, thus relieving them from the danger of facing insolvency this year for the previous year's taxes when and if they face a disastrous year caused by a drought, flood, frost, insects, hurricanes, illness, or labor shortage which reduces or destroys this year's income.

The Carlson bill is the only one that will make all taxpayers current, and by doing so protect the Government against delinquencies, as well as increase the revenue of the Federal Government.

Those who are opposed to the Carlson plan have sought to mislead the public by charging that the measure will create war millionaires. This charge is unfounded, and the taxpayers know that the charge has no foundation in fact. To keep repeating that the Carlson bill will create war millionaires, as the opponents persist in doing, is for them to assume that millions of persons are too indolent to read and too ignorant to understand the antiwindfall provisions of the Carlson bill. Instead of being frank with the citizens by admitting that these provisions eliminate the possibility of windfalls or unjust enrichment, the opponents of the bill resort to demagogery in an effort to divert the attention of the public from the true facts.

It is well-known to the taxpayers that under the antiwindfall provisions of the Carlson bill every taxpayer having a net

taxable income in excess of $5,000 will be required to pay on whichever is higher of the 1942 or 1943 income. Also, the bill provides that those whose taxable net income in the otherwise abated year exceeds 1941 income by more than $5,000 pay a tax at the regular income-tax rates on the abnormal portion of that year's income in addition to whatever tax is payable on the current year's income. Beyond the provisions against windfalls in the Carlson bill there are other laws on the statute books that make difficult abnormal profits. The individual taxpayer, if he has a war contract with the Government, falls within the purview of the renegotiation provision of the law. Then, too, he is confronted with an excess-profits rate of 90 percent; any dividends to individuals after payment of the 90 percent, pay up to 90 percent also. It must be kept in mind, too, that salaries and wages are frozen.

But notwithstanding all of these safeguards against war profiteers and windfalls, the Democratic new dealers continue their effort to mislead the people on this and other sound features of the Carlson bill.

Now that the Democratic Members have been duly chastised by their constituents for their stubborn resistance to the expressed will of the people, the opposition to forgiveness or sin, as they described abatement of the 1942 tax, has now been accepted by them as a virtue.

It is impossible for taxpaying citizens to understand why the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee should deliberately disregard a logical, workable plan of current tax collection, and in its place force upon the American taxpayers a doubling up of taxes in a sum of $5,400,000,000. Think of it. The majority committee bill, if adopted, would not relieve the taxpayers from any burden but instead would load upon their backs each year for 3 years the sum of $1,800,000,000.

The opposition of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee to the Carlson bill, a measure so earnestly desired and so urgently urged upon Congress, presents a display of official stubbornness and tyrannical resistance to the public will which might be construed by some as not in keeping with the philosophy of representative government. I do not so construe the action of my colleagues on the committee. Their difficulty is for them to decide whether it is their duty to obey the demand of the Treasury that they oppose the Carlson bill, or their duty to support the Carlson bill as requested by their respective constituencies, to whom they, as representatives, are responsible.

Often in public affairs there are those who once they start from some false political premise, try to carry it through to the bitter end regardless of the cruel consequences to which their stubbornness may give rise. It has been said that the words of Benjamin Franklin, in the closing hour of the Convention, may well be imprinted on the minds of all legislators as the foundation for every successful achievement in government. Speaking to his fellow delegates in the closing hours of the Constitutional Convention, held in Philadelphia during 4 hot summer months of 1787, Benjamin Franklin said:

> I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve; but I am not sure I shall never approve them. For, having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged, by better information, or further consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise. It is, therefore, that the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and to pay more respect to the judgment of others. * * * Thus, I consent, sir, to this Constitution because I expect no better, and because I am not sure that it is not the best. * * * On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would, with me, on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility, and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument.

I believe it would be well for all of us, in the present crisis, to make manifest our unanimity by adopting the Carlson bill in accordance with a sound and overwhelming public sentiment in favor of this legislation.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, with the exception of those who lose their jobs, or who, through injury or illness, are unable to earn a taxable income, no single living person is forgiven one dollar of tax under the Ruml-Carlson proposal. If the plan were put into effect, the people profiting thereby would be the widows and dependents of the taxpayers when the latter die. Each year since the income-tax law was enacted, every taxpayer has paid 1 year's tax, or he has been unable to pay his tax, or he has illegally avoided payment. There has been no single exception. All taxpayers paid a year's tax in 1941, a year's tax in 1942, they either have paid or will pay a year's tax in 1943 and another in 1944, and so on as long as they shall live, provided they have a taxable income.

It has not been contemplated, in any proposal before the committee, that any living person should be forgiven the payment of any part of his income tax in any year. All that is involved in the Ruml-Carlson proposal is changing the designation of the year in which the tax is paid. In other words, we simply propose to call the tax we pay in 1943, the tax of 1943, instead of the tax of last year. We should not forget that we paid a tax last year and all other past years when we had an income sufficiently large to bring us within the taxpaying brackets.

Under our present system, we pay our 1942 tax in 1943, and we have all the latter year in which to pay that tax. A large proportion of the taxpayers is compelled to pay its income tax quarterly during the year after which the income is earned and spent.

Under the Ruml-Carlson plan, we will pay during the present year and each year hereafter not a dollar less nor a dollar more than the law calls for. But when a taxpayer dies, his widow will not be faced with the necessity of paying the tax on her husband's previous year's income. The average widow, especially if she is left with little children, has trouble enough in properly caring for them without being hounded to death by the Treasury Department trying to collect a year's income tax on the income her husband earned in the year previous to his death. Further, in the case of the taxpayer himself, under the present law, if in 1943 he is employed at good wages and at the end of the year has earned enough to put him in the taxpaying bracket, and he then loses his job, is injured, or otherwise disabled, he is faced with the necessity of paying an entire year's tax at a time when he has no income.

Among the great majority of our people, when the father and breadwinner dies, the widow, particularly if she has little children, is faced with a future of uncertainty and fear. In many instances the little family has been unable to accumulate enough to care for the little brood for more than a short time. Under our present system the widow becomes liable for every penny of the tax owed the Treasury Department by her deceased husband.

There are a number of instances which have been publicized recently where men have died and the Treasury Department has proceeded against their widows in an attempt to collect the previous year's income tax which the husband owed at the time of his passing. Yes, even the widows of men who have died or been killed while serving in the armed forces have had this experience.

It makes not the slightest difference whether she has enough money to keep her little family together or not. It makes not the slightest difference whether the little home in which they live is clear of debt. Taxes constitute the first lien on income and on property, and she can be dispossessed and her little brood thrown into the street, if necessary, to collect the income tax due on her husband's previous year's income. I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who wants this situation to continue.

What I am discussing is a matter of most vital interest to more than 42,000,000 income taxpayers of the Nation. They constitute those whose incomes take them only into the lower brackets of the income-tax law. It is they who, because of their small incomes, find the payment of even a small tax a most serious problem. It is they to whom life presents many serious problems which do not confront those with larger incomes.

These 42,000,000 taxpayers and their dependents, constituting as they do all but a very small segment of the American people, need the protection which the Ruml-Carlson bill gives them and they need that protection now.

The committee bill gives these taxpayers and their dependents the benefits only after 3 years, during which time they must pay each year a substantial sum above and beyond the regular year's

tax, which, in fact, constitutes an increase in their tax.

The Carlson bill gives them the benefits now, and it does so without adding to the individual's tax burden.

Mr. Chairman, I concur wholeheartedly in the conclusions of the Republican members on the Ways and Means Committee that the Ruml-Carlson plan is the outgrowth of reason and common sense.

It is as sound as it is simple.

It meets the need for putting the income-tax system on a genuine ability-to-pay basis by gearing current tax payments to current income, thereby relieving all taxpayers of any overhanging income-tax debt.

We urge the House to adopt the Ruml-Carlson plan as a substitute for the committee bill for the following reasons:

First. It accomplishes the objective of placing taxpayers on a current pay-as-you-earn basis immediately and not at some distant time.

Second. It involves no doubling up in payments.

Third. It treats all taxpayers equitably and is the only plan which abates the 1942 tax assessment on the same progressive principle by which it was imposed.

Fourth. It is simple to understand and simple to put into operation and to administer.

Fifth. It is the only plan which meets every problem squarely, openly, fairly, and honestly.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. In view of the fact that the gentleman is the author of that portion of the bill that applies increased exemptions to soldiers I think the gentleman should take a little time to explain it. No one as yet has explained it today and I think it very proper that it should be done by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think every Member of the House is familiar with that provision which appears in all the bills. It proposes to apply to all members of the armed forces of the country during the present war the same tax basis that was applied to the members of the First World War; in other words, it proposes to raise the personal tax exemption of the members of the armed forces up to $3,500 instead of leaving it at the present levels.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to my chairman, of course.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The committee bill and the substitute bill, as I understand, are exactly identical with respect to the members of the armed forces.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I just made that statement. Possibly the gentleman did not hear me.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that apply to any other income a soldier may have in addition to what he is paid by the Government for his service in the armed forces of the Nation?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It applies only to that part of the income of the individual represented by his service pay.

Mr. DONDERO. It does not apply to income from other sources.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It does not.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, there are times when consistency is a jewel; there are times when consistency becomes a dangerous shibboleth. If there be any virtue in having offered a pay-as-you-go plan and sticking to it through the deliberations of the Ways and Means Committee and in the proceedings in the House, I can claim that virtue. Naturally, it is a source of gratification to me that all plans which have previously been presented to the House, and which will this week be presented to the House, embody one-half of the plan originally proposed by me, namely, the withholding against wages and salaries at the source of 20 percent of the tax liability. That was not a part of the original Ruml plan nor a part of the original Carlson-Ruml plan.

I did not offer a plan to remit a portion of 1942 tax liability for the purpose of being generous in a period of a grave war emergency nor for the purpose of currying favor with the taxpayers. I made that proposal because it is highly desirable to get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis. That involves two separate and distinct things—one, to collect at the source and the other to make as many taxpayers as possible current. From the start, it was clearly recognized that the second part of that program could be accomplished in only one of two ways—through forgiveness or through doubling up. I preferred and still prefer the first method. I took the position that the Carlson-Ruml plan even as modified on four different occasions involved more forgiveness than was necessary to accomplish the major part of making taxpayers current and with unjustifiable windfalls. I opposed the pending committee bill because it made only 7,000,000 out of some 44,000,000 taxpayers immediately current, and for the remaining taxpayers extended the period in which currency would occur to 1946—a point which may be and we hope will be beyond the end of the war. I also took the position with respect to the committee bill that there were many taxpayers who had not shared in the war income and for whom the doubling up involved in the committee bill would be a real hardship. To me it was no answer to say that while 4 years of taxes would be collected in 3 years the taxpayer had 4 years of income with which to pay. We all know that most taxpayers do not accrue. They stay 1 year behind in the payment of taxes. Theoretically, taxpayers saved from 1942 income an amount sufficient to pay 1942 taxes. Actually many used 1942 income to pay 1941 taxes and had planned to use 1943 income to pay 1942 taxes.

During the recess of last week I spent some time in my district. The principal question asked me was, "When is Congress going to pass a tax bill?" To that my answer was, "Before the sun sinks on your National Capitol the evening of May 4." While at home I found this to be the prevailing sentiment: "We are patriotic; we recognize that during this war we must pay increased taxes; we are willing to pay increased taxes, but we feel we have the right to know without undue delay what our tax liability for 1943 is going to be." Therefore, on the subject of consistency I have merely this to say: If a majority of my colleagues do not think the plan proposed by me, and which will be offered in a revised bill tomorrow by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FORAND, in the event the Carlson amendment be defeated, is not the best solution of a difficult problem, I intend to vote for the committee bill. I do not intend to announce to my constituents that simply because I could not get the kind of tax bill I preferred I was unwilling for them and unwilling for the Nation to have any tax bill. The House made a fatal mistake when it voted to recommit the last tax bill. That mistake must not be repeated.

REVISED H. R. 2277

The pay-as-you-go tax plan, which will be offered tomorrow by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FORAND, is a revision of H. R. 2277 and is devised to place the great bulk of individual taxpayers to whom tax currency is most important on a fully current basis and to place the remainder of individual taxpayers with higher incomes and consequent higher tax liability in the position of very substantial currency, at the same time avoiding the objectionable features of the full-year forgiveness in the Ruml-Carlson plan or the substantial doubling up with respect to tax payments involved in the revised committee bill, H. R. 2570. With respect to the procedure for collection of tax at source on wages, revised H. R. 2277, which will be H. R. 2577, is identical with the committee bill, and insofar as appropriate, the pattern set therein for current collection of tax on income from sources other than wages is likewise followed.

Under the plan the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FORAND, will offer tomorrow, 90 percent of the taxpayers are put on a completely current basis and approximately 99 percent are put in a position of at least 75 percent currency. This degree of currency is achieved without any doubling up of tax payments or any interruption of the flow of tax money into the Treasury. Moreover, the great inequities resulting from the complete forgiveness of a year's tax liability contemplated in the Ruml-Carlson bill are avoided. Tax forgiveness under H. R. 2577 operates equitably to confer on all taxpayers an equal amount of tax reduction for 1942 in proportion to their respective net incomes, whereas the eventual benefit which would result from the tax forgiveness under the Ruml-Carlson bill would be

heavily weighted in favor of persons with large incomes.

The plan of H. R. 2577 is, briefly, as follows: Individual income-tax liability would be divided into two parts, the great bulk payable currently, and the balance payable in the year following the receipt of income. The amount paid currently, whether it be by withholding and collection at the source or by quarterly payments of estimated liability on the basis of an annual declaration, would approximate the basic tax for which all taxpayers are liable, namely, the 6-percent normal tax, plus the surtax at the first bracket rate of 13 percent, and the net Victory-tax liability. The balance of the tax liability not covered by the current collection at the source or quarterly payments would be payable as under existing law in the year following the receipt of income. In order to achieve this currency the basic tax on 1942 individual income would be canceled. This would avoid doubling up of payments, since the portion of tax liability canceled for 1942 is comparable to that part of the 1943 tax which is collected currently. That part of the first two 1943 quarterly payments—on 1942 incomes corresponding to the basic tax for that year—would be considered a payment with respect to 1943 liabilities. Collection at the source at a rate sufficient to collect the basic tax on wages and salary would begin on July 1, 1943. Two corresponding quarterly payments of tax on income not subject to collection at source would be made September 15 and December 15, 1943. A penalty would be imposed to prevent underdeclaration of estimated income and resulting underpayment of estimated basic tax.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PLAN

First. The plan makes 90 percent of taxpayers current except for minor year-end adjustment necessary under any plan of current collection. In this group are the taxpayers for whom a pay-as-you-go system is really important—those who have little or no surplus income and small accumulated savings. It is this group which would find paying taxes a serious hardship when their income declines substantially—see tables 1 and 2.

Second. The great majority of the remaining one-tenth of the taxpayers would be substantially current. Less than 1 percent of all taxpayers would not be at least 75 percent current. Only about 700,000 taxpayers out of nearly 44,000,000 would carry over a liability of more than about $90 beyond the close of the current-income year.

Third. There is no doubling up of tax collections under this plan. Under the plan approximately the entire basic tax would be collected currently during the year in which the income is received. Liabilities above basic tax would be collected in the following year as under the present law. Since an equivalent of the basic tax for 1942 is canceled the current collection in its place of the basic 1943 liability does not result in any doubling up.

Fourth. The distribution of the amount canceled is much more equitable than under the Ruml-Carlson bill. Under my plan a uniform rate of tax on 1942 income, namely, the normal tax and 13 percent of the surtax net income is forgiven from top to bottom. See tables 3 and 4. The burden distribution of the 1942 tax after the cancelation of the basic liability constitutes an equitable distribution of the tax burden of this magnitude under the principles of exemptions and progressive rates.

Fifth. The total amount of liabilities canceled would be approximately $7,600,000,000 as compared to approximately $10,000,000,000 under the Carlson bill, The cancelation would, however, be much more evenly distributed. Moreover, if income-tax rate increases are made in the future they are likely to be imposed much more nearly along the pattern of cancelation under my plan than under the Ruml-Carlson bill. The benefits of forgiveness granted in order to make taxpayers current would thus fall in about the proportions that the burdens of tax increases would be imposed so that the distribution of forgiveness is thus much more equitable under H. R. 2577 than under the Ruml-Carlson bill.

TABLE 1.—*Amount of tax that would be collected at source under H. R. 2577 for selected levels of net income*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Income tax liability, present law [2]	Amount that would be collected at source [3]	Balance to be paid	Amount collected at source as a percent of total liability
				Percent
$1,200				
$1,500	$48	$48		100.0
$1,800	103	103		100.0
$2,000	140	140		100.0
$2,500	232	232		100.0
$3,000	324	324		100.0
$4,000	532	508	$24	95.5
$5,000	746	692	54	92.8
$6,000	992	876	116	88.3
$8,000	1,532	1,244	288	81.2
$10,000	2,152	1,612	540	74.9
$15,000	4,052	2,538	1,514	62.6
$20,000	6,452	3,488	2,964	54.1
$25,000	9,220	4,438	4,782	48.1
$50,000	25,328	9,188	16,140	36.3
$100,000	64,060	18,688	45,372	29.2
$500,000	414,000	94,688	319,312	22.9
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688	664,312	22.2
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688	3,424,312	21.7

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[2] Excluding Victory tax.
[3] Normal tax and 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE 2.—*Approximate distribution of income recipients by percentage of total liabilities discharged currently under H. R. 2577*

[Calendar year 1943]

Percentage of total liability discharged currently	Number of taxable income recipients (millions)	Percentage of all taxable income recipients	Cumulative percentage of all taxable income recipients	Maximum amount of tax not discharged currently
100 percent	38.7	88.8	88.8	0
90–100 percent	4.2	9.6	98.4	$90
75–90 percent	.3	.7	99.1	550
50–75 percent	.3	.7	99.8	4,200
25–50 percent	.1	.2	100.0	115,000
Less than 25 percent	.002	.004	100.0	
Total	43.6	100.0		

TABLE 3.—*Amount of tax that would be forgiven under H. R. 2577*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Income tax, present law [2]	Amount forgiven [3]
$1,200		
$1,500	$48	$48
$1,800	103	103
$2,000	140	140
$2,500	232	232
$3,000	324	324
$4,000	532	508
$5,000	746	692
$6,000	992	876
$8,000	1,532	1,244
$10,000	2,152	1,612
$15,000	4,052	2,538
$20,000	6,452	3,488
$25,000	9,220	4,438
$50,000	25,328	9,188
$100,000	64,060	18,688
$500,000	414,000	94,688
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688

[1] Maximum earned income assumed.
[2] Excludes Victory tax.
[3] The basic liability of 6 percent of normal tax net income plus 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE 4.—*Effective income tax rates under present law and under H. R. 2577* [1]

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax under present law	Tax after canceling normal tax and surtax at first bracket rate
	Percent	*Percent*
$1,200		
$1,500	3.2	
$1,800	5.7	
$2,000	7.0	
$2,500	9.3	
$3,000	10.8	
$4,000	13.3	0.6
$5,000	14.9	1.1
$6,000	16.5	1.9
$8,000	19.2	3.6
$10,000	21.5	5.4
$15,000	27.0	10.1
$20,000	32.3	14.8
$25,000	36.9	19.1
$50,000	50.7	32.3
$100,000	64.1	45.4
$500,000	82.8	63.9
$1,000,000	85.4	66.4
$5,000,000	87.5	68.5

[1] All figures exclude the Victory tax.

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE TECHNICAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means amends part 2 of subchapter D of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for collection at the source of an amount of tax on wages approximating the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and the first-bracket surtax. H. R. 2577 embodies the provisions of the committee bill with respect to the collection of the tax at source. Thus the wage earner is made current in the payment of his Victory tax and made current in the payment of his income tax to the extent of the normal tax and the first-bracket surtax.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF BASIC TAX TO WITHHOLD AT SOURCE

In order that the taxpayer whose income is not subject to withholding shall be in a position of parity with respect to discharge of tax liabilities currently, H. R. 2577 strikes sections 58, 59, and 60 of the Internal Revenue Code, which are cross-reference provisions, and inserts in lieu thereof new sections 58, 59, and 60,

containing provisions under which the nonwithheld taxpayer becomes approximately equally tax current with the wage or salary earner. These sections correspond in their content as nearly as is appropriate to similar sections added in the committee bill.

The new section 58 of the code contained in section 4 of the bill outlines the requirements and procedure for the filing of declarations and the determination of the estimated basic tax. Under section 58 (a) a single individual, or one who is married but not living with husband or wife, is required to make a declaration with respect to his income from sources other than wages subject to withholding, if his gross income for the preceding taxable year from sources other than wages was in excess of $100 and his total gross income was such as would have required his making a return for such preceding year had he been single during the whole of such year, or if his gross income from sources other than wages can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his total gross income can likewise be expected to be such as will require the making of an income-tax return for the taxable year. Every individual who at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration is married and living with husband or wife is required to make a declaration, if the gross income of the individual when added to that of his present spouse for the preceding taxable year from sources other than wages exceeded $100 and would be such as to require the making of an income-tax return for the preceding taxable year had he been married and living with his spouse during the whole of such year, or if it can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year his gross income when added to the gross income of his wife from sources other than wages will exceed $100 and the total gross income of himself and his spouse will be such as to require the making of an income-tax return of the taxable year. Nonresident aliens subject to withholding under the provisions of section 143, and estates and trusts are specifically excepted from the requirement of making declarations and likewise from the payment of tax currently.

Section 58 (b) prescribes the contents of the declaration required under subsection (a) and calls for a computation of the amount by which the estimated net income for the taxable year exceeds the wages subject to withholding or the estimated amount of the personal exemption and credit for dependents, whichever is the greater. Twenty percent of this excess is considered to be estimated basic tax for the year and under the requirements of section 59 this amount is required to be paid in four equal installments during the taxable year.

The following two cases will illustrate the method by which estimated basic tax for the year is computed: Taxpayer A estimates that his total net income for the taxable year will be $3,000. He estimates that his wages subject to withholding during the taxable year will amount to $2,000. He estimates that the personal exemption to which he will be entitled under section 25 (b) is $1,200. Since the estimated amount of wages subject to withholding is greater than the amount of his personal exemption, the $2,000 amount is subtracted from his total estimated net income leaving $1,000 to which the 20-percent rate is applied, giving an estimated basic tax for the year of $200.

Taxpayer B anticipates that during the taxable year he will receive no wages subject to withholding. He estimates that his net income will be $5,000. The personal exemption which he anticipates will be allowable in his case under section 25 (b) is $1,200, and in addition he has two dependents for whom he is entitled an aggregate credit for dependents of $700. Taxpayer B will under these circumstances apply the 20-percent rate to $3,100 ($5,000 minus $1,900) deriving an estimated basic tax for the taxable year of $620.

Provision is made in subsection (d) of section 58 for the dates of filing of declarations. It being generally required that declarations must be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year but in case that the requirements for filing are first met later in the year, or in case an amendment or revision of a previously filed declaration is made, such new declaration or any amendment or revision of a previous declaration shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of any quarter of the taxable year. Only one revision or amendment of a declaration is permitted during any one quarter. Section 59 provides for the ratable increase or decrease of installments of estimated basic tax to reflect any increase or decrease in such tax liability by reason of an amendment or a revision. This section further provides that payment of the estimated basic tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax liability for the taxable year.

Subsection (b) of section 59 requires that only the amount of estimated basic tax paid shall be assessed by the collector. Thus the collector may not distrain for any unpaid installment for estimated basic tax. This provision, however, would not prevent the application of section 146 relating to the closing by the collector of the taxable year.

SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 58 AND 59

The new section 60 added by the bill contains special rules for applications of sections 58 and 59. In this section there is included in subsection (a) a special option available to farmers—being those persons whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of their total estimated gross income from all sources—to file the declaration required for the taxable year on or before the 15th day of the last month of such year. By this provision recognition is given to the fact that those engaged in bona fide farming operation may find it difficult or impossible to estimate early in the year the income which will accrue to them since unexpected crop failures, market prices and the like, may have such a drastic bearing on the result of farming operations.

Subsection (b) of this section vests in the Commissioner the power to determine under regulations the applicability of the entire system of current payment of estimated basic tax in the case of short taxable years. Subsection (c) contains a rule of special application to the calendar year 1943 and calls for the filing of the first declaration of estimated basic tax on the 15th day of September rather than the 15th day of March. A similar provision with respect to fiscal years vesting in the Commissioner the authority to determine the proper filing date for the first declaration is included.

PENALTIES

Subsection (b) of section 4 of the bill makes several amendments of various penalty sections of the Internal Revenue Code designed to provide sanctions for the enforcement of the current payment provisions added by subsection (a) of that section. In general these penalties exactly parallel those to be found in the committee bill. Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code providing for additions to the tax is amended to include an addition to the tax of $10 or 10 percent of the tax whichever is greater in a case of a failure to file a declaration within the time prescribed. For failure to pay any installment of the estimated basic tax, there is added to the tax an amount of $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is greater. To prevent substantial underestimates of the estimated basic tax which is paid currently, a penalty is included in section 294 (a) which provides for an addition to the tax for the taxable year in the amount of 6 percent of any excess of 80 percent of the estimated basic tax computed on the actual net income over the estimated basic tax computed on the estimated net income in the declaration. In the case of farmers the tolerance limit before the operation of the penalty is 66⅔ percent instead of 80 percent.

PAYMENT OF TAX

Subsection (d) of section 4 of H. R. 2577 amends section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to payment of tax in installments. It changes the existing provisions with respect to individuals who will be subject to current collection of basic tax liability as follows:

The installment privilege may be obtained by individual taxpayers, in which case the first installment shall be an amount equal to the sum of the basic tax and one-fourth of the balance of tax liability. In a definition included in this subsection, basic tax is defined to mean in the case of a taxpayer making a return under supplement T, the total income-tax liability, plus the Victory tax. In the case of other individual taxpayers, basic tax constitutes the normal tax plus an amount equal to a percentage of the surtax net income at the first bracket rate of surtax and the net Victory tax liability. In the case of both the supplement T and other individual taxpayers, any additions to the tax for which the individual may be liable by reason of a failure to file a declaration, failure to pay any installment of estimated basic tax, or failure fully to declare the estimated basic tax, are included as part

of the basic tax and must, therefore, be paid as part of the first installment of the tax. The effect of this subsection, therefore, is that after the date upon which the tax return for a taxable year is filed and the payment of the installment which is required to accompany the return, there is left to be paid in the remaining three installments only three-fourths of the liability for surtax in excess of the surtax computed at the first bracket rate.

TRANSITION YEAR

Section 5 of the bill contains the special provisions required to provide for the transition period by the reduction of the liability for tax for taxable years commencing in 1942 to the extent of the comparable equivalent of the estimated basic tax which is required to be collected currently in 1943. Subsection (a) of this section provides that the section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning in 1942, but shall not take effect until September 1, 1943. This provision is included to insure that the flow of tax money into the Treasury will not be decreased during the period of transition. Thus, even though H. R. 2577 were passed and would become law, and the taxpayers would be apprised of the reduction in their 1942 tax liability, they would not be entitled to reduce their payments with respect to their 1942 tax liability to take account of the reduction in tax on their June 15 installments. Subsection (b) provides that the tax imposed under chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code for taxable years beginning in 1942 shall be the tax computed without regard to the section, less an amount equal to the sum of the normal tax plus 13 percent of the surtax net income for such year. Subsection (c) provides a special rule of forgiveness applicable to persons making return for the calendar year 1942 under supplement T. Since the tax imposed under supplement T is incapable of being broken down into normal and surtax, and since a person entitled to make a return under supplement T necessarily has income of an amount with respect to which only basic tax would be due in most instances, the tax liability for such supplement T taxpayers for the year 1942 is canceled and discharged.

Subsections (d) and (e) contain special rules with respect to short taxable years and any reduction where there is a credit for foreign tax. Subsection (f) provides that the section is inapplicable to an estate, trust, or nonresident alien, subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of the code.

Subsection (g) relates to the manner in which the reduction of the tax effected by the earlier subsections is reflected in tax payments or by way of refund or credit. It is provided that the amount by which the tax is reduced shall, if the taxpayer elects to pay the tax in installments, be prorated to the four installments of the tax. The amounts prorated to the installments falling due after September 1, 1943, are to be applied in reduction of each such installment and any payment made prior to September 1, 1943, on account of the reduction in tax shall be treated as a payment of estimated basic tax for the 1943 taxable year. Thus, in the case of a taxpayer on a calendar-year basis, when September 15 arrives, such taxpayer will file his first declaration, estimating his net income and computing his estimated basic tax for the year 1943. In this declaration he will treat as payments on account of the estimated tax liability the amount by which the 1942 tax is reduced, which has already been paid by him earlier in the year 1943. The taxpayer will be required to accompany his first declaration with a payment on account of his estimated basic tax liability but at the same time if he is a taxpayer who elected to pay his 1942 tax in installments, the payment required on account of the September installment of 1942 tax will be correspondingly reduced. If the total tax liability for 1942 was paid by the taxpayer at the time of filing his return on March 15, the declaration filed by him on September 15 will show a larger payment with respect to the estimated basic tax for the year 1943 and in all probability little or no further payment will be necessary during the year to liquidate the estimated basic tax liability. These illustrations proceed on the assumption that the taxpayer's income is fairly constant from year to year and that his status for personal exemption and dependency credit are likewise stable.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE ARMED FORCES

Sections 6 and 7 of H. R. 2577 contain provisions identical with those to be found in the committee bill relating to additional exclusions from gross income of compensation received for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces, and abatements with respect to tax liabilities owing by persons who die while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces.

THE EFFECT ON CURRENT REVENUE

In proposing a remission of the basic liability for all taxpayers I fully safeguarded current Treasury receipts by imposing a withholding tax equal to the amount remitted. To make sure of that situation I wrote Treasury General Counsel Randolph E. Paul for his latest estimate. Under date of April 19 he wrote that under my proposal Treasury receipts from January 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, will be increased $411,000,000; for the calendar year 1943, $519,000,000, and for the fiscal year of 1944, $593,000,000, and that makes allowance for the estimated loss of revenue by the proposed exclusion of the excess of $3,500 of personal exemption from the base pay of our armed forces.

SUMMARY

For the following reasons I respectfully submit the plan I have proposed is the soundest and most practical of all the pending proposals:

First. It will make 96 percent of the taxpayers current in 1943, which, coupled with collection at the source, makes it a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

Second. It is fair because every taxpayer receives the same tax advantage, namely, the remission of his basic tax liability of the first nineteen units.

Third. It involves no hardship, since there is no doubling up under my proposal. The 4 percent of the taxpayers not made fully current receive a substantial abatement of their 1942 tax liability and will pay the remainder in the future as they have done in the past.

Fourth. Current collections will be measurably increased and the Ways and Means Committee, when it takes up the 1943 rate bill, will be given an opportunity to investigate other sources of tax revenue before deciding that nearly $2,000,000,000 per year of additional income taxes shall be imposed without regard to the effect of that imposition upon a large group of white-collared workers who, as yet, have not shared in the new war income.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, no problem is permanently solved until it is correctly solved. The tax problem is no exception to this rule. The question: Should we place our personal income taxpayers on a current basis? is one that must be met by Congress. No one, I believe, can study our tax structure without reaching the definite conclusion that the personal income-tax debt has become a danger to the solvency of the Treasury and a millstone around the neck of the taxpayer.

The members of the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to again vote for a bill that will collect taxes on current income for current liability. Tomorrow I plan to offer a substitute bill for the proposal that has been submitted by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. The bill I expect to offer as a substitute embodies the basic principles of the Ruml plan. With two modifications the amendment I am offering is similar to H. R. 2245, which was rejected by the House a few weeks ago by a vote of 215 to 198. Following this vote the House then recommitted the bill submitted by the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 248 to 168.

A number of bills and proposals have been studied by the Ways and Means Committee during the past few months.

Generally speaking, there are two methods of getting our income taxpayers current. First, you can collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year—that is, you may think you can—or secondly, you can advance the tax liability 1 year—in other words move the tax clock ahead 1 year. This second proposal has the approval of a large majority of our people. It is the plan that has been proposed by Mr. Beardsley Ruml. Unfortunately, the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee are very much opposed to this plan. In fact, they are so much opposed to it that they, in their new bill, moved the tax clock back 1 year instead of moving it forward 1 year. Thus, their bill becomes the Ruml plan in reverse. If the purpose of the setback is to give the scheme a semblance

of equity, why not move the tax clock back to 1913 when the inequity started.

I sincerely hope every member will study the "reverse Ruml" proposal that has been offered by the Committee and the proposal I expect to offer as a substitute. It is not my intention to devote much time to a discussion of the committee bill as it is well analyzed in the committee report which is now available. Under the bill reported by the majority of the committee only a fraction of the 44,000,000 taxpayers would be made immediately current. Those who would be made current are the new taxpayers this year brought in under the 1942 Revenue Act.

Last year the Ways and Means Committee spent several months writing a new tax bill. Under the committee proposal we admit the increases in taxes were not necessary and that our committee labors were wasted effort. Now it is proposed under the committee bill that the 7,000,000 new taxpayers who were brought in under that bill shall have their tax abated. This is an "on again, off again, gone again Finnigan" type of tax collection.

Income taxpayers who had a tax liability in 1941 can only become current by a substantial doubling up in their tax payments during the next 3 years. They become immediately current by paying 2 years' taxes in one, namely, the 1941 tax applied to the 1942 income, plus the 1943 tax. In effect, the bill is an additional tax superimposed on present taxes.

The American people want to pay their taxes currently and therefore the House should adopt a bill that will place them on a current basis. This can be done in a simple manner and without loss to the Treasury. It is my firm conviction that they want to become current immediately and do not want any doubling up of their tax burden.

Under the amendment I have offered every taxpayer with a net income of less than $5,000 becomes current immediately. The 1942 tax liability becomes the tentative 1943 tax liability.

According to Treasury estimates for 1942 this means that over thirty-seven and a half million out of thirty-eight and a half million of our personal income taxpayers become automatically current under my proposal. These taxpayers whose personal income is in excess of $5,000 become current by paying either the 1942 tax liability or the 1943 tax liability, whichever is greater and by making an adjustment on taxes for abnormal or war income. Every effort is made in my bill to safeguard against windfalls through tax abatement.

The following table gives the number of income taxpayers in the various income brackets:

Estimated number of taxpayers under the present law (excluding the Victory tax) at net income levels estimated for the calendar year 1942, distributed by net income classes

Net income class (thousand dollars)	Simple distribution		Cumulative distribution from lowest income class		Cumulative distribution from highest income class	
	Amount (thousands)	Percentage distribution	Amount (thousands)	Percentage distribution	Amount (thousands)	Percentage distribution
	Number	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*
Under 1	9,385	24.17	9,385	24.17	38,831.5	100.00
1-2	17,363	44.71	26,748	68.88	29,446.5	75.83
2-3	6,887	17.74	33,635	86.62	12,083.5	31.12
3-4	2,697	6.95	36,332	93.75	5,196.5	13.38
4-5	1,176	3.03	37,509	96.60	2,499.5	6.43
5-10	943	2.43	38,452	99.03	1,322.5	3.40
10-25	299	.77	38,751	99.80	379.5	.97
25-100	75	.19	38,826	99.99	80.5	.20
100-200	4.3	.01	38,830	100.00	5.8	.01
200-500	1.2	(1)	38,831.2	100.00	1.5	(1)
500-1,000	.2	(1)	38,831.4	100.00	.3	(1)
1,000 and over	.06	(1)	38,831.5	100.00	.06	(1)
Total	38,831.5	100.00				

[1] Less than 0.005 percent.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.
Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Feb. 5, 1943.

I feel I must comment on the Treasury's definite position for or against tax legislation before Congress. When the previous bill submitted by the majority of the committee was before the House the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, stated he was 100 percent for the committee bill. Last Friday, Mr. Randolph Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury, assured the country in a press release that the Treasury was enthusiastically in favor of the new committee proposal. One would gather from these statements that the Treasury was for any bill proposed by the majority, regardless of its merits or demerits.

In this country the Government is still the servant of the people—and neither the Treasury nor any other department of the Government has the right to impose its will on the people without their consent. It is the Treasury's function to recommend the amount of revenue which should be raised, and to collect that revenue, but it is the function of the people speaking through Congress to determine how the revenue shall be obtained. The economic welfare—in the immediate future and over the long term—of the people, both as individuals and as a Nation requires a basic reform in our income-tax law.

Tax collections must be current. Collections would be much easier—the problem of widespread defaults in case of economic slumps would be eliminated—and our vast national bookkeeping system would be on a much sounder basis. These advantages are admitted by the Treasury and other stubborn opponents of a tax system that will collect taxes on current income for current liability.

The inherent evil of the present tax-collection system will have repercussions on the economic lives of the whole present generation of taxpayers unless it is corrected at the earliest possible moment. This may best be illustrated by giving an example, admittedly oversimplified but essentially typical.

When the income-tax law was passed in 1913, it had one major defect which was not recognized as such at the time but was rather adopted as an expedient: Collections did not start until 1914, but they applied to 1913 income. Insofar as John Smith, taxpayer, was concerned, he in effect started to pay taxes retroactively in 1914. For years he went along on this basis, but it did not seem particularly important because rates were low, he was able to pay his tax fairly easily, and at the same time he managed to save a little money. Now, however, the tax rate has gone up sharply and will go up even more. It becomes a real hardship for Mr. Smith to pay his taxes every year—and always on last year's income. Suppose that he becomes 65 and is forced to retire from business. The year after his retirement, his current income has stopped and he is trying to live on whatever he has been able to sacrifice over many years to save—but he still owes a large tax bill for last year's income. He must use a substantial part, perhaps the major part of his life's savings to pay this income tax.

Suppose again that John Smith has not worked a full lifetime, but rather that after being employed for 5 or 10 years he loses his job through no fault of his own. It is even more likely in this case—in fact it is almost certain—that most of whatever savings he has will be required to pay the tax on the income he received the last year he worked, and he will have no cushion to fall back on during the readjustment period which he must go through.

It will be argued that the taxpayer knew as soon as the tax bill was passed that he would have to pay a tax on the income he was receiving in 1943 and that he should have begun immediately to set aside a part of his income for that purpose. Similarly, anyone who started to work in 1941 or 1942 knew that he would have to pay high taxes on his income and should have made proper arrangements to have the money ready. This argument is worthless in face of the actual fact—people do not do it. As a result of the income-tax payment tradition of this country, 99 people out of 100 are a year behind in tax payments, and, from a psychological standpoint, it would be impossible to change that tradition by any method short of compulsion.

Because of our present tax system, then, men and women who reach the age of retirement or who become sick or disabled or who lose their jobs find themselves with an unbearable load of tax indebtedness, a load which is a severe hardship and which can only be borne by wiping out savings which have accumulated over years of work. Furthermore, the realization that to stop working for any reason means to be faced with a heavy indebtedness which cannot be paid will result increasingly in economic inflexibility.

The Treasury admits pay-as-you-go tax collection is desirable. They also admit there would be no loss in current revenue. Under my proposal, the Treasury would collect thirteen and a half billion dollars in 1943, instead of $10,000,000,000, as under existing law. That is important from a revenue standpoint, and it is most important in siphoning off inflationary money.

The proposal I am offering as a substitute to the committee bill is the only sound and simple method of placing our income taxpayers on a current basis immediately. I want to urge the House to adopt this substitute to the committee bill for the following reasons:

First. It accomplishes the objective of placing taxpayers on a current pay-as-you-earn basis immediately and not at some distant time.

Second. It involves no doubling up in payments.

Third. It treats all taxpayers equitably and is the only plan which abates the 1942 tax assessment on the same progressive principle by which it was imposed.

Fourth. It is simple to understand and simple to put into operation and to administer.

Fifth. It is the only plan which meets every problem squarely, openly, fairly, and honestly.

The amendment I am offering is the one plan, the only plan, that will answer the demand for current pay-as-you-go taxation. All other plans considered by the Ways and Means Committee, of which there were many, either failed to make the taxpayers current or required doubling up of taxes. When the House passes final judgment as between my proposal and the committee bill, I am confident that the will of the overwhelming majority of the sovereign people will this time triumph.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The reason that he pays on 1942 instead of 1943, after you give him credit for his 1942 income, is because in another place in your bill you require that man to pay his 1943 tax payable in 1943 in the year that is the higher?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That has not been brought out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman how the normal formula is arrived at? Make it as brief as you care to. You deduct from him 1942 or 1941, whichever is lower in normal income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I go back to the income tax on 1941, the same as the committee goes back to 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You use that as the normal income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Yes. I may say in a general way that in the excess-profits tax we established a base of 4 years. Except for the administrative difficulty I can see where that might have some advantages, but after all, we must remember that there are administrative difficulties in working out any tax-collection program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are the declaration provisions in your bill, sections 58, 59, and 60, the same as in the committee bill?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. They are absolutely the same as the committee bill. There is no difference between my bill and the committee bill, except as we deal with the 1942 tax liability.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was home all last week, and I heard a comment over the radio to the effect that there had been reached an agreement between the members of the Ways and Means Committee that if these bills were adopted, or something out of this, they did not intend to have an additional revenue bill this year. I would like to clear that rumor up, which was given to my section of the country through a radio commentator. Can the gentleman give us any information on that?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I will have to say to the gentleman from Michigan that he will have to get that from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I would not be able to answer that question.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. One of the main oppositions to this bill by the administration has been the statement that it favors the rich man and discriminates against the poor man, or the medium-class taxpayer. Will the gentleman comment on that statement?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Only to this extent: My bill makes thirty-seven and one-half million income taxpayers who are now under $5,000 current. It makes their 1943 tax liability their 1942 tax liability and I think we are taking care of that group very well. For these folks who are over that amount, I have windfall provisions that I think eliminate any undue enrichment from tax abatement.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has explained his anti-windfall provision, but in case a taxpayer makes a wartime income or enjoys a wartime income in both 1942 and 1943, is it not true he has an abatement of either one of the 2 years' income?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. No, that is not correct. In the first place, he has to pay the higher of the 2 years. Let us take the case of a man who in 1941 had an income of $50,000, in 1942, because of the war he had an income of $250,000, and in 1943 it was not quite so good, but he had an income of $200,000. In that case he would have to pay on the 1942 tax liability of $250,000; secondly, he would go back to 1941 and he would subtract the fifty thousand, which we presume was fairly normal, from the $200,000, and he pays on that difference, or on the $150,000, at the regular income-tax rate.

Mr. MICHENER. That is in addition?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill and the Carlson bill are identical in one particular. Under both bills the taxpayer's liability for tax will be advanced to the end that his 1943 tax will be payable in 1943, his 1944 tax will be payable in 1944, his 1945 tax in 1945, his 1946 tax in 1946, and so on from now on out, instead of paying his taxes in the year succeeding the year in which they become due, as under the present plan.

Aside from that one similarity, where the bills are 100 percent alike, they are different in every other provision except that they are not completely different in all other provisions. For example, the present committee bill recognizes and will put into effect the fundamental principles of the Carlson-Ruml bill insofar as 7,000,000 taxpayers are concerned. If you doubt that, look at the last paragraph on page 2 of the majority report of the committee. It tells you there in so many words that 7,000,000 taxpayers will pay no taxes on their 1942 income. Secondly, it recognizes and puts into effect approximately 50 percent of the fundamental provisions of the Carlson bill for the remaining 37,000,000 taxpayers. You will get that on page 3 of the majority report of the committee. It does this because all of the 1942 taxes for 7,000,000 new taxpayers will be forgiven and approximately 50 percent of the 1942 taxes will be forgiven for the remaining 37,000,000 taxpayers.

I ask you if it is right, just, and equitable to forgive all of the 1942 taxes for 7,000,000 taxpayers and approximately one-half of the 1942 taxes for the remaining 37,000,000 taxpayers, then does it not obviously follow as logical and reasonable that it will be more equitable to forgive all of the 1942 taxes for all of our taxpayers?

How can a government that has existed for 150 years on the principle of equity and justice for all countenance such a plan as the committee bill, that discriminates between the small taxpayers? It is an octopus with an abundance of tentacles but without any head.

A tax bill to be just must be bottomed upon an equitable foundation. The committee bill is without a sound foundation.

Wherein do the two bills differ? First, the Carlson-Ruml bill will bring into the Federal Treasury in 1943 more revenue than the committee bill; that is, the Carlson-Ruml bill will bring into the Federal Treasury, more than the committee bill, the excess of what the so-called war millionaires will pay into the Federal Treasury this year, as explained by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] a moment ago. That will be

the increase to the Federal Treasury under the Carlson-Ruml bill in 1943 over the committee bill. This is an improvement over the prior Carlson bill in that large windfalls to individuals or to the so-called war millionaires will now be impossible.

After 1943 every individual taxpayer will be treated exactly alike under the Carlson bill, with no doubling up on the poor man and with no unpaid tax burden hanging over the heads of a large number of our people when this war is over.

For example, under the committee bill a man who had $5,000 income in 1942 and is married will pay, according to the majority report of the committee, $119.20 next year, in 1944, in addition to his regular 1944 taxes payable currently. In 1945 he will pay the same, $119.20, and in 1946 he will pay the same amount plus his regular normal taxes payable currently in 1946.

A man who is married and had a $10,000 income for 1942 will pay this year under the committee bill just his normal tax for 1943, but next year, in 1944, he will pay his full 1944 taxes, plus $430.64, which is one-third of the unforgiven part of his 1942 taxes; in 1945 he will pay that same $430.64, in addition to his normal tax for 1945, that being the second third of the unforgiven 1942 taxes; and in 1946 he will pay that same $430.64, being the last third of the unforgiven portion of his 1942 taxes, plus the regular taxes due and payable on the current basis in the year 1946.

If this Congress wishes to place the taxpayers of America on a sound pay-as-you-go plan without loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury and without hardship to any except a few war millionaires, there is only one choice, namely, the Carlson bill.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Suppose a man draws a salary or has wages that are taxable, they alone are embraced in the pay-as-you-go plan in both bills.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Suppose he has other income derived from business transactions or income from property, he does not pay-as-you-go on that income, does he?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. He will under both bills by making regular returns as called for by the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How will he pay-as-you-go on his income other than salary or wages? How do you compute that?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I believe the gentleman is confused in that no one goes on a pay-as-you-go basis except those as to whom there is an opportunity to withhold from their salary.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Exactly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is true under either bill.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Therefore, both bills segregate the salary drawers and the wage earners and take from their salaries or earnings monthly or quarterly payments.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is on the withholding feature only.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But that cannot be done as to the income other than salaries and wages of those who are subjected to the pay-as-you-go plan.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right, but the wage earner or salary drawer would have to pay taxes on his other income just the same.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Finally.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At the end of the year, or at the time he makes out his return.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But he does not pay-as-you-go on anything except his salary or his wages.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will put it this way: He does not pay-as-you-go on anything except that which is earned in such a manner that it can be withheld.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Yes. Therefore, all taxpayers pay in the way they now pay except the drawers of salaries and wages.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Except that they are current. They are not paying on last year's income, they are paying on each year's income as that year progresses.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How can they pay it until the year is out?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. In other words, it is not necessarily a question of weekly or monthly payments; the fact is that no matter where their income arises they pay their 1943 taxes out of their 1943 income. Therefore, at the end of the year they are current.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But you do not withhold anything except salaries and wages.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You do not withhold except when it is earned under a condition so that it can be withheld.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is the point and I want to get it clear.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If you have an income from property, like an apartment house or something of that sort which is earned in such a way that it can be withheld by the person who pays you, I have no doubt the Treasury will work that out. But that does not make any difference. He pays taxes just the same.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It is true that the withholding tax placed on wages and salaries begins July 1 of this year?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And for a single person with $2,700 and a married person with $3,500, that makes them current. For all other taxpayers, with wages and salaries above the amount stated, from all other sources, they are required to file their declarations by March 15, and pay quarterly during the calendar year.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. On all income?

Mr. COOPER. On all income.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is true, as to both bills.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. At what rate of tax does the man pay whose income is from other than salaries or wages, in order to remain current?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is just the same as on wages.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman means 20 percent withholding tax?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No; that is not the rate. The rate is computed under the present bill which we passed last year.

Mr. DONDERO. That is 1942?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. So the rate of taxes will be the same?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; in conclusion, under the Carlson bill there will be no doubling up, except for the very few. It will produce more revenue in 1943. It will not create chaos when the war is over. Each bill recognizes the principle of forgiveness. Why not go all the way, as the Carlson bill does?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an amendment without reading, which I propose to offer tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose to offer is as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. SAUTHOFF to H. R. 2570. At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 9. Publicity of returns and declarations.

"(a) In general: Section 55 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to publicity of returns) is amended (1) by striking out 'this chapter', and inserting in lieu thereof 'this chapter by persons other than individuals, and all returns made under'; and (2) by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following, 'All returns and declarations made under this chapter by individuals shall constitute public records and shall be open to public examination and inspection.'

"(b) Effective date.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective only with respect to returns and declarations made after the date of the enactment of this act."

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, restores the publicity of Federal income taxes. Federal income taxes should be made public for two outstanding reasons:

First. To bring into the glare of the spotlight the profits being made out of this war; and

Second. To give to draft boards an opportunity to check on claims for de-

ferment of those eligible to the draft because of dependency.

We frequently hear it said that no millionaires are being made out of this war. That statement is absolutely false, as many millionaires are being made out of this war and every effort should be made to prevent it. If this is a total war, as has been frequently said, and if we are all called upon to make sacrifices, then no one should be permitted to grow rich out of it. It seems an astounding fact, and yet it is true, that Congress is expected to act intelligently in regard to war profits, yet Congress has done nothing about it except to pass an act calling for the renegotiation of war contracts. We should be able to check the Federal income-tax returns of those dealing with war necessities so that we can ferret out any injustices and inequities which are arising in this huge program.

Our experience in the last war should have taught us a lesson, namely, that many gross inequities, unjustifiable expense accounts, padded pay rolls, and other criminal devices were resorted to in order that huge profits might be reaped. There is no doubt that the same thing is occurring in this war, and the searchlight of publicity on the income-tax returns would bring much of it into the open.

The second reason why we should have publicity of Federal income-tax returns is the draft dodging which is now being perpetrated on the grounds of dependency. Draft dodgers are advising their draft boards that someone or other is dependent upon them and the draft boards have no method of checking on these statements to find out whether they are true or false. It is my contention that there ought to be an opportunity for draft boards to check on these statements and find out whether or not they are true. The special subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, headed by the gentleman from California, JOHN COSTELLO, is now bringing to the surface some of those who have resorted to dependency cyclone cellars to evade the draft. The preliminary report of the Costello committee shows that some 840,578 young men between the ages of 18 to 38 are safely protected from the draft in Government service. Not all of these young men have obtained a deferred classification on the grounds that they are indispensable to the Government but many have obtained a deferred classification on the grounds of dependency. A flagrant case which was recently brought to light showed that the dependency claimed was the young man's mother, while a check-up of real estate holdings in that case disclosed that she owned two apartment buildings. This is only one case of fraud that was unearthed by accident. How many more could be unearthed if the Costello committee had access to the Federal income-tax returns. In justice to the young men who are at the front, in justice to their beloved ones at home these violations of the Selective Service Act should be brought to light and the best way is to turn the glare of publicity upon the income-tax returns, both of the selectee and his dependents.

I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this measure to relieve the taxpayers is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country. I represent a district which is a cross section of America. It has great industries. Our people have great agricultural resources. We have people engaged in every activity in which the American people are employed. Without exception during the last week which I spent among my home people, not a single individual voiced opposition to this Ruml-Carlson plan of taxation. The great question that is addressing itself to the people of the country who must bear the load of taxation with which we undertake to fight this world-wide war, is how will we meet the ever-increasing cost of Government, how can we make the payments in the way of taxes that our Government is calling upon us to make.

It has been said that we must not help the many because we might help the few. We must refuse to help 44,000,000 taxpayers for fear some so-called rich man may benefit. If the tax rate of any county in the United States is reduced as much as $1 on the $100 worth of property, the owner of a $1,000 home is saved $10; the owner of a $10,000 farm is saved $100. So it is all individual income taxpayers are treated exactly alike under the Carlson bill. Now, when this war is over and when its cost, as a burden of indebtedness, bears down upon the backs of the American people, in my candid opinion there will not be any rich men in America. The American taxpayer is undertaking to swim across the flood tide of a national indebtedness and tax exactions with a millstone of indebtedness that this present administration has put around the neck of the American taxpayer. It is now proposed, when our national debt limit has been raised to $210,000,000,000, when we are undertaking to finance not only the war efforts of this Nation but that of all of our allies, and not content with that we are going out and forcing our gifts upon people who have not asked for them under the name and guise of the good neighbor policy—and I am not opposed to that within sane bounds—it is now proposed that we put upon the back of the taxpayer, as he undertakes to swim across this flood tide of governmental exaction, an additional load. Everybody knows that the American people, the American taxpayer in every walk of life, desire to be put upon a current, pay-as-you-earn plan. Ours is a simple plan. We simply move the hands of the clock up and we say that from henceforth until death a man shall pay the tax that his Government exacts of him out of the earnings that he shall make in each year that he shall hereafter live. We say that when death comes and the breadwinner ceases to earn, the Federal tax gatherer must stay out of the broken family circle. We say that the tax collector must halt at the grave.

Now, whose Congress is this? Whose Government is it? Who is it that has the right to say how much and in what manner our people shall pay? I conceive this to be a representative body, representative of the people, who, due to their vast numbers, cannot come here and, in person, register their will with respect to this tax bill. The only voice they can utter here, the only representation that they have here, is their elected Representatives. The polls all show and we all know that probably 90 percent of the people want to move the hands of the clock up and put taxpaying on a current basis. If they could come here and so express themselves, are they not the source of power? Have they not the right to say by what method they shall be taxed? And by the same token have we not, as Representatives, the right, yea, the duty, to register their will upon this subject?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I presume the gentleman read the report by Mr. Stettinius, that something like 10 or 12 billion dollars had been given to our allies from lease-lend? Not a word was said against that, but when it is proposed to cancel 1 year's tax of the American people, through which operation the Treasury will not lose a cent, we hear all this hue and cry.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes, and it is absolutely beside the mark. Those who oppose this bill strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. They have billions for all the world—but not 1 cent for the American taxpayer. The truth of it is I sometimes think that what is going on here in Washington by some people can best be expressed by the old nursery rhyme:

There was a man in our town and he was wondrous wise.
He jumped into a bramble bush and scratched out both his eyes.
And when he found his eyes were out, with all his might and main,
He jumped into another bush and scratched them in again.

They have scratched out the financial solvency of the people of this country and now they propose to jump into the bramble bush of double taxation and finish off the American taxpayer. Heretofore, we have sheared him annually—now it is proposed to skin him.

I have heard the argument made that it ought not to be done because we have got a few so-called rich men. I thank God for the fact that under the American system and under our economic setup and under the equality of opportunity that our system has afforded to men in every walk of life, we have some rich men. I do not hold any brief for Henry Ford, but I am glad that he started life with a pair of blue overalls and a monkey wrench and the genius that God Almighty put into his brain, and became a millionaire, because he made other men rich and paid the highest wages that up

to that time had ever been paid to the American workingman and covered this whole country with a network of highways that are animated ribbons of concrete from ocean shore to ocean shore.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the plant at River Rouge now employs 110,000 men.

Mr. JENNINGS. Of course. And at that great plant bombers are being turned out that mean victory. In my town we have a man born with inventive genius. Weston M. Fulton started from scratch. Today there is a plant in Knoxville, Tenn., that makes instrumentalities without which we could not operate our submarines. Mr. Fulton is no longer at its head, but other men have trod in his footsteps, men who had inventive genius and vision. They are at the head of a great industry there that employs over 3,000 men, women, boys, and girls in a defense industry. Who would begrudge that man the money he made by founding that great enterprise?

I heard the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, a man whom I greatly admire, come down here and go on the mound as the pitcher for the majority. He has a marvelous change of pace. He can throw a hard ball, a slow ball, or a curve ball, and he is ambidextrous and can throw either with the right hand or with the left hand. The most profound argument that he adduced against the Carlson-Ruml plan was that Mr. Ruml on a certain occasion wore a coat of lilac hue. He built much of his argument on clothes Ruml is said to have once worn. According to that we should take the picture of George Washington off the wall of this Chamber and throw it and his Farewell Address into the discard, because the old boy wore silk stockings and silk pantaloons and a powdered wig and a ruffled shirt. When we get ready to write a tax plan for the American people we ought to discard the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who heads this great committee, and send for Mahatma Gandhi with his diaper and his nanny-goat and put him at the head of the Ways and Means Committee of this House; that is, if the soundness of a man's views are to be determined by the color or quality of his clothes.

I am for the preservation of the American taxpayer. The time will come if we continue on down the slippery, steep road we are now on to the precipice that leads to the bottomless pit, the abyss of financial bankruptcy and ruin, the time will come when we can put a taxpayer on exhibition and make money charging admission for people to see him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Minnesota has 4 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina 6 minutes before the Committee rises under the order of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, in the passage of the tax bill which we are now considering, it is hoped that the American taxpayer may be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis so that he may meet his obligations to the Treasury of the United States as he earns.

I shall support the Carlson bill. I have an amendment to offer to the withholding-tax provisions which would apply not only to the Carlson bill but to the Doughton bill and to the Robertson-Forand bill. I expect to offer this amendment to the bill that is first offered as a substitute. If that substitute is rejected I will offer it on the later substitutes and, if they are rejected, to the committee bill. The amendment that I propose is as follows:

Following subsection (i) of section 466, add a new subsection as follows:

"(j) Upon the request of an employee, made at the beginning of any taxable year, the employer shall, before withholding the tax as provided in this section, deduct from the amount of wages paid to such employee the average amount for each pay-roll period of the religious, educational, charitable, and other contributions as defined in section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code, which the employee certifies he will pay during the current year."

Mr. Chairman, we are legislating for a long time to come. If the foregoing amendment is adopted, it will mean a great deal to our churches, our colleges, our charitable and humanitarian institutions. The substance of the foregoing amendment has been endorsed by the United Stewardship Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States at their annual meeting held in Philadelphia, Pa., in April 1943. This council represents 24 major religious denominations, having a membership of 24,000,000. This idea is supported by the officers of the Association of American Colleges. It has the individual support of prominent members of the Catholic and Jewish faiths. It meets the wants and needs of many charitable and humanitarian institutions which may not be connected with a church.

Let us consider the need for this amendment. When the withholding tax becomes a law, the individual will have the deduction of the withholding tax and the Victory tax from his pay check. This will be 20 percent for the lowest brackets. Perhaps the cost of living has gone up 20 percent and he is urged to buy bonds in the amount of another 10 percent. He will have but a small amount of money left. It is true that from this money remaining, he can make a contribution to his church or to a college or to the Red Cross or to some other institution and receive a proper credit for this contribution when he files his final report. However, facing these drastic deductions for taxes, the increased living cost, and his bond program, in all probability he will have no money left, or very little money left, for the contribution that he would like to make, that he ought to make, and he would make if he had the funds. The amendment that I propose merely says in substance that he may declare the amount of contributions made or the amount of the contributions he expects to make and take credit for them currently, thereby lessening the amount of his withholding tax.

Under existing law, a taxpayer may deduct from his net income contributions up to 15 percent of his net income. For instance, an individual with a net income of $200 per month might choose to contribute to churches, colleges, hospitals, and the Red Cross the sum of $20 per month, or one-tenth of his income. My amendment would mean that he could at the beginning of his taxable year certify his intention so to contribute and the withholding tax would be based on $180 each month instead of the full $200.

It is very evident that my amendment, or a similar one, would mean a great deal to the fine, essential institutions which depend upon the contributions of the American people. If the law provides, as cited in the illustration I just used, that a man drawing wages of $200 a month can have his withholding tax base reduced to $180 per month by contributing $20 to charity, many, many more people will make such contributions. It will help the Red Cross. It will help every church in America, whether it be Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or of some other faith. It will help every non-tax-supported institution of learning in the land. It will be of a great benefit to every humanitarian enterprise, the contributions of which come within the purview of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Is it necessary for me to state that these institutions need contributions? A look at the facts invites alarm. Taking 1928 as a basis, generally speaking our national income dropped until it reached an all-time low in 1932. Then the national income started to rise and in 1940 it reached the 1928 level. At the end of 1942, our national income was 49 percent above the 1928 level. How does this compare with our church contributions in the United States? From 1928, church contributions declined and reached an all-time low, not in 1932, but in 1934. Have church contributions followed on the upward trend with the national income since 1934? The answer is they have not. Church contributions have remained a very little above the low level of 1934. Today, church contributions are 31 percent below what they were in 1928, although the national income is 49 percent higher.

In 1928 the national per capita income was $633. For that same year the church per capita gifts amounted to $23.30. In 1932, the national per capita income was only $374 and in that year the church per capita gifts were $19.02. The church per capita gifts reached an all-time low in 1936 in the amount of $11.75. In 1942, the national per capita income was $841, much above the 1928 income, while the church per capita gifts for 1942 were $15.20, much below the 1928 figure. Far be it from me to suggest

that the Government of the United States should in any way enter the field of church support. My amendment does not do that at all. It merely makes it optional for the individual taxpayer to take credit for his contributions currently, so he may support his church and the charities and colleges of his choice on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The trend of religious contributions during this present era of governmental affairs may reflect the attitude that we Americans have had toward things eternal, and it may in part account for the terrible predicament in which we now find our country. One of America's leading business executives in a radio address on October 4 of last year said:

> We have woefully failed in love of God and love of man. Human greed and selfishness have brought us to our present sorry plight. Industrial and commercial development has been so rapid, all engrossing that it has outstripped and stultified our moral and spiritual development. To renew, to strengthen, to extend spiritual power in man is the supreme task of this hour.

Surely we are now aware of the fact that the Government of the United States cannot solve every problem that confronts every individual in our country. We must return the first principles. We should refrain from placing everything under Government control and should give God a chance. Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulaus once said:

> Statesmanship is seeing where Almighty God is going and then getting things out of His way.

That truth is in force today. In the trying days that lie ahead, we need the church, our Christian colleges, and our institutions of charity more than ever before. I believe that the principle of the amendment that I expect to offer will materially and greatly aid those institutions and at the same time not in the least disturb the historic and sacred position of separation of church from this great Government of ours. This amendment should be adopted so that these fine institutions can work out their own pay-as-you-go plan for contributions.

A great truth was uttered by William McKinley when he said:

> Our faith teaches us that there is no safer reliance than the God of our fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us now as long as we obey His commandments and walk humbly in His footsteps.

Today America is engaged in an all-out war, a global war, and a war for our survival. We will win this war, but when we do, what then?

When our war job is over our domestic problems will still be with us and it would be foolhardy on our part if we did not heed the advice of those who say that after the present war emergency is over there will be another and a greater period of depression. It is well that we give some thought now as to how we will approach that problem and what our attitude will be.

It is a matter of history that America has never come out of any depression until a spiritual awakening had taken place. A noted example of this is the revival that followed the panic of 1857. At that time the large financial centers crashed, public confidence was prostrate, industry stood still, ruin confronted the leaders of business, and desperate poverty was the lot of countless wage earners. Amidst such conditions a laymen's revival started in many of our great cities and swept over our country. Newspapers at that time carried accounts of men in all walks of life—porters, hand-cart men, policemen, tradesmen, mechanics, ministers, business and professional men of all ages—gathering at places of worship. Those men cried out to God, "Save my soul and restore my credit," or "Save my soul and get me a job." Their common conscience told them why they had to pray, and their common predicament dictated what to pray for.

America came out of that depression and came out with a stronger citizenry. Commenting on it, the Reverend A. J. Patterson, of Portsmouth, N. H., said:

> A religious awakening always follows the track of a business depression; this is convincing evidence of the reality of religion.

We should ever be mindful—

> That only men can make
> A nation great and strong,
> Men who for truth and honor's sake
> Stand fast and suffer long.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was here before on March 25 there were two arguments made against it which the sponsors of the committee bill now before us have abandoned as unsound. One was that it was wicked to forgive any part of the 1942 tax—you must not do it, that was a sin. I notice the chairman of the committee, Mr. DOUGHTON, nodding his head. The other one was that if we passed a tax bill with the Carlson-Ruml plan in it we would be greatly benefiting a few people although it was admitted we would at the same time be aiding some 44,000,000 other taxpayers. I never could see the reason why just because someone might get a little something by tax abatement we should deprive the rest of our people of an opportunity which was theirs if the forgiveness plan was adopted. I want to read a little from a letter that was put in the RECORD by the chairman of the committee, Mr. DOUGHTON. He read that letter on the 25th day of March and it will be found in the RECORD at page 2494. I wonder if the chairman of the committee will listen to the reading of this letter on which he put so much stress. It reads like this—I do not wonder that he does not want to hear it reread in view of the present bill he submits and for which he asks support, but here it is:

> DEAR SIR: Any form of forgiveness of any taxes would destroy American morale and would stab in the back our overseas men.

Skipping down a sentence:

> Nothing Hitler or his crafty, deceptive generals could do would so effectively destroy American patriotism and democracy.

Yet the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, today stood on the floor of this House—after he had on the 25th of March endorsed the foregoing statements—and asked the Members of Congress to support the bill which the majority of his committee reported—a bill which carries something over 44 percent of the forgiveness which the writer of the letter which the gentleman read to the House said would destroy American morale and would stab in the back our overseas men.

Here are two more sentences from that letter which the gentleman endorsed and which he used as an argument against the forgiveness carried in the Carlson-Ruml plan. Those sentences read:

> How can anyone worthy of living in America ask that our just taxes be forgiven when our men are dying? Is it possible that our American Congress would sell us out to the war profiteers and tax dodgers?

I cite those statements to show how absurd were the arguments advanced in March by those who opposed the Carlson substitute. The action of the majority of the committee, in sponsoring a bill which carries a percentage of forgiveness of the 1942 tax is proof, if any were needed, that the so-called forgiveness—in reality, the postponement—or, if you prefer, a tax moratorium—proposed in the Carlson plan is in no way reprehensible.

It is proof that the arguments advanced against the Carlson substitute, when it was before us in March, were unsound and that the majority of the committee have seen the error of their position.

When the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON] finished reading that letter—and there is more to it than I have quoted—he was asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] this question:

> Does the Chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee endorse what that woman says in that letter?

And the gentleman from North Carolina replied:

> I endorse every word of it.

He endorsed the statement that any form of forgiveness of any tax would destroy American morale and would stab in the back our overseas men. Now, what becomes of that argument made when the bill was here on March 25, when you bring in your present bill with the forgiveness feature incorporated in it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; well—what becomes of it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is the situation, the pending bill corrects the things complained of so much better than the proposition the gentleman spoke of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but you did not agree with us then.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We did not agree with you then, but we have done the best we could in the interest of the Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman sacrifice principle for that?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We are sacrificing nothing; the principle is not sacrificed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman's argument is that because the House does not agree with him he is going to agree with the House?

Mr. DOUGHTON. When did the gentleman get so conscientious about principle?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is that?

Mr. DOUGHTON. When was the gentleman reborn on the subject of principle? When did he have a rebirth?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My position has always been the same. You are the one who is now proposing forgiveness of a portion of the 1942 tax which in March you argued was a sin. The gentleman is willing to go 54 percent into sin now, why not relax and enjoy it? It really is no sin, but a relief measure which will aid our people to carry the war burden.

Mr. DOUGHTON. To correct the mistake that was made before does not violate any principle whatever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; you just take the half of what you call a sin now; why not go the full length, get all the benefit it offers to 44,000,000 people? If you are talking about principle why not go along with the people in the way they want and give them all they want now, when no principle is violated?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Has the gentleman from Michigan got a monopoly on principle?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly not. I do not believe a principle was involved. If the gentleman did, or if he now does, why offer a bill which abandons to at least 40 percent that principle?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, during the last 2 hours some insidious propaganda has been spread among the Members of the House. I do not know whether my good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] had succumbed to it when he made his statement here or not, but the fact is word has been passed around that the Forand-Robertson tax plan would not come to the floor of the House tomorrow and that the show-down would be between the Carlson bill and the committee bill. I want to deny that statement and I want to make the situation as clear as I know how by stating that it is the intention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself to have that proposal again brought forth and this time to have the membership of the House vote on it. So much so that a revised edition of the Forand-Robertson bill was introduced by me this afternoon, H. R. 2577, which will be available to the membership tomorrow.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sure the gentleman would not want to give the House an assurance this afternoon that the Members of the House will be given an opportunity to vote on the Robertson-Forand plan tomorrow because neither the gentleman nor any other Member of the House can foresee what the parliamentary situation will be or what parliamentary situation will develop.

Mr. FORAND. I want to assure the gentleman that I cannot make a definite statement that it will come up tomorrow, but if the parliamentary situation is such that it is permissible to introduce the proposal, it will come to the floor.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, that would have been the case also on the 30th of March.

Mr. FORAND. Yes; had not the motion been made by the Republicans to send the bill back to the committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Many Members cannot afford to take a chance, so they tell me.

Mr. FORAND. I think that perhaps was the sentiment a month ago, but thank the Lord the sentiment has changed considerably.

The bill that I introduced today, like the Carlson bill and the committee bill, contains 47 pages that are identical. I refer to the withholding provision, the exemption up to $3,500 for service men, and the abatement of taxes for men who die in the service.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But with this exception, your bill strikes out the discount for cash that is in the other two bills?

Mr. FORAND. I was coming to that. That is why I said there were 47 pages that were identical. Fourteen pages are different. They include the elimination of the discount provision completely and, of course, the forgiveness provisions widely known as the Robertson forgiveness plan, which would be the 13-percent first surtax bracket and the 6-percent normal tax.

We believe that this is the best of the three bills. Under the Carlson bill for a man whose income has been the same for 2 or 3 years there will be definitely provided those individuals a nice forgiveness. It will in no way change the tax brackets. So the man in the million-dollar class who for 2, 3, or 4 years has been paying $864,000 in taxes each year will get the benefit of $864,000, yet his tax rates will remain in the same brackets as they are today, and when you go to increase taxes you will not be able to reach him. You will have to increase the taxes on the taxpayers in the middle brackets and in the lower brackets to make up for the sum that has been forgiven the man in the higher bracket. I do not think that is fair and that is my main reason for offering a proposition that would forgive 19 units to everybody, top to bottom, so when you go to reimpose the tax you can reimpose it on everybody alike. So far as the discount angle is concerned, we have eliminated that completely out of the new print. The committee bill contains some doubling up, you cannot get away from it, and I am not in favor of doubling up.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, under your bill, anyone who has a taxable income of more than $2,000, the amount above $2,000 will not be forgiven?

Mr. FORAND. That is absolutely true, and you will not have to double up and pay that because he will continue to pay in the following year as under the present system all that is above the $2,000 income.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How do you get them fully current, then?

Mr. FORAND. He cannot be current unless he wants to pay up. That is entirely up to himself. However, 38,000,000 of the 44,000,000 taxpayers would be made current under my bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the Forand-Robertson bill is more nearly like the Carlson bill than it is the committee bill?

Mr. FORAND. I will leave that to the judgment of the House.

Mr. JENKINS. That is, they have more points in common.

Mr. FORAND. Possibly. Now, briefly, here is what H. R. 2577, the bill I introduced today, does and how it will work:

The Forand bill—H. R. 2577—provides:

First. Forgiveness of the first 19 units, the basic liability on all income-tax returns—6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax.

Second. Withholding 20 percent at the source on all salaries and wages—3 percent Victory tax and 17 percent income tax.

Third. Increasing exemptions for members of our armed forces to $3,500—less personal exemptions—on compensation received for military service.

Fourth. Abating all taxes owed by a member of our armed forces who dies while in active service.

HOW THE PLAN WORKS

First. Collect March 15 and June 15, 1943, installments of 1942 tax liabilities, as provided under present law. Treat the part of these payments corresponding to the basic liability—6 percent normal tax plus 13 percent of surtax net income—as advance payments of 1943 basic liabilities. Treat the payments in excess of the basic payment as payments of 1942 taxes.

Second. Require September 15 and December 15 installments on 1942 tax only with respect to liabilities in excess of the basic liability.

Third. Forgive the basic liability on 1942 income by crediting it to 1943 tax.

Fourth. Begin collection at source from wages and salaries, July 1, 1943, at a rate of 20 percent to cover basic liability of 6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax, and the Victory tax.

Fifth. For income not subject to collection at source begin current payments

of basic liabilities with the third quarter of 1943 on the basis of simple quarterly statements of income, permitting the use of 1942 income as a presumptive basis where desired.

Sixth. Farmers, because it is impossible for them to know what their crops will bring until the crop is harvested, will be allowed until December 15 to file a declaration and pay two-thirds of their basic tax. Payment of the balance due on that basic liability will be made when they file their income-tax return on the following March 15.

Seventh. Collect the balance of liability above the basic liabilities in the year following receipt of income as under existing law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter received today from Randolph Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, in connection with the tax bill considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in the Baltimore News Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from PM on Mr. John L. Lewis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ACTION ON MARTINIQUE NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today on a matter which is of utmost concern and interest to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Germany has been refueling her submarines on the Island of Martinique.

On March the 1st I took the floor here in the House of Representatives and said that it was high time for the United States to stop any and all appeasement of the Laval-Vichy government in any manner, shape, or form, by direct or indirect aid. I brought forth the fact that a ship by the name of *Guadeloupe* was loaded with food and supplies at New Orleans and headed for Martinique when the crew struck there in New Orleans.

I further revealed that the United States was shipping to Martinique approximately $1,000,000 worth of food and supplies per month.

Martinique, as we all know, is under control of Admiral Robert, who ever since his domination of the island has been anti-United States and pro-Vichy. He has refused to turn over $650,000,000 in gold, which is on the island, together with the six oil tankers, an aircraft carrier, several warships, and many merchant ships.

I also stated on March 1 that 2 months prior to Pearl Harbor the Navy decided to take over Martinique and went so far as to place marines on warships, but the State Department turned thumbs down and nothing was done.

Immediately after I spoke of these matters on the floor of the House the State Department announced that the food supply had been cut off and that America was going to discontinue sending any food.

Evidently Admiral Robert figured that the shoe was going to pinch so he sent forth a press statement to the effect that he might change his mind about the United States if certain conditions were fulfilled. Three days ago Secretary of State Cordell Hull announced that the United States had broken off relations with Admiral Robert, who is in control of the Island of Martinique.

I have definite information, which I can now reveal, to the effect that German submarines have been refueled at the Island of Martinique. As a matter of fact, workmen on defense projects in Trinidad could turn on their short-wave receiving sets and hear the commanders of the German submarines talking back and forth about refueling, and the Island of Martinique was mentioned frequently.

This situation is serious and something should be done immediately. I call this matter especially to the attention of the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt. Now is the time for action. Some may think that it is a question of closing the barn door when the horse is gone. We have not only lost the horse, but if we are not careful we will lose the barn. Let us have action.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my friend the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusettts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House of Representatives be permitted to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, one of the most enlightened constitutions in history was voted unanimously and acclaimed by a freedom-loving people. It was the Polish Constitution. Speaking today, on its one hundred and fifty-second anniversary I render homage to the nation that throughout its history has fought in the cause of freedom and in these dark days remains true to the same glorious tradition.

Poles fought for the freedom of the United States, of Belgium, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Turkey, of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela.

A record second to none! But that is past history. What of today?

Today the Poles are veterans who have fought through 3 years of war that began with an unprovoked aggression against their country, the first and most poignant act of the world drama we are living. Veterans of the war in Poland, of the war in France, of the war in Norway, of the Battle of Britain, of the war in Africa and Syria, of the battle of the Atlantic, of the war in the skies and on the seas. Wherever Poles live, they answered the call of their motherland. From the four corners of the earth they came, because no man hath greater love

than this: to give his life for the thing he loves! Their lives and all they have and are, they offered generously for Poland. From South America and from China, from Australia and from Canada, from Russia and from South Africa, they came. Here in our own country 5,000,000 Americans of Polish descent are foremost in the war effort of the United States. They were with Kelly and Rickenbacker; they were in Bataan and Corregidor, they were on the *Wasp* and on Henderson Field, they are in the skies over Tunis and over Germany, in convoys and on warships, they are in that great army of labor which provides the tools of victory and in the land army whose toil feeds our boys on all the fronts encircling the whole earth.

Today we stand in silence and, numbed by the unspeakable suffering of that valiant nation of old and trusting friends, our hearts bleed with theirs as we behold the anguish of Polish mothers bereft of their small children scattered to the west and to the east, of their daughters given to shame, of their husbands crowding the torture chambers of the concentration camps. We are appalled by the wanton carnage of intellectuals, scientists and artists, men and women who were the pride of the whole civilized world. We stand aghast at the avowed extermination of a whole people.

Shocked by that ghastly process, we render heartfelt tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Poles who, true to their past traditions when oppressed and partitioned by the empires of the Kaiser and Czar, now again plunged into the depths of affliction, keep unshaken their faith that justice will be dispensed to them on the morrow of victory.

When the Almighty looks down upon the darkness of this earth and beholds the shining spirit of the Polish people in their anguish, He sees already dawning for them a greater future, commensurate with the unequalled sacrifice victory had demanded of them, that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

We salute you for having stood firm when all else crumbled before the specter of war. You were first to cast away appeasement. Thrice before in history you saved Europe and again for the fourth time Christian civilization found in you its first and loyal defender.

We salute you for the 8 months of priceless time you gave to the world to arm and resist, for otherwise the second world war would have been lost to liberty, and serfdom might have prevailed.

We salute you for among your children not one was found to clasp the enemy's hand, notwithstanding every inducement offered and in spite of unspeakable torture that was visited upon the Polish nation.

We salute you for in the hour of your own extermination you bestowed care and loving mercy upon the millions of Jews penned up for slaughter in the odious walls of the ghettos.

We salute you for your undying love of liberty, with which you have inspired other complacent peoples, awakening the rhythm of freedom in the hearts of men.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Today persons of Polish blood all over the world—in the deserts of north Africa, in the flying fields of Britain, behind locked doors in the darkened houses of the homeland—are joining in solemn reconsecration to the cause of Polish freedom. It is fitting that the House of Representatives of the United States pause to pay its tribute to a heroic people.

This world conflict in which we are now engaged had its origins in the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth century. It was then that the common people began their age-long struggle against tyranny. The steady rise of the common people has today provoked tyranny to one last desperate effort to enslave the world. America had its great role in these democratic beginnings. So, too, did Poland. Both today are standing firm in the forefront of the struggle against aggression.

This partnership in the cause of liberty began when brave men like Pulaski and Kosciusko left their native land to help the Thirteen Colonies in their war for independence. Pulaski gave his life for America. Kosciusko returned to carry American ideals back to his people at home. When the French Revolution signaled the spread of the doctrines of liberty, equality, and fraternity to the continent of Europe, oppressed peoples everywhere thrilled to attention. Poland was among the first to act. On May 3, 1791, only 2 years after our own Constitution, Poland adopted its great charter, limiting the power of the feudal nobility and setting up new guaranties for the rights of the people.

The Polish Constitution was short-lived. In 1795 Poland was overrun by invaders, and the free Polish state disappeared from the map of Europe. But the free Polish spirit lived on, and the Constitution of 1791 has remained its shining symbol. Through the years of despotism which followed, Constitution Day, the 3d of May, has always been the day on which the Polish people have recalled the hopes of the past, and rededicated themselves to the vision of a free Poland in the future.

The Treaty of Versailles liberated Poland and restored a strong Polish state. It was a land in which liberty, justice, democracy existed as ideals to be striven after. It was a land in which the cause of human freedom, as embodied in the constitution of 1791, was a cause to be honored. It was a land of deep religious faith and of a burning desire for freedom.

Constitution Day in 1943 assumes a new and terrible significance. For, as we all know, Adolf Hitler, in September 1939, unveiled his long-meditated plan to conquer the world, and sent his bombing planes and his mechanized divisions into Poland. The Poles resisted with all the courage and gallantry of a people long devoted to freedom. But courage and gallantry were not enough to defeat tanks and dive bombers. After 4 bloody weeks, organized resistance collapsed. The hopes struck off by the constitution of 1791 were once again in eclipse. Poland once more had fallen to the invader.

The enemies of Poland have learned by bitter experience that defeat cannot break the Polish spirit. The Nazis, the most savage and ruthless conquerors Europe has seen since Attila the Hun, have left no technique of torture untried in their mad attempt to destroy the soul of Poland. Every kind of horror, of degradation, of crime, has been committed, not in the heat of battle but as part of a cold-blooded plan, whose details can add up to but a single and terrible conclusion—the total extermination of the Polish people.

As usual, the Nazis have fatally underestimated the strength of the common people. They have heaped atrocity upon atrocity. They have killed the men, debauched the women, starved the children. Those whom they have not murdered or thrust in concentration camps they have made slaves of the "new order." They have turned Warsaw into a living agony. They have done everything that subhuman deviltry could devise to break the Polish spirit.

But the Polish people fight on. And on this Constitution Day we are grateful for the privilege of paying our humble tribute to this amazing fact. In spite of hunger, in spite of sickness, in spite of the Gestapo and its infernal methods, the Polish people fight on.

Nazi reprisals have been desperate, but unavailing. Hundreds of thousands have been slaughtered by the Nazis; over 60,000 murdered in concentration camps; almost 2,000,000 people have been driven from their homes and sent as slave labor to Germany.

The Polish answer is more sabotage, more resistance, more Nazis stabbed on dark streets by Polish patriots. Guerilla bands roam the countryside, blowing up ammunition dumps, setting fire to factories, dynamiting trains. Over a hundred underground newspapers keep the spirit of resistance alive. Everywhere Poles gather to perfect the plans and methods of their secret war against the Nazis. This is the Polish answer to German brutality. It is an answer which comes from a people whose spirit can never be broken.

On other fronts the Polish armed forces have added great strength to the United Nations. The Polish Air Force, which distinguished itself so mightily in the Battle of Britain, still fights beside the Royal Air Force and the American Air Forces, and smashes Germany from the skies. In some of the Polish Air Force squadrons losses have risen to the proportion of 46 percent of the flying personnel and 23 percent of the machines. Everywhere the Polish soldier is known for his courage, his determination, his grim and dauntless fighting spirit.

For some months now, we have known that Adolf Hitler has been trying to produce a European charter, in a pathetic attempt to combat the power of our own Atlantic Charter. He intends to dig up signatories to this charter from all the states overrun by the Nazi legions. The Lavals and Petains, the Quislings, the Musserts, the Mussolinis, and all the rest will crawl out of their holes to put their X's where the ringmaster directs. But

thus far Hitler has found no Pole to play his dirty game. Thus far all his policy of extermination has succeeded only in hardening the Polish will to resist.

Of late, Hitler has been working overtime in his attempts to woo some Pole to his banner. He has failed.

The people of Poland need have no fear. Their record in this war—that record of resistance, of faith, of amazing heroism—guarantees their security in the future. People who fight for liberty will get it—and deserve to have it.

America knows well enough the honesty, hardiness, and good faith of the Poles. The contributions of Polish-Americans to our industrial and cultural life have been very great. They are among our finest citizens.

We can assure them, and all Poles everywhere, that the restoration of a free Polish people will beyond any possibility of doubt be one of the accomplishments of victory. The hopes embodied in the constitution of 1791 have never been closer to fulfillment. The sufferings and sacrifices of a heroic people will gain their just reward.

Poland will live again.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, Poland—our ally—the first European country to take up arms against Hitler, is celebrating its Constitution Day. Wherever Poles are to be found in their own tortured country or abroad, they are united in the fervent hope and firm conviction that their gallant nation will arise from the ashes of this war as a free and independent state, worthy of its glorious past, and this view is universally shared by Americans.

America and Poland have been bound by ties of similar ideals and aspirations since the dawn of our history. Every school boy has learned in his history texts of the distinguished Polish soldiers, who after fighting for freedom in their own country, came to America to fight for our freedom. Many men of the Polish race, including Pulaski, gave their lives to make America a land of freedom.

Wherever and whenever there has been a fight for liberty or against oppression, in the Old World or the New, other Polish heroes have answered the call, in line with Poland's motto, "For your freedom and for ours."

With Hitler's unprovoked aggression against Poland in 1939, that gallant nation resisted with every resource at her command, small and helpless though it was in comparison with the resources of the aggressor.

In spite of German occupation, in spite of the fact that millions of Poles may be confined behind barbed wire in concentration camps, in spite of starvation, Poland continues to fight because of the unconquerable spirit of her soul.

Poland's national day, which is being celebrated today, is one more proof that the love of liberty, of humanity, equality, and a sense of democracy are inherent in this great race. Poland might have chosen the date of some important military victory as her national holiday, but they have chosen instead the 3d of May. It was on this day in 1791, 2 years after the Constitution of the United States was adopted, that the Diet of Poland adopted a constitution.

This document of freedom stands as a beacon light beckoning to the spirit of Poles everywhere to never say die. It is their inspiration to fight on, and in the end it will triumph. Poland's has been a tragic history, but also a noble and inspiring one. She has been overwhelmed by superior forces of military might, she has been partitioned, torn asunder, and humiliated; but her great soul has never met with defeat, and a great people, with righteousness on their side, will inevitably rise again, undoubtedly to greater heights than ever before.

Many of her sons have come to America. Here they have helped to build our country. They have entered every field of enterprise and into every phase of American life, and they have contributed liberally to the greatness and the glory of our country. And again they have gone forth to war, not as Poles, but as Americans, standing shoulder to shoulder with the sons of the other nations which have given of their best to the building of America. Many have already distinguished themselves on the battlefields of this war, wherever Americans are fighting. Some have given their lives, others will do so before it is ended. But to all will one day come the satisfaction of having contributed to the victory that will once again reestablish the land of their fathers and mothers as a free and independent state, a Poland for the Poles, with a government of, by, and for the people of Poland.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful that in the midst of very important legislative deliberations of the House you have recognized me for the purpose of paying tribute to one of our sister Republics—a cosignor of the United Nations Pact—the Republic of Poland—thereby making it possible for me to transmit greetings to the people of Poland—the land of my forefathers—and its government in exile on this the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the celebrated Polish Constitution.

This historic document was adopted by the Diet of Poland by an overwhelming majority on May 3, 1791, 2 years after the Constitution of the United States was adopted. This celebrated document was the result of the deliberations of the Four Years Diet, Poland's great Parliament which sat from 1788 to 1792.

The Polish Constitution was a democratic constitution, inspired by the events of the times and shows the influence of both the American and French Revolutions and was brought into being without violence which is in keeping with Poland's historical tradition. The Diet of Poland at the time of the adoption of the constitution was composed entirely of the nobility and in the general interest of the people as a whole, the members of the Diet renounced many of their traditional privileges.

The constitution ratified the rights accorded to the burghers, which class was composed of freemen and the merchants, and they were permitted to hold public offices and to enter the Parliament, which erased the barrier which had heretofore separated the burghers from the nobility. The peasant population under the terms of the constitution were placed under the protection of the government and they were encouraged and guaranteed the right to enter into individual contracts with the gentry. The constitution also provided for a central administration of affairs and the management of finances. It was a constitution drafted and adopted by patriots for a freedom-loving people and it is the symbol of a nation, though many times defeated, yet never conquered. It made many important concessions to the people for which they have ever been grateful, and Constitution Day, May 3, is celebrated by Poles and those of Polish descent throughout the world as the great Polish national feast day. The Polish Constitution is to the Polish people their charter of liberty and is comparable to the Magna Charta for the English and the Declaration of Independence for our own beloved America.

In less than 5 years after the adoption of the constitution, greedy aggressors overran its territories and Poland was split among three great imperalistic powers, and for more than 125 years the constitution was the symbol of hope and inspiration of an unconquerable people who lived and worked for the liberation of their fatherland and the day when Poland would rise again and take its rightful place among the freedom-loving nations of this world.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper that the Congress should recognize and extend the hand of fellowship to Poland on this the anniversary of their great national holiday, which is comparable to our own Fourth of July celebration.

There is not a schoolboy in America that does not know of the great services rendered to this country by the brave Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, during the dark days of our Revolutionary War. Count Pulaski gave his life for the cause of freedom in the American Colonies, and this tried and trusted friend of our immortal George Washington died in action during the Battle of Savannah.

Another great Revolutionary War hero was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko—a great general and military engineer of the first magnitude. It was he who fortified West Point and also rendered such outstanding services in the Battle of Saratoga. He fought throughout the American Revolution and returned to his native land to continue his fight for freedom and died in exile, and his name has been immortalized by the words of Thomas Campbell in his Epic of Pleasure:

And freedom shrieked as Kosciusko fell.

He willed his entire estate to Thomas Jefferson to purchase freedom for the enslaved Negroes of America and educate them in democracy.

The history of America is dotted with the names of the sons of Poland who have contributed to the creation and the development of the United States. There were 400 Polish settlers at Jamestown and they assisted Capt. John Smith in laying the foundations for the first permanent English settlement in the New World.

It was a Pole, Jacob Sadowski, who surveyed and led a group of 40 persons in the settlement of Harrodsburg, the oldest city in Kentucky, and it was another Pole, Dr. Alexander Kurcjiusz, who founded and conducted the first high school in the United States at what was then New Amsterdam—now New York City—and Leopold Boech, a Pole, founded the first technical university in the United States. By Presidential appointment, Wlodzimierz Kryzanowski, an American of Polish descent, was the first Governor of Alaska after it was acquired by the United States.

In the fields of music, literature, and science, Poles and descendants of Poles have always been in the forefront, and one could go on and recite name after name of those who have been leaders in their chosen field of endeavors. However, I will name but two more—Madame Curie, the great woman scientist who helped to make the miracle of radium possible—she, as did her husband, died martyr to the cause of alleviating human suffering.

I lack words to pay the proper tribute to the greatest of musicians the world has ever produced—the superb Polish patriot—the beloved Paderewski. It was in 1917 that that great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, expressed the hope that after the World War Poland should become a united, independent, and autonomous nation. Shortly after the Treaty of Versailles the immortal Paderewski—the inspiration of the modern Pole—assumed the helm of the ship of state as Premier of Poland. He spent his entire fortune in the cause of the land of his birth, and his fertile and energetic mind taxed his physical strength to the utmost, and he died here in America—the greatest democracy of all times, where the freedoms that he loved so dearly are the cherished heritage of those privileged to be born beneath the Stars and Stripes. On the slopes of those green hills across the yonder Potomac in the Arlington National Cemetery his body—by an act of Congress—is reposed temporarily under the protection of our Government until the day when Poland will rise again and assume its rightful place in the firmament of freedom-loving nations. When that time arrives and the invaders have been driven from the soil of Poland and the dark clouds of this ghastly catastrophe have rolled away and peace and harmony reign again among the nations of the earth, Paderewski will be borne in state to his motherland and there placed in the Cathedral of Cracow among the kings, heroes, poets—the immortals of Poland's yesteryears. His earthly remains will be placed by the side of Joseph Pilsudski—Poland's hero—with whom in 1919 Paderewski entered into a solemn pact and together they dedicated their lives to the rebuilding of their fatherland after a determined people under their magnificent leadership had crushed the three powers of darkness and the white eagle of Poland spread its strong wings over a liberated land and shrieked its traditional cry of freedom to a reborn nation.

A quarter of a century has rolled away since the World War, and we are in the midst of a Global War. The forces of evil saw fit to first invade the peaceful Republic of Poland and unleash barbarous hordes upon the fertile plains of the land of my forefathers. Though a small nation and outnumbered by greatly superior forces, the people of Poland arose in rightful indignation and resisted the greatest war machine ever assembled in the history of the world. The world will never forget the heroic defense of Warsaw by its mayor, Stefan Starzynski, and the United Nations can never repay the debt they owe this gallant defender because it gave them the breathing spell to marshal their forces. That precious time was purchased for the United Nations by the life of Stefan Starzynski and his heroic soldiers and civilians. The answer of America and the United Nations to this heroic defense is that it shall be repaid, and that some day in the not too distant future the symbol of hope held aloft by Woodrow Wilson will again serve as the beacon light for the United Nations in the restoration of an independent Poland.

The occupation of Poland by the forces of Germany and the stab in the back which Russia executed on September 17, 1939, did not stop the fighting of the Poles in this war.

Today, the Polish Government in exile, under the magnificent leadership of a great Pole—General Wladyslaw Sikorski—Poles are fighting in every theater of war for the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The people of Poland and those of Polish descent swell with pride when they point to the fact that although their country has been suffering inhumanly for more than 3½ years, it is, today, the only German-occupied country that has not produced a puppet government—a Quisling nor a Laval.

Poland has the most powerful fighting force of any occupied country— an army of seasoned and stubborn fighters who have distinguished themselves in front line fighting Its air force has defended London and raided enemy objectives in Europe and Africa. Its small but modern Navy—consisting of destroyers and submarines, a merchant marine and auxiliary forces—has done a magnificent job.

The United Nations are fighting this war in defense of the principles of freedom and justice.

That is the foremost aim for which Poland is fighting and suffering in this war.

It would be both tragic and futile to go through the ordeal of this ruthless Global War and all its sufferings if, after victory, the United Nations were to falter on the subject of principles as so ably set forth in the United Nations pact.

The Polish and the American people have many ideals in common. Freedom and the respect of the rights of the individual are basically the same in the United States and in Poland. Both our peoples have fought to defend these principles whenever they were menaced, and American-Polish friendship is based on this identity of ideals.

If we are sincere in our determination to establish a just and durable peace, we must firmly discourage the imperialist tendencies of the mighty and protect and strengthen the weak. The United Nations will have to stand pat on the principles for which we are fighting, refusing to surrender any one of them to any pressure whatever its source.

The United States of America will not let the Republic of Poland down. The Poles of America are a patriotic and God-fearing people and are united in their support of President Franklin D. Roosevelt—our Commander in Chief—under whose able leadership America and the United Nations will win the war and the peace that follows for the civilized world. The United States salutes her gallant ally in this great world conflict on this significant occasion—May 3—the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland. I thank you.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that we pay this tribute today on this the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland. It is equally appropriate that someone with the splendid background of my colleague from the Sixteenth District of Michigan, JOHN LESINSKI, should be entrusted with the allotment of time to those Members wishing to speak on this most worthy subject. The splendid background of this distinguished Representative, steeped as he is in Polish tradition, is shown in the Congressional Directory. At the early age of 4½ he first attended an American-Polish school in Detroit, St. Albertus. Then he went to the great Polish seminary in Detroit, St. Cyril and Methodeusz. He has been a leader in every great Polish-American movement in Detroit from his earliest years. His biography in the Congressional Directory is worth reading. I am very happy that this honor and distinction has come to him today.

Mr. LESINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. May I observe that Kentucky many years ago, in order to show honor and appreciation to that great Polish patriot, Count Pulaski, named one of the fine counties in my congressional district for him. We have a Pulaski County, Ky.

I appreciate the very eloquent and able speeches made today by the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], by the Republican leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan himself. I indulge the hope that when the war is over every foot of Polish soil will be returned to the Poles.

Mr. LESINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am extremely glad to hear the very distinguished Members originally of Polish strain speak of their great race. I commend them for their own very fine work and their patriotism. I want them to know that two of the young men whom I appointed to West Point were originally of Polish strain, and they are making the finest officers in this World War.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemar yield?

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I always wish to take a humble part in a time like this that is dedicated to the memory of a great country, one that has been so close to the history of the United States all these years, in our first war and in our every war, and in our economic reconstruction. Now that we are again involved in a war and Poland has suffered, I feel that we, her old friends, should very carefully remember that friendship and see that while she is unable to take care of herself we become a sort of trustee of that friendship for her future, that she may ultimately, when peace has again come, regain her own soil inside of the ancient frontiers that were guaranteed to her by the thirteenth point of Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, we are all mindful of the splendid work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] in Poland. We shall ever remember it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to the luster of Polish history by any word which I may utter. It is the men and women of Polish birth or ancestry who have struggled, fought, bled, and died, not only for Polish freedom but for freedom on many battlefields throughout the world, who have embellished the story of Poland. Their deeds have been recorded by more able spokesmen than I.

Poland has been a bulwark of Christianity for many centuries. When the Mongol cavalry of Genghis Khan laid waste the nations of Europe and Asia, Polish knights met and fought his hordes on the plains of northern Europe.

Historians comment that if it were not for Jan Sobieski and his Polish warriors the crescent of Mohammed might have supplanted the Cross of Christ above the churches of Europe. In 1683 the non-Christian followers of Mohammed had overrun country after country and had beaten down all armed opposition. In that year the victorious infidels were hammering at the gates of Vienna, the last barrier in their path for the conquest of Europe. Then it was, when all hope seemed lost, that Sobieski and his Polish Army arrived at Vienna, attacked the followers of the crescent, defeated them, and hurled them back, never to return. It was this victory which firmly established the Cross of Christ and Christianity in Europe.

And today Polish men and women, their sons and daughters, as did their ancestors, are fighting and shedding their blood in the world-wide struggle of the Christian nations against the pagan ideologies of nazi-ism and its allies. The Polish men and women of today are living up to the glorious traditions of their ancestors in the fight to preserve Christianity.

But, alas, while Polish men and women are dying on far-flung battle fronts in defense of freedom, Poland itself is without this precious freedom. It is trampled upon and ground down by the minions of those who would inflict upon the world their pagan ideologies—those who would erase from this world the emblem of Christianity and all that emblem signifies. This world-wide struggle today is not only a struggle to preserve those freedoms which we enjoy—those freedoms which Poland was the first European nation to grant to its people through a constitution similar to our own; it also is a struggle once again between world-wide forces of Christianity and the malignant forces of the adherents to the gospel to all of which Christianity must be unalterably opposed if it is to live.

When the Nazi exponents of the anti-Christian philosophy hurled their armed might against Christian Europe, as did their spiritual ancestors, Genghis Khan and the other murderous leaders of armed and ruthless paganism, Poland, true to its traditions, courageously fought the armed might of the followers of the swastika, the inverted and crooked cross, which incidentally also was the battle flag of the Mongol hordes which overran Asia and Europe centuries ago.

Poland, although foredoomed to bloody defeat because it did not have the mechanized forces necessary to halt the Nazi might, nevertheless did not bow down and submit; Poland fought, how gloriously, all the world knows. And although the inevitable result of such a one-sided struggle in time fell upon Poland, this did not quench the fire of liberty which burns in Polish hearts. Its men, women, and children slain or herded into slavery, its rich harvest fields laid waste, its great cities reduced to a mass of rubble, Poland fights on.

Within Poland, the men and women of Poland do not bend to the Pagan conqueror. In countless ways and by many methods, the dauntless men, women, and children within Poland harry and oppose the armed forces of the enemy within their gates. These brave Poles carry on, hope kept alive by their inborn love of liberty and their homeland and also kept alive by their belief that when the victory is won by the Allied Nations, Poland shall arise from its ashes, again a free land.

On May 3, Polish people throughout the world observe Polish Constitution Day. On May 3, 1791, the Constitution of Poland was enacted. Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, greeted this as—

> The noblest benefit received by any nation at any time.

The preamble to this declares:

> Desiring to make use of the present juncture in Europe and of that moment of impending catastrophe which has restored us to ourselves, free from the shameful commands of foreign violence, valuing dearer than life, than personal happiness, the political existence, the external independence and internal freedom of the nation.

That sentiment, "valuing dearer than life, than personal happiness, the political existence, the external independence and internal freedom of the nation" is the spirit which animates each true Pole; it is the spirit which has sent, and is sending daily, thousands of Polish young men into the armed forces of this Nation—to fight for that "political existence, that external independence, and that internal freedom" which is granted to citizens of this Nation in a degree far beyond that now granted by any other nation on this earth.

In almost every war which has been fought in behalf of freedom, Poles have taken part. Every American school pupil is familiar with the names of Count Kazimierz Pulaski and General Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the Polish heroes of the American Revolution. Both of these men came here with complements of soldiers, officers, and cavalry. The first gave his life for the freedom of this Nation when he fell mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah. The other, not only fought for this Nation's freedom in the War of the Revolution, but not content with that, he willed his entire estate to Thomas Jefferson to buy freedom for the enslaved and to educate them. Tadeusz Strawinski gave his life at Fort Sumter when the first shots were fired in the Civil War and Konstanty Bledowski was the first officer to die on a battlefield in that war. Of the first 100,000 men who enlisted in World War No. 1, 40 percent were of Polish descent.

In the world war which now is raging, the long lists of volunteers, of men inducted, of wounded and killed, once again proves that men of Polish extraction are in the forefront of the battle for freedom.

From the day on which the Nazi conqueror established what will be a temporary regime in Poland, Polish men and women made their way by many routes to France, to England, and to these other nations which are fighting the Nazi hordes. Men of Poland, time after time, have been commended by English officials for their heroic deeds as members of air corps fighting for England and as members of infantry and other units; in the air over England, the channel, France and Germany; and in the air and on the ground in Africa.

And the armed forces of this Nation today contain thousands of Polish names, as have the armed forces of this Nation in every war in which it has been engaged. And on this day, the date of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland, these men and women are fighting and looking forward to that day when Poland will again enjoy freedom as it is granted in this country.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Yes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after listening to this very deep and moving appeal by the gentleman from Connecticut, I could not let this opportunity pass without saluting him as a representative of the Polish people and for the fine work that he has done for them. In the district that I have the honor to represent there are a great number of people of Polish descent. During the past few years the gentleman from Connecticut, who has just spoken, has come to our section of the country, to work with those people. His business with them, and his work with them is something they will long remember. I believe that the people of Polish descent, as well as all Americans, will be proud of the accomplishment and the service to America of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ].

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 152 years ago, on May 3, 1791, a constitution for the government of the free Polish people was adopted. Today the anniversary of that great occasion is being observed by Poles and descendants of Poles all over the world. It is being observed openly by men and women of Polish blood who live in countries free from the yoke of Nazi, Fascist, or Japanese oppression. It is being observed openly, too, by the hundreds of thousands of Polish men and boys who are fighting on a dozen fronts for the freedom of their homeland and the peace of the world.

But in Poland itself—its bloody soil overrun by barbarian conquerors—in Poland itself the recognition of this day can be only a recognition of the heart, not of the hand, which, if raised in salute to Poland's past or Poland's future, would be stricken down by a Nazi sword. I have not the slightest doubt, however, that throughout Poland and in this very hour, men and women are dedicating themselves anew to the struggle for freedom, and that in small clusters—in cellars, in barns, in hidden meeting places in both city and country—men and women of Poland are renewing their determination, never willingly to submit to the cruel mastership of international gangsters.

But recognition of this day should not be limited to Poles alone, nor even to those who are the proud descendants of Poles. The birth of free government anywhere in the world is an occasion for joy in every other free nation. So should the anniversary of such a birth be recognized with gratitude by all of us—North and South Americans, British, Chinese—all of us who fight as allies against those who would enslave us.

The world owes a debt to Poland. She was the first to send shot and shell into the Nazi hordes which sought to overrun Europe, and then the world. Her sons are fighting still—over German skies, on sub-infested seas, and wherever the American battle-flag flies, there are fighting Americans whose fathers were born, or who themselves were born, in Poland.

But we in America have particularly strong ties to Poland. We can share their ideals and aspirations to a greater degree, and understand their strong desire for freedom more keenly, perhaps, than can any of the other United Nations, because it was in the darkest hours of our own struggle for liberty that 2 eminent Poles came to our aid. Two men will live forever in the history of the United States and in the history of Poland. By their willingness to devote their lives, and to face death for the freedom of a land they had never seen, two Polish patriots will live forever in the world's record of true greatness and true chivalry.

Those two men were General Casimer Pulaski and General Thaddeus Kosciusko. Leaving their native land, they journeyed halfway around the world to help a handful of small colonies gain their freedom from autocratic domination, and by doing so they helped to found a Nation which is today the chief hope of freedom in the world. So not only America, but every liberty-loving people on the face of the earth, owe a debt to these two great men—a debt which, God willing, they can pay to the Poland of today.

Today is a day of memories for Polish people—memories of the days before Poland was crushed beneath the Nazi heel—and memories, too, of a great man whom the world but lately lost—Ignace Paderewski. Just as he lighted the souls of music-lovers the world over, so did he help light the beacon of Poland's regained freedom. It is fitting that we today pay tribute to the man who, as Premier of Poland, as the world's greatest pianist of his day, and as a man revered and loved by all who knew or heard him, contributed to the greatness of Poland and the dignity of mankind.

It is fitting, too, that we in America today pause in humble recognition of those brave men of Poland who have lost their lives that all, everywhere, may some day be free, of those who still fight side by side with our own American soldiers and sailors, and of those Americans of Polish blood, who, by their sacrifice and toil, are doing as much to bring victory to the cause for which Poland and America are united, as any group anywhere in our country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join other Members of the House today to participate in the observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution. There are many people who live in my district who are of Polish descent. Among them are some of the best farmers in our State. Many of them are business and professional men. These people are highly patriotic and are numbered among the best citizens of our State and Nation. The Polish people of Nebraska are interested in the ceremonies we hold in this House, especially ceremonies in which the eagerness of mankind for freedom and liberty are eulogized. The Polish people in Nebraska are watching with much anxiety the efforts of the Allies to bring freedom again to the land of their birth and the birth of their forefathers. The Polish people of Nebraska are represented in this Second World War by their sons, brothers, and sweethearts, and even their husbands. They can be found on every battlefield of the world today. They heretofore have always been in the forefront in the battle to preserve our freedom and liberty and our way of life. They can always be depended upon to take their share of responsibility and share in the sacrifices for the preservation of our independence.

I am happy to follow the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable ROY WOODRUFF, on this program. It was my pleasure to travel over Europe with the gentleman from Michigan, ROY WOODRUFF, in 1939, when the Nazis marched into Poland. It has been my privilege to learn from the gentleman from Michigan of his great service to our country in two previous wars. During one of them, the gentleman from Michigan, ROY WOODRUFF, rendered outstanding service in Poland where he was stationed with the troops of the United States. There is no man in this House who has rendered more service to his country during times of war and during times of peace than the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]. His service to our country, especially during war, is one which should remain in American history forever. I am sure the American people of Polish ancestry will never forget the service he rendered during his campaign in Poland during the First World War.

Another of our colleagues from Michigan must not be forgotten in our ceremonies today. I refer to the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. JOHN DINGELL, who 1 year ago initiated this series of annual ceremonies in the House. On that occasion 40 or more Members of the House participated in paying tribute to those who made possible the Polish Constitution. I met the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] in Europe in 1939. It was only a short time before that that he had toured all of Poland. He brought back to us the word picture of that country just before it was invaded by the enemy. Throughout his travels over Poland he spread the word of American friendship for the people of Poland.

Another of our colleagues who has been in close touch with conditions in Poland is the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. CHARLES DEWEY, who served there as a representative of our Government, and who has done much to promote friendly relationships between the two governments.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, there are many other Members of this House whose service to our Government has proved our interest in the welfare of op-

pressed people in other lands. So it is very gratifying to me today to join with them in sending our greetings to the people of Poland and pledging to them our sincere prayers that soon again Poland will be free.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. Following the conclusion of our own war for independence in which many valiant sons of Poland fought side by side with us, and within a short 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, the freedom-loving people of Poland unanimously adopted a constitution to serve as the foundation of their future government. Although Poland was shortly thereafter overrun by more powerful neighbors and remained under the heel of the aggressors for 125 years, nevertheless this constitution remained during all of that time a symbol of the hope and the belief of the Polish people that once again they would have their lands restored and take their rightful place among the nations of the world.

It is quite fitting that we today should pause in our deliberations to salute the people of Poland of past generations and of the present. Not only the whole world, but we in America in particular, are indebted to them for the contributions that they have made to the arts, to the sciences, and to the establishment and the preservation of our own free Republic. None of us will ever forget the contribution that General Pulaski and General Kosciuszko made to the success of our war for independence. In our various governmental units we have remembered October 11 as Pulaski Day in recognition of the contribution that General Pulaski made in our war for independence. As in previous years during my period of service in Congress, I did this year introduce House Joint Resolution 85, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1943, as General Casimir Pulaski's Memorial Day.

Time will never erase the works of Ignace Paderewski, both as an artist and as a statesman. At the time of his untimely passing, I, together with thousands of other Americans, journeyed to the Polish Embassy here in our Nation's Capital to view the last remains of Ignace Paderewski and to pay our respects to this world-famed artist and scholar.

Today men and women of Poland are continuing the fight against aggression. They are fighting under every one of the several flags of the United Nations. The heroic defense of the beleaguered city of Warsaw in the early days of the war will go down in history as an example of courage and valor never to be surpassed. Although it was a losing fight, it gave time for others of the United Nations to make better preparations for the awful war that was to follow.

For more than 3½ years the Polish people of the homeland have suffered under the heel of the conqueror. There is no puppet government in Poland. There is no Quisling there to mislead its people. There still burns in the heart of every Pole an unquenchable hope—a determination—that Poland will again be restored and take her rightful place under the sun.

Mr. Speaker, in the district which it is my honor to represent we have many thousands of Americans of Polish descent. Not as Poles but as Americans, they are making their full contribution toward the winning of this war. They are a patriotic, God-fearing people who are sending their sons, who are buying bonds, and who are making the sacrifices required of all Americans to bring this war to an early and successful end. We salute them and their families of their home land on this glorious day in Poland's history. We join with them in the hope and in the determination that Poland will rise again.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have come from many lands. We are not a race but a nation of mixed blood. Those who have emigrated to these shores for the past 300 years have been inspired by love of freedom to worship, to think, to talk according to their own consciences, by ambition to improve their lot in this land of opportunity and to reap the reward of their own work, thrift, and ability. Only the brave and the venturesome have had the courage to break the ties that bound them to the land of their fathers and to take the high adventure of life in this new country of ours.

This hour has been set aside for tributes to the Polish people, who have contributed so much to the wealth, the culture, and the strength of America. I cannot allow the occasion to pass without expressing my admiration for the millions of Poles in this country, my esteem for my colleagues in this House, and my many friends in my own home city of Polish descent.

It is the earnest wish of Americans, no matter what their ancestry, that ancient Poland will again expel its brutal oppressors and regain its proud place in the family of nations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on this day Polish people all over the world celebrate Constitution Day. After years of yearning to be free, years of internal turmoil and political strife, the Polish Constitution was adopted in 1791. It was patterned after our Constitution, which had been adopted only a few years before.

A strong bond has always existed between the United States and Poland. Both countries have much in common. Both are liberty-loving nations. Both have fought in the past for freedom's cause. Both are fighting today for the preservation of that liberty. Polish patriots fought that our Constitution might come into existence, and it is therefore fitting that Americans should today fight to restore Poland to its former independence and liberty.

Poland's Constitution Day has frequently found that country torn and pillaged by forces that detest liberty and all that liberty stands for. However, physical properties may be destroyed and man-made institutions crumble, but the spirit of such a brave people can never be crushed. Ignoring overwhelming odds, refusing to submit to the yoke of tyranny, the Polish people have preferred to die fighting for honor rather than to live in dishonor.

Poland has given to the world a people who are strong of character, honest, industrious, and devoted to the ideals of freedom of the press, speech, and religion.

The liberty-loving people of the United States look sympathetically today upon Poland in her dark hour. They are resolved that when this war is ended Poland shall again be a free and independent nation and that no other country shall rule over any section of it. She shall not again be divided to satisfy another nation, but shall enjoy the full freedom that is her heritage. Poland shall live and take her place among the leading nations of the world.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray there will be no action by our country now or in the future that will make us party to any plan which has for its purpose the destruction of the Polish institutions, or the refusal to return to Poland its liberty and its historic boundaries.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I heartily agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a day of both pride and hope to Poles throughout the world—to the suffering millions in occupied Poland, to tens of thousands in the Polish armed forces in the Middle East, in Britain, and on the seas, and to the thousands of refugees in India, Persia, and Africa.

For, 152 years ago today, on May 3, 1791, Poland became the first country in Europe to have a written democratic constitution.

To a people deprived during the greater part of the past 150 years of their right to their own political existence, the May constitution has become both a testament of their political genius and a justification of their unbroken will to remain an independent nation.

The May constitution in many ways resembles the American. The May constitution recognizes that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." Furthermore, as in the American Constitution, it adopted the principle of the division of authority, setting up executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish Constitution also accepted the principle of religious toleration, saying:

For as the same sacred faith enjoins on us to love our neighbors, therefore we should guarantee to all people peace in the faith

and government protection, and therefore freedom to all rites and religions in the Polish lands, according to the country's laws.

Instinctively traditionalists like the English, which perhaps explains the decided affinity between the Poles and their British allies, the Poles are particularly proud of their constitution because it came into being without an upheaval and made things better for everybody without causing any of the Polish classes undue sacrifices.

No man was more impressed by this fact than the great British parliamentarian, Edmund Burke, who said of the Polish Constitution:

> In contemplating that change, humanity has everything to rejoice, and to glory in; nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to suffer. Not one man incurred loss or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder (this unheard-of conjunction of wisdom and fortune) not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system or slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals or manners; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned.

The feeling of the Polish people for their constitution is perhaps best expressed by their greatest national poet, Adam Mickiewicz:

> This law did not emerge from the brain of an isolated sage, from the lips of a few administrators, but was drawn from the heart of the great mass; it is not merely written in black and white but it still lives in the memory, in the desires, of the generations, and it is a living law, rooted in the past and developing in the future. * * * In the May constitution * * * the national element, the child of past traditions, is nurtured on the new present-day needs of the nation. Hence it has been well and justly said that the May constitution is the political testament of the former Poland.

The freedom of the individual and the freedom of the nation, these two fundamental features of Poland, constituted not only the main principles of Polish policy during the period of enslavement but gave the Polish cause a universal character. Wherever the struggle for freedom was fought, there Poles were to be found. Fighting for their own freedom, they realized that they were fighting for the ideal of universal freedom.

Today also the Polish nation commemorates the anniversary of the May constitution above all other dates in its history, for the nation regards the democratic and progressive quality of that constitution as an unchallengeable and undeniable justification of its claim to independent participation in the life of civilized nations and as a symbol of its endurance and resurrection.

POLAND AND THE WAR

Following is the strength of the Polish armed forces fighting with the Allies outside of Poland:

First. Army Corps with motorized division in England, more than 30,000.

Second. Polish Air Corps in England, more than 12,000.

Third. Polish Army in the Near East, comprising the so-called Carpathian Division as well as the Polish divisions arrived from Russia, about 100,000.

In addition there are the forces serving with the Polish Navy, with more warships now than in September 1939.

All told, the Polish armed forces total about 200,000 men and occupy fifth place among the United Nations, ranking after England, the United States, Russia, and China.

REBIRTH OF THE POLISH ARMED FORCES

It is clear today that the Polish Army, defeated in September 1939 by overwhelming mechanical and numerical superiority, did not lay down its arms, did not lose its morale, and did not leave its mother country defenseless. All who avoided capture by the Germans or escaped from prison camps arrived in France by way of Hungary and Rumania. There they entered the army then being rebuilt by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski.

Six months after the German attack on Poland General Sikorski had about 100,000 men under arms in France, and Polish aviation was rendering a good account of itself in the dog fights over the front.

The Polish Highland Brigade under Gen. Szyszko-Bohusz fought in Norway and distinguished itself at Narvik.

Out of the French collapse, Poland salvaged its Government and its Army. Following the reorganization of the Polish Army in Scotland, a new Polish Army sprang into being in Russia. The forces which left Russia are now among the new Polish divisions in the Middle East.

Mention of the Polish Navy is constantly recurring in Allied communiqués. The part played by the destroyer *Piorun* in the sinking of the *Bismarck*, the successes of Polish submarines, the unceasing work of the Polish naval and merchant vessels are offering endless evidence of Poland's determination to fight on all fronts.

FACTS ABOUT POLAND

First. Area, 150,470 square miles; population, 35,100,000. Poland ranks sixth in both area and population.

Second. In 1937, of every hundred children in Poland, 91 attended schools. Attendance in primary schools increased from 3,000,000 in 1919 to 5,000,000 in 1939.

Third. State insurance against sickness and unemployment, and old-age pensions covered 2,170,000 persons. Trade-unions were recognized and the 8-hour day established by law in 1919. Compulsory paid holidays for all workers was introduced in 1922.

Fourth. Poland ranks fifth in Europe in the production of zinc and sixth in the production of coal.

Fifth. The first Polish Parliament met in 1454.

Sixth. Poland guaranteed individual liberty by the Neminem Captivabimus decree of 1433, 200 years before the English habeas corpus act.

Seventh. By the Confederation of Warsaw of 1573, Poland granted religious freedom to all at a time when religious persecution was almost universal, and ever since Poland has been the European haven for refugees and minorities.

Eighth. The University of Cracow, founded in 1364, is the third oldest university in Europe.

Ninth. Poland was the first European country to create a ministry of education in 1775.

Tenth. Four times in the last 20 years a worker or peasant has risen from the ranks to become Prime Minister of Poland.

MAY DAY—LABOR DAY

I do not want this opportunity to pass without paying my respects to and saluting Polish labor.

On May 1 the Polish workers have always celebrated their Labor Day. This day marked their victory in the struggle for liberation against the Czarist regime. It was the day that Polish labor proclaimed its solidarity in its struggle for freedom and social justice, and against violence and inequality. Today it takes on additional significance.

Today, when they are enslaved and fettered by the brutal Nazis, the Polish worker will vow to stand fast with the United Nations until every last one of the hated Nazi invaders and oppressors are driven from Polish soil and the Hitler Huns are completely annihilated.

The coming victory will be labor's victory. The workers of the United States, Great Britain, the working men and women of the occupied countries bear the brunt of the fighting and of resistance. Labor is marching in the forefront of all who fight against nazi-ism and fascism. The victory that will be won by labor will bring stable peace, freedom, and social justice.

The Nazi terror has temporarily muted the voice of Polish labor. Trade-unionism has been abolished. The foe has stolen the Polish workers' May day, their labor day, and their constitution day—the Polish Fourth of July. They have lost their homsteads. They have been murdered by the hundreds of thousands. They have had their property seized. Hundreds of villages have been burned to the ground. Mass murders and executions that have horrified the civilized world, and the most terrible cruelties have been practiced against the Poles in order to break down their morale.

Yes, all of these things the Nazis have done, but still they have not broken the Poles' will or their spirit.

Polish labor will arise to strike the final blow at their arch-enemy. The day shall come! It will not be long! Their flag shall fly once more. They shall carry the flag of vengeance, the peoples' wrath!

Polish labor shall lead the reborn Poland to freedom, to justice, to glory. Polish labor shall lead to a unity and understanding with all of their Slav brothers in Europe. Just as the American Slav workers in America have learned to understand each other, to work together, to fight together, united in one cause, and have demonstrated their extreme loyalty to the United States and their profound determination for a United Nations victory.

The Slav people of Europe—the Slav workers, Polish, Czechs, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Macedonians, Ukrainians, Croa-

tians, Serbs, Slovenes, White Russians, Russians, and those of the Baltic States, are all united in their cry for freedom and social justice. Their one desire is peace and happiness, freedom to till the soil, to work, and freedom of religious worship. They are not interested in greed or intrigue.

The Slavish workers in America have demonstrated their ability for unity, solidarity and faith, and confidence in one another. We have confidence that their Slav brothers in Europe will likewise demonstrate that deep understanding which can only come by eliminating selfishness, envy, greed, and suspicion of one another.

The Slavs are a valiant and courageous people. They must show wisdom and leadership. Upon them and their actions will depend the future peace of the world. When victory is won they will be charged with a world trust—to keep the peace of Europe.

In the last world war 300,000 sons of Polish fathers and mothers fought in the United States armed forces. In this war at least 600,000 American boys of Polish extraction shall see service in the United States armed forces. These boys are fighting for America, for Poland, for all of the United Nations, to bring about a speedy victory over the Axis.

There are hundreds of thousands of other American Slavs in the United States armed forces fighting for the same ends, in complete understanding with one another. The Nazi Huns have shown their hatred for all of the Slavs. For centuries the Huns have conspired against Poland and the Slavish countries to bring about confusion and distrust amongst them. Slavish unity, understanding, and cooperation is the key to the future peace of Europe and to the future peace of the world.

We in America know that the eyes of starving Polish men and women, and also those in other Slavish States and countries are turned to the United States. Much depends upon our skillful exercise of an intelligent influence upon international politics. We can play a decisive role in helping the Polish people and the other Slavs to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for their resistance to our common foe—German nazi-ism.

We have no European designs. We have no ulterior motives.

During the last war we had a great Democrat and statesman, President Woodrow Wilson, but an isolationist Congress let him down.

This time we are blessed with the greatest leader and humanitarian in our history, our President, our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have confidence in our President. I have faith in his honesty, integrity, and sense of right and justice. He will not fail the Polish people. He will not fail the Slavs. We can repose our faith, our trust, our confidence in him.

I firmly believe that the American people will back him up in all of his decisions, and the isolationists in Congress shall not dominate the peace conferences.

(Mr. SADOWSKI, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and to add thereto certain resolutions and newspaper articles.)

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the horrible conflagration now raging throughout the world in its fourth year was ignited by a brutal and voracious enemy when, on September 1, 1939, he hurled his bloody torch into Poland.

Growing and spreading with satanic speed, its flames leaped from one country to another, from one continent to another, until it shortly encompassed all seas, oceans, and continents on the globe, engulfing in its chaos even our own great and glorious United States. Despite our peaceful aims and desires, we were unable to avoid it. Our soldiers and marines, our airmen and sailors, are fighting and shedding their blood on all fronts and all seas to defend and preserve those great ideals of democracy and freedom which have made our United States renowned throughout the world.

We are happy, indeed, that many other nations are fighting at our side for the same ideals.

Among these nations we find the Polish Nation, which was the first victim of the barbarity of the German aggressor. This nation observes today one of its greatest national anniversaries—in fact, the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of its first constitution in 1791. At this point may I emphasize the fact that the ideals of democracy and freedom are deeply rooted in the hearts of the Polish Nation, which has at all times been the knightly champion of these ideals—a fact which was well known in Central Europe for many centuries and caused neighbors to regard the free Polish Nation with justified envy.

During the 10 centuries of its existence as an independent nation, Poland passed through varying phases. There was a time when it occupied vast territories and wielded great power in Central Europe. But this great power was not won by conquest, not by aggression against its neighbors, but by voluntary union with its neighbors as equals with them. All Polish wars were defensive wars, and never aggressive. They were only fought to repel invaders, or they were fought in defense of weaker neighbors against those who were insolent and brutal because they were stronger.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 is a symbol of the lofty ideals which have always been part of Polish blood and in which every Polish generation has been bred. Hence the Polish people have always observed it as solemnly as we Americans observe the anniversaries of our independence.

These are very difficult times for Poland. And yet despite their sufferings, Poles, wherever they may be found, are commemorating this occasion with appropriate ceremonies, not only because it preserves the memory of an event of great historical importance in their history but also because these anniversaries are the everlasting fountain of inspiration, spiritual strength, and unyielding determination to stop at no sacrifices, however great, in defense of freedom and all democratic ideals.

May the victory of the United Nations over our common enemy bring a well-earned reward to Poland for its faithfulness to democratic ideals. May Poland emerge from this bloody cataclysm with its boundaries unrestricted—without curtailment of its boundaries—in accordance with the simple dictates of the justice due her for the awful sacrifices she has borne and is still bearing.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, even if time would permit, I could not add anything to what has been so eloquently stated on the floor by the minority and the majority leaders, and all of these other gentlemen, many of whom are of Polish origin, who have so loyally and patriotically served our Nation. I wish to commend our colleague from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] who, besides his diligent efforts in behalf of his constituency and his work as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, has striven to enlist the help and interest of liberty-loving Americans in the welfare and reestablishment of the Polish Republic. My congratulations are also extended to our colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], now presiding over the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHUETZ], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN], all of whom have so inspiringly expressed their views looking to the reestablishment of the Polish Republic in the near future. I am naturally especially interested that Poland should again obtain its freedom and liberty because I know that having felt the harsh hand of oppression it will inspire all other minority countries and they will help to cooperate to bring about the elimination of intolerance toward all.

As a Member of Congress I was proud in actively supporting and voting for a Congressional appropriation for the erection of a monument in honor of our great Polish American revolutionary heroes—Kosciusko and Pulaski—and to be present at the dedication and unveiling ceremonies. As one who aided and cooperated with the great Polish leaders of years gone by, Paderewski, Lechinski, and others in 1918, and as one who had the opportunity and the privilege to witness President Wilson advocating and urging the freedom of Poland and the liberty of all the small nations, I was greatly inspired, but recently greatly grieved that finally through no fault of Poland the Polish Republic was overrun by the Nazi hordes, not because the people of that Republic were not desirous of defending their independence, but because of the unfortunate conspiracy action on the part of the Nazis, French Nazi leaders, and British pacifiers who refused Poland the right to rearm and to defend herself as the people were desirous of doing. If they had permitted Poland to rearm in time and had agreed that

Russia should be permitted to cross Poland to aid Czechoslovakia it is quite possible that Poland as well as Czechoslovakia and the other small nations would be free today or would not have been so wantonly attacked and their homes and lands so distressingly laid waste. Consequently there is no one here or anywhere who regrets more than I that Poland and the smaller nations were so ruthlessly despoiled of their liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that in the near future the United States will again, as she did under President Wilson, be helpful in bringing about the reestablishment of the great Polish Republic and thereby also aid in bringing about the independence and freedom of all the other peoples, not only in Europe, but wherever they are seeking freedom and liberty.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1939, Poland was attacked by Hitler and the present World War started. Poland would not submit to the Nazi hordes. Although the people of Poland have been inhumanly tortured, they carry on the fight for freedom. The United States is in this war for the same cause, we too are fighting for our freedom, to preserve and protect it. When this war is won by the United Nations, Poland will be restored, together with all the other great nations which may be temporarily under the oppression of the conqueror, and freedom, righteousness, and liberty will have a new birth, for all liberty-loving people of the world. Americans of Polish descent are standing loyally behind our Government. They are doing all in their power to help our country win this war as speedily as possible. The heroic stand of Poland, the first of the United Nations to defy Hitler in his scheme to enslave the world, the suffering, the torture, and sacrifices of the people of Poland, for the principles of freedom and self-government will be an inspiration to all future mankind.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago I was privileged to inaugurate the elaborate exercises in which so many Members of Congress took part, commemorating the birth of the constitution on the 3d of May which was enacted by the progressive government of Poland.

Limitations of time have made it impossible for me to carry on and, therefore, I am glad to give encouragement to the wholesome movement of continuing these exercises and creating a congressional tradition of friendly observance of this historic day which means so much, not only to the enslaved people of Poland and of other nations, but also to 7,000,000 or more Americans of Polish antecedents.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Poland lies bleeding and battered, with spirit unbroken, bearing the ghastly stab in the back administered to her by her enemy. She was the first to challenge the passage of the barbaric German hordes as her valiant and heroic sons bared their breasts to defend Christianity and humanity. Civilization will forever remember if some of us might forget that it was Poland and her people who alone stood up in defense of the later enunciated "four freedoms."

Remember that it was the sinful alliance between the two arch thieves of all time who gambled for her raiment and after the stab in the back, instead of the customary kiss of betrayal, drenched the world in a blood bath of war which engulfed even the betrayer, Judas Iscariot, and today she is about to be crucified not between but by the same two thieves.

And why? Because she is unwilling to embrace godlessness and inhumanity and thus to betray her heroic sons and the confidence of the world.

Be on guard, you liberty-loving sons of America, for it is as plain as day and as certain as the sunrise of tomorrow that the only excuse for the recent attacks upon the only legitimate and recognized government of Poland is to create a puppet state subject to and fulfilling the ideals of communism.

I hold unfalteringly to the American and the Christian ideals and contend that America is not fighting for the perpetuation and expansion of withering communism. Our people know that it was the sinful union of commu-nazi-ism that plunged the world into a fiendish war and despair; and that we today as a result are fighting to redeem and reclaim the fallen and courageous ally.

The Polish soldier in this war fights side by side with our American doughboy in North Africa, he continues the battle from Britain's shore, where he left his undying record of heroism which after Dunkerque brought the exclamation in tribute from Prime Minister Churchill that never before so many owed so much to so few.

This undaunted army of Poland fought the Hun in France, pursued him to Narvik, held him at bay for 8 months in Tobruk, and is doing a good job in the Near East and North Africa before returning to defend the fatherland against all her enemies, foreign and domestic.

May God grant the earliest possible and successful termination of the war to save the precious lives of our boys and those of our benighted and courageous ally.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 12, 1943.*

The following appeal was adopted at the plenary meeting of the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, duly held on April 12, 1943, in Chicago, Ill., all national officers being present:

"Whereas the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America fully considered the following sad and grievous facts: That

"The Government of Soviet Russia lays baseless claims to large sections of Poland, wherein are situated the old Polish cities of Lwow, Tarnopol, Stanislawow, Wilno, Bialystok, Nowogrodek, and the lands of Polesia;

"The Soviet Government unjustifiedly denies Polish citizenship to millions of Poles forcibly transported from Poland into the interior of Russia and to Siberia;

"About two and a half million Poles were transported to Russia. Among these were 800,000 Polish children, of whom 400,000 have perished, and the remainder will soon suffer this same fate unless immediate aid is extended to them;

"The German forces in Poland consistently and continually conduct mass murders of Poles and systematically make use of the most vile and bestial means, unknown up to now by the civilized world, for the designed purpose of the complete extermination of the Polish nation: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America has concluded that the stand of the Soviet Government and the communistic press in the United States, for the annexation of lands of sovereign and independent nations, creates disunity and impedes the concerted effort of the Allied Nations to defeat Germany, Japan, and Italy and that the brutal and savage conduct of the Nazis transgresses all Christian principles and degrades all mankind: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America express its unswerving faith in the actions, wisdom, and justice of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the consummation of the aims and principles laid down by him in the Atlantic Charter.

"We express the hope that the United States, together with England and all other Allied Nations, will check and forestall the ambitions and plans of its enemies or allies, who now or in the future may desire or attempt to seize the lands of sovereign and independent states and thus selfishly cause discord and war among the nations.

"We hereby state that our membership of more than 150,000 has at all times fully cooperated with President Roosevelt and our Government, has unceasingly strived in aiding the war effort of our country, and promises to continue to exert its utmost effort in service to our country.

"The executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America appeals to the Members of Congress, the press, and radio commentators that in considering and commenting on post-war solutions they insist that no injustice be done to Poland, which first dared to oppose the Nazis and which at all times during her long and glorious history fought valiantly for her liberty and the liberty of the nations of Europe.

"We call on the Government of the United States to halt the mass murders of Poles by the Nazis and to materially and morally aid the destitute and suffering Polish men, women, and children in Soviet Russia.

"We ask our Congressmen and Senators to consider the interests of tortured Poland and express our gratitude to the Members of Congress who have fought for justice for the enslaved and oppressed nations.

"We call to our membership to purchase United States War bonds to the limit of its ability and to be generous in the contributions for relief of the Polish civilian population in Soviet Russia and other countries.

"We express our gratitude to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States for its generous contributions for relief of Polish war victims and ask continued support of this cause.

"We beseech Almighty God to grant an early victory to the Allied Nations and to establish a just and permanent peace for all nations."

For the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America:

JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.
STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the

RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times under date of April 29, captioned "In the Nation; the wanton ways of Congress with tariff bills."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTIONAL DAY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States was adopted in convention in 1787 and ratified by a sufficient number of the Colonies to become effective in 1788. On May 3, 1791, the Diet of Poland adopted the constitution which is the basis of the observation of today as Constitution Day by Polish people throughout the world. In drafting their constitution the members of the Diet of Poland were influenced by the writings of French and American leaders in their great Revolutions.

This is the fourth anniversary of the adoption of the constitution of Poland which has come during the present global war. Today millions of the Polish people lie dead at the hands of the ruthless invaders of their country. They have not been conquered, though their land is overrun by the enemy. God willing, in due course Poland will rise again as she has in the past to ever greater power and achievements. Today men of Poland are fighting with the Russian forces in Europe and with the British and American troops in Africa and the Middle East. When this war ends the United Nations must restore to the Polish people their liberty and their independence under such terms as will provide them with military and economic safeguards while their nation is reestablished in greater strength and prosperity than ever before.

Many men and women have left Poland during the last half century to come to the United States. They were imbued with the desire for freedom which their ancestors had known and seemed best likely to be secured by them within our territories. They knew that their great ancestors, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, were also national heroes of America. Their children are Americans in every sense of the word. In my own Massachusetts district, in the counties of Hampden and Hampshire, Americans of Polish descent recently carried on a drive for the purchase of Victory bonds to help the United States win the war. They raised more than $2,500,000 for the Treasury of the United States among their own groups. Several bombing planes have been named after Polish heroes as a result of that drive.

They know, as we know, that the people of Poland and the people of America are now fighting together against common enemies. It is, therefore, fitting that all Americans of every racial group should extend to the people of Poland esteem for their great country and should assure them that we are highly resolved that Poland shall rise again as one of the great nations of the world.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, last year on the anniversary of Polish Constitutional Day I told you that Hon. Wladyslaw Sokolowski had but a short time previously taken up his duties as consul general in San Francisco.

Mr. Sokolowski represents the Polish Government in the far Western States. His headquarters are in the city by the Golden Gate. Mr. Sokolowski's influence is helpful, indeed. He is further cementing the cordial feelings existing between our two countries.

Just this morning I returned from San Francisco. Those of Polish descent, in common with all residents of my home city, are giving unstintingly of themselves and their fortunes in the war effort.

Congratulations and sincere good wishes to the people of Poland. They and we stand side by side in our epic struggle against tyranny and oppression.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting on this occasion that we in the Congress of the United States of America pause to pay tribute to Poland, because of the great contribution her sons have made in the building of America.

This is a country made up of minority groups. People of Polish extraction have had an important share in the making of America.

I am glad the Speaker of the House honored the people of Polish extraction by calling to the chair to preside at this time the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]. I am pleased that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], an outstanding Member of Polish extraction, has been honored by being designated to manage this program. We are happy to have on both sides of this House, men who are carrying on the fine tradition of the Polish people in America. I think there are some 10 or 12 Members of this House who are of Polish extraction, outstanding men like SADOWSKI, LESINSKI, WASIELEWSKI, MONKIEWICZ, MRUK, O'KONSKI, DINGELL, SCHUETZ, and GORDON. We are proud of every one of them. They are Republicans as well as Democrats—active members of both political parties.

As Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, I represent several hundred thousand citizens of Polish extraction. In my home city of Cleveland live approximately 100,000 Americans of Polish extraction. They are good citizens, they are industrious and God-fearing citizens, they are making their contribution to the life of the community and the life of the Nation. They are fighting in this war, and we all hope when this war is over—and God willing may it be over soon—that Poland will be reestablished as one of the sister Slavic nations of Europe now under Nazi domination. We hope that the homeland of these great citizens of ours of Polish extraction will flourish again as it did before the Nazi invasion.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, when this country was very young indeed, and when George Washington was still President of the United States, the Polish Diet passed a rather liberal constitution for the government of that nation.

Poland had been despoiled by its neighbors some years before, and the second and third partitions of that country were imminent. Nevertheless, the leaders of that nation showed such vision and foresight as was rarely found among the nations of the earth at that time. With the exception of our own country, none of the countries of the world had a written constitution. Britain had, and still has, an unwritten constitution, and France was just passing through its revolution and proclaiming the "rights of man." Poland was therefore one of the first nations to pass a fundamental law guaranteeing to each person what Thomas Jefferson called "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, never actually went into effect. Before it could be put to the test, Poland's neighbors pounced upon her again, and by 1795 there was no independent Poland until the end of the First World War. However, this Polish Constitution has been forever a document of tremendous importance to the people of Europe. It showed them the path to orderly government and the defense of individual rights.

The Polish Constitution was not revolutionary in nature. It did not abolish the distinctions among the various classes composing the population of Poland, it did not grant equal rights to the peasants and the underprivileged classes of that nation, but it was a step in the right direction. It held forth the doctrine that human rights are sacred, it abolished serfdom, it established courts for the redress of grievances, it established a parliament where the majority could pass laws for the benefit of the nation, it established an hereditary monarchy where the king was the servant of the people, in short it was the forerunner of all those constitutions which Europe later on had to fight for in the revolutions of 1830 and 1838.

We therefore pay tribute on this third day of May to the indomitable spirit of the Polish Nation. Again, as in the checkered history of that country, Poland finds itself partitioned. Again, Polish independence is being taken away and destroyed, but on this 3d day of May 1943, we feel that Poland will rise from its ashes as it has risen before. It will again take its place among the nations of the world, and I am sure that the future of Poland is assured and that its people, forever liberty loving and devoted to the principles of democracy, will

find renewed strength and courage in the principles of its constitution of 1791.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] obtained unanimous consent to have an hour set aside to be devoted to a discussion of the Polish Constitution Day. This year the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] obtained unanimous consent for a 2-hour period to be devoted to the same purpose.

It is my fond hope that this annual setting aside of a certain time to a discussion of the fundamental principles of democracy and the history of a country that played an important role in its development may become a custom and tradition of the House.

Today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day. Though this is the day of the birth of constitutional government in Poland, a thumbing of the pages of history will reveal that the document produced represents the toil, labor, and blood of a liberty- and freedom-loving people. That the evolutionary processes formulated, fashioned, and wove the constitution that the Polish Parliament adopted on May 3, 1791.

In the late Middle Ages during the early Jagellonian dynasty, Poland adopted a system of parliamentary institutions analogous to the English House of Commons and House of Lords. Poland was one of the very few countries on the continent of Europe to possess any semblances of constitutional freedom.

It was in 1454 when the Statutes of Nieszawa were adopted that the Polish magna carta came into being. Under this charter of Polish parliamentarism, the large masses of the country gentry, in addition to the great nobles, were given a voice in the government. The legislative powers of the local assemblies in all important matters affecting the whole community from taxation to war were definitely established. The delegates of the local assemblies under this statute were to meet at three appointed places and the three chief parts of the realm for joint deliberation under the presidency of the king. Occasionally the meetings were held at one place for the whole realm. From these meetings of the delegates, from the provisional assemblies of all Poland, the lower house of the Polish Parliament House, the Sejm or Chamber of Deputies developed in due course of time. After the Statutes of Nieszawa, an upper chamber, known as the senate, was evolved from the council of state, formed of the principal barons, spiritual and temporal.

Through the centuries that followed, repeated efforts were made to extend the right of franchise to the townspeople and peasants in order to remedy the evils that crept into the constitutional system of Poland as the result of the selfish arrogance of the landed gentry. It was not until the era of the Great Parliament of Poland, which was in session from 1788 to 1792, that the reform of the constitution was accomplished. It took 3 long and weary years to bring forth this fruit. In view of the long struggle preceding its realization, it can be appreciated that it was no simple matter to finally obtain its adoption. It came into being by a coup d'état, a bloodless parliamentary revolution.

At one stroke the reformed Polish Constitution did away with some of the worst political and administrative abuses which had crept into the body politic of Poland. It changed the Parliament from a congress of delegates of the district assemblies, bound by their instructions, into an assembly of free representatives of the nation at large. It put into practice the principle of religious tolerance. It abolished the free veto that had plagued Poland and in its place established the principle of vote by majority. It organized a cabinet of ministers on modern lines and made it responsible to Parliament. Further, it removed the greatest cause of civil war in Poland in abolishing free election of each individual king by making the throne hereditary, but at the same time maintaining and putting into modern terms the constitutional limitations of royal power.

On the political side the changes made under the constitution were revolutionary; however, on the social side it is conservative in that it preserved the traditional division of Polish society into three classes—nobles, townsmen, and peasants. Each of these classes enjoyed different civil rights and different origins of jurisdiction. The ancient privileges of the gentry was preserved; the peasant was not lifted from serfdom. This may seem startling at first. It may appear the authors of this constitution were timid indeed, particularly in view of the example set just 2 years before by revolutionary France in the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which abolished all class distinction. However, the reforms of the Polish Constitution compared very favorably with the much more limited changes introduced into social systems of countries in Poland's immediate neighborhood, ruled over by such enlightened rulers of the time as Frederick II of Prussia, Joseph II of Austria, or Catherine the Great of Russia, none of whom made any social changes at all.

Dr. Roman Dyboski in his Outline of Polish History explains that the conservatism of the Polish Constitution is explained by the regard of the legislators for the threatening international position of Poland which made sweeping changes inadvisable; also by their fears that the opposition of the adversaries to the constitution of the too thoroughgoing social reforms might lead to civil war; and finally, by the very sensibly economic concern that a too sudden break with the systems of serfdom would have dealt a blow to Poland's flourishing agriculture. It was believed by the authors of the constitution that a gradual transition to free agricultural labor was more expedient, and the constitution was meant as a beginning in the right direction. Only a couple of years after the adoption of the constitution, freedom was granted to the peasants when they were enlisted in the armed forces to fight off the invasion and partition of Poland.

It is unfortunate that Poland, when on the very threshold of her newly gained and realized constitutional freedom, was partitioned and taken over by her three enemies and neighbors.

During the 125 years that Poland spent under the yoke of her partitioners, her hope for freedom did not perish. Her sons were active in the cause of freedom in many lands throughout the world. The records of the men of Poland in the battle for the freedom of our own country are well known to all.

In 1918, with the ending of World War No. 1, Poland was again free and in the short span of less than 21 years she made great strides politically, economically, and socially only to be again overrun and violated. Though Poland is again in the grasp of her enemies, she fights courageously and valiantly on all fronts in this global war. Today more than 30,000 soldiers are serving with the motorized division in England; more than 12,000 with the Polish Air Corps in Britain; about 100,000 comprise the Polish Army in the Near East; in addition, thousands are serving with the Polish Navy. All told, about 200,000 men are serving the United Nations. They occupy fifth place in strength behind the United States, Britain, China, Russia.

A people with courage and ability like this will not perish. A people with such vital love of liberty and freedom will live forever.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, Poland's history is both glorious and tragic. Today, under the iron heel of an invader whose only thought is to destroy, she is in the most tragic phase. All Americans, thankful for the invaluable aid of Polish heroes in the American Revolution, are anxious to help this country repay its debt of gratitude. We are all united in the battle to end dictatorship and restore democracy and freedom everywhere and victory in this battle will mean the redemption of Poland and her restoration to freedom. We all hope that that day will soon come.

Poland can boast, and justly so, of many heroes who fought valiantly for her freedom and on the honor roll of Polish and world history should appear the names of those who held Warsaw against all odds for 3 weeks. The Polish soldier has proven and continues to prove each day before the world that he can fight inflexibly for ideals that are precepts of honest Western democracies. He has but one desire, the restoration of the greatness of his country, that has temporarily been lost, and even in Poland today, in spite of the terrible outrages of the invaders, heroic, stubborn, and unbending resistance continues.

Underground, the nation of Poland still lives. The eternal spirit of Poland has not been crushed. Although conquered but not subdued, overrun but not mastered, Poland will never die as long as some of its people live somewhere and fight the Germans wherever they can.

When General Pulaski came to us in 1777, he wrote to Congress:

> I came here to sacrifice for the independence of America. I wish to live in a free country and before I settle down, I wish to fight for that country's freedom.

He fought for its freedom, but he did not live to enjoy it. We have enjoyed the fruits of his supreme sacrifice and we in turn accept the challenge of preserving that freedom at whatever cost. In the interest of humanity we also pledge ourselves to carry that freedom and security to Poland and the rest of the world. We must not fail.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this 3d day of May 1943, the Polish people celebrate constitution day. All champions of liberty join the thousands of citizens of Polish extraction in my district, and the hundreds of thousands in my State and all over the United States, in sacred dedication to the realization of constitutional liberty sought and guaranteed on May 3, 1791.

The Polish people throughout their history have always shown a sympathetic chord in the struggle for the evolution of free institutions. Not only for themselves but wherever that struggle manifested itself, they were ready to lend a helping hand and further the cause of free government. We have only to recall the gallant assistance given by such heroes as Kosciusko and Pulaski in our own struggle for liberty to realize the fervor and devotion of Polish patriots to the onward march against despotism and autocracy.

In all its history Poland has probably never celebrated a constitution day of such discouragement and darkness as today. It is our hope and prayer that this may prove to be the darkness that comes before the dawn and that Poland will ere long stand forth in the dawn of freedom which will accord to her her rightful place in the galaxy of nations as a shining example that a free and freedom-loving people has always given to the world.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK].

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I have sometimes wondered what satisfactions a tyrant can experience if he ever compares himself with a freeman. What can a Hitler or a Tojo think of himself when he meditates upon the greatness of a Washington and a Lincoln? Must he not hate himself and curse the fate he has embraced as an author of chapters of savagery in the world's history, when he contemplates the contrasting work of one who loved his fellow men and gave himself over to winning for them a measure of freedom?

The world's peoples, slave and free, raise up two kinds of monuments in their hearts, one of abhorrence for the crimes of the tyrants who have strutted so transitorially, but brutally across the earth, one of admiration and gratitude for the deeds of those enlightened men and women whose human compassion is enduring inspiration.

The occasion for these observations is an anniversary—an anniversary not of a despicable ravaging of a community or a nation by a tyrant, rather an anniversary of a date on which men were made free to choose continued freedom, to govern themselves, to enjoy peace and the pursuits of peace. It is May 3 to which I make reference, and the anniversary is that of the independence day of a people from among whom came forth Kosciusko and Pulaski to serve the cause of our American colonists when they were fighting invasion and oppression—the independence of the Polish Nation with which today we of the United States stand shoulder to shoulder in a global war to win a new era of freedom for the world.

Like our Fourth of July, the 3d of May is a day to celebrate. It is as unlike some other anniversary days as good is the opposite of evil. The 3d of May rises amid mankind's highest attainments. It stands in the calendar of all history to glorify man, to rescue his feelings from the shame he feels when he thinks of some other dates from the memory of which even a Hitler must wish in at least some rare moment that he might shrink and hide himself.

Such another date—an anniversary of shame—is the 1st of September, on which in 1939 that hell-inspired Hitler marched his legions of the crooked cross into Poland to crucify mankind once again. And such another anniversary, which will forever remind our world of man's awful inhumanity to man, is the 30th of January. On that date, which is also the date of Adolf Hitler's assumption of power in Germany, the Nazi command of Fort VII in Poznan held a feast in 1940, a feast with extraordinary entertainment—a hunt in honor of the Fuehrer. About 11 p. m. Polish prisoners were marched out of the cells and ordered to run up and down the corridor—and the Nazis a hunting went. Nine prisoners were shot dead in this hare game. The title of "king of the hunt" was conferred upon a cavalry sergeant, Hoffman.

There is an anniversary of degeneracy, not of emancipation—of death, not of resurrection—for the world to sorrow over, not to celebrate, through the ages to come.

But this May 3 in 1943 is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of a democratic constitution by the people of Poland. Under the influence of the American and French Revolutions, the Polish, too, in 1791 wrote a freemen's charter. Only 4 years thereafter, in 1795, Poland was again captive, her land divided among three imperialistic powers. For a century and a quarter of bondage the Polish people never ceased to dream of liberty, and after the First World War their Poland lived again as a sovereign nation until Hitler attacked.

Though Poland is today devastated and enslaved, people of every nationality who are free or who hope for freedom for themselves remember the birthday of the Polish Nation, remember that Polish Constitution Day gave a people self-government with freedom of religion; and the freedom-cherishing peoples, here in the United States and its Congress, and throughout the world, join in the wish that there will be a new independence day for Poland and that many future Polish Constitution Days will be celebrated by freemen of Poland amid peace and plenty.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN].

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, every American, notwithstanding his nationalistic origin, can wholeheartedly join in paying tribute to the oppressed people of Poland on the anniversary of the adoption of their constitution, a document which was inspired by our great American Constitution. Poland sent some of her most gallant military strategists to the struggling Colonies to help make possible our glorious Republic.

Our debt to Poland did not, however, end with the culmination of the successful struggle of the Thirteen Colonies for their independence. Since that day until the present the United States of America and freedom-loving people everywhere have reason to be grateful to the sons and daughters of Poland for their continuing contributions to our Republic. Millions of men and women from Poland have been attracted to the United States and their descendants have made and are making colossal contributions to the well-being and the progress and development of our Nation. Throughout the length and breadth of this Nation the influence of the people of Polish lineage is felt and it would be impossible to tabulate the magnificent effects of what the people of Polish ancestry have done for the United States.

Imbued with a spirit of liberty and freedom, closely akin to that of the people of the United States, people from Poland have come to the United States and have cherished our ideals of liberty. They have educated their children and taught them to revere and appreciate American institutions and ideals. There are no more patriotic people in our land today than those of Polish origin. Their patriotism, their zeal, and their willingness to sacrifice have been emphasized in the present World War No. 2. The sons and daughters of Polish ancestors in America today are never hesitant to express their appreciation of the services of World War No. 1 President Woodrow Wilson for his attempt to repay Poland for its services to our Republic in the days when it was struggling to obtain its freedom. Poland revered Woodrow Wilson and as a manifestation of its gratitude for his services one of the principal thoroughfares in Warsaw bore his name until the disciples of mechanized mass murder invaded that unfortunate land and destroyed the freedom and democracy which had been guaranteed it by the illustrious American President who guided the destinies of this Nation in the cause of democracy a quarter of a century ago.

Poland was the first nation in Europe to resist the war-mad rulers of the Axis Powers when they started out on their world conquest. There was no such word as appeasement in the lexicon of the patriotic Poles. Little Poland resisted the onslaught of the most ruthless conqueror the world has ever known.

It was in Poland that the world for the first time learned of the might of the German armed forces, but Poland carries on today in all parts of the world and eventually, in the victory of the United Nations, America looks forward to the restoration of that great little republic.

All the world can take cognizance and emulate the heroism of Poland in the sad days that have visited that land. In the meantime, the people of Poland can take courage in the fact that in this great Nation of ours, its citizens regardless of the ancestry of their forebears, look forward to the day when Poland will live again. Then, too, the Polish people realize that America offers asylum to them now as it has in the past; that America appreciates the services of the people whose ancestors came from Poland. America appreciates the wide variety of services those individuals have given to this land and to the cause of democracy for which we are again fighting.

Chicago, the city which I represent, is proud of the fact that one-third of its representation in the Congress of the United States, is of Polish origin.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST-WAR PLANNING AND RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a letter I have just received from the Honorable Thomas E. Conlon, Speaker of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, reading as follows:

HOUSE OF DELEGATES,
Annapolis, Md., April 27, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOMMY: Please refer to my letter of April 16, with which I sent you resolution introduced in the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland by the Honorable J. Milton Dick, of Allegany County, entitled "A house resolution relative to post-war planning and reconstruction."

This resolution was subsequently published in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, April 22, 1943, appearing on page 3736.

I have examined the Journal of Proceedings of the House of Delegates for the 1943 session and find that on April 2 I referred this resolution to the Federal relations committee and it was not reported out by that committee up to the time of sine die adjournment of the house, midnight April 3.

It therefore appears that the resolution in question was not actually adopted by the house and it was a mistake on my part in advising you that it was. The only way I can account for the resolution in question having been sent to you as one that passed the house is that the State printer caused same to be printed in anticipation of its being passed and the printed copy was sent to me along with numerous other resolutions which actually did pass.

I regret my having misinformed you as to the status of the resolution and will appreciate if appropriate correction can be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. CONLON.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I wish to reiterate my stand on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, with reciprocal trade treaties, has pointed the way to reestablishment of world peace by a restoration of world trade.

The work that Mr. Hull has been doing is of special significance to the people of the Third Congressional District of Maryland. The lifeblood of our district is large-scale manufacturing and sea-borne commerce. We live by trade, our people profit by trade, and those nations with whom we trade likewise profit. It is to the mutual advantage of each that international trade should be fostered. After this war this principle will have even greater significance.

Trade makes for the material well-being of our Nation and the other nations of the world. Without it free enterprise is dead.

Mr. Cordell Hull is doing a great service not only to America but to all the peace-loving nations of the world, and he should be encouraged to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution referred to in Mr. Conlon's letter may be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BURCH (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MCGEHEE (at the request of Mr. COLMER), for 5 days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. GILCHRIST (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on account of official business.

To Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. COFFEE), for 2 days, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 755. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation; to the Committee on the Library.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.;

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 23, 1943:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 30 days.

On May 3, 1943:

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.;

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on Thursday, May 6, to consider H. R. 85, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and H. R. 1905, a bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, May 6, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2326, "a bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

356. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

357. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting various legislation passed by Municipal Council of St. Croix with regard to creating a commission to regulate and control the prices of foodstuffs; to require the superintendent of public works to give attention to and make necessary repairs; and also for the retention of the Frederiksted branch of the Virgin Islands National Bank; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

358. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to designate the public library of the District of Columbia a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on Printing.

359. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

360. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $229,500 (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

361. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $16,400,000, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 180); to the Committee on Appropriations and order to be printed.

362. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Production Board, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $5,027,000 (H. Doc. No. 174); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

363. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the emergency fund for the President (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

363. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $78,100, and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 183); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

365. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to $3,500 (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

366. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $181,830,000 (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

367. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress, I am transmitting herewith one copy of the following legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands:

Bill No. 4, law concerning parole of prisoners; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

368. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

369. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

370. A letter from the Chairman, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

371. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence, when not furnished in kind; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

372. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 for the period beginning January 1, 1943, and ending March 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

373. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

374. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943, amounting in all to $122,050,900, to cover the cost of additional compensation granted to certain employees of the Federal Government by the act of August 1, 1942 (Public Law 694), the act of December 22, 1942 (Public Law 821), the act of April 9, 1943 (Public Law 25), and the pending overtime pay bill (H. Doc. No. 184); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

375. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

376. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of $695,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $215,000, the latter in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 191); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

377. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for defense aid, for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $6,423,629,000, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

378. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the National War Labor Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $14,341,300 (H. Doc. No. 178); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

379. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the form of amendments to the Budget for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $99,000 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

380. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration in the amount of $500,000 (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $2,079,800 (H. Doc. No. 185); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

382. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill amending section 2 (b) of the act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1211); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

383. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of

a proposed bill to amend section 19 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of June 26, 1934; to the Committee on Appropriations.

384. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Fountaine Que Buoille (Fountain) River and its tributaries, Colorado, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937, and of Fountaine Qui Vouille River, Colo., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

385. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $500,000 (H. Doc. No. 181); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

386. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the foreign war relief appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, extending its availability until June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 188); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

387. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $20,000 (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2577. A bill to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2578. A bill to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans equivalent to those granted to Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2579. A bill to limit the provisions of certain laws relating to the pay and promotion on the retired lists of the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, of commended officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2580. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2581. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr BURDICK:

H. R. 2582. A bill to provide for the adjustment of claims of the United States in respect of emergency crop and feed loans made by the Farm Credit Administrator prior to 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 2584. A bill to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2585. A bill for the equalization of letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2586 (by request). A bill to remove certain restrictions relating to the appointment of retired commissioned officers to civilian positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2587. A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 2588. A bill to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 2589. A bill to regulate and promote the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2590. A bill to prohibit States from redistricting their congressional districts or reapportioning their Representatives in Congress more than once in any one decennial census period; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R 2591. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, with respect to the creation of national monuments; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 2592. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to repeal and prohibit the issuance of any directive or regulation preventing any member of the military forces on active duty from becoming a candidate for or seek or accept election to any Federal public office not held previously when he or she entered upon active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2593. A bill to repeal the tax on amounts paid for the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2594. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2595. A bill prohibiting certain acts interfering with the national-defense program or with normal Government activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2596. A bill to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2597. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof; the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and civilian employees of the executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes," for the purpose of extending its provisions to include employees of contractors engaged on public works outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 221. Resolution favoring action looking to relief for starving peoples of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. Res. 222. Resolution to make H. R. 1995, a bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protest against and reject energetically the Tydings' bill for independence to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to procedure for recovering damages inflicted upon land structures by watercraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish the Texas State headquarters of Office of Price Administration in Fort Worth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the Federal Rent Control Administration in California; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the pharmacy corps bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States looking toward the establishment of peace on earth and good will toward men in the world following the war in which we are now engaged; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation relative to hard of hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Fermin Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERANDEZ:

H. R. 2602. A bill providing for the relief of Fermin Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Fred Seaman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jethro Humphrey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Kirby; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Easterwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2607. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Goldberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2608. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ferrara; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2609. A bill for the relief of Ralph Gilliland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2610. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Tracey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2611. A bill for the relief of Carolyn Towle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

630. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. J. Harry Carson and members of his congregation, of Moundsville, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

631. Also, petition of Rev. Calvin T. Weimer and members of the First Presbyterian Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

632. Also, petition of Rev. G. N. Perkins and members of the First Christian Church of McMechen, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

633. Also, petition of Rev. Brooks Morgan and members of the Free Methodist Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

634. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of Rev. R. W. Fisscher and 49 additional signers, citizens of Suffolk County, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

635. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Rev. Lee H. Ball and three other residents of Mahopac, N. Y., in behalf of the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. Also, petition of 61 residents of the city of Newburgh, N. Y., petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, for the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

637. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 40 citizens of Butler County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

638. By Mr. CLASON: Resolutions of the Senate of Massachusetts, memoralizing the Secretary of State to request the Burmuda Refugee Conference to allow the Joint Emergency Committee for European Jewish Affairs to appear before it and present its program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

639. By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the Florida Legislature, 1943 session, to continue Florida's assistance to the United Nations in war aims; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

640. Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Grandview, Granger, Zillah, Toppenish, and Yakima, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation or alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobolization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

641. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 278 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

642. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. R. F. Hart and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

643. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 30 citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

644. Also, petition of 82 citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the committee on the Judiciary.

645. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of committee of 50 citizens of Copenhagen, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

646. By Mr. FORAND: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of the New England Governors, meeting in Montpelier, Vt., on April 23, 1943, taking steps to protect the interests of New England in the class freight rate investigation of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

647. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the undersigned members of the Ohio Woman's Christian Temperance Union to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

648. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the California Legislature regarding Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 memorializing Congress and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow hunting in the Sleepy Lake area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

649. Also, resolution No. 3325 passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress as to war and post-war program of United Nations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

650. Also, petition of the California Legislature regarding Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, relative to hearing instruments for persons who are hard of hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

651. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

652. By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire: Concurrent resolution of the General Court of New Hampshire, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

653. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 31 residents of Bad Axe and Huron County, Mich., expresaing interest in prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

654. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of E. H. Hines, of Groesbeck, Tex., favoring a general sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 3, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from this high hill of the Nation's life we would remember before Thee all those who serve in our stead for freedom's cause. With unspeakable solicitude we would gather in the arms of our intercession this morning every family where a vacant place speaks eloquently of one far away today in the Nation's service.

"O hear us when we cry to Thee
For those in peril on the sea."

Creator, who dost from above
Observe Thy sons with eyes of love,
Who canst preserve where'er they be
Our men who fight for home and Thee;
O put Thou forth a guiding hand
For those in peril on the land.

"Almighty, who canst from on high
Protect our flyers in the sky
And guide each pilot in his plane
The length and breadth of Thy domain;
O hearken to our fervent prayer
For those in peril in the air."

Hasten, we beseech, the day of victory for truth and justice and righteousness, when there shall rise to Thee glad hymns from air and land and sea. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the joint resolution with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Truman
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	
Gillette	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

POST-WAR PLANNING—PURPORTED RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES—CORRECTION OF RECORD AND JOURNAL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make a correction of the RECORD.

On April 22, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate a document received from the speaker of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, purporting to be a resolution adopted by that body relative to post-war planning and reconstruction, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered printed in the RECORD.

The Chair has since received a letter from the speaker of the house of delegates stating that, as a result of an investigation, it appears the resolution was not in fact adopted by the house of delegates, that its transmission to the President of the Senate was done through error, and he asks that this correction be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Chair accordingly lays the letter before the Senate and refers it to the Committee on Finance, to accompany the resolution of the house of delegates heretofore referred to that committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the speaker of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, Mr. Thomas E. Conlon, has also written me concerning this matter, and stated that in the last days of the session the resolution was inadvertently assumed to have been adopted, whereas, as Mr. Conlon now informs me, the record shows the resolution never was adopted. Therefore, the resolution having been sent to the President of the Senate in good faith, but in error, and having been inserted in the RECORD as a legislative memorial from the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland, I think the appropriate action, if I may suggest, would be to have the resolution expunged from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because, as Mr. Conlon states, the record of the Maryland House of Delegates now shows the resolution was never favorably acted upon by that body.

In view of those circumstances, which I have myself investigated, and know to be accurate, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the original resolution sent to the President of the Senate and inserted in the RECORD may be expunged from the RECORD of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Maryland is discussing a memorial which was printed in the RECORD a few days ago?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It cannot be expunged from the RECORD. It is there. The RECORD in which the resolution is printed is the temporary RECORD, however.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I ask that it be expunged from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. McNARY. I think the motion should be that it be not included as a part of the permanent RECORD, rather than that it be expunged.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was my intention, and I thank the Senator for making it more express. I ask unanimous consent to omit from the permanent RECORD the resolution purporting to have been adopted by the House of Delegates of Maryland dealing with the question of reciprocal trade treaties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Maryland is agreed to, and the original entry also will be stricken from the Journal.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications

and letters, which were referred as indicated:

LIQUIDATION OF UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision extending to June 30, 1944, the availability of the 1942-43 appropriation for the liquidation of the United States Housing Corporation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $70,000, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 237 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General together with statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

TEMPORARY INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes (with an accompany paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CANAL DREDGING CO. V. THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 36)

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the findings of fact and opinion of the Court of Claims in the case of *Canal Dredging Co.* v. *the United States*, No. 43837; to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of Agriculture (2), Federal Security Agency, and the Executive Office of the President which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry technical engineers and draftsmen (per annum employees) of the New York Navy Yard, praying for the prompt enactment of House bill 1860, to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Memorial 6

"Memorial relating to procedure for recovering damages inflicted upon land structures by watercraft

"Whereas the present remedies afforded in law courts for recovery of damages from owners of tugs, barges, vessels, and other watercraft inflicting damage or injury to bridges, trestles, and other land structures within or abutting upon navigable waters are inadequate, inconvenient, and expensive, and in many instances owners of such watercraft who are nonresidents of the State in which such damage or injury is inflicted can only be served with process and sued in the State where they reside at considerable expense and inconvenience to the residents of other States whose property is damaged, and even when judgment is recovered at law there is no assurance that satisfaction thereof can be realized; and

"Whereas there is at present no appropriate Federal regulation or provision of Federal law requiring immediate reports by masters of such watercraft to the United States engineers or other responsible Federal officer or officers of damage inflicted by such watercraft upon such land structures with further requirement that such reports be promptly brought to the attention of the owners of such land structures so damaged, which results in many owners of watercraft escaping detection and suit for damages for such injuries inflicted by their craft; and

"Whereas the American Bar Association at its fiftieth-eighth annual meeting in July 1935, recommended to the Congress of the United States the enactment of remedial legislation to extend admiralty and maritime jurisdiction to cases where watercraft inflict damage upon land structures, which recommendation appears in the Reports of American Bar Association, volume 60, pages 241 to 244, inclusive"; but such recommendation has never been put into effect by act of Congress; and

"Whereas appropriate Federal legislation to remedy the conditions above described should now be enacted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and the Senate of the State of Florida do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide: (1) That the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States shall extend to and include all cases of damage or injury to property caused by a vessel or other watercraft on navigable waters, notwithstanding that such damage or injury be done or consummated on land structures; (2) that masters of watercraft be required to make immediate and comprehensive reports of any such injury or damage inflicted by their watercraft upon any private or public land structure to the United States engineers' office having jurisdiction of the navigable waters on or near which such land structure is situated, and that the United States engineers be directed to make such reports immediately available to owners of such land structures; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State provide copies of this resolution, suitably prepared as a memorial, and respectfully present such copies to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor April 27, 1943."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war—prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of certain alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of German H. H. Emory Post No. 8, the American Legion, Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to adopt the American's Creed as the official creed for all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 875. A bill to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service; with amendments (Rept. No. 214).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1041. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 215).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1061 (by request). A bill to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1; and

S. 1062 (by request). A bill to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, in the performance of their official duties; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1063. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1064. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1065. A bill to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes;

S. 1066. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1067. A bill to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence, when not furnished in kind; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1068. A bill to prohibit strikes among employees engaged in work necessary to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; and

S. 1069. A bill to permit employers engaged in production necessary to the war effort to discharge employees who participate in strikes or organized slow-downs among the employees of such employer; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1070. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that registrants who interfere with the war effort by participating in strikes in essential industries shall be inducted into the Army of the United States, and may be assigned to work in such industries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1071. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Morris White Fashions, Inc., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1072. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the last war in 1918 and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and thereafter which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1073. A bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of George N. Cox, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Steve York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER and Mr. McKELLAR each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN WAR INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 838) to provide for vocational rehabilitation to persons disabled in war industries or otherwise and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE JUDICIARY AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK (for Mr. LUCAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LUCAS to House bill 2409, the judiciary and legislative appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Strike out lines 1 to 14, inclusive, on page 58, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "provided for, $1,137,100: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of the secretaries, exclusive of temporary additional compensation, and exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall correspond with those of the assistant administrative grade (grade 7 of Clerical, Administrative, and Fiscal Service) and their basic salaries shall be adjusted by the Director as of July 1, 1943, so that they are given credit for one rate of $100 in grade 7 for each 18 months' prior service as secretary to any Federal judge or other United States Government official (*Provided*, That the annual basic compensation of the secretary to a circuit or district judge shall not (exclusive of temporary additional compensation) exceed $3,200): *And provided further*, That the salaries of law clerks shall correspond with those of the assistant professional grade."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. TRUMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 146), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941, and Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to January 25, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program), is hereby increased by $100,000.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—INVESTIGATION OF HEALTH CONDITIONS AND FIRE ESCAPES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 147), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That there is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $105.70, for expenses incurred by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the investigation of health conditions, and fire escapes in the District of Columbia.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on April 28, 1942, the law with reference to the renegotiation of contracts became operative. I have two highly informative letters—one from the Under Secretary of the Navy, the other from the Under Secretary of War—giving detailed statements of the progress made by the War Department and the Navy Department under the law, showing what has been accomplished up to date, and what is contemplated for the future. The record to date is impressive and the officials who have performed this important public service are entitled to special commendation. I ask that the letters be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 28, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: A year ago today the statutory authority to renegotiate contracts became law. On this anniversary you might like to know what the Navy has accomplished under the legislation.

The Navy Price Adjustment Board, acting under the renegotiation law, has been able to reduce by more than $1,000,000,000 the cost to the Government of contracts which it has renegotiated. The figures for the entire year ending today are not available yet, but through the end of March price reductions and cash refunds arranged by the Navy Price Adjustment Board already had amounted to more than $950,000,000. This total does not take into consideration the very substantial amount which will be saved through the lower prices which will prevail on future business. Furthermore, as you know, other reductions and refunds have been negotiated by the War Department and the Maritime Commission Boards.

These price reductions and cash refunds have all been agreed to voluntarily by the contractors in recognition of the fact that without these adjustments their companies would have realized excessive profits. These contract reductions have not injured business. On the contrary, they have, in general, left the companies with a dollar amount of profits, both before and after taxes, which compares very favorably with earnings during peacetime.

The Navy estimates that it will be called upon to renegotiate about $35,000,000,000 of contracts. By the end of March proceedings had already been started with companies holding almost $29,000,000,000 of contracts, showing that the work is well advanced. Furthermore, the companies who have already completed renegotiation or who are in the final stages of renegotiating held contracts amounting to $13,000,000,000, or more than one-third of the total anticipated volume. I think there is no doubt about the ability of the Navy to complete its task under the law. Incidentally you might be interested in knowing that the Navy has told 240 contractors, whose contracts amount to about $500,000,000, that their profits are not excessive and need not be renegotiated.

In my opinion, one of the most significant facts about the first year's operation of renegotiation is that all agreements have been reached voluntarily. I think this accomplishment is due to the good fortune of the Navy and other departments in assembling what the Truman committee called an unusual group of able, conscientious, and patriotic lawyers, accountants, and businessmen as administrators of renegotiation. In other words, the law which you sponsored has been used by farsighted businessmen, both within the Government and outside, in order to handle the explosive problem of war profits in a manner mutually satisfactory to private business and to the public interest. I think you can be justly proud of your support of this measure.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1943.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The war contract renegotiation statute—in which you have shown such an active and constructive in-

terest—has been in effect for 1 full year—since April 28, 1942. This is, therefore, an appropriate time to tell you of the progress which the War Department has made in the renegotiation of war contracts since the law went into effect.

To the end of March 1943, price reductions and cash refunds totaling $1,527,000,000 have been effected by the War Department. Of this, $560,000,000 represents cash refunds and $967,000,000 represents price reductions.

These reductions and refunds resulted from renegotiations by the War Department Price Adjustment Board and sections and by the contracting officers of the Supply Services and the Army Air Forces, Matériel Command. The existence of the statute providing for renegotiation has also been responsible for closer pricing on new contracts awarded since the date of its enactment, and particularly in the last few months, but no reasonably accurate estimate can be made of this effect.

War contractors are showing increasingly a disposition to cooperate fully and voluntarily with the War Department Price Adjustment Board, as illustrated by corporate advertisements appearing in daily newspapers and by statements made in stockholders' reports.

Better understanding of the purposes, principles, policies, and interpretations of the Renegotiation Act is resulting in rapid acceleration of the work of opening renegotiation and reaching final settlements. This better understanding has been facilitated by adoption and publication of policies followed jointly by the price-adjustment boards, by numerous addresses made by authorities on price adjustment before business groups, by articles in the public press, and by educational institutions which have inaugurated seminars on the subject.

The Renegotiation Act is providing a means for buying material for war economically, for combating inflation, and for guarding the system of private enterprise against the charge of profiteering at the expense of the taxpayers and men in the armed forces.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

MOTHER'S DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by him on Mother's Day before the mothers of Adas Israel Congregation, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT ABERDEEN ORDNANCE SCHOOL GRADUATION EXERCISES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MEAD at the graduation exercises of the officer candidates division of the Ordnance School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., on April 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEND-LEASE FOR WAR ONLY?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lend-Lease for War Only?" written by Senator BUTLER and published in Nation's Business for May 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

100-OCTANE GASOLINE—STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of 100-octane gasoline made by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before the Truman committee on Monday, May 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSION TO MOSCOW—PROLOGUE BY JOSEPH E. DAVIES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to Russia, as a prologue to Mission to Moscow, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARM PROGRAM AND THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY GORDON ROTH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Gordon Roth, director of public relations of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, on the food-for-freedom program, April 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION OF WAR POLICY BY REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF OREGON

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration of war policy issued by the Republican State Central Committee of Oregon, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF AMERICAN FLIERS IN JAPAN—ADDRESS BY LOTHROP STODDARD

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the script of a radio address delivered by Lothrop Stoddard on April 25, relative to the execution by Japan of American fliers, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM TUCSON (ARIZ.) CITIZEN

[Mr McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, published in the Tucson (Ariz.) Citizen of April 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to strike out on page 2, line 8, the words "or other cause."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to present an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it lie on the table. I have had the amendment mimeographed, and will distribute copies to Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] within the last few minutes has consulted me, to advise that it is his intention to offer, as a substitute for Senate bill 796, now pending, an amendment which is on our desks. The proposed substitute would incorporate most of if not all the amendments which the Senator from Texas yesterday said it was his intention to offer with reference to the bill. He has asked whether I would consent to withdraw my pending amendment, to the end that he may offer his amendment in the nature of a substitute, with the understanding that I may thereafter renew my amendment with reference to the substitute. I ask whether, should the Senator from Texas offer the substitute as indicated, I may thereupon renew my amendment with reference to the substitute so offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I propose to offer to the pending bill, Senate bill 796. The amendment is as follows: On page 3, line 3, after the word "stoppage", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination on account of race, color, or creed in employment and administration with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under such authority."

I ask that the amendment lie upon the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, yesterday I offered several amendments, and sent forward others which I asked to have lie on the table, but which I did not at the time offer. A number of Senators seem to be somewhat uncertain about the situation because of the number of amendments. I have taken the liberty of redrafting the whole bill, incorporating in it the various amendments which I intended to propose, and I now ask that I may offer the proposal which I send to the desk as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill.

Under the rules of the Senate, the Senate may proceed to consider a substitute just as though it were the original bill, and the same privileges of amending it and modifying it obtain as to the original bill.

My purpose in taking this action is to make it easier for Senators to have a picture of the bill in its entirety and to obtain a clearer understanding of all its provisions.

I send my proposal to the desk as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is to taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, whenever the President finds,

after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause, that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant in the interest of the national defense: *Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this paragraph, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and the authority to operate any such plant under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed."

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3 hereof, in any case in which possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, such plant, while so possessed, (a) shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant was so taken, or (b) in the event operation of such plant is interrupted or stopped at such time, shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at such plant immediately preceding such interruption or stoppage.

SEC. 3. When possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, or a majority of the employees of such plant or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval of the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein, or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 5. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has withdrawn his amendment on page 2, line 8, which had been the pending question.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to propound an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Texas. I listened carefully to the reading of the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute. I wish to inquire whether the amendment has been submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, which reported out the original bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the Committee on the Judiciary has not been in session since yesterday. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is simply a compilation of the original bill and the amendments which I offered yesterday. I had the matter placed in this form for the convenience of Senators. There is a printed copy of the amendment in the nature of a substitute on the desk of every Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no desire to criticize the procedure. I simply wish to know whether the amendment was offered on the responsibility of the very distinguished Senator from Texas, or whether it was one which had been proposed to the committee, and which the committee reported, inasmuch as it is a substitute, as I understand, for the entire original bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment was offered on my responsibility. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that while the Committee on the Judiciary has not been in session since yesterday, I consulted privately a number of members of the committee. There is no substantial difference between the substitute and the original bill, except that in the substitute are incorporated two amendments which I offered yesterday providing penalties in the case of interference with the Government's control and operation of plants. Other than that there is no material difference.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as a final statement, I hope that the able Senator from Texas will discuss the substitute and point out the difference which exists between it and the bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut for yielding to me.

Mr. DANAHER. It was a pleasure to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, this bill is a most extraordinary one. It was originally introduced as Senate bill 2054 in the Seventh-seventh Congress, under date of November 17, 1941. It was reported to the Senate on December 1, 1941; and throughout the Seventh-seventh Congress it remained on the calendar, without action being taken.

Senate bill 795, in the Seventh-eighth Congress, was introduced on or about March 1, 1943, in identically the same language as that of Senate bill 2054, in the Seventy-seventh Congress. Senate bill 796 was reported from the committee on or about March 30, 1943, and was the bill which was upon our desks yesterday as a result of the vote last week to make it the unfinished business. Various questions having arisen, the Senator from Texas has obviously markedly altered the original Senate bill 796. The substitute now before us goes far beyond anything which was covered in the hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Seventy-seventh Congress. There were no hearings whatever on Senate bill 796 in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and most assuredly there were none to canvass the questions which are presented by the substitute to which my amendment is directed. For example, Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would strike from line 11, on page 2, the words "or other cause." Why? Because the first impact of this particular measure, should it become law, would be to authorize the President of the United States to seize and take away from its owners any plant which is "equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any article or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith."

Mr. President, the plant doe not have to be one which is actually engaged in the furtherance of the war effort. It does not have to be a plant which indeed is engaged in the production of something essential to the war effort. It does not have to be a plant which is engaged in production at all, so long as it is "equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles" which, according to the language of the bill, "may be required for the national defense."

As if that were not enough, Mr. President, it is stated in the alternative that if there be any plant which is equipped for the manufacture or production of materials "which may be useful in connection therewith," the bill will have its adherence.

That is a strange situation. It inveighs obviously and directly against property, in the first instance, insofar as the bill would be predicated upon the seizure of a plant which is equipped for the production of materials which may be useful for the national defense. What item is not? What article essential to the civilian economy is not useful with reference to the national defense?

Before the President of the United States may exercise the authority conferred by the bill it must appear that certain conditions exist:

Whenever the President finds, after investigation—

And yesterday I suggested an amendment which the Senate agreed to and

which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has incorporated in the substitute—

and proclaims—

To the end, in other words, that the President must proclaim that the following conditions exist: First—

that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance—

Whatever that may be—

or other cause—

So long as the President of the United States says that for any cause, independent of whether it is the result of a strike or other labor disturbance—

that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant in the interest of the national defense—

The President may take the plant away from management and turn it over to some Government agency to be denominated by him, and thereafter assumedly to operate it.

No provision is anywhere made that the plant shall be so operated. No terms or conditions are stated as to who will pay to the owners the losses incurred through Government ownership or by a Government operator. There is nothing in the way of a definitive standard by which management or labor could state on what basis the plant would be returned to management. In other words the proviso says that the plant, when seized—

shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

In the use of the words "in a manner consistent," the substitute does not even apply the same tests, Mr. President, as those under which the plant was taken away in the first place. Were it to be returned upon a statement to the President's satisfaction that the conditions which led to its seizure had been removed, there would at least be some standard; but not even that is provided.

So, Mr. President, when we find the language so broad that under its terms the President may take over any plant in the United States so long as it is equipped to produce some article which may be required in the war effort "or which may be useful in connection therewith," I respectfully submit that the Congress is being asked to go further than it ever has gone in any instance of like character in our entire history.

Mr. President, were the power to be confined, let us say, to the situation presented by a strike, we would have reason to inquire into the necessity for the proposed legislation in the first place, for certainly the Senator from Texas read only yesterday a list of some seven or eight plants which, in fact, have been seized by the President during a period commencing on a date in early June 1941 and continuing to the present date. So, when for one reason or another the President has seen fit to step in and take over a plant which he has found to be essential to the war effort, a plant in which a Government contract was being executed, and thereafter to operate it, we already have, apparently—I emphasize the word "apparently"—the authority in the President to act; that is to say, if we are to rely upon the opinion of the Attorney General in a previous instance.

Let us take, for example, the case of the seizure of the North American Aviation Co. on or about June 9, 1941. At that time the then Attorney General, Mr. Robert Jackson, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, stated a circumstance which we may well consider as we look over the proposed legislation. I quote from his published opinion:

The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of governmental efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlement; they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line, which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

In the Attorney General's opinion is a perfect instance, Mr. President, of the "other cause." A small minority may create—to correlate it with other language in the bill—a labor disturbance, whatever that may be, and however ill-defined it may be. That small minority, by such action, may induce the President of the United States to step in and take the plant away from management and turn over its control and operation to the authority or agency denominated by the President, which, in turn, before the plant ever can be returned to management, may insist on such terms and conditions as it prescribes, whereupon the President may return it if he is satisfied that it will be operated in a manner consistent with the needs of national defense.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was the Senator reading from the statement or decision of the court, or of the Attorney General?

Mr. DANAHER. I was reading from an opinion of the Attorney General in connection with the President's proclamation upon which was based the seizure of the North American Aviation plant in June 1941.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was that Attorney General Biddle?

Mr. DANAHER. No; Attorney General Jackson.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Who is now on the Supreme Court.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. As I read the bill and the proposed amendment, it is directed against property and against the owners of property. Is not that true?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly the whole jurisdiction for action is predicated upon the existence of property in the control of some management.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It seeks to penalize citizens who are owners of property, and the property itself, and misses entirely the target, which is a comparatively small group of labor leaders who defy the Government. Is not that true?

Mr. DANAHER. I will answer the Senator in this way: I do not say, nor do I know, that it seeks to do so, as the Senator suggests. Certainly a necessary result of action under section 1 of the bill is to take property away from it owners and turn it over to some Government agency, for whatever purpose, because the words "or other cause" are sufficiently broad to include whatever reason or ground the President may choose to ascribe and proclaim as the basis for his action, always conditioned, of course, by the other language in the context, to the effect that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of the plant in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But there is nothing in the bill, as I read it, which either penalizes individuals or prohibits them from doing the things which have caused the present trouble.

Mr. DANAHER. The substitute offered by the Senator from Texas contains several penalty clauses. It would suspend so much of the Norris-LaGuardia Act as would deny injunctions in labor disputes. It prescribes certain criminal penalties. There are many circumstances and conditions under which those penalty provisions would operate. There can be no question about that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has referred to one instance which might be "or other cause." However, is it not true that the President, under the broad language "or other cause," might step into a plant and simply say, "We think we can operate this plant better than you are operating it." Might he not say, "We need more airplanes. We do not like the way you are producing, although you have complied with your contract. We think we can operate the plant better than you can." Would not the language "or other cause" cover an instance of that kind?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not know that I presently recall all the facts of the Brewster Aeronautical Co. seizure in New Jersey, but it is my present recollection that the President then said that the management of that company was inadequate, and that the company was ill-equipped to do the job. The President stepped in, took the plant over, turned it over to the Navy, and had

members of the Navy supply the industrial "know how." The Government thereafter operated it. It is my recollection that the plant, after being reorganized on the administration's basis, was returned to private management.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Executive order which was issued, as it appeared in the Federal Register of April 22, 1942. This may answer the question of the Senator from Ohio. It reads:

Whereas Brewster Aeronautical Corporation has entered into contracts for the construction and manufacture of essential war materials and such war materials have been in the course of manufacture at the plants of said company; and

Whereas it is deemed essential that such plants be taken over for use or operation by the United States of America in order that they be effectively operated;

I ask the Senator to dwell on the second "whereas" in the light of the question he asked. In other words, it is "deemed essential."

I continue to quote from the Executive order:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, pursuant to the powers vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy immediately to take possession of and operate the plants of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation located at Long Island City, N. Y., Newark, N. J., and Johnsville, Pa., through and with the aid of such person or persons or instrumentality as he may designate, and, insofar as may be necessary or desirable, to produce the war materials called for by the company's contracts with the United States, its departments and agencies, or as may be otherwise required for the war effort, and do all things necessary or incidental to that end. The Secretary of the Navy shall employ such employees, including a competent civilian advisor on industrial relations, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this order, and, in furtherance of the purposes of this order, the Secretary of the Navy may exercise any existing contractual or other rights of said company, or take such steps as may be necessary or desirable.

Possession and operation hereunder shall be terminated by the President as soon as he determines that the plants of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the war effort.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 18, 1943.*

Obviously, Mr. President, whenever any dissident group chooses to create a labor disturbance—it does not even have to be a strike—the President may step in, if he finds that there is some impeding of the war effort. Whenever he says that for any "other cause" there is such a cessation of continuity of supply, he may step in.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that the President might find that in his opinion, in order that a plant may be operated in the way he thinks it should be operated, there should be participation by labor in management. If that were refused, he might step in in order to set up such a form of management. The failure to grant such labor participation might be considered "or other cause," as I read the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the President should ascribe to such a situation the "other cause" as a basis on which there is an interruption of continuity of supply from a particular plant, then, of course, the language "or other cause" would be sufficiently broad to include such a situation. It might even extend to a case in which a plant lays off employees because it cannot program work for the reason that it has no materials. It may lack adequate priorities. I know of one very large defense industry which at this minute is going from a three-shift to a two-shift basis for the reason that it has not adequate supplies and cannot get them. So there might be such an interruption for reasons entirely beyond the control of management, upon which the President might base action looking to a seizure.

I do not choose to argue the merits of the entire bill. I have not tried to cover the whole subject. I only emphasize to my colleagues that the language of this clause is so broad, having in mind the objectives allegedly sought for in the bill, that to my way of thinking we most assuredly should disapprove the incorporation of any such language in this measure. I therefore ask that the amendment which I have offered be adopted, and that in line 11, on page 2, the words "or other cause" be stricken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the Senator from Connecticut who raised the question as to the compensation to owners. If the Senator will refer to section 9 of the original Selective Service Act of which the pending bill is an amendment, he will find a general provision for the compensation to the owners of any plants which may be taken over.

Some Senators say that this is an attack on property. Mr. President, property cannot be left in the hands of the owners and at the same time be operated by the Government. If the Senate thinks that private property is so sacred that the Government cannot take it over as a war instrumentality for the manufacture of munitions, supplies, ships, and airplanes, it is the Senate's business to say so; but I do not think that property is any more sacred than blood and human life. We are trying to win this war.

The language of which the Senator from Connecticut complains and which he seeks to strike out is rather broad; but we are dealing with conditions which we cannot always foresee; we cannot anticipate every situation which may arise. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 2 of the bill the President cannot exercise this authority until "he finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbances or other cause." The words "or other cause" are what he seeks to strike out. The powers which are provided for by the bill cannot be exercised by the President until he makes that kind of a finding, and the plant has to be one which is equipped and suitable for the production of national defense articles. The fear about making a wholesale attack on property, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, has no foundation in fact. The seven cases which were cited, and to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred, were all cases in which either the Army or the Navy took over plants, and within a very few days after they were taken over they were returned to their private owners. The pending bill specifies that the plants shall be returned to their private owners whenever the President decides they should be returned. Who else could decide? No one but the Executive authority. Congress may enact laws, but we personally cannot execute them.

They must be executed by administrators under Executive authority. When the President determines that a plant can be operated privately in a manner consistent with the national defense and the national need, he is directed to turn it back to private ownership. The record shows that he has done so in every instance. The Government does not want to hold these plants. I predict that as soon as the present crisis shall have passed, the coal mines will be returned to private owners. The Government does not want the coal mines.

Mr. President, I shall briefly refer to the bill in general and to the only substantial change which I have proposed over the original bill. It was carefully examined by the Judiciary Committee, and extensive hearings were held; it was deliberated upon and gone over most critically and in great detail. I propose in the substitute and in an amendment offered by me yesterday, which Senators had an opportunity to inspect, a provision that once the Government takes over a plant—and under my theory, at least, when the Government takes it over, it is a Government plant, operated under the direction of the Government for the manufacture of supplies for the prosecution of the war—anyone who interferes with the operation of the plant, or conspires to interfere with it, or who induces people not to be employed, or to leave employment, shall be subject to a criminal penalty. It would not be general, and would not even affect war plants excepting those which have been taken over. It would not apply to any other war plant, no matter how great a quantity of munitions the plant might be supplying.

Mr. President, would that be an invasion of the rights of the individual? When the Government establishes an arsenal or a navy yard, or when it establishes a shipbuilding plant and it becomes a Government plant, has any citi-

zen the right to conspire or interfere with the operation of that plant, or to do anything to induce others to interfere with its operation? And if he does, has not the Government the right to prohibit such action and prevent it by the imposition of criminal penalties?

The only other change is that there is a provision in another clause, applicable only in those cases in which the Government takes over the plant, to enable the court to prevent interference with the operation and prosecution of the work. Those are the only two amendments of any consequence. The Judiciary Committee is familiar with those questions, and I am sure that it would approve the amendments if it were in session. I have consulted a number of members of the Judiciary Committee, and I have yet to find one who objects to those two proposals.

Mr. President, the question is up to the Senate. If the Senate does not wish to do anything, that is the function of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment.

It is very easy for any Member to conjure up some imaginary situation and say "No." "No" is a very easy word to say when one does not want to do anything.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas what power is granted in the proposed legislation which the Chief Executive does not now have under the War Powers Acts which Congress has heretofore passed?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator.

I hold in my hand a memorandum prepared by a member of the Attorney General's staff. He did not represent the Attorney General. I do not mean to quote the Attorney General, but at my request the gentleman to whom I refer made some investigations and prepared a little memorandum for me. If the Senator will bear with me I shall point out that section 9 of the original Selective Service Act was the authority for taking over all these plants. That section was offered as an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It reads as follows:

SEC. 9. The President is empowered, through the head of the War Department or the Navy Department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

Then, without quoting all this rather long and involved section, it is provided that the employer, the owner of a factory, or the operator—

who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, then, and in either such case, the President—

Shall take over.

That was the naked authority placed in the original Selective Service Act. The Congress has not enacted any legislation specifically giving the President the power to do those things, except that in the Second War Powers Act in connection with condemnation proceedings—and that was the purpose of that act—it was provided that the President might, by going into court and filing a petition, take immediate possession of any real estate or plant necessary for the prosecution of the war. That was on the theory that if sites or lands were essential the Government would not need to wait until the matter had been adjudicated through the process of condemnation, but the property might be seized and the adjudication determined later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; though I have not answered fully the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that what the country is primarily interested in at this moment is the coal strike situation. I am wondering if the Senator could advise me under what authority the President has said that he would take over the coal mines and the Government would operate them, so to speak? I do not say that the President said the Government would operate them, but he said that the Government would take over the coal mines. I am wondering under what authority we have delegated to him he can do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I know of nothing better in that respect than to cite some of the Executive orders under which the President has heretofore acted.

Mr. LUCAS. Where did he get the power to issue the Executive orders—from what section of the statutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is probably more familiar with the statutes than is the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, I did not hear his answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois is no doubt more familiar with the statutes than is the Senator from Texas. I have been out of practice for a long while.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not so familiar with the statutes as is either the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me quote from a memorandum I had prepared on this subject. I think it will help the Senator from Illinois:

The Executive orders under which the Government has recently taken possession of several manufacturing plants do not cite any specific statute as the basis of the authority for the issuance. The following language is typical of that used in the executive orders, "by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States as President and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it is hereby ordered—

And so on. There is a school of thought, as the Senator from Illinois no doubt knows, that the Constitution in conferring on the President authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy gives him very large powers of rather undefined character, which some experts have referred to as "aggregate powers." My purpose in this bill is to give the President specific authority, to put the Congress squarely behind him, and to confirm and ratify in him the power to do the things which time has demonstrated must be done.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. Who is there in the Senate who will stand on the floor and now say that property is so sacred that in the coal strike the President should have had his hands tied and be compelled to stand still? There was no alternative for the President of the United States except to take over the mines. Six hundred thousand miners are engaged in producing coal. It might be said, "Oh, you could put someone in jail." Well, Mr. President, we cannot put 600,000 people in jail, and the mines having the coal in them—and coal is what we want—had to be operated; they had to continue in production, and there was no other course open to the President of the United States. He had to take charge of the coal mines. There are those who say, "You must not touch private property; you must not interfere with free enterprise."

Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator to yield about 10 minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was yielding to the Senator from Illinois. When he shall have concluded, I will then yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, and then to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to make one further observation in line with what the Senator has said. I agree 100 percent with what the President of the United States has done in connection with the coal strike, and, in my humble opinion, the country is behind him in the action he has taken. Whether he has the power or has not the power, he has assumed the power, under the Constitution, to do this thing; he has done it, and he has to stand by his guns in connection with this great undertaking in order to keep down civil strife, in my judgment. If he has the inherent power under the Constitution to do the many things he

has done by Executive order, and the country is, apparently, behind him in the situation, I was wondering whether or not all the measures and all the things the Senator contemplates doing by the pending bill are not, in reality, covered by the Constitution, or at least, by the powers which have heretofore been granted him under the two war powers acts. That was my thought. If that be true, I am wondering whether this bill, for instance, is necessary?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that, however much he may be convinced, he will find Senators on the floor who say, to the contrary, that the President has not the power.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senators who make such a statement, I take it, are not going to object very strongly to what the President has done in connection with the coal strike. I have not heard very much objection to his action by any Senator who may wish to discuss the question of property rights. Most of those to whom I have talked, on both sides of the Chamber, have applauded the President, and the country, in my judgment, is applauding him for what he has done. I have not heard anyone yet who raised the property question so far as the coal strike is concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator I think he is exactly right. Practically all Senators approve what the President has done; the country approves what he has done; and I do not think the Senate ought to be timid about saying so by passing legislation. This bill is not only for the present coal strike; it has been pending for over a year; it is a general bill, for we may be faced with other situations, and the necessity may arise for taking over other plants in connection with this war. So it is not an answer simply to say that the coal strike has been settled and we need not do anything more about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume the only reason the Senator has called up the bill is because of the critical situation throughout the country. The bill has been lying dormant for many months; no action has been taken upon it; and it occurred to me that, perhaps, the Senator's bill may be questioning the authority of the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I assure the Senator that I have no such purpose. My purpose, in the beginning was to give the President adequate and unquestioned support. It is now questioned; the Senator himself raised a question; the authority of the President is questioned whether you are criticising his action or whether you are not. The passage of this bill will put it far beyond any question. I did not originate the bill on account of the coal strike; it has been here for more than a year; I endeavored to secure action on it a year ago, but the President of the United States asked me not to press the bill at that moment because he was getting a no-strike agreement from Lewis and Green and Murray. The President had a 7-point program to handle the labor situation, and I very reluctantly agreed not to push consideration of the bill. I will tell the Senator when I decided to bring it up definitely. I wanted to bring it up all along, but I realized I had to have votes. I have not had much experience in politics, but whether in the Senate or in Precinct No. 8, it is necessary to have the votes, and I did not want to bring up this bill until I had sufficient votes to pass it. Mr. Lewis appeared before the Truman committee 3 or 4 weeks ago. I happen to be a member of that committee, and when he said he did not regard his no-strike agreement as binding, when he told the country he did not regard it as necessarily binding, that it was only binding in case the War Labor Board did equity and he reserved to himself the right to say what equity was, I determined then that if I could get this bill before the Senate, I was going to bring it up and press it in order that if he did disregard the agreement, the President or the Government of the United States would have a weapon with which to meet the threat and the danger. I applaud what the President has done. I am not hostile to his interests. I am trying to help him, I am trying to support him, I am trying to get the Senate to confirm and to ratify and to approve what the President has done.

Let me say to the Senator, these matters have never reached the courts. They may reach the courts in the view of some Senators who are against the invasion of private property. If they do reach the courts, I want the law to be so clear and so explicit and plain that the actions will be maintained by the court.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As I recall, a bill substantially similar to the pending bill was in the Senate, and was favorably acted on, by a vote of some 67 to 7. Am I correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LODGE. That bill contained substantially what is contained in the first section of the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. My recollection is that under the original bill the President would have been required to use existing conciliation facilities before he invoked his power.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that is accurate.

Mr. LODGE. He had to show that he had used existing conciliation facilities, did he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. An amendment was adopted, presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], as I now recall, about resorting to conciliation. The amendment was not offered by me, but it was adopted, though I do not recall its scope.

Mr. LODGE. But it was not part of the original bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, it was not part of the original bill. It had something to do with conciliation. The matter went to the House, and the House refused to agree to the Senate measure; it went out in conference, and that was the last of it. But in substance the Senate a year and a half ago, perhaps, passed a provision similar to that now pending, the very one authorizing the President to do the things authorized by the pending bill.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator had the votes at that time?

Mr. CONNALLY. I had them at that time, and I hope to have them now. I hope Senators have rather been strengthened and confirmed in their positions, rather than made timid or cautious or hesitant.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The difficulty under which we are at present laboring has to do largely with the activities or the absence of activities on the part of one individual or a small group of individuals. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNALLY I suppose the Senator means the leaders?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; the leaders.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The miners themselves, the workers in the mines, are not to blame for the present situation, the owners of the mines are not to blame for it, but the individuals who are controlling the miners, a small handful of men, I take it, are responsble for it. I desired to ask the Senator whether, in framing his bill, he had considered whether some provision should not also be included to place a penalty upon the heads of men who bring about such a situation as that we have faced for the last 5 or 6 days. Section 4 applies only after the President has taken over.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. None of the provisions apply before action by the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. However desirable what the Senator suggests might be, I do not offer the bill as a cure-all; I do not offer it as completely covering all the ground of labor unions and strikes. I could not do that. We could never succeed in passing it. I am trying to approach this matter with some one definite provision. If other Senators have other bills affecting other angles of the labor situation or the industrial situation, I hope they will introduce their bills and have them properly reported. But to undertake to cover all these matters in one measure such as the pending bill would be futile. It would involve us in a maze of difficulties. We would have debate in the Senate until next Christmas, perhaps, with no action whatever. I am sure that after the Senator has served a little longer he will realize the difficulties to which I refer. I know of his zeal and his daily attendance here and his study of all these measures, but I suggest to him that the most effective way to legislate is to deal with one particular angle of a matter,

and take action on it, without seeking to cover the whole earth.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the situation at the present time, under existing laws and the Constitution, there may be some question about the authority of the President to take the action which he found it necessary to take in connection with the coal strike. The purpose of the pending bill, as I understand, is to confer on and vest in the President express authority by law to do the very thing he has done in this crisis.

Mr. CONNALLY. And to operate the mines.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And to operate them. The measure goes further, and provides penalties for those who interrupt or interfere with such operation after the Government has once taken over a plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No such authority now exists by law.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if the miners, the management, or others, should undertake now to obstruct the operation of the mines, there would be no law under which to deal with them effectively, or to punish them for committing such an offense.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is accurate in that respect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the pending bill will cure that defect, then it will be a measure fully supporting the position the President has taken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, and I entirely agree with him.

All Senators are aware of the fact that questions of order and questions of local control are all within the police power of the States. We cannot pass general laws with respect to those things, but we can pass a law when, in a case like the present one, a particular activity affects a Federal operation. Therefore, as the Senator from Arkansas so well suggests, without legislation of the character of the bill before us, interferences and matters of that kind would come under the State law, of which we have no jurisdiction and no authority and no power. But I am confining the bill to plants which the President, under the direction of Congress, takes over, and when he takes one over, it becomes a Government plant.

Would we tolerate men interfering with the operation of an arsenal which belonged to the Government? Would we for a moment tolerate someone interfering with the operation of an airplane plant which we ourselves owned? Would we permit someone to stand in the yard of a shipbuilding plant and interfere with its operations for a moment? Of course we would not, and we should not. When a plant becomes a Government plant, it must not be touched by sabotage, by inducements of any kind to hamper or hinder or interfere with its operation. That is all this bill covers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to the Senator that that was my interpretation of the objectives and purposes of the measure, and in view of recent developments and the crisis which exists, and in view of some doubt as to the authority and power of the President to take the action which he has taken, I think the Congress would be derelict in its duty in this hour of crisis if it did not enact the pending bill, or some similar measure, so as to support the position the President has taken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator a question to ascertain whether my interpretation of his proposal is correct.

Under section 9 of the existing law, there is a provision that the Army and Navy may take over plants which have refused to cooperate, or to take charge of certain orders, or transform the plant, and providing conditions of compensation.

The Senator's proposal enlarges that power to take over plants when the President finds that any plant is in a situation where labor disturbances are impeding production. But in section 2 and in section 3 of the Senator's proposal, providing for the fixing of certain labor conditions, and providing for appeal, it applies, as the Senator has drawn it and introduced it, not only to the plants taken over by the President under this authority but to plants taken over under the previous conditions set forth in section 9. Sections 2 and 3 will apply to plants taken over by the Army and the Navy, and provide for the fixing of labor conditions. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that that is probably correct. I do not know of any plants at the moment, other than the mines, which are now taken over, because the records I have show that all other plants taken over have been returned to their owners. The plants were taken over by the Army and Navy, I will say to the Senator from Iowa, but they were taken over by authority vested in the President under section 9.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment further?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course the taking over is done by the Army or Navy. Under this authority war plants are taken over. when the President finds certain situations to exist; they can then be taken over by any department or agency the President designates.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under existing law, that is, section 9, there is no provision for the fixing of labor conditions or for appeal to the War Labor Board, but under the Senator's proposal appeal to the War Labor Board and fixing of labor conditions will apply to any of the plants taken over by the Army or the Navy under authority previously exercised.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Texas makes the statement that the enactment of the proposed legislation would ratify what the President has already done. I wish to say quite frankly that I do not believe it would ratify anything the President has already done. In addition to that let me say to the Senator that there seems to be some question in the mind of the proponent of the proposed legislation himself, as well as in the mind of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and some other Senators, whether the President has the right now to take over the mines.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me correct the Senator from Montana. I have not made such a statement. I said there is a question in the minds of some persons. It may be that the President, under his aggregate powers under the Constitution and his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has authority to take over the mines. I hope that is true.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say quite frankly that I think the President has that power now, when a serious strike situation faces the country. It is my judgment that under his broad powers the President has authority to take over the mines in certain situations. But by the passage of the pending bill the question is immediately raised whether the President had the power to take such action in the past, and the owners of plants which have previously been taken over, who feel they have suffered damage as a result thereof, may come into court and say, "We have suffered damage as a result of the seizure of our property, and we ask compensation for the damage we have suffered, because the President had no right to take over our property." The owners will immediately cite as proof of their contention the fact that the Congress of the United States did not believe the President had authority to take over, and therefore gave him the power at the present time by the passage of the proposed legislation. If the action now proposed to be taken by Congress is actually taken, it will furnish a very strong argument to those who contend that the President had no authority to take over war plants, and they can argue that the Congress did not think he had authority to do so, and therefore passed the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The President——

Mr. WHEELER. Permit me to conclude. The Senator from Texas brought up his bill because of the coal strike. Everyone knows the bill would not have been brought up at this time if it had not been for the coal strike.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Montana is speaking with a good deal of authority on that subject. I brought up an identical measure a year ago, and the RECORD will show that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and I, 2 or 3 weeks ago or a month ago, exchanged

comments on the floor of the Senate about having the bill considered by the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me amend my statement by saying that it is my view that the Senator brought up the bill for that reason.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be the Senator's view, but the Senator's view sometimes covers more territory than he is able to stand on.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that it is my view that the bill would not have been brought up at this time but for the fact that the coal strike was imminent.

Mr. CONNALLY. And let me say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana would never have moved to bring up this bill, or any bill like it, if the Senator wants my view.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator can have his view about the matter, and I shall have mine.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to the fact that the strike has apparently been settled, and that Mr. Ickes has to a large extent granted the miners what they were contending for, by giving them six days of work a week, with time and a half for overtime.

Mr. President, I wish to say that some amendments have been submitted which have never been passed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary. They are very important amendments. Frankly, I think the bill ought to go back to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Texas, if I correctly understood him, stated that he did not know whether the Government had power under laws now on the statute books to punish persons who interfere with or try to interfere with the operation of a plant after the Government has taken it over and it is owned and operated by the Government. If I am incorrect in my understanding of the Senator's remarks, I hope he will correct me. I am frank to say that I do not know about that, but I am under the impression that, under the laws now on the statute books, the Government has power to punish persons who interfere with the operation of Government-owned property. It is my opinion that there are on the statute books today laws providing for the punishment of anyone who maliciously does injury in any way to Government property. If there are no such laws on the books, then I agree with the Senator from Texas that something should be written into the law to cover that situation.

If there are no laws on the statute books providing for the punishment of anyone who interferes with the operation of Government property or who in any way injures it in time of war, then there ought to be such laws on the books. I venture the assertion, however, without having positive knowledge on the subject, that there are such laws in existence. That question should be considered, and we should ascertain what the result will be of the action now proposed to be taken.

The Senator from Texas said I was not in favor of any law——

Mr. CONNALLY. That statement was only provoked by the Senator's undertaking to analyze my motives.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not desire to offend the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw those remarks if they bother the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. No; they do not bother me in the slightest degree. If I were never nettled by anything other than by what the Senator from Texas said, I would in fact never be nettled.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Montana has said that if we were to enact the proposed measure into law it might be a confession on the part of the Congress at least that authority does not exist for the acts of the President in taking over war plants. If there is such authority or if such authority now exists, it occurs to me that the passage of the proposed legislation, declaring and giving to the President express authority to deal with similar problems in the future, would not at all detract from or weaken the existing authority.

If the authority does not now exist during the war emergency, and with these problems arising, such authority should be vested in the President, with certainty, and implicitly, so that there can be no confusion or divided opinion about the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. If the President does not have the authority, of course, he should have the authority to take over plants under certain conditions in wartime. There is no question in my mind about that matter. Some provisions of statutes have been called to my attention just now which would indicate to me that the bill ought to be carefully considered, and, in my opinion, it should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and there thoroughly considered together with the various laws which are now on the statute books providing for punishment of persons who interfere with the operation of a plant after it is taken over by the Government. There is no immediate emergency for the enactment of the proposed legislation at this particular time, particularly in view of the headlines appearing in today's newspapers to the effect that Mr. Ickes has granted the miners 6 days' work a week, with time and a half for overtime.

While I am on my feet, I wish to make a further statement. One of the reasons why in the minds of many people the coal miners of the country have had a just complaint is that in many of the States coal miners may work in the coal mines only 2 or 3 days a week in the summertime.

So, when we consider their total pay for a year we find that over the year they are not paid wages anywhere near commensurate with those paid in other industries.

Also, I call attention to the fact that all other miners in the United States—copper miners, gold miners, silver miners, quartz miners, and any other miners—are paid from the time when they enter the mine until the time when they come out.

Also, let me say in reference to the coal mines—and in my State there are a few coal mines—that one of the things which is causing the disturbance particularly in the coal mines and the copper mines has been the fact that the men working in those mines could go to the Pacific coast or to Bayview or to Idaho and get jobs paying them $100 a week. Copper mining itself is a hazardous occupation, but coal mining is far more hazardous than is even copper mining, because of the gases, and so forth.

The coal miners have the most hazardous occupation in the country. In the summertime they work only 2 or 3 days a week. Furthermore, every other miner about whom I know is paid for his time from portal to portal, and so are the employees of every other industry in the United States. When they enter the factory they are paid from the time when they press the button as they check in until they check out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that in no way by my remarks did I undertake to question the merits of the claims or contentions of the miners, but I do question the wisdom of having the President placed in an attitude of taking action which amounts to the seizure of property without express authority to do so. Since in this emergency a situation has recently arisen whereby it has become necessary for the President to do so, I feel that the Congress should pass a law giving him express authority, and we should do so lawfully, not by guess or with uncertainty. We have a War Labor Board which supposedly has jurisdiction to settle the merits of the miners' claims. For some reason that Board has not been resorted to for action. I believe that the Government should set up—and the Congress is responsible for doing so—a constituted authority to deal with those problems in order that they may be solved in an orderly and legal way.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to speak a moment more, let me say that I thoroughly——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to be discourteous to the Senator, but I have been waiting for a long time for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] to make some remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I simply want to say that I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Arkansas has said, but I think that we should find out and determine—and the matter should be gone into very thoroughly—whether at the present time we have laws under which such persons could be punished and such plants taken over, or whether the Congress should set up a board and give it the power to subpena—a power which the War Labor Board has not had. That is one of the reasons why it has broken down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to ask the Senator a question about section 4 of his substitute which is a new element not heretofore injected into the consideration of such legislation as that now pending. Before I do that, I wish to predicate my question upon the following observation: I think it is unfortunate that we are compelled under the circumstances to try to write a labor legislative policy on the floor of the Senate of the United States. However, that is what we are compelled to do under the circumstances. Evidently the Committee on the Judiciary—and I do not say this in criticism, but merely as an observation of a fact—did not give thorough consideration to the bill; otherwise it would have changed it from its original terms which were drawn before we got into the war, before the War Labor Board was set up, and before any formula was adopted by the Government for the settlement of wage disputes. The bill was reported in its original form after the War Labor Board had been in existence for a year and after the Government had done all that it had done by the various Executive orders and by the interpretations of those Executive orders, in the attempt to adjust labor disputes. The accuracy of the observation I have just made is confirmed by the fact that the Senator from Texas, the author of the bill, has undertaken to correct that situation by offering his substitute.

All I have said emphasizes the unfortunate fact that we are trying to write a bill on the floor of the Senate. Some 10 amendments are now pending. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has undertaken completely to rewrite the bill, and the language of his proposal injects into the situation still another question of legislative policy.

I make the preceding observations because I feel that the bill is entitled to careful consideration, and I give full credit to the Senator from Texas for his sincerity and persistence over a period of a year or more in trying to get the bill before the Senate. Now he has injected a new element, to be found in section 4, which I desire to read. Then I shall ask him for his interpretation:

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein, or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing.

Mr. President, I take it for granted that what the Senator there is attempting to do is as follows: If, before a strike has occurred or when there is a threat of one, the Government has taken over the plant concerned, he seeks to make it unlawful for any employee to go on strike or to agree or instigate or cooperate with others by going on strike, or to do anything else set out in the language referred to.

However, suppose in the case of the miners or in any other similar case, when the Government takes over a plant there already is a strike and the men already have quit work. The measure provides a penalty to be imposed for doing that. Congress has never passed any antistrike legislation; and I have never advocated any rigid antistrike legislation, because I agree with what was said a few minutes ago by the Senator from Texas, that it is impossible to put 600,000 men in jail. It was Edmund Burke who, in a debate in the English House of Commons, said:

I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot indict or put in jail 600,000 men, even after the Government has taken over a plant. It would be impossible to penalize 600,000 persons.

The language proposed by the Senator provides a penalty of not exceeding $5,000 or 1 year in jail, or both. Suppose men have already gone on strike—and I am not by any indirection of language condoning the striking of any men in any plant used for the production of goods needed in the war effort, whatever their rights may be; and certainly there are moral rights attached to men employed in plants producing war goods in this country, rights which I think must be observed, and I do not think the great body of the miners of the country wish to disregard that moral obligation. For years I have been intimately acquainted with the miners in my State. It took a long time for them to obtain an organization which gave them the right of collective bargaining. It took a Senate investigation of the coal situation in my own State, conducted under the leadership of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], to give the miners the right to organize in certain portions of the State and to enjoy the right of collective bargaining. Those miners have always been the finest type of American citizens. In my State they dwell largely in the mountain sections, where the purest strain of Anglo-Saxon blood in America is to be found. Whether in the sale of bonds, or in Red Cross drives, or in any other activity involving the war, the most patriotic, loyal, and enthusiastic audiences it has been my privilege to address have been the mining people in the eastern part of my State. Let me relate an instance to confirm that.

Last fall, Miss Greer Garson, a great motion-picture actress and a great woman, came to Washington after spending nearly a month making speeches in the coal-mining sections in the mountains of eastern Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia in behalf of the sale of Defense bonds and stamps. I wish to pay her the compliment of saying that she is not only a great actress, but a great woman. She came to Washington after spending a month in the hills and hollows and small towns where the miners live in houses owned and rented to them by their employers. They buy their food, clothing, and supplies from stores owned and operated by their employers, under a system which has grown up. When she came to Washington she met a small group of Senators and described her experiences. That little group of a dozen men were profoundly affected by what she had to say regarding her experiences among those mountain people, whose sons and fathers go down into the bowels of the earth to dig out the coal, and who have given their sons to the armed forces of the United States to the number of 75,000.

Miss Garson said that when she spoke to those people, many of the women were barefooted; and notwithstanding the fact that they had no shoes upon their feet, they came crowding around her with their money to buy War stamps and War bonds. Many of them handed her $18.75 and got back a $25 bond. Her description of those meetings was the most dramatic and affecting thing I have heard in a long time.

I make that preliminary statement because I do not want my colleagues to be distracted from what may be the equities involved with respect to these 600,000 men because of their attitude, their belief in, or their opinion of, John L. Lewis. John L. Lewis happens to be the head of the miners' organization. He has probably done more than has any other man who was ever at the head of the organization to solidify the miners' unions by extending them and gaining for them their rights. Whatever we may think of him, we must not lose sight of the men who go down into the mine pits to dig out the coal. Imponderable human equations enter into the question, which make it impossible for us to do justice to ourselves or to the country if we try to legislate in anger or excitement, or because we are offended at someone who may have done something of which we do not approve.

I apologize for the length of my question; but I wished to lay that basis.

Suppose a strike has already taken place under the existing law, which has been sustained by the Supreme Court, and which grants the legal right to strike, regardless of any moral rights in time of war, which I think is a very serious question, and one which labor must consider. But suppose that, acting under the law, which gives employees the right, as between them and their employers, to go on strike, they have already done so. They are out. The Government comes along and takes over the property, as it did last Saturday in the case of the mines. Does the language of the Senator's proposal mean that if they remain out, having already gone out on strike before the Government took the property over, and

do not go back to work in the pits, or, if it happens to be some other kind of plant, they do not go back to work immediately after the Government takes over the plant, those men have either coerced, instigated, or induced, or attempted to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere with the operation of the business? If they should remain out, under a law under which they went out legally, would they be subject to the penalty provided in section 4? If two or three men should meet on the street and say, "We will not go to work today," would that be a conspiracy which would be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year? I think that situation raises a serious question, on which I should like to have the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator's question. I do not think they would be subject to any penalties unless they did some affirmative act of interfering. If they are already out on strike, they certainly do not come within the terms of the bill by staying out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator specifically——

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me answer one question before going to another.

There must be something affirmative. A man does not commit a crime by going to sleep. He must be awake and do something. It is not my purpose to make it a crime for them to stay out; but if they should gather around the entrance to the mine and stop somebody from going to work by begging and pleading with him not to go back to work, I think they would be amenable to the language of the bill. I think they would probably be amenable if they were to propagandize in the press, or do something of that sort, insisting on the men not going back to work. But simply negative action, staying out after they are already out, would not bring them under the provisions of the bill. I do not think any lawyer would contend that it would.

Mr. BARKLEY. The words which bother me are "or continue to interfere." Of course, a strike does interfere, even though it be a legal strike.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Government takes over, if they are out, they are not connected with the operation of the plant. I do not think they would be amenable unless they did something affirmative to interfere with those who have charge of the plant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that the bill would give the Government the right to order them back to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it could not, by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Government had the right to order them back, and they declined to go back, would that, in the Senator's view, be an interference?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Let me say that I have the same general views about labor as does the Senator from Kentucky. I sympathize with any man who labors. This bill was not drawn to attack the mine workers. It was drawn a year and a half ago. It is general in its terms. It was intended to cover any plant. I believe that men have the right to strike, of course, but I do not think that they are above the law. I do not think that they ought to insist that they are privileged above other citizens.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I agree with that statement. I do not think any group or class of people can be set apart, or ought to be allowed to set themselves apart, on an island of safety, and say that the law which applies to others shall not apply to them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree. I want to see the men in the mines get fair pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. I use the illustration of the mine because it is the immediate thing at our doorstep.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want the men in the mines to get fair pay. We have set up a National War Labor Board to determine questions of compensation and of relationships.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

That Board is open to everyone in the United States. It was open to the representatives of the mine workers. They were entitled to come before the Board and submit their case; but, with contempt, they spurned the offers of the Government. They said, "No; we will not submit to this Board. We will not submit the issues of fact and the issues of justice and equity to the Board which the Government has set up. We will submit them only to our own imperious will; and if that will is not respected, then we will tie up every mine in the United States, and choke the war plants which must have coal in order to manufacture arms and munitions."

That is the question to which I am directing my attention. God knows I want the laboring men in every locality, whether they be members of a union or not, to receive fair wages. My record in the Senate and in the House during all these years will bear witness to the fact that I favor liberal, progressive legislation. I have so voted; but I do not want to create the impression that there is any class, group, or organization in the United States which is superior to the national welfare, or is sovereign over the Government of the United States. There is one union in this contest which is supreme, and that is the Union of the 48 States—the Government of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, I think there is some question as to whether, in section 4, we would not be giving too great power to put into jail any individual member of a union who engaged in a strike. I seriously question whether clause 3, "to conspire to do any of the foregoing" should be there.

I should like to suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that the following provision of the British Trade Disputes Act would be a reasonable addition to section 4 of the pending bill.

Provided that no person shall be deemed to have committed an offense under this section, or at common law, by reason only of his having ceased work or refused to continue to work, or to accept employment.

That is the British provision, and it has worked satisfactorily. I have included that provision in the amendment which I intend to offer. I think it would improve section 4 of the bill to eliminate clause 3 of section 4 and substitute the provision to which I have referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will offer that as a separate amendment, so that it may be passed on on its own merits, without being complicated by other matters.

Mr. TAFT. I merely suggest it as an answer to the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to pursue my question, except to say that the very situation to which the Senator from Ohio calls attention was in my mind.

The language of clause 3 is "to conspire to do any of the foregoing."

If three men happened to meet on the road before worktime in the morning, whether by concert or not, and one of them should say, "Are you going to work today?" and one of the men should reply, "No, I am not going to work," and they asked the third man, and all three of them should say, "No; we are not going to work"—that might be regarded as a conspiracy.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose someone overheard a conversation among the three of them and they all said, "No, we are not going to work today." I do not know whether that would be regarded as a conspiracy, but if they agree not to go to work, or merely expressed a determination independently not to go to work, although three of them were doing it, someone might undertake to show that it was a conspiracy. I do not believe we ought to leave room for any such vague interpretation as might be given to that language and that is why I should like to see the language cleared up.

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If we should send the bill back to the Judiciary Committee and the committee should mull over it for a month and bring it back to the floor of the Senate, we should then have the same questions and the same issues, because every Senator regards himself as just as capable as any member of the Judiciary Committee. I do not question that right. I would not question the ability of any Senator, most of whom are distinguished lawyers, to go over the bill in detail after it comes back to the Senate. That is why I do not want to see the bill sent back to the Judiciary Committee merely for purposes of delay.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio. They have spoken with regard to the third clause of section 4 of the pending bill—"to conspire to do any of the foregoing." It does not make any difference whether that clause is included or not. The law of conspiracy today is that anyone who conspires with anyone else to violate any law on the statute books

of the United States is guilty of conspiracy and subject to punishment by imprisonment for at least 2 years in the penitentiary.

The Senator has asked whether the men who stayed away from work would be guilty of conspiracy under the proposed language. I submit in all seriousness that in my judgment without question they would be subject to the law and be punishable. If any of the men should meet in their union hall, or in their homes, and discuss the question whether or not it was right for them to go back to work, they would then be subject to sentence and punishment under the language of the pending bill. There is no question about that in my mind. I think there is not a court in the United States that would not hold that under the terms of the proposed law the men would be guilty—of doing what? The language of the bill is, "To coerce, instigate, or induce." It would not be necessary to coerce them. What is the meaning of "induce"? All that it would be necessary to do would be to talk to the men and say, "I am not going to work; I do not think the conditions are fair." That would be held to be an inducement not to go back to work. The language is:

(1) To coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere—

To continue to interfere with what? To continue to interfere with production, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption. We talk about slow-downs in a mine or factory, but it is almost an impossibility to describe a slow-down. Some men work faster and some work slower than others. The provision also contains the words, "or other interruption." A worker would be interrupting the operation by staying away from work. When a worker says to a fellow employee, in private conversation, "I am not going back to work," or "I do not think I ought to go back to work, and I am not going back," he is interrupting the operation of the business, and interrupting the production of coal, copper, or whatever may be involved.

There is no question that this language would cover the men who stayed out, provided that they even talked about it with anyone. It may be that that is what Senators wish to write into the bill, but when it is said that such language would not apply to men when they stay away from work I say that, in my judgment, such a conclusion is entirely wrong. I do not think anyone who has given it serious consideration, or any court which has ever given such phraseology serious consideration would hold in any other way.

PROBLEMS OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a very interesting letter written by Mr. D. O. Hammerberg, milk administrator for the State of Connecticut, to Mr. Chester Bowles, Connecticut State director for the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. Hammerberg's letter is lengthy, but it covers a subject of great interest to all Members of the Senate and to the people of every State in the Union, and I ask for its publication in the RECORD because I think that it is a splendid contribution to studies being made of the dairy industry. I shall not dwell upon it now, Mr. President, because the letter speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE MILK ADMINISTRATOR,
Hartford, April 23, 1943.

MR. CHESTER BOWLES,
State Director,
Office of Price Administration,
Hartford, Conn.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: During recent weeks many statements have been made in the press and at public meetings regarding the adversity which now attends the dairy industry in this State. From the most extreme statements which have been made one might infer that the relation between prices and costs is so adverse in milk production that large numbers of dairy farmers are being driven into bankruptcy; that they are forsaking their farms in large numbers; and that, in spite of the shortage which has prevailed for several months in many food items, the immediate threat of a milk shortage is more acute and serious than any which has been encountered thus far in the whole food program. Few of these extreme statements are wholly true; many of them are not true at all. Nevertheless, certain phases of the present situation are so acute that a comprehensive appraisal is required.

As you know, I had occasion to summarize many of the important facts relating to the present situation after our recent public hearing. The nature of these facts, together with others to which I have access, convinced me that they should be brought to your attention immediately. In this letter, naturally, I can present only some of the most important factors. Nevertheless, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for giving them full and careful consideration.

Before proceeding with a detailed presentation a few words of explanation are required. It is obvious that no base period is ideal for purposes of comparison with the present. In much of what follows, and especially in the discussion of trends in prices and costs, I have relied heavily upon the period immediately preceding the year 1941 as a basis for comparison. In general, prices and costs were more stable during this period than during any other recent period which I have examined. At that time, too, our economy had not yet become subject to the influences of war which have had such profound effects upon it during the last 2 years. I am fully aware, too, that there are great differences in the trends which various prices have followed, that important changes have occurred in the quality of services and products entering into the cost of production, and that priorities, rationing, and other restrictions have introduced great differences in the availability of many of the important cost items required by the industry. Even after allowances are made for all of these considerations, however, the broad outlines of the present situation are quite clear.

I. TRENDS IN THE PRICES RECEIVED FOR MILK BY PRODUCERS

Between January 1940 and January 1943, the weighted average of the prices received by wholesale producers in Connecticut for 4-percent milk delivered to Connecticut dealers increased from $3.02 to $4.01 per hundredweight, an increase of 33 percent. This increase resulted from a variety of causes: successive increases in the prices for class I milk, changes in the proportion sold as class I rather than in the lower-priced surplus classes, and substantial changes in the prices for the surplus classes. The increase in the proportion sold as class I, in turn, was brought about by the great increase in the demand for milk in fluid form which accompanied the increase in the population of the State and in consumer incomes; it was also due in no small part to the changes in the classification and accounting provisions of the new milk marketing orders which became effective in October 1941.

The prices quoted above were derived from data collected in the Office of the Milk Administrator. Average prices to producers were computed from data contained in reports submitted to this office by milk dealers. The class prices on which these computations were based were those established by the administrator. Comparisons between the above-mentioned trends in prices and the trends in costs discussed in the following paragraphs should be made cautiously, however, because it is recognized clearly that the official prices were not enforced as rigorously during the early part of this period as they were in the latter part. In the course of a comprehensive and thorough auditing program during 1942, for example, $179,738 in underpayments and back payments by dealers to producers were discovered; of this amount $119,499 were collected and paid to producers. Even before the volume of these audit adjustments became known, the prevailing opinion in the market was that the prices established under the new marketing orders were being enforced fully; since the prevailing complaint, prior to the issuance of the new orders, was that the price regulations were not being enforced rigorously, it is probable that the volume of underpayments in the early part of the period (which were not collected) greatly exceeded the amounts discovered and collected after the new orders became effective. The returns actually received by producers, therefore, increased considerably more than a comparison of the official average prices for January 1941 and 1943 would indicate.

II. TRENDS IN THE COSTS OF PRODUCTION

Since January 1940 the prices of most cost elements have also risen. The degree of variation in the extent to which they have risen, however, is very great. Three of the most important cost elements have risen greatly in price: the wages of farm labor, with board, has risen approximately 99 percent; the price of cow replacements has risen 72 percent; and the price of purchased feed (using a 16-percent ration as a basis for comparison) has risen approximately 31 percent. On typical farms containing 15 to 25 dairy cows, operated largely with the labor of the operator and his immediate family, these items comprise approximately 53 percent of the total average costs of production.

These three items have risen most in price. At the other extreme are such costs as tax levies on real estate and personal property; interest on indebtedness; electric, telephone, and insurance rates; and a few other items whose cost rates have scarcely changed at all during this period. Intermediate between these two extremes are items such as seeds; fertilizers; auto, truck, and tractor expenses; repairs; upkeep; new buildings; and new equipment, for which average cost rates have increased between 10 and 50 percent, probably averaging about 24 percent.

Had there been no change in the efficiency with which cost factors were used on the typical farm during this period, the increase in the cost only of the three major items—labor, feed, and sow replacements—would

have increased the average costs of production by about 30 percent or about 1.7 cents per quart (79 cents per hundredweight). Certain conditions which prevailed on dairy farms, especially during the early part of the period, tended to offset the effects of these rising costs. In 1940, for example, there was considerable excess capacity on many dairy farms in Connecticut. To the extent that the dairy farmer could increase his production through moderate increases in his use of the variable factors and without increasing his fixed investment in land, buildings, and equipment, the lowered fixed costs of production per quart tended to offset the increase in the cost of the variable factors. Most, if not all, of this capacity is now being utilized fully.

Important changes in the management of the farm which occurred during this period also tended to offset rising cost rates at least partially. When farm help was cheap and easy to procure, labor was used rather ineffectively on many Connecticut dairy farms. When it became relatively expensive and difficult to procure, it was employed much more economically. This scarcity of labor also emphasized the need for conserving the farmer's own time and that of his family. It is difficult to appraise the net effect of these contrary tendencies. Per unit labor costs indisputably have risen. At least during the early part of the period, on the other hand, they did not rise nearly so much as the index of wage rates would indicate. Between 1940 and 1942, for example, average farm wages with board increased from about $23 to $57 per month, an increase of 58 percent; during this same period the per quart cost of hired labor on 24 specialized dairy farms, on which account books were maintained in cooperation with the University of Connecticut, increased from eight-tenths of a cent to 1 cent, an increase of 25 percent. New equipment and repairs also became scarce; hence, farmers have taken better care of their machinery. This, too, tended to offset rising cost of rates.

Perhaps the best single indicator of the composite effect of all of these factors is the trend in dairy farmers' net income. Since attention is focused at this point upon the prices paid by dealers to producers (rather than upon the retail prices of milk), I have chosen to present only the trend in the labor incomes of specialized wholesale milk producers. For the 3 years 1940, 1941, and 1942, the average labor income for a group of 24 specialized wholesale dairy farmers who kept detailed farm account records in cooperation with the University of Connecticut, were $738, $1,464, and $1,799. During these 3 years the average annual volume of milk delivered from these farms, corresponding to the general trend throught the State, increased considerably.

These figures on labor income emphasize the importance of the preceding analysis. Between 1940 and 1941, for example, the weighted average price received by Connecticut producers for milk delivered by them, increased from about $3.05 per hundredweight to about $3.42 per hundredweight, an increase of 37 cents per hundredweight, or 12.1 percent; between these 2 years wages paid to farm labor (with board) increased from about $36 to about $45 per month, an increase of 25 percent; yet between these 2 years the average labor incomes of these farms increased from $738 to $1,464, an increase of 98 percent. Between 1941 and 1942, in contrast, the weighted average price for milk increased slightly more than it had the previous year; the actual increase was from about $3.42 to $3.86 per hundredweight, an increase of 44 cents, or 12.9 percent. In the meantime the average cost of farm labor rose from about $45 to $57 per month, an increase of 27 percent, and only very slightly more than the previous year; in contrast to the previous year, however, average labor income on the aforementioned farms only increased from $1,464 to $1,799, an increase of 23 percent. Hence, while the changes in the price received for milk in the 2 years were nearly the same, on the one hand, and while the increases in the cost of farm labor were likewise very similar, although not identical—in the earlier part of this 3-year period, the trends toward higher costs were more than counterbalanced by the higher price received for milk, the increased production, and the increase in efficiency. In the latter part of the period, on the other hand, the increase in the price of milk, the greater volume of production and the increases in efficiency were much less effective in counteracting the upward trend in the price of cost factors.

In the meantime, the upward trend in wage rates, feed prices, and especially in the price of cow replacements, has not only continued but has grown far more acute. Moreover, experienced and reliable farm help is almost impossible to obtain or to retain. Many types of farm machinery are very difficult to obtain new, and the prices of used machinery and equipment (obtainable at farm auctions, for example) have risen until they often exceed the price of new equipment. Farm supplies, even dairy feeds, are hard to obtain and high in price. There has also been considerable complaint that the quality of many items has deteriorated.

Summarizing the price, cost, and income aspects of the problem, therefore, one may say that the situation now prevailing is discouraging to producers from nearly all perspectives. With the exception of the 12-cents-per-hundredweight increase in the class I price, which will become effective May 1, 1943, there has been no increase in the class I price since December 1941. There is now so little surplus on the market that farmers can expect to derive very little additional income from the increase in the proportion of their milk sold at the higher class I price. For the same reason they can expect little additional income from the increase in the prices of the surplus classes. In the meantime, as I have already indicated, the most important cost items—farm labor, feed, and cow replacements—have continued to rise sharply. Compensation for these higher costs cannot be expected from any of the forces which have been operating previously. Nor can the farmer combat these encroachments upon his income through more strenuous personal or family efforts. Indeed, there is considerable evidence to indicate that the farmer's working day is already too long and too strenuous.

III. TRENDS IN SUPPLY

The effects of the foregoing factors are also clearly evident in the trends in milk supplies. The volume of milk delivered by wholesale producers has increased rather consistently ever since 1935. The trend has been particularly pronounced during the last 2 years. Between 1940 and 1941, for example, total deliveries by Connecticut wholesale producers to Connecticut dealers increased from 399,303,000 pounds to 417,891,000 pounds; and in 1942 the total increased to 456,118,000 pounds. During each month of 1942, total deliveries were 9 percent greater, on the average, than during the corresponding month of 1941. This trend has not continued into 1943. In January 1943 deliveries exceeded those of the previous year by 5 percent. In February of 1943, however, they were slightly below, and in March 1943 they were 4 percent over, the figures for the corresponding months of 1942. We are now entering the season of the year in which production is greatest. Supplies of fluid milk will be ample during the next two or three months. It is evident, however, that the peaks of production which were attained last year will not be equalled this year. In spite of the great increases which had occurred in production, the supply of milk was barely sufficient to meet fluid milk requirements during the months of July and November of last year. In view of the prospective increases in demand, and especially if supplies are not maintained at present levels (allowing for seasonal variations), it appears likely the market will be very short of milk in July of this year and that the shortage will be extremely acute by November.

IV. TRENDS IN DEMAND

Viewed from the standpoint of the trends in demand, the present situation is even more acute. For many years the volume of milk sold in fluid form has been increasing in Connecticut. This trend has been accelerated sharply during the past two or three years by the enormous increase in the purchasing power of consumers, by the increases in population resulting from employment in war industries, and more recently by the advent of rationing. The drastic curtailment of products for which consumers normally spend their incomes and the acute shortage of many other foods have had abnormally great effects in the past few months. Many of these trends will continue. The birth rate is still rising and the full effects of rationing of other foods have not yet become apparent.

Up to the present time these increases in demand have been met partly through increasing production and partly by shifting milk away from normal surplus outlets. Substantial quantities of milk will not be available from either of these sources after June 1943. Between June and November production normally decreases by 12 percent. The proportion of milk sold as surplus is now smaller, for this time of the year, than it has ever been since complete market figures became available.

V. TREND IN THE NUMBER OF PRODUCERS

During recent weeks there has been much discussion about the number of farmers who have gone out of business or ceased to produce milk. It is difficult to obtain reliable current information with respect to the number of milk producers in the State or in regard to the numbers going into or out of the milk-producing business. The reports which we receive from dealers show that many producers are shifting from one dealer to another but they do not indicate that large numbers of producers have ceased to deliver milk. There has been a substantial decrease in the number of very small producers, i. e., producers milking less than five cows. The volume of milk produced by such herds is very small; even though the cow is sold, moreover, it may still be producing milk. A few very large herds have also been dispersed. In many cases, however, the animals contained in these herds are of superior quality and have been purchased by other producers so that the dispersal of these herds apparently has had little or no effect upon the total volume of milk produced. The number of auctions has been unusually large this spring. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the new farm owners or operators will continue to produce milk on these farms. It is even more difficult to discover what happens to the cows. It is probable, however, that most of them have been purchased by other dairymen. The number of dairy cows imported into the State in 1942 was 14 percent greater than in 1941, and 61 percent greater than in 1940. The figures for 1940, 1941, and 1942, respectively, were: 10,754, 15,144, and 17,278; thus far in 1943 the number imported each month has been greater than for the corresponding month of 1942. The number of Connecticut cows killed in Connecticut slaughterhouses this winter has been somewhat smaller than in previous years. It is probable, therefore, that there have not been many producers who have gone out of business as yet, and that the decrease, if any, in the number of cows being milked is even

smaller. Contrary to much prevailing opinion, the available evidence indicates, in fact, that the number of cows and heifers (2 years old and over) on farms is somewhat larger now than at any previous time. Inferentially, at least, more reliable current information regarding this matter can be obtained from the figures on production. With the exception of February, which was an extremely cold month and therefore highly unfavorable for milk production, deliveries by wholesale producers during this winter have exceeded those of a year ago.

In spite of the less favorable cost and price conditions, bankruptcies among dairy farmers have been almost nonexistent in this State up to the present time. Interest and amortization payments have been prompt; production credit loans are being repaid promptly, and there has been no unusual increase in the number of requests for such loans; and dairy farmers' accounts with feed and cattle dealers appear to be somewhat smaller, on the average, than in previous years in spite of heavier feeding and relatively larger replacement costs.

It appears, therefore, that when producers go out of the dairy business they do so primarily for other causes. There are countless unusual irritations and discouragements in this business at this time. Dependable and experienced farm help is not obtainable. The burden upon the farmer, both in supervision and in actual work, has therefore increased tremendously. Machinery, equipment, supplies, and repairs are also extremely difficult to get. The shortage of tires and gasoline increases the difficulty of management and operation in a great many ways. For the same reason interruptions caused by break-downs are more serious.

Many farmers regard the present as a good time to sell their business. Real estate values are high; cows and equipment can be sold for favorable prices; and alternative opportunities for employment are numerous and lucrative. If they are so disposed, farmers can take advantage of these factors favorable for sale and at one stroke rid themselves of the discouragement and irritations which now attend the dairy business.

When dairy farmers contrast their meager earnings with those received by other farmers and especially when they contrast them with the incomes received in war industries by relatively young, unskilled, and inexperienced workers, moreover, they have unusual reasons for being discouraged. Reference was made earlier to the fact that labor incomes on 24 dairy farms which kept detailed records in cooperation with the university increased from $1,464 in 1941 to $1,799 in 1942, an increase of 23 percent. Between the third quarter of 1941 and the same quarter in 1942, a period comparable to the one used in comparing the incomes of farmers, the average monthly income received by workers covered under the Unemployment Act in Connecticut, which included over 600,000 workers, increased from $138.42 to $188.63, an increase of about 36 percent. When comparisons such as these are drawn, farmers cannot refrain from demanding that the policies which result in this discrimination be rectified or at least modified. We must remember, too, that theirs is an industry attended with considerable risk, that it requires a large investment of capital and labor, and that most of them have devoted a lifetime to the acquisition of the necessary skills and experience. It is, moreover, not the average farmer who will sell the farm and quit the business. Many farmers have received less than the average increase in price; many others have incurred much more than the average increase in labor costs; still others have been subject to much more than the average difficulty in obtaining machinery, equipment, and supplies. These are the farmers who are subject to the greatest inclination to sell.

In the meantime, the farmers' cost of living, of course, has also risen. Hence, even the same monetary income will not purchase nearly so many goods and services as it did a year ago.

For all of these reasons there is profound discouragement amongst nearly all dairymen in this State. I cannot emphasize too strongly the danger presented by these conditions, not only for the continuation of one of the most important industries of the State, but also for the maintenance of an adequate supply of a food upon which nearly all residents in this State are dependent.

In view of the urgent need for food, it is necessary that all agencies do everything in their power to maintain such price, cost, and supply conditions that dairy farmers will remain in the business and continue to produce all of the milk they can. If herds are once dispersed they are not likely to be replaced under present conditions even if the unfavorable relationship between milk prices and the costs of production were changed greatly.

VI. DIFFICULTY OF OBTAINING SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLIES FROM OTHER MARKETS

At present prices, moreover, it is difficult to obtain supplementary supplies of fluid milk from other markets. Historically the price of fluid milk in Connecticut has been much higher than those prevailing in New York and Boston and at least equal to or somewhat in excess of those prevailing in Providence, Worcester, Springfield, and other nearby markets. In 1940, for example, the class I price for 4 percent milk delivered to the dealer's platform in Connecticut was $3.43 per hundredweight; adjusted to a comparable basis, the class I price in New York City was $3.31 per hundredweight. At that time, therefore, the class I price in Connecticut was 12 cents per hundredweight higher than the price in New York City. At the present time the price for class I milk in Connecticut is $4.13 per hundredweight; while in New York City it is $4.20 per hundredweight; hence, the price is now higher in the New York market than in Connecticut. Comparisons between the prices in Connecticut and the prices in the Boston market reveal a similar though greater change. The class I price in Providence, R. I., which has seldom been as high as those prevailing in Connecticut, is now $4.25 per hundredweight for milk containing 3.7 percent butterfat. Even after the change in the butterfat basis for payment has been put into effect in Connecticut, the price in Providence will still be 12 cents per hundredweight higher than in Connecticut. Few Connecticut dealers can afford to pay the prices charged for fluid milk in these neighboring markets (and the premiums which customarily prevail for intermittent purchases) and then incur the cost of transporting milk in fluid form from these markets to their Connecticut plants. From the standpoint of consumers, therefore, and without regard for the plight of the dairy farmer, the present situation is highly critical.

In this connection it should be pointed out that with respect to most of their food requirements Connecticut consumers are at the end of the marketing process which is farthest removed from the source of supply. Therefore, their supply of food is affected by all of the factors which may cause interruptions in any part of the marketing process. In wartime these are legion. Shortages or break-downs of transportation facilities, lack of containers, maladjustments in price relationships or in rationing regulations—any of these may cause serious dearth in eastern markets. In this respect the supply of milk is a notable exception. It is produced locally and subject primarily to conditions and regulations over which there is local control. It is imperative, therefore, that the local agencies which have jurisdiction over the conditions under which it is produced and marketed exercise that control in such a manner that the supply will remain adequate and its movement to market unimpaired.

VII. DANGER OF INFLATION

I believe that most dairy farmers are fully aware of the great havoc which uncontrolled inflation would bring upon them and their industry. It is my impression, too, that most of them are entirely sympathetic to, and in agreement with, the efforts and policies which you and your coworkers have applied in attempting to control it. They know that theirs is an industry in which the fixed investment is large and the turn-over is slow, and that the problem of adjusting these investments from an inflated to a deflated price level is extremely slow and heartbreaking not only for farmers but for investors. They are especially aware that the long-range production plans which are necessary on a prudently managed dairy farm cannot be made intelligently or with any degree of security amidst the violent price fluctuations which always accompany inflation. They realize that if uncontrolled inflation comes, the price of milk is likely to rise less rapidly and to less extreme heights than the prices of other foods and other commodities. The importance of milk in the diet and the public interest which surrounds all decisions pertaining to this product will require either drastic rationing or more rigorous price control than that applied to other commodities so that every person, rich or poor, will be able to obtain at least a minimum quantity.

Dairy farmers are well aware of all of these things. By the same token, however, they cannot understand why the producers of such a vital food should be required to contribute their efforts in less advantageous economic circumstances than the producers of other less important foods or products. Overarching all of these considerations, too, there appears to be a feeling that the burdens of this war will be so great that they must be distributed equitably or they will be unbearable.

For all of these reasons everyone involved with the industry has been reluctant to make demands for price adjustments which would precipitate or even facilitate the creation of an inflationary spiral of prices, wages, and costs. All elements have relied upon their own efforts and ingenuity to meet the situation as long as possible. Dairy farmers, as I have already indicated, have increased their efficiency greatly. The output of milk per unit of labor or of investment is far greater than it has been at any previous time. Milk dealers similarly have made a substantial number of adjustments in their methods of delivery and in their other operations to meet the shortages of labor and transportation facilities. In the Milk Administrator's Office, we have tried to work out such classification, pricing, and accounting provisions that every dealer would pay promptly and in full, on a uniform pricing basis, for every quart of milk delivered to him. Through our regulations and our auditing, administrative and legal procedure, we have tried to enforce these price orders rigorously and impartially. The volume of underpayments discovered and collected, which I mentioned earlier, is one tangible criterion of the effectiveness of this program. With your cooperation and without increasing the price per quart to consumers, we soon will have increased the returns to producers as much as practicable through an adjustment in the basic butterfat content for which class prices are established.

For these very reasons, however, there is little more that can be done, either through our efforts or through those of others in the industry to improve the economic position of the dairy farmer. Apparently the only alternatives available at the present time are an increase in the price for fluid milk or a subsidy in the cost of living. In the past subsidies usually have been applied only in cases where the public was unwilling to pay a price for the product which was high enough to cover the costs of producing it or as a temporary means of carrying an inefficient industry through an especially unfavorable situation. Neither of these conditions apply in the case of milk production. The stigma attached to this term has made subsidies very unpopular amongst dairy farmers. If it is necessary to maintain the retail prices of milk at their present levels in order to control inflation and if it is necessary for this reason to apply a subsidy to milk at the present time, it should be made clear that it is a subsidy of the cost of living rather than of the cost of production, and that it is consumers, and not producers, who are being subsidized. If this were done, dairy farmers would have little valid reason for objecting to them.

Whatever the outcome, our first problem is to ascertain how much of an increase in returns to producers is required to enable them to meet production costs and to maintain production of an adequate supply of milk. It appears, therefore, that a public hearing should be called as soon as convenient in which evidence may be submitted on this issue. I recommend that you or someone in your organization attend all sessions of this hearing so that you may obtain all of the facts and make your own appraisal of them. I have presented my own appraisal of the situation solely in order to impress upon you the urgent need for early and careful consideration of this problem and of the best means of coping with it.

Very truly yours,

D. O. HAMMERBERG,
Milk Administrator.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter which I have just submitted for printing in the RECORD, there be printed a brief radio address by Mr. Bowles. The radio statement is an answer to Mr. Hammerberg's letter, and it, too, should be of widespread interest. Both papers deal with the problem of the dairy farmer and the need for the continuing help of the dairy farmer in the war effort. Both papers offer worthwhile reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, in my morning mail, I received a letter from Donald Hammerberg, Connecticut's able milk administrator. In this letter, Mr. Hammerberg discussed the problem of our Connecticut dairy farmers with his usual intelligence and understanding. He pointed out the increased cost of milk production and the danger of a milk shortage later this summer. He recommended that a joint public hearing be held in the near future at which the entire Connecticut milk problem could be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. Hammerberg suggested that both the State milk administration and the Office of Price Administration be represented at this meeting, because we are both concerned over any moves affecting milk prices.

It goes without saying that in behalf of the State Office of Price Administration I will most certainly accept Mr. Hammerberg's suggestion for a public hearing under joint auspices. A formal acceptance will be in the mail within the next few days.

The purpose of the hearing will be to secure the full facts on the cost of producing milk in Connecticut. Only with the complete story at our disposal will it be possible to make a fair and sensible decision.

There are, however, certain facts which are already available to us. Many of them Mr Hammerberg brought out in his letter to me.

First of all, we have reasonably reliable figures on the price which Connecticut farmers have received for their milk over a period of the last three years. According to Donald Hammerberg, our dairy farmers received 33 percent more money for their milk in January 1943, than in January 1940.

But how about our dairy farmer's expenses? According to Mr. Hammerberg, the cost of replacing older cows with new stock is 72 percent higher today in Connecticut than in 1940. The cost of hired dairy farm labor is almost double. Dairy feed costs are up 31 percent. These three items represent more than half the cost of running a dairy farm.

On the big farms of our West and South, farm income for hogs, corn, wheat, cotton, and livestock is up an average of 85 percent while expenses have increased less than half that amount. It is obvious that our Connecticut dairy farmers are in a far less favorable position than farmers in other parts of the country.

Now how about our milk supply? Mr. Hammerberg has some interesting figures on that. Last year was the biggest milk-production year in Connecticut's history. The first 3 months of 1943 showed a slight additional increase over a year ago. According to Mr Hammerberg, a good many small dairy farmers with a half dozen cows or so have gone out of business and some big herds have been auctioned off in Litchfield and Windham Counties. Mr. Hammerberg believes, however, that these cows, for the most part, have found their way into other Connecticut herds and are still producing milk for Connecticut families. In spite of the many wild stories to the contrary, it is his opinion that there are more cows today in Connecticut than there were a year ago.

However, it would be very foolish to develop any false feeling of security from these figures. Our dairy herds are now producing at very nearly peak efficiency. The very best that we can hope for, according to present indications, will be to maintain our milk production at the 1942 level. Since the demand for milk is increasing every week, we are likely to face a growing shortage even under the most favorable conditions.

Our Connecticut farmer is not afraid of hard work and long hours. He keenly feels his responsibility to his fellow citizens. He has spent a lifetime in developing his skill and in building his herd and his investment. But today he is tired and worried and discouraged. Rightly or wrongly, he does not see how he can go on producing milk in the present volume, unless he receives a higher price for his product.

Now our Connecticut farmers have been helped somewhat by a joint decision of Mr. Hammerberg and the State Office of Price Administration on the subject of butterfat. After May 1 it will be legal for milk to be sold throughout Connecticut with the same butterfat content as in other Eastern States, which is slightly lower than our Connecticut standard. This will give our farmers about one-quarter of a cent extra on every bottle that they sell. It will increase their total income by half a million dollars.

The decrease in the butterfat content of milk will, as I say, help the farmer somewhat. Most farmers, however, do not feel that it will be sufficient to allow them to go on producing the volume of milk which we so badly need to maintain the health of all of us.

At the hearing which Mr. Hammerberg has suggested, we will hear their story from beginning to end. We cannot, of course, make any judgments in advance.

However, I would like to make one point extremely clear. If the hearing establishes the fact that our farmers really need more income to allow them to continue producing milk, you can be sure that I will do everything in my power to see that they get it. It is unfair, even in wartime, to ask a man to produce anything without a decent compensation. More than that, our Connecticut milk industry is vitally important to the health of every citizen in our State. In my opinion, it must be allowed to function at peak efficiency and peak production.

All right, let's assume that the hearing clearly establishes the farmer's need for an increased income for his milk. How can this increase be accomplished?

There are three possible ways, and only three ways, in which the dairy farmer can be paid a higher return for his product.

First, we could allow the farmer to charge the milk dealer more and, in turn, we could allow the milk dealer to charge the public more. That, of course, is the way a situation like this would be handled in ordinary times. But the times through which we are living are not ordinary. A higher price for milk is one more step toward inflation.

President Roosevelt's hold-the-line order of 3 weeks ago clearly eliminates this method of relieving the dairy farmer's problem. This order stated that no further increases would be allowed in the price of any cost-of-living product. In Washington last week I found a grim determination on the part of all the officials with whom I talked to see that this order is carried out.

All right, let's examine our second choice: Choice No. 2 is the lowering of the cost of milk distribution. If it costs the dealer less to deliver your milk to your doorstep, he could afford to pay the farmer more and still maintain his present income.

A milk-zoning plan has been worked out for the State of Connecticut which in most parts of the State would allow only one milk truck to cover each street. It has been estimated that this plan could save the milk dealers between three-quarters of a cent to a cent and a quarter on every quart.

Three or four weeks ago I urged Connecticut dealers to consider the adoption of this plan on a voluntary basis. However, there is a considerable amount of opposition from dealers, consumers, and from labor. Many consumers do not like the idea of giving up the milkman from whom they have been buying milk for years. Some milk-truck drivers feel that they would be forced from the trade which they have learned over a long period of years into work to which they are unaccustomed.

Now, let's consider our third choice. In Canada and England, when farmers or any other group actually require more income to maintain their production, a subsidy is provided by the Government to protect the consumer against a resulting increase in price. In Canada the subsidy on milk is, roughly, 2 cents on every quart. This subsidy is paid to the dealer as a protection for Canadian families against an increase in the cost of living. It is actually a consumer subsidy.

For the past 18 months, through such subsidies, the Canadians and British have kept prices definitely in check. I believe it would be fair to say that in Canada and England, thanks largely to subsidies, the danger of inflation has been licked.

Some months ago you used to hear people say that subsidies would be too expensive. This argument has pretty well disappeared. While the food subsidies in England cost $400,000,000 a year, they have eliminated rises in the price of food products which would have totaled many, many times that sum.

However, there are some good arguments against subsidies and these arguments are expressed with vigor by many sincere and

conscientious people. It is often suggested, for instance, that subsidies might get out of control. It is argued that if it were possible for Congress to grant subsidies today, it would be equally possible for Congress to withdraw those subsidies tomorrow.

Now, I have outlined what I believe you will agree are the only three ways in which we could increase the price which the farmer gets for his milk. Each one of these methods would give the farmer the extra money which he believe he needs. One method has been definitely eliminated by the President's order to "hold the present price level." Each of the other two have definite disadvantages which are obvious to anyone.

This situation is rather typical of the position in which Government administrators often find themselves. The fields of price control, rationing control, and manpower control are immensely complicated. Rarely is the Government given a choice between a right way and a wrong way. Almost invariably, the choice, as in this case, lies between two or three methods, each one of which presents serious problems.

Sometimes farmers speak with considerable feeling when they compare their incomes with those of an industrial worker's. In many cases, the men who used to work their farms a year ago are now employed in war factories at two, three, and four times their former wages. With industrial wages at their present levels, our farmers maintain that other citizens can well afford to pay higher prices for food products.

However, we must remember that everybody doesn't work in a defense plant. There are tens of thousands of teachers, municipal and State employees, office workers, insurance workers, store clerks, gasoline service attendants in our State whose incomes are up only slightly.

Moreover, we should never lose our perspective on the position of the industrial worker. Even in 1939, there were well over 100,0000 men out of work in our own State of Connecticut. Two or three hundred thousand more were working only 15, 20, or 30 hours a week.

During boom times, the farmer has rarely prospered to the same extent as industrial workers. On the other hand, he is rarely faced with the same specter of unemployment and insecurity during periods of depression.

I know a half dozen young men today working in the Sight Light Co. and Pratt-Reed, near my home in Essex, who are laying every single penny aside with which to purchase a farm when the war is over. In spite of the hard work and long hours, a farm to them represents security, a certain pride of ownership, which no factory job could give them.

Moreover, inflation would lay a particularly heavy hand on the dairy farmers of our State. If inflation came, their feed costs would go higher, than any prices which they can now imagine. Their labor costs and all their other expenses would boom upward at the same terrific rate. But the price of milk would always lag behind. Our dairy farmers would be squeezed into an increasingly difficult position. In the end, many hundreds of them might well lose their farms, their savings, and their insurance just as dairy farmers did in all parts of the world following the last World War.

The open hearing suggested by Mr. Hammerberg should give us the real facts on the milk production costs of Connecticut dairy farmers. It should indicate clearly whether a higher return to the farmer is needed to allow him to continue producing the milk which is so vitally important to all of us.

And let me again repeat to every dairy farmer in this State: If the facts brought out in that hearing prove that an increase in the returns from his milk is necessary, I will do everything in my power to see that relief is provided. I only ask our farmers and all of our citizens to remember that our choice of method is a narrow one—a reduction in the cost of distributing milk, or the type of milk subsidy which has been used in Canada and Eng'and. The possibility of increasing the price that Connecticut families pay for milk has already been specifically eliminated by the President's recent order, if I understand it correctly.

The establishment of firm price control necessary to defeat inflation is not an easy task. The situation which I have outlined to you on milk tonight is typical of many situations to which we must find the most intelligent possible answers during the next few weeks.

And now good night to all of you until next week at this same time.

CHESTER BOWLES,
State Office of Price Administration Director.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the real purpose of this bill, if I know what it is, is to provide for the continued, uninterrupted, and maximum production of the arms, munitions, and other supplies necessary to keep our brave boys properly equipped to meet the enemy and defeat him. That is what this bill is for. The Mexican General Villa once said, "If you get a reputation for rising early, you can lie abed all day." So a bill to which is applied a name or an epithet has attached to it something which is very difficult to remove, but I assert that this bill is not a labor bill, and it is not intended to reform labor laws or change existing labor relations. It is intended, however, to cause on the part of industry the performance of service which is absolutely necessary in order to win this war. It makes very little difference what cause it is that interrupts production; any cause is sufficient for us, as citizens of the United States to denounce its repetition and to prevent its recurrence, and the words "or other cause" in this bill cannot by being lifted out of the bill be given their real meaning; they must be regarded in the matrix in which we find them. It is not "other cause" alone that puts into effect by act of Congress the fundamental power which the Government has in time of peace and in time of war to make private property serve the public use. It is only such causes as are mentioned in this bill; namely, such causes as unduly impede or delay the national defense program; such causes as make necessary the exertion of such power and authority to insure the operation of plants in the interest of national defense. No other cause empowers the Government to go into operation and conscript property.

This is a bill conscripting property. It is nothing short of that, and let us face it. We assert the right, as representatives of the people, to declare as a policy that all industry shall respond to the national defense with all that it takes. It is nothing short of that. We are speaking for the people. Do not let any small, petty issues interfere with that voice. It is not a party here or a party there that is concerned in winning this war; it is not a faction here or a faction there; it is not labor against capital or capital against labor. The effort which we make today is the supreme effort of the people in a struggle in a total war. It is nothing less than that. Today every minute is fateful. Let the production of the mines slow down a minute, and that weakening of the blow is felt in the mountains of Tunis, and they know it over there; they are telling us so constantly. We know it, too, and let us not allow adventitious or selfish interests to impede that blow from the mines to the enemy.

Mr. President, is this a strange bill? Is it novel? Does it assert a power of Government which ought to be impeded and shackled beyond any limitation that has been imposed heretofore? Let us look into it. Everyone of us knows that a necessary characteristic of government is the power to do this very thing, namely, to subject private property to public use.

We say that to do this lawfully the Congress of the United States must lay down the rules of the procedure which takes away from the private owner his property and turns it over to the Government, and provide for compensation in so doing. Still we recognize that in emergencies, when there is not time to do all that, the Government, in order to save itself, may assert the power to commandeer; it may step into a situation such as that in the coal mines, when the very life of our country, the further existence of freedom, is at stake and say, "We will talk about legislating later, but coal must be produced, because coal is necessary to the winning of this war, and every minute's delay costs the dear lives of our sons."

We have done it in other ways. We have commandeered ships; we have commandeered railroads. In every instance if a citizen had doubt and wanted to combat his Government in the effort to win the war, he had the power then, he has it today, and he will have it under this bill. A citizen has rights against his Government; he may assert them in a court of justice; he will always find a sanctuary there for his claim; he will always have a remedy, and when it is a remedy against his Government, whether it is a town, or a county, or a State, or the United States itself, greater damage is allowed than ever is the case in litigation between private individuals. Our books are full of examples of the exertion of authority in the national defense, where the Government has shown it was necessary in the national defense to commandeer ships; that there was no room for delay; that other means of obtaining them were impossible. So there was a just exertion of authority. There is nothing new about this proposal as a matter of policy.

Ever since the First World War we have been asserting this right in the Congress. In 1920, which is about as early as action could be taken in Congress after the last World War was over, we enacted a statute similar to that now

proposed. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is a repetition of the first paragraph of section 120 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended. I have it in my hand; I have read it many times; and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD at this point, so that others may make the comparison with section 9 of the act of 1940, and see that the Congress declared the policy that the Government should take over private property for public use in the case of recalcitrant owners or operators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Without objection, the excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEC. 120. Purchase or procurement of military supplies in time of actual or imminent war.

The President in time of war or when war is imminent, is empowered, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the Army, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War, then, and in either such case, the President, through the head of any department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement herein provided for, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the Ordnance Department of the United States Army to manufacture therein in time of war, or when war shall be imminent, such product or material as may be required, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and by a fine not exceeding $50,000.

The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, as a matter of policy, the American Legion, which is the greatest patriotic organization in the United States in the way of membership and probably in the way of dignity and importance, has never missed a year that it has not declared for the total mobilization of all factories in time of war. It also, of course, comprehended all our skills, all our resources, and all our manpower in every one of its declarations, but it clearly included property.

The two great parties, the Republican and the Democratic Parties, in national convention in 1924, which was just 4 years after section 120 of the National Defense Act was adopted by the Congress, declared for the total conscription of all our skills and manpower and property in the event war should ever come to us again.

At that time the scenes of the First World War were vivid in the memories of all men, and those who made the pronouncement were acting deliberately, because they had waited until 1924 before making this solemn declaration. There will be found a plank in each platform devoted exclusively to the subject of total mobilization, which included the property now under consideration.

Mr. President, that was not enough. In 1928 the Republican convention, which I myself had the honor of attending and which was a memorable one to me for many reasons, not particularly for this cause, went on record again for the total conscription of all our skill and manpower and resources.

The following year the country hit the toboggan, economically, and we all know what our subsequent experience has been. All of which is more than enough to account for our not having gone into this field heretofore. But we are in it now by necessity. We are not more than 50 percent mobilized. We are not under such rules of warfare that we can maintain order. We are not equipped with laws which will enable us to keep the wheels turning; and that is a ridiculous position for a great country such as the United States of America to be in during total war.

Ever since the beginning of this war, and our entry into it, we have fumbled the ball of manpower and mobilization of our factories and our farms. We escaped by a very narrow margin, a terrible crisis when the crops had to be harvested last fall, and while I do not like to be considered a prophet of evil things, I say that if we do not take care of our manpower problem broadly, comprehending the whole problem, not taking it up piecemeal and fixing a little thing in one place which disjoints all the rest of the economy, when harvest time comes again we will see a worse condition than we saw last year.

Mr. President, the pending proposal is but a part of the whole picture. This proposal supplements section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act. It extends the theory of the act. It is not new. It merely says that we will supplement the powers enumerated, which are powers given by the Constitution to government, powers which are inherent with government without being given, anyway, that we will now add to these powers, which we undertook to implement in section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, so that it will not be necessary to fine a recalcitrant owner or operator in order to keep his plant working. Any cause—"any cause" are the vital words in this proposal—any cause which makes a plant become inoperative and interferes with the war effort—and that is a necessary condition—any cause which interferes with the war effort is the actuating fact which throws into gear our Government. This proposal, if enacted, will be our declaration, as representatives of the people. It will be the people governing themselves.

The fact that we implement our act by saying that one officer or another shall be the person who executes our will is merely an incident. I am afraid that in this case it is an unfortunate incident. But remember, this power cannot be exercised by us as administrative agents. We cannot do that. We must repose in someone the authority to do our will in this matter, and we declare our will and the will of the people when we say that the sole basis of action here is that this is necessary in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, that premise is one which will not be denied by any American citizen inside Congress or outside. Once we recognize that, once we recognize that time is of the essence in this situation, once we admit that we are in mortal danger every moment today, then I think all reasons for postponement, all reasons for sending back bills to committees, are gone, unless the bills are ill-considered; and the pending bill is not. This bill has been considered thoroughly many times. There is not a novel principle in it, there is not a new idea in it. It is different in substance and form from the bill we had before our committee, but the provisions which were not then in it are not new to us as legislators. We are familiar with them. We know their import.

The sole question is a question of policy. It is not a question of principle. No constitutional law is violated by the proposal. The question is solely whether the Congress of the United States recognizes the fundamental truths that this great country is in mortal danger, that every moment counts, and that every energy which is possessed by the people of the Nation, and every resource it has, must be thrown into the effort to win the war at the earliest possible moment, and with every effort that may be necessary to win it. It is our duty to our sons, to the great principle of freedom, and to the very existence of a free Government on this continent, that we give all that it takes, and we have faith in the people of this country, that they have the character and the fortitude to bear all the burdens

and all the sacrifices, and that they have all the courage, necessary for a total effort.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVETRON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barbour	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	La Follette	Scrugham
Buck	Langer	Shipstead
Burton	Lodge	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Moore	Walsh
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ferguson	Murray	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

Mr. LANGER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. On what question are we about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on page 2, line 11, to strike out the words "or other cause."

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent on important public business.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent due to a death in his family. He is paired on this question with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend. He has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Ferguson	Reynolds
Ball	Gerry	Robertson
Barbour	Gillette	Russell
Buck	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bushfield	Holman	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Tobey
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Radcliffe	Wherry
Davis	Reed	Wilson
Eastland	Revercomb	

NAYS—34

Austin	La Follette	Overton
Bankhead	Lodge	Pepper
Barkley	Lucas	Scrugham
Bone	McCarran	Stewart
Brewster	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
George	Mead	Wagner
Gurney	Murdock	White
Hayden	Murray	
Hill	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Ellender	Nye
Bailey	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Green	Smith
Bridges	Guffey	Truman
Brooks	Hatch	Wallgren
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley
Downey	Kilgore	Willis

So Mr. DANAHER's amendment to Mr. CONNALLY's amendment in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should object to having the reading dispensed with. I think the amendment should be read. It is very important.

Mr. TAFT. The only reason why I asked that the reading of the amendment by the clerk be dispensed with is that I intend to read it myself when I am through.

Mr. McNARY. I have no choice as to who shall read the amendment, but I want to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the amendment will be read from the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. 7. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the Board), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the Conciliation Service) certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If, in the opinion of the Board, a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case. The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of the said Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and said act of October 2, 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law under the provisions of section 7 hereof.

(c) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be deemed by the Board material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

(d) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

SEC. 8. Whenever any labor dispute has been certified to the Board, or jurisdiction assumed on the Board's own motion, and until 10 days after the order of the Board has been issued, the parties to the dispute shall continue production under all the same conditions which prevailed when the dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or temporary order of the Board. During said period the provisions of section 4 of this act, and the criminal penalties therein provided, shall apply with respect to any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility affected by such dispute, and the parties to any labor dispute in connection therewith, to the same and in the same manner as if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States.

SEC. 9. Whenever the Board has issued an order under the terms of this act, and the employer or employees fail to comply with the terms thereof, or operations are hindered or reduced by lock-out, strike, or otherwise, the Attorney General of the United States may apply to the circuit court of appeals of any circuit in which the hindrance or reduction occurs for an order or injunction; and in such case, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, jurisdiction is conferred upon such circuit court of appeals to order the parties to comply with the order of the Board, and to enjoin or restrain the doing of any one or more of the following acts:

(1) The beginning or the continuance by one or more employers of a lock-out of any of the employees of such employer or employers;

(2) The instigation, promotion, furtherance, or support by any person or labor organization or officer thereof of any strike against one or more employers, or of any organized stoppage or slow-down of the work in which such employer or employers are engaged; provided that no injunction shall be issued against an individual employee by reason only of his having ceased work, or refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of this act, a "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment regardless whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer or employee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill of the Senator from Texas whether or not my amendment shall be adopted. However, it seems to me that without my amendment the bill would have a substantial disadvantage; it would afford only a partial solution.

We have given no one in the Government the power to deal with the problem of strikes. We have given no one the power to compel any disputant in a strike to appear before the National War Labor Board. Its jurisdiction, except as to the fixing of wages, which it may do under the Anti-inflation Act which Congress passed in October, rests entirely upon the voluntary consent of employers and employees. Many of them do not admit that they are bound in any way to appear before the Board, or bound by the voluntary agreement between employers and labor representatives who appeared before the President and entered into the agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a general question. I have hastily examined his amendment. Is there anything in the amendment which would change or in any wise interfere with the practices and methods which the War Labor Board has heretofore pursued?

Mr. TAFT. In no way. In order not to raise that question I have proposed to give the Board broad powers. It seems to me that the Board would have power under the terms of this amendment to act as it is now acting. However, it would have a great deal more power, because the Board would be given power to enforce its orders.

As I see it, the difficulty with the bill without this amendment is that the only way the President can deal with a strike is, first, to seize the plant or mine, or whatever facility may be involved in the dispute. He has no other remedy. He must first seize it, and the Government must take it over. The Government has given back such facilities in nearly all cases, although not in all cases. There is certainly one railroad which the Government is still operating, and I think there is one industrial plant which the Government is operating. Whether Mr. Ickes has ever given back anything, or whether he will give back the mines, is certainly somewhat open to question.

In any event, it seems to me that that is the last resort. I do not see why private ownership cannot operate. As a matter of fact, in most cases in which the Government has gone in, it has recognized that it must appeal to private employers actually to operate the plant. Today the mines are being operated by the employers.

It seems to me essential that we set up a system of settling labor disputes. The natural way to do it is to confer power on the National War Labor Board to hear disputes and determine controversies, and then enforce its decisions in such manner as we may provide.

My amendment would not change the bill of the Senator from Texas. I do not propose to interfere with the remedy which he proposes. If the President thinks it is necessary to take over a plant, I am willing that he take over the plant. My amendment would simply provide another method, a method which I think would be far better. It is based upon justice, and upon public hearings. It would no longer be in the arbitrary power of the President in any labor dispute to take over a plant which he thought should be taken over.

First, the parties must appear before a board—practically a court of justice—which hears all the facts and determines publicly who is in the right and what the decision ought to be. It seems to me that that is the American way to deal with a labor dispute or any other dispute.

My amendment provides that the board may assume jurisdiction of any dispute. It does not have to be necessarily concerned with the war business, although the board must find that it is a labor dispute which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort. The conciliation branch of the Department of Labor is supposed to certify a dispute of that kind when it finds that it can no longer conciliate; but because in some cases there has been a question as to whether the case has been certified soon enough, I would give the Board the power, on its own motion, to assume jurisdiction of a dispute. If it finds that substantial interference with the war effort is likely to result from the labor dispute, it is given power to hold a public hearing, at which both parties are entitled to appear, and to decide the dispute.

In deciding the dispute it is governed by law. In the anti-inflation act we have set forth the circumstances under which wages may be increased. We have provided that the wages of September 15, 1942, shall prevail except when the President finds it is necessary to adjust such wages in order to secure the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities. Those are the circumstances. We have laid down the principle; and my amendment would authorize the board to apply that principle to each case and determine whether an increase in wages should be granted. It would be given power to subpena witnesses, and the courts would be given power to enforce its subpenas.

Section 8 provides a criminal penalty for anyone who strikes or locks out during the pendency of the hearing, and only during the pendency of the hearing. The time is short. There is no time to enter into a general court dispute; and it seems to me fair to ask the parties to conform during that period without strike or lock-out. There is a criminal penalty if they do not conform. I have merely provided that the same criminal penalties as are provided in section 4 of the bill shall apply. I think those are somewhat extreme, and I think perhaps they should be modified later by amendment.

After the decision is rendered, the remedy is for the Attorney General to apply to a court for an injunction. In effect, that gives the court an opportunity to review the proceedings and determine whether or not the National War Labor Board has complied with the law, and whether or not its decision is arbitrary. However, its decision on the facts is intended to be final. The court determines only questions of law. The court is then given power to issue an injunction, and it is presumed that both labor and employer will comply with that injunction. If they do not, I see no reason why the President should not order out the troops to enforce the provisions of the injunction if he sees fit to do so.

I have not imposed a criminal penalty except as it may come by way of contempt proceedings for disobedience of the court's order on the part of those who strike in violation of the Board's order.

We could go further. We could go to that extent if it becomes necessary. If possible I should prefer to avoid it. I might say that section 9, formerly sec-

tion 7, dealing with injunctions, is taken very largely from the bill of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] which he introduced a year ago, providing a means for dealing with strikes in this matter.

I am also indebted to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] from whose bill I have taken one or two of the provisions in writing the amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Referring to section 6, I should like to obtain the Senator's opinion as to how this would operate in the event that an interruption, such as that described in section 1 of the bill, should happen during the 10 days of prohibited time. Section 6, as I interpret it, would prohibit a strike for 10 days.

Mr. TAFT. It would impose a criminal penalty for striking similar to that which would be imposed under the amendment in the nature of a substitute sponsored by the Senator from Texas, in a case where the workers are striking against the Government. It would impose a criminal penalty for any such strike from the time the Board assumes jurisdiction until 10 days after the rendering of the order, that is, during the hearing. The difficulty with a criminal penalty, as I see it, is that it is a very harsh penalty. The Government can arrest every labor leader in a particular union. I do not like to impose a criminal penalty if it is not absolutely essential. I think that to ask them to comply and go to a public hearing and present their case is such a simple request, and so obviously fair, that I cannot see how anyone could object. If they wish to dispute the final order of the Board I think they should have an opportunity to be heard on an injunction proceedings before the Court rather than be thrown into jail overnight.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that the Government did not care to enforce the criminal penalty, does the Senator interpret his amendment in such a manner that the Government has the alternative remedy of stepping in and taking possession during the 10 days in the event this provision were violated?

Mr. TAFT. I see no particular reason why section 1 cannot be applied at any time during the proceedings, after the proceedings, or before. I have not tried to limit in any way the remedy proposed by the Senator from Texas, and I think if the Government finds that it cannot do it in any other way it may step in at any time during these proceedings. My only effort is to provide a remedy which does not require the Government to operate the business of the railroads and coal mines of the United States. The Government should have remedies without taking that extreme course.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a question to him regarding section 6?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand, the Senator would provide a penalty which would be applicable throughout the period during which the dispute is pending before the Labor Board.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it not our experience and observation that one of our troubles has been the interminable pendency of disputes before the National War Labor Board, and might not section 6 therefore submit a labor dispute to almost an interminable status quo?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator will find that when there is any serious dispute, or actual strike, the Labor Board is prepared to act very promptly. I do not have any great criticism of the Board from that standpoint. The criticism which I have concerns cases involving applications for increases in wages, when the men continue working, and the Board does not decide the cases, but keeps the men in suspense for a long time. The employers are then annoyed because there is a large retroactive award when the Board finally decides such a case. I do not think the Labor Board will be slow in deciding any case in which there is a strike so serious as to interfere with war production.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Within the fortnight, under our State law the Governor of Michigan was served with a strike notice with respect to certain telephone and communications companies. The strike is based upon the protest that the dispute was certified to the War Labor Board last October or November, and that even up to the present moment the parties in interest have been totally unable to obtain a decision.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Board has been slow, but if there had been a strike I believe its action would have been prompt.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator think that section 6 should apply to the time from October to April?

Mr. TAFT. I would think it ought to apply during the time of the hearing before the Board. I suppose we could incorporate a provision that the Board must decide the case within 3 months. But I think we can fairly leave it to the Board.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator is much too optimistic in that aspect of the matter because, in my judgment, one of the grave but lesser dangers today is the sheer physical inability of the Board to keep up with its work. I think it probably has literally thousands of decisions pending before it at the present time.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if he would consider amending section 6 in the third line after the words "has been issued," by inserting the words "but not to exceed 90 days in all."

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I am quite willing to agree to such an amendment. I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. BALL. I think that many disputes are entitled to much quicker settlement than they have been given.

Mr. TAFT. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. BALL. I do not know whether I have suggested the proper place at which to insert the change, but I suggest that in the third line of section 6, after the words "has been issued" and the comma, there be inserted the words "but not to exceed 90 days in all" followed by a comma.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will suggest a modification at a later time.

It seems to me that when we deal with this subject we ought to deal with it in its entirety. Until the present time this particular amendment has not been before Congress, but the subject has been before Congress for 2 full years. Many Senators have introduced bills on the subject. In preparation of the amendment I read at least 12 bills which were introduced during this period. It seems to me that on the whole it would be better to pass a comprehensive measure. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that it will not hurt his bill, and I hope he will accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that from the examination which I have been able to make, and from what I have heard in the explanation made of the amendment by the Senator, I am not at all hostile to its purpose. The only question I had in mind was that probably his amendment prohibiting strikes during the period of consideration would meet with some opposition and some resistance.

Mr. TAFT. For instance, the Railroad Labor Act, as Senators know, provides the same thing. It provides that during the hearing before the Railroad Labor Board there shall be no strike, and conditions generally are to continue, and the strike is made illegal. There is no criminal penalty provided, but I think an order of the Board could be enforced by injunction under the Railroad Labor Act. So it is not a new principle which is being suggested here.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I shall not resist the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Ohio takes his seat, I wonder if he would yield to me for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. I note in the Senator's proposal that the Board may assume jurisdiction when, in its opinion, a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort. Then, there is a provision that the decision of the Board shall be final and not subject to review, except as provided in section 7. Is it the conclusion of the Senator that there could not be a review of the assumption of jurisdiction?

Mr. TAFT. I think if the Board made a proper determination that there was a substantial interference with the war effort that would be a finding of fact which it would be difficult for a court to go back of. Of course, if the decision of

the Board was outrageous, if it was ridiculous, I suppose the court could go back of it.

Mr. GILLETTE. On their own motion they could take cognizance and jurisdiction of a dispute should they think the facts justified them doing it, and no other tribunal could review that action.

Mr. TAFT. The court could review the action of the Board as to whether they had a legal right to take it, as to whether they had complied with the law in their hearing, whether their order complied with the law, and whether it complied with the anti-inflation law as to fixing wages and other conditions.

Mr. GILLETTE. And it is the opinion of the Senator that the provision amendment as to the decision of the Board, including its interpretation of provisions of the Price Control Act, should be final except as provided in section 7. Would that preclude a review of jurisdictional control?

Mr. TAFT. Except as to questions of law, and jurisdiction is a question of law. I have given the Board rather complete authority to determine the fact as to whether a strike interferes substantially with war production. How far the court might go back of that question of fact I am not quite prepared to say.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Ohio desire to continue?

Mr. TAFT. I think I have finished except I desire to offer a modification of the amendment so as to provide a 90-day period, but I shall be glad to hear what the Senator has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to say, as was developed in the colloquy with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] yesterday, that I have prepared an amendment to section 5, which is now upon the table and which I had intended to offer to the substitute of the Senator from Texas. The subject matter of that amendment has been included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, and if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is accepted it will be unnecessary to pursue further the amendment which I had in mind to offer. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should fail, then, I expect, immediately following the determination of that question, to offer the amendment which is already prepared and now on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that I can offer any observations which will help any Senator in casting his vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or on the bill, with or without that amendment. I dare say there are not three Senators on the floor who understand what would be the effect of the Taft amendment. So far as I know, nobody has conferred with the War Labor Board as to whether this amendment goes beyond its powers and interferes with its procedure or falls short of the powers which the Board already attempts to exercise under the Executive order of the President. We are called upon here, without previous notice and without the amendment even being printed except in mimeographed form, to set up by law the jurisdiction and define the limitations of the War Labor Board created by the President under agreement with all the elements of labor and employment and which has been functioning under the Executive order. It seems to me that somebody ought to have an opportunity to consult with members of the War Labor Board to ascertain to what extent this amendment would affect their procedure. I certainly would welcome an opinion from that Board as to the limitations set out in the amendment on its jurisdiction, but I do not suppose I will have any opportunity unless I slip out and call up someone on the telephone, read the amendment to the War Labor Board, and find out in what way it would affect their procedure.

It seems almost criminal for the Senate of the United States to be compelled to write a labor policy under such circumstances as these. The Judiciary Committee, in my opinion, should have gone into this whole subject before reporting the bill which is now under modification on the floor. Certainly whatever consideration the committee may have given to the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas, the committee has given no consideration to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, and never was asked to give any consideration to it.

This amendment provides for injunctions; probably, in effect, if adopted, it would wipe out the Norris-LaGuardia Act or nullify it, without giving anyone an opportunity to be heard as to the effect of the amendment upon that law. It is a criminal antitrust law; that is what it is; without giving anybody who works or who employs workers an opportunity to be heard or to make any suggestion for the modification of the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has offered.

It might be possible to work out by statute a comprehensive provision defining the duties of the War Labor Board, after deliberation, consideration, and argument, back and forth across the committee table, and, after giving both sides an opportunity to be heard, it might be entirely possible to draw a provision which we could all support. Certainly I do not want to put myself in the position of trying to obstruct wise legislation, with the meager knowledge I have, and when there is doubt of the interpretation of the amendment itself, for within 5 minutes the Senator who is the author of the amendment modified it. I certainly would not be willing to vote in the dark for the adoption of this amendment; I do not intend to do it. Other Senators may vote as they please.

Personally, I hope that the present controversy will be settled before any measure could be passed by the two Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. I do not undertake to speak for the President with regard to the pending proposal. I have not consulted him about it. I have received no word from him in regard to it in any fashion. So what I say, and the votes I cast, are my individual opinions and actions.

The Government has now taken over the mines, and Mr. Ickes has issued an order putting into effect the 6-day week, which is one of the contentions made by the miners, and I think it is commendable on their part to indicate that they want to work 6 days. They are not idlers; they are not deliberately seeking to curtail production. They want to produce every workday of the week. They had a sort of an understanding that they were to do that. Some of the mines are operating 6 days a week, some of them are not. I do not know how true it is, because we have not yet gotten all the facts in regard to the controversy in the coal industry, but I have been informed that some operators have refused to put into effect the 6-day week because they do not want to pay time and a half for the sixth day, notwithstanding the price of coal was increased 22 cents a ton, I think it was, in order to take care of the time-and-a-half overtime for the sixth day of work. Certainly they have no right to receive the increased price for coal intended to take care of time and a half for overtime on the sixth day and not put into effect the 6-day week. I do not think anyone could justify that, because if they were allowed the increase in order to take care of overtime, and they are not having overtime, they certainly are not entitled to put that extra money into their pockets as profits. I do not know how many of the mines are doing that, I do not know what proportion are refusing to put into effect a 6-day week, but regardless of that, the order of the Secretary of the Interior puts it into effect in all the mines of the United States, puts them all on the same basis, and provides, of course, that application may be made in any individual case for an exception if they could make a showing.

I have no inside information as to what has transpired during the last 6 weeks in the negotiations between the operators and the miners. So far as I have seen in any public newspaper, no concessions were made by the employers of any sort going even 1 inch in the direction of meeting the requests of the miners.

I have said heretofore, and I repeat now, and it is not said to have any effect upon what may happen, and it would not have any effect anyway, I have been of the opinion that the miners have a case in behalf of some sort of an adjustment which should be heard, and which has a right to be heard, and has a right to be heard without regard to prejudice, or hatred, or excitement, on the part of anyone against anyone else, because whatever agreement is entered into now will probably be one that will go beyond the war.

I presume there will be no great difficulty about selling all the coal that is mined while the war is on. The contracts usually run for 2 years, and we all hope the war will be over in less than 2 years. We do not know that it will be, no one can tell, but we hope it will be, and in the very nature of the case, when it is over, the problem of the production of coal may present a new situation.

It is hoped that the order of the Secretary of the Interior is conducive to bringing about a situation in which the operators and the miners can get together, or the miners and the Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, can get together on a fair basis, without regard to anyone saving his face on either side. This is no time to save faces. There are fundamental questions involved here which carry the matter beyond the right of anyone to ask anything out of pride, or vanity, or for any other reason except the best interests of our country.

I express the hope that within the 2 weeks' period an adjustment may be made which will be fair to the country and to all parties in this controversy, but, without regard to that, I doubt very much whether the kind of bill we are likely to write here on the floor of the Senate will have any effect upon the controversy, or could become law in time to make any contribution toward its settlement or its solution. I might be wrong about that; I am merely expressing my individual opinion, but here we have before us proposals which have never even been discussed by the Senate of the United States; there has never been any report by any committee of the United States Senate on the questions now pending before the Senate, and upon which we will be called to vote in a few moments. It is not fair to the Senate, it is not fair to the country, it is not fair to the coal industry, it is not fair to the war effort, it is not fair to anyone, to require us, without some information gathered from authoritative sources, as to what the effect of our action here will be, to vote at this time.

Mr. President, I am serious about this; I am not captious. I look upon this whole situation as profoundly affecting the morale of our country. We have to deal with it in calmness, we have to deal with it as a jury would deal with a case submitted on evidence, except that we have to deal with it without evidence, because none has been submitted to us.

I do not know what the remedy is. It has been whispered around in the Senate that the bill should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to give further consideration to it. Perhaps that should be done, I am not saying. I, myself, have no present intention of making such a motion. I do not think I should do so, even though I might vote for such a motion if it were made.

I am dealing with the practical situation which now confronts the Senate. I am appealing to Senators to act as a jury, calmly and deliberately, without any prejudice against anyone. Certainly I do not have any against anyone. I, together with all my colleagues, want to do my duty as I see it. But we cannot reach up into the sky and pull a rabbit out of some imaginary legislative hat and say we have solved, out of hand, the whole labor problem of the United States. That is what is attempted in the pending amendment, especially the one offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that the principle of the pending bill was embodied in the Ball bill at the last session, a bill which was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and which was on the calendar of the Senate for more than 12 months. So that it is not quite accurate to say that the question is new. It is true the wording is somewhat different.

Mr. BARKLEY. And, of course, every time the wording of a bill is changed the possible interpretation of it is changed.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct; but I wish to repeat that the general principle was before the Senate, and has been reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it never received action. The Senator stated that it was here a year and that the Senate did not take it up and act on it.

Mr. TAFT. I think that was very unfortunate.

Mr. BARKLEY. But any Senator could have moved to take it up on any day. There is no rule which keeps a Senator glued to his seat if he has the urge in his bosom to move to take up a proposal.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator sure it is in the bosom?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I prefer not to descend any lower.

The bill before the Senate is really a rigid antistrike bill, brought forward under the stress of a coal situation, but which does not affect that alone, if it affects it at all. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio does not only affect plants which may be taken over by the Government, but it affects all controversies involving a labor dispute which may threaten to retard or interfere with the war effort. The measure invokes the injunctive process by the Attorney General of the United States. It provides that he may obtain an injunction. For years and years we have debated in the Senate and House of Representatives, and all over the country, whether labor disputes ought to be settled by the injunction process. Congress has passed legislation against such procedure, and that legislation, known as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, is now on the statute books. Both major political parties have declared against regulation of labor by the injunction process over a period of a quarter of a century or more.

The language of the amendment is so broad and comprehensive that I dare say the Senator who offers it could not anticipate or prophesy what the decisions of the courts might be with respect to a number of its provisions. It provides that in making decisions the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Emergency Price Control Act, and the act of October 2, 1942, which applies only to the dates on which wages shall be frozen or ceilings shall be fixed, and all other applicable provisions of law, which is indefinite. We cannot trace down all the statutes which would apply to this situation so as to be able to know what we are to vote on. It provides further:

> And where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

Certainly that language nullifies the Little Steel formula, it wipes it out, it throws it out of the window, and says that the only rule which shall be in effect to govern the actions of the Board shall be the order of the Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the Little Steel formula is based on the anti-inflation law of October 2, 1942, and provides that wages shall not be raised except to secure the efficient prosecution of the war, or to remedy a gross inequity. That is the law laid down by the Congress. The Board and the President have no authority to pursue any other process than that. I think the Little Steel formula, as a matter of fact, is consistent with the language I propose. It certainly does not outlaw the Little Steel formula.

Mr. BARKLEY. That formula was promulgated before the act of October 2, 1942.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but then the act was passed and has always been supposed to be in accord with the Little Steel formula, if the Board wished to enforce it. I think I would say that the President could change the Little Steel formula tomorrow, so far as we are concerned. There is nothing to prohibit that being done. The President may say that in the efficient prosecution of the war he can raise the Little Steel formula from 15 percent to 20 percent. This provision does not abrogate that formula, but the President may abrogate it any day.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment sets up a new standard which is an indefinite standard——

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. That where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide, and so forth. As to whether the Little Steel formula, which was promulgated by the War Labor Board before the act of October 2, 1942, is modified, or nullified, or entirely wiped out by the previous language of the Senator's amendment is a matter which is open to dispute. No one knows.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there is anything open to dispute. The subject matter of the Little Steel formula is the increase of wages. Increase of wages is dealt with by the law of October 2, 1942, not by other law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Increase of wages is what most labor controversies are about.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and we decided what the increase of wages should be in the

act of October 2, 1942, and the Board may apply under that law the Little Steel formula, or some other formula if they see fit, but they must follow that law now, and they must follow it after the passage of the pending legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. The very dispute in which the Senator and I are engaged emphasizes the impossibility of knowing now what the amendment proposed by the Senator really means. It emphasizes the lack of any information from those who have been administering the law as to what it means, or as to what it would do to them. Whether we have, in the wisdom we exercise in our capacity as Senators, the right to deal on the spur of the moment with these great problems is a serious matter.

Mr. President, I do not want to delay necessary legislation, but I want to vote with my eyes open. I want to vote with some knowledge as to the interpretation of amendments which are offered. I do not feel that I can support this amendment or any other amendment which involves an entirely new field of legislation which has not been undertaken by either branch of Congress, and certainly not by both of them together, without having further information on the subject. Unless I have an opportunity to obtain such information, I shall feel it my duty to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I make that statement in explanation of my vote, and not for the purpose of influencing anyone else's vote. I am not responsible for anyone's vote but my own.

I hope therefore that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not be agreed to. I devoutly wish there were some way by which the Senate might become informed on this whole problem before being required to vote upon it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to make a simple statement in regard to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other amendments, and in regard to the position I shall take with respect to the various amendments. Surely no one in the United States should be better informed about legislation and prospective legislation than the leader of the majority. Still he is at a loss with respect to what the substitute and the other amendments may do to existing labor legislation.

There is no more difficult subject before the American people, Mr. President, than the subject of the relations between industry and labor. As our country has made progress socially and economically it has been necessary for us from time to time to meet different situations which have arisen, because certain rights of men have been achieved almost entirely as the result of strikes. Sad as it is to make that statement, it is nevertheless true. As a result, legislation dealing with the relations between industry and labor has generally been protective in character, attempting to restrain certain advantage takers from accomplishing certain things which the American people know are not just and right.

Mr. President, in the last 10 years we have moved forward markedly well in our industry-labor relations. I call attention to the fact that probably the greatest single thing ever accomplished in our industry-labor relations was an agreement made between representatives of industry and representatives of labor to settle disputes by peaceful means. It was an attempt on the part of representatives of industry and labor to bring about in the United States a condition which would make it possible to settle disputes by peaceful means. That agreement was reached at the beginning of a great war. It was reached when certain types of legislation had been introduced in the Congress of the United States. That agreement has brought about an experimental method of trying to handle such disputes, a method which in the main has been more successful than anyone ever dreamed it might be.

All anyone has to do, Mr. President, is to compare the industrial labor relations of the last war with the industrial labor relations of this war. All anyone has to do is to compare the production had in the last war with what we have done in this war in the way of production—how many men have been put to work, how many women have been put to work, how much has been accomplished—in order to realize that we have passed through one of the most important periods of our whole history, because we have convinced the people of the United States that these things can be done, and can be done by peaceful means.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I prefer not to yield, because I am simply making a statement, not arguing on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I want the people of our country to realize that in the midst of a great experimental struggle which bids fair to be successfully concluded, there is projected legislation which would introduce a process of government which would not be wholly helpful because we do not know all the facts about the strike. But the Government of the United States is in control; and, Mr. President, I, for one, am willing to trust the Government of the United States. I know of no other institution on earth that I should prefer to trust. I am sure no other institution that has ever existed would try to bring about a greater degree of justice and would actually do so than would the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not unfamiliar with martial law. I know what strikes mean. I have been in the midst of them, and I have been with troops; and I know the heartaches, I know the anxieties, I know the terror that comes into the minds of women and children during such episodes. From the standpoint of a military man, I know that there is not one of them on earth who would not say that the hardest of all the tasks imposed on the military is that of taking care of industrial labor disputes and of administering them properly.

Mr. President, we have tried a new technique. The President of the United States has not put the mines in which strikes occurred into the hands of the military—and of course I may be begging the question—but he has called in a civil authority of the United States to administer the mines. That experiment is worth while. We are probably doing greater things than anyone realizes. If the experiment works, think what might have been accomplished in the history of industrial relations, and what will be accomplished. We all know that the worst element in lawmaking, one against which we have a Constitutional ban, is that of legislation directed against a given person, general legislation aimed at a given person. Under our democratic processes such legislation is considered so unfair that we have a Constitutional ban against it; and whenever in the history of our country we have attempted to cover a particular man or a particular incident by general legislation we have generally passed bad legislation.

Mr. President, the substitute offered is to a bill which has been on the calendar for some time. I do not want to talk against that, because I am not arguing on the bill; but it seems to me that what is taking place in America today in regard to strikes is the thing being aimed at. Certain it is that we shall make a mistake if we try to legislate against a condition about which we do not know. Let us have faith in what we have accomplished in the last two or three years in the war effort. Let us have faith in the great labor program with which we have gone forward. Let us amend that program constructively, not act hostilely toward it.

Mr. President, it might be well to point out what the Senate is called on to do in acting upon the amendments which have been printed and which are before us for consideration. We have the original bill; we have a substitute bill; we have an amendment by the Senator from Texas amending his substitute. We have another amendment by the Senator from Texas, still further amending his substitute. We have yet another amendment by the Senator from Texas, still further amending his substitute. We have yet another amendment by the Senator from Texas still further amending his substitute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that the substitute incorporates at one place all the amendments which have been referred to by the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am very happy the Senator has corrected me. The substitute, then, has taken the place of the amendments which lie on our desks. Therefore, I withdraw the statement I made. However, we have the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I trust, Mr. President, that in spite of the fact that I stood corrected in regard to my statement relative to the amendments of the Senator from Texas, my point is nevertheless well made. My plea is that we not legislate at a time when the Government of the United States has things under control and when, by reason of

that fact, we may go forward in a tremendous degree in reaching a better understanding of our industrial labor relations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the time has come to have some understanding as to whether the Congress of the United States, and especially this body, shall legislate, or whether we shall continue to have government by decree. In the last hour that question has been brought to the foremost rank of the issues before this body.

Let me briefly refer to some of the things which have been stated. I want the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], for whom I have the highest personal and senatorial respect, not to take what I am about to say as a personal criticism. However, he knows, we all know, the country knows, that it has been impossible to get a bill reported from the Committee on Education and Labor of this body for consideration on this floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to reply to his statement. I know that the Senator does not want to be unfair. The Ball bill, as has been stated by the Senator from Ohio, was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. That bill was reported before the nonstrike and nonlockout agreement was made between industry and labor. The bill should not have been considered after that agreement was reached, and was not considered; but so far as the committee itself is concerned, its record is good.

The Connally bill did not go to the Committee on Education and Labor. It went to the Committee on the Judiciary; and other bills on similar subjects have been referred to other committees.

Mr. President, our committee probably has gained the reputation of being a burying ground——

Mr. REED. It certainly has.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But the fact remains that we have not been a burying ground and we have not been a cemetery, because the Senate has referred the bills to other committees, and our committee has not been given a chance to consider them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. From the remarks I have made here today, anyone should know that I would try to stop legislation so long as things were working as well as they are now working.

Mr. REED. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course, it is quite true that the bills were reported before the voluntary agreement not to strike was entered into in December 1942. However, today Mr. Lewis, the head of one of the greatest unions in the United States, has repudiated that agreement. That is the reason why conditions are different from those which existed when the Ball bill and the Connally bill were held up last year. Today, that agreement is repudiated by a substantial number of labor leaders; so we face an entirely new situation, one in which the voluntary agreement can no longer be relied upon to secure industrial peace.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say in behalf of the Senator from Utah that I think he is a victim of the rules of the Senate. I do not think any committee has the right to set itself up in final judgment and substitute its judgment for that of the Senate on any bill which is committed to it. At some time in the future I expect to bring up the question of amending the rules of the Senate so that every committee to which a bill is referred will be instructed to return the bill to the Senate with some kind of a recommendation—not necessarily a favorable recommendation, but some kind of a recommendation. The Senate rules are deficient in this respect: Once a bill is referred to a committee, it stays there unless Senators undertake the almost impossible task of successfully moving that the committee be discharged. That is next to impossible.

Let me return to the history leading up to the status of the bill and the amendments before us at this time. In order to obtain some committee expression upon these labor bills, it is very true that pains were taken to refer them to committees other than the Committee on Education and Labor. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] followed that course with respect to the original Connally bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress. It went to the Committee on the Judiciary, and came back with a recommendation. It was passed in the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and was sent to the other House.

The Senator from Texas will clearly recall that there was another Connally bill, and after a long discussion on the floor of the Senate, and personal conferences with the distinguished majority leader, who was as reluctant then as he is now to have such legislation considered, finally the Senator from Texas, with the assurance of support from many other Senators, including myself, secured an agreement with the Senator from Kentucky that on a certain day a motion to take up the Connally bill would be the order of business in the Senate. At the request of the President, that was postponed once, and later, when the day came when that was to be the order of business of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Texas rose, in his calm, majestic manner, and mournfully, reluctantly, I am sure, and more or less disconsolately, announced to his colleagues that at the request of the White House he was withdrawing his motion. It is true that some other Senator could have made the motion. However, it is true that for the past 2 years this body has been under pressure from the executive branch of the Government not to consider any labor legislation, and it has not done so.

The Senator from Texas reintroduced the bill in the present Congress. It again went to the Committee on the Judiciary, and not to the cemetery of the Committee on Education and Labor. It came out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and it is before the Senate. The Senator from Texas probably recalls that in its main aspects it is the same as the bill which this body once passed. However, some changes in circumstances have occurred since the Senator's bill was reported from the committee. I refer to the creation of the War Labor Board by executive decree, if you please, and not by act of Congress. The Senator from Texas offered amendments to make his bill correspond to the present state of facts, and that is all.

The Senator from Kansas had an amendment which he desired to offer. However, it was included in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I renew my suggestion that if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio shall prevail it will be unnecessary for the Senate to consider the amendment which I had prepared. If it shall fail, I will offer my amendment. It is much simpler and shorter, and touches only one point.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude as promptly as possible. The Senator from Ohio has offered an amendment. I am moderately familiar with labor legislation, including proposed labor legislation which has been considered in the committees of the Senate. There is nothing novel or startling in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. In fact, it fits in with the present times. It fits the current situation like a glove on a hand. It is complementary to the original bill of the Senator from Texas. It does not violate in any way any of the principles of that bill. As the Senator from Ohio has said, it contains some ideas of the Senator from Ohio and of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], both of whom are members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and also of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. President, if there has been one thing which has outraged the people of the United States, one thing for which they have criticized the Congress, and particularly the Senate, it has been our failure to consider legislation touching the industrial labor problems. The people of the country have been more outraged by the present situation than by any other single thing.

Nothing this body could do would more certainly forfeit the respect and confidence of the people of the country than to fail to act on the proposal before us. If, after marching up the hill, after having before us a fair, reasonable, and sane proposal along this line, we now surrender to pressure—the same kind of pressure to which we have surrendered heretofore—and abdicate to the executive branch of the Government our part of the responsibility, we shall forfeit the respect and confidence of the people of the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say first, in answer to what the Senator from Kansas has said, that I do not believe that we are abdicating to the executive department of the Government because we want legislation drafted in a sane, sensible way, and to have it considered by some committee.

Secondly, I do not agree with the Senator from Kansas when he says that

every piece of legislation which is introduced by a Senator or Representative ought to be reported by a committee and come to the floor of the Senate or the House. If there is one thing a committee can do it is to keep crackpot legislation from reaching the floor of the Senate. That is one of the great services which a committee can render. We all know that in times of hysteria bad bills reach the floor of the Senate, Senators vote for them, and we have bad legislation. A long time ago, when I was in the State legislature, I learned that one of the things which a committee had to do was to keep bad legislation from reaching the floor. If a majority of the Senate of the United States ever wishes to get bad legislation out of a committee, it can always do so. The suggestions made by the Senator from Kansas indicate that he is in favor of all unsound legislation coming to the floor of the Senate and taking up the time of the Senate for discussion.

I know perfectly well that the Senator from Texas is as much a friend of labor as I am, and I sympathize with many of the things which he has said. However, I wish to call attention to this proposition: Suppose men go out on strike, and some of them do not go back into the mines, no matter what happens, even though an agreement is made that is satisfactory to the representatives of the mining company; in my judgment the bill would reach those participating in the strike who did not go back into the mines.

Mr. CONNALLY. I repeat what I have already stated, that that is not my purpose, and if the Senator desires to offer an amendment to meet such an objection, I shall be glad to accept it. I do not want to make it a criminal offense for any man to refuse to work. If one wants to quit, get his hat and go out about his business, that is perfectly all right; I do not want to deprive any citizen of that right. If one takes some affirmative action which interferes with the operation of the plant, that is one thing; if he simply quits and goes out about his business, I do not want to interfere with him. That is a fundamental American right, and I do not want to take it away from any citizen.

The Senator from Kentucky has spoken about writing this bill on the floor of the Senate. The only provisions in the bill not considered carefully and meticulously by the Judiciary Committee are in sections 4 and 5 covering all offenses of interference. Those are the only provisions not considered by the Judiciary Committee. This bill was before the committee more than a year. We had exhaustive hearings. We had the Under Secretaries of War and Navy before us. We had Admiral Land before us. All these officials approved the bill, and said they needed it, and that it would meet the labor situation. The other clause was not the committee's clause. I assume responsibility for sections 4 and 5 as they are before the Senate. It will not take a great deal of mental effort to read one page, and that is all that is involved. If the Senate wants to amend those sections, or remove them, slow them down or soften them up, I am perfectly willing to go along. I do not want to make this a harsh bill. I have no desire to go out on a witch hunt, but I do want to set up an agency that will assure the continued production of war materials in these plants. I want to make it impossible for anybody affirmatively to interfere with such production.

It has been suggested that we strike out the words "to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere." Some of that language, so far as I am concerned, can be stricken out.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I have the floor, but I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment I suggest, to be offered at the proper time, is on page 4, lines 16 and 17, to strike out the words "or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing," and insert the words "*Provided*, That no person shall be deemed to have committed an offense under this act by reason only of having ceased work or refused to continue to work or to accept employment."

That is taken from the British Trade Disputes Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am entirely in agreement with that. It is not a harsh bill at all. I want to say to the Senator from Montana that I am perfectly agreeable to accommodating this section, but this section and section 5 are the only provisions in the bill which have not been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, not once but two or three times, and gone over very carefully.

Mr. BARKLEY. By that the Senator does not mean that the Judiciary Committee considered the Taft amendment, does he?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am speaking of the proposed substitute.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I say very frankly that the provisions of the Connally bill without sections 4 and 5 would not be objectionable to me at all, but the provisions of sections 4 and 5 do, in my judgment, need careful study. It is not possible to strike out some provisions and write in amendments on the floor of the Senate and produce a good bill.

In subsection 2 of section 4 there is contained the following language:

> To aid any such lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein.

If a businessman should extend credit to someone who was out on strike he would immediately become subject to a $5,000 fine and imprisonment in the penitentiary for a year. Is that what the Senate of the United States wants to do? Is that what Senators, in this time of hysteria, wish to say to any businessman who may give credit to a miner because he is on strike? Do Senators wish to starve a miner to death because he has not gone back to the mine?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator indicate what words he thinks can possibly have that meaning?

Mr. WHEELER. The language is, "or things of value to those participating therein"—if anything of value is extended to anyone.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but "for the conduct or direction" of the strike. Those are the important words—money furnished for the conduct or direction of the strike. That is the meaning.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but if one should furnish food to a miner who was on strike, would he not be helping a striker?

Mr. TAFT. No; he would not be furnishing any aid for the conduct or direction of the strike.

Mr. BARKLEY. The language quoted by the Senator from Ohio appears before the word "or" which separates it entirely from what follows.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; it says, "or other benefits or things of value to those participating therein."

Mr. TAFT. I think the last clause clearly refers only to strike benefits received from the union.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator at all. I went through the coal investigation, when Senator Gooding was appointed chairman of the committee by Senator Watson, during a Republican administration. Senator Metcalf, of Rhode Island, was a member of the committee, as were Senator Pine, of Oklahoma, and Senator Wagner, of New York.

What did the employers do to the miners at that time? As a matter of fact, the men were not allowed to hold meetings in churches; they were thrown out on the little houses which were owned by the companies. Do we want a return of the conditions of that time?

Then the operators brought in a number of colored people from the South and kept them herded like cattle in the buildings, 10, 17, 18, and as high as 24 deep, living one on top of the other in little shacks around the coal mines.

I realize that it is not popular at this time to stand up and say a word about the miners; but so far as I am concerned personally, I shall not vote for legislation which would make it a crime to furnish food or money so as to give a miner a chance to live and exist, even though he does not want to work in a particular mine or in any particular place of business.

Mr. President, that is the reason why the pending legislation should go back to the committee and be carefully studied. I know the Senator from Texas does not wish to see legislation enacted which would permit such things to occur as I have pointed out. To write into legislation such language as "instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere" I am sure is not in the mind of the Senator from Texas. It is a very difficult thing to write a bill on the floor of the Senate without giving it consideration. We should study the laws which are now on the statute books dealing with this subject.

It is all very well for Senators to stand up and wrap the American flag around

them and say they are doing this because the boys are fighting "over there." Certainly every Member of the Senate is just as patriotic as any other man, and they all desire just as much as does anybody else, to help the boys abroad fight; but, while they are doing that, they do not want to do something which would break down the stability of our own Government. I do not think a continuance of this matter for a few days of study by the Judiciary Committee, or any other committee, would hamper the war effort, and I do not think a further careful study of this bill by the Judiciary Committee or any other committee would injure the boys who are fighting over there. Those boys know what they are fighting for. I am sure they are opposed to strikes by labor, and I deplore that there have been strikes, but, on the other hand, as I said a while ago, no one can say to me, when a comparison is made of what the miners are getting with what those engaged in war industries are receiving, that the miners have not some complaint.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, without criticizing or making a suggestion of criticism of the honesty of purpose and earnestness of purpose of those who have been proposing and supporting the pending legislation, I have been one who has been hoping that someone would offer a motion to recommit the pending measure and all amendments thereto to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study and report. In support of that view to which I am impelled, I want to invite attention to the situation in which we now find ourselves. Here is the Connally substitute which proposes that under certain circumstances the President, when he finds that the production of war materials is being interfered with by labor disputes, may authorize an agency of the Government to take charge of a plant. How does any dispute get before the War Labor Board when that has been done? Section 3 provides:

SEC. 3. When possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant or a majority of the employees of such plant or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant.

Then it provides that the Board shall take action, and, after the report of the Board has the approval of the President, the finding shall be complied with by the governmental agency in charge of the plant.

Section 5 provides for the participation by the courts.

What does the proposal presented by the Senator from Ohio do? Under his amendment it is not necessary to wait for the President to find the existence of a condition caused by labor disputes which interferes with production, but the War Labor Board, on its own motion, if it believes that a certain condition is interfering with the progress of the war effort, assumes jurisdiction. It does not wait for the action of the President; it does not wait for taking over the plant; it does not wait for a governmental agency or a group of employees to submit a controversy to the Labor Board, but the Labor Board, on its own motion, can take charge, give notice of hearing, and the fact that any of the parties refuse to attend the hearing does not deprive the Board of jurisdiction but it may proceed to hear the case and render a decision. The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act shall be final, except as it may be subject to review under section 7.

What is section 9? Section 9 merely provides that when the Board has made a finding and issued its order the Attorney General may go before the circuit court of appeals and ask—for what? For an order to compel compliance with the order of the Board, not to review its findings, not to question the jurisdiction which it assumes, but merely to compel compliance with the order of the Board. Further, the court may issue injunctions, if it shall see fit, to implement the two closing provisions of the proposal.

Under the Connally proposal when the President, in his judgment, steps in, and, through an agency takes possession of a plant, then if the governmental agency or a group of employees so desire they can submit the case to the Labor Board, but the finding of the Labor Board is not final; it is reviewed by the President, and then it is subject to review by the courts. Under the Taft proposal there is a board, an agency of the President, of its own motion stepping in and assuming jurisdiction when it thinks it ought to assume it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know of any provision whereby there is an appeal from the War Labor Board to the President under his Executive order delegating his power to the National War Labor Board. So far as I know, there is no appeal from any order of the Board today. I can understand what the Senator's objection is as to the proceedings before an administrating board. But the courts cannot ordinarily review the facts unless the finding is, in some way, outrageous, but it can review the law under this amendment, just as in any other case. If the court finds that the Board has proceeded illegally or has not complied with the law, it may refuse to enforce the order. If it finds it is legal, it must accept the judgment of the Board as to the facts. There is nothing in this procedure that is not in every piece of labor legislation we have today, so far as I know.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am afraid the conclusion of the Senator from Ohio is not justified by the provisions of either of the proposals. Under the Connally proposal when a case is presented to the War Labor Board in the manner provided by the governmental agency or by the laborers themselves the Board proceeds to hear it; then it makes a decision; its order is presented to the President, and, if approved by the President, it becomes effective.

Section 5 provides that the district courts of the United States and the courts of the Territories shall have jurisdiction, subject only to the provisions of section 17 of the act of October 15, 1914, to restrain violations or threatened violations of the act. That is not a review of the findings, but it provides that they can prevent violations of the act. Under the proposal of the Senator from Ohio a board, entirely on its own motion, assumes jurisdiction and gives such notice of a hearing as it sees fit to give, and if either or both of the parties refuse to appear the board is not deprived of jurisdiction but proceeds to consider the matter.

Mr. TAFT. Why not? What is the matter with that procedure?

Mr. GILLETTE. I should not think so eminent a lawyer as the Senator from Ohio would ask a question of that kind, when the proposal is that a tribunal, I care not what it is, of its own motion, may assume jurisdiction over a question of law or a dispute of facts and, giving the type of notice that it sees fit to give, may then proceed, whether those to whom the notice is given see fit to recognize it or not, to make a decision, and the decision shall be final and not subject to review.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is well understood that in this case the public interest is involved, and not the interest of a party; it is not a court proceeding; it is entirely a public interest; and this is a public board concerned with the elimination of labor disputes which interfere with production.

Why should the Board not assume jurisdiction of a case of that kind, whether the employer wants them to do it or whether the employee wants them to do it? I cannot understand the Senator's objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. So is a court a public agency, but there is provision made in every law whereby a citizen cannot be deprived of his property or natural or personal rights without an appropriate notice. No court can take jurisdiction of a matter pertaining to the rights of an individual without giving him notice and opportunity to be heard.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield further, I have provided for notice, though not spelling it out. I was trying to make it as simple as possible. I presume every court would say there must be reasonable notice, and if the notice were not reasonable a court would not enforce the order of the Board. Of course, it could be spelled out; we could make the provision twice as long and spell out every feature of it, but I think the provision for notice is a sufficient protection of the rights of both the employer and the employee.

Mr. GILLETTE. At the same time the Senator fails to provide specific notice, the type of notice which should be given, he provides that the agency which is assuming jurisdiction may give such notice as it sees fit. If the notice is not accepted, if the parties do not appear and proceed, it can reach a decision, and such decision, including the assumption of jurisdiction, is not open to review anywhere.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with the Senator. Of course, it is open to review if notice has not been given, and that means reasonable notice.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator point out where in his proposal it is provided the decision shall be open to review?

Mr. TAFT. It necessarily has to be open to review, because it says it is not final on questions of law.

Mr. GILLETTE. Except as provided in section 7, and the Senator provides in section 7 that the Attorney General may go before the circuit court of appeals and ask for an order to compel a party to comply with the orders of the War Labor Board.

Mr. TAFT. If the proceedings of the War Labor Board are illegal in any way or the notice is not sufficient, the court will refuse to enforce the order of the Board. I do not understand at all the objection the Senator urges to the legal provision of the amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator's difficulty is due to the failure of the Senator from Iowa to make his point clear. I am sure the point of the Senator from Iowa is clear to the Senator from Iowa, even if he does not convey it to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to submit a question, if I may, to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in the first instance, and perhaps to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in respect to his substitute. This is a layman's question, addressed to the lawyers who are presiding over the destinies of the pending proposal.

I am very anxious that there shall be additional statutory protection to the uninterrupted production of war necessities, but I am wondering whether in order to achieve that purpose it is necessary for me to impinge upon a very profound hostility I have always had to the use of injunctions in labor disputes. I voted for the original Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I have always felt that one of the most useful things we ever did, not only as a matter of fair play, but in respect to the status of the courts was substantially to separate from court jurisdiction the responsibility of, in effect, umpiring labor disputes.

What I wish to ask the able Senator from Texas, if I may, is this: In his proposal, on page 4, it is provided that any person who willfully violates any provision of the act is to be guilty of a felony, and subject to a fine or imprisonment. Is not that a conclusive penalty? Is it necessary in addition to go back into all the old injunctive process in connection with labor disputes?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not a legal inquiry really. Of course, it might be that we could get along without the provision. Like the Senator, I voted for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and I favored the policy embodied therein. This provision, however, applies only to plants taken over by the Government. It seems to me that if the Government is to operate a plant, it should have the widest and the fullest authority to operate it as it wants to do and to prevent interruption. Therefore, because of the attitude of some who were interested in the bill, I inserted section 5. I do not think the bill would be very seriously crippled if it were eliminated, but I think it is improved by its remaining in. I do not think it would be fatal to strike out that provision, but I hope that will not be done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his frank statement. When the Government has taken over the operation of a plant and it becomes in essence a Government operation, it is rather difficult to resist the argument that the Government should not be deprived of any instrumentality in the enforcement, virtually, of its sovereignty.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Nevertheless, I apprehend that the very fact that the injunctive process is restored in the Senator's bill is the reason why it appears in the additional amendment offered by the able Senator from Ohio, where, it seems to me, it becomes decidedly more offensive, using that word in the sense in which I have used it.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator that my intention in including the injunctive process, rather than a criminal penalty, for failure to abide by a decision of the Board, was the desire to make it somewhat milder. In the first place, I do not think the general feeling against injunctions applies to an injunction sought by the Government. We have had injunctions sought by the Government, and they may be sought today, I think, under the Sherman antitrust law. Subject to certain exceptions, they certainly may be sought against industry, and I believe sought against labor, in some cases. They have been sought, perhaps not successfully, in a few recent cases. I do not think the objection to injunctions granted to an employer against an employee applies to injunctions sought by the Attorney General of the United States in the public interest.

In the second place, if we include a criminal penalty, we run the risk of permitting the Government to arrest everyone. They break the strike by force; they arrest everyone who is striking. Perhaps those arrested cannot be convicted, for it takes some time to do that, 30 days, 40 days, or a couple of months, but in the meantime the strike is broken. It seems to me those people should have another hearing in a court somewhere, that they should be able to appear formally before the circuit court of appeals. That is not a single judge; it is the circuit court of appeals, as provided in the bill originally offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. There they can be heard, they can present their case. It is true under a certain state of facts they may be bound, but in general they can secure a review to determine the justice of the decision rendered against them.

The proposal seems to me, therefore, a fairer and a milder method of trying to enforce an order of the War Labor Board. It is a difficult problem. That is why I have inserted the provision for the injunctive process, instead of a criminal penalty, putting anyone in jail who refuses to comply with an order of the Board.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will refer to the text of his amendment, on page 3 he details the specific injunctive authority which he is creating, and it applies, among other things, to "organized stoppage or slow-down of the work," and so forth. Of course, that is a totally novel field into which to go with the injunctive process, is it not? And does the Senator think that the statute is sufficiently definitive to justify the language he has used and the extension of authority for which he is providing?

Mr. TAFT. I think that organized stoppage and slow-downs are the most serious threat we face today——

Mr. VANDENBERG. So do I.

Mr. TAFT. And if there is any way by which we can attempt to meet that threat, I think we should do so. I think a court should be able to work out the details, perhaps better than the Board or the individual. As a matter of fact, I took the language of the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], Senate bill 2068, introduced November 24, 1941. Section 1 and section 2 are taken expressly, word for word, from his bill, including the provision as to "organized stoppage or slow-down of the work in which such employer or employers are engaged."

I am not sure whether that came from the British Trade Disputes Act or not. I suspect it is a British provision. After the general strike in England a law was passed prohibiting strikes under certain circumstances, and penalizing those who took part in strikes, and to a large extent our legislation is drawn from that original act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am impressed by the Senator's presentation of authority and his reference to the Senator from Utah. Still I find myself disturbed by this general renewal of the injunctive process in labor disputes, unless it is necessary. I am perfectly willing to do whatever is necessary. The Senator's amendment on page 2, at the end of section 6, now section 8, provides that "the parties to any labor dispute in connection therewith," and so forth, shall be subject to its provisions "to the same extent and in the same manner as if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States." That would seem to refer back in general at least to the original Connally bill. Why cannot the Senator from Ohio stand upon that and drop section 7, now section 9, entirely from his proposal?

Mr. TAFT. I could, of course, do so, except that this language applies only to the period during which the trial is going on. Section 6, now section 8, is intended to apply only during the period of hearings. In other words, it seemed to me reasonable that we should say, "You must submit your disputes to the War Labor Board, and if you do not, we can arrest you offhand, and fine you, and put you in jail." But when we come to apply that remedy to the final compliance of the order I think it is a pretty drastic remedy, and I do not know whether it would work. Frankly, antistrike legislation is a new field. But I think the injunctive proposal in section 7, now section 9, is a sounder approach

and more likely to be successful, and fairer to all concerned, than a criminal penalty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The fact remains that the criminal penalty is in lines 18, 19, and 20 on page 4 of the basic bill, and there it stands, and if the criminal penalty stands, the Senator himself says that it is more punitive than the injunction.

Mr. TAFT. Only for this short period. I should like now to take this opportunity, if I may, to modify my amendment, in what is now section 8, on page 2, in the middle of the section, after the words, "during said period," to insert "(but for not longer than 90 days from the date of certification or assumption of jurisdiction)".

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by inserting in section 6, now section 8, line 7, after the word "period", the words I have just read, which the clerk has, and which I will ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 8, page 2, line 7, after the word "period" it is proposed to insert "(but for not longer than 90 days from the date of certification or assumption of jurisdiction)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, that particular modification is the result of our earlier colloquy, and I heartily approve it. I persist in the feeling that it ought to be possible to achieve all the essential purposes here undertaken, and I totally favor such essential purposes. I think it ought to be possible to do it without reopening the vast field of controversial law which we have substantially put behind us with respect to the use of injunctions in labor disputes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think that in fairness to myself, I should state what was going on in 1941 in connection with the bill which was introduced that year. We ought to remember, too, that under the injunction process in effect in our country before the Norris-LaGuardia Act, anyone might go to any court and obtain an injunction. The Norris-LaGuardia Act stopped that very unjust practice, and no one, especially myself, wanted to see that practice restored. But, Mr. President, it should be noted that with respect to things done in our defense plants which were contrary to the national policy, the right to apply for injunction was limited to the Attorney General of the United States under the bill which was introduced in 1941. It was only the Government of the United States which could proceed to bring about an injunction, with the proper review, so that the national effort in regard to the national defense could go forward in an orderly way, and not be interfered with by disorderly processes. That much at least should be said at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious we cannot dispose of the bill or the amendments this afternoon. I suggest, therefore, that we suspend consideration of the bill now. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has a matter he wishes to bring up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I simply wish to make one brief observation. So far as section 4 is concerned certain Senators have objected to some of its language. They fear that it might make it an offense for a man to strike. I wish to say that I have no desire to do anything of that kind. I do not want to make the bill harsh. I hope that Senators will overnight give consideration to any suggestion they desire to make in respect to change of that language.

Mr. President, on page 4, line 6, I am perfectly willing to eliminate the words "or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce"; on the same page, line 7, to strike out the words "or continue to interfere"; and on the same page, in line 15, to strike out the word "or things of value"; so that the language beginning in line 14 will be "funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein."

Then I am willing to insert after the end of section 4, in line 17, the following provision:

> No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

I make this statement in the RECORD of what I am willing to concede with respect to section 4 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I shall be very glad to have other suggestions from Senators tomorrow in the form of amendments.

Furthermore, Mr. President, on page 4, line 16, I propose to strike out the words "or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. I have another suggestion which I am sure the Senator will accept.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. WAGNER. On page 4, line 23, after the word "shown" I should like to insert what I am sure the Senator intended to insert, but which is not there, "but solely on application of the Attorney General"; so that an injunction cannot be applied for in the district court except by the Attorney General.

Mr. CONNALLY. By the Attorney General or, under his direction, by the district attorney.

Mr. WAGNER. Well, that would be under his direction.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to that, if the Senator will offer it in the morning.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted to him a number of changes to be made in section 4.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have just indicated a number of changes which it would be agreeable to me to have made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have offered an amendment which I shall ask be considered tomorrow. My amendment simply carries out the suggestions I have made today to the Senator. The amendment I have offered includes all the suggestions I have made today to the Senator, with the possible exception of one which I shall now point out, and which I shall ask to have agreed to. I refer to the words "or things of value," in section 4, line 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. I proposed to strike out the words "or things of value."

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that will make the language conform to what I suggested.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that the bill in one form or another has been before the Senate for approximately a year and a half. I have no particular pride of authorship; but, so far as I recall, this is the first time in all the years I have served in the Senate that we have had before us any measure dealing with these subjects.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator's remark provokes me to make the following inquiry: Three new Republican members were added to the Judiciary Committee as it was organized in January of this year. Has the bill been before that committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. It has; and it—this bill—was favorably reported by that committee, except for the sections which I have recently proposed to add.

Mr. McNARY. That is the bill which was on the calendar; is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but we had to introduce it at the present session of Congress, and had to have it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I want to know.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; we did that.

Mr. McNARY. The bill which passed the Senate 2 years ago was again brought before the Committee on the Judiciary with its present personnel this year; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And the bill was reported by that committee; was it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, what I have just said has no reference to the Taft amendment or the amendments now proposed by the able senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is very true, Mr. President. I did not have the amendments in the bill originally, because heretofore I realized it would be very difficult to pass any radical measure. Nevertheless, for a long period of time I have wanted to bring up the bill. I did not bring it up solely because of the coal strike, because the bill has been pending for a year and a half when no coal strike

was going on. However, as I have previously stated, when Mr. Lewis testified before the Truman committee that he did not regard as binding the no-strike agreement he had entered into, and when he indicated that he would pursue his own course without regard to his obligations under that agreement or promise, I thought that was a good time to bring up the bill. But the RECORD will show that even before that time I indicated a desire to bring up the bill, and had colloquies with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] about the bill, and he indicated that later on the bill would be considered.

So I hope the Senate will understand that I have no other purpose than to serve the public interest. I do not want to be harsh or arbitrary about the measure. I am agreeable to accepting any amendment which will improve the bill, but I want to say that in all this tremendous Government activity and crisis the Congress of the United States should have a part. It should pass the necessary laws, not leave and entrust everything to the power of the Executive. I am not hostile to the Executive, as all Members of the Senate know; but, Mr. President, the people of the United States expect the Congress to assert its authority and to give to the executive departments whatever power is necessary in order to meet the crisis now confronting us and to meet any other crises we may face.

Mr. President, the bill is a general bill; it applies to every situation. It may be needed 6 months from now in connection with a situation occurring in an airplane factory or in a cannon factory or in any other factory producing munitions of war or other war supplies. It is intended to cover the whole field. Certainly it is better to legislate now. Senators say they do not want to legislate in haste and passion. It is better to legislate now, before controversies arise, so that we may not be met with a charge that we seek to correct only one situation.

Mr. President, I am not seeking to correct only one situation. I am seeking to correct every situation falling within the terms of the bill. I am seeking to anticipate such things and, by anticipating, to make them impossible. I hope that all other Members of the Senate will consider this measure during the evening, and will consider it carefully and constructively.

I do not want the bill to be sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary. I regret that the majority leader, the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], has, in effect, suggested that the bill should go back to that committee. He has said that the Committee on the Judiciary has been at fault. I deny that the committee has been at fault. It gave this matter careful consideration over a period of a year and a half. It sought to get consideration of the measure on the floor of the Senate, but never was able to obtain consideration by the Senate of the bill as originally introduced. That bill was not subject to some of the objections which now are urged against the pending bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary has served the country in a very useful way in the production of this measure and in its consideration. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings held before the committee. At the hearings the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, urged the passage of the original bill, and said it was needed, and would meet the situation. Mr. Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, appeared at the hearings and testified that he approved the bill, and that it would meet the situation and would solve their difficulties. Admiral Land, the chairman of the Maritime Commission, although wanting something stronger and more vigorous, said that the bill would go a long way toward solving their difficulties in the matter of building ships and in connection with shipbuilding plants.

Conditions have changed, it is true; but, Mr. President, they have not changed for the good, they have changed for the worse. If the passage of the bill was necessary back yonder, more than a year ago, according to the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy, it is tenfold more necessary now when the present crises and dangers hedge us about.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not undertake to side-step this matter by sending the bill back to the committee, but will face it.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not take my observations earlier in the afternoon as any reflection on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not want to do so, but the Senator said the Committee on the Judiciary was at fault.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did say that. What I had in mind was that the hearings to which the Senator has referred were held before any War Labor Board was set up——

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. And before anything was done. I do think the committee would have served he Senate if, after the War Labor Board had been set up and after the so-called formula had been promulgated, in the light of those changes the committee had studied the measure and had inquired as to what effect the original bill, upon which it held hearings, would have on those proceedings.

In the light of the committee's failure to do so—probably through oversight—it has become necessary to attempt to modify and correct the bill on the floor of the Senate, a procedure which I regard as regrettable.

The Committee on the Judiciary is one of the great committees of the Senate, and in all its history it has performed an outstanding service to the country; but I think it unfortunate that it did not bring its hearings down to date to the extent of considering the new situation created by the President's Executive order setting up the War Labor Board and the formula under which it has operated.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his remarks; but I say that that was one small part of an amendment I offered the other day, and which was readily agreed to—an amendment substituting the War Labor Board for the originally proposed Defense Wage Board. So in that respect I think there is no need for controversy or for the committee to go into its room, shut the door, pull down the blinds, and turn on the electric lights, to see whether we should take out the provision for the old board or put in that for the War Labor Board. In that connection there was no objection or complaint, and in that respect I do not consider that we were very derelict.

So, Mr. President, I hope that overnight the Senate will study the bill and will try to understand it. I have no purpose other than to be constructive. I hope that the Senate will consider the bill and dispose of it, not send it back to the committee for another tussle.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, warning that the prices of food have "reached a point so high that the future of our war effort is most seriously threatened," Secretary-Treasurer George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor, on Friday last called upon President Roosevelt to order the Office of Price Administration to roll back retail food prices "within a definite, specific period of time" to the levels of May 15, 1942.

In a Nation-wide radio broadcast the plain-talking labor leader branded price control in regard to food "a miserable failure" and quoted actual prices of simple, basic foods in American cities today in substantiation of his charge. He listed many foods which have gone up 100 percent or more since January 1941 and one which has risen 275 percent.

A Flying Fortress is a wonderful instrument of war—

Mr. Meany declared—

but if it has no fuel it cannot get off the ground. The American worker, as figures prove, is a wonderful producer, but if he does not have sufficient nourishing food in his stomach, he cannot do a job at top speed and at peak efficiency.

Speaking over the Mutual System—from WOR, New York—the A. F. of L. secretary-treasurer said:

Holding the present line on food prices is not enough. The American people are already over their heads. Prices on food staples must be rolled back.

Can we expect this to be done under the present governmental policy? Obviously not. According to the senior assistant to the Director of the Office of Price Administration, in a remark of 3 or 4 days ago, there is nothing in the President's hold-the-line Executive order of April 8 to prevent price adjustments. This statement was evidently made to appease certain food producers by indicating that the President's order did not prevent the Office of Price Administration from allowing prices to go even higher than they are today.

Pointing out that the men and women of American labor are producing planes, ships, tanks, guns, and ammunition "at the fastest rates ever attained," Mr. Meany said:

The cost of food, generally, has doubled in the past 2 years. What does this mean to the American worker and to his wife and

family? It means that the American housewife, confronted with such sky-high prices and desiring to discharge her responsibility of keeping the war workers in her family nourished so that they can produce for victory, has no alternative but to pass up the foods which are essential to a balanced diet but which are now beyond the reach of the average family's pocketbook.

Mr. Meany conceded that many workers are now earning more than they formerly made, but emphasized that many workers, millions of them, "have received no increase in pay in the last 3 years, or have received purely nominal increases amounting to 3 or 5 cents an hour, or $1.50 to $2 per week." The average pay envelope for all manufacturing industries, including the war industries, holds only $41 each week, he said.

Mr. Meany asked that President Roosevelt, under his wartime powers, issue an Executive order to the O. P. A. "not stating in general terms that food prices should be held down, but stating in definite, specific terms that retail food prices must be rolled back within a definite, specific period of time to the levels which prevailed on May 15, 1942."

Only in this way—

Said the A. F. of L. leader—

can the American worker be assured that he will be unhampered in his efforts to perform the tasks that he is not only willing to do but that he is anxious to do—to produce all the weapons of war that our Nation needs for final and complete victory.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Meany be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this titanic world struggle in which our Nation is playing a most vital part, production of war essentials and final victory itself are inevitably tied to the question of food.

The importance of food in wartime—both on the battle front and on the home front—cannot be overemphasized. We are at war against a tough, vicious enemy who has never underestimated the importance of food as a weapon of war.

To win this war all of us must fight harder and work harder than ever before. Everything we do, as a people, must be measured by its effect on our fighting power at the battle front and on our production power on the home front.

It is in this spirit that I speak tonight about the most serious problem that the American worker faces today in his efforts to produce the things our boys at the front need to bring final and complete victory.

The record of the American worker in the war to date gives him the right to be heard through his chosen representatives in a spirit of constructive criticism on any matter which affects our war effort. This record has two sides.

The American soldier and the American worker are one and the same man. As I speak to you tonight, millions of men from the families of American working people are already in uniform and, as our Nation during the next few months selects an additional 4,000,000 men for fighting, it is safe to assume that most of them—as in the case of those already in uniform—will come from the homes of American wage earners.

In an all-out war the fighting men depend upon the home front—the production front. And so the other side of American labor's record in this war is being made here at home. Here we find millions of American workers, men and women who hate Hitlerism and totalitarianism in any form, turning out planes, ships, tanks, guns and all the other necessary implements of warfare.

These men and women of labor are producing these planes, ships, and other articles at the fastest rates ever attained—faster than they are being produced in Great Britain and in Russia, faster than they are being produced in Germany and Japan.

Let me give you, in passing, just a few figures on our production. In the short month of February American wage earners turned out, among other things, 419,000 bombs, 8,000 cannon for aircraft, 2,500 tanks, 14,000 Army trucks and 75,000 machine guns. Last month, the month of March, our shipyards delivered a total of 146 Liberty ships, just a little less than five 10,000-ton cargo ships per day. This month, April, as Donald Nelson said the other day, our aircraft plants are turning out 7,000 warplanes.

This is what American labor is doing here at home. Yet, amazing as this record is, we are determined to step it up and then step it up again. It is no military secret that war production must be greatly increased to supply the amounts needed for victory.

In the face of these imperative demands upon our war production American labor today finds itself squeezed between the jaws of an economic vise. On the one hand we find wages practically frozen by a Government decree that has, to all intents and purposes, made the Little Steel formula the law of the land. On the other hand, we find a steady and continuous rise in prices of all the commodities that are essential to the maintenance of a standard of living under which the workers of our country would be able to meet the tremendous demands made upon them.

Let us look for a moment at one of the horns of labor's dilemma—the Little Steel formula. This formula, first enunciated by the War Labor Board about 1 year ago, is based on the arbitrary assumption that there was a reasonable and proper balance between wages and living costs on January 1, 1941. The idea back of the formula was to maintain that balance so that neither wages nor living costs would get out of hand and thereby cause a rising spiral and eventual inflation.

In this connection let me state emphatically that labor is just as aware of the dangers of inflation as are the economic theorists.

When the War Labor Board, about one year ago, ascertained by official figures that the cost of living had risen by 15 percent between January 1941 and May 1942, it assumed that wages should increase 15 percent to compensate for this rise in the cost of living and thereby maintain the theoretical balance.

Now we find that, although the cost of living has advanced quite rapidly since May 1942, the 15 percent then allowed to compensate for the increase, up to that time, is all that is now going to be allowed.

Labor objected to the Little Steel formula when it was first adopted by the War Labor Board, but when a decision was reached by majority vote the labor members of the Board cooperated wholeheartedly in applying this formula to the wage stabilization problem.

Now, let us look at the other side of the picture. Let us look specifically at the one item that is the largest single factor in the cost of living, which we have been trying so hard to keep in balance with wages. This item is food.

What has happened to food prices? What has happened to the prices that our Government agency in charge of price control has told us, time and time again, would be held down? Have food prices been held in check? Are food prices under control? Or are they already so out of bounds as to constitute not only a rank injustice to the American people but an actual threat to our war effort?

Mr. American Citizen, you know the answers to these questions. Or if you do not happen to know, your wife certainly does. Just ask her. There isn't a housewife in America who has not had the answer pressed home to her day after day in her trips to the grocery store, the meat market, and the vegetable stand.

Are food prices being held down? The answer is a loud, resounding "no." Are food prices too high? Emphatically, yes. They have reached a point so high that the future of our war effort is most seriously threatened. The truth is that price control by Government, insofar as it relates to food in this country, has been a miserable failure.

Let us be specific about this. Let us look at retail cash prices from the markets of an industrial city in the Midwest—a typical American community. Prices on staple food articles, verified by newspaper advertisements from this city, are quoted in full in this month's Federationist, the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor. What do we find here? Potatoes—just plain potatoes—which cost 25 cents a peck in January 1941, now cost 89 cents a peck. This, in terms of percentage, represents an increase of approximately 250 percent. Wage rates for millions of American workers are held down to 15 percent; but potatoes, one of the workers' staple foods, are up 250 percent.

The price of hamburger, in this same city, has gone from 17½ cents a pound to 45 cents a pound in the same period of time. Cabbage has gone from 5 cents to 15 cents per pound. Boiled ham, which so many workers use for sandwiches taken to the shop for lunch, has gone up from 35 cents a pound to 75 cents a pound in this same industrial city.

Let me give you some figures secured from another of our American industrial cities by an American Federation of Labor survey, made on the basis of present cash prices as against prices quoted in newspaper advertisements in January 1941. What do we find in this town?

Bread up 22 percent. Butter up 69 percent. Milk up 18 percent. Oranges up 116 percent. Cucumbers up 141 percent. Green peppers up 275 percent. And potatoes up 219 percent. In the meat line, in this same town, we find hamburger up 172 percent, pork chops 113 percent, lamb 105 percent, boiled ham 212 percent.

While these examples I have given refer to but two cities, our information in Washington indicates that this condition prevails in every city in the Nation.

In short, despite what some statisticians may tell us as to the cost of a theoretical meal for a theoretical worker in a theoretical city, the workers of America and their wives know that the cost of food, generally, has doubled in the past 2 years.

What does this mean to the American worker and to his wife and family? It means that the American housewife, confronted with such sky-high prices and desiring to discharge her responsibility of keeping the war workers in her family nourished so that they can produce for victory, has no alternative but to pass up the foods which are essential to a balanced diet but which are now beyond the reach of the average family's pocketbook. It means that, with wages practically frozen, the steady, continuous advance in food prices represents a steady, continuous decrease in real wages for the American worker.

In effect, it means that his standard of living—a wartime standard, if you please—is slowly but surely being destroyed.

It is quite true that many workers are now earning more than they formerly made,

but it is also true that millions of workers have received no increase in pay in the last 3 years, or have received purely nominal increases amounting to 3 to 5 cents an hour, or $1.50 to $2 per week.

The average worker in nondurable goods is earning $32 a week. The average worker in durable goods, which category includes all the war industries, has a take-home pay of $47 per week. The average pay envelope for all manufacturing holds $41. This is the actual average for take-home pay in all manufacturing industries, including overtime as well as straight weekly earnings. These are official United States Government figures—figures compiled from the Nation's pay rolls.

Forty-one dollars per week for a man and his family in a war industry does not mean inflation or extravagance, even in ordinary times, yet millions get far less than this. From this sum must come rent, shoes, clothing, insurance, medicine, taxes and—most important of all—food. Let us remember, in this connection, that the low-paid worker is now paying a heavy tax which was placed on his shoulders since the May 15, 1942, wage freeze date as embodied in the Little Steel formula.

March 15 of this year meant that the average American had to pay out a large income tax in addition to the hidden taxes that he always pays on consumer goods. Labor has no protest against paying its share of the cost of preserving our democratic way of life, but in terms of war production—which must be our controlling yardstick in measuring all of our activities—money for food must take priority in the worker's budget over money to be laid aside for taxes.

The worker must have food of sufficient nutritional value to enable him to produce at a rate which industrial history has never heretofore known. A flying fortress is a wonderful instrument of war, but if it has no fuel it cannot get off the ground. The American worker, as figures prove, is a wonderful producer, but if he does not have sufficient nourishing food in his stomach he cannot do a job at top speed and at peak efficiency.

Let me make it clear at this point that labor has no complaint or protest against the policy of food rationing. Labor has been in favor of rationing from the start. To workers, rationing means that the person with a small income gets a fair share of the foods available; provided always, however, that he has the money to pay for what he needs. Neither is labor protesting against lend-lease shipments of food to our fighting allies. The American worker knows that a pound of butter for a Russian soldier or a can of bully beef for a British soldier in Tunisia is food for our defense. We have favored rationing, we have favored lend-lease, we have favored price and wage control.

We have wage control. The War Labor Board, under the Executive order of the President, has done a real job of stabilizing wages. We have not had and do not have effective price control insofar as food is concerned.

What then is the answer to the dilemma of the American worker today? His wages are practically frozen and food prices are skyrocketing to a point where sufficient food for the worker and his family is beyond the capacity of his pay envelope. The answer is simply this:

Let us reestablish the balance between wages and food prices by pushing back the retail cash prices of all food staples to the lev l which prevailed on May 15, 1942, which is the date used to control wages under the Little Steel formula. Holding the present line on food prices is not enough. The American people are already over their heads. Prices on food staples must be rolled back.

Can we expect this to be done under the present governmental policy? Obviously not. According to the senior assistant to the Director of Office of Price Administration, in a remark of 3 or 4 days ago, there is nothing in the President's hold-the-line Executive order of April 8 to prevent price adustments. This statement was evidently made to appease certain food producers by indicating that the President's order did not prevent Office of Price Administration from allowing prices to go even higher than they are today.

The answer appears to lie in an application of the same method by which the lid has been put on wages. Under the President's wartime powers an Executive order to Office of Price Administration should be issued, not stating in general terms that food prices should be held down, but stating in definite, specific terms that retail food prices must be rolled back within a definite, specific period of time to the levels which prevailed on May 15, 1942.

Only in this way can the American worker be assured that he will be unhampered in his efforts to perform the tasks that he is not only willing to do but that he is anxious to do—to produce all the weapons of war that our Nation needs for final and complete victory over the forces which are attempting to destroy everything the American worker holds dear.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House Joint Resolution 115, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 4, 1943.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said joint resolution with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"War Training Service: For pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status, while undergoing training or during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment numbered 5 is not satisfactory to the War Department, in that it provides that the $50 a month may be paid to enlisted reservists on an inactive status. The Senate will remember that what we are seeking to do is to compensate a group of young men who have been taking pilot training under the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Army officials with whom we have consulted feel very keenly that if we establish a precedent by paying enlisted reservists on an inactive status it will rise to haunt us, because there are a great many men in that situation, who say that they are waiting around expecting to be called into service and that they ought to be paid for it.

I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I now submit and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

War training service: Pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein, while undergoing training under supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration war training service and during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the words substituted for the House language are "to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein."

We agree with the House change, that the period of waiting between assignments shall be reduced to 2 months.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has been very keenly interested in this matter, and I wish he would join me in a brief explanation to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when this matter first came up on the floor of the Senate I agreed with Senators who felt that these men were entitled to receive some compensation, but I very definitely did not agree with the language which was used to put it into effect, because it seemed to me that that language would open the door to a great many other persons whose claim was not nearly so good.

I am heartily in accord with the amendment which the Senator from Arizona offers. It achieves the end which the Senate has in view, and it defines those who are to be the recipients of this money in a way which is satisfactory, but it does not open the door to a great number of other possible claimants who would have no right to receive compensation. Therefore, I believe that this amendment carries out what the Senate had in mind when the question was before us on the 26th of April, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that all that is involved is a question of language which will define the group which we desire to compensate, and inasmuch as it was the amendment of the Senator from Nevada which was adopted by the Senate, I wish to say that we worked on the problem this afternoon in an effort to frame language which would define the group, and the amendment now offered by the Senator from Arizona is entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

A WAR CREED FOR AMERICANS—EDITORIAL FROM HOLDENVILLE (OKLA.) DAILY NEWS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD

as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "A War Creed for Americans," written by Col. John F. Easley, editor of the Daily Ardmorite, Ardmore, Okla., and thereafter printed in the Holdenville Daily News of April 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAR CREED FOR AMERICANS!

(By Col. John F. Easley, Editor, Daily Ardmorite, Ardmore, Okla.)

I shall not parade the faults of my country. Though they may be legion, yet they are far less than those of any foreign country.

When I see something I am sure is a fault, I shall take it up immediately with those at its source.

If I parade the faults of a friend, I cease to be his friend but, instead, become his enemy.

If I continue in daily bitter criticism against my country then I cease to be its friend.

If I am not its friend, then I am its enemy—and, God forbid.

If I am an enemy then I am committing treason against my country, and again I say, God forbid.

I may not be the most profound scholar in my profession but I do have sense enough to be loyal to my country.

I may never be America's greatest fighting man, but I do have strength enough and courage enough to be an American patriot.

I may not be America's richest man, but in this hour of my country's peril I can bring all I have and lay it upon its altar.

Patriotism cannot demand more; my country should not be required to accept less.

My pledge is that from this day on I shall forget the past and look steadfastly to my country's present need and seek with all my might to supply it.

I shall put winning this war in first place and shall leave economic questions alone until victory.

I shall not allow all the bitterness expressed against my country's war effort to embitter me against my country, for I owe all I have, even life itself, to the men in the armed service of my country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and/or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission in the Washington office and in various States.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN S. CHANDLER, JR.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have been informed by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that there is an agreement between him and the chairman of the committee that he may have until Thursday of this week to file minority views. Therefore it would not be suitable to bring it up tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will proceed to state the remaining nominations.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester S. Dishong to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. McDonnell, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Kemper, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald S. Shaver to be postmaster at Ely, Nev.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. John Lesesne DeWitt, United States Army, now invested with the rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Fourth Army.

Maj. Gen. Ben Lear, United States Army, now invested with the rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Second Army.

Maj. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., (brigadier general, United States Army), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Reed Hodge (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Bernard Larkin (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William E. Kepner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hugh Joseph Gaffey (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clements McMullen (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Gale Breene (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Julius Easton Slack (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Eugene Harriman (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frederick von Harten Kimble (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Leo Donovan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Seelye Arms (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Dean Coldwell Strother (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. Oscar Bergstrom Abbott (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Bartlett Murphy (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Glen Clifford Jamison (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Gaulbert Weaver, Infantry.

Col. Robert Battey McClure (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul California Wilkins (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cecil Ray Moore (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. George Corwin Beach, Jr., Medical Corps.

Col. Egbert Frank Bullene (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Warfare Service), Army of the United States.

Col. Arthur William Pence (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Sidney Erickson, Infantry.

Col. William Oliver Reeder (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Falligant Travis (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. Edward Brigham McKinley (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Daviess Patrick (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Aaron Bradshaw, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ludson Dixon Worsham (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. John Ferral McBlain (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Benton Sayler (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. John Henry Gardner (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Charles Palmer Bartholf, Infantry.

Col. Harold Napoleon Gilbert (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. George Eitle Hartman (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Emil Charles Kiel (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edmond Harrison Leavey (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Harry Frank Thompson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Martinus Stenseth (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Harvard Goldthwaite, Medical Corps.

Col. Joseph Augustus Baer, United States Army.

Col. Uzal Girard Ent (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. George Anthony Horkan (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Calvin DeWitt, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Gilbert Xavier Cheves (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lucas Victor Beau, jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Washington Curtis (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Glenn Oscar Barcus (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Andrew Porter (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edgar Peter Sorensen (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Burton Sweet (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Arthur Barnes (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Camm (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Benjamin Kean (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Brooks Bradford (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Arthur Hazelton Carter (colonel, Inactive Reserve), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Robert Wood Johnson, Army of the United States.

Col. John Merryman Franklin, Army of the United States.

Col. Boykin Cabell Wright, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Carleton F. Bryant to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of September 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of May 3) 1943.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Chester S. Dishong to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida.

William H. McDonnell to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Charles E. Kemper to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

POSTMASTER

NEVADA

Donald S. Shaver, Ely.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose seal is on all Thy works, take out of our hearts all resentment and unworthy ambition. We pray that the spirit of the Lord may be magnified in human weakness and that we may carry ourselves as becometh the sons of God. O Thou who art the path, the goal, and all that is and evermore shalt be, keep us from that fatal delusion which extends intellectual boundaries and contracts spiritual frontiers; give deliverance to any who, having a form of godliness, yet deny and freeze the springs of the immortal soul.

O Master, lead on and on the better processes of our natures, inspiring us to meet the claims of Thy holy will and ever to feel the constraints which are upon us. Thou who givest abundantly, instill into our lives the living truth that our love and faith are tested by what we are willing to suffer and sacrifice; Thou hast appointed a cross for everyone who is to wear the crown. Let us know of that peace which is experienced on those fair tablelands of the soul, where the abiding values of life are revealed and which surpass all the dreams of time. There fears are torn away and Thy presence beats a pathway through the tides of sin and sorrow, and nothing will ever eclipse the glory of our Saviour. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled, "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Post Office Department.
3. Department of War.
4. Executive Office of the President.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have all agreed that the amendments which have been added to this bill by the Senate, with the exception of No. 5, should be concurred in. Therefore, I suggest that the chairman ask unanimous consent to concur in these items en masse when we get to them and not take up any more time than we should.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has stated the situation very accurately. There are nine amendments here in eight of which we wish to concur without amendment. On one amendment we we shall move to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, after line 5 insert the following:

"LEGISLATIVE

"SENATE

"Senate Restaurants: For payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with the act approved September 9, 1942 (Public, 709, 77th Cong.), fiscal year 1943, $10,000."

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 9, after "and" insert "not to exceed $14,000 additional or a limit of."

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 8, after "expended" insert "not to exceed $2,000 additional or a limit of."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, after line 11 insert the following:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

"For an additional amount for dust prevention, sweeping and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $57,000.

"For an additional amount to enable the Commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, and so forth, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $190,000.

"DIVISION OF EXPENSES

"The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 4, after line 18 insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"FOREIGN INTERCOURSE

"Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers: Effective March 25, 1943, the appropriation 'Salaries, Ambassadors and Ministers,' contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be available for salaries of Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua, at the rate of $10,000 per annum each."

Senate amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9: Page 5, after line 2 insert the following:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

"Division of Disbursements, salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses,' fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, $550,000.

"SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

"Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For an additional amount for 'Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes,' fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, $28,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the Senate amendments:

Senate amendment No. 1 provides $10,000 additional for Senate restaurant, fiscal year 1943.

Senate amendments Nos. 2 and 3 are form amendments. They make no change in the purport or money in the House text.

Senate amendment No. 4 provides for the District of Columbia, payable from District revenues, as follows: Street Cleaning Department, $57,000; collection and disposal of refuse, $190,000. Increase for street cleaning is due to wage scale increase for per diem employees effective December 1, 1942, not provided in original appropriation. Increase for collection and disposal of garbage due to three items: Increase in wages of per diem employees effective December 1, 1942, $120,000; salvage campaign—scrap metal, tin, and so forth—$25,000; and increased volume of work, $45,000.

Senate amendment No. 6 makes existing appropriations available to pay salaries of our representatives as heads of missions in seven Central American countries as ambassadors instead of as ministers. There is no change in salary. These changes have been made and ambassadors have all been confirmed as of March 26, 1943. These countries have likewise raised their missions from legations to embassies in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. What does the gentleman understand to be the difference between a minister and an ambassador other than the fact that a minister deals through subordinates of a foreign power, while an ambassador deals directly with the head of the government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no other essential difference. The change is necessitated by the increased burden of diplomatic exchanges with our sister nations in Central and South America. It is also indicative of the warm friendship and close cooperation between the nations of the western continent.

Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 8 appropriates $550,000 additional for Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, due to increased volume of checks issued over those estimated and to handling War Savings bond purchases of Government employees through payroll deductions.

Senate amendment No. 9 increases the Secret Service appropriation by $28,000 in connection with protection of the President, obviously needed in time of war.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment No. 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 2, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"War Training Service: Pay at a rate of $50 per month to persons, not on active service or training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States, who are undergoing flying training under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service, or who have successfully completed any such course of training and are awaiting order or assignment to advance courses under the direction or supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or to active service or training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States, fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 5 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 5 to House Joint Resolution No. 115 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"War Training Service: For pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status, while undergoing training or during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 5 provides pay for inactive Army Reservists in training under the Civilian Aeronautics Administration. This amount is retroactive to December 15, 1942.

Approximately 14,000 in the Army Reserve placed in inactive status to take flying training from Civil Aeronautics were urged to take these courses by Army and Civil Aeronautics and expected to be through in 6 to 11 months. However, due to shortage of training planes these courses have been delayed. Naval Reservists, training at the same fields with these men, have been paid $75 per month during their training by the Navy. This amendment proposes to eliminate this discrimination.

The substitute offered by committee proposes to pay these Army inactive Reservists at $50 per month from December 15, the same date on which Naval Reservists began training at $75 per month, until their courses are finished. Pay while waiting between courses is to be limited by the proposed language to not to exceed 2 months. If they wait longer it will be without pay.

The Senate language is faulty in that it takes in certain classes of trainees who are already being paid and should not receive double pay, and is much broader than the language proposed by the House.

Many of these men gave up jobs to take these courses, and have been forced to wait on their training without compensation. They are not suitable for combat pilots, but are eligible to qualify in other flying capacities such as glider pilots, civilian pilots, and so forth, and are entitled to this compensation and recognition.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and

include a very interesting article by Robert Norton that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of last Sunday.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGÁN] may have permission to extend his remarks and include certain remarks of Raphael Carrion, of Puerto Rico, before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affars on May 3, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Atcheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a tribute paid to Mr. William Randolph Hearst on the anniversary of his eightieth birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WELCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] be granted leave of absence until May 24, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include several clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a set of resolutions of the Lucas County Conservation Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Detroit News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FAMILY WEEK

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include in my remarks an editorial from the Tablet, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RABAUT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an estimate from the Government Printer on the inclusion in the Appendix of an article by John Pearson, which I would like to include. They say it will run 2⅔ pages and will cost $120. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRADE TREATY ACT—PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means may have permission until tomorrow midnight to file separate views on the joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under the Trade Treaty Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial from the Endicott Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, last night I listened to Mr. William L. Shirer, in his regular evening comment, and he had something to say about the food parley which is soon to be held in Hot Springs, Va. It seems that they are going to allow the newsmen as far as the courtyard of the hotel in which the conference is to be held. The powers that be will allow them to talk to the delegates from the yard, but will not allow them to go inside into the conference room, where the wires will be pulled. Mr. Shirer also said that he has attended some of these conferences and that the the only ones from which he had ever known newspapermen to be barred were the two which were presided over by Adolf Hitler—a commentary into which I think the White House should look and take note of before it persists with the present arrangement of doing business behind closed doors.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by inserting an article on the Reverend Father George Hilner, one of the eminent clergyman and agricultural scientists of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that following my remarks, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, upon the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, information comes to the members of the Committee on Agriculture that thousands of acres of tomatoes, peas, beans, and other vegetables are going to rot because of inaction on the part of the War Labor Board to permit a slight increase in wages in order to secure labor to harvest and can those crops. Our country is on the verge of a tremendous shortage of food in the large consuming areas of the United States. It seems to me it is about time for the Members of the House and Senate as representatives of the people to take some action which will force our key agencies to act in order to get food for the people of this country. The situation is critical and action must be taken now if we are going to get canned vegetables for the people of America, our armed forces, and our allies.

Waste of food should not be tolerated. When a governmental agency prevents the employment of workers to harvest and process canned foods, it is criminal waste, and believe me, when the shortages appear next winter and the people are not able to secure food, the responsibility for the shortages will be laid on the doorsteps of the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, and other Federal agencies. If any Member is interested, I would suggest that you call on the War Labor Board to find out why they are not permitting a slight increase in wages so as to permit canners to hire workers to harvest and can the crop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add to some remarks that I will make today some charts which I propose to explain.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I filed at the Clerk's desk a request that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] be excused. I understand that request was lost in the shuffle somewhere yesterday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] be excused as of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial from the Senate and House of the State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT BILL OF 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2570, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first, the Ruml tax plan means releasing or giving away by the Government of $10,000,000,000. In a time of great depression or deflation it could possibly be defended, but it cannot under any circumstances be defended at a time when our country is facing ruinous inflation. The releasing of this much money at a time like now, when we have so much excessive purchasing power, would start us on the road toward the German type of inflation.

Second. If the Ruml plan is adopted and $10,000,000,000 is given to income-tax payers on money that was earned last year and upon which the taxpayers are expecting to pay, it will compel the Government to seek this money through printing-press sources, so the proposal is tantamount to a printing-press money proposition.

Third. At this time we should be interested in mopping up or absorbing all possible purchasing power through sales of bonds and stamps and other methods and should not, under any circumstances, resort to releasing $10,000,000,000 at a time when it is calculated to cause runaway inflation.

Fourth. The Ruml plan will cost $20,000,000,000 instead of $10,000,000,000. If $10,000,000,000 is given away by the Government, that amount will have to be replaced by borrowing from commercial banks which create the money to furnish to the Government. Interest will have to be paid. By the time long-term bonds are paid, as much is paid in interest as on the principal. Our debt is now so large that possibly $2 or $3 interest will be paid on every $1 principal, so the Ruml plan will cost not only the $10,000,000,000 but will cost $20,000,000,000 or more by the time the debt is paid to pay the cost of the Ruml plan.

Fifth. The Ruml plan will force a sales tax, which will result in placing our Congress in the idiotic position of giving war millionaires the profits that they made in 1942 and replacing the money with the pennies from the poor through a sales tax. In other words, the Ruml plan means releasing money paid upon ability to pay and requiring the poor to make up for it.

Sixth. A fight for the Ruml plan is a fight for the rich and against the poor.

Seventh. The Ruml plan is nothing more nor less than a $10,000,000,000 bonus. Much of it will go to war millionaires. I cannot understand why the Republican Party can afford not to support the Democrats' plea that there will be no millionaires made in this war. The Ruml plan will start off with making war millionaires. It represents a bonus to the rich. It will give one citizen nothing, another $5 and another $5,000,000. Some of the highest salaries were made last year, 1942, during the early part of this war before there was sufficient experience for the Government to determine fair profits.

Eighth. The Ruml plan will sabotage the President's efforts to stop inflation. The President has asked for $16,000,000,000 more in taxes. If we give a $10,000,000,000 release instead, we are going in the opposite direction of the President, who is trying to prevent war millionaires and stop inflation.

Ninth. Today our country has a huge dam that is protecting the United States from ruinous or run-away inflation. The base of this dam may be considered price control, which has been very effective and without which we would now be suffering from inflation. Above price control another substantial part of the dam is savings—tied-up capital in war bonds or through other methods. The top of the dam that prevents the great excess of purchasing power may be designated taxes which Congress will require the people to pay to hold back ruinous inflation. The top of that dam now is the $10,000,000,000. If we lower it through the Ruml plan by giving away the $10,000,000,000, the inflationary excess purchasing power will be released and go over the dam and ruin the value of our money.

Tenth. The Ruml plan is in favor of the rich but it will destroy the poor and the middle class. Our people on fixed salaries and fixed incomes cannot survive $100 shoes, $100 hats, and bread that will cost several dollars a loaf.

Eleventh. The so-called soldier's bonus for veterans of World War No. 1 after 1931 amounted to about $2,000,000,000 Some of the same people who are now clamoring for the Ruml plan, which would give the war profiteers a bonus of $10,000,000,000, were then saying that $2,000,000,000 would break the Government and cause ruinous inflation. The unthrottling or releasing of $10,000,000,000 of purchasing power would put us on the road to ruinous inflation.

Twelfth. Most of the clamor is for a bonus to big taxpayers. That is where most of the noise comes from. Not one of them is willing to say, "Give me $4,000,000 from the United States Treasury" or "Give me $5,000 from the United States Treasury," but the enactment of the so-called Ruml plan would mean just that.

Thirteenth. The two most important problems facing the American people today are:

First. Winning the war.

Second. Preventing inflation.

If the Ruml plan is adopted, even when we win the war, our country will be injured to the extent that our loss will be almost as heavy on the domestic front as if we had lost the war. So let us do both—win the war and prevent inflation.

A vote for the Ruml plan is a vote for a sales tax; a vote for runaway inflation; a vote for printing-press money; and a vote to favor the rich at the expense of the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

It had been my hope that we would be able to conclude this debate by confining remarks to fact and reason, but it appears not. The gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. PATMAN] had displayed an amazing lack of information on the subject on which he spoke. I want to say to the gentleman that under the Carlson plan the Government will not lose a single dime in this year or next year or in any subsequent year.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. I do not yield to any more demagogs.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the words of the gentleman be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. I withdraw them.

Mr. PATMAN. I object to that, Mr. Chairman. I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman take his seat under the rules.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Texas take his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I do not yield to any more demagogs.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Minnesota has no right to speak until this matter is disposed of. I demand that the gentleman take his seat until the matter is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please be seated.

The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and that he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I do not yield to any more demagogs.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the Clerk failed to record sufficient of the gentleman's remarks to make it intelligible. What preceded should have been reported also; otherwise the Speaker is not advised of what the gentleman was talking about.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to supplement what was said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] arose and asked the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] if he would yield. Then is when the gentleman from Minnesota said:

"No; I do not yield to any more demagogs," which was in violation of the rules of the House, as it was an offensive expression used toward the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to that point, not so long ago I rose to a question of personal privilege. The charge was made against me that I was a demagog and was demagoging. I recall very distinctly that at that time the Speaker ruled that that was not a violation of the rule and did not raise the question of personal privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that point, the difference between the present situation and the case referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is that in the case of the gentleman from Michigan it was something said about him in the press. This was language used toward a Member on the floor of the House. "Trifles light as air," a Supreme Court judge once said, "taken in the light of surrounding circumstances, may have a violent import." This was an offensive expression directed at the gentleman from Texas by a Member on the floor of the House and therefore violated the rules of the House.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, may I direct the Speaker's attention to the definition of a demagog? It certainly seems to me that if the gentleman from Texas was in any way affronted by the observation of the gentleman from Minnesota that he should refresh his memory with reference to definitions.

Mr. Webster says that a demagog is—and I quote:

A leader or orator and popular with or identified with the people.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to interrogate the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania read all of the definition?

Mr. DITTER. No, no; but I should like to make the further observation to the Speaker that it neither lies in the Speaker's mind, nor is it possible for the gentleman from Mississippi or the gentleman from Texas to determine which definition the gentleman from Minnesota used. The gentleman from Minnesota might just as well have intended a gracious compliment as an affront of any kind, and I submit that the discretion of the Chair does not permit a latitude by which the Chair can determine which use the gentleman from Minnesota was making of the word.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to say, however, that it was quite apparent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I have just a moment to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]? Evidently the gentleman from Minnesota was thinking in the lower brackets; that is, the definitions the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not read. The gentleman from Minnesota refused to yield to the gentleman from Texas to answer him, which shows that the gentleman from Minnesota was using his expression "in the lower brackets" in an offensive manner to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to have the gentleman read the rest of the definition in the lower bracket.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to call for the regular order pretty soon.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not indulge the patience of the Speaker any further as I feel I have convinced him that he will not overstep the bounds of discretion that he always exercises within proper limitations, and that he will not impute to the gentleman from Minnesota anything other than what he intended.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. Of course, this situation can readily be cured without the Chair having to pass upon the matter. The Chair did pass upon an identical thing some time ago and made a ruling which he is not going to change at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota did ask unanimous consent that the words be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make that request at this time?

Mr. KNUTSON. Only on condition that the Speaker rules in support of the position I have taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair held that words accusing a Member of demagogy did not avoid personalities and he must rule the same way today.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, with this understanding: I think the House has permitted things to go on here that are really a disgrace. We have been calling one another names we should not call, and I believe it is putting the House in disrepute. The minority committee report of the gentleman used that word twice in it in referring to the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, his own colleagues on his own committee, and I think it is going too far. With the understanding that the gentleman will refrain from doing so in the future I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the words be withdrawn?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its session.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2570, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this Carlson-Ruml plan seems to have excited more or less feeling. Just why, it is difficult for me to understand. I do not see how it can be charged that a man is a demagog because he supports or opposes one version or the other. When the bill was before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the 25th of March, you will see that those who supported the Carlson-Ruml plan were charged by a member of the majority with being either fools or scoundrels. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whether that is parliamentary language? The charge was that those who supported the Carlson-Ruml plan were fools or scoundrels. Let us have a rule that applies to both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I challenge the gentleman to find those words in the

majority report. You are putting words in there that are not in there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, but I will answer. I was not referring to the majority report. I was calling attention to language used on the floor of the House on March 29—you will find the words on page 2619 of the RECORD, end of first paragraph, middle column. I yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. If we are to have rules of the House, let us have them apply to all.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if any such language was used on the floor of the House it was in violation of the rules of the House and it was the duty of the gentleman to have the words taken down at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not set myself up as a critic, and I am not a schoolteacher finding fault with everything that is said here. I do not yield any further. You will also find in the RECORD of March 25—page 2494—the charge that those on the minority side who supported the Carlson substitute were accused of stabbing the soldiers in the back. Was that parliamentary language or was it a violation of the rules? Give us a little credit on this side and do not jump on us all the time. We raised no point of order when those charges were made against us. I remember distinctly standing back here on the floor and asking permission to speak on a question of personal privilege because I had been charged with being a demagog and being guilty of demagogery.

The charge was not made against me as an individual, it was made against all of the Members of the House, and, being a Member of the House, it was my contention that it raised a question of personal privilege. The charge was made in an editorial of the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1941, which was entitled "Demagogs at Work." The editorial contained this statement:

> Another District day in the House has come and gone. Again efforts of earnest men to solve intricate District problems have been leered at, jeered at, stamped upon, and discarded by demagogs. (Permanent RECORD, p. 4308.)

The Speaker ruled—permanent RECORD, page 4308—that—

> There is nothing in this matter that refers to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] either individually or in his official capacity. The Chair would hesitate to hold a question of personal privilege of Members of the House lies in a general criticism of the action of the House.

It was my contention then, it would be my contention now, if the question arose, that charging that all Members of the House were demagogs included the charge that an individual was a demagog and raised the question of personal privilege, even though I was not named.

Two precedents from 3 Hines section 1834, and section 1835, sustained that view. Nevertheless, forced to accept the ruling of the Chair, the contention was then made by me that the editorial raised a question of the privilege of the House, inasmuch as it charged that Members of the House were unprincipled politicians; that they sought to make capital of political discontent in order to gain political influence or office.

A demogog is defined by Webster's Collegiate Dictionary as:

> A popular leader or orator; a speaker who seeks to make capital of social discontent and gain political influence.

Webster's unabridged also gives this definition:

> One skilled in arousing the prejudices and passions of the populace by rhetorical, sensational charges, specious arguments, catchwords, cajolery, and so forth, especially a political speaker or leader who seeks thus to make capital of social discontent and incite the populace, usually in the name of some popular cause, in order to gain political influence or office.

Funk & Wagnalls' unabridged defines a demagog as:

> An orator or leader who seeks to influence the people by pandering to their prejudices and passions.
>
> An unprincipled politician.

The Speaker then said—RECORD, page 4308:

> The Chair has Webster's International Dictionary before him, and in that the word "demagog" is defined as follows:
>
> "1. A leader or orator popular with or identified with the people."
>
> It is only fair to say that there is a notation under that that it is obsolete or historical.
>
> "2. One who plays an insincere role in public life for the sake of gain, political influence, or office; a poser in politics; especially one who panders to popular prejudice or seeks to inflame reasonless passions in the advancement of his personal interests."
>
> For the moment at least the Chair would hesitate to hold that the gentleman's resolution is privileged. The Chair assures the gentleman that he would like to look into it further. He would hesitate to hold at this time that the general criticism of Members of the House is a matter so involving the privileges of the House that a resolution of this kind would be in order.

It was then agreed that the matter would be taken up at some subsequent time. Subsequently, if recollection serves correctly—and I am sure it does—the Member from Michigan was advised by the Parliamentarian that inasmuch as there was more than one definition of a demagog, one which held an individual so characterized up to public scorn and the other complimentary, that no one could say that the critical definition was the one intended to be applied. Having been so advised, the Member from the Fourth Michigan District let the matter drop and did not thereafter, as recollection serves, raise that issue. That construction of the term "demagog" would be a correct one if the context surrounding its use or if the circumstances under which it was uttered did not supply the needful interpretation.

It was my contention on that occasion that the unfavorable characterization of a demagog was intended because the editorial itself contained these words:

> House Members were willing to punish the District in the hope that it would win votes back home.

That was a direct charge that the Members of the House voted as they did on that occasion in order to win political support. An unworthy motive, an unjustifiable action, but as stated, the Chair did not officially pass upon the question at the time and an official decision was not sought in the House because of the reason heretofore stated.

If it could not be gathered from that editorial, which the Members if interested will find reprinted on page 4308 of volume 87, part 4, of the permanent RECORD of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, that the term "demagog" was used by way of criticism, I respectfully submit it must have been extremely difficult for the Chair to say that the word "demagog" was today used with the intent that it should carry with it the unfavorable, rather than the favorable, interpretation. Let the rules be the same, whether applied to the membership on the right or the membership on the left of the Chair.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I desire to say that if he heard words used toward a Member that were offensive and in violation of the rules of the House it was his duty to have them taken down. But he must discriminate between language used in a newspaper about a man being a demagog and words thrown into a man's face on the floor of the House in an offensive manner.

I know that I get into as many acrimonious debates as almost any other Member of the House, but I do try to respect the feelings of the other Members. But if I should say anything offensive to a Member or in an offensive manner, then it would be his duty to have those words taken down and move that they be stricken from the RECORD. That is the question before the House at this time.

But as for matters stated in a newspaper about a man's being a demagog, that is entirely different from a Member standing on the floor of this House and in an offensive manner refusing to yield to a man and branding him to his face as a demagog, with all its far-reaching implications.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call to the attention of the Committee that under the unanimous-consent agreement debate was to be upon the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, there is a selection in one of the old readers we used to read when we were children in school, the last sentence of which is this:

> Let us now return to the more important concerns of the day.

We have spent the last 10 or 15 minutes straightening out a little incident that I am sorry occurred.

We have before us today a very important decision to make. I doubt that

it is within the experience of any Member of this House that he has ever known a legislative problem that has excited more general attention in the Republic than this so-called pay-as-you-go tax plan. Everybody has been talking about it for months. When I say "everybody," I mean all the newspapers, all the magazines, the students everywhere in the colleges and in the schools, and the people on the street. The working people, the rich people, the professional people, and everybody else have been tremendously interested.

We are going to decide this matter this afternoon. I feel sure we are going to decide something. I have been sort of ashamed of myself for a long time, and I think practically every member of the Committee on Ways and Means has had the same feeling, in that we have apparently been so futile in our efforts. For 3 or 4 months now we have been wrestling with this proposition and have arrived at no conclusion. Never before in my experience have I seen the Congress or the committee so willing to reject propositions and so ready to refuse to accept or ratify something. We have turned down many plans under many circumstances, in the committee and on the floor of this House, but we have never adopted or passed anything. We have never come to the place yet where we could agree on anything. The people are tired of it and we are going to be criticized very severely if we do not finish this thing up today, and I think we will.

Let me give you a reason or two why we have had all this delay. It is not altogether the fault of the Committee on Ways and Means. It is not altogether the fault of this House. It is largely the fault of the Treasury of the United States. I do not want to place any undue burden on the Treasury of the United States, but the Treasury of the United States in connection with this bill has been unusually active. It has changed its colors and changed its position many times.

In peacetimes the Treasury is not such a very important factor in the congressional set-up of the Government, but in wartimes, when we are spending millions and millions of dollars every day more than we take in, the Treasury should have a policy and it should adhere to it as one would adhere to a principle. But what kind of a policy has the Treasury had in the consideration of this bill?

The first thing the Treasury did was to attack this man Ruml. I do not know why they developed such an antipathy to him. He is one of their own new dealers. I have never heard of him being a Republican. He does not belong on our side. But I have seen it in print many times that they turned it down because he came out with a plan they did not know about.

What did Mr. Ruml do that was at all reprehensible? The first thing he did was to go to the Treasury with his plan. The Treasury gave him no encouragement and then proceeded to bring out a plan of its own. I want to cite to you the different positions the Treasury has taken on this matter to illustrate how vacillating the Treasury has been.

The Treasury came out with a plan of its own, and what was that plan? It got its plan ready and submitted it to different people. Among them was the C. I. O. It got the approval of the C. I. O. What is that plan that the C. I. O. approves today? It is the Forand plan. That is the plan under which the Treasury at that time agreed to forgive $7,600,000,000. You talk about forgiveness. My good friend from Texas said that would break up the Nation. Oh, what a flood of inflation it would open. But the Treasury prepared that bill, and it was O. K.'d by the C. I. O. At that time the Treasury was willing to forgive $7,600,000,000 out of $9,200,000,000.

That bill provides greater forgiveness than any bill except the Carlson bill. Let us not be too ready to put our finger on a lot of hypothetical and theoretical matters such as those presented to us a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Let us confine our discussions to practical matters. What was the next position that the Treasury took? It said, when we had the big fight on the floor of the House a few weeks ago, that they were for the committee bill. That bill was rejected by the House by a tremendous vote. They said they were not willing to forgive anything. They shift with phenomenal alacrity from a bill carrying billions of forgiveness to a bill that the chairman [Mr. DOUGHTON] supported so vigorously. The chairman of the committee had been consistent all the time until now. He did not want forgiveness. The Treasury said, "No; we must not have forgiveness," but today the Treasury comes on with a forgiveness of $5,000,000,000, and so does the chairman, who heretofore has been adamant. That is the great Treasury of the United States. Mr. Morgenthau said at one time that he was in favor of one plan, and the next time he said that he was in favor of something else, and what are we going to do about this today?

We have undertaken and have proven that the Treasury is not to be depended upon. We need pay no more attention to the Treasury. We should now attempt to do what the people desire us to do. The people have had plenty of time to study this proposition. There is only one time under a democracy when a legislator might be justified in rejecting the voice of the people, and that is when the people cannot have had a chance to study a proposition, but when the American people have studied a proposition thoroughly and have had a chance to know and digest it, I tell you that it is then dangerous to turn deaf ear to the voice of the people. The voice of the people is the most potent force in a republic next to the voice of God. The people have decided that they want a pay-as-you go bill. They want to accent both the word "pay" and the word "go." When they pay they want to go some place. In this case when they pay they want to be current. They do not want us to throw their money to the winds. They want to go as well as pay.

What else do they want? They have spoken emphatically that they do not want any doubling up. They have said that emphatically in the newspapers of New York, and the newspapers of Cleveland, and in all the newspapers and magazines of the country, and in other ways. They do not want any doubling up.

Let me discuss for a minute these two plans, the Treasury plan and the Carlson plan. What does the committee bill purport to do? Here is the bill. Let me read the title of the bill. Here it is, "A bill to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes." In other words, they say that they have dedicated themselves to the preparation and enactment of a bill that will do what? Make provision so that the people can be current with their tax paying. What do I mean by that?

My distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] yesterday would have you believe, if I understood correctly, and if I did not understand him correctly I want to be corrected, that a currency in taxation means that if a man were to pay up all his tax installments, one at a time, he is current. That is not what it means. What it means is that if a tax has been levied on you to be paid within a certain time that you will be current only when your taxes are all paid up. That is, if you levy a tax for 1942, you pay it in 1942, and then you are current. Let us see what this bill does. Let us take the new Treasury bill. I do not claim to be an expert, but from a somewhat extensive study of these bills I know that the Carlson bill will give more relief to the average American people than will this makeshift bill which is known as the Doughton committee bill. Why? Because the Carlson bill has elements of currency about it that the other bill does not have. I make that as a positive statement. How can I substantiate that statement?

The Carlson bill, if adopted, in 1943 will make 97 percent of the taxpayers of the country current. There is no question about that. Let me talk about these figures on this blackboard here. I am sorry that I may not be able to make these illustrations very readable for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I shall do my best. Here we have 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946—these are all in a row. And why do I put them there? Because that long line of dates represents the time it takes one to pay his taxes under the committee bill. What do I mean? Last year, the year 1942, it took almost all year, all up to October to pass the 1942 tax bill. Never before in the history of the country that I remember did Congress take so much time to pass a tax bill as we did to pass the 1942 bill, and that was supposed to be a model bill. Let us see what this committee bill does? With reference to the 1942 tax bill it throws the 1942 bill out of the window and it goes back and takes the 1941 tax bill as the measure by which the 1942 taxes are measured. In other words, it applies the 1941 rates to the 1942 income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. JENKINS. It substitutes the 1941 bill for the 1942 bill and throws the 1942 bill out of the window, and for what purpose? They want to practice a little forgiving themselves. They know that the 1941 rates are only about one-half as high as the 1942 rates, and they propose to forgive the difference. The 1942 tax bill brought in 7,000,000 new taxpayers. Seven million people went to a notary public and made their returns last March because of the passage of the 1942 tax bill. That was primarily because the 1942 tax bill lowered the exemptions. And now they propose by this committee bill to say to that 7,000,000 people, "We will relieve you from the burden of the 1942 tax bill." Why? Because they cannot legislate. Because the majority cannot stand up and demonstrate leadership as such men as Claude Kitchin would have done. Men of that kind who have operated on this floor for your party like Oscar Underwood. The Democratic majority cannot operate because you have not stood on principle. You cannot do it because you are not right.

You throw out the 1942 tax bill, and go to 1943, and levy a tax on 1943. And let me ask you to follow me further on this board. You, in your bill, started out with 1941, and you threw 1942 out, and you come to 1943, and then you go to 1944, and that is when you make your first payment under 1943, and then you have 2 more years to pay on, and most taxpayers will have to do that, so that you run along from 1941 to 1946. That is not currency. You offer to give them 6 percent if they pay up in 1944. But if they do not pay up at that time, then they can pay it in 1945 and 1946. Can any of you have the temerity to claim that that is currency. If so, I pause to permit you to assert yourselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the 1942 tax they are paying in 1945 and 1946?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but as far as this committee bill is concerned, 1942 goes out. It would take the best lawyer in the country to keep anybody straight on that plan. You have agreed with the American people that you want currency, and how will you get it out of that formula? It is preposterous enough to be ludicrous. You cannot do it. That is the reason this House turned down the bill which the committee presented to this House 3 or 4 weeks ago. The House turned it down by about 150 votes because it was patchwork. That is all this is—patchwork. Patchwork legislation just will not do. This House will not accept this committee bill. It is not grounded in principle but is a product of expediency.

Now let me go to the Carlson bill. What will the Carlson bill do? It has been amended so that the limit of $20,000 contained in the other Carlson bill has been reduced down to $5,000. In other words, any man whose taxable income is less than $5,000 in 1943 will pay his tax in full this year 1943. Under the Carlson plan all taxpayers whose net taxable incomes are less than $5,000 will be current with their taxes by the end of 1943. There will be no going back, no going forward about it. Any plan that will make 97 percent of the taxpayers current by the end of 1943 without any doubling up comes nearly being current. That is exactly what the people want.

The Democratic leadership should bestir themselves and appreciate the situation and act accordingly. You should throw aside some of these political New Deal entanglements that put a rope around your neck and see how it feels to be free from any domination of any kind. You are dealing with 44,000,000 taxpayers today and it behooves you to heed their opinions and respect their wishes. Then we come back to 1942 and we say, "Now, in 1942 you made some money that you made rather easy. You had a windfall there. Let us see how much did you have. You had the difference between 1941 and 1942, or the difference between $20,000 and $70,000 which is $50,000." We say to you, "My dear friend, you made $50,000 as a windfall there, so under the Carlson plan that $50,000 is taxed at the regular rate right straight up to the top, just as under the present law, and your tax on that $50,000 windfall will be $28,000. So in that case the man who earned $100,000 in 1943 and earned $70,000 in 1942, and earned $20,000 in 1941 will pay a tax of $69,000, plus $28,000, or $97,000 in all. That is the way we make him current. He pays it. He has got to pay, so you see that under the Carlson plan we get all the taxes that we should get in all good conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, I want to show you in these figures down here at the bottom of this chart some figures that are astonishing. They astonished me when I first saw them. Yesterday Members talked on this floor about a capital levy. Somebody said, "The committee bill will result in a capital levy." What does that mean? That means that when a taxpayer pays a greater tax than the amount he earns and has to go to his bank and borrow the money or go down to his safety deposit box and get the money to pay his taxes. That is a heck of a situation when a man has to go down into his reserve or into his capital to get the money with which to pay his taxes. That is confiscation pure and simple. You will find no such situation developing under the Carlson plan. Let me show you what these figures show that I have on this blackboard. I am going to insert this table in the RECORD.

Now, here is the situation: Let us take these figures down here near the bottom and take a man who has an income of $250,000. Under the committee bill he will pay $260,000 every year if he takes the 3-year extension. He will pay $10,000 more every year than he receives.

TABLE 10.—*Married person, no dependents—Total current burden*

Net income before personal exemption	Current tax, including gross Victory tax [1]	Current tax plus unforgiven 1942 tax		
		If unforgiven 1942 tax is paid in full on or before Mar. 15, 1944	If unpaid balance of unforgiven 1942 tax is paid on or before Mar. 15, 1945 [2]	If one-third of unforgiven 1942 tax is paid on each installment date
$1,200	$35.47	$35.47	$35.47	$35.47
$1,500	100.13	100.13	100.13	100.13
$1,800	172.00	192.30	182.59	179.20
$2,000	219.91	257.51	239.51	233.24
$2,500	339.69	420.53	381.53	368.36
$3,200	507.38	648.76	581.08	557.51
$3,300	534.33	685.76	613.27	588.03
$5,000	992.58	1,328.72	1,167.81	1,111.78
$10,000	2,676.36	3,890.76	3,309.40	3,107.00
$15,000	4,854.13	7,396.42	6,179.37	5,755.65
$20,000	7,531.91	11,838.13	9,776.64	9,058.93
$25,000	10,577.69	16,992.93	13,921.65	12,852.49
$50,000	28,074.58	47,243.81	38,067.05	34,872.18
$100,000	69,584.36	119,124.80	95,408.64	87,151.89
$250,000	207,857.69	356,372.05	285,274.75	260,522.36
$500,000	441,746.58	766,416.94	610,989.64	555,877.91
$1,000,000	900,000.00	1,588,901.56	1,259,108.26	1,144,291.33
$2,000,000	1,800,000.00	3,231,492.16	2,546,203.36	2,307,621.33
$5,000,000	4,500,000.00	8,187,473.36	6,422,193.56	5,807,614.67

[1] Computed on a gross income reduced by 10 percent in arriving at specified net income.
[2] Assuming equal payments made in 1944 and 1945.

That is not simply for 1 year. That is the situation when the taxpayer has paid his taxes as shown by this table when he takes advantage of every day that he can under the terms of this Doughton bill. The man will have to go to the bank and borrow $10,000 every year to pay his taxes. That is not right. You cannot vote for that kind of a bill and go back home and justify yourself. You cannot do that.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. He also has to pay his other taxes in addition?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, certainly. He has to pay all other taxes. The levying of taxes is a science and this kind of a procedure is clearly violative of all the true principles of just taxation.

Now, here is a man who has an income of $500,000. His tax will be $556,000 per year under this terrible bill. In other words, this man not only gives to the tax man all he earns but he must borrow $56,000 every year to pay his taxes.

Let us go to the $1,000,000 man. He has to borrow $144,000 every year. He turns over to the tax man all he earns and $144,000 additional every year. The $5,000,000 man has to borrow $800,000 every year to meet his taxes. My dear friends, how can you be so unjust as to defend such a plan?

You talk about soaking the rich. This is more than soaking; this is dishonest. That cannot be fair. You ask me, Where do I get these figures? I get them from the report of the members of the Ways and Means Committee made by the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I am glad that we the Republican members of the committee do not sponsor such an unfair piece of legislation. These figures came from the Treasury Department. But here is a much more striking joker than the one I have just cited you. Please follow me as I make these observations. Here is a man whose income is $25,000. Do you know how much he has got to pay? This chart shows he has to pay $12,850 every year. How much does he then have left? After he pays out over these years the sum of $12,850 each year he will have left $12,150 per year.

Let us go down to this man, the $50,000 man. According to these figures, he will pay $34,000 per year. He will then have $15,000 left; but the $100,000 man, he will pay $87,151, and he will only have $12,849 left. The man who makes $100,000 only has $12,849 left. The man who makes $25,000 has $12,150 left, and the man who makes $100,000 only has $699 more left him than the $25,000 man has. Is not that a funny system? My friends, it is not only funny, it is crazy. It is absolutely crazy. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this committee bill is wonderfully and fearfully made. It does a grave injustice which the people will not tolerate. I blame this on the Treasury of the United States and I blame it on this hodge-podge system of legislation. This is the most important day, you might say, in the tax life of this Nation. Yet this House, this great legislative body, is asked to pass such an unreasonable bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. No; I am sorry but I cannot yield. We have to decide this important matter today. Let us lay aside politics and do it right. Let us pass this Carlson bill that makes 97 percent of the people free. It is good to be free. What a profound proof of democracy is freedom. Financial freedom, legislative freedom, the "four freedoms," and every other kind of freedom; but to be bound down by worry and by strife and by political inability to agree is a terrible calamity for a legislative body.

Now, gentlemen, let us take these figures, ponder them well, and do our duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio yields back 1 minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I again find myself in a position which I do not envy in the least, because I am forced to break with my leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and with my dear friends and colleagues on the Republican side, and through not supporting the Ruml cancelation bill. Some weeks ago I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to Mr. Ruml's proposal for canceling taxes. At that time I made myself very clear. I think I was the first member of our party who raised a public protest. I stated emphatically that I was opposed to canceling taxation on the more than $114,000,000,000 national income which our people received in 1943, and I stated why I was opposed to canceling that tax assessment. I also stated that where trouble—economic trouble—arose in the affairs of an individual because of the fact that he did not, while he was receiving income, set aside the proportion which belonged to the Government according to the laws of this country that the Treasury, the Congress, and the Government together should be cooperative enough with that individual to make it possible for him to pay that liability, although he had not previously provided for it according to law.

I find a situation here where the committee bill extends the time of payment and to that extent does the very thing I recommended at the time when I said we should make it possible for the taxpayer to pay. The committee bill has, in my opinion, done that very thing. I also find where the committee bill does not actually cancel as such but lowers the burden on the taxpayer by making the 1942 rates and the 1942 exemptions applicable as of January 1, 1943, instead of 1942 and by letting 1941 rates and 1941 exemptions apply against the income received by our people in the calendar year 1942. No one under the committee bill thus receives high incomes which are not taxed as provided by the Ruml cancelation bill. Some people may call the committee bill a cancelation proposal; some may call it making the tax act apply in advance instead of making it retroactive. I do not care anything about quibbling over that part of the question. In other words had we made the October 1942 tax rates apply as of January 1, 1943, when we passed that bill instead of applying as of January 1, 1942, as the law now provides, we would have accomplished the very thing in that respect which I understand the committee bill now accomplishes. So to that extent at least the committee bill has come to my views of easing the burden and thus making it possible, by extending the due dates and lowering the amount to be paid, for taxpayers to meet their obligations for taxes; not because I so recommended, but because of this contest that has been going on throughout the country. Yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was exceedingly kind in giving some of the Members additional information with reference to his bill, and after we had left the floor. If I understand him correctly, and if I understand this blackboard presentation correctly, it operates something like this. Here is the $50,000 to be taxed. Is that right? I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Under the Carlson bill we tax every nickel of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This $50,000 will be taxed?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is this whole $20,000 income for 1941, $70,000 for 1942, and $100,000 for 1943 taxed?

Mr. JENKINS. The Carlson bill does not tax that $20,000; that has been taxed in 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask it this way: Are those three incomes taxed under the Carlson bill?

Mr. JENKINS. They certainly are.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understood from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that they are not. Now, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]: Are those three items taxed under his bill?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The $20,000, of course, was taxed on 1942, not on 1941 income.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not make myself clear. I do not want to confuse anyone here at all, and I do not want to be confused myself.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Neither do I.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Carlson bill call for the application of the tax laws in such a manner as to tax all of the income for the 3 years indicated as having been received by the party?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly the Carlson bill does not go back and tax 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us not confuse it. Let me make it clear. The 1941 tax law taxed the 1941 income, and we will assume the fellow paid the 1941 tax in the year 1942.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, in 1942 the taxpayer received $70,000.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Carlson bill tax all of that $70,000?

Mr. JENKINS. No; it does not tax the $20,000.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. All right; now, do not bring that into the picture; that has been disposed of. Is all that $70,000 taxed under the Carlson bill?

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio to answer that question.

Mr. JENKINS. That is taxed. That would be 1943 on the 1943 tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then is this other taxed under the Carlson bill?

Mr. JENKINS. That is the 1943 tax to be paid in 1944.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; the Carlson bill does not call for paying taxes in 1944 on 1943 income, as I understand it. If so, the taxpayer would not be on a current, or pay-as-you-go, basis.

Mr. JENKINS. I thought you meant in due course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I mean exactly what I am asking.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like for the gentleman from Ohio to state whether or not under the Carlson scheme this total of $200,000 is taxed.

Mr. JENKINS. I told the gentleman this——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not care what you told me. Let us start all over again.

Mr. JENKINS. What are you asking me about? I said in the beginning you pay in 1943 on $100,000 and you go back and you get what would have been a windfall in 1942 and you pay on that. You pay on $50,000 completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, let us go back to the Carlson proposition and let me ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this question. If in 1941 I received $200,000 income, in 1942 I received $250,000 income, and in 1943 I received $200,000 income, that is a total of $650,000 income—under your bill, supposing your bill is converted into law within the next few days, would I pay a tax on the total $650,000 I received under the tax laws of this land?

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. You will pay on the higher of the 2 years. You paid on the 1941 year previously.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then that leaves a lot of income in there that is not taxed and that is what I am trying to develop here. In that manner the Carlson bill does not lead to the taxing of all of the income received by the taxpayer.

Look at this, for instance. Here we have just completed selling to our people some sixteen or seventeen billion dollars worth of bonds. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any way on earth to more quickly or more completely destroy the economy of our people than for us to proceed on a program which inflates the currency and inflates the buying power of the dollar—and those bonds are redeemable in dollars—than to proceed on a basis which hands back to those people upon the maturity of those bonds dollars which buy less than those same dollars will buy today.

There is a necessity for paying taxes today to the limit of our ability. I repeat, there is a necessity for us to pay taxes. I have said to my people, and I say so very sincerely here today, that if there is anything I thank God for today it is the privilege of paying taxes to the Federal Treasury because of the fact that my sisters, my brothers, my nephews, my nieces, my aunts, my uncles, and my fellow citizens are making the sacrifices incident to war, on the battlefields and otherwise, for this country. Here I stay back in the good old United States and draw a salary. I am willing to live on anything that keeps body and soul together and to put the balance into the tax box. I ask for no outright cancelation and I shall not advocate and support cancelation in total on the income received by our people in 1942. The committee bill cancels or removes far less than the Ruml bill. Now, let me make that clear. I am construing this committee bill as a revision of the law.

Yes; I weigh my words, I speak my conviction, I fear no man in the position I take and no political party. Some of my friends have called me a political adventurer, but I will take the medicine, I will take the consequences and I will take a position in private life, if necessary. That is FRED CRAWFORD'S responsibility. But I will not go back and face my people as one who advocates cancelation. I held several meetings with them last week—I am getting the mail in now. I know what the situation is—I will not go back and face them and tell them I voted to cancel out entirely the tax liability assessed by the laws of this land.

I took the position before the Ways and Means Committee that we should go ahead and liquidate the tax liabilities by paying them. My father was a steward in the Methodist Church for 40 years and he said to me, "Son, be careful when you make your liabilities. After you make them, you pay them if it takes your heart's blood to do so." That is the kind of economic doctrine under which I grew up, that is exactly where I stand today, that is the way I teach my son, and that is the only sound economic philosophy I know. It is the economic doctrine which made this country a great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in what my distinguished colleague from Michigan had to say about trying to ascertain how much tax was to be paid out of the 1941, 1942, and 1943 incomes. It is perfectly clear there is nothing unknown about this matter. It is known that certain portions of the 1942 tax year are to be abated under the Carlson plan and that the tax clock is to be put ahead to 1943. There is no mystery or nothing new in that at all.

I will now explain some of the details in reference to how the tax is paid. It may come from me with little grace, not being a lawyer, to depreciate the clarity of legal language, but sometimes legal language is complicated. I feel that the language of this tax bill appears to be complicated, and complicates a very simple thing. I shall attempt to show exactly what happens under the Carlson bill.

The Carlson bill recognizes two classes of taxpayers: those people with an income of less than $5,000 on which is assessed a tax bill of $1,050 or less, and those with an income of $5,000 or more. Those of our citizens who have a tax bill of $1,050 or less have no choice as to when they pay their taxes. They pay them in 1943 out of 1943 income. They pay them as I show on this blackboard. Here is 3–15–43, 6–15–43, and along comes 9–15–43. On this September 15 they make a declaration at that time, having had 9 months' experience with their income, as to whether their estimate made March 15, 1943, was correct or not. On September 15 they make their third payment. Then on December 15 they make their final installment on account of 1943, and they are current in tax payments in 1943. All of those people with a tax of $1,050 or less. On March 15, 1944, they make their return for 1944, and if there is any slight adjustment in their 1943 tax bill, if they have overpaid or underpaid, it is adjusted at that time. Those are all of our good fellow citizens with an income of $5,000 or less, on which there is a tax bill of $1,050 or less. They represent 97 percent of all taxpayers, all of whom will be placed on a current pay-as-you-earn basis.

Now let us go to the next class, Mr. X and Mr. Y. Mr. X has an income higher than $5,000 in 1942. This line represents the income of Mr. X.

Mr. MAY. How high does it go?

Mr. DEWEY. It will go to any height, from $5,000 up.

We will say that Mr. X in 1942 had an income of $125,000. In 1943 Mr. X had an income of $150,000. This line represents that income.

Under the Carlson bill what happens? The Carlson bill chooses the higher of those two incomes as being Mr. X's tax liability, and he is, therefore, charged his tax for 1943 on $150,000, that being the higher of the two incomes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will not the taxpayer have income for those 2 years?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes. I shall come to that in just a minute.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will he pay taxes on the income of both years?

Mr. DEWEY. He will pay partially 1 year and fully on the other as I will show.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is easy to answer. If he has an income for those 2 years he should pay taxes for those 2 years.

Mr. DEWEY. If the gentleman will wait a minute, I shall be glad to answer, but of course, I am always happy to yield to my chairman.

He pays his tax on the higher of the two incomes, which is in 1943. We believe that Mr. X has had a war profit in 1942. We use as the yardstick his income in 1941. We find that Mr. X had an income in 1941 of $100,000. The bill allows a $5,000 margin of fluctuation because any income may go up or down that amount with no contact whatsoever with war industry or war profits. So we take that $5,000 and add it to the income of Mr. X, making $105,000 that he had in 1941. The difference between $105,000 and Mr. X's $125,000 in 1942 we consider a war profit that should be taxed. So, just as my good and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] showed that $105,000 is subtracted from his 1942 income, leaving $20,000 of presumable war profits,

which are taxed at the 1942 rate and added to the 1943 income tax of Mr. X and paid with it on March 15, 1944.

If the war profits tax creates a hardship to Mr. X by application to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue he will be given 36 months to pay any hardship amount with interest at 4 percent.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. What becomes of the $105,000?

Mr. DEWEY. There is no mystery about it. The Carlson plan contemplates abating 1 tax year by putting the tax clock ahead. That is what you have all known. We have talked about it for 3 months. There is no new mystery here today. You either like it or you do not like it. It is either wicked or it is not wicked. It is either efficient collection of taxes or it is not. I am not going to be dragged into an argument as to whether or not there is 1 year of forgiveness. Of course there is 1 year partially abated for some. That is what we are all talking about.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Does that $20,000 get added on top of the $150,000 so that it reaches the high bracket, or does it form a new group?

Mr. DEWEY. The tax rates of 1942 are applied to the $150,000 and the tax rates of 1942 are applied to the $20,000, as two separate items, and the two taxes are added together and must be liquidated by March 15, 1944, unless permission is given to extend the time in which payment is to be made.

Mr. KEAN. Then he has the benefit of the exemptions again on the $20,000?

Mr. DEWEY. No, they have nothing to do with it. There is no exemption about it at all. The rate is the normal tax, 6 percent, then the first bracket, 13 percent, and it goes on up with the usual progress of rates as under the 1942 schedule.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman should state to the House that the party he has in mind paid the tax on his 1941 income in 1942.

Mr. DEWEY. Of course, that taxpayer paid a tax on his 1941 income under the 1941 rates, which were then existing, and that tax was deducted from his 1942 income.

Mr. KNUTSON. That was taken out of his 1942 income.

Mr. DEWEY. That is taken out of the 1942 income already, of course.

Mr. KNUTSON. That ought to be emphasized.

Mr. DEWEY. I do emphasize it, and I thank the gentleman for drawing it to my attention. That $125,000 has already been reduced by the amount of the tax on 1941 income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is talking on net income.

Mr. DEWEY. I am talking about the net taxable income after personal exemption and credit for dependents.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to make that observation, so that the committee would clearly understand that it is net income, after all deductions.

Mr. DEWEY. It is the net taxable income—these amounts that I am speaking of. Now, may I take one more minute. It really makes no change, but let us suppose a Mr. Z had an income in 1942 of $150,000, and that he suffered a loss in 1943, and that his income in 1943, was but $125,000. His income will go back to 1941, exactly the same, as Mr. X—$100,000; but in this case as in the case of Mr. X, under the Carlson plan, the higher of the 2 years is chosen so that the income of 1942 will be used as the tax liability of 1943. So the 1942 rates would be applied to the 1942 tax income, and will be considered as the 1943 tax and liquidate that liability. In 1943 Mr. Z also had $125,000 income. This compared to that received in 1941, which shows a difference of $20,000, so that his tax is exactly the same as was Mr. X's.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And there is no lower limit to these war profits adjustment? For instance, I have heard of a Government clerk who made, say $3,500 in 1941, and then jumped into the big money on some war contracts. If he made $3,500, will you just explain what his tax would be for 1942 and 1943?

Mr. DEWEY. If a clerk made $3,500 in 1941, and $50,000 in 1942, and $50,000 in 1943, you would add this $5,000 fluctuation to the $3,500, and that would make $8,500. Eight thousand five hundred dollars deducted from $50,000 would leave $41,500 war profit on which he would pay the 1942 rates, and in 1943 he would pay 1942 rates on $50,000.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. So that a war profiteer——

Mr. DEWEY. Gets caught.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. For all of it.

Mr. DEWEY. For all of it under the 1942 rates.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Back to the example in purple-chalk figures on the board. I am not sure what happens to that $20,000. Is that taxed as a separate income, or added to the $150,000?

Mr. DEWEY. No; it is taxed as a separate item, with the 1942 rates on $20,000.

Mr. MUNDT. Starting at the low brackets?

Mr. DEWEY. Starting at the 6-percent normal and 13-percent surtax.

Mr. KNUTSON. And boiling the whole thing down, there is no abatement on war profits?

Mr. DEWEY. No; there is no abatement on war profits.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes; I yield, although with a certain amount of trepidation, as I respect the ability of the gentleman from Tennessee in all argumentative matters.

Mr. COOPER. Does the distinguished gentleman really want the House to understand that he believes the so-called antiwindfall provision in the Carlson plan takes all these war profits out?

Mr. DEWEY. I think we can only judge by one thing. What are war profits? If you take the 1941 income as a yardstick, any profits that are earned in excess of 1941 income is taxed at the 1942 rate. In my opinion, they are all taxed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, first I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]. His is the frankest presentation of the Ruml plan that I have heard. The gentleman has taken the Well and has frankly presented the case of the Ruml plan. He says you can take it or leave it, whether it is wicked or not as you view it, and all of us, no matter how much we may disagree with the gentleman in his views, must respect him for his candor and his frankness, as I do. However, I disagree with the gentleman, but in disagreement I cannot refrain from expressing my feelings of pleasure in the very frank presentation that he made to the House.

Is 1941 a normal year? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] very adequately answered that question yesterday on page 3846 of the RECORD, when he called the attention of the House to 13 men, whose names I shall not repeat, who received in 1941 very large salaries, 11 of them more than in preceding years. In one case one gentleman received 205 percent more salary in 1941 than in 1940. He received a salary of $121,184 for 1941—205 percent more than he received in 1940—and under the Ruml plan that gentleman will only pay $4,722 taxes. It is very clear that the gadgets in the Ruml plan do not catch the war profits, because 1941, as we all know, was a year of war activity, of activity in preparing ourselves for defense.

Mr. COOPER. The 13 cases I cited were taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1943, and were furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Of those 13 cases of large incomes from war activities, all of them but 2 would entirely escape under the so-called antiwindfall provision of the Carlson bill, and the other 2 would only be affected slightly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me call another matter to the attention of the House. It is not so many weeks ago when the $25,000 net-income order of the President was repealed, in the wisdom of Congress. The President, as we know, had reduced salaries to $67,200, or

about that amount, to bring about a net of $25,000. Congress, in its wisdom, repealed it. Automatically those who were getting $100,000, $125,000, $200,000, and $250,000 went back to that salary. Along comes the Ruml plan and they want to forgive the tax on those salaries for last year. What an inconsistent position for the Congress to be placed in. One week before the last appearance of the Ruml plan, a bill came up to wipe out the $25,000 net limitation on the large salaries that certain persons were receiving in 1941 and 1942, representing increases of salary up to $200,000 and $250,000; 1 week later the Ruml plan proposed to forgive payment completely of any tax on that salary for 1 year, at a time when men and youths are dying to preserve the liberties of our country.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will recall that one of the main arguments used by the advocates of the repeal of the $25,000 salary limitation was that we were going to get it by taxation. Now a plan is offered to forgive taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is not any question about it.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman know that the reason that bill was passed was because of the fact that the President had exceeded his authority and had violated the law?

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact remains, without regard to why it was passed, that it brought salaries back to the higher ranges, and by the Ruml plan you are forgiving the payment of taxes for 1 year. You cannot get away from that fact.

There is no question but that the Ruml plan is misunderstood by many well-meaning persons, but they will find out sooner or later. The political significance of this vote is not today or this year, but in the primaries and the election of 1944. As the people become acquainted with the Ruml plan, and the extent it goes in its forgiveness, then opinions will completely change.

While I am supporting the committee bill because it is fair and just, speaking from a political angle, anyone who votes for the Ruml plan is thereby creating a living and telling issue against himself in the primary and election of 1944. How can any Member explain the fact that while our men and boys were dying to win victory and save our country, most of them receiving less than $75 a month, Members voted to forgive or abate taxes completely for one year to persons well able to pay?

It is possible that there are some Members who voted for the Ruml plan the last time because they felt that some forgiveness should be given, particularly among the smaller-income groups, in order to make the collection-at-the-source method successful and not impose additional hardships on such groups. At that time the Ruml plan was the only opportunity they had to express such an opinion through their vote. That condition does not exist today. The committee bill, which is just and equitable, and based upon ability to pay, gives such Members a better opportunity to express their views than the Ruml plan does.

Let us look at the tax paid. Take the 1942 law, for a married person with no dependents, and let us see what will happen under the 1942 law and under the Ruml plan and the committee bill. We must bear in mind the great majority of the people have in mind the original Ruml plan. Under the present law, a man receiving $1,500, a married person with no dependents, would pay $48. Under the committee bill, he would pay nothing. A man receiving $1,800 would pay $103 under the present law. Under the committee bill he would pay $21.60. A man earning $2,000 under the 1942 law would pay $140. Under the committee bill he would pay $40. A man receiving $2,500, under the 1942 law, would have to pay $232. Under the committee bill, he would pay $86. A man receiving $3,200 would pay $360.60 under the existing law; $150.40 under the proposed committee bill.

When you reach the $5,000 mark, under existing law, the man would pay $746. Under the committee bill he would pay $357.60. In other words, up to $5,000, the forgiveness is from 100 percent down to 52.06 percent.

Now, let us look further. Take the person receiving $50,000. Under existing law he would pay $25,000. Under the committee bill he would pay $20,000 plus. Under the Ruml plan, for 1 year he would pay nothing.

At $100,000, under existing law, a taxpayer would pay $64,000. Under the committee bill he would pay $52,000 plus. Under the Ruml plan, for 1 year he would pay nothing.

A man receiving $500,000—and there are some who receive that in this country—under existing law he would pay $414,000. Under the committee bill he would pay $345,000 plus. Under the Ruml plan, for 1 year, nothing.

Let us go to the $1,000,000 class, and there are some persons who receive a million-dollar net income. Under the existing law he would pay $854,000. Under the committee bill he would pay $732,000. Under the Ruml plan, for 1 year, he would pay nothing.

Let us take the $2,000,000 income group.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us look at the $2,000,000 net income group. Under existing law that person would pay $1,734,000; under the committee bill he would pay $1,522,000 plus; under the Ruml plan he would pay nothing.

Take the case of the person receiving $5,000,000 net income last year: Under the present law he would pay $4,374,000; under the committee bill he would pay $3,922,000 plus; under the Ruml plan for 1 year he would pay nothing.

TABLE 1.—*Single person, no dependents—Amount and percent of 1942 tax forgiven under H. R. 2570*

Net income before personal exemption	1942 tax under existing law	1942 tax under H. R. 2570	Amount of 1942 tax forgiven	Percent of 1942 tax forgiven
$500				
$600	$15.40		$15.40	100.00
$750	43.00		43.00	100.00
$800	52.20		52.20	100.00
$1,000	89.00	$14.50	74.50	83.71
$1,200	125.80	32.90	92.90	73.85
$1,500	181.00	60.50	120.50	66.57
$1,800	236.20	88.10	148.10	62.70
$2,000	273.00	106.50	166.50	60.99
$2,500	365.00	152.50	212.50	58.22
$3,000	472.00	206.00	266.00	56.36
$5,000	920.00	462.00	458.00	49.78
$10,000	2,390.00	1,460.90	929.10	38.87
$15,000	4,366.00	2,949.48	1,416.52	32.44
$20,000	6,816.00	4,868.64	1,947.36	28.57
$25,000	9,628.00	7,157.32	2,468.68	25.65
$50,000	25,811.00	20,803.35	5,007.65	19.40
$100,000	64,641.00	53,173.21	11,467.79	17.74
$250,000	194,616.00	158,499.12	36,116.88	18.56
$500,000	414,616.00	345,929.92	68,686.08	16.57
$1,000,000	854,616.00	733,422.24	121,193.76	14.18
$2,000,000	1,734,616.00	1,523,418.40	211,197.60	12.18
$5,000,000	4,374,616.00	3,923,410.72	451,205.28	10.31

Table 2 shows the amount and percent of 1942 tax forgiven in the case of a married person with no dependents.

TABLE 2.—*Married person, no dependents—Amount and percent of 1942 tax forgiven under H. R. 2570*

Net income before personal exemption	1942 tax under existing law	1942 tax under H. R. 2570	Amount of 1942 tax forgiven	Percent of 1942 tax forgiven
$1,200				
$1,500	$48.00		$48.00	100.00
$1,800	103.20	$21.60	81.60	79.07
$2,000	140.00	40.00	100.00	71.43
$2,500	232.00	86.00	146.00	62.93
$3,200	360.80	150.40	210.40	58.31
$3,500	382.20	161.10	221.10	57.85
$5,000	746.00	357.60	388.40	52.06
$10,000	2,152.00	1,291.92	860.08	39.97
$15,000	4,052.00	2,704.56	1,347.44	33.25
$20,000	6,452.00	4,581.08	1,870.92	29.00
$25,000	9,220.00	6,824.40	2,395.60	25.98
$50,000	25,328.00	20,392.80	4,935.20	19.49
$100,000	64,060.00	52,702.60	11,357.40	17.73
$250,000	194,000.00	157,994.60	36,006.00	18.56
$500,000	414,000.00	345,394.00	68,606.00	16.57
$1,000,000	854,000.00	732,874.00	121,126.00	14.18
$2,000,000	1,734,000.00	1,522,864.00	211,136.00	12.18
$5,000,000	4,374,000.00	3,922,844.00	451,156.00	10.31

The committee bill gives the lower income groups the larger percentage of forgiveness, ranging from 100 percent down to 10.31 in the case of a person receiving $5,000,000 net income.

It is based upon ability to pay; it is equitable and fair; it meets the problem that confronts us; it protects the Government's interests, but at the same time is fair to the taxpayer. How any man in wartime when we are fighting for our very existence, when men to the number of millions are wearing the uniform ready to give up their lives for our country, if necessary—how under such circumstances any man can vote to forgive large sums of money like that I cannot understand. Such action is indefensible. It is beyond my power of comprehension. It cannot and should not be done in wartime by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN].

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the dramatic appeal of the majority leader and the premise upon which he based that appeal. His observations convinced me that he had not read what happens under the Carlson bill and the Ruml plan. He cited instances where a taxpayer would pay a certain amount under the present law, a certain amount under the pending bill, and then said that the same taxpayer under the Carlson-Ruml plan would pay nothing at all for 1 year and deprive the Government of needed revenue in wartime. As a matter of fact, under the Carlson program—and this is based on the testimony of Mr. Randolph Paul who is the counsel and tax adviser of the Treasury Department—the flow of revenue to the Treasury from any individual will not be suspended under the program of the Carlson bill. The effect of any abatement does not come until some time in the future when: (1) Either the Government winds up or (2) when the individual taxpayer loses his ability to pay through business adversity or death. Meanwhile he pays his taxes annually just as he does at the present time. To convey the impression that any individual will have no taxes to pay for 1 year under the dramatic circumstances outlined by the majority leader is committing a fraud upon the American people and misleading them as to the purposes of the legislation now before us.

The income tax is not a tax on income. It is a tax out of income. It is that portion of an individual's income which belongs to the Government and which the taxpayer holds in trust for the Government from the time it is received until it is paid. The effort we are making is to provide a simplified method for getting the Government's share of the taxpayer's income into the Treasury.

We all realize that the best interests of the Government will be served if the law requires that income taxes should be paid when the taxpayer has the ability to pay, that is to say, out of current income. Because of a false start in 1913 when the income tax was first adopted, we find ourselves facing a perplexing problem. Under our present system the portion of the national income which belongs to the Government in a given year is not paid out of current earnings, but is paid out of the income of the subsequent year. We are all agreed that this is wrong, and seek a new method of assessment and collection so that the taxes for the current year shall be paid out of current income.

In every plan that has been offered to accomplish this purpose we are confronted with one major difficulty, namely, that in making the transition 2 years' taxes must be paid in a single year. It is agreed that would be unfair and, in many instances, impossible, because of reasons that have been heretofore discussed.

Many plans for making the transition have been offered. They all recognize the necessity for abating all or a portion of the tax on 1 year's income. On a previous occasion there were many arguments against the abatement of any portion of any year's tax. Those who so argued now favor some abatement. I think I see the reason for their change of mind. It is this: we are dealing with a principle which does not lend itself to compromise, and, until that principle is recognized and has accomplished its purpose, it will continue to give us trouble. That principle is that income taxes must be paid out of current income on a pay-as-you-earn basis.

The gentleman from Tennessee said yesterday—I pause here to pay a compliment to that gentleman. We frequently compliment the chairmen of committees for the excellent work they do but we forget those who give unstintingly of their time, their energy, and their equipment to the work of the committee; they are often lost sight of. There is no member of the Committee on Ways and Means, there is no Member of Congress, more conscientious, more studious, more patriotic, more useful; no one who is more regular in attendance to his duties on the Committee on Ways and Means than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JERE COOPER]. I reserve the right of course to disagree with him on the matters we are called upon to determine, but I respect his industry and sincerity of purpose.

The gentleman from Tennessee said yesterday that under the committee bill, 30,000,000 of the 44,000,000 taxpayers will become current by the end of 1943. Such a statement is inconsistent with the provisions of the bill extending the time for payment of 1942 taxes. If it is so, then 30,000,000 taxpayers, except those who are paying income taxes for the first time, will have the taxes on their 1942 income entirely abated. To dispose of the unabated portion of the 1942 tax the gentleman from Tennessee said that the portion of the 1942 tax which would be carried to 1944 would not be due until 1944.

The fact remains that such installments require the payment of tax on 1942 income out of the income of subsequent years and is exactly the situation we seek to avoid, and it cannot be said that those having such deferred payments to make are paying their taxes currently.

We are permitting political consideration to draw us away from our objective. We are allowing our imaginations to convince us that if we abate the tax on 1 year's income in order to effect a change so much needed and desired, we will as has been said, be favoring those in the higher income brackets. In other words, we are permitting the economy of the taxpayer to guide us in our deliberations rather than the needs or best interests of the Government. In so doing we put self-interest above patriotic service.

I favor the Carlson bill, because it is the most expeditious, the simplest, the least expensive method of accomplishing the desired result. It is the most businesslike, as I will show by using the committee's proposal as an illustration. The committee bill recognizes the need for some abatement of the 1942 tax.

The first step in such abatement suggested by the committee is to reduce the 1942 tax by the adoption of the 1941 rates and exemptions. It is then proposed to permit the payment of the reduced tax in three annual installments beginning in 1944. A further abatement is provided for to those who are capable of making advance payments and who will be allowed a discount, and further concessions are to be granted to those who will find any of these methods of payment a hardship and whose payments may be further extended. The whole proposal is given a rosy hue in anticipation of the collection of a considerable portion of the 1942 tax. It is even suggested that the amounts to be collected will make it unnecessary to increase the personal income-tax rates in the immediate future.

So, it appears to me that one of two things have prompted the proponents of this measure in its preparation—either, one, it is a treasure hunt to increase the Government income for 1944, 1945, and 1946 without increasing rates; or two, it is a unique method whereby the 1942 taxes can be gradually abated or washed out.

The proponents of the committee bill apparently have not looked at the other side of the picture. No estimate has been made of the cost of the administration to collect these deferred payments. No estimate has been made of the losses which are bound to occur over a 3-year period—and more so over a period which may be longer in hardship cases. No estimate has been given as to the extent discounts made may reduce the amount realized. No intimation can be had of the attitude of future Congresses and the effect of this thought on those who might otherwise pay in advance were it not for the possibility that at some time in the future the law may be changed to the advantage of those who have not yet paid and to the disadvantage of those who have done so. In other words the cost of collection may exceed the revenue anticipated.

I am reminded of a story that used to go the rounds in the business world about an individual who went into the business of refining oil. He got a lot of his friends to purchase stock in the company and when the plant was built he invited the stockholders to an inspection. A very fine buffet luncheon was served. The stockholders were taken through the plant and shown the beautiful white-tiled floors, the plate-glass partitions, the nickel-plated furnishings, and the machinery all running smoothly and perfectly. One of the stockholders asked the quantity of oil refined, and the number of barrels sold in a given period, whereupon the refiner replied, "We don't sell any oil. It takes all we refine to run the plant."

This is not the first time that a legislative body has faced this problem. Recently the State of Washington resolved it by the adoption of a plan comparable to the so-called Ruml plan, and, likewise, the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, after struggling with the problem over a period of years in a situation very much the same as we have here, resolved it by the abatement of the tax on 1 year's income. You will find the Wisconsin experience in my extension of remarks at page A1550 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now that the principle has been recognized, let us face the problem fearlessly

without regard to the political effect of appealing to class prejudice. The Carlson bill should be adopted. It is fair to the Government. The flow of revenue to the Treasury, the majority leader to the contrary notwithstanding, will not abate. It is agreed by everyone that the change in the method of collection of income taxes will increase the revenue. It will protect the revenue not only now but for all time to come. As against other proposals it provides the most economical system of administration. It recognizes and adopts and puts immediately into effect the principle of collecting income taxes out of current income when the taxpayer has the ability to pay.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it has been admitted on the floor of this Chamber today by some of its proponents that the Ruml plan would forgive or abate completely 1 year's taxes. With our sons in the service, probably at this moment under fire, I cannot bring myself to favor any such plan. I am opposed to it. For every dollar of tax indebtedness forgiven will mean a dollar to be borrowed to carry on this war and to be later paid with accrued interest throughout unnumbered years in the future. Of course, those who are now fighting this war and are fortunate enough to survive it will be called on to pay a part of this, which we who stay at home in safety with fairly pleasant surroundings ought ourselves to pay. When I mention members of our fighting force I do not do so sentimentally, though God knows I have a right to be sentimental in the matter; I mention it as a sober fact that the Ruml-plan bill will ease up the matter on the American taxpayer and shift the burden to someone else, and that someone else includes the members of our armed forces.

If I wanted to deal in sentiment, I could discuss our obligations to our boys over there, but I could also deal sentimentally with the plight of those who are over here, who may or may not be taxpayers, but who would suffer from the inflation which the Ruml plan, if put into effect, would enormously boost. Do not doubt for 1 minute that this Ruml plan would have enormous effect upon inflation. It would have that effect in two respects: Taxpayers owe the Government ten thousand million dollars on their incomes in 1942. If they are released by forgiveness from paying that enormous sum to Uncle Sam, they will have just that much more to spend on consumer goods and thus hike the cost of living accordingly. I think I am right in assuming that some of that ten thousand million dollars would be spent on consumer goods, for I cannot believe that all, or practically all, of it would be invested in United States War bonds. If the ten thousand million dollars of 1942 taxes forgiven should not be invested in War bonds, a part of that sum would have to be borrowed by Uncle Sam from commercial banks and such borrowing is highly inflationary. Such tax forgiveness they propose could hurt even those forgiven.

Even assuming a violent assumption that every individual forgiven his 1942 income tax would invest at least that amount in War bonds, it would still mean that he had lent his money to the Government instead of paying it as taxes as he should have done.

When this matter was before us several weeks ago, I took the stand against any forgiveness of the 1942 tax obligation, except perhaps in the case of members of our armed services. On March 30 I voted against the Ruml plan and when it carried in the committee, but was defeated in the House, I later voted not to recommit the committee bill. I felt that the committee bill at that time—although not quite what I had hoped for—because it did require a little more doubling up than I thought the taxpayers should be called on to bear—but it was near enough the thing best suited to war conditions that we were apt to approach. The bill was recommitted and now what have we before us today?

I feel that the bill which the committee has brought in now is an answer to the mandates of the House on March 30 last. I believe the minority bill today is so little different from the minority bill at that time that it would require a magnifying glass to see the difference. Today the Rumlites are virtually asking us to accept the very thing which the House rejected on March 30. The committee bill now does call for a certain amount of forgiveness of 1 year's taxes, but according to the explanation given by the chairman and by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] I feel that the amount of forgiveness contained in the committee bill is justifiable. It is justifiable to my mind, and I am about as stanch an opponent of forgiveness of taxes on war income as can be found in this chamber. I hope to have a chance to vote for the bill which the committee presents today.

I resent having anyone say that I voted against the pay-as-you-go plan. The committee bill which the House recommitted several weeks ago did embody the features of a pay-as-you-go plan. The committee bill today—which we may or may not have a chance to vote on squarely—certainly embodies a pay-as-you-go plan. Both bills made it possible for individual taxpayers to get on a pay-as-you-go basis without paying 2 years' taxes in one. My contention is that the real issue has been beclouded and the Rumlites have tried to make it appear—and through radio and press have made it appear—that their plan involving total forgiveness is the only possible pay-as-you-go plan possible of adoption.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, about 6 or 7 weeks ago when the House debated the various pay-as-you-go tax collection plans, I emphatically opposed the Carlson-Ruml bill and every other measure that carried with it the forgive, excuse, or skip-a-year feature. I am still of the opinion that a Nation at war needs every dollar, every penny, it can get into its Treasury. If we do not need money to carry on the fight to victory, why then, do we have War bond drives and the constant beseeching of the public for funds?

Within the past couple weeks I visited my district, and I failed to find any clamor for a forgiveness of the 1942 taxes as has been repeatedly portrayed on the floor by the supporters of the Ruml plan. Since the House had acted on the pay-as-you-go tax-collection bills, I have had but 20 or 25 letters on the subject. Of these but 5 or 6 came from my district. The letters that reached me from my State, three were for the Ruml plan and three against it. Certainly, no one would refer to this as a demonstration or cry for forgiveness, excusing, or skipping of a year's taxes. The people of the Nation are awake to the situation ahead of us. They are ready and willing to do their part. They know that every tax dollar they pay now will mean so many less tax dollars to be paid in the future.

When the tax bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, now before the House, was originally discussed in the Committee, I opposed it.

This bill posseses more merit than any of the others now before the House. A perfect tax measure was never written. Each bill in this sphere of legislation is the result of a compromise. I am supporting the Doughton bill because it appears imperative that some system of installment collection must be adopted if the Treasury is to collect the money needed to successfully finance our way to victory.

The bill now before us represents a departure from our normal way of collecting taxes. There are certain features about it that I find distasteful. I am not particularly keen about the provision in the bill that provides that the employer is to make tax deductions from the taxpayer's pay envelope. There are two principal objections: First, it may be construed that the Government is taking the position that either the taxpayer cannot be trusted or that he is incompetent to handle his fiscal affairs and, therefore, it is necessary to withdraw the tax payment from his pay check without his even getting the "feel" of the money. At the moment no better practical means of collection has been suggested. I sincerely hope, however, that this objectionable feature in the system of collection can be removed in order to help the taxpayer retain his self-respect.

The second feature of the bill that disturbs me is that it makes the employer a tax collector. This entails considerable expense and liability to the employer. True, the employer has been collecting social-security taxes for some time now, and during the past several months has been collecting the Victory tax, but now he is also to have the income-tax collection thrust upon him. I believe that most employers are most happy to be of service to their Government, but I believe that it is the duty of

the Government to avoid unduly imposing upon this volunteer service. To this end I hope that the system of computation and collection may be kept in the simplest form possible so that it may not unduly detract the employer from his gainful pursuit.

The 1942 tax bill is a definite legal obligation. It should stand and be paid. No one supporting its forgiveness has charged that Congress was wrong in enacting it; no one advocating its excuse or abatement has claimed that its rates are excessive and might cause undue hardship. If Congress was wrong in enacting the tax bill or the tax now appears oppressive, then there might be some excuse for changing the rates or otherwise mitigating its pressure upon the taxpayer. However, under no circumstances would Congress be justified in wholly wiping out this once-created liability of the taxpayer.

The 1942 tax bill was not enacted into law until late in October of 1942. The bill by its terms was retroactive to January 1, 1942. There might be some reasonable questions raised as to whether or not the taxpayer under these circumstances has had a fair opportunity to set aside the funds to meet the tax payment. The 1942 tax act provided not only for an increase in rates but also a reduction of the exemptions. In view of the fact that we are now endeavoring to bring income-tax collection on a pay-as-you-go basis, and in view of the fact that the taxpayer has had no proper notice of the extent of his tax on his 1942 income, it seems only fair and reasonable that the 1942 tax rates should be suspended and the 1941 tax rates and exemptions applied to the 1942 income.

We are faced with the problem of raising 16,000,000 000 additional dollars during the next fiscal year. Certainly forgiving in toto an existing tax obligation is no way to raise it. The more we can pay off the war expenditures through present taxation the less it will cost the taxpayers in the long run. Now, when our national income is greater than ever, when we are concerned with inflation because of the surplus consumer dollars, when our banks are bulging with idle money, now is the time to collect the moneys needed to pave the way to an early and decisive victory.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal of idealizing on this bill. Much of this idealizing, or whatever it might be called, sounds to me something like demagogery. That is not an indictment of any particular individual. I hope the words are not offensive. Probably you are sincere in it. But I do not like to see the boys in the Army and Navy made a whipping post for this tax bill. There would be about as many Ruml-plan boys there as those representing the opposition. That argument should not appeal in the framing of this tax bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. No. I paid the gentleman a compliment. He is one of the sincerest men I know.

One point I want to bring out is that "of late progress has to me been simply a swapping of old troubles for new."

I repeat what I have often said before, "I am enthusiastic for the Ruml plan as against the committee plan." I would not care to face my constituents and say, "We have doubled the taxes on you." I should prefer personally that the present method of collection prevail and that I pay when I know what I owe. But I do feel that the people want a pay-as-you-go plan, and I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] that they ought to have what they want even though they may regret it later.

I recall saying that "he who keepeth the whole law but faileth in one point is guilty of all." How some of you can now face this House and say you will forgive one-half, after the arguments you made a few short days ago, is beyond my comprehension. Will you now compromise with evil? I am sorry to have to indict my friends after this manner.

I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], with whom I generally am in agreement, that he had a good deal to say about forgiving, and it would seem that he would now vote against the committee plan and state his preference for the old method of collection. Then he would support his original view as to the forgiveness idea he so strongly criticized.

Yesterday I asked a question of the gentleman from Tennessee. He understands this bill; he is a very able man. I asked him on yesterday to tell us about the $50,000 man. He would not do it, but he afterward placed the information in the RECORD. The $50,000 man whose actual income after taxes is $24,000 would have $25,000 added each year for 3 years, or a little more than 1 year's entire income taken. For 3 long years he has to pay more than he receives. How does he pay his other taxes? How does he meet his living expenses? A little further on he blandly asserts:

> It may not be possible to pay more than 1 year's taxes out of 1 year's income, but, with few exceptions, persons in the higher brackets have assets that they can use to pay it.

If that is not a capital levy, then may I be forgiven for lack of reasoning power.

I am somewhat amazed that in 1943 no payment of the 1942 taxes will be required. The gentleman told us a few weeks ago that we had it in our jeans to pay the 1942 taxes in 1943, but now, even though we may have it in our jeans, he is not going to require us to pay in 1943, but we can wait until 1944, 1945, and 1946. That money now in our jeans may have been dissipated by that time.

How far they have come in their attempt to compromise! How can they excuse such backtracking? Only because they know the people want a pay-as-you-go plan and they now do not dare insist upon full payment, but will compromise on a half payment.

If we are responsible to the people, we should know how this House will vote today. If instead we are responsible to the party whip, we also know how this House will vote. The Democrats have the majority. If ever there was a time to try men's souls it is today. It is party loyalty against the people. I think if the Carlson bill fails, another motion to recommit will be joyfully voted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the $50,000 taxpayer to whom the gentleman has referred has not saved and cannot pay, then what happens to him?

Mr. GIFFORD. Why, he goes into bankruptcy. Where does the gentleman suppose he ought to go?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What would the Government get out of that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at the charge of demagogery made by the gentleman who has just preceded me against those of us who speak of the tax burden that will fall upon the returned soldier if the $10,000,000,000 of 1942 income tax is forgiven. This forgiven or abated tax is an asset of the Government, already levied, and $6,000,000,000 of it has already been paid. If it is abated, it will mean the projection of that much tax burden into the future for future taxpayers to pay.

Within the past 2 weeks I have received more than a dozen letters from officers and men in the Army commending me upon the stand I have taken against the forgiveness of income taxes for 1942. I tell you that no proponent of forgiveness has ever told you when this 1942 tax will be paid if the Ruml-Carlson bill is passed. The reason they do not tell you is because they know it will never be paid.

There is justification for my stand here this morning in favor of this committee bill, even though it carries what they say is a partial forgiveness. If you will recollect, the 1942 tax bill was not passed until October 23, 1942. It was retroactive in its nature to January 1, 1942. Seven million new taxpayers were thereby told in the late fall, just before the beginning of the new year, that they owed taxes for 1942. This 7,000,000 class had had no notice and no chance to save their money to meet their tax bill. This committee bill by applying the 1941 rate to the 1942 income takes care of that situation.

Another thing, to be perfectly fair with the taxpayer, I feel that the Government should let him know on January 1 of each year what his taxes for that year will be in order that he may plan his economy and be prepared to pay his tax bill when it is due. I think the 1942 tax bill should not have been retroactive to January 1 of that year but should have been effective January 1, 1943, thereby giving everybody ample opportunity to make their financial arrangements.

I am supporting this committee bill not on the ground that it is forgiving a cent, but because I take the stand, and always will, that this country, with $29,000,000,000 in the savings banks, and with a national income of $119,000,000,000, should pay its tax for last year and not have that burden spread out in the future and extended as it will be if the Ruml-Carlson bill is passed, so that it will have to be paid by whoever pays taxes in the future, and that will have to be the returned soldier. Call this demagogery, call it anything, but I tell you that the boys in our armed forces will have to bear this $10,000,000,000 tax burden if the 1942 taxes are forgiven, and you know it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. If ten thousand million dollars are forgiven of the 1942 taxes, as Ruml proposes, will not that forgiveness increase the bonded indebtedness of the Nation needed to carry on this war?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And will not such a course greatly increase the indebtedness to be paid on the soldier's return, as well as increase the burden of every other citizen?

Mr. CAMP. Certainly. These men who got the money last year will become old and brittle and pass out of the tax picture, and the men to take their places are the young men of this country.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. HARE. In view of the fact that he has touched upon this point, I am wondering whether he would grant me enough time to read an extract from a letter from one of my boys?

Mr. CAMP. I would like very much to have the gentleman read it and to hear it.

Mr. HARE. This letter was written on March 26. The letter writer says:

> Saw a newspaper yesterday for the first time in several days. I note the attitude of the paper toward the proposed income-tax law. There seems to be quite a drive for the Ruml plan which, as I gather, would forgive or forget the tax for 1942. The paper did not offer any argument against it. What seems to me to be pretty cogent is that if the 1942 taxes are forgiven it will mean that much less money collected at the present time which will mean just that much more national debt to be borne by the servicemen when they get home from the war. It seems to me they expect us to fight and win the war and then pay for it.

Mr. CAMP. Yes; that is what it means. I have something else to say, and then I will close.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CAMP. My time has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The whole object of this forgiving seems to be to get on a current-payment plan.

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. May I ask why the committee did not undertake to put corporations under the current payment plan as well as individuals, and make them make the preliminary report required of individuals and pay their tax quarterly as individuals?

Mr. CAMP. A corporation can do it just as well as an individual, regardless of what Mr. Ruml said of them. It is not in the bill. We have collected $6,000,000,000 of these taxes and if you forgive that, it has either got to be returned to the taxpayer, or applied on next year's taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a passing observation on this new political philosophy which has appeared in our midst in recent weeks. I have always understood that it was the province—rather the general rule—that the minority usually was the loyal opposition. This is the first time that I have ever heard of a minority insisting on writing a tax bill. Of course, I realize that our esteemed minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], is credited with the statement that "no majority of 222 can control a minority of 209." So if you want the responsibility of passing this tax bill, take it. It is yours. You have insisted on having it, and I hope you will enjoy it—from now on.

I joined up with you on the $25,000 limitation to which the majority floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], referred a moment ago, and you and I came to this well and urged the passage of this legislation, and more than once we did declaim that the tax statutes that we already have in effect, and the tax bills that we shall pass, would take care of the men with the large salaries, and here you are urging that the taxes be returned to them, be forgiven.

So that there will be no mistake about my position on the matter, I have reduced this part to writing:

The Ways and Means Committee is the agent and servant of the House. It will be remembered, in fact it will not soon be forgotten, that the committee brought into the House a bill for collection of taxes at the source, those taxes collected at the source to be applied on the 1942 tax liability, that the committee bill provided for no forgiveness of taxes, that the Ruml plan was offered as a substitute forgiving the 1942 taxes to the extent of $10,000,000,000, that the House rejected both the Ruml plan and the committee's bill.

The committee could not be in a position of impeding legislation. By the action of the House the committee was rather compelled to return to the House with a bill embodying a mean between the two extremes or to refuse to bring in legislation of any kind. It chose the former course. It has been said that all legislation is the result of compromise. This bill exemplifies that theorem because it takes a position that is midway between the two extremes.

Many members of the committee are in the position that I am—against any forgiveness of taxes. Personally, I would prefer an amortization of the 1942 taxes over a period of 7 to 10 years, but this did not meet with the approval of the majority of the committee.

Every argument against forgiveness of taxes that can be applied to the Ruml plan applies to the present bill, except that the present bill is a compromise of the two extremes.

It seemed wise to the committee in view of all circumstances and in view of the fact that the 1942 tax bill was not passed until late in 1942, to revert to the 1941 rates and exemptions of 1942 liability and amortize the remainder over a period of 3 years. In effect the use of the 1941 rates and exemptions for the 1942 liability amounts to the application of the 1942 bill to the 1943 taxes, rather than making the 1942 revenue bill retroactive to January 1, 1942. This appears to be a reasonable solution of the problem.

In fact, this would be a complete solution of the problem if we were not confronted with the most serious problem of inflation that has ever faced the Nation. It is conceded that we have an inflationary gap of at least $40,000,000,000—that we have at least $40,000,000,000 in money in the hands of the people—that is much more than the balance of the people's money can buy. In other words, we have at least $110,000,000,000 in money and not more than $70,000,000,000 in goods and services. Consequently, inflation prices, unless curbed, will be disastrous to the purchaser of goods, regardless of his income, if inflation pushes up his prices.

One of the strongest curbs to inflation is taxation. So we should be taxing more instead of less. We should be collecting taxes rather than forgiving taxes, if inflation is to be halted. A most serious discussion of this matter entitled "Inflation Clouds," by Peter Edson, appeared in a recent issue of the Washington News. It reads as follows:

INFLATION CLOUDS

(By Peter Edson)

The thunderheads of inflation now forming on the economic horizon get bigger and blacker every hour. Prices are rising, wages are rising, national income is spiraling up in a whirlwind that carries with it increased purchasing power and in whose vortex is a $40,000,000,000 inflationary gap.

Despite this storm warning, there is every indication that when the House again takes up tax legislation next week, it will put through some form of tax forgiveness. It may not be the pure Ruml plan, which in its original conception called for forgiveness of a whole year's taxes to put tax collection on a current basis. It will probably be a compromise with that idea, tailored to fit the whims of Congress and the popular notion that forgiveness of taxes is nice.

And it would be good news to many taxpayers to learn that half of their tax bill for 1942 would be forgiven, as the new bill reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee proposes. But what has been entirely overlooked is that for every tax dollar whose collection is canceled, the threat of inflation is just that much more real, comes just that much closer.

It is seriously to be questioned if this is any time to think of canceling any taxes. Maybe it's too late to talk of avoiding inflation. Inflation may already be here. But if the menaces of inflation are to be kept under any kind of control at all, now is the time not to talk of forgiving taxes, but, if anything, of increasing them.

That is the highly unpopular doctrine to espouse, and that is why you no longer hear the golden voices rising to Congress or out to decry the idea of tax forgiveness and to plead for higher taxes and still higher taxes to stop inflation.

The administration has fought a losing battle on this policy right from the start. Treasury Secretary Morgenthau has expressed himself as satisfied with the tax bill now before the House. He could do little else. At this late date it is essential that the Treasury know what its tax program is to be for the coming year, and the administration seems to be riding along on the assumption that any kind of a tax bill now is better than no tax bill at all.

Last year it was October before tax legislation was completed. This year to delay passage beyond May 15 would be disastrous. The tax reforms proposed in shifting to a pay-as-you-go tax plan are admittedly important, requiring careful consideration and full deliberation. The war can't be stopped, however, while Congress whittles away in old gaffer fashion. Just over the hill are these storm clouds of inflation.

"The Ruml Plan" is a good trade name that catches the eye and the ear. It is a bottle of medicine that has been smartly merchandised, but oversold as something that would put tax collections on a current basis. That it would do, but the hidden ingredient in the bottle and the potential poison is its power to induce inflation by forgiving taxes.

The Ruml plan in its original form was not pay-as-you-go taxation. Pay-as-you-go taxation means deducting taxes from your pay envelope and other income at the source, before you get your hands on it. The revised House tax bill is on sound ground in advocating these withholding taxes of 20 percent, for they are definitely anti-inflationary. Tax forgiveness in any form isn't.

As contemplated, the forgiveness of taxes, there arises in my mind another serious consideration. Somerset Maugham has made a statement we should ponder today:

> If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose that freedom: and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too.

If a nation would have freedom it must pay the price of that freedom. In a democracy such as ours that price is paid by the individual citizen, according to his ability. We are approaching the test of whether the citizen of a free nation can lay aside all selfish instincts and pay the price necessary to guarantee that freedom. To pay that price out of his own money; to accept the responsibility that goes with that price. Free men of America are paying that price in life and limb and in sacrifice of income, health, and comfort on every battle front. The free American taxpayer will pay that price at home, unless he be taught to avoid that responsibility—urged by his political leaders to avoid that responsibility. No sacrifice however great of the citizen taxpayer at home can compare with the privations of the soldier in the field.

Forgiveness of responsibility is the hand-maiden to repudiation. Forgiveness of taxes may well be a forerunner to repudiation of our bonds. If we forgive billions, why add the taxes for more billions? What assurance has the purchaser of Government bonds, if our credit is impaired by the abatement of the very taxes which apply to the interest and principal of these bonds? If the psychology of abating taxes become dominant we may well look with foreboding on the days of depression when some demagogic appeal for repudiation may find favor in the minds of the people, led by skillful political maneuvering, devoid of principle.

The psychology of getting something for nothing has always been with us. It is akin to the avoidance of taxes. In instances, States and municipalities under unprincipled guidance have avoided their obligations.

The integrity of our credit is basic and fundamental to the stability of our various systems of government. We dare not impair the integrity of our Government's credit.

And I want to spell out exactly how the Ruml plan would do just the opposite.

Our country is today faced with the direst need for revenue it has ever known. Unless and until we here in Congress legislate additional taxes, the Government will have to go on borrowing over $70,000,000,000 a year. What that means is clear—we shall have to provide additional tax revenue. No plan for forgiving taxes can ignore this compelling fact, that revenue must be provided to fight this total war. It follows as a matter of logic and simple arithmetic, that if we drop out 1 year's taxes for old taxpayers, there are only two ways to make up the difference. One is to shift the burden for the "lost year" to new taxpayers. But if we adopt the Ruml plan and skip a year, let us not forget that the new taxpayers, who will eventually have to help make up the difference, will in considerable part be the young men and women now serving in the armed forces.

The other way to recoup for the lost year and to get the added revenue we must have is to raise our tax rates, or to impose new taxes. At this point the full implication of the skip-a-year Ruml plan becomes clear. At the top of the income scale, where rates already reach 90 percent, the handout given by the Ruml plan and its variants would be a permanent gift. Even if resort were had to a new tax, like the sales tax, the upper income group would feel little of its weight. I repeat, the Ruml plan would confer an enormous permanent gift on the upper income groups.

Now let us turn to the middle and lower income groups. They are the ones who would bear the brunt of the tax increases which would be imperative to recoup the Ruml-plan forgiveness. They are the ones for whom income-tax rates can be increased. A 90-percent rate at the top is capable of very little increase. A rate of 40, 30, or 20 percent at the bottom is susceptible of very substantial increase. And, at the same time, it is exactly these brackets which would bear the major burden of a sales tax. In other words, the gift bestowed on the lower income groups by the Ruml plan is that undesirable kind of a gift that we have come to call an Indian gift. What the Ruml plan would give, the increased taxes would take away.

Let us look beyond the bottom of the income-tax scale. Here we find a group who would get no benefit whatsoever from the Ruml plan or its variants. Yet if a sales tax were to follow hard upon the heels of the skip-a-year tax plan, the millions of persons in the lowest brackets would participate in providing the revenue lost by bestowing unwarranted tax benefits on the higher income groups.

Surely it is a perversion of our established principles of democratic taxation to give a huge bonanza to the few at the top, at the expense of the many at the middle and bottom. Yet this is precisely what the Ruml-Carlson bill would do. Inherent in that plan, even with its so-called antiwindfall provisions, is a redistribution of the tax burden from the few to the many, in direct violation of the just and fundamental principle of ability to pay.

I do not for a moment contend that it would be reasonable to demand 2 full years' taxes in 1 from the American taxpayer, but I have said and I will say again that in an hour of dire revenue need, it is a counsel of folly and inequity to cancel taxes and then recoup the loss in a way that completely upsets our tax system, in a way that gives to him who hath and takes from him who hath not. Whatever plan this Congress adopts to put the income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis must permit us to raise the revenue we need for the weapons of war and the good works of peace, in full accord with the established principle of ability to pay. In war, even more than in peace, we should be guided by that principle.

Mr. Chairman, the Carlson bill is faulty. Mr. CARLSON himself, in conversation we had, has already admitted that the self-employed have a distinct advantage over those on wages and salaries, and there is no other way to handle the matter except under his bill, and that they have the advantage of not paying any taxes until along toward the end of the year. It is, in my judgment, full of mistakes of that kind, but fundamentally I believe it is unfair to come to the House and make the claim that these windfall provisions that you are so hazy about cure those defects. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] vouched for Mr. Cooper, and accepted him and paid him high compliment. These figures I am about to read, referred to by the majority leader, are in the RECORD, and if there is any mistake in these figures, surely some of the minority would have called attention to them and would have corrected them.

In the case of Charles Marcus, of the same Bendix Co., only $177 in taxes would be payable on the 1942 income of

$77,000. These figures are in the RECORD and are undisputed.

J. D. A. Morrow, of the Joy Manufacturing Co., would, under the antiwindfall provisions, pay only $282 on an income of $55,000. J. W. Frazer, of the Willys-Overland, would pay $447.22 on a $123,000 income. His income was 205 percent over the 1941 income.

Now, if that feature of the antiwindfall section of the Carlson bill cures those defects, I hope it satisfies you gentlemen who are going to vote for this substitute.

Now, it is said to be demagoguery to refer to the soldiers. I would like to read to you a few lines from Ernie Pyle's article appearing in yesterday's Daily News about the battle in Tunisia. I do this particularly to remind you that the people in America are here in comfort and in good health, with plenty of money to pay taxes and plenty of food to eat. He says:

A narrow path comes like a ribbon over a hill miles away, down a long slope, across a creek, up a slope and over another hill.

All along the length of this ribbon there is now a thin line of men. For 4 days and nights they have fought hard, eaten little, washed none, and slept hardly at all. Their nights have been violent with attack, fright, butchery, and their days sleepless and miserable with the crash of artillery.

The men are walking. They are 50 feet apart, for dispersal. Their walk is slow, for they are dead weary, as you can tell even when looking at them from behind. Every line and sag of their bodies speaks their inhuman exhaustion.

On their shoulders and backs they carry heavy steel tripods, machine-gun barrels, leaden boxes of ammunition. Their feet seem to sink into the ground from the overload they are bearing.

They don't slouch. It is the terrible deliberation of each step that spells out their appalling tiredness. Their faces are black and unshaven. They are young men, but the grime and whiskers and exhaustion make them look middle-aged.

In their eyes as they pass is not hatred, not excitement, not despair, not the tonic of their victory—there is just the simple expression of being here as though they had been here doing this forever, and nothing else.

The line moves on, but it never ends. All afternoon men keep coming round the hill and vanishing eventually over the horizon. It is one long, tired line of ant-like men.

There is an agony in your heart and you almost feel ashamed to look at them. They are just guys from Broadway and Main Street, but you wouldn't remember them. They are too far away now. They are too tired. Their world can never be known to you, but if you could see them just once, just for an instant, you would know that no matter how hard people work back home they are not keeping pace with these infantrymen in Tunisia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act may be cited as the "Current Tax Payment Act of 1943."

(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute by Mr. CARLSON of Kansas: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) this act may be cited as the 'Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.'

"(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

"SEC. 2. Relief from double payments in 1943.

"(a) General rule: This subsection shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning in 1942 but shall not take effect until September 1, 1943. Except in cases of fraud, the liability of any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code) for the tax imposed by such chapter for such taxable year is discharged.

"(b) Special rule where 1942 net income $5,000 or more: In case the tax of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code) for the taxable year 1942 is $1,050 or more, subsection (a) shall not apply. If such case if such tax is greater than that for the taxable year 1943, except in cases of fraud, the liability of the individual for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is discharged and the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased by the excess of the tax for the taxable year 1942 over $1,050 in case the tax for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section) is less than $1,050; or over the tax for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section) in case the tax for the taxable year 1943 (so determined) is $1,050 or more. If the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is not greater than that for the taxable year 1943, except in cases of fraud, the liability of the individual for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is discharged. This subsection shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and before January 1, 1944, but shall not take effect until the date prescribed for the making of the return for the taxable year beginning in 1943, except that the provisions making subsection (a) inapplicable shall take effect immediately.

"(c) Special rule where both 1942 and 1943 income is substantially greater than 1941 income: In case the surtax net income both for the taxable year 1942 and for the taxable year 1943 exceeds by more than $5,000 that for the taxable year 1941, then in order to avoid windfalls the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this subsection but with regard to subsection (b)) shall be increased by an amount equal to a tentative tax for such taxable year computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 which (1) exceeds the sum of $5,000 plus the surtax net income for the taxable year 1941, and (2) does not exceed the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943, constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943 and the net income for such taxable year after the allowance of all credits against net income, and as if section 450 of such chapter were not applicable.

"(d) Extension of time for payment of increase in 1943 tax under subsection (c): Where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the payment of the tax for the taxable year 1943 as increased under subsection (c) upon the date prescribed for the payment thereof will result in undue hardship to the taxpayer the Commissioner under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may grant an extension for the payment of such tax, to the extent of the amount of such increase, for a period not in excess of 18 months, and, in exceptional cases, for a further period of not in excess of 18 months. If an extension is granted, the Commissioner may require a taxpayer to furnish a bond in such amount, not exceeding double the amount of the installment, with such sureties as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of the installment in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the time for the payment of such tax is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on the amount with respect to which the extension is granted at the rate of 4 percent per annum for the period of the extension, and no other interest shall be collected on such amount for such period. If the amount the time for the payment of which is so extended is not paid in accordance with the terms of the extension, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on the unpaid amount at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period from the time fixed by the terms of the extension for its payment until it is paid, and no other interest shall be collected on such unpaid amount for such period.

"(e) Special rule where taxpayer dies in taxable year 1942: If the individual dies during the taxable year 1942, subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply, and the liability for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for such taxable year is discharged to the extent of not more than $1,050.

"(f) Treatment of payments prior to September 1, 1943, on account of 1942 tax: Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made prior to the effective date of subsection (a) or (b), whichever is applicable (or on or after such date pursuant to any extension of time granted by the Commissioner before such date), on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of such chapter and other than an individual to whom subsection (e) is applicable) for a taxable year beginning in 1942 shall be held and considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commissioner prior to such date, payment of the portion thereof which if such extension had not been granted would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to such date shall be made notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b).

"(g) Use of term "taxable year": For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1941," "taxable year 1942," and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1941, 1942, and 1943, respectively; and "taxable year" as applied to the taxable year 1942 shall not include any period of less than 12 months unless occasioned by the death of the taxpayer.

"SEC. 3. Collection of tax at source on wages.

"(a) In general: Part II of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to collection of tax at source on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"'*Part II—Collection of tax at source on wages*

"'SEC. 465. Definitions.

"'As used in this part—

"'(a) Wages: The term "wages" means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"'(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay included in gross income, or

"'(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"'(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, or

"'(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or

"'(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or

"'(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, or

"'(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, or

"'(8) for services for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in section 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States, or

"'(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.'

"For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in section 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"'(b) Pay roll period: The term "pay roll period" means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer.

"'(c) Employee: The term "employee" includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term "employee" also includes an officer of a corporation.

"'(d) Employer: The term "employer" means any person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, except that if the wages paid to an individual are paid by a person other than the person for whom the services are or were performed, the term "employer" (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person paying such wages.

"'(e) Single person: The term "single person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"'(f) Married person: The term "married person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"'(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that for the purposes of this part such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this part his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"'(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that for the purposes of this part such person claims half of the personal exemption.

"'(i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this part.

"'(j) Head of family: The term "head of a family" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (m) stating that he is the head of a family.

"'(k) Dependent: The term "dependent" means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 466 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"'SEC. 466. Tax collected at source.

"'(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages to any individual shall withhold and collect upon such wages a tax as follows:

"'(1) 17 per centum of the excess of each payment of such wages over the withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), and

"'(2) 3 per centum of the excess of each payment of such wages over the withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"'(b) Withholding exemption:

"'(1) In computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as an exemption with respect to the wages paid for each payroll period—

"'(A) in computing the portion thereof required to be withheld under subsection (a) (1), an amount determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"'Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$11	$26	$13	0	$8
Biweekly	22	52	26	0	16
Semimonthly	23	55	27.50	0	17
Monthly	46	110	55	0	34
Quarterly	138	330	165	0	102
Semiannual	276	660	330	0	204
Annual	552	1,320	660	0	408
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.50	3.60	1.80	0	1.10

"'(B) in computing the portion thereof required to be withheld under subsection (a) (2), an amount determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"'Pay-roll period:	Withholding exemption
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	$624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, at the election of the employer the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period may be used in computing the tax required to be withheld.

"'(c) Wage bracket withholding:

"'(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a):

"'*If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly*

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
0	$10						
10	15	$0.50					
15	20	1.30	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	2.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	3.30	1.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	4.50	3.40	2.00	.70	.70	.70
40	50	6.50	5.40	4.00	2.70	1.30	1.00
50	60	8.50	7.40	6.00	4.70	3.30	2.00
60	70	10.50	9.40	8.00	6.70	5.30	4.00
70	80	12.50	11.40	10.00	8.70	7.30	6.00
80	90	14.50	13.40	12.00	10.70	9.30	8.00
90	100	16.50	15.40	14.00	12.70	11.30	10.00
100	110	18.50	17.40	16.00	14.70	13.30	12.00
110	120	20.50	19.40	18.00	16.70	15.30	14.00
120	130	22.50	21.40	20.00	18.70	17.30	16.00
130	140	24.50	23.40	22.00	20.70	19.30	18.00
140	150	26.50	25.40	24.00	22.70	21.30	20.00
150	160	28.50	27.40	26.00	24.70	23.30	22.00
160	170	30.50	29.40	28.00	26.70	25.30	24.00
170	180	32.50	31.40	30.00	28.70	27.30	26.00
180	190	34.50	33.40	32.00	30.70	29.30	28.00
190	200	36.50	35.40	34.00	32.70	31.30	30.00
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$37.50	$36.40	$35.00	$33.70	$32.30	$31.00

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	2.20	.90	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	4.20	2.90	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	6.20	4.90	3.50	2.10	1.30	1.30
60	70	8.20	6.90	5.50	4.10	2.80	1.60
70	80	10.20	8.90	7.50	6.10	4.80	3.40
80	90	12.20	10.90	9.50	8.10	6.80	5.40
90	100	14.20	12.90	11.50	10.10	8.80	7.40
100	110	16.20	14.90	13.50	12.10	10.80	9.40
110	120	18.20	16.90	15.50	14.10	12.80	11.40
120	130	20.20	18.90	17.50	16.10	14.80	13.40
130	140	22.20	20.90	19.50	18.10	16.80	15.40
140	150	24.20	22.90	21.50	20.10	18.80	17.40
150	160	26.20	24.90	23.50	22.10	20.80	19.40
160	170	28.20	26.90	25.50	24.10	22.80	21.40
170	180	30.20	28.90	27.50	26.10	24.80	23.40
180	190	32.20	30.90	29.50	28.10	26.80	25.40
190	200	34.20	32.90	31.50	30.10	28.80	27.40
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$35.20	$33.90	$32.50	$31.10	$29.80	$28.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.90	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	1.90	.60	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	2.50	1.60	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	4.40	3.10	1.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	6.40	5.10	3.70	2.30	1.00	1.00
50	60	8.40	7.10	5.70	4.30	3.00	1.60
60	70	10.40	9.10	7.70	6.30	5.00	3.60
70	80	12.40	11.10	9.70	8.30	7.00	5.60
80	90	14.40	13.10	11.70	10.30	9.00	7.60
90	100	16.40	15.10	13.70	12.30	11.00	9.60
100	110	18.40	17.10	15.70	14.30	13.00	11.60
110	120	20.40	19.10	17.70	16.30	15.00	13.60
120	130	22.40	21.10	19.70	18.30	17.00	15.60
130	140	24.40	23.10	21.70	20.30	19.00	17.60
140	150	26.40	25.10	23.70	22.30	21.00	19.60
150	160	28.40	27.10	25.70	24.30	23.00	21.60
160	170	30.40	29.10	27.70	26.30	25.00	23.60
170	180	32.40	31.10	29.70	28.30	27.00	25.60
180	190	34.40	33.10	31.70	30.30	29.00	27.60
190	200	36.40	35.10	33.70	32.30	31.00	29.60
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$37.40	$36.10	$34.70	$33.30	$32.00	$30.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10	$0.80					
10	15	2.10	$0.80				
15	20	3.10	1.80	$0.40	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.10	2.80	1.40	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.10	3.80	2.40	1.10	.50	.50
30	40	6.60	5.30	3.90	2.60	1.20	.70
40	50	8.60	7.30	5.90	4.60	3.20	1.80
50	60	10.60	9.30	7.90	6.60	5.20	3.80
60	70	12.60	11.30	9.90	8.60	7.20	5.80
70	80	14.60	13.30	11.90	10.60	9.20	7.80
80	90	16.60	15.30	13.90	12.60	11.20	9.80
90	110	18.60	17.30	15.90	14.60	13.20	11.80
100	100	20.60	19.30	17.90	16.60	15.20	13.80
110	120	22.60	21.30	19.90	18.60	17.20	15.80
120	130	24.60	23.30	21.90	20.60	19.20	17.80
130	140	26.60	25.30	23.90	22.60	21.20	19.80
140	150	28.60	27.30	25.90	24.60	23.20	21.80
150	160	30.60	29.30	27.90	26.60	25.20	23.80
160	170	32.60	31.30	29.90	28.60	27.20	25.80
170	180	34.60	33.30	31.90	30.60	29.20	27.80
180	190	36.60	35.30	33.90	32.60	31.20	29.80
190	200	38.60	37.30	35.90	34.60	33.20	31.80
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$39.60	$38.30	$36.90	$35.60	$34.20	$32.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	.70	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	2.20	2.20	.90	.70	.70	.70
40	50	4.20	4.20	2.90	1.50	1.00	1.00
50	60	6.20	6.20	4.90	3.50	2.10	1.30
60	70	8.20	8.20	6.90	5.50	4.10	2.80
70	80	10.20	10.20	8.90	7.50	6.10	4.80
80	90	12.20	12.20	10.90	9.50	8.10	6.80
90	100	14.20	14.20	12.90	11.50	10.10	8.80
100	110	16.20	16.20	14.90	13.50	12.10	10.80
110	120	18.20	18.20	16.90	15.50	14.10	12.80
120	130	20.20	20.20	18.90	17.50	16.10	14.80
130	140	22.20	22.20	20.90	19.50	18.10	16.80
140	150	24.20	24.20	22.90	21.50	20.10	18.80
150	160	26.20	26.20	24.90	23.50	22.10	20.80
160	170	28.20	28.20	26.90	25.50	24.10	22.80
170	180	30.20	30.20	28.90	27.50	26.10	24.80
180	190	32.20	32.20	30.90	29.50	28.10	26.80
190	200	34.20	34.20	32.90	31.50	30.10	28.80
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$35.20	$35.20	$33.90	$32.50	$31.10	$29.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30	$0.50					
30	40	2.50	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	4.50	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	6.50	3.80	1.10	.90	.90	.90
60	80	9.50	6.80	4.10	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	13.50	10.80	8.10	5.40	2.70	2.00
100	120	17.50	14.80	12.10	9.40	6.70	3.90
120	140	21.50	18.80	16.10	13.40	10.70	7.90
140	160	25.50	22.80	20.10	17.40	14.70	11.90
160	180	29.50	26.80	24.10	21.40	18.70	15.90
180	200	33.50	30.80	28.10	25.40	22.70	19.90
200	220	37.50	34.80	32.10	29.40	26.70	23.90
220	240	41.50	38.80	36.10	33.40	30.70	27.90
240	260	45.50	42.80	40.10	37.40	34.70	31.90
260	280	49.50	46.80	44.10	41.40	38.70	35.90
280	300	53.50	50.80	48.10	45.40	42.70	39.90
300	320	57.50	54.80	52.10	49.40	46.70	43.90
320	340	61.50	58.80	56.10	53.40	50.70	47.90
340	360	65.50	62.80	60.10	57.40	54.70	51.90
360	380	69.50	66.80	64.10	61.40	58.70	55.90
380	400	73.50	70.80	68.10	65.40	62.70	59.90
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$75.50	$72.80	$70.10	$67.40	$64.70	$61.90

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	4.40	1.70	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	8.40	5.70	3.00	2.60	2.60	2.60
100	120	12.40	9.70	7.00	4.30	2.60	2.60
120	140	16.40	13.70	11.00	8.30	5.60	3.20
140	160	20.40	17.70	15.00	12.30	9.60	6.80
160	180	24.40	21.70	19.00	16.30	13.60	10.80
180	200	28.40	25.70	23.00	20.30	17.60	14.80
200	220	32.40	29.70	27.00	24.30	21.60	18.80
220	240	36.40	33.70	31.00	28.30	25.60	22.80
240	260	40.40	37.70	35.00	32.30	29.60	26.80
260	280	44.40	41.70	39.00	36.30	33.60	30.80
280	300	48.40	45.70	43.00	40.30	37.60	34.80
300	320	52.40	49.70	47.00	44.30	41.60	38.80
320	340	56.40	53.70	51.00	48.30	45.60	42.80
340	360	60.40	57.70	55.00	52.30	49.60	46.80
360	380	64.40	61.70	59.00	56.30	53.60	50.80
380	400	68.40	65.70	63.00	60.30	57.60	54.80
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$70.40	$67.70	$65.00	$62.30	$59.60	$56.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30						
30	40	$1.90	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	3.90	1.10	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	5.90	3.10	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	8.90	6.10	3.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	12.90	10.10	7.40	4.70	2.00	2.00
100	120	16.90	14.10	11.40	8.70	6.00	3.30
120	140	20.90	18.10	15.40	12.70	10.00	7.30
140	160	24.90	22.10	19.40	16.70	14.00	11.30
160	180	28.90	26.10	23.40	20.70	18.00	15.30
180	200	32.90	30.10	27.40	24.70	22.00	19.30
200	220	36.90	34.10	31.40	28.70	26.00	23.30
220	240	40.90	38.10	35.40	32.70	30.00	27.30
240	260	44.90	42.10	39.40	36.70	34.00	31.30
260	280	48.90	46.10	43.40	40.70	38.00	35.30
280	300	52.90	50.10	47.40	44.70	42.00	39.30
300	320	56.90	54.10	51.40	48.70	46.00	43.30
320	340	60.90	58.10	55.40	52.70	50.00	47.30
340	360	64.90	62.10	59.40	56.70	54.00	51.30
360	380	68.90	66.10	63.40	60.70	58.00	55.30
380	400	72.90	70.10	67.40	64.70	62.00	59.30
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$74.90	$72.10	$69.40	$66.70	$64.00	$61.30

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	$1.70	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30	4.30	$1.60				
30	40	6.30	3.60	$0.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	8.30	5.60	2.80	.60	.60	.60
50	60	10.30	7.60	4.80	2.10	.90	.90
60	80	13.30	10.60	7.80	5.10	2.40	1.40
80	100	17.30	14.60	11.80	9.10	6.40	3.70
100	120	21.30	18.60	15.80	13.10	10.40	7.70
120	140	25.30	22.60	19.80	17.10	14.40	11.70
140	160	29.30	26.60	23.80	21.10	18.40	15.70
160	180	33.30	30.60	27.80	25.10	22.40	19.70
180	200	37.30	34.60	31.80	29.10	26.40	23.70
200	220	41.30	38.60	35.80	33.10	30.40	27.70
220	240	45.30	42.60	39.80	37.10	34.40	31.70
240	260	49.30	46.60	43.80	41.10	38.40	35.70
260	280	53.30	50.60	47.80	45.10	42.40	39.70
280	300	57.30	54.60	51.80	49.10	46.40	43.70
300	320	61.30	58.60	55.80	53.10	50.40	47.70
320	340	65.30	62.60	59.80	57.10	54.40	51.70
340	360	69.30	66.60	63.80	61.10	58.40	55.70
360	380	73.30	70.60	67.80	65.10	62.40	59.70
380	400	77.30	74.60	71.80	69.10	66.40	63.70
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$79.30	$76.60	$73.80	$71.10	$68.40	$65.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is the head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	1.40	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	4.40	4.40	1.70	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	8.40	8.40	5.70	3.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	12.40	12.40	9.70	7.00	4.30	2.60
120	140	16.40	16.40	13.70	11.00	8.30	5.60
140	160	20.40	20.40	17.70	15.00	12.30	9.60
160	180	24.40	24.40	21.70	19.00	16.30	13.60
180	200	28.40	28.40	25.70	23.00	20.30	17.60
200	220	32.40	32.40	29.70	27.00	24.30	21.60
220	240	36.40	36.40	33.70	31.00	28.30	25.60
240	260	40.40	40.40	37.70	35.00	32.30	29.60
260	280	44.40	44.40	41.70	39.00	36.30	33.60
280	300	48.40	48.40	45.70	43.00	40.30	37.60
300	320	52.40	52.40	49.70	47.00	44.30	41.60
320	340	56.40	56.40	53.70	51.00	48.30	45.60
340	360	60.40	60.40	57.70	55.00	52.30	49.60
360	380	64.40	64.40	61.70	59.00	56.30	53.60
380	400	68.40	68.40	65.70	63.00	60.30	57.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$70.40	$70.40	$67.70	$65.00	$62.30	$59.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30	$0.30					
30	40	2.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	4.30	1.40	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	6.30	3.40	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	9.30	6.40	3.50	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	13.30	10.40	7.50	4.60	1.90	1.90
100	120	17.30	14.40	11.50	8.60	5.70	2.90
120	140	21.30	18.40	15.50	12.60	9.70	6.90
140	160	25.30	22.40	19.50	16.60	13.70	10.90
160	180	29.30	26.40	23.50	20.60	17.70	14.90
180	200	33.30	30.40	27.50	24.60	21.70	18.90
200	220	37.30	34.40	31.50	28.60	25.70	22.90
220	240	41.30	38.40	35.50	32.60	29.70	26.90
240	260	45.30	42.40	39.50	36.60	33.70	30.90
260	280	49.30	46.40	43.50	40.60	37.70	34.90
280	300	53.30	50.40	47.50	44.60	41.70	38.90
300	320	57.30	54.40	51.50	48.60	45.70	42.90
320	340	61.30	58.40	55.50	52.60	49.70	46.90
340	360	65.30	62.40	59.50	56.60	53.70	50.90
360	380	69.30	66.40	63.50	60.60	57.70	54.90
380	400	73.30	70.40	67.50	64.60	61.70	58.90
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$75.30	$72.40	$69.50	$66.60	$63.70	$60.90

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	3.90	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	7.90	5.00	2.10	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	11.90	9.00	6.10	3.20	2.50	2.50
120	140	15.90	13.00	10.10	7.20	4.30	3.10
140	160	19.90	17.00	14.10	11.20	8.30	5.40
160	180	23.90	21.00	18.10	15.20	12.30	9.40
180	200	27.90	25.00	22.10	19.20	16.30	13.40
200	220	31.90	29.00	26.10	23.20	20.30	17.40
220	240	35.90	33.00	30.10	27.20	24.30	21.40
240	260	39.90	37.00	34.10	31.20	28.30	25.40
260	280	43.90	41.00	38.10	35.20	32.30	29.40
280	300	47.90	45.00	42.10	39.20	36.30	33.40
300	320	51.90	49.00	46.10	43.20	40.30	37.40
320	340	55.90	53.00	50.10	47.20	44.30	41.40
340	360	59.90	57.00	54.10	51.20	48.30	45.40
360	380	63.90	61.00	58.10	55.20	52.30	49.40
380	400	67.90	65.00	62.10	59.20	56.30	53.40
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$69.90	$67.00	$64.10	$61.20	$58.30	$55.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
20	30						
30	40	$1.50	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	3.50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	5.50	2.60	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	8.50	5.60	2.80	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	12.50	9.60	6.80	3.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	16.50	13.60	10.80	7.90	5.00	2.50
120	140	20.50	17.60	14.80	11.90	9.00	6.10
140	160	24.50	21.60	18.80	15.90	13.00	10.10
160	180	28.50	25.60	22.80	19.90	17.00	14.10
180	200	32.50	29.60	26.80	23.90	21.00	18.10
200	220	36.50	33.60	30.80	27.90	25.00	22.10
220	240	40.50	37.60	34.80	31.90	29.00	26.10
240	260	44.50	41.60	38.80	35.90	33.00	30.10
260	280	48.50	45.60	42.80	39.90	37.00	34.10
280	300	52.50	49.60	46.80	43.90	41.00	38.10
300	320	56.50	53.60	50.80	47.90	45.00	42.10
320	340	60.50	57.60	54.80	51.90	49.00	46.10
340	360	64.50	61.60	58.80	55.90	53.00	50.10
360	380	68.50	65.60	62.80	59.90	57.00	54.10
380	400	72.50	69.60	66.80	63.90	61.00	58.10
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$74.50	$71.60	$68.80	$65.90	$63.00	$60.10

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	$1.70					
20	30	4.20	$1.40				
30	40	6.20	3.30	$0.40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	8.20	5.20	2.40	.60	.60	.60
50	60	10.20	7.30	4.40	1.50	.90	.90
60	80	13.20	10.30	7.40	4.50	1.70	1.30
80	100	17.20	14.30	11.40	8.50	5.70	2.80
100	120	21.20	18.30	15.40	12.50	9.70	6.80
120	140	25.20	22.30	19.40	16.50	13.70	10.80
140	160	29.20	26.30	23.40	20.50	17.70	14.80
160	180	33.20	30.30	27.40	24.50	21.70	18.80
180	200	37.20	34.30	31.40	28.50	25.70	22.80
200	220	41.20	38.30	35.40	32.50	29.70	26.80
220	240	45.20	42.20	39.40	36.50	33.70	30.80
240	260	49.20	46.30	43.40	40.50	37.70	34.80
260	280	53.20	50.30	47.40	44.50	41.70	38.80
280	300	57.20	54.30	51.40	48.50	45.70	42.80
300	320	61.20	58.30	55.40	52.50	49.70	46.80
320	340	65.20	62.30	59.40	56.50	53.70	50.80
340	360	69.20	66.30	63.40	60.50	57.70	54.80
360	380	73.20	70.30	67.40	64.50	61.70	58.80
380	400	77.20	74.30	71.40	68.50	65.70	62.80
$400	or over	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$79.20	$76.30	$73.40	$70.50	$67.70	$64.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	3.90	3.90	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	7.90	7.90	5.00	2.10	1.90	1.90
100	120	11.90	11.90	9.00	6.10	3.20	2.50
120	140	15.90	15.90	13.00	10.10	7.20	4.30
140	160	19.90	19.90	17.00	14.10	11.20	8.30
160	180	23.90	23.90	21.00	18.10	15.20	12.30
180	200	27.90	27.90	25.00	22.10	19.20	16.30
200	220	31.90	31.90	29.00	26.10	23.20	20.30
220	240	35.90	35.90	33.00	30.10	27.20	24.30
240	260	39.90	39.90	37.00	34.10	31.20	28.30
260	280	43.90	43.90	41.00	38.10	35.20	32.30
280	300	47.90	47.90	45.00	42.10	39.20	36.30
300	320	51.90	51.90	49.00	46.10	43.20	40.30
320	340	55.90	55.90	53.00	50.10	47.20	44.30
340	360	59.90	59.90	57.00	54.10	51.20	48.30
360	380	63.90	63.90	61.00	58.10	55.20	52.30
380	400	67.90	67.90	65.00	62.10	59.20	56.30
$400	or over	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$69.90	$69.90	$67.00	$64.10	$61.20	$58.30

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40						
40	50						
50	60	$1.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	3.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	5.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	8.60	2.80	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	12.60	6.80	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	16.60	10.80	5.10	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	20.60	14.80	9.10	3.30	2.90	2.90
160	200	26.60	20.80	15.10	9.30	3.80	3.80
200	240	34.60	28.80	23.10	17.30	11.50	5.70
240	280	42.60	36.80	31.10	25.30	19.50	13.70
280	320	50.60	44.80	39.10	33.30	27.50	21.70
320	360	58.60	52.80	47.10	41.30	35.50	29.70
360	400	66.60	60.80	55.10	49.30	43.50	37.70
400	440	74.60	68.80	63.10	57.30	51.50	45.70
440	480	82.60	76.80	71.10	65.30	59.50	53.70
480	520	90.60	84.80	79.10	73.30	67.50	61.70
520	560	98.60	92.80	87.10	81.30	75.50	69.70
560	600	106.60	100.80	95.10	89.30	83.50	77.70
600	640	114.60	108.80	103.10	97.30	91.50	85.70
640	680	122.60	116.80	111.10	105.30	99.50	93.70
680	720	130.60	124.80	119.10	113.30	107.50	101.70
720	760	138.60	132.80	127.10	121.30	115.50	109.70
760	800	146.60	140.80	135.10	129.30	123.50	117.70
$800	or over	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$150.60	$144.80	$139.10	$133.30	$127.50	$121.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40						
40	50						
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	5.70	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	9.70	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	15.70	10.00	4.20	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	23.70	18.00	12.20	6.40	5.00	5.00
240	280	31.70	26.00	20.20	14.40	8.60	6.20
280	320	39.70	34.00	28.20	22.40	16.60	10.80
320	360	47.70	42.00	36.20	30.40	24.60	18.80
360	400	55.70	50.00	44.20	38.40	32.60	26.80
400	440	63.70	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.60	34.80
440	480	71.70	66.00	60.20	54.40	48.60	42.80
480	520	79.70	74.00	68.20	62.40	56.60	50.80
520	560	87.70	82.00	76.20	70.40	64.60	58.80
560	600	95.70	90.00	84.20	78.40	72.60	66.80
600	640	103.70	98.00	92.20	86.40	80.60	74.80
640	680	111.70	106.00	100.20	94.40	88.60	82.80
680	720	119.70	114.00	108.20	102.40	96.60	90.80
720	760	127.70	122.00	116.20	110.40	104.60	98.80
760	800	135.70	130.00	124.20	118.40	112.60	106.80
$800	or over	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$139.70	$134.00	$128.20	$122.40	$116.60	$110.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40						
40	50						
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	2.10	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	4.10	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	7.10	1.30	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	11.10	5.30	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	15.10	9.30	3.50	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	19.10	13.30	7.50	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	25.10	19.30	13.50	7.70	3.80	3.80
200	240	33.10	27.30	21.50	15.70	10.00	5.00
240	280	41.10	35.30	29.50	23.70	18.00	12.20
280	320	49.10	43.30	37.50	31.70	26.00	20.20
320	360	57.10	51.30	45.50	39.70	34.00	28.20
360	400	65.10	59.30	53.50	47.70	42.00	36.20
400	440	73.10	67.30	61.50	55.70	50.00	44.20
440	480	81.10	75.30	69.50	63.70	58.00	52.20
480	520	89.10	83.30	77.50	71.70	66.00	60.20
520	560	97.10	91.30	85.50	79.70	74.00	68.20
560	600	105.10	99.30	93.50	87.70	82.00	76.20
600	640	113.10	107.30	101.50	95.70	90.00	84.20
640	680	121.10	115.30	109.50	103.70	98.00	92.20
680	720	129.10	123.30	117.50	111.70	106.00	100.20
720	760	137.10	131.30	125.50	119.70	114.00	108.20
760	800	145.10	139.30	133.50	127.70	122.00	116.20
$800	or over	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$149.10	$143.30	$137.50	$131.70	$126.00	$120.20

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	$3.40					
40	50	7.60	$1.90				
50	60	9.40	3.70	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	11.40	5.70	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	13.40	7.70	1.90	.70	.70	.70
80	100	16.40	10.70	4.90	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	20.40	14.70	8.90	3.10	1.70	1.70
120	140	24.40	18.70	12.90	7.10	2.30	2.30
140	160	28.40	22.70	16.90	11.10	5.30	2.90
160	200	34.40	28.70	22.90	17.10	11.30	5.50
200	240	42.40	36.70	30.90	25.10	19.30	13.50
240	280	50.40	44.70	38.90	33.10	27.30	21.50
280	320	58.40	52.70	46.90	41.10	35.30	29.50
320	360	66.40	60.70	54.90	49.10	43.30	37.50
360	400	74.40	68.70	62.90	57.10	51.30	45.50
400	440	82.40	76.70	70.90	65.10	59.30	53.50
440	480	90.40	84.70	78.90	73.10	67.30	61.50
480	520	98.40	92.70	86.90	81.10	75.30	69.50
520	560	106.40	100.70	94.90	89.10	83.30	77.50
560	600	114.40	108.70	102.90	97.10	91.30	85.50
600	640	122.40	116.70	110.90	105.10	99.30	93.50
640	680	130.40	124.70	118.90	113.10	107.30	101.50
680	720	138.40	132.70	126.90	121.10	115.30	109.50
720	760	146.40	140.70	134.90	129.10	123.30	117.50
760	800	154.40	148.70	142.90	137.10	131.30	125.50
$800	or over	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$158.40	$152.70	$146.90	$141.10	$135.30	$129.50

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is the head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40	50	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	5.70	5.70	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	9.70	9.70	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	15.70	15.70	10.00	4.20	3.80	3.80
200	240	23.70	23.70	18.00	12.20	6.40	5.00
240	280	31.70	31.70	26.00	20.20	14.40	8.60
280	320	39.70	39.70	34.00	28.20	22.40	16.60
320	360	47.70	47.70	42.00	36.20	30.40	24.60
360	400	55.70	55.70	50.00	44.20	38.40	32.60
400	440	63.70	63.70	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.60
440	480	71.70	71.70	66.00	60.20	54.40	48.60
480	520	79.70	79.70	74.00	68.20	62.40	56.60
520	560	87.70	87.70	82.00	76.20	70.40	64.60
560	600	95.70	95.70	90.00	84.20	78.40	72.60
600	640	103.70	103.70	98.00	92.20	86.40	80.60
640	680	111.70	111.70	106.00	100.20	94.40	88.60
680	720	119.70	119.70	114.00	108.20	102.40	96.60
720	760	127.70	127.70	122.60	116.20	110.40	104.60
760	800	135.70	135.70	130.00	124.20	118.40	112.60
$800	or over----	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$139.70	$139.70	$134.00	$128.20	$122.40	$116.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	$0.20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.40	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.60	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.80	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10
6	7	1.00	.80	.60	.45	.25	.15
7	8	1.20	1.00	.80	.65	.45	.25
8	9	1.40	1.20	1.00	.85	.65	.45
9	10	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.05	.85	.65
10	12	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.15	.95
12	14	2.30	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.35
14	16	2.70	2.50	2.30	2.15	1.95	1.75
16	18	3.10	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.35	2.15
18	20	3.50	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.75	2.55
20	22	3.90	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.15	2.95
22	24	4.50	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.55	3.35
24	26	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.15	3.95	3.75
26	28	5.10	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.35	4.15
28	30	5.50	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.75	4.55
$30	and over----	20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.70	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$4.95	$4.75

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.45	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	.65	.45	.25	.15	.15	.15
7	8	.85	.65	.45	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30	.20
9	10	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50	.30
10	12	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.60
12	14	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.00
14	16	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.80	1.60	1.40
16	18	2.75	2.55	2.35	2.20	2.00	1.80
18	20	3.15	2.95	2.75	2.60	2.40	2.20
20	22	3.55	3.35	3.15	3.00	2.80	2.60
22	24	3.95	3.75	3.55	3.40	3.20	3.00
24	26	4.35	4.15	3.95	3.80	3.60	3.40
26	28	4.75	4.55	4.35	4.20	4.00	3.80
28	30	5.15	4.95	4.75	4.60	4.40	4.20
$30	and over----	20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.35	$5.15	$4.95	$4.80	$4.60	$4.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	$0.15	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.35	$0.15	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.55	.35	.15	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.75	.55	.35	.20	.10	.10
6	7	.95	.75	.55	.40	.20	.15
7	8	1.15	.95	.75	.60	.40	.20
8	9	1.35	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.40
9	10	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.60
10	12	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.30	1.10	.90
12	14	2.25	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.30
14	16	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.70
16	18	3.05	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.10
18	20	3.45	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.50
20	22	3.85	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.90
22	24	4.25	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.30
24	26	4.65	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.70
26	28	5.05	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.10
28	30	5.45	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.50
$30	and over----	20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.65	$5.45	$5.25	$5.10	$4.90	$4.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	$0.10	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	.25	$0.05	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	.45	.25	$0.05	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.65	.45	.25	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.85	.65	.45	.30	.10	.10
5	6	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30	.10
6	7	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50	.30
7	8	1.45	1.25	1.05	.90	.70	.50
8	9	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.10	.90	.70
9	10	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.30	1.10	.90
10	12	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.20
12	14	2.55	2.35	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.60
14	16	2.95	2.75	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.00
16	18	3.35	3.15	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.40
18	20	3.75	3.55	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.80
20	22	4.15	3.95	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.20
22	24	4.55	4.35	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.60
24	26	4.95	4.75	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.00
26	28	5.35	5.15	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.40
28	30	5.75	5.55	5.35	5.20	5.00	4.80
$30	and over----	20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.95	$5.75	$5.55	$5.40	$5.20	$5.00

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.25	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.45	.45	.25	.10	.10	.10
6	7	.65	.65	.45	.25	.15	.15
7	8	.85	.85	.65	.45	.30	.15
8	9	1.05	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30
9	10	1.25	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50
10	12	1.55	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80
12	14	1.95	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20
14	16	2.35	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.80	1.60
16	18	2.75	2.75	2.55	2.35	2.20	2.00
18	20	3.15	3.15	2.95	2.75	2.60	2.40
20	22	3.55	3.55	3.35	3.15	3.00	2.80
22	24	3.95	3.95	3.75	3.55	3.40	3.20
24	26	4.35	4.35	4.15	3.95	3.80	3.60
26	28	4.75	4.75	4.55	4.35	4.20	4.00
28	30	5.15	5.15	4.95	4.75	4.60	4.40
$30	and over----	20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.35	$5.35	$5.15	$4.95	$4.80	$4.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, at the election of the employer the amount to be withheld shall be determined under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, and for such purpose the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"'(d) Tax paid by recipient: If all of the taxes against which the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part may be credited have been paid, the tax so required to be withheld, collected, and paid by the employer shall not be collected from the employer; but payment of such taxes shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of the tax imposed by this chapter.

"'(e) Credit for tax withheld at source: The tax withheld and deducted under this part shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income; but the amount withheld and deducted as tax under this part during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12, or section 400, as the case may be, and section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowed by section 453) for taxable years beginning in such calendar year.

"'(f) Refunds: Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this part, any refund or credit made under section 322 shall be made to the employer to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not withheld and collected under this part by the employer

"'(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any pay-roll period of not more than 31 consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such pay-roll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"'(h) Withholding exemption certificates: Every employee receiving wages (as defined in section 465) shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 466 (b) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection. In case such a certificate is required because of a change of status, it shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. Such certificate—

"'(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect as of the beginning of the last pay-roll period beginning prior to, or with respect to the first payment of wages without regard to a pay-roll period made after, the expiration of 30 days after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective as of the beginning of any previous pay-roll period ending, or with respect to any previous payment of wages without regard to a pay-roll period made, on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate.

"'(2) If furnished on the date of commencement of employment shall take effect as of the beginning of the first pay-roll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a pay-roll period, on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.

"'A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 466 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding.

"'(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"'(1) with respect to a pay-roll period or other period, any part of which is included in a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(2) without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year,

the manner of withholding and the amount to be withheld under this subchapter shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"'SEC. 467. Liability for tax, and adjustments.

"'(a) Employer liable for tax: The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"'(b) Adjustments: If more or less than the correct amount of tax is withheld or paid for any quarter in any calendar year, proper adjustments, with respect both to the tax withheld or the tax paid, may be made in any subsequent quarter of such calendar year, without interest, in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

"'SEC. 468. Return and payment by employer.

"In lieu of the time prescribed in sections 53 and 56 for the return and payment of the tax imposed by this chapter, every employer shall make a return and pay the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part on or before the last day of the month following the close of each quarter of each calendar year. Such return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury. The employer shall include with the final return for the calendar year a duplicate copy of each receipt required to be furnished under section 469. The employer shall also keep such records and render under oath such statements with respect to the tax so withheld and collected as may be required under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. If the employer is the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, the return required in respect of the amount withheld and collected upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, Territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose. A deficiency may be determined on the basis of the amounts required to be withheld and collected during a calendar year, and in such case the amount of the tax shown on the return shall be held and considered to be the aggregate of the amounts of tax shown on the quarterly returns, the tax imposed under this part shall be held and considered to be the aggregate of the taxes imposed for each quarter of the calendar year, the date prescribed for the payment of the tax shall be held and considered to be the date prescribed for the making of the last quarterly return, and for the purpose of ascertaining the return on the basis of which such deficiency is determined, the quarterly returns shall be held and considered to be one return required to be made on the date prescribed for the making of the last quarterly return.

"'SEC. 469. Receipts.

"'(a) Wages: Every employer required to withhold and collect a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this part in respect of such wages.

"'(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be in lieu of the return required to be furnished by the employer in respect of such wages under section 147 and shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

"'(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the Secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished to employees on the day on which the last payment of wages is made.

"'SEC. 470. Penalties.

"'(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 469 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this part who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 469, or regulations prescribed thereunder,

shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 469 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this part who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 469, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"'(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this part, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax provided for in section 291 shall not be less than $10.

"'(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 466 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would decrease the withholding exemption, shall, in lieu of the penalty provided in section 145 (a), upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.'

"(b) Technical amendment: The heading of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'And collection of tax at source on wages.'

"(c) Expiration date for withholding at source on wages repealed: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by subchapter D) is amended by inserting before 'this subchapter' the following: 'Part I of.'

"(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

"SEC. 4. Refunds.

"(a) Excessive withholding: Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under part II of subchapter D exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter (after allowance of the credits provided by sections 31, 32, and 453) against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be credited against any income tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance thereof shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.'

"(b) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund of amounts withheld under part II of subchapter D of chapter 1, or of amounts paid thereunder, or of payments of the estimated tax made under section 59, shall not, except as provided in chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States.'

"SEC. 5. Current payment of tax not withheld at source.

"(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

"'(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b)) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"'(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in section 465)

"'(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: Can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

"'(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: Can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) reasonably be expected to exceed $3,500 for the taxable year; or did when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) for the preceding taxable year, exceed $3,500 for such preceding taxable year, or

"'(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 465)

"'(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: Can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"'(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"'(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"'(1) the amount which he estimates as the amount of tax under sections 11 and 12, or 400, as the case may be, and section 450, for the taxable year, without regard to any credits under sections 32 and 466 (e);

"'(2) the amount which he estimates as the credits for the taxable year under sections 32 and 466 (e); and

"'(3) the excess of the amount estimated under paragraph (1) over the amount estimated under paragraph (2), which for the purposes of this chapter shall be held and considered the estimated tax for the taxable year.'

"The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a writtten statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"'(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated tax for such year may be treated as the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"'(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the 15th day of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the Collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"'(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than 6 months.

"'(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"'(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"'SEC. 59. Payment of estimated tax.

"'(a) In general: The estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that

"'(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"'(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"'(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment.'"

Payment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"'(b) Assessments: The estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"'SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"'(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be

made at any time on or before the 15th day of the last month of the taxable year.

"'(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (4) and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"'(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September 1943, shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.'

"(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed there shall be added to the tax $10 or an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax, whichever is the greater.

"'(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"'(5) Substantial underestimate of tax: If 80 percent of the tax, in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or if 66⅔ percent of the tax in the case of such farmers, exceeds the estimated tax, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 6 percent of such excess.'

"(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after 'return' wherever appearing therein the words 'or declaration,' and (2) by inserting before 'tax' wherever appearing therein the words 'estimated tax or.'

"(d) Payment by installments: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to installment payments) is amended by striking out 'The' at the beginning thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except in the case of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b)) the.'

"(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

"SEC. 6. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

"(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"'(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed under section 25 (b) by such member for such taxable year (and by his spouse, if such member is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year and such spouse is not entitled to the benefits of this paragraph.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to all compensation received after December 31, 1941, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces.

"SEC. 7. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death.

"(a) In general: Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"'*Supplement U—Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death*

"'SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death.

"'In the case of any individual who dies while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, and the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective on and after December 7, 1941."

Mr. COOPER (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kansas will bear me out in the statement that in the final revised form of his bill which is offered as a substitute amendment, there are only five pages that differ from the committee bill.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I wish to say to the gentleman from Tennessee, that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. In view of that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand we will be able to offer amendments at any point in the Carlson substitute under the request which the gentleman has made?

The CHAIRMAN. The Carlson amendment is entirely open to amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is, for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. PATMAN. I want 5 minutes to discuss the matter. I hope the gentleman will arrange it so that I will have 5 minutes.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I think I reserved the right to object first, at any rate I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I have a very important amendment that I would like to offer to the Carlson amendment. If the Carlson amendment is voted down, I will offer it later. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I made this request as a result of an agreement between the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I submitted the request as the result of an agreement reached by those gentlemen. Of course, if it is objected to, that ends the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would like to state that while 15 minutes is agreeable to me and is agreeable to the gentleman from Minnesota, I have no desire to cut off other members who have not had an opportunity to speak in general debate. In that case if many Members desire to speak I would be glad to have my friend agree to rescind that.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I will object, Mr. Chairman, and that will end the argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are now approaching the time that I think every Member of this Committee has been looking forward to. I do not think there is a Member on the floor of this House who does not believe we ought to dispose of this matter today. The country expects us to do it, and I think for the best interests of every Member of this House—and for the country as a whole, we must demonstrate that we can legislate. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this afternoon this House will adopt some proposal and send it to the Senate. I am, of course, very anxious that my substitute proposal be adopted and approved. No one denies that we need to get our taxpayers on a current basis.

I have never tried to evade this abatement issue. I say there is an abatement in my bill, just as there is in the committee bill. The question is: Do you think we can afford to pay the price to get them current? I think we can; in fact, I do not think we can afford to do otherwise; we need to do it for the solvency of the Treasury and we need to do it for the solvency of the taxpayers of this country.

Three proposals will be submitted this afternoon; there may be others, but three have been discussed here in the general debate on the bill. They are the committee bill, the Forand-Robertson bill, and the proposal I am offering.

We do not want to get too worried about this so-called forgiveness proposition. Let us remember that the forgiveness in the committee bill is $4,671,100,000; in the Forand-Robertson bill the forgiveness is $7,600,000; and in my bill it is $8,534,000,000. The question you have to decide this afternoon is: Do you want to forgive about $5,000,000,000 and get 7,000,000 taxpayers current, but make the rest get current by doubling up? Or do you want to forgive $7,600,000,000 and get all taxpayers who are in the first normal income tax bracket and the first surtax income bracket current? Or do you want to forgive something over $8,000,000,000 and get all the taxpayers current? This is the question you are going to vote on this afternoon.

There are some things about the bill I am offering that I do not like, but it is the best bill I have been able to work out, and those on the minority side have been able to work out, and we have worked hard on this bill.

When you vote on my substitute amendment today, remember there are 37,500,000 taxpayers receiving under $5,000 net income. They would become current this year under my proposal. All taxpayers over $5,000 become current by paying the higher of 1942 or 1943, and by paying tax on any so-called windfall in the year otherwise abated.

There may be some people who will benefit, but we have an excess-profits tax law on our statute books, and we tried to draw that law as tight as we could, so if anybody benefits it will be just because you cannot get a tax bill that reaches everyone, as you would like. Therefore, even though a few people receive some benefits, let us not this afternoon destroy the benefits to some 44,000,000 taxpayers just because you can single out 1 individual or 2 and talk about that case. That is the issue this afternoon. Let us remember that we need this legislation because of the postwar period, which we hope will soon be here, when 17,500,000 men and women, today working in war industry and drawing high wages, will have to shift from war economy to peacetime occupations. They will be living on unemployment compensation checks. Do you expect them to pay their taxes on previous incomes out of compensation checks? They cannot do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank my good friend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for the very kind remarks he made with reference to my efforts in connection with this bill, and I appreciate the very fair and frank statement made by my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Kansas who just preceded me. We have an honest difference of opinion on this important question. I accord to him the same sincerity of purpose and honesty of desire that I know he so cheerfully accords to me. The fact is that practically all of the objections that have been heretofore raised against the Carlson bill can be raised at this time. I do want to point out one thing that I think is of rather great importance.

It has been claimed here repeatedly that the Carlson bill will yield more revenue to the Treasury than the committee bill. I hold here two schedules prepared by the Treasury Department—one prepared at the request of the gentleman from Kansas, who asked the Treasury Department to make estimates on his bill, and the other at my request, to give me estimates on both bills, the committee bill and the Carlson bill. These schedules will show that during the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944—this transition period—the committee bill will yield $3,576,600,000 more revenue to the Treasury than the Carlson bill will yield. Now, that is shown by these estimates prepared by the Treasury Department, one of them prepared at the request of the gentleman from Kansas. It shows that the estimate under his bill for these 3 years is $28,744,000,000. Under the committee bill the estimate for these 3 years is $32,320,600,000, a difference of $3,576,600,000 additional that the committee bill will yield over the Carlson bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to invite your attention to the statement placed in the RECORD yesterday showing how the Carlson so-called antiwindfall provision fails to meet this situation with respect to enormous profits made out of this war. The gentleman from Kansas has endeavored, as he said, to do his best to try to meet that situation, but it just cannot be met by these gadgets that he has provided here. It will mean that many of the war profiteers will go free of the payment of any of this tax on these enormous war profits. It cannot be defended and that part of his bill has not been cured. The defects still remain as they have in the past.

This Carlson bill, which is now offered as an amendment, is about the fourth version of the Ruml plan. Why is it necessary to keep revising it, to keep changing it, if the Ruml plan was perfect to start with? This is about the fourth version that we have had presented here for consideration, and, as I said a moment ago, all of the objectionable features heretofore pointed out still obtain. This new gadget to try to prevent windfalls will not work and it simply does not cure those defects that have heretofore been pointed out. I want to invite your attention again, as did the majority leader and the gentleman from Oklahoma, to these cases appearing on page 3846 of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] who has just taken his place called attention to the fact that this is the fourth plan submitted by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If it were not for violating what took place in executive sessions of the committee I could multiply that figure by a considerable number if applied to the plans that were offered in committee. The majority started out with a pledge to the country to make the American taxpayer current, but it has fallen down on that promise. To hear them talk one would think that the Federal Treasury would lose billions and billions of dollars if the Carlson bill were enacted into law, but they have not shown as yet where the Federal Treasury will lose a dollar this year, next year, the following year, or any other year under the Carlson plan. Do you suppose we would stand here and advocate forgiveness of a complete year's receipts to the Federal Treasury? Why, it is preposterous. We are just as patriotic as you men on that side are. We realize the need of the Federal Treasury and we come to you in good conscience with the Carlson plan because under the operation of that bill the Federal Treasury would collect more than $3,000,000,000 in addition to what will be collected under the existing law. Do you call that a forgiveness? Yes, there is an abatement finally, but it comes when you lose your job or your income drops or you die. That is when whatever the abatement is will take place. I have never in all my years here, and I have been here over a quarter of a century, heard so much misrepresentation as has been indulged in by the House on this subject, and the authors knew better than to make the statements they did. If they did not it would be a confession of gross ignorance.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that under the committee bill the Federal Treasury will collect much more money than it will under the Carlson bill. Why? Because the committee bill doubles up the taxes. How are you going to explain that after next March 15, assuming that the committee bill is enacted and you meet a constituent on the street and he asks, "Why is it that you piled 33⅓ percent in additional taxes on me this year under your bill?"

Do you not feel that the American taxpayers are carrying a big enough load now? We do. After all, this Government belongs to all the people and any abatement that takes place is not going to destroy the country. The country will yet remain and all of our national assets remain subject to taxation.

What about the big estates that so much concern has been shown for—these 50 families? Let me say that any benefit which accrues to the estate at the time of the death of the individual will be taken care of by the estate tax. I am surprised at some of the misrepresentations that have taken place on the floor, not only today but yesterday and in the debate that we had a month ago. It is about time that you get down to brass tacks, face realities, and present this matter in a fair manner instead of misrepresenting it, not only to the Congress but to the people of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who has just preceded me continues to assert that under the Carlson-Ruml scheme or plan or whatever it is the Treasury will receive more money than it will under the committee bill. I do not know what he means.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not say that. I said more than under existing law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under existing law. We are talking about what we are doing here. You are trying to get away from existing law and skip a year.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; the gentleman is in error on that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That has been fully demonstrated by the gentleman from Tennessee when he gave figures from the Treasury Department showing that under our bill the Treasury will receive $3,576,000,000 more money under the committee bill than under the Ruml-Carlson scheme. Now, that ought to be satisfactory and I do not think the gentleman should chastise us and say it is time to get down to facts and quit misrepresenting things. I have never accused the gentleman of misrepresenting things, but he has a proposition which I think is unsupported by the facts, and I challenge it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I never accused the gentleman of misrepresenting.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio said the people should have what they want. Of course, I agree with that as a general proposition, but let us look at it this way. We all would like to have the war stopped now, but we cannot stop it until it is won. Therefore, we have to deal with things practically, as they are and not as we would like to have them. We have to levy a tax in proportion to the ability of the people to pay and in proportion to the needs of the Government. That is our responsibility. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] says that practically everybody is for the Ruml plan. How does he know that?

I am afraid he has formed that opinion after reading a few of the mercenary newspapers which speak only for the big interests of this country.

But I have received one telegram after another showing that the people of this country, when they understand it, are not for the Ruml-Carlson plan. I received this telegram just a few minutes ago:

> Our organization, with a membership of 50,000 workers in insurance companies, banks, publishing firms, social agencies, and other commercial offices, strongly supports your tax bill and is unalterably opposed to Ruml plan. Please use this message in any manner that would be helpful.
>
> RICHARD LEWIS,
> *Acting Secretary-Treasurer, United Office and Professional Workers of America, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York City.*

Fifty thousand workers, bankers, insurance men, and businessmen, send me a telegram that they are 100 percent behind our committee bill and 100 percent opposed to the Ruml plan.

My friends misunderstand the situation when they read a few papers that try to make you believe that the majority of the people of this country believe in skipping an entire year's taxes. They do not favor such a proposition at all. My friends read that in the New York Times, a paper that has misrepresented me and my position constantly since this legislation has been under consideration. I do not criticize all newspapers. Some of them have been manifestly fair, but I know when they are fair and I know when they are not.

My position, with all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, than whom there is no finer Member in this House, conscientious, able, and devoted to his duties, is that his antiwindfall provisions are a delusion and a deception, and do not accomplish the purpose for which they are intended. He has just admitted that there will be a cancelation of taxes for 1 year amounting to more than $8,000,000,000, which is the greatest windfall of all. He takes 1941 as a normal year by which to measure the windfalls of 1942 and 1943, but 1941 was a war year when salaries and wages and profits were greatly increased, and so were 1942 and 1943.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in the previous debate here, placed in the RECORD some facts we all ought to know and see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I took the position then that the windfall provisions are wholly inadequate to take care of the profits received by war brokers. This is because the year 1941 is treated as the normal year. I have before me a table inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], which shows that in 1939 a certain individual received $68,000; in 1940, $102,000; in 1941, $203,000; and in 1942, $287,000. There is no antiwindfall provision in the Carlson plan which takes care of these war profits. It is frankly admitted by all parties that this is a delusion since the antiwindfall provision only pretends to take care of less than $1,000,000,000 out of a cancelation of 1 year's taxes of practically $10,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, there never has been a worse deception than that. It is not intentional, of course, but everyone knows that if you do not pay a year's taxes then you have received the benefit of the cancelation of 1 year's taxes.

Men on this floor continue to tell us about the doubling up, about the increase in taxes, but they do not tell us how the taxes are abated; they do not tell us how much benefit under our bill the taxpayer receives. On a $2,500 taxable income a married taxpayer receives an abatement or a benefit of 63 percent. On $5,000 he receives a benefit of 52 percent. On $10,000 he receives a cancelation of 40 percent. Can you go back home and tell your constituents that you voted for a cancelation of 100 percent? We have tried in this bill to make the taxpayers current and our bill makes the payment of taxes just as current as the Carlson bill does. We abate the increase in taxes attributable to the 1942 act. Do you want to give yourselves a bonus? Go back home and explain, if you can, that you voted to give yourselves a bonus of 100 percent. We give you an abatement of 40 percent in our committee bill, as well as other taxpayers having an income of $10,000, but you propose a windfall to yourselves and ourselves, if you vote for this amendment, of 100 percent. That is exactly what it is. You do not say anything about the forgiveness of 40 percent, but your head becomes a fountain and your eyes rivers of water about increasing the taxes on those who are most able to pay them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement now about limiting the time for debate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that will give those of us who are standing, and desire time, only a little over 3 minutes each.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Those of us who are opposed to all of these bills have had no opportunity to enter into the discussion before, and I do think it is but reasonable to give us a little chance to express ourselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Reserving the right to object, we who have amendments to offer certainly ought to have 5 minutes each, and so should the other Members.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the gentleman from Tennessee to change his request so that Members may have 5 minutes each. That is certainly fair.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I modify the request to make it 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. That is not 5 minutes each. We are likely to get into some difficulty about parliamentary procedure and take up a lot of this time.

Mr. COOPER. Any time taken up in parliamentary procedure does not come out of this time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. At this time I shall have to object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, why has this whole country's revenue legislation been thrown into a demoralization greater than it has even experienced before? Why this effort to relieve the taxpayers of this country for the taxes due on all of their transactions in business and all of their

services for which they received salaries and wages for a whole year? Why on the other hand the effort to change the revenue bill so as to levy rates for 1 year on another year, and then double up in part for 3 years? Why is all that done? On account of the promise of the greatest "gold brick" proposition ever offered the people of the United States, to wit, the current payment of your taxes. That is what it is all pretendedly for. And the first thing we find in this remarkable make-the-taxpayer-current idea is a total failure to deal with corporations in any particular whatsoever, and you are going to put those who draw salaries and wages and all of the individual taxpayers upon a current basis and leave the corporations to pay taxes like gentlemen, as we do at this time, almost whenever they get ready during a whole year. That is unrepublican, it is undemocratic, it is un-American, and there is no good reason for it. Why do they say that a corporation cannot be made to pay currently? Because it will be a lot of trouble to the corporations. Mr. Chairman, it will be less trouble to them than it will be to any of the individual taxpayers. The corporations keep books, they know exactly what they are doing from day to day and it is very easy for them to do it. Yet, it is not necessary to bring them up to a current basis in their taxation.

How about the individuals? When we consider it, and look into it, there has never been such an audaciously unrepublican, undemocratic, un-American proposition before the House of Representatives in my day. The proposition is to take the wage earners first, and the salary drawers, and as the colored folks in my State say, put a "yaller dog" tag on them and segregate them into a condemned group and their incomes and salaries taken from them for tax not yet due and which they may never owe. This is clearly violative of the Constitution of the United States as anything ever attempted—taking property without due process of law and then you take his tax, and he may have other income and deductible losses, and he must make finally what we call a temporary report or statement to the Treasury, under solemn pains and penalties, in danger of criminal responsibility if it is not correct, in danger of civil responsibility if it is not correct, carrying a severe danger to every citizen of this Republic, and they must make it quarterly, and then pay the tax according to what they guess they made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 or 3 more minutes to finish my talk? We have had nothing on our side. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman from North Carolina that the time has been limited to 1 hour and 15 minutes, and that there are 17 who wish to be heard in that time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Well, we cannot be heard, but it is rotten to its very core.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] is recognized.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this tax bill. It is doubtful if I could add a great deal to the discussion, but before we reach the conclusion of the debate I want to call attention to the fact that the bill I introduced yesterday, H. R. 2577, is printed and available to you. I am hopeful that the House will have an opportunity to vote on that bill today. It does not forgive a year's taxes as does the Carlson bill, but it forgives a portion. It does not double up, as does the committee bill, in any sense whatsoever. It forgives the first 19 units for everybody from top to bottom and therefore permits that when increases in taxes are imposed in the future, as they inevitably will be, the taxes can be imposed upon everybody and not just on the middle and lower classes. A complete year's forgiveness, such as is provided in the Carlson bill, means that the people in the upper brackets will have forgiveness of a large sum of money, yet the brackets not being disturbed, you will not be able to reach them when you impose new taxes, but that load will have to be spread among the other taxpayers of the country. Forgiving the 19 units means making 90 percent of the taxpayers current. Those who will not be made current will continue to pay the surplus over the 19-percent bracket in the following year just as they are doing today. Because of that fact I feel that this is a more fair and a more equitable bill than any of the others. My bill contains the withholding provisions of both the Carlson bill and the committee bill; also the abatement of taxes for men who die in the service, and exemptions for service people are raised to $3,500. The bill does not contain any provision for discounts.

I am hopeful that when the vote is taken we can vote down in Committee of the Whole the Carlson bill and at that time, with that substitute being out of the way, I shall offer my bill as a substitute, and that you will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN to the Carlson amendment: Page 61, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 8. Tax with respect to coming into possession or enjoyment of property acquired from a decedent.

"Chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"'SUBCHAPTER C—SPECIAL INHERITANCE TAX

"'SEC. 950. Imposition of tax.

"'In the case of any property which would be includible in the gross estate of a decedent under the provisions of section 811 if it were not for the fact that the death of the decedent occurred or the transfer was made before June 6, 1932 (whether or not before September 8, 1916), there shall be imposed upon the coming into possession or enjoyment of such property after the date of the enactment of the Individual Income Tax Collection Act of 1943 by any individual citizen or resident of the United States, a tax equal to the sum of the percentages set forth in section 935 of the net value of the beneficial interest of which the possession or enjoyment was so acquired by such individual.

"'SEC. 951. Gross value of beneficial interest.

"'The gross value of the beneficial interest shall be determined as of the date on which its possession or enjoyment was acquired.

"'SEC. 952. Net value of beneficial interest.

"'The net value of the beneficial interest shall be determined by deducting from the gross value of such interest an exemption of $100,000.

"'SEC. 953. Administrative provisions.

"'Insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, the provisions of subchapter A shall be applicable to the levy, assessment, and collection of the tax imposed by this subchapter.'"

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the provision that I have been urging for some time, and I expect to keep up the struggle until we reach these large fortunes that are now escaping taxes entirely.

Before the passage of the income-tax amendment, large interests, through their shrewd lawyers, knowing that the American people were going to adopt an income- and inheritance-tax amendment, created these trusts and through them transferred their property, you might say, to future generations. In that way they have escaped all inheritance and income taxes on those inheritances. I have called your attention from time to time to the Marshall Field estate, for instance. It is not by itself. There are others in the same position.

This Marshall Field trust was created back about 1912 or 1913, transferring this property over to the present Marshall Field III upon the becoming of age of his youngest child, which will be September of this year. Unless this amendment, or some similar provision is enacted, this estate will never pay one single dollar in taxes. Yet it has grown to something like $200,000,000. It is being used, as I have pointed out before, for the financing of PM, a publication that is engaged in maligning Members of Congress, and the money that is lost on it is even deducted from his income for purposes of estimating his current income taxes.

I hope this point of order will not be made. I believe this amendment represents the wishes of the overwhelming majority of this Congress. I believe it represents the wishes of 90 percent of the American people.

Are you going down into the pockets of the laboring men and take a part of their pay to help carry on this war and then sit here and see this vast estate of $200,000,000 piled into the lap of this man to be squandered as it is being squandered now, and not pay a dollar of taxes?

I know that some of you want to forgive a year's taxes, and you say they will be here to pay it later. I do not know whether they will or not. I imagine that some of them will be in South America, Central America, Asia, Canada, or some other country, where they do not have high income taxes, in the years to come. I am not in favor of letting them escape now, and unloading that burden on you and your children and on our servicemen when they come back from this war. For that reason I shall vote for the committee bill as between the two, but I would prefer to see the law stand as it is except I would like to see this amendment adopted in order that we may reach these large estates that are absolutely escaping taxation.

I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not make his point of order against the amendment, but that the House will adopt the amendment and say that these large estates, when they fall into the hands of favored individuals who never earned a dollar of them, will have to pay the same taxes as any other estates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. I do not believe the Committee should be called upon at this time to pass upon the merits of this amendment.

I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this bill.

This bill is one to provide for the current payment of individual income taxes. This amendment seeks to amend the estate tax law which is not touched in any way in this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi will doubtless have ample opportunity to present this issue when the next tax bill is under consideration, but certainly this is not the appropriate time or place for this kind of amendment. There is nothing in this bill relating to the subject matter of the amendment. I therefore regret to have to make the point of order but make it nevertheless.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in doing so I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if I may have any assurance that I shall be able to present this amendment to a regular tax bill between now and September of this year? If not it will be too late. I am taking this course because it is the only one that I see open to me.

Mr. COOPER. There has been a tax bill here every year for the last 10 years, but I am unable to assure the gentleman just when the next one is going to be considered. All the indications are that we shall have an opportunity to do so within the near future.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope so. This bill is rather far reaching; it touches everything from the man who would escape the payment of three and one-half million dollars a year under the Carlson plan, or the Ruml plan, on down to the little individual who pays $1 in income taxes. The enacting clause of this bill reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act is to be cited as the current tax payment act of 1943.

It seems to me, that inasmuch as this is a tax collection measure, my amendment would be in order, and therefore the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair draws attention to the fact that the bill under consideration provides for the current payment of individual income taxes. The amendment offered by the gentleman relates to inheritance taxes.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS to the Carlson amendment: Page 44, line 19, following subsection (i) of section 466, add a new subsection, as follows:

"(j) Upon the request of an employee, made at the beginning of any taxable year, the employer shall, before withholding the tax as provided in this section, deduct from the amount of wages paid to such employee the average amount for each pay-roll period of the religious, educational, charitable, and other contributions as defined in section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code, which the employee certifies he will pay during the current year."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Carlson bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment pertains to the withholding tax not only of the Carlson bill but of the committee bill as well. You will find a copy of the amendment on page 3858 of the RECORD for yesterday.

The churches of America, including all denominations, our colleges and our universities, our hospitals, and our many institutions of charity and humanitarianism, have many friends in this House of Representatives. The amendment that I have offered means a great deal to these institutions and to those splendid individuals who are charged with their maintenance and operation.

You will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3 a somewhat detailed discussion of this amendment by me, on page 3858. You will also find a printed copy of this amendment.

The institutions of our country, which must depend upon the voluntary contributions of the American people, are having a most difficult time in our present war economy. It is very necessary that we keep these institutions separate and apart from the Government. At the same time, these educational, religious, and charitable concerns mean so much to the welfare of our Nation that we cannot disregard their well-being any more than we can disregard the well-being of the American homes.

I can best illustrate the import of my amendment by citing an example. Under the present law, a taxpayer may deduct from his net income contributions which fall within a certain category set out in the Internal Revenue Code in an amount up to 15 percent of his net income. That is the law of the land, but let us consider the very practical situation that the vast majority of the taxpayers of America will face. Under the withholding provisions of all of the tax bills before us, the taxpayer will have a deduction from his wages or salary of 20 percent. Perhaps his living costs have gone up 18 or 20 percent. He is urged to spend 10 percent of his income for bonds. The money that he has left is not going to go very far. It is going to be most difficult for him to make the contribution to his church, to the American Red Cross, and to other worthy causes. He will be financially unable to make these contributions and to take his credit at the end of the year. My amendment provides that he may take credit for these contributions as he goes along.

Let us take the case of a taxpayer whose salary is $200 a month. If my amendment prevails, he may notify his employer that he expects to contribute 10 percent of his income to his church and to the American Red Cross. This would be $20 per month. The employer then would withhold the tax from the taxpayer's wages, not on the basis of a $200 monthly salary but on the basis of $180. It is very evident that if the taxpayer has the method available so that he can make his contributions each month and thereby reduce the base for applying the withholding tax, many more contributions will be made.

The passage of this amendment may mean the difference between continuance and closing of some of these worth-while institutions. It will give the American Red Cross, many hospitals, libraries, colleges, and our churches a working basis upon which they may obtain their contributions and will enable them to also have a pay-as-you-go plan. I sincerely hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but shall take only a moment or two.

While we all recognize the merit and the desire to be of assistance to these religious and charitable institutions yet I would point out—and I assume the gentleman from Kansas will probably want to discuss this inasmuch as it is an amendment to his amendment—this would involve interminable work upon all the employers of this country. Provision is made under these tables that appear in the bill for deductions, including religious and charitable contributions, but if this amendment were to be adopted all these tables would be disrupted and put out of line, and it would mean in practical effect that every employer would have to ascertain from every employee what his contributions are to religious and charitable institutions, and it will mean a great deal of work and difficulty for all the employers of the country who have the added responsibility and difficulty of withholding at the source on these wages and salaries. I do think this should be borne in mind, because it will be a tremendous burden to place on the employers of this country. Bear in mind further that the taxpayer can give his religious and charitable contributions and when he makes his final return he may claim them and there will be no difficulty along that line,

but to insert it as an amendment will disrupt these tables and cause considerable work and trouble for the employers of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

RUML PLAN WILL CREATE NEW CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in December 1929 there was a bill before the House of Representatives which had for its purpose the remitting or giving to the income taxpayers of the country $160,000,000, and it was claimed then that it was a large gratuity, bounty, or bonus to the income taxpayers. The argument was made by Mr. Hawley, who was chairman of the committee, that it was necessary to give this money to the income taxpayers so as to have continuing prosperity. It was claimed that they needed the money in circulation. Mr. Hawley was telling the truth. We had just had the stock market collapse and it looked like we needed some money in circulation and a shot in the arm for the country. So that argument at that time was logical.

There was a campaign very similar to the Ruml plan campaign put on at that time through the newspapers, and Mayor LaGuardia, then a Member of this body, in addressing the House on December 5, 1929, said:

> Now, this so-called reduction has been sold to the people of my State. The sales talk in the last few weeks since it was recommended has been so effective in my State that in my representative capacity I can do nothing else than vote for it.

That is the kind of sales campaign they have had on this Ruml plan. The difference is that then there was a logical argument that they needed this money in circulation, they needed more money, because we had just had the stock market collapse. If someone then had offered the suggestion that they give $10,000,000,000 away, I imagine somebody would have said that would be too inflationary, it would absolutely ruin the country, so $160,000,000 was all that the Congress was willing to risk after the stock market collapse.

Here we are faced with the situation where many Members are willing to give $10,000,000,000 at a time when we do not want more purchasing power. We want to absorb purchasing power, we want to freeze it, we want to have money put in Government bonds and savings, and we want to keep it out of circulation. Imagine the difference between those times in 1929 and the time now. Now is no time unless you just want to have inflation to give away $10,000,000,000.

The point has been made that the servicemen will have to pay this money after they come back. Yes, and they will have to pay twice as much money or three times as much money because if we do not collect it from income taxpayers we must turn around and borrow it at interest from the commercial banks; then by the time we pay it back we will have paid twenty or thirty billion dollars instead of $10,000,000,000.

So I insist that the passage of the Ruml plan will cause a sales tax to be enacted in order to pay for it. In addition, it is a printing press money proposition, and a German inflation will be caused by its passage which will be ruinous inflation, it will be a bonus for the rich at the expense of the poor and it will create a new crop of war millionaires in World War No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I have been in favor of the Ruml plan from the beginning. I voted for it the other day and I am going to vote for it again today and I am quite willing to accept the moral responsibility which some of the distinguished statesmen in the House feel will attach to this action.

I am especially interested in that aspect of the case. I was tremendously intrigued by the statement of the beloved and distinguished majority leader made on the floor today in which he pointed out that if we pass the Ruml plan and go before our voters in 1944 they will repudiate us because of the moral obliquity involved; consequently he advises us as a sound, sane political move, to vote against the Ruml-Carlson bill.

I am sorry to see political consideration of that type introduced into this discussion. So far as I am concerned, I am going to vote my convictions regardless of what may happen to me in 1944.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The political solicitude shown by the majority for the minority is really very touching.

Mr. EATON. I am glad that the gentleman is touched. He will be touched worse than that when this tax bill goes through and the tax collector calls on him.

May I say in conclusion that I am unable to comprehend the alleged moral question which has been raised so repeatedly here, why it is 100 percent holy and pure to remit fifty percent of the 1942 taxes and distinctly vile and wicked to remit 100 percent.

I do not like the word "forgive" as applied to our taxpayers. If there is any forgiveness involved in the action of this Congress and the administration toward its taxpayers, it ought to be on the part of the taxpayers toward the wild and weird wastefulness and extravagance which has too often been indulged in by this administration. If we are to place our Federal taxes upon a current pay-as-you-go basis, in my judgment, the straight, practical way to do it is to turn our backs upon the past, and make a fresh start in 1943 with a levy of current taxes laid with equal justice upon all citizens according to their ability to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Page 61, line 4, after the period, insert a new section as follows:

"Section 8. (a) Section 3691 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to personal property exempt from distraint) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) State exemptions to apply: There shall be exempt from distraint and sale such personal property as would be exempt from sale if the distraint constituted execution on a judgment.'

"(b) Section 3700 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to distraint on real estate) is amended (1) by inserting before 'When goods' at the beginning thereof the following paragraph heading '(a) In General.—'; and (2) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) State exemptions to apply: There shall be exempt from distraint and sale such real estate as would be exempt from sale if the distraint constituted execution on a judgment.'"

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. KNUTSON. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply seeks to potect the homes that are going to be put on the block regardless of which bill passes. There is now no Federal protection whatever for homes under the income-tax law. I read here a paragraph from a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in which he states:

> There is no existing provision of law which would prevent the seizure and sale of a taxpayer's home to satisfy a claim for income taxes.

In the revision of my remarks, I shall include the entire letter of the Commissioner.

Heretofore we have had only 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 income taxpayers, mostly persons who can protect their homes, but now we are going to have about 44,000,000 people paying taxes, and we are going to reach down into the poorest homes of the land. You Members of Congress will hear of homes being sold for Federal income taxes. Some of these homes will be in your district. Sickness, hospital bills, and other unavoidable expenses will take every cent of revenue, and many poor persons may see their homes sold for the taxes now being levied, unless Congress adopts some measure to protect homes. The present tax rate reaches into the lowest income brackets and this means that it reaches into the most humble homes, and there is not a line of law to protect those homes from being seized and sold for even the smallest levy of income tax. Recently I introduced a bill, H. R. 2514, to take care of this situation, and it is this bill that I am now offering as an amendment here. As is shown in the letter quoted below, there is a little protection as to personal property, but even that is very meager, and less than we have in most States, and there is no protection at all as to real estate. My object is to remedy that very serious situation, now that nearly everybody will be paying some income tax. I realize the difficulty of presenting an amendment

like this in a short time when everybody is either Ruml or anti-Ruml, but this amendment is meritorious. It ought to have the favorable consideration of this House. Something ought to be done, and something must be done to protect the people in the ownership and enjoyment of their homes.

For a number of years we have been making efforts to rehabilitate homes. We have been trying to protect the poor people in the enjoyment of their homes. Now we are doing the very thing that is going to have the effect of striking out from under those homes every protection they have. Every State has laws protecting the homes, but there is no Federal law protecting them. The homestead exemption laws vary in the several States, and so my amendment seeks to give the home owners in each State the same protection which the laws of that State give. This is fair to every State and all home owners. To fail to do that means confusion and strife. It means also that the Federal Government might become the largest owner of homes. All the efforts we have made to build homes, to finance homes, and to encourage home owning in general, will be worth little if we permit the Federal Government to step in and sell homes for a small unpaid income tax. I urge this House to give this amendment favorable consideration. Congress alone can give home owners this protection. Congress will be derelict in its duty unless it meets this urgent situation now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very excellent explanation made by the gentleman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Commissioner's letter follows:

APRIL 16, 1943.

Hon. LEONARD ALLEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: Further reference is made to your letter of March 31, 1943, in which you request to be advised whether you are correct in your understanding that there is nothing in the law to prevent the seizure and sale of a man's home to satisfy a claim of the Federal Government for income taxes.

There is no existing provision of law which would prevent the seizure and sale of a taxpayer's home to satisfy a claim for income taxes.

Section 3690 of the Internal Revenue Code provides:

"If any person liable to pay any taxes neglects or refuses to pay the same within 10 days after notice and demand, it shall be lawful for the collector or his deputy to collect the said taxes, with such interest and other additional amounts as are required by law, by distraint and sale, in the manner provided in this subchapter, of the goods, chattels, or effects, including stocks, securities, bank accounts, and evidences of debt, of the person delinquent as aforesaid."

Section 3700 of the code provides:

"When goods, chattels, or effects sufficient to satisfy the taxes imposed upon any person are not found by the collector or deputy collector, he is authorized to collect the same by seizure and sale of real estate."

Section 3691 (a) of the code provides:

"(a) Enumeration: There shall be exempt from distraint and sale, if belonging to the head of a family—

"(1) School books and wearing apparel: The school books and wearing apparel necessary for such family; also

"(2) Arms: Arms for personal use;

"(3) Livestock: One cow, 2 hogs, 5 sheep, and the wool thereof, provided the aggregate market value of said sheep shall not exceed $50;

"(4) Fodder: The necessary food for such cow, hogs, and sheep, for a period not exceeding 30 days;

"(5) Fuel: Fuel to an amount not greater in value than $25;

"(6) Provisions: Provisions to an amount not greater than $50;

"(7) Household furniture: Household furniture kept for use to an amount not greater than $300; and

"(8) Books and tools of trade or profession: The books, tools, or implements, of a trade or profession, to an amount not greater than $100."

If further correspondence relative to this matter is necessary, please refer to IT:P:T:2-E-2:MKR.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN D. CANN,
Acting Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, no good purpose would be served by recommitting this problem once more to the Committee on Ways and Means for further consideration. Preliminary action on some kind of pay-as-you-earn tax bill should be taken in this Chamber today.

The statesmen who founded our Republic and framed our Constitution paid the House of Representatives a high compliment. To the House of Representatives was given the exclusive duty and power to originate all revenue laws. We who serve in this Chamber now, like those who have served before us, have every right to take genuine pride in that compliment.

The House of Representatives in turn assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means the specific duty of writing the tax bills which are presented to the Congress for action. The members of the Ways and Means Committee have every right to take genuine pride in the compliment paid to them by the House.

The House went into the valley of decision on March 30 of this year in an attempt to pass a revenue bill. I voted to recommit that bill.

I am now prepared to state what I propose to do today, having in mind that I believe no good purpose can be served by recommitting the problem again.

I intend to vote for the Carlson bill because I want it to go to the Senate. If it fails to pass the House, I shall vote for the Robertson-Forand bill, if that is next in order. If that bill fails to pass the House, I shall vote for the committee bill, if that is next in order. If all of these bills fail to pass, I shall vote for some bill on which a majority in the House may agree, because I contend that the tax cauldron has boiled over twice in this Chamber and we should send it on to the other Chamber to undergo a cooling process.

In conclusion, I want it to be crystal-clear that no vote which I may cast today will bind me to vote either for or against the product which will come from the conference committee made up of Members of both Chambers of the Congress on whatever day their product is presented to the House. I shall feel wholly free to vote in any way I choose at that time. I trust I have made it clear that my votes today will be cast for the purpose of making progress, so that some bill may move from the House to the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART to the Carlson substitute amendment: On page 8, strike out lines 15 and 16 and insert "for services performed for any organization organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, but only if such services are exclusively religious in character or are ordinarily and necessarily incident to the religious activities of such organization."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer this identical amendment when the original bill was under consideration on the 30th of March, and it received quite an audible voice support. Now, since everybody is in the humor for forgiving those who need forgiveness less than the employees of our churches, it would be well to think of the cardinal principles upon which this Government was established.

A few days ago we were paying tribute to Thomas Jefferson, the man who gave birth to the idea of the separation of church and state. My position on this amendment is simply that the amendment divorces the Government from the church and the church from the Government insofar as the church serving as fiscal agents, as was never intended. Making our churches fiscal agents and tax collectors for the Government may create a condition that will not serve too well in time to come. Surely we have not reached the point when we should turn our churches over to Government regimentation under political appointment of bureaus and expert tax agents. I appeal to you to give this amendment your very serious consideration.

This amendment does not exempt the printing offices and the rent properties of the churches. If you will follow me in the reading of this amendment, you will see that this amendment applies only if such services are exclusively religious in character or are ordinarily and necessarily incident to the religious activities of such organization—just the immediate church services. I cannot see how any of us with a clear conscience can forgive the rich and by the same stroke make our churches a fiscal agent of our

Government. I plead with you and beg of you to support this amendment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the Congress. I have received several letters from leading ministers of my district on this same question. I hope the matter will be dealt with properly, and I assure you of my great interest in the provisions of your amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I wish to reimpress upon you that this amendment was submitted when the original bill was up for consideration.

Past facts verify grounds for our churches' fears. What a specter of sorrows has been their experience.

It is not so much that the churches wish to be exempted from the payment of taxes under this bill as it is being the fiscal agent. Yet a complete exemption is not to be compared with other provisions of exemptions to the rich, labor organizations, and other institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is just one other point I wish to cover that I did not before, because of the expiration of time. When the argument is presented that the tax burden as covered by the committee bill when spread over 3 years in certain instances exceeds the amount of the income received by the individual in any one of the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, as presented by the blackboard analysis, that does not impress me for this reason: If I understood the blackboard presentation, it shows the income of the individual for 1 year. Now, if in 1943 I receive $100,000, and I have to pay taxes on that $100,000 plus one-third of the taxes assessed against me on the income I received in 1942, I personally do not consider that a burden, because I received the income in 1942 also. In other words, any argument which is made to the effect that I should not pay taxes on income which I received during this war period in which we are now involved, simply carries no weight with me. Therefore, I am not convinced, nor am I converted to the idea that we are destroying the capital structures of our people by asking them to spread a year's tax liability over a 3-year period.

Furthermore, I wish to say to the House for general information that today the people here who are lined up on the two sides of this question vote collectively. We proceed on a mass basis, as the men in uniform proceed on a mass basis when they go into battle and face the cannon. Eventually, however, we must face these issues as individuals out in the field. We shall then have to meet life as it is. Experimenting with this problem, I went home last week and held several meetings in my district, at which this question was discussed, and in addition, prior to going home, I invited the people of my district, some several thousand, to write me on this question and state exactly where they stood on the question of cancelation and meeting the taxes. One-fifth of the letters that I have received are in favor of cancelation and some of them are very emphatically in favor of cancelation and make no mistake about that; I understand the language they use—but the other four-fifths are against cancelation, and if any of the Members are interested in reading those letters, I should be very glad to permit them to do so.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. If we forgave or canceled the $4,400,000,000 indebtedness against the citizens of Great Britain after the last war, why is it so sinful to forgive a few of our American citizens at this time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman vote with me the other day on the lend-lease when I protested the cancelation motives therein?

Mr. BREHM. I did vote with the gentleman against the lend-lease.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Very well, we agree on that. I certainly did not support the cancelation or repudiation of the other debt which the gentleman calls to our attention. I regret the British did not pay it. So we still agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, at present Federal income taxes are due on January 1. At that time the taxpayer knows his actual profits or losses and the exemptions to which he is entitled for the preceding year. From his records he can make his return, and if able and willing to do so may pay his entire tax on that day. Otherwise he may pay it in four quarterly installments without interest. Much might be said for the accuracy and certainty and the absence of overpayments, underpayments, refunds, and the like resulting from this system as against quarterly payments made in the course of a year based upon estimates of what the tax liability may finally be.

In his persuasive testimony before the committee, Mr. Ruml not only admitted but emphasized his opinion that the only equitable and fair method of getting current in 1943 on the payment of income taxes is by forgiving or excusing all taxpayers alike from the payment of the 1942 taxes, and everybody, including the authors of the three pending bills, admits that we can get on a so-called pay-as-you-go basis only by forgiving or postponing payment of taxes due. Even if it be admitted that the game is worth the candle and that we can afford to pay such a price or that in the course of long years the difference would not amount to much, there must be a serious question in the minds of all reasonable persons as to whether this may not be the very worst time in the history of our Nation to make such a change.

In 1942 the Government spent in round numbers $32,400,000,000, which was almost three times as much as during the preparedness year of 1941 and almost twice as much as in the highest year of the World War period. Twenty-three billion four hundred million or more than 70 percent of this staggering expenditure by the Government in 1942 was borrowed, and beyond any question it was the controlling factor in pushing the national income higher than it has ever been. Under existing conditions in 1942 the Government was forced to spend. In order to thus spend it was forced to borrow. Driven by stern necessity, it borrowed and spent like a prodigal. As a result, the national income jumped by leaps and bounds to new high ground. To my mind, it seems wholly unjustifiable under such conditions and for such a year to excuse or forgive the payment of taxes. To do so would indeed put the individual taxpayer upon a pay-as-you-go basis, but for the Nation considered as such the result would be exactly the opposite.

If we turn from the fiscal year 1942 and glance at the immediate present or future the picture does not brighten. The Budget has estimated that Government expenditures for the fiscal year 1943 will rise to eighty billion four hundred million, with a net increase in the public debt of sixty-two billion four hundred million. It estimates for the fiscal year 1944 Government expenditure of more than $104,000,000,000 with a net increase of the public debt of $75,700,000,000.

To excuse or forgive the payment of any taxes at such a time and under such conditions and in the face of such staggering and almost imaginative Government expenditures is too much for me, no matter what the virtues of the Ruml plan may be. To do so to any extent is, in my judgment, nothing short of the evasion of a plain war duty and would almost drive one to the conclusion that the only group of Americans who are really paying as they go are not on the home front.

I have voted, I think, for every tax bill that has been offered in the past 10 years, and if the pending bills levied more taxes I would vote affirmatively. But when our Nation stands face to face with the gravest crisis since it was established, and when in self-defense it is forced to borrow and spend as no other nation ever has, I cannot agree that it is wise or best for any reason to excuse or forgive the payment of any taxes, and for that reason I am unable conscientiously to support either of the pending measures.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE to the Carlson amendment: On page 5, line 9, after the word "period", change the period to a comma and add the following: "Regardless of the provisions of this act or any other law

to the contrary, every person who worked or was engaged in business or who had an occupation for the entire year of 1941 and filed an income-tax return for the year 1941, or who can show by affidavit that they were so engaged for the entire year of 1941 but that their gross income was not sufficient to require them to make an income-tax return under the law, shall be totally exempt from all income taxes for each year, beginning with the year 1942 until the end of the calendar year in which this war shall end, in which both of the following conditions did or shall occur:

"A. His gross income from all sources did not or shall not exceed $1,800.

"B. His gross income did not or shall not exceed his gross income as shown by his 1941 income-tax return or by his affidavit showing the gross amount of his 1941 income plus 20 percent."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that I offered to the Carlson bill when this bill was before the House a few weeks ago. Since that time I have written to every Member of the House, and specially to those of the Committee on Ways and Means, so I trust that you all are familiar with the provisions of this amendment.

I believe every Member of this House will agree with me that there are thousands of good citizens who would be benefitted by this amendment.

The needs of these people are just as real as yours and mine. They realize that their employers cannot afford to pay the high salaries prevalent in the war industries. Nevertheless, these people have to pay the same prices that those of the war plants are called upon to pay. Their income has not increased but everything they buy has increased at least 25 percent.

From the reception this amendment received the last time I offered it, it would appear that the majority of the Members of this House have no white-collar workers in their district. It also seems to be true that the Members of this House have never had the experience that I have had. Many is the time that I have sat down at the end of the month and tried to figure how I would pay the grocer, the doctor, the landlord, the furniture man, the water bill, light bill, the note on the car and the repair bill, to find that they amounted to about $165 and my pay check was about $125. You may say that was just bad management, but if you have never had this experience, naturally you do not know what I am talking about nor can I expect you to have any sympathy for those who today are laboring under the same conditions and are trying to pay wartime prices for everything consumed, on a peacetime salary.

I ask the Members of this House to forget party lines, and, above all, forget the fact that this is an amendment introduced by a new Member. I am not asking you to help me, I am asking that you help thousands in your own district. Can you afford to turn your back on those in your community who are really suffering?

I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following perfecting amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN to the Carlson amendment: On page 3, lines 11, 14, and 22, strike out "1941" and insert "1940."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a perfecting amendment, which seeks to carry out the idea proposed in the Carlson plan to eliminate windfalls from war profits. The amendment simply changes 1941 as the normal base tax year, as provided on page 3 of the bill, and makes it 1940. Large expenditures for war preparedness started in this country in the middle of 1940. The entire year of 1941 was one of tremendous war expenditures, and large profits were made. All such incomes should be taxed. What I am seeking to do by this amendment is to eliminate all possible windfalls from war profits, and make them subject to taxation, which only leaves a discharge of tax liability on normal incomes using the year 1940 as the basis. War profit and other excessive incomes should not escape full taxation. I believe that this amendment is one that is desired by a majority of the Members, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, when I have the floor, I desire to say a few words about the present tax controversy. During my years in the House, I have witnessed the consideration of many tax bills, but I am frank to confess that I have never observed a mess similar to the situation confronting us in connection with the so-called pay-as-you-go proposal. On March 30, when this legislation was last considered, I and a majority of the Members of the House voted against all tax proposals, and the legislation was returned to the committee. I voted against the Rumi-Carlson proposal for the reason that I felt it went too far in discharging tax liability on war-profit incomes for the year 1942. I did not believe then, nor do I believe now, that there should be a forgiveness of taxes for incomes earned in the year 1942 accruing from war profits. The record will show that on March 30 I offered an amendment to discharge from tax liability the first $5,000 of net taxable income for all individuals, but my proposal did not succeed. I could not support the committee bill because it provided for double taxation.

For the past 30 days members of the Ways and Means Committee have sought without success to reach an agreement on tax legislation. We are still in a mess. The Democratic majority presents a bill which is an improvement over the proposal considered in March. The minority proposes a modified Carlson bill, which seeks to eliminate tax forgiveness on windfall earnings from war profits. This bill also contains a provision, somewhat similar to my amendment of March 30, which discharges from tax liability for the year 1942 all net incomes under $5,000, but it does not adequately deal with excessive incomes over and above normal incomes.

To be frank about it, I do not like either bill. Both bills have many good features, if that can be said for a tax bill. But I believe that a more equitable piece of legislation can be drafted. I recognize that it would be folly to return this bill to the Ways and Means Committee for further consideration. This committee has done its best to reach an agreement, but failed to agree on a satisfactory compromise after 4 months of deliberation. We all know that the Senate will draft a new bill which must come back to the House for consideration before it becomes a law. The Senate cannot consider a revenue bill until action is first taken by the House. If we do not send some kind of tax measure to the Senate this week, there will be no tax bill—and additional revenue must be raised to defray the growing cost of the war.

We would be derelict in our duties if we do not send a tax measure to the Senate at this time. I do not propose to be a party to cause further delay in preventing the Senate from considering tax legislation. Either the Carlson proposal or the committee bill should be sent to the Senate. While I object to some of the features in the Carlson bill, I shall vote to send it or any other proposal to the Senate, with the reservation that when the bill comes back to the House from the Senate, or when the tax conference report is considered by the House, my final vote will be based on the merits of the proposal then considered. I do not want to be misunderstood about my vote on this legislation today. We all know that the Senate will rewrite the bill, and I am hopeful that they will pass a tax bill that I can support when it is returned to the House for final action. My vote, therefore, at this time is to expedite action on tax legislation by the House, and I recommend that my colleagues do likewise, and reserve to themselves the right to vote on the merits of the legislation when the Senate bill or conference report is returned to the House for final action.

In conclusion, let me again urge you to support the amendment which I have offered. It provides that normal incomes for the purpose of the Carlson plan shall be those earned in 1940 instead of those earned in 1941 as provided in the bill, thereby eliminating any possibility for a discharge of tax liability on incomes derived from war profits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were ayes 87 and noes 93.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 186 and noes 158.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina in addressing the House a short time ago said something about a gold brick. He said he believed that the advancement of the idea of current tax payment was a gold brick that had been sold to the American people. I do not share that view. I think there are weighty reasons why it is important for the rank and file of our taxpayers, if possible, to be on a current basis. I do not think it happens to make a great deal of difference with regard to the taxpayers in the higher brackets.

But I do think there is a gold brick connected with this proposition, for in the minds of a lot of people there has been implanted, I am afraid, the idea that if only the Ruml plan is passed providing for the abatement of 1942 tax payments there is going to be that much benefit to all the people of the country from a tax standpoint. That is not true, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, if we are to do our duty as a Congress, it is going to be necessary before this Congress ends for us to pass legislation to increase substantially the tax revenues of this country. Therefore, the bill that we have before us today must, above all things, be considered from the standpoint of over-all tax equity, both now and in the future.

My objection to the amendment which is now before the House is that I believe it fails to do that. The reason I think it fails to do that briefly is this: We know, do we not, that the rates in the higher brackets are now so high, and the amount of additional revenue to be obtained from those higher brackets is, on the whole, so small that the additional revenue we must get if we are to come anywhere near balancing the Nation's accounts has got to come from the middle and lower brackets. But under the Ruml plan the principal advantage from the almost complete forgiveness or abatement that is involved in it will not go to the lower brackets but will go to those in the upper brackets. The principal advantage of the Carlson bill, even as amended, will necessarily go to those taxpayers in the upper brackets. Their abatement will mean many times more to them in terms of income after taxes saved to them than will the abatement for the average taxpayer. Yet that average taxpayer is the one who will have to bear the additional burden of future tax measures in order to make up for this abatement. On the contrary we have two other proposals which if the present amendment is voted down we will have an opportunity to consider; the proposal of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the committee bill, either of which it seems to me from the standpoint of the principle of ability-to-pay taxation and as a means of getting taxpayers on a current basis in the case of those taxpayers where it is important to do so, are superior to the proposal which we have to vote on at the present time.

I therefore shall vote against the Carlson amendment. I shall vote against it on the basis of my conception of basic tax equity, because I know that the needs of this Nation will require an additional tax levy; because I know that additional burden will have to fall on the people generally; and because I want to accomplish currency of taxation insofar as it is possible to do so by providing such abatement as is provided in such fashion as to relieve in the major portion those taxpayers upon whom that additional burden will be placed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why I am talking. I have not been able to hear anybody who has been up here yet, there is so much noise in the chamber. I reckon it is not important for I do not conceive myself to be able to do more than my colleagues who have preceded me.

In view of the very high regard I have for my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I prefer to refer to this proposal as the Ruml plan, having received my best information, I think, and probably the only information I have as to Mr. Ruml from the description of him by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] heretofore made. I have no patience with any of it. I cannot understand why at this time in the year 1943 the proposal should receive serious consideration of Members of Congress, in view of the great debt that is being piled upon this country from year to year of necessity and for war purposes. I cannot understand the idea of a proposal to forgive, if you want to call it, or if you want to say "abate," either $8,500,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 taxes for the year 1942. As my colleague from my own State said, you may in a way conceive yourselves to have become current, but what in the name of common sense have you done to the Government of the United States? The people are the Government.

Mr. Chairman, a tax bill was written for the year 1942. There were two votes against the adoption of that bill as brought to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means. Somebody thought to do something later on and came and stood us up, and I reiterate what my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] said, undertook to sell this Congress and the people a gold brick in the idea that we could makes taxes current by forgiving $10,000,000,000 that were levied for 1942. It is all a farce. There is nothing to it. I do warn you gentlemen that I am going to preserve this minority report for good and sufficient reasons hereafter. It accomplishes the objective of placing taxpayers on a current pay-as-you-earn basis immediately and not at some distant time, as it forgives or abates all taxes for 1942, but hereafter, what as to those whose incomes are not from salaries or wages?

How far does it go? It does not touch the man who is in business unless he receives a salary or a wage. It does not touch the corporations of this country.

Let me read you another objective this minority report says is accomplished:

It is simple to understand.

Yes; I understand it and I understood it before blackboards were put up here to teach children what it is thought they ought to know, canceling $10,000,000,000 of taxes, leaving our Government that much more in the red.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think about everything has been said on all sides of this tax measure. I do not presume to add anything new or startling, nor do I for a minute think that what I say will affect many votes in this House or perhaps any at all. I knew when I came down here in January, in fact I knew before I came down here in January, that the lowest animal on earth in the opinion of the Members of this House was not a bureaucrat but a college professor. I unfortunately happen to be one of those and I have taught the subjects of government and taxation for a good many years in one of the greatest universities in the United States of America.

There is not any difference of opinion on this bill on the subject of: One, collection at the source. Everybody is for it, every bill provides for it. There is not any real argument here about whether or not taxes should be collected currently. Every bill, every amendment offered here, substantially provides for that. The only difference in the opinion of the members of this committee and this House on this bill, which is not a tax bill but which is a bill to change our method of collecting taxes—the only difference is on the price we pay to get the taxpayers current.

When I used to teach taxes I used to tell my students that there were three general theories of taxation. I might say that this bill that is specifically under consideration, the substitute amendment, the Carlson-Ruml bill, is not a tax bill—it is an appropriation bill—and as theories may be used to justify taxes, these theories ought to be usable in reverse to justify the appropriation which this amendment passes out to the citizens of the United States.

The first theory of taxation is the theory of benefits received. It is that we ought to collect taxes from the citizens on the basis that those citizens receive benefits from the Government. That is usable in certain specific instances, but will not justify the great work that the present Government has to do.

Second, there is the theory of ability to pay. All political parties in America subscribe to this.

Third, there is another theory, not talked about much but used often, which

I used to tell my students was the politicians' theory; it is the theory of the most feathers with the least squawking.

Now, let us look at these theories in reverse if we are going to distribute $10,000,000,000 to the citizens of the United States of America. Should we distribute that on the basis of benefits to those people?

It is fair to assume, I suppose, that those whose needs are greatest will derive the greatest benefits from a cash donation made by a government to its citizens. Certainly no one will argue that the Carlson-Ruml amendment distributes this appropriation of $10,000,000,000 on this basis.

Nor can this gift be justified by the advocation of ability to pay in reverse. Those least able to pay will have the greatest need, yet this amendment distributes this money chiefly to those whose incomes are and have been greatest, and, therefore, to those who need it least. The theory of ability to pay in reverse, like the theory of benefits received will certainly not explain adequately the distribution of $10,000,000,000 which is provided for in the Carlson-Ruml amendment.

I wonder if we can apply the third theory to this distribution. This politicians' theory of taxation, that is, "the most feathers with the least squawking" also seems inadequate. When this explanation is used it is generally assumed that the feathers are to accrue to the Government. In this instance, however, the proponents of this amendment provide no feathers whatsoever for the Government, in fact this amendment deprives the Government of the United States of $10,000,000,000 worth of feathers and uses those feathers to line the pockets primarily of the rich. However, there is going to be squawking, there will be plenty of it. These squawks will come from that great mass of American people onto whose shoulders has been put the burden of carrying the cost of this war. If we distribute $10,000,000,000 primarily to the rich, that $10,000,000,000 and another $16,000,000,000, which is needed adequately to finance this war this year, will be laid by the very proponents of this measure upon the great mass of citizens through some form of sales tax or other means cleverly thought up to shift the incidence of taxation.

Mr. Chairman, it is not difficult to see through the minds of the Members of this House who make this proposal. First, they ask us to abrogate the President's authority to limit incomes with the promise that these large incomes will be reduced to reasonable amounts by taxation. Then these same people come along and cancel the taxes which the people with large incomes should pay.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States of America are going to squawk and squawk loudly when they discover that the proponents of the Ruml plan have sold them down the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORAND. Do I understand that this vote is on the Carlson-Ruml plan?

The CHAIRMAN. This vote is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. FORAND. And if this amendment is voted down, then I will be in position to offer a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is voted down, further amendments will be in order.

Mr. FORAND. Other substitutes will be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. CARLSON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 197, noes 166.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. The vote now about to be taken is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 202, nays 206, answered "present" 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—202

Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Morrison, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Mott
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Mruk
Andrews	Griffiths	Mundt
Angell	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Arends	Guyer	Norman
Arnold	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Hale	O'Hara
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Barrett	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole
Barry	Halleck	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Hancock	Phillips
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
Beall	Hartley	Plumley
Bender	Hébert	Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Heidinger	Pracht
Bennett, Mo.	Herter	Ramey
Bishop	Hess	Randolph
Blackney	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Holmes, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.
Buffett	Hope	Rockwell
Busbey	Howell	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Jeffrey	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jenkins	Rohrbough
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Rolph
Carlson, Kans.	Jensen	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Anton J.	Schiffler
Carter	Johnson, Calvin D.	Schwabe
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ward	Shafer
Chiperfield	Jones	Short
Church	Jonkman	Simpson, Ill.
Clason	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Kean	Smith, Maine
Cole, Mo.	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Compton	Kilburn	Springer
Cravens	Kinzer	Stanley
Cunningham	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Curtis	Lambertson	Stefan
Day	Landis	Stevenson
Dewey	Larcade	Stockman
Ditter	LeCompte	Sundstrom
Dondero	LeFevre	Taber
Douglas	Lewis	Talbot
Eaton	McCowen	Talle
Ellis	McGregor	Taylor
Ellison, Md.	McKenzie	Tibbott
Ellsworth	McLean	Towe
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Treadway
Engel	Maas	Troutman
Englebright	Martin, Iowa	Van Zandt
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	Mason	Vursell
Fish	Merrow	Weichel, Ohio
Gale	Michener	Welch
Gallagher	Miller, Conn.	Wheat
Gamble	Miller, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Willey
Gerlach	Miller, Pa.	Wilson
Gifford	Monkiewicz	Winter
Gilchrist		Wolcott
Gillette		Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie		Wolverton, N. J.
		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—206

Abernethy	Coffee	Fitzpatrick
Allen, La.	Colmer	Flannagan
Andersen, H. Carl	Cooley	Fogarty
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cooper	Folger
Baldwin, Md.	Costello	Forand
Barden	Courtney	Ford
Beckworth	Cox	Fulbright
Bell	Crawford	Fulmer
Bland	Crosser	Gathings
Bloom	Cullen	Gavagan
Bonner	Curley	Gordon
Boren	D'Alesandro	Gore
Bradley, Pa.	Davis	Gorski
Brooks	Dawson	Gossett
Brown, Ga.	Delaney	Granger
Bryson	Dickstein	Grant, Ala.
Buckley	Dilweg	Green
Bulwinkle	Dingell	Gregory
Burchill, N. Y.	Disney	Hare
Burdick	Domengeaux	Harless, Ariz.
Burgin	Doughton	Harris, Ark.
Byrne	Drewry	Harris, Va.
Camp	Durham	Hart
Cannon, Mo.	Eberharter	Hays
Capozzoli	Elliott	Heffernan
Chapman	Fay	Hobbs
Clark	Feighan	Hoch
	Fernandez	Holifield
	Fisher	Horan

Hull	May	Sauthoff
Izac	Merritt	Scanlon
Jarman	Mills	Schuetz
Johnson, J. Leroy	Monroney	Sheppard
	Morrison, N. C.	Sheridan
Johnson, Luther A.	Murdock	Sikes
	Murphy	Slaughter
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Va.
	Myers	Smith, W. Va.
Johnson, Okla.	Newsome	Snyder
Kee	Nichols	Somers, N. Y.
Kefauver	Norrell	Sparkman
Kelley	Norton	Spence
Kennedy	O'Brien, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Keogh	O'Brien, Mich.	Steagall
Kerr	O'Connor	Stewart
Kilday	O'Neal	Sullivan
King	Outland	Sumner, Ill.
Kirwan	Pace	Sumners, Tex.
Klein	Patman	Tarver
Kunkel	Patton	Thomas, Tex.
LaFollette	Peterson, Fla.	Thomason
Lane	Peterson, Ga.	Tolan
Lanham	Pfeifer	Vincent, Ky.
Lea	Pittenger	Vinson, Ga.
Lesinski	Poage	Voorhis, Calif.
Luce	Poulson	Walter
Ludlow	Price	Ward
Lynch	Priest	Wasielewski
McCord	Rabaut	Weaver
McCormack	Ramspeck	Weiss
McGranery	Rankin	Wene
McMillan	Richards	West
McMurray	Rivers	Whelchel, Ga.
Madden	Robertson	Whitten
Mahon	Robinson, Utah	Whittington
Maloney	Rowan	Wickersham
Manasco	Russell	Winstead
Mansfield, Mont.	Sabath	Woodrum, Va.
	Sadowski	Wright
Mansfield, Tex.	Sasscer	Zimmerman
Marcantonio	Satterfield	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Dworshak Hendricks Kleberg

NOT VOTING—22

Burch, Va.	Furlong	Magnuson
Case	Gearhart	O'Konski
Cochran	Gibson	Rogers, Calif.
Creal	Hagen	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Jackson	Wadsworth
Dies	Lemke	White
Dirksen	McGehee	Worley
Elmer		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Wadsworth (for) with Mr. Creal (against).

Mr. Hagen (for) with Mr. Burch (against).

Mr. Elmer (for) with Mr. Lemke (against).

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Dies (against).

Mr. Kleberg (for) with Mr. Worley (against).

Mr. Dirksen (for) with Mr. Dworshak (against).

Mr. Hendricks (for) with Mr. Gibson (against).

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Cochrane with Mr. Case.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]. I, therefore, desire to change my vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON]. If here he would vote "nay," and I would vote "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea," and be recorded as "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 2570, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) this act may be cited as the 'Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.'

"(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

"SEC. 2. Collection of tax at source on wages.

"(a) In general: Part II of Subchapter D of Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to collection of tax at source on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"'*Part II—Collection of tax at source on wages.*

"'SEC. 465. Definitions.

"As used in this part—

"'(a) Wages: The term "wages" means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"'(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay included in gross income, or

"'(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"'(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, or

"'(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or

"'(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or

"'(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, or

"'(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, or

"(8) for service for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in section 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States, or

"'(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

"For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in section 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"'(b) Payroll period: The term "payroll period" means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer.

"'(c) Employee: The term "employee" includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term "employee" also includes an officer of a corporation.

"'(d) Employer: The term "employer" means any person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, expect that if the wages paid to an individual are paid by a person other than the person for whom the services are or were performed, the term "employer" (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person paying such wages.

"'(e) Single person: The term "single person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"'(f) Married person: The term "married person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"'(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that for the purposes of this part such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this part his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"'(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) stating that for the purposes of this part such person claims half of the personal exemption.

"'(i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this part.

"'(j) Head of family: The term "head of a family" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 466 (m) stating that he is the head of a family.

"'(k) Dependent: The term "dependent" means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 466 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"'SEC. 466. Tax collected at source.

"'(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages to any individual shall withhold and collect upon such wages a tax as follows:

"'(1) 17 percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), and

"'(2) 3 percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"'(b) Withholding exemption:

"'(1) In computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as an exemption with respect to the wages paid for each pay-roll period—

"'(A) in computing the portion thereof required to be withheld under subsection (a) (1), an amount determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"'Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$11	$26	$13	0	$8
Biweekly	22	52	26	0	16
Semimonthly	23	55	27.50	0	17
Monthly	46	110	55	0	34
Quarterly	138	330	165	0	102
Semiannual	276	660	330	0	204
Annual	552	1,320	660	0	408
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.50	3.60	1.80	0	1.10

"'(B) in computing the portion thereof required to be withheld under subsection (a) (2), an amount determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"'Payroll period:	Withholding exemption
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a payroll period, the exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any payroll period or other period, the exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, at the election of the employer the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period may be used in computing the tax required to be withheld.

"'(c) Wage bracket withholding:

"'(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a):

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15	$0.30					
15	20	1.30	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	2.30	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	3.30	1.90	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	4.80	3.40	2.00	.70	.70	.70
40	50	6.80	5.40	4.00	2.70	1.30	1.00
50	60	8.80	7.40	6.00	4.70	3.30	2.00
60	70	10.80	9.40	8.00	6.70	5.30	4.00
70	80	12.80	11.40	10.00	8.70	7.30	6.00
80	90	14.80	13.40	12.00	10.70	9.30	8.00
90	100	16.80	15.40	14.00	12.70	11.30	10.00
100	110	18.80	17.40	16.00	14.70	13.30	12.00
110	120	20.80	19.40	18.00	16.70	15.30	14.00
120	130	22.80	21.40	20.00	18.70	17.30	16.00
130	140	24.80	23.40	22.00	20.70	19.30	18.00
140	150	26.80	25.40	24.00	22.70	21.30	20.00
150	160	28.80	27.40	26.00	24.70	23.30	22.00
160	170	30.80	29.40	28.00	26.70	25.30	24.00
170	180	32.80	31.40	30.00	28.70	27.30	26.00
180	190	34.80	33.40	32.00	30.70	29.30	28.00
190	200	36.80	35.40	34.00	32.70	31.30	30.00
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$37.80	$36.40	$35.00	$33.70	$32.30	$31.00

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	2.20	.90	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	4.20	2.90	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	6.20	4.90	3.50	2.10	1.30	1.30
60	70	8.20	6.90	5.50	4.10	2.80	1.60
70	80	10.20	8.90	7.50	6.10	4.80	3.40
80	90	12.20	10.90	9.50	8.10	6.80	5.40
90	100	14.20	12.90	11.50	10.10	8.80	7.40
100	110	16.20	14.90	13.50	12.10	10.80	9.40
110	120	18.20	16.90	15.50	14.10	12.80	11.40
120	130	20.20	18.90	17.50	16.10	14.80	13.40
130	140	22.20	20.90	19.50	18.10	16.80	15.40
140	150	24.20	22.90	21.50	20.10	18.80	17.40
150	160	26.20	24.90	23.50	22.10	20.80	19.40
160	170	28.20	26.90	25.50	24.10	22.80	21.40
170	180	30.20	28.90	27.50	26.10	24.80	23.40
180	190	32.20	30.90	29.50	28.10	26.80	25.40
190	200	34.20	32.90	31.50	30.10	28.80	27.40
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$35.20	$33.90	$32.50	$31.10	$29.80	$28.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.90	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	1.90	.60	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	2.90	1.60	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	4.40	3.10	1.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	6.40	5.10	3.70	2.30	1.00	1.00
50	60	8.40	7.10	5.70	4.30	3.00	1.60
60	70	10.40	9.10	7.70	6.30	5.00	3.60
70	80	12.40	11.10	9.70	8.30	7.00	5.60
80	90	14.40	13.10	11.70	10.30	9.00	7.60
90	100	16.40	15.10	13.70	12.30	11.00	9.60
100	110	18.40	17.10	15.70	14.30	13.00	11.60
110	120	20.40	19.10	17.70	16.30	15.00	13.60
120	130	22.40	21.10	19.70	18.30	17.00	15.60
130	140	24.40	23.10	21.70	20.30	19.00	17.60
140	150	26.40	25.10	23.70	22.30	21.00	19.60
150	160	28.40	27.10	25.70	24.30	23.00	21.60
160	170	30.40	29.10	27.70	26.30	25.00	23.60
170	180	32.40	31.10	29.70	28.30	27.00	25.60
180	190	34.40	33.10	31.70	30.30	29.00	27.60
190	200	36.40	35.10	33.70	32.30	31.00	29.60
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$37.40	$36.10	$34.70	$33.30	$32.00	$30.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10	$0.80					
10	15	2.10	$0.80				
15	20	3.10	1.80	$0.40	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.10	2.80	1.40	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.10	3.80	2.40	1.10	.50	.50
30	40	6.60	5.30	3.90	2.60	1.20	.70
40	50	8.60	7.30	5.90	4.60	3.20	1.80
50	60	10.60	9.30	7.90	6.60	5.20	3.80
60	70	12.60	11.20	9.90	8.60	7.20	5.80
70	80	14.60	13.30	11.90	10.60	9.20	7.80
80	90	16.60	15.30	13.90	12.60	11.20	9.80
90	110	18.60	17.30	15.90	14.60	13.20	11.80
100	110	20.60	19.30	17.90	16.60	15.20	13.80
110	120	22.60	21.30	19.90	18.60	17.20	15.80
120	130	24.60	23.30	21.90	20.60	19.20	17.80
130	140	26.60	25.30	23.90	22.60	21.20	19.80
140	150	28.60	27.30	25.90	24.60	23.20	21.80
150	160	30.60	29.30	27.90	26.60	25.20	23.80
160	170	32.60	31.30	29.90	28.60	27.20	25.80
170	180	34.60	33.30	31.90	30.60	29.20	27.80
180	190	36.60	35.30	33.90	32.60	31.20	29.80
190	200	38.60	37.20	35.90	34.60	33.20	31.80
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$39.60	$38.30	$36.90	$35.60	$34.20	$32.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And such person is head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$10						
10	15						
15	20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	.70	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	2.20	2.20	.90	.70	.70	.70
40	50	4.20	4.20	2.90	1.50	1.00	1.00
50	60	6.20	6.20	4.90	3.50	2.10	1.30
60	70	8.20	8.20	6.90	5.50	4.10	2.80
70	80	10.20	10.20	8.90	7.50	6.10	4.80
80	90	12.20	12.20	10.90	9.50	8.10	6.80
90	100	14.20	14.20	12.90	11.50	10.10	8.80
100	110	16.20	16.20	14.90	13.50	12.10	10.80
110	120	18.20	18.20	16.90	15.50	14.10	12.80
120	130	20.20	20.20	18.90	17.50	16.10	14.80
130	140	22.20	22.20	20.90	19.50	18.10	16.80
140	150	24.20	24.20	22.90	21.50	20.10	18.80
150	160	26.20	26.20	24.90	23.50	22.10	20.80
160	170	28.20	28.20	26.90	25.50	24.10	22.80
170	180	30.20	30.20	28.90	27.50	26.10	24.80
180	190	32.20	32.20	30.90	29.50	28.10	26.80
190	200	34.20	34.20	32.90	31.50	30.10	28.80
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$38.20	$35.20	$33.90	$32.50	$31.10	$29.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $1.35 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30	$0.50					
30	40	2.50	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	4.50	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	6.50	3.80	1.10	.90	.90	.90
60	80	9.50	6.80	4.10	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	13.50	10.80	8.10	5.40	2.70	2.00
100	120	17.50	14.80	12.10	9.40	6.70	3.90
120	140	21.50	18.80	16.10	13.40	10.70	7.90
140	160	25.50	22.80	20.10	17.40	14.70	11.90
160	180	29.50	26.80	24.10	21.40	18.70	15.90
180	200	33.50	30.80	28.10	25.40	22.70	19.90
200	220	37.50	34.80	32.10	29.40	26.70	23.90
220	240	41.50	38.80	36.10	33.40	30.70	27.90
240	260	45.50	42.80	40.10	37.40	34.70	31.90
260	280	49.50	46.80	44.10	41.40	38.70	35.90
280	300	53.50	50.80	48.10	45.40	42.70	39.90
300	320	57.50	54.80	52.10	49.40	46.70	43.90
320	340	61.50	58.80	56.10	53.40	50.70	47.90
340	360	65.50	62.80	60.10	57.40	54.70	51.90
360	380	69.50	66.80	64.10	61.40	58.70	55.90
380	400	73.50	70.80	68.10	65.40	62.70	59.90
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$75.50	$72.80	$70.10	$67.40	$64.70	$61.90

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	4.40	1.70	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	8.40	5.70	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	12.40	9.70	7.00	4.30	2.60	2.60
120	140	16.40	13.70	11.00	8.30	5.60	3.20
140	160	20.40	17.70	15.00	12.30	9.60	6.80
160	180	24.40	21.70	19.00	16.30	13.60	10.80
180	200	28.40	25.70	23.00	20.30	17.60	14.80
200	220	32.40	29.70	27.00	24.30	21.60	18.80
220	240	36.40	33.70	31.00	28.30	25.60	22.80
240	260	40.40	37.70	35.00	32.30	29.60	26.80
260	280	44.40	41.70	39.00	36.30	33.60	30.80
280	300	48.40	45.70	43.00	40.30	37.60	34.80
300	320	52.40	49.70	47.00	44.30	41.60	38.80
320	340	56.40	53.70	51.00	48.30	45.60	42.80
340	360	60.40	57.70	55.00	52.30	49.60	46.80
360	380	64.40	61.70	59.00	56.30	53.60	50.80
380	400	68.40	65.70	63.00	60.30	57.60	54.80
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$70.40	$67.70	$65.00	$62.30	$59.60	$56.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30						
30	40	$1.00	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	3.00	1.10	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	5.00	3.10	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	8.00	6.10	3.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	12.00	10.10	7.40	4.70	2.00	2.00
100	120	16.00	14.10	11.40	8.70	6.00	3.30
120	140	20.00	18.10	15.40	12.70	10.00	7.30
140	160	24.00	22.10	19.40	16.70	14.00	11.30
160	180	28.00	26.10	23.40	20.70	18.00	15.30
180	200	32.00	30.10	27.40	24.70	22.00	19.30
200	220	36.00	34.10	31.40	28.70	26.00	23.30
220	240	40.00	38.10	35.40	32.70	30.00	27.30
240	260	44.00	42.10	39.40	36.70	34.00	31.30
260	280	48.00	46.10	43.40	40.70	38.00	35.30
280	300	52.00	50.10	47.40	44.70	42.00	39.30
300	320	56.00	54.10	51.40	48.70	46.00	43.30
320	340	60.00	58.10	55.40	52.70	50.00	47.30
340	360	64.00	62.10	59.40	56.70	54.00	51.30
360	380	68.00	66.10	63.40	60.70	58.00	55.30
380	400	72.00	70.10	67.40	64.70	62.00	59.30
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$74.00	$72.10	$69.40	$66.70	$64.00	$61.30

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	$1.70					
20	30	4.30	$1.60				
30	40	6.30	3.60	$0.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	8.30	5.60	2.80	.60	.60	.60
50	60	10.30	7.60	4.80	2.10	.90	.90
60	80	13.30	10.60	7.80	5.10	2.40	1.40
80	100	17.30	14.60	11.80	9.10	6.40	3.70
100	120	21.30	18.60	15.80	13.10	10.40	7.70
120	140	25.30	22.60	19.80	17.10	14.40	11.70
140	160	29.30	26.60	23.80	21.10	18.40	15.70
160	180	33.30	30.60	27.80	25.10	22.40	19.70
180	200	37.30	34.60	31.80	29.10	26.40	23.70
200	220	41.30	38.60	35.80	33.10	30.40	27.70
220	240	45.30	42.60	39.80	37.10	34.40	31.70
240	260	49.30	46.60	43.80	41.10	38.40	35.70
260	280	53.30	50.60	47.80	45.10	42.40	39.70
280	300	57.30	54.60	51.80	49.10	46.40	43.70
300	320	61.30	58.60	55.80	53.10	50.40	47.70
320	340	65.30	62.60	59.80	57.10	54.40	51.70
340	360	69.30	66.60	63.80	61.10	58.40	55.70
360	380	73.30	70.60	67.80	65.10	62.40	59.70
380	400	77.30	74.60	71.80	69.10	66.40	63.70
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus					
		$79.30	$76.60	$73.80	$71.10	$68.40	$65.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And such person is head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20						
20	30						
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	1.40	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	4.40	4.40	1.70	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	8.40	8.40	5.70	3.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	12.40	12.40	9.70	7.00	4.30	2.60
120	140	16.40	16.40	13.70	11.00	8.30	5.60
140	160	20.40	20.40	17.70	15.00	12.30	9.60
160	180	24.40	24.40	21.70	19.00	16.30	13.60
180	200	28.40	28.40	25.70	23.00	20.30	17.60
200	220	32.40	32.40	29.70	27.00	24.30	21.60
220	240	36.40	36.40	33.70	31.00	28.30	25.60
240	260	40.40	40.40	37.70	35.00	32.30	29.60
260	280	44.40	44.40	41.70	39.00	36.30	33.60
280	300	48.40	48.40	45.70	43.00	40.30	37.60
300	320	52.40	52.40	49.70	47.00	44.30	41.60
320	340	56.40	56.40	53.70	51.00	48.30	45.60
340	360	60.40	60.40	57.70	55.00	52.30	49.60
360	380	64.40	64.40	61.70	59.00	56.30	53.60
380	400	68.40	68.40	65.70	63.00	60.30	57.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$70.40	$70.40	$67.70	$65.00	$62.30	$59.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.70 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	------	------	------	------	------	------
20	30	$0.30	------	------	------	------	------
30	40	2.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	4.30	1.40	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	6.30	3.40	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	9.30	6.40	3.50	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	13.30	10.40	7.50	4.60	1.90	1.90
100	120	17.30	14.40	11.50	8.60	5.70	2.90
120	140	21.30	18.40	15.50	12.60	9.70	6.90
140	160	25.30	22.40	19.50	16.60	13.70	10.90
160	180	29.30	26.40	23.50	20.60	17.70	14.90
180	200	33.30	30.40	27.50	24.60	21.70	18.90
200	220	37.30	34.40	31.50	28.60	25.70	22.90
220	240	41.30	38.40	35.50	32.60	29.70	26.90
240	260	45.30	42.40	39.50	36.60	33.70	30.90
260	280	49.30	46.40	43.50	40.60	37.70	34.90
280	300	53.30	50.40	47.50	44.60	41.70	38.90
300	320	57.30	54.40	51.50	48.60	45.70	42.90
320	340	61.30	58.40	55.50	52.60	49.70	46.90
340	360	65.30	62.40	59.50	56.60	53.70	50.90
360	380	69.30	66.40	63.50	60.60	57.70	54.90
380	400	73.30	70.40	67.50	64.60	61.70	58.90
$400	or over----	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$75.30	$72.40	$69.50	$66.60	$63.70	$60.90

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	------	------	------	------	------	------
20	30	------	------	------	------	------	------
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	3.90	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	7.90	5.00	2.10	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	11.90	9.00	6.10	3.20	2.50	2.50
120	140	15.90	13.00	10.10	7.20	4.30	3.10
140	160	19.90	17.00	14.10	11.20	8.30	5.40
160	180	23.90	21.00	18.10	15.20	12.30	9.40
180	200	27.90	25.00	22.10	19.20	16.30	13.40
200	220	31.90	29.00	26.10	23.20	20.30	17.40
220	240	35.90	33.00	30.10	27.20	24.30	21.40
240	260	39.90	37.00	34.10	31.20	28.30	25.40
260	280	43.90	41.00	38.10	35.20	32.30	29.40
280	300	47.90	45.00	42.10	39.20	36.30	33.40
300	320	51.90	49.00	46.10	43.20	40.30	37.40
320	340	55.90	53.00	50.10	47.20	44.30	41.40
340	360	59.90	57.00	54.10	51.20	48.30	45.40
360	380	63.90	61.00	58.10	55.20	52.30	49.40
380	400	67.90	65.00	62.10	59.20	56.30	53.40
$400	or over----	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$69.90	$67.00	$64.10	$61.20	$58.30	$55.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	------	------	------	------	------	------
20	30	------	------	------	------	------	------
30	40	$1.50	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	3.50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	5.50	2.60	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	8.50	5.60	2.80	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	12.50	9.60	6.80	3.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	16.50	13.60	10.80	7.90	5.00	2.50
120	140	20.50	17.60	14.80	11.90	9.00	6.10
140	160	24.50	21.60	18.80	15.90	13.00	10.10
160	180	28.50	25.60	22.80	19.90	17.00	14.10
180	200	32.50	29.60	26.80	23.90	21.00	18.10
200	220	36.50	33.60	30.80	27.90	25.00	22.10
220	240	40.50	37.60	34.80	31.90	29.00	26.10
240	260	44.50	41.60	38.80	35.90	33.00	30.10
260	280	48.50	45.60	42.80	39.90	37.00	34.10
280	300	52.50	49.60	46.80	43.90	41.00	38.10
300	320	56.50	53.60	50.80	47.90	45.00	42.10
320	340	60.50	57.60	54.80	51.90	49.00	46.10
340	360	64.50	61.60	58.80	55.90	53.00	50.10
360	380	68.50	65.60	62.80	59.90	57.00	54.10
380	400	72.50	69.60	66.80	63.90	61.00	58.10
$400	or over----	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$74.50	$71.60	$68.80	$65.90	$63.00	$60.10

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, o the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	$1.70	------	------	------	------	------
20	30	4.20	$1.40	------	------	------	------
30	40	6.20	3.30	$0.40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	8.20	5.30	2.40	.60	.60	.60
50	60	10.20	7.30	4.40	1.50	.90	.90
60	80	13.20	10.30	7.40	4.50	1.70	1.30
80	100	17.20	14.30	11.40	8.50	5.70	2.80
100	120	21.20	18.30	15.40	12.50	9.70	6.80
120	140	25.20	22.30	19.40	16.50	13.70	10.80
140	160	29.20	26.30	23.40	20.50	17.70	14.80
160	180	33.20	30.30	27.40	24.50	21.70	18.80
180	200	37.20	34.30	31.40	28.50	25.70	22.80
200	220	41.20	38.30	35.40	32.50	29.70	26.80
220	240	45.20	42.30	39.40	36.50	33.70	30.80
240	260	49.20	46.30	43.40	40.50	37.70	34.80
260	280	53.20	50.30	47.40	44.50	41.70	38.80
280	300	57.20	54.30	51.40	48.50	45.70	42.80
300	320	61.20	58.30	55.40	52.50	49.70	46.80
320	340	65.20	62.30	59.40	56.50	53.70	50.80
340	360	69.20	66.30	63.40	60.50	57.70	54.80
360	380	73.20	70.30	67.40	64.50	61.70	58.50
380	400	77.20	74.30	71.40	68.50	65.70	62.80
$400	or over----	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$79.20	$76.30	$73.40	$70.50	$67.70	$64.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And such person is a head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$20	------	------	------	------	------	------
20	30	------	------	------	------	------	------
30	40	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	3.90	3.90	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	7.90	7.90	5.00	2.10	1.90	1.90
100	120	11.90	11.90	9.00	6.10	3.20	2.50
120	140	15.90	15.90	13.00	10.10	7.20	4.30
140	160	19.90	19.90	17.00	14.10	11.20	8.30
160	180	23.90	23.90	21.00	18.10	15.20	12.30
180	200	27.90	27.90	25.00	22.10	19.20	16.30
200	220	31.90	31.90	29.00	26.10	23.20	20.30
220	240	35.90	35.90	33.00	30.10	27.20	24.30
240	260	39.90	39.90	37.00	34.10	31.20	28.30
260	280	43.90	43.90	41.00	38.10	35.20	32.30
280	300	47.90	47.90	45.00	42.10	39.20	36.30
300	320	51.90	51.90	49.00	46.10	43.20	40.30
320	340	55.90	55.90	53.00	50.10	47.20	44.30
340	360	59.90	59.90	57.00	54.10	51.20	48.30
360	380	63.90	63.90	61.00	58.10	55.20	52.30
380	400	67.90	67.90	65.00	62.10	59.20	56.30
$400	or over----	20% of the excess over $400 plus					
		$69.90	$69.90	$67.00	$64.10	$61.20	$58.30

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $2.90 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	------	------	------	------	------	------
40	50	------	------	------	------	------	------
50	60	$1.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	3.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	5.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	8.60	2.80	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	12.60	6.80	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	16.60	10.80	5.10	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	20.60	14.80	9.10	3.30	2.90	2.90
160	200	26.60	20.80	15.10	9.30	3.80	3.80
200	240	34.60	28.80	23.10	17.30	11.50	5.70
240	280	42.60	36.80	31.10	25.30	19.50	13.70
280	320	50.60	44.80	39.10	33.30	27.50	21.70
320	360	58.60	52.80	47.10	41.30	35.50	29.70
360	400	66.60	60.80	55.10	49.30	43.50	37.70
400	440	74.60	68.80	63.10	57.30	51.50	45.70
440	480	82.60	76.80	71.10	65.30	59.50	53.70
480	520	90.60	84.80	79.10	73.30	67.50	61.70
520	560	98.60	92.80	87.10	81.30	75.50	69.70
560	600	106.60	100.80	95.10	89.30	83.50	77.70
600	640	114.60	108.80	103.10	97.30	91.50	85.70
640	680	122.60	116.80	111.10	105.30	99.50	93.70
680	720	130.60	124.80	119.10	113.30	107.50	101.70
720	760	138.60	132.80	127.10	121.30	115.50	109.70
760	800	146.60	140.80	135.10	129.30	123.50	117.70
$800	or over----	20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$150.60	$144.80	$139.10	$133.30	$127.50	$121.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40	50	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	5.70	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	9.70	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	15.70	10.00	4.20	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	23.70	18.00	12.20	6.40	5.00	5.00
240	280	31.70	26.00	20.20	14.40	8.60	6.20
280	320	39.70	34.00	28.20	22.40	16.60	10.80
320	360	47.70	42.00	36.20	30.40	24.60	18.80
360	400	55.70	50.00	44.20	38.40	32.60	26.80
400	440	63.70	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.60	34.80
440	480	71.70	66.00	60.20	54.40	48.60	42.80
480	520	79.70	74.00	68.20	62.40	56.60	50.80
520	560	87.70	82.00	76.20	70.40	64.60	58.80
560	600	95.70	90.00	84.20	78.40	72.60	66.80
600	640	103.70	98.00	92.20	86.40	80.60	74.80
640	680	111.70	106.00	100.20	94.40	88.60	82.80
680	720	119.70	114.00	108.20	102.40	96.60	90.80
720	760	127.70	122.00	116.20	110.40	104.60	98.80
760	800	135.70	130.00	124.20	118.40	112.60	106.80
$800 or over----		20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$139.70	$134.00	$128.20	$122.40	$116.60	$110.80

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40	50	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	2.10	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	4.10	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	7.10	1.30	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	11.10	5.30	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	15.10	9.30	3.50	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	19.10	13.30	7.50	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	25.10	19.30	13.50	7.70	3.80	3.80
200	240	33.10	27.50	21.50	15.70	10.00	5.00
240	280	41.10	35.30	29.50	23.70	18.00	12.20
280	320	49.10	43.30	37.50	31.70	26.00	20.20
320	360	57.10	51.30	45.50	39.70	34.00	28.20
360	400	65.10	59.30	53.50	47.70	42.00	36.20
400	440	73.10	67.30	61.50	55.70	50.00	44.20
440	480	81.10	75.30	69.50	63.70	58.00	52.20
480	520	89.10	83.30	77.50	71.70	66.00	60.20
520	560	97.10	91.30	85.50	79.70	74.00	68.20
560	600	105.10	99.30	93.50	87.70	82.00	76.20
600	640	113.10	107.30	101.50	95.70	90.00	84.20
640	680	121.10	115.30	109.50	103.70	98.00	92.20
680	720	129.10	123.30	117.50	111.70	106.00	100.20
720	760	137.10	131.30	125.50	119.70	114.00	108.20
760	800	145.10	139.30	133.50	127.70	122.00	116.20
$800 or over----		20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$149.10	$143.30	$137.50	$131.70	$126.00	$120.20

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	$3.40	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40	50	7.60	$1.90	-------	-------	-------	-------
50	60	9.40	3.70	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	11.40	5.70	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	13.40	7.70	1.90	.70	.70	.70
80	100	16.40	10.70	4.90	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	20.40	14.70	8.90	3.10	1.70	1.70
120	140	24.40	18.70	12.90	7.10	2.30	2.30
140	160	28.40	22.70	16.90	11.10	5.30	2.90
160	200	34.40	28.70	22.90	17.10	11.30	5.50
200	240	42.40	36.70	30.90	25.10	19.30	13.50
240	280	50.40	44.70	38.90	33.10	27.30	21.50
280	320	58.40	52.70	46.90	41.10	35.30	29.50
320	360	66.40	60.70	54.90	49.10	43.30	37.50
360	400	74.40	68.70	62.90	57.10	51.30	45.50
400	440	82.40	76.70	70.90	65.10	59.30	53.50
440	480	90.40	84.70	78.90	73.10	67.30	61.50
480	520	98.40	92.70	86.90	81.10	75.30	69.50
520	560	106.40	100.70	94.90	89.10	83.30	77.50
560	600	114.40	108.70	102.90	97.10	91.30	85.50
600	640	122.40	116.70	110.90	105.10	99.30	93.50
640	680	130.40	124.70	118.90	113.10	107.30	101.50
680	720	138.40	132.70	126.90	121.10	115.30	109.50
720	760	146.40	140.70	134.90	129.10	123.30	117.50
760	800	154.40	148.70	142.90	137.10	131.30	125.30
$800 or over----		20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$158.40	$152.70	$146.90	$141.10	$135.30	$129.50

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And such person is head of a family and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be					
$0	$40	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40	50	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
50	60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	5.70	5.70	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	9.70	9.70	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	15.70	15.70	10.00	4.20	3.80	3.80
200	240	23.70	23.70	18.00	12.20	6.40	5.00
240	280	31.70	31.70	26.00	20.20	14.40	8.60
280	320	39.70	39.70	34.00	28.20	22.40	16.60
320	360	47.70	47.70	42.00	36.20	30.40	24.60
360	400	55.70	55.70	50.00	44.20	38.40	32.60
400	440	63.70	63.70	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.60
440	480	71.70	71.70	66.00	60.20	54.40	48.60
480	520	79.70	79.70	74.00	68.20	62.40	56.60
520	560	87.70	87.70	82.00	76.20	70.40	64.60
560	600	95.70	95.70	90.00	84.20	78.40	72.60
600	640	103.70	103.70	98.00	92.20	86.40	80.60
640	680	111.70	111.70	106.00	100.20	94.40	88.60
680	720	119.70	119.70	114.00	108.20	102.40	96.60
720	760	127.70	127.70	122.00	116.20	110.40	104.60
760	800	135.70	135.70	130.00	124.20	118.40	112.60
$800 or over----		20% of the excess over $800 plus					
		$130.70	$130.70	$134.00	$128.20	$122.40	$116.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $5.80 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are		And such person is a single person and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	$0.20	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.40	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.60	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.80	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10
6	7	1.00	.80	.60	.45	.25	.15
7	8	1.20	1.00	.80	.65	.45	.25
8	9	1.40	1.20	1.00	.85	.65	.45
9	10	1.60	1.40	1.20	1.05	.85	.65
10	12	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.15	.95
12	14	2.30	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.35
14	16	2.70	2.50	2.30	2.15	1.95	1.75
16	18	3.10	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.35	2.15
18	20	3.50	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.75	2.55
20	22	3.90	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.15	2.95
22	24	4.30	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.55	3.35
24	26	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.15	3.95	3.75
26	28	5.10	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.35	4.15
28	30	5.50	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.75	4.55
$30 and over----		20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.70	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$4.95	$4.75

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are		And such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has					
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.45	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	.65	.45	.25	.15	.15	.15
7	8	.85	.65	.45	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30	.20
9	10	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50	.30
10	12	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.60
12	14	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.00
14	16	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.80	1.60	1.40
16	18	2.75	2.55	2.35	2.20	2.00	1.80
18	20	3.15	2.95	2.75	2.60	2.40	2.20
20	22	3.55	3.35	3.15	3.00	2.80	2.60
22	24	3.95	3.75	3.55	3.40	3.20	3.00
24	26	4.35	4.15	3.95	3.80	3.60	3.40
26	28	4.75	4.55	4.35	4.20	4.00	3.80
28	30	5.15	4.95	4.75	4.60	4.40	4.20
$30 and over----		20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.35	$5.15	$4.15	$4.80	$4.60	$4.40

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'*If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period*

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has					
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
At least	But less than	The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	$0.15	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.35	$0.15	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.55	.35	.15	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.75	.55	.35	.20	.10	.10
6	7	.95	.75	.55	.40	.20	.15
7	8	1.15	.95	.75	.60	.40	.20
8	9	1.35	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.40
9	10	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.60
10	12	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.30	1.10	.90
12	14	2.25	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.30
14	16	2.65	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.70
16	18	3.05	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.10
18	20	3.45	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.50
20	22	3.85	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.90
22	24	4.25	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.30
24	26	4.65	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.70
26	28	5.05	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.10
28	30	5.45	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.50
$30 and over		20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.65	$5.45	$5.25	$5.10	$4.90	$4.70

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number o days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'*If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period*

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has					
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
At least	But less than	The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	$0.10	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	.25	$0.05	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	.45	.25	$0.05	-------	-------	-------
3	4	.65	.45	.25	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.85	.65	.45	.30	.10	.10
5	6	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30	.10
6	7	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50	.30
7	8	1.45	1.25	1.05	.90	.70	.50
8	9	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.10	.90	.70
9	10	1.85	1.65	1.45	1.30	1.10	.90
10	12	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.20
12	14	2.55	2.35	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.60
14	16	2.95	2.75	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.00
16	18	3.35	3.15	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.40
18	20	3.75	3.55	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.80
20	22	4.15	3.95	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.20
22	24	4.55	4.35	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.60
24	26	4.95	4.75	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.00
26	28	5.35	5.15	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.40
28	30	5.75	5.55	5.35	5.20	5.60	4.80
$30 and over		20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.95	$5.75	$5.55	$5.40	$5.20	$5.00

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'*If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period*

And the wages, divided by the number of days in such period, are		And such person is head of a family and has					
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
At least	But less than	The amount to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period					
$0	$1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
1	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
2	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
3	4	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.25	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	.45	.45	.25	.10	.10	.10
6	7	.65	.65	.45	.25	.15	.15
7	8	.85	.85	.65	.45	.30	.15
8	9	1.05	1.05	.85	.65	.50	.30
9	10	1.25	1.25	1.05	.85	.70	.50
10	12	1.55	1.55	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80
12	14	1.95	1.95	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20
14	16	2.35	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.80	1.60
16	18	2.75	2.75	2.55	2.35	2.20	2.00
18	20	3.15	3.15	2.95	2.75	2.60	2.40
20	22	3.55	3.55	3.35	3.15	3.00	2.80
22	24	3.95	3.95	3.75	3.55	3.40	3.20
24	26	4.35	4.35	4.15	3.95	3.80	3.60
26	28	4.75	4.75	4.55	4.35	4.20	4.00
28	30	5.15	5.15	4.95	4.75	4.60	4.40
$30 and over		20% of excess over $30 plus					
		$5.35	$5.35	$5.15	$4.95	$4.80	$4.60

"'If the number of dependents is in excess of five, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of five dependents reduced by $0.20 for each dependent over five, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a payroll period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any payroll period or other period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than one week, at the election of the employer the amount to be withheld shall be determined under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly payroll period, and for such purpose the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"'(d) Tax paid by recipient: If all of the taxes against which the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part may be credited have been paid, the tax so required to be withheld, collected, and paid by the employer shall not be collected from the employer; but payment of such taxes shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of the tax imposed by this chapter.

"'(e) Credit for tax withheld at source: The tax withheld and deducted under this part shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income; but the amount withheld and deducted as tax under this part during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12, or section 400, as the case may be, and section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowed by section 453) for taxable years beginning in such calendar year.

"'(f) Refunds. Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this part, any refund or credit made under section 322 shall be made to the employer to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not withheld and collected under this part by the employer.

"'(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any payroll period of not more than 31 consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such payroll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"'(h) Withholding exemption certificates: Every employee receiving wages (as defined in section 465) shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 466 (b) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection. In case such a certificate is required because of a change of status, it shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. Such certificate—

"'(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect as of the beginning of the last payroll period beginning prior to, or with respect to the first payment of wages without regard to a payroll period made after, the expiration of 30 days after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective as of the beginning of any previous payroll period ending, or with respect to any previous payment of wages without regard to a payroll period made, on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate.

"'(2) If furnished on the date of commencement of employment shall take effect as of the beginning of the first payroll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a payroll period, on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.'

"A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 466 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding.

"'(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"'(1) with respect to a payroll period or other period, any part of which is included in a payroll period or other period with

respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(2) without regard to any payroll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a payroll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year,

"'the manner of withholding and the amount to be withheld under this subchapter shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"'SEC. 467. Liability for tax, and adjustments.

"'(a) Employer liable for tax: The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"'(b) Adjustments: If more or less than the correct amount of tax is withheld or paid for any quarter in any calendar year, proper adjustments, with respect both to the tax withheld or the tax paid, may be made in any subsequent quarter of such calendar year, without interest, in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

"'SEC. 468. Return and payment by employer.

"'In lieu of the time prescribed in sections 53 and 56 for the return and payment of the tax imposed by this chapter, every employer shall make a return and pay the tax required to be withheld and collected under this part on or before the last day of the month following the close of each quarter of each calendar year. Such return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury. The employer shall include with the final return for the calendar year a duplicate copy of each receipt required to be furnished under section 469. The employer shall also keep such records and render under oath such statements with respect to the tax so withheld and collected as may be required under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. If the employer is the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, the return required in respect of the amount withheld and collected upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, Territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose. A deficiency may be determined on the basis of the amounts required to be withheld and collected during a calendar year, and in such case the amount of the tax shown on the return shall be held and considered to be the aggregate of the amounts of tax shown on the quarterly returns, the tax imposed under this part shall be held and considered to be the aggregate of the taxes imposed for each quarter of the calendar year, the date prescribed for the payment of the tax shall be held and considered to be the date prescribed for the making of the last quarterly return, and for the purpose of ascertaining the return on the basis of which such deficiency is determined, the quarterly returns shall be held and considered to be one return required to be made on the date prescribed for the making of the last quarterly return.

"'SEC. 469. Receipts.

"'(a) Wages: Every employer required to withhold and collect a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this part in respect of such wages.

"'(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be in lieu of the return required to be furnished by the employer in respect of such wages under section 147 and shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

"'(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the Secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished to employees on the day on which the last payment of wages is made.

"'SEC. 470. Penalties.

"'(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 469 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this part who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 469, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 469 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this part who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 469, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"'(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this part, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax provided for in section 291 shall not be less than $10.

"'(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 466 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would decrease the withholding exemption, shall, in lieu of the penalty provided in section 145 (a), upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.'

"(b) Technical amendment: The heading of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'And collection of tax at source on wages.'

"(c) Expiration date for withholding at source on wages repealed: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by subchapter D is amended by inserting before 'this subchapter' the following: 'Part I of.'

"(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

"SEC. 3. Refunds.

"(a) Excessive withholding. Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under part II of subchapter D exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter (after allowance of the credits provided by sections 31, 32, and 453) against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be credited against any income tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance thereof shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.'

"(b) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund of amounts withheld under part II of subchapter D of chapter 1, or of amounts paid thereunder, or of payments of the estimated tax made under section 59, shall not, except as provided in chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States.'

"SEC. 4. Current payment of basic tax not withheld at source.

"(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated basic tax by individuals.

"'(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b)) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated basic tax for the taxable year if his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 465)—

"'(1) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and this gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"'(2) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"'(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"'(1) the amount by which his estimated net income for the taxable year exceeds the greater of the following:

"'(A) the amount of his estimated wages as defined in section 465, the withheld tax on which is allowable as a credit for such taxable year under section 466 (e);

"'(B) the amount of his estimated aggregate amount of the credits for the taxable year allowable under section 25 (b);

"'(2) the amount equal to 20 percent of the amount determined under paragraph (1), which for the purpose of this chapter shall be held and considered to be the estimated basic tax for the taxable year.'

"The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"'(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated basic tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated basic tax for such year may be treated as the estimated basic tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"'(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the 15th day of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the Collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"'(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than six months.

"'(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"'(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"'SEC. 59. Payment of estimated basic tax.

"'(a) In general: The estimated basic tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that

"'(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated basic tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"'(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated basic tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"'(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated basic tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment.

"Payment of the estimated basic tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"'(b) Assessment: The estimated basic tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"'SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"'(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the 15th day of the last month of the taxable year.

"'(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (4) and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"'(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September 1943 shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.'

"(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated basic tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated basic tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $10 or an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax, whichever is the greater.

"'(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated basic tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated basic tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"'(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated basic tax: If 16 percent in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or 13⅓ percent in the case of such farmers, of the net income in excess of the amount of wages as defined in section 465 (the withheld tax on which is allowable as a credit under section 466 (e)), or the amount of the credits against net income allowable under section 25 (b), whichever is the greater, exceeds the estimated basic tax, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 6 percent of such excess.'

"(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after 'return' wherever appearing therein the words 'or declaration,' and (2) by inserting before 'tax' wherever appearing therein the words 'estimated basic tax or.'

"(d) Payment of tax: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Installment payments:

"'(1) Corporations, estates, and trusts, etc.: In the case of (A) a corporation, (B) a trust, (C) an estate, or (D) a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b), the taxpayer may elect to pay the tax in four equal installments, in which event the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for the payment of the tax by the taxpayer, the second installment shall be paid on the 15th day of the third month, the third installment on the 15th day of the sixth month, and the fourth installment on the 15th day of the ninth month after such date.

"'(2) Other individuals: In the case of all other individuals, the taxpayer may elect to pay the tax in four installments in which event the first installment shall be an amount equal to the sum of the following:

"'(A) the basic tax;

"'(B) one-fourth of the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter computed without regard to the credit provided in section 466 (e) exceeds the basic tax.

"'The amount of the first installment as computed hereunder shall be reduced by the sum of the amount of the credit allowable under section 466 (e) plus the amount of estimated basic tax paid during the taxable year and in case such sum is equal to or in excess of the amount of the first installment as computed hereunder, but is less than the tax imposed by this chapter (computed without regard to the credit allowable under section 466 (e)) such sum shall constitute the amount of the first installment. The amount of an installment other than such first installment shall be one-third of the difference between the tax imposed (computed without regard to the credit allowable under section 466 (e)) and the amount of such first installment. The first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for the payment of the tax by the taxpayer, and the balance of the tax shall be paid in three equal installments, the second installment on the 15th day of the third month, the third installment on the 15th day of the sixth month, and the fourth installment on the 15th day of the ninth month, after such date.

"'(3) Definition of basic tax: For the purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection the term "basic tax" means—

"'(A) in the case of a taxpayer making a return under Supplement T, the sum of (i) the tax imposed under section 400, (ii) the tax imposed under section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowable under section 453) and (iii) any additions to the tax for which the taxpayer is liable under the provisions of section 294 (a) (3) (4) (5).

"'(B) in the case of all other taxpayers to which paragraph (2) of this subsection is applicable, the sum of (i) the normal tax imposed under section 11, (ii) an amount equal to a percentage of the surtax net income at the first bracket rate of surtax, (iii) the tax imposed under section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowable under section 453), and (iiii) any additions to the tax for which the taxpayer is liable under the provisions of sections 294 (a) (3) (4) (5).

"'If any installment is not paid on or before the date fixed for its payment, the whole amount of the tax unpaid is to be paid upon notice and demand from the collector.'

"(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

"SEC. 5. Relief from double payments in 1943.

"(a) Effective date: This section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning in 1942 but shall not take effect until September 1, 1943.

"(b) In general: In the case of an individual who makes a return for a taxable year beginning in 1942, the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall, in lieu of that otherwise imposed, be the tax computed without regard to this section less an amount equal to the sum of the normal tax plus 13 percent of the surtax net income for such year.

"(c) Supplement T taxpayers: In the case of an individual who makes a return for the calendar year 1942 under Supplement T, the

liability for the tax imposed under section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code for such year is canceled and discharged.

"(d) Short taxable years: The provisions of this section shall not apply to any taxable year which consists of a period of less than 12 months.

"(e) Reduction where credit for foreign tax: In computing the amount by which the tax is reduced under subsection (b) the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be the tax imposed under said chapter prior to its diminution by credit available to the taxpayer under sections 31 and 131 of such chapter. In computing the net tax liability for any such taxable year the amount of such credit shall be computed after taking into account the reduction in tax effected by this section.

"(f) Individuals excluded: The provisions of this section shall not apply to (A) an estate, (B) a trust, (C) a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(g) Refund or credit of reduction in tax: The amount by which the tax is reduced under subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall, if the taxpayer elects to pay the tax in installments, be prorated to the four installments of such tax. The amount so prorated to the installments of the tax falling due after September 1, 1943, shall be applied in reduction of each such installment.

"(h) Treatment of payments prior to September 1, 1943, of amounts by which 1942 tax reduced: Any payment—other than interest and additions to the tax—made prior to September 1, 1943—or on or after such date pursuant to any extension of time granted by the Commissioner before such date—of an amount by which the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is reduced under subsection (b) or (c) of this section for a taxable year beginning in 1942 shall be held and considered as a payment on account of the estimated basic tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commission prior to September 1, 1943, payment of the portion thereof which, if such extension had not been granted, would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to September 1, 1943, shall be paid notwithstanding subsections (b) or (c) of this section.

"SEC. 6. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

"(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"'(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed under section 25 (b) by such member for such taxable year (and by his spouse, if such member is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year and such spouse is not entitled to the benefits of this paragraph).'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to all compensation received after December 31, 1941, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces.

"SEC. 7. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death.

"(a) In general: Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"Supplement U.—Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death

"'SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces in year of death.

"'In the case of any individual who dies while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, and the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective on and after December 7, 1941."

Mr. KNUTSON (interrupting reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, I think the House understands this bill. It is the Robertson-Forand bill and I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asked that further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is not clear to me what the gentleman's motion was and what his substitute is.

The SPEAKER. It is too late now to explain that. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. No debate is in order. Does the gentleman desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. No one knows, so far as I know, what the motion to recommit is.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has been given that it be not read. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 193, noes 173.

Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. KNUTSON demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—230

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Green	Norman
	Griffiths	O'Brien, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Gross	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Gwynne	O'Hara
Andrews	Hale	O'Leary
Angell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Arends		Peterson, Fla.
Arnold	Hall, Leonard W.	Philbin
Auchincloss		Phillips
Baldwin, Md.	Halleck	Pittenger
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hancock	Ploeser
Barrett	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Barry	Harris, Va.	Powers
Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Pracht
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Price
Beall	Heidinger	Ramey
Bell	Hendricks	Randolph
Bender	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Hoeven	Rizley
Bolton	Hoffman	Robertson
Boykin	Holmes, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Brehm	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Buffett	Jeffrey	Rohrbough
Busbey	Jenkins	Rolph
Butler	Jennings	Rowe
Canfield	Jensen	Satterfield
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Anton J.	Schiffler
Carlson, Kans.		Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Calvin D.	Scott
Carter		Shafer
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Chiperfield	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Judd	Slaughter
Clevenger	Kean	Smith, Maine
Coffee	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Smith, W. Va.
Compton	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cravens	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	Kinzer	Springer
Curtis	Kleberg	Stanley
Day	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Lambertson	Stefan
Ditter	Landis	Stockman
Domengeaux	Larcade	Sundstrom
Dondero	LeCompte	Taber
Douglas	LeFevre	Talbot
Eaton	Lewis	Talle
Elliott	Luce	Taylor
Ellis	Ludlow	Tibbott
Ellison, Md.	McCowen	Towe
Ellsworth	McGregor	Treadway
Elston, Ohio	McKenzie	Troutman
Engel	McLean	Van Zandt
Englebright	McWilliams	Voorhis, Calif.
Fellows	Maas	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Vursell
Fernandez	Martin, Mass.	Welchel, Ohio
Fish	Mason	Wene
Fogarty	Merrow	Wheat
Forand	Michener	Wigglesworth
Gale	Miller, Conn.	Willey
Gallagher	Miller, Mo.	Wilson
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	Winter
Gavin	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
Gifford	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gilchrist	Morrison, La.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette	Mott	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillie	Mruk	Woodrum, Va.
Goodwin	Mundt	

NAYS—180

Abernethy	Camp	Dilweg
Allen, La.	Cannon, Mo.	Dingell
Andersen, H. Carl	Capozzoli	Disney
	Chapman	Doughton
Barden	Clark	Drewry
Beckworth	Colmer	Durham
Bland	Cooley	Dworshak
Bloom	Cooper	Eberharter
Bonner	Costello	Fay
Boren	Courtney	Feighan
Bradley, Pa.	Cox	Fisher
Brooks	Crawford	Fitzpatrick
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Flannagan
Bryson	Cullen	Folger
Buckley	Curley	Ford
Bulwinkle	D'Alesandro	Fulbright
Burchill, N. Y.	Davis	Fulmer
Burdick	Dawson	Gathings
Burgin	Delaney	Gavagan
Byrne	Dickstein	Gerlach

Gordon	McCord	Robinson, Utah
Gore	McCormack	Rowan
Gorski	McGranery	Russell
Gossett	McMillan	Sabath
Granger	McMurray	Sadowski
Grant, Ala.	Madden	Sasscer
Gregory	Mahon	Sauthoff
Hare	Maloney	Scanlon
Harless, Ariz.	Manasco	Schuetz
Harris, Ark.	Mansfield, Mont.	Sheppard
Hart	Mansfield, Tex.	Sheridan
Hays	Marcantonio	Snyder
Heffernan	May	Sparkman
Hobbs	Merritt	Spence
Hoch	Mills	Starnes, Ala.
Holifield	Monroney	Steagall
Horan	Morrison, N. C.	Stevenson
Hull	Murdock	Stewart
Izac	Murphy	Sullivan
Jarman	Myers	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Newsome	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Luther A.	Nichols	Tarver
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Norrell	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Thomason
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Tolan
Kefauver	O'Connor	Vincent, Ky.
Kennedy	O'Neal	Vinson, Ga.
Keogh	Outland	Walter
Kerr	Pace	Ward
King	Patman	Wasielewski
Kirwan	Patton	Weaver
Klein	Peterson, Ga.	Weiss
Kunkel	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Welch
LaFollette	Poage	West
Lane	Poulson	Whelchel, Ga.
Lanham	Priest	Whitten
Lea	Rabaut	Whittington
Lesinski	Ramspeck	Wickersham
Lynch	Rankin	Winstead
	Richards	Wright
	Rivers	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—23

Burch, Va.	Furlong	Magnuson
Case	Gearhart	O'Konski
Cochran	Gibson	Rogers, Calif.
Creal	Guyer	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Hagen	Wadsworth
Dies	Jackson	White
Dirksen	Lemke	Worley
Elmer	McGehee	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Wadsworth (for) with Mr. Creal (against).

Mr. Hagen (for) with Mr. Burch (against).

Mr. Elmer (for) with Mr. Lemke (against).

Mr. Thomas, New Jersey (for) with Mr. Mr. Dies (against).

Mr. Jackson (for) with Mr. Gibson (against).

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Case.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. O'LEARY and Mr. GREEN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report back the bill H. R. 2570 with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 2577, as follows.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this amendment are well known. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is this amendment known as the Forand amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no information about that. It is the matter incorporated in the motion to recommit, however.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, who is so thoroughly acquainted with the various bills, if he has examined the amendment which is submitted in response to the instructions contained in the motion to recommit and if he can advise the House if that is the so-called Forand-Robertson bill.

Mr. COOPER. This amendment is the bill H. R. 2577, which was introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to know whether or not it is possible or permissible under the rules that we have at least 30 minutes of debate on the so-called Forand-Robertson amendment, because as far as I know there are no printed minutes or hearings and there has been no hearing or statement in this House on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman desires to prefer a unanimous-consent request he may do so.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in view of the importance of this question, involving every taxpayer in the country, and in view of the fact that there are no hearings and no discussions——

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman has a unanimous-consent request to prefer, he must submit it. He cannot make a speech.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that we have 30 minutes of debate on this particular amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COOPER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state that the amendment has been discussed. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has spoken on it several times and explained it, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has done likewise. I think the House is familiar to a reasonable extent with the provisions of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KNUTSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOPER) there were—ayes 233, noes 115.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 96, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—313

Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Jennings
Allen, La.	Domengeaux	Jensen
Anderson, Calif.	Dondero	Johnson, Anton J.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Douglas	Johnson, Calvin D.
Andresen, August H.	Drewry	Johnson, Ind.
Andrews	Eaton	Johnson, J. Leroy
Angell	Elliott	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Arends	Ellis	Johnson, Ward
Arnold	Ellison, Md.	Jones
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Jonkman
Baldwin, Md.	Elston, Ohio	Judd
Baldwin, N. Y.	Engel	Kearney
Barrett	Englebright	Keefe
Barry	Fay	Kelley
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Keogh
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Kilburn
Beall	Fernandez	Kilday
Bell	Fish	Kinzer
Bender	Fisher	Kleberg
Bennett, Mich.	Fitzpatrick	Knutson
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Kunkel
Bishop	Forand	LaFollette
Blackney	Gale	Lambertson
Bland	Gallagher	Landis
Bloom	Gathings	Lane
Bolton	Gavagan	Lanham
Boykin	Gavin	Larcade
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	Lea
Brehm	Gilchrist	LeCompte
Brooks	Gillette	LeFevre
Brown, Ohio	Gillie	Lesinski
Bryson	Goodwin	Lewis
Buckley	Gordon	Luce
Buffett	Gorski	Ludlow
Bulwinkle	Graham	McCormack
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	McCowen
Busbey	Grant, Ind.	McGregor
Butler	Green	McKenzie
Byrne	Griffiths	McLean
Canfield	Gross	McMillan
Cannon, Fla.	Gwynne	McWilliams
Capozzoli	Hale	Maas
Carlson, Kans.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Madden
Carson, Ohio	Halleck	Maloney
Carter	Hancock	Mansfield, Tex.
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Mass.
Chiperfield	Harris, Ark.	Mason
Church	Harris, Va.	Merritt
Clason	Hart	Merrow
Clevenger	Hartley	Michener
Coffee	Hays	Miller, Conn.
Cole, Mo.	Hébert	Miller, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.	Heffernan	Miller, Nebr.
Compton	Hendricks	Miller, Pa.
Cooper	Herter	Monkiewicz
Courtney	Hess	Morrison, La.
Cravens	Hill	Mott
Cullen	Hinshaw	Mruk
Cunningham	Hoeven	Mundt
Curley	Hoffman	Murphy
Curtis	Holmes, Mass.	Murray, Tenn.
Davis	Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Wis.
Dawson	Hope	Newsome
Day	Howell	Norman
Delaney	Jarman	
Dewey	Jeffrey	
	Jenkins	

Norrell	Rockwell	Stockman
Norton	Rodgers, Pa.	Sullivan
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
O'Brien, Mich.	Rohrbough	Sundstrom
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rolph	Taber
O'Hara	Rowan	Talbot
O'Leary	Rowe	Talle
O'Neal	Sabath	Taylor
O'Toole	Sadowski	Thomas, Tex.
Outland	Sasscer	Thomason
Patman	Satterfield	Tibbott
Patton	Sauthoff	Tolan
Peterson, Fla.	Scanlon	Towe
Pfeifer	Schiffler	Treadway
Philbin	Schuetz	Troutman
Phillips	Schwabe	Van Zandt
Pittenger	Scott	Voorhis, Calif.
Ploeser	Shafer	Vorys, Ohio
Plumley	Sheppard	Vursell
Poulson	Sheridan	Walter
Powers	Short	Ward
Pracht	Sikes	Weichel, Ohio
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Weiss
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Welch
Rabaut	Slaughter	Wene
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wheat
Ramspeck	Smith, Ohio	Wigglesworth
Randolph	Smith, Va.	Willey
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, W. Va.	Wilson
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Wis.	Winter
Reed, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.	Wolcott
Rees, Kans.	Sparkman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Richards	Springer	Wolverton, N. J.
Rivers	Stanley	Woodruff, Mich.
Rizley	Starnes, Ala.	Woodrum, Va.
Robertson	Stearns, N. H.	Wright
Robinson, Utah	Stefan	Zimmerman
Robsion, Ky.	Stevenson	

NAYS—95

Abernethy	Ford	Mahon
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulbright	Manasco
	Fulmer	Mansfield, Mont.
Barden	Gamble	
Beckworth	Gerlach	Marcantonio
Bonner	Gore	Mills
Boren	Gossett	Monroney
Bradley, Pa.	Granger	Morrison, N. C.
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Murdock
Burdick	Hall, Leonard W.	Myers
Burgin		Nichols
Camp	Hare	O'Connor
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Pace
Chapman	Hoch	Peterson, Ga.
Clark	Holifield	Poage
Colmer	Horan	Rankin
Cooley	Hull	Russell
Costello	Izac	Snyder
Cox	Johnson, Luther A.	Spence
Crawford		Steagall
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Stewart
D'Alesandro	Kean	Sumner, Ill.
Dickstein	Kee	Tarver
Dilweg	Kefauver	Vincent, Ky.
Dingell	Kennedy	Vinson, Ga.
Disney	Kerr	Wasielewski
Doughton	King	Weaver
Durham	Kirwan	West
Dworshak	Klein	Whelchel, Ga.
Eberharter	Lynch	Whitten
Feighan	McCord	Whittington
Flannagan	McGranery	Wickersham
Folger	McMurray	Winstead

NOT VOTING—25

Burch, Va.	Gearhart	May
Case	Gibson	O'Konski
Cochran	Guyer	Rogers, Calif.
Creal	Hagen	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Heidinger	Wadsworth
Dies	Jackson	White
Dirksen	Lemke	Worley
Elmer	McGehee	
Furlong	Magnuson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Creal with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Case.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. May with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. HOBBS changed his vote from "aye" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, after any other special orders today, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the legislative business is disposed of, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the status of the Japanese in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader what the program is for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the first thing in order will be the disposition of the motion to reconsider which is pending on the conference report on the pay-increase bill. If that can be brought up, it will be in order the first thing. I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] made the motion to reconsider, but he is now unavoidably absent due to illness in his family.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be the first in order?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that will be the first thing brought up. I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is present. Is that agreeable to him?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is. I hope to dispose of it the first thing tomorrow. Of course, there is no debate upon it, as I understand it, under the rule. It is a mere question of voting.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the vote will be taken on the conference upon the Treasury and Post Office Departments bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that that is quite controversial, and that there are quite a number of items in dispute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand there are at least four items that will have to be brought up separately and debated. We are anxious next to bring up and dispose of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. Since talking with the gentleman from Massachusetts, I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and he is very anxious to bring that up this week. I understand that the bill will be reported out tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We will report the bill out tomorrow, and expect to get a rule and bring up the matter for debate on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that the conference report on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill will take about 2 days.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that they desire to begin debate on the reciprocal trade agreement on Friday.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. We hope to file the report tomorrow, and get a rule on it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When does the gentleman expect to pass that?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That will depend very largely upon the cooperation on the Republican side. We have not been able to reach any understanding with the minority Members as to the time for debate. The gentleman knows as much about that as I do. If the Republicans cooperate on a reasonable time for debate, we hope to dispose of it early next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite an order.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, I do not give my friend any orders. That is a mere suggestion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has not had any discussion with the minority Members here about that, has he?

Mr. McCORMACK. What we are hopeful for is that the debate will be started on Friday, and then we will adjourn over until the following Monday.

I am hopeful we will be able to adjourn from Friday until Monday. Beyond that, of course, I am unable to state now, because that depends upon the time that is provided for in the rule that is reported, but the Ways and Means Committee usually operates so harmoniously on matters of that kind that I am very confident they will get together.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the tax bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include a letter from Philip Murray and a statement by the National Lawyers Guild.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include a letter from the Collector of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article which appeared in the Chicago Times concerning Polish freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter by Mr. B. A. Gronstal, president of the Council Bluffs Savings Bank, and a resolution passed by the Pottawattamie Bankers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent, which was addressed to Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article concerning the American farmer by Mr. G. Skelly, of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning that I was recorded as absent on a roll call yesterday. I was out of town and left in time to reach Washington and was in my office shortly after 12 o'clock ready to answer any roll call. My office force reported there had been no notice by the bells. I inquired of four other offices on our floor and none of them heard any notice of a roll call. I learned from Members on the floor later that they had the same experience. I hate to miss a roll call. It does not mean anything to anybody else but me. I would have been here had the bell given the usual notice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has given proper notice.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am in the same position as the gentleman from Delaware, Judge WILLEY. I came in Sunday night from Canton, Ohio, and came to my office and learned yesterday afternoon that I had missed a roll call. I tried to correct it by calling it to the attention of the electrician, and at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon the situation was corrected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the afternoon and to include therein two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent that my time for tonight may be transferred to a later date. I ask unanimous consent that on May 11 after the other special orders have been disposed of I may address the House for 30 minutes on the Bermuda Conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit during the sessions of the House on the 19th and 20th of May for the consideration of the Chinese bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUPREME WAR COUNCIL

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, since I have seen my name in the press rather frequently of late, I think that at this time I owe it to my district, my State, my fellow Congressmen, and myself to take the floor of the House in order that this statement which I am making shall be embodied in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The press has been giving me considerable publicity in connection with the use of my congressional tag on an automobile owned by John Monroe of 2101 R Street in Washington.

As you all know, I came to Congress 4 months ago as a freshman. My political life thus far has been based on one of independence in thought and independence in action. In 1935 I came out of law school running for office. I wanted to go to the legislature and asked for everyone's support. I was offered city judge by the prevailing machine. I ran for the senate and lost the senate, and did not get the judgeship, but I kept my independence. I ran for Congress, Governor and lost, but I ran for Congress again and won.

In my recent victorious campaign for Congress the main issue was rubber stamp or independence. My opponent was a rubber stamp. I was not, and I won.

Since I have been here in Congress I have voted for every war measure, I have voted for and supported all appropriations that were for the armed forces in the war effort. I have consistently voted against all appropriations that were a waste of the taxpayers' money and not essential to the war effort. I am clearly not a New Dealer. I am a Democrat from way down South, an unterrified Democrat, and proud of it.

On one occasion when I had voted for an amendment to cut the Home Owners' Loan appropriation $4,000,000 on grounds that it had served its usefulness and should now be liquidated, one New Deal Congressman asked me why I did not go along with the New Deal on everything. I told him I went with the New Deal when I thought they were right and that I voted against the New Deal when I thought they were wrong. I further answered, "I cannot go along with some of these dreaming, theoretical bureaucrats. It sickens my stomach." "From your actions," this Congressman said, "one would think you were a conservative and I had heard you were a liberal." I answered, "Yes; I am a liberal, but we are getting so far over to the left if we do not get back a little to the right there will not be anything to be liberal about."

Now, as regards this investigation by the Military Affairs Committee, a great deal of emphasis seems to have been put on my congressional plate. I have a right to put that plate on any automobile, buggy, or even a wheelbarrow if I desire. To further show how ridiculous this matter is, as far as I am concerned, I might state that the Narragansett contract, which is being investigated, was negotiated and completed a year before I ever came to Congress. My car was laid up and out of commission for 4 days. I borrowed this automobile in question and put my congressional tag on it, which I had a right to do.

While I have been in Washington for the last 4 months in Congress, I have visited over 40 homes in this great city. In practically every home a little politics was discussed, but there were two homes in particular where the biggest politicians held forth and the biggest politics were discussed, one being the White House and the other 2101 R Street.

I intend to continue to go where I please and do as I please, as I still

maintain I am independent in both thought and action.

A certain columnist set forth in the press that I inspired and led the Louisiana anti-Roosevelt bloc here in Congress. The only bloc meeting that I know anything about was when Louisiana was wronged and double-crossed and not given the appointment of a Federal circuit judgeship to replace a Louisianian who had recently died. The Louisiana delegation met and agreed that this was unfair politics and that we were not going to take it lying down. I have kept my agreement, and I am sure the other Louisiana Congressmen can answer for themselves. I might add that there are five Members in the House and two Members in the Senate who have been here much longer than 4 months, and to give me the role of leader of the Louisiana delegation, consisting of eight Congressmen and two United States Senators, is certainly flattering. I still maintain that the Louisiana Congressmen are right and that the New Deal is wrong, and that the Allred appointment should never have been made, and that a Louisianian is entitled to that judgeship.

Long before I ever came to Congress I had thought and pictured what a great benefit a supreme war council would be to the United States. As a matter of fact, before and after my election this war council idea became a mild obsession with me. I carefully studied the War Council of England, which consists of eight members, and I decided after much study and thought that I would introduce a bill providing for a war council here in America. I discussed this with several individuals. Evidently the idea must have leaked out, as a high New Deal official, whose name I agreed not to reveal, called upon me and advised me not to file this supreme war council bill. I wanted to know why. I explained that this was patterned after the War Council of England; that instead of having eight members, which I thought might prove a little unwieldy, this war council would only have four. I explained further that a great deal of pains had been taken to get the four men who perhaps would be the closest to the people and the most outstanding to become members of this council. So I provided in this bill, in order to make it nonpartisan, that a Democrat should be elected in the House and the Senate by the Democratic caucus of each body, and that a Republican should be elected by the Republican caucus in both the Senate and the House. These two in the House were to be approved by the Speaker and the two in the Senate were to be approved by the President of the Senate. In this way both the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate had the veto power over the Members who would be chosen. Naturally in this two-party system of ours, I presumed that the Republicans would elect a man they thought would be best qualified and that the Democrats would do likewise. If their actions on this war council were not satisfactory to the people, they would soon have to face the people and be voted upon for reelection. Naturally, knowing this, I felt that these four members of the war council would have on their minds one, and only one, intent at all times, and that is to do the best possible job in order that the people would O. K. it at the next election, when they would be answerable to the people.

I was advised not to introduce this bill. I said, "Why?" I was informed that I had done enough already, that I had resigned from the committees, that I had voted independently, that I had attacked various appropriations which were nonessential to the war effort, and that I had done things that were a great displeasure to the New Deal. "Well," I said, "I am going to introduce this bill." I was then told that it would place me in a dangerous position, and that I would suffer dire consequences. I said, "Why?" I was told that the position I was taking and my actions at this time constituted the greatest luxury on earth. I then said, "What will be done about it?" I was told that I would have to wait and see. I was also asked if I knew what the word "smear" meant. I answered that I not only knew what "smear" meant, but that two could play at that game, that I was no political saint, but to maintain my independence I had to remain as politically clean as it is humanly possible to and still attain office. I then said, "Those here in power in Washington are not in that shape. If they do not like what I am doing, let them crack their whip." This party then said, "Do not forget, I warned you," and that was all. I was the victim of a smear campaign just as I was warned in advance I would be if I introduced this bill for a war council. Think of this, fellow Congressmen, we are all here to do our duty as we see it, and I was warned that I would be smeared if I did what I thought was my duty. I did it and I was smeared, and what is more, I will do it again if the occasion presents itself, and you Congressmen know I am right. This war council bill is now pending before a committee. Guess what committee? None other than the now famous House Military Affairs Committee, and I intend to ask for a hearing before that committee at the earliest date on this bill to aid and assist the President.

The Supreme War Council bill is as follows:

Providing for the creation of a Supreme War Council to consist of 4 members, 2 to be elected and appointed by the Senate and 2 to be elected and appointed by the House of Representatives, to approve the actions of the President and assist him in the conduct of the war

Be it enacted, etc., That Congress shall create and establish a Supreme War Council. Such Council shall be created by electing by a majority vote, one member from the Republican or minority party in the House and one member from the Democratic or majority party in the House, which two members shall be named by the Speaker; and one member from the Republican or minority party in the Senate and one member from the Democratic or majority party in the Senate, which two members shall be named by the President of the Senate. "By electing by a majority vote" is meant the election in party caucus, both in the House and Senate, in the selection of each member.

The duties of this War Council shall be to meet with the President of the United States daily, or at such time as the successful prosecution of the war demands.

The President shall submit to this War Council for its approval all agreements made with foreign powers, all moves of strategy by the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, all negotiations or agreements of any nature whatsoever that may affect the conduct of the war with foreign countries, including all lease-lend agreements. The President shall submit for approval to said War Council all State Department negotiations or agreements that in any way affect the conduct of the war or this Nation's relations with neutral or allied countries. The President shall report and get the approval of the War Council on all domestic matters involving transportation, communication, food, manufacturers' supplies, armaments, ammunition, and any and all goods, equipment, or products necessary to the war effort.

This War Council shall be in effect for the duration of the war. Should any member die or fail to be reelected, then his successor shall be elected as above set forth.

I gave this supreme war council bill to the press at approximately 3 o'clock in the afternoon. It did not appear in any Washington paper and I could not find where it appeared in any other paper. As a matter of fact, at 12 o'clock that night I telephoned one of the leading papers in New York and the gentleman at the desk told me he had received no news in regard to any supreme war council. Naturally I was baffled. Naturally I could not understand why a bill that might affect the welfare, the property, and the life of each man, woman, and child in the United States, and in foreign countries all over the world, that would affect not only our allies, but our enemies, and yet not one line was carried in the metropolitan papers throughout America. I still did not get the drift.

A friend of mine called up one of the leading newspapermen here in Washington and that newspaperman gave the excuse as to why the story was not used was because of the man who introduced it, a freshman Congressman who was unimportant. Well, I had introduced other bills. Some of them made the front pages. When I resigned those five minor committees, that made every newspaper in the United States, notwithstanding the fact I was a freshman. But here one of the most important bills that could be introduced in this Congress did not make one single newspaper in America when it was introduced. I personally distributed that bill after I had introduced it to the press.

When questioned by a reporter about 2101 R Street here in Washington, I asked this reporter why the supreme war council bill which I had recently introduced did not make the papers when it was introduced, with the slight exception that 2 days later it was run in only two daily papers in the United States. The reporter then told me that he had come here to ask me questions and that I had turned the tables on him. He said my question was unanswerable, but that I was learning the way things were done here in Washington.

Now I want to get the record straight. I have always been an independent in politics. I have gone where I pleased,

I have done what I pleased, and I intend to continue so long as the people back home reelect me, and it makes no difference to me how many threats come from how many so-called big shots. I used to tell them in Louisiana that the bigger they were the better I liked to fight them because there in Louisiana I had the opportunity of bringing a lot of big shots down to frying size—just ask Gov. Sam Jones—and I am applying that same attitude as regards the big shots here in Washington. Let them crack their whip. I will do the rest.

ASSISTANCE FROM THE PRESS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a new Member. What, to my mind, is the greatest utterance the President of the United States ever made is one that I cannot refrain from repeating now:

Freedom of speech means nothing if we have nothing to say.

I have had nothing but help from both sides of this Chamber; I have had nothing but help from the press. I believe everybody helps you if you try to help others. I am here to learn.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on Thursday, May 6, to consider H. R. 85, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and H. R. 1905, a bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 6, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2326, a bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1843, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

388. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

389. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

390. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Private Act No. 64, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, approved May 6, 1937, a case with regard to *Canal Dredging Co.* v. *The United States, No. 43837;* to the Committee on Claims.

391. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1940 and prior years in the sum of $336.86, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 in the sum of $1,090,000, amounting in all to $1,090,336.86, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 193); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

392. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

393. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

394. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

395. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 237 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in me by the said statute together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

396. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. H. R. 2553. A bill directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearinghouse for information on methods to control absenteeism; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control; without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1396. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of air-mail service; with amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2613. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to increase allowances to dependent mothers and fathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 2614. A bill to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2615. A bill directing the Federal Works Administrator, through the Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, to make a survey of the need for a system of express highways throughout the United States; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 2616. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the War Minerals Relief Statutes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2617. A bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2618. A bill to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 2619. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2620. A bill to provide for a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2628. A bill to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence, when not furnished in kind; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances, and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Rodney Eugene Hoover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Mattie Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Gilmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 2624. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held; to to Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2626. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Harren; to the Cimmittee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

655. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 19 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

656. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. E. G. Dietrich and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

657. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of 101 ladies of Dayton, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

658. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Bertha H. Harrington, of Charleston, W. Va., and other members of the adult Bible classes of Cavalry Baptist Church Sunday School of that city, in support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. Also, petition of Mrs. W. W. Reif and other residents of Charleston, W. Va., supporting the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

660. Also, petition of Myrtle Dorsey and other residents of Clendenin, W. Va., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

661. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Florida State Pharmaceutical Association, Fort Myers, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 997, the pharmacy corps bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

662. Also, petition of the city clerk of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to eliminating the cost of transportation while on leave from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

663. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Duluth, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuing the National Youth Administration or some other agency similar to the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

664. Also, petition of the secretary to the faculty, University of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to abolishing the present system of the present government of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 3, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank Thee for this shrine of the Nation's faith where, facing vast human issues committed to our hands, relying on a strength and a wisdom not our own, we come humbly to confess "In God we trust." Make us the kind of persons Thou canst trust as the instruments and channels of Thy saving grace. Out of the burning bush of our daily duties as the miracle of insight is wrought anew for us and in us, in the stillness may there come a voice as of old, "The place where Thou standest is holy ground."

For our country we pray, entrusted with power to work weal or woe on the earth. Help her to heal the open sores of the world, which hate and selfishness and misunderstanding have inflicted on the bleeding body of our common humanity. Upon the President and all who counsel with him, upon the Congress and all who represent the Nation's strength and administer the stewardship of her service, we crave divine guidance. In these tragic days, as all mankind stands in the valley of decision, show us the way we should go. Bring us and all the nations to that glad day of the Lord when righteousness and peace shall kiss each other. Upon us may there rest the beatitude of the peacemakers, who shall be called the children of God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2281) to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Gillette
Austin	Caraway	Gurney
Ball	Chandler	Hawkes
Bankhead	Chavez	Hayden
Barbour	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Bone	Connally	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Danaher	La Follette
Bridges	Davis	Langer
Buck	Eastland	Lodge
Burton	Ellender	Lucas
Bushfield	Ferguson	McClellan
Butler	George	McFarland
Byrd	Gerry	McKellar

McNary	Revercomb	Tunnell
Maloney	Reynolds	Tydings
Maybank	Robertson	Vandenberg
Mead	Russell	Van Nuys
Millikin	Scrugham	Wagner
Moore	Shipstead	Walsh
Murdock	Stewart	Wheeler
Murray	Taft	Wherry
O'Daniel	Thomas, Idaho	White
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Radcliffe	Tobey	
Reed	Truman	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referrec as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the personnel of the land forces on a specified date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE (PT. 2 OF S. DOC. NO. 33)

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Cong.) requesting reports for certain months concerning transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service, a summary table of data relating to transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service covering replies received by the Commission through April 21, 1943, and also a separate list of such agencies as have not submitted reports to the Commission or from which only partial or incomplete reports were received (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Hillsboro, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution of the Senate of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the Bermuda Refugee Conference is now in session at Hamilton, Bermuda, for the expressed purpose of exploring the questions of the release of prisoners of war and of their evacuation and feeding; and

"Whereas the Joint Emergency Committee for European Jewish Affairs has not been invited to said conference; and

"Whereas said committee has prepared a 12-point program for the rescue of Europe's enslaved Jews, and desires an opportunity to present said program to the conference: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Massachusetts memorializes the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to request said conference to allow said committee to appear before it and present its program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from Massachusetts and to the Secretary of State.

"In senate, adopted April 20, 1943."

By Mr. PEPPER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Whereas the United States of America, Office of Price Administration, in establishing the eastern gasoline and oil-ration zone, placed all that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River in said zone, which zone extends along the Atlantic Ocean, from and including the State of Maine to and including all the State of Florida east of the said Apalachicola River;

"Whereas, in establishing the Gulf States gasoline and oil-ration zone, the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and that part of the State of Florida west of the Apalachicola River was placed in said zone; and

"Whereas the entire State of Florida, because of its location and proximity to the said States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and to the inland waterway extending along the Gulf coast, logically and rightfully belongs in the said Gulf States gasoline and oil-ration zone instead of the eastern gasoline and oil-ration zone: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States, the Office of Price Administration of the United States, and all national officers, boards, and agencies having any relation to the administration of the gasoline and oil-rationing program be, and they are each hereby, requested and urged to transfer that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River from the eastern gasoline and oil-ration zone to the Gulf States gasoline and oil-ration zone, where it logically and rightfully belongs; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from this State, to the President of the United States, and to the National Office of Price Administration.

"Approved by the Governor April 16, 1943."

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Memorial 6

"Memorial relating to procedure for recovering damages inflicted upon land structures by watercraft

"Whereas the present remedies afforded in law courts for recovery of damages from owners of tugs, barges, vessels, and other watercraft inflicting damage or injury to bridges, trestles, and other land structures within or abutting upon navigable waters are inadequate, inconvenient, and expensive, and in many instances owners of such watercraft who are nonresidents of the State in which such damage or injury is inflicted can only be served with process and sued in the State where they reside at considerable expense and inconvenience to the residents of other States whose property is damaged, and even when judgment is recovered at law there is no assurance that satisfaction thereof can be realized; and

"Whereas there is at present no appropriate Federal regulation or provision of Federal law requiring immediate reports by masters of such watercraft to the United States Engineers or other responsible Federal officer or officers of damage inflicted by such watercraft upon such land structures with further requirement that such reports be promptly brought to the attention of the owners of such land structures so damaged, which results in many owners of watercraft escaping detection and suit for damages for such injuries inflicted by their craft; and

"Whereas the American Bar Association, at its fifty-eighth annual meeting in July 1935, recommended to the Congress of the United States the enactment of remedial legislation to extend admiralty and maritime jurisdiction to cases where watercraft inflict damage upon land structures, which recommendation appears in the Reports of American Bar Association, volume 60, pages 241 to 244, inclusive; but such recommendation has never been put into effect by act of Congress; and

"Whereas appropriate Federal legislation to remedy the conditions above described should now be enacted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and the Senate of the State of Florida do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide: (1) That the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States shall extend to and include all cases of damage or injury to property caused by a vessel or other watercraft on navigable waters, notwithstanding that such damage or injury be done or consummated on land structures; (2) that masters of watercraft be required to make immediate and comprehensive reports of any such injury or damage inflicted by their watercraft upon any private or public land structure to the United States Engineers' office having jurisdiction of the navigable waters on or near which such land structure is situated, and that the United States Engineers be directed to make such reports immediately available to owners of such land structures; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state provide copies of this resolution, suitably prepared as a memorial, and respectfully present such copies to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor April 27, 1943."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution looking toward the establishment of peace on earth and good will toward men in the world following the war in which we are now engaged

"Whereas it is the hope of every American that out of the suffering, the destruction, and the horror of this war there shall rise the foundations of a lasting peace, affording to all peoples of the world freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, and to the minorities everywhere protection of those inalienable rights which should be the heritage of every human being; and

"Whereas there can be no lasting peace unless rampant and unrestrained nationalism and economic and military aggression are forever eliminated from all the nations of the world; and

"Whereas a lasting peace can only be established upon the foundation of the dignity of the spirit and soul of man, and to assure such requires the opportunity for a reasonable measure of prosperity and welfare for all people; and

"Whereas such aims can be achieved only by an international organization of nations, wherein each will surrender some of its sovereignty in order that the protection and welfare of all may be secured: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring):

"(1) That it is hereby declared to be our profound conviction that an international organization of all nations to achieve these results must be an essential condition of the peace which is to come.

"(2) That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end.

"(3) That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution to continue Florida's assistance to the United Nations in war aims

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida in session assembled:

"Whereas the United States of America and its allies are now engaged in a fight to the finish against the foes of liberty, free speech and action, and religious tolerance; and

"Whereas this great Nation of the United States must necessarily call upon all of its resources and upon all of its citizens to make sacrifices in order that World War No. 2 may be brought to an early victorious end; and

"Whereas the sovereign State of Florida has given freely of its manpower and resources to further the victory aims of the United Nations, and has provided the first American hero, Colin P. Kelly, and many other heroic sons, who have willingly laid down their lives that we might enjoy liberty; and

"Whereas the sovereign State of Florida is anxious and willing to further advance the war aims of the United Nations and of the American people by continuing to provide all of our manpower and our entire resources: Therefore be it.

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida in session assembled, That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby declare, resolve, and go on record to the end that the sovereign State of Florida and its people do continue the assistance in every way possible toward bringing the tyrants of the world and the forces of evil to their unholy ends, and that by this resolution does Florida and its patriotic citizens make known to the world their determination to dedicate their lives and property to the eradication of despotism until the Axis tyrants shall bow their unholy heads in unconditional surrender; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this legislative session, that a copy be sent to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a copy also be sent to each United States Senator and Congressman of the State of Florida and a copy furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor, April 27, 1943."

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Memorial 2

"House memorial memorializing Congress to pass pharmacy corps bill

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled:

"Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

"Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

"Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competence and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

"Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Florida State Legislature now in session goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943."

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.—CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Pinellas County, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Board of County Commissioners of Pinellas County, Fla., realizes the importance and necessity to the war effort of the Civil Aeronautics Administration pilot-training program at the junior college in St. Petersburg; and

Whereas it is the desire of this board to see full quotas given this program at the earliest possible moment: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request our delegation in Washington to get behind this program and see that it is continued without interruption and that full quotas are given at the earliest possible moment, it being one of Pinellas County's important contributions to the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the honorable Senators CHARLES O. ANDREWS and CLAUDE PEPPER and to the honorable Congressmen LEX GREEN and J. HARDIN PETERSON.

RESOLUTIONS OF HIMMARSHEE CHAPTER, D. A. R., FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.—RECOGNITION OF FARM LABOR IN WAR EFFORT

Mr. PEPPER also presented resolutions adopted by the Himmarshee Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A resolution relating to the men who have been deferred from the armed service to serve on the farms of the United States

Whereas the production of agricultural and horticultural products is vital to the conduct of the war and to the continuation of morale and health of our armed forces and to civilians of the United States, and our allies; and

Whereas this has been recognized by the President, the Congress, and by the leaders of the armed forces, and various provisions have been made to insure sufficient manpower to get these crops into cultivation and have them harvested; and

Whereas a number of men have been deferred from armed service, and have found themselves criticized, called slackers, and otherwise insulted because they were not in the uniform of the United States Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by this the Himmarshee Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, That further action be taken by the necessary Government officials to see that these men are properly recognized for the services which they are rendering the country, and that we submit a suggestion that they be given a specially designed uniform, or a specially designed insigne of dignity and honor, showing that they are participating in a most vital factor of the war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Mr. Paul V. McNutt, head of the War Manpower Commission; to the members of the Florida delegation in Congress; to Mr. Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; to Mr. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator; and further copies be presented to the State society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, urging their adoption and backing of this particular proposal; and that it be further presented for additional action to the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

CONTINUATION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS POLICY—PETITION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD without all the signatures

attached thereto a petition from sundry citizens of Middlebury, Vt., urging the importance of continuing the reciprocal trade agreements policy.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

MIDDLEBURY, VT., *April 22, 1943.*

Senator WARREN AUSTIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to urge upon you the great importance of continuing the reciprocal trade agreements policy. To abandon this policy at this time, or to indicate that support for it is declining would be to fail to represent public opinion at home, and to create distrust abroad in American willingness to cooperate.

Full employment of our labor and our capacity to produce will be essential in the post-war transition. The freest possible trade should be encouraged to make this possible. To abrogate the policy would be to lose a device to batter down tariff walls against us; and a reversion to the same policy that wrecked the monetary systems and economies of the world after World War No. 1. Not only our economic need, but the desire to prepare a more secure foundation for peace dictates that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be continued. We, therefore, request you to support its continuation by all means at your command.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY M. FIFE.
BAYLSTON GREEN.
(And sundry other citizens, all of Middlebury, Vt.)

RESOLUTION OF POLISH LITERARY GUILD (NEW BRITAIN, CONN.) ON PARTITION OF POLAND, ETC.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Polish Literary Guild, of New Britain, Conn., which I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1943.

At a meeting held April 27, 1943, at the Falcon Hall, at Broad and Washington Streets, New Britain, Conn., the Polish Literary Guild, composed of 19 military, civic, and political organizations, having as its members American citizens of Polish extraction, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Polish nation, suffering physical and mental tortures under the cruel occupation of Nazi invaders, has no voice in its own destinies; and

"Whereas the said Polish nation, decimated, robbed of all its earthly possessions, is subject to most inhuman treatment by the said Nazi oppressors, and yet valiantly opposes these barbarians in this fourth year of the greatest calamity that has befallen them in their history—fighting courageously by every available means from the underground; and

"Whereas Poland's eastern neighbor, once again in history, in September 1939, joined the wanton Germanic hordes in the fourth and most brutal partition of Poland;

"Whereas the said eastern neighbor now takes advantage of his belated alliance with the democracies and makes no further secrets of his real aims as they affect Poland by claiming more than one-half of ancient Polish territory, in contrast to America's unselfish and unbartered help; and

"Whereas the Polish state with its boundaries at the outbreak of this war in 1939 did not consist of other peoples' land, but, on the contrary, formed only a part of Poland's ancient domains as before 1772 when her first brutal partition evoked the sympathy of freemen about to struggle for their independence in this hemisphere and in this land of ours; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the unanimous sentiment of the people assembled as hereinabove stated be, to forward to the Honorable JOHN A. DANAHER, a resolution setting forth the unexampled and undemocratic claims of Soviet Russia, made through their embassy in Washington against rightful and legal Polish territory, as well as making it clear that these claims would deprive the Polish nation, the first of the United Nations to say 'No' to Hitler, a valiant and loyal ally of these United States of ours, fighting at home from the underground, and elsewhere on every battle front, of their inherent right of political independence and self-determination in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, conceived by our great President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the above-named representatives of ours in both Houses of Congress be earnestly requested to raise their voices in their Chambers against the said Soviet claims which violate all human decency, every principle of rightfully conceived democracy, and the fundamental proposition that all men are created equal before the law."

JOSEPH KOZAKIEWICZ,
President.
ADELINA KARWOWSKI,
Vice President.
HELEN KOZLOWSKI,
Secretary.
CYRIL NIKIMSKI,
Treasurer.

DISCONTINUANCE OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY PROGRAM AND REFUNDING OF PENALTIES ON EXCESS WHEAT CROPS—PETITIONS, ETC.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am receiving hundreds of letters from farmers from Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Nebraska, Missouri, Illinois, and other States, both for and against repeal or suspension of the A. A. A. program for the duration of the war. As a matter of fact, the letters run about 9 to 1 in favor of absolute repeal of the A. A. A. and associated parts of the national farm program.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred, two resolutions in the nature of petitions, signed by Victor Hawkinson, of Randolph, Kans., and a score of other farmers of Riley County, and also a third petition or resolution, signed by Otto Geffert, of Greenleaf, Kans., and nearly 30 other farmers of Washington County, Kans. Two of the resolutions ask for complete discontinuance of the A. A. A. program; the third one petitions for the enactment of legislation to refund all penalties paid on the 1941 and 1942 wheat crops marketed from excess acreages.

There being no objection, the petitions or resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator:

We, the undersigned, would have the triple A discontinued for all time.

We all agree that for years to come we are going to need all the crops we can produce. However, in this county the principal Agricultural Adjustment Agency officials have moved from farms within the last few years to be in town, and are receiving Agricultural Adjustment Agency salaries. It would seem it would help more in winning the war if they were out on the farms producing crops.

We respectfully request that the agricultural law that was passed in 1938, giving the Secretary of Agriculture absolute control over all land and water rights in this country, be immediately repealed. We had an illustration of this power, given to the Secretary of Agriculture, when he took off the penalty and other restrictions on wheat over night. If he can take the restrictions and penalty off when the notion strikes him, he can also put them on again. What further proof do we need that the referendum vote concerning wheat was simply a farce?

VICTOR HAWKINSON, of Randolph (and sundry other citizens, all of Randolph and vicinity, Kansas).

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned American citizens, believing in the American principle of fair play to all, do hereby petition the Representatives of the people in Congress to enact, without delay, the necessary legislation to permit a refund of all wheat penalties collected from the producers on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942.

VICTOR HAWKINSON, of Randolph (and sundry other citizens, all of Randolph and vicinity, Kansas).

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator:

We, the undersigned, would have the triple A discontinued for all time.

We all agree that for years to come we are going to need all the crops we can produce. However, in this county the principal Agricultural Adjustment Agency officials have moved from farms within the last few years to be in town and are receiving Agricultural Adjustment Agency salaries. It would seem it would help more in winning the war if they were out on the farms producing crops.

We respectfully request that the agricultural law that was passed in 1938, giving the Secretary of Agriculture absolute control over all land and water rights in this country, be immediately repealed. We had an illustration of this power given to the Secretary of Agriculture when he took off the penalty and other restrictions on wheat overnight. If he can take the restrictions and penalty off when the notion strikes him, he can also put them on again. What further proof do we need that the referendum vote concerning wheat was simply a farce?

OTTO GEFFERT, of Greenleaf (and sundry other citizens, all of Greenleaf and vicinity, Kansas).

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, as part of my remarks, copy of a letter from William Ljungdahl, chairman of the Kansas State Commission of Revenue and Taxation, stating very clearly and understandably the arguments in favor of continuing the national farm program, not only through the war period but into the post-war period.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
COMMISSION OF REVENUE AND TAXATION,
Topeka, April 21, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It was with a great deal of interest that I read your speech

which was broadcast over WIBW, last Sunday evening. I regret that I did not hear it on the air, but it so happened that I was not in a position to do so. It is, I think, a matter of major importance, to consider what should be done with the triple A in this warring period. I should deem it about as practical to completely wipe out the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, as it would be to disorganize labor, or industry, or any other major undertaking which has at heart the interest of all our people. It should further be observed that the effect upon the general public, of such an action, is not merely that of repealing a law, but it is rather, the effect that such repeal may have, not only on those immediately affected thereby, but upon the Nation as a whole.

Agriculture today, is in many instances in an unusually strong position, so far as prices are concerned. Subsidies, or payments, or grants may be unnecessary; I think that we all agree, that agriculture is anxious and willing to produce foodstuffs to the limit of their own ability and to the capacity of their units. On the other hand, back of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is the principle of conservation, and which has cost the American people a vast sum of money to become so organized in a Nation-wide conservation effort, under this institution which we term the triple A. To indiscriminately cast aside this investment, is comparable to the child who tiring of a toy, casts it aside; or, of that particular type of citizen, who buys a piece of equipment one year and the next year is ready to purchase something entirely different. The fundamentals in the triple A are sound and are of immense significance, at least to Kansas agriculture, and I suspect to the agriculture of other States.

Personally, I have never been enthusiastic about crop insurance; I am convinced that commodity credit loans on grain held over, and at nominal rate of interest means stability in price and the protection to the producer, in his being able to retain ownership of his crops at a time when the market may be badly depressed and thereby make it possible to hold it until a more practical time for marketing shall have arrived. Back of it all is that very practical, intangible something which we call organization and cooperation.

It would certainly seriously hamper future organization, when the time for such united effort may present itself, if we ruthlessly destroy by repeal, everything that has been attained through the triple A up to the present time. I would, therefore, urge that the organization be maintained with as small a personnel as may be practical. In that connection, I would urge that Commodity Credit Corporation be kept available in full force to meet any emergency that might present itself, either in the immediate future, or in the future more remote. It is therefore to be stated that in my humble opinion it would be extravagant and regrettable were Congress to repeal the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Rather, let it be developed along the lines that will relieve the present antagonism and result in a strongly protected agriculture, when the period of uncertainty and low prices again jeopardize our basic industry.

With kindest personal regards, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

WM. LJUNGDAHL.

ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN TAXATION AND REGULATION—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a leaf floating on the current of a stream will show the direction the current is taking. An idea many times expressed by a man will indicate what he is thinking. But when the legislative body of a State passes a resolution, it indicates rather clearly what the people of that State are thinking.

This week I have received from the chief clerk of the Senate of the Wisconsin Legislature an enrolled copy of a joint resolution adopted by the 1943 Wisconsin Legislature. The joint resolution directs the Wisconsin Commission on Interstate Cooperation to study the effects of the enlargement of the activities of the Federal Government in various fields of taxation and regulation and to report to the legislature its findings and recommendations as to the restoration to the State of Wisconsin of its rightful powers and duties as a sovereign State.

Mr. President, the resolution is a very significant one. It indicates, as I have said, that the people of Wisconsin are thinking things through, especially things in connection with the post-war period. I feel that the resolution indicates a very serious problem, and one which warrants immediate study.

Some time ago a committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations recommended the creation of a Federal-State fiscal authority to help untangle the maze of overlapping taxes and conflicting fiscal functions of Federal, State, and local governments

The committee submitted its recommendations to the Secretary of the Treasury in a six-volume report embracing a 2-year study. The committee urged coordination and cooperation rather than subordination and coercion, as the answer to intergovernmental fiscal problems, and the committee likewise recommended many changes in existing tax practices.

Mr. President, I have not studied the report; but if the newspaper accounts of the report are accurate, the report itself should be exceedingly thought-provoking in connection with any post-war planning.

The joint resolution adopted by the 1943 Legislature of Wisconsin points out that, according to figures available in October of 1942, employment in the Federal service totaled some 2,687,093 persons.

Mr. President, at this time there are employed in the Federal service approximately 3,000,000 persons. This morning there came to my desk a heart-breaking letter from one of my constituents in Wisconsin—a married woman who, in sending the letter, wrote that her husband did not know she was writing it. They have one child 7 years of age, and she expects another child shortly. Yet her husband is being inducted into the service. And there are 3,000,000 employees in the Federal service.

The resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature points out that for the month of October 1942, the pay roll of the employees of those boards, bureaus, and commissions amounted to $445,135,852, and that for the period of October 1941, through October 1942, the total pay roll for those Federal employees reached the sum of $4,199,653,711.

The resolution goes on to point out that during the last calendar year up to September 1, there have been created by executive order, a total of 19 boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Mr. President, the legislature of my State is concerned with the concentration in Washington of boards, bureaus, and commissions. It is concerned because it believes that we must now consider the post-war problem which that concentration will present.

The Legislature of the State of Wisconsin indicates that after the termination of the present world-wide emergency it will be necessary to end the functions of many of those temporary boards and commissions and to cut the expenditures of the Federal Government according to peacetime needs.

State governments throughout the land are concerned about the Federal assumption of responsibilities heretofore reserved to the various States.

In the State of Wisconsin the Federal Government's collection of taxes increased from approximately $95,000,000 in 1940, to the record total of more than $305,000,000 in 1942, the largest collection being the Federal income tax, which jumped from $67,000,000 in 1941, to $206,000,000 in 1942.

In a peacetime period it is obvious that a continued extension of the tax bases by the Federal Government and the imposition of unprecedented high rates of taxes, particularly on income, would leave little if any opportunity for the States which have similar bases to look to those sources for additional revenue.

Mr. President, a great many States, in the post-war period particularly, will be increasingly concerned with the maintenance of the rights of individual States in the fields of regulation and social legislation.

In view of all of these facts, the Wisconsin Commission on Interstate Cooperation will make a study and will report its findings to the next regular or special session of the legislature with respect to:

First. The specific fields entered by the Federal Government during the past decade;

Second. The most effective means available by which the State of Wisconsin can apprise the Federal Government of the need of reserving to the States their just rights, powers, and responsibilities.

Moreover, the study by the Wisconsin Commission will make such recommendations as it may deem necessary for the formulation of an organization of States in which each State will be represented to formulate a program to prevent further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights, duties, and powers of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, the need for centralization in wartime is obvious to all of us, but we were well on the march toward such centralization long before wartime, and it is conceivable that we can continue that march after the war has been won.

It is difficult to define the limitations for State and Federal activities, but it is undeniable that studies such as this one can serve a very sound constructive purpose. Such an analysis made by each of the 48 States can well redefine our traditional division of power and authority.

Mr. President, it is trite, almost, to say that we face tragic times; but we must remember that the problems of peace will exceed in difficulty the problems of war. The tendency all over the earth for centralization has been too well-marked in the last decade or two. If centralization were all that followed we could well say, "Let it go at that"; but with centralization comes the deletion and depletion of human liberties and rights. When our fathers founded this Government they had in mind not only the need of checks and balances in the Federal Government itself, but checks and balances between existing commonwealths and the Federal Government. So, Mr. President, I am happy at this time to place in the RECORD the resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature which indicates that on the home front the people are thinking. When the people are thinking, the country is safe.

I now present the joint resolution adopted by the 1943 Legislature of Wisconsin with respect to this matter and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 14

Joint Resolution directing the Wisconsin commission on interstate cooperation to study the effects of the enlargement of the activities of the Federal Government in various fields of taxation and regulation and to report to the legislature its findings and recommendations as to the restoration to the State of Wisconsin of its rightful powers and duties as a sovereign State

Whereas employment in the Federal service in the numerous boards, bureaus, and commissions, according to latest available figures for October 1942, has run into an all-time high of 2,687,093 persons; and

Whereas the monthly pay roll of the numerous employees of such boards, bureaus, and commissions for the month of October 1942, was the sum of $445,135,852, and the total pay roll for the period October 1941 through October 1942 for such Federal employees reached the staggering sum of $4,199,653,711; and

Whereas there have been created by executive order during the last calendar year up to September 1, a total of 19 boards, bureaus, and commissions; and

Whereas the concentration in Washington of the numerous boards, bureaus, and commissions has created a problem of grave concern to each individual State; and

Whereas it will be necessary after the termination of the present world-wide emergency to end the functions of all of the various and numerous temporary boards, bureaus, and commissions, and to cut the expenditures of our Federal Government to peacetime needs; and

Whereas the Federal Government has in recent years by taxation, regulation, proclamation, and executive decree, assumed responsibilities and the regulation of approximately every kind of business and human activity, practically all of which subjects and responsibilities were heretofore reserved to the various States; and

Whereas the collection of all taxes by the Federal Government in Wisconsin has increased from approximately $95,000,000 in 1940 to the record total of more than $305,000,000 in 1942, the largest collection being the Federal income tax which jumped from $67,000,000 in 1941 to $206,000,000 in 1942; and

Whereas the extension of the tax bases by the Federal Government and the imposition of unprecedented high rates of taxes, particularly on income, leaves little if any opportunity for the States which have the same or similar bases to look to those sources for additional revenue; and

Whereas it is necessary in the maintenance of a united nation, that the individual States maintain the rights reserved to them, and that further encroachments by the Federal Government in the field of regulation and social legislation be considered in the light of rights of individual States; and

Whereas the States of this Nation by integrated and aggressive action can stop the growing centralization of power in Washington and effect a return to the States of State powers and functions and the reestablishment of State sovereignty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Wisconsin commission on interstate cooperation be and it is hereby directed to study and report its findings to the next regular or special session of the legislature as to:

(a) The specific fields entered, and for all practical purposes taken over, by the Federal Government during the past 10 years.

(b) The most effective means available by which Wisconsin can apprise the Federal Government of the need of reserving to the States their just rights, powers, and responsibilities, and such recommendations as it may deem necessary for the formation of an organization of States in which each State will be represented to formulate a program to prevent further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights, duties, and powers of the States of the union; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the presiding officer of each branch of the other 47 State legislatures and to the council of State governments at Chicago and that they be invited to participate in a program designed to have restored to the individual States their just duties and powers; be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives in the Congress from Wisconsin be invited to participate in the deliberations of this committee and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to each such Representative from Wisconsin.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2346. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 216).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 658. A bill to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 217).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1076. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of the United States Capitol; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of William A. Haag; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1078. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1079. A bill directing the Federal Works Administrator, through the Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, to make a survey of the need for a system of express highways throughout the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1080. A bill authorizing the appointment of Lloyd C. Brogger as a lieutenant, United States Navy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1081. A bill to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1082. A bill to give wartime rank to retired officers of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation of functions relating to irrigation projects on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2750) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FLAG WEEK

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 148), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of June 8 to 14 (inclusive) as Flag Week, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings during that week and inviting the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate patriotic exercises.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and my colleague [Mr. NYE] that I have received a number of telegrams which I wish to read into the RECORD in connection with the Farm Security Administration and other governmental agencies which are engaged in helping the farmers. I read a telegram from Valley City, N. Dak., as follows:

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator:

Hope you will see fit to continue the agricultural program parity soil-building commodity loans. Also Farm Security Administration, which has done good work in this county.

JOHN M. COOK.

I read another telegram from Ellendale, N. Dak., as follows:

ELLENDALE, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

We certainly hope you can see fit to support our present farm programs.

ELLENDALE FARMERS UNION
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

By the way, that is one of the largest cooperative associations in the State of North Dakota.

I read another telegram from Fargo, N. Dak.:

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Farmers here want appropriation bill amended and your support of established programs helping agriculture.

A. S. ALBERTSON.

I read several other telegrams, as follows:

CROSBY, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator:

Attention brought to United States Department of Agriculture War Board by residents Divide County as to necessity of continuing appropriations activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, Farm Security Administration, Farm Credit Administration, and other governmental agencies as they have been conducted in the past. This program is essential to the war effort future of our agriculture. We request your assistance.

A. L. BRUNS,
Divide County United States Department of Agriculture War Board.

CROSBY, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate:

Important to Northwest that agricultural programs continue if essential war production is to remain adequate. Your assistance required when brought to the Senate.

OLE SLETTEN.

VOLTAIRE, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Amend agricultural appropriation bill to conform with appropriations promised by the Department of Agricuture and supported by the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States.

THE VOLTAIRE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
By C. J. HAWTHORNE, *President.*

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers here favor continuation of soil conservation, commodity loans, and farm security.

BARNES COUNTY COOPERATIVE CREAMERY.

I read a telegram from Derrick, N. Dak., as follows:

DERRICK, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Vote on farm bill now before the Senate so that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Federal Crop Insurance, Farm Security Administration bill, and the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation set-up will continue to function.

John Ivesdal, Edmore, N. Dak.; Lars Ingulsrud, Edmore, N. Dak.; Frank Novacek, Edmore, N. Dak.; George Martinson, Derrick, N. Dak.; Jorgen Ivesdal, Edmore, N. Dak.

That telegram is signed by some of the leading farmers of the State of North Dakota.

I read a telegram from Tappen, N. Dak.:

TAPPEN, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington D. C.:

Request your support to provide appropriation for parity payments, soil conservation payments, and Farm Security Administration.

H. B. KILGORE.

That telegram is from one of the outstanding farmers of the State.

I read several other telegrams as follows:

STEELE, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your support to provide appropriation for parity payments, soil conservation payments, and Farm Security Administration.

MILTON E. LEETUN.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We, the members and officers of the Barnes County Farmers Union consisting of over 400 membership request that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program and Farm Security be left as they now operate.

BARNES COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
CARL OGLESBY, *President.*

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We, the patrons of this cooperative, want you to back legislation for parity payment and by all means we want farm security. We must have that program in this territory.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
GEORGE LANE, *Manager.*

Mr. President, the signer of the last telegram, Mr. George Lane, used to be a member of the Legislature of North Dakota, and is intimately acquainted with the farmers' problems.

I read another telegram from Flasher, N. Dak., as follows:

FLASHER, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Work to amend agriculture appropriation bill to support past fundamental agriculture programs.

FARMERS' UNION ELEVATOR.

I read other telegrams, as follows:

FLASHER, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Agriculture appropriation bill must be amended to give added assistance to Farm Security Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and crop insurance. Your help requested.

FARMERS' UNION OIL CO.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Must have your help in providing increase in agriculture appropriation to give us adequate Farm Security Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and crop insurance. Don't let these hard-gained benefits die. We can't live without them. Five hundred members support this wire.

FLASHER FARMERS' UNION LOCAL,
JOHN LOMAN, JR.

Mr. President, I may say at this point to Members of the Senate that these telegrams come from every portion of the State of North Dakota—east, west, north, and south—and that the senders of the telegrams really represent the farmers of the State.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. One of the telegrams which the Senator read prayed the Senator to stand sponsor for the continuation of these and other Government organizations as they have been conducted in the past. The Senator would not go along on that thesis, would he? Does he not sense the need of and desire some improvement? If not, God help us.

Mr. LANGER. They have worked quite well in North Dakota.

Mr. TOBEY. If some of these Government organizations are going to be conducted just as in the past, it will be a continuance ad nauseam, ad infinitum.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know how the programs work in the Senator's State of New Hampshire, but these programs have been very helpful to the farmers in North Dakota. During the period when I was Governor of North Dakota we had severe droughts in that State, and if it were not for the assistance received from the Farm Security Administration, God help the farmers of the Northwest.

I read a telegram from Minot, N. Dak., as follows:

MINOT, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support and fight for sufficient appropriations for Farm Security Administration parity payments, crop insurance, nonrecourse loans.

DONALD BIVINS,
Sawyer, N. Dak.

Mr. President, when it comes to the nonrecourse loans, if the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is interested, I can tell him that not hundreds but thousands of farmers of North Dakota could not get a dollar from the banks of North Dakota, and they would have gone under if it had not been for the help they secured from the Federal Government.

Another telegram, which comes from Velva, N. Dak., reads as follows:

VELVA, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We the 110 members of North Prairie Farmers Union, Local No. 663, request that you amend the appropriation bill and support past fundamental legislation designed to help American agriculture.

ED HYSTAD,
President, Local Farmers Union.

Another telegram, coming from Valley City, reads as follows:

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight to restore all farm benefits in agricultural bill:

BARNES COUNTY LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
B. E. GRANT, *President.*

Another telegram comes from Finley, N. Dak.:

FINLEY, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned farmers of Steele County want you to amend the appropriation bill and to support past fundamental legis-

lation and established program designed to help American agriculture.

Harry Ness, Carl Ness, Oscar Ness, John Ness, Edgar Bjerke, Elmer Bjerke, A. B. Jacobson, M. P. Ostmo, Carl Ostmo, Sam Sanda, Harry Rassmusson, Ole Pederson, M. E. Erickson, Carl O. Rud, Alfred Johnson, Ted Klabo, Kenneth Gronhovd, Morris Ryan, Glenn Ryan, Marvin Riesenberg, Gilmore Berge, Christine Gronhovd, Lovell Johnson, Wilde Pladson, Kermit Livdalen, Moris Gronhovd.

Mr. President, let me add that whenever I receive a telegram relative to any one of the Federal agencies that have done so much for the State of North Dakota I feel it my duty to have the telegram in full placed in the RECORD.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANAHER

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the so-called Connally bill, delivered by Senator DANAHER on the program Congress Speaks, May 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTING SERVICEMEN'S RIGHT TO VOTE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters and documents relating to protecting servicemen's right to vote, which appear in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT MYERS (FLA.) NEWS-PRESS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Boil It Down" published in the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press on April 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified, inserting additional sections at the end of the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram I have received from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate now has under consideration the Connally bill with innumerable amendments. The measure, as I understand it, is directed against those employees who engage in a strike in a war plant.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations with its several millions of members has been conscientiously observing the no-strike pledge given to the President of the United States. This has been done, not because of any fear of penalty, but for the more important reason that the workers are determined not to permit any stoppage which would interfere with production of the maximum amount of war materials to assure a speedy victory over our Axis enemies. We have many grievances, but the Congress of Industrial Organizations shall seek their equitable adjustment through the National War Labor Board, thus assuring continuity of production.

There has developed a growing resentment on the part of workers, which is thoroughly justified, that Congress and the executive branch are concentrating their efforts on the domestic front to repression and degradation of the living standards of labor. Witness the fact that while wages are being stabilized, the President's directive to roll back prices to the level of September 15 has been completely ignored.

At the same time Congress repealed the President's directive limiting net annual salaries thereby permitting skyrocketing of salaries for corporate executives. Now there appears the Connally measure directed against labor at large which has been sweating and even dying on the domestic front as soldiers of production.

I urge that the Senate of the United States return the Connally bill to committee for public hearings thereby affording an opportunity to representatives of labor to demonstrate to Congress the unfairness of any such measure and the adverse impact which its passage would have upon the morale of the workers and their sons and brothers in the armed forces. There must be an end to this war against labor in order that the effort of the entire Nation can be mobilized in a war to destroy Hitler and our Axis enemies.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President of Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. President, I read another telegram sent me, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The appeal you received from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, meets with the full approval of myself and the membership of my international union. The all-out effort on the part of our membership in all categories for a successful prosecution of the war is well known and since they have accepted the responsibilities that go with such a partnership they feel justified in demanding their day in court when threatened with legislation designed only to humiliate and discourage them. Therefore, I urge that the Connally bill be returned to committee for public hearings.

MARTIN WAGNER,
President United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I read another telegram, as follows:

NEW YORK, *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate has under consideration Connally bill with innumerable amendments, directed against employees who engage in a strike in a war plant. As president of the American Newspaper Guild I concur fully with sentiments expressed in Congress of Industrial Organization's president, Philip Murray's, telegram to you regarding this bill and urge that the Senate be not stampeded into hasty action, certainly not without public hearings to enable labor representatives to demonstrate to Congress this measure's unfairness and the damage it would inflict upon the morale of American workers who are exerting their utmost efforts in this war to destroy Hitler and our Axis enemies.

MILTON MURRAY,
President, American Newspaper Guild.

I read another telegram, as follows:

Washington, D. C.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly condemn Connally bill as vicious, unjustified attack on organized labor. Our 50,000 members faithfully obey no-strike agreement and are rendering unsurpassed patriotic service. Passage of Connally bill will antagonize labor and weaken war effort. Urge you vote against the bill and support administration's constructive labor policies.

DICK LEWIS,
Acting Secretary-Treasurer United Office and Professional Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I read another telegram, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Connally bill is directed against those employees who engage in a strike in a war plant. The United Furniture Workers of America has a perfect record of observing labor's no-strike pledge given to the President of the United States. We did not give this pledge in fear of punishment, but because we wanted to insure full-capacity production. The Connally bill can only add fuel to the natural resentment of our workers against the complete collapse of the Office of Price Administration. The Connally bill would not help, but only aggravate, the existing situation. Labor maintains that we are doing our job and Congress can do better by legislating on more important problems arising out of the war than taking time out in this crucial period to take an unnecessary slap at loyal American workers. Let the Senate of the United States tighten up all the various departments of our Government in the war against the Axis father than the war against labor, which is doing its full share.

MORRIS MUSTER,
International President, United Furniture Workers of America, C. I. O.

Finally, Mr. President, I read another telegram, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 4, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Transport Workers' Union of America urges you reject Connally antistrike bill as unmerited assault on organized labor's outstanding contribution toward maximum war production. In interest of successful prosecution of war effort, Congress should address itself to problem of holding down cost of living and ending unconscionable profiteering at workers' expense.

MICHAEL J. QUILL,
International President,
DOUGLAS L. MACMAHON,
International Secretary-Treasurer,
Transport Workers' Union of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as modified, inserting additional sections at the end of the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	George
Austin	Capper	Gerry
Ball	Caraway	Gillette
Bankhead	Chandler	Gurney
Barbour	Chavez	Hawkes
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Brewster	Connally	Holman
Bridges	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Davis	La Follette
Burton	Eastland	Langer
Bushfield	Ellender	Lodge
Butler	Ferguson	Lucas

McClellan	Radcliffe	Truman
McFarland	Reed	Tunnell
McKellar	Revercomb	Tydings
McNary	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Maloney	Robertson	Van Nuys
Maybank	Russell	Wagner
Mead	Scrugham	Walsh
Millikin	Shipstead	Wheeler
Moore	Stewart	Wherry
Murdock	Taft	White
Murray	Thomas, Idaho	Wiley
O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Overton	Thomas, Utah	
Pepper	Tobey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as modified, to insert additional sections at the end of the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question with respect to one of the provisions of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. WAGNER. The amendment of the Senator contains a provision which would attempt to prohibit strikes pending consideration of a dispute by the War Labor Board. That seems to me to be an entirely new departure in Federal labor legislation. What I have in mind is that in the coal situation with which we are so concerned—and properly so—a real strike did not occur. The men merely walked away from their jobs or from the mines. So strictly speaking, there was no strike. It was simply a case of the men walking away from their jobs. There is no way by which the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would prevent a recurrence of a similar situation. We cannot prevent a man from leaving a job. I am wondering what the Senator had in mind. To me it is an entirely new concept. I know something about the strike problem.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the Senator's question. I suppose he is referring to the provision that pending a hearing before the National War Labor Board, but for not longer than 90 days, so there shall not be indefinite delay, the employees shall continue to work and be subject to the same criminal penalties which are provided in case the Government has taken over a plant under section 4 of the bill. The idea has been introduced in section 4 of the bill, and I have merely applied that prohibition and the criminal penalties to those who strike during the period in which the case is being argued before and considered by the War Labor Board. The same principle is contained in the Railroad Labor Act and has been in that act for many years.

Mr. WAGNER. There is no provision in the Railroad Labor Act for a criminal penalty.

Mr. TAFT. However, it makes it illegal to strike during that time. What the effect of that may be, I do not know. It seems to me to be a very mild provision when we say that the workers shall not strike during that period. The penalties may be found in section 4 of the Connally bill, and in that bill there has been inserted, I think—I understood the Senator from Texas yesterday to say he would propose such an amendment—the same provision as that which is found in my amendment which provides that it shall not be considered a violation of the law for an individual employee to cease work, or refuse to continue to work, or to accept employment.

That modification has been made, as I understand, in section 4.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said in the RECORD that I would offer such an amendment, but I do not think it has actually been offered. I hold it in my hand at the present time and am ready to present it. No man should be held guilty of a criminal offense because he quits work.

Mr. TAFT. So if my amendment and the bill as thus amended shall be adopted there will be two crimes for which persons may be put in jail. One is to strike when the Government has possession of the plant. The other is to strike when the Government has not taken possession of the plant, but while a case is pending before the War Labor Board for a period of 90 days. Those are the only criminal penalties which are proposed. The acts for which penalties may be assessed are only those which are set out in section 4 of the bill. If the Senator will examine the bill he will find them.

Mr. WAGNER. Last night I examined as best I could the provisions of the bill. I was much concerned with certain aspects of it.

Mr. TAFT. The penalty is not for striking. The penalty in the Connally bill is only as stated in section 4 on page 4 of the substitute, which provides that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce, or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce, any person to interfere or continue to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment.

That is the first crime; and it is not directed against the individual, but against coercing, instigating, or inducing.

The second crime is:

> To aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof.

Those are the criminal acts; not the act of striking but those particular acts which are enumerated.

So far as my amendment is concerned, I simply carried those penalties over for the 90-day period during which the case is required to be submitted to the National War Labor Board. Such a provision seems to be reasonable. The telegrams read today from the C. I. O. declare their intention to submit their case to the National War Labor Board and reaffirm their voluntary agreement which has been continued up to this time. If we should penalize the failure to do so, I do not see how anyone could have a reasonable objection.

Mr. WAGNER. If an individual simply leaves a plant, there is no provision in the proposed legislation, so far as I am aware, which can prevent him from leaving. Is that not true?

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion, there is nothing which would prevent him from leaving, and he could not be penalized for leaving.

Mr. WAGNER. I believe the workers will resent the criminal compulsion that they must continue to work if they are dissatisfied in some way. They have done very well voluntarily. I think the idea of this type of legislation, criminal compulsory legislation, would be resented by the workers.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator is talking about the individual worker, I will state that I am the one who introduced into this bill a provision of the British Trade Disputes Act, a provision which the labor people in Great Britain insisted upon, and which seems to me to be a reasonable one. The language of that provision is as follows:

> It shall not be considered unlawful, and no injunction shall be issued against an individual employee by reason of his ceasing work, or refusing to continue work, or refusing to accept employment.

That is made perfectly clear in my amendment, and it will be made clear in section 4 when the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] offers his amendment.

So far as the voluntary idea is concerned, so long as all of the workers of the United States voluntarily submitted perhaps that was enough. But we now have a case of the representatives of labor in one of the largest industries, who have said that they are no longer bound to submit, that conditions have changed since the agreement was made, that it no longer binds them, and they refuse to submit to it. That is the issue today. On Sunday night last, the President of the United States made an appeal to the miners to submit their case to the National War Labor Board. They had refused to do so. That is the issue today before the United States. It seems to me that on that issue the Senate should say that if they are not voluntarily willing to submit their case to the National War Labor Board they should be compelled to do so.

Mr. WAGNER. A mere amendment providing that witnesses may be subpenaed would accomplish that purpose. It would bring the individual before the War Labor Board. The point I make is that even under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, the miners would not be affected because they have not struck. They have simply walked out. In such a case, the Senator's proposal would not have any effect. We cannot prevent workers from walking out, and that is what has happened in the case of the coal miners. I am as sorry as anyone can be that the miners walked out at a time when their services were needed by the country. I endorse and approve the President's action in taking over the mines.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that no word was conveyed by telegram, or otherwise, by any union leader that the miners should not go back to work on Saturday morning last? Does the Senator believe that no officials of the union made any mention to the men about the situation and urged them to remain away from the mines on Saturday morning?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know whether they did or not.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think it was a pure chance that no men went to work in the coal mines last Saturday morning?

Mr. WAGNER. If we should undertake to compel them by criminal law to go back to work they probably would not go back. Under our concept I think the idea of criminal compulsion is repugnant. I do not think that a provision of this kind in the bill would be of any help, it has never worked when tried in other democratic countries, and in my opinion the American worker will resent it. I have just been looking over the British record. Their experience has not been very good on that particular phase of the question. A report from the New York Times of April 20, 1942, states:

> Although the British law outlawing strikes was widely hailed as smoothing the production paths, it failed dismally. There was only one test ever made, in which a number of workers were jailed. The fact was not generally published at the time, but the result was that a committee composed of workers and management delegates soon made representations to the court, which freed the sentenced men.

In other words, the British have learned, and we know, that workers in jail produce no more war materials than soldiers' bayonets. The best results are still obtained through the cooperative spirit of freemen. Considering all the facts and circumstances, the record of the workers in this country has been wonderful. Labor and industry have cooperated so effectively that the time lost in war industries through work stoppages has averaged six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total time worked; that is, only 1 hour has been lost for every 600 hours worked in war industries. This is a better record than the British have achieved.

It seems to me the justifiable concern over the present major coal crisis should not obscure the over-all record. I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate should pass proposed legislation which attempted to compel men to work when they do not want to work. Such a proposal is against our whole concept, and I should feel very sorry if we changed that concept at a time when industry, as a whole, and the workers are making an almost miraculous record of war production. It is an unfortunate time, it seems to me, to disturb that situation because of an unhappy temporary dispute which is in process of solution.

Mr. TAFT. I sympathize largely with the feeling of the Senator from New York, and I certainly would be unwilling to go one step beyond what appears to be necessary to meet actual situations which may arise in time of war. I agree with the Senator that a jail penalty is not a particularly effective penalty, even when used against the leaders of the union, and this measure under section 4, as I read it, employs such a penalty, only against leaders. I think, in the long run, probably it is not a wise measure, and so I apply the penalty only to the brief period during which the case is being submitted to the War Labor Board. That is such a reasonable provision, it has existed so long in the Railroad Labor Board, that I have no doubt that with very few exceptions the men would acquiesce in it and be willing to go through with the law if there is a provision that the proceedings will be subject to trial. The present situation is that there is now nothing in the law which requires Mr. Lewis, or even asks him, to submit his case to the National War Labor Board. I am trying to get such a provision into the law.

I have not provided a criminal penalty for not finally complying with the order of the War Labor Board because it seems to me that it is doubtful whether we ought to go that far and because it is doubtful how effective it would be. Instead I have provided an injunction, that is, a formal hearing before the Circuit Court of Appeals, before three judges of outstanding character, in every circuit, who shall determine whether the hearing was fair and properly conducted and whether the Government—not an individual, but whether the Government—is entitled to have the order enforced by injunction. Once the order is issued, the President can take steps to carry it out through the court and the steps are clearly defined with the general agreement on the part of every one and knowledge that the case has been thoroughly tried and every one has been heard and the court has in definite terms said what should be done and what should not be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the Senator's proposal, the net effect of it in disputes similar to the mine dispute would be to make arbitration compulsory?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, even though, after all the hearings, a final decision was handed down, it would not bind anybody to accept it, and a man could refuse to work.

Mr. TAFT. It is declared to be binding but the only penalty provided is that the Government may go into the circuit court of appeals to enforce the order by injunction.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think I made myself clear. There is nothing in the bill that would compel a man to work.

Mr. TAFT. No; but, when it comes to the injunction, and I have read that provision several times—it is only against the leaders, only against instigation to strike, only against using union funds to support a strike and such other action to promote or further a strike as may be taken.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, the net effect is that, instead of having a matter undecided, the Senator's proposal is to have compulsory arbitration, and, once the arbitration is had, if the individual does not commit any overt act against the Government, he does not have to work unless he wants to do so. There is no compulsion to work.

Mr. TAFT. There is one final step we could take if this procedure does not work. Rather than impose criminal penalties against individuals for not working, I would say the last step would be the drafting of the men into an American labor force and sending them into the mines. That is a step I am opposed to taking; I am opposed to the Austin-Wadsworth bill; I hope we never come to that; but, if we are not going to be forced to it, it seems to me we must take a reasonable step today, one that puts things on a legal basis, one that affords a procedure under the laws of justice laid down by Congress to prevent strikes against the war effort.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish the Senator would help me in my interpretation of section 9 of his proposed amendment. As I understand, it is the Senator's purpose, after the Board has issued an order, to authorize the Attorney General to apply to the circuit court of appeals of any circuit in which the hindrance or reduction occurs, the Attorney General then and there to ask for an order or an injunction. I assume that the Senator means he wants an order in aid of the decision of the Board or that he wants an order or injunction to restrain some conduct against which the Board inveighs. My thinking in that particular is stimulated because the Senator has used language commencing in line 19 to the effect that the court may enjoin or restrain the doing of any one or more of the following acts:

> (1) The beginning or the continuance by one or more employers of a lock-out.
>
> (2) The instigation, promotion, furtherance, or support by any person or labor organization or officer thereof of any strike against one or more employers.

Now let us stop for a moment and assume that a whole local union composed of, let us say, 150 members, decides that it will not work; certainly the proviso commencing in line 3 and extending to line 6, on page 5, will not affect the case. Exactly what order does the Senator from Ohio tell us the circuit court of appeals could issue against a local union whose entire membership refuses to work?

Mr. TAFT. I think it could issue an order against the use of union funds, or against any official telling the men not to work. I do not think it could issue an order against an individual man saying, "You shall work," because the proviso expressly provides against that. But if the men possibly meet together, and all agree jointly not to work, there

might be an injunction against such procedure.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator feel that under this section the court would have the power to order a man to go back to work, or, if he refused, subject him to pay a penalty of some sort, by way of fine or serving a term in prison?

Mr. TAFT. No; under the proviso, I do not think the court could order a man to go back to work.

Mr. DANAHER. There would be a contempt proceeding, then, for violation of the court's order?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I think an injunction could be issued against men picketing a mine, for instance, to prevent other men going to work, and possibly they could be put in jail for contempt if they disobeyed the court order. Giving the power to a court means that the court can define the exact act applicable to the situation which results in a strike. I hope I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. DANAHER. I see what the Senator from Ohio means, and I thank him very much.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield, first, to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to section 8, page 3, which contains the provision that—

> Whenever any labor dispute has been certified to the Board, or jurisdiction assumed on the Board's own motion, and until 10 days after the order of the Board has been issued, the parties to the dispute shall continue production under all the same conditions which prevailed—

And so forth. What is the binding effect of the three words, "shall continue production?" How can obedience to that requirement be compelled?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there is any penalty, so to speak, in that case. It is as though Congress should say, "While this is pending, the parties shall continue to work under the same conditions." The important part of it is "under all the same conditions which prevailed when the dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or temporary order of the Board." That establishes the legal conditions. It establishes the effectiveness of section 4 of the Connally bill. If, then, anyone violates section 4 of the Connally bill, he makes himself liable to the penalties of section 4. Insofar as legal effect is concerned, we could leave that out. It seems to me, however, to establish a definite legal condition, and it is important for us to state how the production shall be continued. Shall it be continued on the basis of the former collective-bargaining agreement, or shall it be continued on some other basis? The important thing is that during the pendency of the proceedings before the National War Labor Board there shall be some provision governing the relations of the parties, I do not care what it may be. In the coal case it may be the collective bargaining which has expired, let us say.

Mr. LODGE. This expresses a pious hope, let us say——

Mr. TAFT. It does not express a hope; it declares what the parties are expected to do during that period. Of course, if an employer violates the agreement and a man instigates a strike, there is nothing illegal in the institution of the strike, because the employer is the man who has violated the agreement; but there must be some basis for determining whether the provisions of the Connally Act are applicable. As a matter of fact, I did not include this provision when I first drafted the amendment, but it seemed to me that it should be put in the bill. I cannot see that it possibly can do any harm, and it seems to me that it establishes a definite basis during the hearing before the War Labor Board.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Among the things which the Senator attempts to authorize the court to enjoin are—

> The beginning or the continuance by one or more employers of a lockout of any of the employees of such employer or employers.

Then the second is:

> The instigation, promotion, furtherance, or support by any person or labor organization or officer thereof of any strike against one or more employers, or of any organized stoppage or slow-down of the work in which such employer or employers are engaged.

It seems to me the use of the words "or support by any person" in line 25 would involve the acquiescence of any person who might be an individual member of an organization which had agreed, we might say, or had consented, to discontinue work.

Mr. TAFT. It was because of the presence of the word "person" that I inserted the proviso.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me the proviso does not amount to much if the Senator's observation in reply to the Senator from Connecticut is correct. Let us say there are 150 members of a miners' union, or a carpenters' union, or machinists' union, or any other union, and they decide that they will not continue working. How can they be enjoined? It may be that an organization can be enjoined by having an order of injunction issued against the officers, but the individual members of an organization cannot be enjoined without a personal service of injunction upon them.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be possible to enjoin a whole crowd who organize together or agree together to strike. We could not order anyone to go back to work. We could say, "You met last night. We enjoin you from having another meeting tomorrow night to keep this thing going. You have to permit any of the men who desire to go back to work to return to work." An order could be issued saying, "You cannot call a meeting tomorrow night and all agree that you will not go back to work." I say it would be possible to go that far.

Mr. BARKLEY. How would an injunction be served on the officers of an organization requiring an individual member of an organization to go back to work? How can an individual be enjoined from not working if he has agreed with his fellows, the members of the organization, not to work?

Mr. TAFT. He could not be enjoined. All that could be done would be to enjoin him from having any more meetings to work up a strike and prevent members from going back to work. I do not see how it would be possible to leave out the word "persons."

Mr. BARKLEY. Either the Senator's proviso is of no value, or, if it is of any value, it nullifies the language in subdivision (2) of his category of acts which may be enjoined.

Mr. TAFT. I have tried to draw the distinction. We cannot make it illegal for a man merely not to work. We cannot enjoin him to go back to work. We can enjoin him from taking any steps to promote a strike, either individually or in groups. It seems to me there is a clear, definite distinction, and I think this is the only thing to be done when we are dealing with this kind of a case.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand the Senator's amendment and his interpretation of it to be that no injunction shall issue against an individual employee because of his having ceased work or having refused to work. Suppose the members of a union consisting of several hundred should all walk out of a plant on a given day at a given hour. Would the Senator contend that that was not evidence of a strike and concerted action; or would he say that was action by individual employees, acting individually?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has stated a difficult problem. The difficulty is in producing proof. I do not believe the mere walking out of a number of men at the same time can be proved to be an enjoinable offense. The chances are that it could be proved successfully that it was a concerted effort under somebody's guidance. The chances are people could be found against whom the injunction could be issued, the leaders of the movement.

Mr. OVERTON. Does not the Senator think that in a case where all the employees of a plant walked out at a given time the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur would apply?

Mr. TAFT. It certainly would be evidence, although I rather think any court would require additional evidence of some action by the group. The problem presents itself in a more difficult form in the case of slow-downs. Everyone agrees the slowdown is the greatest threat, and it is also the hardest thing to define, because it is almost impossible to prove that anyone has issued any orders for a slow-down. But possibly some evidence could be obtained even in such a case, and if evidence of issuance of orders could be obtained, certainly such action ought to be subject to punishment. That is why I have included that provision.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's amendment does provide for the issuance of

injunctions against any labor organization, or officer, or members thereof, who instigate or promote or further a strike. Is that not correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Anyone who takes an active part in it may be enjoined.

Mr. OVERTON. Take a case where thousands of employees leave a plant, walk out of it.

Mr. TAFT. If the men go out and stay home I do not think there is much that can be done.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator does not think an injunction could issue in such a case?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think an injunction could be obtained in such a case, unless some leaders were found who inspired the strike. Of course, such things do not happen by chance. Someone has taken the lead in some manner, and I think the leader or leaders ought to be found.

Mr. OVERTON. In a case where the court has found that a strike exists, and an injunction is issued, what would be the effect of the injunction insofar as the organization is concerned, and insofar as the members thereof are concerned?

Mr. TAFT. If the injunction specifically enjoined them, and they disobeyed the injunction. they would be subject to the order of the court.

Mr. OVERTON. Suppose the men walked out and left the plant, and the court should find that a strike was in progress, and an injunction issued, would the injunction compel the men, as members of an organization, to go back to work?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not think they could be compelled to go back to work.

Mr. OVERTON. Then what is the value of the injunction?

Mr. TAFT. The value of the injunction is that it will prevent every deliberate, open act in support of a strike. The strike can be carried on simply by acquiescence of all the members. I admit that this provision will not reach such a case. On the other hand, this is not the situation in connection with any strike of which I have known. Strikes are carried on by means of picket lines; strikes are carired on by means of strike benefits; strikes are carried on by officers of the union or by others. A strike may be carried on by persons who are not officers of the union. That is why I do not like to leave out the words "other persons." Other persons may issue requests or demands to the men not to go back to work tomorrow and may use their influence in support of the strike. That is the way strikes are carried on.

If the fact is that men are so dissatisfied with their conditions of work that they simply quit, there must be something radically wrong with the situation, which indicates that probably the men have the right to quit.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me present finally this case to the Senator: In a case where a strike has been ordered by an organization of employees, and they walk out of the plant, and an injunction issues, but the men do not meet any more, the strike having been ordered and they simply refrain from working, what would the injunction enjoin?

Mr. TAFT. If they go home and stay quietly in their homes I think the injunction would not work. My impression is, however, that that is not the usual condition. If it is made perfectly clear that it is legal for the men to go back to work, and that no one can interfere with them, and if the injunction is enforced against the instigators of the strike, I believe that 90 percent of the workmen in the particular plant will obey the orders of the National War Labor Board and of the court, and I think the strike will come to an end.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. I understood the Senator to say that in a case where a strike is in effect, where the workmen, let us say 150 men in all, stay at home, in his opinion, an injunction could issue against those men assembling?

Mr. TAFT. I think a meeting called to organize the strike, so to speak, to carry on the strike, could be enjoined. I do not know how far the injunctive process could go simply toward prohibiting the men from assembling, if the meeting perhaps was to decide whether or not the men should go back to work.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wonder how one could know in advance what the purpose of the assembly is? How could the purpose be known until the men meet? Does not the Senator think that the proposal for injunction in such a case would run into difficulty with the first amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. TAFT. The terms of the injunction, of course, would be against assembling for the purpose of fomenting the strike. If the men met for that purpose, they would meet for an illegal purpose. If they met for some other purpose, they would not violate the injunction. So I do not see where the first amendment to the Constitution comes in.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the men met for some other purpose and adopted some kind of resolution with respect to the strike, that action would not be in violation of the injunction?

Mr. TAFT. The injunction would not be issued simply against the men meeting. The meeting would have to be called for a particular purpose.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the men were called together to meet for a legitimate purpose, and they did something with respect to the strike after they met, that would not be in violation of the injunction?

Mr. TAFT. It would not be in violation of the injunction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us suppose a strike is already in existence. The strike has not been brought about by the violation of any injunction or of any law. Suppose the men organized to call a meeting to discuss the situation. Let us suppose that someone then goes into court and tries to obtain an injunction against the men assembling, as the Senator says, for the purpose of fomenting a strike. Of course, it could not be for the purpose of fomenting a strike, because the strike is already in existence, or is a continuing one. Suppose the men call the meeting for the purpose of discussing whether they will continue to stay out of employment, or will call the strike off, and go back to work, but after deliberation in a meeting called to discuss both sides of that question they decide not to go back to work. Would they in that case have violated an injunction against their assembling for the purpose of continuing a strike already in existence?

Mr. TAFT. It is possible they would. It would depend, of course, on the terms of the injunction and the facts of the case in each instance.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words then, the organization of the members would be confronted with the fear that, even if they met to discuss the question of calling off the strike, but did not call it off, they would then be guilty of violating an injunction which had been issued against their assemblying?

Mr. TAFT. That might be. They would be there meeting and deciding that they would proceed in violation of law against the interest of the United States as declared by the War Labor Board, as declared by the Circuit Court of Appeals, as declared by the Congress of the United States, and if they should go to jail, after having met for that purpose, it would not concern me. I think such punishment would be only fair if, having met, they formally decided "No; we will defy the courts, we will defy the National War Labor Board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified, inserting additional sections at the end of the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there has been a very great deal of confusion of thought with reference to this measure and the pending amendments. It seems to me that we have beclouded the objective of trying to keep plants in operation with a pending work stoppage in the mine situation; at least it was pending last week when the bill was called up. We have confused our general horizon and allowed it to become obscured by a particular object. If we are to legislate generally under this bill, the first and the clearest thing we should do, it seems to me, is to leave the coal strike entirely out of consideration. We most assuredly could not now ex post facto, so to speak, attempt to legislate in such fashion as to give the bill impact against the coal miners. Whatever the merits of the situation may be—and with my meager knowledge of the work stoppage in the coal mines, I shall not discuss the present situation—certainly, judging from what the press has indicated, a contract expired. In the absence of a contract, the men had no more right to go back to work

than I have to go to work in one of those mines. I do not know whether I am correctly informed on that point; but if the newspaper reports are to be believed, the men had no legal basis on which to go back to work in the mines.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that the Senator is entirely wrong.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well; I have been wrong before.

Mr. TAFT. The labor unions and all the employers agreed that the men would not strike, but would continue to work on the terms on which they were working, the terms on which the War Labor Board decided the case. That was the agreement which was made between the unions and the War Labor Board of the United States. So, certainly the men cannot object and the unions cannot object, and there is no basis for any such objection or argument.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not intend to become bogged down in a discussion about any agreement entered into by the unions. Whether they agreed to enter into the agreement, I do not know; but I assume they did not.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether they entered into the agreement; but let us assume they did. According to statements published in the newspapers, the President issued an order which made it clear to the mine workers themselves that even though they submitted the case to the War Labor Board, under the directive and order issued by the President, the War Labor Board could not give them any change in their present status or any increase in pay. From talking with some of the coal operators themselves, I happen to know that one of the reasons why they thought they could not settle the contract dispute and increase the wages was because of the directive and order issued by the President. At least that was the excuse they gave—and it was published in the newspapers—that they could not come to an agreement with the mine workers because if they did do so they would be violating the Presidential order.

Let me say that if a man has a case coming up in court he certainly will not agree to have it heard by a court which has decided the case in advance. Most assuredly, I would not go into a court to try a case if I thought the court was prejudiced; and no other lawyer who has the interests of his client at heart would go into a court if he thought it was prejudiced or if he thought the case had been decided in advance or if he thought that, because of an order which had been issued by the President, the court could not give him justice.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, under the statute we give an individual litigant a power to file an affidavit of prejudice and to have the trial judge removed from the case.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, that can be done in any court in the country.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think the point raised is very important. If I am not misinformed, I am quite sure that I have seen in the newspapers a statement that a charge of prejudice has been made by the miners against the Board. I am also informed, or have read statements which, if correct, would substantiate the charge, that there is suspicion of the existence of something to prejudice the Board against the miners and the union; because I am told that at one time two members of the Board were officers and members of the union, and were removed as officers and as members of the union.

I think the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has raised a very important question, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] seems to agree when he suggests that if anyone appealing to a court believes it is prejudiced, he has a right to make a motion for a change of venue. While apparently there is no court which has jurisdiction in the instant case, unless Congress gives it, nevertheless it seems to me that if the miners feel that the Board is prejudiced, some arrangement could be made whereby a board of arbitration—a board made up of disinterested persons acting as judges—could take testimony from both sides, and could make a finding as to the merits of the miners' claims.

If the Senator will permit me to proceed for a moment further, I desire to call attention to another matter. I am not familiar with the mining industry, but all my life I have heard many things said about the destitution existing among the miners in the United States. Some years ago David Lewis, who for many years served in Congress, and later was appointed by the President to a mediation board having to do with labor, I assume, was going to make a trip to Europe. He was going to Wales to visit his father's birthplace and the mine where his father worked. Before he left on his trip abroad, I said to him, "Although we have heard so much about the misery and destitution and the bad living conditions and poor working conditions of the miners in Wales, I am told that the conditions there are far better, or at least somewhat better, than the conditions under which our coal miners work." He said, "I cannot believe it."

When I met him immediately upon his return the first thing he said was, "I had the greatest surprise in my life. You asked me to look into the case of the miners in Wales and into their conditions as compared with those of our coal miners." He said, "To my great surprise, I found that what you were told is true."

So, Mr. President, I have more than a suspicion that there is merit in the case of the coal miners of the United States. I do not think we should be in a hurry about this matter. If there is prejudice, and if they have a case which, so far as its merits are concerned, can be determined only by a disinterested and impartial tribunal, it seems to me it would be easy for Congress to find the remedy.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall be happy if I am finally able to reach the point of telling my colleagues what I want to say. However, I am more than glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want in any particular degree to retard the Senator in reaching his point. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Senator has made an observation similar to one I made yesterday in my brief remarks, that insofar as the proposed legislation has been developed we should consider it wholly apart from any consideration of the present condition of the coal-mining industry, I want to reiterate my belief that, no matter what we may now do, we cannot hope that any action we may take here will be taken in time to have any effect upon that controversy. However, I think it may be said—although perhaps in a technical sense it is not true—that for a long time the coal miners organized into the United Mine Workers of America have had contracts with the coal-mine operators. Those contracts have usually run for 2 years. When the contract expired, it has been customary, for years, if a new contract is not made for another period, either on the terms of the old one or on the basis of such modifications as might be agreed upon, for the miners not to work. That is to say, they do not necessarily go on a strike; they never considered that under such circumstances they were going on a strike; but, in the absence of a contract for another period, they simply did not go back to the mines. That happened 2 years ago. It has frequently happened that, when the contract expired, unless there was a new one or unless there was an extension of the old one during negotiations, which has frequently happened, the miners did not go back to work. The view that that was not a strike may be a purely technical one, but the technical point has not heretofore been raised, so far as I recall, that, in the absence of a contract, if the miners did not go ahead and continue to work, they were out on strike.

So I think we must divorce the present situation from our minds in contemplating general legislation dealing with the whole labor problem. To that extent, I agree with the Senator's observations, and I have previously so expressed myself. When I am able to agree with the views of the Senator from Connecticut, I am always happy to make the fact known, although, of course, that point has no great bearing on the present situation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the expression of accord made by the Senator from Kentucky is extremely welcome to me. We find ourselves in agreement more often than not, when the occasion does not arise for either of us to assure the other that that is a fact. But I am certain that he is thinking along the right lines at the moment, even though I

have questioned his expressions and his judgment on some occasions in the past.

Mr. President, we have a situation in which, under the terms of the original Connally bill, we would authorize the seizure of certain plants when, under certain conditions, there has been an interruption of the production of articles useful for the prosecution of the war effort. In the first place, the whole genius of the seizure which is contemplated, turns on giving the President legislative authority to do what thus far he has been doing without legislative authority. If section 1 of the Connally bill does not mean that, then it does not mean anything.

But, Mr. President, even though the exercise of the power and authority proposed to be conferred under section 1 be vast, the author of the bill himself realizes that someone should put a brake on the exercise of such authority, so he interposes a proviso to the effect that whenever the President finds that in fact the plant can again be operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense, the President shall return the plant to private management.

From the impasse which arises in the minds of men when they contemplate the situation of the seizure of a plant, and the otherwise insuperable obstacle of getting the men back to work, we have tried to devise one formula or another—apparently depending on who writes the amendment—to force men to work. Stripped of every ambiguity, that is exactly what it comes down to.

On the one hand, in section 4 of the Connally bill the Senator from Texas proposes that we make it a criminal offense if men continue on strike after the Government seizes the plant, and he provides a penalty of $5,000 fine or imprisonment for not to exceed 1 year, or both.

Then, Mr. President, we turn to the Taft amendment, and we find in sections 8 and 9 provisions which would authorize resort to the equity side of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, to the end that orders or injunctions, as the case may be in a given situation, may be issued, all conditions being defined in those sections.

If we would remove from our minds the idea of attempting on the floor of the Senate to write a policy, as to whether we are or are not to coerce men to work, whether they like to or not, whether they agree with the terms and conditions of employment or not, and actually treat of the subject which properly is before us, I submit, Mr. President, that we could evolve a bill which would be fair, reasonable, and workable. It is with the hope that along some such line I might have an opportunity to contribute a suggestion that I rise at this time.

If we were to strike from the Connally bill sections 4 and 5, and strike from the Taft amendment sections 8 and 9, we should have left a bill of which the summary would be as follows:

That the President may, whenever there is an interruption in the war effort due to a strike, or due to a labor disturbance, and when the national defense or war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed as a result of such interruption, take over the particular plant and cause it to be operated in the best manner available to him. When there has been a disagreement, if the parties can get together, he will return the plant. If they cannot, he will do the best he can to operate the plant. What the circumstances and conditions will be at a given time will depend upon what plant it is, what the questions have been, and what the conditions of disagreement were. It may well be that the difficulty can readily be adjusted.

To illustrate, recently in one of the synthetic rubber plants a whole room full of men walked out and refused to go back to work in what was definitely a war industry, for the simple reason that the fumes from the synthetic rubber were overpowering, poisoning, and asphyxiating the men. There was no adequate ventilation. Finally, when the situation became apparent, the W. P. B. granted priorities, the proper ventilation was installed, the conditions of employment which had led the men to walk out in the first place were corrected, and work was resumed.

Under section 2 of the Connally bill, the Senator from Texas explains that it is his purpose that conditions at the time of the interruption shall be frozen pending a decision on the merits. In section 3 he gives authority not only to the Government agency operating the plant by Presidential direction, but to the employer and to the employee as well, to make application to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in the particular plant.

Then the Senator from Ohio provides, in section 7, that the National War Labor Board, established under executive authority, shall have certain duties, and he prescribes the duties, such as to compel the granting of a hearing. His amendment gives power to the National War Labor Board to call witnesses, and, in the event of any recalcitrant witness refusing to appear, to apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey the subpena issued by the Board, "and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the court to issue such order."

From beginning to end, Mr. President, a bill along some such lines would definitely, so far as it is reasonably possible at this time, undertake to continue operation of plants where there has been an interruption due either to a strike or to a labor disturbance. It would provide machinery for rectification of untoward conditions or any other conditions which are unsatisfactory. It would provide a forum in which a hearing may be had, and would compel the attendance of witnesses, to the end that jurisdiction may be had over the entire dispute and correctives applied.

Mr. President, if that much were done we could make a definite contribution as a first step toward something reasonably like a sound labor policy.

I agree that there would remain undisposed of the question of what to do with persons who refuse to work. I agree that there are as many notions as to what to do with persons who refuse to work as there are Senators. I presume that many of us have had correspondence from our constituents urging that all men be put in jail if they refuse to work in the war effort. We have heard yet other variants of the so-called work-or-fight order. But, Mr. President, whatever view we may take of that, as distinguished from the voluntary system so far as it has been relied upon, let us not becloud the issue by talking about section 4 of the Connally bill, with its criminal penalties, and sections 8 and 9 of the Taft amendment, with its injunctive remedies.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator understand that either one of those punitive measures might be used, and that it would be discretionary with those seeking to enforce the law, in the event there should be a violation? The Senator has talked about the two punitive measures, that is, the criminal measure in the Connally bill and the injunctive measure provided in the Taft amendment. In the event of a violation of law, would it be discretionary with the authorities whether to go to a court of equity and seek an injunction, or to prosecute in the Federal court by obtaining an indictment and finally trying the individual?

Mr. DANAHER. As I understand the language before me, under the Connally amendment, whenever the Government takes over a plant, should there be any such coercion, instigation or inducement to any person to interfere with the operation of the plant or mine, or aid in lockouts, strikes, slow-downs, and so forth, the district attorney in the district in which the offense takes place would have the initial discretion as to whether he would or would not charge the accused with the commission of an offense. It could be prosecutable on information only, rather than by indictment, and consequently, under section 4 of the Connally amendment, he could cause the issuance of bench warrants or commissioner's warrants, and make wholesale arrests if he chose so to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. That would be only in a case in which the Government had taken over the operation of the plant.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is concerned, it would include all labor disputes, whether the plants belonged to the Government or not.

Mr. DANAHER. No; as I understand, it would apply only in cases in which a labor dispute had been certified to the Board, or when jurisdiction had been assumed by the Board on its own motion, and after the Board had acted. I think those three situations would be preliminary to invoking equity jurisdiction under the Taft amendment. I ask the Senator from Ohio if I am correct in my understanding?

Mr. TAFT. There are three different remedies, and they are not alternatives. They cover entirely different cases. The Connally amendment would cover only cases in which the Government had taken over the operation of the plant. Section 8 of the amendment which I have proposed would apply the criminal penalty only during the pendency of the hearing before the War Labor Board, and for a period of not to exceed 90 days. After that the only remedy, if the Government had not already taken over the plant, would be by injunctive process, and that would be entirely within the discretion of the Attorney General and of the President. If they did not choose to invoke the injunction, they would not have to do so. If they think they can get the order of the War Labor Board enforced in some better way, or if they think they can persuade the men to return to work, or if there is any other procedure they think they can follow, they can do so. Finally, if they have no other alternative, the Attorney General can apply to the circuit court of appeals for an injunction.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Ohio for a definite contribution. I hope it answers the question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank both Senators for the explanations which they have given.

Will the Senator from Connecticut further yield for an observation?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The observation which I desire to make refers to the original statement made by the Senator when he started discussing the pending measure today. It is with respect to the termination of the contract. I confess that I do not know what the situation is with respect to that important matter, but I do know that prior to the time when the President of the United States made the speech on Sunday night last urging the men to go back to work, the Senator from Illinois had in his files information from certain mining groups in Illinois to the effect that their contracts would terminate upon such and such date, and that all they wanted was a renewal of the contracts under the same terms which had existed theretofore in order that they might continue to work. It was stated that they cared nothing about the controversy which was then existing between John L. Lewis and the Government. In other words, they were willing to ignore Lewis. All they wanted to know definitely was what their status was to be with respect to returning to work. The contract had expired and they wanted to know whether or not they should continue to work. It was stated that they were willing to continue work in this mine field under the same terms as those embodied in the old contract. They were apparently confused on the issue of whether or not they had that right.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator has said. It seems to me that he has pointed out to the Senate the difficulty of writing on the floor of the Senate, during the period of the war, a labor policy for the future. I hope the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], or some other Senator, will move to send the bill back to the committee to work out a definite policy to be undertaken by the Congress with respect to the whole labor situation. The very argument which the Senator has made shows that confusion exists. It shows the difficult problems confronting us, the varying views of Members of the Senate, and the confusion which exists in the minds of Senators. I hope he or some other Senator will move to send the bill back to the committee.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Montana for his observations. Mr. President, I wish to point out that this bill does not, or at least should not, attempt to write a labor policy. What it does do, or at least what it was intended to do, is to justify plant seizure under certain circumstances and continued operation of the plant. It is true that those circumstances affect labor whether organized or unorganized, or whether in an industry or in a mine. The bill should give jurisdiction to the War Labor Board and authority to the National Conciliation Service, and otherwise make possible the operation of plants. We should write a bill applicable solely to that phase of our public dilemma.

However, Mr. President, when it comes down to the question of what to do with recalcitrant manpower, or even willing manpower, we find ourselves in a situation occasioning all this discussion for the simple reason that over the past 2 or 3 years, notwithstanding the approach of storm clouds, we have been operating solely and entirely under a series of Executive orders. No one who works under them knows whether they will be in force from month to month, or be completely altered in each successive month. The net result is that, on the one hand, we try to move labor from job to job by offering higher wages on the second job. We try to induce workers to leave nonessential industries and go to work in essential industries, by telling them that we will grant deferment under the draft if they will go to work in essential industries, although we would deny deferment if they did not go to work in such industries. The War Manpower Commission has said that men of draft age will be required to obtain certificates of availability, and that there would be job priorities. All these loose ends of labor policy are in no wise involved in the pending bill, nor should they be.

We talk about criminal penalties after the fact, and injunctions with reference to remedial action against the labor unions. Those questions should not be involved in the pending bill. What we should do it seems to me, is to amend the Taft amendment. Since it has been offered as an amendment to an amendment, I understand that as a matter of parliamentary procedure it would not be in order for me to offer an amendment to it at this time. If it were in order, I would move to strike out sections 8 and 9 of the Taft amendment. I hope the Senator from Ohio will do so. If he were to do so we could very properly support the remainder of his amendment. If such action were taken I should hope we then could return to the Connally amendment and strike out sections 4 and 5. We would then have a bill in shape for discussion with some reasonable philosophy underlying it, some general objective which could be defined, and which could be reasonably administered. I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will be in sympathy with some such objective.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the confusion which exists both with reference to the Taft amendment and the Connally substitute and because of the fact that I feel that on the floor of the Senate we cannot write a bill and deal intelligently with this subject, I move that the bill, with all the amendments thereto, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on the subject of how the bill should be modified. If the bill were to be modified as he has suggested we would then be back in the same condition in which we are today. It would give the President power to seize plants, a power which he already has. It would give the National War Labor Board power to hear cases without any compulsion on anyone to allow the Board to hear his case, and we would be exactly where we are today. The bill would be made absolutely useless, and the Senate would be made ridiculous.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the last statement of the Senator from Ohio is accurate, then every kind word I have said about the Senator's amendment I withdraw. [Laughter.] If the Senator from Ohio does not mean to confer upon the National War Labor Board the power, when the United States Conciliation Service certifies that a labor dispute exists, to hear the dispute and to summon both parties—I am referring to line 7 on page 2—what does the Senator mean? Does he not mean that upon certification by the United States Conciliation Service, the War Labor Board may summon the parties before it and enter into a decision of the dispute? Does not the Senator mean that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, but—

I can call spirits from the vasty deep.
But will they come?

The Senator proposes to take out the penalty.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator a further question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield further to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 3, in line 10, the amendment provides that the Board shall have power "to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers," and in line 15, if the witness still does not come, the amendment provides the Board may apply to a Federal court for an order to compel his attendance. Does not the Senator mean that?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly I mean it.

Mr. DANAHER. Then why does the Senator say there is no power in this portion of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. The power is little varied from what they have today. As a matter of fact, they are hearing cases; as a matter of fact, they have got witnesses to appear before them. Under section 7 there is nothing that would require anybody to obey their summons except as witnesses, not as parties to a case. Section 8 contains a penalty for refusing to submit a case. The Senator is trying to strike out the penalty.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the issue here is very clear. The issue is whether we are going to try to prevent strikes against the war effort. Certainly the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut would kill the bill. It seems to me that we have debated this question probably at greater length than any committee will debate it. I do not see any reason for sending it back to the committee. The same questions will arise, the same arguments will be made. The Committee on Education and Labor heard many of the arguments previously. The matter has been before the Senate for 2 years; it has been in every Senator's mail; it has been in every Senator's consideration; it has been given, in the Senate, the fullest kind of debate. In my opinion, the people of the country desire the Congress to deal with strikes; they desire the Congress to take just as effective steps as we think we can find to prevent strikes in war industries against the war effort of the United States. A prompt way of meeting that is to pass this bill, send it to the other House, and if there are any defects—and I certainly do not pretend that the amendment I drew has no defects—they can be carefully considered by the Judiciary Committee of the other House, which is a body composed of very able lawyers, and any smaller legal objections can be straightened out. It seems to me the debate here has shown that the principles underlying the Connally bill and the principles underlying the amendment which I have offered are sound and constitute the best method of meeting the menace that exists today to the war effort of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation to the Senator from Connecticut. I understood him to say that under the parliamentary situation he could not offer an amendment to strike out certain portions of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that, under the rules of the Senate, a complete substitute is subject to amendment just as though it were the original bill. I am not an expert on such matters.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. It was my understanding that the Senator from Ohio has offered an amendment to the complete substitute. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. I have offered an amendment to the substitute; that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. And, therefore, that any part of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Ohio is open to further amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so. Any amendment can be amended.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Texas. If that be an accurate statement of the parliamentary situation, I am glad to be so advised. In any case, as I now understand, the motion to recommit has been made. Is a motion to amend at this time in order?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is not in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not think so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. On that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. WAGNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bridges	La Follette	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	McNary	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh
Connally	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
Ferguson	Pepper	
George	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Were the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief observation, to suggest to the Senator from Montana a modification of his motion. His motion is merely to recommit the bill, with all amendments, to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sure the Senate does not desire to take the position that it wishes merely to dispose of this question permanently by a recommittal to the committee. It seems to me that, in view of the situation, it would be better to have a time limit. Personally, I think that if the bill shall be recommitted, the committee should give opportunity for a brief hearing to those who would be affected by the proposed legislation, and particularly by the Taft amendment, so that we will then know what the situation is, and that the persons affected will have their day in court. I, therefore, suggest to the Senator from Montana that he modify his motion by including an instruction to the committee to report back to the Senate not later than the 20th of May.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I happened to be absent from the Chamber when the motion was made. What was the motion of the distinguished Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Montana is that the pending bill and all amendments thereto be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was merely suggesting to the Senator from Montana that he put a limitation on the time during which the committee should give further consideration to the matter. It occurred to me that instructing the committee to report by the 20th of May, practically 2 weeks off, would afford a fair and reasonable time for them to consider the matter.

Mr. McNARY. I think the motion would be quite inadequate and incomplete if it did not contain a provision of the kind suggested by the Senator from Kentucky. I favor the general objectives of the bill offered by the able Senator from Texas. I think there should be some refinement and some further consideration. I have stated many times that I did not approve writing a bill on the floor of the Senate, and in view of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and other amendments which are pending, and some which have been adopted. I should be willing to see the bill go back to the committee, provided the committee would return it with some recommendation not later than the 20th of May. A mere report would not be satisfactory. There should be a report on the bill favorable or unfavorable.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I had in mind, and I suppose what the Senator from Montana had in mind, although I have not consulted him about it, is that, in view of the confusion and the uncertainty as to the interpretation of all the

pending proposals, and all the amendments which are before us, and which may be offered within a reasonable time—and I felt that fixing on the 20th of May would provide ample time—the committee could take under consideration all these matters and in a few days perhaps give an opportunity to those who would be affected by what we are going to do here to present their views. I think that would be an act of ordinary justice to those who would be affected by the proposal. It occurred to me that this being the 5th of May, giving the committee 15 days, or to the 20th, would afford a reasonable time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, when I made the motion to send the bill back I assumed the committee would report it to the Senate within a reasonable time. I am perfectly willing to adopt the suggestion, and amend my motion by moving to send the bill and all amendments back to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to report back to the Senate, either favorably or unfavorably, upon some legislation of this sort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Within what time?

Mr. WHEELER. On or before the 20th of May.

Mr. McNARY. The form usually employed is to recommit the bill with instructions to report favorably or unfavorably on a given date.

Mr. WHEELER. I accept the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not desire to repeat what I said before the quorum was called, but I think it would be most unfortunate to send the bill back to the committee. I think it has had every consideration, far more consideration, so far as the language is concerned and in every other way, than a bill ordinarily receives in a committee.

In my opinion, the country is looking to us to take what steps we can, as soon as we can, to meet the strike menace which the Nation faces, and if we put this bill off until the 20th of May, which will be a week after the 15-day ultimatum of Mr. Lewis expires, the country will interpret it as merely marching up the hill and getting out of the way until the present fight is over.

Regardless of what date may be fixed, it seems to me most unfortunate for the Senate of the United States to refuse to take any action—and that is the way a motion to recommit will be construed in the country—to take any action dealing with the most serious problem which this country faces in its effort to win the war.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before I take my seat, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not recommit the bill to the committee. The Senator from Ohio has pointed out very vividly that the country expects the Senate to act. This bill has been before the Senate for considerably more than a year, indeed, for a year and a half. It is true that one section has been added, but every Senator understands it, every Senator has read it, and if the bill came back from the committee containing anything like what is in it, it again would be debated and again amended and again considered. At the time of the expiration of the last Congress the bill was on the calendar, so it had to be reintroduced and reconsidered.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to admit that our arms are paralyzed and our brains numb and our consciences dead, when the country calls for action. The Senate should know what it is going to do. We are going to show the country whether we can act. I am not willing to admit that we cannot act, and cannot act intelligently. It is a hard, difficult situation when the leader of the majority and the leader of the minority get together and agree that things should be reconsidered, and thought over again, and deliberated on by a committee, and then when the committee reports, as it has done twice, to the Senate, there should be some other reason why we should hesitate and pause and tremble—yes, hesitate and pause and tremble—before the influences which do not want any kind of action taken on this question.

I do not say this of the leaders of the Senate. I do not say this of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], but we know that there are strong influences in this country which do not want the Senate to do anything with regard to this question. I hold in my hand a telegram, the sender of which thinks the bill ought to be sent back to the committee, and should never come out of the committee, but should be interred, with a little pine board over it on which is written, "Here lies every effort of the Senate of the United States to legislate. Here it lies. Here it is buried. It has been sent back here for interment, and here it is buried. It was sent back here not to a respectable cemetery but to a pauper's cemetery." [Laughter.] The sender of that telegram would like to have the bill put in the lowest place it could possibly be put and buried as deep as it could be buried under the pretense that we are going to have the matter all worked out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my remarks yesterday concerning the Committee on the Judiciary, to which the Senator took exception, I did not assign to that committee so low an estate as the Senator now seems to do when he calls it a pauper's grave. I do not think it occupies that position.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not drawing a comparison between the Committee on the Judiciary and a pauper's grave. I was interpreting what some of the senders of telegrams want done. They want the measure buried in a pauper's grave.

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact that the Senator has modified his amendment takes away the pauper's equation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment has been before the Senate for 2 or 3 days. It is less than a page long. Any Senator who did not have time last night, or this morning before we met, or yesterday afternoon after we adjourned, to read over a page and understand what it means does not have any business being on the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does not the Senator think that, regardless of what kind of a bill the Committee on the Judiciary might report to the Senate, there will be just as many amendments offered when it comes back as are now pending before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, of course. I suggested a while ago that no matter in what form the committee brings the measure back there will be Members who will adjust their glasses and say, "Mr. President, I am wondering if the Committee on the Judiciary considered this aspect of the matter. Therefore, I offer the following amendment." We will probably have more amendments offered if the bill should be returned from the committee after it goes back to the committee—and I do not think the Senate is going to send it back to the committee—but if it does, we will have more amendments when it comes back than we have now before us because Senators will have been thinking more about the matter; they will have been hunting up more cracks to crawl through; they will have been hunting up more schemes to kill the measure without facing the issue.

Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to detour with respect to this question. I do not want the Senate to dodge the issue. Sending the bill back to the committee will be dodging the issue. We have been dodging the issue on this question now for 2 or 3 years. This is the first time the Senate of the United States has had before it any proposed legislation dealing with this subject. A year ago I wanted to bring the measure up, and the leader, who now wants to send it to the Committee on the Judiciary, did not want it to come up, and I acceded to his request because there was then pending the no-strike agreement. The President said he had a seven-point program and that we were not going to have any strike. Under that compulsion—and it was compulsion—I agreed to the request. One does not need to smile and be joyous every time he agrees to something he does not wish to do, but I did it. I wanted to go along with the leadership on the Senate floor, but I am not now going along with the leadership on the floor to a funeral. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] said, "Well, just take out section 4, take out section 5, and take out sections 7 or 8 of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and it will be a fine bill."

That, Mr. President, reminds me of a story which our old friend, Tom Heflin, used to tell in the cloakroom. I shall tell it on the floor. Uncle Remus went fishing. He caught a little perch about 2 inches long, and took the little perch home to trim it and clean it. It was slimy and still alive, and it began to flirt and flip and jerk around. Uncle Remus

exclaimed, "Little fish, what in the world is the matter with you? Why are you cuttin' up so much? I ain't goin' to do nothin' to you but gut you." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is the situation with respect to the motion to recommit. The proponents of that motion have the complacency to say to the Senator from Texas and to the Senator from Ohio and to every other Member of the Senate, "Why are you worrying about this little bill? We want to recommit it. We ain't goin' to do a thing to it but gut it; that's all." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will stand up and face this issue. The Committee on the Judiciary has considered this measure twice. It has held long hearings. It went over the matter with a fine-tooth comb, and it reported the bill favorably to the Senate on two separate occasions. What right have we to expect that future favorable reports by the Committee on the Judiciary will meet with any warmer reception than its report is meeting now? What added dignity will the Senate Committee on the Judiciary attain in these few days? What higher respect will it achieve in the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky than it has now?

Mr. President, the other day the Senator from Kentucky cast some aspersions on the Committee on the Judiciary, and yet he wants to send the measure right back to a committee which has neglected its duty.

Mr. President, the Senate can legislate. The Senate possesses intelligence. Has the Senate courage, though, to face the issue? In public life we talk about ability and all that sort of thing. Most of us have some ability. What we need, however, is the courage to use the ability. The country expects the Senate to speak and act on this subject. The country does not expect it to put the bill in its hip pocket and go back somewhere and sit down and smoke until the 20th day of May.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to vote down the motion to recommit, and let us struggle with the bill, if necessary. We have sense enough to write the bill. According to the Senator from Kentucky, the Senate is a "heap smarter" than the Committee on the Judiciary anyway. The Senator does not think much of the Judiciary Committee. He will not think any more of it unless it buries the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has no right to place an estimate upon my regard for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONNALLY. The estimate I placed on the Senator's regard for the committee is based on what the Senator himself said.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said yesterday, and I now repeat, that the Committee on the Judiciary ought to have given more consideration to the question we now have before us. The Senator says that the Committee on the Judiciary went through the bill with a fine-tooth comb and favorably reported it to the Senate twice, but when the Senate received the bill on the floor this time the Senator had to get another comb and go through the bill and comb out everything the committee had done, and substitute a new bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator is not fair in that statement. I did not comb out the bill. I simply added some other clauses.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator combed out everything except the authority of the President to take over plants, and then he added other provisions which I think the Committee on the Judiciary might well have considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; it might.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it did not. So far as attempting to discredit the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned, I am sure the Senator does not want to put me in any such attitude.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because that is not my attitude.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel, and I have so expressed myself to my friend, the Senator from Texas, publicly and privately in regard to this measure, that in view of the proposed changes upon which we are asked to vote—and I specifically refer to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio which injects an entirely new subject, and which, while it is in the form of an amendment to the Senator's substitute, is really a new bill—it is not unreasonable to suggest that the measure be recommitted. The committee has not considered the subject injected by the Senator from Ohio, and I think that 2 weeks would not be an unreasonable time to give persons who are affected by it an opportunity to be heard. I do not mean to say that I would instruct the committee to hold hearings; but in view of the changed attitude in regard to this proposed legislation, I think it should be done in all fairness.

I hope the Senator is not seeking to create the impression that I have any doubt as to the ability or the courage or the integrity of the Committee on the Judiciary in dealing with this subject. I know how natural it was, probably, for the committee to do as it did. The bill was introduced before we were in the war, before the War Labor Board had been created, before anything along those lines had been done; and the bill was reported favorably by the committee, after it had held hearings. The bill was passed by the Senate. After we became involved in the war and the situation changed, I realized how natural it would be for the committee to say, "Well, we favorably reported the bill once, and we shall favorably report it again, as we did before." However, the very course which has been taken on the floor of the Senate has emphasized, it seems to me, the need for detailed, section-by-section, line-by-line, consideration by the committee and by the legislative drafting service which we have employed to help committees draft legislation, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the bill.

If all that is held to mean any lack of courage on the part of Senators, I am compelled to dissent from that point of view. In the present state of affairs in the country, I think it takes more courage to vote to recommit the bill than it does to vote against its recommittal. With the excited temper of the people who have been aroused by a particular situation, it takes more courage to vote against a bill than it does to vote for it. Even though one is honest and sincere in taking his position, and has in mind the long-range effect of the bill upon our whole situation, it takes more courage to vote in favor of recommitting the bill for several weeks than it does to vote against recommitting it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Senator from Kentucky. It is entirely proper for him to take the position he has taken. He is the leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President let me say that I am not acting in my capacity as majority leader. I want to emphasize that point to the Senator. What I have said today and what I said yesterday have been my own personal views. I have not expressed the views of anyone in the administration, from the President of the United States all the way down. I am expressing no views save my own and I do not want anyone to be governed or influenced by the fact that I happen to be in the position of majority leader. I have expressed my individual views. I believe that the course I favor is the wise course for us to pursue; but it is up to the Senate to decide what course shall be followed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, just a word more and I shall have finished. I have no quarrel with the Senator from Kentucky. He is entitled to his individual views just as is any other Senator. However, the Senator speaks of all the confusion. No other Senator save the Senator from Kentucky and possibly the Senator from Montana has expressed the view that there has been confusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether in making that statement the Senator has in mind both the bill and the amendments which have been offered to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's bill is simple enough and easy to understand; but with the complications which have been added to it by the pending amendments it is not quite so simple.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, Mr. President; the Senator says the original bill is simple and is easily understood, and that the Senate is prepared to vote on it but that because some Senator has offered an amendment to it we should send the bill back to the Committee on the Judiciary. If that were the case, any time a bill which a Senator did not like was pending, all he would have to do would be to get up and offer some wild amendment and then have the bill sent back to the committee.

Mr. President, it is true that the Committee on the Judiciary did not have before it a bill as aggressive or as vigorous as is the pending bill. At that time we were unable to have the Senate consider even a mild bill. The leadership did not want even a mild bill considered by the Senate. They taunted me here, saying, "Why, your bill does not amount to anything. Why bring it up? There is nothing to it. Why don't you put some teeth in it?"

Then, Mr. President, just so soon as we put a couple of little milk teeth in it, they want to call in the dentist and have him pull out the two teeth we have in it, by sending it back to the Committee on the Judiciary as a nursing home. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The mere operation of taking out a couple of milk teeth does not necessarily justify putting in two sets of false teeth.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is more familiar with false teeth than is the Senator from Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to undergo an inspection on the premises if the Senator desires it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to undergo an inspection of the Senator from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The only argument I have heard in favor of recommittal of the bill is based upon the fact that the Taft amendment is pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Every Member of the Senate has had opportunity to study the Taft amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Senators were not spending last evening at a dinner somewhere, they had a chance to study it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, when the Taft amendment was offered, I was inclined to vote against it. I studied it during last evening, and today I am prepared to vote against it. But, regardless of whether I am prepared to vote either for or against the adoption of the amendment, I see no reason why the amendment should not be disposed of; and the fact that that amendment is pending is no reason, it seems to me, why we should vote for the recommittal of the bill to the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, we are the Senate of the United States. We are not sitting around a livery stable somewhere. [Laughter.] We are the Senate. We are supposed to know what to do. We are supposed to have the courage and the sense and the character to know when it is necessary to do something. Today is the third day the bill has been before the Senate. Mr. President, a Senator who cannot read a bill consisting of three pages and cannot find out what it is about in 3 days will not get much help from the report of any committee on anything.

I hope the Senate will reject the motion to recommit the bill. Let us go ahead with it. If Senators want to amend it, let it be amended; but let us go ahead, and not postpone action on the bill until 2 weeks from now or until next year. I think there once was a suggestion that 1 year be set as the time limit within which the committee should report on the bill, because already the bill has been on the calendar for more than a year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Or wait until 60 days after the end of the war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, Mr. President; as the Senator from Missouri has suggested, some Senators might prefer that consideration of the bill be postponed until 60 days after termination of the war. Of course, all that is persiflage and foolishness. The time to act is right now. I hope the Senate will not bypass this measure or dodge it or hide behind any and every obstruction in trying to keep from looking it in the face.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute to express my complete concurrence with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The time to dispose of the bill, or at least the time to dispose of the pending motion—and I say this with due respect to our own dignity, our intelligence, and our courage—is now. I shall be able to record my vote when the yea-and-nay vote is taken; but before the yea-and-nay vote is had, I want to say that I do not agree with the minority leader, I do not follow his leadership, on this question. As he must know, I have been interested in legislation of this character. I have an amendment pending. Nothing has been said to me, I have consulted with no one, about the recommittal of the bill. I hope the motion to recommit the bill will fail.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am glad to say that I agree with the minority leader and the majority leader.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is the first time in a long while. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I admit that I have not always agreed with them. Likewise, neither has the Senator from Texas always agreed with them. Sometimes he has agreed with me.

However, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas talked about courage. Then he said he was compelled not to bring up his bill. Was that courage? No one has ever compelled me not to bring up a bill in which I was interested, and no one has ever compelled me to vote against a bill for which I felt I should vote. I do not think any Member of the Senate, unless it be the Senator from Texas, will say that I lack courage, whatever else may be said about me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not said that.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator intimated that Senators who want to have the bill recommitted lack courage.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not quarreling with the Senator's assertion that he is the bravest man in the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am not saying that I am the bravest man; but I say that when the Senator intimates that every Senator who wants to have the bill sent back to the committee lacks courage, it should be remembered that the Senator has changed the bill several times since it has been before the Senate. Yesterday I called attention to certain phases of the measure, and the Senator agreed that it should be changed with reference to those matters.

Now we have the Taft amendment. Some Senators say that they do not agree with the Taft amendment, and that the Senate should vote it down. I am very much inclined to believe that there are some provisions in the Taft amendment which probably should be written into the law. In my judgment there are some provisions in it which should not be written into the law.

What are we seeking to do? We are seeking, on the floor of the Senate, in a spirit of hysteria because of a threatened strike, to write legislation which we did not want to write and have not written for the past 5 or 6 years.

Where is the courage? Because some persons are saying that we ought to take every workingman out and shoot him, Members of Congress become frightened and intimidated. Because the great newspapers in the East are harping on one thing, and all the financial interests are saying we ought to do this or do that, Members of Congress are intimidated and frightened. Some Senators would not have voted for legislation of this sort 2 years ago because they felt that the labor organizations were all-powerful. Now, when it is thought that the labor organizations are weakening, they say, "We are brave men now," and they are willing to vote for this kind of legislation.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have always been a friend of labor, and I am not ashamed of it. I have stood up for labor when it was unpopular to do so. I have not been merely a fair-weather friend of labor who voted for labor when it was popular to do so and voted against it when it was unpopular to vote for it. I do not care what the Senate does. I will not charge any Senator with cowardice because he votes for or against the motion to recommit. When any Senator denounces the Senate and calls it cowardly, and says it must act, he is like the bird which befouls its own nest.

I say that we ought to recommit the bill. We ought to look further into it. We ought to give those who want to be heard, and who have not had such an opportunity, the chance to be heard with reference to the proposed legislation.

If Senators wish to be stampeded by the statements which have been made, that is perfectly agreeable to me. I will not be stampeded by them. I intend to vote to recommit the bill, and then I will give it consideration in the committee and vote to report some kind of legislation so that it can be considered on the floor of the Senate by the 20th of May.

It has been intimated that some of us do not understand the proposed legislation because we may have been out to dinner last night. I read the bill, Mr. President, and I think I know something about it. But apparently the Senator from Texas did not know what was in the bill when it was brought to the floor of the Senate, because when some of its provisions were called to his attention he immediately offered to change them.

We now have the complicated amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I call attention to the fact that in the Connally bill it is proposed to repeal the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That legislation was before the Senate for many years. Hearings were held on it before the Judiciary Committee, and the bill was passed by the Congress because the Congress said that it was opposed to the use of injunctions in labor disputes. The Senator from New York and I held hearings all over Pennsylvania. Miners were enjoined from attending a meeting to provide for going to church on Sunday. They were enjoined from holding any kind of meeting. The State police were brought in to ride them down. The colored people were put into corrals and kept there like so many animals, and no one was permitted to talk to them.

Now when a Senator rises in his place in the Senate and says that he is a friend of labor, he is said to be a coward because he is afraid that labor may turn against him. When I fought the Supreme Court packing measure every labor organization in my State adopted resolutions against me. Every farm organization in my State adopted resolutions against me. At that time the C. I. O. was headed by John Lewis.

Mr. President, who do you suppose came to see me, at the instance of the administration, in favor of packing the Court? It was Mr. Lewis. He was one of the emissaries sent to see me. I told him he was wrong. Sidney Hillman was another who came to see me, and I told him he was wrong.

When the N. R. A. bill came up I voted against it, because I said that we could not set up a dictatorship over industry in a democratic republic. I voted against it. Mr. John Lewis came to see me and argued with me to vote for it. I told him he was wrong, and I voted against it. With respect to the coal bill, I stated very frankly that I was opposed to it.

So I am not afraid to disagree with labor. I have disagreed with labor many times. I disagreed with labor on a bill which was pending here a short time ago, with reference to certain consolidations. When I think labor is right, I hope I have the courage to stand up and say so; and when I think it is wrong, I hope I have the courage to stand up and say that I think it is wrong.

I do not believe that we ought to enact legislation merely because the great financial newspapers of the country are crying for it. We ought to do it calmly and coolly, and not in a spirit of hysteria. What is meant when it is said that any Senator who wishes to vote to send the bill back to the committee is a coward? It is said that we ought to be men, and that we are not loafers around a livery stable. What does that mean? Does it mean that if we send the bill back to the committee with the idea of having it duly considered by the committee, and having the committee hear witnesses who have the right to be heard, we are in a livery stable? Is that what the Senate of the United States has come to? Are we a crowd of hangers-on around a livery stable? I do not think so. Probably some of those who are receiving huge sums of money from war contracts may think so, but I do not think so.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will be sent back to the committee and will receive consideration calmly and coolly by the Judiciary Committee. The Senator from Texas, for whom I have a high regard, is a member of the Judiciary Committee. I was not a member of the committee when hearings were held before the committee on the bill. As has been stated, the committee reported the bill twice.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has been a member of that committee during the whole of the present Congress, has he not?

Mr. WHEELER. What I meant to say was that I was not a member of the committee when hearings were held.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator was a member of the Judiciary Committee during the present session of the Congress, when the bill was reported.

Mr. WHEELER. I said I was not present when hearings were held.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. The hearings were a year or more ago. However, they were printed and were available to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. However, the bill as it was reported from the Judiciary Committee did not mean anything except to give the President the power which he has already used, and which, according to the Attorney General of the United States, he already has. In my judgment it did not mean anything.

Mr. President, new provisions which, in my judgment, go too far, have been submitted, and it is proposed to write them into the bill on the floor of the Senate. As I stated yesterday, the bill would provide that if a worker should be out on strike, or something of that kind, he could not obtain groceries at a grocery store without the man selling the groceries being subjected to a penalty of $5,000 and imprisonment for a year in the penitentiary. Does the insertion of such a provision indicate proper consideration of the bill? Is that the kind of consideration which the Senate of the United States wishes to give to an important piece of legislation?

Then there has been added, as I have said, section 5. How far do Senators wish to go with reference to that?

Then a Member suggested yesterday that we should provide that only the Attorney General may bring injunction proceedings in the courts.

Some other Member offered another amendment, and another Member offered still another. Then the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] offered an entirely new proposal which, at this time, would completely change our whole labor policy in the United States. We should give the whole subject consideration. We should then deliberately and coolly pass upon it, not for this one particular purpose, but to say what shall be the policy of the United States of America in the future.

I submit, Mr. President, that when the Democratic leader and the Republican leader join in suggesting that the bill be sent back to the committee for further consideration, in my judgment they are acting wisely, and their suggestion should be followed. The bill would later be reported by the Committee on the Judiciary so that we could have it before us by the 20th of May.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe most Senators are familiar with my attitude with reference to the labor conditions throughout the Nation. Since coming to the Senate I have introduced several bills which I believe would tend to reduce the cause of much of the trouble which has been brought on by labor-leader racketeers. I believe we should now consider the whole labor situation and enact legislation which would bring about better conditions and stop the strikes which are retarding the war effort.

However, the bill under consideration, which is sponsored by my worthy colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] deals with an entirely different subject. It deals with labor conditions in those plants which have been or may be taken over by the Government after a lock-out or a strike.

The Senator from Texas has explained on the floor of the Senate that he would prefer to keep his bill in that category and would prefer that labor legislation dealing with industries not taken over by the Government be not covered by amendments to his bill. He stated that he would like not to have such amendments offered because he would prefer to have his bill passed, and such amendments might retard its passage.

I recognize the wisdom of my colleague in desiring to keep his bill free from highly controversial amendments. Out of respect for him I have refrained from offering my amendments to his pending bill. Although his bill deals with an entirely different phase of the labor problem from that which I desire to correct, I am in favor of his bill and shall vote for it if I have an opportunity to do so.

I also believe his bill should be acted upon immediately, and I shall vote against sending the bill and all amendments thereto back to the committee for further consideration.

But in case his bill is sent back to the committee I should like to offer my amendments at this time so that they may be sent back with his bill and other amendments for consideration by the committee. I did not intend to offer my amendments on the floor of the Senate, but inasmuch as the whole subject will be opened up if the bill should be recommitted, I should like to offer four

amendments for the purpose of having them considered by the committee along with other amendments which have been offered. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have my amendments received and placed along with the other amendments which have been offered to the bill, and sent to the committee with the bill for consideration.

The amendments which I intend to offer would abolish force and violence in labor disputes; they abolish the closed shop, abolish the 40-hour week by abolishing premium pay for all hours over 40 per week; unmuzzle employers so that they may at least have the opportunity of speaking and talking to their employees; abolish coercion of employees by anybody, and abolish forcing employers by law to hire thugs and violators of the law, or deal with that class of people as representatives of labor unions.

Mr. President, I offer these amendments for consideration by the committee in case the bill shall be recommitted, and I ask that my amendments be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 be amended as follows: At the end of the act, insert the following: "That during the wars in which the United States is engaged no employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contract with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization. No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States."

That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period."

SEC. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who are engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for violation of any such provision shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes", approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:

"(f) When the wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section."

That it shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term "labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

That section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(6) Nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing the employer from expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between employer and employee. The employer shall be free to state to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization, or organizations, seeking to secure the right to represent his employees and such right shall include the right of the employer to free and open discussion of all the issues involved: *Provided*, That the employer in such discussion shall not threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they have under the law."

That so much of the first sentence of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act as precedes paragraph (1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer, a labor organization, or an officer, member, or employee of a labor organization, or any other person or persons. * * *"

That paragraph (3) of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the Board shall have no power to order the reinstatement of an employee or order payment of back wages to an employee where the employee has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer; nor shall any employer be required to accept as a collective-bargaining agency to represent his employees any person or organization that has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his generous attitude. I am glad he has taken the course which he has taken in not insisting on the amendments to the bill. I am sure the Judiciary Committee will consider the amendments if by any holocaust of fortune the bill shall be recommitted.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to thank the Senator. I will say that although the amendments are not offered for consideration at this time, I expect to ask for their consideration as amendments to other bills that may later come to the floor. I shall also continue to put forth every effort to get my bills out of committees so they can be considered on the floor of the Senate at the earliest possible date. I think it is high time that labor leader racketeers be curbed and prevented from interfering with and retarding the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to recommit the bill and all amendments thereto. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bridges	La Follette	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	McNary	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh
Connally	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
Ferguson	Pepper	
George	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to recommit the bill and all amendments thereto to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions that the committee report the bill back, either favorably or unfavorably, on or before the 20th day of May. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on important public business. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent, conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained on important public business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]; and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea"; and that the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend. He has a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Langer	Shipstead
Barkley	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tobey
Danaher	Maloney	Truman
Davis	Mead	Tunnell
Gillette	Murdock	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Walsh
La Follette	Scrugham	Wheeler

NAYS—52

Austin	Chavez	McFarland
Ball	Clark, Mo.	McKellar
Bankhead	Connally	Maybank
Barbour	Eastland	Millikin
Brewster	Ellender	Moore
Bridges	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Buck	George	Overton
Burton	Gerry	Pepper
Bushfield	Gurney	Radcliffe
Butler	Hawkes	Reed
Byrd	Hayden	Revercomb
Capper	Hill	Reynolds
Caraway	Holman	Robertson
Chandler	McClellan	Russell
Stewart	Vandenberg	Wiley
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson
Thomas, Okla.	Wherry	
Tydings	White	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Wallgren
Downey	Kilgore	Willis
Glass	McCarran	

So Mr. WHEELER's motion to recommit was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senate, the reason why the amendment should be agreed to having been stated several times on the floor. Without the amendment, the only remedy given to the President of the United States in case of a strike, the only remedy with any teeth in it provided in the bill, would be the taking over of a plant and its operation by the United States Government. No other remedy is given, no recourse is afforded to the National War Labor Board or to the courts. There are no penalties provided.

I may say that I intend to vote for the Connally bill whether my amendment shall be agreed to or not, but the first condition under the Connally bill is that the Government must take over the plant, and because that condition exists in the coal industry, and that is the only remedy, the Government has taken over 4,000 coal mines.

It has been said that in previous instances plants have been returned. There is no guaranty that the coal mines will be returned. In any event, as this condition continues, it may well be that the Government must issue all kinds of regulations, and must adopt business policies for the operation of the coal mines. If it must be done, of course, it must be done, but it seems to me there should be another remedy, and the other remedy should be to require the labor leaders, the unions, and the employers to submit their case to the National War Labor Board, to make it a crime if they refuse to do so, and when they have submitted a case and have had their hearing and had a decision as to their future relations, then the Attorney General should be given the opportunity to go into the Circuit Court of Appeals and seek to enforce the decree by injunction, if we are to afford any effective means of dealing with strikes apart from the remedy proposed in the original bill, namely, the seizure by the Government of all the industries and mines in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified, to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in the nature of a substitute, as amended. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, in the nature of a substitute, it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. 7. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the "Conciliation Service") certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case. The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of said Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and said act of October 2, 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law under the provisions of section 9 hereof.

(c) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be deemed by the Board material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

(d) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

SEC. 8. Whenever any labor dispute has been certified to the Board, or jurisdiction assumed on the Board's own motion, and until 10 days after the order of the Board has been issued, the parties to the dispute shall continue production under all the same conditions which prevailed when the dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or temporary order of the Board. During said period (but for not longer than 90 days from the date of certification or assumption of jurisdiction) the provisions of section 4 of this act, and the criminal penalties therein provided, shall apply with respect to any business establishment, plant, mine, or

facility affected by such dispute, and the parties to any labor dispute in connection therewith, to the same extent and in the same manner as if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States.

SEC. 9. Whenever the Board has issued an order under the terms of this act, and the employer or employees fail to comply with the terms thereof, or operations are hindered or reduced by lock-out, strike, or otherwise, the Attorney General of the United States may apply to the circuit court of appeals of any circuit in which the hindrance or reduction occurs for an order or injunction; and in such case, notwithstanding the provision of any other law, jurisdiction is conferred upon such circuit court of appeals to order the parties to comply with the order of the Board, and to enjoin or restrain the doing of any one or more of the following acts:

(1) The beginning or the continuance by one or more employers of a lock-out of any of the employees of such employer or employers;

(2) The instigation, promotion, furtherance, or support by any person or labor organization or officer thereof of any strike against one or more employers, or of any organized stoppage or slow-down of the work in which such employer or employers are engaged: *Provided*, That no injunction shall be issued against an individual employee by reason only of his having ceased work or refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of this act a "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment regardless whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer or employee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent, conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on important public business.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]; and that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea"; and that the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend. He has a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—34

Austin	Eastland	Revercomb
Ball	Ferguson	Robertson
Brewster	Gurney	Taft
Bridges	Hawkes	Tobey
Buck	Holman	Tydings
Burton	McClellan	Walsh
Bushfield	Maloney	Wherry
Butler	Maybank	White
Byrd	Millikin	Wiley
Capper	Moore	Wilson
Chandler	O'Daniel	
Connally	Reed	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Reynolds
Barbour	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Barkley	La Follette	Scrugham
Bone	Langer	Shipstead
Caraway	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McNary	Truman
Davis	Mead	Tunnell
Ellender	Murdock	Vandenberg
George	Murray	Van Nuys
Gerry	Overton	Wagner
Gillette	Pepper	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Wallgren
Downey	Kilgore	Willis
Glass	McCarran	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, to Mr. CONNALLY's amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator withhold his amendment for a moment?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yesterday I stated that I would be willing to strike out certain language in section 4 which was objectionable to some Senators. I send forward an amendment striking out the language, and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 6, after the word "induced", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "or attempt to coerce, instigate, or induce" and the comma; on line 7, after the word "interfere", to strike out "or continue to interfere"; on line 15, after the word "benefits", to strike out "or things of value"; on lines 16 and 17, after the word "therein", to strike out the comma and "or (3) to conspire to do any of the foregoing"; on line 17, after the period, to insert the following:

No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield so I may ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Except for the last paragraph which the Senator from Texas has added to his amendments, they are substantially the same as the amendment to which I called the attention of the Senator from Texas yesterday, and involve the same subject matter to which I directed his attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. I particularly call attention to the amendment to strike out the words "or things of value." The proposal to strike out that language was made by the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators to meet the objection that strikers might not be able to buy groceries and other articles. The last amendment contains affirmative language proposed to make it absolutely clear that no one shall be considered to be guilty of an offense simply by reason of quitting work, or refusing to return to work, or not accepting employment. There is no purpose in the bill to bring about forced labor. It never was my purpose to do so. I do not think the bill as originally drawn did such a thing. In order to meet objections made by some Senators that there might be a hint of something of that kind, I am perfectly willing to put language to that effect in the law so as to make it absolutely clear.

Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on the amendments. I modify my amendment in the nature of a substitute in the manner provided by the amendments which have just been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The right of the Senator from Texas to modify his amendment in the nature of a substitute was lost by reason of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move the adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be voted on en bloc.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, we are voting on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas, and have now reached section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The perfecting amendments offered by the Senator from Texas have not as yet been agreed to or rejected.

Mr. REED. However that may be, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas, in section 5 thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment is not in order at this time.

Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be voted on en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I misunderstood the parliamentary situation. I desire to offer an amendment to section 5 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas. I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, in line 3 of Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That upon a finding by the President, or certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the production of or service rendered by any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is essential to the war effort, any such court shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility as such court would have under this section, if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States", so as to make the section, as amended, read as follows:

SEC. —. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act: *Provided*, That upon a finding by the President, or certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the production of or service rendered by any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is essential to the war effort, any such court shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility as such court would have, under this section, if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have the particular attention of the Senator from Texas. My amendment does not propose an extensive change. I have discussed it with the Senator from Texas, but I do not know whether he is prepared to accept it. I hope he is not violently opposed to it.

Section 4 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute defines what acts will be in violation of the law. Paragraph (b) of section 4 prescribes the penalty.

Let me now read the probative matter contained in section 5:

The district courts of the United States * * * shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17—

That relates to notice to the opposite party—

to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

That, Mr. President, is the probative matter. In other words, section 4 carries the penalties which would be applied in case of violation of the act after a trial in court, but section 5 gives the district courts of the United States jurisdiction to restrain violations. Of course, the courts could not impose the penalties carried in section 4. That jurisdiction applies under this bill at this time only to those plants which have been taken over by the United States. I am sure the Senator from Texas will confirm that statement. He does so by nodding in the affirmative.

Mr. President, if there are any plants which do not need any protection of the courts as against possible violation of the law, it is those plants which are in possession of the United States. But under the bill proposed by the Senator from Texas the only way a plant can receive protection from the courts against violation of the law or contemplated violation of the law is by having the Government to take it over.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Government taking over any more plants than the Government finds absolutely necessary. The Government has taken over, as has been brought out in the debate in the last 3 days, about seven plants. It has taken over the coal mines. If there are any plants entitled to protection from the courts and which ought to be given protection by the courts, there are innumerable plants all over the country which may have some labor difficulties, and yet have no right to apply to the courts for the protection a court order might give them. In that respect I think—and I hope the Senator from Texas will agree—the Senator's bill is still deficient. I do not see that any great damage could possibly be done by extending the protection of the court to such plants.

Mr. President, let me read to the Senate the section I propose to have added. First let me say to the Senator from Texas that after he made his objection on the floor the day before yesterday, I agreed that my original idea was subject to revision. So I revised it.

Now let me read to the Senate what I propose to have added. I do not change anything, but I propose to add the following:

Provided, That upon a finding by the President, or certification by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the production of or service rendered by any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is essential to the war effort, any such court shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility as such court would have under this section, if such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility were in the possession of the United States.

That is all; nothing in the Connally bill is changed. The language just read is added only for the purpose of bringing the plants under the protection of the court. In order to make them eligible for such protection, it is necessary to have a finding by the President of the United States or by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of the Navy that they are essential to the war effort.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator explain what he means by the words "or threatened violations", in line 11 of page 2? What is a "threatened violation"?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that language is language of the bill of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LANGER. I know that; but I should like to know how the Senator defines it.

Mr. REED. I prefer to let the Senator from Texas define his own phraseology. All I have undertaken to do is to adopt his language for the purpose of adding my amendment.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator define what he means by the words "or threatened violations", in line 11 on page 2?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the word "threatened" is one of common acceptation and knowledge. I do not know that I can define it in any way so as to cover all possibilities. It means any overt act which indicates an intention to violate the provisions of section 4 or to do any of the things denounced in section 4.

Mr. LANGER. Would the act have to be an overt act?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly. We cannot probe into a man's mind. He would have to do something that would violate the provisions of the section.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kansas that I appreciate very much his support of the main bill; but I hope he will not press for the adoption of his amendment, for the reason that the main purpose of the bill is to confine its application to plants taken over by the Government. Whenever we go out into the whole field we shall have all sorts of discussion, litigation, and uncertainty. Furthermore, I do not regard the amendment of the Senator from Kansas as a workable one; because if a certificate had to be obtained from the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, they probably would be deluged with applications for certificates, and there would be great delay before action could be secured. I hope the Senator will not press for the adoption of his amendment. If he desires to have it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, I assure him that it will receive every consideration.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator knows that is impossible. As a matter of fact, if the Senator will let me proceed for a moment, I should like to say that my amendment would not do anything that would not be done by the Senator's bill, except to allow a plant or mine or establishment to be taken over by the Government before anything proposed to be done under the Senator's bill could be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. The courts are now open to everyone. However, the purpose of my bill is to confine the application of its provisions to Government-operated plants. If we go out into the general field and apply the provisions of the bill

to a plant not operated under Government direction, but a plant operated by a private employer, we shall be bringing in something not within the purview of the original bill, and shall bring on endless discussion and litigation.

I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press for the adoption of his amendment. I know he is in favor of my bill; but every little clod in the road impedes the speed and the smooth rolling of the automobile.

Mr. REED. My amendment would help the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know it might help it in the view of the Senator from Kansas, but I am sure it would not help it with the Senate generally.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press for the adoption of his amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment I now offer. I am sure the Senator from Texas has no objection to it. I desire to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 23, after the word "shown", it is proposed to insert "but solely upon application by the Attorney General or under his direction," so as to read:

SEC. 5. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, but solely upon application by the Attorney General or under his direction, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, would the Senator object to changing the amendment to read, "solely under the Attorney General or under his direction"?

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. That would empower the Attorney General to act through a district attorney, if necessary. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it occurs to me that if the Senate is going to give the War Labor Board power to issue subpenas it should have power and jurisdiction to have the case. In other words, it seems to me that if we are to begin to confer power on the War Labor Board, it had better be done under section 7 of my amendment, as I propose it, rather than simply under an order giving the Board power to issue subpenas. The power to issue subpenas does not confer jurisdiction of the case, but only power to take testimony. I do not know whether the Senator might consider offering section 7 of my amendment without any compulsory features, in lieu of language which simply confers the power to subpena.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, a further amendment which I have would give to the War Labor Board the power to issue subpenas. I shall propose that amendment in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. I thought that was the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. WAGNER. No; that amendment is not now before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. May the amendment be read again, then, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 23, after the word "shown", it is proposed to insert "but solely upon application by the Attorney General or under his direction."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 4. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies on the desk and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 13, after the word "stoppage", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination on account of race, color, or creed in employment and administration with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under such authority."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment because I believe that when the United States Government becomes the operator of a business establishment or of a plant which it takes over it should set an example for the rest of the United States to follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have the amendment restated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 13, in the substitute, after the word "stoppage", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination on account of race, color, or creed in employment and administration with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under such authority."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this amendment has been incorporated in a number of measures. I recall that last year I offered it on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. It is not a new philosophy. It is an old one and covers nearly every statute which has been enacted.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I should like to say just a word in support of the amendment which has been offered by my colleague the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is designed to prohibit discrimination against any American workman on account of race, creed, or color, and to provide for the fullest utilization of his skills and services, whoever he may be, in the promotion of the all-out war effort in respect to those plants taken over by the Government under the authority of the proposed legislation. There are many industrial plants in the United States today which maintain agreements with representative unions for a closed shop. For example, in the United States navy yards, the machinists' union, electricians, boilermakers, and other metal-trades organizations, still maintain in their constitution a provision as to membership which states that an employee must be an American citizen, a Caucasian, and 21 years of age, to be eligible for union membership. These restrictions are in force despite the fact that there are 20,000 or 30,000 Negro apprentices with highly developed skills, and that there is great demand for such skills today. In other words, the whole war effort is precluded from the use of their talents and services by what amounts to a closed shop maintained by these particular unions in the United States navy yards, which deny membership to Negro Federal civil-service employees and refuse them promotion to the status of journeymen by excluding them from their unions. Similar conditions exist in many plants throughout the country manufacturing airplanes and other vital matériel for the war effort.

Since the proposed legislation is designed to keep all war production at a maximum at all times, it seems very necessary to adopt the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] prohibiting discrimination in employment in industrial plants engaged in our war effort, wherever it becomes necessary for the United States Govern-

ment to take over the management and control for war purposes.

Similar antidiscrimination amendments, which I have offered, have been included in Federal legislation relating to the Civil Aeronautics Authority and its pilot-training program, the C. C. C., Federal aid in the field of education, national hospitalization legislation, and the Selective Service Act. Since the pending bill makes particular reference to certain sections of the Selective Service Act, it is obviously important that this provision be included in this bill.

In many of our industrial plants in New Jersey such legislation would not be necessary, for we have a fair and just policy in regard to the employment of all American citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color; but I know that this situation does not obtain as generally as we would like to have it obtain. I feel that there is nothing more valuable in stimulating the morale of our people at this time, particularly of our patriotic colored population. I am sure that at the height of this struggle for democracy and freedom the Government should and will always put the full force of its sovereign powers back of the principle that every American citizen must have the right to work and make his full contribution, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is wholly unnecessary. There is no implication that under Government management there would be any discrimination. The Constitution guarantees all citizens equal rights.

Let me suggest further that the adoption of such an amendment would result in interference with the control by the unions over their own membership. Suppose there is a closed shop, and that one union has all the employees in its membership. Whenever we try to tell the union what it shall do, or what kind of men it shall have in its membership, we are interfering with the union. I have no desire to interfere with the freedom of men to organize. I wish to protect collective bargaining. I do not wish to try to tell the union what its membership shall be, or how its affairs shall be managed. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. (Putting the question:) The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we have already acted on the Taft amendment as a whole, and it has been rejected. However, section 7 of the Taft amendment, as printed and lying on the desks of Senators, not only is an innovation, but a definitely worthy one. It would prove to be a marked addition to the bill. Because it is admirably conceived and would help the bill in a very definite way, I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and have asked him to reoffer that portion of his amendment, with the assertion that if he did not choose to do so I would. He suggested that I act accordingly.

Mr. President, I offer, in my own name, but with all the credit for its compilation due to the Senator from Ohio, section 7 of the so-called Taft amendment. It is printed and on the desks of Senators, and readily accessible to all Senators. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the substitute it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the "Conciliation Service") certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case. The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of said Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and said act of October 2, 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law under the provisions of section 9 hereof.

(c) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be deemed by the Board material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

(d) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, through an inadvertence, on page 3, lines 8 and 9 of the original Taft print, there appear the words "under the provisions of section 9 hereof." I modify the language by eliminating those words from the amendment as printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would it be a correct interpretation of the Senator's motion to say that the amendment he now offers would give the War Labor Board an official status, regularize its operations, and establish by law the formula for its operations, and that we would eliminate from the Taft amendment particularly the injunctive process, which, I regret to say, was the reason for my opposition to the original Taft amendment? Will that occur if the Senator's amendment shall be adopted?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the effect of the proposed amendment. He has correctly defined my reason, as well as his own, for voting against the original Taft amendment.

Mr. President, if we adopt this language, we will not only strengthen the Connally bill and improve it generally, and "regularize," as the Senator from Michigan has said, the procedures of the War Labor Board, but we will also authorize the Board to bring before it witnesses, through the power of subpena, and, in addition, to have the power of the courts to execute subpenas by additional order as to recalcitrants within the jurisdiction of the courts who otherwise would refuse to appear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Furthermore, so far as our recent experience with a major labor difficulty is concerned, it would be impossible, under the proposed language, for any labor leader, or labor group, longer to ignore the War Labor Board when it undertook to assume jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. That would be my construction of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will allow me to say so, it seems to me that his motion is incontestable and is valuable.

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate the Senator's observation. I think the logic and the judgment of all of us dictate its acceptance without further argument.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. While of course I should prefer the amendment with power of enforcement, undoubtedly the amendment offered by the Senator fills a blank in the present law regarding the jurisdiction of the National War Labor Board, and I believe it can stand on its own feet without the other sections. Later on, if it does not work, compulsory provisions can be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is one other point which, it seems to me, we should consider before we reach a final vote. I refer to section 5 of the Connally amendment. I shall omit for the present any reference to section 4, which superimposes criminal penalties on existing law.

Mr. President, section 5 will undo Federal legislation with reference to the jurisdiction of the courts as to injunctions, and I believe, sir, that we will be doing our cause no good, and that we shall incite great mistrust of the whole bill. Everything which can or should be said on the point is now in the minds of Senators, and I respectfully move, without further argument, that section 5 be stricken from the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning in line 21, page 4, it is proposed to amend by striking out all down to and including line 3, on page 5, as follows:

> SEC. 5. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories or possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to the opposite party) of the act entitled "An Act To Supplement Existing Laws Against Unlawful Restraints and Monopolies, and for Other Purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, to restrain violations or threatened violations of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. I do not care to debate it, as we debated it thoroughly when it was before us for consideration previously. The provision is limited to plants which the Government takes over. It would not change the Norris-LaGuardia Act in any respect, except in the one particular case, and I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not wish to argue the point, but certainly those of us who, as attorneys, have watched the progress of injunction cases in the courts down through the years cannot but be filled with dismay at the thought of giving a rule of law application in one set of circumstances and not in another. We would create one set of pariahs, if you choose, in the eyes of the law, and then leave it to the ingenuity of counsel to frame up such language as they say will inveigh against the proscribed groups. Then there may be some technically asserted violation of the terms of an order, an order perhaps issued ex parte, for all we know, or at least referable to one judge in some district court somewhere, and then there are all the remedies through actions for contempt, with jail and other penalties attached.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that in our anxiety in the Senate to do what is necessary, right, and proper to accomplish worthy objectives, we most assuredly do not want to go back to dark days.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Was not the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] adopted, which provides that an injunction may be obtained solely on application of the Attorney General, or someone under his direction? I believe the amendment was adopted.

Mr. DANAHER. It may have been. I have not kept a journal of all the amendments which have been offered, accepted and acted upon with reference to the pending bill. I believe the amendment to which the Senator from West Virginia refers was adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In that event, does it not do away with the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that counsel might frame their bills in these cases?

Mr. DANAHER. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If that is under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, and is done in the name of the United States Government, it is a very different thing, it seems to me, from the procedure by counsel for private organizations.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct in saying that it is a different procedure in the fact that it emanates from a different source. But with reference to the use to be made of injunctions, with reference to contempt citations for violations of the injunctions, and with reference to accomplishments of what someone in the Department of Justice decides shall be done, the effect is the same. It is the same thing, in substance, that has given rise to so much complaint with reference to consent decrees and with reference to violations of the antitrust laws.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Notwithstanding the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from New York, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut what effect the language proposed would have upon that, whether it would in any way modify this provision:

> The district courts * * * shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject only to provisions of section 17 * * * of the act of October 15, 1914—

And so forth. Would that or would it not be in conflict with the provision of the Senator's amendment, adopted earlier in the day, providing that only the Attorney General of the United States, or those under his authority or direction, could bring an injunction suit?

Mr. DANAHER. I do not know, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky. I am not able to answer the question. I have my bill marked up in the language offered by the Senator from New York, but I am unable to answer the specific question the Senator from Kentucky propounds.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, as I recall it, related to a different section of the bill and to a different set of circumstances; but section 5 seems to put no restriction whatever upon the injunctive process for cause shown except as it may be subject only to the provisions of section 17 of the act of October 15, 1914. If that is the interpretation, the amendment of the Senator from New York would not have any effect on what the Senator proposes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct. I think the words "solely upon application by the Attorney General" are limited to and modify only the word "shown" in line 23; but, Mr. President, without becoming involved in the technical details of what is obviously a technical matter, there is no place in this type of bill, proceeding from this particular philosophy, for the use of the injunctive remedy.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator should point out that the elimination of section 5 would not take the teeth out of the bill, however, because the preceding punitive criminal section would still remain.

Mr. DANAHER. That is certainly correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Also, in response to a comment by the able Senator from Texas, I call attention to the fact that when I asked him the same question yesterday about the elimination of this injunctive process provision at this point he said:

> I do not think the bill would be very seriously crippled if it were eliminated, but I think it is improved by its remaining in. I do not think it would be fatal to strike out that provision, but I hope that will not be done.

In other words, although the able Senator from Texas preferred that the language should remain in the bill, he

conceded that its elimination would not seriously affect the objectives.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the point made by the Senator from Michigan is well taken, and I thank him for his contribution. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is it not true that unless section 5 is stricken from the bill that a portion of the Norris-LaGuardia Act will be repealed?

Mr. DANAHER. It would certainly be overridden; let us put it in that way.

Mr. LANGER. Would we then not have the same situation we had a few years ago when the Attorney General of the United States applied to Judge Wilkerson in Chicago, which led to the same situation which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] discussed a while ago? Is not that true?

Mr. DANAHER. I must confess that I do not recall the circumstances of the case to which the Senator from North Dakota has reference, but I stand simply, so far as I am concerned, on my point in reference to the thoroughly undesirable nature of this language. I hope, Mr. President, that section 5 may be stricken from the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate to eliminate this provision from the bill. I cannot agree at all with the objection to using in labor disputes injunctions which are sought by the Attorney General of the United States to enjoin a strike against the United States. Injunctions are often a much more effective means of preventing such a violation of the law than punishment by arrest and trial in a police court proceeding. Over and over again this Nation has proceeded to act by the injunction procedure. We have enjoined railroad rate increases. Some of the most effective actions the United States Government has ever been able to take have been taken by injunction. In 1919 John Lewis and the United Mine Workers were enjoined by a district court in Indianapolis on application of Mr. Palmer, the Attorney General in President Wilson's Cabinet, and on President Wilson's order. It is an effective, useful method, and, to my mind, a much more satisfactory method of determining the real question in issue than arrest and trial in court, because by proceedings on an injunction the court can determine whether or not an act was illegal, and a man can have his hearing and can get advice from the court as to what he can do in a strike and what he cannot do. I believe it would be a very effective means of enforcing the provisions of the bill, and that the provision ought not to be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that my amendment has been discussed, I do not mean to indicate that I am in favor of section 5 at all, for I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that it ought to be stricken out. I do not like injunctions in labor controversies, and I know much about them both as judge and attorney. If, however, that section is to remain in the bill, I wanted it limited to applications made by the Attorney General.

Mr. DANAHER. I understood the purpose of the Senator from New York, and I concur in it, but I think section 5 ought to go entirely out of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. [Putting the question.] In the judgment of the Chair, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have noticed in the course of the debate that the exact power under which the President has seized the coal mines has not been pointed out. No one has put his finger on the particular power which authorized the President to seize the coal mines. It is assumed that among the many powers conferred on the President there is, somewhere, rambling around a specific power which authorized him to take the action he has taken.

During the Civil War President Lincoln had to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. He had no specific power to do that, and Congress, after he had suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, ratified the action he had taken. I believe it would be wise for this body to follow that precedent. No one as yet has proven conclusively that the President has the express power to seize private property in the fashion it has been seized in the labor dispute affecting the coal mines. So I propose a short amendment to the bill which I read as follows:

> That the action taken by the President on May 1, 1943, providing for the possession and operation of the coal mines by the Government, and the action taken by the Secretary of the Interior since that date, pursuant to the Executive order of the President, No. 9340, are hereby confirmed and validated.

Stopping right there, that would end all dispute as to whether or not the President was right or wrong in seizing the property.

We do not know what may happen during the conduct of this war before it is over; I think it appropriate that the legislative branch keep its record straight, and where powers are exerted by the President about which there is some question it would be wise, if we agree, that the power is not clearly expressed in previous legislation, to assert it here in the form of affirmative action rather than to leave it in the field of speculation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question that bothers me in regard to the Senator's amendment is whether the amendment itself raises a question of doubt as to the legality of the President's action. If the adoption of such an amendment now would be regarded as having been based upon some doubt on the part of Congress that he had authority to proceed as he did, would not Congress have to take similar action every time the President took over a plant in the future, if he were required to do so, even under the law which we are proposing now to pass? If by action we take here we cast a doubt upon the legality of the President's action, it certainly would encourage those who are disposed to question it to go into court and challenge his right to do it. The Senator's amendment could have validity only regarding taking over the coal mines, and it would have no effect upon any other plant taken over in the future.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I was very attentive to the colloquy which took place a few days ago between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the author of the pending bill. I recall that the Senator from Illinois was most insistent that the particular power which the President exercised be pointed out in the legislation so that we would know whether or not the President had proceeded in accordance with the power conferred on him by Congress, or whether there was some hidden power in the Constitution under which he was acting, or some implied power, or what was the authority he had for this action.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment. So far as I know, no one rose on the Senate floor at that time and showed where the power was expressly conferred on the President to seize the mines in the circumstances which confronted him at the time he took the action. If there is such a power, someone among the 96 Senators present should be able to point it out.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I pointed it out, and I think it is perfectly clear under title II of the War Powers Act that he had power to seize the mines. I read from section 2:

> The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or any other officer, board, commission, or governmental corporation authorized by the President, may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings, to acquire by condemnation, any real property, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, together with any personal property located thereon or used therewith.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may differ with my colleague from Ohio, the section which he has just read refers to a case where the Government intends to acquire the permanent ownership of property.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. In my judgment it has nothing to do with seizure of property as a means of keeping law and order, and of producing goods essential to the war effort.

Mr. TAFT. I think clearly so. It says:

> To acquire by condemnation any real property, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, * * * that shall be deemed necessary, for military, naval, or other war purposes.

Certainly the production of coal is a war purpose within the terms of the act. The only question is whether or not the President followed the proper procedure in taking possession. He may take immediate possession without waiting for any court proceedings under title II.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may again take issue with the Senator from Ohio, the purpose of the act was to acquire property which the Government intended to use. The purpose of the Executive order issued by the President in the coal mine case was not to acquire property which the Government intended to use; it was to take over property temporarily, merely as a law and order proposition, until the property seized could be employed in the war effort.

Mr. TAFT. And in the meantime produce the coal that was needed for the war, which the Government is doing today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, but since the Senator has read the section of the War Powers Act, I am more convinced than ever that if that is the authority which actuated the President in seizing the mines, it is not in point, and the act was not passed for that purpose, because the Government today is not owning any of these mines, it is not attempting to own them. Already by Executive order they have been restored to their owners. The owners have been told to operate them under the jurisdiction of the National Government. So the citation is not in point. Therefore I think we should adopt an amendment validating the action of the President, for without it, it is questionable whether the President had the clear-cut authority in the instant case to take the action he did take.

The section which the Senator from Ohio has read provides for the condemnation of land. He knows and I know that there will be no condemnation proceedings filed in this case. He knows and I know that the Government does not want to acquire the coal mines. He knows and I know that the only purpose of the Government's being in the mines now is to establish law and order, so that work may be resumed, and, in my humble judgment, it is not for the purpose for which the section read by the Senator from Ohio was enacted in the first instance.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that if the President had no power to seize the mines there is no reason why we should confirm his action. If he did not have power to seize the mines, he should not have seized them. It seems to me either the President had the power, in which case we do not need to confirm his action, or he did not have the power, in which case we should not confirm it. What he did was not the only remedy which could have been taken. The President could have sought other remedies. In my opinion, it was a very poor remedy for dealing with the situation. I certainly should object strenuously to any general, over-all authority confirming some act of the President which was illegal. I think that clearly under section 2 of the War Powers Act he could have taken over the mines. Whether he did so under section 2, or conformed with its provisions regarding the filing of court proceedings, I do not purport to say, but certainly I see no reason why the Senate should undertake to examine the President's acts and determine whether or not they were illegal, and then confirm them if we think they were illegal. I cannot see any reason for the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has made out a good case as to why the amendment should be offered. First of all, he has read no law which confers upon the President the power to take the property under the circumstances under which the property was taken. He has read, instead, provision for the exercise of the power of eminent domain, of condemnation, either permanent or temporary, which is not in issue in this case.

In the second place, we are not privy to why the President took his action. Whether it was wise or whether it was not wise is not a subject of debate at this particular time. What is involved is whether he had the power to take the action. It is a fait accompli, it is something which has already happened, and in my opinion this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol should be very zealous to see that when the President takes some action which is questionable, we either condemn it, if he has no power to take the action, or validate it. We should not leave it in the realm of decree. We should proceed in the regular legislative way, and that is the purpose of my amendment, so that the power will be definite and vested in this particular case, even though the action has been taken. Without such a legislative provision, it seems to me we are legislating on something which we simply use as a smoke screen, more or less, to sidestep some action which has already been taken.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would the provision in the Constitution with reference to ex post facto laws apply to the Senator's amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; this would not be an ex post facto law.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator has just stated that it is something which is fait accompli.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Something which is completed.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the seizure by the President was illegal in the first place, the only way by which it can be validated, not from the time he seized it, but from now on, is by affirming the action of the President, and having the President sign the bill making it law, and from that time on it will be the law of the land. If it were illegal ab initio, up to the time it is corrected it will still be illegal, and the only way we can wipe out the illegality is by making the power he assumed and used and exercised beyond the question of a doubt, if he did not previously have the power.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the language of the Senator's amendment limit the action to that sort of approval?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. Similar action was taken during the Civil War. President Lincoln suspended the Habeas Corpus Act. He had no more authority to do that than I had. The right to a writ of habeas corpus is a constitutional right, but in wartime we do not draw the line so tight as to what constitutional rights we have and which ones we do not have. The point was that it was necessary for President Lincoln to take the action he took in the case of the Habeas Corpus Act. He could not wait. The fate of the Union depended on his action, and he suspended the act. He knew there was question as to his constitutional power to do it, but he had to preserve the Union, and he had to do something which was aparently unconstitutional in order to preserve the greater thing, which was the solidarity of the United States. What happened? After President Lincoln took this step, Congress passed an act in almost the exact words I have used, validating the action of the President, and after that there was no question as to whether the power Lincoln had exerted was properly used or not, because the Congress made it valid.

In the instant case, referring to the Second War Powers Act from which the Senator from Ohio read—will the Senator give me the section from which he read?

Mr. TAFT. Title 2, section 2, at the top of page 2.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Ohio read section 2. I read:

> The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or any other officer, board, commission, or governmental corporation authorized by the President, may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer, or may cause proceedings to be instituted in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings, to acquire by condemnation, any real property, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein.

Let us take up that language phrase by phrase. Did the President acquire the mines by purchase? No. Did he acquire them by donation? No. Did he effect any other means of transfer? No. Did he cause proceedings to be instituted in any court? No. Did he acquire them by condemnation? No.

Therefore, how did the President acquire them? Where does the power lie? The President was confronted with a fact, not a theory. The miners were out. The coal mines were not being worked, and whether I agree with it or do not agree with it, the President took what seemed to him to be the appropriate action to take in the circumstances. I am not arguing the pros and cons of that action. No Member of the Senate can show me the authority of the President for that action expressed in any law passed by the Congress. It may be implied in the Constitution. It may be implied as a part of his power as Commander in Chief, but, so far as I know, there is no express authority of the Congress directly giving him the right to

seize private property in conditions such as those we have before us.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will probably recall that when the President seized the plant of the North American Aviation Corporation in Inglewood, Calif., the question of his authority was submitted to the Attorney General of the United States. The then Attorney General, Mr. Robert A. Jackson, who is now an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion, copy of which I have in my hand, held that the President did have authority under the Constitution and under the laws of the United States, to take over the plant at Inglewood, Calif. I do not wish to raise any question as to the authority of the President of the United States in the premises in the particular case now in question. This authority has never been challenged in any court, so far as I know, by the ownership of the seven plants which the President has taken over from time to time. The authority has never been questioned in court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not mean that at all. The Attorney General delivered that opinion after the President had seized the plant for the simple purpose of validating the action of the President of the United States, insofar as he, the Attorney General, could validate it. But that does not make the action valid. The Attorney General can rule one way and the Supreme Court of the United States can say his ruling is erroneous. We all know as practical men that the Attorney General sits in the President's cabinet. He would be a very poor attorney general, indeed, if, after the President had acted, he did not try to find a means to support the President, rather than to issue a detached opinion, irrespective of his obligation to his chief, to cover any circumstances upon which he might be called to rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Maryland has called to our attention the action of a former President of the United States suspending the writ of habeas corpus, and the subsequent action by Congress validating that action on the part of the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator further said that the President had no power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would be interesting at least to know where Congress received the authority to ratify and confirm an act by the President which was in direct violation of the Constitution. Was not the act of Congress just as illegal as that of the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's point is unanswerable, except that in time of war certain actions are on the border line. But certainly if the representatives of the people, the legislative branch, gave to the President the authority to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, that action on its part was more in keeping with legality and with the procedure laid down by our Constitution, than it was for the President to suspend the act by a Presidential edict.

Mr. President, if there is no other law dealing with the subject than the Second War Powers Act, and I have applied that law to the case by reading from it the powers given to the President to institute proceedings by purchase and the like, none of which were used in this case—some Senators may disagree with me—I believe it would be wise, for the war is far from being over, to guard jealously the residuary powers which reside in the legislative branch.

I realize that the President acted in good faith in the present instance, that he tried to serve the national interest, even though we may disagree with the method, and it is important to ratify that particular action, but we should not go into the field of things done over a long period of time by Presidential orders, which Congress has not passed on. If we were to ratify them all, the situation would get entirely out of the hands of Congress.

I do not mean to make any invidious comparison by what I am about to say, but in the last days of the Weimar Republic I remember a decree was issued by the then chancellor, and when Hitler came to power, after that, I recall that that decree was used as a precedent so that Hitler ruled Germany by decree, using as authority for what he, Hitler, did, the very formula which his predecessor in a democracy had used in a single case.

Mr. President, I do not say that as reflecting in any way on the instant case in which the President has used this power, but I say that up to this good hour no Member of the Senate has pointed to any one single piece of legislation which has authorized the President to take the action he has taken. I think it is important that we affirm what he has done, as a matter of good clean, concise, and intelligent lawmaking, and I think it will afford a safeguard with respect to actions in the future if we proceed in the orderly fashion rather than in a haphazard way.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place, it seems to me that under the Second War Powers Act there is no question whatever that the President could have taken over the mines. It provides for condemnation for temporary use of the mines, and that is what the Government has acquired by the action it has taken. The Government has actually acquired temporarily the use of the mines in order to produce war materials. If the President did not conform to all the methods of procedure under section 2 by filing the proper petition, all he has to do is file a petition in court, and I do not see why Congress should attempt to validate his act or to deal with the question at all. I cannot see any reason for our undertaking retroactively to determine the legality of some action which the President has taken.

I doubt very much if the Senator from Maryland is correct in his statement of the history of the matter. My recollection of the habeas corpus episode was that the President suspended the writ of habeas corpus. Chief Justice Taney, of Maryland, then held that action illegal, and that the President could not suspend the writ of habeas corpus; and Chief Justice Taney restored to liberty a man who had applied to him for a writ of habeas corpus. Congress did not subsequently validate the President's act in setting aside the writ of habeas corpus, but Congress thereafter passed a law authorizing the President to dispense with the writ of habeas corpus when he found it necessary to do so. However, that action was taken nearly a year after the decision by Chief Justice Taney. I am not absolutely certain of the facts, but those are the facts set out by Mr. Justice Sutherland in his work, Constitutional Power in World Affairs, in dealing with the question. He said:

> Congress apparently accepted the view that the President did not have the power, because they, on March 3, 1863, passed an act by which the President was authorized to suspend the privilege of the writ whenever in his judgment the public safety required it.

Mr. President, in passing the Connally bill we are, in effect, saying that we approve the President's general policy; and I think the record should stand as it is. I do not think we should try to go back and correct the record. Even if the President's act was illegal, I think it created in certain persons rights which they are entitled to enjoy, whatever they may be. I think we should not attempt retroactively to change the record.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say a brief word in conclusion on the amendment. Certainly there can be no harm in its adoption. No one will be hurt. The President's hands will be strengthened. If there is a gap in the authority, if we need a clear-cut and express act, then the amendment will clear up that situation. So no harm at all can come by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, from the historical standpoint we should adopt the amendment anyway; because we do not know when there will loom up on the horizon some other matter in connection with which property will again be seized. I think we should make these grants of power express. Certainly, in my humble judgment, without questioning the President's motives, the act read by the Senator from Ohio does not confer on the President the authority and the power which he used in seizing private property.

I have read that act phrase by phrase; and so far, up to this time, not a Member of this body has pointed to any other act, any single act, which authorizes the action the President took.

I am not saying this in criticism of the President. It would be rather difficult to suggest a better course of action than the one he followed. I am not saying he was unwise in doing what he did; I am not saying he was unpatriotic in doing what he did; for I do not believe he was. However, I am saying that as a

legislative body we should not have powers floating around loosely by decree. No Member of the Legislature seems to be able to show expressly where the power used by the Chief Executive resides in some law passed by the Congress. It is not in this act; and if we adopt the amendment, no harm will be done. In my humble judgment, we shall have strengthened the hands of the Chief Executive if we adopt the amendment.

Mr. President, I understand that the author of the bill is favorable to the amendment and is willing to accept it; and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me correct the Senator. Of course, I am not hostile to the idea of approving or confirming anything the President has done. I am very much in favor of doing that. But as the Senator's amendment is drawn, I think it inevitably questions the authority of the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Who has not questioned it, when the Senator from Illinois has——

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to question it. If the Senator would word his amendment so as to approve what the President has done and then stop, I would not have the same objection to it that I have to it in its present form. The amendment provides that the action of the President and the action of the Secretary of the Interior——

Mr. TYDINGS. We say, "are hereby confirmed and validated." How would the Senator have me word it? It seems to me that as it is it approves the President's action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, it does not use the word "approved."

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator have me strike out the word "confirmed" and insert the word "approved", so as to read "approved and validated"?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not want the word "validated" to be included. The word "validate" of itself implies illegality to start with, and a necessity for confirmatory or validating action.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's desire to try to bring my point of view in line with that of his own reasoning, but I should prefer to have the amendment rejected rather than to have the word "validated" stricken out; because in my humble judgment I have made out a case on the basis of sheer logic and sound argument, a case which no one has refuted by any showing of the clear power in the hands of the President to take the action he has taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me refer to the North American Aviation Corporation case referred to by the Senator from Texas. Before reading the statement made by the Attorney General in that case, I wish to say that I do not think the colloquy which occurred the other day between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Texas, in which the Senator from Illinois asked the Senator from Texas to point out specifically the statute under which the President took over the mines, offers any justifiable basis for the adoption of an amendment which in itself legislatively would cast reflection upon the validity of the President's action. I think the action of the President in taking over the mines has met with the universal approval of the American people. His action has not even met with question by any Member of the Senate, although the Senator from Illinois asked what was the authority under which the President acted.

I read now the statement issued by the Attorney General following the proclamation of the President ordering the Army to take possession of the plant of the North American Aviation Corporation at Inglewood, Calif.:

> The Presidential proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the Presidential powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.
>
> The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged army, to provide for a strengthened navy, to protect Government property, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act. For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law-enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress but the aggregate of all such laws plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.
>
> The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are placed in his sole command and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain.
>
> The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike. The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of governmental efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed. There can be no doubt that the duty constitutionally and inherently rested upon the President to exert his civil and military, as well as his moral, authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern.

Mr. President, in the Executive order issued by the President on May 1—last Saturday—various whereases, which I need not read, are first recited, and then it says:

> Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows—

The President is not required, in a proclamation such as that, to set out each statute or each provision of the Constitution. He bases his authority, as the Attorney General has stated, upon the aggregate and cumulative powers conferred upon him by the Constitution and by the laws enacted by Congress. It seems to me that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, who, of course, is acting in perfectly good faith in offering it, would raise a legislative question as to the legality of the President's action. If the amendment were adopted, it would be construed in the mind of everyone in the United States as a doubt expressed by the Senate that the President had the power to do what he did.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he believes that Congress can now, by any act, validate what might have been an invalid action by the President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have very grave doubt as to whether Congress could validate an otherwise invalid action by a sort of ex post facto proceeding. Although it may not fall under the terms of the Constitution against ex post facto laws, it is an ex post facto proceeding.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be an order nunc pro tunc.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator from Texas, who is always ready with legal quotations and aphorisms, says, if the President's action were illegal, the effect would be that we should be seeking now, by a nunc pro tunc pronouncement, to validate what was invalid at the time of its execution. I believe there is no question as to the validity of the President's action; but I do not believe that we should throw doubt upon it by adopting an amendment based upon the theory that it was illegal.

Mr. TUNNELL. On the assumption that there had been some invalid act, if the rights of anyone had been infringed, would they be cured by an act of the legislature now?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. Furthermore, of course this legislation must be enacted by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President. If the President's act was illegal, every act under his order is illegal, and would be illegal until Congress acted and the President signed the bill, even assuming that by that means we could validate something which was invalid at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the substitute it is proposed to add the following new section:

> SEC. —. The action taken by the President on May 1, 1943, providing for the possession and operation of coal mines by the Government, and the action taken by the Secretary of the Interior since that date pursuant to the Executive order of the President No. 9340 are hereby confirmed and validated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] (putting the question).

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city, conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent, conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I am further advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend. He has a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN].

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—63

Austin	Ferguson	Pepper
Ball	George	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gerry	Reed
Barbour	Gillette	Revercomb
Barkley	Gurney	Reynolds
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Truman
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Millikin	Wherry
Danaher	Moore	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Wilson

NAYS—16

Aiken	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Mead	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham	
La Follette	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Wallgren
Downey	Kilgore	Willis
Glass	McCarran	

So the bill S. 796 was passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the many changes which were made in the bill before its final passage, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended and finally passed, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill, as passed, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant in the interest of the national defense: *Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this paragraph, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and the authority to operate any such plant under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed."

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3 hereof, in any case in which possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, such plant, while so possessed, (a) shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant was so taken, or (b) in the event operation of such plant is interrupted or stopped at such time, shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at such plant immediately preceding such interruption or stoppage.

SEC. 3. When possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, or a majority of the employees of such plant or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval of the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

SEC. 6. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the "Conciliation Service") certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference

with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case. The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of said Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and said act of October 2, 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law.

(c) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be deemed by the Board material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

(d) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any persor within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

SEC. 7. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 203, Senate bill 885.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the motion, provided it is understood that the bill shall not come up for consideration by the Senate before 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that that is the understanding. The bill is not to be taken up today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 885.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that the total mobilization of all the Nation's resources is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, that keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively is essential to the successful prosecution of the war, and that it is the policy of the Nation to guarantee the production and distribution of the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively in order that such civilian population can produce and distribute what is required by our armed forces and allies to win the war. The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the Nation to mobilize the capacities and resources of all small business concerns in the production and distribution of goods and services for the civilian population.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the policies set forth above there is established in the Office for Emergency Management a Civilian Supply Administration. The Civilian Supply Administration shall be under the direction of a Civilian Supply Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year, and shall draw no compensation for personal services from any other source. The Administrator may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and may fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to—

(1) ascertain the quantities and types of goods and services (including but not limited to food, clothing, shelter, fuel, transportation, and medical care) necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively;

(2) ascertain the manpower, manufacturing facilities, materials, operating supplies, and other productive resources necessary to enable civilian industries, trades, and services to produce and distribute the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively;

(3) apply to the appropriate Government agencies which allocate resources for military, naval, export, and civilian purposes for the amounts and types of manpower, materials, facilities, transportation, and other resources determined by him to be essential to produce and distribute the necessary goods and services. The appropriate Government agencies shall allocate to civilian use the resources which they deem essential to produce and distribute the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively. In the event the Administrator is of the opinion that the resources allocated to civilian use by such Government agencies will not enable him to carry out the purposes of this act, he may apply to the Economic Stabilization Director or such other officer as the President may designate for such purposes. The Economic Stabilization Director or such other officer as may be designated, after conferring with the claimant agencies affected, may issue such directions as may be appropriate and any such directions or any modifications thereof shall be binding upon all other departments and agencies of the Government. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deny to any claimant agency asserting that its operations have been adversely affected the right to appeal to the President for a revision of any allocation of resources for military, naval, export or civilian purposes;

(4) assist the civilian population and civilian industries, trades, and services in making any adjustments rendered necessary by the war;

(5) assure to the consumer a fair and equitable distribution of materials and goods through the channels of trade and assist retail, wholesale, and service trades in the adjustment of operations to the amount of merchandise, equipment, operating supplies, and manpower available to them;

(6) subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, determine the need for rationing goods and services to the civilian population and when and where rationing shall be instituted. The Administrator shall direct the appropriate agencies to ration such goods and services as he deems necessary in the war interest;

(7) conserve the productive resources available for civilian production and distribution by reducing and eliminating nonessential uses of goods, services, and productive resources, and by stimulating utilization of adequate substitutes for goods of limited supply;

(8) cooperate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in attaining the most effective use of small business concerns in the production and distribution of essential civilian goods and services.

SEC. 3. The Federal departments and agencies which administer the national policy of economic stabilization and prevention of inflation shall, to the extent practicable, cooperate with the Administrator in achieving the production and distribution he deems necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively.

SEC. 4. The Administrator or his designated representative shall be a member of the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the interdepartmental advisory committees of all other Federal agencies, committees, or bodies which divide the productive resources for military, export, and civilian purposes.

SEC. 5. The Administrator is authorized to obtain such information as is necessary to perform his duties, and the Federal agencies and departments shall furnish such information (as has not been received in confidence) as the Administrator may need in the conduct of his duties.

SEC. 6. In order to keep the smaller business concerns in operation, the Government agencies which allocate resources for military, naval, export, and civilian purposes shall, wherever properly possible, allot to such concerns a larger proportion of their pre-war civilian business than is allotted to larger concerns or to concerns with more direct or indirect Government business.

SEC. 7. The Office of Civilian Supply established by General Administrative Order No. 17 of the War Production Board on March 3, 1942, and its records, and property and such of its personnel as may be required by the Administrator shall be transferred to the Civilian Supply Administration within 15 days from the effective date of this act. So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the Office of Civilian Supply as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Civilian Supply Administration for use in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred under this section. In determining the amounts to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include

amounts to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to such transfer.

SEC. 8. The Administrator is hereby authorized to appoint such advisory committees composed of representatives of governmental or private groups as he deems appropriate.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 9. The Administrator shall render a report to the President and to the Congress in January of each year, summarizing the activities of the Office in the calendar year just ended, together with such recommendations as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. He shall also make interim reports quarterly during each of the months of January, March, July, and October.

EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall expire 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Legislative Clerk read the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is understood that the nomination is to be passed over in order that minority views may be filed, which I understand will be done tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA TO THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. For the information of the Senate I wish to announce that arrangements have been made for the President of Bolivia to visit the Senate Chamber at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow. I am not certain whether he will deliver a short address. He probably will. I hope that as many Members of the Senate as possible will be present to greet the President of Bolivia.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

James P. Blaisdell to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco area office.

Stanley N. Bailey to be assistant area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office.

George Sidney Drysdale to be head manpower utilization consultant, at $6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

Lorentz E. Wormley to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Portland area office.

Edmund J. O'Boyle to be senior manpower utilization consultant in the Division of Manning Tables, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Walter Lee McDonald to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Toledo area office.

Orville W. Erringer to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office.

Orland V. Steele to be senior administrative officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Adjutant General's Department

Lt. Col. Winfield Chapple Scott

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel, Infantry, with rank from April 19, 1943

Earl Landreth

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Walter Leland Richards
Charles Roland Glenn
Philip Palmer Green
Claude DuVall Holmes
Francis Carrillo Tyng
William Stephen Culpepper
Hertel Philip Makel
Richard Henry Eanes
Henry Edgar Keely

To be major, Medical Corps

Francis Patrick Kintz

To be captains, Medical Corps

Fratis L. Duff
Leon Donald Beddow
Warren Jackson Barker

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

Chauncey Edmund Cook

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Edwin Joseph Sunderville

To be colonel, Chaplains

Albert Kingsbury Mathews

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

George R. Stallings	Alec M. Sim
Edward P. Dupras, Jr.	Howard C. Steffens
Edward J. Doyle	Dennis D. Nicholson, Jr.
Meade Whitaker	
Sherman W. Parry	Bernard J. Favaro
Robert H. C. Johnston	Joseph C. Fegan, Jr.
Philip R. Freeman	George E. Moore
William C. Esterline	Harold V. Warner
Richard H. Mickle	Gerald L. Eagleburger
George F. Vaughan	William D. Moody
James B. Peeso, Jr.	Martin M. Calcaterra
George H. Shackelford	John J. Jachym
Paul H. Bratten, Jr.	John D. Case
Winfield S. Haltom, Jr.	James C. Bradhurst
	Lyle S. Whitmore, Jr.
Royal E. North	Newton MacLeod
Anthony Caputo	Charles A. Chambers
Robert H. Lage	Robert E. Dawson
John F. Ross, Jr.	Edward R. Healy
Robert V. Ruhe	David Applebaum
Richard W. Akeley	Lowell T. Keagy
Alex W. Wall	Richard Harte, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Dorothy F. Seiferlein, Fraser.
Worthy M. Logan, Ottawa Lake.
J. Ralph Reeds, Scottville.

TENNESSEE

William J. Long, Bethel Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord God, as we walk the common ways of life, we are grateful that

our Father in heaven is a shield and defense in every time of need. O that we might be to others what Thou art to us. Reveal Thyself to those whose faith is limited by unwise teaching, to those who have never dared to let out their souls in trust to a trustworthy Saviour. We praise Thee that it is through a holy faith that we are joined to Thee and made strong to rise into that chamber in which the legislation of the soul is goodness and wisdom is supernal.

Do Thou establish Thy covenant with the young and aged, with those who have made the venture upon life and have turned from the faith of our fathers. Give us an increasing ambition for sterling manhood and not for the things which surround it; may it be ordained for strength and defense of human frailty. In the midst of doubt and infirmities, send back mortal spirits refreshed and ready for daily duty, enshrined in patriotic purposes and endeavors. Blessed Father of mercies, the sob of agony is wrenching the heart of the world. O teach us the lesson we are to learn from the unspeakable affliction which is goading the soul of man. Make us to kneel in ashes of humility, humble our pride in confession, forgive our self-indulgence, arm us with an overcoming faith, and incite all America to set the example of nobility, justice, and generosity. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees with an amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 5 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government" for the disposition of executive papers in the following Department and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Executive Office of the President.
3. Federal Security Agency.

THE LATE LT. GEN. FRANK M. ANDREWS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the death of Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews is not only a great loss to the Army of the United States and the cause of the United Nations, but it is the cause also of deep sorrow in my home town of Nashville and in all the State of Tennessee.

General Andrews was born on the banks of the Cumberland and in the very shadows of the Hermitage, home of Andrew Jackson. He came from a distinguished and fighting Tennessee family, and 37 years of his life were given in active and energetic service to the Army of the United States.

He was an enthusiastic advocate of air power in warfare and in the years preceding the present conflict often found himself in a distinct minority because of his emphatic position with reference to the importance of air warfare.

While the crash that ended his life and services to the Army did not occur in the thick of battle, it brought death in the line of duty as he would have desired it. Not so long ago, when cautioned by fellow officers against solo flying at the age of 59, General Andrews replied that he did not want to be "one of those generals who die in bed."

No higher tribute can be paid to any man than to say that he was a good soldier. General Andrews was in every sense a good soldier and a great general. In sorrow we salute him and in silence we mourn his loss as a national tragedy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a communication from the Missoula County Old Age Pension Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

A THIRD WAR

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a statement taken from Raymond Clapper's column of March 18, 1943, entitled "A Third War," from which I quote the following:

> When I find that Justice Roberts of the United States Supreme Court thinks it necessary that the United States take the lead in securing order in the world, that carries a good deal of weight with me. Justice Roberts can have no ax to grind.
>
> He is safe for life on the Supreme Court. What Justice Roberts says carries weight with me because I know he could be no crackpot, having been a conservative Republican, a corporation lawyer in Philadelphia, and because since Herbert Hoover appointed him to the Supreme Court his life work has been the study and protection of the American Constitution. I know as everybody in Washington knows that Justice Roberts is one man who is not inclined to gamble or play carelessly with American institutions. We do not know what the Senate will permit the country to do toward joining with other nations. The Senate is trying to make up its mind. That makes this the most critical hour since we waited in 1940 to know if Britain would stand or whether we would have to face the whole Nazi world alone.
>
> So I offer Justice Roberts as a witness.
>
> Will the Senators give some weight to his views before they take the irreparable step of refusing to permit America to join other nations?

COAL-MINE DISPUTE

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we may be bombed out of this war by the Axis before we are through, but God forbid that we should be bombed out of it by John L. Lewis. Each passing day and every event proclaims the fact that the Congress of the United States cannot avoid its responsibility in this matter. Governmental decrees are unavailing. Mr. Lewis must be overtaken. The people of this country are disgusted with maneuvering which always results in the increase of Lewis' arrogance.

We are told that the coal-mine dispute has been certified to the War Labor Board. If in the meantime Mr. Lewis is to be permitted to negotiate with the Government or any of its officials, or if the operators are ordered to resume negotiations with him, I venture to say that the people of this country will have no difficulty in recognizing the whole affair as a sham. The effrontery of Lewis is not surprising, but the methods employed to stop him are utterly amazing. Mark it, the people are not going to be defeated in such a fashion.

We should for once and for all time put an end to the stoppage of war industry. Behind all of this is a prairie fire of inflation. We are not going to succeed by governmental seizure of plants. The administration has never missed a chance to punish lagging employers. If they are contrary, the Government takes over their property. If employees are indifferent and unmindful of their obligations, the Government seizes the employer's property. Each day proves how ridiculous this is.

We cannot afford to trifle with this situation any longer. I am mindful of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the House has passed legislation to make impossible such a condition of affairs. Nevertheless, we must try again; our duty is plain. Millions now in the armed services are inarticulate—it is our duty to speak for them.

Testing time is here—indeed, it has been with us for a long time. Perhaps I should say opportunity comes again. Shall we prove ourselves to be lions in zebra skins?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery before the New York Electrical Society and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers on Shipbuilding in World War No. 2. The article will take about three and a half pages of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an appeal for the passage of anti-poll-tax legislation issued by the United Christian Council for Democracy and signed by 476 religious leaders in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by Kingsbury Smith entitled "Our Plan for a Post-War Germany" and also an article by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, and I would also like to include in the unanimous-consent request that these articles appear in the order I have named in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by The Assistant Secretary of the Navy before the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on April 5, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

GUADALCANAL LETTER

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, on March 8, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from an Army first lieutenant on Guadalcanal describing a soldier's life on the island and pleading with the folks back home to forego amusements and send the boys guns and planes.

The Associated Press picked the letter from the RECORD and gave it widespread publicity. Its authenticity was immediately questioned in a newspaper column in my own district. I satisfied the columnist in question and the matter was dropped.

The Guadalcanal letter continued to receive widespread publicity, however. It was set in type and distributed in pay envelopes of defense factories; it was carried in the wallets of hundreds of people who felt its message keenly.

Now, just recently the letter again appeared in the columns of the Philadelphia Record as having been sent to the head of a large manufacturer in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia newspaper contacted me because again its authenticity was questioned. I made it possible for them to verify its origin.

In the past I have directed questioners to my own source of information—one of my own constituents—and the uncle of the first lieutenant involved. Now, however, it is my privilege to insert into the RECORD the correct name of the writer of the letter. He is First Lt. Richard G. Wattles, son of Col. and Mrs. W. P. Wattles, of Wynnewood, Pa. His parents now have no objection to his being identified by name.

Lieutenant Wattles wrote in his letter that his 18-year-old brother, a marine, had spent 5 months on Guadalcanal and was "an old man." The marine brother is Pvt. Lawrence B. Wattles.

I hope that the identity of these two boys, normal young Americans who are doing the actual fighting while so many of the rest of us spend our time in pointless bickering and self-seeking, will silence those critics who suspected that the letter was propaganda.

I hope Lieutenant Wattles' letter will be given further publicity. I hope its message will be read in every home in the land.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the heroes of the Guadalcanal Zone and to include quotations from a letter of Dr. Hagen, of the Fargo Clinic; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions of the 32 local labor unions of North Dakota in support of the war effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY BILL

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct a question to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. As I understand, it is proposed to take up today the conference report on the overtime pay bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. Do I correctly understand that the same report is being submitted that was rejected by the House prior to the recess?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is it identical in every respect?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. It is a question of voting again on the same thing.

Mr. RIZLEY. On the identical report?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. As I recall, after the bill passed the House certain increases were made in the Senate in the amount of overtime in the higher brackets on the basic-pay rate. Is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Also in the lower brackets. The Senate bill gave more to the lower brackets and took off the $5,000 ceiling, although we still have a ceiling of $2,900 on everybody's salary. Nobody gets any extra pay for any part of his salary over $2,900. However, the Senate put in a minimum provision of $300, which also increased the cost.

Mr. RIZLEY. Has there been any conference with the Senate since the House sent the matter back to the conferees for further investigation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There has not, because a motion to reconsider was entered the next day.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that a majority of the membership of this House would today reverse the position that they took when this identical conference report was before the House about 2 weeks ago.

According to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who is in charge of this bill, he has returned to the House for approval the same identical report that was rejected by the House some 2 weeks ago. As stated by the gentleman from Georgia, no further conference was had or attempted with the Senate conferees, as under the parliamentary situation a motion to reconsider was entered the following day after the rejection of the conference report on a roll-call vote by the House.

The President vetoed the Bankhead bill a few weeks ago, basing the veto primarily, as he claimed, upon the fact that the slight increase in agricultural products only three items of which would have been affected by the bill, namely, wheat, cotton, and sugar, would lead to uncontrolled inflation. As a matter of fact, the slight increase that would have resulted from the Bankhead bill on farm commodities would have been much less than the additional increase in salaries of Federal employees provided for in this bill. It is admitted by the proponents that with the present number of persons on the Federal pay roll that the increase provided for in this bill will amount to approximately $700,000,000. With additional persons going to work daily, it is fair to assume that the increase will shortly amount to a billion dollars in increased salaries.

If paying the farmers less than one-half of a billion dollars in increased prices would cause inflation, who is there to say that an additional billion dollars paid to Federal employees would not be inflationary?

Right now at this very moment the Chief Executive and John L. Lewis are in the throes of a conflict which threatened, and still threatens, our country's very existence in these trying times of war. It has been said repeatedly on the floor of this House within the past few days that the action of John L. Lewis in attempting to obtain a $2-a-day increase for those who mine coal and ordering a strike if they do not get the wage increase is little less than treason. As a matter of fact, the increases in this pay bill amount to almost as much as involved in the pay raise bill for the miners.

Next to the war, the threat of bureaucracy to our country is perhaps the greatest menace confronting us. Many of these bureaucrats whom we lambast from the floor of this House from day to day are drawing salaries ranging from $3,200 to $10,000, and what do we propose to do to curb them? By this bill we increase their salaries. Not only do we increase the base rate pay of their salaries but we propose to pay them overtime in addition thereto.

All of us are in sympathy with those on the Federal pay roll in the smaller brackets who are entitled to an increase in pay because of the high increased cost of living but under this bill the sky is the limit. And instead of doing what we ought to do—raise the wages of those in the lower brackets, giving them a decent wage and stop this policy of time and one-half for overtime—we are confronted by this bill which reaches into the higher pay rolls, increases the salaries of those already being paid high salaries, and in addition thereto, pay them overtime.

Under the rule by which we are to reconsider this conference report we are precluded from debate. We cannot even ask questions. Hence I have taken this time to express my views so that my position in this matter will be known to everyone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the leading editorial from the Herald Tribune today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced two bills and a resolution, all of which have to do with the creation of a department of industry. I have felt for some years that industry should be dignified by representation in the Cabinet of the United States. The need for this post is especially acute now because of the friction that exists in the many agencies having to do with the activities of industry in the present emergency—a friction which hampers, if not wholly wastes, the energies and the accomplishments of those agencies.

Congress is constantly passing bills affecting industry. When those bills come to the President for consideration there is no Cabinet officer charged with the particular duty of presenting industry's viewpoint before the President takes action upon them. This situation is disadvantageous to the President, to industry, and, indeed, to our entire country.

It is not the intention of the resolution and the two bills to place a dictator over industry. The secretary of industry should act as an empowered agent for industry in the Government. There will be no conflict or duplication of authority, either with the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce. The purpose of the office would be for the compromise of any misunderstanding.

The post of secretary of industry would require a man of outstanding ability, sound judgment, and great courage. It is fortunate that there are a number of available men eminently qualified to serve in the President's Cabinet. I have in mind such men as Bernard Baruch; John A. Coleman, president of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange; Frank Gannett, newspaper publisher; Thomas Girdler, president of Republic Steel; Basil Harris, president of the United States Lines; Frederick E. Hasler, president of the New York State Chamber of Commerce; William Jeffers, Rubber Czar; Eric Johnson, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Henry J. Kaiser, shipbuilder extraordinary; Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board; and Frederick Williamson, president of the New York Central Railroad.

I have not set up the jurisdiction of the department because I believe that the Judiciary Committee could make a better study of this matter than could any one Member of the House. I hope that the committee will shortly present to the House legislation along the lines which I have suggested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the tax bill and include therein a number of letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Governor Cooper, of Tennessee, on the question of discriminatory freight rates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on the Rural Electrification Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY BILL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am directing your attention to the vote that will be taken on the overtime bill today. The vote will be taken without any chance for debate or discussion. It is my contention that the report should be sent back to the conference committee for revision.

I think the Members of the House are in favor of increased pay for overtime and want to see to it that the lower-salaried groups receive fair and adequate compensation. There is little disagreement about that, but this bill not only provides for continuing the increased payment for overtime but it also allows, among other things, increases for all employees, even those receiving more than $5,000 per year. The former legislation put a ceiling at $5,000. In the conference report the sky is the limit.

I still think we ought to let the bill go back to the conference committee and let it put a limit of at least five thousand or fifty-five hundred.

I think we ought to realize that the additional payments to thousands of employees receiving $5,000 or more will amount to about $20,000,000. I cannot believe the taxpayers of this country want us to do it. So I suggest that you turn the conference report down. Let us take it back to the committee and let it return to the floor with a reasonable ceiling and save the $20,000,000 in place of paying most of it to newly appointed individuals, most of whom are in the new agencies and bureaus and are now getting from $5,000 to $10,000 a year. I think the bureaucrats are pretty well paid and we ought not to increase it more.

Again let me say I am in favor of continuing the overtime pay and for increases in the lower-salaried groups, but I do not favor increases to individuals who are now adequately compensated.

Mr. Speaker, one thing more. A great deal has been said about wage ceilings. Here is a case where, if you support the conference report, you lift the ceiling for high-salaried Government employees to the tune of $20,000,000.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY BILL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, when the overtime pay bill came before the House in the first instance I voted for it. It contained a limitation that overtime pay or an increase in pay would not apply to anyone receiving a salary of $5,000 a year or more. I favored an increase in pay for Government employees in the lower brackets and still do. The bill went to another body and came back with the provision that it would apply to anybody receiving a salary up to $10,000 a year. I voted against that provision and report and it was defeated in the House. Now the matter comes back to us again today with a limitation, as I understand, of $8,000. I cannot accept it and shall vote against it. There is no justification for increasing the pay of those in the higher brackets. Let us send this report back to the conferees for further consideration letting the country know that the House of Representatives stands for reasonable pay increases to those in the lower-income brackets.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The situation is this. The heads of agencies and departments do not participate in any extra pay. There is a ceiling on the amount of salary which shall participate in extra pay of $2,900, which applies to everybody, but there is no ceiling otherwise. In other words, a man who makes $6,000, $8,000, $9,000, or $10,000 would still get his extra pay on $2,900.

Mr. DONDERO. But not on any other part of his salary? However, he would still receive an increase in his salary.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis is demanding $2 a day increase for 650,000 miners or they will quit mining and do something else. Some people are calling that treason. Today we are to vote on a bill that is to give $2 a day extra to employees who average in pay more than the miners are getting—18,000 of them getting over $5,000 a year. We cannot claim that it is because this highly paid group need it. The argument is that if they do not get the increase they will quit their jobs and do some other kind of work. That is not being called treason. I do not know what to call it, but it seems to me it is bad statesmanship to do this now. I hope that we vote down this conference report. Then the conferees can cut this bill down to the group that really needs an increase. How can we hold the line against inflation, when we ourselves increase the pay of thousands of well-paid job holders.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular business tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PAY BILL

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do this to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] whether this increase in pay applies to Congressmen?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What provision is there in the bill which will guarantee to this Congress that the $2,900 proposition does not apply to Congressmen?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman will read the conference report, he will see that it specifically states that it does not apply to elected officers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. They are exempted?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; nor does it apply to department heads.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wanted to make sure about that point and have it appear in the RECORD.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, on this payroll bill, which is coming up, there is just one issue, and that is whether or not we give a raise to men now receiving $5,000 a year. We definitely voted it down some 2 weeks ago, and the circumstances have not changed since that time. No new arguments have been introduced and no new reason for a change in the vote has been given. The only thing that could possibly be considered as an argument are the thousands of telegrams which have come in here in the last few days. I hope the conference report will be returned to the conference committee, following the recent House action.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have been advised that we are going to have brought up before us if, in a parliamentary way, it is possible, an opportunity to eat dirt on the vote that we took a couple of weeks ago, and thereby hand an increase in pay to that group who draw salaries of between $5,000 and $10,000 a year. For my own part I do not propose to eat dirt, and I hope that the House of Representatives does not propose to eat dirt.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT—PERMISSION TO FILE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a committee report upon the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PAY BILL

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few observations regarding the salary increase bill. In my opinion the Senate amendments raise the salary level to an increase of $1,000,000,000 a year. The farm parity bill is fresh in our minds. This bill passed both branches of Congress and it was calculated that it would increase farm parity to an amount also of $1,000,000,000. This bill was vetoed by the President as being inflationary. How can we with good conscience support this measure in the face of an increase of $1,000,000,000 when we well know that this sum would bring farm labor up to parity. I hold in my hand a release by the American Federation of Labor quoting George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., as asking for a slash in the cost of food. Those of us from the agriculture sections know that the farmer is not receiving the benefits of these high prices. When cabbage is worth $12.50 a ton in the Rio Grande Valley and sells for 25 cents a pound or $500 a ton in New York, the profits are being made by the transportation companies and the various labor organizations who handle these products and the mercantile world. I am told by one of my colleagues that a cooperative canning concern, I believe it is located in Kansas, paid $36,000 more for the cans the food went in than the farmer received for the vegetables and products that went into the cans. Just before we recessed we refused to concur in the Senate amendments and I can see no reason why we should reverse our decision of that date. I am not excited over the letter I read into the RECORD yesterday from Mr. Ira E. Zimmerman, national vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees. I think the sooner we refuse to let Government employees join labor unions and let them fill all jobs for the benefit of all the people the better off the whole country will be. When less than one-eighth of the entire citizenship of the United States is a member of organized labor, the seven-eighths majority should not have to bow to any minority group who are apparently in the saddle. Yesterday we forgave $10,000,000,000 by the passage of

a tax bill. If we concur with these Senate amendments of this bill we will increase our obligation one additional billion. And the man who feeds the world—the farmer—is the man who will suffer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PEOPLE OR THE EXTORTIONISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the day before from the Well of the House considerable was said about John L. Lewis and his coal strike. I call attention of Members to page 3883 of the RECORD of May 3, 1943, where a Member of the other body inserted a statement showing what is going on in Missouri. It seems that Brother Ickes is charged with the construction of a pipe line across the Mississippi. That pipe line would carry 250,000 barrels of high-octane gas per 1 day and more than 300,000 barrels of fuel oil. The people in the North who were worrying last winter about not having enough fuel oil might look into this situation and take constructive action.

If the press reports are correct, Secretary Ickes joined Under Secretary Patterson in charging that Jeffers, Rubber Administrator, by his program had prevented the production of high octane needed by the armed forces. That report, upon investigation by the Truman committee, was shown to be unfounded, but from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday it appears that union organizers, whose sole demand is for union dues, are holding up the construction of a pipe line needed for the transportation of high-octane gas and crude oil. They are doing it by violence, having already sent two men, whose only offense was that they refused to pay tribute to the A. F. of L., to a hospital. This pipe line is being constructed under the general supervision of the War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation, one of Jesse Jones' defense plant corporations and a branch of the R. F. C. Here is a strike directed against the United States Government, against the armed forces.

Just how much longer will Secretary Ickes, who has always the reputation of being courageous and honest, stand for this defiance issued by Buck Newell, business agent, of the A. F. of L.'s H. E. U. of St. Louis, Mo.

Buck Newell, you may recall, is the notorious racketeer who practices his trade of extortion in St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity. Who wins, Buck Newell or honest Harold? The gangsters and racketeers or the people who want oil?

Must the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces wait for needed gas until Buck gets his cut?

WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, when the salary increase bill for post-office employees was under consideration I appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to make a plea in their behalf. I am just as anxious as any Member of this House to help the employees of the Federal Government who come in the lower-income brackets, who can hardly exist, with the high prices they have to pay, let alone live, especially in Washington, but I cannot under any circumstances bring myself around to the point where I am going to vote this increase to any bureaucrat who is receiving $5,000 a year or more.

I hope the membership of this House will have the same courage it had before and turn down this conference report when it comes back to the House.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does the gentleman realize that he voted to give a postal supervisor who makes $4,900 a year an increase of $1,133 per year?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is perfectly true, but there were not 18,000 bureaucrats in the Postal Service receiving $5,000 a year or more. These postal supervisors have attained their positions through long years of hard and meritorious service to the people of this country.

The only condition under which I will vote for this conference report is when it is amended so it will not give this increase to those who do not deserve it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, when this pay increase bill came before the House it was under suspension of the rules, was it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. With 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And so was the postal employees' bill for which the gentleman voted.

Mr. KEEFE. I voted for the post-offices pay increase bill, and I voted against suspending the rules and passing this bill. I am of exactly the same opinion today that I was when I cast that vote. I cannot face my people back home and admit that I voted for an increase of pay to thousands of Federal employees who, by increase of grade under civil-service status have received one or two or three or more pay increases during the past year, through reclassification. Now, you did not tell this Congress or the public how many thousands there were who fall in that classification. The plea is made that we must have this legislation to take care of the increased cost of living. Thousands of them have already had their pay increased three or four times by reclassification.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House in its wisdom will reverse its decision of a few days ago in connection with the conference report on the pay increase bill. I say this because I think it is a wrong basis for any of us to consider a man a bureaucrat because he happens to make more than $5,000 a year. A bureaucrat could be a bureaucrat and make $2,900 a year. The degree does not matter. Motive, purpose, or character cannot be based accurately on whether an employee receives below or above $5,000 a year. Equal treatment under the law is incorporated in this legislation. I simply believe that today when you have given to a postal supervisor a raise of $1,133 a year on his $4,900 salary, this House should be willing to give a man making more than $5,000 an increase for the duration of the war only, of approximately $620. Remember, there were but four votes in this House against the pay increase for postal employees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXPANSION OF FACILITIES FOR HOSPITALIZATION OF DEPENDENTS OF NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1936) to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after "and", insert "in emergencies."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please explain the amendment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Senate amendment is restrictive in character. As the bill passed the House it permitted, outside of the continental limits of the United States, hospitalization to be granted to officers and employees of any department or agency of the Federal Government, to employees of a contractor with the United States or his subcontractor, and to the dependents of such persons, and to such other persons as the Secretary may prescribe. The Senate has inserted "in emergencies" and therefore it is restrictive in character as to the people to whom it shall apply, outside of the United States.

The Committee on Naval Affairs has authorized me to present to the House the acceptance of the Senate amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR OVERTIME PAY ACT OF 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule 18, I call up for consideration the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Was the motion to reconsider made by one of those who was in the majority upon that question?

The SPEAKER. It was. It was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not stated the motion yet.

The question is: Will the House reconsider the vote whereby the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes, was rejected?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to lay the motion on the table.

The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—yeas 62, nays 90.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present and make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 266, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—130

Andersen, H. Carl	Barrett	Bolton
Andresen, August H.	Bates, Mass.	Boren
Angell	Bennett, Mich.	Brehm
Arends	Bennett, Mo.	Brown, Ga.
	Bishop	Brown, Ohio
	Blackney	Buffett
Burgin	Hoffman	O'Hara
Busbey	Horan	O'Neal
Camp	Hull	Ploeser
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Poulson
Carson, Ohio	Jensen	Rankin
Carter	Johnson,	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Anton J.	Rizley
Church	Johnson, Ward	Rockwell
Clevenger	Jones	Rohrbough
Compton	Jonkman	Rowe
Cox	Judd	Russell
Crawford	Keefe	Schiffler
Curtis	Kefauver	Schwabe
Dewey	Kinzer	Short
Disney	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Ditter	Lambertson	Springer
Dondero	Landis	Stanley
Dworshak	Lea	Stefan
Ellis	LeCompte	Stewart
Elmer	Lewis, Ohio	Sumner, Ill.
Engel	Luce	Taber
Folger	McGregor	Talbot
Fulmer	McLean	Talle
Gale	McWilliams	Tarver
Gilchrist	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Gillie	Martin, Mass.	Vincent, Ky.
Gore	Mason	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Vursell
Griffiths	Miller, Conn.	Weichel, Ohio
Gross	Miller, Mo.	West
Gwynne	Miller, Nebr.	Wheat
Halleck	Mills	Whitten
Hancock	Monkiewicz	Whittington
Hare	Monroney	Wickersham
Heidinger	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Herter	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson
Hill	Murray, Wis.	Winter
Hinshaw	Nichols	
Hobbs	Norrell	

NAYS—266

Abernethy	Drewry	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Eaton	J. Leroy
Anderson, Calif.	Eberharter	Johnson,
Anderson, N. Mex.	Elliott	Luther A.
Andrews	Ellison, Md.	Johnson,
Arnold	Elston, Ohio	Lyndon B.
Auchincloss	Englebright	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fay	Kean
Barden	Feighan	Kearney
Barry	Fellows	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Fenton	Kelley
Beall	Fernandez	Kennedy
Beckworth	Fitzpatrick	Keogh
Bell	Flannagan	Kerr
Bender	Fogarty	Kilburn
Bland	Forand	Kilday
Bloom	Ford	King
Bonner	Fulbright	Kirwan
Boykin	Gallagher	Klein
Bradley, Mich.	Gamble	Kunkel
Bradley, Pa.	Gathings	LaFollette
Brooks	Gavagan	Lane
Bryson	Gavin	Larcade
Buckley	Gerlach	LeFevre
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Lesinski
Burchill, N. Y.	Gillette	Ludlow
Burdick	Goodwin	Lynch
Butler	Gordon	McCord
Byrne	Gorski	McCormack
Canfield	Graham	McCowen
Cannon, Fla.	Granger	McGranery
Capozzoli	Grant, Ala.	McKenzie
Celler	Green	McMillan
Chapman	Gregory	McMurray
Chenoweth	Hale	Maas
Clark	Hall,	Madden
Clason	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Coffee	Hall,	Maloney
Colmer	Leonard W.	Manasco
Cole, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield,
Cole, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Mont.
Cooley	Harris, Ark.	Mansfield, Tex.
Cooper	Harris, Va.	Marcantonio
Costello	Hart	May
Courtney	Hartley	Merritt
Cravens	Hays	Merrow
Crosser	Hébert	Miller, Pa.
Cullen	Heffernan	Morrison, La.
Cunningham	Hendricks	Morrison, N. C.
Curley	Hess	Mott
D'Alesandro	Hoch	Mruk
Davis	Hoeven	Murdock
Dawson	Holifield	Murphy
Day	Holmes, Mass.	Myers
Delaney	Holmes, Wash.	Newsome
Dickstein	Hope	Norman
Dliweg	Howell	Norton
Dingell	Izac	O'Brien, Ill.
Domengeaux	Jarman	O'Brien, Mich.
Doughton	Jeffrey	O'Brien, N. Y.
Douglas	Jennings	O'Connor
O'Leary	Rogers, Mass.	Summers, Tex.
O'Toole	Rolph	Sundstrom
Outland	Rowan	Thomas, Tex.
Pace	Sadowski	Thomason
Patman	Sasscer	Tibbott
Peterson, Fla.	Satterfield	Tolan
Peterson, Ga.	Sauthoff	Towe
Pfeifer	Scanlon	Treadway
Philbin	Schuetz	Troutman
Pittenger	Scott	Van Zandt
Plumley	Shafer	Vinson, Ga.
Poage	Sheppard	Voorhis, Calif.
Powers	Sheridan	Walter
Pracht	Sikes	Ward
Price	Simpson, Pa.	Wasielewski
Priest	Slaughter	Weaver
Rabaut	Smith, Maine	Welch
Ramey	Smith, Va.	Wene
Ramspeck	Smith, W. Va.	Whelchel, Ga.
Randolph	Smith, Wis.	Willey
Reece, Tenn.	Somers, N. Y.	Winstead
Reed, Ill.	Sparkman	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wolfenden, Pa.
Richards	Starnes, Ala.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rivers	Steagall	Woodruff, Mich.
Robertson	Steerns, N. H.	Woodrum, Va.
Robinson, Utah	Stevenson	Wright
Robsion, Ky.	Stockman	Zimmerman
Rodgers, Pa.	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—37

Baldwin, Md.	Furlong	Magnuson
Burch, Va.	Gearhart	O'Konski
Carlson, Kans.	Gibson	Patton
Case	Gossett	Phillips
Cochran	Guyer	Rogers, Calif.
Colmer	Hagen	Sabath
Creal	Jackson	Simpson, Ill.
Culkin	Johnson,	Snyder
Dies	Calvin D.	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Kleberg	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	Lanham	White
Fish	Lemke	Worley
Fisher	McGehee	

So the motion to table was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. HARE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MAHON, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. HOLMES changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 169, noes 82.

So the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 275, nays 119, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—275

Abernethy	Andersen,	Arnold
Allen, Ill.	N. Mex.	Auchincloss
Allen, La.	Andrews	Baldwin, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Angell	Barden

Barry	Harless, Ariz.	Patton
Bates, Ky.	Harris, Ark.	Peterson, Fla.
Beall	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Ga.
Beckworth	Hart	Pfeifer
Bender	Hartley	Philbin
Blackney	Hays	Pittenger
Bland	Hébert	Plumley
Bloom	Heffernan	Poage
Bolton	Hendricks	Powers
Bonner	Hess	Pracht
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Price
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	Priest
Brooks	Holifield	Rabaut
Bryson	Holmes, Mass.	Ramey
Buckley	Hope	Ramspeck
Bulwinkle	Howell	Randolph
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Jeffrey	Reed, N. Y.
Byrne	Jennings	Richards
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson,	Robertson
Cannon, Mo.	J. Leroy	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Johnson,	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Luther A.	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Johnson,	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Lyndon B.	Rolph
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Clason	Kean	Sabath
Cole, Mo.	Kearney	Sadowski
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Sasscer
Compton	Kelly	Satterfield
Cooley	Kennedy	Sauthoff
Cooper	Keogh	Scanlon
Costello	Kerr	Schiffler
Courtney	Kilburn	Schuetz
Cravens	Kilday	Scott
Crosser	King	Shafer
Cullen	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cunningham	Klein	Sheridan
Curley	LaFollette	Sikes
D'Alesandro	Lambertson	Simpson, Pa.
Davis	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dawson	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Day	Lea	Smith, W. Va.
Delaney	LeFevre	Smith, Wis.
Dickstein	Lesinski	Snyder
Dilweg	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Ludlow	Sparkman
Domengeaux	Lynch	Spence
Doughton	McCord	Stanley
Douglas	McCormack	Starnes, Ala.
Drewry	McCowen	Steagall
Durham	McGranery	Stearns, N. H.
Eaton	McKenzie	Stevenson
Eberharter	McMillan	Sullivan
Elliott	McMurray	Sumners, Tex.
Ellison, Md.	McWilliams	Sundstrom
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Talbot
Englebright	Madden	Taylor
Fay	Maloney	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Manasco	Thomason
Fenton	Mansfield,	Tibbott
Fernandez	Mont.	Tolan
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Treadway
Fogarty	Martin, Mass.	Troutman
Forand	May	Van Zandt
Ford	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Fulbright	Merrow	Voorhis, Calif.
Gallagher	Miller, Conn.	Walter
Gamble	Miller, Pa.	Ward
Gavagan	Monkiewicz	Wasielewski
Gavin	Morrison, La.	Weaver
Gerlach	Morrison, N. C.	Weiss
Gillette	Mott	Welch
Goodwin	Mruk	Wene
Gordon	Murdock	Whelchel, Ga.
Gorski	Murphy	Willey
Graham	Myers	Wilson
Granger	Newsome	Winstead
Grant, Ala.	Norman	Wolcott
Green	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Griffiths	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.
Hale	O'Connor	Wright
Hall,	O'Leary	Zimmerman
Edwin Arthur	O'Toole	
Hall,	Outland	
Leonard W.	Patman	

NAYS—119

Andersen,	Buffett	Dewey
H. Carl	Burgin	Disney
Arends	Bushey	Ditter
Barrett	Camp	Dondero
Bates, Mass.	Carson, Ohio	Dworshak
Bennett, Mich.	Carter	Ellis
Bennett, Mo.	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bishop	Church	Elmer
Boren	Clevenger	Engel
Buchm	Cox	Fellows
Brown, Ga.	Crawford	Folger
Brown, Ohio	Curtis	Fulmer
Gale	Judd	Rees, Kans.
Gathings	Keefe	Rizley
Gifford	Kefauver	Rockwell
Gilchrist	Kinzer	Rohrbough
Gillie	Knutson	Rowe
Gore	Kunkel	Russell
Gossett	Landis	Schwabe
Grant, Ind.	LeCompte	Short
Gwynne	Lewis	Smith, Ohio
Halleck	McGregor	Springer
Hancock	McLean	Stefan
Hare	Mahon	Stewart
Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Stockman
Herter	Mason	Sumner, Ill.
Hill	Michener	Taber
Hobbs	Miller, Mo.	Talle
Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.	Tarver
Hoffman	Mills	Vincent, Ky.
Holmes, Wash.	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Horan	Mundt	Vursell
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Weichel, Ohio
Jenkins	Murray, Wis.	West
Jensen	Nichols	Wheat
Johnson,	Norrell	Whitten
Anton J.	O'Hara	Whittington
Johnson,	O'Neal	Wickersham
Calvin D.	Ploeser	Wigglesworth
Johnson, Ward	Poulson	Winter
Jonkman	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—40

Andresen,	Dirksen	McGehee
August H.	Fish	Magnuson
Baldwin, Md.	Fisher	O'Konski
Bell	Furlong	Pace
Boykin	Gearhart	Phillips
Burch, Va.	Gibson	Rogers, Calif.
Carlson, Kans.	Guyer	Simpson, Ill.
Case	Hagen	Slaughter
Cochran	Heidinger	Thomas, N. J.
Coffee	Jackson	Wadsworth
Colmer	Jones	White
Creal	Kleberg	Worley
Culkin	Lanham	
Dies	Lemke	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Creal with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Heidinger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Col. Robert Wood Johnson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, on the role of big business in saving small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include in one an address by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the American Business Congress on the subject Antitrust Policy During the War; in another to include an address by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, delivered at the University of Virginia on the subject The Government and the War, and in the last to include an address by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on the occasion of the presentation of the Four Freedoms Annual Award by the Italian-American Labor Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]?

There was no objection.

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. ENRIQUE PENARANDA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA, TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Bolivia, will be received by the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 6, 1943, at 12:45 o'clock and will address the House of Representatives at that time. The President of Bolivia will be accompanied by His Excellency, Dr. Tomas Manuel Elio, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bolivia; His Excellency, Gen. David Toro, former President of Bolivia; His Excellency, Señor Don Enrique Finot, Bolivian Ambassador to Mexico; His Excellency, Señor Dr. Gabriel Gonsalvez, Ambassador; Gen. Felipe M. Rivera, Minister Plenipotentiary; The Honorable Señor Don Jorge del Castillo, Minister Plenipotentiary, Secretary of the Presidency; The Honorable Señor Don Jorge de la Barra, Minister Plenipotentiary, Director of Protocol; His Excellency Señor Don Luis Fernando Guachalla, Ambassador of Bolivia; The Honorable Pierre de L. Boal, American Ambassador to Bolivia; Brig. Gen. James H. Walker, United States Army, Military Aide; Capt. Albert E. Schrader, United States Navy, Naval Aide.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the gentleman give us the program for the balance of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On tomorrow we will take up the conference report on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill. It is my understanding that general debate on the reciprocal trade agreement matter will start on Monday next. Yesterday I stated it would start

Friday. I am glad my friend asked the question so that I may advise the House that general debate on that matter will start Monday. I anticipate there will be 2 days general debate. In any event I hope that general debate will start on Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. What else will come up this week besides the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nothing else this week except what might be considered by unanimous consent, and I have no knowledge of any matter that might be brought up by unanimous consent at this time. There will be nothing, so far as I know, except the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office bill.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time tomorrow, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 115, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5, and consider that at this time.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 5, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

"War Training Service: Pay at a rate of $50 per month from and after December 15, 1942, to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein, while undergoing training under supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service and during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses), fiscal year 1943, $3,500,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that this bill will now take care of approximately 11,000 inactive reservists who are undergoing training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and who have not participated in the pay that is given to the regular reservists in active service?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. Both the House and the Senate versions provide for a nominal salary of $50 a month. The difference between the House and the Senate is largely a matter of verbiage. Both the House and Senate provisions take care of the situation as the gentleman indicates.

Mr. STEFAN. This takes care of approximately 11,000 hardship cases of inactive reservists who are unable to pass the physical examination or are on the borderline, a situation about which there has been considerable complaint?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It remedies effectively a situation which has been in need of adjustment for some time.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the testimony correctly and the testimony before Senator McCARRAN'S committee, the point is not that these men are physically incapacitated; the fact is that these men were told they would go right through and get their flight training and then qualify for instructorships. They are not capable of taking combat training. But these men have not been able to finish their course on time. Meanwhile, they have been held in abeyance after giving up their businesses and going away from home, and have received no pay whatever.

Mr. STEFAN. I sympathize with the gentleman because I have been fighting for some relief for these men, but I think the gentleman is mistaken. I want to be put straight on it if I am wrong. These men were put on inactive service since they were unable to qualify physically, or, in some cases, they were over age, or other things occurred by reason of which they could not go into combat service; but they were taking more intensive training than the regular active reservists. They were not receiving $50 a month pay. At one time they were forced to pay their own transportation to the point of training. I understand there are 11,500 of these men. The Army needs them very badly because they are going to do unusually fine work. They wear C. C. C. uniforms, while the regular reservists on active service have regular uniforms.

I think this is a very meritorious bill, and I compliment the committee for eliminating the hardships for these men who have been performing wonderful work.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am wholeheartedly in favor of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These are men who for various reasons are unable to qualify for combat training. They took this training without pay, without even being allowed transportation expenses. All they received was subsistence. The fact that they did not complete training within 11 months, as expected, was due to the lack of equipment. We did not have training planes enough at the time. The delay is due to no fault of their own. It seems only right that we should make provision for this small salary of $50 per month while they are waiting between courses.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it not also true that men who have taken the similar course in the Navy have been paid right along?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; in the same camps, side by side with them, Navy men are receiving $75 per month.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it retroactive to any certain date?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is retroactive to December 15.

Mr. STEFAN. Of last year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. December 15, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 5.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the language of the Senate amendment is much more involved than that which we sent over there. It would mean something different, perhaps, from what is intended if it operated beyond July 1. However, in view of the fact that this is an appropriation entirely for the fiscal year 1943 and that no construction can be placed upon it in the meantime that would cover more ground than is intended, I am not going to oppose it. It is an item that we shall have to watch as other measures come along, if they do, for an effective date after July 1. Until that time, however, I can see no particular objection to the language we have before us.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained, this amendment provides pay at the rate of $50 per month to Army Air Corps enlisted reservists in inactive status while they are taking training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration and while waiting between courses—but not to exceed a period of pay status of 2 months between any two courses. The total involved between December 15, 1942, and June 30, 1943 is $3,500,000. The original Senate language was confusing and took in a wider scope than was intended. The House amendment was specific and accurate in its intent. The Senate amendment to the House amendment accomplishes the purpose the House sought but could be interpreted to go further and would have wider application. However, the information from the Department of Commerce is that the language adopted by the Senate will have the same effect as that sought by the House except that it applies also to civilians who are not in the Army Reserve, either active or inactive, who might take this training. Since there are none of this latter class and will be none, at least prior to July 1, when these funds expire, there is no harm in adopting the Senate change.

Any provision made for this purpose for the fiscal year 1944 should be more appropriately worded to accomplish the precise purpose in mind. The Senate amendment to the House amendment seeks to do something which it does not succeed in doing and might result in doing something of which neither House approves. Since there is no prospect administratively of action not contemplated, I am moving adoption of the amendment in order to avoid further delay on the bill, which carries other funds which are badly needed and which must be made available without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS ON EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority on the Ways and Means Committee have until tomorrow night at midnight to file their minority views on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SON OF REPRESENTATIVE BALDWIN, OF MARYLAND

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise to inform the House that my colleague from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] has been notified by the War Department that his son, Lieutenant Baldwin, is reported missing in action in Africa in defense of his country, which explains his absence from the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain proceedings with reference to the twenty-second anniversary of the pastorate of Dr. Brown, of the First Baptist Church of Knoxville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] for 10 minutes.

McKINLEY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, MUNCIE, IND.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent bond sales many splendid records were made by the citizens of our country. In my home State of Indiana, and in the many and various counties thereof, splendid records were established and in many instances counties have more than doubled their respective quotas. To all those who rendered such outstanding service to our country, in this time of extreme peril, the people of the Nation, and our Government, recognizes the patriotic endeavor of those participating in this essential work. They are fighting on the home front while our boys are fighting on the battle fronts.

Mr. Speaker, I desire, especially, to refer to a very outstanding achievement in the sale of bonds and stamps by one of the high schools in the congressional district which I have the distinct honor to represent. Information has just reached me of the fine record which has been made by the McKinley Junior High School, of Muncie, Ind., of which Mr. Charles G. Hampton, of Muncie, is the principal, regarding the sale of bonds and stamps since we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. After that vicious and unwarranted attack, by Japan, the students of this high school began selling bonds and stamps. This policy was fully approved by Mr. Charles G. Hampton, the principal, and the teachers, and all of the students took a very active part in this sales program and campaign, which continued until the close of the school, in the month of June, 1942. The result of the efforts on the part of the student body, and the teachers, in this bond and stamp sales campaign was that $7,202.35 in value of bonds and stamps were sold before the close of the school year.

Mr. Speaker, in the month of September 1942, when the school year 1942–43 began, the students of this high school decided to enter the bond and stamp sales again, for the present school year, and they set as their goal the sale of $150,000 in value of the Government bonds and stamps; the students set up booths and sales counters in various hotels and public places in their home city of Muncie at which they conducted such sales, and all were very alert and active in this all-out effort to aid in the prosecution of the war by selling the bonds and stamps of our Government. It is needless for me to say that the students of this high school abandoned their week-end vacations, and their enjoyment of various amusements, to take part in this campaign which they had inaugurated. These students were fighting for their country—they were fighting for the boys in the service, their brothers, their neighbors' boys and their friends; they did not want to let our boys down, but they wanted to do their bit as average American boys and girls in this crisis.

Throughout this school year these boys and girls have continued their campaign, and the staggering amount of the sales made by them, during this school year and up to April 29, 1943, was the sum of $232,720.27. This school does not close for the year until on the 11th day of June 1943. They will continue to make their drive to sell bonds and stamps until their school year has ended, and it cannot be estimated now the amount that the total sales will aggregate at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to incorporate this unusually fine record of this outstanding public school in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I wish to pay my humble tribute, publicly, to Mr. Charles G. Hampton, the principal, to the teachers, and to every student of the McKinley Junior High School, of Muncie, Ind., for this wonderful record in selling bonds and stamps, and for the patriotic effort on their part to aid our country in this all-out war effort. This evidence of patriotism and this demonstration of sturdy loyalty on the part of these loyal young Americans means that we will win this war, and that we will win it both quickly and decisively—and that we will, again, chart our course along the paths of peace in this Nation.

To the principal, the corps of teachers, and to the students of this high school, I extend my personal congratulations and my wholehearted commendation upon this noteworthy achievement. It is a distinct honor to represent the district in which your high school is located. I salute you—your Government is very proud of you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and one deeply concerned with the potential danger which faces all of us with the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, unless such act is amended in the interest of the American worker, the American farmer, and the American small industrialist, I take the liberty at this time in presenting for the consideration of the Members of the House a few thoughts worthy of their attention.

The question before the Congress is not whether or not the Reciprocal Trade Treaty policy should be continued as it is but whether or not this Congress will ignore the failure of this policy to achieve the purposes so glibly put forth and whether or not the Congress will represent the wishes of the American people and attach amendments thereto which will protect the interests of the American people or whether we will shame-facedly respond to the master's whip as is demanded by the bureaucrats and theorists and some of the large vested interests of America.

To indicate the desperate position in which the State Department's officials and their supporters find themselves, we had before the Ways and Means Committee a proponent of this measure, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. The hearings will disclose that, but for the questioning on the part of Members, the country would have been led to believe that the American Federation of Labor is in full accord with the present reciprocal trade agreement policy. It developed through questioning that President Green was not speaking for the American Federation of Labor. He was expressing his own views. Having in mind that a presentation in opposition to the reciprocal trade agreements was presented before the Ways and Means Committee some 3

years ago, I looked over the hearings held at that time, and I find that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in May of 1938 went on record quite strongly on this question, and, for the information of the Members, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a full copy of their action as printed on page 1369 of volume 2 of the hearings on Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1940.

Resolution unanimously adopted by executive council of the American Federation of Labor, executive council minutes, April 25 to May 5, 1938, Washington, D. C.

Whereas the provisions of reciprocal trade treaties negotiated by the State Department with foreign nations affect very vitally both the economic conditions of American workers and unemployment, and there are many organizations, representing thousands of workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which are seriously affected by these trade treaties, and for that reason are deeply interested in their provisions; and

Whereas the economic and industrial interests of these workers demand that the American Federation of Labor exercise all efforts possible to prevent the importation of goods from foreign countries, under the provisions of reciprocal trade treaties, where lower wages, longer hours, and lower living standards prevail than exist in competing industries within the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the American Federation of Labor expresses its opposition to reciprocal trade treaties which discriminate against American workers. We are opposed to reciprocal trade treaty provisions which provide for importation of goods and merchandise which because of low labor costs abroad are sold at a lower price than the same goods and merchandise produced by workers in the United States, where wages and conditions of labor are established on a higher standard than those which prevail abroad; and be it further

Resolved, That a committee representing the American Federation of Labor be accorded the privilege of presenting labor's point of view relating to the provisions of reciprocal trade agreements affecting labor before said agreements are negotiated and ratified.

Mr. Speaker, also and of interest to those who respect the appeal of labor, I note a letter under date of August 2, 1938, in which President Green sought to assure the committee created by the American Federation of Labor to represent it and make the presentation of the American Federation of Labor's position to the representatives of the State Department engaged in reciprocal trade agreements that there had been no change in the policy of the American Federation of Labor in spite of a wrong impression that had been created by the publicity department of that body. I am inserting a copy of the letter at this point in my remarks:

AUGUST 2, 1938.

Mr. I. M. ORNBURN,
Secretary, Union Label Trades Department, American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Because I fear a wrong impression may have been made by the press statement which was issued by the publicity department of the American Federation of Labor relating to the exportation of lumber and logs from the northwest section of our country I deemed it advisable to transmit to you this communication.

There has been no change whatever in the position of the American Federation of Labor toward the policy pursued by the State Department in its policy of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. We entertain the definite opinion in the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements that the economical and industrial interests of the workers employed in all industries and particularly in those which suffer most from the importation of goods from abroad should be properly and adequately protected.

I assure you that the American Federation of Labor is deeply interested in the work of the committee, of which you are chairman, and in the presentation of the position of the American Federation of Labor to the representatives of the State Department engaged in negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. The efforts of your committee will be given the support and assistance of the American Federation of Labor.

Very truly yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

I also find on the same or adjoining page, and insert at this point as a part of my remarks, a list of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor who are affected by the importation of competitive products of workers in foreign nations:

Boot and Shoe Workers Union.
American Flint Glass Workers Union.
National Brotherhood of Operative Potters.
Glass Bottle Blowers Association.
Window Glass Cutters League.
International Typographical Union.
International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union.
International Photo-Engravers Union.
Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union.
International Brotherhood of Bookbinders.
Cigar Makers International Union.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union.
Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.
International Union of United Brewery Workers.
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen.
United Brick and Clay Workers of America.
Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers.
International Association of Marble, Slate, and Stone Polishers.
International Wood Carvers Association of North America.
Coopers' International Union of North America.
International Brotherhood of Paper Makers.
International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers.
United Leather Workers International Union.
Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Helpers International Union.
Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association.
Wall Paper Craftsmen and Workers of North America.
American Wire Weavers Protective Association.

The membership of these organizations, 1939, total more than 1,500,000.

Amongst unions directly affiliated with the American Federation of Labor whose membership are also seriously affected are those employed in aluminum, cement, lace, distillery, and other industries.

The Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, through its president, John Frey, appeared at the hearing on the British Trade Treaty and opposed any reductions on items in which members of unions in the Metal Trades Department were employed.

Mr. Speaker, the hearings on this question of authorization to enter into reciprocal trade treaties, I repeat, are the fallacy and the hypocrisy of the Roosevelt administration.

In 1934, under a Congress controlled by the "master's voice," we entered into this experiment of reciprocal trade treaties with the assurance on the part of the bureaucrats and the theorists that through the reduction in our tariff rates we would be able to find expanded markets in foreign countries for the products of America's industrial workers and the products of America's farms.

In 1937, when renewal of this authorization was sought, there was no evidence to indicate that the purposes for which the act was created had been achieved. At that time, with Europe agog and with Asia at war, we were assured that the continuation of this authorization would build for a sound and durable peace.

In 1940, with world war virtually on and the purposes which the proponents of this legislation set forth farther away than ever, the excuse was then given that the continuation of this authorization was the foundation stone of Roosevelt's foreign policy. During the last few weeks your Ways and Means Committee has listened to a virtual admission that none of the purposes which this legislation sought to achieve have been accomplished; that reductions of some 43 percent in tariff rates have been made on 63 percent of our dutiable importations; that the representatives of American labor, American farmers, and of American small businessmen are all of one mind, namely, that the continuation of this authorization without substantial limitations attached thereto constitutes a tremendous danger to our people.

The sole excuse, which is easily controverted, is the assertion on the part of the proponents that foreign nations might not thoroughly understand our change of policy. I appreciate the desire of every true American for peace. I do not subscribe to the theory that the representatives of foreign governments are ignorant or totally unaware of the American form of government and the constitutional safeguards which we have prospered under for the past 150 years. To my mind the assertion that foreign governments would misunderstand our position is not enough to warrant the continuation of these agreements. My belief, Mr. Speaker, is that if we are to renew reciprocal trade agreement authorization we should specify:

First. That no competitive products of workers in foreign countries should be permitted entry into American markets at total delivered costs which are less than our cost of production.

Second. That no trade agreement should become effective without the confirmation of the Congress of the United States, or the Senate, if such matters come properly within the purview of a treaty.

Third. That any injured American should have the right by specific legislative approval, if such is necessary, in this particular case, to seek judicial review

in any case wherein he can prove substantial damage to his property or personal rights.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield up the time today and will later ask for time some day next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] for 20 minutes.

THE JAPANESE SITUATION ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the State of California and have had an opportunity to discuss with the citizens in my district some of the problems in which they are most interested during the present emergency. I find that the vast majority of them are definitely opposed to the return of any Japanese to the Pacific Coast States while the war is in progress. As most of you undoubtedly know, all of the Japanese in California, Oregon, and Washington were removed from the prohibited and restricted areas in these three Pacific Coast States shortly after war was declared. They are presently confined to concentration camps in other parts of the country.

While on the coast, I spent 2 weeks as one member of a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs investigating congested war-production areas. We held hearings in San Francisco for 2 days and during that time had an opportunity to discuss the status of the Japanese with Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, Commanding General of the Fourth Army and the Western Defense Command. In response to an inquiry directed to him by one member of our subcommittee, General DeWitt had the following statement to make with reference to the problems with which he was primarily concerned:

General DEWITT. I haven't any problems except one—that is the development of a false sentiment on the part of certain individuals and some organizations to get the Japanese back on the west coast. I don't want any of them here. They are a dangerous element. There is no way to determine their loyalty. The west coast contains too many vital installations essential to the defense of the country to allow any Japanese on this coast. There is a feeling developing, I think, in certain sections of the country that the Japanese should be allowed to return. I am opposing it with every proper means at my disposal.

Mr. MAAS. And you want it left alone? You don't want any change in the situation.

Mr. MOTT. Is the element responsible for bringing them back the same one that wants them put in the Army?

General DEWITT. I don't know what element you refer to, but I have constant requests for individual Japanese to return. We can handle individuals if there aren't too many. No Japanese can come back now for any purpose except by permit from my headquarters. There are a number of Japanese in the area now who are in hospitals, too sick to be moved or are in mental institutions, but very few. We let them come in in an emergency to visit the sick and those in mental institutions. We also let them come to relocation centers. The great difficulty is that if you let an individual Japanese in for any reason at all, you establish a precedent and the whole question begins to develop and ramify so you can't stop it.

Mr. MOTT. What is the idea of putting the Japanese in the United States Army at all? Is that a matter of military policy? Did the War Department decide that?

General DEWITT. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Not some civilian agency agitation?

General DEWITT. I don't know anything about that. I have had nothing whatever to do with it. Manzanar and Tule Lake are kept under my observation as they are in the prohibited area. Recruiting parties were sent in by the War Department to obtain volunteers, and I do not want to be understood as in any way criticizing that action. At one time we had a great many Japanese in military units on the west coast. They were all, at my request, transferred out by the War Department to other organizations. At the present time there are eight Japanese in the area by permit—seven translators with the Federal Communications Commission and one with the Immigration Department. They are required to wear identification at all times.

In response to further inquiries, General DeWitt then went on to say:

General DEWITT. As far as I am concerned, I am not concerned with what they do with the Japanese as a whole, just so they are not allowed to return to the west coast. My superiors know I consider it unsafe to do so.

This testimony was given to our committee on Tuesday, April 13. On April 19, General DeWitt issued Public Proclamation No. 17. The pertinent part of it reads as follows:

All terms and conditions of public proclamations, civilian exclusion orders, and civilian restrictive orders, this headquarters, heretofore issued, governing the presence, entry, and movement of persons of Japanese ancestry within said military areas of western defense command are suspended in said military areas as to persons of Japanese ancestry who are members of the Army of the United States on active duty or who have been inducted and are in uniform while on furlough or leave.

J. L. DEWITT,
Lieutenant General,
United States Army, Commanding.

What an utterly incomprehensible and contradictory policy for the War Department to adopt.

If we are going to permit Japanese wearing the army uniform to return to the Pacific area will someone please tell me what is to prevent the Japanese from bringing agents to our coast and letting them mingle with the persons who are permitted to enter under this proclamation? I simply cannot understand it. I would like to have it explained to me by the authorities in the War Department who had General DeWitt sign that proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that General DeWitt did not issue that proclamation of his own free will. The statements which I have already read to the House would definitely prove otherwise. In the meantime and prior to the issuance of Proclamation No. 17, an editorial appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post on April 15 entitled "A Jap's a Jap." I intend to insert the entire editorial in the RECORD but for the information of the House, I simply want to read one paragraph of it:

Now Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, who, as commanding general of the Western Defense Command, carried out the evacuation and relocation, was quoted the other day as declaring: "A Jap's a Jap. It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not. * * * The west coast is too vital and too vulnerable to take any chances." The general should be told that American democracy and the Constitution of the United States are too vital to be ignored and flouted by any military zealot. The panic of Pearl Harbor is now past. There has been ample time for the investigation of these people and the determination of their loyalty to this country on an individual basis. Whatever excuse there once was for evacuating and holding them indiscriminately no longer exists.

I wonder if that represents the attitude of the citizens throughout the United States generally? Certainly it is not the attitude of the citizens in the three Pacific Coast States, I can assure you gentlemen, because I have just returned from there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman not realize that those who write these Washington newspapers know more about how the war should be carried on, and what we should do here in Congress than either the military authorities, or the people's representatives? The gentleman has been here for a number of years, and he surely must have discovered that. That is, they think they do.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would suggest that the gentleman who wrote this editorial interview some of the people who have lived with the Japanese for the past two or three generations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I also just returned from my district in southern California after spending a week there, and although there is some sentiment as expressed in the press occasionally by local people and also by certain civilians connected with our Government, that some of the Japanese be allowed to return to the coast, I found that very nearly all of the people with whom I came in contact are utterly and absolutely opposed to it. A good many of them are not only opposed to it for the duration of the war but for all time to come, for they have had long experience with the Japs, and they know that it is very difficult to tell whether a Japanese of American birth is loyal to this country, or is not. Some of them may be able to prove that loyalty to our country by service perhaps in Africa, but I am certain that our boys in the Solomon Islands do not want to worry about making any mistakes. They are shooting at everything that looks like a Jap and no questions asked.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think that is the attitude expressed in almost every congressional district on the Pacific coast, and those feelings must

be taken into consideration. I have lived in California all of my life, and over 9,000 Japanese were moved out of my congressional district. I have lived among the Japanese there, and I defy anyone to go among those Japanese now and tell me which are loyal and which are disloyal, and as General DeWitt says, the situation is too critical for us to take any chances.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is true; and also I might state that if any untoward event should occur on the Pacific coast such as an attempted landing, air raid, or something else, and Japanese were found in the locality, even though they themselves personally knew themselves to be loyal to this country 100 percent, they would undoubtedly find themselves in a very unpleasant position and even liable to be killed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman puts it rather charitably when he says they would find themselves in an unpleasant position.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean unpleasant in a military sense.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Correct.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. General DeWitt has not changed his mind during the last year as regarding his original stand that the Japanese at all times should be moved from the west coast.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No. If the gentleman heard the statements I read he will recall that from statements made to our subcommittee it is quite apparent that General DeWitt has not changed his mind.

Mr. BENDER. That was my view as a member of the Tolan committee. We had hearings in all three States. We had before us not only the general and his associates but we had before us every civic leader and practically every informed leader of thought in all those States, and they were most emphatic in supporting the general's contention that these Japanese should not be kept on the west coast and should not be returned. I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to our attention, and I hope the gentleman's statements will not be ignored by the proper authorities.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

In order to clarify the attitude of General DeWitt may I read one more statement that was offered to our subcommittee during those hearings? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] during the course of this conversation asked General DeWitt:

> Mr. BATES. I was going to ask—would you base your determined stand on experience as a result of sabotage or racial history or what is it?

In response the general said as follows:

> General DEWITT. I first of all base it on my responsibility. I have the mission of defending this coast and securing vital installations. The danger of the Japanese was, and is now—if they are permitted to come back—espionage and sabotage. It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen, he is still a Japanese. American citizenship does not necessarily determine loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, many of us who represent districts on the Pacific coast are of the opinion that the new policy with respect to the Japanese in the armed forces of the United States has been forced on the War Department by civilian agencies. The problem is critical and will become more so as the war progresses and I fear serious racial troubles if any attempt is made to move the Japanese back to the Pacific Coast States when the war is terminated. Congress should take definite steps now to thoroughly investigate this entire problem and I urge speedy and favorable consideration of the resolution which has been introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to my colleague from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. From the gentleman's experience with the Japanese does he believe that there could be any method, questionnaire, or procedure by which one could determine whether or not a Japanese even though he were American born is loyal or disloyal since they have found a great many American-born Japanese disloyal?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Answering the gentleman I may say I know of no way by which their loyalty or disloyalty can be accurately determined.

Mr. POULSON. Does the gentleman realize that the War Department board I think under Mr. McCloy believes that they have devised a questionnaire or at least a method by which they can determine whether or not the Japanese are loyal and should be released?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; I have heard of such a questionnaire. I should be very much interested in having a look at it.

Mr. POULSON. I happen to have here a copy of a letter got out under some plan of following up that same idea. Mr. McCloy stated that they would not allow them in War Zone No. 1 which is right along the immediate west coast, but is it not true that that zone does not take in all of California? In other words, there is a portion in the interior of California which is not within that zone.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. POULSON. And if they were allowed to go within that very zone they would be just as dangerous for the welfare of the Pacific coast as if they were allowed to be right on the coast itself? Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; that is correct, and I think that General DeWitt's original order should be carried out to the letter and that this proclamation which he issued on the 19th of April should be revoked at the earliest possible date.

Mr. POULSON. And that this is a matter which definitely applies to the present situation during the war, and this is not a policy to exist after the war. We are making a stand on the present emergency.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I compliment my colleague from California on the splendid way in which he has represented his district and is representing his district; and I commend him for the position he has taken on this very important investigation which affects everyone of us in California.

The people of my district feel exactly the same as the gentleman feels: That the Japs are out and they should stay out. Incidentally, last fall I went down to Salinas, which before reapportionment was in the gentleman's district, and I found the sentiment down there was also overwhelming to the effect that now that the Japs have been evacuated we should keep them out of California permanently.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is absolutely correct and I thank him for his observations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. During my recent visit home I found there were others being excluded from the Pacific coast defense areas than Japanese; that is, others than men and women of Japanese descent. For instance, I found one case in which an American citizen of perhaps several generations of German descent who had indicated the possibility of his disloyalty to this country, through certain remarks which he had made in public during a public meeting, had been asked to retire beyond the western defense zone, and he was then preparing to do so. He was moving to Denver. There are numbers of others who are not of Japanese descent who have likewise been asked to move from the coast, because General DeWitt's No. 1 job is to protect that area and see to it that espionage, sabotage, and other aid to the enemy be reduced to an absolute minimum and that nothing untoward happens to the United States as a whole, through entry from that coast.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is true.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is true on that coast or this coast or the Gulf coast or anywhere else in the United States. If the commanding general wants certain people kept out and believes he can do a better job defending that coast by keeping them out, he should have prompt authority to do that regardless of any civilian influence no matter how high placed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Absolutely. That is his responsibility. If he is given the responsibility to defend that particular coast, then it should be his recommendations and commands that are agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is his responsibility and he should have full power.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Absolutely.

Now, I want to read one further statement in line with what my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] asked General DeWitt if he drew a distinction between Japanese and Italians and Germans. General DeWitt replied as follows:

> You needn't worry about the Italians at all except in certain cases. Also, the same for the Germans except in individual cases. But we must worry about the Japanese all the time until he is wiped off the map. Sabotage and espionage will make problems as long as he is allowed in this area—problems which I don't want to have to worry about.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman, of course, realizes that today is the first anniversary of our surrender of Corregidor. I think it is a very unfortunate thing that at this time we should be confronted with this proposal to return the so-called good Japanese from these relocation camps. I believe it can be safely said that as far as the War Department is concerned it was not their proposals, but it has come from those civilians who are in charge of the War Relocation Authority. They believe they have evolved this method of segregating the good from the bad. I think the gentleman will agree that you might be able to distinguish a bad Japanese from a good one but I defy anyone to find a good one and distinguish him from a bad one.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman entirely. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House. I sincerely trust that his committee will look into this question and ascertain whether or not it will be possible to revoke the proclamation that General DeWitt signed on April 19. I am inclined to believe he signed it against his better judgment.

Mr. COSTELLO. I have taken this matter up with Mr. McCloy's office. He indicated to me that because of certain conditions in these relocation camps where subversive Japanese are attempting to line up all Japanese in an attitude that is unfriendly to the United States Government, he felt there should be a segregation. Of course, in that we certainly agree with him. If they know a bad Japanese in a camp, they should remove him from that camp and put him in more strict internment. That would not mean to try to say that the rest are good and are entitled to return to the west-coast area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Thank you.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken and to say that in my district and in my State this problem is a very acute one. My information is, although I have not had an opportunity to return to my district, that the viewpoint of the people has not changed in the least since the beginning, when we insisted that the Japanese be taken from the whole coastal area. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not his opinion, in view of the fact that the Japanese in the Aleutian Islands are making considerable headway, that this problem is even more acute than it was in the beginning?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct. I believe the people in our country feel very much that way about it.

Mr. ANGELL. It is a possibility, if not stronger than that, that there may be an attack by the Japanese on the Pacific coast?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is true. Of course, like the gentleman, I do hope that our military authorities will clean them out of the Aleutians at the earliest possible date. But in response to the point raised by my colleague [Mr. COSTELLO] I should like to observe that I think the military men ought to run this war, in the first place. That is their job. When it comes to this policy established with respect to the Japanese, that is another thing that the military authorities should run. Why these civilian agencies should try to impose their suggestions on the military authorities at a time like this is beyond me. I do hope that the Military Affairs Committee can find some answer to that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. In just a moment. I wish now to yield to my colleague [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that there is one other important thing that should be brought to the attention of the people at this time. That is, that in the southern part, particularly, I know of my own personal knowledge, there are a great many Filipinos.

These Filipinos have a very keen hatred, naturally, toward the Japanese. Does not the gentleman feel that if these Japanese are allowed to go back into the California zone there would be killings and violence between the Filipinos and the Japanese? Therefore it would offer an excuse for retaliation by the Japanese Government against those Americans who are now interned in Japan.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. It is a risk that we cannot afford to take.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman one or two questions, not the least bit in the nature of a critical approach because I very much appreciate the information you have given us. Can the gentleman tell us how many people have been evacuated out of the three or four Western States?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Does the gentleman refer to Japanese?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Japanese.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Approximately 120,000 from the States of California, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Roughly, how many people would be involved in this order that the gentleman read awhile ago?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot answer the gentleman's question definitely, but if it were only 10 it would be 10 too many.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has brought up here a question of national scope. It interests Michigan just as much as it does California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It should, naturally.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I represent Michigan. Now, I am seeking information from you gentlemen from the west coast. What are we going to do with those 120,000 people? Have you any suggestion that I can give to the people of my district and my State as to what disposition should be made of that 120,000 group which is now concentrated, I understand, in camps?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I should like to answer the gentleman in this way: I do not believe that the problem has received proper study. It must be studied and I think it should be studied by Congress. Our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has introduced a resolution to set up a special subcommittee of the House of Representatives to investigate the status of the Japanese in this country, both now and after the war. I would urge speedy passage of that resolution and the appointment of a committee so that a proper study may be made and a solution arrived at.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With your experience in California and that of our colleagues here from those Western States, what danger is there, if any, to the people and to the country and to our war effort if we decentralize that 120,000 group and place them around in industries and on farms so that they can go to work and earn their way? In other words, I am not the least bit sympathetic to taxing my people and making them work for 120,000 American citizens who are locked up somewhere in a concentration camp and who are not permitted to do anything. If we in this country cannot fix it so that people under our jurisdiction can work and produce and make their own way, how in the name of God are we going to save the world? That is the thing I am getting at.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of Congress from the three Pacific Coast States are gratified to know that this is not going to be our problem alone. I think it is a problem in which the rest of the people should take a very evident interest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With that I agree.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with General DeWitt that the only way to properly police the Japanese who have been removed from the three Western States is to keep them there for the duration of the war. He said their danger is and always will be espionage and sabotage. If they are confined under proper military guard, then I know they are not going to cause us any trouble.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is the gentleman's attitude, what sense would there be in our approving this resolution to set up a committee to make a study if they are to be kept locked up? Let us keep them locked up then.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Does not the gentleman recognize the fact that the war will terminate some day and that we will still have the problem of 120,000 Japanese in this country?

Mr. CRAWFORD. At which time we propose under the Atlantic Charter, lend-lease, and these other agreements to proceed to take care of the victor and vanquished, reestablish their economy, and make the world safe for everybody. How are we going to keep 120,000 American citizens locked up under those conditions?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. These are not 120,000 citizens. Some of them are citizens of this country, having been born here, some of them are not citizens, having come in before the exclusion act was passed. We have many different elements among the Japanese and I say it is high time to study the whole situation. I still say that the Japanese in this country who are American citizens present a critical problem under our Constitution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They certainly do.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I would like to make this observation: We have about 10,000 of these Japs in the State of Wyoming who came in from California. They came in under an agreement with our State officials that they would be interned in camps and that after the war they would be removed and sent back to California. The people of Wyoming are relying on the assurance given to them at that time.

I might add that about 1,200 of the Japanese interned in Wyoming have declared their loyalty to Japan and yet they are permitted to mingle among loyal Japanese and to provoke disloyalty in others.

Furthermore, the people of Wyoming are very much dissatisfied with the report that these Japanese are fed better than the people of Wyoming. Certainly they are not entitled to be treated better than our own people. We certainly do not like that at all.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot say that I blame the gentleman. We do not like it in California. May I say this also for the gentleman's benefit. I do not know who gave him the assurance that when the war was over these Japanese were going to be welcomed back into the State of California, but I will say that the majority of citizens in my State have told me, "Do not send them back under any circumstances at any time."

Mr. BARRETT. The War Relocation Authority certainly gave assurances to the officials in Wyoming, and the people of my State are determined to see that these Japanese are removed back to California the minute the war is over.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Of course, the gentleman's attitude just further complicates the problem.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The gentleman from Michigan spoke of dealing with American citizens. Is it considered in California or perhaps any other place in this Union that, even though a person is native-born, if he owes allegiance to a foreign country he is a genuine American citizen?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That may be the basis on which we can eventually dispose of this question. The fact that every Japanese, no matter where born or under what flag, is always considered a subject of the Empire of Japan, may aid us eventually in clearing up this very critical question of citizenship under the Constitution.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I think that is a very important phase that should be understood by the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe that Secretary Ickes and his good wife have set a good example to the rest of the country in how to handle this situation?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I wish Secretary Ickes would pay a visit to my State and ask the citizens out there what they think of his present attitude toward the Japanese in this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know what they think, but I certainly would like to find out what they are thinking. We have seen a great deal of publicity in the papers about what Mr. and Mrs. Ickes have done to help solve the problem.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Generally, it was that Mr. Ickes could have them all if he wanted them, but we do not want them back in California.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Maybe if he did get them all we would have a larger farm population.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short chart pertaining to the export of flue-cured tobacco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes today at the close of other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this subject I wish to assure you, my colleagues, that I am cognizant of the seriousness of the present world situation. There is much more involved than economic questions. The economic questions are secondary in importance to the successful prosecution of the war. We cannot escape the fact, however, that these same economic questions must be faced. They must be faced if we are to exist. Pollyana attitudes will not feed a people. They must be faced if we are to live up to our obligations to our country; to the 10,000,000 men who are or will be in our armed forces who will deserve and demand consideration upon their return to civilian life; and to our constituents who expect us to plan, provide, and legislate for the best interests of all the people of the land.

An over-all picture of today would require that we consider the statements of world leaders, the world food situation and the legislation that has been passed during the past 3 years.

First, we have section 7 of the Atlantic Charter, which states:

> Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Most people would subscribe to this statement if the interpretation is in keeping with the words used in phrasing it. We have the "four freedoms," with No. 3 closely associated with food and clothing.

Secondly, in our approach to the difficulties of these food problems is the consideration that we must give to the World Food Conference to be held at Hot Springs, Va., on May 18. Since the United States has been and is such a leading agricultural country, a large percentage of the people of the United States are affected by any changes in agricultural production and distribution. What makes the United States the greatest nation in the world is that the United States is a union of countries in terms

of agricultural production. Many of our States exceed many countries in food production. The United States has within its confines the largest area of rich, productive, fertile land to be found in the world. In terms of production its 340,000,000 acres of crop land has never been made to produce their maximum.

This conference will create domestic as well as world-wide interest. From announcements, one might conclude that its purpose is to obtain a world-wide picture of food conditions as they exist in the various parts of the world. Many people feel that we really should have a food conference at which we take up the immediate food problems of the world rather than having a conference on a long-range basis, especially when there are so many factors involved that will depend upon the peace terms at the end of the war. Regardless of its being called to discuss long-range food problems it is evident that the immediate food needs of the various countries cannot escape discussion at this food conference. While some critics suggest that this world food conference is the beginning of a world O. P. A., W. P. A., or A. A. A., we can at least wait until after the conference until we come to any definite opinion as to the constructive work that can be brought about by this and contemplated succeeding world food conferences.

Third, we must consider the reciprocal trade treaties in the face of the world upheaval. They must be viewed as to their relative importance in connection with the world agricultural picture. The entire exports and imports are a small part of the domestic trade within the United States. Its importance in dollars is usually exaggerated. The domestic and foreign agricultural trade or distribution will be no small part of the world's economic problems that we will be compelled to face and to solve. We should not let our own personal opinions in regard to tariffs interfere with the maximum food production that is needed to win the war. It is regrettable that many people approach a discussion of world agriculture in the manner that they do because they make statements that are not even based upon facts. They indulge in so many glittering generalities. They try to prove benefits that are not in keeping with the facts. Many become so partisan in their presentation that it makes it difficult for one to try to analyze the situation on a factual basis. Anyway, there are three situations in connection with agricultural world trade that I would like to call to your attention today.

First. The fact that since 1920 there has been a gradual loss of export markets for the agricultural products of our country. This reduction in agricultural exports has been gradually taking place since 1920. While agricultural exports were formerly nearly half our total they have gone down from 40 percent to 30 percent to 20 percent, and by 1940, only 12 percent of our total exports were agricultural products. There have been four different tariff acts in operation from 1920 to 1940. The facts are that the agricultural exports as a percentage of our total exports have been becoming less and have been on a steady, and rather constant, decline. You can, if interested, in this situation study the table I will insert at the end of my remarks. It shows that from 1925 to 1940 our agricultural imports exceeded our agricultural exports. You will find in one year, 1937, that our imports of competitive agricultural products—the agricultural products which could be produced in the United States even exceeded our total agricultural exports for that year. You will also note that in 1940 our agricultural imports were over twice our agricultural exports. This was in dollars and may have been two to four times in pounds, bushels, or tons. Since these imports and exports are recorded as dollars, I wish to call your attention to the fact that in the terms of pounds, bushels, or tons, the difference is much more pronounced. The reason for this is that the imports are figured on the basis of the value at the point of origin while the exports are figured on the value at the place of export. A commodity may be declared at 4 cents per pound in a foreign point of origin and may be sold to the American consumer with shipping costs, insurance, profits, transportations, and other costs, plus the duty of say 1 cent per pound and the American consumer may pay 8 cents per pound or more for it. If a similar or the same commodity was worth 8 cents per pound in the United States and was exported, 100 pounds of it would show an $8 export and an equal amount would show up as a $4 import.

This gradual loss of agricultural exports no doubt has been one cause of the expression that the "farmer is being sold down the river" in world agricultural trade.

With an increasing number of American farm people, trying to obtain and maintain a higher standard of living than ever enjoyed by any rural people in the world. Do you know how they can compete for the world agricultural markets with people who do not have these opportunities of progress? It is a deep question. It requires much more than superficial, partisan, vocal, and written expression.

The agricultural imports have been about half our total imports since 1920. The particular tariff act of the four in operation from 1920 to 1940 did not seem to have much influence on the proportion of agricultural imports to the total exports. In other words, the relation of agricultural imports to total imports has been rather evenly maintained at about 50 percent, while our agricultural exports have continually dwindled from 49 down to 12 percent.

The Census Bureau shows that in 1900, 60.3 percent of our population was rural and that by 1940, only 43.5 percent of it was rural. Many of the rural people feel that as the rural population decreased the greater was the difficulty of their group in securing the economic consideration that they have been and are now entitled to. Since 23 percent of the people of our country live on farms and have only 8 to 10 percent of the farm income, many of them feel that this is a result of a lack of equality and economic consideration for them as a group. One can see that since half of them do not even have electric lights in their homes and only 1 out of 10 has a bathtub in his home, how they might come to this conclusion. I realize that this is not the time for social reforms but they are a part of the picture which cannot be ignored. It might be a worth while agricultural goal to work towards having a country where the rural people had 100 percent electric service and 100 percent modern conveniences.

Second. In considering our future domestic and foreign trade policy, it would be well to review some of the legislation that has been passed since the Reciprocal Trade Treaties were renewed 3 years ago. One instance, in the Price Control Act, section 4A, Public Law 147 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, this act provides and, I quote:

> Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof.

The purpose, no doubt, of this provision was to give the producer some assurance that if he increased his production he would not be faced with ruin for his efforts. It is the law of the land. Let us analyze this situation for a minute. What is going to be the situation if this floor of 90 percent of parity is maintained and if the world price of agricultural commodities are such that they can pay the duty and still be shipped into our country at that time? This is a question that should have consideration and should be taken into account before any additional agreements are entered into.

For example, take hogs. Let us think some of these things through rather than listen to the babblings of the partisans who have nothing but generalities and false pictures to offer.

I will not use the present high prices. I'll go back to 1939 with its low price. The parity price of hogs in 1939 was $9.01 per hundredweight. The average actual price received by farmers August 15, 1939, was only $5.30 per hundredweight. Now 90 percent of this $9.01 is $8.10 per hundredweight. The tariff is only $1 per hundredweight. If, after the war we have a guaranteed minimum floor-price in the United States of $8.10 established by law and we still have a $1 per hundredweight duty in effect, how many coolers will we need to store the imports that will be attracted to our markets? If the world price of pork was so low that imports would come to our country in 1939 when hogs were 61 percent of parity, what is going to be the situation when the United States domestic market has a floor of 90 percent of parity? In other words, we have already stepped up pork production from 12,000,000,000 pounds in 1937, 14,000,000,000 in 1938 to over 21,000,000,000 pounds in 1942. This 21,000,000,000-pound production is over twice the 1936 production.

Can we expect to put a quota on hogs which represent one-tenth of 1 percent

of our national production or practically an embargo like we have done with wheat and still talk about a good-neighbor policy? What is your answer to this question? You and I as Members of Congress have the responsibility of working for the best solution of this problem and what is your solution? An easy answer would be to say that we should lift the world prices sufficiently high so that hogs would not be attracted to our markets. We also have removed the duty on fats and oils during the Seventy-seventh Congress and this has a direct bearing on the price of lard and of hogs.

Next, let us take cheese. The production was increased 50 percent in about 1½ years as a result of requests by the Secretary of Agriculture. This production then most assuredly would come under the provisions of the law. The comparable parity price of today would be some 21 cents a pound. The index figure in computing parity might be below the 1.8 cents that prevails at the present time due to the fact that the things the farmer will buy may be cheaper at that time. However, in 1939, when the comparable parity price of cheese was some 17 cents a pound, the actual market price was only 11.7 cents per pound for the first 6 months of that year and our imports were over 6,000,000 pounds for that year. If the world price of cheese becomes as low as it was in 1939 and if millions of pounds were imported when domestic cheese was 65 percent of parity, what amount do you think will be imported if the guaranteed floor price is 17 cents per pound, or 90 percent of parity. You can figure this out for any particular product you are interested in but any compilation should be restricted to a product or crop an increase in which was asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture. The basic commodities are already provided for by loans. If this question is not properly considered we can readily vision the warehouses and elevators that will be needed to store the food products that will be attracted to our shores.

For all we hear many expressions that indicate that we are going to have enormous food exports after the war, I wish to call your attention to the 1920 agricultural imports in the table at the end of my remarks. You will note that the agricultural imports after World War No. 1 exceeded the agricultural exports. We must be prepared to be on the receiving end as well as on the sending end.

This table shows the exports and imports from 1920 to 1940. I repeat, during this time four different tariff schedules were in operation. First, the Tariff Act of 1913 was in operation in 1920 and then the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, the Tariff Act of 1922, the Tariff Act of 1930, and the adjustments of the Tariff Act of 1930 under the Reciprocal Trade Treaties, though not a separate tariff act.

While it is recognized that the low duty on agricultural products in the Tariff Act of 1913 caused a serious import situation that was erased by the demands for food in World War No. 1; while it is well known that in 1935, 1938, and 1940 many duties were reduced on livestock and livestock products, that caused an extended period of low prices, during which period the highest percentage of farms were foreclosed in some sections producing livestock and livestock products ever foreclosed by the Federal land banks; the facts are that during this 20-year period the agricultural exports had a rather continual downward trend, regardless of the tariff act which was in operation. I repeat, the table also shows that the agricultural imports were maintained and that they continually represent about one-half of our total imports although our agricultural exports have been continually becoming a smaller factor in our total exports. If we produce food and cannot export it, doesn't that provide additional food for domestic consumption and for domestic distressed markets? Do you want to continue a program to give away the home market of the American farmer? If you do, should not we be fair and tell him it is for the best interests of our country to do so and not to be continually trying to deceive him with a lot of political chatter as to how he is being benefited when he is not? If it is best to further industrialize our country and have additional industrial exports and have our population consume a proportionately larger amount of imported food, let us be frank and openly propose such a national program without all the false premises that are so deceivingly being circulated. We cannot domestically consume this food not exported and in addition consume the same amount of imported food we have consumed in the past.

There are many other thought-provoking angles to be considered in connection with this food problem. They include the readiness with which one individual or one group may be interested in giving the other fellow's and the other group's market away. It makes so much difference as to whose ox is being gored. I shall try to present additional facts about food for freedom—the immediate as well as the long term picture—as time and opportunity permit. Remember, we have practically lost our agricultural exports, we have the same proportional agricultural imports. There is the problem. What is your answer?

There is one evident fact, and that is that we cannot domestically consume all the agricultural products formerly exported and the equal agricultural food imports.

The table is as follows:

Total value of United States foreign trade in relationship to United States foreign trade in agricultural products, 1920–40

Year	Exports [1]			Imports [1]				
	Total exports including reexports	Exports of agricultural products	Percentage agricultural exports are of total exports	General imports	Imports of agricultural products			Percentage agricultural imports are of total imports
					Not produced at all in the United States	Competitive agricultural products imported	Total imports of agricultural products	
1920	$8,228,000,000	$3,443,000,000	41	$5,278,000,000	$1,092,000,000	$2,157,000,000	$3,249,000,000	61
1921	4,485,000,000	2,114,000,000	47	2,509,000,000	584,000,000	735,000,000	1,319,000,000	52
1922	3,832,000,000	1,884,000,000	49	3,113,000,000	773,000,000	834,000,000	1,607,000,000	51
1923	4,167,000,000	1,820,000,000	43	3,792,000,000	934,000,000	1,094,000,000	2,028,000,000	53
1924	4,591,000,000	2,110,000,000	45	3,610,000,000	927,000,000	984,000,000	1,911,000,000	53
1925	4,910,000,000	2,136,000,000	43	4,227,000,000	1,339,000,000	1,001,000,000	2,340,000,000	55
1926	4,809,000,000	1,817,000,000	38	4,431,000,000	1,443,000,000	973,000,000	2,416,000,000	54
1927	4,865,000,000	1,885,000,000	38	4,185,000,000	1,225,000,000	996,000,000	2,221,000,000	53
1928	5,128,000,000	1,863,000,000	36	4,091,000,000	1,145,000,000	955,000,000	2,100,000,000	51
1929	5,241,000,000	1,693,000,000	32	4,399,000,000	1,201,000,000	1,017,000,000	2,218,000,000	50
1930	3,843,000,000	1,201,000,000	31	3,061,000,000	768,000,000	701,000,000	1,469,000,000	48
1931	2,424,000,000	821,000,000	33	2,091,000,000	561,000,000	447,000,000	1,008,000,000	48
1932	1,611,000,000	662,000,000	41	1,323,000,000	372,000,000	296,000,000	668,000,000	50
1933	1,675,000,000	694,000,000	41	1,450,000,000	367,000,000	365,000,000	732,000,000	50
1934	2,133,000,000	733,000,000	34	1,655,000,000	408,000,000	413,000,000	821,000,000	49
1935	2,283,000,000	747,000,000	32	2,047,000,000	483,000,000	589,000,000	1,072,000,000	52
1936	2,456,000,000	709,000,000	28	2,423,000,000	547,000,000	695,000,000	1,242,000,000	51
1937	3,349,000,000	797,000,000	23	3,084,000,000	711,000,000	868,000,000	1,579,000,000	51
1938	3,049,000,000	828,000,000	27	1,961,000,000	479,000,000	477,000,000	956,000,000	48
1939	3,177,000,000	655,000,000	20	2,318,000,000	592,000,000	526,000,000	1,118,000,000	48
1940	4,022,000,000	517,000,000	12	2,625,000,000	742,000,000	543,000,000	1,285,000,000	49

[1] It should be noted that the use of dollars in showing imports and exports can be deceiving. For example, the imports are based on the values at the point of place of origin and the exports are based on the export values. We may have a favorable trade balance, in dollars, and still the American consumer may pay more for the imported products than the American producer ever received for the same product which went into export at the higher price. Note also that the exports include reexports.

Source: Statistical Abstract, 1937; Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, U. S. Department of Commerce.

(During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the following colloquy occurred:)

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman suggests that we might wait to see what comes out of this conference. The gentleman knows that as a general rule most of the things that come out of a conference remain secret. The plan I heard announced over the radio is that 25 percent of all the food produced in this country is to be shipped out of the country under Lend-Lease. Does the gentleman assume that the results of the conference will call for additional help from our country to the other countries of the world in addition to the 25 percent?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no way of knowing what is going to happen in the future, I may say to my colleague from Minnesota. I know I received a letter this morning from Wisconsin stating that they do not want to take 50 percent of that good cheese out there; they are going to take 70 percent of it now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is good cheese.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not know whether that is a recommendation for the cheese or bad news to the cheese consumers of America. I think there has to be some relationship of food distribution as far as the world is concerned and as far as the United States' consumption is concerned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The main sources of supply of food for the world at the present time are in the Western Hemisphere; the United States producing the bulk of it, and Canada and the South American countries also being large producers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; you are correct, as usual.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The conference is going to be here. Does the gentleman believe the conference will figure out ways and means to distribute the food from Canada and from the South American countries, or just on the distribution of the food raised in the United States?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not be able to answer. I might say to my colleague that I thought possibly our exchairman might give both a personal invitation so we could go direct and find out the answers to the questions the gentleman is asking me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin has given a great deal of study to this subject as well as other agricultural subjects, because he has the capacity and the understanding and can put his thoughts down in concrete language so that they can be understood by the rest of us who are laymen. With reference to this problem, I am concerned with what is going to take place with the American people, when the time comes around. Does the gentleman think we should have a conference here on how to feed the American people, in addition to our soldiers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get off on any sidetrack in this discussion today, because I have approached it not even on a pleasantly partisan basis, I think the gentleman knows that I have been afraid the outfit will starve everybody to death in this country. I believe that as much today as I did a year ago. I believe we are doing things that are strangling production, and that every time we do that we are getting that much nearer to starvation. It could all be avoided by letting someone else know something.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel it was planned that way by some of these intellectual supermen who are running these things?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, I am in a charitable mood today. I shall have to reserve an answer to that. The serious part of it is, is that it is happening whether planned or not. I do think Congress should be represented at the Food Conference, so that we could find out what is going on, because we will be called on to legislate for the people about what food there is and what could be done about it. I think they have made a serious mistake in not taking Congress into their confidence on this food parley. I go further, and I say that I think the Secretary of Agriculture and all the keymen down there on this food program would have carried on their program much more expeditiously and pleasantly if they had just spent a little bit more time consulting the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and these other committees that have direct control over the legislation that must be passed and extended in order to promote a maximum food-production program. However, I am not the Secretary of Agriculture. I cannot tell them what to do. I must just worry about it, like my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman says about the failure of men who make policies is true of everything that has been done in the past 10 years, is it not? First they make the policy, and then they come to Congress and say that they have committed us, and that Congress must pass legislation to carry out these policies. Is not that correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I dare say that most every one of us who has followed the matter closely must come to that conclusion, whether we want to or not. I do not like to come to any such conclusion, but frankly I say that that is in my opinion the truth.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; gladly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman believe that the main object of this so-called food conference will be to consider the question of food? Does not the gentleman generally believe that they will consider other matters not related to the food problem and give very little consideration to the question of food?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has a perfect right to have his opinion about the questions they will take up.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to ask the gentleman whether he will not proceed, so that we may understand the subject of his discussion this afternoon. That is why I stayed here. I wanted to hear him. I suggest that he does not yield any more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understood the gentleman to say that hogs were what price in 1939?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In August 1939 they were $5.30 per 100 pounds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At that time the reciprocal trade agreements were in operation, or at least several of them?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In that year what were the imports of agricultural products—what percentage of the total imports?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. About 50 percent. What year did you want to know? In 1939?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Were we importing pork products at that time?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The reason I rose was to mention what the gentleman said in the last statement, to the effect that next week we take up the reciprocal trade-agreement program, and this issue will be before us, and we will have to deal with it. We have to vote on it. I got the distinct impression that the country is now somewhat solidly behind the reciprocal trade-agreement program, and I got the further impression that this House will approve it, amendments or no amendments. We will certainly vote for some amendments; but if they fail to carry, I feel sure that this House will send the reciprocal trade-agreement program on its way. Of course, that comes with great interest to every beef, hog, and milk producer in the United States.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I want to put this one further picture before you. I will use wheat. If anyone feels that the reciprocal trade treaties are answers to all questions he had better follow wheat through, because he will find that our wheat exports have dwindled until they are 3 percent of our total production. I am not saying that in criticizing the reciprocal trade treaties. We formerly exported up to one-third of the wheat produced in this country. It has gone down now to 3 percent. It has gone down like all the rest of our agricultural products. Oh, we heard a lot of things about the Hawley-Smoot tariff. It was so bad. I know the administration would not keep

it if it was so very bad. It is not anywhere nearly as bad as they say it is. They kept the 1930 tariff up to the present time. Then they turned around and what happened? They implemented the tariff on May 29, 1941, by what is an embargo. Eight hundred thousand bushels of wheat and 4,000,000 pounds of flour. Do you think we will have a good-neighbor policy by putting in an embargo that represents one-tenth of 1 percent of our national production? Do you know of any group of producers that would not be satisfied with an embargo representing only one-tenth of one percent of its production? We have lost our agricultural exports, yet our agricultural imports are maintained the same as they were before. I will not argue between the trade treaties or the Smoot-Hawley tariff or any other tariff that was in operation. I will grant they were all the same. It was all 50 percent of the imports being agricultural products, but please answer this question: Who is going to eat the wheat that we produce but do not export as we formerly did? Do not our agricultural imports have a great influence, much more significance than they had before when we have the food backed up in our markets that formerly went to the markets of the world? So I think it transcends any particular discussion of a particular brand of tariff. I think the question is larger than any partisan approach to it. I think it is something that we must take into consideration if we want to follow the footsteps of our distinguished leader, Churchill, who was not interested in dismembering the British Empire. He did not feel that was his responsibility. Most of us feel that our responsibility is to the people who selected us.

These are some of the things we should be thinking about. So when the producers are producing twice what they did in 1936—we have jumped up to 21,000,000 of pork from 10,000,000 from 1936 to 1942—to me those are the things to be considered by the people of this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Following through on the wheat proposition, assuming that the duty on wheat is cut 50 percent, and wheat starts coming in from Canada, Argentina, Australia, and these other countries, the American farmer should be protected with the 90-percent price-maintenance provision.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely. He is protected by a 90-percent parity loan.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The money will then have to come out of the Treasury and all of the taxpayers will pay for the so-called good-neighbor policy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE] may extend his remarks and include a statement on the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS AND THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1943, I introduced into the House H. R. 2568. This bill is the result of a considerable amount of thought and study which I have given to problems arising as a result of the letting of large numbers of contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

We cannot, as is well known, afford to waste any of our manpower. It is well known that in certain fields, notably agriculture, a serious shortage has existed. And it is also true that as time goes on we may be faced with real labor shortages in other directions. It, therefore, is all important that the most efficient and effective use of manpower be made by all industries and employers.

In the discussion of absenteeism which has taken place in the House, I have pointed out that my own experience has been that the average worker in war plants is complaining not because he has had too much work to do, but because in many instances he has had too little and he has felt that his labor was not being put to the best use of which it was capable. This inevitably has been very bad for morale.

I have become more and more convinced that the root of this problem lies in the fact that under a cost-plus-fixed-fee arrangement, whatever the argument in favor of that type of contract may be, the incentive for keeping costs down by making the most efficient use of labor and other production factors is not present. And while increasing costs do not increase the contractor's fee under this type of contract, nevertheless, if he can look forward to contracts in the future he does as a matter of fact stand to gain from keeping the cost record high so that as to future contracts the amount of his fee will not be reduced. This practice has by no means been universal, and there are some outstanding examples of corporations which have voluntarily come in and stated that they now had sufficient experience to definitely estimate their costs and to make contracts on a flat price basis, and in some instances they have voluntarily asked for a reduction of the prices.

I accord all possible honor to such corporations for their patriotic action and have no hesitation in mentioning specifically the Vultee Aircraft Co., of southern California as one which has taken this action. Nevertheless, by and large, the abuses which I have mentioned are present, as some of the evidence which I am about to give the House will, I think, abundantly indicate.

First of all I wish to read a portion of a letter which I have received from one of the most eminent private counselors in the whole Nation. He writes me as follows:

> I have people coming to see me all the time who are working in different war plants and judging from their universal complaints they are quitting in disgust because they are so frequently encouraged to "act busy" when they really have little or nothing to do. Is most of this production on a percentage basis? It must be. Is there anything that a person can do to see that this waste of our manpower is stopped? I wish I could have a job that would give me a chance to help to stop it. There should be a Government man on every big job simply to see that they are not overmanned.

That presents the general problem. To make the matter more concrete, however, and to illustrate more effectively the point of view of at least one group of skilled workers toward it, I read herewith from an editorial appearing in the Journeyman Plumbers and Steamfitters Journal for November 1942:

> In one instance on a certain project on the west coast men are on the job with 2 years' work ahead of them but they are standing around waiting for material. In the same locality men were recruited on the east coast for a job and when they arrived they were forced to wait around for tools and materials to arrive so they could go to work. In Nebraska we had 35 men who were forced into idleness for more than a month because there was insufficient material with which to work. Then we were called upon to supply another 150 men to the job and they were forced to join the other 35 in waiting for material to arrive. Down in Kansas 600 men were on a job where there were insufficient tools and only enough work to keep 360 men busy.
>
> The question is asked, If this waste of manpower is not the result of inadequate or poor planning, and we answer emphatically "yes"; inadequate planning which stems back to the source of most of the trouble. The real source is the manner in which most of the contracts for construction work have been let and to whom the jobs were given. In the greatest majority of cases where waste of manpower was rampant the jobs were let to general contractors on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. This, we found, was the prime incentive for many general contractors and subcontractors to hire many more men than needed with a consequent loss of manpower due to overmanning the job. Naturally, under the method of financing, this ran the cost of the job up with a resultant increase in the profits to the contractor. The general contractor often hired help directly which he assigned to the subcontractors. On a certain project in Richmond, Calif., the general contractor continued to request our local union to supply him many plumbers for the job. When the plumbing contractor was approached he claimed he didn't need any of the men called for and, in fact, he had about 25 plumbers who could be released for work on other vital projects.

Nor is this problem a matter of indifference to the great bulk of employers, both large and small. For example, I read the following letter from a man who is employed by one of the largest corporations in America and with whom I discussed the provisions of my bill:

> I have discussed this proposal of yours with a great many people in industry since our conversation.
>
> I believe that almost without exception the idea of penalizing the contractor a percentage of the excessive cost over and above the contract figure and up to one-half or some other percentage of the contract fixed

fee would be the only potent means of eliminating excess manpower from concerns operating under such cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. It is the general feeling of practically everybody concerned that some such action must be taken immediately if we are to prevent curtailment of production in essential war industries which are competing for labor with cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors. Such essential industries are operating in most instances with a fixed price ceiling on their product and a frozen wage scale as set up by the War Labor Board and are, therefore, at the mercy of concerns which do not care an iota what the cost of their labor is or how much excess labor they have. As you probably know the manpower situation is becoming increasingly critical and unless some relief is offered quickly to enable vital concerns to get some of the excess labor now going to waste in cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors' plants and others, serious curtailment of the defense program will result.

So far as small companies are concerned, the situation is even more serious. Let me read some extracts from a letter from a very fine lady who went to work for a small company working on subcontracts for the war, out of her patriotic desire to be of assistance to the war effort.

In February I went to work in a small defense factory and thought you might be interested in some of the things I saw, as I have been keeping my eyes open and talking to other workers, getting their views. I have learned a great deal.

When I considered working I began to investigate different plants. I thought first of the larger plants, but found that these large plants have more people than they need to do the work. Their foreman will tell them to make an hour's work stretch over 3 hours, etc. Women I know who are working have told me that they sit hours and do nothing. One woman said she felt like refusing her check, as she had done so little work. A man I know well and see often says they only work part of the time in his department. A young man I know who works for a defense plant laughed at me for feeling that I am patriotic and want to work. He is so thoroughly convinced there are far more people hired than are needed. He says they stand around a lot and could do with less people.

The shipyard workers say the same—they are compelled to work Sundays and do not have enough to keep them busy so they play cards and keep out of the way of the foreman.

When I ask the reason, the answer has been, Cost plus—the more people hired, the more 10 percent for the company. I hope something is done soon about it.

That does not exist in small plants as generally work is done for a price and small plant owners are keeping the pay down as low as possible and getting every ounce of strength for their money.

In fact there is too much difference in the pay and the same price should be paid for all work of the same kind, then moving from one job to another would in a large measure end. Freezing people on jobs is wrong, I think; it gives the employer and employee too much chance for all kinds of things.

Some of the women in our department are working because we feel it is duty. One is a woman, 47, with 5 sons in the service; another has a son in England; several have sons in the Northwest Pacific; 1 girl has a baby 3 months old; another mother has 2 babies—7 months and 3 years; a lawyer's wife works next to me. These are the women who are doing a grand job, so I would truly like to see the situation brought to light. Are we needed or are there plenty of people to work?

The small businessman working on a flat-price contract is up against competition for labor which he is having increasing difficulty to meet. He must attempt, if he is to make both ends meet, to make the most efficient possible use of his own labor. But when he is up against the competition of other employers who do not confront this necessity the situation becomes very difficult indeed.

I now come to a brief statement in the nature of a 6-point summary of the difficulties attendant upon cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. This comes from a man who is an expert accountant and who has been very close to this whole picture indeed.

The following list is only a partial summary of the evils that result from this type of contract:

1. Prime contractors run up their original estimates on new contracts, so that they may obtain the largest possible fee, since it cannot be increased later.

2. It is to the prime contractors' interest that the high original estimates are not reduced in actual cost practice, since it may affect negotiations on future contracts.

3. Since the prime contractors' fee becomes fixed, after the original bargaining, there is no incentive to reduce the out-of-pocket outlay for actual cost of production.

4. Not only is there no incentive for the prime contractor to speed up production in his own plant (which would reduce his local cost), but there is no incentive to buy close from his subcontractors. His inclination is to buy where it is easiest to obtain needed material, without regard to cost, "since Uncle Sam is paying for it anyway."

5. The production element involved is more important than the dollar element, as important as the dollar element is. Dollars spent for "costs" mean hours consumed in labor. More dollars mean more labor. Reduce dollars and there is a very real incentive to reduce labor, for any given job. When this happens, unit production increases, and it is production we need badly

6. If evidence is wanted as to what is involved, consider the reported savings being made by the price inspection and renegotiation branches of the Contract Sections of the Material Command. Theirs is an attempt to plug the leaks created to a large extent by the looseness of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Yet these departments admit that the millions they are saving every month are small in comparison to the greater millions that are going over the dam. Personnel restrictions place a limit to the amount of this work that can be done, and the personnel now being consumed in this work might better be used on actual production of planes, tanks, and ships.

I have selected from among the many letters I have received from workers on the job one such letter which seems to me places this problem before us in a way to require some action on the part of Congress. This man writes as follows:

During the past several months I have been employed as a skilled building tradesman on naval air base installations being constructed by private contractors on a fixed-fee-plus-cost basis. I have seen appalling loss of man-hours on these jobs. I myself have been kept for weeks on a job with only enough work assigned to keep me actually busy 1 day out of 5 or 6. I have watched the same condition continue for months on various jobs, and as a result have seen hundreds of many kinds of tradesmen (carpenters, electricians, plumbers, plasterers, laborers, steamfitters, and so forth) produce only a fraction of the work which they were capable and anxious to perform.

With no way to obtain statistics, it is of course impossible for me to do more than estimate what I think the losses may be. However, it seems to me that the jobs I was working on, and very likely many more jobs that I have heard about from other workmen to whom I have talked about the problem, were at least 25 percent overmanned. That means that many thousands of men throughout the country could be released if proper steps were taken.

But I wish to point out that if a certain type of building is made to cost say 25 percent or 50 percent more under present practice than under previous competitive bidding, then the fixed fee set for that type of building on subsequent contracts is going to be based upon the higher costs. Thus, if a certain type of building costs $100,000 to construct by the fixed-fee-plus-cost method, the same type of buildings which are constructed later will have their fees based upon an estimated cost of $100,000 instead of $50,000 or $75,000 that the building might be constructed for if the man-hours were fully utilized. Therefore, by present methods it seems reasonable to assume that the fees of the private contractors are being kept higher than they might otherwise expect, and the contractors are not likely to discontinue the practice of employing more men than they need until they are forced to do so. It seems to me that the fixed-fee-plus-cost contract is the root of the trouble, and that the conditions I have observed may very likely be found to be rampant wherever that type of contract is being used.

I realize that it takes time to get legislative action such as might be required to bring about the remedy suggested by this article. I believe it would not be desirable either to require competitive-bid contracts on all Government work at this time because critical time would undoubtedly be lost. However, there do seem to me to be other solutions which would not have those objections. One method is to set up, if possible by exercise of power already authorized, an authority to investigate these conditions and force the contractors to release the excess men. Another way might be to devise a method whereby the profits of the contractors could be increased as building costs decreased. Possibly a certain percent bonus on all savings from a certain estimated figure would do it. To arrive at the best remedy will require careful study, but it should not be delayed.

Now, what do I propose to do about this? Let me read to the House the text of a very brief bill which I have drawn and introduced and to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks. The bill, H. R. 2568, reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that Government procurement agencies shall so far as possible avoid the letting of contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis and shall endeavor wherever possible without detriment to the war effort to let contracts either on the basis of competitive bids or on the basis of negotiated contracts at flat prices.

SEC. 2. In the case of any contracts where in the judgment of procurement agencies, the letting of a contract on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis is unavoidable, such contracts shall contain the most accurate possible estimate of cost which shall be known as the bogey price. Such contracts shall also contain a clause providing as follows:

"If the actual cost of material delivered under the contract exceeds the bogey price of

such material, the contractor's fee shall be reduced by one-half the amount of such excess: *Provided, however,* That in no case shall such reduction be more than 50 percent of the fixed fee provided for in the contract; if the actual cost of the material to the Government is less than the bogey price, one-third of the amount of such reduction shall be added to the fee of the contractor: *Provided further,* That such addition to the contractor's fee shall not be in excess of 50 percent of the fee originally agreed upon."

Now, I am encouraged to be able to state to the House that already I am informed the Navy is making use of a new type of contract. It has been devised in order to attempt to meet some of the problems to which I have already referred, but notably, as I understand it, to try to remedy the disability under which subcontractors for small producers are now laboring. Under this new type of Navy contract specifications are sent out by a navy yard for a certain job and the amount of the cost which the yard has found to be proper for such a job is indicated. The company desiring to bid on such a contract submits its estimates against the ceiling cost, which is determined on the basis of the experience of past manufacturing in the navy yard itself. The contractor's fee is fixed at a given percentage of the estimated cost. If then the contractor is able to produce at less than that cost, he obviously receives a certain advantage. But if his costs exceed the estimated cost, he cannot possibly derive any advantage, and if this happens, he furthermore stands to lose future contracts, which, of course, is the important point.

This type of contract is, it seems to me, decidedly a step in the right direction, though it cannot be of as universal application as the proposal which I have advanced in my bill.

The time has arrived when as to a great deal of the manufacturing which is being done for this war, it should be possible to determine cost much more accurately than has been the case in the past. And while I do not pose by any means as enough of an expert on these matters to say that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts could be done away with, I do most earnestly believe that the time has come when great improvements can be made on the methods so far employed. And it is for that reason that I have introduced my bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman from California for the effort which he has been making and is making now in attempting to solve a very important and intricate problem. If more of us would give serious attention to this a good deal could be accomplished.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very deeply. I am not certain that the specific percentages I have in this bill are correct. Maybe they should be altered, but I am sure it offers the right approach to this problem and one that should be used as the basis of discussion by a committee looking toward solution of this problem.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman is trying to help solve a problem here that is extremely imporant.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman think these big corporations and these big industrialists want to get away from the cost-plus proposition? They want to continue it, do they not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not ask about that. It is a case of what is best for our country as a whole.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is only the little fellows who are really doing a good, honest job on these contracts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that there are, unfortunately, some among that small group who have obtained the lion's share of this war work, who would not want to give up the cost-plus-fixed-fee system.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is no question about that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. They might not be glad to see this change made. But I am also convinced that the average businessman of this country is quite as patriotic as anybody else and I am convinced he would be very glad to see some move of this kind taken.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I also want to commend the gentleman for his study. I think it is going to help the situation regardless of what action the Congress takes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

CRUDE OIL PRICES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a solemn and terrible day of judgment awaits those who willfully interfere with the production processes of this Nation whether it be in the production of food, war equipment, or oil.

The announcement by Price Administrator Prentiss Brown denying the request of Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes for a general increase in crude oil prices is certainly shocking to an oil-hungry Nation. Most surprising, however, is the fact that a practical man like Price Administrator Prentiss Brown should offer to socialize the industry by offering Government aid to subsidize drilling 4,500 wildcat wells.

The Government suggests furnishing capital through existing banking facilities and in return for this aid the Government is to receive one-fourth interest in any well proving a commercial producer. If the well proved to be dry and the interest would prove to be worthless, then any obligations that the funds so advanced would be considered discharged.

It is evident that the influence of bureaucracy is at work and the philosophy of "production for use and not for profit" is becoming more evident every day. The professors are trying to put the small oil producers out of business so as to concentrate production in a few hands so in event the Government should socialize the industry it would simplify matters if bureaucracy decides to take over the petroleum industry.

The question is whether we can retain the free enterprise system of ours or whether the bureaucrats are going to take over the industrial and economic life of the Nation. This is a matter that rests with the Congress. It is surprising that Price Administrator Prentiss Brown would be influenced by the crackpot philosophy of the impractical dreamers who surround him.

The position of the small independent producer in the oil industry is well known to Administrator Brown. He recognizes that production is rapidly declining daily, that demands for increased crude supply will become increasingly greater over the months that lie ahead; even in the face of this all-out war effort he thwarts the will of the American people by his present action. The next great bottleneck in the United States will be oil. Congressional action should be taken immediately.

Bureaucracy is riding high. The O. P. A. recognizes the necessity of a price increase being granted immediately of at least 50 cents a barrel on oil, and if this Nation of ours wants more oil, and we have got to have it, or there is a possibility of our losing the war and the peace that follows, the only way to get more oil is to pay the man who goes out after the oil a sufficient price to at least pay for the lifting cost and make it a profitable venture.

However, this action looks like an attempt to socialize the oil industry. We are heading for a crisis in this country unless we secure the oil to meet the war demands.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for permission to speak further at this time concerning the action of the House on the report on H. R. 1860 as amended by the other body. I do not criticize the vote of any Member of this House on that report. It was not my province to influence any Member as to his action. I do feel, however, that the House should not have accepted the legislation handed to us by the body at the other end of the Capitol, but should have given the conference committee an opportunity at least to amend the measure with respect to the increase in salaries of eighteen or twenty thousand employees

who may or may not work more than 40 hours per week but who, nevertheless, will receive at least $435 a year increase in their pay. Some will exceed that amount.

I realize as you do that all Government employees have increased taxes and other expenses, but the same thing goes for farmers and bank clerks and store clerks and salesmen and small businessmen and merchants who do not begin to receive as much as $5,000 income a year. They are not in a position to ask the Government to increase their income.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about freezing salaries and wages, but the House saw fit today to dip into an almost exhausted Federal Treasury and pay $20,000,000 in salaries to its employees who are now getting all the way from $5,000 to $10,000.

I am not unmindful that we have many career men and women who, because of their important duties and efficient service, are not receiving as much pay as they deserve, but that situation should be met in another way. It just does not seem quite reasonable to me that in order to take care of that particular group we should include everybody on the list.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] pointed out, there has been a lot of criticism about increases in wages to men employed in industry, but the House saw fit this afternoon to increase the high-salaried group to the extent of $1.50 to $2 per day. Let me repeat again, I am in favor of taking care of all of the employees in our Government in the lower-salaried brackets, but in view of conditions as we find them in our country this afternoon, and considering the income and pay granted to other folks outside of the Government and to the men in our armed forces, I still think that the action of the House with regard to the higher-income groups is unwarranted and inconsistent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on Thursday, May 6, to consider H. R. 85, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," and H. R. 1905, a bill to liberalize the provisions of existing laws governing the granting of service pensions to certain soldiers and widows of deceased soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1893, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 6, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2326, a bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

398. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 26, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Portland Harbor, Maine, with a view to determining whether the removal of Soldier Ledge in Hussey Sound and certain additional shoal areas in Casco Bay, Maine, is advisable, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 3, 1941, and March 12, 1942, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2630. A bill creating the Department of Industry; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2631. A bill making the provision of the executive departments' law applicable to the Department of Industry; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2632. A bill to authorize the issuance of unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2633. A bill to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorize the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2634. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2635. A bill designating the 19th day of April of each year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. Res. 223. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Department of Industry; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2629. A bill to provide an allowance for quarters and subsistence for midshipmen of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2636. A bill for the relief of John E. Folsom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bellia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2638. A bill for the relief of the alien, George E. Schieff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. F. Trucano; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

665. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition signed by 155 citizens representing the various churches of Mayfield, Ky., petitioning Congress to act favorably on House bill 2082 and Senate bills 569 and 682, dealing with the prohibiting of the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the period of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

666. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of employees of veterans' hospital, Knoxville, Iowa, urging enactment of Federal employees pay-increase bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

667. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolutions adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study and formulate plans for the enforcement of world peace by and through international cooperation and a council of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

668. By Mr. LANE: Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enforce world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

669. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Neil McClure, the Reverend and Mrs. Van B. Wright, and 40 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

670. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Mrs. Ivan Foss, of Guilford, Maine, and 18 others, urging passage of House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism and speed production by prohibiting manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

671. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America, Toledo, Ohio, opposing the landing in American markets of foreign competitive goods at less than American cost of production; unalterably opposed to continued authorization for trade treaties unless said authorization provides for congressional approval or Senate ratification that such trade treaties be terminated at the conclusion of the present war or that no provision be made for the entry into American markets of foreign-made competitive goods at less than American cost of production; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

672. Also, petition of Dr. J. Russell Bucher and members of the First Church of God of McMechen, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

673. Also, petition of Mrs. Ira C. Shaffer and members of her affiliation, of Mannington, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

674. Also, petition of Rev. Anna B. Potter and members of the First Methodist Church of Newell, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 3, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that our common life on this shrinking sphere which is our home is driving us from self-contained complacency to a vivid sense of comradeship with our brothers everywhere whose future we share. We are grateful for the hard-learned lessons in Thy stern school of discipline, that no nation liveth or aileth to itself, that the deepest facts of humanity are not to be found in any book of geography, that our selfish spite fences shut out more than they shut in, and that upon the East and West, the North and South is the compulsion that the best be shared as good neighbors. We repent of our part in the sins of the social order which are now making nations and races speak to each other through the frightful when the God who is over all meant that they should speak to each other through the beautiful.

Keep us, we beseech Thee, from the seat of arrogance where sit those of whom the Holy Book declares, "They speak peace with their neighbors, but mischief is in their hearts." Above the walls of suspicion and prejudice may we hear a brother's heartbeat across our national borders. May our own attitudes contribute to the warmth of that climate of friendship which shall color every landscape with its magic charm and at last spread its divine tints across all the areas of human life. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

By THE VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States, proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Delaware are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which the Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, the said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Delaware Member thereof.

"Approved by the Governor April 22, 1943."

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 857

"Joint resolution providing for a declaration of the Federation of the World

"Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in—

"THE DECLARATION OF THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD

"Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities: the city, the state, the nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

"Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly but purposefully through the centuries, civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without governments perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

"Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organize the international community: totalitarianism and democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicated upon the principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship and enslaves men; the latter, a proved bulwark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the consent of the governed, embodies the will of freemen and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The cornerstone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its favors; the foundation of democracy is man whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence; of the latter, freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambition; the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation.

"One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. The present conflict is irrepressible and decisive. It is the challenge of the ages to the generation of today, and represents those spiritually cosmic forces which visit the world at critical periods in human history to shape the destinies of men. This world cannot remain half-slave, half-free; half-totalitarian, half-democratic. The laws of civilized society prevent intercourse between slaves and freemen from being either congenial or profitable. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be ruled by tyrants and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples, and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order.

"Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble, and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guaranties against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as are provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

"The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civilization now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

"Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function, they capitulate on the fundamental principles of their raison d'être. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by diverse national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

"History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual and as a citizen and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence, and assets of society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

"There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional, or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation should be excluded from membership in the Federation of the World that is willing to suppress its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the polls.

"It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

"That man should be forever free and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience.

"That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy.

"That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, as a consequence of the present war, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals.

"That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.

"That the present conflict will determine the survival of free institutions throughout the world, and that it is morally incumbent upon this generation, as one of the declared objectives of the current war, to federate the nations, in order to make secure, and hereafter unchallenged, freedom for all peoples everywhere, and in order to impart to those who are called to give their lives and fortunes for the triumph of democracy the positive assurance of the incorruptible utility of their sacrifice.

"That world federation is the keystone in the arch of civilization, humanity's charter of liberty for all peoples, and the signet authenticating at last the union of the nations in freedom and peace.

"That the universal ordeal, through which mankind is now passing, marks the birth of a new epoch that will affirm for all time the indestructible solidarity of civilization and the abiding unity of the human race.

"That there are supreme moments in history when nations are summoned, as trustees of civilization, to defend the heritage of the ages and to create institutions essential for human progress. In the providence of God, such a crisis is this hour, compelling in duty and unprecedented in responsibility—a fateful moment when men meet destiny for the fulfillment of historic tasks: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of Rhode Island does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World, and to that end it hereby endorses the declaration of the Federation of the World as is specifically set forth in the preamble hereof, and makes said declaration a part of this resolution in the same manner as if same were recited herein, and requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Rhode Island to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States, approving the principle of world federation and requesting the President of the United States to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World, which shall be submitted to

each nation for its ratification; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That there be selected a territory for the seat of government for the Federation of the World, and that the nation in which the said territory is located be requested to withdraw its jurisdiction over this area and cede it to the Federation of the World for its capital, with all the prerogatives and attributes of sovereignty, in order that there might be built in this area a city symbolic of world unity, adequate for the needs of the nations and worthy of the aspirations and destiny of mankind; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Rhode Island; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be in full force and effect upon and after its ratification.

"Approved by the Governor April 22, 1943."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Abilene, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks and appropriately referred telegrams which I have received from farmers of North Dakota, from some of the chambers of commerce, and from farmers' union locals, all of them asking the Senate to see to it that the Farm Security Administration and some of the other farm agencies be not abolished, and that the appropriations for them which were eliminated by the House of Representatives be reinstated.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELGIN, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members New Hope Local, Grant County, wish you to put your full support opposing agricultural appropriation bill as passed by House of Representatives. Enlarge appropriations for Farm Security Administration, triple A, and full agricultural program as advocated by National Farmers' Union.

MEMBERS NEW HOPE LOCAL,
FARMERS' UNION,
By VERN LONIE.

ELGIN, N. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Grant County Farmers' Union members and officers unalterably opposed to agricultural appropriation bill as passed by House of Representatives. We demand enlarged and adequate appropriations to continue established agricultural programs. Demand your total support.

GRANT COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
GODFREY SCHRIOCK, *President.*

HEBRON, N. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

One hundred and twenty-eight members Hielborn Farmers' Union ask your support of Agricultural Adjustment Agency and Farm Security Administration.

ERNEST WALTER, *Secretary.*

SELFRIDGE, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep present farm payments and committee system.

ANTON GLASSER,
Solen, N. Dak.

HETTINGER, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight restore all agriculture appropriations.

ADAM COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
ALBERT THORSEN, *County Chairman.*
E. A. STAFNE, *County Secretary.*

MCINTOSH, S. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Soil conservation districts vitally interested in preservation triple A as it stands and farm security farmers wondering why Congress scrapping their agencies. They resent sending boys to fight for world that creates Hitlers.

CEDAR SOIL CONSERVATION
DISTRICT, N. DAK.,
JAMES J. MAHER, *Chairman.*

MCINTOSH, S. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Why scrap triple A farm security? Farmers take interest in Government through their agencies which is basis for democracy.

SIOUX COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION.
OLIVER M. DAHL, *Secretary.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your good work in behalf of our agricultural program. We urge you to vigorously oppose the agricultural appropriations bill recently passed by the House. Keep up the good fight.

WARD COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
O C. LANSVERK.

SELFRIDGE, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Present farm program fine. Keep payments and farmer committees.

GEORGE HETTICK.

SUTTON, N. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Ninety-six dues-paying members of Sutton local Farmers Union request you support the National Farmers Unions' policy regarding appropriation for various farm programs.

SUTTON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 70.
ART DAFOE, *Secretary.*

BELFIELD, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully request that you use your power and influence to the utmost to defeat or amend the agriculture appropriation bill passed by the House which would take the triple A out of the hands of the farmers and eliminate or seriously cripple the present farm program which has meant so mucht to the farmers in this part of North Dakota. Under present conditions it is imperative that the agricultural program be kept on a steady basis. Conservation on our soil is the foundation of our Nation.

BELFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *May 5, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of North Dakota want the agricultural program continued. Commodity loans and soil-building practices are responsible for better farm incomes. Farm security has assisted many farmers in becoming self-sustaining, capable of taking care of their own families and increasing food production during this emergency period. This organization believes the agricultural program and farm security should not be greatly curtailed.

CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
WILLARD CARLSON, *President.*

HILLSBORO, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We urgently ask your support in the fight to maintain the present farm program. We think that if the agriculture appropriation bill is allowed to pass as passed by the House it would be a disaster. In our contact with the farmers of the county all are concerned with the situation and are demanding action to keep and enlarge the present farm program.

Traill County Farmers Union, Orlando Odegard, Buxton, president; A. C. Clifford, Kelso, secretary; Arthur Rygg, Clifford, vice president; Joseph Amb, Portland, director; Clarence Anderson, Clifford, director; Mancur Olson, Buxton, director; W. B. McNamee, Kelso, director; Albin Mohn, Buxton, director.

TOLNA, N. DAK., *May 3, 1943*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator:

In behalf of the farmers of America and the welfare of the Nation as a whole we urgently ask that you use your power and influence to protect and conserve the farm program that has in the past been such a help to small business and a savior to agriculture, namely the Agriculture Adjustment Act, Farm Security Administration, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Program. We urgently ask you to vote to provide funds to continue these programs.

Laval Farmers' Union Local, C. C. Haas, chairman, John Schindele, secretary; Dayton Farmers' Union Local, Oliver Twete, vice chairman, L. S. Johnson, secretary; Ford Farmers' Union Local, Theo Quam, chairman, F. Fredejickson, secretary; Farmers' Union Oil Co., Tolna, N. Dak., A. Pare, president; Farmers' Union Elevator Co., Tolna, N. Dak., J. N. Johnson, secretary.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 676. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 218).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1083. A bill for the relief of William E. Seidewitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1084. A bill to amend section 27 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 159), an act making appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1086. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-13, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1087. A bill for the relief of Burton S. Radford; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate Joint Resolution 56, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN EFFECTING A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce for proper reference a joint resolution relating to the participation of the United States in the establishment of a just and lasting peace. I also request that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) relating to the participation of the United States in the establishment of a just and lasting peace was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress and the President of the United States have demonstrated that this Government intends to utilize to the fullest extent the military and economic resources of the United States and its possessions in the prosecution of the war, and to cooperate fully with the members of the United Nations in the war effort; and

Whereas a spirit of international cooperation has been evidenced by many acts of the Congress and of the Government in the past and more recently by the establishment of a reciprocal trade-agreements program, by the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941, and its continuance, by the joint resolution of April 10, 1941, reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine, by the recent ratification of the treaty relinquishing extraterritorial rights in China, and by the increasing participation of our armed forces in the war in various parts of the world; and

Whereas the interests of this Government in the establishment of a just and lasting peace are so manifest: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States and of the United Nations should have the utmost confidence that the United States will utilize all of its resources to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion, and will cooperate fully with other nations in establishing and preserving a just and lasting peace and in establishing such organizations as may be necessary to suppress any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it will be necessary to take a recess for 15 or 20 minutes in a little while. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] desires to make a connected statement on the bill under consideration, and it would probably be disadvantageous for him to begin now. So, if there is any further routine morning business any Senator desires to transact or any desultory remarks to be made, we might occupy a few minutes doing that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is an appropriation bill on which a few minutes could be spent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we had better have a quorum before doing anything.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Green	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Truman
Chandler	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Van Nuys
Connally	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	Overton	Wiley
George	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has been called from the city because of the death of a very dear friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

METALLURGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on the subject of metallurgy which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Couldn't Happen Anywhere Else" published in the Argus, of Seattle, Wash., issue of May 1, 1943, and an article from the same publication under the headline "The stroller," which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LT. GEN. FRANK MAXWELL ANDREWS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Lt. Gen. Frank Maxwell Andrews, published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of Thursday, May 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEWIS AGAINST NATION—EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lewis Against Nation," published in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., of May 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF THOMAS WILSON DORR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GREEN on May 4, 1943, on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of Thomas Wilson Dorr in the Rhode Island State House in Providence, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERFERENCE BY LABOR LEADERS IN CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement, a news article, and an editorial, each pertaining to the subject of interference with the construction of pipe lines, published in the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian, which appear in the Appendix.]

DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, a year ago the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision involving the rights of freedom of the press and freedom of religion, and in a case coming up from a lower court by a majority of one vote upheld a law which provided that a municipality or a State had the right to license the distribution of literature, in this case pamphlets of a religious character. At the session of the Court last Monday, in connection with a similar case, the Court took the opposite view by a majority of one.

In the decision a year ago the Court held that the power to license and tax the distribution of literature, even of a religious character, inhered in the States and the municipalities, to enable them to prevent disorder. In other words, the maintenance of law and order in a community was taken away from the police department and vested in a commission, or city council, giving them the authority, by State law, to license and tax in order that they might be able to prohibit the distribution of printed matter.

Mr. President, a year ago, when the Court rendered an opinion directly opposite to that rendered last Monday, I was so shocked and surprised that I thought I ought to call the attention of the public at that time to that remarkable decision. I now ask unanimous consent to have the statement which I then made to the press a year ago printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPSTEAD FLAYS COURT RULING AS MOB CONCESSION—HITS DECISION AGAINST SECT FOR PEDDLING WITHOUT LICENSE

Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Republican, of Minnesota, declared yesterday that the Supreme Court decision on the Jehovah's Witnesses case limits the freedom of speech, press, and religion, and licenses the freedom of the mob wherever it desires to interfere with those freedoms.

The Supreme Court on Monday upheld convictions of Jehovah's Witnesses, a religious sect, for peddling without a license.

LIMITS FREEDOMS

Senator SHIPSTEAD issued a statement declaring:

"The Supreme Court has held in this case, by a decision of 5 to 4, that the exercise of free speech, free press, and religious freedom may be limited by legislative bodies 'to times, places, and methods not at odds with the preservation of peace and good order.'

"This can now be done through the power to license and tax.

"The power to license is the power to regulate and prohibit. The power to prohibit and tax is the power to destroy.

"The specific constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech, the press, and religion is by this decision limited to that of other human activities, the freedom of exercise of which is not so specifically guaranteed in the Constitution.

"FREEDOM OF THE MOB

"The free exercise of these three freedoms can therefore be prevented by bigots and mobs by simply creating disorder.

"This is licensing the freedom of the mob wherever it desires to interfere with freedom of speech, religion, and the press."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to point out that these provisions of the Bill of Rights are in jeopardy—and they are in jeopardy even when the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold them by a majority of merely one vote. A year ago, as I have said, the Supreme Court took the opposite position from that now taken by the Court, and did so by a majority of only one vote. So when we have off-again on-again decisions by the Supreme Court on a matter so vital as this, and particularly in such times as the present, I think the Congress of the United States and the American people ought to take cognizance of the jeopardy in which the Bill of Rights finds itself in the present day. As I have said, the Court has now reversed its previous decision.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the prevailing decision of the Supreme Court rendered during the present session of the Court, on last Monday, May 3, 1943. The majority opinion was delivered by Mr. Justice Douglas, and it was concurred in by Chief Justice Stone, Mr. Justice Rutledge, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Murphy.

The dissenting opinion was delivered by Mr. Justice Reed and it was concurred in by Mr. Justice Roberts, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, and Mr. Justice Jackson.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.

The city of Jeannette, Pa., has an ordinance some 40 years old which provides, in part:

"That all persons canvassing for or soliciting within said borough orders for goods, paintings, pictures, wares, or merchandise of any kind, or persons delivering such articles under orders so obtained or solicited, shall be required to procure from the burgess a license to transact said business and shall pay to the treasurer of said borough therefor the following sums, according to the time for which said license shall be granted:

"For 1 day, $1.50; for 1 week, $7; for 2 weeks, $12; for 3 weeks, $20: *Provided*, That the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to persons selling by sample to manufacturers or licensed merchants or dealers doing business in said borough of Jeannette."

Petitioners are Jehovah's Witnesses. They went about from door to door in the city of Jeannette distributing literature and soliciting people to "purchase" certain religious books and pamphlets, all published by the Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society.[1] The "price" of the books was 25 cents each, the "price" of the pamphlets 5 cents each.[2] In connection with these activities, petitioners used a phonograph,[3] on which they played a record expounding certain of their views on religion. None of them obtained a license under the ordinance. Before they were arrested each had made "sales" of books. There was evidence that it was their practice in making these solicitations to request a "contribution" of 25 cents each for the books and 5 cents each for the pamphlets, but to accept lesser sums or even to donate the volumes in case an interested person was without funds. In the present case some donations of pamphlets were made when books were purchased. Petitioners were convicted and fined for violation of the ordinance. Their judgments of conviction were sustained by the Superior Court of Pennsylvania (149 Pa. Sup. Ct. 175, 27 Atl. 2d 668) against their contention that the ordinance deprived them of the freedom of speech, press, and religion guaranteed by the first amendment. Petitions for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania were denied. The cases are here on petitions for writs of certiorari, which we granted along with the petitions for rehearing of *Jones* v. *Opelika* (316 U. S. 584) and its companion cases.

The first amendment, which the fourteenth makes applicable to the States, declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press. * * *." It could hardly be denied that a tax laid specifically on the exercise of those freedoms would be unconstitutional. Yet the license tax imposed by this ordinance is in substance just that.

Petitioners spread their interpretations of the Bible and their religious beliefs largely through the hand distribution of literature by full or part-time workers.[4] They claim to follow the example of Paul, teaching "publickly, and from house to house." Acts 20:20. They take literally the mandate of the Scriptures, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16: 15. In doing so they believe that they are obeying a commandment of God.

The hand distribution of religious tracts is an age-old form of missionary evangelism—as old as the history of printing presses.[5] It has been a potent force in various religious movements down through the years.[6] This form of evangelism is utilized today on a large scale by various religious sects whose colporteurs carry the Gospel to thousands upon thousands of homes and seek through personal visitations to win adherents to their

---

[1] Two religious books—Salvation and Creation—were sold. Others were offered in addition to the Bible. The Watch Tower Bible & Trace Society is alleged to be a nonprofit charitable corporation.

[2] Petitioners paid 3 cents each for the pamphlets and, if they devoted only their spare time to the work, 20 cents each for the books. Those devoting full time to the work acquired the books for 5 cents each. There was evidence that some of the petitioners paid the difference between the sales price and the cost of the books to their local congregations which distributed the literature.

[3] Purchased along with the record from the Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society.

[4] The nature and extent of their activities throughout the world during the years 1939 and 1940 are to be found in the 1941 Yearbook of Jehovah's Witnesses, pp. 62-243.

[5] Palmer, the Printing Press and the Gospel (1912).

[6] White, the Colporteur Evangelist (1930); Home Evangelization (1850); Edwards, the Romance of the Book (1932) c. V; 12 Biblical Repository (1844) Art. VIII; 16 the Sunday Magazine (1887) pp. 43-47; 3 Meliora (1861) pp. 311-319; Felice, Protestants of France (1853) pp. 53, 513; 3 D'Aubigne, History of the Reformation (1849) pp. 103, 152, 436-437; Report of Colportage in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, American Tract Society (1855). An early type of colporteur was depicted by John Greenleaf Whittier in his legendary poem, the Vaudois Teacher. And see, Wylie, History of the Waldenses.

faith.[7] It is more than preaching; it is more than distribution of religious literature. It is a combination of both. Its purpose is as evangelical as the revival meeting. This form of religious activity occupies the same high estate under the first amendment as do worship in the churches and preaching from the pulpits. It has the same claim to protection as the more orthodox and conventional exercises of religion. It also has the same claim as the others to the guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The integrity of this conduct or behavior as a religious practice has not been challenged. Nor do we have presented any question as to the sincerity of petitioners in their religious beliefs and practices, however misguided they may be thought to be. Moreover, we do not intimate or suggest in respecting their sincerity that any conduct can be made a religious rite and by the zeal of the practitioners swept into the first amendment. *Reynolds* v. *United States* (98 U. S. 145, 161–167) and *Davis* v. *Beason* (133 U. S. 333) denied any such claim to the practice of polygamy and bigamy. Other claims may well arise which deserve the same fate. We only hold that spreading one's religious beliefs or preaching the gospel through distribution of religious literature and through personal visitations is an age-old type of evangelism with as high a claim to constitutional protection as the more orthodox types. The manner in which it is practiced at times gives rise to special problems with which the police power of the States is competent to deal. See for example *Cox* v. *New Hampshire* (312 U. S. 569) and *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire* (315 U. S. 568). But that merely illustrates that the rights with which we are dealing are not absolutes. *Schneider* v. *State* (308 U. S. 147, 160–161). We are concerned, however, in these cases merely with one narrow issue. There is presented for decision no question whatsoever concerning punishment for any alleged unlawful acts during the solicitation. Nor is there involved here any question as to the validity of a registration system for colporteurs and other solicitors. The cases present a single issue—the constitutionality of an ordinance which as construed and applied requires religious colporteurs to pay a license tax as a condition to the pursuit of their activities.

The alleged justification for the exaction of this license tax is the fact that the religious literature is distributed with a solicitation of funds. Thus it was stated in *Jones* v. *Opelika*, *supra*, page 597, that when a religious sect uses "ordinary commercial methods of sales of articles to raise propaganda funds," it is proper for the State to charge "reasonable fees for the privilege of canvassing." Situations will arise where it will be difficult to determine whether a particular activity is religious or purely commercial. The distinction at times is vital. As we stated only the other day in *Jamison* v. *Texas* (318 U. S. —), "The State can prohibit the use of the street for the distribution of purely commercial leaflets, even though such leaflets may have 'a civil appeal, or a moral platitude' appended. *Valentine* v. *Chrestensen* (316 U. S. 52, 55). They may not prohibit the distribution of handbills in the pursuit of a clearly religious activity merely because the handbills invite the purchase of books for the improved understanding of the religion or because the handbills seek in a lawful fashion to promote the raising of funds for religious purposes." But the mere fact that the religious literature is "sold" by itinerant preachers rather than "donated" does not transform evangelism into a commercial enterprise. If it did, then the passing of the collection plate in church would make the church service a commercial project. The constitutional rights of those spreading their religious beliefs through the spoken and printed word are not to be gaged by standards governing retailers or wholesalers of books. The right to use the press for expressing one's views is not to be measured by the protection afforded commercial handbills. It should be remembered that the pamphlets of Thomas Paine were not distributed free of charge. It is plain that a religious organization needs funds to remain a going concern. But an itinerant evangelist however misguided or intolerant he may be, does not become a mere book agent by selling the Bible or religious tracts to help defray his expenses or to sustain him. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion are available to all, not merely to those who can pay their own way. As we have said, the problem of drawing the line between a purely commercial activity and a religious one will at times be difficult. On this record it plainly cannot be said that petitioners were engaged in a commercial rather than a religious venture. It is a distortion of the facts of record to describe their activities as the occupation of selling books and pamphlets. And the Pennsylvania court did not rest the judgments of conviction on that basis, though it did find that petitioners "sold" the literature. The Supreme Court of Iowa in *State* v. *Mead* (230 Iowa 1217), described the selling activities of members of this same sect as "merely incidental and collateral" to their "main object which was to preach and publicize the doctrines of their order." And see *State* v. *Meredith* (197 S. C. 351); *People* v. *Barber* (289 N. Y. 378, 385–386). That accurately summarizes the present record.

We do not mean to say that religious groups and the press are free from all financial burdens of government. See *Grosjean* v. *American Press Co.* (297 U. S. 233, 250). We have here something quite different, for example, from a tax on the income of one who engages in religious activities or a tax on property used or employed in connection with those activities. It is one thing to impose a tax on the income or property of a preacher. It is quite another thing to exact a tax from him for the privilege of delivering a sermon. The tax imposed by the city of Jeannette is a flat license tax, the payment of which is a condition of the exercise of these constitutional privileges. The power to tax the exercise of a privilege is the power to control or suppress its enjoyment. *Magnano Co.* v. *Hamilton* (292 U. S. 40, 44–45), and cases cited. Those who can tax the exercise of this religious practice can make its exercise so costly as to deprive it of the resources necessary for its maintenance. Those who can tax the privilege of engaging in this form of missionary evangelism can close its doors to all those who do not have a full purse. Spreading religious beliefs in this ancient and honorable manner would thus be denied the needy. Those who can deprive religious groups of their colporteurs can take from them a part of the vital power of the press which has survived from the Reformation.

It is contended, however, that the fact that the license tax can suppress or control this activity is unimportant if it does not do so. But that is to disregard the nature of this tax. It is a license tax—a flat tax imposed on the exercise of a privilege granted by the Bill of Rights. A State may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution. Thus, it may not exact a license tax for the privilege of carrying on interstate commerce (*McGoldrick* v. *Berwind-White Co.* (309 U. S. 33, 56–58)), although it may tax the property used in, or the income derived from, that commerce, so long as those taxes are not discriminatory. Idem, page 47, and cases cited. A license tax applied to activities guaranteed by the first amendment would have the same destructive effect. It is true that the first amendment, like the commerce clause, draws no distinction between license taxes, fixed sum taxes, and other kinds of taxes. But that is no reason why we should shut our eyes to the nature of the tax and its destructive influence. The power to impose a license tax on the exercise of these freedoms is indeed as potent as the power of censorship which this Court has repeatedly struck down (*Lovell* v. *Griffin* (303 U. S. 444); *Schneider* v. *State*, *supra*; *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut* (310 U. S. 296, 306); *Largent* v. *Texas* (318 U. S. —); *Jamison* v. *Texas*, *supra*). It was for that reason that the dissenting opinions in *Jones* v. *Opelika*, *supra*, stressed the nature of this type of tax (316 U. S. pp. 607–609, 620, 623). In that case, as in the present ones, we have something very different from a registration system under which those going from house to house are required to give their names, addresses, and other marks of identification to the authorities. In all of these cases the issuance of the permit or license is dependent on the payment of a license tax. And the license tax is fixed in amount and unrelated to the scope of the activities of petitioners or to their realized revenues. It is not a nominal fee imposed as a regulatory measure to defray the expenses of policing the activities in question.[8] It is in no way apportioned. It is a flat license tax levied and collected as a condition to the pursuit of activities whose enjoyment is guaranteed by the first amendment. Accordingly, it restains in advance those constitutional liberties of press and religion and inevitably tends to suppress their exercise. That is almost uniformly recognized as the inherent vice and evil of this flat license tax. As stated by the supreme court of Illinois in a case involving this same sect and an ordinance similar to

[7] The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists who filed a brief amicus curiae on the reargument of Jones against Opelika has given us the following data concerning their literature ministry: This denomination has 33 publishing houses throughout the world issuing publications in over 200 languages. Some 9,256 separate publications were issued in 1941. By printed and spoken word the Gospel is carried into 412 countries in 824 languages. 1942 Year Book, page 287. During December 1941 a total of 1,018 colporteurs operated in North America. They delivered during that month $97,997.19 worth of Gospel literature and for the whole year of 1941 a total of $790,610.36—an average per person of about $65 per month. Some of these were students and temporary workers. Colporteurs of this denomination receive half of their collections from which they must pay their traveling and living expenses. Colporteurs are specially trained and their qualifications equal those of preachers. In the field each worker is under the supervision of a field missionary secretary to whom a weekly report is made. After 15 years of continuous service each colporteur is entitled to the same pension as retired ministers. And see Howell, The Great Advent Movement (1935), pages 72–75.

[8] The constitutional difference between such a regulatory measure and a tax on the exercise of a Federal right has long been recognized. While a State may not exact a license tax for the privilege of carrying on interstate commerce (*McGoldrick* v. *Berwind-White Co.*, supra, pp. 56–58) it may, for example, exact a fee to defray the cost of purely local regulations in spite of the fact that those regulations incidentally affect commerce. "So long as they do not impede the flow of commerce and are not made the subject of regulation by Congress they are not forbidden." *Clyde Mallory Lines* v. *Alabama* (296 U. S. 261, 267), and cases cited. And see *South Carolina* v. *Barnwell Bros., Inc.* (303 U. S. 177, 185–188).

the present one, a person cannot be compelled "to purchase, through a license fee or a license tax, the privilege freely granted by the Constitution"[9] (*Blue Island* v. *Kozul* (379 Ill. 511, 519)). So it may not be said that proof is lacking that these license taxes either separately or cumulatively have restricted or are likely to restrict petitioners' religious activities. On their face they are a restriction of the free exercise of those freedoms which are protected by the first amendment.

The taxes imposed by this ordinance can hardly help but be as severe and telling in their impact on the freedom of the press and religion as the "taxes on knowledge" at which the first amendment was partly aimed (*Grosjean* v. *American Press Co., supra*, pp. 244–249). They may indeed operate even more subtly. Itinerant evangelists moving throughout a State or from State to State would feel immediately the cumulative effect of such ordinances as they become fashionable. The way of the religious dissenter has long been hard. But if the formula of this type of ordinance is approved, a new device for the suppression of religious minorities will have been found. This method of disseminating religious beliefs can be crushed and closed out by the sheer weight of the toll or tribute which is exacted town by town, village by village. The spread of religious ideas through personal visitations by the literature ministry of numerous religious groups would be stopped.

The fact that the ordinance is "nondiscriminatory" is immaterial. The protection afforded by the first amendment is not so restricted. A license tax certainly does not acquire constitutional validity because it classifies the privileges protected by the first amendment along with the wares and merchandise of hucksters and peddlers and treats them all alike. Such equality in treatment does not save the ordinance. Freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion are in a preferred position.

It is claimed, however, that the ultimate question in determining the constitutionality of this license tax is whether the State has given something for which it can ask a return. That principle has wide applicability. *State Tax Commission* v. *Aldrich* (316 U. S. 174), and cases cited. But it is quite irrelevant here. This tax is not a charge for the enjoyment of a privilege or benefit bestowed by the State. The privilege in question exists apart from State authority. It is guaranteed the people by the Federal Constitution.

Considerable emphasis is placed on the kind of literature which petitioners were distributing—its provocative, abusive, and ill-mannered character and the assault which it makes on our established churches and the cherished faiths of many of us. See *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette*, concurring opinion, decided this day. But those considerations are no justification for the license tax which the ordinance imposes. Plainly a community may not suppress, or the State tax, the dissemination of views because they are unpopular, annoying, or distasteful. If that device were ever sanctioned, there would have been forged a ready instrument for the suppression of the faith which any minority cherishes but which does not happen to be in favor. That would be a complete repudiation of the philosophy of the Bill of Rights.

Jehovah's Witnesses are not "above the law." But the present ordinance is not directed to the problems with which the police power of the State is free to deal. It does not cover, and petitioners are not charged with, breaches of the peace. They are pursuing their solicitations peacefully and quietly. Petitioners, moreover, are not charged with or prosecuted for the use of language which is obscene, abusive, or which incites retaliation. Cf. *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire, supra*. Nor do we have here, as we did in *Cox* v. *New Hampshire, supra*, and *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire, supra*, State regulation of the streets to protect and insure the safety, comfort, or convenience of the public. Furthermore, the present ordinance is not narrowly drawn to safeguard the people of the community in their homes against the evils of solicitations. See *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut, supra*, 306. As we have said, it is not merely a registration ordinance calling for an identification of the solicitors so as to give the authorities some basis for investigating strangers coming into the community. And the fee is not a nominal one, imposed as a regulatory measure and calculated to defray the expense of protecting those on the streets and at home against the abuses of solicitors. See *Cox* v. *New Hampshire, supra*, pp. 576–577. Nor can the present ordinances survive if we assume that it has been construed to apply only to solicitation from house to house.[10] The ordinance is not narrowly drawn to prevent or control abuses or evils arising from that activity. Rather, it sets aside the residential areas as a prohibited zone, entry of which is denied petitioners unless the tax is paid. That restraint and one which is city-wide in scope (*Jones* v. *Opelika*) are different only in degree. Each is an abridgment of freedom of press and a restraint on the free exercise of religion. They stand or fall together.

The judgment in *Jones* v. *Opelika* has this day been vacated. Freed from that controlling precedent, we can restore to their high, constitutional position the liberties of itinerant evangelists who disseminate their religious beliefs and the tenets of their faith through distribution of literature. The judgments are reversed and the causes are remanded to the Pennsylvania Superior Court for proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Reversed.

The dissent in *Jones* v. *City of Opelika* covers these cases also.

A true copy.

Test:

_____,

Clerk, Supreme Court, United States.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. ENRIQUE PENARANDA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOLIVIA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I announced yesterday, the President of the Republic of Bolivia will, within a few moments, visit the Chamber of the Senate as our guest. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Vice President appoint a committee of four to greet the President of Bolivia, and to escort him into the Chamber; and I ask that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the President of Bolivia and to escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Gen. Enrique Penaranda, President of Bolivia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Bolivia, including His Excellency, Dr. Thomas Manuel Elio, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bolivia; His Excellency, Señor Dr. Don Luis Fernando Guachalla, Ambassador of Bolivia; the Honorable Pierre de L. Boal, American Ambassador to Bolivia; His Excellency, Gen. David Toro, former President of Bolivia; His Excellency, Señor Don Enrique Finot, Bolivian Ambassador to Mexico; His Excellency, Señor Dr. Gabriel Gonsalvez, Ambassador; Gen. Felipe M. Rivera, Minister Plenipotentiary; the Honorable Señor Don Jorge del Castillo, Minister Plenipotentiary; the Honorable Señor Don Jorge de la Barra, Minister Plenipotentiary, Director of Protocol; Señor Alfonso Crespo, Subsecretary of the Presidency; Señor Guillermo Elio, private secretary to the Foreign Minister; Señor Jorge Penaranda Castillo, private secretary to the President; Brig. Gen. James H. Walker, United States Army, military aide; Capt. Albert S. Schrader, United States Navy, naval aide; Col. Oscar Moscoso, Military and Air Attaché, Bolivian Embassy; and Mr. Stanley Woodward, Assistant Chief, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, ladies, and gentlemen, the President of Bolivia, Gen. Enrique Penaranda, will now address you.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA

Señor Presidente, señoras y señores, also honor es para el Presidente que habla, ingresar a este santuario de las libertades americanas.

Creed que mi emoción es sincera, porque veo en vosotros, señores legisladores, la representación y esencia del pueblo americano y porque al dirigirme a vosotros sé yue es también al pueblo americano a quien hablo.

Aprecio pues debidamente el homenaje que ello significa y os lo agradezco en nombre de mi país, que poco sería decir en el mío propio.

---

[9] That is the view of most State courts which have passed on the question. *McConkey* v. *Fredericksburg* (179 Va. 556); *State* v. *Greaves* (112 Vt. 222); *People* v. *Banks* (168 Misc. 515). Contra: *Cook* v. *Harrison* (180 Ark. 546).

[10] The Pennsylvania Superior Court stated that the ordinance has been enforced only to prevent petitioners from canvassing "from door to door and house to house" without a license and not to prevent them from distributing their literature on the streets. 149 Pennsylvania Superior Court, page 184.

El Parlamento Americano se ha destacado siempre con relieves singulares en el panorama histórico y político de esta gran Nación. Significa esencialmente el poder soberano del pueblo y hoy en especial, representa para el Mundo, no sólo la manifestación objetiva de este poder, sino garantía cierta de que todos los hombres libres—dentro y fuera de los Estados Unidos—hallarán siempre en vosotros a esforzados defensores del Derecho.

Sois asimismo, ejemplo de ese admirable equilibrio que permite resguardar toda la majestad de un poder soberano, celoso de sus fueros y respetuoso al tiempo, de los límites de su propia investidura.

Es precisamente en tan armoniosa coordinación que radica la grandeza de vuestros empeños democráticos, la seguridad de los ciudadanos y su igualdad ante la ley.

Soy yo, a mi vez, representante de una República que ostenta legítima tradición democrática, en cuyos orígenes vibró purísimo el sentimiento que la Revolución Francesa y la de vuestros gloriosos antepasados acababan de esparcir por el mundo.

Proclamada Nación independiente, Bolivia en su primer Congreso de 1825, debió luchar contra obstáculos materiales que, en veces, hicieron dudar a los hombres de poca fe, sobre el futuro de sus destinos. Empero, pasadas las turbulentas manifestaciones de una evidente crisis de adaptación, pudo constatarse cuan fuerte y arraigada era esa conciencia democrática boliviana. En los momentos más aciagos de su historia, Bolivia, por obra de sus propios hijos, albergó esperanzas y vióse renacer en su Parlamento y Asambleas Constituyentes.

Y es que la luz de esa conciencia republicana, jamás se había extinguido y, por el contrario, ardía con más brillo, vencidas las sombras de un instante.

Y sigue irradiando sus destellos luminosos—acaso más luminosos que nunca—en horas de tribulación como las presentes. En circunstancias en que la solidez de las convicciones democráticas ha sido puesta a prueba, puedo declarar con orgullo que Bolivia, ha reefirmado las suyas con vigor y decisión inalterables. A ello obedece que, en la lucha sin cuartel en que estáis empeñados, mi país haya contribuído a vuestra causa con el aporte íntegro de sus riquezas materiales y de su solidaridad moral.

Contóse Bolivia entre los primeros países que rompieron relaciones diplomáticas con el Eje. Transcurren sólo unos pocos días desde que mi Gobierno declaró el estado de guerra contra las potencias del Pacto Tripartito, impulsado por su fervor democrático y en un esfuerzo por hacer aun más activa su colaboración material y moral a las Naciones Unidas.

Al hallarme entre vosotros, legisladores de la democracia más poderosa y también más ecuánime, no puedo ocultaros la inquietud de mi espíritu.

Nos encontramos en un alto del camino, enfrentando a la agresión y al atropello. Nuestros más caros ideales se hallan amenazados y sombríos temores obscurecen el futuro de la humanidad.

Luchamos pues en defensa de esos ideales. Bajo tan noble bandera se cobijan esos vuestros soldados que hoy pelean y vencen o mueren por ellos, y a quienes anima, acaso más que la fuerza material, el convencimiento de la causa justa que sostienen. Por eso el triunfo será de ellos, señores Representantes.

Pero, si ardua y heróica es la tarea de aquellos guerreros, no lo es menos la que espera a los legisladores de América. De sus deliberaciones de hoy dependerán las decisiones de la hora, ya cercana, en que la justicia volverá a ser impuesta y reinará nuevamente, entre los hombres de buena voluntad, la paz de Nuestro Señor.

La jornada que vivimos, es trascendente. Acaso se asemeja a esa otra de nuestra iniciación republicana, pródiga en manifestaciones de unión y fraternidad. Pero los parlamentos de nuestro Continente trabajan aislados y sin contacto. Hasta ahora hemos vivido en esta "grande isla que es América," sin conocernos, y tal vez sólo nos ha salvado la identidad de nuestros ideales democráticos.

Iniciada felizmente una era de intercambio político, cultural y económico de proporciones crecientes, corresponde a los Parlamentos del Nuevo Mundo—mediante una unión Interparlamentaria Americana—fortalecer los lazos de comprensión y amistad, dando preminencia en la relación internacional de nuestros países, a los legisladores de América.

Es por el pueblo y para el pueblo que somos Gobierno. Corresponde pues al pueblo decidir de sus destinos, buscando inspiración en la conciencia que Dios ha puesto en cada ser y que surge purísima cuando en la tierra brillan, triunfantes, la Libertad y la Justica.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address of the President of the Republic of Bolivia is as follows:

Mr. President, Members of the Senate of the United States, it is indeed a great honor for me to come into this shrine of American liberties.

I assure you that I am sincerely moved, because I consider you the true representatives of the American people, and know that through you I am speaking to them. I am grateful, therefore, for this honor, and I thank you in the name of my country as well as in my own.

The Congress of the United States has always played a significant role in the historic and political life of this great Nation. It stands, essentially, for the sovereign power of the people, and today especially it symbolizes to the world at large not only the objective manifestation of that power, but a real assurance that all freemen—within and without the United States—will find in its midst stanch defenders of justice and right.

This Congress is the best example of that admirable system of checks and balances which makes it possible to safeguard and preserve a sovereign power that is zealous of its rights and at the same time respectful of the limitations of its own privileges.

It is to such a harmonious balance of powers that we may trace the origin of your democratic institutions, the security of your citizens, and their prized equality before the law.

I, too, represent a republic that is proud of its genuine democratic tradition; a republic whose birth was influenced by the lofty ideals that your own War of Independence and the French Revolution had just spread throughout the world.

No sooner was Bolivia's independence proclaimed, than the Nation was forced to struggle, in its first Congress of 1825, against material obstacles that at times caused men of little faith to lose confidence in the future. However, once those turbulent manifestations of a period of transition were over, it was evident that the Bolivian democratic consciousness was strong and deep-rooted. In the darkest days of her history, Bolivia, thanks to her own people, kept hope alive, and saw new life come to the Nation through its Parliament and its constituent assemblies.

It had to be so, because the flame of Bolivia's republican spirit had never been extinguished; rather, it burned brighter, once the momentary shadows had been dispelled.

That light keeps shining today, perhaps brighter than ever. In dark moments like the present, when the strength and the wisdom of democratic convictions have been questioned, I am proud to say that Bolivia has reaffirmed her faith with unfaltering confidence and determination. As a result, my country has offered to you the sum total of her resources and her support in the vital struggle in which you are now engaged.

Bolivia was one of the first nations to break diplomatic relations with the Axis, and only a few days ago, moved by democratic fervor and the desire to make its material and moral collaboration with the United Nations even more effective, it declared the existence of a state of war with the Axis Powers.

As I face you; the lawmakers of the most powerful democracy, I cannot but recognize the solemnity of the moment.

We have come to a halt in the road. We are fighting aggression and violence. Our most cherished ideals are threatened, and somber fears darken the outlook for the future of humanity.

We are fighting to defend those ideals. Your soldiers have made them their battle cry, and are struggling bravely to win or die for them. Perhaps, even more than material strength, it is their conviction of the justice of their cause that keeps them marching forward. That is why victory shall be theirs.

Yet, hard and heroic though the task of those warriors may be, no less hard and heroic a task awaits the lawmakers of America. Their deliberations today will determine the decisions to be made at the hour, already near, when justice is restored, and when peace once again reigns among men of good will.

This is, indeed, a most significant moment. There is something in it that recalls the days of our republican infancy, when there were so many evidences of unity and fraternity. But today the parliaments of our continent are isolated—without contact. Until now we have lived in this "great island, America," without knowing each other. Perhaps our only bond has been the identity of our democratic ideals.

Now that an era of closer political, cultural, and economic interchange has, fortunately, been initiated, it is the task of the lawmaking bodies of the New World to strengthen our ties of friendship and understanding by playing an ever-increasing role in the external relations of our countries. This could be accomplished through an American interparliamentary union.

We are governments of the people and by the people. It is for the people, therefore, to decide the future by seeking inspiration in the conscience with which God has endowed every human being, and which finds its purest expression when liberty and justice shine triumphant upon the earth.

Following his address, the President of Bolivia and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. LUCAS].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1936) to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 885) to establish a civilian supply administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the bill now under consideration, Senate bill 885, which would establish a civilian supply administration, comes to the Senate primarily as a result of the efforts of the Small Business Committee of the Senate. Some time ago the chairman of the Small Business Committee [Mr. MURRAY] appointed the distinguished Senators from Ohio and Nevada [Mr. TAFT and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and myself to give special attention to this all-important subject. Thereafter the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Nevada, and I drafted what came to be Senate bill 885, and only because I introduced it in the Senate did it come to be known as the Maloney bill. Actually the bill was prepared by the members of the subcommittee to which I have just referred.

The bill was thereafter referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, of which, it so happens, all the members of the aforementioned subcommittee are members.

We held lengthy hearings on the bill. All those who expressed the desire to be heard were heard. Prentiss Brown, of the Office of Price Administration, appeared and testified in favor of the bill. William Jeffers, Rubber Director, appeared and testified for the bill. Representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations appeared and testified for the bill, and subsequently the American Federation of Labor, by way of a letter, expressed itself in sympathy with the proposal. Representatives of the various businesses of the country, including the great food interests, representatives of service organizations, and representatives of some other organizations appeared over a period of weeks, and it seemed to me that there was represented at those hearings a majority of the American people.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's statement, but I have a question to propound. The Senator is more familiar with the record than am I. I should like to know if those representatives appeared in behalf of the objectives or declared policy of the bill, or whether they appeared in behalf of the creation of a new agency?

Mr. MALONEY. As I understood the testimony, at least all of those whom I have mentioned, appeared in favor of the principles of the bill. Some of them appeared to testify for the bill. Some of them said they were 100 percent for it as it was. I should like to point out that thereafter, after the hearings had been concluded, a largely attended meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency rewrote the bill to a considerable extent, endeavoring to meet the suggestions and objections which had been voiced during the hearing. I should like to add that after that had been done the bill had the unanimous approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill is not intended to seek more for the civilian at the expense of our military forces. It is not designed to offer competition to the Army and Navy. As a matter of fact, it is pretty much intended to protect the armed forces of our country.

Neither is the bill an indictment of the War Production Board or the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Nelson. Its purpose is to give the civilian population of the United States—120,000,000 people or more—a voice and a vote at the conference table, and thereafter, if the need arises, the right of appeal to the Director of Economic Stabilization. What is wrong with that? Is that more than the right of Americans?

For more than 16 months our country has been directly engaged in a war that has become the most bitter and most devastating conflict in the history of the world. Our Army has already become the largest in the history of our Nation, and by the end of this year will have increased to staggering proportions. Men of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are now fighting on more fronts than any of us would have dreamed possible a little while ago.

We have come to describe this war by a phrase previously unknown in the annals of military science—"total war."

What is the meaning of the phrase? Is it a total war because it has spread to all the continents? Not at all.

In my opinion, the phrase has a different meaning. The essence of a total war lies in the aggressive mobilization of all our resources, all our materials, all our machinery, and all our manpower in an effort to destroy our enemies.

In other words, it is a war in which all of us, men and women, are called upon to augment the fighting of our armed forces and those of our allies. The total effort takes in the energy of those in the factories, shipyards, and mines, and on the farms. It includes those who supply the guns, planes, ships, and tanks, and the food and clothing that are needed to destroy the enemy. This is a war that must also be waged by the farmers who raise our crops, the miners who produce our materials, the operators who drill for oil, the producers of all the essential commodities needed by our civilian population as well as by our armed forces, the wholesalers and retailers who provide our citizens with food, clothing, fuel, and drugs, and the service establishments that wash our laundry and repair our shoes.

This principle was recognized at the outset of the war by the President when, immediately after Pearl Harbor, he said, "We are now in this war. We are all in it all the way."

This principle is recognized by our military strategists, who well recall the fact that the collapse of Germany in 1918

was brought on more by a disruption of supplies to Germany's home front than by any setbacks on the field of battle. A good example of how this principle has been put into operation is the recent bombing raid on Germany in which the R. A. F. dropped not bombs, but counterfeit rationing cards for the purpose of disrupting the distribution of Germany's meager food supply among its hungry civilians.

This principle is recognized by the military strategists of the Nazis. An example which we can all appreciate is that of the German submarine campaign in our coastal waters against tankers carrying fuel oil to our northern States.

Unfortunately this principle, recognized by our President, our allies, and our enemies, is not yet understood by some of those in charge of organizing our home front.

In theory we have a War Production Board at the top of the economic, industrial, and production pyramid in the war effort. The powers of this Board have become something for scholars to trace through a maze of orders and directives.

It is proper and desirable that there should be differences of opinion, and that they should be fully discussed. It is, however, neither proper nor desirable that the various czars and directors should be able to stand adamant on their opinions. We are now being treated to the spectacle of the highest executives in our war production effort publicly accusing each other of hurting the war effort, and carrying a dispute almost to the point of a complete impasse. It has been necessary for a committee of the Senate to sit and hear these men give vent to their grievances and air their confusion.

We all know that there should be a proper forum and a proper authority before whom these conflicts can be fully explored in an orderly procedure, and with a decorum befitting the stature of the parties involved. It is neither fitting to a great nation, nor is it conducive to efficient administration of the war effort, to decide issues of major importance in a hair-pulling contest.

Before Pearl Harbor, when our main occupation with the war was to send supplies to other countries fighting against Hitler, the home front took care of itself. We had ample resources available for civilian production and civilian distribution. In fact, one of our principal jobs was to divert some of these resources toward direct production of the implements of war.

After Pearl Harbor, however, it became evident that our direct military requirements would eventually encompass all the resources which could possibly be made available for our armed forces and our allies. It became abundantly clear that the demands of a global war are almost without limit, that everything which could be hurled against the enemy would be needed. Logically, that was the time to start active planning for the needs of our civilian population. That was the time to plan the use of our vast resources in such a fashion that our civilian population would have all goods and services which it needed to produce the supplies for our armed forces and our allies. That was the time to integrate the home front with the battle front.

But it was not done. Our administrators were preoccupied—and perhaps necessarily so—with working out the new and difficult job of computing military requirements and converting industries to war production. By December 7, 1942, however, 1 year after Pearl Harbor, we still lacked a plan for integrating the home front with the battle front. On that day, Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, made a public statement in which he declared that our country was now entering the period of total mobilization. Yet, on that day the War Production Board had no master plan for meeting the needs of the civilian population. It is doubtful that it had even attempted to develop such a plan.

Today, more than 4 months later, there is still no master plan for meeting the essential needs of the civilian population. Within the War Production Board the Office of Civilian Supply has had no authority except to send advisory memoranda to people who are too often not interested in considering its advice. True, a new Director of Civilian Supply has been appointed, and he has been named a vice chairman of the War Production Board. Yet the very name of the Office of Civilian Supply, as it now exists within the War Production Board, is a hollow mockery.

The present function of the Office of Civilian Supply, as conceived by the Chairman of the War Production Board, is to produce a selected group of statistics on civilian requirements. I say selected advisedly. It has not even the function of estimating civilian requirements for food, since that is within the province of the Food Administrator. It has not had even the function of estimating the civilian requirements for manpower.

A much more fundamental fault of the present set-up is that the War Production Board's Office of Civilian Supply is not a claimant agency for the civilian population. Even if it had a master plan of civilian needs, or even if it should at some time in the future develop a plan of civilian needs, it has no power whatsoever to administer such a plan. It has no power to go before the Food Administrator and get the food that is needed for civilian activities. Although it can go before the War Production Board to obtain materials and facilities, this function is limited to an exceedingly narrow sphere.

I can best explain this situation by a quotation from the Banking and Currency Committee hearing held on March 24 on S. 865, the civilian supply bill.

Senator BALL. Is not your agency a claimant agency which builds up available supplies of critical materials? In other words, you are the claimant agency for all requests, are you not?

Mr. WEINER. At the present time we are claimant agency for some civilian requirements. But we are not sure from day to day what those requirements are for which we are claimants, because, generally speaking, we are claimants for what others are not claimants for. Since that varies considerably, we have difficulty finding out from day to day what others are claimants for, so we can catch up the slack.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Under the Senator's proposal would the agency which he would create have supervision over the functions which are now being performed by the O. P. A., and the Food Administrator's office, as well as the Petroleum Administrator's office?

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all. Under the bill—and I shall return to the Senator's question later—the Civilian Supply Administrator, would make claim against the Food Administrator and the other agencies on behalf only of the civilian population.

Mr. LODGE. So he still would be competing within the War Production Board with the other agencies making claims? Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. No; he would not be competing at all but he would be the sole claimant for the civilian population. He would be charged only with the responsibility of making claims for the civilian population.

I continue to read from the committee hearings:

Senator BALL. But you represent most civilian claimants, do you not?

Mr. WEINER. I would say offhand as to direct and indirect civilian claimants, there are 8 claimants before the Requirements Committee. We represent most of the general items, but if I might cite an example, in the case of a repair part for a compressed-air pump, in a gas station, we are responsible. For a repair part for a fuel pump, Mr. Ickes is responsible. And to go forward similarly with things on the ordinary farm, a simple item like pipes, or fittings, if it is for one piece of equipment for the barn, it is ours, but if it is for a truck, that is for the Secretary of Agriculture; and if it is for a highway vehicle, that is for the Office of Defense Transportation, and if it is a part for an off-the-highway vehicle, that is for the Secretary of Agriculture, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Who makes that division?

Mr. WEINER. It is partially made, to a slight extent, I would say by the Executive orders creating different agencies. But the most of it has been done by the War Production Board, evidently.

Furthermore, even if we had a plan, and even if we had a real civilian claimant agency, there is now no provision whatsoever for the administration of an integrated program. It appears that outside of the President there is no single administrator who can make a final decision for the allocation of resources for civilian needs. If insufficient manpower is provided for essential civilian activities, there is nothing that the present Office of Civilian Supply can do about it. When enough manpower is provided for an essential civilian activity, there is no guaranty that there will be sufficient fuel for the factory or store that gets the workers, or sufficient repair parts for the machinery used by the workers, or sufficient food for the workers to eat.

The consequences of this chaotic situation are already abundantly apparent. Entire sections of the country have already suffered from acute and

unpredicted shortages of meat, fuel, and other necessities. In congested war areas, where more and more women are pouring into the factories, essential laundries have been forced to close down because of the lack of repair and operating supplies, thus contributing to absenteeism and lowered morale.

Yet we have really not yet felt the results of the chactic civilian supply situation. We have been getting along on our existing stocks of civilian goods and our existing reserves of manpower available for civilian use. By the end of this year, however, these stocks and these reserves will be gone. Our margin for error will have disappeared.

By the end of this year, unless drastic measures are promptly taken, we face a break-down on the home front that will threaten the prosecution of the war. Our factories may produce more than enough of some civilian goods, but they will turn out far less than enough of others. While labor for civilian production may be available in some areas, materials will be lacking. In other areas, materials will be available and labor will be lacking. In others, materials, labor, and fuel will all be available but our civilian production lines will be broken for the lack of minor repair parts.

Unless effective planning is instituted immediately, even though civilian goods are produced in sufficient quantities, the goods may never get where they are needed. Smaller stores and stores in farming and rural areas, remote regions, and new communities, will all lose out in the struggle for a share of available supplies because of an overloaded transportation system. There may be hours, days, weeks, and months when civilian goods cannot be moved in sufficient quantities to or from crowded areas. This is a particular danger in industrial communities where too complete a diversion of facilities and manpower to war production may destroy local sources of civilian supply and create an overdependence on goods imported from other areas. Unless we act now to put our house in order, small business in the civilian field—and about 95 percent of all American small business concerns are engaged in civilian production, distribution, or service activities—will find its stocks depleted. The profit reserve that may have been built up during the earlier days of the defense program will be melted away. Thousands upon thousands of smaller manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, and others—the essential as well as the nonessential, the established operator as well as the fly-by-night—may be wiped out of existence.

The enactment of the bill that is now before us will be the first step toward the proper organization of the home front. I say the first step because there is a second step of great importance, the proper administration of the act.

What does this bill provide?

I can summarize it very briefly.

First, it establishes a national policy for the home front. Let me quote:

> The Congress hereby declares that the total mobilization of all the Nation's resources is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, that keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning is essential to the successful prosecution of the war, and that it is the policy of the Nation to guarantee the production and distribution of the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively in order that such civilian population can produce and distribute what is required by our armed forces and allies to win the war.

Moreover, since the majority of small business is engaged in civilian activities, the bill sets forth—

> that it is the policy of the Nation to mobilize the capacities and resources of all small business concerns in the production and distribution of goods and services for the civilian population.

Second, the bill sets up a Civilian Supply Administration within the Office for Emergency Management as an independent claimant agency on behalf of 125,000,000 Americans. As a claimant agency, it has powers and responsibilities—and this is important—similar to those of already existing claimant agencies such as the War Department, Navy Department, Lend-Lease Administration, Board of Economic Warfare, and the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation. Under this proposed legislation the Civilian Supply Administrator will draw up a master plan of what is needed for the civilian population—not only of the food, clothing, shelter, fuel, and other finished products, but also of the manpower, materials, and other resources necessary to produce essential civilian products. Then, on the basis of this master plan, he will go before the Government agencies that divide the existing supply of resources—that is before the War Production Board for materials and facilities, the War Manpower Commission for labor, the Office of Defense Transportation for transportation, the Food Administrator for food, and so forth. He will sit as an equal at the conference table. Of the resources allocated for civilian use he will try to see that a proper amount goes into the production of alarm clocks, that a proper amount for the production of ice boxes, and a proper amount for the distribution of groceries. He will try to conserve such resources by eliminating nonessential uses and by stimulating utilization of substitutes. Moreover, he is given the responsibility of obtaining proper distribution of civilian goods and services. Subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, he will determine the need for rationing and when and where rationing shall be instituted—a power that is now in the hands of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, but which is essential to the operation of a Civilian Supply Agency. The Civilian Supply Administrator would not actually administer rationing but could delegate the administration to the Office of Price Administration. Moreover, he will determine policies on inventory control and allocation programs in the field of wholesale and retail distribution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand who would delegate that power to the Price Administrator.

Mr. MALONEY. You are correct, it would remain there.

Mr. TAFT. And he would simply assume the functions now performed by the War Production Board or the Food Administrator in directing the Price Administrator?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Price Administrator today has no power to act except as conferred upon him by these boards?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct; and perhaps "delegate" was an inappropriate word to use.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Am I correct in my understanding of the bill that if the Civilian Administrator comes to the conclusion that there were not sufficient resources placed under his control and command to enable him to carry out the purposes of the proposed act, and he is unable to obtain such resources, he could go to the Navy and War Departments and obtain a part of the resources which would otherwise be used for military and naval purposes?

Mr. MALONEY. He would not go to the Army or Navy at all, let me say to the Senator. The Army and Navy themselves are claimant agents. He would go to the War Production Board if he desired to obtain materials which would be used by the Army and Navy.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Army and Navy stated that they desired certain materials, could those materials be taken away from them under the provisions of the bill by the Economic Stabilization Director or anyone else?

Mr. MALONEY. Rather than answer yes or no, I should like to explain to the Senator how it would work. The claimant agencies, the Army and Navy, would appear before the War Production Board and explain the needs and requirements of the Army and Navy. The Senator understands that their requirements include not only guns and tanks and ships and planes, but food and clothing and fuel and all the other thousands of items necessary to the maintenance of our civilian economy and necessary for the health and welfare of our people. As they were dividing up or allocating the materials which were available, the Civilian Supply Administrator would say, "I need so much for the civilian population; they must have so much meat in order to work and to enable them to produce the guns and tanks and planes; they must have so much food; they must have so many pairs of shoes; they must have so much of this, that, or the other thing;" and the War Production Board then would say, "We cannot allow you that amount or we can allow you only half of that amount." If the Civilian Supply Administrator felt that the curtailment was too severe, that the limitation was too great, he would, under the bill, have a right to appeal to the Economic Stabilization Director, whose decision would be final. The other claimant

agencies or the War Production Board would, of course, as is now the case, have the right to appeal to the President.

Mr. OVERTON. That would apply to steel, for instance, and to lumber?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; that is entirely correct.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to ask whether any objection to this bill has been raised by the Army and Navy?

Mr. MALONEY. Insofar as I am aware, no objection has ever been raised by the Army and Navy, and I should suppose that the Army and Navy would heartily support this proposal, because I think it would be helpful to their program. Personally, I feel that they should welcome it.

Mr. LODGE. Because it would enable them to share in the pie. Is that it?

Mr. MALONEY. The authors and sponsors of the bill and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate are all agreed, there was unanimous agreement, I think all those interested are agreed, that the Army and the Navy should be first, that the civilian population should come second, probably a close second. I do not know; perhaps lease-lend should be second, perhaps foreign rehabilitation should be second, perhaps the need of aid to South America should be second, but somewhere in the picture come the American people, and the representative provided for in the bill would be concerned only with the needs of the American people and the appeal in their behalf.

I personally cannot see any reason for an objection to the proposal. It is the responsibility of the Congress, in the last analysis, to protect and provide for those people whom we here represent, and we do not have, and up to now they do not have, a representative at the table to which I have just referred, and the bill merely gives us a representative, along with these numerous other claimant agencies, some of which are almost entirely responsible to populations beyond the seas. We just want to move into that company, we want a place at that table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In line with the questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the explanation made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, when the Civilian Administrator felt that he was being curtailed too much, let us say, on a claim in which the Army was interested, as against the Civilian Administrator, as I understood the Senator, he then would have a right of appeal to the Stabilization Director. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. During the period while the appeal was pending what would happen?

Mr. MALONEY. Nothing would happen.

Mr. MURDOCK. Nothing would happen; that is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me make sure that the Senator understands me. Nothing unusual would happen; things would go along in their regular way, under the authority and power of the War Production Board.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us see if they would. If the Civilian Administrator, who is to be provided for under the proposed act, had the right of appeal to the Stabilization Director, then, as I understand the bill, no decision, even if it involved the supplying of the Army or the Navy, could be made, except by the Stabilization Director.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator could not be farther wrong than he is in that instance.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to have the Senator explain to me, then, what would happen when the Civilian Administrator was dissatisfied, and appealed to the Stabilization Director. What would happen then?

Mr. MALONEY. The Civilian Supply Administrator would go to the Economic Stabilization Director, who at the moment is Mr. James Byrnes, and say, "We feel that the civilian population of the country is being too seriously neglected. We have been allocated 'X' pounds of meat, and we do not think our population is going to get along on that, and we are putting the question up to you to decide. You will now hear the War Production Board, or such of the other claimants as care to be heard, and we will abide by your decision, because that is the law."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me perfectly clear that in the absence of any provision for a supersedeas or anything else, whatever order might be made by the War Production Board, we will say, in some case, or the Food Administrator, would go into immediate effect.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. And would be in effect until the Economic Stabilization Director set it aside.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. So I do not see that there possibly could be delay of any kind.

Mr. MALONEY. There would be none, and there could be none. The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that be true, and if the decision of the War Production Board is to be final until set aside by the Economic Stabilization Director, then it is difficult for me to understand what the Senator would accomplish by his bill over and above what we now have.

Mr. MALONEY. We would have a claimant to go before the Economic Stabilization Director to ask him to make a decision if an allocation were insufficient.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then am I correct in assuming, from what the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut say, that when the War Production Board had made its decision that would be the end of it, and that the allocation made to the Army in greater amount than the Civilian Administrator expected would go to the Army, regardless of what might happen under the jurisdiction of the Economic Stabilization Director? I cannot get it through my head—and of course that may be understandable by the Senator from Connecticut——

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator need not add the last clause; I have not made any such implication, except that the Senator voted for the bill in the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator is wrong in that statement. I said that the bill, as it was amended, was much better than it was originally, but I think there is no record of any vote on my part favoring the reporting of the bill.

Unless we are to accomplish something by the bill, then certainly there is no reason in the world for creating another commission, there is no reason in the world for providing for another administrator, and if the answers of the Senator from Connecticut are correct, and if the statement of the Senator from Ohio is correct, that a decision of the War Production Board would stand until it was set aside, then what would be accomplished by the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. I gather that the distinguished Senator from Utah feels that any decision by the Chairman of the War Production Board should be final even if it very seriously affected the civilian population.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will permit, in the early stages of the war we were confronted by divided authority. If there was anything for which the Congress clamored, if there was anything that was argued every day in the Senate and in the House, it was the necessity of placing war production and the war program under one head.

Mr. MALONEY. And that is where they now are.

Mr. MURDOCK. A head was selected. Donald Nelson is the head. He came before our committee, and told the Senator and told me that he could not distinguish between the military needs and the civilian needs, that to him they were one. If the bill we are discussing would do anything, after we have brought all the powers of our war production and our war program under one head—and in my opinion a very competent and a very efficient head—it would divide that authority, and in my opinion it would result in the same chaos which prevailed prior to the concentration of authority in one head.

Mr. MALONEY. I take it that the Senator from Utah would now put the Rubber Director and the Petroleum Administrator and the Food Administrator back under Mr. Nelson?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know that they were ever under him, but I do know we cannot keep dividing the program among different heads and secure the type of efficiency the war program needs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the assumption of the Senator from Utah that there is any combined authority in the Government is a complete misunderstanding. What is the situation? Mr. Donald Nelson has charge of materials other than food; Mr. Davis is entirely independent of Mr. Nelson, and has complete charge of food; Mr. Eastman has complete charge of transportation; Mr. McNutt has complete charge of manpower. We have six or seven different men who allocate different things for the war purposes. The only purpose we have is to have one man who will do a little over-all thinking, for all these purposes, who is interested in seeing that the civilian population, or particular industry, gets manpower and food and materials and everything else necessary, a man who puts the whole picture together, and appears to represent them before the various claimant agencies, and in order that there may be some unity it is provided that if, for instance, Mr. McNutt will not furnish any manpower for laundries, if the War Production Board will not furnish materials for laundries, if Mr. Eastman, perhaps, will not furnish any transportation for laundries, it will be possible to appeal to someone over everybody else who will decide that laundries are essential, or are not essential, in the prosecution of the war.

The assumption that we are proposing to divide authority is a complete mistake in any analysis of the present setup. In fact, from my own standpoint, I think one of the most important purposes is the unity that is given by providing for the Economic Stabilization Director, who is in the White House, who is in effect an Assistant President, unifying all the programs dealing with the civilian administration. So that I think the bill is a creator of unity, not a creator of disunity.

Mr. MALONEY. I think the Senator is exactly right, and that is the principal function of Mr. Byrnes. I should like to say also that I prefer a war council, but it would be rather presumptuous, to my mind, to propose that by way of legislation. It would be pleasing to me if the President decided to set up the much-talked-about war council.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not believe I have stated anything on the floor of the Senate which even in substance would support the construction which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has placed upon my statements. I am simply taking the position that by the creation of a Civilian Supply Administration authority is subdivided still further and placed in the hands of one more person, and, as the Senator from Ohio said, if the question is one of manpower, we would have a Civilian Supply Administrator of equal stature with War Manpower Commissioner McNutt, and if the civilian administrator was not satisfied with the decision which Mr. McNutt made, or which the War Production Board made, then he could appeal to the economic stabilizer, and decision on the appeal would require a period of time. What happens to the country's war program during that period of time?

Mr. MALONEY. The same as is happening now. I should like to make reference to one thing the Senator from Utah has said, that under this bill another man is appointed to do another job. That is most certainly true, and the entire purpose of the bill is to give complete power to an agency to see that the population of this country receives its share of what there is, its actual needs.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the Senator another question, and then I shall subside?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand from the statement just made by the Senator from Connecticut, that the head of the Civilian Supply Administration, which it is proposed to create under the bill, in his position as representative of the civilian population, will be of equal stature with the Chairman of the War Production Board?

Mr. MALONEY. Unfortunately he will not be. He has a right, in cases where conflicts arise, to appeal to the Economic Stabilization Director, who in this instance would be supreme in power and over Mr. Nelson.

Mr. MURDOCK. And if the person against whom a decision is made in favor of the Civilian Supply Administrator is not satisfied with the decision, he can appeal to the President of the United States?

Mr. MALONEY. I assume one can always appeal to the President of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. So by this measure we create not one right of appeal, but two rights of appeal.

Mr. MALONEY. It is not necessary to create a right of appeal to the President. The right of appeal to the President is always in existence.

Mr. MURDOCK. But appeal can be made to the President under such circumstances. There is one right of appeal to the Economic Stabilization Director, and if his decision does not satisfy the one against whom the decision is made, the aggrieved person can appeal to the President. During the pendency of those appeals, I ask the Senator, what happens to the war program?

Mr. MALONEY. I have told the Senator two or three times, and let me try again to make it clear. The war program goes on under Mr. Nelson just as it is going on now. There is no interruption, there is no change.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator is correct, and there is no change, then why the necessity for considering this bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Because of the appeal to which the Senator has referred. Insufficient allotment to the civilian population provides a reason for appeal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I suggest there is another reason, and that is that the case of the civilian population is more likely to be presented to the War Production Board and to receive consideration without any appeal, than it can today when there is no one appearing before the War Production Board on behalf of the civilian population.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call the Senator's attention to paragraph 6 of section 2, on page 11 of the bill, if we are through discussing the point which the Senator from Utah raised a moment ago. I call the Senator's attention to this language:

subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director—

The new administrator may—

determine the need for rationing goods and services * * *.

Then the following language:

The Administrator—

Which means the new official we are making provision for in this bill—

shall direct the appropriate agencies to ration such goods and services.

I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut explain what is contained within the word "services." Does that mean that we are creating conscription of labor in this country under the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all, I will say to the Senator. I will come to that a little later.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well.

Mr. MALONEY. Next the bill gives the Civilian Supply Administrator the right to appeal to the Economic Stabilization Director, or such other officer as the President may designate, for a revision in any allocation made by any of the allocating agencies. The Economic Stabilization Director, or such other officer as may be designated, may then issue a decision that would be binding upon all other agencies of the Government, and that could be reversed only by Presidential action. Without this right of appeal, and without the final decision lodged in the hands of the Economic Stabilization Director, or such other officer as may be designated, there would never be any guaranty that all aspects of civilian supply were taken into consideration. Without this provision, the final decision would be made individually by the agencies that allocate our resources—the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Food Administrator, the Fuel Administrator, and others—and there would be no integrating force except the persuasive power of the Civilian Supply Administrator.

I should like to illustrate how the specific powers of the Administrator would operate in the case of a typical consumers product like shoes.

Under section 2 (b) (1) the Administrator is authorized to ascertain the

quantities and types of goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively. The Administrator would, therefore, estimate the number of shoes necessary for the civilian population during a given period, say 1943 and 1944. In addition, he would find out how many men's shoes are needed, how many women's shoes and how many children's and how many leather shoes, and how many rubber overshoes. He would find out how much shoe repairing is needed. Under section 2 (b) (2) the Administrator is authorized to ascertain the manpower, manufacturing facilities, materials, operating supplies and other productive resources necessary to meet civilian needs. Accordingly, the Administrator would estimate how much and what kind of leather, rubber, steel, textiles and other raw materials are needed by shoe manufacturers and shoe repair shops. Similarly, the manpower, machinery, and operating supply needs of the entire shoe industry would be ascertained.

After having completed his estimates of the shoes required by civilians and the resources needed to produce and distribute these shoes, the Administrator, under section 2 (b) (3), would present his shoe program to the various Government production and supply agencies, claiming from each of these agencies the materials, manpower, supplies, and other resources needed to keep our population from going barefoot. For the manpower required to meet the needed civilian supply of shoes the Civilian Supply Administrator would apply to the War Manpower Commission. For the rubber he would apply to the Rubber Director. For the steel and manufacturing facilities the Administrator will apply to the Chairman of the War Production Board. For the leather needed to produce and repair the shoes I assume he would apply to the Food Administrator. For the fuel necessary to assure the civilian supply of shoes he would apply to the Petroleum Administrator for War. For transportation he would appeal to the Office of Defense Transportation.

Naturally, the other claimant agencies, the military agencies, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Lend-Lease Administration, and others, will apply to these same Government bodies for their share of the resources. The War Production Board, the Rubber Director, the Food Administrator, and the others would still determine the division of the particular resources under their jurisdiction among the various claimants—military, foreign, and civilian. Once the allocations of resources for civilian shoes have been made and are accepted by the Administrator, the appropriate Government production agency—in this case the War Production Board—would exercise its powers to see that such resources were used for the specific types of shoes that the Administrator originally determined necessary.

It may be, of course, that, in the opinion of the Civilian Supply Administrator, insufficient resources are allocated for civilian shoes to enable him to carry out the purposes of the bill. If, for instance, insufficient leather was allocated by the Food Administrator to produce and repair the shoes required by civilians, the Administrator is given the right to appeal to the Economic Stabilization Director, or such other official as the President may designate for such purposes. After conferring with the agencies affected, the Economic Stabilization Director, or such other official as the President may designate, would issue directions deciding the appeal, and his decision would be binding upon all other agencies and departments of the Government. This right of appeal, of course, is not to be construed to deny to any Government agency the right of appeal to the President, and this is expressly stated in section 2 (b) (3). It is assumed that the Administrator would not appeal each allocation in which his requests for resources have been cut back by the appropriate Government production agencies. I assume that only major allocation decisions would be appealed. The Civilian Supply Administrator might elect to accept a cut-back in his program of shoe requirements in order to conform with the reduced quantities of leather available.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I hesitate to ask the genial Senator to yield; but inasmuch as he is on the subject of procedure by appeal, I should like to ask a question. I know it will be accurately answered.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Does not the bill provide for the expansion of the authority presently vested in the Director of Economic Stabilization?

Mr. MALONEY. I have never been entirely sure of what powers were in the hands of the Director of Economic Stabilization; but certainly by statute the bill would establish a power about which there may now be some doubt. I doubt that he has the power to make such a decision now. Under the proposed statute, obviously he would have.

Mr. McNARY. I quite agree with that. I am in very grave doubt as to the authority now asserted by the Director of Economic Stabilization; but with that I am not going to quarrel at the present time.

Let me ask whether the bill grants him any greater authority than that which he now possesses? Does it by any language convey any additional power to the Director of Economic Stabilization?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know how much power the President has delegated to the Director of Economic Stabilization, who was appointed by Executive order, and I do not know how far the President can go under Executive order. I think the question might be raised in certain instances; but obviously under this bill the powers of arbiter would be established.

Mr. McNARY. Where is there in the bill—that is the question—language providing for the granting to him of any more power than that which he now possesses under the Executive order?

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot tell. I do not know what powers he has under the Executive order, and I doubt whether any other Member of the Senate clearly understands the matter.

Mr. McNARY. I think that is a very important question to be considered in connection with the very able statement the Senator is making with regard to the additional rights or powers to be conveyed to the civilian administrator.

Mr. MALONEY. It seems so to me.

Mr. McNARY. It is my judgment, that the Director of Economic Stabilization under the Executive order is exercising probably greater power than he legally has; but I am not complaining about that, because I have great confidence in Mr. Justice Byrnes, who was a Member of this body for years. Having that power, can the Senator point out any provision of the bill which confers upon the Director of Economic Stabilization any power greater than that which he has at this time?

Mr. MALONEY. We would specify by statute that he should dissolve disputes between certain agencies of government.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, yes; that may be entirely so, and that is what the Senator is resting his case upon. In my judgment the Senator's bill is not conferring any power on him at all beyond that which he has under the Executive order creating the position; and the right today to appeal to him is just as great, and the road is just as clear and unobstructed, without having the bill enacted into law.

Mr. MALONEY. There is one point the Senator misses, and I shall cover it in greater detail a little later: Who would make the appeal to him now, without the enactment of this bill? There is no one to make the appeal.

Mr. McNARY. Anyone can go to him now. He has the same authority now as that which he would have if the bill should become a law.

Mr. MALONEY. But as of the present time there is no independent civilian supply claimant; there is no man to make the appeal. The purpose of the bill is to provide for the establishment of such a claimant.

Mr. McNARY. The agencies the Senator has mentioned are more or less to be duplicated by the proposed agency. They have a right to go to Mr. Byrnes today.

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all; there is no independent civilian supply claimant.

Mr. McNARY. Not at all. The bill would give him the name; but the claimant agencies are not the Director; the claimant agencies are the Army, the Navy, and other governmental agencies—the Manpower Commission, Mr. Eastman, the Director of Defense Transportation, and so forth. They are the claimants, evidently, if I construe the Senator's bill correctly. They now have a right to go to Mr. Byrnes, or today Mr. Byrnes can make an order overruling any decision at which they may arrive.

Mr. MALONEY. I am not sure that he has.

Mr. McNARY. If that is not a correct interpretation of the bill, at least I concede that I am not questioning the wisdom of my distinguished friend. I am laboring under the difficulty confronting

all Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee. This is the first opportunity I have had to read the bill. I have been trying to read it and at the same time listen to the very excellent address being presented by the Senator. Let me say that I do not believe the Senator would be doing by the bill what he thinks he would be doing. I shall address myself to the general subject a little later. I thank the Senator very much for his kindliness and courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to comment further on the matter briefly at this point. I had hoped to cover the question the Senator has raised and the part I have not covered I shall cover later. I should like to point out now to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that today there is no independent civilian-supply agent or claimant. Some time ago Mr. Nelson himself recommended that there be one. Since then he has had a change of mind. He says he thought it would work 3 or 4 months ago, but now he does not think it would work, in spite of the fact that now he has been dealing with the subject for a year and a half.

Strangely enough, Mr. Jeffers, who had written a letter in February saying he was opposed to it, testified before the committee that, as a result of his experience, he thought it was now all-important.

Under the existing set-up there is a civilian-supply representative. He is completely under the domination of Mr. Nelson; he cannot independently appeal to anyone else. His appeal would be to the man who made the decision, namely, Mr. Nelson, and on the appeal Mr. Nelson would again make the decision. So it seems to me rather frivolous for a man to appeal the decision of his case to the man who already has decided it.

So we are lacking a claimant for the civilian population of our country, although we have, with independent powers, a claimant for the countries of Europe; and in the person of the Vice President of the United States, we have a claimant for the countries of the southern part of our own hemisphere. We have about 16 claimant agencies; but we do not have an independent claimant or agent for the people who make up the civilian population of our own country. I think they have been neglected. I think that at the moment the neglect is obvious; and I think it may well result in a most dangerous situation in the days that lie ahead.

I, with many other Senators, recall the statement made in Von Ludendorff's book, Ludendorff's Own Story, in which he pointed out, as Von Hindenberg and others have also pointed out, that the greatest contribution to the defeat of Germany was the collapse of the home front when the civilian-supply program broke down.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator permit me to obtrude at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not want the Senator to lead off on a matter that is of a more or less sentimental character. I agree with him in the objectives he is trying to reach. I think the civilian population has not received the consideration it should receive. I go along with the Senator until we get to the mode of procedure or the machinery by which the appeal might be made. There I depart from the Senator's position. I take the general stand that we have too many agencies now, and that the bill would simply result in the creation of another agency with overlapping jurisdiction—unquestionably so, as I see it—without conferring on anyone finally the right to adjudicate the question the Senator has very much in mind.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I think the bill very clearly would give Mr. Byrnes the power to adjudicate. I should like to point out that there would not be a duplication; that at the moment there is, in name only, a Civilian Supply Agency, a part of the War Production Board. It has employed in the past 600 persons. Testimony before our committee by the present civilian-supply official was that the new agency would operate with less than 1,000 persons. The bill provides that the present department of the War Production Board dealing with the civilian supply shall be taken over; so there would be a change only to the extent that the man would be given independent power, that he would not be subservient to the Chairman of the War Production Board, as is now the case.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to ask the Senator to yield again.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask the Senator not to hesitate.

Mr. McNARY. I really should apologize for interrupting. What the Senator has said illustrates a general difference very prominently manifesting itself, in my own mind, as to the number of employees who naturally would attach to the new agency. As I read the bill very hurriedly, it seems to me that the Senator is covering an immense amount of territory which now is being covered by other groups or other agencies of Government; and how that could be done with the present set-up of the War Production Board, if the Senator is desirous of having a complete divorcement, I do not understand. It is my guess, and I make it here, that if the bill becomes law the new agency will have several thousand employees within a thousand hours, which is about 40 days. Let me state to my dear friend the Senator from Connecticut that it never has proven otherwise. Whenever we create an agency, or whenever one is created by Executive order, in a short time we are astounded by the number of persons who are employed and the great expense to the taxpayers in taking care of the functions and duties of an agency which is simply stepping on the toes and intruding itself upon the activities of some existing agency.

Mr. MALONEY. I can assure the very distinguished Senator from Oregon that I am among those who have been loudly endeavoring on the floor of the Senate—not always successfully, but with some measure of success—to abolish existing agencies. I did not have much help when I tried to wipe out the N. Y. A. and other agencies.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator has followers.

Mr. MALONEY. I have followed the Senator closely in that effort. On the particular occasion to which I refer, I was probably more articulate than others.

I should like to point out also that the proposed legislation would come to an end with the cessation of the war. I know that there is no one more concerned over the question than is the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon. He has talked with me about it many times. I can appreciate his fears. They are very natural fears. Other Senators have fears about the possibility of a run-away agency.

Mr. Nelson has in his department more than 22,000 employees. I shall not criticise that agency now. Other agencies of the Government are overburdened with employees. One day I stood at this desk and stated that if I were in charge I would send half of them home. I would still send half of them home. It was I who asked the question of the present Civilian Supply Administrator, "How many employees would be needed to operate this agency? In my judgment you cannot do it with 5,000, but you can do it with less than 1,000." He said he would have less than 1,000.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I find nothing in the bill which would limit the number of employees. The number would be left to the sole discretion of the Director.

Mr. MALONEY. That is entirely correct. It would be up to the Director and to the Congress, which appropriates the money. In the final analysis, the sole discretion is with Congress.

I realize that there can be abuses if a bad selection is made—and, God knows, there have been many bad selections, and the abuses have gone on and on. I have tolerated them as best I could, because I do not want to muddy the waters in time of war. I feel like screaming every day, as large numbers of constituents of every Senator are shrieking, about these abuses.

In the earlier part of my remarks, I stated that this is only the first step, and that it cou'd not be successful unless the second step were successful. The second step is the administration of the act. Unless we can get wise, able, conscientious, patriotic, and thoroughly competent men, this plan will not work. But the system of civilian supply is not working now. The civilian population has been neglected. We had witnesses before our committee who testified that they could not get equipment to repair plumbing in the cities of Detroit and Chicago. There is great danger from the health standpoint because they cannot obtain pipe, fittings, and parts. We had witnesses from Chicago and elsewhere who told us that they could not get the parts for refrigerators or washing machines in homes. They stated that they could

not gets parts for plumbing facilities in homes, and that great danger confronts us if we cannot get those things. The danger is now on a comparatively small scale. If we go on blindly for another 6 months, we shall have it in a big way next winter.

The civilian population of the country, instead of being dealt with on the basis of proper civilian supply, has been treated on a basis of civilian denial. I am blaming no individual. I do know, however, that it is our responsibility and not the responsibility of Donald Nelson or any one downtown to protect the civilian population. It is our job, and when the war is over, or when the trouble comes, we cannot say, "The Army took too much," or "The Navy took too much," or "The Bureau of Economic Warfare took too much," or "Too much was sent to Africa and the distressed countries of Europe." We will be asked, "Where was the Congress?" If I were operating the Army, or a part of it, I should be making big demands. I should probably be overdemanding. Those in control of the Army are charged with the responsibility of obtaining enough—I rather suspect that they are asking for enough all along the line. In some instances we are already surfeited with certain things which the Army requires, and I have no criticism of that situation, but I do criticize Congress if it passes up this opportunity to obtain for a representative of the American people a chair and a vote at the council table. By Executive order various other claimants have been set up outside the War Production Board. I am only asking that consideration be given to 120,000,000 American people.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator about the difficulties of the civilian population. I am heartily in accord with the objective which the Senator is seeking by this bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I know the Senator is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Why not put our finger on the cause of the difficulties of the civilian population? The thousands upon thousands of regulatory orders and priorities which have been issued prevent our people from obtaining goods.

Mr. MALONEY. I am coming to that.

Under section 2 (b) (4) of the bill the Administrator is authorized to assist the civilian population and civilian industries, trades, and services in making any adjustments made necessary by the war. In the case of shoes, the Administrator may endeavor to educate the civilian population in the proper care and preservation of footwear and the necessity for conservation measures in the use of footwear. He may also stimulate voluntary action by business and community groups in such matters as cutting down unnecessary distribution costs, pooling deliveries, and adjusting storekeepers' hours.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is intended to be accomplished under subparagraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 2, on page 11, line 10? The language is:

(4) Assist the civilian population and civilian industries, trades, and services in making any adjustments rendered necessary by the war.

What does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. MALONEY. Let me refer again to the statement which I have just made.

In the case of shoes, the Administrator may endeavor to educate the civilian population in the proper care and preservation of footwear and the necessity for conservation measures in the use of footwear. He may also stimulate voluntary action by business and community groups in such matters as cutting down unnecessary distribution costs, pooling deliveries, and adjusting storekeepers' hours.

I can think of such a case as the regulation of hours, and how he could assist in bringing about a unification of hours. In the State in which I live the Governor issued a request that business houses close on Monday. Some of them complied and some of them did not. In other instances stores remained open at night. As the Senator knows, the whole problem was one of power and fuel. Some stores remained open at night and others did not. Consequently, there was created a sort of unfair competition. Under the language of the bill the Administrator would assist in making any adjustments rendered necessary by the war.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it involve policing?

Mr. MALONEY. No; it does not go that far. The word is "assist." It is a matter of education. It would be a moral responsibility upon the Administrator.

He may also stimulate voluntary action by business and community groups in such matters as cutting down unnecessary distribution costs, pooling deliveries, and adjusting storekeepers' hours. Under section 2 (b) (5) the Administrator is empowered to assure a fair and equitable distribution of consumer goods through the channels of trade, and to assist the retail, wholesale, and service trades in adjusting themselves to the level of operations required by the amount of resources available. Accordingly, the Administrator might seek to assure adequate supplies of footwear to regions whose populations have increased as a result of the growth of war industries, and to divert particular types of footwear to regions where climate or occupations call for their particular use. He would determine policies on the control of shoe inventories and in the allocation of shoes to various classes of wholesalers and retailers.

I selected shoes because they are not made in Connecticut.

Under section 2 (b) (6) the Administrator is authorized, subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, to determine the need for rationing goods and services to the civilian population, and when and where rationing shall be instituted. If shoes had not yet been rationed, the Administrator—after ascertaining the need therefor, and after obtaining the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director—would be the one to direct the Office of Price Administration to ration shoes to the civilian population. Since shoes are already rationed today, the Civilian Supply Administrator might, under this bill, issue a directive to the Office of Price Administration modifying the rationing of shoes or establishing new policies of shoe rationing.

Under section 2 (b) (7), the Civilian Supply Administrator would be authorized to conserve the productive resources available for civilian production and distribution by reducing and eliminating nonessential uses of goods, services, and productive resources, and by stimulating the utilization of adequate substitutes for goods of limited supply.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut what is contemplated by the word "services"?

Mr. MALONEY. It might mean laundries or barber shops.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Might it mean labor?

Mr. MALONEY. No; it would not mean labor as such.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the word might be construed to be sufficiently broad to include labor.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite understand what the Senator means, but I do not think it can so be construed in this bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it include professional services?

Mr. MALONEY. It could include professional services.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the word is open to vast possibilities. As one Senator pointed out, it touches on the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think it does. It is a very common term used in legislation and otherwise. We frequently talk about goods and services, meaning service organizations, delivery trucks, laundries, and barbers and optometrists and shoe repairmen. It refers to what the men do, rather than to the men themselves. If the Senator can suggest more appropriate language, I should be glad to have him do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I recognize the connotations to which the Senator addresses himself, but I believe the term "services" also has a commonly understood meaning as including at least some forms of human activity, such as professional services, if not common labor.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct. If he can suggest better phraseology I should like to have it. I am opposed to the Austin-Wadsworth bill, or anything like it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may add to what the Senator has said, I, too, am opposed to it, and if the language of the proposed bill includes anything of that kind, of course, it would raise a conclusive and insuperable objection on my part to the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. It would also have the same effect with me, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, but I am sure the term "services" as used in the bill cannot be so construed.

And now I refer back to section 2 (b) 7.

If, for instance, the quantities of sole leather available for civilian footwear are insufficient, the Administrator might direct that limited quantities of sole leather be used per shoe, or that certain nonessential styles of shoes be eliminated. Thus, the Administrator would be enabled to stretch the leather available for civilians over a greater number of pairs of shoes and thereby meet the needs of the civilian population.

Under section 2 (b) (8) the Administrator would be authorized to cooperate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in attaining the most effective use of small business concerns in civilian supply. This means that in the case of shoes the Administrator and the Smaller War Plants Corporation would jointly work out a program to relieve distress among smaller shoe manufacturers, and enable them to contribute their utmost to the production of essential shoes.

Section 3 directs all agencies adminstering the national policy of economic stabilization and prevention of inflation to cooperate with the Administrator to the extent practicable, on the task of meeting essential civilian needs. This provision recognizes the fact that the basic aim of our economic stabilization and anti-inflation policies is the prevention of price increases which would tend to disrupt the production and distribution of essential civilian supplies. If, for example, it were found that price ceilings imposed on shoe manufacturers made it unprofitable for them to manufacture civilian shoes, the Office of Price Administration, under this provision, would be expected to make the proper adjustment in its price ceiling.

Section 4 makes the Civilian Supply Administrator a member of the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the interdepartmental advisory committees of the Food Administration, the Petroleum Administration for War, the War Shipping Administration, and any other agencies which divide up the resources of the country. This provision gives the Administrator an opportunity to participate in the basic policy discussions of the other agencies insofar as they relate to the civilian supply of not only footwear but of all other civilian goods and services.

I should like to invite particular attention to section 5 of the bill because a suggestion has been made on the floor of the Senate that in order to obtain information which would be necessary for carrying out the program there would have to be a duplication of effort.

Section 5 authorizes the Administrator to obtain information from businessmen and from other Federal agencies. He could therefore and thereby draw upon the information which they may have for whatever purpose he may need it in the conduct of his work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask for information concerning the particular section of the bill to which the Senator is now addressing himself. Section 5 would give to the Administrator power to investigate and secure information, or gather information from various lines of business. Is it not possible that under the power granted by that section the Administrator could simply conduct fishing expeditions to embarrass and annoy the owners of plants?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall come to that point in a minute. The Senator already knows that under existing law officials may not torment officers of industries and others with questionnaires unless such questionnaires first have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I may say by way of giving ourselves a little applause that such restriction is the result of a bill introduced by the Small Business Committee of the Senate, and which is now law.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator, but would we not be granting that particular power by the passage of this bill?

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to have the Senator bear with me until I can make a further explanation of it.

Under this section the Administrator could obtain existing information concerning the shoe industry from the Office of Price Administration, for example, without having to spend the time and money which would be necessary if he had to gather such information directly.

I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that he could not obtain income-tax reports from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or confidential information from any agency.

We wish specifically to take care of the situation to which the Senator has so properly and wisely referred.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How about the individual? The Administrator could not secure the information from a Government agency, but under the terms of this bill could he not go into a man's own business and secure it?

Mr. MALONEY. Only under existing law. I cannot anticipate a case in which he would do so harmfully.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONEY. It would not broaden the law. It would not, in my judgment, create any new power.

Section 6 provides that all Government agencies that allocate our resources among various uses should allot to small business concerns, wherever possible, a larger proportion of their pre-war civilian business than is allotted to larger concerns, or to concerns with more direct or indirect Government business. This provision recognizes the fact that a larger shoe manufacturer or a large shoe distributor can operate under bigger cuts in civilian business than can smaller concerns. If effectively administered it would tend to preserve and strengthen the smaller shoe manufacturers and distributors, many of whom might otherwise have to go out of business.

Other sections of the bill speak for themselves and need no illustration.

Section 7 provides that the present Office of Civilian Supply within the War Production Board, together with its records, property, personnel, and funds, shall be transferred to the new Civilian Supply Administration.

Section 8 authorizes the Administrator to appoint such advisory committees, composed of representatives of governmental or private groups, as he deems appropriate.

Section 9 calls for quarterly and annual reports to Congress summarizing the activities of the Civilian Supply Administration.

Section 10 provides that the bill shall expire 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

When this bill was first introduced by the Subcommittee on Civilian Supply of the Senate Committee on Small Business, there were some who misunderstood its purposes and provisions.

I can well recall some of my colleagues feeling that the creation of an independent Civilian Supply Administration would add to the existing duplication of effort in the conduct of the war. The hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, however, have made it clear to everyone that it is the existing duplication of effort in the field of civilian supply that threatens our conduct of the war on the home front, and that the passage of this bill will do more than anything else to eliminate duplication and bring order out of chaos.

There were some who thought that it would take away from the other Federal agencies essential production powers. A careful reading of the bill, however, would make it clear to anyone who may still harbor such questions that a Civilian Supply Administration is not a production agency in any sense of the word, and that it merely relieves the production agencies of the job of deciding how much is needed for the civilian population, thereby giving them the opportunity to concentrate their efforts upon their central job, namely, production. This fact is substantiated by testimony on behalf of the bill by Mr. Jeffers, one of the most aggressive of all the production administrators.

Finally, there may have been some who feared that a strong Civilian Supply Administration might put the fat back on our civilian economy, that it might take things away from our men on the fighting fronts and allow our civilian population to wallow in luxuries. This, needless to say, is exactly contrary to the spirit and letter of the proposed legislation and the intent of those who framed it. The whole purpose is to provide more effective assistance to our men on the fighting fronts, to speed up the prosecution of the war, and bring nearer the day of victory by mobilizing the home front in support of the armed forces.

The people of this country have long been looking to the Congress for leadership. Through their elected representatives in Washington, they have wanted to participate more fully in the decisions that shape the destiny of our country.

Our people have not looked to Congress in vain. The Civilian Supply bill, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, represents a united, bipartisan effort on the part of many Senators to determine our Nation's wartime policy on the home front and to substitute a workable, practical civilian supply organization for the existing chaos. While I do not wish to minimize the value of the work done on the bill by its cosponsors, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], or by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, there is hardly a member of the entire Banking and Currency Committee who has not made a personal contribution toward the framing of the proposed legislation. The passage of this bill by a united and determined Congress will not only put our Government and our country in better shape to fight the war, but it will also give everyone, including our enemies, a working demonstration of democracy in action. It will help establish more firmly the somewhat neglected principle that we can fight the war most effectively through the use, rather than the suspension, of the democratic processes we are fighting to defend.

Mr. President, I have occupied the floor for a long time. I am not familiar with the following legislative program. Other members of our committee may desire to discuss the bill, but I think, in view of some of the things which have been said here that I ought to analyze the recent order issued by Mr. Nelson. Some Senators are quite familiar with the fact that for the past few weeks persons associated with the War Production Board, to put the statement conservatively, have been lobbying constantly against this bill. I see nothing more in their purpose than the long-time Washington desire to keep power, to retain control. I do not say that disparagingly. I am certain that Mr. Nelson is as conscientious as a man can be in feeling that the civilian supply need can be better taken care of under his guidance than it can under the direction of someone who has no other special Government work to do. I have insisted, the members of our Smaller Businesses Subcommittee have felt, the entire membership of the Banking and Currency Committee has felt, after the hearings, after testimony by those who are extremely close to the civilian population, after testimony by the C. I. O., the American Federation of Labor, and business groups of this country—and they are close to the ordinary citizen—that there was no reasonable ground for opposition. After their testimony as to the need there came a unanimity of opinion insofar as our committee is concerned. I cannot see the reason for the opposition; but Mr. Nelson has moved again and again and again to set aside this proposed legislation, and I think that probably I ought to take a little more time of the Senate to attempt to make an analysis of his recent order. It is called a new order on civilian supply but to me it looks like the old order a little more dressed up. So I shall risk tormenting Senators, because I think this analysis ought to be made a part of the RECORD.

So, Mr. President, I revert to the recent order dealing with Mr. Nelson's Office for Civilian Requirements. I have felt that this order is one of the results of the bill sponsored by Senators TAFT, SCRUGHAM, and myself. If I may have the attention of the Senators, and particularly any of the Senators who have the feeling that this recent order makes it unnecessary to pass the bill now under consideration, I will be grateful. I think I can show that almost nothing is changed. I think I can prove that the new order is almost meaningless and, in fact, as I have said, is the old order dressed up.

On May 1, 1943, 15 months after the creation of the War Production Board, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, issued a general administrative order, 2–99, establishing a vice chairman and Office for Civilian Requirements in the War Production Board. This internal administrative order presumably represents Mr. Nelson's present views as to how the civilian-supply problem should be dealt with. It is in many respects a remarkable order: First, it is the ninety-ninth administrative order issued in 15 months; it is a 6-page document—one of the longest administrative orders ever issued by the War Production Board—and, finally, it represents his third change of mind in 3 months on how to handle the civilian-supply problems. This latter point is important, since this order can be changed again whenever Mr. Nelson changes his mind again. I have studied Mr. Nelson's order carefully and have come to the conclusion that the 130,000,000 civilians of this country cannot be adequately protected by this internal administrative order.

I shall explain why I have come to this conclusion. Before doing so, however, I wish to point out that Mr. Nelson evidently has had a belated change of mind on the civilian-supply problem. Not only does his administrative order borrow profusely from the so-called Maloney bill, but, contrary to his own prepared testimony on the bill before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, he has now established a claimant for civilians, albeit a limited claimant for controlled materials under the War Production Board. It is interesting to compare Mr. Nelson's administrative order of May 1, 1943, with his prepared statement and testimony on S. 835 before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The heart of the administrative order provides that the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements shall be a claimant for consumer goods and services. The pertinent sections of the order provide that:

SEC. 5.01. * * * the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements shall—

1. Determine the requirements for civilian goods and services and act as claimant therefor.

SEC. 7.03. The vice chairman for Civilian Requirements shall be a member of the requirements committee of the War Production Board and shall be a claimant before that committee for such consumer goods and services and such controlled materials going into such consumer goods and services as may be the concern of that committee.

On April 6, 1943, less than a month ago, Mr. Nelson read a prepared statement on the so-called Maloney bill to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee wherein he stated as follows:

I have come to the conclusion that the concept of a claimant for civilians is confusing. I think it is confusing logically and confusing emotionally. The very name implies that the civilian portion of our population is seeking to get something which it does not have. * * * I believe, therefore, * * * that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people is not to claim but to give. * * * The activities of a claimant agency are those of bargaining. They normally include asking for more than is expected, in order to have leeway for bargaining. * * * Used for civilians I believe they would be repugnant to the people of this country.

I must say that the Maloney bill must have had a profound influence on Mr. Nelson, whose administrative order repudiates his own statement to the Senate Committee. If Mr. Nelson still believes that there should be no claimant for civilians, I can only say that he must also have concluded that the vice chairman for an Office of Civilian Requirements which he has established in the War Production Board is "repugnant to the people of this country."

A general administrative order issued by the chairman of the War Production Board is subject to rapid and frequent amendment by the Chairman. Yet such an internal order is proposed as the basis for establishing the Civilian Supply Agency within the War Production Board.

From its inception in January 1942 to date, the Chairman of the War Production Board has issued 99 general administrative orders providing for different organizational changes in the War Production Board structure. With respect to one single division of the War Production Board, the Operations Division, the Chairman of the War Production Board has issued 10 general administrative orders modifying its functions and organization during a period of 15 months. On the average, therefore, a particular general administrative order lasted 45 days. This is a rather insecure basis for a civilian-supply organization to protect 130,000,000 civilians in the war.

A vice chairman in charge of Civilian Requirements in the War Production Board was established after the Senate hearings on the Maloney bill were completed. The vice chairman for Civilian Requirements is one of six vice chairmen of the War Production Board and he is a claimant for controlled materials. All the other vice chairmen—the executive vice chairman, and those for Programs, for Operations, for Miscellaneous Planning, Production and Procurement, and for International Supply—deal with problems of allocations of materials and production. None of them are claimants. Thus the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements will be the only claimant among the vice chairmen of the War Production Board. All other major

claimants are independent and outside the War Production Board.

I should like particularly to emphasize that statement, because of the charge made here that we were taking a claimant out when as a matter of fact about all the other claimants are out.

Compare the position of this one of six vice chairmen of the War Production Board with that of the other major claimants. The Vice President of the United States is head of the Board of Economic Warfare, which acts as claimant for the populations of Central and South America. Can we not have that much for the people of our own country? Shall we give them less than we give to the populations of Central and South America at our own conference table here in Washington?

Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is head of the Lend-Lease Administration, an independent agency which claims for the needs of our allies and reports directly to the President. I am among those giving applause to Mr. Stettinius. I am among those who have always favored the lease-lend program. But shall we, the Congress, deny to the civilian population of our own country that which we give to all our allies in all the foreign fields? Is it wrong to ask for them, who send us here, a place comparable with that we have given to dozens of other countries over the earth? I cannot believe it. I cannot believe that the Senate or the Congress as a whole will vote against giving the same representation to the people whom they are directly representing.

Both the Army and Navy, headed by Cabinet members, are independent and claimants and report directly to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. The civilian supply organization of the War Production Board is therefore so inferior in stature to other major claimants that it is not in a position to be effective in assuring adequate civilian supplies.

The main fault of the general administrative order lies in the inadequate coverage of the civilian-supply organization. In the first place, the Office of Civilian Requirements is limited to the field of consumer goods and services "personally consumed or used by individual citizens in the United States." This seems to me to make the civilian-supply organization unduly narrow. More important, however, is the confinement of the Office of Civilian Requirements to only those fields over which the War Production Board has authority.

Due to the limited authority of the War Production Board the General Administrative Order No. 2–99 establishes the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements as claimant only for such materials as are under the War Production Board. Whenever the word "claimant" is used in the administrative order, therefore, it is necessarily qualified and limited to "claimant for materials which are under the jurisdiction of the War Production Board." This means that the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements can claim for the steel, rubber, fuel, and textile fabrics which go into the manufacture of shoes for the civilian population. However, he cannot claim for the manpower necessary to produce and distribute the shoes, for the leather necessary to manufacture the shoes, and for the shipping space necessary to bring in the hides required to assure sufficient supplies of leather for the shoes. Moreover, Mr. Nelson's order does not give the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements an official claimant membership on the requirements committees of the Rubber Director or of the Petroleum Administrator for War.

In other words, under this general administrative order the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements would not be in a position to assure the supply of the necessary shoes, or, for that matter, any other goods and services to the civilian population. He could not do this because he is established only under an administrative order within the authority of the War Production Board. In order to claim for manpower he would have to go to the War Manpower Commission, which is established by independent Executive order, and is not subject to jurisdiction of the War Production Board. In order to claim for rubber he would have to go to the Rubber Director, who is established by independent Executive order. In order to claim for leather he would have to go to the Food Administrator and the Department of Agriculture, which are established by statute and Executive order and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the War Production Board. In order to insure sufficient quantities of fuel oil for the manufacturer of shoes the vice chairman would have to go to the Petroleum Administrator for War, who is established by Executive order. In order to claim for the transportation required to assure the distribution of shoes to the civilians, he would have to go to the Office of Defense Transportation, which is established by independent Executive order, and is not subject to the jurisdiction of the War Production Board. In order to claim for shipping space to import more hides for leather, he would have to go to the War Shipping Administration, which is established by Executive order and is not subject to the War Production Board.

It is quite obvious that there could be no integration, planning, and assurance of adequate civilian supplies under these circumstances. The vice chairman for Civilian Requirements would be only an official claimant for the steel tacks that go into the making of shoes. It would not be possible to make many shoes with only steel tacks. The War Production Board cannot give the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements status as a claimant before other Government agencies because the War Production Board has no such authority over them. The Maloney bill affords an over-all claimant status for a Civilian Supply Administrator so that civilians can be adequately provided for.

The impossibility of doing an adequate job for civilians under this War Production Board general administrative order is apparent—so apparent that an attempt is made in the order to gloss over the defect by establishing a so-called Civilian Requirements policy committee. The stated function of this committee is "to correlate the policies of the several Government agencies concerned with the supply of essential goods and services for civilians." The committee has no powers to decide civilian-supply policies nor are the committee's decisions binding on any of its members.

The members of the committee are the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Price Administrator, the Petroleum Administrator for War, and the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, presided over by the Chairman of the War Production Board. Except for the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements, all the other members of the committee are members of the War Production Board. The formation of this committee seems strange indeed when its members are all available for discussion of civilian-supply matters at War Production Board meetings.

In other words, they will meet Tuesday, let us say, as members of the War Production Board, and the same men come back on Wednesday and discuss another subject. I wonder if it is wise, in times like these, to bring men back tomorrow or the day after tomorrow to discuss that which might properly have been discussed when they were all together the day before.

If civilian-supply problems can be dealt with by a correlating committee, it seems like duplication to me to establish a new committee when the War Production Board itself is supposed to care for civilian requirements as well as military and export. If civilian-supply problems cannot be dealt with adequately by the War Production Board itself, there is no reason to believe that they can be dealt with by a subcommittee composed of War Production Board members. I can only view this committee as a rump session of the War Production Board which, for 15 months, has failed to solve these questions. This is mere camouflage. What civilian supply needs is an administrator with authority, not a debating society.

Probably the single most important factor to maintenance of an adequate civilian economy during the coming year is the manpower situation. Consequently, any person charged with the responsibility of providing adequate consumer goods and services for the civilian population must have an effective voice on manpower. It is noteworthy that Mr. Nelson's general administrative order on civilian supply has only one reference to manpower. It provides in section 5.01–7 that the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements shall "determine the impact of manpower shortages upon the supply of essential consumer goods and services; and when necessary, determine the relative essentiality of different consumer goods and services, and report such determinations to the War Manpower Commission."

This provision is most inadequate to assure necessary civilian supplies. In effect, the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements is authorized to make studies

and reports on manpower shortages. These are weasel words which purport to give civilian supply a voice on manpower when in reality it will have none. The vice chairman is given no claimant representation before the War Manpower Commission on which sit other claimants for manpower such as the Army, Navy, and Agriculture. It is clear why Mr. Nelson could only authorize his civilian Supply Agency to make studies and reports on manpower—the War Production Board has no control or jurisdiction over the War Manpower Commission. The Maloney bill will remedy this defect. The Government representative of civilians can be only a fraud and deception upon the public if he has no effective voice on manpower as it relates to civilian supply.

It is expressly provided in the general administrative order 2–99 that the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements shall not be a claimant with respect to food. This is in keeping with the testimony of Mr. Nelson before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 885 where he said—p. 237 of hearings:

I do not have anything to do with food stuffs.

The vice chairman for Civilian Requirements will also not be a claimant for transportation and housing. It is not clear from the order what his status with respect to the Petroleum Administrator will be. It is noteworthy that in the course of the hearings Mr. Nelson answered the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on such matters as follows—pp. 250–251 of hearings:

Senator DANAHER. I will say that I have personally concluded that there were various features in which you do lack authority to do perhaps some of the things that this bill strikes at.

Mr. NELSON. But I have never found in the fields that I cover anything that stood in the way of doing the job; that is, exclusive of transportation, fuel, and food.

It is quite apparent from what Mr. Nelson has said that the War Production Board is without sufficient authority on food, as well as on transportation and fuel to do the necessary civilian-supply job. It follows that the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements under the War Production Board must be limited by whatever authority the War Production Board is limited.

Consequently, the man responsible for civilian needs would have nothing to do with food, transportation, and possibly fuel, as well as new housing and manpower, under the general administrative order. How can a civilian-supply organization provide adequately for civilians during the war when, of the necessities of life, it can deal only with materials for clothing and similar things, while shelter, food, transportation, and medical care are outside its province?

In connection with the food problem I wish to make clear that the Food Administrator has control not only over edible foods but over fats and oils out of which are made such consumer products as soap and greases, castor oil, and so forth. Without representation before the Food Administrator to claim for soap, the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements is supposed to see to it that there are adequate laundry facilities to launder the clothes of civilians. I would like to see a laundry operate without soap. This situation can be multiplied several hundred times.

The Food Administrator has control over such items as milk, sugar, casein, and turpentine and resinous products. These agricultural products are used in the making of paints, glues, and drugs, as well as many other consumer products for which presumably the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements is responsible. Without being a claimant—as are the military and export agencies—before the Food Administrator, how is the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements to assure that the necessary agricultural products are made available for the manufacture of civilian supplies? The general administrative order is defective in this respect as well as with respect to transportation, housing, manpower, and possibly fuel—all vital elements of maintaining adequate civilian supply. The Maloney bill corrects these defects.

The lack of official representation and status as a claimant before production and supply agencies other than the War Production Board would be a death blow to the attempt to maintain an adequate civilian economy. The military and export agencies long ago learned this lesson and were established as claimants before each and every production and supply agency so that they could bring into balance their entire programs.

I should like to say that Mr. Nelson said that the Army had in its organization on requirements and supply a quarter of a million persons. The General Administrative Order 2–99 merely establishes a claimant for civilians in one single agency—the War Production Board—and emphasizes the lack of representation before all the other production and supply agencies like the War Manpower Commission, the Rubber Director, the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Food Administrator, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the War Shipping Administrator. Without being able to assure sufficient quantities of the resources controlled by these other production and supply agencies, the civilian economy cannot be adequately protected and kept in balance. Mr. Nelson himself, during the course of his testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 885, indicated agreement with the necessity for representation of civilian supply before other production and supply agencies. Thus, on page 249 of the hearings, is the following:

Senator MALONEY. Appreciating the seriousness of the civilian-supply problem, as you do—and you have made statements about it very recently—do you think it might have been proper if you had arranged to have civilian supply represented on food and manpower and transportation?

Mr. NELSON. It might have been, sir, and it may have been a mistake in not working that out at the time the order was put through. I agree with you.

It has not been done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, would the Senator permit me to amplify the RECORD by a statement from Mr. Nelson?

Mr. MALONEY. Please do.

Mr. McNARY. Which I received today in answer to my own inquiry made on my own initiative and for personal reasons. I read:

Our civilian-supply set-up in the War Production Board has not been good, and I have been in the process of reorganizing it. I now have it organized under Mr. Arthur D. Whiteside, a man of unquestioned reputation and ability, and have signed, on Saturday—

That was 5 days ago—

an administrative order which gives him as much authority as any man can have to determine civilian requirements and to see that the necessary things are done consistent with the demands on the material and manpower which must be met to win the war. I think this agency should be given a chance.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Oregon offers that at an inopportune time. I am exceedingly sorry——

Mr. McNARY. The Senator was discussing that phase of the matter.

Mr. MALONEY. I want it to go in the RECORD, and I want to comment on it.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is now discussing that phase of the question.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct, and I have nearly concluded. I have spent the last half hour proving that it is just a sham and it may result in a shambles.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if what I have read disconcerts the Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the RECORD at this time the excerpts which I have read from Donald Nelson's letter. I shall repeat them later.

Mr. MALONEY. I am sorry, but I did not make myself clear to the able Senator from Oregon. I did not mean that it was disconcerting to me. What I meant was that I have been dealing with that matter for the last half hour. I have been spending the last half hour, while the able Senator was compelled to be out of the Chamber, and while other Senators were compelled to be out of the Chamber, in discussing the order to which Mr. Donald Nelson referred in his letter which was on May 1, and proved, I think, to those who have done me the honor of listening, that he has not done anything about it except to say to Mr. Whiteside, "I have set up a civilian supply agency", and then to say to himself, "But there is not anything you can do." We have simply colored the old picture.

Mr. McNARY. I have been attempting to be wholly correct.

Mr. MALONEY. That is always true of the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. At this time I want to withdraw from the RECORD the excerpt I read into it. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD will not be encumbered by the excerpt, I ask that it be withdrawn. Later I shall read it and comment upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I hope I have not offended the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Not at all; I think the Senator is probably quite correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not been present all the time during the course of the Senator's speech. I am very sympathetic with his bill; but there is one matter in it concerning which I should like to have a little information. As I understand the Senator's bill, it provides for taking out of the War Production Board the activity which now is a part of its activities, the part which the Senator calls the civilian supply.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are we to understand, therefore, that the cost, with the exception of the Administrator's salary of $12,000 a year, will be substantially or approximately what the cost is now; in other words, that it will not mean a large appropriation of additional moneys in order to carry on independently the supply activity now being carried on in the War Production Board? Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct. The only way we would deviate from his suggestion would be if there were appointed a man who would violate the testimony of those who are best informed on the subject, and who told us that the agency could be operated with less than 1,000 men, and that they have been employing up to 600 now. So the Senator is substantially correct, on the basis of all the testimony we had.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I asked that question of the Senator because, of course, generally speaking, I have opposed the addition of new activities. We already have a great many. I am already inclined to support the Senator's bill; but I should feel very much more inclined and more pleased to support it if I knew that the cost would be substantially the same as it is for the present organization.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes, Mr. President.

Let me impose upon the Senator and ask him to do me the honor of saying for the RECORD that I have been associated with him in the effort to reduce such expenditures.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has. During our entire operations in the Appropriations Committee he has steadfastly stood for that thing; and as I read his bill, the cost need not be any greater than it is now.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I had just finished reading Mr. Nelson's statement before the hearings, in which he said he agreed with me. Yet Mr. Nelson, in his general administrative order, has not made provisions for such representation of the vice chairman for Civilian Requirements for such vital elements of civilian supply as food, fuel, manpower, and transportation. Only the so-called Maloney bill will fill those gaps so that a strong, central civilian-supply Agency can care for the war needs of the civilian population.

Mr. President, I had prepared an analysis of a letter which was written to Members of Congress by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I know that the views of Mr. O'Neal have great weight with Members of this body. He knows them personally, and has been more or less in contact with them over the years. Later I shall make an analysis of Mr. O'Neal's letter if there appears to be a need for it. Because other Senators have indicated a desire to speak, I shall not do so at this time, other than to say that the letter itself indicates quite clearly that Mr. O'Neal was not referring to the bill now before the Senate, but his letter was drafted after having read the original bill to which the majority leader himself objected. Mr. O'Neal does not deal with the bill as it came out of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I am inclined toward the view, prompted only by my own feeling, let me say, that Mr. O'Neal would deal much differently with the bill now under consideration. Later on, I may, if the need becomes apparent, take further of the Senate's time to present my analysis of his letter. However, for the time being, I think I shall rest at this point; although I may want to discuss another matter in a general way before we end.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this time?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the Senator's earlier discussion did he explain the meaning of the first two sentences of section 2, subsection (3), with especial reference to the use of the word "manpower"?

Mr. MALONEY. That means just what it implies, as differed from the question of services. It means amounts and types of manpower.

Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The specific point I have in mind is whether it gives authority to take a man or a group of men from one job and put them into another job, against their will.

Mr. MALONEY. That is the last thing it is intended to do, let me say to the Senator; and I do not think it would do that. I will be with the Senator as probably the last two Members of this body standing here and protesting if any attempt is made to do that. Certainly that is my position at this time. The provision does not mean the drafting of men. The matter would be handled under the War Manpower Commission by an official description of industries and areas and businesses as essential. As to the procedure under that case, I am assuming it would be for the Civilian Supply Administrator to say, "The laundry business is essential, at least in this area, and you will not take manpower away to put them into what you have heretofore called essential industries."

The Senator knows that the people of the country within certain age groups have been greatly disturbed because of the promise or threat that if they were engaged in a nonessential industry they would be called for service, and that those in essential industries might remain where they were. The laundries were not originally regarded as an essential industry—I select them because we have had so much discussion of them. Largely as a result of Mr. Weiner's organization of civilian supply, laundries, at least in the area in which I live, have been called an essential industry. As a matter of fact, a study of the matter was made recently in Waterbury and Hartford, Conn. The report is not out, but I am advised that the whole area was declared essential, the purpose being, not to take manpower away, but to leave it there for laundries and for the other service industries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to another part of the bill. At the very beginning, under the declaration of policy, it says:

> The Congress hereby declares that the total mobilization of all the Nation's resources is necessary—

And so forth. As I understand, at a time when we are spending perhaps 65 percent of our national income for war, we shall have reached as high a level of expenditure as would be consistent with efficient conduct of the war effort. If that be true, and taking the words literally, will there not always be a part of our civilian life that is not totally mobilized for war? In other words, is that a rhetorical expression, or does it mean exactly what it says?

Mr. MALONEY. It means we should aim to get everything reasonable out of all parts and portions of our population, that every man should make every contribution he can make, and that the Government should not erect any barriers, but should assist every man in making his maximum contribution—keeping the lumberman supplied with food so he can do his utmost to comply with the demands for lumber, keeping the miner supplied with all he needs so he can mine more coal—or perhaps more silver.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate especially the Senator's solicitude with respect to silver. I hope he continues to think along that line. Would it be fair to say that the intention of the sponsors of the bill is to aid in the mobilization of so much of our economy as is necessary, and no more?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Or are we pursuing some over-all mobilization, as we so frequently hear it expressed rhetorically on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MALONEY. I have already stated to the Senator and to the Senate that I am opposed to the Austin-Wadsworth bill. I am opposed to the drafting of civilians. I am opposed—to the extent of language which I would not use on the floor of the Senate—to the suggestion that we draft women. I can conceive that there may come a day when it will be necessary to do things which are pretty repugnant to us right now, but we are pretty far from that situation now. I do not know that I could be described as an idealist, to the extent that some men are. I do not think anyone

would call me an extremist. I am trying to be conservative, modest, and sensible so far as this bill is concerned. I am rather proud of the part which I have been permitted to play in the presentation of the bill. I am sure that it is imperfect. Certainly it could be improved upon. However, I think it is a good bill. I think it is sane and sensible, and I think it is extremely necessary. At least, I think I have proved to Senators who have listened to me for the past half hour or more that the new order of Mr. Donald Nelson, as Chairman of the War Production Board, cannot do the necessary work. His appointees' hands are tied. I have no criticism of Mr. Whiteside, the man whom he has just appointed. He comes from my State, and I am informed that he is a very fine man, but he cannot fulfill his mission under this order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When the Senator uses the word "mobilize," I assume he means directly and also indirectly. He is using the word indirectly, I assume, in its broadest sense. If we consider it from that standpoint, it is probably true that everyone in the country will fit into the war picture in some way or other.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Two days ago the Governor of Michigan arrived in Washington with his State council to present a rather novel proposel to the Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration. It is deemed absolutely essential, as a result of the council's studies, that there shall be reasonable summer vacations for war workers within the Michigan area, as a matter of successful prosecution of the war and "keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively," to use the language of the bill.

The plan has been developed on the basis of so-called certified vacations. That is to say, the worker shall not be allowed to take a vacation unless he is certified by his employer as entitled to it on the basis of his production record. Secondly, he must take it at a time when it would not interfere with war production. Meanwhile, it would be arranged that he should have the place for his vacation available elsewhere in the State. It is a thoroughly novel plan for certified vacations for war workers, within the language of the declaration of policy in the bill, namely, that it is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war that the civilian population should be kept healthy and functioning effectively.

This is what I wish to ask the Senator: Suppose Congress should enact Senate bill 885 and create the Civilian Supply Administration. Would the Civilian Supply Administration be the agency to which the Governor of Michigan would appeal with a program of this nature, instead of the Office of Defense Transportation or the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. MALONEY. The very able Senator has said that the idea is entirely new. I should assume—and this is an unstudied opinion—that the appeal might very properly be directed to the Civilian Supply Administrator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What would be the Civilian Supply Administrator's inherent authority to deal with it conclusively, if at all?

Mr. MALONEY. I assume that the first thing he would do, if he were already fortified with information, would be to ascertain, if travel by boat were desired, what the gasoline situation was. If travel by train were desired, he would ascertain what the transportation situation by rail was, and if he concluded that there was a sufficient amount of whatever the needed material was, I further assume he would give careful thought to the importance of vacations for war workers in view of their contribution to the Army and Navy. I think he would have to arrive at some decision.

The question might go to the President. The Administrator would say to Mr. Eastman, if trains were involved, "We ought to have an extra train out to this part of Michigan." Or he might say to Mr. Ickes or Mr. Brown, "We must have enough gasoline to operate these boats." If there were a disagreement and he were not satisfied, he would take the question to Mr. Byrnes, who would decide it.

The idea is new. I am giving what the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would call a horse-back opinion. I do not know. As I look at it now, I do not think it is a very difficult question to answer, if one had time to make a little inquiry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was hopeful that the Senator's answer would be that at least in a primary sense the control of the problem would rest with the new instrumentality, because the thing strikes very fundamentally at health and efficiency, particularly in the metropolitan Detroit area, which has produced 10 percent of all the armaments which are going into national defense.

Unfortunately, up to date the response has not been particularly sympathetic in other directions; but in other directions the authorities are not charged, in the language of the bill, with keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively. Therefore I am hopeful that the Senator is correct when he says that the answer to my question is that under the terms of the bill there would be a place where the Governor of Michigan and his experts could go to an authority charged with keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, because the very able Senator from Ohio seems anxious to answer the question, and because he is one of my lawyers, I yield to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should say that the situation presented by the Senator from Michigan very well illustrates one of the important functions of a civilian supply administrator, as I conceive it. Ordinarily the Governor of Michigan would come to Washington and the Senator would arrange for him to see Mr. Nelson and Mr. Eastman. He would have an interview with those gentlemen, and then he would go back to Michigan and nothing would happen. Everything would remain just as it was before. I have been through that procedure time and time again.

If we had a Civilian Supply Administrator, and the Civilian Supply Administrator should say, "Yes; that is a program for which we stand," then the Governor of Michigan would go back to Michigan and the Civilian Supply Administrator would keep pushing day and night for the various allocations necessary to obtain the trains and other things which were needed. He would sit in the inner council, where those problems are considered and finally decided.

To my mind, the situation presented by the Senator from Michigan illustrates the need for a Civilian Supply Administrator. My answer is that that is a very good example of the function of a Civilian Supply Administrator and what he might accomplish. Otherwise, businessmen and others who come to Washington have an interview one day, the next day they are gone, and the next week they are forgotten. They expect their Senators to keep after the problem every day. Of course, we do not; and gradually the whole project disappears.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Ohio for his supplementary testimony. Of course, the thing which happened to the Governor of Michigan is precisely what he indicated. He came here with his staff and was very cordially received by Director Eastman. I am speaking with the greatest earnestness about that. Mr. Eastman could not have been more cordial in his reception; but what Mr. Eastman had to consider was the question of how many trains he had and what should be done with them in respect to their mathematical distribution. There was nothing involved in Mr. Eastman's responsibilities which had anything to do with keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively.

Director Brown, of the O. P. A., himself coming from Michigan, naturally was particularly sympathetic with the proposal. Perhaps he may yet do something about it; but I suspect that in the final analysis the Governor of Michigan will discover that his trip to Washington has concluded precisely as the Senator from Ohio indicates.

What I wish to know is whether or not there is to be an over-all responsibility in the Civilian Supply Administration to accomplish the fundamental things which are now deemed by many of our authorities to be so essential. In my opinion, the situation which I have outlined illustrates the need for such an agency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in my opinion the answer to the Senator's question is clearly "yes." I believe that that is just the sort of thing for which the

Civilian Supply Administrator would be expected to assume responsibility.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, a letter dated April 23, enclosing copy of a letter which he addressed to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] stating his opposition to Senate bill 885. I ask that the two letters be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1943.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter which I have addressed this day to Senator MALONEY concerning S. 885, which would establish a Civilian Supply Administration. The letter, I think, is self-explanatory.

I will appreciate it very much if you will give the letter and its contents such consideration as you can and make such use of it as you wish, as I feel that the bill, if enacted, would have very serious effects upon our present transportation system.

Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: I am informed that S. 885, introduced by you last month, has now been reported favorably by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and will soon receive the consideration of the Senate. My attention was not at once called to the bill, and thereafter I was reluctant to seek an opportunity to be heard, assuming that in view of the close relation of the bill to the transportation service of the Nation, the committee would request my appearance at some designated time. The fact that no such request was made suggests that the committee may not have regarded my views on the bill as important. Whether or not this was the reason, I have, of course, no criticism to offer. However, because of my conviction that the bill, if enacted in its present form, would have serious consequences in the field of wartime transportation, I feel that I should at least go on record in regard to the matter. Therefore, I take the liberty of addressing you, and hope that what I shall have to say may have the benefit of your consideration and also be brought to the attention of the Senate before final action is taken by that body.

Insofar as it applies to transportation, the bill provides that the Civilian Supply Administrator shall first determine the amount and type of transportation services and facilities necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively, and then determine and apply to the appropriate Government agencies for the amount and type of manpower, facilities, services, materials, and supplies required to establish and maintain such transportation services and facilities. After the supply agencies have allocated to the Administrator the productive resources claimed, the Administrator will determine the specific civilian purposes for which they shall be used, and the supply agencies will carry out such determination. It is further provided that the Civilian Supply Administrator is authorized to determine the need for rationing transportation services to the civilian population and when and where rationing shall be instituted. The appropriate agencies would be required to carry out such determinations.

I believe the bill is introduced in support of the theory that essential civilian supply must be treated equally with war production, that civilian and military demands on productive resources can and should be segregated, and that all civilian requirements should be represented and claimed for by one agency, the Civilian Supply Administration.

The war agencies of the Government are set up on functional lines. One has charge of industrial production, including allocation and priorities; another, price regulation; another, manpower; another, food production and distribution; another, communications; another, overseas transportation; another, domestic transportation; and so on. Each of these, of necessity, has responsibilities in both military and civilian fields. The establishment of a separate civilian agency, as the protector of a very vague and undefined interest, would cut across all of these agencies in complete disregard of their functional character, and certainly to the detriment of their successful operation.

Whatever may be the problems involved in a segregation of civilian and military requirements in the field of production and the rest, I am certain that no such segregation can be made applicable to the Nation's transportation services and facilities. These services and facilities cannot be divided and the operating units thereof earmarked for or allotted exclusively to civilian use as against military use or vice versa. These services and facilities are and must be used jointly and interchangeably, the quantity and type to be devoted to any particular use depending on the demands of the time, place, and purpose.

Consider, for example, steel rail. How would it be possible for anyone to determine the amount of such rail for replacement purposes that the railroads need to maintain transportation services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively, as distinguished from the amount that they need for purposes more directly related to the war effort? The same question may be asked with equal pertinence in the case of any item of railroad property, or with respect to any other type of transportation.

If it is agreed that transportation presents but a single problem, then there must be a single claimant to determine and apply for the materials and equipment required to establish and maintain the transportation service essential for both civilian and military needs. This is exactly the function the Office of Defense Transportation is now performing. I feel it would be most unfortunate if an attempt should now be made to thrust a new and separate agency part way into the field of determining transportation priorities and preferences or of supplies and materials for transportation purposes. The fact is that it would be impossible for the proposed Civilian Supply Administrator to stop part way. He could only go the full distance and determine and apply for the materials and equipment necessary for wartime transportation as a single entity.

In such a situation there could be only three possible results. One would be for the Civilian Supply Administrator to accept and support the conclusions reached by the Office of Defense Transportation. Another would be for both agencies to present separate and independent conclusions. The third would be for the Office of Defense Transportation to retire from this field and leave it to the Civilian Supply Administrator. Except for the first of these alternatives, it would be necessary for the Civilian Supply Administrator to equip himself with a staff such as the Office of Defense Transportation already possesses. This would add to the numerous instances of divided responsibility and duplication of effort which have existed in many Federal war agencies but which, in the field of transportation, have been alleviated to the extent that transportation has been recognized as an integrated function and not made the subject of divided authority.

It cannot, I think, be claimed with any semblance of foundation in fact that the transportation system of the Nation has not thus far met both civilian and military needs adequately. Indeed the criticism with which I am frequently met, in Washington but not elsewhere, is that the civilian needs have too generously been met. While I do not agree with this criticism, it seems to be reflected in S. 885 by the emphasis which is placed upon the possible need for rationing transportation services to the civilian population. That is, I may say, a thought which has particularly found support in military circles.

If S. 885 should become law in its present form, I am quite certain that I would be unable effectively to carry out the responsibility for domestic transportation service which has been placed upon me by the Executive orders of the President. It would, as I see it, create a chaotic and impossible situation.

I believe that I understand what you are endeavoring to accomplish in this bill, and to a degree I sympathize with that intent. My thoughts on the general subject were set forth at length in a letter which I wrote Senator MURRAY on February 20, 1943, and which he no doubt will make available to you, if you care to read it. I do not feel, however, that S. 885 in its present form will prove at all satisfactory in its results. If you care to go into the matter at greater length, I am, of course, at your command at any time.

Because of his known and long-standing interest in transportation, I am forwarding a copy of this letter to Senator WHEELER.

Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

CONDITIONS IN JAPANESE RELOCATION CAMPS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to call attention of the Senate to a matter of vital importance at this time. I refer to a condition existing in the Japanese relocation camps under the supervision of the War Relocation Board. I feel it is very necessary that something should be said in the hope that by bringing this question to the attention of the Senate, the committees which are charged with the duty of looking into the matter will be encouraged to take prompt action to correct a situation which is rapidly developing in such a way that it may easily get beyond the control of the parties who are responsible for operating and keeping order in these camps.

The situation has become much more serious in the last few weeks, especially since the publication of the murder by the Japanese of our brave aviators who took part in the air raid on Tokyo under General Doolittle some 12 months ago, and the still more recent intimation regarding certain of our men who are prisoners of the Japanese on Bataan "that appropriate punishment has been meted out to those who posed as noncombatants."

Since Kipling wrote, "Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," truer words have never been written or uttered.

Mr. President, everyone knows how Japanese camps came to be located in the various Western States. The military authorities decided that it was against the interests of the Nation to allow the Japs to remain within a zone adjacent to the Pacific coast, and a number of internment camps were located. What I am now saying is, I believe, applicable in a general way to all these camps, but the information on which I am basing my statements is largely the result of an investigation made at the Heart Mountain Relocation Camp in northwest Wyoming.

When the question of this camp in Wyoming was first raised, it was strongly opposed by the then Governor, Nels H. Smith. Governor Smith's attitude was straightforward, it was western, and consequently thoroughly American. He said, "The only condition under which we will have them is that at the conclusion of the war they shall be returned to the place whence they came, and that if they are used to work on our farms or in the beet fields, they must return to the camp on a stipulated date."

What has actually occurred? Many of these people have left the camp for town jobs in Wyoming, Montana, and other States, just as have those who are working for Secretary Ickes. They are supposed to be loyal citizens. It was evidently the assumption of the relocation authorities that any American citizen of Japanese ancestry was a loyal American. Anyone who has ever had dealings with these people knows that such an assumption is false and impossible.

Mr. President, in general, these camps consist of three distinct classes of internees; first, the old-line Japanese, Japanese citizens who are mostly of the farmer-peasant type, and not particularly well educated. The majority of them do not speak English. In most cases they have been in the country at least 25 years. They left Japan before the present military regime took control. They are the older internees, and, in general, want no trouble.

The second group is composed of Japanese who were born in this country, and sent to Japan for their education. They speak fluently both Japanese and English. Their sojourn in Japan and their period of education was during the present Japanese military regime. Many of them are American citizens, but in general they are loyal to Hirohito and the military regime of Japan.

The third group are the American-born citizens who have received their education in this country, and have grown up surrounded by our customs and habits, and live a normal American life. They are the youngest group.

Of these three groups the most dangerous is the second group. They intimidate the third or younger group, and endeavor to force upon them their idea of the Japanese military control of Asia. This idea is the predominant concept in the camps today. These three groups are not segregated in any manner. They live in the same camp. There are no restrictions of any kind as to mixing or meeting one with another. They eat together and live together.

In the Heart Mountain Camp in Wyoming there are over 10,000 internees. I doubt if "internee" is the correct word, but it is the word used for Japanese and Jap-American inhabitants of these camps. The Japanese are normally industrious, hard-working people.

Mr. President, is it not courting trouble and creating dissension to move over 10,000 hard-working, industrious people into a camp and deprive them of all opportunity to work or even engage in normal exercise? That is just the situation which exists in this Japanese camp today, and I imagine in most of the other Jap internee camps in the United States. They have had little or nothing to do for over 6 months, and there is very little prospect of their having any considerable work to do during their internment. They are well housed, better, in fact, than are 75 percent of the people of the State of Wyoming. They have plenty of food, such as meat, canned goods, fresh vegetables, fruit, butter, cream, and milk. They are not rationed. They apparently can get all the intoxicating liquor they want. In fact, every factor is perfect to encourage the existence of the worst possible condition. The camp to which I refer, with others, is controlled by the War Relocation Board. The personnel is typical of the incompetent, wasteful, extravagant, spend-all-the-money-you-can type of administration which has grown up in the last 10 years.

Six or eight months before Pearl Harbor a number of men from northwestern Wyoming went to Wake Island to work. Many of them were still there at the time of Pearl Harbor and the whereabouts of many of them today is unknown. Can you imagine, Mr. President, the feeling and attitude of the relatives of those men? Here they see these Japanese coming and going in their cities, being well paid, and living on the fat of the land at our expense. Their children are being taught free by the highest paid teachers in the State. The school districts of Wyoming cannot compete with the high wages which the War Relocation Board pays teachers.

The authorities of this camp have purchased, or have possession of a sawmill and logging camp located about 60 or 70 miles from the relocation camp. The object is to obtain lumber for further camp construction. The only road between the camp and the sawmill passes right by the great Shoshone Power and Irrigation Dam, which is situated about 30 miles west of the Jap camp. It is a concrete dam over 300 feet high, which supplies irrigation water for some 250,000 acres of food-producing land and for electric power which radiates over a large part of Wyoming and into Colorado. The Jap internees go back and forth every day without any special guard. True, there is a local guard at the dam, but of what value would he be against a dozen armed Japanese. I say armed advisedly, because there is nothing to prevent these internees from going into any store and buying anything they want and taking it into camp and out again. No inspection of the camp internees or their automobiles or trucks is made.

Mr. President, the object of my speaking on this subject today is to try to bring before the Senate a very serious situation confronting the Nation. Already there are more than rumblings of trouble breaking out in this camp. I say there is trouble both within and without the camp. Within for the reasons I have stated. Without for the very natural reason that Americans are not going to stand by and see this administration pampering and petting a bunch of disloyal internees, supplying them with food in quantity and quality they cannot get themselves, when all the time they know that their own fathers, brothers or sons are being murdered or mistreated, or, at best, just being permitted to exist by the Japanese war lords.

The situation is more serious than I can convey to the Senate. A subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has conducted hearings and has visited a number of these camps with the purpose, as I understand, of considering the advisability of turning the management of the camps back to the Army. Mr. President, it is essential that something be done and done quickly; otherwise it will be impossible to prevent regrettable incidents. The present set-up cannot continue without trouble.

The United States has been endeavoring to draft or enlist some of these Japanese, who are American citizens, into our Army, and a questionnaire was submitted to them. One question in the questionnaire was of a most interesting nature, and was to the effect, "Are you prepared to fight in the United States Army, or would you prefer to be repatriated to Japan and fight for Hirohito?" That was the substance of the question, and from 70 to 80 percent of these Japanese-American citizens stated that they would prefer to be sent to Japan.

I helped obtain permission for an investigator on the staff of the Denver Post, to go to the Wyoming Relocation Camp and investigate the conditions there. I knew perfectly well that under normal conditions, when he presented his permit at the headquarters of the camp, he would be well received, taken around and shown just what the authorities wanted him to see and nothing more; so I took steps to see that this investigator was acquainted with some of the many extraordinary conditions which I had been led to believe existed in that camp. This investigator went to the camp. He was received by the manager, who advised him that it was in excellent order; that he wanted him to go any place he saw fit and that he would give him a guide. Much to the surprise of the guide, the investigator singled out cook compound No. 21, and, to the amazement of the guide and the consternation of the camp officials, he climbed to the attic and discovered quantities of rationed foods, or-

dered by the Japanese chef and secretly stored there. The same was true in barracks No. 6 and others. The amount of foodstuffs checked in the camp is fantastic; in fact so fantastic that I feel they must be made a part of this record. This investigator found a three years' supply of some foodstuffs.

Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate giving a list of all the foodstuffs this investigator found, but I ask that the newspaper reports of the investigation, which I have here in my hand, be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks and be made a part thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A at the conclusion of Mr. ROBERTSON'S remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do, however, Mr. President, desire to call attention to a few items mentioned. He found a $12,000 supply of baby food, that is, strained vegetables and fruits, 268,293 cans of rationed vegetables, 86,480 cans of fruit, 6,853 gallons of mayonnaise, and the camp manager told the investigator that 4,000 gallons more had just been shipped to other camps. While he was in the camp, the investigator saw 29,300 pounds of meat delivered, consisting of pork loins and beef quarters.

A summary of the canned vegetables, such as tomatoes, beets, beans, peas, spinach, pumpkin, corn, and sauerkraut, and the fruits, including pears, peaches, cherries, and blackberries, shows a total of 20,017,222 points, or enough rationed foods for the 10,300 internees for 3 years 7 months and 14 days; that is, if they were subject to the same conditions of food rationing that you and I are subject to, today—which they are not.

There are many signs of waste and incompetent ordering. For instance, there are 100 tobacco carts. What for? No one knows. One hundred and twenty sets of mule harness, although there is not a mule or a horse at the camp, and mules are rarely used in that section of the country. Lying around in the weather are 100 or more wood-heater stoves, and radiators rusting out in the open, and building material in piles, broken by the weather.

It is very apparent that the authorities have no control whatsoever over the inmates who do pretty well as they wish. Inside the camp, 1,200 Japs profess loyalty to Hirohito and his war regime, and are free to go about preaching the doctrine of Japan, and intimidating and threatening those who profess loyalty to the United States.

Wanton waste pertains to every aspect of this camp, and no effort is made to check it. The same kind of thing that is taking place at the Heart Mountain camp is evidently going on at other camps, and is portrayed by the article by Westbrook Pegler in the Washington Daily News of April 30, from Sacaton, Ariz., in which he says:

We, the great-hearted, idealistic people of the United States of America have got ourselves into a terrible fix with these Japanese of ours—14,000 of whom are impounded, so to speak, in the concentration camp which we call a relocation project, on this God-forgotten Arizona desert.

The native Americans among them are entitled to every right and privilege of citizenship, but many of them are hateful, reptilian enemies of our country who would delight to do us dirt if they could.

Mr. President, the situation I have attempted to outline to the Senate is a serious one. The people of Wyoming, and of other States where these camps are located, are not going to stand by and see these Japanese, whether they are American citizens or not, petted and pampered. Our people are doing all they can in the war effort, doing without many of the necessities of life, certainly doing without many of the things which these Japanese are being given by an indulgent administration. Is it difficult to imagine the feelings of our people who see this day after day, who think of their loved ones fighting at Guadalcanal, New Guinea, the Marshall Islands, or who are prisoners of war of Bataan, Corregidor, or Wake Island? What kind of treatment are these prisoners of war having meted out to them in the Japanese camps? Murder and "appropriate punishment."

Mr. President, these Japanese must be segregated into their different classifications. They must be kept in an internment camp, kept inside, Mr. President. They must be treated as prisoners of war, and unless they are, the responsibility for whatever happens will rest on the head of this administration.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Denver Post of April 23, 1943]

FOOD IS HOARDED FOR JAPS IN UNITED STATES WHILE AMERICANS IN NIPPON ARE TORTURED—3 YEARS' SUPPLY HELD IN WYOMING CAMP—RATIONED ITEMS PILED UP THAT ENEMY NATIONALS MAY WAX FAT

(By Jack Carberry)

CODY, WYO., April 23.—American flyers have been executed—"murdered" is the accurate word—by the Japanese. Every tenet of international law and human decency has been flouted.

Thousands of other Americans—soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians, men, women, and children—are prisoners in Japan, locked in squalid concentration camps, subjected to daily cruelties, forced to perform the hardest and most degrading labor, and subsisting on the meagerest starvation rations.

That's the Japanese way.

With President Roosevelt's announcement of the barbarous killing of our flyers, captured after the raid on Tokyo, still ringing in the Nation's horrified ears, the story of prodigality, waste, and extravagance that marks our treatment of Japanese guests in war relocation camps becomes even more striking than it would be normally.

OPENLY DISLOYAL JAPS PAMPERED

I have just returned from a 3-day trip to Heart Mountain, the War Relocation Authority's camp 23 miles north of Cody.

There I saw the 10,300 Japanese residents, some native-born, others citizens of Japan, at work—God save the mark—and at play. I talked with and interviewed those in authority, including starry-eyed dreamers, who pamper and pet, coddle and cater to even the most outspokenly disloyal among their charges.

I visited and checked warehouses, filled to their very eaves with every type of rationed food, much of which cannot be purchased for love or for money, with or without ration stamps, by the American men and women who founded and peopled these American hills.

I came here to check a report made not only to one but to four governmental agencies by a former camp employee, who fighting with the Canadians, was wounded at Dunkerque, and whose son died in battle in Africa on January 11 last.

FOOD SUPPLY FOR YEAR REPORTED

Earl Alfred Best, assistant steward at the Heart Mountain project, now, a resident of 1629 York Street in Denver, informed his superiors at Heart Mountain, Army authorities, Cody officials, and finally the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the War Relocation Authority was piling up hoards of food here that, in his opinion, were sufficient to do the residents of the camp for more than a year.

He stated that to his knowledge Japanese residents of the camp were hiding these foodstuffs in attics, and in some instances exchanging ration commodities for whisky. He named names of those he charged were "selling" liquor to camp residents in exchange for hams, bacon, canned goods, and fruits.

QUITS POSITION IN DISGUST

Although Best, in his report, gave locations of where he said hidden stores of food could be found, no action was taken. He then resigned on April 1, giving as his reason an unwillingness to work in such an atmosphere.

On my visit to Heart Mountain camp I found the evidence to support Best's charges—found cases of foodstuffs where he told his chiefs, weeks ago, they could be found. I discovered not the year's supply of rationed food which Best said jammed the camp warehouses, but more than three times that amount.

I saw a carload of the finest oranges and another carload of the choicest grapefruit being unloaded and stored. In mess hall iceboxes I found crates of avocados. Hidden in attics, I discovered cases of cereals and fruits and shrimp—shrimp that is purchased for the Japanese residents—in the little 10-ounce cans for which the American housewife must not only give 31 cents in Denver stores, but three precious red points as well.

OVER 3 YEARS OF RATIONED FOODS

I discovered canned vegetables—tomatoes, beets, beans, peas, spinach, pumpkin, corn, and sauerkraut—and fruits, including pears, peaches, cherries, and blackberries, with a total point value of 20,017,222. This checked against the camp population of 10,300 equals a supply of these rationed foods which should last for 3 years 7 months and 14 days.

I watched meat trucks driving in from Billings, Mont., delivering pork loins, little pig sausages, and beef quarters—29,300 pounds of this butchered meat last week.

Kitchens, everywhere, were filled with canned foods of every type and description—food purchased not in the gallon-size cans, but in the convenient No. 2 and No. 2½ size cans, which could well lend themselves to exchanges for whisky, such as Best charged in his report to his chiefs.

STORES OF FOOD BEYOND BELIEF

I gained admission to the bulging warehouses and the foodstuffs found there were beyond belief.

Upon my arrival at Heart Mountain I asked for an inventory of foodstuffs on hand. This, I was informed by Fred Haller, camp steward, was not available, although he stated his office kept a perpetual inventory which, although not compiled, permitted a check at any time.

I demanded such a check, and that a counting of foodstuffs on hand be made. The check was made, as to the foodstuffs in the warehouses. Time did not permit a check of additional cans, packages, and supplies in camp kitchens and pantries. Some pantries, I found, contained hundreds of cans of

food while others had much smaller amounts on the shelves.

The figures, used here, are those arrived at in the check of the warehouses only, and do not include additional thousands of dollars worth of foods stored in mess-hall kitchens.

There were five babies in the camp hospital. In the camp warehouse I found a full carload—$12,000 worth—of baby foods, such as strained juices, spinach, carrots, and other similar baby foods.

My visit to Heart Mountain was known to officials there before my arrival. They had been tipped from Washington, they told me, that I was coming. I was told by officials five carloads of canned foods had been shipped to other camps before my arrival. Director Robinson, during the course of my inspection, told me that he had given orders that said, as he put it: "See that he finds nothing wrong."

It was interesting that the very first kitchen I asked to inspect was Nos. 21-27. Accompanied by War Relocation Authority officers, I entered the pantry. It was well stocked. There were sacks of rice and the shelves were loaded down with every type of canned fruit and vegetable.

"Where," I asked the Japanese cook in charge, "are the rest of your supplies?"

He protested loudly. Everything, he said, was in plain sight. I asked to see his attic. Laying hands on me, as I got a barrel and climbed up to enter an attic door, he said:

"The only thing up there is some old macaroni."

"I'll take a look," I said.

In this attic—the very first one I entered—I found secreted under the eaves 10 cases of corn flakes and 10 cases of fruits and shrimp.

"I can't understand it," Robinson said. "I told them to see to it that you found nothing wrong."

But as great as were the supplies in kitchen pantries and no matter how much may be hidden beneath the eaves of the 456 barrack-like apartment buildings and 42 mess halls at Heart Mountain, the stores of food stacked in the warehouses is even more amazing.

In the warehouses I found 86,480 cans of fruit—81,860 of these are the No. 10 or 6½-pound can.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHT THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE CANS OF RATIONED VEGETABLES

I found 268,293 cans of rationed vegetables. 114,885 of these the No. 10 cans and 153,408 No. 2 cans.

I discovered 141,405 packages of cereals—corn and wheat flakes, rice krispies, grapenuts, farina, rolled oats, and similar breakfast foods.

Stacked to the eaves in the warehouses and on pantry shelves in the mess halls were 61,914 jars of jellies and jam—grape, peach, plum, orange, strawberry, apricot, and apple butter.

There were 58,849 pounds of macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles and 10,320 pounds of dry beans and split peas.

There were 5,208 one-pound and 1,608 two-pound boxes of soda crackers and 4,452 pound packages of graham crackers.

SPICES ALMOST BEYOND COUNTING

Spices almost beyond counting, for they are purchased in the little 4-ounce cans, such as the single apartment dweller might buy, sat on shelves. There were 3,070 of these tiny cans of cinnamon, 1,229 of cloves, 2,168 of mustard, and 6,247 of pepper, plus a 100-pound barrel of pepper.

I found 6,853 gallons of mayonnaise—and just before I arrived, according to Robinson, some 4,000 gallons had been shipped out to other camps.

This was part of the five full cars of commodities which were shipped from the camp just before I got there.

Robinson and his chief steward, Fred Haller, placed part of the blame for these gigantic stocks on the Army Quartermaster Department.

"We," Robinson said, "put in our order for foodstuffs. This goes to the Army quartermaster and he makes the purchases. It is the Army's system to send us, in many instances, a full carload when we ordered less. You see we have free storage space here and articles can be bought and shipped cheaper by the car. Then we can send it from here to other camps, as it may be needed."

THE ARMY'S WAY OF DOING THINGS

Robinson did not explain how it is cheaper to ship to remote Heart Mountain, unload a car, store it, and then reship it to some other remote camp than to have the shipment go to that camp in the first place.

"It is the Army's way of doing."

The Army, however, does not purchase supplies other than the foodstuffs.

The Army had nothing to do with 20 new Fordson tractors which arrived just before I reached camp, or with 120 sets of mule harness and 100 tobacco carts which got there somewhat earlier. There is not a mule or a horse on Heart Mountain, and it was some days before anyone there knew what the two-wheeled carts which arrived with the harness were for.

Lying in the weather are 100 or more wood heater stoves. Piled about to rust are radiators which were to have been placed in two elementary school buildings which were never constructed. Firebrick, which was to have been used in these buildings, lies broken and scattered, and compoboard, its wrappings ripped away by the winds, stands in piles awaiting the first rains and ruin.

TRACTORS USED TO RUN RACES

The Fordson tractors and several new Diesels, including a gigantic bulldozer, are being used to plow up 1,900 acres of nearby land, which, Robinson says, is to be put into vegetables to supplement the more than 3½ years of canned supplies already on hand. These are used only through part of each day, the farm workers being on the camp's 5½-day, 44-hour week. Much of this time the tractors, in their silver-painted newness, are used in the fields by the Japanese workers to run races.

They tell you, "It's sure fun to drive them in high."

And even with such inducements as this, the camp is finding extreme difficulty in getting its residents to work on the farm or at their other tasks.

In articles to follow this one I will tell you what I found relative to the labor problem at Heart Mountain.

[From the Denver Post of April 24, 1943]

AMERICA'S JAP "GUESTS" REFUSE TO WORK BUT NIPS ENSLAVE YANKEES—HOSTILE GROUP IS PAMPERED AT WYOMING CAMP—EVERY PRIVILEGE EXTENDED TO 1,200 WHO PREACH GOSPEL OF TOKYO

(By Jack Carberry)

CODY, WYO., April 24.—Americans—the gallant marines of Wake, 37 of whom came from this very town; the Red Cross nurses of Bataan, and the soldiers of the Solomons—now held in Japanese concentration and prison camps are not being asked to work.

They work—or else. And "or else" is death, or daily beatings, the water cure, starvation, and every possible indignity.

Here, at Heart Mountain relocation center, where the War Relocation Authority is host to some 10,300 men and women of Japanese blood, the pampered and petted charges of the Government are not only being politely asked to work, but are being flooded with offers of gainful employment, under conditions far better than most of them, before coming to the center, ever knew.

Few of the Japs accept these offers.

One reason for this is that at Heart Mountain there are more than 1,200 men and women, some American-born, others Japanese-born, who, in a registration last February asked either for repatriation or expatriation to Japan, there to serve their Emperor.

No distinction has been made between these twelve-hundred-odd camp residents and those who stated, in their regisration papers, that they would be loyal, working and fighting for America.

Every privilege—social functions organized by the War Relocation Authority social service workers at the camp and the games and sports and entertainments—is afforded these 1,200 admittedly disloyal Japanese. They are given the same food, allowed the same free access to the outside, including trips to the center's sawmill located within the very shadow of the great Shoshone power site, and treated in all other ways just as though they were loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Inside the camp these 1,200 go about freely, preaching the gospel of Japan.

Not only that, but they threaten those who have expressed loyalty to America.

Japanese residents of the camp told me, during a 3-day inspection of the center, that they feared to leave Heart Mountain—feared to accept outside employment and leave their families, including small children behind.

These 1,200 disloyalists are now talking strike on May 1.

DIRECTOR LAUGHS AS STRIKE NEARS

Camp Director Guy Robertson, asked if he had heard of these threats, termed the 1,200 "a minority group" and laughed at the strike threat which one hears everywhere.

"I did not hear it as relating to May 1—but I have heard it about the first of every month up to now," he said.

The figure "1,200" is not exact. I asked for the exact number and was informed, by camp officials, that this was "a military secret." Of the 1,200, I was told some were small children, whose parents had signed for them. I was informed that of the 1,200 "about 600" were males—both natives of Japan and those holding American citizenship.

Robertson was asked if he had been told that the hoarding of food by Japanese inside the camp was in preparation for this much-discussed strike.

In the face of the fact that his associates accompanied me when I found cases of foodstuffs hidden beneath attic eaves, Robertson stated he did not believe there was any food hoarding in the camp.

FACTS LAID BEFORE NATIONAL DIRECTOR

The story of the true situation existing at Heart Mountain has been laid before Dillon Meyer, National Director of the War Relocation Authority. The following letter was sent to Meyer early this month by G. N. Wells, vice president of the Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers Association and director of the National Beet Growers Association, who has spent all his time at Heart Mountain and the relocation center at Tule Lake, Calif., attempting to induce residents to accept employment at from 65 cents to 85 cents an hour.

Wells' letter said:

"Dire necessity prompts me to write this appeal to you. As you must know, the beet-sugar producers of the West have for some weeks been attempting to recruit labor in the War Relocation Authority camps. We are meeting with very little success, especially here at Heart Mountain, Wyo.

"Everyone must realize the importance of getting every available man and woman to work during this critical time. It is, therefore, with mounting disappointment and disgust that we observe thousands of able-bodied men of Japanese race sitting in idleness, refusing offers of employment, while

our own men and women and children are forced to labor in the fields to the end that we may provide food and fiber for the war effort. The people of this Nation are not going to tolerate this sort of thing when the facts are known.

"There are several things that the Government can do to get these people to work:

"In the first place the life in War Relocation Authority centers is too easy. Many of the young men are already spoiled because they have tasted idleness and found it good.

"In the second place, those who have applied for repatriation and expatriation are urging all Japanese to refrain from work or from participation in the war effort. It is of vital importance that these nonloyal people be immediately separated from those who, if left to their own choice, would undoubtedly remain loyal. This could be done at once by fencing off a portion of the camp and confining the nonloyal people in a restricted area where they could not have social intercourse with the rest of the camp. This would in itself produce the desired result in a few days. Other more drastic measures such as restricting diet could be employed if necessary. Curtailment or cessation of all social services that are now being offered would help. Setting up of quotas of workers that each camp must furnish would also be beneficial.

"I am not making these suggestions without some experience as I have been working both at Heart Mountain and Tule Lake since February 1, trying to get these people out. So far I have had little success, and my experience has been duplicated by others. I am not in any way being critical of your administration for I know you have had a thankless and difficult task. However, the time has come when all of us must work to live, and the Japanese are no better than others. However, if something is not done at once activating this large and efficient group of manpower the matter must of necessity be brought to the attention of the proper congressional committee. May I hear from you at your earliest convenience?"

E. M. Rowlat, Acting Director of the War Relocation Authority in Washington, replied stating:

"We agree with you in the importance of reemploying evacuées. Our program contemplates increasing encouragement to the evacuées to accept outside employment, which we are hopeful will result in a much greater and more efficient use of the manpower resources of the centers."

ATTITUDE OF EMPLOYERS CRITICIZED

Rowlat then made excuses for the failure of the Japanese to accept the high-paying offers which have been made to them. He said:

"The experiences of 1942 are fresh in their minds and the communities in which they did not find conditions to their liking will probably have difficulty in recruiting workers."

Rowlat, in his letter, took the position that the American people—the people who are offering employment to the able-bodied residents of the center—just don't seem to have the right attitude.

The entire defense of War Relocation Authority has been, and is, that the American people just do not understand what the social workers among them—and the social worker group predominates within the War Relocation Authority—term "these dear children."

Relative to Wells' charge that disloyal Japanese within the camp are threatening and urging others to refrain from accepting work, the War Relocation Authority's Acting Director made this statement:

"A considerable degree of segregation has been accomplished by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other intelligence agencies. They have apprehended persons of known subversive tendencies and placed them in detention or internment camps. Further action is being developed."

No action, however, has been taken to date by anyone relative to the 1,200 camp residents who signed their names to statements that they wished to be sent to Japan, there to serve their Emperor and bear arms against the United States.

Wells, and representatives of various employers, have been on the grounds at the camp since February. This last week Wells, at his organization's expense, took two representatives of the Japanese residents on a tour of Montana and Wyoming ranches, showing them conditions and listing offers of employment.

Only in a very few scattered instances have these offers been accepted. Employers have inserted large paid advertisements in the camp newspaper, pleading with the Japanese to accept employment at high wages.

The response these employers, seeking to use the available manpower at the camp, have received will be set forth in another article Sunday.

[From the Denver Post of April 26, 1943]

THOUSANDS OF TONS OF COAL ARE WASTED AT HEART MOUNTAIN—FUEL ALLOWED TO BLOW AWAY ALTHOUGH JAP CAMP OWNS SAWMILL TO PROVIDE BINS—OTHER COSTLY PRACTICES NOTED

(By Jack Carberry)

CODY, WYO., April 26.—Heart Mountain, the War Relocation Authority's Japanese camp 23 miles north of this picturesquely beautiful American mountain town, is heated with coal. The more than 500 buildings within the compound are equipped with stoves, and the ranges in the 42 mess halls are coal burners. The fuel for these is purchased in carload lots and trucked into the camp. There it is dumped on the ground in great piles alongside the barrackslike apartments, and at the rear of the mess halls.

There are no coal bins, although more than 6 months ago the War Relocation Authority purchased a sawmill in the timbered fastness of the mountains which lie directly above the great Shoshone Dam and power station. This station, one of the greatest hydroelectric plants in the country, supplies not only the power used in the entire northwestern section of Wyoming but delivers supplemental power to as far distant points as Los Angeles.

The War Relocation Authority paid $6,000 for the lumber mill. To date, according to Project Director Guy Robertson, less than 12,000 feet of lumber have been taken out. This is despite the fact that the mill was all set up when purchased, and large crews of Japanese have been assigned to its operation—crews that each day go unguarded into the country which overlooks the war-vital Shoshone project.

Had lumber from this mill been used to construct coal bins, thousands of tons of coal, now blowing in fine dust over the countryside, would have been saved.

ONLY LARGER LUMPS OF COAL USED

The Jap residents of the camps and the cooks in the mess halls can scarcely be blamed for this condition. They use only the good coal—the larger lumps. This is but natural. If anyone knew that as soon as the bigger lumps were gone from his coal pile somebody would come along and dump more, without cost to him, on top of what was left, he, too, would not use the finer coal and the slack.

In consequence of this, piles of slack, in some places 20 and more feet across, and in others nearly head high, stand back of the barrack buildings and outside kitchens. This coal, it appeared, has been used to fill chuck holes in the streets of the camp.

These streets are in such condition that it is impossible to drive over them at a speed in excess of 10 miles an hour. To do so would add further automobile wrecks to the already well-filled junk-car graveyard which lies south of the camp.

NO ATTEMPT MADE TO SALVAGE LUMBER

This automobile graveyard adjoins a lot, well over 2 acres in area, littered with lumber taken from thousands of crates and boxes in which tons upon tons of supplies for the center have been shipped in. Much of this lumber is salvagable, but no effort is made to put it to use.

The lot is the scene of the original camp lumber supply—a supply that when Heart Mountain was completed, measured 5,000,000 surplus feet of pine and spruce. Director Robertson said he had asked for some of this lumber, but it was carted away, he knew not where.

None in the camp could tell me who owned this 5,000,000 feet of lumber which was left over when the camp was finished. The center was built on the cost-plus plan. Its method of building will never be forgotten by residents of this locality. The contractors inserted advertisements in newspapers all over the Nation asking for carpenters. These ads read, "If you can drive a nail, you can qualify as a carpenter."

OVERTIME PAY WAS GUARANTEED

Not only was overtime promised, but it was actually guaranteed, and I talked with boys in this locality who were paid as much as $95 a week—and others got more—for their labor. The camp construction indicates that not all who "qualified" could even drive a nail. In putting on siding and roofing the "carpenters" employed often missed the studding by as far as 2 inches, and the nails still remain sticking through on the inside.

At present the only construction activity inside the camp is the erection of the high school, a great sprawling building which sits in the very center of the project. Its dome-roofed gymnasium and theater looms over all parts of the camp. None here could tell me what this building has cost to date or what it will cost.

It was part of a project upon which more than $3,000,000 was to be spent—the erection of two elementary school buildings and the high school building. The War Relocation Authority stopped work on the elementary school buildings just as putting in the foundations began. Materials for these buildings lie everywhere—new radiators rusting in the weather, compoboard, with wrappings torn away by the wind, awaiting ruin in the rain, and brick, some of which has been carted off by Japs in the camp and used for walks, the rest of it just breaking up in the elements.

GARBAGE COLLECTED BY OUTSIDE CIVILIAN

Garbage collection is done under contract by an outside civilian.

Apparently nobody collects trash. Explaining great piles of rubbish heaped along the sides of the "streets," camp officials told me they were holding a clean-up week.

I overheard a conversation between Camp Steward Fred Haller and Supply Director Everett Lane in which it was stated they were having great trouble inducing the Jap workers on the camp pay roll to pick up this trash. It was stated that morning—April 20—the Jap workers assigned to the task had refused to pick up the rubbish.

ALL WORKERS ARE ON 44-HOUR WEEK

The same day, I learned, Jap workers engaged in running 20 brand-new Fordson tractors and 3 Diesel-powered engines on the proposed vegetable garden adjoining the camp had refused lunches sent to them at the scene of their labors.

All workers in the camp enjoy a 44-hour week. Recently, when workers in the offices—there are scores in every office—were reporting anywhere from an hour to as much as 2 hours late, and quitting anywhere from a half hour to an hour early, a system of time signals was put in.

The fire whistle blows at 8 a. m., noon, 1 o'clock, and 5 o'clock. Workers are supposed to be at their task when the 8 a. m. whistle blows and to remain on the job until 5 p. m., with their hour out for lunch.

But when the lunches were served the field workers—two meat sandwiches, a cheese sandwich, some fruit, and a beverage—they demanded the right to go to the camp for a hot meal.

Their demand, as are all demands by the Japanese in the camp, was promptly met.

STEWARD WHO REFUSED TO HOARD WAS FIRED

There is an official record of how all demands are met so that trouble may be avoided.

Last October the then camp steward had on hand supplies adequate for full unrationed feeding for 2 months. But the newspapers, at that ime, were filled with stories telling how rationing was certain to come. The Japs, in the camp, made demands at that time that the food stocks be increased. The steward, who refused to make unnecessary requests for more supplies, was dismissed. The great hoards of food now in the warehouses then began coming in.

"It was a delicate situation," Director Robertson told me.

On file, in one Federal Government agency, the identity of which I am not privileged to reveal, is a document telling how, when an effort was made last January to find hidden supplies of food stored in kitchen attics, the lives of a Japanese worker, accused by his fellows with being a stool pigeon, and of a camp worker, were threatened.

INVESTIGATOR DRIVEN FROM KITCHEN WITH AX

The Japanese cook and his assistant drove the Jap boy and the camp investigator from his kitchen with a butcher knife and meat ax. The Japanese boy, this record states, was saved only by the intervention of women waitresses in the mess hall.

The Japanese cook was taken before Director Robertson and admitted the charges.

"I told Haller (the steward) to fire him," Robertson told me. "But the people in the block said this would cause trouble. I had the cook apologize."

"There was no apology—an apology was not the way to settle this," the man whose life was threatened told me.

The food stored in that kitchen was not removed by the camp authorities.

Documents supporting these charges are available to any agency which may undertake an investigation of conditions at Heart Mountain.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming, on the statement he has just made in respect to the Japanese relocation centers, and I desire to say to the Senate that the Committee on Military Affairs has recently made quite an extensive investigation of these centers, and a report is presently being prepared. The report will be made to the committee tomorrow morning, and later to the Senate.

The situation is such that the subject needs the immediate attention of the people of the United States, especially those in authority who can see to it that the conditions the Senator has described are corrected. I hope very much that Senators will give attention to the report, and attend the meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs when the report is made, if it is possible for them to make their engagements such that they can do so. I again compliment the Senator from Wyoming for the fine statement he has just made of the conditions in the camps.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, as Governor during the past 4 years of the State of South Dakota, adjoining the State of Wyoming, so ably represented by my colleague who has just spoken, I wish to supplement what he has said about the War Relocation Authority.

During the last year, while I was in office as Governor of the State of South Dakota, I was asked to permit the bringing of some 500 to 700 Jap laborers into the sugar-beet fields of our State. I replied that I could not approve it. Those making the request said they could not bring them in unless and until the Governor of the State had approved it. They brought terrific pressure to bear on me, through the War Relocation Authority, seeking to place the Japs in South Dakota.

Finally I said that because of the seriousness of the labor situation in my State I would permit them to be brought in under certain conditions. I said to the War Relocation Authority that if they would bring them under guard, keep them in concentration camps under guard, provide guards for our irrigation dams, which serve the sugar-beet area, see that they kept out of our towns and places of public gathering during the time they were there, and took them back to the places whence they came, I would approve their entry. With the usual insolence and disregard of the public, the War Relocation representative said, "You will take them as I specify or you won't take them at all." We did not take them at all, Mr. President. After I left the State of South Dakota conditions were somewhat changed, and my successor in office permitted some Japs to come into the State this spring.

In explanation of my action, I may say that I refused to permit the Japs to be brought in for the reason that the Japanese Government is holding several thousand American boys as prisoners of war, and I said that if anything happened while these interned Japs were in the State of South Dakota retribution would fall upon the American boys in Japan, and for that reason I would not let them come into our State.

Within 30 days after the Japs were brought into the State of South Dakota this spring it was reported to me that they have five fights in a pool hall or on the public streets of one of the nearby towns. When that news gets back to the Empire of Japan, we all know what will happen to an equal number of boys of ours over there.

Mr. President, I absolutely approve what my colleague the Senator from Wyoming has said about the action of the War Department in enlisting Japs in the United States Army as a coherent part of the Army. As I understand, they are now forming a division of Japs at Sparta, Wis., to be employed to fight alongside our boys. It is not fair to them, it is not fair to us, and I join my colleague in condemning the action of the War Relocation Board and the War Department in doing that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have been profoundly impressed by the very able statement of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate I myself will urge immediate action on the serious matter of the Japanese refugee camps.

I am glad to hear the statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and of his report, and it is my hope that immediate action may be taken by the Committee on Military Affairs and by the Senate upon this very serious question.

REFUGEE CONFERENCE IN BERMUDA—NEW YORK TIMES ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, sometime ago the President of the United States appointed the senior Senator from Illinois as one of the three delegates from the United States to attend the refugee conference in Bermuda. For some 11 days on that island the American delegates were in conference with the delegates from the British Government, discussing the refugee problem throughout the world. I returned by plane only last Sunday, coming on to the city of Washington late Sunday evening.

Two other members were appointed on the committee by the President. One was Dr. Harold Dodd, president of Princeton University, whom I had never before had the pleasure of meeting, but one whom I found to be a gentleman of the old school, a man who is not only a renowned educator in this country, but one who understands the practical side of the problems of life. The third member of the committee was the Honorable SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and a member of the Jewish faith.

On Tuesday of this week there appeared in the New York Times a paid advertisement, the contents of which have caused the Senator from Illinois to address the Senate at this time, in advance of the time I had expected to speak in connection with any phase of the refugee problem.

This edition of the New York Times bears a six-column advertisement, which costs no small sum of money, dealing with the Bermuda conference, and the headline of the advertisement is:

TO 5,000,000 JEWS IN THE NAZI DEATH-TRAP BERMUDA WAS A "CRUEL MOCKERY"

At the bottom of this six-column advertisement appears the name of the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Colorado, as national chairman of the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews.

On the left-hand side of the advertisement appears the names of some of the most prominent men in this country, including some 33 Senators, as follows:

Senators John H. Bankhead, Alabama; Warren Barbour, New Jersey; Theodore G. Bilbo, Mississippi; Arthur Capper, Kansas; Albert B. Chandler, Kentucky; James J. Davis, Pennsylvania; Sheridan Downey, California; Guy M. Gillette, Iowa; Carter Glass, Virginia; Joseph F. Guffey, Pennsylvania; Edwin C. Johnson,

Colorado; Harley M. Kilgore, West Virginia; William Langer, North Dakota; Francis Maloney, Connecticut; Burnet R. Maybank, South Carolina; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; E. H. Moore, Oklahoma; James E. Murray, Montana; Claude Pepper, Florida; George L. Radcliffe, Maryland; Robert A. Taft, Ohio; Elbert D. Thomas, Utah; Charles W. Tobey, New Hampshire; Harry S. Truman, Missouri; James M. Tunnell, Delaware; Millard E. Tydings, Maryland; Charles L. McNary, Oregon; James M. Mead, New York; Frederick Van Nuys, Indiana; Robert F. Wagner, New York; David I. Walsh, Massachusetts; Kenneth S. Wherry, Nebraska; Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin.

The names of those Senators are included in the group of other names.

Mr. President, I have talked with a number of Senators, not all of them, whose names appear in this column, in connection with this advertisement, and it was apparent there was not a single one of them who knew anything about this advertisement which has been placed in the New York Times by this committee.

Let me say that when I first read the advertisement and found the name of my good friend, the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] at the bottom of it I was not only disturbed but I was amazed to find that the Senator from Colorado would do such a thing. I could not believe it, and I immediately talked with him, and learned the truth, which was that Senator JOHNSON knew nothing whatever about the advertisement, and had not approved its publication.

Mr. President, it was necessary that Senator JOHNSON go to New York today, and, unfortunately, he cannot state here in person his views on the contents of the advertisement nor discuss his position as national chairman of the committee. Therefore, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a copy of a letter which my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado, has written Mr. Peter Bergson, Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MAY 6, 1943.

MR. PETER BERGSON,
Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BERGSON: I have before me a copy of an advertisement appearing in the May 4 issue of the New York Times in which, among other things, the recent Bermuda conference is discussed adversely.

In this advertisement there appeared in a separate column the names of prominent Americans, including many Senators. My name appears as national chairman of this organization. While there is nothing to indicate that this group of distinguished citizens endorses the specific advertisement, the inference might be made that they do. I did not see it until it was called to my attention the next day.

The committee and I must come to an understanding at once that greater caution be exercised in publishing the names of Senators who favor our cause.

The State Department appointed our distinguished colleague, Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, one of the three representatives of the United States to the Bermuda Conference. For reasons which appear important to this conference, no report has been issued as yet. I am advised that one will be forthcoming as soon as it is deemed certain that such report will be of no advantage to our enemies.

My colleagues and I have great respect for Senator LUCAS and we do not deem it fair to him to prejudge or condemn the work of the committee until after it has had sufficient opportunity to make a report. None of the work of the conference has been disclosed to me in confidence or otherwise, and in all fairness I must therefore withhold my judgment until such time as I know what actually took place in the conference.

Sincerely,

ED. C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator, Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it should be understood, and emphatically so, that the committee which was appointed by the President and approved by the Secretary of State obviously had exceedingly limited jurisdiction in connection with this vital problem. We had no right to make any commitments so far as our Government is concerned. Any individual might have been appointed outside the United States Senate or the House of Representatives. The representatives to that conference did, however, make certain findings and recommendations, to their respective governments, the United States and Great Britain.

Those findings and recommendations, because of military needs, obviously must remain a secret until such time as the two governments see fit to release all or certain portions of the report. Undoubtedly from time to time certain phases of the report will be released. I am pledged to secrecy until the report is officially released, and I have no intention of violating that trust by revealing on the floor of the Senate, or elsewhere, any confidential information concerning the conference. But what is made clear by the advertisement is the fact that the persons who wrote it profess to know more about the report than does the committee which sat in Bermuda for some 11 or 12 days.

Mr. President, I desire to read to the Senate a few excerpts from the advertisement. It says the following, among other things:

Not only were ways and means to save the remaining 4,000,000 Jews in Europe not devised, but their problem was not even touched upon, put on the agenda, or discussed. More than that—the name "Jews" was banished from the vocabulary of this convention, as PM's foreign editor, Alexander Uhl, reports: "It was regarded as almost improper to mention even the word 'Jew.'"

Mr. President, in answer to that misstatement I want to read at this time the communiqué which was issued by the delegates at the conference and which was sent to all parts of the world. The text of the final communiqué of the Bermuda conference on refugees is as follows:

The United States and United Kingdom delegations examined the refugee problem in all its aspects, including the position of those potential refugees who are still in the grip of Axis Powers without any immediate prospect of escape.

Nothing was excluded from their analysis and everything that held out any possibility, however remote, of solution of the problem was carefully investigated and thoroughly discussed.

Mr. President, any individual who troubled to take the time to read the communiqué which was issued jointly by the delegations at Bermuda could not by the wildest stretch of the imagination have any basis for a sentence of the kind I read a moment ago from the advertisement.

I read further from the communiqué issued by the delegations at the Bermuda conference:

From the outset it was realized that any recommendation that the delegates could make to their governments must pass two tests: Would any recommendation submitted interfere with or delay the war effort of the United Nations, and was the recommendation capable of accomplishment under war conditions?

Mr. President, I submit to every prudent man that those purposes are sound ones upon which to approach a world problem of that character.

I read further from the communiqué issued by the delegations at the conference:

The delegates at Bermuda felt bound to reject certain proposals which were not capable of meeting these tests.

The delegates were able to agree on a number of concrete recommendations which they are jointly submitting to their governments and which it is felt will pass the tests set forth above and will lead to the relief of a substantial number of refugees of all races and nationalities.

Since the recommendations necessarily concern governments other than those represented at the Bermuda Conference and involve military considerations, they must remain confidential. It may be stated, however, that in the course of the discussion the refugee problem was broken down into its main elements. The questions of shipping, food, and supply were fully investigated.

Mr. President, if anyone thinks that we have a surplus of ships in this war, then he is not in agreement with the military and naval experts.

I read further from the communiqué issued by the delegations at the conference:

The delegates also agreed on recommendations regarding the form of intergovernmental organization which was best fitted, in their opinion, to handle the problem in the future. This organization would have to be flexible enough to permit it to consider without prejudice any new factors that might come to its attention.

In each of these fields the delegates were able to submit agreed proposals for consideration of their respective governments.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I do not understand the advertisement. What is it that we are supposed to endorse?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what the sponsors are supposed to endorse; I only read the Senator's name, which appears in the advertisement, which at least by inference, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] said in his letter——

Mr. MOORE. I never have been consulted about it, I never have even read it, and I do not even know what the purpose of the advertisement is.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that; of course all Senators know that. But the point I am making is that people who are emotionally concerned in the cause, as well

as individuals who read the advertisement and who do not understand it, cannot gain any impression other than that the Senator from Colorado and the other Senators and the able and responsible individuals of this country whose names appear with the advertisement are responsible for it. That is the point I am making; I say that the advertisement is wholly unfair to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado who has lent his name as national chairman of the organization, and to the other Senators whose names are also listed in the advertisement. For instance, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is also listed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I see that I am in good company. Where did the Senator obtain the advertisement?

Mr. LUCAS. The advertisement appears in the New York Times for Tuesday, May 4, 1943.

In the advertisement the statement is made:

It was regarded as almost improper to mention even the word "Jew."

Ah, Mr. President, what a diabolical untruth is found in that particular statement. Why do they do this at this particular time? Why does this organization rush into print with a denunciation of the accomplishments of the conference less than 48 hours after the American delegation has returned to the United States? No one, other than the members of the delegations and the two respective governments, knows what is in the report. Yet the authors of the advertisement would assume to know all about it.

Here is a further statement in the advertisement:

But not only the attention of the victims of Nazi atrocities and of their friends the world over was concentrated on the meeting at Bermuda: Hitler, too, was concerned with the United Nations' reply to his challenge to the extermination of the Jewish population in Europe. Alas! To him Bermuda was again convincing proof that the United Nations were neither ready nor willing to answer his threat with action.

They take upon themselves to assume a situation of that kind—

They were continuing to give him carte blanche in his extermination process, exactly as in the pre-war days they permitted him to deal with Jews in Germany, with Austria and Czechoslovakia, thus paving the way for aggresion, invasion, and war.

In other words, the inference made in that statement is that because the United Nations did not go to the front in 1937 and 1938, we are responsible for the war.

Mr. President, there is "cruel mockery" in this advertisement, in addition to the embarrassment it has caused my good friend the Senator from Colorado and other Senators whose names appear in the advertisement.

The advertisement further says:

Now we are witnessing a variety of attempts to justify the Bermuda failure, to wrap it in secret formulas, such as "no dealing with Hitler," or "not to interfere with the prosecution of the war," or "not to undertake anything which should prolong the war," etc. All this is just throwing sand into the eyes of public opinion. All this has nothing to do with the real facts and the harrowing truth.

Mr. President, there is the "cruel mockery" that is throwing sand into the eyes of public opinion—that kind of an advertisement which is being paid for at the rate of about $2,000 for that particular page.

This advertisement charges that we have attempted to justify what its authors choose to call the failure of the Bermuda conference by saying that we should not interfere "with the prosecution of the war," or "not to undertake anything which should prolong the war."

Mr. President, it was President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill who said to Hitler that there would be an unconditional surrender, and that those were the only terms upon which they would deal with the savage beast across the sea.

The advertisement further states:

With the Bermuda conference a thing of the past, not having even discussed the problem of the extermination of the Jewish people in Europe, now, more than ever, it is clear—

How do they know? Why do they print a statement of that kind, when they know nothing about what went on in the Bermuda conference? What is the motive behind that kind of a statement?

More than ever it is clear that we are dealing not only with a refugee problem, but with the Jewish problem of Europe. These two problems should not be confused. They are entirely distinct. Democracy cannot connive with the slaughter of millions of innocent civilian people—the Jews in Europe.

This infers that democracy in this country is conniving in the slaughter of those poor unfortunate people in Europe.

Let me digress at this point to say that I yield to no man, regardless of his race, creed, or color, in my humanitarian sympathy for those people who are now locked on the inside of Europe's conquered lands. I believe that I understand the heartbeats of the underdog. I believe that I understand what it means to make one's own way in this life. I believe I understand something about suffering in the early days of life. Some of the best friends I have in this country, Mr. President, are members of the Jewish faith. Henry Horner, the great Governor of Illinois, one of the best, if not the best, our State ever had, was my dear friend. He was responsible, more than any other individual, for sending me to the United States Senate. He was a good man. He was a great man. Henry Horner did more to destroy intolerance and bigotry in the State of Illinois than any other public official who ever held an executive position in that State. My friends among the Jewish faith in my State are legion. When it is said that the Senator from Illinois would do anything that would interfere one iota with giving assistance to these poor helpless souls, those who make such statements simply do not know what they are talking about, and I will not permit the charge to go unanswered.

The authors of this advertisement did not wait for the facts. They rushed into print and condemned individuals about whom they knew little or nothing. They do not know what occurred at the Bermuda conference, yet they make a blanket indictment of the action and accomplishments of the conference. Mr. President, they are injuring their own case with an advertisement of this kind.

The article further says:

There are ways and means to stop Hitler's wholesale murder and to evacuate those who can be evacuated. But no one has been assigned to deal with this tremendous problem. What is necessary is that the machinery for action be created. The United Nations, which have uttered so many words of pity must now do something if these words of pity are to be more than empty lies.

That is a serious statement to make. It is a serious matter to charge the United States with empty lies in connection with statements which they have made on behalf of the oppressed and persecuted peoples of Europe. America has always been the friend of downtrodden and oppressed peoples, and she will continue to be in the fullest extent possible in dealing with this problem; but this kind of an advertisement does not do the cause any good. I think I know what I am talking about. This kind of an advertisement plays into the hands of Adolf Hitler.

The advertisement further states:

They must create a United Nations agency composed of military and diplomatic experts which should have full authority to define and effectuate a realistic and stern policy of action to save the remaining millions of Jewish people.

This communiqué discusses the Intergovernmental Committee. The Intergovernmental Committee was the committee which was set up at the conference which was called by President Roosevelt in 1939. Under the terms of agreement among the nations represented, they were attempting then to deal with the Jews in Germany, Austria, and Sudetenland. Obviously, in view of the situation which existed in the world, the Intergovernmental Committee did not have the power or authority to go further. One of the things which we did in connection with this conference was to broaden the powers and authority of the Intergovernmental Committee.

Mr. President, I have said about all I wish to say in connection with this "cruel mockery." I regret very much to see the inflammatory statements which are made in this article.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I regret the use of my name in that advertisement. Let me say to my friend that I have no information with respect to the deliberations of the Bermuda conference; and without knowing what its findings were and seeing its report, I would not criticize it. I am absolutely certain that the Senator from Illinois, under his appointment through the State Department, ably represented our Government at that conference. I agreed to permit the use of

my name by the Jewish people who wanted to organize an army based on Palestine to fight for the liberties of the Jewish people and their allies all over the world. I believe in the right of people to fight for their freedom. I was familiar with the Balfour declaration, and with Woodrow Wilson's attempts to establish a State for the Jews in Palestine. I have been one of those who have tried to insist that the British Government and our Government, acting together, keep their commitments to the Jewish people made many years ago—in fact, about the time of the last World War. Except for that purpose, the use of my name was entirely unauthorized. I believe that the same statement applies to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

In the future, I shall insist that if my name is used, it be not used to criticize conferences in which the United States Government engages for the purpose of trying to solve the manifold problems which present themselves to our people. I think the criticism is unjust and untimely. I will say to my friend from Illinois that I sincerely regret the use of my name. The use of it in that connection was entirely unauthorized.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. What is true of the Senator from Kentucky is also undoubtedly true of others whose names have been used. To a certain extent the advertisement is very innocent looking. It cannot be definitely said that any of the persons whose names were used had anything to do with it, but the ordinary reader looking at the advertisement cannot help but believe that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] signed the advertisement, and that some of his colleagues had something to do with the approval of it before it was placed in the New York Times.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am very certain that there is not a Senator on that list who knows anything about the advertisement or had anything to do with it. The reason my name is on the list is that I was laboring under the delusion that this was an organization for a Jewish army to help win the war. If it is the intention to use the committee for any other purpose, it can no longer have my support or the use of my name.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that there could not possibly have been any reason for putting my name on that list even in behalf of a Jewish army. If the Jews want to fight in this war, let them fight under the flags of the countries to which they belong. I certainly am not in sympathy with authorizing or encouraging the formation of an army in this country under any flag but the American flag.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely read the names of Senators, and the Senator's name is on the list, and I wanted him to know about it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. As stated by the distinguished Senator, I am among those who endorse the right of the Jew in Palestine, the so-called stateless Jew, which means the Jews who have no state connection, to fight as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] for his own liberty and his own freedom. I think that it was in that particular connection that many of us became interested in supporting this movement. It must be clear that there was never any thought that Jews who live in this country and who are as much Americans as any of us would be organized into a separate corps or into a separate army. However, we felt, in view of the fact that the problem connected with our war in Europe and in Africa involved a matter of transportation of men and material, and, in view of the fact that for months now the submarine has taken a toll of a million tons of shipping a month, together with the contents of the vessels, that if in Palestine and in Africa the Jewish people already there wanted to form an independent armed corps or army, that it would not only aid them, but it would aid our own problem.

Our problem is to transport to Africa men and material to "carry through," and if there were 200,000 armed Jews there, all we would have to carry over there would be the matériel such as munitions, arms, and so forth, to provide for our men already there and the group of 200,000 Jews.

Furthermore, the Jews in Palestine and the Jews forced to leave Europe have something to fight for. They have seen their relatives, they have seen their property, and they have seen their liberty liquidated. They would be fighting men fighting for a cause. That was the basic reason for many of us supporting the objective of the Palestinian army. It would help America; it would help the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I fully agree that it is an unfortunate circumstance that the advertisement to which the Senator from Illinois refers, has appeared; first, because it indicates that the man who wrote it was not cognizant of the fact—he could not have been cognizant—of what took place in the Bermuda conference, because no one but members of the conference and the Government know what is contained in the report.

Second, the author of this advertisement has damaged the cause by such an attack. It seems to me that while the primary object of the Palestinian Army is worthwhile, it cannot be attained by an attack, if you please, on a committee appointed by the President, and I for one would not lend my name to any such attack or procedure. I feel, however, that the preparation of the advertisement is probably due to the overzealousness of someone who should have known better. Of course, it might be interesting to know who paid for it. Does the Senator have any information on that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that in the right-hand lower corner of the advertisement I find the following:

> I want to help your campaign "Save European Jewry by action—not pity." You have my support in carrying your fight through the press, the radio, and in public meetings throughout the country, as well as in your endeavors in Washington and London—capitals of the United Nations.

That appeal is a little different from what is expressed in the title of the organization, which is "Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews."

Yesterday Mr. Bergson, the individual to whom the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] addressed his letter, said that the money which was collected through this means was used, among other purposes, to pay for this kind of advertisement.

Mr. WILEY. Has the distinguished Senator from Illinois had an opportunity to interview Mr. Bergson?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I saw the gentleman yesterday.

Mr. WILEY. What was his reaction?

Mr. LUCAS. I would rather not go into the detail of what I told Mr. Bergson yesterday.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator mean that he would rather not go into the detail of what he said, or what Mr. Bergson said?

Mr. LUCAS. I would rather not go into the detail of what I said. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have said all I care to say upon this subject. I wish to conclude by repeating with all the sincerity which I possess, that I regret exceedingly that I had to take the floor and discuss this full-page advertisement, but I believe that in so doing I have done my duty as a member of the conference. I am deeply and sincerely interested in the refugee problem—the problem of the Jews—and the Senator from Illinois is a better friend of the Jewish people of this country and the countries across the water than are those who are responsible for this type of advertisement.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he takes his seat?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say for the RECORD that I had occasion on yesterday to talk with Representative SOL BLOOM, who I understand was a member of the conference which the Senator from Illinois attended.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. While he told me nothing of what transpired, he was extremely high in his praise of the contribution made to the conference by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. In view of the fact the Senator has mentioned the name of Representative SOL BLOOM, I wish to say for Mr. BLOOM that no individual at the conference was more interested, or did more to aid in every aspect of this problem, than did Representative BLOOM. I will say further that Mr. BLOOM agrees with the Senator from Illinois in what he is now doing.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—CONFLICTING WAR PROGRAMS (PT. 9 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I desire to submit a report to the Senate on the hearings which the Special Committee

to Investigate the National Defense Program has been holding for 5 or 6 days in regard to a controversy over rubber, high-octane gas, and escort vessels.

First, I desire to read an extract from a committee report which was submitted to the Senate on December 10, 1941, under the unanimous direction of the committee as a whole. That report starts off with the statement that—

> The committee held an executive session for the purpose of determining how they could best contribute to the defense of the Nation.

That was 3 days after Pearl Harbor.

> From their inception the special committee have concerned themselves with the nonmilitary aspects of the defense program, that is to say, with seeing to it that the defense articles which the Army and Navy have determined that they need are produced in a minimum of time at a minimum of cost and with as little disruption of the civilian economy as possible.

The committee never have investigated and they still believe that they should not investigate military and naval strategy or tactics. The reason for that is that the committee, as a whole, has the utmost confidence in Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, and believes that matters of tactics and strategy should be entirely in their hands.

The conflict between the synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and escort vessel programs has been relieved and largely removed by bringing the respective loyal, competent, and aggressive disputants face to face. This should have occurred days ago in the ordinary quiet process of administration.

It shows the need for the following procedure recommended on March 11, 1943, on page 3 of this committee's second annual report:

> During the coming year attention must continue to be focused on the primary need for clearly defined authority in the administration of our domestic war program. This authority should be centralized in a few officials—each solely responsible for the administration of certain activities. Each should be of high ability. In addition to doing their administrative work they should meet frequently to eliminate all conflicts of jurisdiction and be ready to advise with the President on important questions of policy while relieving him completely of purely administrative work.

On April 22 the newspapers reported that the Under Secretary of War had accused the persons responsible for the synthetic rubber program of delaying production of aviation gasoline to the serious detriment of the war effort. The Petroleum Administrator was reported to second the charges, although the fact appears to be that the newspapers correctly stated his opinions without authorization. The Under Secretary of the Navy entered the fracas, towing into the scene the long-delayed escort-vessel program. Finally, the newspapers reported that the Rubber Director had demanded an investigation, and suggested the resignation of the losing combatant.

This committee announced hearings when it became evident that some of the Nation's key officials had publicly worked themselves into an impossible position. The democratic right of public expression had passed the point of useful exchange. The problems of balancing complex programs involving the high strategy of war cannot be solved in an open forum. The difficulties of such a procedure were demonstrated at this committee's hearings. In several cases, witnesses were constrained, and properly so, to present vital facts to the committee privately. The public, which in effect was originally invited by the disputants to judge the issue, cannot know all the facts at this time.

More important, the tenor of the alleged public statements was such that further controversy of this character might seriously impair the effectiveness of able leaders. We cannot afford unnecessarily to lose any men who have proved their ability to cope with the intricate problems which we now face.

Energetic, aggressive men, striving to meet war needs, will tend to clash when their duties bring them into conflict. But destructive, wasteful feuding must be suppressed.

The task of control and guidance is of utmost importance. Clear leadership in strong hands is required. The influence from above must be always toward unity. Where necessary, heads must be knocked together.

The issues in this dispute, involving war strategy, can and should be resolved by the agency established for that purpose, the War Production Board. This report is directed, not at these issues, but at the weaknesses in administration of the war effort which permit such disputes to reach the point of public controversy.

After Pearl Harbor we found ourselves woefully unprepared for war. This committee reported on the rubber situation and warned that supplies were dangerously low; that erection of synthetic rubber facilities was essential; that there would probably be no new rubber for civilians until 1944. Precious months were wasted in discussion after our findings were made public. Finally, after the President's Baruch committee arrived at the same conclusion, synthetic rubber got under way. To accomplish this, a rubber czar was set up, within the War Production Board to be sure, but still more or less autonomous. For a few more months the rubber program seemed stalled, hampered by a clash of personalities and by inability to obtain sufficiently high priorities ratings. In the fall of 1942, for instance, the Navy and Maritime Commission had tied up practically all of the Nation's valve-making facilities.

To break the priorities jam the War Production Board instituted in December a program expediting 20 percent of the rubber, and 20 percent of the aviation gasoline programs. This amount proved insufficient, and in January of 1943 a total of approximately 55 percent of the Buna S rubber program and a somewhat smaller percentage of the aviation gasoline program were expedited.

It is significant that the contest between rubber and aviation gasoline at that time proved too hot for the War Production Board to handle, and it was finally decided after an appeal to higher authority. Even after the decision the battle flared up publicly from time to time.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor the committee studied the aviation gasoline situation, and, as in the case of rubber, followed later developments. The armed forces failed by a wide margin to anticipate wartime needs for aviation gasoline. A year after Pearl Harbor the armed forces were still raising their sights. Their estimates made last September will apparently be met by production this summer. But during last fall and winter—after almost a year of war—these estimates were tremendously increased. This, of course, intensified the priorities jam.

Throughout last winter the Navy was not in a position to build escort vessels in large numbers due to a strategic decision to devote available facilities to another product. Until February of 1943 the Navy was not in a position to place the bulk of its orders and therefore the War Production Board could not begin scheduling.

To expedite the rubber and 100-octane programs certain of the rubber plants and aviation gasoline plants were given precedence over other claimants. This, of course, put the Rubber Director in the driver's seat for at least a part of the trip. It resulted in unfortunate personality clashes, as it required other claimants to go to the Rubber Director instead of to the War Production Board for some very important and sorely needed items. On the other hand, it was a method determined after consultation with the various agencies, and after prolonged, if not too prolonged, consideration. Efforts were made to relieve the impact of the expediting directives where collisions resulted, with varying success.

At the present time the order of expediting the various programs is considered settled by the War Production Board. A vigorous effort to schedule production is under way, apparently with the hearty approval of all concerned. The Chairman of the War Production Board has declared that no new issue was presented to him before the present public flare-up, and his statement was sustained by the other testimony.

Vigorous, able men are now at work on these programs attempting to make up ground lost because of our failure to set our sights high enough. There is a perfectly normal and healthy tendency on the part of each leader to view his program as the most important. Each has complained to the committee that his program has been treated inequitably. It is perfectly clear today, as it was a year ago, that these three competing programs, synthetic rubber, 100-octane gasoline, and escort vessels, are essential to win the war.

The precise balancing of these programs in point of quantity and of time is crucial. A serious error could spell disaster. The deciding agency must have the facts relating to all three programs before it. Its decisions must stick. Confusion in planning today will cut produc-

tion a year hence. It defeats strategy. Weakness in enforcing decisions will breed confusion.

The job of balancing the conflicting programs has been done and is being done by the War Production Board. The task is one of tremendous magnitude. It can no more be accomplished by discussion before a committee than by castigation in the press.

The present conflict is a result of basic weaknesses in the control of the war effort. In its report of January 15, 1942, this committee called for a strong over-all planning agency. The committee and the Nation believed that these weaknesses had been eliminated by the subsequent creation of the War Production Board. The Chairman of the War Production Board was given sweeping powers, which at least on paper appeared broad enough to enable him to direct war production under the Commander in Chief.

The Chairman was empowered to:

(a) Exercise general direction over the war procurement and production program.

(b) Determine the policies, plans, procedures, and methods of the several Federal departments, establishments, and agencies in respect to war procurement and production, including purchasing, contracting, specifications, and construction; and including conversion, requisitioning, plant expansion, and the financing thereof; and issue such directives in respect thereto as he may deem necessary or appropriate.

(c) Perform the functions and exercise the powers vested in the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board by Executive Order No. 8875 of August 28, 1941.

(d) Supervise the Office of Production Management in the performance of its responsibilities and duties, and direct such changes in its organization as he may deem necessary.

(e) Report from time to time to the President the progress of war procurement and production; and perform such other duties as the President may direct.

Federal departments, establishments, and agencies were ordered to comply with the policies, plans, methods, and procedures with respect to war procurement and production as determined by the Chairman. The Chairman was empowered to exercise his authority through such officials or agencies and in such manner as he might determine. His decisions were, by the terms of the order, to be final.

Here is a clear and unequivocal delegation of authority. Why, then, was it not exercised? At least part of the answer is to be found in the history of some of the major problems of 1942. The past year has seen several disputes which called for exercise of the Chairman's power to issue "such directives as he may deem necessary and appropriate" and to make final decisions.

The determination of the Nation's rubber requirements was made on a plane superior to the War Production Board. The findings of the President's Rubber Committee were ordered to be executed by a rubber director. This official was declared to be responsible to the Chairman of the War Production Board, but was given power himself to issue directives to the various agencies. The Chairman of the War Production Board was requested by the Commander in Chief to divest himself of concern with the rubber program. Therefore, practically speaking, the Chairman of the War Production Board has had only tenuous authority over the Rubber Director although technically he is the boss.

An administrator was placed in charge of petroleum programs, including aviation gasoline. The Executive order declares that he "shall be directly responsible to the President." On the other hand, he exercises the "powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the Chairman of the War Production Board" with respect to the petroleum industry, "subject to the direction of the Chairman of the War Production Board." The lines of authority are confusing even on paper. As a practical matter they breed disputes such as that under consideration.

Today discussion of the over-all legal authority of the War Production Board is mere pedantry. Although the authority may exist it has not been exercised. But the Chairman of the War Production Board has exercised the power to allocate materials and to schedule the production programs of the various departments, and to resolve conflicts between these programs.

Even in the matter of scheduling, when the conflict between the rubber and aviation-gasoline programs reached major proportions, the dispute was carried from the Chairman of the War Production Board to the Commander in Chief, who upheld the Chairman.

The War Production Board is serving well as a scheduling and allocating agency. It has succeeded in deciding between claimant programs and in providing materials within the limitations of the conditions under which it has been forced to work. In this field the War Production Board and its Chairman have been successful, and his authority should be sustained.

Two things must be accomplished. First, the strong over-all authority of the War Production Board must be made a living reality. This authority must be ready to make decisions and to enforce them over the objections of aggressive department heads. It must operate in such manner that the various men responsible for individual programs will feel that they have been fairly treated and fully heard.

Second, without dilution of the power of the chairman, the War Production Board should function as a board. The persons in charge of each major program should sit on it and discuss their problems together regularly and frequently. Each must be made to feel a great sense of responsibility for the entire program with no diminution of his responsibility for that part directly under his control.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish briefly to comment on the report just made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. It seems to me it has a very direct bearing on the question at issue in the bill now before the Senate, Senate bill 885, which would establish by statute a Civilian Supply Administration, again outside of and independent of the War Production Board.

The present confusion in administration of our war effort seems to me to arise out of the fact that while the War Production Board as originally created was designed to be the top, over-all agency, in a little over a year since it was established we have seen one czar after another established, with power completely independent of the War Production Board, having to do with rubber, food, fuel, manpower, transportation.

Time after time we have seen the top men in these agencies become involved in conflicts which eventually got into the press, and served only to confuse the American people. They were conflicts which should have been settled by the War Production Board, acting as a board, with the chairman of that board having the final authority. That is the only sane, sensible way to settle such jurisdictional conflicts.

It seems to me the basic weakness of Senate bill 885 is that it seeks to remedy that situation by establishing still another czar, leading to further conflict of jurisdiction and greater confusion.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Minnesota realizes that Senate bill 885 provides the opportunity to avoid the conflicts to which he has referred, because provision is definitely made in the bill that the Economic Stabilization Director shall settle disputes which have heretofore gone out to the public and raged for days. It would avoid all the conflicts to which the Senator has referred. I hope the Senator realizes that.

Mr. BALL. I noticed the provision in the bill providing for a Civilian Supply Administration which may have the right of appeal to the Director of Economic Stabilization. That in effect gives to the Director of Economic Stabilization the job which the Chairman of the War Production Board is supposed to be doing, and I do not think it makes good administrative sense.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one more question? The present claimant agencies are the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Aircraft Resources Control Office, Lease-Lend, Board of Economic Warfare, Agricultural Department, Office of Defense Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, National Housing Agency, and Office of Rubber Director. Those are the claimant agencies now existing outside the War Production Board. Would the Senator—and to be consistent I think he must—place all those agencies under the War Production Board?

Mr. BALL. I think as they relate to the war-production job they should be under the general direction of the War Production Board. That is where they belong.

Mr. MALONEY. So the Senator would accord Mr. Nelson complete and final and uncontradictable control over all these agencies?

Mr. BALL. I do not think that he should administer them. Of course, that is impossible. We must have strong men administering each of these various programs. But they should come to the

War Production Board and be subject, in asking for their share of the critical materials, to the final determination of the War Production Board.

Mr. MALONEY. Of Mr. Donald Nelson.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the report just submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], with which I heartily concur, deals with current problem No. 1 of war production.

We have mastered the art of war production. We have solved most of the problems of pioneering in a science not common to democracies. We are successfully waging a total war.

Whole new industries have been built from the ground up. These industries are pouring forth a flood of weapons which will win this war.

One major problem is still vexing us. We cherish our liberties. We are fighting for them today. Not the least of them is the right to full public expression. We have not yet found the balance which will preserve this right and yet enable the administration of war production to progress with smooth efficiency.

The answer does not lie in generalizations or in platitudes. It will be found—as the Special Committee to Investigate the War Program has just reported—in a clarification of the authority of the Chairman of the War Production Board. This authority needs stronger support than the thin, cold words of any statute, directive, or order. It must be made to live. It must be respected. It must not be undermined.

I believe that the Chairman of the War Production Board will gain rather than lose strength by consulting regularly and frequently with the men in charge of each major program.

At the committee's hearings it was apparent that each administrator thought of his program as the most vital. They should all sit down together frequently and hear the other fellow's side of the story. They should all feel jointly responsible—in a consultive capacity—for the whole war effort and not merely for the one part which is their chief responsibility.

The leaders who have emerged to direct our war production effort are able, forceful, and patriotic men. Each has done a splendid job.

Mr. Donald Nelson's responsible task of directing and correlating these all but insuperable forces is not an enviable one. All things considered, he has succeeded remarkably in tying together our industrial machinery into a mechanism for the progress of the war. Under his leadership war production is each day reaching new high levels. We have won the battle of production.

The task of streamlining the organization should not prove too difficult. The only fault that could be found with any of the witnesses who appeared before the committee was a consuming zeal to do a good job. These men are used to success. They are here to succeed, and not to find excuses for failure. Each has been of great value in his own sphere.

William Jeffers proved his talents long before he came to Washington. Once here he showed why he rose to the presidency of a great railroad. He has been tireless in his efforts to put across the rubber program. Today synthetic rubber is a reality.

Under Secretary Patterson came to this city with a brilliant record as a judge and a soldier. His energy and devotion to his task are axiomatic. And our well-equipped fighting men are proof of his success.

Under Secretary of Navy Forrestal, coming to the Navy Department after an outstanding business career, has paralleled Judge Patterson's accomplishments for the Navy. He is doing a big job well.

Secretary Ickes has brought years of experience to his position of Petroleum Administrator and his many other important war tasks. He has prosecuted each ably and successfully.

These men may have at times pressed a bit too fast in their enthusiasm. They are all working under severe strain and constantly meeting and solving new problems. But they are all doing fine jobs. They are all invaluable to the war effort. Their names will stand out when the production record of this war is finally written. I am certain, Mr. President, that they will all work together for and until victory comes to the United Nations. They are able men, doing a fine task, and as the committee report indicates, cooperation and coordination is the great current need.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to address only one or two questions to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] relating to the report which he submitted on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I notice that in referring to the report he emphasized the fact that the committee had recently submitted its second annual report, and that it had made certain recommendations with regard to the conduct of the various administrative bodies in the war effort. That indicated a study over the past year or two of the subject of organization of the Government. The example which arose and is made the subject of the report was a typical example of the operation of that system. I take it that the report, in which I concur and with which I strongly agree, is a recommendation that the individuals concerned get together and work together, not a recommendation for the need of any statutory change at this time in the administrative organization of the Government. Is that correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator is expressing the opinion of the whole committee when he says that.

Mr. BURTON. And the report is not in any way a personal commendation of the individual initiative or aggressiveness of the persons who have engaged in the controversy, but, rather, is a recommendation that they get together and work together with the same aggressiveness they have heretofore shown in working against one another.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true; and I think the statement the Senator has made is also concurred in by the committee. The officials are honest and energetic; all they need is a safety valve.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2346, which is the bill providing appropriations for civil functions of the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying aside the unfinished business and proceeding to the immediate consideration of the appropriation bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection whatsoever. I favor the motion; but I wish to make a statement. If it should appear that any controversial amendments shall be offered from the floor, I should like to have the bill go over until another day.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I feel much the same as does the able minority leader. I do not have any objection, under those conditions, to having the unfinished business laid aside. I am assuming that its provisions are not controversial and that the bill may be disposed of quickly. I realize that the bill is an important one. The chairman of the subcommittee is an important Senator, and I am extremely anxious to cooperate with him.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. President, I should like to say at this time, if I may, that there has been some question as to whether or not the Senate would meet tomorrow for the further consideration of the unfinished business. I have been advised that the members of the Committee on Finance are extremely anxious to continue all day tomorrow and without interruption their study of the pending tax bill. I am anxious, because of the interest of the country in the matter, and because of its importance, that a tax bill be brought before the Senate at the earliest possible moment. But I am also anxious to cooperate with the members of the Committee on Finance, and am quite agreeable to the suggestion that the unfinished business go over until Monday. I think that procedure probably is the preference of the majority leader.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut is very gracious. In view of his statement, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it shall adjourn until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it has been suggested that Monday is calendar day. So, I ask that at the conclusion of today's session the Senate take a recess until Monday.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SHOULD THE PRESIDENT HAVE A FOURTH TERM?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on April 29, 1943, I had the good fortune and pleasure to participate, with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in America's Town Meeting of the Air, which was broadcast from Pittsburgh, Pa. In presenting the negative side of the debate subject, Should the President Have a Fourth Term? the Senator from New Hampshire delivered a logical and keen argument. Since that time I have received numerous requests from all parts of the country for copies of the program. These requests indicate the interest and deep concern of the people of America in this subject. Therefore, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the splendid speech made by the Senator from New Hampshire on that occasion become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it be embodied in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES (REPUBLICAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE) IN DEBATE ON FOURTH-TERM ISSUE AT AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR BROADCAST, PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL 29, 1943

The question we are discussing tonight needs no answer from us here, whether we are speaking of Franklin Delano Roosevelt or any other man. It has been answered by 150 years of American history and tradition. It will be answered by the American people at the polls. They will decide whether we are to remain a representative republic or whether we shall become a permanent, self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

How long should a man be President of this country? There are people in this audience who since Mr. Roosevelt first was elected have come of age, married, had children, watched those children grow up and go to school, and faced this question at the dinner table, "Daddy, has Mr. Roosevelt always been President?" I have a son in the armed forces of this country in foreign service. He is old enough to fight for his country, yet he cannot remember any President but Roosevelt.

Thomas Jefferson warned repeatedly against keeping one President in office. He put the crown aside when it was offered to him despite the grave emergencies that then faced his Nation, warning that "There will never be a time when real difficulties will not exist, and furnish a plausible pretext for extending the term."

President William McKinley was once boomed to continue beyond two terms. To that he replied: "There are questions of the gravest importance before the administration and the country, and their consideration should not be prejudiced in the public eye by even the suspicion of the thought of a third term."

You see, my friends, Jefferson and McKinley recognized that when the attempt to establish a continuing dynasty was made, it would come under the cloak of some emergency, under the pretext of the "indispensable man" theory. Every man is indispensable to his own partisans who benefit by his office, but the world moves on no matter what happens to the indispensable man.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is not the first President to have the Temptress of Ambition dance before him. The difference is not in the kind of temptation, but in the fact that Presidents of the past put the future welfare of the Republic ahead of any personal ambition, or belief in their indispensability.

Actually, the problem we should be discussing here tonight is how far this administration is bold enough to go in using the powers of its war machine to force the reelection of the President. We can all regret that in the midst of a dangerous war—20 months before the 1944 elections—the New Deal has introduced a political campaign into our national life. We can cry out that it is wrong at the most critical juncture of our African and South Pacific battles for the henchmen of the New Deal to be sent out by the White House to start their political maneuvering. We all know that at this time, if ever, the White House should put patriotism above the suspicion of encouraging a premature political campaign which is bound to arouse every agency of disunity in the land.

This campaign is over an issue so vital that it will shake the faith of the people as to the permanence of our form of Government. It will remind them of those shameful days at the Chicago Convention of 1940, of which Raymond Clapper, the well-known publicist, wrote they had "made a mockery of democracy," and asserted that the "low" was reached in White House political fixing.

And we will recall that the President, after forcing his own renomination, became alarmed at the country's fears that his ambitions knew no bounds. In the midst of the election campaign he pledged to the people that when the third term was over "there will be another President." Then, 2 days later—just before the election—he again sought to allay the fears of the people by promising his neighbors in New York that "it is the last time, very obviously, that I will do that as a candidate for office."

As this drive goes forward, we Americans must look to see what 4 more years of the New Deal mean. We see the same bureaucrats, vowing furiously that the Nation needs Roosevelt. We see them using every art of propaganda aided by Government money. We know that 4 more years of Roosevelt mean 4 more years of "I-Am-the-Law" Hague in New Jersey, of the Kelly-Nash gang in Chicago, of LaGuardia and Marcantonio in New York, and the Communist, Earl Browder. We look in vain for the names of Carter Glass, of Senator Byrd, of Senator George, of Al Smith, and Jim Farley. The Democratic Party has been taken over by the palace guards, the White House machine, and the bureaucrats who would be masters of the American people.

Four more years of Roosevelt mean 4 more years of Harry Hopkins with his spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect policies operated from within the White House itself.

It means 4 more years of government by "lame ducks," repudiated at the polls and given higher offices by the President in exchange for political service.

It means 4 more years of New Deal wasters, spending billions recklessly while rejecting Republican pay-as-you-earn taxation.

It means 4 more years of planned agricultural mismanagement which has reduced, for the first time, Americans to hunger levels.

It means 4 more years of using the White House powers to build a national Tammany Hall through such Federal appointments as Judge Meany in New Jersey and Paving Block Ed Flynn.

It means 4 more years of crucifying small business and above all years of W. P. A.-ing the world at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Should the present President, or any President of the United States, have a fourth term? No—not unless we are ready to accept some form of dictatorship with the America we have known and loved gone forever.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2346, a bill providing appropriations for civil functions of the War Department.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial expenses," on page 3, line 7, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out "$605,643," and insert "$1,230,058."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are two items in the amendment. The first is for $28,000 to be made available to enable the caretakers of national cemeteries to hire additional men. They claim that because of the increased wages they have to pay in order to get men to do the work, they do not now have sufficient money to enable them to have the work done. That is the first item.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why was the appropriation increased from $605,643 to almost twice that amount?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The next item covers that matter. When the bill was in the other House that body decided to eliminate the item for the purchase of headstones for the graves of soldiers, and to put the item in the regular appropriation bill for the Military Establishment, which will come along

later. So the House did not make provision for the purchase of the 57,000 headstones which is the number for which applications by the families of deceased soldiers are pending. The money added by the amendment to the bill is to cover the cost of the purchase of the 57,000 headstones.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry relative to the amendment. I understand that the item referred to does not really represent an additional appropriation, but merely involves putting the appropriation in this bill, instead of in the regular War Department appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; that is correct. The appropriation bill for the civil functions of the War Department has heretofore carried that item; but for some reason the House decided to put the item in the regular War Department appropriation bill. However, the Senate committee preferred to have the item placed in the pending bill.

Mr. BURTON. But that does not mean a $600,000 increase in expenditure, I take it. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Rivers and harbors", on page 6, line 4, after the figures "$35,700,000", to strike out "and, in addition, $2,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works,' is hereby reappropriated for the execution of detail investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized" and insert "and so much of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works' as the Secretary of War determines to be necessary is hereby made available for the execution of detail investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have from the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma an explanation of the amendment on page 6, line 4?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as the bill passed the House, $2,000,000 was earmarked to be made available to the Chief of Engineers for the purpose of making surveys and plans for authorized projects, and having such plans and surveys completed and ready for immediate use when the war is over, the purpose being to have available projects which could be quickly advertised so as to give employment to the returning soldiers and to those who will cease to be employed in defense plants. The amendment submitted by the Senate is to strike out the appropriation of $2,000,000, and to leave the matter within the discretion of the Secretary of War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood Control," on page 7, line 24, after the figures "$100", to strike out "and, in addition, $2,400,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation Flood control, general, is hereby reappropriated for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood control projects, and for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood control work threatened or destroyed by flood, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941" and insert "and so much of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation Flood control, general, as the Secretary of War determines to be necessary is hereby made available for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood-control projects, for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, for reimbursement to the city of Hartford, Conn., as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and for construction of the flood-control projects heretofore authorized for the Mermentau River, Bayou Teche, and Vermilion River, La."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to say a word by way of explanation. The Senate committee recommends that two projects in Louisiana be provided for in the bill. Heretofore, so far as we are concerned, the Senate has made appropriations to build a levee work or a ditch work in Louisiana to take care of certain swamp lands which heretofore, when floods came, overflowed, with the result that crops were destroyed. The crops include rice, cotton, and sugarcane. Furthermore, in that particular area is a substantial oil field; and every time a considerable flood occurs there, the whole territory is inundated, the crops are destroyed, and the oil field is greatly injured. So the Senate committee recommends again that the items be included in the pending bill.

Mr. OVERTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] with respect to an amendment relating to certain Louisiana projects, the statement I made before the subcommittee conducting hearings on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. OVERTON, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION AND MERMENTAU RIVERS, LA.

Senator OVERTON. I desire to present briefly to the committee an appropriation item covering the Bayou Teche and Vermilion River and the Mermentau River, La.

AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS

Both these projects were authorized by Congress in 1941, by Public Law 228, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 377, first session. The text of the authorization of the Teche-Vermilion projects is as follows:

"The project for the improvement of Bayou Teche and the Vermilion River, La., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 93, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $1,390,000."

The text of the authorization of the Mermentau River Basin project is as follows:

"The project for the improvement of the Mermentau River, La., for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 94, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $970,000."

SUPPORTING TESTIMONY IN HEARING IN 1942 ON WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

When this subcommittee had under consideration the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1943, on which hearings were conducted by this committee in March of last year, the testimony in support of the urgent necessity of constructing both projects was adduced before this committee. The statements of the various witnesses are to be found on pages 64 to 84, both inclusive, of the March 1942 hearings. I do not think it necessary to present the same or additional witnesses at this hearing, with the exception of two Representatives, one from the Third Congressional District of Louisiana and the other from the Seventh District of Louisiana, who are in a position, Mr. Chairman, to bring us right up to date with reference to the situation generally that prevails in the two basins.

The statements made in the March 1942 hearings will suffice, and I ask permission, Mr. Chairman, to incorporate by reference into these hearings the statements made in support of the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau projects to be found on pages 64 to 84, both inclusive, of the hearings conducted before the committee on H. R. 6736, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions of the War Department, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

Senator THOMAS. I understand that you are not asking that the testimony taken here at that time be printed at this point in the record, but merely that we refer to the testimony and make it a part of the hearings, so that anyone interested can see what you are referring to; the same being the hearings on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1943, and the pages indicated found in part I. Is that correct?

Senator OVERTON. That is correct, Senator.

Senator THOMAS. Very well.

FACTS SUPPORTING PROJECTS

Senator OVERTON. It may be well to point out to the committee some of the main facts supporting an amendment to provide for an appropriation for these projects in the present bill.

AREA AFFECTED BY PROJECTS

The area affected by the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau projects involves all or part of 12 parishes, having an area of 9,904 square miles and a population of almost half a million. This area contains over two and one-quarter million acres of farm lands.

CAUSE OF FLOODING OF AFFECTED AREA

The area is subject to inundation, mainly as a result of the silting of the outlets of the Vermilion and Mermentau Rivers. The silting has so increased and has so dammed

these outlets that a comparatively small rainfall results in the overflow of large quantities of rich, cultivable lands.

EXPENDITURES BY LOCAL DRAINAGE DISTRICTS

In order to solve the flood problems in the area, local drainage districts to the number of 121 were formed and over $8,000,000 have been spent for drainage purposes. But the drainage systems constructed are ineffective because the Mermentau and Vermilion Rivers are, as above stated, through silt formation, closing these outlets and the silting is progressing upstream rapidly.

So that it makes very little difference how much money they spend on drainage systems and how many drainage channels they have, the drainage is controlled by the outlets of these two rivers, the Marmentau and the Vermilion, which empty into the Gulf of Mexico. So that if these outlets are silted up and closed, very largely, why, the drainage systems incorporated in these numerous drainage districts are wholly ineffective.

Now, for example, at mile 5 on the Mermentau, the channel cross section had an area of 1,350 square feet below sea level in 1913 and in December 1940 this area had contracted, through silting, to only 300 square feet. Practically the same condition prevails in the Vermilion River outlet.

PRINCIPAL CROPS GROWN IN AREA AFFECTED

Now the principal crops grown in the affected area are rice, of which we have an insufficient supply; sugarcane, and there is an insufficient supply of sugar, cotton, corn, sweetpotatoes, and livestock.

In 1939, this area produced over four and one-half million barrels of rice, which represents a production of over one-third of the total rice produced in the United States. In that year, the sugarcane production was over a million and a quarter tons; bales of cotton over 70,000; sweetpotatoes over 4,000,000 bushels; corn over 6,000,000 bushels; and over a third of a million head of beef cattle.

TOTAL LOSS OCCASIONED BY 1940 FLOOD

In the following year, 1940, the area was visited by a precipitation of rainfall of from 12 to 24 inches in a few days—my recollection is in 1 or 2 days—resulting in crop losses, estimated by the Department of Agriculture, at over $10,000,000, of which between 60 to 80 percent was to be attributed to this flood; and also resulted in a tremendously increased silting of the outlets of the two rivers in question.

Since 1940, the production of the Vermilion and Mermentau area has greatly decreased because even a comparatively slight rainfall results in the destruction of crops.

LOCAL DRAINAGE EXPENDITURES USELESS WITHOUT COMPLETING PROJECTS

The efforts of local drainage committees and the expenditure of over $8,000,000 to drain this rich producing area are "love's labors lost," and a tremendous destruction of the production of vitally needed foods, running into millions of dollars, will continue to occur unless the authorized improvements of these two streams receive the comparatively small appropriation necessary for the construction; namely, $2,360,000, being $1,390,000 for the Teche-Vermilion and $970,000 for the Mermentau.

APPROPRIATION APPROVED BY SENATE IN 1943 BILL

This subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations and the Senate itself made an appropriation in a less sum than the sum authorized when it had under consideration the War Department civil functions appropriation bill last year. The appropriation, however, was lost in conference, solely because there was no Budget estimate. I do not think that I betray any confidences when I state that the House conferees considered the two projects meritorious and disagreed to the Senate amendment solely on the ground that there was no Budget estimate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I have spoken of an appropriation, it is my understanding that there are unobligated balances under "Flood control, general," in the sum of $36,000,000, approximately, and instead of making an appropriation of new money, this committee could adopt an amendment to the bill that would allocate unobligated balances of existing appropriations under "Flood control, general" in the sum of $2,360,000 to take care of the two projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 23, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$14,000,000", and at the end of line 24, after the word "vehicles", to insert a comma and "$14,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment is simply to correct a clerical error in the composition of the bill. The first item is to strike out "$14,000,000" in line 23 and then to put the same item of $14,000,000 at the end of line 24. There will be no difference in meaning, but the amendment is simply to make the language clearer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 14, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works" and insert "Flood control, general."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment was recommended at the request of the War Department. The words stricken out are "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works." The Department recommended that those words be stricken, and that the words "Flood control, general," be inserted, for the reason that the words "Flood control, general" are a little broader than are the words "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works." The amendment is simply a means of giving the Department a little more leeway than it would have were the words proposed to be stricken to be kept in the bill. That is the purpose of the amendment, as we understood it in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2346 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment concerning the omission from the War Department civil functions bill, which has just passed the Senate, of provision for an appropriation for the project known as the Florida barge canal. The full committee, by a vote of 17 to 14, determined, notwithstanding the favorable report of the subcommittee, not to recommend the appropriation of that item at the present time.

I have conferred with some of the members of the committee who opposed the appropriation. I find that they were not divided from the proponents of the project on the issue of its merits, but only on the question of when it was desirable and proper in the national interest to begin the actual construction of the project. In fact, I have heard it said by members of the committee that at least two-thirds of the membership of the full committee expressed themselves as being in favor of the project. So far as I know, no question has been raised by members of the committee save as to the question whether or not, in view of the shortage of critical materials and manpower, the construction of the project, however useful, should be immediately begun.

I am sure that my friends on the committee will understand that I do not subscribe to the judgment which they entertain about this matter. However, I have the most profound respect for them, and I submit to their judgment in this matter. Therefore we who are the proponents of the amendment which would have authorized the appropriation which would have made possible the initiation of construction as soon as the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce might have approved the initiation of construction, have not offered the amendment. However, the proponents of the project are still of the opinion that the wiser course would have been to have made provision, by an appropriation, for the initiation of the project.

What I wanted to say, Mr. President, was that I think the action of the committee is based upon the impression given by the Office of Petroleum Administration for War that the facilities it has provided for furnishing petroleum products to the Atlantic seaboard are adequate, to use the language of Major Parten, representing the Petroleum Administration for War, "to meet all essential needs of that area." The committee had before it that statement of Major Parten. They were told that the Petroleum Administration for War has under construction two pipe lines to move petroleum products from the Gulf area to the Atlantic seaboard. One of those is a 24-inch pipe line, originating in the Texas oil fields, extending to Norris City, Ill., and thence

to the Atlantic seaboard. That pipe line at the present time has reached only Norris City, Ill. A second pipe line, 20 inches in diameter, is to be constructed by the Petroleum Administrator for War from the Texas oil fields by Seymour, Ind., to the Atlantic seaboard. Not a foot of that 20-inch pipe line has been laid in the ground.

It is estimated by the Petroleum Administration for War that the 20-inch pipe line will move 165,000 barrels of petroleum products a day by the first of December of this year, and that it will move 235,000 barrels of petroleum products a day by April 1944.

The Petroleum Administration for War advised the committee, in the hearings which are published, that when those two pipe lines were completed and when all the other overland facilities which they contemplated were in operation, the total quantity of petroleum products to be transported to the Atlantic seaboard would be 1,600,000 barrels a day.

Mr. President, I wonder how many Senators know; I wonder how many of the people of New England know, that that is only substantially what the peacetime petroleum supply of that area was. Therefore, we are told by the Petroleum Administration for War that they do not contemplate putting into that area a larger quantity of petroleum products than went there in peacetime. Of necessity, then, they expect the peacetime supply of petroleum products to the Atlantic seaboard to serve not only the peace needs of the civilian population, or the normal needs of the civilian population, or even the war needs of the civilian population, but in addition thereto, the Maritime Commission, which furnishes petroleum products to our Allied ships as well as our own, plying the high seas from the Atlantic seaboard; the Lend-Lease Administration, which supplies our allies; the Navy, and the Army, and in addition thereto, the war industries located in that area.

I do not quarrel with the decision of the able committee in relying upon the advice given it by the Petroleum Administration for War. Yet, Mr. President, I say on this floor this afternoon that such a supply of petroleum products will not be adequate to meet the war needs of this Nation and give anything to the civilian population. I wonder how many Senators from the Atlantic seaboard know that a part of the plan of the Petroleum Administration for War is to require that facilities using 100,000 barrels of petroleum products a day be converted during the coming season from the use of petroleum products to the use of coal. Last season facilities using 120,000 barrels of petroleum products a day were converted. This additional conversion is to be required of the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. President, we are supplying an army abroad of relatively small size compared to the forces we will have in the European theater of operations. Every Senator knows that we will double, treble, quadruple, and multiply by 10—yes, 20 times—the number of troops we now have in the European theater of military operations.

We know about the shortage of petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard during the past winter. As these military operations are stepped up, as a larger number of ships come into being which must be fueled from that area, as lend-lease requirements multiply, as the Navy has yet a greater demand, petroleum products for the civilian population of the Atlantic seaboard will be cut more and more. They will be required to convert more and more heating facilities in their industries and homes. They are already saying to some of us in the South, remote from the coal fields and proximate to the Gulf of Mexico, that we must convert our facilities from the consumption of gasoline and fuel oil to the consumption of coal. That means that coal cars must go to West Virginia and Pennsylvania to get coal and carry it back to Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, and other States in the southeastern portion of the country.

Mr. President, I acquiesced in that decision; yet from my own knowledge of the demands of the war effort in that area, and the quantity which it is contemplated to provide to that section, I am certain in my mind that it will not be 6 months before Secretary Harold Ickes will be before Congress or the War Production Board asking for authority to start a third pipe line.

Someone may ask, "Why not build more pipe lines?" I wonder if Senators know how much steel has been allocated to the two pipe lines already approved by the War Production Board? Six hundred and forty-eight thousand tons of new steel, Mr. President. It would take 28,000 tons of new steel to build the Florida Barge Canal. Someone may say, "Yes; but after all, look what a large quantity of petroleum products the pipe lines move." Mr. President, even the figure of 648,000 tons—and that is the figure of the War Production Board in the record—does not contemplate the feeder lines which must be built to get to the pipe lines, nor does it contemplate the distribution facilities from the termini of the pipe lines on the Atlantic seaboard to the area to the north and south of those termini.

Mr. President, figures have been submitted for the RECORD, which will bear scrutiny, and I think they can be confirmed by the figures of the Chief of Engineers. They comprise factual data to show that it is possible to move a given quantity of petroleum products from the oil area of Texas and the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard with greater economy by the use of steel in building the proposed barge canal, as well as the tugs and the barges to be operated thereon, than by building pipe lines to move the same quantity of petroleum products.

I wonder if Senators are aware of how serious the discrimination is today against the Atlantic seaboard in the use of petroleum products. An A card in the Atlantic seaboard area, district No. 1, is worth 1½ gallons of gasoline a week. West of district No. 1, outside the Atlantic seaboard area, it is worth a minimum of 4 gallons a week. I heard that the value of the A card on the Atlantic seaboard is about to be reduced to 1 gallon a week.

In today's newspapers the Office of Price Administration tells the people of the Atlantic seaboard of the serious shortage which prevails in that area with respect to petroleum products, and no encouragement is offered for the future.

Mr. President, I started to say that I wonder if Senators are aware how that situation would be improved if the proposed barge canal were in operation and we had the tugs and the barges in which to move the petroleum supplies over it. One tug pulling a tow of three barges, each carrying 10,000 barrels of petroleum products, would raise the value of an A card in the Atlantic seaboard area from 1½ gallons a week to what it is in every other part of the country outside the Atlantic seaboard area.

One tug moving 1 tow of 3 barges, carrying 10,000 barrels each, per day, moving through the canal from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard, would raise the value of an A card from 1½ gallons a week to what it is in other sections of the country.

Now, let me give one other figure, Mr. President. Four tugs, each towing a total of 3 barges, each barge carrying 10,000 barrels of petroleum products a day, moving through that canal to the Atlantic seaboard, would completely eliminate the undervalue of the A card for that area, and eliminate the necessity of any conversion or fuel-oil rationing in that area.

Four tugs, each pulling 3 barges a day, moving eastward and northward through the canal, would eliminate the lessened value of the A card in that area and remove the necessity for fuel-oil conversion or rationing to the people of that section.

Mr. President, if I may mention one other factor, let me say that 90,000,000 tons of freight were moved by water from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard before the war. The German submarine has substantially stopped that movement—indeed, practically entirely stopped it. Does the Senate realize what that means in additional burden to the railroads of the Nation? I will explain what it means. It means that moving the volume of traffic which has been diverted from the Gulf and Atlantic to the railroads because of the submarine menace will keep every railroad in America operating at maximum efficiency for 70 days out of the year. Do I make clear what I mean? I mean that the elimination of our Gulf-Atlantic commerce by the hazard of the submarine has thrown upon the railroads of the Nation a burden which takes every railroad in America 70 days to move, acting at maximum efficiency. If the Florida barge canal were functioning, it would, to a very large degree, restore that traffic to the water, and take it from the already overburdened railroads of the Nation.

What is one of the results, Mr. President, of the added burden which has

been placed upon the railroads? It is that while the traffic upon the railroads of the Nation has increased by more than 30 percent, the number of wrecks upon the Nation's railroads has increased by more than 90 percent. That means broken rails, broken cars, broken locomotives, and lost lives. It means the diversion of the railroad facilities from the movement of things essential to the war effort to more of the ordinary commerce passing between the Gulf and Atlantic coast areas.

Mr. President, one of the great men who sat in this body, who notably and nobly served the Nation, was our late lamented colleague, Senator William Gibbs McAdoo, of California. A motion picture was made a few years ago to indicate the attitude of certain Members of this body toward the construction of the Florida Ship Canal. Among the illustrious men of the Senate who appeared in that picture, which is still extant, was former Senator McAdoo, and in that picture Senator McAdoo said, in substance:

> Having been Director General of the Railroads of the United States during World War No. 1, I know that the railroads, without water transportation being available to assist them, cannot move the war commerce of America between the Gulf coast and the Atlantic seaboard.

How correct he was, Mr. President, has been borne out by the experience we have already had in this war.

I am not quarreling with any of my colleagues. I respect their judgment and opinion. Upon the advice which they had they might with difficulty have done other than what they did. But I am asking the Senate, Congress, and the country to keep a close eye on whether the facilities which are in contemplation by the Petroleum Administration for War will prove adequate to serve the needs of the Atlantic seaboard and the war needs which flow from that section. If it becomes apparent that the 1,600,000 barrels a day will not serve that area, that additional facilities must be provided, that the materials will be used either for the construction of pipe lines or the proposed canal together with the tugs and barges to be operated upon it, then I humbly ask the Senate, the Congress, and the country to maintain an open mind, to reconsider this project, to compare it with alternative methods of transportation, and to judge whether or not it is in the public interest that it be constructed.

Obviously pipe lines cannot carry sulfur, which moves in large volume from the Gulf coast to Baltimore and the Atlantic seaboard for war purposes. Obviously pipe lines cannot transport other dry cargo, but the canal could and would.

More and more it appears on the record today that a large amount of money, running to at least $25,000,000 a month, is being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make up the difference in the cost of moving petroleum products, and essential war materials, including sulfur, from the Gulf coast to the Atlantic seaboard by rail instead of by water, as those commodities previously moved.

While, therefore, the letters of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War which are in the record were written to the committee in respect to its inquiry as to their opinion upon this project, they have indicated by subsequent letters that they did not lay this proposed project alongside an additional pipe line and pass judgment upon a comparison between the two. They were taking the word of the Petroleum Administrator for War that he had already provided sufficient facilities to serve the needs of the Atlantic seaboard. But in supplementary letters to the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who now sits before me, and the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], Secretary KNOX, and Under Secretary Patterson both said that, assuming the same economy of the pipe line and barge canal, together with the tugs and the barges to be operated on it, in the use of critical materials, they would prefer the canal to the pipe line.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In reference to the letters which the Senator said were subsequently written, it was in no way the desire of the authors of the bill providing for the canal to interfere with any strategic materials which are necessary insofar as the war is concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. In the Senate Committee on Appropriations there was inserted an amendment offered by the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the subcommittee, acquiesced in by the proponents of this project, to provide that no construction should be begun upon this project, even if the appropriation were made, unless such construction were approved by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. It was not the intention of anyone to interfere with more essential projects or programs of the armed services.

Mr. MAYBANK. Simultaneous with the statement of the Petroleum Administrator for War, the substance of which the Senator has stated, that the needs of the Southeast had been cared for, as the able Senator has said, the O. P. A. Administrator made the statement that we were to be even further reduced in the use of gasoline. I might add for the RECORD that the condition is still the same as it was last June, when we first passed the legislation; the pipe lines running through Georgia and the Carolinas are still being used to remove gas from the rationed States and to ship it into the unrationed States, where the coupons are worth much more in the quantity of gasoline. So far as I can find, the people cannot understand how it is that there is still being taken from the pipe lines running through the Southeast, not gasoline for the Army or the Navy, because they could have it all, so far as we are concerned, but gasoline is being taken from us and given to others, and more is being given to others than we receive.

I may say, Mr. President, that I am informed—and it appears in the press every day—that the automobile dealers and the various motor clubs cannot ascertain, they cannot get an answer, why something should be taken from us and given to someone else—and with the distinct understanding that it is not for the Army or the Navy or the war effort, for they could have it all—but why our individual citizens should be denied gasoline when individual citizens who are our neighbors are able to get it, and why, with such a condition existing, we are again told and notified through the press that the people of that section are to be further penalized, allowed less and less gasoline, and I might say even less kerosene oil.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida there be printed the letters of the War and Navy Departments to which he has referred.

Mr. PEPPER. The principal letters and the supplementary letters?

Mr. MALONEY. The latest letters, which are a part of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly have no objection, but I ask that the letters to the Secretaries be printed with the replies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from South Carolina for what he has said.

In my State the people who wish to hunt in their own woods and fish in their own streams have been forbidden to do so if they are to be transported to the places of hunting and fishing by automobiles, yet they see the citizens of an adjoining State come to fish and to hunt with impunity, before their very eyes, by using some of the gasoline which passed through the State of Florida.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only that, but the drug salesmen of our State cannot obtain gasoline to take them into the rural districts of the State, while the salesmen from other States nearby can get the gasoline with which to take them into the rural areas to take care of the needs and the health and the welfare of the people.

Mr. PEPPER. If the agencies of the Government responsible for the movement of petroleum supplies had been on the alert, if they had been competent, if they had had some imagination, a great deal of the suffering and the shortage on the Atlantic seaboard during the past winter would not have occurred. Month after month some of us from that area begged and pleaded with the Petroleum Administration for War and other agencies of the Government to build barges to be used upon the waterways we already had, and only 6 or 8 months after they should have been completed were we ever able to initiate even a modest program.

Mr. President, the people have reason to be indignant because of the incompetence exhibited in the effort to supply the petroleum needs of the Atlantic seaboard. I repeat, there is a canal a minimum of 9 feet deep, now being made 12 feet deep, from Corpus Christi, Tex., to the west coast of Florida. There is a canal over 900 miles long, with a minimum depth of 12 feet, from the east coast of Florida to Trenton, N. J., and from Norfolk, Va., to Trenton it has a minimum depth of 27 feet. If the 92-mile connecting link, costing no more, at the outside, than fifty or sixty million dollars, along the route approved and surveyed by the Engineer Corps, were constructed it would put together the Gulf coast intercostal waterway and the Atlantic intercoastal waterway, and make a continuous inland protected waterway some 2,000 miles in length from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J.

Mr. President, would that be to the national interest? The Russians are building canals in the midst of war, the Germans are building canals in the midst of war. I am told that one of the first things the Nazis did when they came into the occupied countries of Europe was to connect up a system of canals and waterways and make them bear the commerce they wanted to carry.

I wish that in some way those of us who have fought through thick and thin for this project, in my own case for 6½ years since I have been in the Senate, and my predecessor ahead of me, one of the grandest men who ever honored this body, revered by men on both sides of the aisle, Senator Duncan U. Fletcher. I wish that we could get this project in the realm of merit, and keep it from being, as it has been so much in the past, a political football.

The project does not mean any more to Florida than it means to the other States along the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard. I have taken a great deal of punishment politically, I suppose I shall take much more, because I believe this is a worthy project in the national interest. Therefore I have fought for it, and I shall continue to fight for it. But when President Roosevelt, with the able Senator from Arkansas, the great Joseph T. Robinson, the leader in the Senate, carrying the banner of this project—it was then a sea-level canal—proposed and initiated the construction of it in 1935, and spent some $6,000,000 upon it, he was stopped. Why? Because it lacks merit? No; because the political opposition was strong enough to stop it.

Mr. President, the Army and the Navy now say they wish they had the canal. They now say it cannot be built before the war will be over. If the President had been allowed to continue his work in 1935 the canal would have been ready by 1940 or 1941 or 1942 at the outside. Think of the lives, think of the ships, think of the cargoes which would have been saved if the peninsula of the State of Florida had been bisected by this waterway and the convoys around it made unnecessary.

But, Mr. President, it was said then that the canal could not be constructed in time. First, it was said we were not going to have a war at all; that we would not need the canal, and that no one would use it. Has that reason for opposition been confirmed by experience? It is said now that if the canal can be built before the war is over those who have opposed it would favor it. Who dares to say, Mr. President, when the war is going to be over? Who dares to say with certainty in his heart, that this holocaust will have ended by the time General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, says the canal can be constructed—at the outside, 2 years? Indeed, when questioned by Senate committee members, General Reybold said it was reasonable to assume that the canal could be built by the winter of 1944–45. So this project was not offered to meet the demands of the winter of 1943–44.

Mr. President, I ask the Congress what provision is being made, what has been made, what is to be made for the needs of the Atlantic seaboard for the winter of 1944–45? When the critical materials situation eases a bit, when the manpower demand becomes less severe, when more drag lines become available by reason of the cessation of other Government work which is in progress, I believe, in fact I know, from having talked to members of the committee who thought this project should be temporarily deferred, that it will receive a cordial and a hospitable reception in the distinguished Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I hope that representatives of the Petroleum Administration for War will be candid enough to come back and tell the Congress, "We have erred in our estimate that the facilities we were providing would be adequate to meet the especial needs of the Atlantic seaboard. We find we are in error. You shall have to make it possible for us to have an additional pipe line." Then, Mr. President, Congress can pass upon the relative merits of the two projects. They know that the canal can be built and tugs and barges be in operation by the time a third pipe line can be provided.

Senators know that this project has merits or it would not have received a favorable report from the distinguished subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, led by the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. A good record is here now, Mr. President, ready to be inspected by all upon its merits.

I wanted to rise principally, therefore, to call the attention of the Senate to the record which has been made, to invite consideration of it by the Senators interested in the petroleum supplies of the Atlantic seaboard, so they may make their own inquiries with respect to this question. Has Secretary Ickes' Petroleum Administration for War assured those Senators that they will receive an adequate quantity of petroleum products in the winter of 1944–45? If they are not confident that he has, then, Mr. President, let them make a comparison between the canal and a third pipe line. Let them determine which will require more critical materials, more manpower, or take longer to build, and which will do more good to the Nation and best serve the war effort.

Upon that basis, Mr. President, we leave the matter, with complete satisfaction and confidence in the Members of the Senate and of the House.

EXHIBIT 1

APRIL 26, 1943.

HON. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have seen the Navy Department's letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in respect to the amendment pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee proposing an appropriation for the unfinished link in the Atlantic-Gulf Intracoastal Waterway across Florida.

You advise that the canal, if completed, would have certain naval advantages for small craft, and that if "large numbers of tugs and barges were available such that critical war materials, oil, and produce could be transported without the use of sea-borne shipping the situation would be desirable in connection with the present war effort."

You state further, however, that "should any considerable amount of critical materials be required in the construction of the canal or any considerable construction of floating equipment, tugs, and barges be required such that any diversion of strategic and critical materials from the present shipbuilding program would result, the Navy Department would consider the project as undesirable for completion at this time."

You, therefore, express the opinion this project should be held in abeyance.

It is apparent that you have based your opinion upon the naval value of this project. We who live on the Atlantic seaboard and who have already experienced the privations and hardships which come from a petroleum shortage in that area due to lack of adequate transportation facilities, are concerned not only about the naval value of this project, but about what it would mean to the civilian economy as well as to meeting needs of our armed forces in the United States engaged in training, of war industries located in that area, lend-lease shipments, of the ships operating under the War Shipping Administration which are fueled from that area, and the petroleum needs of our armed forces across the Atlantic.

The War Production Board advises that they have already allocated 648,000 tons of steel for the construction of the two pipe lines, either in course of construction or proposed by the Petroleum Administration for War.

This does not include steel used in the feeder lines to these pipe lines, nor the steel going into some 15 80,000-barrel storage tanks which must be constructed in connection with such pipe lines. Neither does this figure include the critical materials used in the conversion from oil to coal in district No. 1 of facilities normally consuming around 100,000 barrels of fuel oil per day, and a similar amount of conversion which is going to be required under the present program of the Petroleum Administration for War in district No. 1 this year.

You have apparently assumed that if this link in the Intracoastal Waterway system were not constructed that the Nation would save the critical materials such construction would require. It is the opinion of many of us, however, who know how seriously the economy of the Atlantic seaboard is affected and will be affected by a petroleum shortage and a further conversion program, and it has been made clear by the Petroleum Administration for War itself, that there will have to be constructed additional pipe lines to supply district No. 1—the east coast of the United

States—with a minimum quantity of petroleum products for the civilian population and the civilian economy in view of the constantly increasing demands for petroleum products from that area for offshore war purposes.

General Reybold has testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that he knew he could construct this canal across Florida to connect up the Gulf and Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway system within 2 years, and that it was reasonable to expect that he could have it in operation by the winter of 1944–45.

The figures of the Chief of Engineers also disclose that there is a greater economy in constructing this barge canal and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon, even if such barges are all steel (and the Engineers have already built an experimental concrete barge which shows much promise and admittedly wooden barges are completely satisfactory for moving residual fuel oil), than in constructing pipe lines from the Texas oil fields to the Atlantic seaboard for the movement of a given quantity of petroleum products.

General Reybold further testified that the canal would move dry cargo, including essential war materials which, of course, could not be moved through pipe lines. It is apparent that this Intracoastal Canal, if completely in operation, would greatly relieve the already overburdened railroads and allow their facilities to be employed more completely in essential war transportation.

We would, therefore, like to have your opinion on the following question:

If the Congress should decide to provide additional transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, including the presently approved pipe lines, and if it is true that there is a greater economy in the use of critical materials in the construction of this waterway and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon then in the construction of additional pipe lines, or the provision of other facilities for the movement of such additional supplies of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, then in view of the naval value this waterway would have over and above the naval value of such other methods of transportation in the movement of petroleum products and dry cargo, and in view of the permanent aid to the commerce of the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard area from the existence of an Intracoastal Canal 12 feet deep from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., would you still say that you do not favor the amendment proposing this appropriation for this waterway?

Very sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.
BURNET R. MAYBANK.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 27, 1943.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATORS: In your letter of April 26, 1943, concerning the Florida barge canal you have given certain information in connection with the relative advantages of pipe lines and the canal for the purpose of handling oil. Certain long-range advantages are expected to be obtained from the canal.

In a previous letter of April 19, 1943, the Navy Department expressed the opinion that the Florida barge canal should be held in abeyance as a matter of conservation of critical materials, particularly critical material in connection with the current naval shipbuilding program.

In your letter you suggest that the Congress may find it necessary to provide additional transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard in addition to the two large presently approved pipe lines for which it is understood 648,000 tons of steel have been allocated.

You ask, if on the assumption that additional transportation facilities are decided upon by the Congress as being necessary during the present emergency, and if there is greater economy in the use of critical materials for the construction of the waterway, and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon, as compared to any additional proposed pipe lines or other facilities that may be proposed, would the Navy still say that they did not favor the amendment proposing the appropriation for this waterway?

Under the conditions you have outlined, and also providing that such allotment of critical materials as is necessary for this project is not made from critical material required for the naval shipbuilding program, the Navy Department withdraws the opinion previously expressed that the project should be held in abeyance.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

EXHIBIT 2

APRIL 26, 1943.

Judge ROBERT PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY PATTERSON: We have seen your letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee respecting the proposed appropriation for the construction of the uncompleted link in the Gulf-Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway system across the peninsula of Florida in which you advise that the War Department does not favor the enactment of the amendment proposing such appropriation, notwithstanding the military value which such project would have if now in existence.

You base your opinion upon the hypothesis that the canal could not be put into operation for a considerable period and the military value which the project would have when completed would not equal the cost of its present construction in terms of critical materials, manpower, and equipment.

It is apparent that you have based your opinion upon the military value of this project. We who live on the Atlantic seaboard and who have already experienced the privations and hardships which come from a petroleum shortage in that area due to lack of adequate transportation facilities, are concerned not only about the military value of this project, but about what it would mean to the civilian economy as well as to meeting needs of our armed forces in the United States engaged in training, of war industries located in that area, lend-lease shipments, of the ships operating under the War Shipping Administration which are fueled from that area, and the petroleum needs of our armed forces across the Atlantic.

The War Production Board advises that they have already allocated 648,000 tons of steel for the construction of the two pipe lines, either in course of construction, or proposed by the Petroleum Administration for War.

This does not include steel used in the feeder lines to these pipe lines, nor the steel going into some fifteen 80,000-barrel storage tanks which must be constructed in connection with such pipe lines. Neither does this figure include the critical materials used in the conversion from oil to coal in District No. 1 of facilities normally consuming around 100,000 barrels of fuel oil per day, and a similar amount of conversion which is going to be required under the present program of the Petroleum Administration for War in District No. 1 this year.

You have apparently assumed that if this link in the Intracoastal Waterway System were not constructed that the Nation would save the critical materials, equipment, and manpower such construction would require. It is the opinion of many of us, however, who know how seriously the economy of the Atlantic seaboard is affected and will be affected by a petroleum shortage and a further conversion program, and it has been made clear by the Petroleum Administration for War itself, that there will have to be constructed additional pipe lines to supply District No. 1—the east coast of the United States—with a minimum quantity of petroleum products for the civilian population and the civilian economy in view of the constantly increasing demands for petroleum products from that area for offshore war purposes.

General Reybold has testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that he knew he could construct this canal across Florida to connect up the Gulf and Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway system within 2 years, and that it was reasonable to expect that he could have it in operation by the winter of 1944–45.

The figures of the Chief of Engineers also disclose that there is a greater economy in constructing this barge canal and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon, even if such barges are all steel (and the engineers have already built an experimental concrete barge which shows much promise and admittedly wooden barges are completely satisfactory for moving residual fuel oil), than in constructing pipe lines from the Texas oil fields to the Atlantic seaboard for the movement of a given quantity of petroleum products.

General Reybold further testified that the canal would move dry cargo, including essential war materials, which, of course, could not be moved through pipe lines. It is apparent that this intracoastal canal, if completely in operation, would greatly relieve the already overburdened railroads and allow their facilities to be employed more completely in essential war transportation.

We would, therefore, like to have your opinion on the following question:

If the Congress should decide to provide additional transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, including the presently approved pipe lines, and if it is true that there is a greater economy in the use of critical materials in the construction of this waterway and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon than in the construction of additional pipe lines, or the provision of other facilities for the movement of such additional supplies of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, then, in view of the military value this waterway would have over and above the military value of such other methods of transportation in the movement of petroleum products and dry cargo, and in view of the permanent aid to the commerce of the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard area from the existence of an intracoastal canal 12 feet deep from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., would you still say that you do not favor the amendment proposing this appropriation for this waterway?

Very sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES.
BURNET R. MAYBANK.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1943.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In your joint letter to me of April 26 you ask:

"If the Congress should decide to provide additional transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, including the presently approved pipe lines,

and if it is true that there is a greater economy in the use of critical materials in the construction of this waterway and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon than in the construction of additional pipe lines, or the provision of other facilities for the movement of such additional supplies of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard, then in view of the military value this waterway would have over and above the military value of such other methods of transportation in the movement of petroleum products and dry cargo, and in view of the permanent aid to the commerce of the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard area from the existence of an intracoastal canal 12 feet deep from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., would you still say that you do not favor the amendment proposing this appropriation for this waterway?"

The answer to the hypothetical question which you propound is obvious. Under the assumptions and conditions outlined in the above question, and further assuming that the waterway will have equal or greater capacity to other means of transportation, I should naturally favor the amendment proposing this appropriation, as opposed to a similar amendment for other means of transportation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, it so happens that I live in New England, the most seriously distressed section of the country insofar as an oil shortage is concerned. It so happens that I am chairman of the Oil Shortage Committee of the Senate. I had not intended, after having taken so much of the Senate's time today, to discuss the matter, but the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] seemed to make the prediction that there will be a continuing oil shortage in New England next winter. I think he may be correct. I think it likely that there will be a continuing oil shortage in New England next winter. I am hopeful there will not be suffering. I am hopeful there will not be much distress. As of this moment, however, the situation does not appear to be too dark. We will be bringing into New England next winter, as I see the picture now, something in excess of 1,600,000 barrels of oil a day, which is in excess of any amount heretofore carried. There have been many conversions from oil to coal, which should bring some relief to the situation.

None of us can foresee the future, at least very far, but if our success in north Africa, and what follows north Africa, continues, there is a possibility or likelihood of greater relief from the standpoint of oil in that area, although the demand and the requirements of the Army and Navy, as has been pointed out, are extremely heavy. We cannot now foresee what the needs might be. They will probably be increased.

I am speaking now primarily because a great many persons in New England have been very much concerned about the Florida barge canal proposal. There has been an extensive advertising campaign which started in Florida and has been carried on in New England.

One of the able Senators from New England, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has been a recent advocate of the barge canal, and his opinions on the subject have been quite widely discussed in New England, and there has been, on the part of a portion of our population, a strong demand that New England Senators support the long-time effort being made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and others to build the Florida barge canal.

It seems to me singular, Mr. President, that all save one of the New England Senators on the Committee on Appropriations voted against the construction of this canal. So far as the committee is concerned, only one Senator from New England supported this proposal. All the others, among them myself, opposed it.

Probably the Florida ship canal or barge canal should have been built some time ago. That is a question. Probably the Florida barge canal or ship canal should be built some time in the future. That is a question. But the committee, after long and careful study, after having the benefit of all the views, persuasive as they are, of the able Senator from Florida, decided not to vote the money to build a canal at this particular time.

Because I live in New England, and because I happen to be chairman of the Oil Shortage Committee of the Senate, I am greatly concerned, and I asked members of the staff of the Oil Shortage Committee and members of the staff of the Truman committee loaned to us if they would endeavor to obtain the current facts insofar as the Florida canal is concerned. Late as it is, I feel that under the circumstances, Mr. President, I should submit these facts prepared for and presented to me by the persons to whom I have just referred.

The current barge canal proposal should be distinguished from the earlier proposed Florida ship canal project. The ship canal was envisaged as a sea-level canal deep enough for ocean freighters.

The canal which at present is urged by the Florida Canal Authority is a high-level barge canal having five locks. This canal would have a 12-foot depth—insufficient for oceangoing vessels. The highest point above sea level would fluctuate between 42 and 55 feet. This summit level of the canal would be 30 miles long. It would involve the excavation of about 81,000,000 yards, of which 17,000,000 or 18,000,000 yards are rock. Two locks would be on the Gulf side and three on the Atlantic side. Its controlling width would be 125 feet.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I do not wish to enter a controversy, but merely to discuss the facts.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the able Senator from Connecticut say that 18,000,000 yards are rock?

Mr. MALONEY. I said seventeen or eighteen million yards are rock—r-o-c-k.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason why I rose and asked if the Senator would yield was to make the observation that the rock is not rock in the sense in which that word is generally used, but is Ocala limestone. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator would not want to——

Mr. MALONEY. I have no disposition to dispute that observation.

Mr. PEPPER. General Markham, Chief of Army Engineers, has visited that area and has carefully examined the nature of the so-called rock, or Ocala limestone, even going to the extent of breaking it up in his hand with a hammer, in order to determine its hardness. I should like to make that statement at this time.

Mr. MALONEY. I have no disposition to dispute that statement; but I should like to say that although the Senator from Florida has so pointedly made reference to the situation which will exist in New England next winter, the hearings on the bill completely dissipate the suggestion that if the Florida Canal were built now it would afford any relief to the needs of New England next winter.

Insofar as the needs of New England are concerned, the Florida canal, if authorized under the bill, would have no effect whatsoever. In my opinion, Mr. President, based upon the statements of representatives of the Army, and other persons concerned, construction of the Florida canal under an authorization this year would not have any influence on the situation in New England during the winter of 1944–45.

Contention was earlier made that the canal could be constructed in a period of 10 months. The accuracy of that statement was rather completely dissipated during the hearings on the bill. The Army engineers say that under certain circumstances—circumstances generous to the proposal—the project might be completed within a period of 2 years. That would not even help those of us in New England the winter after next, Mr. President, and I should like to lay emphasis upon that point at this time.

When I was interrupted by the Senator from Florida I had referred to the question of rock excavation and after that I had said that two of the locks of the canal would be on the Gulf side, and three would be on the Atlantic side. The controlling width of the canal would be 125 feet.

Mr. President, serious conflict exists concerning the cost of the canal in dollars, in critical materials, and in labor. It should be borne in mind that the cost of the canal itself is minor in all those respects, as compared to the cost of the barges and tugs required to haul a significant amount of oil over the enormous distance involved. Advocates of the canal claim that the one-way haul will be 2,010 miles. The Petroleum Administrator for War states that the shortest safe route will be upward of 2,156 miles.

The cost of the canal is estimated by its advocates at $44,000,000. General Reybold, Chief of the Army Engineers, recently estimated that if done under rush wartime conditions it would cost in the neighborhood of $60,000,000.

Perhaps the most serious of the controversies hinges on the time required

for completion. General Reybold estimated last summer, in testifying before the Commerce Committee, that it would consume approximately 3 years. In recent testimony before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, General Reybold testified that he had had the project reviewed by a board of prominent engineers. They had determined that 2 years was the lowest practical estimate.

I should like to say here, Mr. President, that that would take us beyond the winter of 1944–45.

Arthur A. Johnson, a fairly prominent private contractor, testifying on behalf of the canal, stated that he would be willing to accept a penalty contract for the completion of the canal in 10 months. Mr. Johnson, however, qualified this statement with three very serious provisos: "Providing that we have no delay in the procurement of necessary materials; in other words, that the materials required for this operation be given suitable priority; providing we are not interfered with in procuring the necessary manpower; providing we have suitable priority in the initial transportation of the large volume of construction equipment required for the completion of the work." In my opinion, those conditions cannot reasonably be expected to exist. We are fighting a war. We have a severe shortage of manpower, a shortage of steel and a shortage of construction equipment. While the shortage of construction equipment may be easing somewhat, the others are growing more acute at this moment.

Mr. Johnson's suggestion that he would require a priority on transportation makes his proposal even less realistic. Priorities on freight transportation, except for direct military use of facilities, have not yet been instituted and, in my opinion, should not be instituted on account of the inevitable confusion incident to rationing. The railroads are doing an excellent job without it.

Mr. Johnson testifies in effect that he could construct the canal in 10 months under peacetime conditions. Even the highest priority programs are at present encountering delays in the procuring of necessary materials and manpower, and the highest priority programs are each of them very much more important than is this canal. It will suffice to name the programs now under directive: They are rubber, 100-octane gasoline, and antisubmarine vessels.

A most serious question is the usefulness of the canal even if it existed at the present moment. The canal will haul no oil by itself. Oil can be hauled through it only by barges, tugs, and men. The cost of the long barge haul in critical materials, manpower, steel, and other war essentials is such that it is wiser to build additional large pipe lines than to build barges and tugs for operation over this lengthy route even if the canal is assumed to exist.

Pre-war dollar cost reflects the normal economic situation. It also reflects to no inconsiderable degree the original investment in steel, horsepower, and construction cost, and the operating cost in manpower, of any method of moving oil. Tank ship movement from Texas to New York was available just before the war at a price of 21 to 24 cents a barrel, which gave a profit to the tanker operator, exclusive of overhead, of somewhere in the neighborhood of 8 cents a barrel. The bare cost of moving oil over that route by tanker was in the neighborhood of from 15 to 25 cents a barrel, depending on its size and speed and depreciation of the tanker, and all out-of-pocket cost and overhead, but not including any return on investment. Rates, due to the law of supply and demand, have at times been much higher—even 60 cents.

The price of moving oil by pipe line from Texas to the eastern seaboard is, of course, not available. No such pipe lines existed before the war. However, the Government will make a sizeable profit on carrying oil in the Big Inch pipe line at the expected charge of 40 cents a barrel, the same as the wartime tanker rate. The tanker rate is higher now than in peacetime, due to sinkings. The cost of moving oil by barge through the proposed Intracoastal Waterway from the Houston-Port Arthur area to Trenton, N. J., would probably be between 75 cents and $1 a barrel. The proposed O. P. A. ceiling rate, after conference with practical barge operators, is $1.20 per barrel. The underlying reasons for those cost figures are inescapable A Maritime Commission tanker will carry 130,000 barrels of oil at a speed in the neighborhood of 15 knots. A barge tow in the Gulf area will move 30,000 barrels, and in the Atlantic area, 20,000 barrels, at a speed of 4 knots. There are men on those vessels, and they have to be paid. The great number of man-hours required to move oil by barge should be apparent. Another significant cost factor operating against the barge as a peacetime venture for other than short hauls is the constant heavy expense of maintaining a channel by dredging. The ocean is free.

I stated a moment ago that the Government would make money on the movement of oil through the Big Inch at 40 cents a barrel. Movement of 300,000 barrels per day will provide a gross revenue of $120,000 a day. Estimated out-of-pocket cost for operating the Big Inch would be in the neighborhood of $40,000 a day, made up of salaries, maintenance cost, and power cost. At that rate the Government would recover its estimated investment of $95,000,000 in 3 years, or, to look at it another way, would have an operating cost of about 13½ cents a barrel, and everything above that would be return of investment.

Amortizing the Government's investment may be treated in two ways: You may regard the pipe line as being purely a war facility and amortize it over the duration, in which event the Government would have no book investment in it at the end of the war. Or you may amortize it at the Interstate Commerce Commission rate for pipe lines, which envisages a life of 20 years. At the wartime 5-year amortization rate, the Government would have a depreciation cost of about 19 cents a barrel, thus bringing the total operating cost and depreciation to 32 cents a barrel. In this event, however, at the end of the war the Government will have a very valuable asset in which it has no book investment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the able Senator make the statement that the construction of this canal could not possibly do any good for New England for the winter of 1944–45?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator does not think he said that; but it is the Senator's opinion, based upon the expert advice of our engineers and Government experts, that the canal could not be completed under the present circumstances before or during the winter of 1944–45.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention first to the following testimony appearing on page 76 of the record of the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee?

Senator BRIDGES. General Reybold, one other question: In consideration of your knowledge of Mr. Johnson's background and his past performances, and in view of the surveys you have made which show that this canal might be completed in as short a period as 18 months, would it be reasonable to expect that if things proceeded without too many obstacles it might be completed somewhere between the Johnson estimate and your estimate of 2 years?

General REYBOLD. That it might be completed?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes.

General REYBOLD. That is a possibility.

Senator BRIDGES. Is it a reasonable possibility?

General REYBOLD. That is a reasonable possibility. I can say this, that the Corps of Engineers, if given this job to do, will give it the works. There need be no fear about that.

The following statement is on page 82——

Mr. MALONEY. Before the Senator gets to page 82 let me point out that in making the inquiry the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said to General Reybold:

if things proceeded without too many obstacles.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. I read from page 82 a further exchange of questions and answers between the Senator from New Hampshire and General Reybold. The Senator from New Hampshire is speaking:

We will admit that this coming winter we cannot get relief. As a result of the barge canal, I should think, judging from your own testimony here, however, that it might be entirely possible that the barge canal could be in operation to afford relief before the next winter.

Senator LODGE. 1945?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes; the winter of 1944–45.

General REYBOLD. That would be a very reasonable objective for us to drive at, Senator.

Mr. MALONEY. I call the Senator's attention to the words "drive at."

Mr. President, when properly interrupted I was discussing the cost to the Government. I continue along that line.

Amortizing the Government's investment over the 20-year period, the depreciation cost would be about 5 cents a barrel and the over-all cost of operating the pipe line would be about 18 cents a barrel. The pipe line should be a sound investment for the people of the United States in peace as well as in war.

Indeed, reliable information in my hands indicates that the actual cost of constructing the Big Inch will be substantially under the $95,000,000 estimate.

Solely from a standpoint of wartime economics, the canal is equally uninviting. To move a barrel of oil from Texas to the eastern seaboard we must invest steel, manpower, and horsepower. If we invest in barges, the steel comparison with pipe lines will not be too unfavorable, although it will be unfavorable. For each ton of steel invested in barges, we will get .46 of a barrel of oil per day. If we invest in a pipe line, we will get about .84 of a barrel of oil per day. But it is in investing horsepower and manpower that the barge shows up as an incredibly inefficient long-haul vehicle.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the able Senator examined the bases upon which those comparisons of economy in the use of critical materials were made? For example, is the Senator able to state whether the figures he is now giving us, and which were given to the Senate Appropriations Committee by Major Parten, contemplated the use of an 8,000-barrel barge instead of a 10,000-barrel barge?

Mr. MALONEY. Frankly, I do not know on which figure these comparisons are based.

Mr. PEPPER. It is obvious that if we contemplate using a barge which would move only 8,000 barrels of petroleum, we will have a greater use of steel than if we contemplate a barge moving 10,000 barrels. I think the able Senator will find that it is that kind of thing which represents the difference between the basis of our engineer's calculation that there would be greater economy in the use of the canal and the tugs and barges to be operated thereon in moving a given quantity of petroleum thereon, as compared with the use of a pipe line.

Mr. MALONEY. That is quite understandable. I am not disposed to contradict or quarrel with the Senator on that point. I asked for the best opinion that was available, and I feel in duty bound to submit the information of those who will examine the record, because I opposed the construction of the canal at this time and because some New England people have been led to believe that if we had voted for this appropriation oil would flow freely into New England during the coming winter, which the Senator himself knows is an impossibility so far as the canal is concerned.

I was speaking about the investment in the pipe line and the cost per barrel of oil per day, compared with the cost of the canal.

For each horsepower invested, we will get 0.67 of a barrel of oil from a barge tow as contrasted with between 2.2 and 3.1 barrels from a big pipe line. Manpower at the moment is the most critical shortage of all. Long-haul barge transportation shows up worst of all in manpower. For each man-day invested in the operation of the pipe line, we will get about 350 barrels of oil—800 men yielding 300,000 barrels per day. For each man-day invested in the operation of barge tows, we will get 50 barrels of oil or less. A 50-day turn-around between Trenton and Texas is about right. The crew of a tow is between 10 and 14 men. A tow can handle 20,000 barrels on the Atlantic side and 30,000 barrels on the Gulf side, or an average of 25,000 barrels. Fifty days multiplied by 10 or 14 men gives 500 or 700 man-days.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator know whether the estimate of 50 days for turn-around time for barge movement for the round trip in 10 days in excess of the Chief of Engineers' estimate of 40 days?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not remember what the Chief of Engineers' estimate was, but the Army engineers have been asked to verify these figures, and I find no instance of a contradiction. I cannot further substantiate the figures than that, as I have previously explained.

Getting back to the question of manpower, this leaves out of account the time of lock tenders and office help involved in the operation of the barge canal and barge tow system.

In justice to the people of the Atlantic seaboard, the most efficient method of employing steel, manpower, and horsepower to transport the oil they need should be adopted. The big pipe lines are far and away the most efficient war-time method. Long-haul barge transportation is incredibly inefficient. Therefore, I must strongly urge, in the interests of warm homes next winter in Connecticut and New England, that this wasteful project be prevented, at least at this time.

The foregoing appraisal has assumed that the canal itself was in existence and that it was only necessary to build barges and tugs to operate through it. The facts, of course, are otherwise. Analyzing the canal on the basis of General Reybold's 2-year estimate, the canal has little or no value from the standpoint of the east coast oil shortage. Two years from now, May 1945, its completion could be expected and the canal will, therefore, be of no importance until the third winter (1945–46). By that time it is not unlikely that the war in the Mediterranean will be concluded and that this artery will be open to the commerce of the United Nations. When we control the Mediterranean, the offshore demand of the Army and Navy from the eastern seaboard area should in some measure decline. They can obtain some oil from sources in Iran and Iraq. By 3 years from now the Navy will probably have reduced the submarine menace to a degree that it will again be possible to operate tankers along the Atlantic seaboard. If the canal project offers no relief until the winter of 1945–46 it should be dropped from consideration. A large diameter pipe line can be constructed in about 6 to 8 months.

Assuming, however, that the claims of the promoters of the canal are true and that the canal under existing wartime conditions can be completed in 10 months—and I do not believe it can be done without serious interference with more important war programs—it would still afford no relief until the winter of 1944–45. If started June 1 of this year, it would not be completed on the 10-month estimate, until April 1 of next year, when the heating-oil problem for next winter would be nearly over.

By the admission of the canal's supporters, it will consume about 15,000 tons of critical materials, and this provides nothing for barges. This is insignificant as compared to the steel requirements of a pipe line, but it should be realized that a pipe line is a combined railroad track and tank car and locomotive, while a canal, to continue the metaphor, is only a small segment of a railroad track. The cars of the canal, namely, the barges, would consume a prodigious amount of steel and the locomotives—tugs—a prodigious amount of Diesel horsepower.

The Petroleum Administration for War stated that to move 125,000 barrels per day of residual fuel oil from Texas to Trenton would require 125,000 tons of steel, 312,000 horsepower, 520 power units, the whole at a cost of $186,000,000, exclusive of the cost of the canal, and an operating personnel of 5,200 would be required.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator from Connecticut recall the testimony of General Reybold before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the engineers had constructed a concrete barge which was already on an experimental run, and that while it had not yet been completely proved, the engineers were encouraged as to its probable success?

Mr. MALONEY. I was not present when that testimony was submitted. I will say, by way of protecting myself, that I was presiding over a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, that would not change my opinion, because I seem to recall that people have been experimenting with concrete barges almost since I was a little boy, and they have not up to now been proving very successful.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Florida will agree that the record shows that the concrete barge to which he has referred was entirely in the experimental stage and that there was nothing about it on which any solid or far-reaching plans could be based.

Mr. PEPPER. So that if a concrete barge were to prove satisfactory, then, of course, the quantity of steel required in the construction of barges would be enormously reduced.

Mr. MALONEY. The quantity required would be considerably less, to say the least.

Supporters of the canal have challenged these cost figures by asserting, for example, that 600-horsepower Diesel tugs could be constructed for as little as $90,000. The credibility of the canal supporters may be realized from the fact that the lowest bid received by the Office of Defense Transportation for the construction of such a tug was substantially in excess of $200,000. Adding the cost of the canal to these figures would bring the investment to $5 per annual barrel, as against approximately $1 per annual barrel by the pipe line.

Much has been made by canal advocates of the fact that railroads are now receiving approximately $250,000,000 per year for moving about 800,000 barrels of oil per day. This cost is compared unfavorably with the cost of the canal. Tables have been placed in the record indicating the comparative cost of the canal and the railroad subsidy to each State. Three facts should be noted in connection with this comparison: (1) Most railroads are now in the excess-profits category and hence are returning a large percentage of this money to the Government in the form of taxes. (2) The railroads exist and require little new critical material. (3) The cost comparison projected by the advocates of the canal leaves out of account everything but the cost of the canal. They argue that since the remainder of the costs would be financed privately that this omission is sound. This is entirely misleading. The cost of moving oil through the canal, that is, the cost of the barge movement, both capital investment and operating cost, would ultimately be borne under this private financing plan by the eastern consumer.

The President has felt, and I think correctly, that since the added transportation cost of oil for eastern consumers was due to the war, part of the cost should be borne by the Federal Government and hence the people of the whole country. The tankers constructed by the oil companies with the dollars of eastern consumers have been taken for more important war work. In simple justice it is bad enough that the eastern consumer be colder without at the same time being poorer.

If, however, Congress desires the eastern seaboard to absorb the added transportation cost due to the war, it can be done quite simply. The price of petroleum products can be increased in the East, and the railroad subsidy discontinued. The barge canal offers no escape from this dilemma. Either an increase in the price of petroleum products on the eastern seaboard or a subsidy to the barge operator would be essential if the persons financing the barges and tugs were to recover their investment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that if the money which is now being spent to make up the difference in the current movement of petroleum products by rail and by water were to be used in the construction of the water-method transportation—that is, by tugs, barges, and canal—the Nation would have as an asset for its money the tugs, barges, and canal, and that those items would constantly be representing an amortization of the new facilities by the lower cost in moving petroleum by the canal than in moving the petroleum by the railroad?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the Senator realizes that if it shall be determined that we must have this much oil, and that we must sacrifice the steel, horsepower, manpower, and everything else, the cheapest thing to do would be to build a new pipe line. It could be finished more economically and carry oil more economically, and could be completed much more quickly than could a canal. The question is, Can we afford the materials at this particular time in competition with the great needs of the armed forces?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a further comment?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, the record distinctly shows that we completely and unequivocably contradict the data with which the able Senator has been supplied, and we can prove, we think, to any impartial body, that the use of steel in the building of the canal, the building of the tugs, and the barges to be operated thereon, would result in greater economy in the use of critical materials than would be the case in the movement of the same quantity of petroleum by pipe line.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not believe the record will bear out the Senator's statement.

Mr. PEPPER. The Petroleum Administrator for War does not say that, but the engineer of the Florida Ship Canal Authority has taken the figures of the Petroleum Administrator for War point by point and has shown the error of those figures, so the record will show both sides of this controversy concerning economy.

Mr. MALONEY. While I do not maintain that the expert for the Florida Canal Authority would be biased, I believe it is less likely that the representative of the Federal Government would be biased.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it possible that the able Senator from Connecticut cannot imagine that Mr. Harold Ickes would be an opinionated person?

Mr. MALONEY. I like Mr. Ickes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. While the two Senators are discussing the question of water transportation of oil, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, who is from New England, as well as other Senators on the floor from New England, to the fact that there is an avenue of transportation of oil by water now existing, that it is not being utilized to anywhere near its full capacity, but only probably to about one-eighth of its capacity, or one-seventh, or some such figure, by reason of the fact that there are not sufficient towboats and tugboats. The water-borne transportation to which I am referring is on the Mississippi River, and up the Ohio into Pittsburgh. All the oil which comes out of the Texas and Louisiana fields, through the intercoastal canal, must cross the Mississippi River at New Orleans, by the intercoastal canal, and then continue through New Orleans on to Mobile, and on to Florida. The barges which would be employed in that operation are much less—about one-third of the capacity of the barges which can be used on the Mississippi and the Ohio.

It will take me only about 3 minutes, if I may read in support of what I am saying, the testimony of General Reybold.

Mr. MALONEY. I am perfectly willing that the Senator take that much time if he will bear part of the burden of apology which is due to the press, the Official Reporters, and other employees of the Senate, who have been compelled to sit here so long due to this controversy.

Mr. OVERTON. My purpose is to call the attention of New England to this additional method of obtaining oil, so that they might explore and undertake to develop it. What I wish to read will be found on page 115 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I read:

Senator OVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask General Reybold some questions in connection with the Florida barge canal.

General, oil and oil products are now being transported by barge from the Gulf in the intracoastal canal and up the Mississippi, and up the Ohio, into the Pittsburgh region. Is that not correct?

General REYBOLD. That is correct, sir.

Senator OVERTON. Do you happen to recall at the instant about how many barrels a day are being so transported?

General REYBOLD. At the present time approximately 130,000 barrels per day are reaching Pittsburgh from sources mentioned.

Senator OVERTON. After the oil gets into the Pittsburgh area, then it has to be carried by rail or by pipe line for distribution in the eastern area?

General REYBOLD. That is correct, sir.

Senator OVERTON. So I suppose there is no limit as to what can be conveyed by barges up the Mississippi and the Ohio; but there is a bottleneck, I presume, in the Pittsburgh area, by reason of the fact that there are not sufficient pipe lines or the pipe lines are not of sufficient capacity, or the railroads are not able to transport it. Is there some bottleneck there?

General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

We are limited on the Ohio River, of course, to the maximum number of lockages that could take place in any period of time, say, 24 hours.

CAPACITY OF OHIO RIVER FOR DAILY OIL SHIPMENTS

Senator OVERTON. Well, what quantity of oil could be carried to Pittsburgh by these river routes per day?

General REYBOLD. It would be the practical capacity of lock 41 on the Ohio River. This lock can accommodate a daily movement of 650,000 barrels of petroleum products, having in mind the needs of other essential commodities.

Senator OVERTON. The maximum capacity is not being presently used, is it?

General REYBOLD. No, sir.

Senator OVERTON. Why is that; because they do not have sufficient barges or sufficient towboats?

General REYBOLD. It may be.

Senator OVERTON. Or tugboats?

General REYBOLD. It may be, and it may also be that so much oil is not needed in the Pittsburgh area.

Senator OVERTON. But the point is when it gets into the Pittsburgh area then it is a comparatively short haul from the Pittsburgh area to the eastern area?

General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Now, we do know, on the Mississippi River, that one towboat can push up at one time 80,000 barrels of oil, whereas a tugboat on the Intracoastal Waterway hauls only 3 barges of 10,000 barrels, or 30,000 barrels.

Senator OVERTON. All of the oil that comes from the Texas fields through the intracoastal canal crosses the Mississippi River at New Orleans in order to reenter the canal and the Florida intracoastal canal.

General REYBOLD. That is correct, sir.

Senator OVERTON. It crosses at New Orleans.

General REYBOLD. Then, there is a great deal of oil that moves over the intercoastal waterway, west of New Orleans, which in turn goes up the Mississippi River.

Senator OVERTON. Yes, sir.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is very welcome. I was saying that in either event the Government or the eastern consumers would have to pay the highest cost of rail or barge movement. The cost of either is high—at least twice and probably three times or more that of movement by pipe line.

From the standpoint of ordinary thrift, construction of as many additional pipe lines as necessary is essential if it is anticipated that the war will last long enough to amortize any new facility constructed for the carrying of oil. It would be very pleasing to me if a third pipe-line project were undertaken at this time, assuming that it is possible to spare the steel and other equipment; and the Army and Navy forces would be quite persuasive with me in that respect.

Probably the barge rate established by the Office of Price Administration would be close to the rail rate. Mere dollar cost of movement by rail—about $1.50 per barrel—as against movement by barge—about $1.20 per barrel—cannot be allowed to control. Much of the cost of rail transportation consists of depreciation charges for equipment, franchises, and track already in existence. Such an accounting transaction constitutes no drain on our productive facilities. Every cent of the cost of the barges, the tugs, and the canal would be a direct drain on our strained construction manpower, construction equipment, steel production, and engine production. Barge transportation will cost almost twice the steel, four times the horsepower, and seven times the manpower of big pipe-line movement.

The minute the war is over, or even the minute the Navy regains substantial control of our eastern sea frontier and freedom from the submarine menace, the canal is a "dead horse." Ocean vessels are by far the cheapest of all known methods for long-haul movement of large quantities of goods. For one thing, there is no right-of-way to maintain; for another, the manpower involved is negligible. A fast tanker can make a round trip in about 10 to 12 days between Texas and New York. A crew of 48 would be large. Four hundred and eighty man-days would, therefore, move 130,000 barrels of oil from Texas to New York, or approximately 270 barrels per tanker man-day. Ten men operating a 25,000—20,000 Atlantic side, 30,000 Gulf side—barrel barge convoy having a turn-around of 50 days would require 500 man-days to move 25,000 barrels of oil the same distance, or approximately 50 barrels of oil per man-day. The pipe line comparison is equally striking—800 men will be required to operate the Big Inch, which will deliver 300,000 barrels per day, or over 350 barrels per man-day. The comparison with ocean vessels is equally true whether the cargo be oil or any other substance, such as sulfur or lead.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Even upon the Senator's hypothesis that the German submarine menace would be over a year or 2 years or 2½ or 3 years from now, and that ocean-going vessels would be available——

Mr. MALONEY. I made no prediction about the submarine menace.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought the able Senator stated a short time ago that probably by the winter of 1944–45 the submarine menace would be overcome so that we could use ocean-going vessels to move products from the Gulf to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. MALONEY. I expressed the hope.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator expressed the hope, and he was making the point that probably we would be in a position to use our ocean-going vessels to move products from the Gulf region to the Atlantic seaboard. If that were possible, would it not be better to use barges in such movement and save the ocean-going vessels, both tankers and cargo-bearing vessels, so as to use them in moving supplies to our forces across the seas, in which service barges could not possibly be used?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall let the Senator answer that himself. I wish I could make some prediction about when the war will end. I wonder if the Senator from Florida has some idea about when it will be over.

Mr. PEPPER. I have some idea, although it is not worth more than the idea of any other citizen. I would not be willing to gamble on the war being over by the winter of 1944–45, or, for that matter, by the winter of 1945–46. But if I had an opportunity to provide a better method of transportation, which I knew would serve the needs of the Atlantic seaboard, by the winter of 1944–45, or even the early part of 1945, I would not be sure that that would not be possible before the end of the war.

Mr. MALONEY. I am pleased to associate myself with that observation of the Senator. The difference between us is that I am greatly concerned about the suggestion that we interfere with convoy vessel construction and the means of propelling Government vessels of war. I do not want to risk interfering with those activities only because there is a possibility we might get some value from the canal in 1945 or 1946.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, I will say that I made inquiry of Colonel Textor in the War Production Board, and Colonel Textor stated that the building of the tugs and the using of the Diesel motors to go into the tugs would not interfere with the Navy escort vessel program, nor would the use of steel that would go into these tugs or barges interfere with the octane gas program or with the rubber program.

Mr. MALONEY. I dispute that contention, and I shall make some reference to it in a moment.

I was referring to the comparison between the contributions made by the pipe line and barges. I should like to say to the few remaining Senators that I shall be through in less than 10 minutes—I hope in 5 minutes.

The estimate I have just made that the barge turn around between Port Arthur and Trenton would be 50 days has been challenged by the advocates of the canal. Assuming, however, that the barges can make an average of 100 miles in 24 hours—they can make slightly less loaded and slightly more unloaded—the round trip of 4,200 miles would consume 42 days, plus 1 day at each end for loading or unloading, as the case may be. The canal advocates have estimated as low as 40 days for a complete round trip. That was what the Senator from Florida pointed to earlier in our discussion.

Practical barge operators, however, always figure in calculating their costs on what they term an "inefficiency factor" of about 20 percent. A barge tow is an extremely unwieldy device. A three-barge tow will stretch out for 700 or 800 feet. The barges used on the Intracoastal Waterway are without steering apparatus. When such a tow passes under the numerous bridges across the Intracoastal Waterway with a cross-wind or current tending to blow the barges against the piers, it is a feat of seamanship of the highest order to prevent the last barge in the tow from hitting the underpinning of the bridge. A barge tow recently hit a railroad bridge near Apalachicola and moved the bridge itself a distance of 7 feet.

This sort of thing is a frequent happening. So much so that insurance companies are insisting that a tug be stationed at this particular bridge to assist in nudging the barges through the opening. The tows are frequently halted by fog and at times great congestions of tows occur when a collision happens and a barge blocks the channel. The waterway has numerous obstructions besides bridges—such as sharp bends, islands, and snags. Taking the inefficiency factor into account by adding 20 percent to the turn-around time will give you over 50 days.

There is at present a severe shortage of masters, pilots, and mates for intracoastal tugboats. To obtain a Federal license to serve in any of these capacities will require an apprenticeship of about 3 years—and this period is hardly excessive. To move, let us say, 300,000 barrels a day—the same as the Big Inch—over the barge route would require between 6,000 and 8,000 men, half of them with this scarce skill.

Before concluding, I wish to refer to the interference that a large tugboat program would cause with the desperately needed Navy program for the rapid construction of submarine chasers and escort vessels. While these engines are considerably smaller than those used on the escort vessel, they are of a size directly competitive with the needs of the smaller subchasers. Even if this were not so, Diesel engine-building capacity may easily be converted from one size to another and the few men skilled in this trade can do either type of work. Recently the Navy had a large number of hulls of these vessels lying idle for lack of engines. I do not want to help rob the Navy.

Mr. President, I should like to make one more observation and I am through. During the course of the hearings on the War Department civil functions bill and on this canal, I asked the representative of the Petroleum Administration for War what was the potential flow of oil a day through the Big Inch line. Senators will recall that we planned a 300,000-barrel-a-day production into the eastern area through the canal. The answer to my question was that the flow through the Big Inch pipe line, under an accelerated program made possible by additional power and pumping equipment, could be an additional 150,000 barrels a day. That means, Mr. President, an excess of 150,000 barrels a day over the estimate heretofore made. It would require a considerable additional equipment. But it could be done, and the representative of the Petroleum Administrator for War says that he would prefer, and that the Administration would prefer, to speed up or accelerate the production of that pipe line rather than to undertake the construction of the barge canal at this particular time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. MALONEY. Of course.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator not recall that while the representative of the Petroleum Administration for War did state that the 24-inch pipe line could be stepped up by additional power, so as to carry 150,000 barrels a day capacity more than its normal, yet to do so would require the addition of a number of pumps and the employment of additional steel, which would make the use of critical materials to do that as great as would be required to move the same quantity of petroleum by tugs and barges.

Mr. MALONEY. For the purpose of the RECORD I am willing to agree. I think there was a little difference in favor of the pipe line insofar as materials and power equipment are concerned, but I should like to point out that 150,000 barrels a day would come out of that pipe line every day, at a much lower cost than would be possible under the barge-canal program.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate very much. I do not apologize, because I think it is most important, after the persuasive and very eloquent statement of the Senator from Florida, that I should, for the benefit of my own constituents and the people of New England, and those who will later consider this subject, present these facts for the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senate recesses I should like to make a very brief statement on my own behalf. I, too, live in New England, and I have intimate acquaintenance with the hardships which the people there have undergone in the past winter, because of the shortage of petroleum. I am also conscious of the threat to the national security which is implicit in the possibility that our oil-consuming war industries will not have sufficient fuel. In fact, I am so impressed with the seriousness of the situation that I long ago made up my mind that I would support any reasonable scheme that would tend to relieve it, and would oppose any plan, no matter how meritorious it might be in any other way, which I thought would tend to discourage the relief of that situation.

Mr. President, I have very reluctantly come to the conclusion that the Florida barge canal is in that category. I say this with great respect for the way in which the Senator from Florida has battled for this cause. He has certainly left no stone unturned, and he has been thorough, he has been eloquent, and he has fought hard and valiantly for this project. When it was first presented I was quite attracted to it. It was presented on the basis that it would be completed in 10 months, and in 10 months' time we would begin to receive the benefits of it in New England; in fact, the hearings were conducted on that basis. Then at the last minute the proponents of the amendment exercised the right which was undoubtedly theirs to modify their own amendment.

Any pretense that it could be done in 10 months was removed, and in my judgment the whole argument of doing this thing from the standpoint of relieving the fuel famine in New England disappeared. So for this reason I was one of the Senators from New England on the Appropriations Committee who opposed this proposal. I am one who subscribed to what the Senator from Connecticut has so ably said.

The hour is so late that I shall not burden the RECORD with further observations of my own. I feel that if we can spare the manpower, if we can spare the power equipment, if we can spare the metals to build a canal of this kind, we will do a great deal better to put it all into a third pipe line. I believe that this proposal would not only be of no benefit to us for two winters at the very least, but that insofar as it would compete with pipe lines it would be a detriment to us.

Mr. President, if any other Senator present desires to make any further remarks, I shall yield. Otherwise, I intend to move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the able Senator permit me to say that I am very grateful for the very generous remarks he has just made. I have supported the project since I have been in the Senate, and I shall continue to support it, because I believe it to be in the national interest, and I believe it to be in the aid of the furtherance of the war effort. I am sorry I do not agree with my distinguished friends, the other Senators who have spoken this afternoon, in the preference of a proposed or possible pipe line, rather than the Florida Canal project.

Mr. President, I rose to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the testimony of the engineer for the Florida Canal Authority, Mr. Henry H. Buckman, giving his figures, and the reasons for the figures, and giving the criticism of the figures made by the able senior Senator from Connecticut, to show that in the use of critical materials to enable the movement of a given quantity of petroleum by the barge canal, and with the use of the tugs and barges which would operate on it, there would be greater economy than there would be in moving the same quantity of petroleum by pipe line.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, but with no intention of doing so, and only for the purpose of getting an additional line in the RECORD, I desire to suggest at this point that the figures, estimates, and views of the representatives of the Federal Government will be found in the hearings on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, but I am sure the Senator from Florida will not object if I follow his request with a request of my own to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain excerpts from the hearings.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Wednesday, April 28, 1943.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, Capitol, Hon. ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators THOMAS of Oklahoma, CHAVEZ, MAYBANK, CARAWAY, and BRIDGES.

Also present: Senator PEPPER.

Senator THOMAS. The committee will be in order.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Florida Barge Canal

* * * * * *

Further Statement of Henry H. Buckman, Engineering Counsel for the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida

* * * * * *

Mr. BUCKMAN. * * *

Expense of barges and tugs to be repaid by private enterprise

I should like to point out to the committee first of all that the cost of barges and tugs for this canal is not a Federal expense. It cannot be regarded in the same category as the cost of constructing the canal—the $44,000,000 which is here under consideration.

Senator CHAVEZ. Who is going to meet the expenses?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Private enterprise, constructively, is now making expenditures, Senator. There are now several hundred barges being built by the Defense Plant Corporation, and they are reconstructing for oil traffic several hundred steel dry-cargo barges, and those barges are being leased to private enterprise, and paid for on a basis which contemplates the return to the Federal Treasury of every dollar of that money.

Now, the Defense Plant Corporation advises me that they are prepared to expand that program on that basis, as far as it may appear to be in the public interest, and in accordance with sound practices.

There can be no question that the hauling of petroleum over this canal at the present time is a business which pays well and enables these operators to pay fair, substantial lease payments on these barges.

Senator BRIDGES. Whom are these leased to; the oil companies or to transportation companies, as a whole?

Mr. BUCKMAN. I know only of those which are leased to transportation companies. There may be cases where they are leased to oil companies, but I have no information on that.

But, they are leased to the men who are in the towing business, in the transportation business, and they are all eager to get all they can. There is room for a great many more.

But I think it is well that it be clearly understood that we do not contemplate going into the Federal Treasury, as a permanent expense item, for the barges and tugs which would operate upon this canal any more than we do for railroad cars or locomotives which operate upon a track.

Senator CHAVEZ. You say it is not a permanent policy, but nevertheless the Federal Government does have to advance the money to construct them originally?

Mr. BUCKMAN. It would probably have to advance much of the money, just as any other loan; that is correct.

Senator CHAVEZ. So in a sense there would be an expenditure by the Federal Government, which it contemplates getting back?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes. I used the word "expense" in the technical sense, as something which goes out without any return. I prefer to call it a financing operation by the Government with the expectation of return to the Treasury.

But however you regard those details of definitions, over all it is true that such costs stand in a different category.

Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. Buckman, there was testimony with reference to 5,000 barges that would have to be built to operate in this service.

Mr. BUCKMAN. If you will permit, I will come to that in some detail in a few moments.

Senator CHAVEZ. Pardon me.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Because I wish to go into that.

The second point I wish to make with regard to this particular testimony to which I have referred is this, that those figures which he used were the estimates which would be required to carry the entire 1,600,000 barrels a day and were not the figures which would be used if you were computing the program suggested by the Chief of Engineers, namely, 250,000 barrels a day. In other words, they are some seven times greater than anything that is here contemplated.

I think it is well to make that point clear.

Barges, tugs, horsepower and tons of critical material required to transport 100,000 barrels per day through Florida Canal

Now I should like also, before going into the general picture, to deal point for point with certain testimony introduced by the Petroleum Administration for War, purporting to show that ton for ton of steel and horsepower for horspeower, the pipe line is more efficient in the use of material and power than is the barge method of petroleum transport.

Now, as a matter of fact, the reverse is true, as will be seen from the computations which I hope to give you in a moment.

Parenthetically, and very respectfully, I should like to say that before it has completed its findings, I suggest to the committee that this appropriation be made by Congress and that the technical questions having to do with the relative efficiency in the employment of material and manpower, and the decision as to whether this or that facility takes more or less, be left to the technical agency of the Government designated for such matters; that is, the War Production Board. Thus Congress will have implemented its policy expressed in the authorization act and will have completely fulfilled its legislative functions and sent the case to the administrative branch for action under existing authority.

Senator CHAVEZ. Let me get myself clear on that, Mr. Buckman. Your idea is that the congressional function will go only so far as appropriating the moneys?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir. In other words, pursuing the usual course which Congress has followed; that is, to appropriate to the War Department $44,000,000 for this work. Congress has created or delegated the authority for the creation of certain agencies which shall pass upon projects and enterprises during the war, all of those things which are undertaken by the several departments of the Government, as to which shall have priority, and which shall be deferred; which shall go first. In other words, if and when Congress appropriates this money it would be recognized, I think, by Congress and by everyone else, that when it came up to the War Production Board if they judged it not in the public interest to see this thing built at this time, it probably would be deferred, and that would be a technical judgment based upon these highly technical details which it may be that the committee and Congress would prefer not to pass judgment upon.

Senator CHAVEZ. Well, of course, you might be correct; but I personally believe that the committees of Congress should have technical information, and I have reached the conclusion that in many instances many of the departments feel just like you do, that all that Congress should do is appropriate; but I think it is the duty of Congress to find out. Of course, it might not have the technical training, but as a general rule they are intelligent and they can appreciate when a good man like you comes before them and gives them technical information on engineering matters.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Senator, I am more than delighted to have you take that point of view. It was only for fear that the committee might become impatient if I went too much into details and decimal points.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am very strong for the engineering profession.

Mr. BUCKMAN. That was the only reason I suggested it.

Senator CHAVEZ. It is one profession that I really respect.

Mr. BUCKMAN. That gives me courage to proceed with a somewhat detailed technical presentation, which I have prepared.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am not referring to you in any way whatsoever at all, but I know there are some departments that think that Congress should appropriate and after that they are nothing but a nuisance, and I do not want to be a party to that opinion at all.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Senator, our presence here today I think is eloquent proof of our position in that matter. We have come to Congress in the hope that the Congress might listen to these technical details, and we are overjoyed at the opportunity of having the committee listen to them.

Senator CHAVEZ. Of course it is up to the chairman, but I know that I feel like getting technical information.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Well, that is very heartening, I assure you.

Barrel delivery daily per ton of steel employed on Intracoastal Canal route, Port Arthur, Tex., to Trenton, N. J.

I should like now, in view of the many erroneous factual statements that have been made, to place in the record the following factors.

The barrel delivery daily per ton of steel employed on the Intracoastal Canal route from Port Arthur, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., across this proposed canal in Florida would involve the following factors:

First, the route is from Port Arthur, Tex., to Trenton, N. J.

Second, the distance is 2,010 miles.

Third, the speed of these barges will be 4 miles per hour loaded, 6 miles per hour empty, and 5 miles per hour on the average.

The capacity of the fleet suggested by the Chief of Engineers is 250,000 barrels daily delivered in Trenton or in that area.

The components of that fleet are 1,000 10,000-barrel barges and 334 tugs.

The towing string will consist of three barges behind one tug.

The steel requirements——

Senator CHAVEZ. That would be 30,000 barrels?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Thirty thousand barrels per tow; yes, sir.

The steel requirements are, in each barge, 225 tons; in each tug, 160 tons.

The total steel in the barges is 1,000 times 225, or 225,000 tons, and the total steel in the tugs is 334 times 160, or 53,440 tons, making total steel in the fleet of 278,440 tons.

Now, to get the number of barrels of petroleum delivered per day per ton of steel employed, we must divide the 250,000 barrels daily by the 278,440 tons of steel, and the answer is 0.89.

In a moment I will compare that with the pipe lines, and with the figures given by the Petroleum Administration for War for the barges.

Senator CHAVEZ. The comparison is going to be in the carriage of the product the same distances, either by canal, or by the pipe lines?

Mr. BUCKMAN. In other words, the endeavor is, Senator, to place these two facilities upon a comparable basis and then see how the figures fall out.

Comparison with 24-inch pipe line

Now, here are figures relating to the 24-inch pipe line. They are obtained from the War Production Board.

The location of the trunk line is from Longview, Tex., to Norris City, Ill., and thence via Phoenixville, Pa., to Bayonne, N. J., and the vicinity of Philadelphia. In other words, it branches or forks at Phoenixville, Pa., and one branch goes to Bayonne, N. J., and the other to the vicinity of Philadelphia.

The length of the trunk line, including the two forks at the east end is 1,385 miles, namely, to Norris City 550 miles, and from Norris City to Phoenixville 722 miles, and from Phoenixville the two forks comprise 113 miles, making a total of 1,385 miles.

Now, the actual steel allocated for that line, in the trunk line, and the accessories, the pumps, and so forth, was 368,000 tons; feeder lines at the western end 30,000 tons; storage tanks 10,000 tons, making a total of steel involved for the 24-inch line from Texas to the coast of 408,000 tons.

The capacity assumed by the Petroleum Administration for War was 300,000 barrels daily. We question that capacity. It is higher, we feel, than practical operating con-

ditions will permit. I merely insert that for the record.

But, we will use for the purposes of these computations, the assumed capacity of the Petroleum Administration for War, namely, 300,000 barrels daily on that line.

Now, if we divide the 300,000 barrels daily by the amount of steel, 406,000 tons, we arrive at a daily barrel capacity per ton of steel of 0.73.

Senator CHAVEZ. What was the other?

Capacity per ton of steel in barges and tugs compared with per ton of steel capacity of 24-inch pipe line

Mr. BUCKMAN. Eighty-nine one-hundredths. In other words, when you take the cold figures of the amount of steel in the barges and tugs and the amount of steel in the pipe line, you will find that the barges and tugs per ton of steel will transport 0.89 barrel of petroleum, per ton of steel, whereas the 24-inch pipe line will transport 0.73, or a substantially lower amount.

That is not all there is to the story. I am coming back to that in a minute.

Comparison with 20-inch pipe line

There is an additional factor which raises a very considerable margin in favor of the tugs and barges, but I will first go to the factors on the 20-inch pipe line.

The location of that line is from east Texas to Seymour, Ind., and thence to Trembly, N. J. There are 1,470 miles of trunk and 205 miles of feeders.

The steel in the trunk and accessories is 280,701 tons, and in the feeders and tanks 14,550, or a total of 295,251.

The assumed capacity is 235,000 barrels daily, and there again we feel that that figure is substantially high. For the record we make that statement, but we accept for the purpose of these computations the Petroleum Administration for War's assumed capacity of 235,000 barrels daily for the 20-inch line.

If that figure is divided by the tonnage, 295,251, the result is 0.79, as compared with 0.73 for the 24-inch line, and 0.89 for the barges and tugs.

Capacity per ton of steel of both pipe lines compared with capacity of barges and tugs per ton of steel

So that taking the average of the 20-inch line and the 24-inch line, which we should do, because we want all of the experience data we can get behind us, we have these two large pipe lines transporting oil from Texas to the Atlantic seaboard and to one point on the Atlantic seaboard, or two points, but not distributing it, and at best computed to deliver an average of 0.76 barrels of oil per ton of steel. Whereas the barges and tugs will not only deliver a larger amount—0.89 barrel—to the ton, but will distribute it for the full length of the Atlantic seaboard as far north as Trenton.

Now, I submit, instead of an efficiency of 0.84 per ton of steel for pipe lines, as stated by the Petroleum Administration for War as against 0.46 for barges, or 45 percent less than the pipe line, the true figures, without giving the barges the benefit of the distribution function, show the steel efficiency of the barge is 0.89 as against 0.76 for the pipe line; or that barging is 17 percent more efficient in steel than is the pipe line, without taking into consideration the distribution function of the barge line. This is only part of the picture. The pipe line with its 17 percent less steel efficiency delivers petroleum to a given point on the seaboard. To get a correct view of its relative efficiency there must be considered the steel in the facilities necessary to distribute up and down the Atlantic coast. If we are to utilize pipe lines for this, it will halve the already lower efficiency of the pipe lines. If tank cars are used, it will quarter it, or more. On the other hand the lower amount of steel used in the barges and the tugs not only brings the petroleum to the East, but it will distribute it all along the coast from Miami to Trenton.

Tacitly, that was admitted by the representatives of the Petroleum Administration for War yesterday in testimony here when upon questioning they were asked how they would get this oil to New England from New Jersey, and they said that they were contemplating the building of another pipe line. In other words, the steel to get this oil distributed on the Atlantic coast line is far more than the steel simply going into the pipe lines from Texas to the coast. But the steel in the barges will distribute the oil all along the Atlantic coast as far north as New Jersey, and that is a factor which does not appear in the presentation made by the Petroleum Administration for War.

Transporting residual fuel oil in wooden barges

However, that still is not all of the story. In a communication to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations considering this matter, the Petroleum Administrator for War sets forth the practicability of transporting residual fuel oil in wooden barges and assumes that if the canal is open such practice will obtain. In my view it might very well obtain in the light of the scarcity of steel.

The Petroleum Administrator for War stated in that communication that there can be, needs to be, brought to the eastern seaboard from the Gulf and Texas areas 150,000 barrels daily of these residual fuel oils, which he says may be transported in wooden barges.

Initial program for transportation through canal of 250,000 barrels daily

Now, the Chief of Engineers has suggested as an initial practical program the creation of a fleet to carry 250,000 barrels daily all told.

If we assume that 150,000 barrels of that, or three-fifths of the fleet, will be in wooden barges, then we get an altogether different picture and one even more favorable to the barge as regards the consumption of steel.

For an initial program of 250,000 barrels delivered daily to the east coast as suggested by the Chief of Engineers, there is no necessity for comparing the steel efficiency of the pipe line with the steel efficiency of an all-steel barge fleet. The Petroleum Administration for War has pointed out the practicability of transporting residual fuel oil over the intracoastal route by using wooden barges to the extent of 150,000 barrels per day.

Fleet required to transport 250,000 barrels daily through canal

Now, to transport 150,000 barrels of residual oil daily from Port Arthur to Trenton, using the factors which I have already placed in the record, and 100,000 barrels of white products, or 250,000 barrels daily, all told, would require the following fleet, using the type of wooden barges now being built for the Defense Plant Corporation for this carriage, by the Chief of Engineers; but of 10,000-barrel capacity instead of 6,000 barrels. That would require 600 such 10,000-barrel wooden barges, having 45 tons of steel in each, or a total of 27,000 tons of steel.

Then, it would require four hundred 10,000-barrel all-steel barges for products, at 225 tons of steel each or 90,000 tons of steel.

There would be required the same number and kind of tugs, namely 334 at 160 tons each, which would be 53,440 tons of steel, making the total steel in this composite fleet to carry residuals and white products 170,440 tons.

That divided by 250,000 barrels per day gives 1.46 barrels of petroleum products transported daily by the barge canal, as against the .76 barrel to be transported by the pipe line, or an efficiency factor of practically twice that of the pipe line, without taking into consideration the distribution function of the barge canal.

Steel efficiency of proposed fleet compared with steel efficiency of pipe lines and tank cars

I submit that it will be seen at a glance that the steel efficiency of such a fleet is nearly twice that of a pipe line and that a pipe line cannot carry residuals.

The only intelligent comparison would be with the only other available means; that is, the tank car, and here the barge shows a steel efficiency more than four times as great.

Greater efficiency of barge in horsepower and manpower

Nor can the horsepower efficiency, nor the manpower efficiency of such a fleet in such service be compared with the pipe line, because the pipe line cannot transport residuals and when compared with the tank car, the barge shows a far greater efficiency in horsepower and in manpower.

The figures submitted by the Petroleum Administration for War as to the relative efficiency of the pipe line and the barging, for the job in hand, are not only inaccurate in fact and not on a comparable basis—that is, they omit the necessary distribution facilities from the pipe line which exists in the barge—but they show, contrary to the fact, that the barge is less efficient in the employment of steel, horsepower, and manpower, than is the pipe line, whereas the reverse is true.

LONG HAUL EFFICIENCY OF INLAND BARGE

Nor should the statement that the barge is efficient on the short haul but not on the long haul be allowed to go unchallenged. Not only does the accumulated experience of many years refute this, but present-day practice is based upon the long-haul efficiency of the inland barge. Witness the millions of tons of petroleum now moving, and the plans of the Petroleum Administration for War to move more from the Texas fields up the Mississippi, more than 1,500 miles, and along the Intracoastal Canal to west Florida, more than 800 miles, and along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville north for more than 1,000 miles. Those are integral parts of the program of the Petroleum Administration for War, yet the gentleman representing the Petroleum Administration for War has stated that barges are not efficient on long hauls.

Same time required for barges to go from Texas to Pittsburgh as from Texas to Trenton, N. J., via proposed canal

As a further example of the inconsistency of such testimony, I call to your attention the fact that the Chief of Engineers has stated that the number of days for a barge to go from Port Arthur, Tex., to Pittsburgh and return is 40, and the number of days for a barge to go from Port Arthur, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., via the Florida Canal and return is 40. The same barges, the same steel, the same tugs, that would take this oil only to Pittsburgh, the Chief of Engineers says, will take it all the way to the east coast at Trenton.

Yet the Petroleum Administration for War has organized a program of barges to Pittsburgh only, thence transferring to a pipe line, whereas the Chief of Engineers has suggested using the same barges and the same length of time and going all the way to Trenton—with the same amount of steel.

Table of comparative efficiencies in steel and horsepower of barge and pipe-line movements

At this point, Mr. Chairman, permission is requested to insert in the record a table showing the comparative efficiencies in steel

and horsepower of barge and pipe line movements. Manpower figures are not included, because the factor which must be added to the pipe-line operating manpower for distribution is indeterminate.

Senator THOMAS. Do you have the table which you desire to insert at this point?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir; it is here.

Senator THOMAS. Without objection, it will be inserted at this point.

The table referred to follows:

Summary of comparative efficiency barge versus pipe-line transport

[Barrels delivered daily per ton of steel and per horsepower employed]

	Barge, including distribution	Pipe line, excluding distribution
Barrels delivered daily per ton of steel employed, all steel fleet	0.89	0.76
Using wooden barges for residuals, and steel barges for products, with all steel tugs	1.46	.76
Barrels delivered daily per prime horsepower installed	1.24	.99
Barrels delivered daily per utilized horsepower	2.40	.99

Comparison from distribution factor of barges and pipe lines

Mr. BUCKMAN. It is evident, I think, that the manpower for distribution from the pipe line up and down the Atlantic seaboard, via tank car and truck and so forth, is greater than the manpower required to operate the pipe line itself. It will much more than weigh down the balance in favor of the barge, the operating personnel of which also supplies the distribution function.

As a matter of fact, without adding a ton of steel or a man to the crew, these barges and tugs will not only distribute their own petroleum north-bound; but they will take the pipe-line petroleum and distribute it sound-bound, as well.

Senator CHAVEZ. Will you clear me on that particular point, as to the difference in distribution between the pipe line and the barges, as contemplated under the proposed legislation? Do I understand that the pipe line can deliver only to certain points?

Mr. BUCKMAN. It delivers only to its terminus.

Senator CHAVEZ. To its terminus?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. It can deliver in between?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes; it can, but it is not contemplated. I mean, there are no taps on these through pipe lines.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is what I wanted to know. Your contention is that the barges can stop anywhere and deliver?

Mr. BUCKMAN. That is what the Chief of Engineers has pointed out.

Steel and horsepower required for transportation of petroleum from Port Arthur, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., via proposed Florida canal

There were some figures introduced yesterday—very happily, I think, for all concerned—by one of the gentlemen representing the Petroleum Administration for War, because they now enable us to inspect the figures upon which the Petroleum Administration for War has apparently based its erroneous conclusions. We must take sharp issue with those figures, point for point. Those figures related to the steel and the horsepower required for the transportation of petroleum.

I have set these up in parallel columns with the figures of the Canal Authority—for which I shall give the supplementary authority as we go along—so that you may compare them, and I think you will then understand these widely divergent opinions and views as to the relative efficiencies of these two facilities, and that you will be able to decide which are correct and which are in error.

(A discussion followed, off the record.)

Mr. BUCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have seen this sheet just handed to me, entitled "Break-Down of Figures Submitted by S. D. Archbold," and those are the figures to which I have just referred.

Senator THOMAS. Are the figures you have placed in the record the same as those used by Mr. Archbold?

Mr. BUCKMAN. No; the figures I have placed in the record are the figures of the Authority; and I now propose to discuss, if you please, the comparison in each case of the figures of the Authority the figures placed in the record by Mr. Archbold.

Senator THOMAS. Are they substantially the same?

Mr. BUCKMAN. They are widely different.

Senator THOMAS. Inasmuch as that statement was requested, I thought it might go in the record.

Mr. BUCKMAN. I should like it to go into the record.

Senator THOMAS. Without objection, it will go in the record at this point—being the statement of Mr. Archbold.

Mr. BUCKMAN. I should like to have it placed in the record, Mr. Chairman, so that it may be used for comparison.

Senator THOMAS. It will be placed in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Break-down of figures submitted by S. D. Archbold

Tugs, 600 horsepower, 225 tons each.

Barges, 8,000 barrels, 215 tons each.

On basis of 100,000 B/D, Port Arthur/Houston to Trenton via proposed canal (turn-around time, 47 days).

Mileage, 2,204 (loading and discharging time total, 3 days; A. V. run, 100 miles per day; 20 percent inefficiency included).

Would require 691 barges and 295 tugs for a total of 214,940 tons and require 177,000 horsepower.

On the basis of tug cost of $200,000 each and a steel barge cost of $55,000 each—

Barges	$38,000,000
Tugs	59,000,000
Total	97,000,000

No terminal steel included.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Now I am about to cite the figures placed in the record by Mr. Archbold and the corresponding figures of the Canal Authority.

Figures on mileage

The Canal Authority's mileage from Port Arthur to Trenton is 2,010. The mileage of the Petroleum Administration for War—to which I shall hereafter refer as P. A. W.—is 2,204. The Canal Authority cites for its figures the Chief of Engineers and the Hydrographic Office. They are measured miles.

Average speed of barges

The average speed of these barges is taken by the Canal Authority as 5 miles per hour, by the P. A. W. as 4.16 miles per hour.

Senator CHAVEZ. What is the opinion of the engineers? What figure do they take?

Mr. BUCKMAN. The engineers have not made a statement in the record, but General Reybold did state that the time required for the round voyage is 40 days, and since we also compute 40 days, it is a fair assumption that our speed is the same speed taken by the Chief of Engineers.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

Figures on turn-around time

Mr. BUCKMAN. The turn-around time of the Authority is 40 days, and of the P. A. W., 47 days. The Authority offers as supplementary authority for the 40-day figure the statement of the Chief of Engineers before the committee. He supports that figure of 40 days.

Senator CHAVEZ. Is that based upon the identical routes?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. And upon some past performances?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. It is based upon certain averages?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Both the Canal Authority and the Chief of Engineers have made careful studies as to the chief factors entering into that turn-around time.

Senator CHAVEZ. Including past performance in certain areas?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir. The only real basis is past performance. Experience records are worth a great deal more than anything projected.

* * * * * *

Comparative figures on size of steel barges

Mr. BUCKMAN. Going back to the comparison of these figures, namely, those submitted by Mr Archbold of the P. A. W. and the Canal Authority, the size of the steel barges is taken by the Canal Authority as 10,000 barrels and by P. A. W., 8,000 barrels.

The 10,000-barrel barge taken by the Canal Authority is the barge recommended by the Chief of Engineers and is also the standard barge now in use.

Comparative figures on number of barges required

The number of barges required, as computed by the Canal Authority, is 400, and by P. A. W. is 691. That is merely a matter of arithmetic. If you take smaller barges, you must have more of them to do a given job. But I call your attention to the fact that by pursuing that method, you can boost indefinitely the amount of steel you may wish to show as necessary.

Comparative figures on number of tugs required

The tugs required, as computed by the Authority, are one-third that number of barges, that is, one-third of 400 or 134; and by the P. A. W., 295—namely, more than twice as many. The Authority supplements its statement by referring to the figures of the Chief of Engineers, which agree with those of the Authority.

Comparative figures on tons of steel in each barge

As to the tons of steel in each steel barge, the Authority takes, as the tonnage in a steel barge of 10,000 barrels, 225. The P. A. W. takes as the steel in a steel barge of 8,000 barrels capacity, 215. The figure of the Canal Authority is based upon actual steel in actual barges of that size now moving over the waterways.

The tons of steel in each wooden barge is 45, as given by the Authority. It isn't given at all by P. A. W. The authority for that is the standard design of wooden barges which are now being built for 6,000 barrels, and making a proper allowance to raise the steel content of the 6,000-barrel wooden barges to 10,000 barrels, raising it from 30 to 45 tons.

Tons of steel in each tug

The tons of steel in each tug are taken by the Canal Authority as 160, and by the P. A. W. as 225. The Canal Authority submits that a survey of the actual tugs of this power now in operation shows that the tugs which have given service for many years contain somewhat less than 160 tons of steel, and there is no need for putting more than that much steel in a tug for this service.

It obviously is possible to build a tug bigger or heavier, with heavier plates on it, if you wish to do it. But practical operating tugs

now doing this heavy-duty work and which have done it for many years, will run 160 tons and less of steel.

Comparative figures on prime horsepower per tug

The prime horsepower per tug is taken by the Canal Authority as 600, which is recommended by the Chief of Engineers; and the same figure, 600, is taken by P. A. W.

Utilized horsepower per tug

The utilized horsepower per tug, which is quite a different thing, is 309; it is not given by P. A. W.

With your permission, I will come back to that difference between prime horsepower and utilized horsepower, shortly.

Comparative tons of steel in barges and tugs

The total tons of steel in the barges is, therefore, taken by the Canal Authority as 90,000 and by the P. A. W. as 148,565. I think you will see where the divergence begins.

The total tons of steel in the all-steel tugs, at 160 tons each, given by the Authority, are 21,440; by the P. A. W. as 66,375

Comparative tons of steel and prime horsepower in fleet

The total of all steel in the fleet, as given by the Canal Authority, is 111,440 tons, as against 214,940 by the P. A. W. There you have a divergence of nearly 100 percent.

The total prime horsepower in the tugs as given by the Canal Authority is 80,000; but the P. A. W. has 177,000. That difference is due simply to the fact that the P. A. W. erroneously assumed 295 tugs at 600 horsepower each; and the Canal Authority bases its program upon 134 tugs at 600 horsepower each.

The divergence of factoring, as between the Canal Authority and the P. A. W., results in over 100 percent difference in the horsepower requirements. And, again, I hope that I am enabling the committee to see how these impressions arise that the pipe line is more efficient, either in steel or in horsepower, than is the barge. The reverse is the case.

Comparative figures on cost of barges and tugs

The total utilized horsepower of the fleet, as given by the Canal Authority, is 41,406. The cost per barge, as given by the Canal Authority, is $55,000; and as given by the P. A. W., it is the same amount, $55,000 each.

The cost per tug, as given by the Canal Authority, is $200,000, and by the P. A. W., the same figure, $200,000.

Cost of wooden barges

Senator CHAVEZ. Pardon me right there, Mr. Buckman. Have you any figures on the wooden barges?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir. The cost of the wooden barges I haven't included in this tabulation. But they are not very much lower in cost than the steel barges, because of the additional labor required. They will probably run from 8 to 12 percent less in cost.

I do wish to point out at this time that this figure used by the Canal Authority in this particular tabulation—namely $200,000—as the cost for one of these 600-horsepower tugs, is a figure to which we do not agree. We feel that that is altogether too high to build a serviceable, 600-horsepower tug for this service. But in order not to complicate this immediate discussion, we have for the moment accepted that figure for purposes of the comparison.

Comparative figures on total cost of barges in fleet

That would give a total cost for the barges in this fleet, according to the Canal Authority, using the same unit figures as the P. A. W., of $22,000,000.

The P. A. W. figure, using their higher number of barges, is $38,000,000.

Senator CHAVEZ. How does that compare with the figures of the witness who appeared yesterday? Do you recall them?

Mr. BUCKMAN. I think he didn't break down his figures; but from the over-all statement that he made, I think he was taking at least in part the Canal Authority's figures for equipping this canal to take the 1,600,000 barrels a day. If I am correct in that, his figure would have to be broken down to the Canal Authority's figures. We are discussing here a 250,000-barrel program.

Senator CHAVEZ. I understand.

Comparative figures on total cost of tugs in fleet

Mr. BUCKMAN. The total cost of the tugs, as given by the Canal Authority, is $26,800,000, using the same unit costs as the P. A. W., and the P. A. W. total cost of the tugs, using their higher number of tugs, is $59,000,000.

Comparative figures on total cost of fleet

The total cost of the entire fleet—barges and tugs—would, therefore, be $48,800,000, even allowing $200,000 per tug, which we consider excessive. Set that figure of $48,800,000 for the entire cost of the fleet, as against the total arrived at by the P. A. W. of $97,000,000, or over a 100-percent increase, and you again get a view of how these figures can be increased by erroneous factors.

Comparative figures on barrels of oil delivered daily per ton of steel

Translating those figures into barrels of oil delivered daily per ton of steel, we see that the barge canal, according to the Canal Authority, will carry 0.89 barrel of oil per ton of steel, whereas the figures submitted by P. A. W. are 0.46.

It is easy to see how they arrive at those figures, and how much in error they are. The barrels delivered daily per ton of steel, if three-fifths of the load is to be carried in wooden barges—namely, if three-fifths of the load is to be residual fuel oil—would be 1.46 as against the efficiency of 0.46 given by P. A. W.

Comparative figures on barrels per day per prime horsepower

The barrels delivered per day per prime horsepower, as given by the Authority, are 1.2, as against 0.67 as given by P. A. W.

The barrels delivered per day per utilized horsepower, as given by the Canal Authority, are 2.4, with that figure not given by the P. A. W.

Superiority of efficiency in steel and horsepower in favor of barge method of transporting petroleum

If the committee please, bear in mind with respect to all of these figures, which to our mind unquestionably show not a slight but a vast superiority in efficiency for both steel and horsepower in favor of the barge method of transporting petroleum, that none of those figures takes into consideration the distribution function of the barge on top of this already great margin of superiority.

I don't want to tire the committee too much with other figures. I wish to add this, however.

Senator THOMAS. Let me make this suggestion: If you have there a volume of figures, you might insert those in the record as fully as you care to.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Senator, I have just a few more figures, and then I would like to proceed with the balance of my statement, if that is agreeable.

Senator THOMAS. You may proceed as you wish, having in mind that we want to complete these hearings at this session here this morning.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Very well. I shall go through it, then, as rapidly as possible.

Prime horsepower employed by pipe lines

With your permission, I will insert that statement regarding the prime horsepower employed by the pipe lines, which is far greater than the horsepower simply on the motors at the pumps, as reported by the Petroleum Administration for War.

Senator THOMAS. Very well. Without objection, that may be done.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"COMPARISON OF PRIME HORSEPOWER REQUIRED—BARGE VERSUS PIPE LINE

"To properly compare the prime horsepower efficiency of the barge, 1.2, with the prime horsepower efficiency of the pipe line, the figure 2.2 given for the pipe line by Petroleum Administration for War (which is for secondary, motor, horsepower only) must be multiplied by 0.45 to give the prime horsepower actually required. The proper comparison then becomes 1.2 efficiency for the barge as against 0.99 for the pipe line."

Other commodities that would be transported through canal

Senator THOMAS. At this point, let me ask you this question: To date this proposal has been presented on the basis very largely of the transportation of fuel oil and oil products. Of course, it is obvious to me that oil is not the only commodity that will be transported through this canal when the canal is constructed, and I would like for you to add to your statement, if you can, a list of the goods or commodities that might be carried through this canal both ways—from west to east and north, and from north and east to the West.

To me it is obvious that coal, for example, might be transported, as one commodity—and I use that only as an illustration of what might be transported through this barge canal. No doubt you have made a survey of the commodities available in the South and the West that might be transported very efficiently by water. I would like for the record to show what goods originating in the West might be sent east and north through this canal, and what goods originating in the North and East might be transported to the West.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Senator, I have those items here and had intended to present them at this time. For my guidance, if you will instruct me, are you proposing to give me a few moments more?

Senator THOMAS. We can run along as long as the committee wishes to sit.

Mr. BUCKMAN. I think I can finish up in half an hour, if that isn't imposing too much on the committee.

Senator THOMAS. If you will make the record clear on the transportation of the various commodities.

Mr. BUCKMAN. I will be happy to place this all in the record, and then go ahead, if that meets with the pleasure of the committee.

Senator THOMAS. At least, I want you to hit the high spots. I find that the record contains a statement relative to other commodities on page 86, when Colonel Goethals was on the stand. I made this statement [reading]:

"Without objection, a statement of that character covering the subject of commodities will be placed in the record."

Then a statement is furnished, and we find there a list of commodities contemplated to be transported through this canal. I would like to have your statement about the matter, as well.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Thank you, Senator. I have prepared a list, and have added a list prepared by the Department of Commerce.

Senator THOMAS. I think the record ought to be made complete. The pipe lines can transport only one thing, which is oil.

Mr. BUCKMAN. That is correct.

Senator THOMAS. Another thing, when the war is over the pipe lines will go into disuse; but this canal, if constructed, will be good for

the transportation of almost every type of commodity, and indefinitely.

Mr. BUCKMAN. That is the position of the Authority, sir.

Senator THOMAS. You may proceed. I beg your pardon for interposing, but I think the record ought to set these things out a little more fully.

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir.

Fundamental question involved

I would like to say, from our point of view, consideration of the construction of a barge canal across Florida, to complete and make available the Intracoastal Waterway from Texas to New Jersey poses the following fundamental question:

Shall we accept the destruction of our ocean-borne domestic commerce upon which we have hitherto depended for more than half the ton-miles of transport necessary to support our economy, and endeavor to fight the war with such makeshift and supplementary overland transportation as we may be able to devise, or shall we restore this lost transport by resorting to an alternative method for water-borne freight, that is to say, the completion and use of our Intracostal Waterway?

Upon our arriving at the correct answer to this question may, and probably will, depend the length of the conflict, the measure of its cost to our people, and the degree of our success. Here is far more than the movement of a certain amount of petroleum. The problem involves also the transport of many millions of tons of dry cargo, the wisest use of our rail system, the mobilization, arming, and training of our Army and Navy and their overseas transport and supply, the health and morale of the civilian population, the efficiency of industry, and the most expedient use of manpower and material.

Enemy action has resulted in a major alteration for the worse of our over-all transportation situation. Until and unless that situation is remedied, we face continued and increasing inadequacy of transport. Only an early termination of hostilities, from unforeseeable causes, could in time relieve us of this problem.

Necessity for general transportation relief and expansion

To argue, on however fallacious grounds, that a highly specialized facility such as a pipe line, incapable of transporting more than certain selected petroleum products, requires less steel or less power than a barge, is to ignore the greater part of our dilemma. While it can be shown that inland water transport is in truth a more efficient means of moving petroleum than is a pipe line, I invite your attention to the more important fact that above and beyond our need for petroleum in the East is our necessity for general transportation relief and expansion. How these are to be obtained by any means which we can safely and expediently employ, except by resorting to water-borne traffic, has yet to be suggested by anyone.

As pointed out by President Adams and President Jackson, and many before and since their time, the great salient of North America is the peninsula of Florida; and the ability to circumnavigate its extremity or traverse its base is the ultimate military key to the Mississippi Valley. We have lost our ability to maintain our supply lines via the straits, and it is a tragic fact that we cannot yet route water-borne cargoes across this barrier between the East and the central South and West.

I think that the able Chief of Army Engineers Major General Reybold, effectively disposed of the question as to whether it is practicable, without disproportionate drafts on manpower and material, to make this inland water transport available for service during the war, when he indicated that it might be completed and implemented by the winter of 1944–45—unless we care to assume the termination of the conflict before that time. The decision to be made is not whether we can repair and expand our wartime transport by this means, but whether we feel that such repair and expansion is necessary or whether better means for doing so are available.

No agency of Government specifically charged with duty of developing and fostering inland water transport

One of the difficulties which has faced Congress in its consideration of this matter is the fact that there is no administrative agency of the Government which is specifically charged with the duty of developing and fostering inland water transport. On the other hand, all competing forms of transportation are the special interest of some such agency. It is understandable, human, and natural, although unfortunate, that these agencies should, on the one hand, avoid the responsibility of putting forth suggestions for barge transport and on the other oppose any development which may appear to threaten the further development of the utilities with which they are especially concerned.

The Maritime Commission is concerned with ships, not inland barges. The Petroleum Administration is apparently dedicated to the building of a system of pipe lines. The traditional and apparently fixed policy of the Army and the Navy is to regard as outside their sphere of interest all civilian-operated transport, unless and until such transport fails to supply their operational requirements, and to look with disfavor upon any development embodying a draft upon potential military necessities if such a draft can be met by deductions from the civilian requirements.

In time of war this is probably the best policy for the Military Establishment to pursue, leaving to Congress the responsibility of providing for the welfare of the people and for the measure of unavoidable sacrifice they must make to preserve the internal structure of the Nation and furnish the necessary support for the war effort.

Senator MAYBANK. May I ask a question there? In view of the fact that this question concerns the military as against the civilian, will there be any critical material of the nature that is now being discussed and argued over in connection with the rubber program as against the 100 or high octane, used in the construction of this canal, of any consequence?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Certainly of no consequence, Senator.

Circumstanced as we are, there is unquestionably enough petroleum, food, steel, and other material for the Army and Navy. Because these arms of the service have and should have first call on our resources. What they take must be yielded by the civilian supply, and the deficiency borne by the people or made up by measures the responsibility for the adoption of which rests with Congress, not with the Military Establishment.

It is understandable, therefore, that we are unable to draw from the Army or Navy affirmative support for the construction of this project at this time, any more than the Petroleum Administration was able to draw from them an approval of the 24-inch pipe line, or the railroads were able to draw an approval for more locomotives and cars. Yet the civilian authority caused the pipe line to be built, just as a certain number of locomotives and cars are being built, and, it is hoped, this canal will be built. The Army and Navy and the civilian population will all be beneficiaries.

Nor can we look for encouragement to the Office of Defense Transportation, which is naturally centered upon the notable effort of the railroads, and, from the departmental point of view, can hardly be expected to welcome the diversion of materials from what they consider the program with which they are most concerned.

However, it may be appropriate to point out that waterway transportation, including this project, has always been strongly and effectively opposed by the railroads. They bear a share in the responsibility for a situation which finds us without this essential water transport, and must answer for it at the bar of public opinion.

So must the Petroleum Administration for War answer for its past and present obstruction of the canal, and so must we who insist that it should be built. There is this difference, however, in our position and theirs. Whereas we hold and have always held that all our facilities for transport, pipe lines, railways, and waterways, should be developed in the public interest, theirs has been a position antagonistic to all forms of transportation except that of immediate concern to them.

Canal would provide a major additional transportation facility

In seeking this appropriation, we have no disposition to hinder the appropriate executive agencies in the exercise of their judgment as to the course that should be pursued. It is recognized that there exists a serious shortage of transportation facilities. If and when this barge canal is built, and the necessary conveyancing facilities become available, there will exist a major additional means of supplying a very large portion of our requirements.

We feel that there should prevail the right to make such means available, and we feel that this right should not be lightly ignored; that it should be carefully weighed not alone in the light of facilities presently to be available, but in the light of growing demands, which, conceivably, may reach proportions far beyond present estimates.

If the appropriation is made, Congress will not be responsible for not having made it possible to take advantage of this additional means of supply, but will have implemented its policy expressed in the authorizing act. In that act Congress expressly recognized the project as a defense measure, and its emergent nature was explicitly stated by the declared purpose—"to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment." Higher authority for the military value of the project cannot be had.

Document on defense coordination of the Panama and Florida canals

I will now ask the committee to refer to Senate Document No. 198, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "Defense Coordination of the Panama and Florida Canals." Please refer to the map, sheet 7 of 8.

This document relates in particular to the formerly proposed ship canal across Florida; but the features I desire to point out relate in a large measure to the present proposed barge canal. The date of this document is April 1940, nearly 2 years before our entry into the war.

Principal areal sources of raw materials

This chart, sheet 7 of 8, outlines the principal areal sources of raw materials in the United States and Latin America.

Area A, the Eastern Seaboard States, is the principal consuming and manufacturing area, while area B, the Mississippi Valley, is the chief producing area. Areas C, D, E, F, and G are next in order from the supply point of view. The raw materials produced in all these areas are listed at the left of the chart. I wish to offer this chart for the record.

The principal logistic problem is the transport between areas A and B, and between areas A and C. Transport between area A and areas D, E, F, and G is only of relatively less importance. Eighty percent of all transport is between A and B, and the maintenance of this transport is our chief problem. Normally, this transport is afforded by rail and

by coastwise vessel. At present, coastwise traffic is suspended, and all freight must move overland.

Likewise, freight from areas E and F and a large part of that from G could move by vessel to the Gulf coast, and thence overland to A, thus further burdening our rail system.

With the completion of the link across Florida, a large part of the tonnage which formerly moved coastwise between A and B will be able to move via the intracoastal canal, as well as the tonnage originating in E, F, and G, which could be transshipped to barges at Gulf ports.

Movement of Venezuelan oil

At this point I desire to call your attention to the fact that the safest and only practicable present route for oil from Venezuela to Atlantic ports of the United States is to a Gulf port and thence overland to the north and east. If we have to get more petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard than our own fields can produce under existing conditions, Venezuelan oil could move to our Atlantic coast via the comparatively safe Gulf waters and thence, by transshipment and barges, via the Intracoastal Waterway to the east. Here is reasonably satisfactory insurance against an insufficient supply of our own.

Potential war service of canal

Some idea of the potential war service of the barge canal can be gained by remembering that in the year 1941 approximately 23,000,000 tons of dry cargo moved coastwise between A and B, and that if the fleet of 1,000 barges and 334 tugs suggested by the Chief of Engineers were duplicated for dry cargo, it would carry 27,000,000 tons. In other words, that number of dry-cargo barges with tugs could restore the entire coastwise traffic over the intracoastal route, which formerly moved between these areas by ocean vessel.

Effect of war upon coastwise shipping

If the committee will now turn to the chart marked "4 of 8," there will be seen the former coastwise routes pursued by traffic between these areas. Each dot represents an actual ship. The numbers at the left each relates to a ship. The name and description of the ship will be found opposite its number on pages 7 through 24.

All of this coastwise traffic has been now suspended. It will be easily seen why this is so. That the destruction of many of these ships and the removal of all from the coastwise routes was definitely foreseeable in April 1940 is shown by reference to pages 33 and 34.

Copies of the two charts and of pages 33 and 34 are offered for the record.

* * * * *

Freight savings

Mr. BUCKMAN. Leaving for a moment the war service of the canal, I ask the committee to look at two charts I now hand to you. These charts were prepared in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and while they relate to freight savings which would be afforded by the ship canal, they are of value in considering the freight savings which would undoubtedly accrue by use of the barge canal in peacetime. They also show rather distinctly how the proposed barge canal across Florida connects not only the Gulf and the Atlantic intracoastal waterways, but connects these with the entire inland waterway system of the Mississippi Valley, making possible through barge shipments from central Mississippi Valley points to points on the Atlantic seaboard. I wish to offer these charts for the record

The first of these charts is marked "Tributary Area for Domestic Water-Borne Commerce," and the second is marked "Tributary Area for Foreign Commerce."

Effect of canal on freight rates

While it must be remembered that the areas shown are tributary to the proposed ship canal and would not be identical with those which might be shown for the barge canal, the vastly lower cost of barge transport for heavy bulk freight compared with rail costs (the ratio is about 3 to 8) would undoubtedly create comparable areas in which there would be important freight savings. Freight rates do not exist until a traffic artery is opened. Hence no rates have been established on barge hauls from Gulf to Atlantic areas. It is a safe assumption, however, that the lower cost of barge hauling would result in lower rates on this route, as it has done on all other waterways. The railroads have testified to this.

Commodities that would move through canal

In its report under date of February 1, 1934, the Department of Commerce gives the following partial list of commodities which would move through this canal barge at a lower rate than by rail overland: Asphalt; autos, tractors, and parts; bags, bagging and ties; beverages, cereal—beer; canned meats and fish; canned vegetables; cement; chemicals; citrus fruits; clay and clay products; coal and coke; cottonseed products; fertilizer and fertilizer materials; grain, other than wheat.

Grain, wheat; grain products, flour, feed, hay; gravel; groceries, miscellaneous; iron and steel, billets, plates, and sheets; iron and steel, structural; iron and steel, pig and scrap; iron and steel, pipe and tubing; iron and steel, wire products; iron and steel, miscellaneous; lime, limestone, and plaster; lumber; lumber products; machinery and parts.

Naval stores; paper and paper articles; peanuts; petroleum products; phosphate; roofing and roofing material; salt; soap and soap powder; sugar; vegetables, fresh and dried.

Since the time of this report there will undoubtedly have to be added to this list the following: Sulfur, cotton, ores, beef, wood pulp, cross ties, ceramic ware, glass sands, bauxite, building stone, road materials, maize oil, carbon products, fuller's earth, fish oils, paint pigments.

I do not think that anyone versed in transportation will question the far-reaching and favorable reduction in rates which this canal would bring about for more than half the States of the Union.

Movement of petroleum through canal

I now turn to the principal liquid cargo which will naturally move by this waterway—petroleum. In time of peace, despite the fact that the ocean tanker will undoubtedly carry the through cargoes from Gulf ports to north Atlantic ports, the ability of the barge to make distribution at any point on the waterway will insure a large peacetime movement of this commodity by this means, especially to points between New Orleans and Norfolk.

Wartime movement of petroleum from gulf and Mississippi River ports to Atlantic seaboard

Of more immediate concern is the wartime movement of petroleum from Gulf and Mississippi River ports to the Atlantic seaboard.

The Chief of Engineers has stated that the theoretical capacity of the presently proposed locks is the bottleneck of the canal, and that this is equivalent to approximately 1,080,000 barrels per day. However, he prefers the view that a practical limit would be 600,000 barrels per day, and has suggested that a practical initial program would be the opening of the canal and the provision of a fleet of 1,000 10,000-barrel barges and some 334 tugs to assure delivery in the Philadelphia area of 250,000 barrels per day. This fleet could be in substantial measure recruited from tugs now built or building (more than 100) and barges built or building (more than 500).

Operation of barges on waterways a proven business enterprise

It should be borne in mind that the cost of the barge fleet is not necessarily a Government expense but, like existing equipment, is properly the concern of private enterprise. The view that anything more than the cost of the canal itself ($44,000,000) is an anticipated net expense to the Federal Treasury, is fallacious. The operation of barges on these waterways is a proven business enterprise.

Need for additional facilities for transportation of petroleum

While it is only one of the aspects of this undertaking, the need for this waterway to augment our wartime petroleum transport and to relieve the railways merits the most careful consideration. That additional transportation facilities for this purpose are needed is not disputed. The Petroleum Administrator for War has clearly indicated his view in this matter by the suggestion that a third large pipe line may be applied for. This without any anticipation of relieving the consumer of rationing.

That rationing must continue until and unless we get more transportation has been clearly stated. The Petroleum Administrator for War made the following statement before the Truman committee, in January of this year:

"Secretary ICKES. We realize how serious the situation is, and no one can foretell, least of all I, what the demands are going to be from the armed fronts. The President said that we are going to strike everywhere. You can't move without gasoline. I know what the British stock position is today. It is the worst we have ever had. It is below the danger point. Summer is coming, when we can move large quantities where we have available storage. The operation of replenishing our east coast storage alone is an enormous task, and you can add to that making the much greater quantities of 100-octane gasoline that the armed forces are now asking us for and getting it over to north Africa and England and maybe other fronts that are soon to be opened. I wish that these points had been raised earlier."

Later, in the same hearing, he said:

"And the projected demands are astounding. I can't give you the figures in a public meeting. I should be glad to tell you, if you want to have it."

In a statement issued on March 16, 1943, the Petroleum Industry Council for War (a body created by the Petroleum Administrator for War) said:

"By the end of 1943, however, deliveries should actually be greater than they were before the war. Unfortunately, the civilian consumer may not get any part of these increased deliveries, and some degree of rationing will continue. In fact, the present forecasts of military demands indicate a definite possibility that the shortage next winter will be equally as critical as it was this winter."

Extract from letter of April 1, 1943, to Congressman SNYDER from Secretary Ickes

In a letter dated April 1, 1943, addressed to the Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the Subcommittee for War of the House Committee on Appropriations, the Petroleum Administrator for War said:

"The account in this morning's paper of the testimony of Mr. George A. Wilson, of the Transportation Division of this Office, before the Subcommittee on War Department, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, creates the impression that the

Petroleum Administration has already determined that fuel-oil rationing next winter will be unnecessary.

"It is most unfortunate that any such statement should be made, because it has not foundation in the supply facts as they are before us at this time, and is definitely not a position which the Petroleum Administration can take in advance of knowing more than can now be known as to the days ahead. On the contrary, with stocks on the Atlantic seaboard badly depleted, with off-shore military requirements continuing to increase for obvious reasons, with the greater demand of a war industry operating at full speed, and with such unsettled questions as whether we are to have the material with which to build the additional pipe line planned, there can be no solid basis for assurance that a continuation of restrictions upon consumption will not be necessary.

"It is always difficult to forecast the future and particularly difficult in times of war. Next winter is 6 months off and many things can happen in 6 months to change radically a position so sensitive as that of petroleum supplies. But if we are guided by the facts before us today—and we cannot well be guided by anything else—we can conclude only that we are by no means out of the woods; that to enter next winter as well supplied as we were this winter represents a colossal task considering the condition of inventory, and that there is very present indication that we face deficiencies ahead."

Probability of continued and more stringent rationing

The essence of the situation appears to be that we are not only certainly faced with a continuance of present rationing, but we are faced with the undoubted probability of more stringent rationing than the civilian population and industry can stand, unless we take steps now to augment our petroleum transport.

Mr. Chairman, may I have permission in reviewing my testimony, if I find a statement which I think should be off the record to take it out?

Senator THOMAS. That is the rule of the committee.

Each witness is the judge of what should or should not be in the record. If our clerk thinks something is questionable, he may call your attention to that, so that you may agree on what should be in or out of the record.

Senator MAYBANK. I understand you say this is referring to 1940?

Mr. BUCKMAN. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Tuesday, April 20, 1943)

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

STATEMENTS OF J. R. PARTEN, DIRECTOR, TRANSPORTATION DIVISION, AND SHERMAN ARCHBOLD, F. C. COLEGROVE, W. C. KINSOLVING, WILLIAM EBERLE, ADOLPH H. LEVY, PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

* * * * *

Comparative use of critical materials

Mr. PARTEN. As is shown on exhibit A, the use of critical materials necessary for the barrels per day delivered to the east coast would be wasteful as compared with other methods of petroleum movement. That is, the use of 1 ton of steel in the approved 20-inch pipe line at 235,000 barrels per day capacity will increase east coast deliveries by 0.34 of a barrel of oil per day. The use of 1 ton of steel in constructing barges to deliver the same products from Houston, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., will deliver only 0.46 of a barrel per day.

Less power equipment required for movement of petroleum by pipe line

In the second place, there is a shortage of power equipment. The approved 20-inch pipe line with the use of 1 horsepower will deliver 2.2 barrels per day to the east coast. One horsepower used in the barges necessary to deliver the same products from Houston, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., will deliver only 0.67 of a barrel of oil per day.

Comparison from standpoint of manpower

Furthermore, in the use of manpower—which is now a national problem—we can make another comparison. The pipe line will require relatively few skilled men. The pilots for the tugs must be trained, and there will be many required if an appreciable amount of oil were moved via the Florida Canal. When the 20-inch pipe line is completed, one man will be required for every 400 barrels per day delivered to the east coast. On the other hand, if barges via the Florida Canal were used to move the same products, one man would be required for every 34 barrels per day of oil delivered from the marginal sources of supply to Trenton, N. J.

Construction of pipe lines

Therefore, it is our conclusion that if additional transportation is required over and above that now planned, the way to get that transportation is either to speed up the construction of the large pipe lines, and if the equipment be sufficient, even the consideration of building a third large pipe line to the eastern seaboard.

Position of Petroleum Administration for War on construction of Florida Canal

We have never been able to bring ourselves to a point that we can recommend the building of extensive barge facilities, because of the cold facts that steel, horsepower, and manpower requirements are too great, as compared with those required in the other media of transport to do this job and that, Mr. Chairman, is the basis of our position with relation to the Florida barge canal.

Now, as I have tried to make plain before, we are not saying the barge canal across Florida should not be built. We are simply saying that it will not appreciably help us solve this east coast shortage of oil.

Senator THOMAS. And your statement is made strictly then on the problem confronting you of getting oil from the interior to the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. PARTEN. That is correct.

Senator THOMAS. Senator LODGE, do you have any questions?

Use of manpower and critical materials on other types of transportation

Senator LODGE. Yes. And so you not only do not believe that the construction of this canal would help the petroleum situation, but as I get your comment you also feel that in view of the tight situation insofar as manpower, steel, and other types of power are concerned, it would be done at the expense of pipe lines and other types of delivery?

Mr. PARTEN. That is true. If it should be done it would represent, in our opinion, a wasteful use of critical materials.

Senator LODGE. Which might set us back insofar as building pipe lines are concerned?

Mr. PARTEN. I think that is correct, undoubtedly.

Senator THOMAS. Any further questions?

Senator LODGE. And, of course, this proposition rests on a number of different arguments, and this morning we are just considering one of them, as you have correctly pointed out; but if you look at it solely resting on the point of national defense—it has a local angle from the standpoint of the Southern States, and has a local angle from the standpoint of the Northeastern States—but if you are just thinking about relieving the fuel situation in New England, on the basis of what you say, you would not build this canal, but you would take the manpower, and the steel, and the other types of power that would be consumed by this canal, and you would use them for pipe lines.

Mr. PARTEN. We would, sir.

Time for completion of 20-inch pipe line

I can visualize that if it were not for the tightness in power equipment, the unavailability of power equipment, we might get that 20-inch pipe line completed within the year. We first planned to complete that pipe line within the year, but we have been informed that the situation is so tight on power equipment that we would have to be, or would be obliged to remodel our program and instead of putting all of the designed pump stations on that line, we are first going to complete the line with alternate stations installed. That is where we are getting the 165,000 barrels a day at the outset. As the power equipment is available, we will fill in those intermediate stations thereafter, and step it up to 235,000 barrels per day.

One method can only be used at the expense of another

Senator LODGE. So if there were enough power and enough steel, and enough men, or a surplus of all of those things, why you might not object to doing this, but when those factors are short and tight, one thing can only be done at the expense of something else.

Mr. PARTEN. That is true.

Senator LODGE. That is all I have.

(April 27, 1943)

Question as to use of canal if it were complete now

Senator MALONEY. Major Parten, in your judgment, if the Florida Canal were now complete, would you advocate or undertake to advocate the construction of barges and power to carry the oil or other products across Florida; preferring it to other methods; convoyed vessels, for example?

Mr. PARTEN. Senator, I do not believe that we could in the light of the material requirements and the power and equipment requirements; and the manpower requirements.

Estimate of oil that could be transported through canal

Senator MALONEY. What is the most liberal estimate of the oil that could be transported across Florida, assuming that you had all of the barges you wanted?

Mr. PARTEN. It would be difficult to estimate that from a power standpoint and from a material standpoint. Our figures show that Norfolk would be about a breaking point on the delivery of material that way; petroleum that way.

Senator MALONEY. I am very timid about asking questions, because I have missed so much of the hearings, having been obliged to attend other hearings, and perhaps some of this you have been over before.

Potential capacity of 24-inch pipe line

What is the potential capacity of the Big Inch line?

Mr. PARTEN. Three hundred thousand barrels per day.

Senator MALONEY. That is what is estimated, but what is the maximum with additional power?

Mr. PARTEN. We could build that line up to 450,000 barrels a day with the addition of 200-percent power equipment.

Senator MALONEY. Well, that would give an additional 150,000 barrels of oil a day in the distressed area.

Mr. PARTEN. Yes.

Comparison of power equipment required for 24-inch pipe line and for barges

Senator MALONEY. Which takes the most vital equipment, the additional power for the "big inch" line, or the additional power needed to build the barges and the power equipment, and so forth, to get across Florida?

Mr. KINSOLVING. The power for the "big inch" which is now being completed would be 117,000 horsepower.

Mr. PARTEN. Senator, I would like to make an answer to that question and insert it in the record. As I understand what you would like to have would be a relationship of the power, by stepping up the 24-inch pipe line to its maximum feasible capacity, which would be 150,000 barrels a day additional, as against the power equipment required to haul 150,000 to the consumers on the eastern seaboard if we had the Florida Canal.

Senator MALONEY. That is right.

Mr. PARTEN. I would guess offhand that the power equipment required would be a standoff. That is a curbstone opinion. I would like to prepare an answer to that and put it in the record, if I might.

(The information referred to follows:)

"The power required to move 150,000 barrels per day by barge from Houston to Trenton would be about 225,000 horsepower, while the power necessary to increase the 24-inch pipe line capacity by 150,000 barrels per day would be about 234,000 horsepower."

Senator MALONEY. I am not talking about dollars.

Mr. PARTEN. I understand.

Senator MALONEY. I am talking about power.

Mr. PARTEN. I understand, Senator. Here is what we get up against. When we get beyond a certain capacity in a pipe line the required power equipment goes up very rapidly to increase the capacity. That is the reason that we only designed the 24-inch pipe line for 300,000 barrels per day.

Senator MALONEY. I understand.

Mr. PARTEN. I said to get a 50-percent increase in through-put capacity we would have to add 200 percent of power equipment or an additional 234,000 horsepower.

Question as to stepping up power on 24-inch pipe line or constructing canal

Senator MALONEY. I understand. What I was trying to develop was the answer to what you would do if you were only confronted with the problem of transporting oil to the East; whether you would step up the power on the "big inch" line to get that 150,000 barrels, or whether you would build barges; dig the canal and provide the power.

Mr. PARTEN. I can answer that question for you. We would step up the power on the 24-inch line or propose another large pipe line; one of the two or both.

Senator MALONEY. Actually, as I see the situation—and I am asking a question—if it were entirely a matter of getting oil to the East, which has become a big issue in connection with this matter, it would be cheaper, would it not, to build another pipe line?

Mr. PARTEN. That is true.

Senator MALONEY. And you would get more oil.

Mr. PARTEN. Cheaper from the standpoint of the critical materials and also cheaper from the standpoint of——

Senator MALONEY. Standpoint of manpower.

Mr. PARTEN. And from the standpoint of manpower.

Senator MALONEY. The operations, I mean.

Mr. PARTEN. Operating manpower; that is true.

Senator MALONEY. And cheaper per barrel of oil?

Mr. PARTEN. Those figures are in the record. It would be cheaper in dollars to deliver the oil.

Senator MALONEY. And it certainly would be better—at least it would in my judgment—and again I am asking a question—it would be better for the people in the distressed oil areas to have the pipe lines. They could do a better job, could they not?

Mr. PARTEN. I think so, undoubtedly, Senator.

Use of canal in peacetime

Senator MALONEY. As a matter of fact, Major—I do not know whether you are sufficiently familiar with this subject or not—but, if we were now in peacetime it would be much more economical to forget the Florida Canal, insofar as the transportation of oil is concerned; and forget the pipe line. I am talking about going around the Florida Keys.

Mr. PARTEN. From the standpoint of oil deliveries on the eastern seaboard in normal peacetime economy, I would say "Yes."

Senator MALONEY. You do not believe, do you Major Parten, if we built this Florida Canal and peace comes, that it will ever be used to transport petroleum to any appreciable extent?

Mr. PARTEN. Not to any appreciable extent, because we are going to have a lot of pipe lines, and a lot of tank ships at the end of the war, I think.

Senator MALONEY. As a matter of fact, the present pipe lines are sufficient for a long time after the war ceases; we will have sufficient carrying capacity?

Mr. PARTEN. I would say that we are going to have a very bountiful capacity of petroleum transport to the eastern seaboard after the war is over.

Senator MALONEY. So, insofar as the argument now made concerning this, we are dealing purely with wartime matters. Is that right?

Mr. PARTEN. Yes. And I am only discussing the standpoint of petroleum supply.

Mr. MALONEY. That is the big issue.

Senator THOMAS. Any further questions?

* * * * *

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GLASS: The War Department does not favor enactment of the amendment to H. R. 2346, Seventy-eighth Congress (a bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes), which proposes an appropriation of $44,000,000 for the construction of a barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, concerning which amendment your committee desires the views of this Department.

If the canal were completed and available for use at this time, it would, of course, be of military value.

However, if the amendment were adopted, the canal could not be put into operation for a considerable period. Many men, whose efforts it is believed could presently be more advantageously devoted to other work in connection with the war effort, would be required in the construction of the canal. The project would, further, require the uses of critical materials which the Nation cannot afford to have diverted from other war uses. Large quantities of equipment, which are now or may, due to changing war conditions, be required elsewhere, would also have to be assigned to the construction work.

The canal cannot, therefore, be put into operation except at a sacrifice of other projects and programs which now require the manpower and materials which would be necessary for its completion. Balancing conflicting needs, the War Department believes that it would be inadvisable at this time to commit to the project the manpower, critical materials, and equipment necessary to complete the barge canal and thus to obtain any future military advantage which would result.

Accordingly, the War Department does not favor the enactment of the proposed amendment to H. R. 2346.

The fiscal effects of the enactment of the amendment are indicated by the sum proposed to be appropriated therein.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

LETTER FROM NAVY DEPARTMENT

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

The CHAIRMAN, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The estimates for the completion of the Florida barge canal have been variable, the minimum estimate being 10 months providing that no restrictions are placed on material, labor, and equipment, otherwise the completion time would be from 2 to 3 years.

If the canal were completed certain naval advantages for small craft would result, but these cannot be considered to be of primary importance. On the other hand, if the canal were completed and large numbers of tugs and barges were available such that critical war materials, oil, and produce could be transported without the use of sea-borne shipping the situation would be desirable in connection with the present war effort.

Submarine action in the area involved since July 1942 has only resulted in the loss of a few vessels and, therefore, as an immediate measure the project cannot be given a high naval priority.

Should any considerable amount of critical materials be required in the construction of the canal or any considerable construction of floating equipment, tugs, and barges be required such that any diversion of strategic and critical materials from the present shipbuilding program would result, the Navy Department would consider the project as undesirable for completion at this time.

The Navy Department is of the opinion that this project should be held in abeyance.

Respectfully,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MALONEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. George B. Wilson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of October 1942;

Capt. Ralph S. Wentworth, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Iceland, to rank from the 24th day of April 1943; and

Capt. Charles M. Yates, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Oran, to rank from the 26th day of April 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Antionette T. McKechnie, to be postmaster at Gearhart, Oreg. (adversely reported).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask that in the case of the nominations confirmed, the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the executive calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. MALONEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Rena M. Rinaldi, Randsburg.

GEORGIA

Royce D. Power, Vienna.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ollie W. Bowers, Central.

WISCONSIN

Frank Hanley, North Freedom.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in our failure to understand, we praise Thee that Thou art not far away. Over against every desire and every yearning, Thou, O Christ, wilt meet every want. As we walk among our fellows, grant us such cheerfulness and faith that we may reflect the beautiful secret of our Master. Grant that those under circumstances of temptation and trial, and those who are bestead by false criticism, may know that all things work together for good to them who love Thee.

We pray for greater and more just consideration among our people that divisive influences may be overthrown and destroyed; do Thou greatly multiply the things which make for unity and peace. O Thou, Regent over all doubts and darkness, we need the covert on which the storm beats in vain. As Thy spirit moves on the face of the contrary waters, we need Thee above all besetting clouds, principalities, and powers. Bring out into the light of day all who are failing our country in the realm of selfishness and arrogant ambition. In these burdensome days we pray that every citizen of our Republic may free himself from every fatal indifference lurking within and take his stand which refuses to be bound by the windowless chambers of association and prejudice. Almighty God, be present in the battle line, the march, and in the bivouac where the trees sigh in summer and wail in winter. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 796. An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a questionnaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two different matters, and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, of all the democratic freedoms, none is more priceless than freedom of the press. It is the cornerstone of representative democracy. When facts are suppressed or misrepresented, the government "of the people, for the people, and by the people" perishes.

The tax fight through which we have recently passed aroused more interest and vitally affected more people than any issue of recent years. Editorially, the majority of the press favored the Ruml plan, but, thanks to a firm allegiance to the fundamental principle of freedom of the press, all papers faithfully, fairly, and impartially reported the facts concerning all of the tax proposals.

I take off my hat to the members of the Fourth Estate serving with us at the National Capitol. They were called upon to report on a highly technical issue. They burned the midnight oil to get the facts, and then, without fear or favor through the news columns of the papers for which they wrote, they presented those facts to the reading public.

It should be gratifying to those who voted for the tax bill that passed the House on Tuesday to note the favorable newspaper comment on the bill. There were friendly comments in all of the Washington papers, the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, and many others.

It is impossible for any Member to carry in his head all of the details of a complex tax bill. The answer to many questions being asked concerning provisions of the House bill will be found in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, commencing at page 3850.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial address made by Surrogate James A. Foley, of New York, at the meeting of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on the life of Maj. Gen. Alexander E. Anderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative proceedings and any other special orders today I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the Foreign Commerce Weekly. The Government Printing Office indicates that the cost will be $75. Nevertheless, I ask that it be included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from this morning's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein an editorial and official military reports in connection with the retirement of Chap-

lain Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni, chief chaplain at Camp Grant, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on the resolution to extend the reciprocal trade agreements, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] appeared before the committee and made a very able statement. I would like to have that made available to the entire membership of the House. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD. The cost will exceed the usual amount, but I think it is well worth while.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE COURAGE OF YOUTH IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks by the insertion of a small editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, at a time like this, it is refreshing to note the courage, intelligence, and energy with which the youth of the land is lending itself in the advancement of every plan in furthering the war effort and in every program that will enable us to feed a hungry world. Boys and girls, Future Farmers, and 4–H Club members are making a great contribution at this time. Their efforts, I am sure, are appreciated by all people who are studying agricultural problems and as an evidence of the appreciation of the people of these efforts, I quote herewith an editorial from the Nashville Banner of Monday, May 3:

THE RICHER FOR IT

Agriculture—unlike all the other industries—did not grow up. It was born full grown, and has been from the beginning, because from the beginning the human race has had to eat. Nevertheless, it can be said that the best of farmers grow up with it, and those making the most of their opportunities have made improvements in it.

Future Farmers and 4–H Club members are peculiarly blessed with that opportunity, an instance of which comes to mind with the announcement that 670 of them in Tennessee this spring marketed a half-million pounds of quality fat hogs in shows and sales here, at Memphis, Knoxville, and Chattanooga. They have learned the value of quality livestock, and such diversification of money crops as accents agricultural progress.

These 670 farm youths are richer by almost $70,000, and as local packers bought their products, the State stands to eat better to the extent of 500,000 more pounds of quality pork.

DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the freight rate structure now in existence in this country is grossly discriminatory against the West and South. These differences must be eliminated if the South, the West, and the Southwest are to be permitted to develop properly. In order to eliminate them I am this day introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which is drawn along lines recommended by Mr. Robert E. Webb and Mr. C. E. Childe in the majority report on their study of national freight rates, made by the Board of Investigation and Research. This committee was authorized by act of Congress and has given months of careful study to the subject.

The bill is an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. It adds a new section which declares that it is in the interest of the proper development of this country as a whole that there be established a uniform classification of property and a uniform scale of class rates for application to the transportation of property by railroad throughout the United States. The bill provides for full hearings on the reasonableness and lawfulness of the classification and rates proposed.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has not taken the proper action to eliminate discriminatory freight rates that now exist. The adoption and carrying out of the provisions of this bill will stop the present industrial choking of the South, the West, and the Southwest. It will encourage industry to locate in these areas close to raw materials and natural resources of the country. Nebraska has the raw materials, ample power facilities, a water level rail freight route, a chain of large airports and ideal climate and labor conditions. It only lacks fair freight rates. What is true of Nebraska is also true of the South and Southwest. It is most urgent and necessary that the Congress provide for the elimination of these discriminatory rates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CONFUSING DIRECTIVES FROM THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, so many cockeyed orders and directives are coming out of Washington, which are adversely affecting the business of the country that we have about reached the point where a halt should be called on these bureaucrats who issue the orders and leave businessmen all in doubt as to whether "the snake that made the track was going in or backing out."

The lumber division of O. P. A. has just issued an order undertaking to tell lumbermen how to tell a sawmill from a lumber yard. It was so confusing that trying to get the meaning was like endeavoring to hatch chickens from scrambled eggs. The lumbermen of my district threw up their hands in disgust and despair. Then a man in charge of that branch of the O. P. A. issued a clarifying directive that could be understood. Then a so-called lawyer, who never had a lawsuit in his life, held that it is illegal to clearly define a lumber yard in such terms that you can distinguish a mill from a distribution yard.

There ought to be an end to nonsense sometime. Those businessmen who up to this time have been able to travel under their own power ought to be let alone. The uncalled for interference with the lumber business of my section is threatening its continuation, may throw thousands out of work, reduce the available supply of lumber, and seriously retard the war effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COST OF CATTLE FEEDING

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARENDS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TYPICAL AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter which to my mind represents a typical American family. I think it possesses enough merit to justify its insertion in the RECORD as an example of American patriotism.

It reads as follows:

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO, *April 23, 1943.*

Dr. WALTER E. BREHM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BREHM: Our only son is a volunteer in the service of our country.

Twenty percent of our income is going into War bonds.

We have only requested an A gasoline ration card.

We have not hoarded canned goods.

We have supported every war activity, both financially and physically.

We have given our blood to the Red Cross.

And we are happy to have been able to do what we have done.

Although our taxes are greatly increased and my salary is frozen, we still do not mind.

But when we read and hear daily of the high-handed actions of some of our labor-leading racketeers who think they are mightier than the country that made their present position possible, then we believe it is time to call a halt.

We sincerely hope that you, as elected Representative of all the people, will make it your first order of business to see to it that these men are compelled to act patriotically in time of war, whether it is their selfish personal desire to do so or not.

We love our country—it is too fine a country to go the way of France. Please act before it is too late.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. X.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein

a resolution from the Legislature of the State of Delaware.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders and the regular business on the Speaker's desk today I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SILVER PURCHASE ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SULLIVAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 1291) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 (Rept. No. 420), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1291) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 1295) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort and for other purposes (Rept. No. 421), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1295) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes.

That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF NATURALIZATION LAW

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 1941) permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States (Rept. No. 422), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1941) permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1940

Mr. NICHOLS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on House Joint Resolution 111 to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111), to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. GATHINGS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

THE SILVER PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nevada has made some observations on silver with which I emphatically disagree. The House passed the so-called Celler amendment precluding any moneys appropriated under the Treasury-Post Office bill from being used for the purchase of silver. In order to create no embarrassment I did not press for the inclusion of that amendment in the final conference report, but I indicate to the gentleman from the silver State that this does not mean that I have ceased my fight to wipe out of the way lock, stock, and barrel all the silver purchase acts, and I shall press my claim before the Committee on Ways and Means to have a hearing and ultimately favorable review and approval of my bills to abolish these silver purchase acts by that committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DWORSHAK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked, what has been done for small business? Much has been done and much is now being done. One hundred and thirty-one different offices have been established throughout the country which will enable a small businessman to go near home and get the same service and consideration that the big businessman gets in Washington. Not as much has been done as I would like to see done but very good progress is being made and I think that progress may be considered satisfactory under Col. Robert Wood Johnson. The gentleman's statement about long-haired New Deal theorists down at O. P. A. ruining small business I do not think is justified. Although many things are being done by O. P. A. that I object to, they cannot be laid entirely at the door of the Democrats in O. P. A. If the gentleman will examine the personnel of O. P. A. he will find over 60 percent of them are Republicans, so you certainly would not consider that they are all New Deal Democrats. You cannot consider that only administration Democrats are the ones who are trying to destroy small business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Colonel Johnson impressed me as being very much of an outstanding American. As I recollect it, though, he is not a Democrat?

Mr. PATMAN. I understand Colonel Johnson, who will soon be General Johnson, is a Republican. I know lots of mistakes have been made down there but they are not all made by Democrats. Of course, the Democrats are responsible, but over 60 percent of the personnel of O. P. A. are Republicans.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not class these intellectual supermen as either Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. PATMAN. Why does not the gentleman name one?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is Dr. Galbraith.

Mr. PATMAN. Who else?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. PATMAN. Who else?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Baker.

Mr. PATMAN. Who else?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Weiner.

Mr. PATMAN. Who else?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I could go on down the line and give you scores of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Will you put them in the RECORD?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Ginsburg who just went out is another one.

Mr. PATMAN. Consider the number of employees of O. P. A., then compare the number the gentleman mentions with the total number employed and they are insignificant. Anyone who is wrong down there should be put out and I have requested the removal of certain personnel in O. P. A.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. These men make the policies, and they know nothing about business, production, or distribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an interesting letter sent to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey by Hon. FRANCIS E. KELLY, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE O. P. A.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I do not pretend to know all about the O. P. A., but I would like to direct to the attention of the gentleman from Texas, who is always defending governmental organizations, the fact that it is true there are hundreds of fine men and women employed in O. P. A. There are literally hundreds of splendid people holding positions of an executive character in O. P. A. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that the difficulty lies in the comparatively large number of dreamers who are to be found in the attorneys' section and in the economists' section. These are the men who have the power to write the interpretations and the rulings that override the actions of the splendid men, the gentlemen who are trying to do a good job down there in O. P. A. When we find fault, we are directing our criticism toward these lawyers and these economists whom the gentleman from Texas knows are there and who are indulging in practices that indicate a determination to wipe out the profit system and small business rather than to control prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA, GEN. ENRIQUE PEÑARANDA

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to wait upon and escort the President of Bolivia into the Chamber, the gentleman from Masschusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Under previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Bolivia and his party entered the Chamber at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m., and the President of Bolivia was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee of Representatives appointed for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, today it is my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to welcome into this Chamber a distinguished citizen from a friendly country in the Western Hemisphere. We in this Hemisphere more than ever before should know each other, our problems, and our mutual interests. Therefore, Mr. President, at this time especially we are glad to welcome you. Members of the House of Representatives, I present to you the President of the great Republic of Bolivia.

The PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is indeed a great honor for me to come into this shrine of American liberties.

I assure you that I am sincerely moved, because I consider you the true representatives of the American people, and know that through you I am speaking to them. I am grateful, therefore, for this honor, and I thank you in the name of my country as well as in my own.

The Congress of the United States has always played a significant role in the historic and political life of this great Nation. It stands, essentially, for the sovereign power of the people, and today, especially, it symbolizes to the world at large not only the objective manifestation of that power, but a real assurance that all freemen—within and without the United States—will find in its midst stanch defenders of justice and right.

This Congress is the best example of that admirable system of checks and balances which makes it possible to safeguard and preserve a sovereign power that is zealous of its rights and, at the same time, respectful of the limitations of its own privileges.

It is to such a harmonious balance of powers that we may trace the origin of

your democratic institutions, the security of your citizens, and their prized equality before the law.

I, too, represent a Republic that is proud of its genuine democratic tradition; a Republic whose birth was influenced by the lofty ideals that your own War of Independence and the French Revolution had just spread throughout the world.

No sooner was Bolivia's independence proclaimed than the nation was forced to struggle, in its first Congress of 1825, against material obstacles that at times caused men of little faith to lose confidence in the future. However, once those turbulent manifestations of a period of transition were over, it was evident that the Bolivian democratic consciousness was strong and deep-rooted. In the darkest days of her history, Bolivia, thanks to her own people, kept hope alive, and saw new life come to the nation through its Parliament and its Constituent Assemblies.

It had to be so, because the flame of Bolivia's republican spirit had never been extinguished; rather, it burned brighter, once the momentary shadows had been dispelled.

That light keeps shining today, perhaps brighter than ever. In dark moments like the present, when the strength and the wisdom of democratic convictions have been questioned, I am proud to say that Bolivia has reaffirmed her faith with unfaltering confidence and determination. As a result, my country has offered to you the sum total of her resources and her support in the vital struggle in which you are now engaged.

Bolivia was one of the first nations to break diplomatic relations with the Axis, and only a few days ago, moved by democratic fervor and the desire to make its material and moral collaboration with the United Nations even more effective, it declared the existence of a state of war with the Axis Powers.

As I face you, the lawmakers of the most powerful democracy, I cannot but recognize the solemnity of the moment.

We have come to a halt in the road. We are fighting aggression and violence. Our most cherished ideals are threatened, and somber fears darken the outlook for the future of humanity.

We are fighting to defend those ideals. Your soldiers have made them their battlecry and are struggling bravely to win or die for them. Perhaps, even more than material strength, it is their conviction of the justice of their cause that keeps them marching forward. That is why victory shall be theirs.

Yet, hard and heroic though the task of those warriors may be, no less hard and heroic a task awaits the lawmakers of America. Their deliberations today will determine the decisions to be made at the hour, already near, when justice is restored and when peace once again reigns among men of good will.

This is indeed a most significant moment. There is something in it that recalls the days of our republican infancy, when there were so many evidences of unity and fraternity. But today the parliaments of our continent are isolated, without contact. Until now we have lived in this great island, America, without knowing each other. Perhaps our only bond has been the identity of our democratic ideals.

Now that an era of closer political, cultural, and economic interchange has, fortunately, been initiated, it is the task of the lawmaking bodies of the New World to strengthen our ties of friendship and understanding by playing an ever increasing role in the external relations of our countries. This could be accomplished through an American inter-parliamentary union.

We are governments of the people and by the people. It is for the people, therefore, to decide the future by seeking inspiration in the conscience with which God has endowed every human being and which finds its purest expression when liberty and justice shine triumphant upon the earth.

At 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m. the President of Bolivia and his party departed.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the Speaker called the House to order at 1:05 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings had during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 796. An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, and 25; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,519,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That the office of Comptroller of Customs at San Francisco, California, is hereby abolished. The duties imposed by law and regulations upon the said Comptroller of Customs, his assistants and deputies, are hereby transferred to, imposed upon, and continued in positions now established in the Customs Service by or pursuant to law, as the Secretary of the Treasury by appropriate regulations shall specify; and he is further authorized to designate the title by which such positions shall be officially known hereafter. The Secretary of the Treasury, in performing the duties imposed upon him by this paragraph, shall administer the same in such manner that the transfer of duties provided hereby will not result in the establishment of any new positions in the Customs Service: *Provided further*, That no interior port of entry shall be closed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$578,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$467,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$795,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$134,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an admendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$276,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "seven hundred and eighty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,902,-160"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,-030,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "three hundred and forty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$822,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,-650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 8, 17, 18, and 26.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
J. W. BAILEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $163,760 for the Division of Tax Research as proposed by the Senate, instead of $116,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $90,165 for the Office of Tax Legislative Counsel as proposed by the Senate, instead of $74,700, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Deletes superfluous language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $271,000 for miscellaneous expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $274,300, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Limits the amount to be expended for "expenses of loans" to $57,-600,000, instead of $57,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $58,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount of the appropriation is to be allotted to agencies and activities of the Treasury Department in such manner and in such proportion as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $21,519,935 for the Bureau of Customs, instead of $22,-525,535 as proposed by the Senate, and $20,-481,585 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Abolishes the office of comptroller of the customs at San Francisco, Calif., instead of abolishing all offices of comptrollers of the customs as provided by the House, and provides that no interior port of entry shall be closed.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $1,150,000 for the Bureau of Narcotics instead of $1,200,-000 as proposed by the Senate, and $1,100,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $578,450 for salaries, office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $586,900 as proposed by the Senate, and $570,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $467,500 for salaries, office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $475,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $460,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $795,000 for salaries, office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $310,000 as proposed by the Senate and $780,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $134,000 for salaries, office of the Solicitor, instead of $138,000 as proposed by the Senate and $130,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $276,540 for salaries, office of the Chief Inspector, instead of $281,000 as proposed by the Senate and $274,320 as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 17 and 18 Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Authorizes employment of 785 post-office inspectors instead of 760 as proposed by the House and 835 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $2,902,-160 for salaries of post-office inspectors instead of $3,025,500 as proposed by the Senate and $2,840,500 as proposed by the House. Deletes a provision limiting the employment of 25 post-office inspectors to a period of 1 year proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,030,700 for travel and miscellaneous expenses of the postal-inspection service instead of $1,089,200 as proposed by the Senate and $1,001,450 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Authorizes employment of 340 clerks instead of 336 as proposed by the House and 347 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $822,600 for salaries of clerks instead of $815,000 as proposed by the House and $835,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $8,650,000 for salaries of clerks at third-class post offices instead of $8,700,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Includes the words "and airmail" in the title of the appropriation for star-route service in Alaska to describe properly the functions supported by the appropriation.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement and, as to those in which the managers on the part of the House are in agreement, the motion to be made is indicated:

Amendment No. 1: Deletes a provision, included in the bill by the House, prohibiting the expenditure of any appropriation in the bill for carrying out the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts.

Amendment No. 2: Increases the appropriation for "Foreign funds control" from $3,100,000 to $3,800,000.

Amendment No. 8: Authorizes the payment of mileage for use of personally owned automobiles to employees of the War Savings staff. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment limiting the authority to regular field employees of the staff.

Amendment No. 17: Authorizes the employment of a temporary expert by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or civil-service laws.

Amendment No. 18: Increases the appropriation for the Bureau of Accounts, Post Office Department, from $133,640 to $300,000.

Amendment No. 26: Provides for a study by the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General of the use of the mails by agencies in the executive branch of the Government, the report on such study to be filed within 60 days of the passage of the act, in lieu of the provision included by the House prohibiting the use of any funds in the bill for carrying penalty mail.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, your conferees have brought back four substantive controversial provisions for the judgment of the House. Those will be taken up in the regular order, which provides for an hour's discussion of each proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report itself is signed by the members of the committee, and therefore I shall not ask for a vote upon it. I do want to call attention to the fact that the organization under Mr. Graves

that is selling Government bonds is indulging in operations that are very destructive of the efforts to sell Government bonds and are interfering very much with the interest people throughout the country are taking in those efforts.

It has been brought to my attention that a very prominent farm leader a little while ago was asked to speak on the radio with reference to the April drive. He was asked to submit his proposed speech to this division for their consideration and after a few days received a letter from the Office of War Information telling him how he should write his speech and telling him how he should promote such things as the Social Security Act, such things as have been very controversial in this country, such things as were originated by Prince Bismarck in Germany many, many years ago. This resulted in no speech.

When an outfit that is entrusted with that kind of a job continues to try its very best to create situations and disputes among the American people, it is about time it is brought up short. It shows that no mistake was made by the House in cutting the appropriations for this outfit and indicates that they should have had a larger cut than was imposed upon them.

I am hopeful that as a result, perhaps, of what I am calling attention to at this time this outfit will pay more attention to selling Government bonds and less to promoting controversial activities in connection with that activity.

The letter that was sent to this gentleman was signed by a man named Harry C. Levin, Regional Radio Director of the O. W. I. in New York City.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this report is a unanimous report by the committee of conference, and I move its adoption.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 19, strike out the following:

"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used, directly or indirectly, during the fiscal year 1944, for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and yield myself 10 minutes.

When the Treasury-Postoffice Departments' appropriation bill was before the House under the 5-minute rule the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] offered the following amendment, which was adopted:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used, directly or indirectly, during the fiscal year 1944, for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts.

The Senate struck out this amendment. I have moved to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

I ask you to support the motion to recede and concur because this provision would have a harmful effect on the administrative operations of the Treasury Department in this time of war and grave emergency when the smooth and efficient operation of that department is most important. The Treasury Department submitted the following statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

It appears that although the enactment of this provision would not have the effect of repealing either the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 or section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, it would have the effect of hampering—and perhaps, even preventing—the carrying out of many of the provisions of both of these acts. Many of the functions of the Bureau of the Mint in acquiring and handling silver, and of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in issuing silver certificates are paid for out of the Treasury appropriation. So, too, are the salaries of some of the people engaged in administering the operations of the silver acts.

This House provision which the Senate amendment seeks to eliminate does not repeal the Silver Purchase Act. It temporarily nullifies it. It strangles its operations for the next fiscal year. It leaves the Secretary of the Treasury in the ridiculous situation of being still under a mandate from Congress to purchase silver until the accumulation of silver is one-fourth of the total monetary stocks or until the price of silver reaches 1.29 an ounce. As there is no prospect that either one of these objectives will ever be reached the mandate continues and will continue until it is repealed in the regular way, but this amendment would take away from the Secretary of the Treasury all of the money necessary to do the things Congress has ordered and is ordering him to do.

If the Silver Purchase Act is to be repealed it should be repealed after thoughtful consideration by a legislative committee of all of the various factors involved in such repeal and the committee should provide whatever legislative safeguards might be necessary to ward off the harmful effects that are bound to come from an abrupt termination of the appropriation as is here proposed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the Celler amendment in any way interfere with the use of silver for war purposes?

Mr. LUDLOW. It interferes very drastically with the operations of the Treasury Department, as I shall explain later on.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But it does not interfere with the use of silver for war purposes?

Mr. LUDLOW. As I understand there is a certain allocation of the accumulation of silver to the War Production Board. I do not know that it would interfere with that arrangement that has been made, and I am not arguing it from that standpoint.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there are two important reasons why this Senate amendment should be concurred in by the House? One is that to put the amendment into enactment would cripple the proper operation of the Treasury Department without any material benefit and without repealing the legislation objected to by the authors of the amendment?

Mr. LUDLOW. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And also that the amendment the Senate threw out is really legislation on an appropriation bill? If so, it ought not to have been permitted here in the first place.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the gentleman has correctly stated the two main objections to this proviso.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the House will concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that silver's contribution to the war effort to a considerable extent has permitted the mining and production of copper and zinc, so essential to the war effort, at a much lower price than those metals could be produced, were it not for the production of silver?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is true.

The adoption of the House language in the pending appropriation bill would cause utter confusion in the administration of the Treasury Department. The officials of that Department are so deeply concerned over the chaos that would be precipitated that they have sent me two letters pleading with the House to accept the Senate amendment. I want the House to listen to a letter I have received today from Daniel W. Bell, the Under Secretary of the Treasury. I read from it as follows:

A number of important questions are left in doubt by the above amendment. The Department has been studying these problems and I believe you will see our position more clearly if they are presented to you in some detail. Accordingly, I am taking this opportunity to indicate to you some of the more serious questions raised by the above amendment.

Foreign silver purchased pursuant to section 3 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 is acquired through the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as fiscal agent of the United States. Expenses incurred by that bank are considered a part of the cost of the silver purchased. Silver certificates are then issued against a sufficient quantity of the silver purchased to cover the cost. To this extent the expenditures incidental to the acquisition of silver under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 are not charged against Treasury appropriations.

The Treasury Department, however, pays the cost of printing and issuing these silver certificates out of its annual appropriations. Section 5 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 requires the issuance of silver certificates in a face amount not less than the cost of all silver purchased under that act. Consequently, each purchase of silver under section 3 involves the costs of printing and issu-

ing certificates, which costs are charged to the annual Treasury appropriations. The above amendment would appear to preclude the Department from using the appropriations for that purpose.

A tax of 50 percent on profits obtained from the transfer of any interest in silver bullion was established by section 8 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. The Bureau of Internal Revenue collects and administers that tax and the costs it incurs are paid out of its annual appropriation, which is included in H. R. 1648. This tax is one of the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and it would appear that the 1944 appropriation could not be used for the purpose of enforcing this provision if the above amendment is adopted.

Section 4 of the Act of July 6, 1939, directs the coinage mints to accept, at a specified return to the depositor, all newly mined domestic silver which is offered to them. The mints must first satisfy themselves that the conditions of the law have been met, and this requires investigations which frequently extend over a period of several months after the deposit is received. All of the expenses involved in investigating deposits and determining whether there has been compliance with the conditions of the statute and the regulations are paid out of annual Treasury appropriations. These payments would appear to be prohibited by the amendment adopted by the House. Moreover, it is possible that the mints would not be able to make adequate determinations in cases where deposits are received prior to June 30, 1943, but with respect to which investigations will not have been completed on that date.

In addition, there is a difficult problem which cuts across all of the provisions of both of the acts mentioned in the above amendment. There are numerous employees of the Treasury Department whose salaries are paid out of the annual Treasury appropriations, who spend varying amounts of time in carrying out the provisions of those acts. The language of the amendment prohibits the use of the 1944 appropriation "directly or indirectly" for the specified purposes. There is considerable doubt, therefore, whether the Department would be able to continue to pay their salaries, in whole or in part, in the event that the amendment should be enacted and they should continue to perform such duties.

The provision cutting off the appropriation to enforce the Silver Purchase Act is really legislation guised in the form of a limitation. Our friends who are champions of this provision have inveighed time and again against legislative riders on appropriation bills, and have offered amendments to strike such riders, as in the case of the recent Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, yet in this particular instance they are in reverse form and are seeking to accomplish by indirection what should be handled as legislation through a legislative committee. This provision has no place on an appropriation bill. It applies only to the appropriation for the next fiscal year. If it should be decided year after next to reinstate the appropriation new personnel would have to be trained to perform the functions under the Silver Purchase Act as the old personnel would have been completely wrecked—starved to death. That is no way to handle such an important matter. It can be approached satisfactorily only from the standpoint of permanent legislation and not in this temporary, whimsical fashion. In these times of great national emergency the Treasury Department has enough to engage its attention without having to cope with the confusion and administrative handicaps which this provision would create. I ask the House to heed the solemn warning of the Treasury Department and adopt my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand, the gentleman is opposed to the Silver Purchase Act, but he thinks this is an unwise way in which to approach the subject?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am not undertaking to argue either the merits or the demerits of the Silver Purchase Act, but I am objecting very strenuously to the method of repealing a law by denying an appropriation, and I think we ought to pursue a constructive attitude instead of an obstructive attitude toward the operations of the Treasury Department in these days of great stress and emergency.

Mr. GRANGER. And in view of what the Secretary said, it would hamper the war effort if it hampered the purchase of commercial silver, would it not?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think it would hamper the war effort all along the line.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is a remarkable thing about this amendment. The Treasury Department knew what this amendment was away back in January, when the bill was passed by the House. When the bill was over in the Senate the Senate Committee on Appropriations held hearings. I have those hearings in my hand. Not one single word was said there about the silver purchase amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman evidently has made a mistake in his inspection of the Treasury note. In the copy that I have before me of what the Treasury Department sent up to the Senate, on the first part of the first page this matter is discussed.

Mr. TABER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman is correct. I thought that referred to another amendment. Then a letter came from the Treasury Department dated the 25th of March, and not a single word is in that about the matter. It is apparent to me that if the Treasury Department regarded this as a major item, they would have had something to say about it, and developed a case if they had any before the Senate committee. Here is the situation. The Treasury Department is buying silver at a price of 77 cents an ounce, as I understand it, far beyond what the market price of silver is elsewhere, far beyond what it would run if it was allowed to get to its own level.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the market price of silver?

Mr. TABER. It is almost impossible to tell. The foreign market price is away down, something like 25 cents. It would be lower than that if we did not have the support program and that sort of thing here. We go ahead with a support program for silver, the only metal for which there is a definite, positive support program. There is no other way to stop it than by a rider on an appropriation bill. That will stop it. These activities with reference to the purchase of silver will just have to be stopped, if no one is paid for operating the act. That is just what will happen. It will not do any damage to the Treasury. On the other hand, instead of gathering in a great quantity of silver at 77 cents an ounce, we will be rid of that operation. That is the picture that we are presented with. If we retain this amendment, that simply provides that during the fiscal year 1944 no part of the money appropriated in the act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Act.

That does not mean that silver cannot be sold. That does not mean that it cannot be protected, but it does mean that they will have to stop buying silver. That is just what the House of Representatives wanted to do when it adopted that amendment. It will not interfere with any legitimate activity of the Federal Government. The amendment is perfectly clear, perfectly plain, and it will do the job and it will do no possible harm.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the amount of silver that the United States Government has on hand?

Mr. TABER. It has on hand silver to the extent of 1,174,028,371.8 ounces in bullion silver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. It has 358,561,952 ounces of silver in silver dollars. That silver has cost an average of over a dollar an ounce altogether. At the present time they are buying it at 77 cents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Are we selling this silver to other governments?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. There is no demand for it. We have an enormous storage of it up at West Point.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Are we increasing the volume that we have on hand?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes, all the time. They are issuing silver certificates against it. These things represent dollar bills that we carry in our pockets, as

a general rule, on the basis of about $1.35 an ounce. These certificates are redeemable only in silver.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can you state a single benefit that is derived from the purchase of this silver except payment to the silver producers of the West in the form of subsidies?

Mr. TABER. There is no benefit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there any single benefit derived from this Silver Purchase Act?

Mr. TABER. There is none. Some people have said that there was a profit on account of the issuance of silver certificates, but that is not true. There is no profit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact also that the purchase of silver is one of the most inflationary measures that this country has adopted?

Mr. TABER. It is and it is a very serious one.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am sure, knowing the gentleman's idea of fairness, that if he were familiar with what we call marginal mines in the West, in the production of copper, where the production of silver is sort of a byproduct, that were it not for the policy of the Government in the purchase of silver as it has been inaugurated under the Silver Purchase Act, we today would have to close down those marginal mines, or else the Government would have to pay a much higher price for copper, zinc, and lead than it pays now.

Mr. TABER. They might have to pay a small amount additional for zinc, lead, and copper, but we would be rid of this terrific subsidy that goes to the American Smelting and Refining Co. and the United States Smelting and Refining Co.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is one of silver's contributions to the war effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take these few minutes to speak on two different topics.

First, I want to speak on the question immediately before us, because it deals directly with concurring in the Senate amendment. I think it is clear from what the chairman of the subcommittee has said, and what we all realize, that when the amendment was put on in the House last March it was regarded then by the gentleman from New York, and he plainly said so, as a mere gesture. He had a determination that something ought to be done about silver, one way or another, so the amendment was put on. Now we are asking that it be taken out by receding and concurring in the Senate amendment. It had no business going into the bill originally, because plainly it is legislation on an appropriation bill, as the chairman has logically pointed out. I think it ought to be removed for that reason alone. If there be an evil in our silver policy, which I do not recognize, which this aims to cure, it ought to be cured in the proper way and not by this method.

Another thing I wanted further to emphasize in regard to this matter is that if the amendment remains in the bill and becomes an enactment, it will not accomplish what its author expected it would accomplish. It will not repeal the Silver Purchase Act. It will only hamper the Treasury. I feel sure that the entire membership has planned to vote to recede and concur in the Senate amendment as the logical and proper thing to do in answer to the request of the Treasury Department.

Now let me turn to something else. The gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], presented one of these documents, which, fortunately, I have in my pocket—a $1 bill, a silver certificate. Out of all the discussion I have heard in this Chamber belittling silver, I have never yet heard of a Member refusing to accept one of these from the sergeant-at-arms. I regard this as a dollar bill. It will buy 100 cents' worth of consumable goods for me. I am perfectly willing to accept my salary in such. If I were a merchant or a businessman I would be perfectly glad to accept everyone of these as 100 cents.

We have heard a great deal of fallacy in this Chamber lately in regard to many things, such as forgiving taxes without loss to the Treasury, Uncle Sam's going into debt to acquire silver bullion, and the like.

Suppose a miner brings 100 ounces of pure silver to Uncle Sam. Some of you would say Uncle Sam is a fool if he pays more than thirty or thirty-five dollars for the bullion. I say Uncle Sam is wise to acquire the 100 ounces, issue thereon 129 of these $1 bills, give the miner 71 of those bills in payment for the silver, and use the others to buy $58 worth of guns and ammunition to fight this war.

But I want to tell you that this piece of green paper is worth 100 cents in anybody's goods or services and in this money silver is valued at the rate of $1.29 per ounce. When it is contended in this House that we are subsidizing silver, that Uncle Sam is giving away a lot of money when he pays 71 cents an ounce for the silver, such Members simply ignore arithmetic. I want to say that when Uncle Sam buys silver at 71 cents an ounce and coins it into money or puts it out in this form Uncle Sam is making a profit on it, a huge profit of 45 percent on the deal.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I should like to have the gentleman from Arizona answer this question: Whether we will have at the end of the present year a national debt far in excess of $200,000,000,000?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is probably correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And we have something like twenty-nine or thirty billion dollars in gold that could be used to back up that particular debt?

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe that is about right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Why is it not feasible, then, to keep on buying silver at this arbitrary price just as we buy gold at an arbitrary price and use that for backing up the War Savings and Defense bond certificates we are selling at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK. It sounds logical to me. I believe the gentleman is exactly correct about that. Instead of calling that pile of silver which we have at West Point superfluous I feel it should be called one of our greatest national assets.

We have just listened today to a gentleman from Latin America, President Penaranda. We know that all through Latin America the white metal is more desirable even than the yellow metal. Let me tell you that the gold which Columbus and his followers took back to the Old World from the New was white, not yellow; it was silver, not the gold about which we read in the textbooks. When we are sitting around the council table dealing with Latin America, to say nothing of China and India, we shall be at a great advantage by having in our possession the greatest stock of silver ever collected on earth. That is our national asset, yet there are some who would dissipate it by changing the general law in regard to the matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am glad the gentleman brought out the facts he did about India, Latin America, and China. We know that their standard is silver, not gold. What good would it do us to corral all the gold in the world if we will be the only country that remains on the gold standard?

Mr. MURDOCK. We must have more hard money rather than less—but not go exclusively to gold.

My other colleague from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] spoke a moment ago about copper, lead, and zinc mines in connection with silver production. I should like to amplify that if I had the time, but all I can say now is that if you stop silver mining entirely you will stop the mining of strategic copper, lead, and zinc, or force a much higher price for them.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Will the gentleman clear up this point: Does the Treasury or the Congress of the United States appropriate any money to buy this silver? Or is it paid for under the coinage rights of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for asking me that question. The question brings out very clearly an important point that the Committee on Appropriations does not appropriate money to buy silver; it constitutes the money for its own purchase and now yields a big profit as seigniorage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that the silver certificates we have are worth 100 cents if you can have the points issued by the O. P. A. to buy the necessary food. If you do not have the points, your silver certificate is not worth very much. But let me refer for a moment to what the gentleman said about our monetary policy as it related to India, China, and some of the other countries where they have been using silver as their historic monetary metal. It is to be regretted that the policy inaugurated in the United States took the people of Mexico, India, and China off the silver standard. In fact, we paid such a high price for silver in this country that they melted up their coins, and sold their bullion silver to the United States because it was more profitable for them to sell their silver to us than to keep it for money. Now we have most of the silver that should have been retained in those countries and they are operating on a paper money for the lack of silver.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That might be true in the case of China, but insofar as Mexico is concerned it produces one-tenth of the world's silver and does not need to melt down its dollars for sale to this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. About 10 years ago we put such a high price on the silver that they produced in Mexico and these other countries that they sold it all to the United States Treasury. What is the situation today? We are paying domestic producers 71 cents an ounce for silver, and all foreign silver has gone down to from 35 cents to 45 cents an ounce.

The administration is working on a plan to establish an international bank and to control the money of the entire world through an international banking group. I notice that this group does not take into consideration the real value of silver. They want to deal with gold or paper money. In fact, the British want to have a new medium of exchange called bancor, and the Treasury Department has its scheme where they are going to call the new unit of value unitas. So we may be going on a new system of domestic and international currency. At a later date I hope to have the opportunity of discussing both of these systems. Those who are friendly to silver better get down to a real American policy of handling this metal so that we can let the other countries in the world keep some silver to do business with rather than take it all away from them by unsound price and monetary policies formulated by experts who are not particularly interested in anything but their own theories.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Some time ago it was said that when the United States Government initiated its silver policy it caused runs on the banks in China. Today we hear of increased inflation in China and in currency. Does the gentleman know whether there is any correlation between that inflated currency exchange in China today and the continued insistence of the silver-buying policy of America? I am just asking the question for information.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about there being some relation to it, because before we lowered the price paid for foreign silver, we purchased most of the silver that they had in China and India, and those countries went on a paper currency, which caused a decided inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the carrying out of the Silver Purchase Act does not cost the taxpayers of this country 1 cent. I want to get this thought over to you as practical men. There are no silver-producing mines in the United States today such as we had in years gone by. The only production of silver we have today is by way of a byproduct in connection with the production of copper, zinc, and lead.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I may say to the gentleman that we produced considerable silver from the gold mines of the West prior to the time they closed down.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is also to a certain extent right. I want to call attention to the further fact that most of our copper is produced from the mines of three States in the United States, Arizona, Utah, and Montana.

Mr. SULLIVAN. And Nevada.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Nevada and a little in Idaho, but not to any great extent. Now, then, 18 percent of the silver produced in the country is produced by way of a byproduct to the production of copper alone.

I call your attention to the fact that the Anaconda Copper Co. owns the great producing mines in Butte, Mont., and they are very deep and expensive of operation. These mines produce copper, zinc, lead, and silver and silver predominates next to copper. You will understand that it costs little to take the silver from the copper ore. Consequently the sale of the silver permits the operation of these mines on a lower price for copper, lead, and zinc.

Were it not for the Silver Purchase Act and the price that they get for silver, I question very much whether those mines could be operated today on the basis of the present price of copper, and when I said a few moments ago that the contribution of silver to our war effort, if nothing else, is sufficient to justify the continuance of the purchase act, I did so for the reason that it holds down the price that the Government has to pay for copper, zinc, and lead, the essential materials for carrying on the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman agree with me when I say that the Butte Hill was originally a silver discovery and as the silver played out deposits of copper were found?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. What would be the position of this country today if the Butte Hill was not producing?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the Butte Hill was not producing copper today, you would be absolutely at a loss for copper, the most essential raw material that we now have, and we would be sunk.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Bearing out the gentleman's statement of the connection between silver and strategic metals, is it not true that the mining industry has been greatly perturbed during the past few weeks, understanding that if the price of silver is changed they will have to close down some copper, lead, or zinc mines, or else they must get higher prices for those metals?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no question about that. I want to tell you one other thing. This is not a subsidy at all, but if it were, it would be justified during this emergency. We subsidize a lot of things that the country needs.

Let me tell you something else. If you cut out this Silver Purchase Act or nullify it you will put our miners on a basis of competing with the Latin-American countries in the production of copper, zinc, and lead and you will lower the standard of living of your American miner down to the standard of living of them. They do not pay within 70 to 90 percent of the scale of wages that is paid to the miners in this country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman explain to me the philosophy back of the action of the administration in closing down gold mines in the country, then encouraging foreign producers to produce more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Gold is not supposed to be an essential war material. That is one reason. In closing down the gold mines, as the gentleman from California pointed out, you are decreasing the production of silver.

Personally, I think it was a mistake for the Government to close down gold-producing mines. We will need this gold and movements are on foot now to have that policy changed.

The distinguished gentleman from Arizona held up a dollar bill. Let me tell you something. This is just a pure business proposition. The Treasury purchases from the miner 100 ounces of silver for approximately $71.10. It issues 71 dollar bills to pay for the 100 ounces, and puts away in the vaults 58 ounces against which it may issue additional

money if it sees fit to. If we can purchase an article for 71 cents and be able to use it for trade or purchase at $1.29, we would be simple fools if we did not carry that out.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The gentleman says we purchase that silver. Does the gentleman mean we appropriate money with which to purchase it, or do we pay for it through the right of coinage under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We do not appropriate a dime; we do it through the process of coinage; and we are making money on every 100 ounces of silver so acquired.

As long as business and industry grows there is going to be a greater demand for hard money, and business and industry will grow as long as our economic world trade increases. If you will only think through this lease-lend program, you will see that that is a program that goes beyond this war. It goes to the future. It is going to increase trade with foreign countries. It, of course, will have to be changed. As we increase that trade, we must enlarge the volume of our hard money.

There is a very prevalent—but nevertheless erroneous—thought making itself heard that the leaders of the so-called silver bloc or anyone for that matter who supports the present silver purchase program is a traitor to his country. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that the opponents of this program, lead by the silversmiths, jewelry manufacturers, and other consumers of silver, have resorted to flooding the country with false and misleading propaganda against the present program. Specifically, take the recent article appearing in the Reader's Digest entitled "Twelve Men Against the Nation." That article, and others like it, purports to show that our silver policy has and is retarding the war effort. It is not only not retarding the war effort but is in fact actually helping the war effort in a supplemental way.

There is now in the offing the picture of a serious silver shortage if the present silver purchasing program is not carried on. Silver is becoming increasingly needed in the war effort and at the same time there is a general world-wide increased demand for silver as a medium of exchange. It behooves us to make certain that we have a sound monetary system to cushion the shock of deflation that will certainly come with the close of the war.

A year ago there was approximately $11,566,000,000 in circulation or an average of $86.15 per person. Today, that amount has jumped to $16,251,000,000 or an average of $120.04 per person. Now, the amount of money in circulation is going to increase—you can be sure of that—and, as it increases, people are going to lean more and more toward "hard money" as a medium of exchange. That has been the experience of every nation during a war in the past and it is what is actually happening in other countries right now during this war. Many of the nations we are doing business with refuse to accept paper money from the soldiers but none refuse "hard money." That should dispel any and all doubt that silver as a medium of exchange is a fictitious metal. It is not—from time past silver has always been a standard medium of exchange. Here in our own country no great protest has as yet been made over the great amount of new money that is being poured out daily, but it is only a question of time until the people of this country are going to realize the fictitious nature of this added money and are going to insist on "hard money." When that day comes inflation will have hit the top of the ladder.

When the war is over both India and China will offer great fields for development. Both of these countries have always been silver-using countries, and right now Mexico clearly shows with what high regard her officials hold silver when they withhold a commitment of 22,000,000 ounces of silver. I do not need to tell you again that we are embarked on a course that will greatly enlarge our industrial and business growth.

More silver will be needed to support our paper currency as our business and industry growth enlarges. When the time comes that our trade, industry, and business cease to increase that will be plenty of time to change our silver policy. The price of silver is pegged at 71.11 per ounce here with foreign silver at 35.3 cents per ounce. Up until July 29, 1942, purchases of foreign silver for manufacturing purposes were allowed. Since that time the demands of silver for war use have been so great that the Government has abolished altogether such purchases since November 15, 1942, since which time no foreign silver has been permitted to be used in the manufacturing of luxury articles.

In 1942 there was over 110,000,000 ounces of silver imported as well as 60,000,000 ounces of domestically mined silver for use in war industries. That entire output of imported and domestic silver was at all times available for use in war materials. So that the charge that "the silver crowd will not let war industries use the one essential metal of which we have plenty" just does not hold water and in its last analysis can be seen for what it really is—just another publicity trick by the silver-using groups to muddy the waters so that the American people will not see the move they are making to get 50-cent silver instead of 71-cent silver.

In conclusion let me point out that were we to change our silver purchasing at this time we would close many marginal mines which produce silver as a byproduct in connection with the production of copper, lead, and zinc, where the ore is not rich in those minerals.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman can explain to the House how increasing the debt a dollar and getting an asset into the Treasury worth 25 cents is making a profit.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am sorry that question comes up at all. The arguments produced by those who favor striking out the Celler amendment are so sophisticated that they really do not deserve any consideration at all. It is folly to say that the Treasury buys this silver at 71 cents, coins it into $1.29, and that this does not cost anybody anything, even that the Treasury makes a profit on it. What these men do not tell you is who pays for that profit. Certainly that profit is going to come from the pockets of American citizens somehow or some way.

The fact is that the difference between the fictitious monetary value of $1.29 per ounce placed on silver and what the silver actually fetches on the world market, is simply inflation and nothing else. What these men are advocating is to continue the inflationary process that is involved in the Silver Purchase Act. This is one of the most vicious processes of inflation that is taking place at the present time, because it involves the standard unit of value. It is a pernicious process of debasement of our money.

The question has been brought up here about China. Let anybody go back and look at the record and see what the Silver Purchase Act did to China. It closed practically all of the banks in China and threw that country into a depression that was equally as bad as our own, if not worse. It was at that point that Japan struck China, when our Silver Purchase Act had made China vulnerable.

We have heard about the prospect of less copper being mined if this amendment is not concurred in. That argument is too absurd to merit serious consideration. To show how sophisticated are the arguments of the proponents of this silver-purchase program, it is to be noted that they have changed their position entirely. Formerly they argued silver producers did not receive a subsidy. Now they are openly admitting that they do receive a subsidy.

I repeat that the only benefit that comes from the Silver Purchase Act goes to the silver producers in the West. This is a selfish piece of legislation. It is one of the most diabolical pieces of legislation on the statute books of our country; there is no question about it. Let us be honest, open, and aboveboard. Because the silver interests in the Western States have a certain amount of power in this Congress, they can foist this fraud and deception upon the people.

Let me refer again to the difference between what is paid for silver and the price at which it is monetized. That ultimately resolves itself into a tax, a tax upon the people. To be sure, it is not levied directly, but indirectly, and it acts exactly as though it had been levied directly. Anybody can see that with just a little study.

I do not know just what inconvenience it may cause the Treasury if the Celler amendment is retained, and shall not discuss this point because I am not familiar enough with the conditions existing in the Treasury to do so, but the in-

convenience to the Treasury is infinitesimal compared with the damage the Silver Purchase Act is doing to the country. Therefore, let us stick to our guns, refuse to concur in the Senate amendment, and throw out one of the most vicious schemes of monetary debasement with which this country has ever been plagued.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly interested to hear the gentleman from Ohio telling how this great group of western men were so powerful that they were able to bring to this Congress a piece of legislation and crowd it down the throats of this Congress. There are exactly 17 people who by the greatest stretch of imagination could be considered in that group—2 from Arizona, 2 from Utah, 2 from New Mexico, 2 from Montana, 1 from Nevada, 1 from Wyoming, 4 from Colorado, 2 from Idaho, and I am going to add 1 from the State of California, God bless the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]. Those 17 men are presumed to have been able to crowd this down the throats of 435.

Do you think that sounds sensible? Not in the slightest.

When this matter was up I never said one word on the floor of this House about it and did not have a great deal of interest in it. I have never been tremendously impressed by the argument that we had to keep the mines of the West open by this purchase of silver, because I recognize that if you drop the price of silver you have to increase the price of copper to keep these mines going. We do that when copper is a war necessity.

The chief reason why we wish to keep the silver price is that through its use it is not necessary to pay a higher price for copper in order that the mines may stay open. If you raise the base price 2 or 3 or 4 cents a pound for copper in the Southwestern States you automatically increase the national cost of copper by millions of dollars. It was a matter of economy to this country to pay, if the gentleman wants to so call it, a subsidy for silver in order to keep the base price of copper down. Those of us who sat on a subcommittee of five members this House appointed to deal with the price of metals may recall that the Office of Price Administration recognized that when we begged them not to increase the over-all price of copper, but to make special contracts at higher prices with marginal mines. Every member from every western State did that, because we recognized that in so doing that we saved money for this country.

I want to say a word about the subject the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] brought out, because he touched on the most important phase of this problem, and that is the international aspect. I want you to remember that very shortly we may all be sitting in a world-wide peace conference, and it is not well for America to throw away her pat hand and draw five new cards. The United States has 70 percent of the monetary gold in storage, and it has 60 percent of all the monetary silver in storage. We must not forget that. We must then remember that Great Britain has 58 percent of the world's production of gold, but she has only 18 percent of the world's production of silver. We must recognize that the United States has so large a share of the world's supply of monetary gold and monetary silver that no world system of coinage or money, whether based on gold alone, or gold and silver combined, can ever be set up on a world-wide scale without the cooperation of the United States.

When we give that cooperation how are we going to do it? We have found out today that our hard metals are our greatest asset for international trade. When the men in China wanted to buy things they wanted silver. Why? Because there they have always been on a silver basis, and the greatest asset we have in dealing with them is our surplus of silver. Another strange thing has happened. For the first time we have men fighting on the north coast of Africa. Throughout the whole section of Asia Minor our Nation has had to ship silver in order to pay the fighting men, because the people of those areas have their monetary system based on silver. The same is true of India. The value of the rupee is so low in India it can be pegged only to silver, and if the United States is going to stay in this world-wide game, it needs both gold and silver in its campaign.

I am not talking about what people have referred to as the democratic policy. Let me remind the Republicans that in 1896 William McKinley ran on a pledge of bimetallism, with the ratio of gold and silver fixed by international agreement. Look at section 311 of the United States Code, and you will find there written into law the policy that we shall use both gold and silver, and surely we do not want to throw that away at the present time.

Fifty years ago we went to England and asked that nation to join us in a plan to carry out this bimetallism program. England was then not so very cooperative, because in 1816 she had gone on the single basis of gold and had thereafter become the banker and shipping master of the world. She did not, therefore, pay very much attention to the United States, but now we are in a different situation. We have the gold and the silver, and on the North American Continent 85 percent of all of the silver in the world is mined. We should not forget that when we sit down at a world peace table to decide what we shall favor as to the use of silver in any monetary scheme. In the meantime we should continue our silver program, which costs us nothing, and may be of great national importance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not a monetary expert and I doubt if there is one man in this House who is a monetary expert, and there are very, very few in the United States. To thoroughly understand the big question that is under discussion here today would take months, but in amplification of the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] I wish to state that in the settlement of the post-war currency problems, the United States, if it retains its present holdings of gold and silver, will be in a very powerful position. It owns about 70 percent of the monetary gold and well over 60 percent of the monetary silver of the entire world. Its holdings are so predominant that it is difficult to see how monetary systems, whether based on gold alone or gold and silver together, can be adopted on any world scale without the cooperation of the United States.

In the reestablishment of currencies and their rates of exchange, the best interests of the United States and of the world at large demand that silver be restored as a monetary metal and international bimetalism be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that Congress is watched with such curiosity by the newsmen and people of the country at large. There often seems no logic in their actions.

For instance, we all listened with sympathetic attention and approval to the President last Sunday night as he stated his case for the Nation against strikes in wartime and the reasons for not approving the $2 a day raise in pay asked by the coal miners. The reason was to prevent further inflation.

Three days later Congress passed the Federal pay bill increasing the pay of all Federal employees from $1 to $2 a day, which will cost the taxpayers two-thirds of a billion dollars a year for increased salaries and wages to 1,800,000 Federal employees. How can we justify congressional approval of the President's action in turning down Mr. Lewis' claim that the additional wage asked by the miners is necessary to pay the increased cost of living, and yet graciously vote a like increase to every Federal employee, whether needed or not?

Today there is another reversal of form in the effort by some Members of Congress to close down the silver mines of our country, where some 30,000 metal miners are employed. One of the worst bottlenecks in the war effort has been the lack of certain strategic ores, especially copper and zinc, for war purposes. In my State, Colorado, these ores are not found except with silver.

During peacetime it would be bad enough to force these mines to close because, with few exceptions, silver mines in the United States cannot be operated at the world price of silver, but during wartime it would still further complicate this bottleneck of lack of zinc and copper. The only alternative would be to increase the price of these other metals which would make them more out of proportion to the world price than is silver.

In all this we must remember that the Silver Purchase Act does not cost the Government anything, and actually makes money for the Treasury. Also, I am told that our fighting men in countries like Africa or India, are paid in silver and gold because that is the only kind of money that the natives recognize. The promise to pay on a paper bill means nothing to them, but silver and gold always means purchasing power. It would be too bad if, by Executive order, we close the gold mines in the United States, leaving only Great Britain and other foreign countries to mine the gold supply for the world, and now by act of Congress close the silver mines so that Mexico and other countries will furnish the world with silver, leaving our great potential wealth buried because of lack of protection.

Let us hope that Congress will be consistent and not again change its course and force the western silver mines to close, at any time, especially during this difficult war period.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the question of the Silver Purchase Act is a highly controversial one. I am not sure, to be perfectly frank with the House, as to how I, a member of this committee, would vote on the question of the Silver Purchase Act if brought up as legislation. However, here is an attempt in an appropriation bill on a matter of very great importance in this country and in the world today, to stop the operation of that act without real consideration being given to it.

I am inclined to think that on a matter of this sort the House owes it to the Members from all sections of the country who may be affected by this, who may have opinions of their own about it, to let those men be heard at a proper hearing and give them their day in court. The only way that can be done is for the legislative committee which brought out the bill for the purchase of silver, to consider that matter, after full hearings, giving everyone who is interested in the subject, everyone whose district and whose section of the United States is affected, ample opportunity to be heard. It is an unscientific way to write legislation by stopping an appropriation.

Just as an example of how far reaching this may be, I think this statement is true, that many of the functions of the Bureau of the Mint in acquiring and handling silver and of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and issuing silver certificates are paid for out of the Treasury Department appropriation, paid for out of this part of the appropriation that we are now trying to strike. There is no man on this floor and not a member of the subcommittee who can state what this amendment would do as to the impairment of the functions of the Treasury Department if it were adopted.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury in a letter dated April 16 to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], chairman of the subcommittee, makes this statement:

> This Department is of the opinion that if there is to be any change in the Government's silver purchase policy it should be accomplished by means of a more specific mandate, indicating clearly what is the intention of the Congress.

In fairness to our associates, in fairness to the parts of the country affected, in fairness to the entire situation, the proper way to do this is to let the legislative committee act upon it, and not attempt by means of an amendment on an appropriation bill to stop this great program which some believe in and some do not.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be adopted, and then I will join with any others in urging the legislative committee to consider this matter and bring it before the House where all can be heard and where each may have his day in court.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that prior to the change in the silver purchase policy about 3 years ago we were paying the same subsidy for all foreign silver as we were for all domestic silver. Then it was decided on the floor by an amendment that was offered and accepted, that we would no longer pay a subsidy on silver produced outside of the United States, but we would fix the price of domestic silver at 71 cents an ounce. There was no particular deliberation had by a legislative committee on that point, because the amendment came up on the floor and was accepted and was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. That dealt with one phase of the subject, but the abolition of the entire work is certainly deserving of more consideration and the opportunity to be heard by every Member interested in the subject.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 59 and noes 64.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 194, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—159

Abernethy	Bland	Brown, Ga.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bloom	Bryson
Barrett	Bonner	Bulwinkle
Barry	Boren	Burdick
Beckworth	Boykin	Burgin
	Bradley, Pa.	Camp
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Cannon, Mo.	Hill	O'Connor
Capozzoli	Hobbs	O'Leary
Case	Hoch	O'Neal
Chapman	Holifield	O'Toole
Chenoweth	Holmes, Wash.	Outland
Coffee	Horan	Pace
Cooper	Hull	Patman
Costello	Izac	Patton
Cox	Jackson	Peterson, Ga.
Crosser	Jarman	Price
Curley	Johnson, J. Leroy	Priest
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Luther A.	Rabaut
Davis	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramspeck
Delaney	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Dickstein	Kee	Rivers
Dilweg	Kefauver	Rockwell
Dingell	Kelley	Rowan
Doughton	Kerr	Russell
Drewry	King	Sadowski
Dworshak	Kirwan	Sasscer
Eberharter	Larcade	Sauthoff
Elliott	Lesinski	Scanlon
Englebright	Ludlow	Schuetz
Feighan	McCord	Sheppard
Fernandez	McCormack	Smith, W. Va.
Fisher	McKenzie	Snyder
Fitzpatrick	McMillan	Sparkman
Flannagan	McMurray	Spence
Fogarty	Mahon	Starnes, Ala.
Folger	Maloney	Steagall
Forand	Manasco	Stockman
Fulbright	Mansfield, Mont.	Sullivan
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Tarver
Gavagan	Marcantonio	Thomason
Gordon	Monroney	Tolan
Gore	Morrison, La.	Vincent, Ky.
Gorski	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	Murphy	Walter
Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.	Ward
Green	Myers	Welch
Gregory	Newsome	West
Hare	Norman	Whitten
Harless, Ariz.	Norton	Wickersham
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Harris, Va.		Winter
Hart		Woodrum, Va.
Hays		Zimmerman
Hébert		

NAYS—194

Allen, Ill.	Ellison, Md.	Kinzer
Allen, La.	Elston, Ohio	Kleberg
Andersen, H. Carl	Engel	Kunkel
Anderson, Calif.	Fellows	Landis
Andresen, August H.	Fenton	Lane
Andrews	Gale	LeCompte
Angell	Gamble	LeFevre
Arends	Gathings	Lewis
Arnold	Gavin	Luce
Auchincloss	Gerlach	McCowen
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	McGregor
Barden	Gilchrist	McLean
Bates, Ky.	Gillette	McWilliams
Bates, Mass.	Gillie	Maas
Beall	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Bender	Gossett	Mason
Bennett, Mich.	Graham	Merrow
Bennett, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Michener
Bishop	Griffiths	Miller, Mo.
Blackney	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Bolton	Gwynne	Miller, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Hale	Mills
Brehm	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Monkiewicz
Brooks	Hall, Leonard W.	Mruk
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Buffett	Hancock	Norrell
Busbey	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Butler	Hartley	O'Hara
Canfield	Heidinger	Peterson, Fla.
Carson, Ohio	Herter	Philbin
Carter	Hess	Pittenger
Celler	Hinshaw	Plumley
Chiperfield	Hoeven	Poage
Church	Hoffman	Poulson
Clark	Holmes, Mass.	Powers
Clason	Hope	Ramey
Clevenger	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Colmer	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Compton	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Cravens	Johnson, Anton J.	Richards
Crawford	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rizley
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson
Curtis	Johnson, Ward	Robsion, Ky.
Day	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Dewey	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Ditter	Kean	Rohrbough
Domengeaux	Kearney	Rolph
Bondero	Keefe	Rowe
Douglas	Kilburn	Sabath
Durham	Kilday	Schiffler
Eaton		Schwabe
Ellis		Shafer
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.

Simpson, Pa.	Taber	Vursell
Slaughter	Talbot	Wadsworth
Smith, Maine	Talle	Wasielewski
Smith, Ohio	Taylor	Weichel, Ohio
Smith, Va.	Thomas, Tex.	Wheat
Smith, Wis.	Tibbott	Whittington
Springer	Towe	Wigglesworth
Stanley	Treadway	Willey
Stearns, N. H.	Troutman	Wilson
Stevenson	Van Zandt	Wolverton, N. J.
Sumner, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Sundstrom	Vorys, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—80

Baldwin, N. Y.	Guyer	O'Konski
Bell	Hagen	Pfeifer
Buckley	Heffernan	Phillips
Burch, Va.	Jeffrey	Ploeser
Burchill, N. Y.	Judd	Pracht
Byrne	Kennedy	Randolph
Carlson, Kans.	Keogh	Robinson, Utah
Cochran	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Cole, N. Y.	Knutson	Satterfield
Cooley	LaFollette	Scott
Courtney	Lambertson	Sheridan
Creal	Lanham	Short
Culkin	Lea	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Lemke	Stefan
Dawson	Lynch	Stewart
Dies	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Dirksen	McGranery	Thomas, N. J.
Disney	Madden	Weaver
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Weiss
Elmer	Martin, Mass.	Wene
Fay	May	Wheichel, Ga.
Fish	Merritt	White
Ford	Miller, Conn.	Wolcott
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	Mott	Worley
Gearhart	Mundt	Wright
Gibson	Nichols	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. LaFollette against.
Mr. White for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Short.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. May with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 4, line 13, strike out "$3,100,000" and insert "$3,800,000."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement with Senate amendment No. 2 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have moved to recede and concur in this Senate amendment, which would give to the activity known as Foreign Funds Control $700,000 more for the fiscal year 1944 than was provided in the bill as it passed the House. Let us study for a moment the picture of this appropriation.

The appropriation for foreign funds control for the current fiscal year 1943 is $5,000,000.

The Budget estimated $4,350,000 would be required in 1944.

The House committee cut that appropriation by a quarter of a million dollars to $4,100,000.

On the floor of the House it was slashed another million dollars and brought down to $3,100,000.

The Senate raised the amount to $3,800,000.

The amount appropriated by the House is $1,900,000 below the appropriation for 1943.

The amount appropriated by the Senate is $1,200,000 below the appropriation for 1943.

If the Senate figures are accepted the appropriation will still be $550,000 below the amount the Budget considered necessary to conduct this control during the next fiscal year.

This appropriation for foreign-owned property control finances the Treasury Department's program of financial and economic warfare. The program is carried on by the Foreign Funds Control in Washington in cooperation with the 12 Federal Reserve banks, acting as field agents of the control, and the 15,000 private financial institutions in the United States. Foreign Funds Control was set up in April 1940, after the invasion of Denmark and Norway, to handle the freezing control of foreign-owned assets in this country. The control now extends to the assets of 35 foreign countries totaling over $8,500,000,000.

The list of these countries you will find set forth on page 72 of the hearings on this bill. All of these controls except one are involuntary. China requested to be placed under the control and that was done at the request of that Government.

The assets include gold, securities, currency, bank deposits, and many other types of tangible and intangible property. Transactions involving any of these assets are subject to review and licensing by the Treasury Department to insure that the transactions are in the national interest.

A very elaborate system of licensing has been adopted involving both general and special licenses. If you will examine the record, page 74, you will find that this control has voluntarily reduced its own expenditures and has cut down its personnel drastically in both Washington and in the field. It has cut its expenditures almost in half since its peak which occurred during the months immediately following Pearl Harbor when it was expending at the annual rate of over $9,000,000. During the fiscal year 1943 it will spend approximately $5,000,000.

The Treasury Department has this to say in regard to the drastic cut imposed by the House:

> The proposed House reduction of $1,250,000 in the 1944 appropriation for Foreign Funds Control would mean crippling the Government's effectiveness in economic and financial warfare. The activities of Foreign Funds Control in cutting off trade and communication with the Axis and Axis sympathizers, in breaking down enemy-controlled international cartels, in preventing the Axis from cashing in on looted securities and currency, in enforcing the blacklist and preventing enemy financial transactions, and in assisting the Army in financial and property-control matters in occupied areas have been described in detail before both committees. No one can foresee the precise military consequences of relaxing these controls. It is clear, however, that the proposed House reduction, coming on top of the stringent economy measures that have been taken voluntarily during the past 15 months, could be made only by substantial elimination of major activities. If the $3,800,000 figure passed by the Senate is agreed upon, every effort will, of course, be made to live within it. But even the adequacy of this figure will depend largely upon the course of the war during 1943–44.

The Foreign Funds Control is closely tied in with the war effort and an inseparable part of it. As the United Nations move into conquered territory, Foreign Funds Control moves with them. The Control now has a force in Africa. Invasion of Europe, which may be expected at any time, would mean a sudden and rapid expansion of the Control. It is not safe to wait until such invasion takes place. It must be anticipated and plans must be made in advance. As the war progresses, Foreign Funds Control is continually being assigned new projects of financial and economic control.

The question was raised on the floor of the House whether the establishment of the office of Alien Property Custodian results in the duplication of any operations of Foreign Funds Control. The President, by an Executive order on July 7, 1942, clearly delineated the respective functions and responsibilities of Foreign Funds Control and the Alien Property Custodian. Representatives of each agency appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations and demonstrated that there is no overlapping or duplication of effort.

I want to call attention at this point to what Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, stated at page 64 of the Senate hearings on this bill. Senator GEORGE is very closely in touch with the activities of Foreign Funds Control. Senator GEORGE said:

> The Foreign Funds Control appropriation is not used for the same purpose nor is it overlapping with the Alien Property Custodian. They deal with altogether different matters.
>
> Foreign Funds Control will be unnecessarily crippled and irretrievable damage may be done to the national effort unless the Senate provision is adopted and I sincerely hope that my motion to recede and concur will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is an effort on my part to continue to save $700,000 that was saved in the House on this item. Here is the picture: As the Alien Property Custodian was set up, all the business activities of these aliens were transferred to the Alien Property Custodian and that reduced the activities of the Foreign Funds Control much more than the amount involved represented. The cut this year below last year is only from $5,000,000 to $3,800,000 in the Senate; in the House it was a cut to $3,100,000.

The activities were cut more than that. The personnel cut will be approximately 400 out of 1,600 in the Foreign Funds Control, but we were presented with this picture: People living in this country whose property was affected would have to go before the Foreign Funds Control in New York and have a hearing for a week and then the same people on the same subject would have to go to Chicago and spend a week before the Alien Property Custodian because this Foreign Funds Control outfit insisted on doing something that they had not any business having anything to do with, and that is the way they were using all the help they had, they were doing things that had been taken out of their jurisdiction. It is a good deal of a burden upon any property that is in the hands of the Government as a trustee to have two outfits monkeying around with it where there ought to be only one. A part of the operation of cutting this appropriation was for the purpose of getting rid of that kind of activity.

Then there were some people approached in New York by this outfit and they were asked what their politics was. When they said their relatives were Republicans they began to ride them. I do not like that way of doing business. The fellow who was sent out to do that job could pretty well be eliminated and save some money to the Federal Treasury.

Their activity has been cut probably 50 percent by taking away the business enterprises. The only new activities that they have had are small activities in north Africa, where they told us they had eight or nine on the pay roll. They tried to make out at first it was a big job, then when we got down to the number of people involved there were only eight or nine. There is also one small operation in South America, where they have a very, very small number of people involved. For the life of me, I cannot see, nor can any intelligent person who wants to do the fair thing, why they should have more than $3,100,000. I think it is a very liberal amount and we should not go any further.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I want to get a little information. I notice that there are $8,500,000,000 taken over in this control of foreign assets. Does not the management of that money pay for itself?

Mr. TABER. It does not in the Foreign Funds Control because Foreign Funds Control is a separate proposition, or supposed to be, from the Alien Property Custodian. The Alien Property Custodian does pay for itself.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Why should not this fund pay for itself if we manage it for them?

Mr. TABER. It should. The only thing is this: There are certain neutral countries and certain allied countries, such as the Netherlands, where there are some monies in this country and where we are decidedly in the nature of a trustee because of our situation.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. There is also Axis money involved?

Mr. TABER. There is Axis money and that should go, and it is supposed to go, to the Alien Property Custodian. That is subject to a fee.

The trouble is that these people are not doing the job they are supposed to do but they are trying to do the job of the Alien Property Custodian. The result is a serious duplication of effort, therefore they can get along with less money. On top of that all of the business activities have been taken over by the Alien Property Custodian and their activities have been reduced at least 50 percent. With a cut such as they have been given they can get along and do everything that they need to do without having an opportunity to do those things that they should not do and without having the opportunity of having more people on the pay roll than there is any possible excuse for. I want to see them have money enough to do the job, but I hate to see them get a great deal more. I am sure that these people can do their job with what the House provided. We had them before us after the rumors of a lot of these things came up and they made a rather pitiful showing, telling a big story about their activities, then when we got down to the personnel that was required for that activity, you could count them on the fingers of one or two hands.

There is no excuse in this situation for any more money than the $3,100,000 which the House appropriated and I hope that the House will refuse to agree to the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] to increase this amount $700,000, which will be utterly and entirely wasted for no good purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means very much concerned with the fiscal affairs of the Government, I have had occasion to look into this matter of Foreign Funds Control, and it occurs to me that as a matter of good business this appropriation should be approved in at least the amount provided in the Senate amendment.

The appropriation for Foreign Funds Control for the fiscal year 1944 has been reported by the joint conference committee in disagreement between the figures of $3,800,000 and $3,100,000. The Budget Bureau estimated that $4,350,000 would be required for this appropriation, and it was originally approved by the House Appropriations Committee in the amount of $4,100,000. This figure was set by the committee after searching hearings on the work of the agency and the distinction between its activities and that of other Government agencies. However, on the floor of the House an amendment was adopted reducing the appropriation by $1,000,000. After hearings before the Senate committee, the appropriation was approved by the Senate in the amount of $3,800,000, after which the conference committee disagreed.

This appropriation for Foreign Funds Control finances the Treasury Department's economic and financial warfare programs. In essence, the purpose of these programs is to to prevent the enemy from getting and utilizing funds for military campaigns, propaganda, sabotage, and other subversive activities throughout the world. Adequate financing is just as necessary to the enemy as tanks and ships and guns. Foreign Funds Control is the main agency of the Government concerned with combating the enemy on the financial front.

Inside the United States there exist over $8,000,000,000 in assets owned by foreigners subject to Axis rule which the enemy would like to use. Foreign Funds Control insures not only that these billions are unavailable to the Axis but also that they are used constructively for the benefit of our war effort. Outside the United States the enemy is trying to cash in on the great loot of American dollars, dollar securities, diamonds, and other valuables seized from invaded countries. Foreign Funds Control by rigid scrutiny of transactions prevents the enemy from effectively using these resources against us. The Control regulates foreign exchange transactions passing through the world-important United States markets to make certain the enemy cannot benefit. It drives the enemy out of business in Latin America. It ferrets out Axis financial fronts, uncovers Axis control of American assets and American firms, and applies effective sanctions to insure that such activities cannot continue.

To date these programs of financial control have apparently been successful. One indication of this lies in the fact that whereas after the last war the Germans boasted they had had tens of millions of dollars in this country for their spies and agents, in this war the eight recently captured saboteurs were forced to bring in their money on their persons because all internal sources had been cut off by Foreign Funds Control.

Because of the importance of the Foreign Funds Control program to the war effort it is felt that any curtailment necessitated by inadequate funds would be a mistake. During the current fiscal year the program requires an expenditure of slightly over $5,000,000. A reduction to $3,800,000 would require a substantial curtailment. Any reduction beyond that figure, however, would seriously cripple the Control's economic and financial warfare activity. Because billions of

dollars are at stake in this financial warfare, any such further reduction for want of a minimum appropriation would be false economy.

Mr. Speaker, the function of this agency is not ony to provide for the necessary supervision and control over eight and one-half billion dollars in this country belonging to foreigners that our enemies now want to get the use of, but this agency also has to take care of the situation in all of the areas where our fighting men are now engaged.

In the invasion of north Africa, when our forces entered there, agents of the Foreign Funds Control Agency had to advance right along with them. General Clark, who had to be provided a large sum of money to carry out and successfully discharge his important mission there, was assisted by this agency.

It seems to me this is an important part of this great war effort. There should be no doubt that at least the amount of money this agency says is the minimum with which it can function should be provided. I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly true, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, that is a war activity. Let there be no mistake about it. The work of this Foreign Funds Control is a very important job dealing with the war. It is a matter that has far-reaching implications.

You cannot always tell what you have accomplished by way of prevention, but in my opinion, this group—and I think this is so, verified by the record—has had a great deal to do with the prevention of possible loss by sabotage and all the horrors that go with it.

It appears to me that this agency has been economical. I was impressed by the fact that in their testimony they were asking for less than what they had asked for before. Last year they had $6,253,000. This year we cut them $250,000, to $4,100,000. The Committee of the Whole cut that amount to $3,100,000, and this amount has been increased by the Senate to $3,800,000.

The gentleman from Tennessee has described the general functions of this agency. During the last war we did not have this sort of control, consequently we had a great deal of sabotage and destruction of life and destruction of property.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, we had the Alien Property Custodian, and instead of having small amounts of property under that control they had many times the amount of alien property that this outfit has.

Mr. O'NEAL. The fact remains that the Attorney General of the United States has stated publicly that during the 14 months we have been engaged in the war and during the 3½ years the present war has been in progress there have been no acts of sabotage in the United States. As appears in the testimony in the Senate hearings in 1922, the German Government spent $27,000,000 in the United States during the last war for propaganda, subversive activities, sabotage, and espionage. These funds were made available to the German Government from foreign-owned assets in the United States.

During this war, as quickly as the foreign-owned assets in this country could be taken over they have been taken over by the Foreign Funds Control, $8,500,000,000, as the gentleman from Tennessee said, and it is remarkable to note that there has been no sabotage in the United States, unless the recent incident at Elkton might be put in that category. Somebody has done a very good job on this, and I am inclined to think it is largely due to the Foreign Funds Control.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The important thing to bear in mind is that the Alien Property Custodian and the Foreign Funds Control have entirely different functions to perform.

Mr. TABER. That is just it. They should be made to keep that way.

Mr. COOPER. They do keep that way.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. COOPER. The record shows it.

Mr. TABER. It shows the opposite.

Mr. O'NEAL. The Alien Property Custodian manages foreign businesses that are taken over here, which is an entirely different job from this. They take a foreign-owned factory in this country, a German- or Axis-owned factory, and manage it, and incidentally charge for it. By negotiation with the Foreign Funds Control there has been established a direct and distinct separation of duties. There is no overlapping. They perform a different type of work entirely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. With reference to the employment, over $1,000,000 of this sum is for employees in the Federal Reserve banks of this country. They are doing the Foreign Funds Control work. There are 1,269 persons employed under these estimates in this country and the rest of the world, over and above the employees in the Federal Reserve banks.

As the gentleman from Tennessee has said, we have done a most important job through the Foreign Funds Control when going into new countries like North Africa. The whole story is outlined in the Senate hearings. Let us hope that we are going into some other countries. The only agency to do this job as we advance, and let us hope that we do, is the Foreign Funds Control. That is the reason I started my statement by saying it is a war activity of greatest importance. I think we should back up the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman certainly does not mean to say to this House that such sabotage as has been prevented in the whole United States owes its prevention to this little organization. Is the gentleman leaving out the F. B. I.?

Mr. O'NEAL. Do not tell the gentleman what he should say. I will tell you what the gentleman said: That Germany had $27,000,000 in this country for sabotage purposes during the last war and there was great sabotage, but during this war the Foreign Funds Control has seized all the German money that was here and prevented its use. I cannot say they have prevented all of the sabotage but I say that money is necessary to perform sabotage, and if they have controlled practically all of it, $8,500,000,000——

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If they have it under control now.

Mr. O'NEAL. They have left very little for the German agents to use here. The Germans even had to send $175,000 over from abroad with the saboteurs, and that was seized. When it was seized, there was no money for the saboteurs to operate on.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean to give the impression that that agency was responsible for the lack of sabotage?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman has said twice and will say it again, if the gentleman from Ohio does not understand——

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understand.

Mr. O'NEAL. That if you impound the money, whoever does it, so that they have no money to operate with, you will certainly reduce sabotage. The testimony is that they did impound this money and therefore it was not used. You can say who did it or who did not do it.

I trust the motion will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in what I shall say with respect to the operations of the Foreign Funds Control, I hope I shall not be construed as deprecating the work of this organization. I do not think that is the issue before the House, and I regret that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] in characteristic manner—that is, characteristic of arguments here on the floor of the House—have seen fit to obscure the issue, rather than to clarify it. No one challenges the necessity for the Foreign Funds Control. It was set up immediately after Pearl Harbor, and they spent in that year about $9,000,000. No one questions that it did a fine job. No one questions that there is a job to be done now. They went out and seized these foreign funds, and then a row developed between this organization and the Alien Property Custodian as to the exact limits of their various functions. Some of us on this committee pretty well understand the background of that little battle between Foreign Funds Control and the Alien Property Custodian, and at least so far as it appears on the surface each organization has retained its function. The Alien Property Custodian has taken

over all the work of operating and managing foreign business. It has taken that away from the Foreign Funds Control that first froze those assets and caused them to spend $9,000,000 in their first year of operation. But their work has been receding rather than growing greater. It is true that they make the statement that every time they go into a foreign country they have to have a set-up and we are giving them the money to do that.

The simple question here is, Should you give them $4,100,000, or should you give them $3,800,000, or will they be able to perform their function with $3,100,000? I submit that a reading of the testimony of these gentlemen before the Senate committee will disclose that they do not need $3,800,000 to perform their function. I want the Foreign Funds Control group to be able to carry on their important work, which I do not deny is important. The simple question is, Should we just recklessly say, this is a war activity, a great activity, and, therefore, we should give them whatever they ask? Their work is receding, it is not growing, it is tapering off. There may be an opportunity for some question. Some compromise between $3,100,000 and $3,800,000. There may be an opportunity for some compromise, but I feel that the House having voted on this once, the matter should be sent back to conference, and let us survey this situation just a little more in the hope that we can carry out our real function as Members of Congress passing on these questions, and try to save a little bit of money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Was there any evidence before the committee, or does the gentleman know of any evidence, which will substantiate the proposition that it was this outfit that is responsible for the lack of sabotage in this war, and not the F. B. I. or the security agencies of the Army and the Navy and the other vast organizations for which we have appropriated?

Mr. KEEFE. May I say this, that the gentleman who testified on this subject testified before the Senate committee and drew the conclusion that his organization was in large measure responsible for the lack of sabotage in this country, by pointing out the fact that in the last World War German agents had control of $27,000,000 of money in this country, and that because they had seized Axis-controlled funds in this country this time, and there is no sabotage, therefore the conclusion is inevitable that the reason there is no sabotage is because they seized the funds, and that is all there is to it. It is an argument around a circle. There may be some truth in the matter, but I do not believe the conclusion is inevitable that the lack of sabotage is due merely to the work of this organization.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If that argument is sound then, since we have foreign funds under control, we could follow through the argument by appropriating nothing for this organization or for the F. B. I. or anything else, because having the German money in hand, we are safe.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think that is exactly the situation. I do not want to stop this organization entirely.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman has made a clear statement, and if the gentlemen will read the Senate hearings they will find what the individual referred to said, and how much he can claim credit for. I am not attempting to state, but I do know that we have had little sabotage and that there is some reason for it.

Mr. KEEFE. I have this suggestion to make. I am just as much interested as any man on this committee to see that Foreign Funds Control group has sufficient funds to work with, and I for one am not willing to be swayed by an emotional appeal, that, because it is claimed this is a war effort, we must therefore lose all sense of proportion, all sense of judgment, and just give this agency anything it asks. We should send this thing back to the conference committee, and somewhere between $3,100,000 and $3,800,000 something can be agreed upon in further conferences between the Houses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, just one word in conclusion. The gentleman says that the work of this activity is receding. I do not believe he has read carefully the hearings on the bill. If you turn to page 72 of the printed hearings you will get some idea of the monumental task that confronts the Foreign Funds Control.

The total value of blocked property is about $8,500,000,000. You will find that these are some of the financial operations that this control has to administer:

Short-term funds, including earmarked gold, $4,000,000,000.

Securities, $2,000,000,000.

Direct investments and miscellaneous investments, $2,000,000,000.

Blocked national revenue in the United States, $500,000,000.

I cannot conceive that that can be done without reasonable personnel to handle the matter. I think it would be a tremendous mistake to cut down this activity.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman understands, does he not, the short term fund item of $4,000,000,000, or half of the job, has already been completely done, and that all of the business properties are out from under the control of these people, and that means that more than half, altogether, of this eight and one-half billion is off the board. So that is the meat of the situation.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the gentleman is mistaken. This set-up is the work that this activity has to perform.

I would like to call attention a little further along in the hearings, to the distribution of blocked properties; the Netherlands, $1,800,000,000; Switzerland, $1,500,000,000; and so on down the line. Germany, $150,000,000. It was developed in our hearings that a large amount of the blocked property in Switzerland, $1,500,000,000, while it purports on its face to be Swiss property, is probably camouflaged Nazi property.

If you will look over the tremendous volume of work that is to be done by this activity, then I think it ought to be perfectly plain to everybody that the amount which the House appropriated is far too little. Even the amount allowed by the Senate probably is below the actual need and the chances are that if we provide the higher amount allowed by the Senate a deficiency appropriation will be required before the fiscal year 1944 ends.

If you will turn to page 74 of the hearings you will find how they have been voluntarily reducing their personnel. On the basis of the Budget estimates they have set up for 1944, 1,120 permanent personnel as against 1,205 in 1943 and 1,287 in 1942. So they are voluntarily reducing their personnel and the Senate amendment, which is much below the Budget, would require further personnel reductions. Necessarily there will have to be considerable additional reduction of personnel if we accept the Senate figures. Now, in heaven's name, how far are you going to go toward cutting this activity so that they cannot function? It is one of the most important activities in connection with the war because it has to go into every country when we take over and set up its organization there. If we have an invasion of Europe, as we all hope before long, its duties will be tremendously multiplied. It is next to insanity to cut this amount down. No one believes in economy more ardently than I do but I do not believe in cutting appropriations for necessary, vital activities without rhyme or reason.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the gentleman will turn to page 2 of the hearings conducted before the Senate Appropriations Committee he will find the following:

> Immediately following Pearl Harbor, which was the peak of the work of the Foreign Funds Control, it was spending at an annual rate of over $9,000,000. During the fiscal year 1943 it will spend approximately $5,000,000.

So that it is obvious that the work has receded to the extent that it has justified about a 50-percent reduction.

I contend that under those circumstances it is reasonable to assume that the work will continue to recede.

Mr, LUDLOW. The gentleman stopped reading a little to soon. If the gentleman will just read a little further, he will find this:

> Its work load is expected to continue during 1944 at approximately the same level as at present.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But they have still recommended an additional reduction in view of that statement.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were ayes 46 and noes 90.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 144, nays 195, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—144

Abernethy	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, La.	Green	O'Connor
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gregory	O'Neal
	Hare	Outland
Baldwin, Md.	Harris, Ark.	Pace
Barden	Harris, Va.	Patman
Barry	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.
Bland	Hobbs	Price
Bonner	Hoch	Priest
Boykin	Holifield	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Ramspeck
Brooks	Jackson	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rivers
Bryson	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson
Bulwinkle		Rowan
Burgin	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Russell
Camp		Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Cannon, Mo.	Kee	Sasscer
Celler	Kefauver	Scanlon
Chapman	Kelley	Schuetz
Clark	Kerr	Sheppard
Coffee	Kilday	Sikes
Cooper	Kirwan	Slaughter
Costello	Kleberg	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Lane	Smith, W. Va.
Crosser	Larcade	Snyder
Curley	Lesinski	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Spence
Davis	McCord	Starnes, Ala.
Delaney	McCormack	Steagall
Dingell	McGranery	Sullivan
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Tarver
Doughton	McMurray	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	Mahon	Thomason
Eberharter	Maloney	Vincent, Ky.
Elliott	Manasco	Vinson, Ga.
Feighan	Mansfield, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fernandez		Walter
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Ward
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Weaver
Fogarty	May	Whitten
Folger	Morrison, N. C.	Whittington
Forand	Murdock	Wickersham
Gavagan	Murphy	Winstead
Gordon	Murray, Tenn.	Woodrum, Va.
Gore	Myers	Zimmerman
Gorski	Norton	
Granger	O'Brien, Ill.	

NAYS—195

Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Ditter
Andersen, H. Carl	Burdick	Dondero
	Busbey	Douglas
Anderson, Calif.	Butler	Dworshak
Andrews	Canfield	Eaton
Angell	Carson, Ohio	Ellis
Arends	Carter	Ellison, Md.
Arnold	Case	Elmer
Auchincloss	Chenoweth	Elston, Ohio
Barrett	Chiperfield	Engel
Bates, Ky.	Church	Englebright
Bates, Mass.	Clason	Fellows
Beall	Clevenger	Fenton
Bender	Cole, Mo.	Fisher
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Gale
Bennett, Mo.	Compton	Gamble
Bishop	Crawford	Gathings
Blackney	Cunningham	Gavin
Bolton	Curtis	Gerlach
Boren	Day	Gifford
Bradley, Mich.	Dewey	Gilchrist
Brehm	Dilweg	Gillette
Gillie	Kinzer	Robsion, Ky.
Goodwin	Knutson	Rockwell
Gossett	Kunkel	Rodgers, Pa.
Graham	Lambertson	Rogers, Mass.
Grant, Ind.	Landis	Rohrbough
Griffiths	LeCompte	Rolph
Gross	LeFevre	Rowe
Gwynne	Lewis	Sauthoff
Hale	Luce	Schiffler
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCowen	Shafer
	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Hall, Leonard W.	McLean	Simpson, Pa.
	McMillan	Smith, Maine
Hallock	McWilliams	Smith, Ohio
Hancock	Maas	Smith, Wis.
Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Springer
Hartley	Mason	Stanley
Heidinger	Michener	Stearns, N. H.
Hess	Miller, Mo.	Stevenson
Hill	Miller, Nebr.	Stockman
Hinshaw	Miller, Pa.	Sumner, Ill.
Hoeven	Mills	Sumners, Tex.
Hoffman	Monkiewicz	Sundstrom
Holmes, Mass.	Monroney	Taber
Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, La.	Talle
Hope	Mruk	Tibbott
Horan	Mundt	Towe
Howell	Murray, Wis.	Treadway
Hull	Newsome	Troutman
Jeffrey	Norman	Van Zandt
Jenkins	Norrell	Vorys, Ohio
Jennings	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vursell
Jensen	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Johnson, Anton J.	Pittenger	Wasielewski
	Plumley	Welchel, Ohio
Johnson, Calvin D.	Poage	Welch
	Poulson	West
Johnson, Ind.	Powers	Wheat
Johnson, Ward	Ramey	Wigglesworth
Jones	Rankin	Willey
Jonkman	Reece, Tenn.	Wilson
Kean	Reed, Ill.	Winter
Kearney	Reed, N. Y.	Wolverton, N. J.
Keefe	Rees, Kans.	Woodruff, Mich.
Kilburn	Rizley	

NOT VOTING—94

Andresen, August H.	Furlong	O'Konski
	Gallagher	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	O'Toole
Bell	Gibson	Patton
Bloom	Guyer	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hagen	Philbin
Buffett	Harless, Ariz.	Phillips
Burch, Va.	Hart	Ploeser
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Pracht
Byrne	Heffernan	Randolph
Capozzoli	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rogers, Calif.
Cochran		Satterfield
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Schwabe
Cooley	Kennedy	Scott
Courtney	Keogh	Sheridan
Cox	King	Short
Creal	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	LaFollette	Stefan
Cullen	Lanham	Stewart
Dawson	Lea	Talbot
Dickstein	Lemke	Taylor
Dies	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	McGehee	Tolan
Disney	Madden	Weiss
Durham	Magnuson	Wene
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Wheichel, Ga.
Fay	Merritt	White
Fish	Merrow	Wolcott
Ford	Miller, Conn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulbright	Mott	Worley
Fulmer	Nichols	Wright

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Fulbright for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Ploesser against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Schwabe against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Carlson of Kansas against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Creal with Mr. Stefan.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: Page 13, line 5, change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided further*, That field employees of the War Savings Staff may be reimbursed, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, for travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in the promotion of the sale of United States Government securities (estimated War Savings bonds) within the limits of their official stations."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a motion to be read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, that has been agreed to by both sides.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 8, and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In the first line of said amendment after the word "That" insert the word "regular."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has stated, that amendment is agreed to by the entire conference committee.

For the information of the House I would like to state briefly what it provides.

The restoration of this proviso would materially assist the War Savings staff in the performance of its duties in many large cities, as, for example, the cities of Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Employees of the War Savings Staff assigned to these territories are required to hold several meetings daily in connection with the installation of pay-roll savings plans in industrial plants. If these employees could be permitted to use their own cars, on a reimbursable basis, a serious loss of time could be avoided. A similar proviso has already been approved by Congress with respect to certain other agencies, the F. B. I., for instance. It applies to the United States marshals, and the same provision is included in a number of appropriation bills; so the committee has agreed, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I have stated, and is unanimously in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is a unanimous agreement on this amendment, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to amendments Nos. 17 and 18, inasmuch as they relate to the same subject matter they should be considered together because there is no point to 17 unless 18 is agreed to.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am advised there is some doubt whether it can be handled in that way. On No. 17 we are going to move to recede and concur with an amendment. The two could hardly be grouped together.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17. Page 34, line 7, insert after the word "account": "including the employment of a temporary expert by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the postal service."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I send a motion to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 17, and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "including the employment of three temporary experts by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the postal service."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman from New York advise as to the remaining items that appear to be in controversy?

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, this item including an increase of $166,000 is in controversy. The argument against it will be made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Amendment No. 26 will probably be controversial, especially if a motion is made to recede and concur. That is the $70,000,000 penalty mail proposition. In my opinion it should be kept in the bill. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads undertook to say to us that they would bring in legislation to meet the situation, but this has not been done and the situation is crying for correction. We will have to have a vote on that.

I would suggest that amendments Nos. 17 and 18 be considered together, because a vote on one would cover both.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if I understand the matter correctly, there is liable to be some controversy. It is now 20 minutes past 4 and we have a number of special orders pending. We might as well look at this thing rationally and if we cannot get through at a reasonable hour tonight let it go over until tomorrow, for I know the Members have a great deal of work to do in their offices; I know I have a great deal to do in my office, and I know what the other Members will do with the balance of the time today.

There are at least two controversial items, Nos. 18 and 26. There may be some controversy over those, in order for those who are opposed to items 18 and 26 to protect their position on them. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have two fights and a semifight, as I understand it, as 17 and 18 are linked up together?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see where those who oppose 18 are forced to the position of probably opposing 17. Then if 18 should be concurred in by the House, item 17 should be concurred in in accordance with the motion made.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the gentleman is correct. If it is desirable to adjourn now, I think it would be best to adjourn probably before we take up No. 17 because it is absolutely interrelated and connected up with No. 18. It is entirely agreeable to me to pause at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the thought I had in mind. It is very apparent that we have at least 2 hours' debate and probably two roll calls and there are special orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was also thinking of a question of personal privilege, after the special orders are out of the way.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of that, if Members on both sides have no objection, we might as well suspend. I do not want to take anybody off their feet. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

Mr. LUDLOW. I may say to the gentleman that is entirely agreeable to me, and it seems to me that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I shall be compelled to object if a unanimous-consent request is made. I see no reason why we should not proceed to finish this matter up. If there are special orders, they are special orders and necessarily follow this business, and it seems to me it will not take us an hour to finish this work.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Wisconsin does not undertake to put the gentleman from Massachusetts in the position of wanting to protect the special orders alone. I am simply saying you are going to have 2 hours' debate anyway. Do not worry about that. You are going to have two roll calls. I do not think my friend from Wisconsin wants to interefere with the House proceeding under those circumstances. I was hoping we would suspend consideration of this conference report and then let the special orders proceed rather than to go on and have 2 or 3 hours' debate.

Mr. DINGELL. Why not put it to a vote of the House whether we are going to stay here or not? I am not willing to permit one man to tell me whether I am going to stay here or not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan realizes that I am trying to get everyone together. We can do things together. The House is very tolerant. I just want to protect those who have special orders.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will it be the program tomorrow to go on with this and finish it when the House adjourns tonight? Will it be the program to go on and finish it tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is up to the chairman of the subcommittee. Of course, tomorrow is another day.

Mr. TABER. I understand, but the membership is anxious to know about what the program will be if we adjourn.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program tomorrow will be that this bill, as I understand it, would be in order. It would be the order of business, if it is called up.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is, if it is called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless the House adjourns.

Mr. MICHENER. Am I correct in assuming that if this bill is completed tonight, the House will adjourn over until Monday? If the bill is not completed tonight, it will be completed tomorrow and the House will then adjourn, after completion of this bill tomorrow, until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the bill is completed tonight I cannot guarantee that we would adjourn over until Monday. I was hopeful that we would be able to adjourn from Friday to Monday, though.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. As I understand it, if we adjourn until tomorrow and finish the bill tomorrow the gentleman anticipates there will be a couple of roll calls in the meantime?

Mr. TABER. There is not any question but what there will be at least one roll call on amendments to this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the adjournment so that they can get the majority Members in?

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Michigan always is so nice in undertaking to assist everybody else.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that if some kind of an arrangement cannot be made privately, the House proceed with the matter in hand.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like the floor if the gentleman is through.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am not through. I have not even started.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] will proceed.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this provision inserted in the bill by the Senate would give the Postmaster General a small cost-ascertainment unit whereby he would be enabled to get some line on the costs of the various services rendered by the Postal Establishment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I understood the gentleman to say that this was to give the Postmaster General a small sum. We have heard it said that this amendment is related to amendment No. 18, and apparently, by the report, there is a difference of $166,000 or $167,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. I will explain that to the gentleman as I go along.

Mr. CASE. What I should like the gentleman to explain is the small sum to which he refers of $166,000 or $167,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. The small sum I referred to is $1,702. That is all in the world there will be above the appropriation that is being used now for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Then does the gentleman expect on amendment No. 18 to ask for only $1,700?

Mr. LUDLOW. No; we ask for $300,000, which would be only $1,702 more per annum than has been used for cost-ascertainment purposes, which has been paid out of the mail transportation fund. It is proposed to reorganize the Service and set up a new unit under the Bureau of Accounts. That will withdraw it from the Third Assistant Postmaster General, who has heretofore been in charge of this unit, and will transfer it from his bureau over to the Bureau of Accounts.

Mr. CASE. If the gentleman's proposal were only to ask for $1,700 there probably would not be a great deal of contest about it, but if it is $166,000 there will be.

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not propose to ask for $1,702. I am merely making a statement of fact as to what this unit will cost under the Senate amendment in excess of what it costs this year under the old dispensation. The excess would be $1,702.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Then do we correctly understand that if this amendment is agreed to it will have no effect whatever on amendment No. 18?

Mr. LUDLOW. No, that is not correct. No. 18 is an integral part of this proposition. Amendment No. 18 would have to follow if this amendment No. 17 is adopted, and $300,000 would be carried in the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean that if amendment No. 17 is adopted it would affect amendment No. 18?

Mr. LUDLOW. Amendment No. 18 is necessary to implement No. 17 with funds to carry on. Let me read my statement, and I think the matter will be cleared up.

Heretofore the Department has made cost surveys under a system known as cost ascertainment which has been paid for out of the appropriation for railroad transportation of the mails. The Postmaster General, after a careful study of the methods followed and the results obtained, has determined that the old system is not producing accurate information and that it is possible to revamp the whole program along modern cost accounting lines thereby securing definite, accurate data which will be most useful in proper administration of the Postal Service which is a billion-dollar-a-year business.

Cost ascertainment surveys have heretofore been handled by the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General. That survey has now been discontinued and it is proposed to set up the new program in the Bureau of Accounts. The amount expended on cost ascertainment in 1942 was $164,658 and the proposal for 1944 involves a cost of $166,360, an increase of only $1,702. The elimination of the cost-ascertainment system was taken into account in reducing the railroad transportation item in the bill which shows a reduction of $8,000,000 below 1943.

This item was reduced by $166,360 by the House when the bill was on the floor.

Postmaster General Walker, on page 91 of the Senate hearings, says:

> We find ourselves in the position that here we are doing a business of $900,000,000 a year and I have been unable to find out what it costs to handle first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, what it costs to handle registered mail, or the Special Delivery service, or air mail.

He would not now have the information on which to recommend any change in postal rates. It is due to him that we provide him this facility which he so much needs and which can be done with an increased cost of only $1,702. He has in mind not to exceed three experts to assist him. One of these has been comptroller of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and another is assistant comptroller of the Guarantee Trust Co.—page 93, Senate hearings. The expenditures for management personnel in the Post Office Department amount to only six-thousandths of a dollar for each dollar of postal expenditures—Senate hearings, page 92.

Surely the Postmaster General, the head of the greatest business in the world, is entitled to an infinitesimal sum to enable him to establish a dependable cost-ascertainment unit. Let us concede to him that small measure of encouragement in the discharge of his arduous duties.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, in considering extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements program, we are debating not only a fundamental post-war problem in a very concrete sense, but an issue immediately fraught with momentous war implications. The principles of cooperation with other nations inherent in this program constitute not only the basis for what post-war understandings the United States has made, but, what is of perhaps more immediate essentiality, they are the fundamentals upon which the United States has based its World War No. 2 political offensive in proclaiming abroad that a United Nations' victory would bring a better world for all peoples "of like mind" as well as for the victors.

Repudiation of the trade-agreements program or nullification by restrictive amendment at this critical time would surely undermine world confidence in the nobility of our war aims. It would notify the world that because of shifting party politics, the United States did not have, and apparently could not have, a sustained foreign policy, either economic or political; that the United States Congress was already back on an isolationist tack. This would do incalculable damage to our war effort.

On the other hand, extension of the program would indicate Congress' willingness to extend and participate in international cooperation, at least to this limited extent.

I believe one cannot study the history of wars nor be cognizant of the intangible elements inherent in the present global conflict without reaching the conclusion that political and psychological offensives are important corollaries to successful military action. Indisputably, this kind of an offensive is sometimes phenomenally successful. For instance, President Wilson's famous 14 points are now universally acknowledged to have had a tremendous effect on the outcome of World War No. 1. For more recent examples, look at the propaganda efforts of our enemies in this war.

Today, in an effort to offset Axis propaganda, our own Government is undertaking to tell the world's teeming millions that a United Nations' victory would be a good thing for the world. In other words, our foreign broadcast spokesmen and foreign information writers are daily and nightly pledging a better, more cooperative world if we win; that we want to be a good neighbor and make peace secure. Knowing full well that Congress has the final say in the sphere of foreign affairs, the Government has been quite circumspect in its foreign propaganda program and has carefully based it upon those principles of international cooperation previously approved by Congress.

Through the Atlantic Charter and in the lend-lease agreements, we have made material headway by a combination of executive and legislative action in holding out to the world an opportunity of broader economic and political cooperation. The basic principles of international economic cooperation inherent in the reciprocal-trade-agreements program have been embodied in the lend-lease agreements entered into between the United States and our many allies, and they are apparent also in the Atlantic Charter.

In these agreements, the United States has agreed that in the final determination—

> The terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries and to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world relations.

And let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that since the signing of these agreements, the Congress has extended the Lend-Lease Act. By these agreements, we have further agreed with the United Nations that the final agreements shall include provisions—

> open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion * * * of production, employment, and the exchange * * * of goods * * * and to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

These are brave words, and they express high hopes. But our allies and other nations, too, are looking to our decision on the extension of the trade-agreements program as an indication of how seriously or lightly we regard these promises and agreements.

The post-war question paramount in America's mind, and I dare say foremost in the minds of the world's humanity, is how to make peace secure. This question cannot be resolved, as some people seem to think, merely by whether the United States joins some sort of a league of nations. To be sure, a step of this nature may be necessary, but such membership alone will not be sufficient and, at best, could only be a beginning. There must be cooperation between nations to remove the causes of war. To be successful, any such international undertaking must include the United States which, if we are victorious, will occupy a world position, both economically and politically, of dazzling preeminence. The United States cannot for very long, nor can any other nation in this world of shrunken space and time, be either prosperous or secure in peace in a world spiritually, economically, and politically bankrupt.

So, in a very real sense, upon this bill we will make an elementary choice between economic cooperation between nations, which is a necessary foundation upon which to build a structure of international political cooperation and peace, on the one hand, and extreme economic isolationism, a blind alley which the between-war period has proved stupid and disastrous, on the other. This decision will vitally affect the war which, may I remind you, is not yet won even in Europe, to say nothing of Japan.

The most important issue involved in this decision is its international and immediate war implications. Surely, this is a field in which partisanship can be set aside. I ask my Republican colleagues whom I know to be patriotic, whom I know to be anxious to make every contribution toward victory, to regard the extension of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program as being a vital part of the war effort and to consider it on a nonpartisan basis. I plead with you not to jeopardize our international understandings at this crucial moment, not to destroy world confidence, an important ally, in the nobility of our intentions after victory, not to drive even our allies into a reconstruction of the age-old European abomination, balance of power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a motion?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The colloquy we have had shows that it will probably be 2½ or 3 hours before we can complete the consideration of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

MARCH 5, 1943.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, VITO MARCANTONIO, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 131) entitled "A resolution to make H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers," a special order of business, which was referred to said committee February 23, 1943, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Vito Marcantonio.
2. Grant Furlong.
3. Warren G. Magnuson.
4. Homer D. Angell.
5. James M. Fitzpatrick.
6. Andrew L. Somers.
7. Sol Bloom.
8. James A. O'Leary.
9. Usher L. Burdick.
10. James F. O'Connor.
11. John M. Coffee.
12. Harold C. Hagen.
13. Richard Welch.
14. Alvin E. O'Konski.
15. Samuel Dickstein.
16. George H. Bender.
17. Howard Buffett.
18. George G. Sadowski.
19. Louis J. Capozzoli.
20. Joseph A. Gavagan.
21. John J. Delaney.
22. William L. Dawson.
23. Adolph J. Sabath.
24. William A. Rowan.
25. Martin Gorski.
26. Thomas S. Gordon.
27. Thomas O'Brien.
28. James H. Fay.
29. John Lesinski.
30. Charles R. Clason.
31. Matthew J. Merritt.
32. Jennings Randolph.
33. John C. Butler.
34. Ray J. Madden.
35. Arthur G. Klein.
36. Thomas D'Alesandro.
37. Charles A. Wolverton.
38. Louis Ludlow.
39. James J. Heffernan.
40. Joseph Mruk.
41. Thomas H. Cullen.
42. Walter A. Lynch.
43. Thomas F. Bunchill.
44. Ed Rowe.
45. Henderson H. Carson.
46. Charles N. LaFollette.
47. Joseph Clark Baldwin.
48. Edward J. Hart.
49. Emanuel Celler.
50. Daniel Ellison.
51. Ralph E. Church.
52. Eugene J. Keogh.
53. Winifred C. Stanley.
54. Charles S. Dewey.
55. Noble J. Johnson.
56. Thomas E. Scanlon.
57. Clare Boothe Luce.
58. Reid F. Murray.
59. Harry Sauthoff.
60. Joseph J. O'Brien.
61. Karl Stefan.
62. Edwin A. Hall.
63. Cecil R. King.
64. Christian A. Herter.
65. George D. O'Brien.
66. John D. Dingell.
67. A. C. Schiffler.
68. Elmer H. Wene.
69. Charles L. Gerlach.
70. James P. McGranery.
71. Homer A. Ramey.
72. Leonard W. Schuetz.
73. William T. Byrne.
74. Frances P. Bolton.
75. Harry L. Englebright.
76. W. A. Pittenger.
77. John D. McWilliams.
78. Ranulf Compton.
79. Fred C. Gilchrist.
80. J. Glenn Ball.
81. B. J. Monkiewicz.
82. Bernard W. Kearney.
83. Francis J. Myers.
84. Augustine B. Kelley.
85. Fred A. Hartley, Jr.
86. Walter E. Brehm.
87. John Jennings, Jr.
88. Henry M. Jackson.
89. Evan Howell.
90. Frank A. Barrett.
91. Jesse P. Wolcott.
92. E. M. Dirksen.
93. Samuel A. Weiss.
94. Compton I. White.
95. Calvin D. Johnson.
96. Fred E. Busbey.
97. William J. Miller.
98. William E. Hess.
99. D. K. Hoch.
100. Philip J. Philbin.
101. Stephen A. Day.
102. J. Harry McGregor.
103. Marion T. Bennett.
104. Walter H. Judd.
105. Thomas J. Lane.
106. C. W. Bishop.
107. William S. Hill.
108. Earle D. Willey.
109. Earl Wilson.
110. Richard T. Gale.
111. Mike Mansfield.
112. D. Lane Powers.
113. Gordon Canfield.
114. J. W. Robinson.
115. Chet Holifield.
116. John M. Vorys.
117. Maurice J. Sullivan.
118. Melvin J. Maas.
119. John E. Fogarty.
120. Charles A. Buckley.
121. Leonard W. Hall.
122. Carroll Reece.
123. William B. Barry.
124. Donald L. O'Toole.
125. Robert Crosser.
126. Charles H. Elston.
127. Will Rogers, Jr.

128. John Edward Sheridan.
129. Joseph L. Pfeifer.
130. Carl T. Curtis.
131. Edith Nourse Rogers.
132. Harry P. Jeffrey.
133. Martin J. Kennedy.
134. William Lemke.
135. Edward O. McCowen.
136. Leo E. Allen.
137. P. W. Griffiths.
138. J. Buell Snyder.
139. James C. Auchincloss.
140. C. W. Vursell.
141. Aime J. Forand.
142. Gerald Landis.
143. Deal P. Taylor.
144. Fred Norman.
145. George E. Outland.
146. Mary T. Norton.
147. W. P. Lambertson.
148. Herman Eberharter.
149. Hamilton Fish.
150. Paul Cunningham.
151. George W. Gillie.
152. W. G. Andrews.
153. John Phillips.
154. John H. Tolan.
155. Michael J. Kirwan.
156. Louis E. Miller.
157. Norris Poulson.
158. Harve Tibbott.
159. Joe L. Smith.
160. Henry C. Dworshak.
161. Jerry Voorhis.
162. Foster Stearns.
163. Michael J. Bradley.
164. J. M. Robsion.
165. R. B. Chiperfield.
166. Raymond S. Springer.
167. William W. Blackney.
168. Paul W. Shafer.
169. Michael A. Feighan.
170. W. H. Wheat.
171. Sid Simpson.
172. Dewey Short.
173. Charles B. Hoeven.
174. Charles A. Plumley.
175. Robert A. Grant.
176. Angier L. Goodwin.
177. Chester H. Gross.
178. Merlin Hull.
179. Ivor D. Fenton.
180. Robert L. Rodgers.
181. James E. Van Zandt.
182. Thomas F. Ford.
183. W. K. Granger.
184. William I. Troutman.
185. William C. Cole.
186. Howard J. McMurray.
187. H. Carl Andersen.
188. Anton J. Johnson.
189. John B. Bennett.
190. Albert J. Engel.
191. James A. Wright.
192. Clarence J. Brown.
193. John W. Murphy.
194. Frank B. Keefe.
195. John Kee.
196. Lansdale G. Sasscer.
197. U. S. Guyer.
198. Ed. V. Izac.
199. Ben F. Jensen.
200. Francis E. Walter.
201. Albert E. Carter.
202. J. W. Ditter.
203. R. B. Wigglesworth.
204. James Gallagher.
205. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
206. Louis C. Rabaut.
207. Walter C. Ploeser.
208. George J. Bates.
209. Carl Hinshaw.
210. J. Roland Kinzer.
211. Thomas A. Jenkins.
212. Roy O. Woodruff.
213. Margaret Chase Smith.
214. Clinton P. Anderson.
215. James M. Curley.
216. Earl R. Lewis.
217. Lawrence H. Smith.
218. A. M. Fernandez.

This motion was entered upon the Journal, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, May 6, 1943.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in Room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

399. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, totaling $137,400, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 194); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

400. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

401. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

402. A letter from the War Food Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. Minority views on House Joint Resolution 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 409, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 224. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1291, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 225. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1295, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist in the allied war effort, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 226. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1941, a bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 227. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, a joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2581. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 1403. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields; without amendment (Rept.

No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; without amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 255. A bill for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton; with amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 304. A bill for the relief of J. E. Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 560. A bill for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey; with amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal; with amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2299. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of J. P. Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Bessie Myers; with amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2641. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2642. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to provide that certain strikes and other concerted refusals to work shall constitute insurrection against the United States and be punishable as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2643. A bill to protect the rights of citizens of the United States against the abuse of power by any officer or employee of any department or independent agency of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2644. A bill to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2645. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and a uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 229. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. Res. 230. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study and formulate plans for enforcement of world peace through international cooperation and a council of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 2647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Boyle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2648. A bill for the relief of Avid Evers; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

675. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Rose Beeghley and 33 other citizens of Lewis, Harrison, and Barbour Counties, W. Va., urging the passage of House Resolution No. 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

676. Also, petition of Daisy G. Reger and 19 other citizens of Lewis, Harrison, and Upshur Counties, W. Va., urging the passage of House Resolution No. 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

677. Also, petition of R. P. Swisher and 13 other citizens of the city of Weston, W. Va., urging the passage of House Resolution No. 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

678. Also, petition of T. J. Hinzman and 21 other citizens of the city of Weston, W. Va., urging the passage of House Resolution No. 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

679. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the undersigned citizens of Ohio to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Hilda Warman and 55 other citizens of Philomath, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

681. Also, petition signed by Inez Huyette and 19 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. By Mr. FISH: Petition from 20 residents of Middletown, N. Y., petitioning for the passage of House bill 2082, a measure to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1943.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, whose kingdom is from everlasting to everlasting, bless us with the significance of these moments; let there be deep feeling and solemnity in all hearts. Endue us with those quiet, crowning comforts which come from an applauding voice within. Forbid that we should lament even mutely about the labors with which our days are entwined. Inspire us to be morning-souled, reflecting the sacrificial law of our Saviour who has taught us to bear one another's burdens.

Heavenly Father, we pray that Thou wilt clothe us with a strong adjunct of power, sincerity, and honest conviction. War, with its drenching storms of hate, nakedness and death, with its deeply tragic scenes, has a strange fascination to obey the instinct of honor and chivalry. Motherhood today challenges the

bravery and sacrifice of the ages. In the silent homes which once echoed with the voices of happiness and hopes, about whose hearthstones plans were laid for future joys and achievements, she bends grimly to the call of fadeless devotion. She realizes that the star of blue will be replaced by the star of gold. Oh, give them heart's ease to replace the heartaches and to bear the burden of the conflict. Bring them at last to a blessed recompense and an overflowing cup. As the beautiful dawn climbs toward a full-orbed day, so, blessed Lord, let the sun of an enternal hope stream through the windows of their earthly night and give them peace. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2346. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes:

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the day and other special orders, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, after the conclusion of regular legislative business today and other special orders, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from Hawaii on the results of the war-loan drive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include tables from the Department of Agriculture in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJ. KENNETH McCULLAR

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by myself before the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Wheeling, W. Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I obtained consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Rear Admiral Vickery before the New York Electrical Society and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, on the subject of shipbuilding in World War No. 2. I stated that the speech would take about three and a third pages of the RECORD. I find it will take three pages of the RECORD at an approximate cost of $135. It contains valuable information, and I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter to the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article I received from the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, entitled "A Million Polish Hostages Appeal to the Conscience of the American People."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain tables from the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Kentucky Irish-American, with reference to Senator CHANDLER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OUTLAND was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the legislative program and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPRESSED FOODS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during my special order today I expect again to discuss the compressed-food program. I make this announcement now because certain members have inquired as to where constituents of theirs who are interested can find the names of those in private life and in public office who are best informed on the practical realities of the compressed-food program. I shall include such a list of names in my remarks and they will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on the resolution to extend the reciprocal trade agreements Mr. F. E. Mollin, executive secretary of the American Livestock Association, appeared before the committee an dmade some statements which I would like to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an article by Clarence K. Streit on the political organization of the post-war world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 2 days' leave of absence for my colleague, Dr. FENTON, on account of illness in the family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Breeders Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSING FOR NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to the attention of the House the manner in which the personnel of our Navy are being treated with respect to housing. Many of the men coming in from sea, who are assigned to shore duty at naval establishments on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are at the mercy of unscrupulous owners of real estate. These men have had little or no chance to spend any time with their families for months and are entitled to the opportunity to spend some of the time they are on shore duty with their families. Near those same naval-shore establishments fine housing projects have been built for the benefit of civilian workers.

It certainly seems to me that our men who are fighting this war ought to be given at least the same consideration as is given those people who are paid large salaries for doing war work. The Federal Housing Administration apparently believes that its efforts should be devoted to taking care of civilians. It seems to me that when the next bill providing funds for housing is taken up we should earmark a part of it for the Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FOOD SUPPLY FOR U. S. O.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, a problem has arisen in my area, which has doubtless come to other areas of the United States. If so, I would be glad to hear about it. It is in connection with the U. S. O. and its allocation by the O. P. A. of such things as coffee and sugar and the ingredients for the usual doughnut. The U. S. O. is given an institutional quota by the O. P. A. in each district based in the same manner as are other institutions.

Of course, the O. P. A. is limited in the quotas available for assignment in the several districts for what is intended to be civilian consumption. On first thought it seems to me that the foodstuffs to be supplied to the U. S. O. should not come through O. P. A. allocation but should be allocated or supplied directly from the military commissary, because, after all, the food is for distribution among military personnel. With those men absent from their post, on leave, or traveling on orders, it seems to me that the military might well supply quotas of their own material to aid the U. S. O. in supplying these men with coffee, doughnuts, and sugar, thereby eliminating an unnecessary drain on the civilian quotas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to H. R. 1366, now known as Public Law 25, which provides an increase in the salaries of postal employees. I wish to describe a certain appreciative action being taken by the post-office employees of Detroit, numbering about 4,200, in tribute to my colleague, the Honorable GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, and to include therein a certain letter and inscription.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUESTIONNAIRES OF THE O. P. A.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, while I was home on Easter vacation I was told a very funny story and peculiar incident which I think deserves repeating to my colleagues.

It seems that one of our most illustrious and distinguished citizens became a grandfather in my town and knowing that the parents of this child were very, very busy he took it upon himself to visit the O. P. A. in the hope that he would obtain for this week-old infant ration book No. 2. He found, however, that it was not so easy as that; there were complications. He was told to give the child's name and address and the O. P. A. would attend to the rest of it. In a couple of days this little week-old infant received a letter, one of the first letters he had received in all his life from the O. P. A. He was asked among other questions:

Why did you not apply for your ration book No. 2 when the others did?

But the prize question of them all was:

Where were you at the time ration book No. 2 was issued?

I relate this without editorial comment, only for your edification.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have several unanimous-consent requests: One, that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include in each a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL AND THE UNIONS IN THE POST-WAR ECONOMY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask for the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. I ask him what there is in the record of this administration which would cause him to think that the fighting men are going to receive equal consideration with those who are members of unions. These men in the Navy do not belong to the United Mine Workers; they do not belong to the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. Why should they ask the Goverment for housing? All they are doing is just fighting and dying for the rest of us and making it possible for the workers in these unions to have jobs at high pay and to live in comfortable homes. Union racketeers who stay here at home in safety and in comfort are holding up the tools of our fighting men until the union organizers get their blood money.

I understand now we are to bring out a bill which will give everybody the right to vote regardless of what the States may say. Americans like to vote, but they also like to eat and Americans would like to see the Congress rise to its responsibility and say that American citizens can earn a livelihood without paying tribute to some union. Why are

we not interested in seeing that American citizens can work and eat as well as vote!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the hour of meeting of the House on Monday be 11 o'clock.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I must object to that. Monday morning is the busiest time of the week. I do not think we should meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the ranking minority Member asked me to submit this request.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going to meet on Monday morning at 11 you can just as well meet on Saturday.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We are only going to have general debate.

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to meeting at any hour on Monday. It was my thought that inasmuch as we have only 2 days of general debate that would be one way of getting more time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a great many Members will be getting back to the city on Monday morning. I do not think the House should meet before 12 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are going to have general debate on the trade-agreements bill.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman from North Carolina stated that it was immaterial to him whether we met at 11 o'clock or at noon.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is immaterial to me, too, but there are a lot of Members who want to be heard in general debate and we had a "gentlemen's agreement" that we would not ask for more than 2 days' time.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we can run in the afternoon just as well as we can meet at 11 o'clock. Every Monday morning the desk of every Member is literally piled with mail. I think we ought to wait until 12 o'clock to meet.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we meet on Monday, will they protect the special orders before adjournment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] object?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	O'Konski
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	O'Toole
Barry	Gibson	Philbin
Bell	Gifford	Ploeser
Bender	Gore	Plumley
Bonner	Granger	Pracht
Buckley	Gross	Randolph
Burch, Va.	Guyer	Robertson
Burchill, N. Y.	Hagen	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Hall, Leonard W.	Sabath
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Sadowski
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Satterfield
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Scanlon
Cochran	Judd	Scott
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cooley	Keogh	Sheridan
Cox	Klein	Short
Creal	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Culkin	Lanham	Slaughter
Dawson	Lea	Smith, W. Va.
Dickstein	Lemke	Somers, N. Y.
Dies	Luce	Stefan
Dirksen	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	McGehee	Taylor
Ditter	McGranery	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Magnuson	Weiss
Ellsworth	Mansfield, Tex.	Wene
Fay	Marcantonio	Whelchel, Ga.
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	White
Fish	Merritt	Wolcott
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fogarty	Mott	Worley
Furlong	Nichols	Wright
Gallagher		
Gavagan		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and thirty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 231.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 26th day of May 1943, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until the last issue of the RECORD of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned; and be it further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the routine business and special orders have been disposed of, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article by Westbrook Pegler, which appeared in yesterday's News, and in the other to include another article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business before the House is the further consideration of the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 to the bill H. R. 1648, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, and concur in the same with an amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and move that the House insist on its disagreement to all the pending amendments in disagreement.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

Amendment No. 17. Page 34, line 7, insert, after the word "account", "including the employment of a temporary expert by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil service and classification laws, for the purpose of making studies of the cost, rating, and accounting procedures of the Postal Service."

Amendment No. 18. Page 34, line 12, strike out "$133,640" and insert "$300,000."

Amendment No. 26. Page 52, line 11, strike out the following:

"SEC. 204. No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of government."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 204. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to conduct jointly a study of the use of the mails free of postage by the departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government, and shall report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the passage of this act such

actions as may be considered in the best interests of the Government toward reduction in the volume and cost of handling such penalty mail."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The effect of that motion would be to send the bill back to conference?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the motion is agreed to, then a conference can be asked for.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the remaining Senate amendments in disagreement.

The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 125, noes 1.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 5, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—323

Abernethy	Cole, Mo.	Graham
Allen, Ill.	Colmer	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Compton	Grant, Ind.
Andersen, H. Carl	Cooper	Green
Anderson, Calif.	Costello	Gregory
Anderson, N. Mex.	Courtney	Griffiths
Andresen, August H.	Cravens	Gwynne
Andrews	Crawford	Hale
Angell	Crosser	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Arends	Cullen	Halleck
Arnold	Cunningham	Hancock
Auchincloss	Curley	Hare
Barden	Curtis	Harless, Ariz.
Barrett	D'Alesandro	Harness, Ind.
Bates, Ky.	Davis	Harris, Ark.
Bates, Mass.	Day	Hart
Beall	Delaney	Hartley
Beckworth	Dewey	Hays
Bell	Dilweg	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Dingell	Heidinger
Bennett, Mo.	Dondero	Hendricks
Bishop	Doughton	Herter
Blackney	Douglas	Hess
Bland	Drewry	Hill
Boren	Dworshak	Hinshaw
Boykin	Eaton	Hobbs
Bradley, Mich.	Eberharter	Hoch
Bradley, Pa.	Elliott	Hoeven
Brehm	Ellis	Hoffman
Brooks	Elsaton, Ohio	Holifield
Brown, Ga.	Engel	Holmes, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Feighan	Holmes, Wash.
Bryson	Fellows	Hope
Buffett	Fernandez	Horan
Bulwinkle	Fisher	Howell
Burgin	Flannagan	Hull
Busbey	Forand	Izac
Butler	Ford	Jackson
Canfield	Fulbright	Jarman
Cannon, Mo.	Fulmer	Jeffrey
Carson, Ohio	Gale	Jenkins
Carter	Gamble	Jennings
Case	Gathings	Jensen
Chapman	Gavin	Johnson, Anton J.
Chenoweth	Gilchrist	Johnson, Calvin D.
Chiperfield	Gillette	Johnson, Ind.
Church	Gillie	Johnson, J. Leroy
Clason	Goodwin	Johnson, Luther A.
Clevenger	Gordon	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Coffee	Gorski	Johnson, Okla.
Cole, N. Y.	Gossett	Johnson, Ward
Combs	Graham	Jones
Cooley	Grant, Ala.	Jonkman
Cox	Grant, Ind.	Kean
Creal	Green	Kearney
Culkin	Gregory	Kee
Dawson	Griffiths	Keefe
Dickstein	Gwynne	Kefauver
Dies	Hale	Kelley
Dirksen	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Kerr
Disney	Halleck	Kilburn
Ditter	Hancock	Kilday
Domengeaux	Hare	Kirwan
Durham	Harless, Ariz.	Kleberg
Ellsworth	Harness, Ind.	Knutson
Englebright	Harris, Ark.	Kunkel
Fay	Hart	LaFollette
Fenton	Hartley	Lambertson
Fish	Hays	Landis
Fitzpatrick	Hébert	Larcade
Fogarty	Heidinger	LeCompte
Furlong	Hendricks	LeFevre
Gallagher	Herter	Lesinski
Gavagan	Hess	Lewis
Gearhart	Hill	Luce
Gerlach	Hinshaw	Ludlow
Gibson	Hobbs	McCord
Gifford	Hoch	McCormack
Gore	Hoeven	McCowen
Granger	Hoffman	McGregor
Gross	Holifield	McKenzie
Guyer	Holmes, Mass.	McLean
Hagen	Holmes, Wash.	McMillan
Hall, Leonard W.	Hope	McMurray
Harris, Va.	Horan	McWilliams
Heffernan	Howell	Maas
Judd	Hull	Madden
Kennedy	Izac	Mahon
Keogh	Jackson	Maloney
King	Jarman	Mansfield, Mont.
Kinzer	Jeffrey	Mansfield, Tex.
Klein	Jenkins	Martin, Iowa
Lane	Jennings	Mason
Lanham	Jensen	May
Lea	Johnson, Anton J.	Michener
Lemke	Johnson, Calvin D.	Miller, Conn.
Lynch	Johnson, Ind.	Miller, Mo.
McGehee	Johnson, J. Leroy	Miller, Nebr.
McGranery	Johnson, Luther A.	Mills
Magnuson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Monkiewicz
Marcantonio	Johnson, Okla.	Monroney
Martin, Mass.	Johnson, Ward	Morrison, La.
Merritt	Jones	Morrison, N. C.
Merrow	Jonkman	Mruk
Miller, Pa.	Kean	Mundt
Mott	Kearney	Murdock
Newsome	Kee	Murphy
Nichols	Keefe	Murray, Tenn.
O'Konski	Kefauver	Murray, Wis.
O'Toole	Kelley	Myers
Pfeifer	Kerr	Norman
Philbin	Kilburn	Norrell
Ploeser	Kilday	Norton
Plumley	Kirwan	O'Brien, Ill.
Pracht	Kleberg	O'Brien, Mich.
Randolph	Knutson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Robertson	Kunkel	O'Connor
Robinson, Utah	LaFollette	O'Hara
Satterfield	Lambertson	O'Leary
Scott	Landis	O'Neal
Sheppard	Larcade	Outland
Sheridan	LeCompte	Pace
Simpson, Pa.	LeFevre	Patman
Smith, W. Va.	Lesinski	Patton
Snyder	Lewis	Peterson, Fla.
Somers, N. Y.	Luce	Peterson, Ga.
Stefan	Ludlow	Phillips
Taylor	McCord	Pittenger
Thomas, N. J.	McCormack	Poage
Weiss	McCowen	Poulson
Wene	McGregor	Powers
Whelchel, Ga.	McKenzie	Price
White	McLean	Priest
Whittington	McMillan	Rabaut
Wolcott	McMurray	Ramey
Wolfenden, Pa.	McWilliams	Ramspeck
Worley	Maas	Rankin
Wright	Madden	Reece, Tenn.
	Mahon	Reed, Ill.
	Maloney	Reed, N. Y.
	Mansfield, Mont.	Rees, Kans.
	Mansfield, Tex.	Richards
	Martin, Iowa	Rivers
	Mason	Rizley
	May	Robsion, Ky.
	Michener	Rockwell
	Miller, Conn.	Rodgers, Pa.
	Miller, Mo.	Rogers, Calif.
	Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.
	Mills	Rohrbough
	Monkiewicz	Rolph
	Monroney	Rowan
	Morrison, La.	Rowe
	Morrison, N. C.	Russell
	Mruk	Sabath
	Mundt	Sadowski
	Murdock	Sasscer
	Murphy	Sauthoff
	Murray, Tenn.	Scanlon
	Murray, Wis.	Schiffler
	Myers	Schuetz
	Norman	Schwabe
	Norrell	Shafer
	Norton	Short
	O'Brien, Ill.	Sikes
	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Slaughter
	O'Connor	Smith, Maine
	O'Hara	Smith, Ohio
	O'Leary	Smith, Va.
	O'Neal	Smith, Wis.
	Outland	Sparkman
	Pace	Spence
	Patman	Springer
	Patton	Stanley
	Peterson, Fla.	Starnes, Ala.
	Peterson, Ga.	Steagall
	Phillips	Stearns, N. H.
	Pittenger	Stevenson
	Poage	Stewart
	Poulson	Stockman
	Powers	Sullivan
	Price	Sumner, Ill.
	Priest	Sumners, Tex.
	Rabaut	Sundstrom
	Ramey	Taber
	Ramspeck	Talbot
	Rankin	Talle
	Reece, Tenn.	Thomas, Tex.
	Reed, Ill.	Thomason
	Reed, N. Y.	Tibbott
	Rees, Kans.	Tolan
	Richards	Towe
	Rivers	Treadway
	Rizley	Troutman
	Robsion, Ky.	Van Zandt
	Rockwell	Vinson, Ga.
	Rodgers, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
	Rogers, Calif.	Vorys, Ohio
	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
	Rohrbough	Wadsworth
	Rolph	Walter
	Rowan	Ward
	Rowe	Wasielewski
	Russell	Weaver
	Sabath	Weichel, Ohio
	Sadowski	Welch
	Sasscer	West
	Sauthoff	Wheat
	Scanlon	Whitten
	Schiffler	Wickersham
	Schuetz	Wigglesworth
	Schwabe	Willey
	Shafer	Wilson
	Short	Winstead
	Sikes	Winter
	Simpson, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
	Slaughter	Woodruff, Mich.
	Smith, Maine	Woodrum, Va.
	Smith, Ohio	Zimmerman
	Smith, Va.	
	Smith, Wis.	
	Sparkman	
	Spence	
	Springer	
	Stanley	
	Starnes, Ala.	
	Steagall	
	Stearns, N. H.	
	Stevenson	
	Stewart	
	Stockman	
	Sullivan	
	Sumner, Ill.	
	Sumners, Tex.	
	Sundstrom	
	Taber	
	Talbot	
	Talle	
	Thomas, Tex.	
	Thomason	
	Tibbott	
	Tolan	
	Towe	
	Treadway	
	Troutman	
	Van Zandt	
	Vinson, Ga.	
	Voorhis, Calif.	
	Vorys, Ohio	
	Vursell	
	Wadsworth	
	Walter	
	Ward	
	Wasielewski	
	Weaver	
	Weichel, Ohio	
	Welch	
	West	
	Wheat	
	Whitten	
	Wickersham	
	Wigglesworth	
	Willey	
	Wilson	
	Winstead	
	Winter	
	Wolverton, N. J.	
	Woodruff, Mich.	
	Woodrum, Va.	
	Zimmerman	

NAYS—5

Camp	Manasco	Vincent, Ky.
Folger	Tarver	

NOT VOTING—105

Baldwin, Md.	Fitzpatrick	Miller, Pa.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fogarty	Mott
Barry	Furlong	Newsome
Bender	Gallagher	Nichols
Bloom	Gavagan	O'Konski
Bolton	Gearhart	O'Toole
Bonner	Gerlach	Pfeifer
Buckley	Gibson	Philbin
Burch, Va.	Gifford	Ploeser
Burchill, N. Y.	Gore	Plumley
Burdick	Granger	Pracht
Byrne	Gross	Randolph
Cannon, Fla.	Guyer	Robertson
Capozzoli	Hagen	Robinson, Utah
Carlson, Kans.	Hall, Leonard W.	Satterfield
Celler	Harris, Va.	Scott
Clark	Heffernan	Sheppard
Cochran	Judd	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	King	Snyder
Creal	Kinzer	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	Klein	Stefan
Dawson	Lane	Taylor
Dickstein	Lanham	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Lea	Weiss
Dirksen	Lemke	Wene
Disney	Lynch	Whelchel, Ga.
Ditter	McGehee	White
Domengeaux	McGranery	Whittington
Durham	Magnuson	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Wolfenden, Pa.
Englebright	Martin, Mass.	Worley
Fay	Merritt	Wright
Fenton	Merrow	
Fish	Miller, Pa.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Leonard Hall.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Somers with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Scott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions made on the conference report and the amendments in disagreement was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that six Members have already been granted permission to address the House this afternoon, and the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to address the House for 5 minutes now unless it is agreeable to those Members that the gentleman from Michigan precede them.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker. I believe the rules should be observed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Expressing his own personal opinion, the Chair feels that where special orders have been previously entered it is rather difficult for a Member to try to precede the Members who have been granted that permission. If the gentleman desires to address the House after the Members having special orders have spoken, the Chair is sure such permission can be obtained.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on four occa-

sions and include in each a resolution of the Florida Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WAGE INCREASES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an apology is undoubtedly due the House because of my objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that he be permitted to address the House at this time for 5 minutes. My purpose was wholly selfish. I figured that, if he was not permitted to speak now, there was a possibility that he might remain here and hear some of the rest of us talk and I was quite certain that no one would leave until he had finished. That was the only reason I objected.

Congress cannot dodge its responsibility for what may happen in connection with the coal strike. The papers this morning carry the news that the War Labor Board is asking that it be permitted to disregard the Little Steel formula. Of course, that means that it intends to grant John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers an increase in wages.

Already the Secretary of the Interior has increased the wage of the coal miners by some 30 percent by requiring a 6-day week, which means that they will receive pay and a half for all work over 35 hours per week and double pay for any work performed on either Sundays or holidays. That is a substantial increase.

At the same time, the leaders of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are supporting Mr. Lewis in his demand for an increase in wages by insisting that we roll back the prices of the things the workers must buy. That will be a fine thing if those who furnish the food, clothing, and shelter receive compensation equal to that given the union men.

In addition, they have a further new pay formula, which is that the workers throughout the country should receive a take-home wage equivalent to the sum they received before. That being interpreted means that the pay check which the employee receives at the end of the week or the 2-week period or the month shall be equal in amount, after social-security payments have been deducted, after union dues have been deducted, and after certain other sums have been deducted, to what he received before.

That may sound all right, but, as you understand, it means that the man who receives that kind of a pay check is not contributing anything to the war effort. If, by way of compensation for my services here, I am to have an amount equal to my last year's net income from salary received, what have I contributed toward the war? This idea that there should be an increase in wages to meet every increased cost of living means that every fellow who receives that kind of an increase is not contributing to the war effort.

If a man receives an increase in wages which enables him to meet all expenses and deductions and still retain the same amount he received before, has he contributed anything toward the defeat of our enemies?

The President may think that he is fooling the people in this controversy with John L. Lewis, but they are on to him, and they are on to the Congress, and they are going to place the responsibility in the end upon our shoulders. It is not only the coal strike that makes them indignant, but throughout the country the unions, and at the present time the A. F. of L. in particular, are insisting that they shall have the right to levy tribute upon every man who wants to work in defense of his country.

The Ways and Means Committee of this House spent several months trying to figure out a tax bill. The House spent several days debating a tax bill; but these men who are hiding behind the union organizations, many of them ex-convicts, many of them traveling the country on rationed gas and rubber, have put across without legal right a plan which requires men who work—they are not the people's representatives, the people's Congress—but they have put across this program which requires men who work in these defense and other industries to contribute $11,000,000 every single month to the treasuries of those two unions. That is not tax money. That is tribute money.

I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who I see before me, that he find out how those fellows get away with that procedure. There is no forgiveness in connection with the collection of those dues. They pay them, whether they like it or not, and they pay them before they go to work.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman's conscience is bothering him about forgiveness?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My conscience is not bothering me any. When you can vote billions of dollars to foreign governments, but refuse to extend to the taxpayer a moratorium on a tax bill, and when you voted to give Federal employees drawing from $5,000 to $10,000 a year a minimum increase of $300 per year, do not talk to me about forgiveness. We are not forgiving anybody anything. You are postponing the day of payment. And if this New Deal keeps on spending, then the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will never get enough money to meet the bills, no matter what he does.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It will not be necessary if you can forgive it as fast as you impose it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are you talking about? You borrow it, or you get it by taxation, and it is evident to every person and to my good friend from North Carolina that the new dealers are going to get every last dollar that they can rake and scrape out of the bottom of the barrel. They are going to get every dollar a man has before they are through with the taxpayer. It will not be forgiveness, because the citizen will not have anything left.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They are no worse than the old dealers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the old dealers, of course, were not always honest. I admit that, and I admit that the Republican Party was corrupt at times, and that it did buy votes, but, thank God, we bought them with our own money and not with Federal funds appropriated to aid the sick and the poor and unfortunate. And another thing we never did. We never brought in a lot of fellows from foreign countries who did not believe in our Government and put them on the Federal pay roll and keep them there. We knew enough to recognize our enemies and keep them off the Federal pay roll. And if we had our little Green House on K Street you have your great big Red House on R Street.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But some of your most distinguished men and leaders patronize it. Our President has never been there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has his wife—was she not down there? You ask Harry Hopkins and find out.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If she was, she was in good company.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will say she was, with Monroe, Mrs. Smith. She was in better company than she was when she took those Communists under her wing and went with them over before the Dies committee in an effort to give them face.

Mr. DOUGHTON. She can take care of herself. You cannot disparage her.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You brought the matter up. I did not. No one wants to disparage her. She makes her own record.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I want to talk about something that I had in mind when I got up here.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is what I want to talk about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then what did I have in mind?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned that the Little Steel formula was in jeopardy and that Congress had a certain responsibility. I wondered whether the gentleman believed that Congress upheld the Little Steel formula in view of the raise-in-pay bill that we passed yesterday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course Congress did not. That was just another step toward inflation. This is what I wanted to talk about. The intimidation of businessmen and the extortion practiced against employees.

Here are three illustrations which show you how this administration, this saintly administration, this pious administration, this honest, politically honest administration has gone into partnership with the racketeers and ex-convicts. Here is one of them. It is being practiced in Port Huron, Mich., where ex-convicts are going up from Detroit, going up to Port Huron and following the milk drivers around on rationed gasoline and tires, compelling them to come across and get into the union of A. F. of L. teamsters before they can peddle milk in the city of Port Huron. The administration gave them authority to use those cars and gave them authority to obtain that extra gasoline.

The Port Huron Times-Herald, in an editorial under the caption "Must be a juicy racket," and in a news story, tells the tale in its issue of April 30. The editor of that paper, Mr. Louis A. Weil, realizes, as do many others, what is happening. Fortunately for the country, perhaps, unfortunately for him and his newspaper business—for the unions will probably retaliate—he has the courage of his convictions and he lays the cold facts black on white in his newspaper.

As he writes, it is a racket. And for this extortion, as practiced by the A. F. of L., the President of the United States and his administrative agencies are directly responsible.

The President is responsible because, under the oath which he took when he assumed office, he pledged support to the Constitution and to the people who live under it. The people are not being protected in their constitutional rights.

While the fault primarily rests upon the President's shoulders, Congress cannot escape liability, for Members of Congress, too, are sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution and that without reservation.

If the President will not perform his duty, Congress cannot escape responsibility by shirking its obligation.

Two bills which I have introduced, H. R. 1173 and H. R. 2032, would remedy the situation, if they were adopted and enforced. The Connally bill, sent over by the other body, will not.

That you may have one phase of this extortion in mind, I will read this editorial, and I will read the news story. They are as follows:

MUST BE A JUICY RACKET!

And so the boys are going to spend $100,000, if necessary, to cram their union down the throats of the milk drivers who refuse to join!

"We won't be licked," Racketeer Coleman, so-called organizer, whose acts and record so far in this community smell to high heaven and back again, warned the grocers at their meeting with him.

Well, why not? Why shouldn't they spend $100,000?

What's $100,000 when it comes to saving a racket which has netted many times this amount to those who work it?

If they collected it through the same criminal methods which have been attempted in this community, what's the difference how much they spend?

It would be blood money, taken from the hard-earned wages of a lot of honest, decent men and for which they get nothing in return.

The Times-Herald has said before and we repeat, this isn't an attempt to legally organize a union.

There are many, many unions in Port Huron and they are a credit to their leaders and organizers.

They have improved wage and working conditions, they have raised the standard of living among the workers.

They are officered and managed by men of high caliber, who have at heart the welfare of their fellow workers.

They are affiliated with both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor and other national labor organizations.

They are as much a part of our American system as are the various corporations which, for the most part, give them employment.

But it wasn't necessary for them to spend huge sums of money, or to violate any of our laws to get their membership.

The reason was they proceeded in the legal, lawful way.

They didn't invade this city with a lot of goons and gangsters and tell employers they would have to organize their men "or else."

They went directly to the men, as the law requires, and in a perfectly decent and proper way asked the men to join.

They explained the benefits of the union in a logical and perfectly effective manner.

And this newspaper has supported them and will continue to support them in their efforts to help the workers through their unions.

They didn't need to threaten a lot of innocent bystanders, such as are the grocers in this instance, with picketing, boycott, and every other illegal means at their disposal, unless they do the dirty work for these mobsters.

They didn't shout that they had $100,000 to spend to force a handful of good American citizens to pay tribute to them without getting one thing in return.

No, they didn't do a single thing of that kind.

But Coleman and his gang have said "to hell with the law" and they have laughed at restraining orders from our courts.

They have followed hard-working men around our streets and threatened them and their customers.

They have said to employers they "don't give a damn for the ignorant drivers" (these are their words); "you get your men organized or else."

They are continuing to say that, despite their promise to the War Labor Board.

They have illegally used gasoline and tires.

And now they come back with the threat that they will spend $100,000 solely for the purpose of forcing 50 milk drivers to join their organization.

Yes, it must be a juicy racket and one which pays big dividends to those who promote it.

Coleman was 100-percent right when he told a local employer that he (Coleman) worked like Hitler.

There is no better way of describing his conduct here.

And he and his kind are just as dangerous, too, as is Hitler to the freedoms for which our boys are giving their lives in far off foreign lands.

How much longer will they be permitted to get away with it?

DRIVERS SCORE UNION ATTEMPT OF BOYCOTTING—FILE PROTEST WITH WAR LABOR BOARD IN STATEMENT OF COLEMAN

The National War Labor Board in Washington, D. C., Thursday afternoon received vigorous protests from Port Huron retail grocers and meat dealers and nonunion dairy employees over the extension of boycotting activities by the American Federation of Labor teamsters' union here.

Arthur J. Smith, president of the Port Huron Grocers and Meat Dealers Association, said this morning his group sent the following telegram to the War Labor Board and Paul S. Lunt, special investigator for the Board, who was sent here by the Board at the height of the local milk controversy last month:

"Your representative, Paul S. Lunt, when here, requested that we advise if any threats of boycott were made in connection with the milk situation at Port Huron. At a meeting of our association last Wednesday night, Morris Coleman, representing the teamsters' union, advised that unless our members discontinued handling Babcock and Wurzel milk, picket lines would be placed against our stores. Coleman further stated that unless we cooperated, shipments of merchandise to our stores would be discontinued.

"We cannot understand why we as innocent American citizens should be used in this fight, nor why our businesses should be thus threatened. We respectfully request our Government's protection."

Stanley C. Benedict, attorney for nonunion dairy workers who have steadily resisted attempts of the teamsters' union to organize them against their will, said he sent the following telegram to the War Labor Board:

"Boycotting activities by union greatly enlarged. Please inform me if you plan to intervene."

Smith and Benedict said they have received no answers to their telegrams. The dairy workers' protest is the second they have submitted to the War Labor Board since the teamsters' union, through Coleman, stopped wholesale deliveries of milk to several outlets in what was interpreted as a violation of an order issued by the War Labor Board's trucking commission at the conclusion of a hearing, April 13, in Detroit.

Coleman earlier this week "put the heat" on four more outlets—the local Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. warehouse market, the Port Huron store of the L. K. Liggett Drug Co., Powers Hamburgers, and the Victory restaurant.

W. R. Dawson, manager of the A. & P. market, said the market stopped taking milk from the Babcock firm Monday at the direction of company headquarters in Detroit. Dawson said union representatives made no threats directly to him, but it was understood the union had warned company officials in Detroit that truck deliveries of merchandise to the store would be stopped if it did not cease taking milk from the Babcock company. The local A. & P. market, which sells about 1½ quart cases of milk a day, will not handle any milk until the controversy is settled, Dawson said.

David E. Rounsville, manager of the Port Huron Liggett store, said James R. Hoffa, Teamsters' Union boss in Detroit, told the firm's district office late last week that if the local store continued to take milk from the Babcock firm freight shipments to the drug company's 20 Michigan outlets would be cut off. Rounsville said he has changed to another dairy.

Dale E. Powers, operator of two hamburger stands here, said Coleman in a telephone conversation Tuesday told him the union was going ahead with its organizational campaign here and asked him to stop taking milk from the Wurzel company.

"We'd hate to go through that picketing again," Powers quoted Coleman as saying in a reference to union picketing of the hamburger stands early in March.

Powers said he has not shifted to another dairy despite Coleman's threats. ' He said his brother, who operates two hamburger stands in Detroit, was also threatened with a boycott if the Port Huron Powers' stands did not cooperate with the union. The stands operated by Powers' brother are not connected with the local establishments.

The Victory restaurant, which formerly bought milk from the Wurzel company, shifted to a union dairy Wednesday after a threat by Coleman that the union would cut off delivery of meat to the restaurant if it continued to buy from Wurzel.

DRIVERS WILL JOIN UNION IF

Stanley C. Benedict, attorney for nonunion dairy workers here, today supplied the answer to Morris Coleman's $100,000 promise.

Commenting on a statement by Coleman that the union has $100,000 to spend in its

organizational campaign here, Benedict said the nonunion milkmen will affiliate with the Teamsters Union if it pays them the "hundred grand."

Divided equally among the 54 nonunion men, it would give each of them some $1,850. This would enable every one of the milkmen to pay his $5 initiation fee (special cut rate offered by Coleman recently) and $2 monthly dues for nearly 77 years.

The Times-Herald did not attempt to question Mr. Coleman for a statement on the proposal.

The A. F. of L. teamsters also went over into Holland, in the Fifth Michigan District. The Harrington Coal Co. sold and delivered coal to factories making shells for the armed forces. Because the Harrington coal drivers would not join that union, the A. F. of L. threatened to stop the delivery of material to a factory making munitions and to take away the finished product, the shells.

Now, what is the use of our talking about ruling the world and policing the world when we cannot even compel the A. F. of L. crooks and ex-convicts to lay off of the drivers who want to take the finished shells from the factory to the Army and the Navy?

Oh, we can blow hard, hot and cold, but we let these racketeers who are our political supporters stand between production and delivery—between our fighting men and the things they need to fight with.

In St. Louis—you will notice the account in the RECORD at page 3825—you will find it in this week's proceedings put in by a Member of the other body, where the A. F. of L. down there, when they were trying to lay this 24-inch pipe line across Mississippi, a line which carries 300,000 barrels of crude and 250,000 barrels of high octane gas a day, is holding up construction of that line, and doing it on the order of Buck Newell who in 1937 was convicted of defrauding the Federal Government.

What do you think of a government, what do you think of an administration which stands back of that kind of procedure? And stand back of it; this administration has and it does, for time and again administration agencies under the direct control of the President have taken over industries and said that no man can work there until they join one of these organizations and sign on the dotted line, pay dues, initiation fees, and assessments.

Now, the responsibility rests upon the President in the first instance, because he is the administrative head and took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution, to protect the rights of the citizens; insure equal justice under law. But we are not getting it. The responsibility, in the first instance, I say, is his, and when he fails, as he has failed, and when he makes the kind of a bargain that he has made, letting these fellows collect millions of dollars every month, when he does that and profits politically, then it is up to the Congress to perform its duty.

When this Connally bill comes here and we have it before us, is there any reason why we should not throw it out of the door and substitute in its place the Smith bill or H. R. 2032 or H. R. 1173, and then let the other body take it or let them assume the responsibility?

For more than 2 years the Smith bill has been buried over there—ever since June 7, 1940—and the vote was 258 for and 129 against—RECORD, page 7805 of part 7, volume 86, Seventy-sixth Congress. December 3, 1941, the Smith bill again went through the House by a vote of 252 to 136—RECORD, page 9397, part 9, volume 87, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Now, let us have some legislation—not to prohibit strikes. I do not favor that, but to protect the man who wants to work, and compel the union men to practice peaceful picketing. Let a man strike if he wants to, but let us fix it so that, if you want to go to work to help the men who have gone, you may work, free from any interference from me or from anyone else. That is my platform.

I say to the majority side, if you do not accept your share of the responsibility, next election day we will all pay, and perhaps if the war ends before, and the boys come home, we will pay then, even though a majority of the Members of this House have brothers or sons in the service.

It is about time we got out from under the domination of these union racketeers and performed our duty to those who sent us here. It is time to tell the world that this Congress has made its choice and that we are back of our sons and brothers, our fighting men, and against the extortionists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement from the Booneville Democrat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of Ohio was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPRESSED FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago yesterday I addressed the House for 50 minutes on the subject of compressed foods and the possibilities and potentialities which these new type foods have, both from the standpoint of saving war-winning shipping space now during the war and from the standpoint of their peacetime usability in this country.

I take the floor today to report to the House on the highly gratifying progress which has taken place during the past 30 days on this whole program of new type foods.

I want to preface my report by saying that in my opinion this has become the most far-reaching and fastest moving nonmilitary program in our whole gamut of war activities. I recognize that is a strong statement and I want to call the attention of the House at this time to some of the supporting evidence.

It may be recalled that in my talk of April 6 I listed 10 recommendations which it seemed to me were worthy of consideration and which I had determined upon after devoting over a year to the study and investigation of this subject and its possibilities. I just want to briefly mention those recommendations now and to indicate the progress which has been made on those recommendations during the past 30 days.

Number 1: The first recommendation was that a coordinator of compressed food should be appointed in the office of the Lend-Lease Administration and also in the office of the War Production Board, in order to facilitate the use of compressed foods.

I am happy to report now that progress has been made in that connection and that Mr. Byron Spence is today Compressed Food Coordinator in the Office of Lend-Lease. Those of you who may have constituents in your districts who are interested in gearing their productive machinery into the compressed-food program would do well to contact Mr. Byron Spence, because he is one of those directly instrumental in the utilization of these new type foods. Also I am happy to report that the War Production Board has acted and that Mr. M. Lee Marshall today is the Coordinator of Compressed Foods in the office of the War Production Board and is in position to discuss with your constituents the possibility of securing priorities on critical materials if they are in position to produce and process these new type foods.

Number 2: This recommendation called for a Nation-wide survey to be made to determine what idle equipment is available in this country for the compression of foodstuffs, and I want to record progress in that connection because both the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the War Production Board have advised me that they are collecting the necessary data, the necessary specifications and information to conduct this survey so that the full information will be available in Washington for a definite speeding up of this compression program. In Smaller War Plants Corporation the compression assignment has been given to Mr. Harold Kolseth.

Number 3: The third recommendation was that the War Production Board should give a high priority to materials needed for the manufacturing of compression equipment and machinery, because a ton of steel used in building compression equipment may well save hundreds if not thousands of tons of steel

which would then be unnecessary for the construction of merchant ships to haul a like amount of food. This high priority has been given.

Number 4: The fourth recommendation was that Congress should monitor the program of compressed foods and evidence a continuing interest in the manner in which shipping space is being used in the interest of saving space which is so closely identified with victory in this war, and it is my hope that this report today may help to stimulate additional interest among Members of Congress, although I am indeed grateful for the fact that well over 30 Members of the House and Senate have already indicated an active cooperative interest in this challenging new program.

Number 5: The compressed food and dehydration program should be doubled in size, I suggested on April 6, and while we have certainly not attained that goal, I am glad to report that there is a steady increase at a constantly accelerating rate in the program of dehydrating and compressing foods.

Number 6: The sixth recommendation was that the Lend-Lease Administration should include a special section in the next quarterly report to the President, the press, the Congress, and the country as to what actual savings have taken place because of this compressed food program. We shall of course have to wait until the next report to know whether or not any action is taken in that direction.

Number 7: The seventh recommendation was that attention should be given to the possibility of developing these processes so that during bumper crop seasons when we have large crops, when we have food, we can preserve it in convenient, compact, and serviceable form in order to carry us over emergency periods, and that study is now being made by the various interested authorities.

Number 8: The eighth recommendation was that attention should be devoted to the peacetime possibilities of the permanent utilization of compressed foods, because in many products the costs of transportation are so high that by compressing and dehydrating foods near their areas of growth we can greatly reduce the transportation costs, thus permitting farmers to receive more for their produce and to allow the consumers to purchase them for less. Studies are being made and some tables prepared indicative of these peacetime possibilities.

Number 9: The ninth recommendation was that the dehydration and compression program could best serve America during the war and afterwards by having the machinery for dehydrating and compressing established near the areas of growth of the raw materials so that we could get the biggest dividend from these transportation savings, and I am glad to say that every department of the Government which is cooperating in this program agrees with this position, and progress is being made in the construction of this equipment and these plants out in the growing areas. Before long I expect that the biggest egg-processing plant in the world is going to be under way and in process of construction out in the Middle West, out in the large farming area, and that this compression of egg powder will produce real economies for the Government.

Number 10: The tenth recommendation was that financial assistance should be given by the Government to help private sources who are ready and willing to process and package dehydrated foods by the compression program in order that it may be handled by private initiative and by private individuals but with the Government cooperating so that a portion of the loss of experimentation, if any, will be shared by the Government as these private concerns explore the possibilities. Lend-lease has made available to those who have the know-how and the machinery and the potentiality of production, money for these purposes, and trial orders have already been given.

Now, so much for the progress in the direction of these 10 points.

THREE ASPECTS OF COMPRESSION PROGRAM

Today the food-compression program is divided into three factors or three divisions. First, is the matter of product change, by which I mean that in the whole compression of food technique it is sometimes found that food with equal vitamin content and equal nutritive value can be substituted for more bulky foods in overseas shipment, and consequently large amounts of shipping space can be saved. It is necessary to apply sound judgment and careful planning and skillful analysis to these foods in order to procure available shipping dividends of this kind.

Let me give you an example of the savings that have already been made since the first of April, actual savings in shipping space, through the application of the compression technique from the standpoint of product change. For example, vinegar which used to be purchased of a grade which was 40 to 50 grain vinegar has been discontinued and today they are purchasing vinegar of 250 grain content, and during April the application of this compression technique of shipping concentrated products resulted in the saving of 20,414 cubic feet in shipping space alone, just in the change-over from one type of vinegar to the other.

There are other possibilities in this connection, for instance, the substitution of boneless meat for meat in which the bones are a part of the shipping weight. This field opens up a great vista of possibilities from the standpoint of product change from bulky, heavy, space-consuming products to lightweight, compact, concentrated products which utilize less shipping space.

The second factor of the compression program is the matter of package change, the elimination of barrels and kegs and cans with rounded edge, those notorious space-robbers, which failed to fill in the chinks and failed to take care of all the available space, is now being given special attention. There is under way today a great program of package conversion from barrels and from kegs to sacks and to rectangular containers made from fiberboard and other materials must less critical than tin.

In the matter of package change, let me call your attention to the fact that in April alone in the matter of dried eggs, by taking them out of barrels and putting them into 14-pound rectangular packages, a saving of 137,000 cubic feet of shipping space was made in egg powders alone in this first experimental month of the program. In grain and bran a similar change in the elimination of barrel containers resulted in a saving of 97,800 cubic feet of shipping space.

The third aspect of this compression program is the matter of the process change, compression per se, compression of bulky, dehydrated foods to smaller compact units. An example of that is what has been done in connection with soup. Soups have been compressed and the size of the containers correspondingly reduced. They have been pressed and the air has been squeezed out. Compression, you know, is nothing more or less than squeezing the air out of foodstuffs. The air has been squeezed out and the size of the package reduced so that a saving of 51,282 cubic feet of space has been saved in the experimental month of April alone from the standpoint of soup through the matter of process change as a factor of compression.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am very much interested in this entire question. I have heard that we have now in the country certain machinery and certain plants that could be adapted to this work. Will the gentleman discuss that a little as he goes along?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I will get into that a little bit later, if I have time; but to answer quickly the question now, we do have a type of machinery which fits in very nicely to this program. Any kind of press which will provide a good, sanitary method of squeezing the air out of the products and squeeze bulky packages or products into smaller units, answers the purpose. The whole tile industry, especially the ceramic tile industry, is becoming interested in this program because it has a vast number of idle presses which can be readily converted over to this kind of work. The same thing is true of presses making coal briquettes and items of that kind. We find that their machinery is adaptable to these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about some starry-eyed theory, about some dreamy thing that may come true tomorrow. We are talking about a program involving a vital saving of shipping space, shipping space which is a prerequisite to victory in this war. We are talking about techniques which are presently operating. In April alone a total of 306,496 cubic feet of actual shipping space was saved in materials now on the ocean and when I call your attention to the fact that a Liberty ship has only 468,000 cubic feet of shipping space, it is readily seen that in this early development of the program, while it is still in an experimental stage, we have saved virtually 75 percent of the ship-carrying capacity of one

giant Liberty ship. That is why I say this is one of the most rapidly developing programs and one of the most far-reaching programs facing the country today in a nonmilitary sense. If we can utilize the techniques which have demonstated their successful applicability to date, we can save in the neighborhood of 200 Liberty ships during the remainder of this year, 200 ships which can be carrying munitions, tanks, planes, and ammunition, while the remaining ships can carry just as much nutrition and just as much food as would be necessary with the addition of these 200 ships did we not utilize this compression program.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. The gentleman has spoken of ceramic plants.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Ceramic tile plants as being plants that are readily adapted. Does the gentleman have anything to say concerning plants for the manufacture of ceramic pottery?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not familiar enough with the pottery industry to know whether or not it has presses which would squeeze materials into rectangular shapes.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I am not thinking of that so much as I am thinking of the possibility of using the kilns for the drying of pottery in the drying of foodstuffs.

Mr. MUNDT. It unquestionably would be adaptable to a food-dehydration program, but we must not confuse the dehydration program with the food compression program, because food compression is a process of taking the previously dehydrated foods from which the water has been eliminated and squeezing out the air.

I may say to the gentleman, however, that in his State of Ohio, in Cincinnati, the Cambridge Tile Co. is presently engaged in the process of compressing food. I am sure that Mr. Berchenall, the president of that company, would be happy to correspond with the owners and operators of the pottery plants to which the gentleman refers and indicate to them whether or not they could make the change-over satisfactorily.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the gentleman considered also the advantages in the saving of shipping space, as involved in getting sugar here from Cuba, for example?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, we could certainly do much if we were interested particularly in that aspect. For example, we could modify the coffee shortage of the people of this country by constructing a compression plant in Brazil and shipping coffee here in compressed cubes. I have a small cube of coffee on my desk in my office right now that is sufficient for breakfast coffee for four people. It is less than half as large as a pack of playing cards. But we are interested primarily—I know I am, and I know you are—in making available to the people across the seas the foodstuffs they need. I am not so much interested in the reverse opportunities of bringing additional food to this country at the moment.

I think we are going to witness in the next 6 months and perhaps in the next 6 weeks some startling developments, and that some of the old sea dogs down on the water front who have been interested only in determining that they should not submerge the Plimsoll marks too deeply under the water are going to discover that by the application of compression methods to the loading of ships and to the products with which ships are loaded they can greatly increase the carrying capacity of these merchantmen.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Governor Bricker recently mentioned that in Ohio they are working on a project to get dehydration units down to a cost of $50. If such a process should work out, that would bring it within the reach of the individual farmer and increase the possibilities of this whole program very largely.

Mr. MUNDT. It certainly would. I believe that after the war we shall find that a tremendous change-over will take place in the food habits of America, and that farmers will become, at least in part, the processors of their own foods so that the transportation they used to give to the carriers will go down in the banks to the credit of the farmers themselves, who need it so badly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have not made the profound study of this matter that the gentleman has, but one angle that is important is that these dehydrated compressed foods taste all right when you get through, so that when it comes to the matter of selling, because people will want this compressed food, the taste will be there, the attractive, natural flavors of the foods after they have been inflated and had water added, will still be retained.

Mr. MUNDT. Right. I happen to know that the gentleman went with me one noon to the Statler Hotel, where we applied the old formula that the proof of the pudding is the tasting thereof, by eating some of these foods ourselves, at a special luncheon arranged by Lend-Lease officials.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is any special equipment required for dehydration? I have in mind the National Biscuit plant in my district, the operation of which has been suspended for some time. Should not that be utilized for dehydration?

Mr. MUNDT. To do the type of dehydrating we are doing today, which is a tremendous improvement over what was done in the World War, does require special equipment, because it is a process of forcing and circulating heated air through the food products. Of course, dehydration itself is as old as the life of man. The old Indians out in my country used to dehydrate their meat by hanging it out to dry. But the modernized techniques of compression and dehydration do require some special equipment. However, the biscuit company probably would have much equipment that could be readily converted.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Rotating ovens for cracker and cookie baking and things of that sort could very easily be adapted to that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It is a matter of adapting the existing equipment and of using the least possible amount of new critical materials.

Let me tell you about a trip I took a week ago Wednesday to Philadelphia, where I spent the day with officials of the Moore-McCormick Lines and out on the docks watching the loading of ships, picking up some first-hand information through talking with the dock superintendents, the officers and sailors of the merchant ships, the stevedores, and everybody else concerned with the handling of foods and the loading of ships.

A large Liberty ship and a Russian merchantman were being loaded on the docks we visited that day. After spending all day there and going down in the holds and talking with these men who were loading the ships, and watching the process by which the holds were filled up and the loads were divided between the underhold and the 'tweendecks, and so forth, I came away with the conclusion that a tremendous amount of compressed food could be packed in many of these ships without in any way disturbing the present loads.

For example, in one large ship loading for Russia we saw a huge forging being placed in the bottom of the hold. Out of the packing case a cylinder was protruding about 2 feet. There was a great space almost 2 feet in width and 10 feet tall which had to be shored off, as they refer to it, or blocked up so that jiggling and shaking would not occur. We figured out by computation with the figures that are available that you could provide in that one space alone, which is now going to waste, enough life-sustaining food rations to keep a thousand Russians alive for a month by sending over lightweight, compact, compressed foods, and we discovered that by using similarly compressed-food units more food could be squeezed into unused cracks, crannies, corners, crevices, and vacuums which are left through necessity in the packing of cumbersome machinery in the holds of ships.

I want to say something about the 3,000 pounds of compressed eggs which I told you on April 6 were then on the ocean en route to Britain. This was the first actual shipment of compressed food in the history of America ever to leave these shores under the direction of the Government to be shipped abroad. Those eggs have now arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a letter I received from Mr. Stettinius reporting on the

reception being given these eggs in Britain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OFFICE OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1943.

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: One of the members of the British Food Mission has just returned to Washington from London by plane. He advises us that the test shipment of compressed dried eggs arrived 5 days before he left London. The shipment was sent immediately to the Cambridge testing laboratory for reconstitution tests and a complete report should be along in about 2 weeks. Meanwhile, you will be interested to know that a preliminary examination showed the egg powder came through in fine shape.

The Department of Agriculture has promised to furnish us a progress report at the end of April and we will make sure that you receive a copy.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall not take time to read the letter now, but the laboratory experiments are continuing, and everybody is extremely happy with the condition in which those eggs arrived and their usability over there.

I also ask permission to insert a list of names of the private companies and the public officials who are directly concerned with the food-compression program, so that Members who are interested in the program will have direct information as to whom they should contact, in any consideration they may give to this program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Byron Spence, who serves under Mr. Stettinius as Coordinator of Compressed Foods for Lend-Lease, has done a thoroughly outstanding piece of work of pioneering in this important development and is accomplishing miracles in the field of ship saving, as is his Director, Edward R. Stettinius. Others who have rendered a trojan service to the Government and to the war effort by their determined activities in the food-compression field from the standpoint of effecting a change-over from food compression, the theory, to compressed foods, the actual fact, are such private concerns and individuals as the following, who are putting private money and trained personnel into this whole development program in a highly helpful manner: Mr. John Donnelly and the Auto Ordnance Co., of Greenwich, Conn.; Mr. Walter Johnson and the Johnson Coal Cubing Co., of Detroit, Mich.; Mr. E. G. Loomis, of the E. G. Loomis Co., of Newark, N. J., makers of compression machinery; Mr. Chester Berchenall, of the Cambridge Tile Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; Mr. Ezra Levin, of the VioBin Corporation, Monticello, Ill., in the field of dry milk powders and a suitable binder therefor; the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., of Wilmington, Del., which is developing cellophane wrappers for many types of pressure-packed foods, which may become staple products on the shelves of American grocery stores after the war; Dr. P. H. Tracy, of the University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., who has made remarkable progress in the use of wheat germ oil as an antioxident in the use of whole milk powder; and Mr. Carlos Van Leer, of Washington, D. C., who is one of the country's authorities on the compressed-food development, especially from the standpoint of its application to milk and egg powders. I mention these names and firms here, Mr. Speaker, partly to give credit where credit is due and partly so that Members of Congress and their constituents may know whom to contact if they have food processors or producers in their districts who are interested in helping with this tremendous food-development program.

Everybody with compression machinery or equipment, or with experience in the pressure packing of foodstuffs in concentrated form and in rectangular packages of noncritical materials, or with know-how in the reduction of dehydrated foods to compressed food blocks, or even with available venture capital and an adventuresome spirit coupled with a desire to participate in one of the most romantic and significant developments of this war should contact the authority or individual—in Government or private life—whose special function seems most closely identified with the desires and the capacities of the would-be producer of compressed foods in substantial quantities. The closer these food-compression plants can be kept to the regions producing large amounts of raw materials, however, the greater the savings in transportation space which will accrue to the Government and the larger the possibilities of post-war development, since these savings in transportation will then go to the farmers in the form of higher prices for their products and to the consumers in the form of lower prices for the necessities of life.

It should also be added that Gen. Robert Johnson, of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; Admiral Jerry Land, of the Maritime Commission; Mr. Douglas, of the War Shipping Board; Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board; Maj. Robert J. Blair, of the Subsistence Research Laboratory of the Chicago Quartermaster Corps; Mr. Mike Norton, of the Department of Agriculture; and Mr. Chester Davis, the new War Food Administrator, have all shown a most sympathetic interest in these new-type foods and have been most highly helpful in promoting and accelerating their expanded usage in space-saving shipments overseas. Undoubtedly there are others to whom credit is due, but I can list only those with whom I have had direct contacts and with whom I have worked on this program, since I have no other means of knowing the names of many others who I am sure have contributed greatly to the steadily growing conversion to these modern methods of making each supply ship leaving America render its full potential service in this great and cruel war of survival. As their names are made known to me, however, I shall be glad to include them on this honor roll in future reports to Congress on this fascinating and far-reaching program of saving shipping space and food conversion.

Mr. Speaker, this speech is growing overlong, but I have tried to crowd into it the results and observations of 17 conferences which we have held in my office on this subject since April 6, and of 7 conferences or meetings which I have attended in the various Government departments concerned. I sincerely appreciate the great interest which Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, have demonstrated in this program during the past 30 days, and at a later date I shall bring you a further report on this subject.

I do not want to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the progress which I have reported, however, is all that has been made in this rapid-pace movement in the program of ship saving through proper planning and processing of food shipments. But it is sufficient to be embodied in this report. Nor do I wish to leave the impression that all of the difficulties have been surmounted, that every Government agency and department is doing its utmost to get the maximum dividends from this program in the shortest time, and that nothing more is needed in order to save the hundreds of Liberty ships which it is estimated can be saved this year in nonmilitary food shipments alone if compression and its associated techniques are fully utilized. There is still a lot of work to be done, and the efficiency of the program can be further improved at many points.

TWO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE POLICY

I have two recommendations which I would like to make today and on which I expect to concentrate until action is secured.

The first: I believe this food-compression program has now developed far enough and sufficiently demonstrated its vast potentialities so that an over-all interagency coordinating committee should be established on this compression program. Every agency and department concerned with the handling of food for overseas shipments, including the military branches of the Government, should have a representative on this coordinating committee and it should be headed by somebody—preferably by somebody in Lend-Lease or in the Office of Food Administration—directly concerned with the compression program for overseas shipments. I am happy to advise the House that several of the agencies affected have already been contacted and have tentatively agreed to the creation of such a coordinating committee and designated the individuals to serve upon it.

The second recommendation is perhaps the more important. The food-compression program is still suffering somewhat from the prevailing Washington malady of distributed and diffused authority. There are many good men interested in the program but none has yet been given sufficient responsibility for expediting action and making final decisions on this program. There is still too much necessity to send interested people from department to department and from man to man within a given

department. This program is far too important to be retarded by a herd of headless horsemen, each eager to pull in the right direction but none having the authority to determine the direction or to give the order to get set in the tugs.

Therefore, I believe it is important that this program be established as a staff operation created under the direct authority of the War Food Administrator, and under the personal direction of somebody fully familiar with the whole program of compression and its associated techniques. The most energetic, capable, and best informed man in the compression field should be placed in charge of this office and should be given authority to act promptly, to make decisions, and to assume responsibility for moving forward with full speed on a matter as vital to our victory in the war as the saving of shipping space now going to waste. Whoever heads this specific office should be responsible solely to Mr. Davis or Secretary Wickard, whoever is the supreme authority in our war-food program, and he should have something of the same responsibility and freedom of action that Mr. Stettinius has so wisely given to Byron Spence with such gratifying all-around results. I hope that such a clarification of authority and responsibility will soon be provided as it will greatly facilitate action and enable Members of Congress and others who are interested to conserve time and amplify results by giving them a definite authority with power to act and with whom they can cooperate and function.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I speak a good word for the much-abused Government bureaucrat. My experience with the food-compression program has convinced me that just as all is not gold that glitters, so, too, "all is not bad that 'bureaufies.'" As indicated earlier, the rapid progress which has been made in the compression field has largely been implemented by the Government officials—bureaucrats—whose names I have previously mentioned. Their cooperation has been near 100 percent. No coercion has been necessary—it has been a cooperative enterprise. Leadership rather than the usual bureaucratic lethargy of which we hear so much has been demonstrated again and again. Correspondence has been promptly answered, courtesies have been extended, promptness of action has been most gratifying. With the exception of the diffused authority which I have referred to in my preceding recommendation, and that is due, I believe, not to anybody's reluctance or incapacity but due rather to the fact this whole program is so new that its action-demanding potentialities may not be fully appreciated as yet, there has been a manifestation of efficiency and cooperative determination on the part of all concerned that gives a Member of Congress renewed and revived faith in officialdom and which points a way to a type of service which could do much to heighten Government standards if it can become the general rule.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement, but he has been my leader in all these matters, and I also want to compliment some of the men down there in the bureaus, who are trying to do a good job, but I have found this, that there are men from various branches of our business structure, who are in agencies like the O. P. A., and who seek to tell policy makers what should be done for that particular line of business, and I find that these policy makers are unwilling to follow the suggestions and recommendations made by men who have had experience in industry, and in some instances it has gone so far that these practical businessmen who were in there have either been fired or have quit in disgust. I would like to have the gentleman's reaction on that.

Mr. MUNDT. I must admit I have had that experience in dealing with certain Government bureaus, especially in connection with the farm-machinery situation, and our friend Joe Weiner down there, who is long on theories, but short on practical experience.

I am happy to say, however, that in this food-compression program so far it has been handled solely by practical businessmen and shipping experts working for the Government, without a single theorist interfering. I think that is one reason why the progress has been as rapid as it has been my privilege to report it as being here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a radio speech made over KMPC, Hollywood, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ANTHRACITE COAL SITUATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the past month in the public press and over the radio, and generally in public and private speech, much has been said about the coal-supply problem and the problem of labor. In many instances the discussion has been one of personalities rather than issues, a question of hatreds rather than justice. A question of the importance of a plentiful coal supply, but with little if anything said about the grievances of labor and of their wage demands.

In the midst of this confusion, it was refreshing recently to hear the radio address of Dorothy Thompson, in which she reviewed the mine situation. It was with sympathetic understanding that Miss Thompson pictured the miners' plight in Wales and in the United States. For those of you who had the privilege of seeing that great movie, How Green Was My Valley, you would agree with Miss Thompson's verbal picture which was truly representative of many Pennsylvania mining communities.

On the floor of the House on April 16, 1943, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Congressman LAFOLLETTE, gave some personal observations recommending sound, calm reasoning in meeting this problem.

Almost invariably no distinction has been made in such public discussion between the various branches of the coal industry and the particular problems pertaining to each respective branch, and yet there are many important differences in the nature of the coal itself, the uses to which coal is put, the methods of mining, the methods of processing the product, the contracts governing labor, the basic day rate, and generally in the practices prevalent in the industry in the respective coal areas. Based upon differences in composition and characteristics of the product, trade practices and historical usage recognize two major differences in the coal industry of the United States—bituminous coal and Pennsylvania anthracite.

Anthracite and semianthracite are also mined in parts of Virginia, Arkansas, Colorado, and New Mexico. While locally these operations represent distinctive and important industries, the tonnage involved is relatively small and for statistical convenience the outputs of those mines are usually grouped with the totals of the bituminous-coal industry.

I represent the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania—northeastern Pennsylvania, where I was born and have lived all of my life. I feel I know a little something about that area and its problems, and for the purpose of this discussion I have supplemented ordinary observation by attending for over 6 hours the last session between Mr. Lewis of the miners' union, and the War Labor Board. Last week I attended the coal panel of the United States Chamber of Commerce in New York. Thereafter, I talked to some operators and miners' representatives.

Upon my return to Washington, I studied the Anthracite Commission's coal report. I consulted Dr. Bowden, of the Department of Labor, on miners' wages in hourly, weekly, and annual incomes; the Department of Labor's Faith

Williams on the cost of living; Dr. Steelman's office on wage negotiations; Dr. Sayers, of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines; Dr. Harr, of the Bituminous Coal Commission; the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Department; some newsmen who know considerable about the labor question, and finally the esteemed and gracious Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, and her able assistant, Mr. Tracy. All of this was to learn something of the problems of the anthracite coal industry, and more particularly something about the justice of the demands of the anthracite miners for a raise in pay and an adjustment of their working grievances.

First, I stand for continuous and uninterrupted production of coal—anthracite and bituminous. The Nation comes first. The war must be won. There shall be no hindrance of any kind. Our first and paramount duty is to uphold and maintain the hand of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Now, as to the issues: The Pennsylvania anthracite I desire to discuss excludes all bituminous fields in my great State.

The anthracite fields are divided into three trade regions—Lehigh, Schuylkill, and Wyoming. This classification is generally used by the trade, and it is also followed in the district organization of the United Mine Workers of America, in which district 1 corresponds to the Wyoming region, district 7 to the Lehigh region, and district 9 to the Schuylkill region. Geographically, the anthracite area is classified by fields—the northern, eastern middle, western middle, and southern.

This classification is used in technically operating studies because it follows more closely the geologic conditions that largely influence the methods and cost of mining.

The northern field is the same as the Wyoming region. The Lehigh field and that part of the southern field lying east of Tamaqua—known as Panther Creek Valley—make up the Lehigh region. The Schuylkill region comprises the western middle field and that part of the southern field lying west of Tamaqua. For historical comparison the tonnage of the small Bernice Basin, situated in Sullivan County, is often included with the statistics of the northern field, although the coal is classified officially as semianthracite. The total area of the four fields is about 484 square miles; the northern covers 176 square miles, the eastern middle 33, the western middle 94, and the southern 181.

Based upon the quantity of minable reserves, the southern field is first, followed by the western middle, northern, and eastern middle. The output of Pennsylvania anthracite in 1941 totaled 56,368,267 net tons. The production figures just given include fresh mined coal from underground and strip pit operations, culm bank output, and river coal recovered from the streams draining the Pennsylvania anthracite fields. This was a substantial increase over the 51,484,640 net tons produced in 1940. This was due in part to the increased consumption, increased purchasing power, high industrial activity under pressure of war, substitution of anthracite for fuel oil and coke in some sections of the market, and the inclusion in the 1941 figures of some illicit coal previously not considered in the statistics of the Bureau of Mines. Compared with the First World War, the 1941 output was only a little more than half the 99,611,811 tons produced in 1917. The noted decrease in production during the period between two wars has been due mostly to inroads made by oil, coke, and bituminous coal in the present anthracite markets, and the loss of a large part of the market west of Buffalo, N. Y.

The estimated production of Pennsylvania anthracite in 1942 was 59,961,000 net tons, an increase of 6.4 percent over 1941. The estimated production for the calendar year of 1943, through the week ending April 24, was 19,938,000 net tons, an increase of 7.6 percent over the output of 18,522,000 for the comparable period of 1942. The estimate for the year 1943 will exceed 62,500,000 tons. Consumption of Pennsylvania anthracite in 1942, including that exported, amounted to 60,400,000 net tons, an increase of 4,400,000 tons over the estimated consumption in 1941.

Producers' stocks amounted to 798,000 net tons on January 2, 1943, and on April 24, 1943, were 173,000 net tons.

On January 3, 1942, they stood at 1,237,000 tons and on April 25, at 532,000 tons.

Pennsylvania anthracite is used chiefly for space heating in homes, offices, apartments, hotels, schools, hospitals, and public buildings, including Army camps. Of the total consumption in the United States about 77 percent is used for those purposes, and of the exports, virtually all of which are shipped to Canada, about 90 percent are larger sizes used for space heating and housing purposes. The other important consumers are railroads, electric-power utilities, manufacturing plants, and producers themselves, who use about 5 percent of the total production for colliery fuel.

The principal anthracite markets today are the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, accounting for approximately 97 percent of the total anthracite shipments to destinations in the United States in 1941. It has been said by competent persons that the percentage did not change appreciably in 1942.

The peak year for employment in the Pennsylvania anthracite industry was 1914, when 179,679 men were employed; in 1917, the year of the largest output, the number was 154,174. The average number of men employed in 1941 was 88,054, a decrease of 3,259 from the 91,313 employed in 1940.

During the year 1942, in January, the total number of wage earners, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was 80,600 men; in June, 74,900 men; in November, 76,000 men; and in December 1942 there were 75,300.

In January 1943 there were 69,000 men, and in February 1943, 74,000 men. It is interesting to note the comparison between the years 1914, with 179,679 men employed, and February 1943, with 74,000 men. It is apparent from a comparison of those figures that there is a gradual movement of manpower from the coal industry. This is understandable at the present time when you compare the wages in the other industries throughout the country with those of the mining industry, and at the same time consider the conveniences offered to the workers in other industries as compared with those in the mining industry, and also when you take into consideration the nature of the employment of the miners, keeping in mind the fact that in 1941, 64,764 mine workers were killed and injured in bituminous and anthracite mines, and in 1942 it is estimated that the casualty roll will number 75,000 killed and injured in all mining in this country. The coal industry is laborious, strenuous, and hazardous. It requires special aptitude and skill. It is indeed a special service to the country and Nation which mine workers render.

On the basis of this service, the miners request from their employers and Government that fair consideration is due them and should be given to them, when one considers the question of their grievances and their request for a wage increase. Coal stands unique among our natural resources. It is the greatest source of energy for the Nation. Without coal there could be no effective shipping of industrial products, maintenance of the home or transportation of goods. Coal must be available in amounts needed and at the hours needed. Coal will not win the war but we cannot win the war without it. One and one-half tons of bituminous coal must be mined for every ton of steel manufactured for battleships, tanks, or planes. Bituminous coal is the backbone of all industrial effort. It provides power that drives four out of five railroad locomotives, generating 65 percent of all electric and furnishing heat for approximately 40 percent of all occupied space in heated dwellings.

My problem is, however, not bituminous coal but anthracite. During the First World War, the distribution of anthracite covered a wider area than in 1941. It has changed from 44 States to 42 States. Not only has the area of distribution changed but the percentage of shipments to various sections has changed.

In 1941, a mine agreement was entered into in the anthracite industry which provided a 10-percent increase. The agreement was to run for a 2-year period. This was, incidentally, the only industrial agreement I know of which was to run for a 2-year period.

From the time of entering into the agreement until the present day, there has been an increase in the cost of living to the detriment of the miner. While other industries were receiving increases in pay, the miner lived up to his con-

tract. In fact, up to October 1942, it was possible, where no complaint was made by the employer, to have unlimited pay increase. In October 1942, by Executive order, wage increases were prevented unless the War Labor Board consented in the case of income up to $5,000, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as to wages and salaries over $5,000. Up to that late period, mine workers had received from the period January 1, 1941, to September 1942, only a 10-percent increase. Even under the Little Steel formula, they would have been entitled to an additional 5 percent but they lived up to the terms of the contract; and this, while all other workers were demanding, and, on the whole, receiving, substantial increases.

The chief problem of the Government in wartime, from the standpoint of living cost, is to keep the worker reasonably content with his pay and at the same time prevent wage demands from destroying inflation control. The purposes of wage stabilization have been fourfold:

First. To prevent the kind of wage rise that augments the cost of war weapons and punctures the price ceiling placed upon basic civilian items.

Second. To curtail competitive bidding for the dwindling amount of nonmilitary commodities.

Third. To stop pirating of workers by money promises.

Fourth. To provide labor with living essentials that assure diet, health, and other standards sufficient to maintain the tangible of high regular output and to maintain somewhere around par the intangible of morale.

To achieve this elastic, if not elusive, objective is the primary task of the War Labor Board, an agency consisting of 12 members, 4 representing management, 4 the public, 2 the American Federation of Labor, and 2 the C. I. O. The Executive Order No. 9017 on January 12, 1942, outlined the duties of the Board to be that of finally determining any labor-management controversies that could not be otherwise resolved. It is assumed, however, that before a dispute should reach the War Labor Board that a bona fide attempt at collective bargaining had first been attempted.

On March 5, 1943, the tridistrict convention of the anthracite mine workers, consisting of 300 delegates, concluded its convention in the city of Scranton. The result of the convention was the formulation of 21 demands, principal among which were the following:

(a) An increase of the basic day rate from $5.08 a day to $7.08 a day, and in the case of miners, an increase of $2 to the basic miners' rate, which was $7.43.

(b) Elimination of existing practices whereby allegedly unfair charges were made for supplies.

(c) A 6-day week with the provision that the sixth day would be eliminated when the war emergency ended.

(d) An agreement for a 1-year period with the right of either party to terminate on 30 days' notice.

(e) Payment for time actually spent at work, commonly referred to as "portal to portal."

(f) Unionization of miscellaneous, supervisory, and general employees. Subsequently, the demands of the miners were presented to the operators in New York City. The first meeting was held on the 31st day of March 1943. Despite the fact that the parties have been in conference from that time hitherto, no agreement has been reached. The morning paper reports the operators concede four of the demands—that is: First, 1-year contract; second, 6-day week, ending after war; third, modernizing of rate sheets; fourth, correction in the practice of collecting dues.

It is quite apparent to anyone familiar with the proceedings in New York City that it was practically impossible to have any agreement whatsoever as to anthracite miners' demands until the problem of the bituminous miners and operators had been determined. For this, in my humble judgment, there is absolutely no good reason. Their contracts expired at different dates—bituminous on March 31, anthracite on April 30. There are ever so many problems entirely different in circumstances and aspects between the two branches of the mining industry.

In September 1942 a suggestion was made by the Secretary of the Interior that the mines work 6 days per week in order to increase the supply of coal. At the request of the anthracite operators in January 1943 there was an increase allowed by the O. P. A. of a rate, varying according to sizes of coal, from 35 to 55 cents, which on the average could be termed "a 50-cent increase," the purpose of the increase being to provide for increased cost to operators of materials and supplies, and to provide an increase in charge for every ton of coal mined and sold to the public in order to cover cost of the extra pay allowed to the miners for Saturday work, on that particular day his rate of pay being time-and-one-half. Some time ago there was a meeting before the War Labor Board. Because of my interest in the mine situation, I spent approximately 7 hours listening to the discussion between the anthracite miners, the operators, and the War Labor Board, relative to the stoppage of work on the part of some miners. At that time worker after worker complained to the Board that although a 6-day week had been provided for, and although a premium had been allowed to operators in the way of increased price per ton of coal, that for various reasons the workers were not permitted to work the full 6-day week, and, consequently, were not permitted to have time-and-one-half for the 6 days of work.

Some time ago the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, through Dr. Steelman, suggested as a basis for settlement of differences between operators and miners, the adoption of policy of having a 6-day week. At no time was it suggested by the Secretary of Labor that this meant 52 weeks of work in any 1 year, but that it would be 6 days of work during any week in which a particular mine worked. This, in my judgment, was an excellent basis for settlement. No agreement, however, was reached. It is now the policy of the Government, through Secretary of the Interior Ickes, that all mines are operating a 6-day week. This means a considerable increase in annual income if work continues.

May I demonstrate this with figures:

Statistical trends in the Pennsylvania anthracite industry, 1890 to 1941, inclusive

Year:	*Average number of days worked*
1890	200
1891	203
1892	198
1893	197
1894	190
1895	196
1896	174
1897	150
1898	152
1899	173
1900	166
1901	196
1902	116
1903	206
1904	200
1905	215
1906	195
1907	220
1908	200
1909	205
1910	229
1911	246
1912	231
1913	257
1914	245
1915	230
1916	253
1917	235
1918	293
1919	266
1920	271
1921	271
1922	151
1923	283
1924	274
1925	182
1926	244
1927	225
1928	217
1929	225
1930	208
1931	181
1932	162
1933	182
1934	207
1935	189
1936	192
1937	189
1938	171
1939	183
1940	186
1941	203
1942	
1943	

While in New York, I heard one Mr. Cooke of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Coal Co., when asked if he would advise users to stock the coal bins, answer in the negative. This is the first time I have ever heard a merchant discourage the purchase of his product. He reasoned that instead of filling the bin, the operator preferred that only some coal be in the bin at all times. I believe this policy is unwise; it is contrary to experience over the years; it is contrary to the advice of Secretary Ickes, and contrary to the advice of Mr. Dickinson as to bituminous coal. Why not sell all the anthracite you can and insure the miners steady employment? Pile up good-sized stock piles to meet

any possible emergency. Now that oil is so particularly needed in the war effort, when there is a great possibility of more conversion back to coal, a plentiful stock pile would be splendid encouragement for the use of anthracite.

During the last 24 hours the anthracite operators have taken the novel position of asserting that since the miners received a 10-percent increase in the early part of 1941, and since they receive time and one-half on Saturday for time actually worked and for services actually performed, that that is equal to a pay raise of 9 percent so that their pay raise would be, during the period from January 1941 to date, 19 percent. I challenge that reasoning; to me it appears specious and fallacious. Obviously in ordinary fairness and decency the miners would be entitled to 5 percent increase under the Little Steel formula, and by analogy through the ruling of the War Labor Board, because of unusual circumstances, the miners would be entitled to more than 5 percent because of the increase in the cost of living and their having refused to violate their contract over a period from 1941 down to March 1943.

In a full-page advertisement in all daily papers throughout eastern United States there appeared, under the auspices of the anthracite operators, a set of figures with the caption "Hard coal facts." With your indulgence, I should like to discuss several items in that advertisement.

First. There are two kinds of coal. With that I agree.

Second. A statement is made that anthracite is one of the highest wage industries. Reference is made to the United States Department of Labor figures, and the advertisement has selected as standard the rates of pay to the lumber and timber worker, to the food worker, to the iron and steel worker, and, finally, comparison is made with the rate paid to the anthracite miner. If one were, however, to examine the same record prepared by the Department of Labor, it can be found that anthracite by comparison with a vast number of other workers, is paid a much lower rate per hour and receives a much lower sum of money in weekly earnings. For example, the hourly rate for the anthracite worker is given as $1.069. If you examine the figures of the Department of Labor, you will find that the rate of pay selected was that for February 1943. In that particular month the anthracite miner was paid the highest rate he received in many years; and when compared with the rate paid for month after month after month for several previous years, the hourly rate at no time ever reached that figure. To pursue this discussion and show exactly what I mean, I quote for you the hourly rate paid in other industries and the weekly earnings paid. I do this to demonstrate that the weekly earnings of the anthracite miners were lower than that of many other industries.

Next, a statement is made that anthracite mine workers' earnings have increased 76.9 percent since January 1941. How was that figure arrived at? Once again, if you will examine Department of Labor statistics you will find that in January of 1941 the average weekly earnings of the miner were $25.13, and then compare that with February 1943, and you will find the weekly earnings were $44.47. It is true that the differences between those two figures is 76.9 percent, but the fact remains, however, that for the entire period from January 1941 down to February 1943 the rate of pay never reached $44.47, but was always considerably below that figure, with the exception of 1 month, June 1942. Let me illustrate this fact. The average weekly earnings for 1941 were $27.41; the average weekly earnings for 1942 were $33.85. The figures as given by the advertisement cover only January and February of 1943, so that the average weekly earnings increase from 1941 to 1942 was the sum of $6.44, which, as I figure, is far from 76 percent; in fact, a pencil will indicate that it is less than 24 percent, and this includes the time and one-half rate for overtime. For the record I insert herein the actual figures of the Department of Labor so that one who reads may figure for himself:

Keeping in mind the fact that February 1943 was the top month in many years in the anthracite mine pay while the rates for the other industries here referred to have been at or near these figures for some time

February 1943	Hourly rate	Weekly earnings
Anthracite coal	$1.069	$44.47
Aircraft engine industry	1.25	60.27
Ship and boat building industry	1.224	57.16
Blast furnaces, steel works and rolling mills	1.094	46.57
Forgings—iron and steel	1.179	57.66
Firearms	1.167	56.32
Cash registers and calculating machines	1.137	54.83
Tractor manufacturing	1.095	51.60
Engines and turbines	1.145	57.17
Transportation equipment	1.172	53.80
Locomotives	1.222	60.30
Automobiles	1.205	55.67
Petroleum refining	1.175	49.51
Rubber tires and inner tubes	1.133	50.93

In this connection, may I direct your attention to an address by Hon. James Byrnes, Stabilization Director, over the Columbia Broadcasting Co. stations. The following language was used:

The average weekly earnings of all factory workers (that is, the amount the worker takes home in his pay envelope) have increased more than 50 percent since January 1941, and more than 60 percent since September 1939.

And again:

We must not retreat in our fight to stabilize the cost of living. The act of Congress provided that prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living should be stabilized and except as otherwise provided in the act such stabilization should, so far as practicable, be on the basis of levels existing September 15, 1942. We must hold that line.

The next item is the assertion that the miners demand overtime pay after 35 hours. An examination of records of the Department of Labor reveal again that on the average during the years that have passed, it is a rare occasion that more than 35 hours have been worked in any particular week. In fact, in the entire 2 years from January 1941 to December 1942, at no time did the average weekly hours reach 36 in any one month, and the only time the average weekly hours went beyond 36 was in February 1943 when 41.5 average weekly hours were worked, and that is the figure responsible for the $44.47 which was used as the high average weekly earning in order to ascertain the 76.9 percent figure in the advertisement just described.

Anthracite mining

[U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2, 1943]

Year and month	Average weekly earnings	Average weekly hours	Average hourly earnings
1940	$24.94	27.2	$0.924
1941	27.41	28.1	.971
1942	33.85	33.7	.989
1941—			
January	25.13	27.0	.925
February	29.35	31.4	.926
March	27.79	29.9	.927
April	16.43	18.5	.922
May	22.59	22.9	.945
June	34.20	34.0	1.002
July	23.25	23.2	.998
August	33.56	33.8	.989
September	32.60	33.4	.982
October	32.12	31.9	1.006
November	27.38	27.2	1.007
December	24.05	23.6	1.007
1942—			
January	26.31	27.0	.970
February	33.23	33.8	.900
March	34.43	34.6	.963
April	30.57	30.5	.995
May	35.05	35.2	.991
June	40.25	35.4	.982
July	32.00	32.3	.984
August	34.00	34.0	.992
September	35.40	35.8	.983
October	34.36	35.1	.984
November	35.05	35.7	.993
December	36.14	35.9	1.003
1943—			
January	31.29	30.9	1.011
February	44.47	41.5	1.069

Next is the question of national policy and in that connection I recall the 50-cent-per-ton increase given in January of 1943, at which time there was absolutely no talk of holding the line or of inflation, and at which time the miner was abiding by his contract and not asking for any increase in wages.

The next item discussed is the question of living cost, and a statement is made that living cost increased 19.9 percent while wages increased 76.9 percent. I believe I have demonstrated to you the error in the advertisement as to increase in earnings. As to the cost of living increase, I submit the following:

TABLE OF PRICES

A table of prices (collected by the Scranton Times) based on the usual selling basis of measurement follows:

Article	1942	1943
	Cents	*Cents*
Cabbage	3	13
Carrots	5	6
Beets	5	13
Spinach	5	19
Tomatoes	17	35
Pascal celery	8	29
Potatoes	33	60
Asparagus	19	39
Iceberg lettuce	8	13
Cauliflower	19	50
Green beans	19	35
Green peas	8	25
Cucumbers	8	23
Roasting chickens	31	40
Steak cod	19	41
Cod fillets	27	45
Buck shad	15	29
Shad roe	17	49
Salmon steak	25	45
Smelts	10	16

Let me give you some other figures taken from the Department of Labor's report on retail prices in the city of Scranton:

	Feb. 13, 1940	Feb. 16, 1943	Office of Price Administration ceiling in dollars and cents
Flour, 10 pounds	$0.39	$0.54	
Rice, pound	.07	.119	
Meats:			
Round steak, do	.354	.464	$0.50
Chuck roast, do	.249	.322	.36
Veal cutlet, do	.416	.539	.56
Pork chops, do	.234	.447	
Ham, sliced, do	.402	.613	
Leg of lamb, do	.272	.394	.45
Butter, do	.369	.548	
Cheese, do	.237	.361	
Oranges, dozen	.224	.391	[1].45
Cabbage, pound	.041	.058	[1].15
Green beans, do	.179	.173	[1].25
Onions, do	.037	.064	
Potatoes, 15 pounds	.345	.523	[1]1.02
Spinach, pound	.107	.148	[1].15
Canned foods:			
Peaches	.174	.266	
Corn	.111	.141	
Peas	.13	.157	
Tomatoes	.09	.124	
Dried prunes	.097	.172	
Lard, pound	.102	.203	
Eggs, dozen	.347	.471	

[1] Now.

As to the advertisement Portal to Portal, it is my belief that the only place a car similar to the one shown in the advertisement can be found is the observation car in Montreal, Canada. Certainly there are no arrangements for transporting miners similar to the one in the advertisement, at least not in the experience I have had in observing coal mining cars.

As to the question of how much anthracite could be increased in price, on that the miners and operators are far from accord. I leave that to the statisticians of the parties and to the O. P. A.

To conclude—

(a) The establishing and continuing of the 6-day per week policy is a considerable improvement.

(b) Certain commissary grievances outlined by the miners' representatives will be adjusted by Secretary Ickes' recent order.

(c) Under the operation of the Government, complaints as to overcharge as to supplies and certain services rendered will be removed.

(d) Under Government supervision, improper charges for services not rendered will be removed.

(e) Under all rules of fairness, the mine workers are entitled to at least 5 percent under the Little Steel formula and under the reasoning of that doctrine and decision they are entitled to more than 5 percent; particularly is this so since the miners have abided by their contracts over the entire period from the spring of 1941 to April 30, 1943.

(f) As to the question of Portal to Portal, the matter should be fairly and honestly examined. If it is a fact that the miners are working in excess of 8 hours without being paid therefor, they most certainly have recourse to the court and are entitled to relief under the provisions of the holdings of the court in the fifth circuit at New Orleans, that is, the wage-hour law.

(g) While it is true that Executive Order 932A, of April 8, took away the power of the War Labor Board to deal with inequities, such power still rests with Stabilization Director Hon. James Byrnes. Mr. Byrnes can delegate to the Board the right to handle this particular problem. Most certainly the miners should not be punished for abiding by their contract.

(h) Much relief can be had by proper price regulation enforcement.

In the report of the Anthracite Coal Commission, April 2, 1942, recommendations were made—

First. That a laboratory be established in the anthracite area to study the problem of coal.

Second. Recommendations were made that industries be placed in the anthracite area.

As to the first recommendation, although an appropriation has been made by Congress, no steps have as yet been taken to see that the laboratory is constructed and operated.

As to the second proposition, the administration has been helpful and considerate; progress is under way. Much remains to be done—much will be done.

When the tanker supply was removed as the result of the war, the Government saw fit to subsidize the efforts of those who supply oil so that inequities would be removed.

Surely, a group of men, God-fearing men, patriotic in every respect—in my own community there are close to 22,000 sons and daughters of miners now on the battlefields throughout the world—surely once again men who live by their contracts as long as that contract exists should not be punished in the public press, over the air, or in the public minds for seeking what—pure, simple, ordinary, old-fashioned, homespun justice. They ought to have it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables, charts, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to congratulate and commend the gentleman for making what I consider a very splendid and enlightening contribution to this most important subject, a subject which has the interest not only of the Congress but of the entire country. I am particularly gratified that this contribution is made by a gentleman who comes from the hard coal region of Pennsylvania, the main section of the country where this product is produced. I am sure that the Congress and the country will benefit by the splendid address made this afternoon by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman very much.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Saturday, May 1, entitled "Civilian Defense Vindicated," and an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal of Thursday, April 29, entitled "Civilian Defense in Action."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from the news commentary program of Ian Ross MacFarlane, originating from the studios of WCAE, Pittsburgh, Pa., through the Mutual Broadcasting System network at 10 a. m., March 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, is is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COAL MINERS' WAGES

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pleasure that I follow the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the subject he has so splendidly presented to the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I approach the Well of this House today with a deep feeling of trepidation. My message is a protest against what appears to be an irresistible force of insidious propaganda, designed by hidden influences and power within the Government to malign, besmirch, and destroy as honest, humble, and God-fearing, patriotic people, together with their leadership, as exists on the face of the earth today. I want to appeal to the Members of this body to honestly investigate the facts of these people whose whole purpose of life I deem a privilege to champion and espouse. I am fully aware that the same sinister soulless beings who would break the spirit of this fine patriotic group and destroy their leader will post my name on the roster amongst those marked for political liquidation. I speak today only because my convictions are entirely too vigorous for longer silence. Thomas Paine said:

> He who would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent that will reach unto himself.

I defend the United Mine Workers and their leadership as being among the finest of our patriotic citizens. I proclaim with pride that no group has made a greater contribution to the war effort than the coal miners, in proportion to their resources. I decry the absence of justice for them in their oppression.

Let me first dissuade anyone from the conclusion that John L. Lewis exercises a dictatorial position over the miners. I quote from the United Mine Workers' Journal of October 1942:

> For 22 years on the second Tuesday in December, by secret ballot, tabulated and

counted by tellers selected at the pit heads of all the mines in America. John L. Lewis has been elected President of the United Mine Workers of America.

In spite of all the insidious propaganda, the miners have faith in their leader. I quote from PM and most of us know what is back of that paper:

The coal miners must learn—as they do not know now—that their best hope for a decent and fair solution for their troubles lies in Franklin D. Roosevelt, not in John L. Lewis.

Further quoting PM of Sunday, May 2:

And we shall also fight to put Mr. John L. Lewis out of the labor-leading business. We believe the miners deserve more money, but we also believe John L. Lewis must not run and ruin the United States of America.

Now listen from the same pen in PM:

The tragedy is that the grievances are real, the chances for dealing with them existed; and that Mr. Lewis' personal feud with the administration has obscured those issues. Labor observers almost uniformly agreed that the United Mine Workers could have won a substantial gain for the miners on the merits of their case. So far the United States Government has done little to break the Lewis spell that grips the mining towns. It has given the miners no reason to believe they have any friends in Washington outside the United Mine Workers building. Most of all it has taken no drastic steps to ease the living cost crises that face them.

Now get this:

Congress has refused to prevent the rich from living as usual.

Just what is the plight of the miner on the wage and cost-of-living problem?

The miner's wage was fixed in May or June of 1941. His average income for 1942 was approximately $1,400. This means he had $27 a week to keep his family in 1942.

From a survey made by William Pierce, secretary of Library, Pa., local, this table shows what happened to cost of living between the time the miners' wage was fixed by contract and 1943:

	January 1941	January 1943
Shoulder of lamb, per pound	$0.22	$0.39
Bacon, per pound	.18	.39
Pork, per pound	.25	.39
Butter, per pound	.35	.57
Oranges, per dozen	.25	.59
Spinach, per pound	.05	.10
Rubber boots	4.50	5.25
Work shoes	2.95	4.95

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I think the gentleman's colleagues would be very appreciative if he would tell them where they can get meat today at the prices he quotes. I think the gentleman's prices are too low, that the gentleman is not even doing the miners justice, because I think prices are higher than the gentleman gives.

Mr. ROWE. I acknowledge that these statistics may be a week old.

Down in Terry, W. Va., a miner's wife reports she must pay 23 cents per quart for fresh milk for her children, out of a $1,400 annual salary of her husband. In Washington we voted a $2 per day increase to clerks, stenographers, and over $600 a year increase to the bureaucrats and "lame ducks" whose salaries were more than $5,000 annually, yet a few weeks ago the bureaucrats ordered a subsidy of 1 cent per quart that the taxes of that poor miner must help pay on milk for themselves.

The miner wanted $2 per day increases for 600,000 members, or the right to stop working at a job that would not keep body and soul together. The papers said he was holding a dagger at the Nation's heart, he was unpatriotic, he would cause inflation. He was refused and went back to work under his flag, to await his day of justice in the court of public opinion.

A powerful political force in this country wanted and secured a $2 a day increase for nearly 3,000,000 persons. They justified the increases they obtained on the claim that war inflation is here now.

How tragic it must be to the miner to know his measure of justice. I pray my voice will awaken the conscience of some of my colleagues in the cause of these great Americans. Justice is a machine that, when someone gives it a starting push, rolls on itself. Let me tell you some facts about these lowly, humble Americans.

Of the 600,000 United Mine Workers members 100,000 now bear arms, exclusive of their sons, who are not members, in the bloody battle for justice and freedom all over the world They are not the type who ask for soft spots or commissions. The windows of 700 miners' homes show gold stars to date for dead and missing members in this war. Those who are left in the mines to work number 164,000 less than were in the mines during the last World War, yet they mined 1½ tons more per man-day during 1942 than in 1918. His base wage is 50 cents per day less than it was 23 years ago.

Would you ladies and gentlemen ask your clerks and stenographers to buy their own typewriters, ribbons, pencils, and paper out of their salaries? Certainly not. Well, the miner must pay for sharpening his tools and for the tools, blasting powder, caps, fuzes; and he is compelled to rent the lamp by which he sees in the dark mines from the company, and they take a 4-cent-a-day profit from him in the rent. The United Mine Workers have purchased $40,000,000 worth of War bonds. They have contributed $1,000,000 to war agencies. Yes; the United Mine Workers are doing their part.

Is the miner's work the kind of work any of you would want to do? Would you have your son point his ambition toward a life in the mines? I know you would not. I know something about coal mines. I was in one of them at the tender age of 12. My brother is still in one of them. He is 54 years of age. He has been a good father to a large family. His back has been broken twice in the last 7 years. His working partner was smashed standing at his side. His oldest son also wore a cast from shoulders to knees for 14 months. An explosion put this same boy at death's door at another period for months, but he is back at work in the mines again. His other son is in the Army, the hard way, from private up to top sergeant, although he is a Phi Beta Kappa who earned every inch of his way through college. Yes; the miners are of sturdy character. They have to be in order to be miners. In 1943 the Government wants 700,000,000 tons of coal mined, and the miners know that for every million tons of coal mined 2⅓ miners will be killed under the ground. He also knows that 12 out of every hundred miners will be injured this year in the mines.

I always feel complimented when I shake the hand of a coal miner or a farmer. Neither of them wants much to do with anything but just plain Americanism. The United Mine Workers bars Communists, you know. They just do not like their agitation. I know the leader of these fine people is all out for the good of this country. I received word at my office yesterday from a large stockholder in the mining industry that some of the operators wanted to deal with John L. Lewis because he was fair and a man of his word, but if they did such a thing, the long-haired boys at Washington would crucify them. Ickes and John L. Lewis have talked together, and Ickes has already followed certain suggestions made to him. It is my firm conviction that agreements could be reached between these men, but I am just as sure that the powers back of the War Labor Board do not want them to agree. The fourth termers want this fight to continue to liquidate John L. Lewis. After Lewis the next execution will be Murray or Green, then the others in order. John L. Lewis is just as much of a bulwark for miners' rights as this Congress is a bulwark for the rights of men in this republican form of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, if someone could just explain to the hardy miners and their wives, who must have plenty of meat for satisfaction of diet and hard labor, the meaning of a letter signed by Prentiss M. Brown, in answer to an inquiry about giving the miners out in Wyoming a little more meat, I am sure they could laugh in the face of their serious trouble. This is the letter:

This will acknowledge your letter of March 16, 1943; with reference to the nutritive requirements of miners.

The problem presented in your letter is receiving thorough consideration at present. We are enclosing a pamphlet issued by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council, entitled "Recommended Dietary Allowances."

According to these eminent authorities, the protein requirements of sedentary and very active men are identical (see table 1, page 2). The caloric requirements differ, and the inference is that very active men require considerable amounts of sugar, starches, cereals, and fats.

The problem of keeping miners in good physical condition (due to lack of sunlight because of underground work) is one of availability of vitamin D, the sunshine vitamin. We are enclosing copies of two recent news releases, OWI 1341 and OWI 1424, which are relevant to the problem which you presented. We suggest that your constituents may find it advisable to consult with local, regional, and national nutrition authorities, including the Civilian Requirements Branch of the Food Distribution Administration.

My God, that sort of piffle to some of the pride of our Nation—telling them what is good for their health and to keep in good physical condition. Most any miner at 60 years of age can outwork or whip four-fifths of these misfits down here in Washington without getting up a sweat.

It is my profound conviction the mining of coal during the war should not stop, and I have complete faith that the miners will continue as long as Uncle Sam gives them assurance of a fair break. The patriotism of the miners and their leaders is such that I have faith in them and do not believe they will let their country down. These brave and righteous people need defenders and I am anxious to help secure justice for them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a speech made by the gentleman from New York, Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman, House Pensions Committee, on April 17. This address was delivered at the annual muster day dinner of the Greater New York Executive Council, United Spanish War Veterans, Concourse Plaza Hotel, New York City.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SLAUGHTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE CONNALLY BILL

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days I believe the House will be called upon to consider some kind of antistrike legislation. In all probability we will have the so-called Connally bill under consideration, which was adopted by the Senate last Tuesday. After reading the hearings held last year on the Connally bill and very closely following the debate in the Senate, I am at a loss to understand why it is necessary to have the Federal Government take over any given plant, involved in a labor controversy, before the provisions of the Connally bill can be invoked.

Assuming that a given employer is willing to submit any dispute that may exist between his employees and himself, I can see no justification in depriving the rightful owner of that plant of his property. Every penalty of the Connally bill can be invoked before the Government confiscates the plant, leaving industry in the hands of its rightful owners. Some day in the not too distant future, the more than 120,000 Connecticut men now serving with our armed forces in every part of the world will return home victorious. When that day comes I want to be sure that I can look every one of them in the eye and assure them that no vote or act of mine prevented them from receiving the munitions and equipment they so badly needed during the war period.

No one man and no organization can be permitted to retard the flow of munitions to our various fighting fronts. I am sure that the Congress has both the ability and the courage to enact legislation that will prevent any man or any group of men from interfering with the successful prosecution of the war. Labor must have confidence in the agencies of the Government set up by this administration to deal with labor disputes. When the leader of any organization refuses to submit the differences to the War Labor Board, he thereby refuses to cooperate with his Government in time of war.

I do not want to deprive any man, acting as an individual, of the right to determine where and by whom he shall be employed, but I do say that any man or group of men who deliberately attempt to sabotage our war effort should be taken out of circulation and, if necessary, put in jail for the duration of the war.

Every Member of this House knows of relatives, friends, and neighbors who have given up good positions, left their homes and families to serve their country during this war. They are not asked whether or not they approve of the personnel of the General Staff. They are not asked whether or not they approve of the officers selected to serve on courts martial. They willingly and cheerfully subject themselves to military law and regulations. To say that we can require 11,000,000 men to serve with our armed forces in all parts of the world and, at the same time, that we cannot require other men to work in essential defense industries seems to be the height of ridiculousness.

At the present time there is a 15-day truce between the coal-mine workers and their Government. During this period of truce it is the duty and responsibility of this Congress to formulate by legislation, a sound labor policy. After that policy is formulated and its provisions made known to the people of the United States, it is our duty to see that every bit of the power of the Federal Government is exercised in the enforcement of that labor policy.

There is one other thing in connection with this coal miners' strike of which the American people will not approve and that is the taking advantage of the strike situation to invoke measures intended to further arouse the American people against organized labor. I dare predict that if certain men, high up in this administration, have their way, this miners' strike will be used as an excuse for requiring a national dim-out. We do not need a dim-out to emphasize the fact that we are engaged in a most critical war. There are those in our Government who, for several months, have advocated a national dim-out as a means of increasing our war fervor. We are willing to make any needed sacrifice but we will not willingly submit to any unnecessary regulations nor regimentation. I can think of nothing more depressing than an unnecessary dim-out.

No evidence has been submitted to indicate that there is a shortage of electrical power. With the miners now working 6 days a week, there should be no shortage in the future unless it is the intention of the Government to permit the miners to shut down the coal mines of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I propose today very briefly to urge the membership of the House to cooperate in the curing of bad practices and maladministration in the O. P. A. by reasonable administrative channels, if possible, but by legislation, if necessary. Three of our products under O. P. A. administration are handled very detrimentally to the agricultural and public life of my State. Recently I had in my office a meeting of O. P. A. and agricultural officials with a Florida delegation in connection with prices on new Irish potatoes.

A ceiling has been placed on potatoes of from $2.50 to $3.10 per 100 pounds. This represents in this instance about 40 to 60 percent of the cost of production. The growers had adverse frost conditions early in the year, followed in many places by extensive drought. The yield has been reduced on an average of probably 50 percent. The smaller the yield per acre the greater the labor cost price in harvesting and average pro rata labor cost price in cultivating. The less yield per acre causes, of course, disaster within itself. Three dollars and ten cents per hundred with average labor conditions, average season conditions, and average production would give a fair but hardly adequate return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is something that should be and must be corrected. The grower will get $2.50 to $3.10 for his potatoes. When you go to the store, if you can buy one at all, it will cost you from $12 to $13 or $16 a hundred pounds, giving speculators profits of from $2.50 to $3, as against from $12 to $16 selling price, or, say, $3 for the grower and $10 for the one who exercises practically no risk, who handles the product.

Mr. Speaker, do you not know that if we had in the O. P. A. officials who would do their duty as honest American citizens they would stop that? I do. The President's Executive order freezing prices to hold the line in connection with the cost

of living undoubtedly intended to apply to the cost that you and I pay when we buy this food to eat, but those men, I believe, have interpreted that to say that it means that everything must be frozen and the producer must go out of business. What is obvious to me is that in the whole outfit there they obviously must have no one in power who is a friend of the producer or who has sufficient vision to see that those kinds of practices are drying up production, and he, that same Administrator, who is trying to protect, and is protecting the speculator, may soon be hungry.

An ostrich will stick his head under the sand and think he is protected. Now, these gentlemen in there who protect the hucksters, the speculators, and the retailers, and forget the producer, may soon find out, if they have sufficient wisdom to find out anything, that they themselves will be hungry. It is hard to conceive of men of mature age, 21 years and above, American citizens, who are so ignorant or weak or so partial and vicious in their practices and in their zeal to protect speculating interests that they would dry up production in this country and cause the American people further to be hungry. That is what is going on in O. P. A.

I am not willing to say that the Department of Agriculture officials are blameless in this. There appears to be an interlapping of authority of administration between the two departments. In fact, in some instances, it is my belief that the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administrator may make recommendations to O. P. A. officials and that upon these recommendations the O. P. A. may make their findings. This possibility is the case with our Irish potato situation now in the State of Florida and it is possible also that it has something to do with the vicious milk ceilings which are causing Florida milk cattle to be butchered for beef and Florida dairymen to go out of business. It is probable that we should hold even more responsible the Department of Agricuture than the O. P. A. I am not quite sure where the definite responsibility lies but I do know that the practices now going on and for which O. P. A. officials are getting the blame are drying up food production in the country and rapidly bringing us to starvation. If I have spoken harshly concerning O. P. A. officials when Agriculture officials are to blame, such is not my intention. What I am trying to do is to bring to your attention the tragedy of the situation in general and to urge you to cooperate for relief.

We have in Florida the ability to produce a small percentage, maybe 30 or 40 percent, of the dairy products needed there. We import the balance. O. P. A. has put a ceiling on milk in Florida, which has slaughtered out through sales to butchers a large percentage of the dairy herds in Florida. We plead with them to raise the ceiling and let the producers have a little more for their milk so they will not sell their cows for beef. They have alibied around about investigating and surveying and later reporting, but the herds continue to be sold. I dare say there is not a single man in the O. P. A. employ who has ever been connected with a single dairy south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that the condition brought about in your State is the result of regulation, rulings, or interferences from Washington as it affects your dealers and your producers?

Mr. GREEN. I believe that we could lodge 90 percent of it right there.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is making a very good statement in reference to pointing out what the O. P. A. is doing. For his information, may I say that the same type of action has been taken against the dairies all over the North. In my State and in many other States great numbers of dairy cattle have been slaughtered in the last year simply because of the action and the ruling of O. P. A.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe it should be brought home to them for the benefit of the agency that their duty is to encourage the production of food, that we may face starvation in many parts of the world, and they have a duty to encourage production and not destroy it.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate the gentleman's frank observation.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say that the reason I asked the question is that I am to follow the gentleman on a subject that bears very similar aspects in the question of food production in my State.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan and appreciate his understanding of the matter.

I realize that wholesale price raises may bring about inflation, but I have never believed and I still do not believe that reasonable price payments to the producer for his food commodity will bring on serious inflation. I do not believe it.

Those gentlemen should have a little common sense, a little business judgment, and be able to look a little further than today's meal, because if they do not the food scarcity in this country is only beginning.

The Irish potato growers in Florida, it is obvious, will lessen their acreage next year because O. P. A. and Department of Agriculture will not permit the crops to bring the cost of production. In that connection, there is growing up, I believe—I have read it in the papers—a serious black market. The purchaser in a truck will go to the field and offer a good price. The farmer in many instances, not knowing anything about O. P. A. ceilings, will sell to him at from 7 to 10 cents a pound these Irish potatoes. The purchaser brings these potatoes on and sells them to the market man, who sells them to us at 10 or 15 cents, just the same as if it went through the O. P. A.

What I am getting at is this. Under an American form of government and of free opportunity, why should a man who risks $100 in handling a few bags of Irish potatoes make $6 or $7 per bag for handling those potatoes, while the man who produces them and sells them at $3 a hundred suffers in that transaction a loss of $1 out of every $3? Do you not see how foolish, dishonest, and un-American this is?

I do not know whether or not we will get any relief. We talked with them. They gave us a respectful hearing and promised to take it under advisement. They did the same thing 3 months ago with regard to milk production.

These early Irish potato growers in Florida should have at least $5 per hundred pounds for their crop. In some instances, the growers have mortgaged their farms, including their homes, and embracing their entire life's savings in order to obtain fertilizer, seed, and labor to plant and cultivate these crops. I know of one man who mortgaged his entire home and farm for $5,000 in order to make the present crop of potatoes. I do not know what percentage of normal his yield will be but it probably will be from 50 to 65 percent. Cold weather did great damage to his crop; the drought impaired the yield; and high cost of labor and inability to obtain labor at the right time is added cost and loss. In his particular case, if he does not get cost of production, he may lose his home, farm, and life's earnings and will not be able even to plant one potato next season. Gentlemen, in such event, O. P. A. and Agriculture Department officials are absolutely responsible for his loss and the ones responsible should be impeached, convicted, and turned out of public office, and should discontinue receiving salaries from taxpayers' money.

Now, these officials did not cause the cold or the drought and did not compel him to plant these potatoes, but they do have the responsibility, under act of Congress, to set ceiling prices upon his production. They have, without knowledge or without desire for justice or through misunderstanding of the whole situation and shortsightedness on their part, set ceilings on this man's and on the other growers' production which are, in fact, a travesty on justice. They have the power to remedy this and to raise ceiling prices under the circumstances. I hear of no effort on the part of these officials to do anything which would prevent the common carrier, the wholesale broker, or the retail merchant from making their profits. The farmer above mentioned risks everything he had of worldly goods in this production. The common carrier, the wholesaler, and the retailer risk the small item invested by them in the transaction on their part lasting for only a few days or a few hours. These speculators are permitted to have on an average of $10 where the grower has on an average of $3, and in the Florida case, instead of the grower having $3, comparatively speaking, and taking into consideration his loss, he is, in fact, losing probably $1 to $1.50 on every 100 pounds of Irish potatoes he is now selling.

Let me tell you of another practice that has grown up. In my State we have a number of markets through which livestock is auctioned commonly. It is called the farmers' market. The farmer brings in his cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats, and it is auctioned off to the highest bidder. The one purchasing it will feed it, perhaps, or finish it, or, if it is ready for butchering, he will take it to the slaughter pens, have it inspected, slaughtered, and sell it. The O. P. A. practices in Florida are constantly forcing these animals out of these markets and, in fact, closing our farmers' livestock markets and putting them out of business. At a later date I hope to discuss this farmers' livestock marketing situation at greater length.

This concerns me seriously because, as a feeble Member of this great body, I realize that our people, the innocent ones, who will need food, are the ones who will suffer.

I read in the paper the other day that one of these gentlemen who is doing the rationing and holding down and theorizing was not born in America. I do not know whether or not he is an American citizen now. He has been quoted as saying that we should have rationing right on after the war, that at all times we will need rationing in America. That is so strange to me. Could one have views so foreign?

When this thing is over, some of these fellows, insofar as their present employment is concerned, are really going to be rationed and liquidated because of their inefficiency, because of their failure to see the predicament in which we are, because of their holding to details and technicalities which are preventing production of food in America.

The following is a communication received by me from the Honorable Z. D. Holland, superintendent, Board of Public Instruction, Bunnell, Fla.:

BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
FLAGLER COUNTY, FLA.,
Bunnell, Fla., April 28, 1943.

The Honorable LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Irish potatoes are retailing from 8½ to 10 cents per pound here. The poor farmer, not 10 miles distant, is allowed only 3.1 cents per pound by the Office of Price Administration.

Weather conditions this year have decreased the yield of potatoes and cost of production is greater. This means that if the average farmer breaks even he is lucky. Personally, I think it is a shame the Office of Price Administration will not allow the farmer to make as much as the retailer.

I borrowed money from a Federal agency to plant potatoes, securing the loan by a mortgage on everything I have. Then the Office of Price Administration sets a ceiling price so low that it is doubtful if the reduced yield will bring enough money to pay off the loan. The Government will then foreclose the mortgage and own a farm.

I will assure you that I will do everything possible for the war effort, everything being equal; but the above-cited instances are not fair, nor just, and not right. If the same ceiling price is maintained for another year, I am sure that there are many hundreds of acres that will not be planted.

Can anything be done to increase the ceiling price?

Yours very truly,

Z. D. HOLLAND.

Here is a telegram from the Escambia County Farm Bureau, Pensacola, Fla.:

PENSACOLA, FLA., *May 2, 1943.*

Congressman LEX GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Irish potato situation critical. No rain in weeks. Present ceiling prices ruinous to farmers and if not increased will contribute to black markets and will be reflected in drastic reduction in production next season. Most stores here have no potatoes. Public willing to pay fair prices. Potato ceilings out of line with other truck crops. In the depression year 1936, when potatoes not as scarce as present, they sold for $6 per 100 pounds. We do not ask for as much. Our country is at war, and we are willing to make sacrifices. We do feel the ceiling should be raised to $4, only two-thirds the depression prices, and probably not half the price if there were no ceiling. With production costs much higher, we feel that it is for the best interest of our Nation to ask that you exert every effort possible to get the potato ceiling raised to $4 per 100 pounds.

ESCAMBIA COUNTY FARM BUREAU.

Here is a telegram from the Honorable J. W. Townsend, J. S. Howard, and R. B. Roberts of Union County, Fla., and many other growers from Union and Alachua Counties, Fla.:

SANTA FE, FLA., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,
Congressman at Large,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Office of Price Administration restrictions force local growers to sell Irish potatoes for $3.10 per hundred No. 1 products. North Carolina growers are sending into our territory their last year's crop and selling for $8.75 and are subjected to no ceiling. We need at once a flooring on Irish potatoes of $4; otherwise we are ruined. We need also a flooring on snap beans at $3. Recent freezes and droughts are bringing these products to market at higher production cost than usual; as result the yields will be cut to 60 percent of normal in many instances.

J. W. Townsend, R. B. Roberts, J. W. Waters, W. L. Brown, C. R. Howard, J. S. Howard, J. B. Johnson, S. M. Brown, Wesley W. Roberts, Percy Snyder, J. H. Cason, J. G. Boyd, St. Claire Crowford, J. W. Dukes, R. B. Warren, C. D. Newbern, J. D. Rimes.

I have received an unusually large additional number of communications from potato growers in all parts of Florida, urging the predicament brought about by these ceiling prices and in each instance pleading for relief in order that they may continue to produce. My colleagues, I have repeatedly expressed to you my belief and firm conviction that the only certain method to obtain food production during this war crisis is for the farmer and livestock man to be by his Federal Government assured that he will obtain cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. This is the practice of the Government in practically every other war effort. The manufacturer who builds an airplane, tank, gun, or any part thereof, or any war requirement equipment or material, knows in advance and before he produces that he will obtain in sale price his cost of production plus reasonable profit. He does not, in fact, run any risk. He knows before he enters into production that he will have his cost plus a reasonable profit. Your Government and my Government has given him this assurance and even enters into contracts with him to this effect. Is there anyone who would deny that food is an essential to the war effort? If food is an essential, then why cannot the Government insure to the producer that this producer will have cost of production plus a reasonable profit? Mark my word, this is going to be realized before the war is won, and I predict that in order to obtain adequate food in the fullness of time during this war, our Government will have to insure the producer cost of production.

Farmers and farm labor are leaving their efforts of production to go with high-paying war industries, and for this they are not to be censured but indeed to be commended for their prudence in an effort to provide for their families, buy War bonds, and contribute to the war effort. No class of workers in the world has ever been more patriotic than the farmers and stockmen of our Nation; no one desires more fervently to buy War bonds than does the farmer; no one buys nearer to his limit than does the farmer. He desires to do and is doing his full part in the war effort. But he cannot be expected to continue to produce food at a loss. To continue to do this his production will be of short life because farmers as a rule do not have reserve funds to draw upon to continue operating at a loss.

I have farmed all of my life, and I know that there is no class of workers in the United States who deserve so much and receive so little than those men who are laboring out beneath the blue canopy of heaven and wringing their living from the breast of mother earth.

We have in the Department of Agriculture the Extension Service with county farm agents in practically every farm county in the Nation. These farm agents through the Secretary of Agriculture have been authorized to invite production and set maximum production in each county, for which the Government would be responsible for floor prices. The Commodity Credit Corporation of the Government could be utilized to put the process into motion and I venture the statement at this time that this fund would never have to be utilized because the ready market in the present hungry America will rapidly absorb every possible fruit of the soil that can be produced for the duration of the war. These floor prices could guarantee to the farmer cost of production plus reasonable profit. This program, in fact, will not bring on inflation and in my opinion, will not substantially increase the cost to the consumer of food production. There is adequate in-between latitude in order to absorb the difference between loss in a farm's production and cost plus reasonable profit. This can all be brought about without

seriously increasing cost of food to the consumer. No; it would not bring on inflation.

I had hoped to have time to go at length into the destructiveness of milk ceiling prices in Florida which is equally as pressing or more so than our potato growers' problem, but time will not permit that today. In the very near future, it is my hope to give to you a portion of this tragic picture of the Florida dairymen and by the way, brought about by price ceilings of O. P. A. and Department of Agriculture officials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein letters, excerpts, and communications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], I ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short excerpt from Time magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was intensely interested in what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] had to say on the subject of the effect of the regulations and rules issued by O. P. A. on the growers and producers of food in the State of Florida.

Recently one of the prominent publishers of this country conducted a national survey bearing directly on the subject of food production. In my judgment, one of the gravest questions this country has to face in this year of 1943 is the production of food. Food is the first essential in continuing to a successful conclusion the struggle in which we are now engaged.

It is interesting to note the result of this national survey. It appears that more than 5,000 farmers from every section of the United States answered a questionnaire which was sent throughout the land, in the following manner. Eighty-nine percent of the more than 5,000 farmers who answered said that the greatest handicap in the production of food in this country was "too much interference from Washington."

This brings to my mind that oft-quoted statement of Thomas Jefferson, that "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap the people will soon want bread." It seems to me we have arrived at that period in our history, although Jefferson uttered those words more than a century ago.

In connection with that subject, there came to my desk this morning a letter from the commissioner of agriculture of my State of Michigan. In it was a letter written to him by one of the farmers; a large producer of food. I want to bring to the attention of the House and the country what the effect has been on that farmer or producer of food by the regulations, rules, and orders that have been issued in Washington; whether intentionally or whether unwisely makes little difference, the effect is the same.

He writes to the commissioner of agriculture of Michigan as follows:

COLDWATER, MICH., *April 28, 1943.*

Mr. CHARLES FIGY,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: To date there is a crying need for more meat and every farmer in the Nation has been asked to try and increase production in order to help relieve the shortage.

Hundreds of suggestions have been made as to how we might best accomplish this purpose, and, to my mind, probably one of the better ones was to market our hogs at a 300-pound weight rather than the customary 200 pounds. The thing looked sensible to me, and I decided to give it a try.

We are not large hog raisers in this part of the State, but many of us market around a hundred head of hogs per year. Last spring's pigs were running in the cornfield and doing right well when they reached the 200-pound stage, but we had resolved to help the meat situation and we fed them for another 6 weeks or 2 months.

In the meantime the newspapers and radio were filled with talk that the Government had decided to drop the price of pork at least 2 cents per pound. At that time no cellar had been placed under the market and hogs did drop 2 cents per pound. In addition to that, I got a penalty of 20 cents per hundred for having my hogs too heavy.

I set that down as lesson No. 1, but I was still convinced that if we would all market our hogs at 300 pounds the pork shortage would be taken care of. Last fall's pig crop of 52 head developed what the veterinary called enteritis, and we lost 22 pigs after they weighed about 75 pounds each. The remainder we fed out and 2 weeks ago we were offered $15.50 per hundred for these hogs. We turned the offer down, because we were determined to stick by our resolve and produce 300-pound hogs.

Ten days ago the newspapers again came out with the story that living costs were going to be reduced, and that one of the first items to be cut down would be pork. This time we got cold feet and sold 17 head yesterday at $14.25, instead of the $15.50 we were offered 2 weeks ago, and we are serving notice on everybody that while we are just as patriotic as the next fellow, we will be darned if we will take a $2 penalty on every hundredweight of hogs in order to be patriotic.

After all, the bond solicitors want us to buy bonds, and we can't even pay the interest on the mortgage with that kind of financing.

If you have managed to read this far, Mr. Secretary, you will know how, at least, one farmer in the State feels on this question. A premium of a few cents a hundred on 300-pound hogs would bring the bulk of all the hogs in the State up to that weight before marketing.

The present plan of a penalty on everything over 200 pounds will see the bulk of the hogs marketed at 180 to 200 pounds.

Could not you just pass this suggestion on to Secretary Wickard and some more of the "powers that be" in Washington? I know it is too simple for them to understand, as they must have a round-about way of taking care of their problems, but this one will work, and to date theirs have all failed.

Very truly yours,

E. M. DOBSON.

The commissioner of agriculture of Michigan writes me:

Mr. Dobson is a very reliable farmer in southern Michigan and I think serious consideration should be given to statements from men of his type.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the letter in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ilya Ehrenburg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including therein an interesting article written by Robert L. Norton, appearing in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter which I received from Mr. John Fitzpatrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WARTIME FOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the wide and excellent use of the theater and motion picture for wartime food-education programs which has been made possible by cooperation of the Skouras Theaters, a large number of food industry associations, and the American Theater Wing by making use of a script and film prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

In the light of a current article in a national magazine which, because of its brevity and of the selection of picture material chosen, gives an inaccurate exposition of the subject matter, purpose, and sponsorship of the play, It's Up to You, I am setting forth the facts connected with this production.

The play, It's Up to You, was launched for several performances in several of the larger Skouras motion-picture houses throughout the metropolitan area of New York. The houses were contributed free. No admission was charged. The expenses incident to the production which was done by a professional cast were defrayed by the Skouras Theaters, the Food Industry Association, and the American Theater Wing with theatrical unions cooperating.

The play in six scenes, forcefully and dramatically tells the story of the effort to increase food production and to maintain manpower on the farm, warns against waste of food and patronizing the black market, and the wrong use of non-nutritious foods. It also explains rationing. The scenes are serious and dramatic, with musical interludes between them.

George Skouras, of the Skouras theaters, made the play possible by offering his chain of theaters in New York City for free use of such a play. The other theater chains have offered 2,100 theaters from coast to coast for similar use. Amateur groups are requesting the script of play in large numbers to be put on locally. It is expected that when the entire program is carried out, 10,000,000 will be able to witness this production and 100,000 people, including amateur groups and local sponsoring groups, will take part in the production. By this means, the script and film prepared by the Government will achieve an exceptionally wide distribution at no additional cost to the Government.

The entire project had the approval of the Office of War Information and the War Activities Committee of the Motion Picture Industry. The production would not have been possible, however, had it not been that Mr. Skouras personally financed such items as printing of programs, arrangement of lighting effects, and so forth, as well as paying all normal expenses of opening his theaters for the production free of charge to the public. Neither would it have been possible had not a group of food-industry associations financed such items as the hiring of actors and the many incidental expenses of that nature. These associations were: The National Association of Retail Grocers, the American Meat Institute, the National American Wholesale Grocers Association, the National Association of Food Chains, the National Brokers Association, the Super Market Institute, the National Voluntary Groups, the National Restaurant Association, the National Food Distribution Association, the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, and the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.

The Department of Agriculture had no part in the handling of the stage-production funds, which were paid direct to the American Theater Wing by the contributors. The actual business management has been handled by the American Theater Wing, which is an organization of theater people to carry on war activities such as the Stage Door Canteen.

The play was well received in New York and Washington, where it was brought to free performances by the American Theater Wing.

Following are excerpts from New York and Washington papers who unanimously praised the project:

And the canned sound effects will be released to little theaters all over the country through the National Theater Conference. It is an exceptionally flexible production; any town that has a movie operator, a stage of any sort and a few amateurs will be able to make a good show of it. And most of the work is already done.

It's Up to You represents not only an outstanding example of the way in which the theater can carry important wartime messages, but a significant advance in theatrical technique as well. (Marjorie Kelly, Washington Post.)

If so, look it up if you want to see what real power the theater arts are capable of when they are controlled by skill, free imagination and a high purpose. * * * When a production combines dance, drama, music, movies, patriotism, statistics, and emotion in one unified theater form, who is to undertake to separate them into departments? All these elements are put together magnificently, and played and sung by an admirable cast. And the whole thing is free. (John Martin, New York Times.)

It's Up to You is a play with a message, i. e., that food is important in winning the war and that there is a sound reason why Americans today have to put up with rationing and food shortages. It conveys that message, backs it with graphically illustrated facts, enlivens it with humor, garnishes it with songs, gives it significance with drama. * * * Don't miss it. For if this be propaganda, let's have more of it. (Mark Schubart, New York PM.)

* * * might be playing for a $4.40 top rather than "for free" as the soldiers say. (New York Herald Tribune.)

It's Up to You, the living theater explanation of the food situation, proved all over again that the theater is one of the best mediums of public education. * * * It seems to me that many another United States agency could very well explain their problems and gain public understanding and cooperation through the same facilities. (Katherine Smith, Washington Times-Herald.)

With the launching of the play completed, it is now being carried on by local groups through the country and the script and film is available to all who desire it. They can be obtained by writing the American Theater Wing, 730 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., or Alan Schneider, Office of War Information, Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on the Investigation of Restrictions on Brands, Names, and Newsprints of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, May 10, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearings. War Production Board will testify on newsprint supply.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

A meeting of the Committee on Flood Control will be held in the committee room on Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of hearing the testimony of Col. Lewis A. Pick, division engineer, Omaha, Nebr., on the recent floods along the Missouri River. Colonel Pick should give to the committee valuable enumerations respecting the operations of the Fort Peck Dam and respecting flood control along the entire Missouri River.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

403. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the 1944 Budget for the Federal Security Agency, involving a decrease of $1,672,000 (H. Doc. No. 195); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

404. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the office of the Liaison Officer of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $62,320 (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education. H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled

"An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn." (Public Law 525, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2650. A bill to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife and Fish Refuge; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2651. A bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2652. A bill to amend section 222 (e) of Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 2653. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the State of Washington and to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. and Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of the property of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. as their respective interests may appear, fee title to certain lands of the United States in Pierce County, Wash., for highway and railroad purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2655. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2656. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933, enacted to promote the welfare of Indians of the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex., and to protect their interests in certain lands within the Carson National Forest; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2657. A bill to aid in obtaining for Indians the services of doctors and dentists during the present war; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2658. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 2659. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida May Gaston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 2660. A bill for the relief of Chase, Parker & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

683. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. Ralph Brown and members of the Church of God and the pastor, Reverend Boggess, McMechen, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

684. Also, resolution unanimously passed by the West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers of Wheeling, W. Va., Allen Simmons, secretary, urging opposition to Senate bill 702, with a companion bill, House Resolution 2100, to mobilize the scientific and technical resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

685. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Fannie Cannon, route 1, Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 2350; to the Committee on Pensions.

686. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Eva T. Wimmer and 17 other citizens of Robinson, Kans., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which asks the suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry, including importation and exportation of beverage alcohol, for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

687. Also, petition of Lloyd Griffis and 40 other citizens of Greenleaf, Kans., urging the Representatives of the people in Congress to enact, without delay, the necessary legislation to permit a refund of all wheat penalties collected from the producers on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

688. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study and formulate plans for the enforcement of world peace by and through international cooperation and a council of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

689. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima and Lacrosse, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

690. By Mr. ROWAN: Resolution of the Chicago Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

691. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of the Earnest Workers' Sunday School Class of the Presbyterian Church of West Union, Ohio, favoring the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

692. Also, petition of Mrs. Vincent Fairley and six other residents of the Sixth Ohio Congressional District, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

693. Also, petition of Anna M. Barrett and 19 other residents of Highland County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

694. Petition of C. E. Fairley and 39 other residents of Leesburg, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

695. Also, petition of Elizabeth Cremer and 49 other residents of Mount Orab, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

696. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Ringle and 91 other residents of Oakland, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

697. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by C. S. Bridges, of Belknap, Ill., signed by himself and 72 other residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Illinois, urging the continuance of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

698. Also, communications from the Equity Union Creamery & Producing Co., of Pana, Ill., and the Sanitary Milk Producers, of St. Louis, Mo., urging that congressional approval be required on all trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

699. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 118, of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, signed by J. E. Curry, president, and Joe Matthews, secretary, at Harrisburg, Ill., urging a sufficient appropriation for the continuance of the National Youth Administration training program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 3, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who didst entrust Thy Son to a human mother, we thank Thee for the sacrament of motherhood, as our Nation has turned again with memory and hope to its cleansing springs. In this day when blackest paganism is invading the homes of millions, polluting childhood and degrading womanhood, we are grateful for the spectacle of our free land bowing at the white altar of motherhood, confessing its faith in the centrality of the home, recognizing that there is the source of all that is vital in the life of the Nation. We give Thee hearty thanks for noble mothers whose precepts are more far reaching than the statutes of the State, whose word is more potent than the pomp of governments, whose simple faith is more enduring than the formal creeds of the churches.

Here at the fountainhead of our Nation's rule we would remember the patriot mothers of the Commonwealth who, even with a sword through their very souls, breathe cheerful benedictions on warrior sons as carrying the shield of a mother's willing sacrifice they march away to face loneliness, wounds,

and death that freedom may live. May the protecting love of motherhood with open eyes and strong with Christly passion set its tireless strength to lift humanity from the reign of brutal force and to found the larger family of men on the blessed might of love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 17, 18, and 26 to the bill.

RESIGNATION OF LOUIS RAYCROFT AS REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—CORRECTION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the remarks which I made on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, April 29, with reference to the War Manpower Commission, in which I stated that I had been informed that the resignation of Louis Raycroft as regional director of the War Manpower Commission for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, had been brought about through political pressure. I wish to make it clear that I was so informed and that my information came from none other than Mr. William M. Leader, president, branch 1, of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, whose telegram to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, protesting against this pressure resignation, was included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on Thursday last.

In delivering my remarks on the floor of the Senate, it was not my intention to charge the War Manpower Commission with playing politics. For that reason, in the first paragraph of my remarks I took great care to include the words "I am informed that his resignation was brought about through political pressure." I did not feel that it was again necessary to repeat the words "I am informed" in the second paragraph of my remarks, but in order to make the RECORD clear I now ask unanimous consent to amend my remarks in the RECORD of that day and to include in the second paragraph, after the word "resignation", the words "which I am informed was." I ask that I be granted permission so to correct my remarks to make it clear that I in no way wish to charge the War Manpower Commission with political motives in dealing with its personnel. However, at this time I wish to point out that I contacted Mr. Raycroft for the first time on Friday, April 30 last, when he appeared before the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor to announce that he had tendered his resignation to the War Manpower Commission. At that convention there was a decided demonstration on the part of the labor leaders in support of the work which Mr. Raycroft had accomplished in his position with the War Manpower Commission; and a further demonstration of great reluctance and dissatisfaction with the fact that he was dissolving his connections with the War Manpower Commission.

I take sincere exception to any attempts to belittle this man because of his associations with any of the various organizations of which he might be a member, for, as I stated on Thursday last, Mr. Raycroft has enjoyed the hearty support and cooperation, both of organized labor and organized industry.

I wish again to repeat the admonition which I made last Thursday, when I pointed out that if politics is allowed to enter into the administration of the manpower program this country will be faced with an all-encompassing and disastrous tragedy on the home front. The administration of the manpower problem is not a concern of party politics. It is not the concern of the New Deal, the Democrats, or the Republicans. It is the concern of the whole Nation, and it should be treated as such. Political motives and political desires should not be allowed to influence the administration of this very important program in any way. In saying this I take sincere exception to the remarks delivered on the Senate floor on Monday, May 3, by the distinguished and able Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], in which he intimated that political considerations should certainly be a concern in this program, and in which he lamented the fact that few, if any, Democrats in his State had been appointed to jobs with the War Manpower Commission by Mr. Raycroft. I wish to reemphasize my feelings on this matter and to make it clear that if politics appears in this program it shall be strenuously and continuously objected to by me on the floor of the Senate, and it shall be opposed by me in every possible way, for I am fully convinced that the manpower program goes far beyond party lines and that it extends to the very heart and fiber of our national well-being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the correction requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be made in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1944, totaling $196,708, in the form of amendments to the Budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIAL OR RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO LEASING OF COAL LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER (MO.) FLOOD CONTROL REPORT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of a survey of the St. Francis River watershed, Missouri (above Wappapello Dam), made pursuant to law, describing an investigation of a program of run-off and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention in aid of flood control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER (NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA) FLOOD CONTROL REPORT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of a survey of the upper Susquehanna River watershed, New York and Pennsylvania, made pursuant to law, describing an investigation of a program of run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in aid of flood control (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—SUBSTITUTION OF A NEW PAGE

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission transmitting copies of a new page 64 to be substituted for page 64 in the Commission's annual report transmitted by letter of March 3, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE (PT. 3 OF S. DOC. NO. 33)

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Cong.) requesting reports for certain months concerning transfers and reductions of personnel in the classified civil service, supplemental reports for the months of January and February 1943, received by the Commission from the executive departments and agencies during the period from April 17 through April 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the chairman of the Textile Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foundation for the calendar year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for collaboration between the Executive and the Congress in connection with efforts of the United Nations to win the war, restore order, make the peace, and prevent future wars; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jews in occupied Europe by Nazi Germany has resulted in the extermination of at least 2,000,000 members of that race, and the remnants of Jewish population in Europe stand in immediate danger of similar extermination unless havens of refuge are made available to them; and

"Whereas thousands of Jews are massed in European ports clinging desperately to hopes of salvation; and

"Whereas the United Nations are faced with the solemn obligation, in the interests of humanity and justice and in accordance with the principles for which this war is being waged, to undertake steps which will facilitate the immediate removal of Jews from Europe and to provide them with a permanent haven after the termination of the war: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we express our profound sympathy to the victims of Nazi religious persecution and racial hatred; and

"Resolved further, That we respectfully urge the United Nations to act immediately through an international rescue agency in finding even temporary havens of refuge for those homeless and persecuted Jews who can now be rescued; and

"Resolved further, That we urge that all barriers on Jewish immigration into Palestine be now removed so that those Jews who can find escape from Axis-dominated Europe have permanent haven therein in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Balfour declaration; and we view with favor the absorption of all Jews into Palestine after the war who need or desire to go there not only as an act of justice to the Jewish people but as an integral part of a new democratic world order in which every people shall have the right to self-government and self-determination; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the British Embassy in Washington for transmission to the proper authorities in London."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 110

"Whereas all Texans and citizens of Texas are imbued with love of freedom and independence, and this State has come into existence, grown, and lived in freedom and independence through the indomitable struggles of its sons against tyranny and oppression; and

"Whereas at the present time Texas has a higher proportion of her population in the combat services of our country than any other State, there being 50,000 in the Navy, almost a quarter of a million in the Army and the major part of an entire division of the Marine Corps, and Texas men serving with Gen. Douglas MacArthur outnumber the men from any other State serving in the Southwest Pacific area; and

"Whereas the life and reputation and experience, the gallantry and the wise leadership of General MacArthur has given the people of Texas faith in his knowledge and ability; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has made a prayerful plea to the United States to send more equipment, supplies, and aid to the South Pacific; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has repeatedly stressed the importance of the Japanese threat; and

"Whereas the valiant efforts of the people of China with the help of our great Gen. Claire Chennault are holding back and keeping occupied four distinct Japanese armies, and China has received comparatively little aid from the United States, and has so far been able to hold off the Japanese armies and prevent their further aggression against the United States; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the people of this State that Japan is as terrible, if not a more terrible threat, to the liberty and life of this Nation than Germany, and that if our defensives and offensives in the Pacific and in China are not strengthened and immediate help sent to General MacArthur, the very existence of this Nation will be endangered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the senate concurring), speaking for the people of Texas, That they inform the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States that the people of Texas, as throughout the history of this State, want and will maintain, defend, and preserve the liberty and freedom of this Nation, the Christianity and democracy of the world, and in the belief that General MacArthur, who was born on an Army post, and, like his father before him, has spent his life in active military service, chiefly in the Pacific area, and who, through hard and bitter battles of the Pacific on the fighting front, has experienced the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, knows what conditions exist and what is needed on the battle front; and be it further

"Resolved, That Texans petition the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to heed the advice and pleas of the fighting generals on the battle fronts rather than the pencil-and-paper, armchair strategists of this war whose closest contact with the actual war is little better than that of the ordinary civilians, the radio and newspapers participants; and, therefore, Texans and the State of Texas, do hereby intercede in behalf of her many sons fighting in the South Pacific and in China and petition the Congress and the President of these United States to respond without delay to the plea of General MacArthur and to the needs of the United States Air Force in China; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States, as well as to Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Claire Chennault."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Salisbury and vicinity, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF DELAWARE—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask consent to present Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6 of the General Assembly of Delaware addressed to the Congress of the United States, memorializing the Congress to adopt a constitutional amendment limiting income taxes to one

quarter, or a maximum rate not exceeding 25 percent, and also limiting certain other Federal taxes to a rate of not exceeding 25 percent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 6th instant, p. 4017, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY—NAMING OF A BATTLESHIP "CONNECTICUT"

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a resolution memorializing Congress concerning the naming of a battleship, "Connecticut," passed by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut and sent to the Secretary of the Navy and to the Members of the Connecticut delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut was received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session A. D. 1943.

Resolution memorializing Congress concerning the naming of a battleship "Connecticut"

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas all of the line of warships which have proudly borne the name "Connecticut" during the American Revolution and since until the year 1923, when the last of the line was decommissioned, have played a prominent and glorious part in the defense of our country; and

Whereas the sixth and last ship of that name, of which many citizens of this State were members of the crew, was the flagship of the first battleship fleet to circumnavigate the globe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is requested to provide for naming another battleship "Connecticut" in honor of our State; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, and to each of the Members of Congress from Connecticut, who are entrusted with the duty of presenting this resolution to the Congress.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE OF AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH—RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted unanimously by the seventy-first New Jersey Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church held at Atlantic City, May 8, 1943, Bishop David Henry Simms presiding. The resolution is in support of the fundamental rights of the American citizen, whoever he may be, without any prejudice on account of race, creed, or color.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 500,000 soldiers and sailors of the colored race are fighting, bleeding, and dying for democracy, along with others on the war fronts;

Whereas discrimination, prejudice, and segregation deprive 13,000,000 colored Americans of their constitutional rights on the home front, in war industries, on trains, busses, and taxicabs under the control and direction of the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Annual African Methodist Episcopal Conference in seventy-first session assembled, express its unanimous disapproval of these un-Christian and undemocratic practices;

Whereas several United States Senators, including the Senate Republican leader, Senator CHARLES MCNARY, of Oregon, Senators W. WARREN BARBOUR and A. W. HAWKES, of New Jersey, spoke and supported on the floor of the United States Senate, the antidiscrimination amendment, designed to prohibit discrimination against colored workers in these plants, taken over by the Government, which was championed by Senator WILLIAM LANGER (Republican) North Dakota: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express our sincere commendation of the just and constructive action of these several Senators, particularly the two New Jersey Republican Senators, BARBOUR and HAWKES.

We also urge continuing support of the fight for the fullest representation on the Office of Price Administration price and rationing boards in New Jersey, the selective-service boards. We protest the present discrimination and urge the most active support of anti-poll-tax, antilynching, and civil-rights bills, now before the Congress by the New Jersey Congressmen and Senators as well as patriotic and loyal American citizens; finally, be it

Resolved, That we direct our thoughts and energies toward an unceasing battle on the home front to assure our sons and daughters in the armed services, returning to a country much further advanced in its democratic treatment of all its citizens, regardless of race or creed.

We endorse and support the program in Washington along these lines of legislation, public relations, and education as developed and prosecuted so militantly and effectively by the National Negro Council, directed by Edgar G. Brown, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, and the office of the Negro Fraternal Council of Churches in America.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a letter addressed to me from Martin Jacobson, of Mohall, N. Dak.; another letter addressed to me from Hilda and Joseph L. Metcalf, of Fort Pice, N. Dak.; and telegrams from Belfield, Fillmore, Turtle Lake, Minot, and Mylo, N. Dak. The writers of the letters and senders of the telegrams urge the Senate to do all it can to continue in full force and operation the Farm Security Administration and kindred agencies.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOHALL, N. DAK., *April 30, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have owned my farm near Mohall for the past 41 years. During the bad years in 1930 and 1935, I became heavily indebted because of crop failures and sickness and was about to lose my farm.

I applied for a loan through the Farm Security Administration in Renville County. This loan, throughout the years, amounted to over $2,700. The Farm Security Administration cooperated with us in every way, helped us with our planning, and always showed us the utmost courtesy.

After 8 years of the Farm Security Administration's supervision, I have paid up my indebtedness in full and have assets of about $10,000. Mine is not an exceptional case. I am just one of the many that have saved their farms through this program.

We in Renville County believe that the Farm Security Administration, crop insurance, full parity payments, incentive payments, low-cost credits, and, above all, the adequate appropriations for the Department of Agriculture have saved the North Dakota farmer during the bad years of the 1930's, and we demand that this program be carried on.

Yours very truly,

MARTIN JACOBSON.

FORT RICE, N. DAK., *April 6, 1943.*

Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will write you a few lines this evening in regard to the Farm Security Administration. It has been a great help to us.

We came out here in 1925 and worked out by the month. A man with a family does not make any headway that way, so when the Farm Security Administration started up we asked for a loan, and they gave us a fine start. We are not big farmers like some, but live within our means, and am sure the big fellow was once a little man, too. As we earn, we expand. This year we sold $4,000 worth of stock, poultry, etc., paid all our debts and what our loan called for too, besides buying what we needed, besides putting 10 percent into bonds. We hope to purchase a home in the near future.

So you can see what they have done for us and other farmers. We could not get the help from banks as we did not have the security. I do believe we produce just as much food as the big farmer, considering our acreage.

If we are to keep this a free country, give the little fellow a chance, as we are all entitled to a way of earning our living, and also the freedom which we enjoy by being self-supporting.

We are proud to help produce the food for our Army and will do all we can.

Sincerely yours,

HILDA AND JOSEPH L. METCALF.

BELFIELD, N. DAK., *May 10, 1943.*

Hon. WM. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We and many of our neighbors respectfully ask that you use your power and influence to restore to the agricultural appropriation bill the parity and soil-conservation payments, crop insurance, incentive payments, and loans on war-risk crops. We also think that the triple A should be run by the farmers instead of county agents.

JOE MALKOWSKI.
JOHN OTT.
PETER YOURK.
PAUL OBRIGWITCH.
EARL JOUBERT.

FILLMORE, N. DAK., *May 8, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We wish your support of legislation to continue soil conservation and Agricultural Adjustment Administration program and more essential crops and parity payments.

FILLMORE EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.,
R. W. MORRILL, *Manager.*

TURTLE LAKE, N. DAK., *May 8, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the 94 members of the Turtle Lake Farmers Union local, ask you to support Claude Wickard in saving our agricultural program as it was and leave it in the hands of the farmers.

FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 494,
Mrs. THOMAS BOE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *May 8, 1943.*

Hon. WM. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand four hundred families in Ward County, for whom I speak, hope you will continue the fight for adequate funds for our farm programs and help retain and improve them. We demand the defeat of agricultural appropriations bill as passed by the House.

WARD COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
W. R. BLUME, *President.*

MYLO, N. DAK., *May 7, 1943.*

Senator WM. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you make every effort to maintain present farm programs.

OSCAR SOLBERG.

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY—NAMING OF A BATTLESHIP "CONNECTICUT"

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on April 17 I received a letter from His Excellency, Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of the State of Connecticut, transmitting a copy of a letter which Governor Baldwin had addressed to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy. The letter to Secretary Knox dated April 12 reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There is a great deal of interest among the people in the State of Connecticut to have one of the new battleships of our Navy given the name of our State.

There have been several ships in our Navy bearing the name of "Connecticut," and some bearing the names of Connecticut cities, notably the old *Hartford*, Admiral Farragut's flagship at Mobile Bay.

The fleet which went around the world in 1907 had as its flagship the battleship *Connecticut*.

I earnestly hope that you can give this matter favorable consideration.

Yours very sincerely,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, *Governor.*

I joined with Governor Baldwin in making representation to Secretary Knox, and under date of April 23 received the following letter from Secretary Knox:

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 17, 1943, in which you join with Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of the State of Connecticut, in urging that one of the new battleships be named after that State.

The Bureau regrets to advise you that all battleships under construction at the present time have been named. It will, however, be pleased to submit this name to the Secretary of the Navy for consideration in the event that funds are appropriated for additional vessels of this type.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,
RANDALL JACOBS,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.

Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut has adopted a resolution memorializing Congress concerning the naming of a battleship "Connecticut." I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the general assembly be properly referred and incorporated in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session A. D. 1943.

Resolution memorializing Congress concerning the naming of a battleship "Connecticut"

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas all of the line of warships which have proudly borne the name "Connecticut" during the American Revolution and since until the year 1923, when the last of the line was decommissioned, have played a prominent and glorious part in the defense of our country; and

Whereas the sixth and last ship of that name, of which many citizens of this State were members of the crew, was the flagship of the first battleship fleet to circumnavigate the globe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is requested to provide for naming another battleship "Connecticut" in honor of our State; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, and to each of the Members of Congress from Connecticut, who are entrusted with the duty of presenting this resolution to the Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen; without amendment (Rept. No. 219).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 966. A bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 220).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the manpower resources of the United States; with an amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1088. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 1089, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of John Henry Miller, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. GERRY) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 57, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

TIMES FOR HOLDING ELECTIONS FOR SENATORS, REPRESENTATIVES, AND PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at this time I desire to introduce a bill relating to the times of holding elections for Senators, Representatives in Congress, and Presidential electors. The bill is very short, and I shall read it for the benefit of the Senate and the country:

Be it enacted, etc., That when a Senator or Representative in Congress, or Presidential elector is to be chosen at any election, the persons entitled to vote in such election shall be given an opportunity to cast their votes at any time between 6 o'clock ante meridian and 9 o'clock post meridian on the day on which such election is held, and the polling places at which such persons are entitled to vote shall be kept open for such time as may be necessary for such purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be received at this time, and appropriately referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, for due consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1089) relating to the times of holding elections for Senators and Representatives in the Congress and Presidential electors, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two brief remarks in connection with this bill, which I believe to be very important. I do not think there is any question that the Congress of the United States has the legal power to legislate on this question. Section 4 of article I of the Constitution provides as follows:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The Congress of the United States has recognized that provision in the past by enacting a law designating, for example, the time of election of Members of Congress. The law was enacted on March 3, 1875, and amended June 5, 1934, when the so-called "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution was adopted. That section of the statute, section 7 of title II, United States Code, 1940 edition, provides as follows:

The Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even-numbered year is established as the day for election in each of the States and Territories in the United States of Representatives and Delegates to the Congress commencing on the 3d day of January next thereafter. This section shall not apply to any State that has not yet changed its day of election and whose constitution must be amended in order to effect a change in the day of election of State officers in said State.

In my opinion, if the Congress has the right to designate the time of the election, it also has the right to set the time of the opening and closing of the polls.

I introduce this measure with the utmost seriousness. I want it distinctly understood that I am not attempting in any way to tell the State legislatures or the people in the States what they should do with respect to the opening and the closing of the polls so far as State, county, township, or municipal elections are concerned. My bill deals only with Federal officials.

During the past 2 years, under the exigencies of war, when millions of people have been laboring overtime in an effort to do something to win victory as quickly as possible, I know that thousands of people have driven as much as 50, 60, or 75 miles in the morning to get to a defense plant to work during the day in order that they might contribute their share to the war effort. Between 50 and 60 individuals leave my little home city of Havana, Ill., every morning at 5:30 or 6, driving 50 or 55 miles to the Caterpillar Tractor Co., in the city of Peoria, where they are engaged in war work all day long, returning home at 6 or 6:30 in the afternoon.

In Illinois the polls open at 6 o'clock in the morning and close at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The result is that the individual who leaves before the opening of the polls and does not return until after the closing of the polls has no opportunity to vote. The only thing this bill would do would be to give such a citizen the opportunity to vote.

In every election campaign we hear candidates on both sides, over the radio and from the platform, asking the people of the country to exercise the right of franchise guaranteed to them under the Constitution. There is considerable complaint constantly through the press and over the radio because of the thousands upon thousands who fail to vote on election day.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced would give them the opportunity. In my opinion, there is no question about the constitutionality of the proposed act. This is solely a matter of regulation and has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of qualifications, which we have heard debated in the past when the poll-tax bill was before the Senate.

I hope the Committee on Privileges and Elections will consider this measure at the earliest possible time in order that the State legislatures throughout the country, if they so desire, may take advantage of the Federal law and enact laws which will be on all fours with the law which we enact. In my opinion the bill is important. It is constructive. It is for the best interests of the American democracy which we are all trying to serve in this war effort.

BOUNDARY AGREEMENT BETWEEN NEW YORK STATE AND STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in these days when boundary controversies are usually settled by wars, it gives me pleasure on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GERRY] and myself to introduce a joint resolution praying the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of a boundary line between those States. I request that the joint resolution be received at this time and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. GERRY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MOBILIZATION OF MANPOWER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN AND EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my brief statement, a copy of an address relating to Senate bill 666, a bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System. This address was delivered by me at the annual meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on May 6, 1943.

I also ask to have printed, accompanying it and following it, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, May 7, entitled "A Simple Answer to Lewis."

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M-DAY FOR AMERICANS

(By Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont)

In 1943, all of the skills and all of the man-hours and manpower of this Nation will be mobilized. This will be done somehow, because it is necessary for the winning of this war. The method of doing it is the subject of my remarks today.

Since December 7, 1941, all thoughtful people have come to realize that a new and awful chapter of the world's history has begun, namely, a war between manpowers and manpowers of all the peoples of the earth.

Notwithstanding this, the mobilization of all mobile persons in America has progressed haltingly and with many unnecessary delays attributable to our reluctance to accept inevitable suspension of individual rights in the cause of ultimate preservation of those rights.

In a word, we have progressed from the purely voluntary method to the voluntary method accompanied by indirect sanctions, and thence to the involuntary method, through various orders, which are asserted to be supported by penalties provided by law.

Now we are forced to take another step, because these efforts have failed to mobilize our entire mobile population.

Voluntary methods and Executive orders reach only a limited number and kind of jobs, and only those people who are within reach of indirect sanctions. The method of dealing with manpower without legislative authority cannot accomplish the registration, classification, training, selection, assignment, placement, promotion, and transferring, which are essential to accelerate production and increase quality and quantity.

Without legislation such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, enacted in advance of exhaustion of our manpower, we cannot tap the pool where additional manpower can be found. This pool may be described as having four elements:

1. Those not in the labor force, namely, women not now employed, students, part-time workers, retired workers, the handicapped, those in institutions, and those who will be released from time to time upon termination of contracts.

2. Those already in the labor force who are employed and those who are employed part time, negroes, aliens, and other minority groups who have suffered from discrimination.

3. Those already in the labor force who are employed at the top of their skills but are not working in essential industry.

4. Those already in the labor force who are engaged in essential industry, but who are not employed at the top of their skills—an invisible host.

The question of the day is whether the next step shall be additional orders, or whether we shall extend the existing selective-service principle to the entire war effort of this country.

The voice of history, speaking with not so venerable accent, suggests the latter.

John J. Corson, formerly Director of the United States Employment Service, Director of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, states in his excellent work, Manpower for Victory, a book copyrighted in 1943, having a foreword by Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, dated March 1943 (at p. 200):

"Manpower, during World War No. 1, was not allocated effectively between the armed forces, industry, and agriculture. Up to the end of the war there were continuous conflicts between many Government agencies dabbling in the manpower field. And the few steps taken were accompanied by limited consultation with labor and management, the parties immediately involved. A severe manpower crisis was averted only by the early end of the war, the small size of our armed forces, the ability of our allies to provide us with most of our arms, and the relatively modest scale of the entire American war effort."

Clarkson's Industrial America in the World War, copyrighted in 1923, advises:

"In another war the principle of the selective draft should be applied to dollars as well as to men. Industry should be persuaded to cooperate of its own initiative as in the World War, but behind all industrial mobilization should be the formally adopted principle of conscription, which is the direct inference of the conception of modern war as a war of all persons and all things. * * * In the next war all industry—the whole economic life of the Nation—as well as human life, should be conscripted" (p. 482).

The voice of leadership today requests the new method: The American Legion persistently advocated the principle of conscription of all resources, beginning immediately after World War No. 1. It is a coauthor with a citizens committee of the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

The national conventions in 1924 of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties adopted planks for their platforms proposing universal mobilization in time of war.

The national convention of 1928 of the Republican Party repeated its declaration of 1924, stating that "the country demands that should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms, the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize the prices of services and

essential commodities, whether utilized in actual warfare or private activity."

The voice of leadership today requests the new method. Responsible heads of those departments of government which are conducting the major operations of war supply support the Austin-Wadsworth bill—namely, Secretary of War Stimson, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and Administrator of War Shipping Administration Land.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, while testifying on a similar bill, the principle of the Austin-Wadsworth bill was advocated by Chairman of the War Manpower Commission McNutt, and Chairman of the War Production Board Nelson, as well as others.

When will the people, through their representatives in Congress, declare their own liability, and provide for their own intelligent organization and direction?

Resort to the fundamental question of constitutionality could be used at this point only for delay. Delay costs lives. It can have no valid or good effect.

Assuming for the sake of argument (but in no wise conceding) each of these methods to be in contravention of the express provisions of the Constitution, nevertheless, the imperative demand for self-preservation should suspend the debate. If we should lose the war we would have nothing about which to debate

Victory depends upon mobilization. Our paramount objective cannot be attained if we spend our time discussing a question of constitutionality until after M-day has passed.

It has been said that freedom to do right is freedom enough. In this war, which is a threat to every liberty that we cherish, there can be no question about the right or the duty of each individual citizen to do his part to the utmost of his capabilities.

Boldly facing these facts, we see the triumph of free government in the courage, intelligence, and spirituality of its people. In danger, we see them rising to the most sublime heroism. They willingly, yes, enthusiastically, make the sacrifice that involves the suspension of their own individual liberty to contract, to make their own choice of occupation, or to change about at will, or to live in luxury.

Thus we see the American people, not as enslaving themselves, but as wisely providing for permanent freedom and a better life for themselves and their posterity.

As I have said, the method of mobilization through orders cannot reach all of the population, and all jobs. We cannot visualize any further device which could be distorted into either an authority or a sanction for assigning every mobile person in America, male and female, to the service or job that he is best qualified to perform.

On the other hand, legislation, such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, providing for registration, classification, selection, and assignment, would authorize an effective method.

We have experimented with orders in this vital effort for a year and a half, leaving our boys begging for more planes, and failing our officers of supply by production below schedule.

The Executive and the Congress are reluctant to act in advance of forthright acceptance by the citizens of the fact that the manpower needed for vital war work cannot be obtained through Executive orders.

A national poll of public opinion taken a year ago by the American Institute of Public Opinion showed 82 percent in favor of registration and 61 percent in favor of drafting. Yet, on April 17, 1943, a similar poll reflected public opinion of more than half of the American people as believing that there is no shortage of manpower in war plants and no urgent necessity for legislation.

From the point of view of Capitol Hill, at the moment, we estimate the population divided between those who believe that our people have not the stamina to endure the sacrifices and burdens required by an all-out effort to win the war in the quickest possible time and, on the other hand, those who are determined to make all the effort and endure all the sacrifice that is necessary to win the war in the shortest time and with the least expenditure of human life.

Both groups are for winning the war. But one believes time is on the side of the United Nations, while the other believes time is against the United Nations. One side would reduce the number of men for the armed forces and make it easier for the people at home. The other side would adhere to the operating program of the joint Chiefs of Staff and do all that is required to support armed forces of 11,200,000 men and women. Meantime, the authors of S. 666 believe that the Executive and the Congress should assume the responsibility of passing the necessary legislation to meet the need of the day.

The work of hearing and recording the facts and probabilities goes forward in the appropriate committees of both Senate and House. It is providing a solid foundation for legislation.

The press has faithfully and ably reported these hearings. Editors, columnists, radio commentators, and authors all over the country have brilliantly expounded the imperative need to suspend some of our peacetime rights and privileges under the grim necessities of wartime and the relative superiority of legislation over orders as the democratic process to throw all of our resources into high gear. They have broadcast the truth that the satisfactory guaranty of return of those rights after the war is the expiration date fixed in a law.

However, the great difficulty is imparting to the public an adequate understanding of what is involved in waging this war—remoteness and spread of the battle fronts, the variety of elements of air, water, and land to be mastered, the complexity of hazards, the rapidity of change and wastage, and the mortal danger of delay anywhere along the line of production and transportation.

A personal service for us to our country, and to our cause, is to show to our people who do not yet realize it, the immediate need for this legislation. I will briefly point to evidence which I consider absolutely conclusive:

Our service in the theaters of war is just beginning to attain its pace. What we have accomplished in the southwest Pacific and in north Africa is encouraging, but it is only the beginning of major battles which are inevitable.

The wastage of manpower, ships, tanks, planes, guns, food, and fiber, has already become enormous. Our danger from failure to provide recruits and adequate supplies to General MacArthur and his men, and to General Eisenhower and his men, and to those great air squadrons which are now daily covering Europe, increases momentarily.

To make this factual I need point to but one instance, namely, our failure, in 1942, to produce the 60,000 planes scheduled; we produced only 48,000. In February 1943, this year in which M-day comes, we fell short of schedule 500 planes.

While Under Secretary of War Patterson was testifying to this fact before our committee, in support of S. 666, a military mission from General MacArthur was in Washington begging for planes. Five hundred planes to MacArthur in February probably would have saved the lives of many of our brave boys, and brought us nearer that victory for which we must sacrifice everything that it takes.

Our plans for 1943 are such as to increase our air power until our squadrons, together with those of our allies, will double the air squadrons of the enemy. This means, in terms of immediate need in 1943, more than double the manpower for the building of aircraft.

In December 1942 we had 600,000 workers on aircraft. Two million persons will be required by December 1943. This one item alone indicates the immediate necessity for this legislation. It calls for an increase in manpower of 1,400,000 persons. There is no authority whatever for mobilizing these aircraft workers through Executive order.

But we cannot stop here. In shipbuilding we employed 1,300,000 workers in 1942. In 1943 we must have 1,600,000, or 300,000 new workers.

The deficiency of the existing method of Executive orders is factually illustrated with respect to shipping by the recent testimony of Admiral Land, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, in the hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on this bill:

"Based upon the acceleration of the shipbuilding program, the yards had a total of more than 130,000 new jobs to fill during the first quarter of 1943, and their replacement needs exceeded 200,000. Total intake requirements for all of the shipyards during the quarter were, therefore, more than 333,000 employees. The total intake for the period was only 262,000 employees. The difference between total intake and total requirements indicates a deficit of more than 70,000 employees."

In ordnance, which is the other big war producer, we had employed in 1942 1,800,000. In 1943 we must have 2,100,000, or an increase of new men and women of 300,000.

These data ought to move the reasonable person to conviction of the immediate need for this legislation.

But let me put it in another light: It is imperative that we bring into the labor market during 1943, 4,000,000 additional persons.

It is also necessary that we provide for the internal shifts caused by changes in design, and for other demands within the war industries, especially in the transfers from industry to armed forces, 8,000,000 workers. Besides this, the manpower problem for 1943 involves the provision of 15,000,000 people to take care of the turn-over.

The margin between manpower needed and manpower available is dangerously narrow. Our actual labor force in 1942, which is known to have taken up all employables except a million and a half, totaled 59,600,000. We know that there will be required in 1943, for armed forces, agriculture, and industry, a total of 63,200,000. Beyond this probable casualties are estimated at 300,000.

I think that one of your great opportunities as leaders of thought is to point out to your friends and neighbors how nearly touch-and-go this manpower question is right now.

It is dangerous to postpone this legislation. Such postponement has the immediate effect of deficiency in production and transportation. How further can I emphasize this than by pointing out to you that our goal for production of ships in 1942 was 8,000,000 tons. Yet the acceleration in progress of the war demands that we produce in 1943, 18,800,000. This tonnage, when added to that of our allies, is only 50 percent of the tonnage that could be used in saving countless lives and stepping up the day of victory.

These major illustrations of production goals requiring manpower that I have cited are so probative that I will not attempt further proof of the immediate necessity of preparing for M-day.

M-day is not a single day. If it were, we might not be equal to it. In the proper conduct of the war, and in the provisions of S. 666, the requirements for recruits to the armed forces, and for additional workers in industry, agriculture, and other essential employments, fall on different days throughout the year.

The bill provides:

"Whenever the President shall determine that additional workers are needed in any war industry, in agriculture, or in other occupations, activities, or employments essential to the effective prosecution of the war, he shall by proclamation specify the numbers of such workers and the purposes for which they are needed. The President shall thereupon, if he deems it practicable without impairing or delaying the war effort, issue, through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, a call or calls for volunteers, specifying the number of persons required, their qualifications, and, so far as practicable, the places where their work would be performed, and asking that qualified men and women volunteer their services within a specified time or times; and if and to the extent that the President shall deem it practicable, such calls for volunteers shall be issued before action is taken to obtain workers through the selective-service process provided for by this act."

All objectives, such as coordination of complete information showing where there are jobs and where there are men and women, classification, selection, testing for aptitudes, intensive training for redirecting and stepping up skills, impartial administration, and assignment of both volunteers and selectees, are arranged for in the bill. While the coercive element of punishment is important, it is the least important of the provisions.

The main purpose of the bill is to provide for that democratic process of legislative declaration by the people of their liability to register and be available to their Government, and to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a noncombatant capacity according to their ability, and as selected. It is to insure the efficient utilization of the willing worker, who left to himself, would be unable to determine where and how best to serve the Nation at war.

Our noncombatant army must correspond in power, striking force, and mobility, to our armed forces in the theaters of combat. The blow that is struck in Guadalcanal or in Tunisia starts in the mine in our mountains. And it could be stopped there.

Moreover, the manner of delivering the blow changes almost daily. For example, the small tanks will soon be superseded by larger tanks. This means a change-over in tooling, in skills, and even in the number of employees.

The flexibility required of this noncombatant force demands its comprehensive, orderly, and effective control and direction. Direction is one of the great imperatives which legislation alone can supply.

I have already expressed my doubt of the possibility of affording this over-all direction through Executive orders. For example, can you, by Executive order, compel the women of America to register?

But, assuming that all mobile persons, and all jobs could be coordinated by Executive order, do the people of this country favor dictation by order when they can attain the objective by the cherished institution of government by law?

If your service, and that of others, should result in the people of America demanding the immediate passage of legislation to meet M-day, such demand would be self-government of highest character, demonstrating our fortitude and capacity to return to the guaranties of liberty, and the ways of free government which our forefathers set up, and which we in our generation shall have gloriously saved.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1943]

A SIMPLE ANSWER TO LEWIS

John L. Lewis' challenge to the country's prosecution of the war has obscured for the moment the more basic problem of our manpower, how it may be recruited to its maximum strength and how distributed for maximum efficiency. But this continuing threat of a coal strike which would paralyze war production, or, if averted through surrender to Lewis' demands, would lose us the battle against inflation, should bring into high relief the question of our manpower policy. Are we going to remain satisfied with the voluntary system for war workers, which, besides creating critical shortages and maldistribution, invites such hold-ups as the one Lewis is attempting? We know the alternative. It is a national service act which says to all labor, organized, unorganized, and potential, you are to do the bidding of the United States Government in this war exactly as are the millions of young men it selects for military duty. Lewis' arrogance, it seems to us, has greatly emphasized the need to adopt this alternative. Perhaps for this the Nation should thank him.

Our major allies as well as our enemies, all of them greater realists than we, have found that total war makes the conscription of labor as well as of troops imperative. Great Britain, a democracy like ourselves and equally reluctant to compromise even temporarily with democratic tradition, long ago introduced the compulsion to work or to fight and dictated to its workers their respective jobs as it and we do in the case of fighters. As one result a British Lewis, prepared to cripple his country's war economy, is unthinkable.

A National Service Act (more specifically the Austin-Wadsworth measure) would be a simple answer to Lewis and his followers and to any other group that might seek to follow their example, but this answer would be incidental to its broader solution of the whole labor situation. Repeatedly, before Lewis raised his ugly banner of revolt, we urged that the selective-service principle be extended to labor. We do so again, using the threatened coal strike merely as one illustration of the folly of further delay in coming to grips with the whole acute problem of manpower, now under piecemeal, political, and futile treatment.

Meanwhile, we favor legislation aimed directly at union behavior for the duration, and also for the long pull. For the duration we strongly urge that any instigator of a strike in a war plant, and not only in a plant taken over by the Government (as the Connally bill specifies), be deemed guilty of a felony; also, that the Wagner Act be suspended and labor relations frozen. For the long pull let Congress revise the Wagner Act to correct its lopsidedness; let it amend the antitrust and antiracketeering laws to impose on labor the same standards of conduct demanded of the rest of us. While the sight of Lewis shaking his fist under Uncle Sam's nose still burns is the time to clean up the statutory mess of which he is the product.

MOTHER'S DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Mother's Day address delivered by him May 9, 1943, at Taunton, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject A Republican Program delivered by Senator TAFT, at a meeting of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, at Columbus, Ohio, May 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM FROM ECONOMIC AGGRESSION—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom from Economic Aggression," delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the Toledo Forum on Peace Problems May 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CELEBRATION OF FETE OF JOAN OF ARC—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. William C. Bullitt at a celebration of the Fete of Joan of Arc held in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on May 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

1943 CROP PRODUCTION GOALS—REPORT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report by Chester C. Davis, Administrator of the War Food Administration, with respect to mobilization of farm labor, and so forth, for meeting 1943 crop production goals, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARM PROBLEM

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a signed statement of the National Farm Committee relating to the agricultural problem, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL AVIATION PROBLEMS

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of important civil aviation questions, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GROVER BOND

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Grover Bond, of Charlotte, N. C., written by Tom P. Jimison and published in the Charlotte News of April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NEW DAY AND FREEDOM FROM WANT—LETTERS BY HARRY DANIELS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "A New Day," written by Harry Daniels, of Washington, D. C., and a statement entitled "Freedom From Want," by the same author, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA—LETTER FROM RALPH ADIMARI

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Ralph Adimari, of Washington, D. C., written under the heading "What is this thing called American?" which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT OF MR. DAVIES TO RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY HELEN ESSARY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Helen Essary in her column entitled "Dear Washington," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAPANESE IN RELOCATION CAMPS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Japanese-Americans," from the Washington Post of May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIZING INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidizing Inflation," from the New York Times of May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEPH LEIB

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the activities of Joseph Leib, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL COMMENT ON TRUMAN COMMITTEE REPORT ON WAR MANAGEMENT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Management," published in the Washington Post of May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, to Senate bill 885.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the bill was under consideration by the Senate last Thursday, in a series of inquiries I made, to which answers were made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], I definitely expressed my opposition to the bill, and assigned my reasons therefor. The measure is one which does not require a tremendous amount of debate, in fact, it is not susceptible of much debate if one wants to reach the important point.

I agree with the objectives of the able Senator from Connecticut. I depart from him in the methods by which these objectives should be reached. I have long recognized and made up my judgment that the civilian population is entitled to greater consideration than it is receiving, and to that extent I am in perfect accord with the able Senator from Connecticut. But when he brings in a bill, after recital of those facts, and attempts to create a new agency, then I leave him by himself.

If there is one thing for which we have all criticized the present administration in the past, both in Congress and in the press, it is because of the number of agencies which have been created by it, their overlapping jurisdiction, the confusion which has arisen therefrom, and the resulting duplication of purposes and efforts. I have thought we had too many czars, too many dictators, too many directors who issue too many directives and executive orders, until the country is flooded with confusion and complexities. I think that is due largely to the fact that responsibility is not reposed in one or two persons.

If one wanted to go into this subject thoroughly and in detail, Mr. President, and take up the subject of ceilings on agricultural products, or the use of oil, or rubber, or farm machinery, or pleasure cars, almost any article one can mention, one could hardly find any subject in connection with which a great many agencies of the Government were not dealing in some form or other.

I do not think it is necessary to create a new agency to make it possible for the administration, or any existing departments of the Government, or commissions, to deal fairly with the civilian population. Frankly, I think that Mr. Nelson is doing a very good job indeed; an excellent job. I am referring to Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board. He has had his difficulties, and the main difficulty, in my opinion, has not been his lack of administrative qualities; his difficulty has been due to the number of competitors dealing with the same subject matter in the same field. I think that if Mr. Nelson had been given plenary and strict authority, well defined, and had received ample support in that authority, his administration would have been exemplary.

I am quarreling with the number and not with the purpose or desire of these agencies to carry on the functions which have been given them either by executive order or by statute passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I know we are prone to criticize, and I think much of our criticism has been justified. At least I have tried to justify any criticism I have made upon the theory that it would probably be helpful to the ones to whom directed.

As I read the bill—commendable in its purpose, objectionable in the manner in which it reaches its objective—I find myself confronted with the question, Are we going to create one more agency on top of the multitude of agencies now attempting to carry on the war and look after our domestic activities? If I thought the civilian population needed another creature, or creator, or structure I would support the proposal; but I recall when the war efforts were first undertaken, one or two agencies were created. Since that time, whenever an obstacle is met, whenever we are confronted with a difficulty, in order to overcome the difficulty and to solve the problem we rush in and appoint a new commission, a new dictator, or a czar. To me that is just the way not to solve the problem. We need someone in authority with courage, straightforwardness, good, hard sense, supported by the authority and the power which should reside in executive officers. I think that would solve many of the problems which are now confronting us.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Nelson which I obtained at my own request, so it is not propaganda. A few days ago I asked Mr. Nelson over the telephone about this bill and his views upon it. I did not have time to follow the hearings, not being a member of the committee, but at the same time, while having great confidence in the personnel of the committee and particularly the very gracious and capable Senator in charge of the bill, I thought I would seek a little outside information because of the effect the creation of the proposed agency would have. I read the pertinent part of the letter into the RECORD last Thursday, and it is simply this, Mr. President, without reading it again: Mr. Nelson stated that recently he has created in his organization a bureau, we will call it, or a unit, covering civilian needs, and ha selected Mr. Whiteside, a very estimable and capable gentleman, to handle that job. Mr. Nelson says Mr. Whiteside can handle the job effectively and well, and all Mr. Nelson asks is that a fair opportunity be given to demonstrate his ability to handle it with the machinery now extant.

Mr. President, I think that request is fair. If one with courage and ability, proven as Mr. Nelson has proven it, says that all he wants is a fair chance with a new set-up, without creating a new agency, to do this particular job with respect to a situation which we criticize, I think, in all fairness, we should give him the opportunity.

I have no doubt about the ability of Mr. Nelson to do this job. I know he has a high purpose, and that his ambition is to succeed in carrying on the work which has been assigned to him. However, Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate—and I have been one for a good many years—at this time I cannot, on the one hand, criticize the multiplicity of agencies, and, on the other hand, vote to create a new agency, for I think the creation of so many new agencies is the cause of all the confusion which now exists in the various departments of government.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not understand the bill in the fashion that my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Connecticut does. I am not criticizing merely for the purpose of assaulting his objective, for I repeat that I am in favor of the general purposes of the bill, but I am not in favor of the method the Senator employs. He starts with some language which I think should not be in the bill, but I am not going to offer any particular refinements at this time, or language that I think would improve the bill if it should become a statute. However, there is something peculiar about this expression:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at what point of the bill is the Senator reading?

Mr. McNARY. On pages 9 and 10. I shall start now with line 9, paragraph (3), on page 10:

(3) apply to the appropriate Government agencies which allocate resources for military, naval, export, and civilian purposes for the amounts and types of manpower, materials, facilities, transportation, and other resources determined by him to be essential to produce and distribute the necessary goods and services.

Mr. President, if the Administrator—and he will be a very worthy gentleman—were to attempt to exercise the powers which we loosely and generously confer upon him by the bill, he would find himself engaged in the transportation business. Immediately he would be in conflict with Mr. Eastman, so far as railroad transportation is concerned. Probably he would find himself in conflict with the Maritime Commission, so far as maritime transportation is concerned; and probably he would be in conflict with all the agencies that take care of and manage the air transportation resources of our country, to say nothing of the agencies having to do with our highways over which we use our busses, our trucks, and our pleasure cars.

That situation in itself would bring the new director, or the new czar, into the fields of several agencies which now are overlapping and which no one is able

to disentangle. His work would be done, Mr. President, with regard to the—

Manpower, materials, facilities, transportation, and other resources.

I do not know just what that would be. The language is sufficiently broad to mean almost anything and to comprehend almost everything.

But I hasten on. In line 18 we find:

In the event the Administrator is of the opinion that the resources allocated to civilian use by such Government agencies will not enable him to carry out the purposes of this act, he may apply to the Economic Stabilization Director.

Mr. President, I am now approaching what I think is very clumsy legislation. If the new director is dissatisfied with the attitude of Mr. Eastman as to transportation matters, or of Mr. McNutt as to manpower matters, or of Mr. Jeffers, or of Mr. Brown, or of Mr. Nelson, or the heads of any of the other agencies, or if he is dissatisfied with the encouragement they give him with regard to civilian supplies, then he takes the matter up with Mr. Justice Byrnes, Czar Byrnes, of whom we are all very fond, and for whom I share a very deep friendship. After he takes it up with Mr. Byrnes—and in the bill the agencies are called the claimant agencies affected, which is peculiar language, but evidently refers to the various agencies—then, if Mr. Byrnes decides that Jesse Jones is correct in his views with regard to synthetic rubber or natural rubber, or that Mr. Jeffers is correct regarding rubber or that Mr. Nelson is correct regarding rubber, or that the War Department is correct regarding rubber, or that General Arnold is correct regarding rubber, or that Mr. Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, is correct, and ad infinitum, if the civilian supply czar is still displeased—probably he would be; I think that at that time I myself would feel that I was suffering from a worthy grief—then what does he do? I think I understand the language, Mr. President, but perhaps I do not:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deny to any claimant agency asserting that its operations have been adversely affected, the right to appeal to the President * * *.

Mr. President, That is a statement which indirectly indicates to me that the authors of the bill are trying by statute to give a right of appeal to the President of the United States. Anyone who has any knowledge of jurisprudence knows that the right to appeal is not an inherent right in and of itself, and never existed at common law. It must be conferred by statute. The bill says the agency shall have the right to appeal. It does not definitely by statute convey upon the agency the right to appeal. I do not think the bill would convey the statutory right to appeal; because it begins by saying:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deny to any claimant agency asserting that its operations have been adversely affected the right to appeal. * * *

Mr. President, how awkward is that language. Let me give an illustration. Let us say that the civilian supply emperor goes to Mr. McNutt, and they disagree over manpower. The civilian supply emperor decides that he is correct, and says to Mr. McNutt, "You must do it this way." Then he appeals to Mr. Byrnes. Mr. Justice Byrnes says, "Mr. McNutt, I think you are wrong, and I think the new czar is right." However, that is not the end of it. Probably it should be; but the aggrieved agency, the manpower agency, then can appeal to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, if I were the close, sincere defender of the administration I might wish to be, but have not been invited to be, I would resent any effort to place any more burdens upon the shoulders of the President. With the innumerable duties the President has to perform, I think the way it should be handled is to relieve him from all the mere details. Mr. President, I can conceive of a thousand grievances that Mr. Byrnes could not handle. If he were to attempt to handle them, and if the aggrieved agencies did not wish to follow his suggestions, they would go directly to the President who would be required to give much of his time to various agencies in connection with problems which should be handled by agencies already in existence.

Mr. President, one could talk at length on the pending bill. Rather hastily I have covered my views, which can be stated simply in one word: If I had my way, I would repeal some of the statutes now in existence; I would revoke some of the Executive orders which have created the multiplicity of agencies of government, and I would have one real agency or director to handle this war problem.

I recall—not pleasantly, but graphically—being in this Chamber more than 24 years ago, when we were engaged in a world war and when 2,000,000 of our soldiers were abroad, that Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hoover, one operating in one field and one in the other, did practically everything that is being done by all the agencies operating today, and did it well. I may be repetitious, but I wish to say that if I were advising the President, I would advise that the number of agencies be reduced instead of expanded.

The objection I have to the bill is simply that by it Congress will be setting a bad example, in my opinion, by adding to the number of agencies, when we have said over and over again that there are too many now in existence.

Mr. President, I shall not follow in the footsteps of the great number who have criticized. I shall vote against the bill, although I believe that its objective, its general purpose, to give the civilian population greater consideration, is worthy and has merit.

I should like to contribute whatever I can along that line to the efforts of the able Senator in charge of the bill. I wish to read into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Nelson, contained in his letter to me of May 3, 1943:

I now have it—

Speaking of the War Production Board—

organized under Mr. Arthur D. Whiteside, a man of unquestioned reputation and ability, and have signed, on Saturday, an administrative order which gives him as much authority as any man can have to determine requirements and to see that the necessary things are done consistent with the demands on the material and manpower which must be met to win the war. I think this agency should be given a chance.

Furthermore, I feel that the organization of the war agencies should be the responsibility of the Executive. But, if in the opinion of Congress the war agencies should be reorganized, it should be done in total and not piecemeal. It is a mistaken principle of organization, it seems to me, to have the war agencies partly organized by Congress and partly organized by the Executive. Confusion is bound to result.

I know that the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has done a thorough job in looking after the needs of the little businessman. That committee considered this problem. It was then referred to the very excellent Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. The bill is in charge of the thoughtful Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. I should like to go along with him and share—if he asks me to do so—in the general purposes of the bill, but I cannot follow this method. I wish to leave things as they are, without adding to the present confusion.

For that reason, Mr. President—and I speak only for myself—I shall vote against the passage of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which prepared the bill, and I have taken an interest throughout in the formation of the proper kind of governmental organization to deal with this problem. In my opinion, far from complicating the problem, the bill would very much simplify the present governmental organization.

Mr. Nelson has been opposed to the bill throughout. It would take away from him a bureau which he now has and which I think never should have been in the War Production Board, and which, so far as I can see, has nothing to do with the functions of the War Production Board. The bill would establish an independent organization. So I think Mr. Nelson is making a mistake in opposing the removal of this bureau from his organization. He admits that the bureau he has, which incidentally already has a personnel of from 300 to 500, has not done a good job, because under the pressure of this bill he has attempted to put Mr. Whiteside at the head of a bureau with more powers. He admits, therefore, that the civilian bureau we have had has not done the job, and yet he wants to keep control of that bureau.

The principal objection which I have heard urged against the bill is that it would create another bureau. I have been against creating more bureaus, but when we passed the Overman Act we took all limits off bureaus. The President may create any number of bureaus. He has created them without our saying a word. Our only control of the bureaus is through appropriations. We had to create the Office of Price Administration. I think that is about the only congressional bureau which has been created. All the others, including the Office of

Defense Transportation, the War Production Board itself, the War Shipping Administration, and the new Manpower Commission, which is setting up offices in every State and city in the United States and creating a vast organization like the O. P. A., were set up entirely by Executive order.

It certainly is ridiculous to urge the objection that we are creating another bureau when we have given the President carte blanche to establish all the bureaus he may wish to establish. We are not creating another bureau. There may be a little additional personnel, although I doubt it. I would far rather have more personnel in a bureau which functions effectively than to have 300 in a bureau which has been completely suppressed and has not accomplished the purposes for which it was supposed to be created.

So I do not believe that the objection based upon the ground that we are creating another bureau is a valid objection. I think it is largely the responsibility of Congress to create Government organizations.

Nearly 2 years before the creation of the War Production Board by Executive order, the Senator from Vermont and I both introduced bills to create a War Resources Administration with a single head. The Congress should then have created it. It would have saved tremendous confusion, and we would have said clearly what the War Production Board was supposed to do.

I think the function of the War Production Board is perfectly clear. It is to produce munitions. It was created as a sort of ministry of munitions, such as existed in every country during the World War. That is its function.

Mr. Nelson rises or falls, depending upon his success in creating the material for the conduct of the war. That is his primary consideration. With him the civilian population must be, and should be, a purely secondary consideration.

I think Congress should have created the set-up. Today the vast confusion of bureaus and the conflicts and disputes which are arising are largely due to the fact that bureaus have been set up without logic. They have been created entirely by Executive order. They conform to no known plan of governmental organization which anyone can discover. There is no war cabinet. In the World War President Wilson had five or six men who had charge of various activities. Mr. Baruch, in effect, was where Mr. Nelson is. Mr. Hoover had charge of food, and Mr. Garfield of fuel. There were also Army and Navy representatives.

Mr. Wilson met twice a week with the war cabinet, and they discussed the questions which arose. If there was a difference between any of those men the President settled it then and there. He was a good executive. That is the way he conducted the war. Now a dispute arises between two departments of the Government and nothing happens. It goes on for months. They shout at each other in the newspapers and try to settle their disputes by public opinion.

I think Congress ought to go much further than this bill. It ought to create a war cabinet. It ought to create an organization in which the relative powers are clear, and in which someone can settle disputes as they arise. I think that one of the great advantages of the bill, aside from the question of civilian supply, is the right of appeal to Mr. Byrnes or any other person the President may designate.

This war is infinitely larger than the other World War, and the President's task is much harder than the task Mr. Wilson had. If he is unable to settle disputes between various departments of the Government he can assign Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Hopkins, or anyone else who sits at his right hand and has his confidence, to settle them.

That is what the appeal to Mr. Byrnes means. The only reason we do not take away the appeal from the President is that these are Executive matters. In the conduct of the war the President must be the final judge. It is not a court appeal. The problem is one of distribution of administrative powers. Under the terms of the bill, if the President can administer the powers himself, he may do so; but we have provided, in effect, that he may appoint Mr. Byrnes as Assistant President, if you please, to settle disputes between the various bureaus, czars, and commissions, mostly created by Executive order.

I do not know whether the people realize the situation which has gradually grown up in the Government. Mr. Nelson has no great amount of power today. His function is still that of the War Production Board, one of the allocating agencies. As I see it, today the war government is divided into half a dozen allocating agencies, which have the function of trying to create, to produce, to obtain production in a particular field, and, having obtained production, of allocating that production among the various claimants. Mr. Nelson is the czar of war materials, manufactured goods, and munitions. He allocates such goods to the various claimants.

Mr. Davis is the Food Administrator. His function is to obtain the production of more food, and then decide on the allocation of that food as between the Army and the Navy.

Mr. Eastman is the head of the Office of Defense Transportation. He is charged with the land transportation of supplies necessary for the Army, and the transportation of troops and everyone else.

The Maritime Commission has the function of assigning ships. It is said that the Civilian Supply Administrator will interfere with the Maritime Commission. I think he will. I think that if it becomes necessary, in behalf of the civilian population, to bring more sugar from Cuba to America than is now being brought, and if it should become necessary to assign ships to Puerto Rico to keep the civilian population alive, there ought to be someone in the Government who would stand up and say even to the War Shipping Administration, "We need these ships for civilian purposes in order to keep the Nation alive. Neither the Army nor the Navy will say that. They want every ship there is, of course. That is natural. But there should be someone on the other side of the situation to represent the civilian administrator before the War Shipping Administration.

When former Senator Brown testified he used that as an example. He said:

> We ought to bring more sugar from Cuba. It is essential that we have five or six hundred thousand tons more of sugar in order to can the fruits and vegetables we are asking people to raise in this country. Otherwise we cannot allocate the sugar.

He said:

> I stepped out of my function somewhat in order to get the Maritime Commission to make available ships in which to import more sugar.

But he pointed out that he as Price Administrator was not particularly concerned with civilian supply.

So I think there ought to be someone in the Government to represent the civilian population before the Maritime Commission or War Shipping Administration so as to secure adequate shipping facilities for the civilian population.

As allocating authorities we have Mr. Nelson, we have Mr. Eastman in land transportation, the Maritime Commission in sea transportation, Mr. Blandford in housing, Mr. Davis in the case of food, and Mr. McNutt as to manpower. We have also in a kind of a semiautonomous state the rubber czar and the oil czar, Mr. Ickes and Mr. Jeffers. To exactly what extent they are under Mr. Nelson I am not certain. They are subject in some way to his control, but certainly they seem to be in an autonomous state.

There are then at least seven independent allocating agencies. Today the Army, the Navy, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare are all claimants before these allocating agencies, making it clear that they want certain things for the Army or for the Navy or for foreign populations. This bill proposes to create a Civilian Supply Administrator on an equal basis with the others who can appear before the allocating agency. He would not be a czar, he would merely be in a position to go to the other half dozen allocating agencies and say, "We want you to allocate so much to the civilian population." There would be an appeal.

Take the case of the laundries. I do not remember the exact circumstances, but in order to operate a laundry it is necessary to have some laundry machinery, and to have repair parts for laundry machines. Men and women must be obtained to operate the laundries. It is necessary to apply to the Office of Defense to obtain rubber tires to run trucks. What happens? One agency decides that laundries are essential civilian activities. Another agency decides that they are not necessary, that a civilian can get along without laundries, although, of course, many women who formerly did their own laundry work are now employed in munition plants. It is necessary for some one superior officer to decide whether laundries are essential or not essential. If they are essential, the civilian administrator ought to represent them. He ought to get from the Rubber Adminis-

trator enough tires, and from the Defense Administrator enough trucks, and from the War Production Board enough parts to keep the machinery going. Much of the laundry machinery today is probably worn out. In some cases it will be necessary to go to the Manpower Commission to have allocated a sufficient number of men and women to run the laundries.

We have, therefore, a condition involving five or six allocating agencies and five or six claimant agencies. If at any time the Army or Navy is turned down by the War Production Board on something which they think is essential, does any Member believe they do not run to Mr. Byrnes today, and do so without any legal authority? Of course they do. If Mr. Byrnes will not give it to them, they go to the President directly, and get from him the final decision. He has complete power finally to make the decision.

It seems to me that we have reached the point where we ought to have a Civilian Supply Administrator able to pursue the same course. When we created the War Production Board, we did not bother with the question of civilian supply. It was assumed that we had a perfectly unlimited supply of material and ample manpower, and that all we had to do was to draw on the pool for what we wanted for the Army and Navy and essential foreign services. That was the assumption.

It is said we are reaching the point where no such assumption can be made. Some claim that we cannot safely provide for 10,800,000 in the armed forces without serious interference with production at home. Maybe we can go somewhat further, but there is a point beyond which we cannot go. Certainly that question ought to be determined; someone ought to face it and determine what is necessary to keep the civilian machine running. I am in favor of armed forces of 10,800,000. I am willing to vote for it if it becomes necessary. I think we shall have no serious trouble in providing 10,800,000 men without any interference with the necessary production.

But there is another machine besides the armed forces, and that is this tremendously complicated machine of 125,000,000 people.

One hundred and twenty-five million people must provide all the food for this Nation as well as for other nations. They must supply all the food and munitions for our armed forces, and most of the munitions and supplies for many of our allies. That machine has to be kept running smoothly, and it is a far more complicated machine to run than any army. Compulsory orders cannot be issued to 30,000,000 families throughout the United States. We cannot enforce military discipline on every farm in the United States. That is why I do not think the compulsory approach represented in the Austin-Wadsworth bill is the proper approach to get the machine to operate; but the machine should operate. Someone should look upon the machine as a whole and ask if we are sure we are obtaining the things to keep the machine in operation, and the meat to feed the men who have to do the physical work, and a supply of the absolutely necessary and basic materials and foods to maintain in operation this machine of 125,000,000 people. That is a job. It is a single job, and it seems perfectly clear to me that it has no relation whatever to Mr. Nelson's job. Mr. Nelson is engaged in trying to produce munitions of war, everything which the Army and Navy need, and to allocate fairly as between the Army and the civilian population.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the bill suggests—I wish it went further than to suggest—a war cabinet. It suggests the coordination of all these agencies under an assistant president. It suggests that the disputes between the different allocating agencies be settled, but, as I see it, it is not true that we are taking anything away from Mr. Nelson that is related to the allocation of war materials. We are simply providing that the Civilian Administrator shall be in the same position as the Army and Navy and the Lend-Lease Administration now are, and as the South American countries are through the Board of Economic Warfare. We are simply saying that the American people should have the same representation in obtaining supplies which are necessary for them. The Administrator will have no final power to get them. We are naturally all in favor of the Army and the Navy up to the very limit. We are all concerned in seeing that they get everything they need, but there is a point beyond which we may not be able to go, and that point of view ought to be represented by some one in the Government.

We are not creating another bureau. The President could do this tomorrow. Our control over office employees has now gone so far as the creation of offices is concerned. We can control only through the appropriations. I think that Congress made a great mistake, incidentally, after they created the Price Administration when they appropriated $120,000,000 for 1 year for 60,000 employees in that administration. I do not know what the appropriation will be for the Manpower Commission, but again we get a vast number of bureaucratic organizations spread over the entire United States.

Here we are saying, in effect, that this existing bureau shall be independent. We are not even creating the bureau, but we are saying that it shall have the power that other bureaus have to appear before allocating agencies and present their case and present the whole picture to Mr. Byrnes, or the President, or perhaps to some other assistant president acting in the civilian field. Far from producing complications, I think it points toward a gradual integration and simplification of the whole war administration so far as it relates to the civilian aspects. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see its way clear to approve the bill when it has considered the different reasons for and against it.

THE BITUMINOUS COAL ACT—NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to give notice now that at the next meeting of the Senate I shall address the Senate for a few minutes on the history of the bituminous coal legislation and the benefits from the Bituminous Coal Act. I do that at this time for the reason that there are 51 new Members of the Senate since this act was first brought to the attention of the Senate in 1935, and I should like to have them familiar with the act and be able to give it some study, as we will soon have to act again on the legislation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may interrogate the Senator, there will be a session tomorrow, and will the Senator be prepared to proceed tomorrow?

Mr. GUFFEY. I shall be prepared to proceed tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, and 25; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,690,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,519,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That the office of comptroller of customs at San Francisco, California, is hereby abolished. The duties imposed by law and regulations upon the said comptroller of customs, his assistants and deputies, are hereby transferred to, imposed upon, and continued in positions now established in the Customs Service by or pursuant to law, as the Secretary of the Treasury by appropriate regulations shall specify; and he is further authorized to designate the title by which such positions shall be officially known hereafter. The Secretary of the Treasury, in performing the duties imposed upon him by this paragraph, shall administer the same in such manner that the transfer of duties provided hereby will not result in the establishment of any new positions in the Customs Service: *Provided further*, That no interior port of entry shall be closed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$578,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$467,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$795,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$134,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$276,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "seven hundred and eighty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,902,160"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,030,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "three hundred and forty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$822,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 8, 17, 18, and 26.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
J. W. BAILEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous sent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is whether there is any objection to the present consideration of the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. There is none on my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry concerning the report. What occurred in the conference to that portion of the bill relating to penalty mail?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House disagreed to it, in fact, they disagreed to Senate amendments No. 1, No. 2, No. 8, No. 17, No. 18, and No. 26. I intend to move, first, the adoption of the conference report; then I shall move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments heretofore adopted and ask for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

I wish to explain to the Senate the amendments about which there is disagreement. The first, and probably the one which will be most actively contested, is that relating to silver. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is exceedingly interested in it, and, of course, that item will not be taken up until he returns to the Senate.

The next amendment in disagreement is that increasing the appropriation for foreign funds control. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to that item, and it will be necessary to have another conference about it.

Another amendment in disagreement relates to the employment of an expert by the Bureau of Accounts. The House objects very seriously to the Senate amendment, and it will have to go back to conference.

The House objects to the Senate amendment increasing to $300,000 the appropriation for the Bureau of Accounts, and that amendment will have to go back.

Another amendment which will have to go back to conference is the one affecting the use of the franking privilege by the departments. The Senator from Oregon will recall that the House bill prohibited the use of the franking privilege on the part of any officer of the executive departments and administrative agencies of the Government. The Senate adopted a provision which I will read at this point. It is on page 52 of the bill:

SEC. 204. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to conduct jointly a study of the use of the mails free of postage by the departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government, and shall report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the passage of this act such actions as may be considered in the best interests of the Government toward reduction in the volume and cost of handling such penalty mail.

Our committee believed that that was the best, and really, the only fair and just way that the matter of penalty mail could be handled, at all events.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my inquiry was addressed a few moments ago in regard to the provision as to penalty mail to which the Senator just now alluded and read. Wherein did the Senate action modify the House bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House bill provided as follows:

SEC. 204. No part of the money appropriated in this title shall be expended for the purpose of collecting, sorting, handling, transporting, or delivering free the mail of any officer in any executive department or administrative agency of government.

The Senate struck all that out, and inserted a provision that there should be an examination by the Director of the Budget Bureau and the Postmaster General and a report within 60 days, and the Congress will act upon that report when it comes in.

Mr. McNARY. And upon those two provisions the House and the Senate conferees disagree?

Mr. McKELLAR. The conferees disagree, and it will have to go back to conference.

Mr. McNARY. That is one item it is desired to carry back to conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I will so move.

The only other amendment in dispute is on page 13, line 5, which I will explain to the Senator and the Senate. The Senate inserted the following provision in the item, "Expenses of loans":

Provided further, That field employees of the War Savings Staff may be reimbursed, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, for travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in the promotion of the sale of United States Government securities (estimated War Savings bonds) within the limits of their official stations.

The House has amended that provision by inserting after the word "That" the word "regular", so that it will read "That regular field employees of the War Savings Staff", and so forth.

I think that is a very wise amendment; I shall move, first, that the Senate agree to that amendment, and then I shall move that the Senate insist further upon the other amendments which I have described, and let them go back to conference.

Mr. President, the first question, as I understand, is on the adoption of the conference report. I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on amendment No. 8, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 7, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the second line of said Senate engrossed amendment after "That" insert "regular"; and that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 17, 18, and 26 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment numbered 8.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments still in disagreement, ask for a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, are amendments in order on the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are.

Mr. TAFT. On page 10, line 12, I move that after the word "transportation" and the comma there be inserted the word "housing" and a comma.

The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that the National Housing Agency is considered an allocation agency, and if the Administrator thinks more housing should be allotted to the civilian population, he must apply to the National Housing Administration in the first instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, line 14, to strike out the period after the word "services", insert a comma and the following: *"Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent any other officer or agency of the Government from making a similar application to the appropriate Government agency or joining with the Administrator in his application."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in my opinion, this is already provided for, but a number of the agencies felt that it might be construed that they must go to the civilian supply administrator in the first instance before making application direct to the War Production Board. In order to make it perfectly clear that they could join together in making an application, I agreed to offer the pending amendment for several of the war agencies which were interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am not against the objectives sought in the bill now under consideration, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] assured us that the bill would not provide for the creation of another bureau, and it seems to me that, by whatever name it is called, it means just that. It establishes a director, at a salary of $12,000 a year, and confers upon the director the power to employ whatever number of employees he sees fit to choose, and, subject to the power of the Congress to make appropriations, in any number he may see fit to choose. There is no limitation whatsoever upon the number of employees in the bill as suggested, however desirable the objectives may be.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know of a single governmental agency, except the House and the Senate and the Supreme Court, in which the number of employees is limited?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not, but I would certainly put a limitation in many of the bills creating new bureaus.

In addition to granting unlimited authority in the selection of employees, the bill under consideration creates this agency, by whatever name it may be called, and turns it loose to go forth and study the needs of this country.

I came to the Senate with a very fixed impression in my mind that we had too many bureaus and too many governmental agencies at the present time, and that we need less of them instead of more, and that we need fewer governmental employees instead of more. But the provision in the bill which sets up the authority of the agency which is to be created turns loose a fishing expedition, by which a man who might not be a proper leader of the agency could cause untold annoyance and irritation to industry and business, by prying into their private records and into their stocks of merchandise.

Mr. President, as I see it, that is not the most serious objection to the proposed bill. There will be found on page 10, line 6, and on page 11, lines 21 and 24, the words "and services." Are we studying this bill as carefully as we should before it is offered to the President for signature, to determine what these words may mean, and what they may be interpreted to mean? I ask the question because in recent months there have been instances when the intent of Congress was misinterpreted.

What does section 6, on page 11, provide? It provides that "subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director" this new agency shall "determine the need for rationing goods and services."

In the next sentence it provides that "The Administrator shall direct the appropriate agencies"—mark the words, Mr. President, "shall direct"—"The Administrator shall direct the appropriate agencies to ration such goods and services," and so forth.

I questioned the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a few days ago about the meaning of those words. Are we, in attempting to cure a condition which we feel should be remedied, inadvertently to turn over to some Government bureau or agency the power to ration the labor and the services of this country?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. That is exactly what we are not going to do under the bill. As I tried to explain to the Senator a few days ago, the word "services" in the bill means such things as laundries, barbers, optometrists, and repair services. I cannot for the life of me understand why the particular word "services" should cause the Senator such concern.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I will tell the Senator why. Naturally, being a lawyer by profession, I went to the only place of which I know to get a definition. I went to the Law Library because I was troubled after the Senator's explanation a few days ago of the meaning of the word "services," not that I thought the Senator had any intention to mislead or misinterpret or misconstrue, but because I felt there was a possibility, if the bill should become law, that someone else might misconstrue or misinterpret the word. Therefore, I went to the Law Library, and this is what Corpus Juris says about the word "services":

> In general, a word of different meanings, according to the sense in which it is used; and the sense in which it is used must be determined from the context. Common or ordinary sense as singular noun. As lexically defined, "service" means aid rendered; an act of helping another, or of serving, and advantage or benefit conferred; any work done for the benefit of another; assistance rendered; benefit or good performed, done, or caused; employment in the interest of a person, or of a cause; labor performed for another, or in the interest, and under the direction of others.

Mr. President, that is the definition of the word "services" as it appears in the standard legal work Corpus Juris, and I know of no better place to which to go to obtain a definition. If there could be a provision in the bill which would limit the agency from taking charge of manual services and rationing the labor of this country, then perhaps the point would be met, but I insist that under the language used in the bill it would turn over to the Civilian Supply Agency the power to ration the labor of America, and I am against the bill until and unless it is drawn in a manner which definitely precludes such a possibility.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know that the Congress of Industrial Organizations appeared and testified for the bill, and that the American Federation of Labor went on record in the committee as being in favor of the bill?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I knew that they had done so.

Mr. MALONEY. And that representatives of enough millions of Americans to make up the majority of the population of the country are in favor of the bill?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Was there discussion of the word "services" in the hearings or in the testimony before the committee?

Mr. MALONEY. No; it is such a commonly used word that no one seemed to think it was necessary to discuss it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not understand what those words in the bill mean, and I went to the Law Library in order to ascertain what the legal definition was.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think as written in the bill it is clear that the word "services" would not include the rationing of manpower, but I see no particular reason why that should not be expressly stated, if it would meet the Senator's objection. After the words "determine the need for rationing goods and services" we could insert, "but not including manpower" in parentheses, and then the words "to the civilian population" would follow. Language of that sort I think would be easy to insert. Certainly manpower is not intended to be included. The word "services" is taken from what appears in line 15 above. In it we find the words "retail, wholesale, and service trades." The word "services" means service trades. It means such things as laundry service, transportation service, and so forth.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not question what the sponsors of the bill intended it to mean, but I do not want someone else to interpret it in a different way.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be easy to make the provision clear, and I should be glad to prepare an amendment making clear that when it comes to rationing it shall not include the rationing of manpower.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. I desire to call the Senate's attention to a letter which I have received from President Edward A. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in which he, on behalf of his organization, registers very definite objection to this bill. He says very briefly, quoting simply a sentence or two:

> We are greatly concerned over the Maloney bill, S. 885, proposing to establish a Civilian Supply Administration under the Economic Stabilization Director, with far-reaching powers over supplies, production, and distribution of civilian goods.
>
> In our judgment, the creation of such an agency would injure, rather than help, the production and distribution of essential goods needed for the war and to sustain our civilian economy, because it would divide responsibility with respect to the over-all job of production and distribution. It would divide the powers and authority exercised by the War Production Board, Food Administrator, and other governmental agencies, and even go so far as to forbid any Federal department or agency to take any action regarding any of the far-reaching functions heretofore assigned to the Civilian Supply Administrator without first obtaining his approval.

Mr. President, the Farm Bureau Federation is an organization of Nationwide scope, representing a great many persons in our midst. The head of that organization has expressed his definite opposition to the bill. While I very gladly accept the suggested amendment of the Senator from Ohio with respect to the words "and services," in principle I am against creating more Government bureaus, and therefore shall continue to be against the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, during the course of very lengthy discussion in the Senate a few days ago, at which time I analyzed the recent order of Mr. Donald Nelson, I referred to the letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation president, Mr. O'Neal. I said then that if it later appeared necessary in the discussion of this proposal, I would attempt to analyze Mr. O'Neal's letter. It seems appropriate to do so now. I shall not take too much time of the Senate, because I took so much of its time last week and because I felt then that I had pretty well covered everything except the letter to which the Senator from South Dakota has just referred, a copy of which he, like other Senators, has received from Mr. E. A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The letter from Mr. O'Neal is in opposition to S. 885 to create a civilian supply administration. I should like to have Senators note that the letter which bore Mr. O'Neal's signature was dated the 28th day of April, and did not at all refer to the bill which was reported to the Senate 6 days earlier, on the 22d of April, but to the bill as it was originally introduced, and which later was considerably modified and perfected by the Banking and Currency Committee.

I believe that Mr. O'Neal would have found the answers to many of his objections in the amendments to the bill adopted by the committee. His letter also indicates that he misunderstands the purpose of Senate bill 885. The bill merely establishes for civilians a claimant agency of equal rank to the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease Administration, Board of Economic Warfare, and Director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation. The bill has nothing to do with farm or industrial production, as Mr. O'Neal seems to feel.

The hearings on the bill now available in print show this clearly. Specifically Mr. O'Neal in his letter of April 28, 1943, states that he is opposed to the Maloney bill, S. 885, for certain reasons he proceeds to state.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator from Connecticut says the bill has nothing to do with farm population, but if the words "and services" were left in the bill, and misinterpreted, they still might have a very important effect on the farm population, might they not?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator unintentionally misquoted me. He said I said the bill had nothing to do with farm population. I said the bill had nothing to do with farm or industrial production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that one of the greatest mistakes, which shows the need for this bill, was made when the War Production Board did not allocate to farm machinery the amount of steel that should have been allocated to farm machinery last year? The civilian needs for that purpose were completely neglected, as is now admitted, and if there had been in existence a civilian supply administrator, who had been an independent representative of the civilian population, the farmers today might well have sufficient farm machinery to deal with the situation.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Ohio is quite correct, and I have the feeling that those in authority have told Mr. O'Neal that everything will be all right now if they can have another chance, and that they will pay specific attention to the farm machinery and other farm problems. But I want to say to the Senator that if his fears were realized insofar as the word "services" are concerned, of course it would have a tremendous effect upon everyone, and from my standpoint, as from his, a bad effect, and I should oppose it. I am assuming, however, that the Senator from Ohio—although I do not think such action is necessary—is going to submit an amendment which will have the approval of the Senator from South Dakota, and which will remove that particular fear from the Senator's mind.

I return to Mr. O'Neal's criticism.

First—

> It would divide responsibility with respect to the over-all job of production and distribution.

That language is contained in Mr. O'Neal's letter.

The Maloney bill will not divide responsibility with respect to the over-all job of production and distribution. The Civilian Supply Administrator established by the Maloney bill is given no authority with respect to production and supply. The Government controls over production and supply will remain exactly where they are today—in the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, the Petroleum Administrator for War, and others. The Maloney bill proposes to set up a claimant for the civilian population—the Civilian Supply Administrator. The Civilian Supply Administrator will act as a consumer and buyer by putting in his claims for resources to the production and supply agencies, just as the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and Board of Economic Warfare do in the role of claimant agencies. The production and supply agencies, like the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and others, are the producers and sellers and will continue to exercise this very same function. If anything, I believe the Maloney bill will assist in clarifying and centralizing the responsibility for production.

Second—

> It would divide the powers and authority exercised by the War Production Board, Food

Administrator, and other governmental agencies.

The Maloney bill will not divide the powers or authority exercised by the War Production Board, Food Administrator, and other governmental production and supply agencies. I assume Mr. O'Neal was referring to the priorities, allocation, and similar powers. There is nothing in the Maloney bill which gives the Civilian Supply Administrator any priorities or allocation powers. He is not authorized to issue orders directly to the public or business but is to deal only through existing agencies like the War Production Board and Food Administrator which will continue to retain and exercise the priority and allocation powers.

The third point in Mr. O'Neal's letter is that the bill would—

even go so far as to forbid any Federal department or agency to take any action regarding any of the far-reaching functions assigned to the Civilian Supply Administrator without first obtaining his approval.

Mr. President, the amended bill (S. 895) as introduced by me in the Senate, contains no provision such as that to which Mr. O'Neal refers. Section 6 of the original bill contained a far-reaching provision regarding prior clearance with the Civilian Supply Administrator by other Federal departments or agencies acting in the civilian-supply field. However, that provision was deleted by the amendments made to the bill by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. After careful study and thought, the committee made that change. Mr. O'Neal was not aware of that fact, when, 6 days after the bill was reported, he wrote a letter criticizing it. He was referring to a bill introduced a month or more before. The amended bill which I introduced in the Senate on April 22 contains no such provision as that to which Mr. O'Neal refers in his letter of April 28.

The fourth objection stated in Mr. O'Neal's letter is that—

We believe that the necessary adjustments and modifications which are required in our production program can be made more expeditiously and effectively within the framework of the present set-up.

Mr. President, the so-called Maloney bill does not upset the existing war organization. It is designed specifically to be adjusted to the existing framework of war organization. It is because the provision for the establishment of a Civilian Supply Administrator is adjusted to the present framework of war organization that I cannot understand Mr. O'Neal's statement of opposition to the bill on that ground. If Mr. O'Neal refers to the handling of the civilian-supply problem within the War Production Board as being more expeditious and effective, I cannot help but disagree with him, in view of the facts presented to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which indicate that the War Production Board is too limited in authority to do the whole and necessary civilian-supply job.

The fifth objection or observation of Mr. O'Neal's letter is as follows:

The inevitable delays and confusion that would ensue as a result of such a complete reorganization of the planning and operating responsibilities for the production program might be disastrous.

As I have previously stated, the Civilian Supply Administration bill is designed to fit into the existing framework, and does not call for a "complete reorganization." Moreover, it is clear that the Maloney bill has nothing to do with the controls over production, and would cause no reorganization on that score. I believe Mr. O'Neal is laboring under a misapprehension that the Maloney bill contemplates lifting the production responsibilities from the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, and placing them with the Civilian Supply Administrator. That would be a major reorganization, with probable disastrous consequences. No such thing is contemplated. The Maloney bill leaves the production responsibilities exactly where they are today—with the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and similar agencies. There would be no delay and confusion resulting from such changes, because there would be no such change under the Maloney bill.

Also in Mr. O'Neal's letter the following language appears:

Time is precious. The farmer's planting season is already at hand. Too much time has already been lost by continual reorganizations, constant reshuffling of responsibilities, and multiplication of Federal bureaus with conflicting duties and responsibilities.

I assume that that particular part of Mr. O'Neal's letter had very great influence with the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

Mr. O'Neal intimates that the passage of the Maloney bill would interfere with the farmers' planting season. The Maloney bill has nothing to do with the farmers' planting season. The Food Administrator would continue, as he does today, to exercise full and complete control over the food production program. The Civilian Supply Administrator would exercise no control over the food production itself. Once the food is produced, the Civilian Supply Administrator would put in a claim for the food and food products required by the civilian population, just as the military and export agencies do today for their own requirements. That, I maintain, has nothing to do with the farmers' planting season.

Our experience with war organization had thus far demonstrated the necessity and desirability of establishing an independent Civilian Supply Agency to protect the civilian population of this country. The establishment of an independent Civilian Supply Agency will not set up another duplicating agency, but will fill a void in the existing war organization by clearing up existing overlapping and confusion of responsibilities in the civilian-supply field. The Civilian Supply Administration is like a necessary fourth wheel to a car which today has as its other three wheels the Army, the Navy, and the export agencies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am interested in what the Senator has to say about priorities. I am wondering if, in his contemplation of the bill, and acting under it, he intends to change the priorities as between the military forces and the civilians.

Mr. MALONEY. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, let me ask the Senator, what is the actual value of the bill? If nothing is to be changed, why the necessity for the bill? Of course, the needs of the armed forces will come first.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And I presume that the military needs of our allies, under lend-lease, will come close behind the needs of our armed forces.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, after everyone's military needs have been supplied, the civilian population will come in for their supplies.

Mr. MALONEY. Not unless we are careful about it, and that is one of the purposes of the bill. The Senator understands, I assume, because he is an attentive Senator, and I know he has given the bill considerable thought—we had hearings on it for weeks, and we have discussed it here for hours—that not only are the Army and the Navy, including their Air Corps, claimants, but also the Maritime Commission and the lend-lease agency are claimants, and lend-lease takes in many countries. In addition to that, the Board of Economic Warfare makes claim for all the countries to the south of us, and it is also a claimant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Are their claims given priority over those of our own civilians?

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, we have no independent claimant for our own civilians.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly the goods are distributed on a priority basis. If there are not enough goods for everyone, they have to be distributed on a priority basis; and the Senator has already stated that the armed forces will come first.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; of course I have said that time and again. But if the Senator will permit me to finish this one statement—I am glad to be interrupted, but I should like to continue for a moment—I was about to give the Senator the names of some of the agencies which have independent claimants. In addition to the claimants for the War Department, the Navy Department, the Aircraft Resources Control Office—which is the agent for the Army Air Forces and for the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy—and the Lend-Lease Agency, there are claimants for the Board of Economic Warfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Petroleum Administration for War, the National Housing Agency, the Office of the Rubber Director, and several other agencies. All those are independent claimant agencies. I think it is important that they be independent; but if I had my way, I would set up a war council and would handle the matter a little differently from the way in which it is now handled.

But I do not know how any Senator can object—I am sure the Senator from Colorado cannot—to giving to the 130,000,000 American people the kind of claimant influence or appeal for our

products that is given to representatives of countries beyond our borders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, that is my difficulty. I do want our civilians to be considered, and I know there are agencies of the Government that seem to hate the American citizen. Notwithstanding the fact that the American citizen provides his sons for the battlefield and his money for bond issues, and all that, I find agencies in our Government that fairly despise the American citizen; and they would like to choke him off from everything if they could possibly do so, in order to convince him that our Nation is at war, so they say. I am very much out of patience with that sort of bureaucratic attitude which is so prevalent in the United States. I am wondering if the Senator's bill would in any small measure relieve that intolerable situation.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know to what intolerable situation the Senator refers. I do not suppose it would remove any existing hatreds.

The President, himself, would appoint the administrator. If the law were properly administered it would assure to the civilians enough goods, materials, foods, and services, to keep our civilian population healthy and functioning in order that our people might make their full contribution to the war. The Senator could not help but know, as a Senator, that in many instances there has been a break-down in civilian supply. Laundries throughout the land are closing. Service organizations repairing electric refrigerators, washing machines, and all sorts of electrical equipment, are without parts. There is a break-down in civilian supply. It has not as yet become very obvious, but we had witnesses before our committee from various parts of the country who said, for example, "We are in the plumbing business. We are large plumbing supply people, and we cannot get the equipment to protect the plumbing in homes and apartment houses in our neighborhood or our area."

A dangerous situation is created so far as the health and welfare of our people are concerned. All that the bill is intended to do, and all that it would do, would be to give to this vast majority of our population a representative at the council table who could say, "We need so much." Thereafter, if denied the minimum needs, the claimant agent would have the right to appeal to the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. President, there are one or two other matters which I should like to clear up. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] raised the question as to whether the bill would not cause more confusion and duplication by establishing an independent Civilian Suppy Administration. The creation of an independent Civilian Supply Administration would help eliminate some of the duplication and confusion in the civilian supply field among various war agencies today, and that is one of the reasons that favorable action by the Senate on the bill is highly desirable. Let me explain why.

First of all, there is a beginning of a civilian supply agency, although a most limited one, in existence today within the War Production Board. The bill provides for the transfer of this agency as the nucleus for the independent civilian supply administration. Thus the new civilian supply administration would not have to start from scratch. Second, the bill would unify and centralize all civilian supply work in the Government so that programs and planning for the civilian population would occur in one place rather than a dozen places. Today each agency seems to have a portion of its personnel devoted to work on civilian supply. Thus the Food Administrator has a substantial staff which works on civilian requirements as well as other aspects of the civilian food problem. The War Manpower Commission has a staff which looks after the manpower problem as it affects civilian industries, trades, and services. The War Production Board has an entire division working only on civilian supply problems. The Office of Defense Transportation has a group which works on civilian transportation problems. The Petroleum Administrator for War is similarly organized. The Rubber Director is similarly organized. Thus, we have today an extraordinary amount of duplication of effort in the civilian supply field. Each of these groups prepares, reviews, and analyzes figures and facts bearing upon civilian supply as it relates to the resources under its own jurisdiction, and in so doing there are a very substantial number of common facts and figures which are not being coordinated and followed through one central station. Senate bill 885 proposes to unify and coordinate this work on civilian supply by putting the responsibility for ascertaining civilian requirements and presenting them properly in one civilian supply administration. This would eliminate the necessity for each of the other agencies having substantial numbers of persons working on the same problem. This would tend to eliminate duplication and confusion by centralizing responsibility in one agency much as the other major claimants, the Army, Navy, and export agencies, do today.

The able Senator from Oregon earlier asked what the bill would accomplish over the present situation. I should like to answer that question more explicitly than I did the other day.

First. The bill would give the 130,000,000 civilians of this country a central claimant. Today there is no central claimant for the civilian population. Claims for the civilians are handled by several different agencies. Because of the fragmentation of claims there can be no powerful civilian supply representative of equal rank around the conference table with the other claimants.

Second. The bill, by establishing an independent, central civilian supply agency, would for the first time make possible the development and presentation of a unified and balanced civilian supply picture. The Civilian Supply Administrator would cover the whole civilian front, and would therefore be able to draw programs and plans which are sound and practical because they take into consideration all the elements. The Civilian Supply Administrator would thus be able to do for civilians what the Army and the Navy are able to do for the armed forces by planning and following through on adequate supply programs. Nothing of this nature is being done today because civilian supply is split into fragments, each little civilian supply group in each of the production and supply agencies working independently and on only a portion of the civilian supply problem.

Third. The bill would make possible for the first time a proper balancing of civilian supply. As the resources available for civilians become shorter and shorter—and I fear, Senators, they will become shorter, and probably in altogether too short order—the need for making the most use out of these smaller portions for civilians becomes paramount. That is what I call balance. Others call it integration. Because there is no single central Civilian Supply Agency today, balance and integration for civilian supply is practically impossible. The War Production Board may allocate enough steel for steel tacks to make 350,000,000 pairs of shoes for civilians. The Rubber Director, on the other hand, may allocate enough rubber to make only 80,000,000 pairs of shoes. The Food Administrator may allocate only enough hides to manufacture 200,000,000 pairs of shoes. The War Manpower Commission may have embarked upon a program which would not permit sufficient manpower to manufacture even 100,000,000 pairs of shoes. The Petroleum Administrator for War may have allocated only sufficient fuel to enable the manufacture of 50,000,000 pairs of shoes. Because each of these agencies is independent, there is no balance between them on a civilian supply program. Obviously there will be waste and confusion, when all these resources are necessary to the production of shoes, and therefore lack of any one resource will limit the amount of production. The situation today shows a lack of balance and integration.

If there were no Army Supply Corps the Army might get an allocation of sufficient steel to make helmets for a 20,000,000-man Army and only enough guns for a 5,000,000-man Army. The Army Supply Corps puts balance into the military picture by taking the steel which otherwise would be wasted in excess helmets and putting it into more guns, where it may be needed. The civilians need such balance too, and they can get it only when they have a strong, central Civilian Supply Agency.

Fourth, the bill would, for the first time, give civilian supply an equal right of appeal to the President or his appointee. Today civilian supply cannot appeal on an equal basis with the military and export agencies. Let me explain why. As I have said before, each of the civilian supply agencies is buried within a production and supply agency. There is a little civilian supply under every czar. Since every little civilian supply is under a big czar, we cannot expect a subordinate to appeal over the head of the czar to the President. That is why there is no equal right of appeal for the civilians.

We cannot expect a Vice Chairman for Civilian Requirements to appeal over the head of the Chairman of the War Production Board, his superior, after the Chairman has already made a decision. The equal right of appeal provided for in the bill would also establish an orderly channel for the decision of controversies among the Government agencies—something which I consider most desirable and necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, contemplating that at an early date the Senate will have before it for consideration the resolution extending the Hull Trade Agreements Act, briefly referred to as the Trade Agreement Act, I am presenting at this time some material which I think is explanatory and evidence of support of the continuance of the act. It shows full justification, in my judgment, for the continuance of these agreements.

First, I wish to present an excerpt from the Department of State Bulletin which explains briefly the motive of the agreement. Next, I offer a brief statement made by the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, asking for the continuance of these agreements.

Also I present from the press of the country, the Washington Star, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and other papers, editorials and statements supporting the movement to continue the act under which trade agreements have been made.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METHOD

Specifically, the act empowers the President, in order to obtain from other countries concessions on American exports, to modify excessive United States tariff rates, to bind existing tariff rates against increase, and to guarantee continued duty-free entry of products now on the free list.

The act does not empower the President to modify tariff rates except under a trade agreement; it does not empower him to reduce the duty on any foreign product under a trade agreement by more than 50 percent or to transfer any item from the dutiable list to the free list.

It does require that trade agreements be concluded only after the President has sought the advice of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and other appropriate agencies of the Government, and only after public notice and full opportunity for presentation of information and views by any interested person.

All Government agencies concerned with foreign commerce cooperate, through interdepartmental committees, in studying all pertinent facts and views. Before any trade agreement is concluded, public notice is given of all products on which concessions by the United States will be considered and public hearings are held by representatives of the Government agencies concerned. Resulting recommendations in regard to trade agreements are submitted to the President through the Secretary of State.

CONCESSIONS OBTAINED

The United States, in negotiating a trade agreement, asks a foreign country to lower its excessive tariff rates on our exports, or to liberalize quota or exchange restrictions on them.

* * * * *

CONCESSIONS GRANTED

Under trade agreements the United States has agreed to tariff reductions or to the continuance of existing tariffs or free entry in the case of imported products needed or desired by American producers and consumers. Concessions are granted on imported products more or less similar to those produced in the United States when they are in the national interest and when reciprocal concessions are obtained in return.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

We can all be gratified with the showing of national unity which has been manifested through spokesmen for all branches of American life at the hearings which were concluded yesterday before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I have discussed the matter with the chairmen of the committees of the House and Senate and I entirely agree that this country's vital interests would be best served by a clear-cut continuance of the Trade Agreements Act for the customary 3-year period as proposed in the pending legislation, and that there should be no amendment to this legislation, particularly at this time when we are most concerned that there may not be the slightest basis for doubt in anyone's mind concerning our steadfast determination to cooperate fully with like-minded nations in peace as well as in war.

[From the Washington Star]

RECIPROCAL TRADE PACTS

The reciprocal trade agreements bill, extending for another 3-year period a system of dealing with tariff duties inaugurated in 1934, has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee to the House.

* * * * *

International trade is a great safety valve against war, just as economic warfare among nations is a known forerunner of armed conflict. International trade, however, cannot be a one-way matter. The reciprocal trade agreement system was devised by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, passionately devoted to the cause of international trade. It was enacted into law at a time when economic chaos was enveloping the world, and when trade barriers had been erected by all the major nations of the world and some of the lesser.

There are two important considerations entering into the continuance of the trade agreement law. The first involves the immediate confidence of the nations now allied with the United States in the future willingness of this country to cooperate for a better world. The second, the more long-range consideration, involves a certain and sure policy of lowering trade barriers to permit the maximum of international commerce. On either or both counts, the trade-agreement law should be reenacted.

Secretary Hull has urged the act be continued without such amendments as are proposed by the Republicans on the ground that otherwise the confidence of other nations in the goodwill of the United States would suffer a serious blow. The Republicans describe the trade-agreement law as a "blank check" placed in the hands of the President, which might be used to the detriment of the American people, or large groups of them.

The proof of the pudding, however, is in the eating. Thirty trade agreements have been entered into in the last 9 years with 27 nations. They did have the effect of increasing our foreign commerce. It has not been shown they have had a harmful effect upon Americans.

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT EXTENSION IS URGED BY MANUFACTURERS' GROUP — NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS PRESIDENT ASKS SAFEGUARDS TO GUIDE NEGOTIATORS IN FUTURE

SAN FRANCISCO, April 14.—Frederick C. Crawford, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, told industrialists last night the association had reversed its traditional opposition to the Hull reciprocal trade treaties.

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1943]

MR. HULL'S TRADE TREATIES

Fourteen members of the House Ways and Means Committee voted yesterday to recommend the continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program in its present form. The bill now goes to the House, where opposition threatens it. In the Senate 40 Members polled last week by the Associated Press were found to be in favor of continuance for another 3 years, with only 19 definitely opposed and 37 noncommittal or not reached for comment. One amendment was accepted in committee empowering the President to suspend the operations of the act in the case of any country dealing with international cartels.

Secretary of State Hull has made the point that there should not be "the slightest basis for doubt in anyone's mind concerning our steadfast determination to cooperate fully with like-minded nations in peace as well as in war." This is the heart of the matter. No one can foresee the exact situation in which the trading nations will find themselves after the war is over, but they will certainly need to buy and sell more freely than they were doing between 1932 and 1939. The alternative to the policy of the Hull treaties is the policy of cartels, blocked payments, economic warfare, and, sooner or later, another worldwide depression. We have reached a place where the cultivation of limited group interests leads toward general ruin. The game of economic isolationism is as deadly as that of political isolationism.

[From the Washington Post]

TRADE AGREEMENTS

There have been disturbing rumors of late that when the Trade Agreements Act of 1940 expires next June Congress will either allow

it to lapse or renew it in a form that will destroy its usefulness. It is pointed out in this connection that the recurrent votes on this legislation, first approved in 1934 and reapproved in 1937 and 1940, showed a steady decline in the affirmative majority, and that there is now a large element in Congress which wants a return to the old system of tariff making. If these rumors are correct, we may lose the peace even before we win the war. Certainly the failure by Congress to renew the Trade Agreements Act will be regarded everywhere as a clear indication that we propose to return to economic isolation. That means political isolation as well.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1943]

TRADE PACTS URGED—TREATIES MODIFYING TARIFFS RECOMMENDED FOR PEACE

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I was tremendously impressed by the recent speech of Wendell L. Willkie at Indianapolis. I use the word "tremendously" advisedly; for coming from a man who has been a candidate for President on the Republican ticket, and who is still a leader of a large part of the Republicans in this country, it indicates a great change of heart on the part of those who are willing to follow him. Mr. Willkie came out squarely for the trade treaties which Secretary Hull has negotiated with many nations during the past few years.

History is usually taught politically in most schools. It is a list of kings and dynasties, of campaigns and battles, of conquests and of religions; but if it is studied from an economic point of view, much is learned that can help us with today's problems. A study of such history is convincing that civilization and prosperity have always followed the trade routes since the dawn of civilization.

We also learn that almost all wars in history have been trade wars, from the siege of Troy to today. They were caused because the natural flow of trade was interfered with and certain nations, chafing under their inability to get raw materials, or to sell their own produce, have sought to get rid of such interference by force—robber barons, pirates, brigands have all been important restraints in their time; but today the greatest barriers to trade that ever existed have arisen in the form of tariffs, quotas, etc.; in other words, laws passed by great nations which often tax or otherwise penalize trade almost out of existence.

The word "trade" means the exchange of goods or services. Trade cannot be carried on in any other way but by exchange. No nation can always sell and never buy. The chief reason the war debts of the last war were never paid was because our tariff laws prevented debtor nations from trading with us. How else could they pay them but to send us goods or services?

Our infant industries have grown up to be giants, and giants require an awful lot of nourishment. The only nourishment giant industries can get is by selling their products all over the world. And it should be remembered that a wall of any kind, or a closed door, blocks movement in either direction. In the end we cannot sell unless we buy—unless we trade in its fullest and most comprehensive meaning.

* * * * *

E. VAIL STEBBINS.

NEW YORK, *February 17, 1943.*

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 4, 1943]

HULL'S TRADE PACT PLAN GETS UNEXPECTED BACKING—MANUFACTURERS' GROUP AND AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR REVERSE LONG-ESTABLISHED POLICIES

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, May 3—Only a paltry paragraph or two heralded the news that business has changed its policy and now favors the Hull reciprocal trade program.

At least that portion of business as represented by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce made such an announcement through representatives appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee. The public appearance of the National Association of Manufacturers was made after its board privately agreed to reverse its policy of 3 years ago with very little dissent of members.

The business experts did not say so, but apparently they figured world trade must be different after the war. Our manufacturing production capacity has been greatly expanded by the armaments program.

CHANGE TO PEACE PRODUCTION EASIER

The machines now used for weapons can be changed back to peacetime products much easier than they were changed to war. Replacement of one or two parts and tools are all that will be necessary in many instances, they say, and a better machine-tool industry exists to do the job.

This extra production will have to be sold either in a greatly expanded American market (more people able to have radios, bathtubs, refrigerators, etc.) or in a larger foreign market. The world will have little gold or goods with which to buy our surplus manufacturing production.

It would be very foolish of us to sell these extensively on credit through any of the old or newly suggested devices. Actually, all we would be doing under such arrangements is to give our products away at the expense of our people as a whole.

As long as we export more than we import, we will naturally accumulate world debts which cannot be paid, or gold which is of doubtful value. We already have too much of both.

* * * * *

And, inasmuch as labor has joined in approval through American Federation of Labor's Bill Green, it looks like Mr. Hull has gathered unexpected support.

[From the Atlanta Journal of April 14, 1943]

RECIPROCITY AND THE SOUTH

How can anyone who has at heart the interests of the agricultural South oppose a renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? The prosperity of this region depends in large measure on foreign markets for its cotton, tobacco, naval stores, and other important crops. In normal times there must be an overseas outlet for these commodities, or the producer will suffer the consequence of a supply far in excess of demand. Georgia farmers can well remember that some of their hardest years have been those in which, from one cause or another, foreign markets for their cotton were cut off or greatly reduced.

The reciprocity program serves the South, along with the rest of the United States, by extending and widening the channels of international commerce through which our country's surplus of farm and factory products can be sold abroad. Reciprocity means, of course, that we give certain advantages in return for those we receive and that our imports as well as our exports will increase. Only thus can trade be healthy and lasting; it must be mutually profitable if it is to live and grow. It is a matter of record, over a long span of years and decades, that our national prosperity has been highest when our exports and imports were greatest. Naturally so, because those are the periods of rising production and consumption. As an authority points out, "The expansion of foreign markets for American products means increased production in the export industries and outlet for surplus fram products. This in turn leads to increased employment, increased wages, and better farm prices. Thus the farmer and the worker who produce for exports obtain a direct benefit from the increased sales abroad. This increases their purchasing power in the home market of other domestic industries and other branches of American agriculture, with widespread benefits throughout the country."

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which Congress now is called upon to renew, is a tested means of promoting the international commerce from which all these benefits arise. Its opponents, most of whom are advocates of the old log-rolling and miscalled "protective" tariff system, are disturbed because reciprocity increases our imports along with exports. That is like objecting to a bargain because it is profitable to both parties. These opponents say that American farmers are made to compete with the products of pauper labor in foreign lands. The facts do not bear out this assertion. On the contrary, under the trade agreements negotiated by Secretary Hull American agriculture and industry have been carefully safeguarded against unjust competition from abroad, and most of the concessions made on imports under these agreements have involved commodities which we produce not at all or in a volume insufficient to meet the domestic demand.

There are compelling reasons in the realm of post-war stability and reconstruction, reasons having to do with the future of world peace and progress, why the reciprocity program should be continued. But for the sake of our own practical interests alone, it should be preserved.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish also to state, without quoting in its entirety, that the able editorialist of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, has advocated the continuance of the Hull trade agreements, in an article appearing in the New York Times of April 29. In referring to the Hull trade policy, Mr. Krock says, "It has worked well and it should not have its edge taken off."

Now I wish to quote from the House report on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act:

OVERWHELMING PRESS SUPPORT

The trade-agreements program has been the subject of editorial comment in a great many newspapers in all parts of the United States, both before, during, and since the committee's hearings. Here also, the opinion expressed is strikingly close to unanimity. Overwhelmingly, the country's press supports the trade-agreements program. An analysis of newspaper opinion prepared by James S. Twohey Associates, an independent agency, reported on April 17, 1943, that of the newspapers that have commented on the program some 86 percent are in favor of renewal. * * *

I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts from the editorials from all sections of the country included at this time as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 26, 1943]

It seems safe to hope that there will be enough Members of both Houses to appreciate how paralyzing a blow to our plans for a stable peace would be rejection or crippling amendment of the Trade Agreements Act.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of April 15, 1943]

Mr. Hull's policy has proved economically sound, and it is beyond denial that it is largely responsible for solidarity in this hemisphere. Isolationism is as outmoded as the feudal estate.

[From the Boston Herald of December 24, 1942]

The [trade] agreements represent the spirit of democracy. Foreign trade cannot be merely a one-way process. To sell we must buy.

[From the Chicago Sun of April 18, 1943]

Extension of the Trade Agreements Act is clearly one arm of the only post-war policy by which we can hope to prevent the rise of new aggressors.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 14, 1943]

At no time in the years since the [trade-agreements] program began has it been more important for Americans to show themselves clearly behind this act than now.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 26, 1943]

For this Nation to abandon its reciprocal trade-treaty system this spring would confirm the worst fears of the rest of the world that the United States intended after the war to go back to the economic nationalism which proved so injurious before.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 6, 1943]

One of the severest blows that could be delivered to the war effort would be rejection of Hull's request for renewal [of the Trade Agreement Act]. It would be an international calamity to reject reciprocity now.

[From the Dallas News of April 19, 1943]

These treaties have been a help to our trade and are indispensable as a foundation for our post-war commerce with other nations. To drop the [trade-agreements] program now would be to abandon one of the main provisions of the Atlantic Charter and to cause our allies to distrust us.

[From the Des Moines Register of April 12, 1943]

On the broader basis of the interests of the country and the world there never was much question about the desirability of carefully controlled and limited procedure for taking the top off the worst of the trade barriers, as set forth in the Trade Agreements Act. The world-shaking events of the last few years, especially, are at last awakening people to the highly painful and personal consequences of neglecting world interests.

[From the Detroit News of April 14, 1943]

Wise Republicans * * * prefer not to make a party fight against the trade-treaty program. * * * Trend now toward commercial isolation would move toward political isolation.

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of April 12, 1943]

Pointing out that trade is "part of America's big post-war opportunity," the National League of Women Voters has fired a broadside in the battle for renewal of the trade-agreements program. * * * Notice is hereby given to the Kansas statesman in Washington that 'Mom," speaking through the League of Women Voters, is not to be sneezed at. She may pop up in some primary or election with her war paint on. She might have enough strength to chase you into the dog house.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union of April 17, 1943]

Renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act will assure all the peoples of the world that we really mean to stand by the agreements which embody the high ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter. Conversely, failure to renew the act would in effect repudiate one of the basic promises made in that document.

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of April 8, 1943]

If international trade is to be promoted, there must be international agreement on tariffs; and while no system can be expected to work perfectly, the system of international agreements negotiated and concluded by the Secretary of State seems the nearest approach to solution of the problem that has been devised.

[From the Hartford Courant of April 14, 1943]

Mr. Hull should be joined in his plea for a stand that would have a "most heartening effect on people here and everywhere who look forward, with profound hope, to a world rich in economic and spiritual opportunities for all." The Secretary's arguments are on high ground and are irrefutable.

[From the Indianapolis News of April 15, 1943]

The Hull argument that the [trade-agreement] policy is essential to both the war and the adjustments of the peace is powerful and probably will be effective.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of January 13, 1943]

The high-tariff policy pursued by the United States following the First World War contributed to world economic difficulties. The extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act would demonstrate that Congress does not want to do the same thing again following the present conflict.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times of April 13, 1943]

If it [Trade Agreements Act] is not renewed before that time, Congress will have put the world on notice that we are withdrawing from a vital field of cooperative effort. The shock to the hope of our allies and friends for a durable peace can readily be imagined.

[From the Los Angeles Times of December 25, 1942]

* * * In general, both Mexico and the United States have everything to gain and very little to lose from expanded commercial interchange, which should lead to greater friendliness in all relations. If the new pact results in both countries becoming better customers of each other, it will have very beneficial results.

[From the Madison (Wis.) State Journal of April 6, 1943]

To overcome some of the disadvantages of these tariff walls there were established reciprocal trade treaties with some 25 nations. Unfortunately, in the past, the dairy industry generally opposed these agreements. Today the more enlightened farmer approves their principle. Already they have offered many advantages to American agriculture, industry, and business generally.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of April 14, 1943]

There is no doubt that the failure of Congress to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will expire in June unless Congress takes action to maintain it, would have an injurious effect on inter-Allied relations and the progress of the war.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 19, 1943]

Congress is reported likely not to extend the Trade Agreements Act, or at least to amend and restrict. Yet in their 9-year history the trade agreements have been the only forward, successful part of our economic policy.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of April 7, 1943]

The action Congress takes on renewal of the Trade Agreements Act will be one of the prime factors in determining whether the pre-war and wartime controls over individual enterprise, in the international field, shall be demobilized or tightened when the war is won.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 24, 1943]

If the Republicans intend to make the reciprocal-trade treaty program a party football, their choice may not be a happy one. They can hardly refuse to permit renewal of the President's authority to make the treaties without waging a fight that will antagonize some of our war allies and expose themselves to the charge of impairing our relations abroad.

[From the New York Times of April 3, 1943]

The congressional Republicans themselves have been reminded of the fact that historically their own party was the first to sponsor tariff reciprocity. These things considered, it becomes possible to hope for strong bipartisan support for renewal of the present act.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 3, 1943]

Of proved value in the past, the Trade Agreements Act is even more valuable today as an assurance to our allies that the United States will not relapse into a narrow isolation after the war, and it will be more valuable still tomorrow.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 4, 1943]

The case for formally continuing the trade pacts rests on broad public policy. Prompt action by Congress would give welcome assurance to our allies and help to strengthen the common cause.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 3, 1943]

In renewing the reciprocity treaties, the United States is not being asked to do out of altruism anything not to its own advantage.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 14, 1943]

Mr. Hull is right when he observes that renewal or repudiation of the reciprocal trade policy will be viewed as a sign post indicating the path that the United States will follow when the world is again at peace.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of April 15, 1943]

In the long view and despite certain maladjustments, the reciprocal trade agreements have increased our foreign trade, they have demonstrated that we can and will cooperate on a world-wide scale, and they have gone a long way toward eliminating the extreme nationalisms, the trade rivalries, and the actual hatreds engendered by the dog-eat-dog trade relations of the past and the short-sighted tariff wars that tended to Balkanize the world.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of April 19, 1943]

Today it is scarcely conceivable that any legislator in this country who clearly understood the implications of his action would vote against renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

[St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 6, 1943]

If common sense prevails, there ought to be little debate about continuing a policy that is advantageous to us and that is among the nations of the world a pledge of our good faith.

[St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 14, 1943]

To judge by what the Congressman * * * said, he thinks that the reciprocal trade agreements have ruined agriculture. This is not true of the past, is not true of the present, and will not be true of the future. In fact, there is good reason to believe that the only real and lasting solution of the farm problem possible, must come through a general reduction of world trade barriers after the war, and a general increase of world trade.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of April 6, 1943]

Standing alone, the reciprocal trade treaty program would deserve prompt and unequivocal support of the Senators. As an important part of the fabric of State Department activity, the renewal asked should be a routine matter of common sense.

[From the Seattle Star of February 13, 1943]

Mr. Willkie did a good job in his Indianapolis speech in summoning from the Republican Pantheon such worthies as Blaine, McKinley, and Taft to support the reciprocal trade policy. * * * That a Republican majority will challenge the renewal of these treaties—and thus raise the charge of isolationism at a moment when there is virtually no commercial foreign trade anyway—seems improbable.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of April 5, 1943]

An important initial installment of the answer to the question—and one that the world would understand at sight—would be the practically unanimous extension for another term of years by Congress of the Trade Agreements Act. Legislation to that effect would signify that this Congress was not disposed to revive that form of extreme economic isolation which a new high-protective tariff would certainly involve.

[From the Syracuse Post-Standard of April 5, 1943]

If we should, by any chance, turn the tariff program down now, it would mean to other nations simply that we placed nationalism and our own affairs above international cooperation and aid in rebuilding a world damaged badly by wars resulting from this same type of nationalism.

[From the Tucson Star of April 14, 1943]

Secretary Hull has just appeared before Congress to ask that this program (trade agreements), which expires in June, be renewed * * * the failure of Congress to act will amount to notice to the world that in the future the American Congress will not ratify or help or continue what has been, for nearly 10 years, a consistent American international economic policy.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1943]

Our experience since 1934 has proved that the process of negotiating reciprocal-trade agreements offers the one practical approach to a moderation of the fierce nationalism which destroys world trade; at any rate, the one approach open to a tariff-protected economy.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of April 3, 1943]

There have been disturbing rumors of late that when the Trade Agreements Act of 1940 expires next June Congress will either allow it to lapse or renew it in a form that will destroy its usefulness. * * * For us to abandon it at a time when its usefulness can now really begin would be a blunder worse than a crime.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of April 13, 1943]

The repudiation of the policy of reciprocal-trade agreements by Congress now would have a chilling effect on the nations now our friends.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the women of the country evidently have seen the benefit of the trade agreements, and I ask to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article appearing in the Washington Herald of April 27, wherein the General Federation of Women's Clubs have sent an appeal for the endorsement of the pacts.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, sent out an appeal yesterday to the 16,500 constituent groups of the General Federation, including more than two and a half million club women, to support the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mrs. Whitehurst pointed out that the General Federation endorsed the program at the convention in Kansas City in 1938 and reaffirmed its stand at the board meeting in Washington, January 1940.

"We believe that this program has proved its worth," Mrs. Whitehurst's statement reads. "This worth has been proven in the past decade by available facts and figures. A lasting peace can only come when the people of all countries are able to approach their common problems from an international standpoint, not from a merely selfish one.

"MUTUAL BENEFIT FOR NATIONS STRESSED

"To exchange the fruits of labor of one country," she continued, "for the fruits of labor of another country on a basis of mutual benefit is what the world longs for. No nation is, or can be, self-sufficient. The good of one nation is the good of all—just as with individuals. When trade between nations is reduced or destroyed, dislocation follows, living standards are lowered, poverty and bitterness follow, and wars threaten.

"The reciprocal agreements program, we believe, moves in the opposite direction—toward prosperity, here and elsewhere, thereby helping to lay a firm foundation for a reliable and enduring peace, the great longing in the heart of every woman," Mrs. Whitehurst asserted.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article by Virginia Prewett, appearing in the Washington Post of April 24, endorsing the agreements.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Latin Americans watching the Washington scene have eyes for one thing only at present—the fight on in Congress over renewal of the Trade Agreements Act.

What they see is a paradox. Never before has this Nation cooperated with other countries as we are doing today. Never before has there been so much talk about the part we must play in building the post-war world. Yet never since this country began cautiously to move out of isolation has the keystone of international collaboration, the trade agreements program, been in such danger.

The Trade Agreements Act was passed to implement a policy of international collaboration that Secretary of State Cordell Hull announced at the Seventh Pan-American Conference at Montevideo in late 1933. There were two urgent reasons for our adopting this policy at that time. One was economic. High tariffs spreading over the world in the late 1920's and early 1930's had collapsed world trade. We, who had become a mighty exporting nation, as a result of the World War had lost two-thirds of our foreign trade. This loss had undermined our industrial economy, leaving millions unemployed.

ACT REVIVED TRADE

Trade agreements were a means to revive foreign trade—and with it our internal economy—by opening channels for our goods through the high protectionist walls other countries had raised against us.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish also to include an excerpt from an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of April 15.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But international trade is always subject to constant change, and especially in fluid times like those through which the world is now passing. Circumstances may easily arise in which certain provisions of a treaty may become unsatisfactory to us or to the other signatory. If the Trade Agreements Act is extended, it will be easy to deal with such provisions. Our representatives can then sit down with the representatives of the other country (after due notice to all those who may be interested) and work out a new agreement suitable to the altered circumstances.

But if the Trade Agreements Act is killed, authority for such negotiations will be lacking; and if a treaty becomes unsatisfactory to us or to the other signatory, the only way out of the difficulty will be to denounce it and allow it to expire after the necessary 6 months' notice. One by one the treaties may be expected to die in this manner, and as they die the Smoot-Hawley duties will come back into full force and effect. Should all the treaties be so wiped out, the country would be back where we were in 1930, when the Smoot-Hawley law dealt the coup de grace to our foreign trade.

Does the Republican party really want to assume responsibility for any such result? Does it really want to scrap machinery for adjusting tariffs to changing conditions and go back to the rigidities from which, to our great advantage, we have escaped? If it does not, it had better pass the word along to Mr. GEARHART and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee before it is too late.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may say that the United States have been most fortunate in having one so capable as the Honorable Cordell Hull as the head of the Department of State in this tempestuous period.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT ON TAX BILL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I should like to make an announcement. The tax bill will be reported during the day, I think, and if the

text does not reach the floor in time to report it in open session, I ask unanimous consent that it may be reported during the recess or adjournment following today's session, in order that the Senate may have available for its use the printed bill which has been agreed upon or has been ordered reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

In this connection, I should like to state that it will not be possible to file the committee report on the bill, but the report will be available during Tuesday, or it will be on the desks and available to all Senators early Wednesday morning. It is the purpose of the committee to move to take up the bill for consideration Wednesday morning next. The bill itself is expected to be reported today, but I am asking unanimous consent that if the bill should not reach the floor before the hour of adjournment, we may have permission to file it during the recess or adjournment following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the unanimous consent being granted. However, it is not necessary in order to comply with the rules of the Senate. If the bill shall be filed tomorrow, it will come within the rule permitting it to come up on Wednesday. It is not necessary to file it today, unless the Senator desires to bring it up tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator, if he will permit, that I had informal advice that perhaps the Senate would not be in session tomorrow, and anticipating that that might happen, I made the request.

Mr. McNARY. I would designate that advice as informal. At any rate, I have no objection to the request. I am glad to know that the bill will come up for discussion Wednesday at noon and that its consideration will continue without abatement until final disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia will be agreed to. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I asked for and was granted unanimous consent to report House bill 2570, the bill to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes. I am now able to make the favorable report from the Committee on Finance on the bill itself, but will ask that the privilege of filing the report tomorrow be continued, if the Senate shall not be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment (Rept. No. 221).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the unanimous consent obtained by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] with regard to filing a report on the tax bill after the adjournment of the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the right to file minority views during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 885) to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in order to meet an objection raised by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], I offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 21, after the word "services", it is proposed to insert in parentheses the words "but not including manpower", and in line 24, after the word "services", it is proposed to insert in parentheses "but not including manpower."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota raised the question that the word "services" might be interpreted to mean rationing manpower. While I do not think it could be so construed, I suggested to him that I would present this amendment in order to make the meaning perfectly clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the arguments have been concluded and we are about to vote, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I thought, however, that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut had not completed his very excellent statement on the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Connecticut does not desire to add to what he has already presented, though if the Senator from Oregon feels that there is need of further argument, I shall be very glad to proceed.

Mr. McNARY. I am always interested in what the Senator has to say, of course, but I am also interested in getting to a vote as quickly as possible, with a minimum of debate.

Mr. MALONEY. I shall cooperate with the Senator to the limit to that end.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Capper
Austin	Brooks	Caraway
Bailey	Buck	Chandler
Ball	Burton	Chavez
Bankhead	Bushfield	Clark, Idaho
Barbour	Butler	Clark, Mo.
Bone	Byrd	Connally
Danaher	Lucas	Scrugham
Davis	McClellan	Shipstead
Eastland	McFarland	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Taft
Ferguson	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
George	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Gerry	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Millikin	Truman
Green	Moore	Tunnell
Guffey	Murdock	Tydings
Gurney	Murray	Vandenberg
Hatch	Nye	Van Nuys
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Walsh
Hill	Pepper	Wheeler
Holman	Radcliffe	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
La Follette	Revercomb	Wilson
Langer	Reynolds	
Lodge	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. McNARY. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent attending hearings on the Puerto Rican independence bill.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained in Government departments on business pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who, if present, would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who, if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr.

WILLIS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who, if present, would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—44

Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Reynolds
Buck	Hawkes	Russell
Butler	Hayden	Scrugham
Byrd	Hill	Stewart
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Van Nuys
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	Wilson
George	Radcliffe	

NAYS—29

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lodge	Truman
Bushfield	McNary	Tunnell
Capper	Millikin	Vandenberg
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Nye	

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews	Glass	Robertson
Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Barkley	Kilgore	Tobey
Bilbo	McCarran	Wallgren
Bone	Mead	White
Brewster	Murdock	Wiley
Downey	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 885) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 885

An act to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that the total mobilization of all the Nation's resources is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, that keeping the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively is essential to the successful prosecution of the war, and that it is the policy of the Nation to guarantee the production and distribution of the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively in order that such civilian population can produce and distribute what is required by our armed forces and allies to win the war. The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the Nation to mobilize the capacities and resources of all small business concerns in the production and distribution of goods and services for the civilian population.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CIVILIAN SUPPLY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the policies set forth above there is established in the Office for Emergency Management a Civilian Supply Administration. The Civilian Supply Administration shall be under the direction of a Civilian Supply Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year, and shall draw no compensation for personal services from any other source. The Administrator may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, and may fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to—

(1) ascertain the quantities and types of goods and services (including but not limited to food, clothing, shelter, fuel, transportation, and medical care) necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively;

(2) ascertain the manpower, manufacturing facilities, materials, operating supplies, and other productive resources necessary to enable civilian industries, trades, and services to produce and distribute the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively;

(3) apply to the appropriate Government agencies which allocate resources for military, naval, export, and civilian purposes for the amounts and types of manpower, materials, facilities, transportation, housing, and other resources determined by him to be essential to produce and distribute the necessary goods and services: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent any other officer or agency of the Government from making a similar application to the appropriate Government agency or joining with the Administrator in his application. The appropriate Government agencies shall allocate to civilian use the resources which they deem essential to produce and distribute the goods and services necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively. In the event the Administrator is of the opinion that the resources allocated to civilian use by such Government agencies will not enable him to carry out the purposes of this act, he may apply to the Economic Stabilization Director or such other officer as the President may designate for such purposes. The Economic Stabilization Director or such other officer as may be designated, after conferring with the claimant agencies affected, may issue such directions as may be appropriate and any such directions or any modifications thereof shall be binding upon all other departments and agencies of the Government. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deny to any claimant agency asserting that its operations have been adversely affected the right to appeal to the President for a revision of any allocation of resources for military, naval, export, or civilian purposes;

(4) assist the civilian population and civilian industries, trades, and services in making any adjustments rendered necessary by the war;

(5) assure to the consumer a fair and equitable distribution of materials and goods through the channels of trade and assist retail, wholesale, and service trades in the adjustment of operations to the amount of merchandise, equipment, operating supplies, and manpower available to them;

(6) subject to the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, determine the need for rationing goods and services (but not including manpower) to the civilian population and when and where rationing shall be instituted. The Administrator shall direct the appropriate agencies to ration such goods and services (but not including manpower) as he deems necessary in the war interest;

(7) conserve the productive resources available for civilian production and distribution by reducing and eliminating nonessential uses of goods, services, and productive resources, and by stimulating utilization of adequate substitutes for goods of limited supply;

(8) cooperate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in attaining the most effective use of small business concerns in the production and distribution of essential civilian goods and services.

SEC. 3. The Federal departments and agencies which administer the national policy of economic stabilization and prevention of inflation shall, to the extent practicable, cooperate with the Administrator in achieving the production and distribution he deems necessary to keep the civilian population healthy and functioning effectively.

SEC. 4. The Administrator or his designated representative shall be a member of the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the interdepartmental advisory committees of all other Federal agencies, committees, or bodies which divide the productive resources for military, export, and civilian purposes.

SEC. 5. The Administrator is authorized to obtain such information as is necessary to perform his duties, and the Federal agencies and departments shall furnish such information (as has not been received in confidence) as the Administrator may need in the conduct of his duties.

SEC. 6. In order to keep the smaller business concerns in operation, the Government agencies which allocate resources for military, naval, export, and civilian purposes shall, wherever properly possible, allot to such concerns a larger proportion of their pre-war civilian business than is allotted to larger concerns or to concerns with more direct or indirect Government business.

SEC. 7. The Office of Civilian Supply established by General Administrative Order No. 17 of the War Production Board of March 3, 1942, and its records, and property, and such of its personnel as may be required by the Administrator shall be transferred to the Civilian Supply Administration within 15 days from the effective date of this act. So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the Office of Civilian Supply as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Civilian Supply Administration for use in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred under this section. In determining the amounts to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include amounts to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to such transfer.

SEC. 8. The Administrator is hereby authorized to appoint such advisory committees composed of representatives of governmental or private groups as he deems appropriate.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 9. The Administrator shall render a report to the President and to the Congress in January of each year, summarizing the activities of the office in the calendar year just ended, together with such recommendations as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. He shall also make interim reports quarterly during each of the months of January, March, July, and October.

EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall expire 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President.

CRITICISM OF THE BERMUDA REFUGEE CONFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I followed with great interest the remarks made a few days ago on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on the Bermuda Conference and the critcism made of it by the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews. My interest in this matter was the more aroused since my name was included in a list of endorsers of a proclamation in favor of Jewish rights, an excerpt of which has been quoted by the Committee for a Jewish Army.

Like other Members of the Senate whose names were quoted in that connection, I had not known of the advertisement prior to its publication. Speaking for myself, I do not see the slightest objection to the use of a bona fide quotation from a statement I had endorsed on the need to help the Jews of Europe with action and not merely with words. But, since a doubt arose in the mind of the Senator from Illinois as to whether, by so quoting our names in this connection, the authors of the advertisement may have created the impression that we endorse their own feelings, it might be just as well to be more circumspect in the future. In general, however, I have become resigned in the long years of my public life to the danger of any statements made by us being quoted against us at the most likely or unlikely moments. We all become inured to it.

However, there is another issue involved in this matter. The Senator from Illinois informed us that he proposed to address the Senate very soon regarding the work of the Bermuda Conference. I confess I am looking forward to this address with the greatest impatience. The situation is rather difficult. On the one hand, I should not like to appear to pass judgment upon the work of the Bermuda Conference before its full records are available to us. On the other hand, I am not certain that its records will be made available to us at all, or at any rate sufficiently soon to be of any particular use. The Senator from Illinois himself has mentioned that he is bound to respect the secrecy of the conference's procedure. To this secrecy he will still be bound at the time when he speaks to us on the subject. On the other hand, we are urgently reminded of the fact that 2,000,000 Jews in Europe have been killed off already and that another 5,000,000 Jews are awaiting the same fate unless they are saved immediately. Every day, every hour, every minute that passes, thousands of them are being exterminated.

The very terms of reference of the Bermuda Conference, as announced in the note by our Department of State to the British Ambassador, made it very plain that the scope of the conference was circumscribed so narrowly that this objective could not be adequately dealt with during its sessions. That the specific elements presented by the Jewish question, as distinct from the general "refugee problem," were not to be dealt with, is also clearly stated in the note of the Department of State. Even the excerpts from the communique of the Bermuda Conference which the Senator from Illinois read on the floor of the Senate fail to mention the word "Jew."

Therefore, I feel it is clearly the course of my colleagues and myself to answer the public demand of all liberty-loving humanitarian people, and also our own consciences, and that this specific problem needs an urgent solution. Should we not wish to take on ourselves the moral responsibility of being passive bystanders to the continued slaughter of the surviving 5,000,000 European Jews, we can and should see to it that all those who can still escape their tormenters have some way opened to them. Further it should be our duty to keep in mind that Palestine lies very near Eastern Europe, within easy reach by sea and even by land. Thus no ships are needed at all, and the task is by no means impossible of achievement. It is finally our duty to realize that in those stateless Jews of Europe, who are already in Palestine, there is an untapped reservoir of manpower which could and should be made available in this world struggle, as a Jewish army.

I am glad to note that the great American people are also fully aware of these facts and sentiments, as is evidenced by the tremendous demand which they have voiced in the last few months. The press, the radio, and the streets of America are the home battle fronts, and one of their prime objectives today is the saving of these defenseless people. The same front in England has been fighting in this field even longer. Reading from the New Statesman and Nation, one of the leading liberal weeklies of London, dated April 9:

> It is not clear why we, in England, must wait for American cooperation, desirable though it is. * * * The massacre goes on and where so little can be done, it could have been expected that the British and American Governments would snatch eagerly at the few opportunities that present themselves. Instead, the Foreign Office keeps on insisting that this is a matter in which the United Nations must act together, while America has hitherto been uncooperative.

The London Daily Express of the same date editorially emphasized the need for immediate action.

In these circumstances I am happy to know that a colleague of ours, the senior Senator from Illinois, has been allowed to take part in the work of the Bermuda Conference. He himself admitted to us that he was not given the power to make any commitments or decisions, but at least he will be able to enlighten us as to whether the scope of the Bermuda Conference, as dictated by the Executive Departments of the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain, was sufficiently broad to permit us to hope that action will be taken on a scale commensurate with the immensity of the problem. If not, I am certain that the Senator from Illinois will be the first one to advise us to make felt the sense of this body that more concrete action be taken to save these human lives, whether in the form of a specific body, as has been advocated by the Committee for a Jewish Army, that is, a special United Nations agency of military and diplomatic experts, with full authority to determine and effectuate a realistic and stern policy of action to save these remaining millions of Jewish people who are marked for cold-blooded slaughter by Hitler, or: First, by immediate utilization of all existing possibilities of transfer of Jews from German-dominated countries to Palestine or to any temporary refuge and the initiation of all further possibilities in this program, or, second, the immediate creation of a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, including "suicide" commando squads which will raid deep into Germany and air squadrons for retaliatory bombing; or some other workable solution to deal with this vital and urgent task for which all human decency cries out.

USE OF FOOD LOCKERS IN THE PRESERVATION OF FOOD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve on subcommittees which have had to do with the question of critical materials which have been fabricated for domestic and commercial uses throughout the country, particularly those used by the American family.

Within the past few days—as I recall, on Friday or Saturday of last week—a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is chairman, had under consideration releasing fabricated materials for the manufacture of food lockers, which are used extensively throughout my State as well as other Middle Western States, especially by farm families, in the preservation of fresh foods.

I feel that the subcommittee is doing a very important work. When critical materials have been fabricated and stored in warehouses, and no demand has been made by the Government upon the warehouses for the release of such materials, I cannot understand why they should not be used for the purposes for which they were fabricated. They are not being used for anything else. For any other use, they would have to be remelted and would become almost worthless so far as the amount of steel is concerned. That is the case with the lockers which I have in mind, and about which I wish to speak for a few minutes.

For a number of years frozen-food locker plants have played an increasingly important part in the food supply of the farm families of Nebraska. Nebraska now has 222 such plants serving approximately 50,000 Nebraska farm families. In a number of counties as many as 50 percent of our farm families make use of locker facilities for the storage of their meats, poultry, fruits, and vegetables which are locally raised and consumed by the families of those who raise them.

This practice of processing and storing at home for future use the produce of Nebraska farms has lowered the cost of living for those farm families. It has eliminated otherwise necessary transportation to and from distant processing points. It has saved many tons of metal which might otherwise have been required for canning, and has given to those families a better-rounded diet of fresh food throughout the year.

At the present time there is a widespread demand for additional plants in communities which do not now have such service. While the necessity for conservation of critical materials is, of course, fully realized, I have been advised that there is available throughout the country a very considerable quantity of the refrigeration equipment required which has already been processed and manufactured. Much of this equipment has been lying idle for many months in the warehouses of distributors and manufacturers, apparently unwanted by any agency of the Government, and much of it is unusable for other refrigeration work.

I believe that it is only common sense to make this equipment available to communities which desire and need locker service, and that such use would not interfere with the war effort, but would materially assist in supplying civilian food needs as well as in the conservation of the products of Nebraska farms.

Mr. President, I should like to ask that Senators from large areas in the Middle West, especially where ranchers have to travel several hundred miles to secure fresh foods, meats, and vegetables, give this subject consideration. I ask that they speak to the members of the subcommittee and see if we cannot have these lockers released for the purposes for which they were fabricated. The fabricated materials to which I have referred, which are now stored in warehouses, would be of greater service in preserving food on Nebraska farms than in any use to which the Government might put them at this time.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during my unavoidable absence from the Senate, Senate bill 575 was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. It had been my intention to file minority views on the bill. I desire very much to file minority views, and I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to file them tomorrow, during the adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection whatsoever to the filing of minority views, but at this time I wish to give notice that if the tax bill shall not be taken up on Wednesday next, I shall move to take up Senate bill 575 for consideration on Wednesday, or at the first opportune moment after that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico to what bill he desires to file minority views?

Mr. HATCH. The bill which requires Senate confirmation of the appointment of all employees receiving more than $4,500 a year.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator any objection to my accompanying the report with another one?

Mr. HATCH. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so, but perhaps I might say, first, that there might be some things which I might not desire to have included. I shall, however, be very glad to see what the Senator desires to have incorporated.

REFUGEE CONFERENCE IN BERMUDA—NEW YORK TIMES ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President I have noted in the RECORD the discussion which took place on Thursday last as to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made reference to it and stated that he had talked to a number of Senators whose names appeared in the advertisement and had been advised that none of them had been informed of the advertisement.

My name happened to have been signed to the advertisement. I am very appreciative of the fact that the senior Senator from Illinois took the trouble to call my attention to it, and I wish to say that I knew nothing about it, as other Senators knew nothing about their names being attached to the advertisement and so stated on Thursday.

I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois, and I am confident that, when the time is propitious, he will make a report concerning the Bermuda Conference. I want to commend him for the part he played in the conference, and in calling the advertisement to my attention and to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely want to take the opportunity to thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for the remarks he has made in connection with the advertisement about which the senior Senator from Illinois had a few words to say on Thursday last. I may add, while I am on my feet, with respect to the advertisement, what I think will be of some interest to the Senate and the country. The individual who is responsible for the advertisement is a gentleman by the name of Peter Bergson, and, by chance, I learned that Mr. Bergson, who saw fit to draft such a condemnatory advertisement against the Bermuda Conference, is not even a citizen of this country. He is now as I understand, a citizen of Palestine. He and four or five other Palestinians are in this country at the present time, preparing full-page advertisements, among which was the one we discussed on the floor of the Senate on Thursday. It seems to me to be rather unusual to find citizens of another country coming here and doing what was done in this particular instance. I did not know this when I made my speech or I would have made reference to it then; but I resent it more than ever, Mr. President, as the result of what I have learned about Mr. Bergson's status, and I should think that Senators who have been "taken in," so to speak—I do not mean to say they have been "taken in," but certain Senators at least were imposed upon—by this advertisement, should also resent it to find an individual who is not an American citizen uses their names to condemn a colleague in the United States Senate without their knowledge or authority. I may have some more to say about Mr. Bergson before this matter is finished.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think the Senator need be surprised, for some of the most violent criticisms directed against Members of the Senate and the House are from aliens, persons not citizens of this country who are enjoying privileges here and who go about saying vicious things. If the Senator would like to have me do so, I will give him a couple of such instances, so that when he takes it up he will have more ammunition.

Mr. LUCAS. I will be delighted to have the Senator do so. I think it is high time that the people of this country and the legislative branch of the Government should seriously consider what the Senator from Kentucky has said with respect to aliens who are here, protected, for the moment, under a visitor's visa, if you please, publishing condemnation of every type and kind against those who are doing their utmost to see that the American way of life may survive. We are all interested in that in the Senate notwithstanding certain reports to the contrary here and there which we read almost every day. There is much in what the Senator from Kentucky says, and the time may come for a showdown with respect to the alien groups, regardless of who they may be, who are here under temporary sufferance at the hands of a benevolent Government which accords them better treatment than they can get in any other place under God's shining sun, and while they are here they take advantage of the courtesy and kindness extended to them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I might say to the Senator that some of the newspapers widely circulate their speeches and "play them up." Any time an alien wants to put his patriotism and his loyalty to this country up against mine, I am ready for the contest. I think we ought to name some of them, and I will furnish the Senator from Illinois some names.

Mr. LUCAS. I will join with the Senator in that contest, and we will go along with him, shoulder to shoulder.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Illinois that my name was attached as one of the members of a committee, but I did not see the advertisement, and did not know that it was published.

The paid advertisement which appeared in the New York Times last Tuesday cast severe aspersions on the members of the committee appointed by the President of the United States, to represent this Nation at a conference in

Bermuda, which conference had been called for the purpose of considering ways and means of solving the problems of the many millions of war refugees who are now suffering untold horrors at the hands of their Axis conquerors.

This advertisement, in addition to attacking the entire conference, by referring to it as "The Bermuda Failure," also makes it appear that a number of Senators have approved this untimely advertisement by permitting their names to be listed in connection with it.

Mr. President, I want to make it known here and now that I have every confidence in the integrity and ability of the committee appointed by the President to represent the United States at the Bermuda Conference. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the able Representative from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the scholarly president of Princeton University, Dr. Harold Dodd, represent a committee whose sympathy, ability, and character are beyond question.

I believe that the advertisement which appeared in the New York Times is untimely, unnecessary, and unhelpful. I certainly do not subscribe to it, and had I been informed of its content and purpose, I would certainly have insisted that my name be omitted.

I, like a number of my colleagues here, agreed to the use of my name by the Jewish people for the purpose of raising a Jewish army based on Palestine to fight on the side of the Allies against Hitler. The use of my name for any other purpose was clearly unauthorized, and I sincerely regret that my name has appeared in connection with this unjust and untimely advertisement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it was Calvin Coolidge who said, "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time." Yet while America fights for her existence, while she stands with her back to the wall, facing the most efficient, the most powerful, the most ruthless, the most barbarous combination of foes ever faced by any people anywhere at any time, and while her sons are writing in human blood new chapters in the story of the valor and bravery of mankind to decide the sole issue at stake, that is, Shall the people of America be free or shall we be enslaved? and while it is admitted that thousands of American soldiers will be unnecessarily maimed and killed unless the weapons of war are speedily manufactured in overwhelming quantities, a group of predatory agitators and labor racketeers have caused and are causing strikes, walk-outs, and slowdowns in the vital war industries of America.

In the year after Pearl Harbor, four and a half million man-days' labor were lost in strikes in American industry. In January, February, and March of this year there were 665 strikes in American industry, involving 204,000 workmen, and in which 850,000 man-days' labor were lost. Furthermore, if reports are true, a larger amount of production was lost by slow-downs in war industry. Men high in authority in the Government state that the American Army, in the midst of a great war, will not be completely equipped until late 1944, or from 15 to 18 months in the future.

In the past few days the miners in the coal industry, over 500,000 in number, have been on strike, and now, by coercion, I believe, but at the direction of their leaders, threaten to strike again. Such a strike would lock the wheels of vital industry, and, if continued for any length of time, would cause the defeat of America, the enslavement of her people, and the slaughter of her sons.

At this hour construction of the pipe line to carry petroleum products from the oil fields of Texas to the homes and industries of the East, and which when finished will release urgently needed tankers to supply across the seas the armies of America, has been stopped because of a strike—a strike which, according to the public press, has been due to the desire of certain agitators—Owen Femmer, Ted Nichwitz, and John Rathouz, labor racketeers—to force those who labor for their country on this construction project to become members of certain labor unions and that before working on this job these workers must join these unions and pay tribute to these racketeers.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a statement showing labor disturbances during the month of April of this year, which were a contribution to the Axis war effort. This statement was recently placed in the Appendix of the RECORD by the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. As I have said, Mr. President, to win this war we must have all-out production from American industry. The paramount duty to his country of every American not in the armed forces is to produce what he is called upon by his Government to produce, and to produce it at his maximum capacity. There is a right to strike in time of peace, but there is no right to strike in time of war. The responsibility for the enactment of antistrike legislation for the duration of the war rests upon the Congress of the United States. We must no longer temporize. We must no longer compromise. We must no longer negotiate. We must no longer conciliate. We must have general legislation which will imprison any man, regardless of who he is, who aids, abets, or encourages any strike or organized slow-down of work. The agitator or racketeer who incites or causes a strike in a war plant, or in any industry engaged in production of armaments or war materials, in my judgment commits a crime against this Government, and should be dealt with accordingly. Strikes are treasonable in effect and character; they sabotage the war effort, endanger the lives of our soldiers, increase the casualties and sacrifices of our men. Because of strikes in this time of war, men can be killed, our Nation destroyed, and our people enslaved.

Mr. President, the bill of the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] passed by the Senate a few days ago is a fine measure. It squarely meets the present coal-strike emergency. It means much to the war effort of this country. It is not an all-comprehensive measure, because it is impossible to pass in one measure comprehensive antistrike legislation. The bill provides for the seizure of and operation by the Government of any plant where production is interrupted by strike or other labor trouble. However, the plant is to be returned to the owners when the labor emergency is over. The bill also makes it a criminal offense for any person to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere with the operation of any plant taken over by the Government, by lockout, strike, slowdown, or other interruption, or to aid any strike by giving direction or guidance in its conduct.

These principles are fine, Mr. President, but the bill is limited in its scope to strikes in plants which have been taken over and are being operated by the Government. The criminal punishment is for strikes against the Government. But we must go further than this. We must have legislation that will stop strikes and organized slowdowns in all war industry, whether operated by the Government or not. To accomplish this we must be able to handle by law the agitator and the racketeer, those who by causing strikes, walk-outs, and lock-outs would cause, attempt to cause, or conspire to cause the stoppage or slowdown of war industry, a law which would force to work that small segment of American labor and industry who would, by strike, lock-out, or organized slowdown, hamper their country's war effort.

Mr. President, to accomplish this purpose, on Tuesday last I introduced in the Senate three bills. They are short bills. They are simple bills. They are important bills. They will accomplish this objective. One bill provides that until the end of the war, as proclaimed by the President, it shall be unlawful for any person to aid, encourage, request, or advise any group of employees, in an attempt to enforce labor demands, to perform less work than the maximum they can perform. It makes it unlawful for him to conspire to do so. It authorizes his incarceration in the penitentiary for a period up to 2 years if he does so, attempts to do, or conspires to do so. This is a simple bill, a just bill. But, Mr. President, the bill goes further—it provides that no person who has been convicted of a violation of the act, and no labor organization in which such person is an officer, can be recognized as a representative of employees for the purposes of any act of Congress.

The second bill amends the National Labor Relations Act to authorize an employer engaged in the production of goods

for the war effort to discharge any employee who, during the war, engages in, aids, or abets any strike or organized slow-down of work among the employees of such employer.

The third bill, Mr. President, would draft strikers in war factories between the ages 18 to 65 into the Army, and reassign them if necessary to their jobs, but without overtime pay for the first 48 hours of labor each week. The loss in this overtime is just. The manufacturers' profits are not increased, because any increase in profits because of the forfeiture of overtime are recaptured by the Government.

Labor is entitled to an adequate wage. Labor is entitled to a square deal. There is now set up and in operation adequate, fair, and impartial machinery to hear, determine, and do justice in all labor disputes. "Give us justice" is the only request that should be made by any group. But should justice be denied, there is still no right at this grave hour to strike against America.

Mr. President, these bills are fair. They are just. They are necessary for the war effort of this country. The need for comprehensive antistrike legislation such as is embodied in these bills is urgent. Congress is the only source of power to prohibit strikes, just as it is the only source of power to draft boys and young men into the Army. It is not enough to say that the Government must first take over and operate the mines and plants before we can stop strikes or organized slowdowns of war production. This course will put the Government to operating the business of the country. I suspect that some labor leaders desire this because they think they can fare better by Government operation, but that is not the American way. However, Government operation should be resorted to wherever necessary to secure production.

The great rank and file of American labor, Mr. President, are just as patriotic as any group of workers anywhere. They are sincere, patriotic, God-fearing Americans—the very cream of civilization. They love their country. Their sons on the islands of the seas, in the skies, beneath the surface of the oceans, and on four continents of this earth are performing heroic feats of valor for their country. They desire to see the war swiftly and decisively won. They desire protection from the racketeer. They desire to have their right to work in defense of their country unhampered and unimpeded by anyone. They desire their boys to quickly return home. They desire to enjoy the fruits of their labor in the American way. This is not a fight on labor; only a very small minority of labor is involved in this conduct. Labor needs protection from the grasping, greedy racketeer. The cause of labor needs protection from the saboteur who parades in labor's robes.

Mr. President, it is no answer to say that a magnificent job has been done upon the production line. The mere fact that our Army will not be completely equipped until late 1944 proves that still much more must be swiftly done. It is not a question of whether or not a man in public life is a friend of labor. It is beyond that. The public interest is paramount. The question is simply whether or not the Congress will see to it that an uninterrupted stream of guns, planes, tanks, and supplies reaches our fighting forces, no matter who gets in the way, and no matter who gets hurt. If it is necessary to suspend some rights for the duration, then they must be suspended; everyone must sacrifice. If saboteurs masquerade in labor's clothes, they must be ferreted out and treated like any other saboteur. A saboteur clothed with labor's power is more dangerous than the experts trained in destruction, whom Hitler recently sent to our shores, some of whom were very promptly executed.

This, Mr. President, is the greatest internal question that confronts wartime America. Sabotage must be prevented; it must be punished, whether it comes from within or without. The soldier on the firing line demands these principles. The fathers and mothers of America, of every race and creed, demand them. America is sovereign. A great people's just demands must be fulfilled.

EXHIBIT 1

CHICAGO, April 2.—A dispute over seniority rights of two workers halted production of war materials today at Ford Motor Co.'s assembly plant here.

SALT LAKE CITY, April 3.—Mill workers called off a threatened strike (after receiving raise) that would have halted a fourth of the Nation's copper production.

PITTSBURGH, April 4.—An estimated 1,600 American Federation of Labor laborers went on strike today at the Kobuta synthetic rubber plant here, declaring the United States wage adjustment board had refused their demands for a pay increase.

NEW KENSINGTON, PA., April 5.—The Aluminum Corporation of America disclosed today that its Army-Navy E award has been withdrawn because of loss of production hours due to strikes.

LANSING, MICH., April 6.—United Workers Association union, Committee of Industrial Organizations affiliate, has recommended that the Government permit, sponsor, or direct a 5 percent monthly bonus for workers who have a perfect attendance record.

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The War Labor is studying an incentive pay bonus pay to increase production in "problem plants" of the aircraft industry.

DETROIT, April 8.—A work stoppage interrupted production of war vehicles in the Highland Park plant of the Ford Motor Co. here today, affecting 5,000 workers.

DETROIT, April 9.—A wage dispute that caused men in the transportation division of Ford Motor Co.'s River Rouge plant to stop work hampered production of amphibian jeeps.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 10.—Workers involved in a work stoppage at two war plants here tonight were facing immediate induction into the armed services, draft board officials announced.

GARY, IND., April 11.—Production halted today in the No. 5 shop at Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation's Gary plant after union steel workers refused to work due to a grievance the nature of which was not clear. The shop produced high-grade armor plate.

NEWARK, N. J., April 12.—Labor troubles involved two important New Jersey war industries today. At Bendix Aviation Corporation's plant at Bendix workers who walked out yesterday were dismissed.

CLEVELAND, April 13.—United Automobile Workers at Thompson Products, Inc., major producer of aircraft parts, went on strike in protest against the dismissal of 12 men.

TOLEDO, Ohio, April 14.—President of the Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., said today the plant's Army jeep assembly line was closed and 2,500 workers thrown into idleness as the result of a strike at the Spicer Manufacturing Co., which provides axles for jeeps.

WASHINGTON, April 15.—The Chairman of the War Labor Board told strikers at the Universal Cement Co.'s plant at Universal, Pa., today that they were violating labor's pledge.

TROY, N. Y., April 16.—Operations in the blast furnace of the Republic Steel Corporation's plant here were suspended today when members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations' United Steel Workers Union walked out in protest over dismissal of a master mechanic.

CHICAGO, April 17.—A partial strike at the Illinois Gear & Machine Co. has affected war production in a protest against the dismissal of Richard Keith, union official, on charges of absenteeism.

SAN FRANCISCO, April 19.—United States District Judge A. F. St. Sure dismissed indictments against 78 members of an American Federation of Labor painters' union who had refused to paint Government housing projects with spray guns because it would cut down available work for the union's members.

HOQUIAM, April 20.—Workers returned to the Hoquiam plant of Rayonier, Inc., after a 10-day strike resulting from a Congress of Industrial Organizations-American Federation of Labor jurisdictional dispute. Officials said the plant is making vital war material.

EDGEWATER, N. J., April 21.—Several thousand workers of the Edgewater plant of the Aluminum Co. of America were under local union orders to strike Thursday.

HARLAN, KY., April 22.—A 2-week strike of workers at two mines at Louellen, Ky., ended today, but 2,000 men remained idle at 3 other struck mines in southwestern Kentucky.

PITTSBURGH, April 23.—Pennsylvania plants producing 12,000 tons of fuel daily for war-busy steel mills were closed by a coal miners' walk-out.

NEWARK, N. J., April 24.—Strikers at the Celanese Corporation of America's big plant here continued picketing today after President Roosevelt ordered them to return to work. War Labor Board said the strike had curtailed vital war production and hampered 21 other plants.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 25.—Approximately 4,500 United Mine Workers' Union members went on strike here yesterday.

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Although United Mine Workers' spokesmen said no work stoppages had been authorized, 10,000 miners laid down their tools, and there were reports of slow-downs in some pits continuing to produce war-vital fuel.

NEW YORK, April 27.—John L. Lewis raised the threat of a full-scale soft-coal strike tonight. * * * By the day's end 50 mines were closed, and 28,000 miners had put down their tools.

CLEVELAND, April 28.—Unionists on Cleveland streetcar and bus lines struck at midnight tonight * * * ignoring a plea of Under Secretary of War Patterson to call off the strike.

LACKAWANNA, N. Y., April 29.—The strike in the billet yard of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation's Lackawanna plant has seriously impeded output of urgently needed alloy steel for war products, the plant manager said.

BOW LAKE, April 30.—Work on the Seattle-Tacoma airport was at a standstill, with members of the operating engineers' union still on strike.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Carleton F. Bryant to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from September 25, 1942.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN S. CHANDLER, JR., TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. LANGER, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted his individual views on the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., for appointment as United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, which were ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hayden	Scrugham
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the postmaster nominations and confirm all such nominations except that of Antoinette T. McKechnie. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] has asked that the nomination of Antoinette T. McKechnie be reported unfavorably, and it has been so reported. Therefore, I ask that all the nominations except the first one on the calendar be confirmed, and that the nomination of Antoinette T. McKechnie be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, except that of Antoinette T. McKechnie? The Chair hears none; and, without objection the nominations, except that of Antoinette T. McKechnie, are confirmed.

ANTOINETTE T. MCKECHNIE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Antoinette T. McKechnie to be postmaster at Gearhart, Oreg.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the nomination be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was rejected.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of the nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATION OF STEPHEN S. CHANDLER, JR.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, sometimes it is hard to do one's duty. I face such a situation now as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which was referred the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

As is well known, a United States district judge holds a position of exceptionally extraordinary power, and he holds the position for life. Not even the President who appoints him can remove him, but under the Constitution of our country he can be removed only by impeachment—something which has happened but rarely.

Especially in these trying times, a United States district judge often holds in his hand the life or death of citizens, and, by the power given him, he can practically instruct a jury to bring in a verdict in cases which may involve just that, or in other cases which may involve vast sums of money. His powers are much greater than those of a judge of a district court of a State. Federal judges upon the district bench have almost the powers of a czar, and some of them have been tyrannical enough to misuse their powers.

In a matter relative to Oklahoma, where the value of oil fields runs into the billions of dollars, in a matter pertaining to that great, splendid State which has furnished so many outstanding citizens who have become leaders in the arts, in science, in medicine, in business, and in statesmanship, it is especially important that the Senate do its duty and exercise the highest degree of care. The Senate should be sure to do so in taking action on the pending nomination, because under the Constitution every Member who votes to confirm the nomination is responsible for the appointment.

The President alone cannot place Mr. Chandler in the position to which he has been nominated. The Senate alone cannot place him there. The President and the Senate jointly, acting together, can make Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., United States district judge. No other power on earth can do so.

Mr. President, I oppose the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Chandler. I do so because conscientiously I feel I

would be a coward to sit idly by while such a terrible outrage was being perpetrated upon the people of the great State of Oklahoma. A people with a history as fine as theirs, the people of a State which has such an outstanding record of achievement, certainly deserve a better fate and a finer service than the United States Senate would render by the confirmation of this person to the highest judicial position in Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I take my position against this appointment with regret, but I feel impelled to do so for the following reasons: When we accept the responsibility of office as United States Senators we accept the responsibility for performance of unpleasant duties, as well as pleasant ones. It is never pleasant to refuse to confirm a nomination for such an office after the name has been submitted. Under the existing circumstances I see no other alternative. I have no interest in who is appointed to fill this vacancy. My action comes solely from my own conception of my duty. I had never known of Mr. Chandler before his name was submitted to the Senate. I know that he is highly regarded by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If for no other reason, I should have liked to be able to take another view of this matter, but I cannot do so for the reasons I shall now state.

This judgeship was created by an act of Congress approved by the President on May 24, 1940. The bill was introduced in the House on June 5, 1939. It passed that body on March 14, 1940. It passed the Senate on April 16, 1940. So it appears that this judgeship has remained unfilled for about 3 years. Mr. Chandler's name was before the Department of Justice, not only during all this time but it appeared there before the bill was passed. Is it unfair, therefore, to assume that there was considerable reluctance, on the part of those charged with the duty of making the recommendation and the nomination, to submit the name? I think not, and I think the reason is apparent.

It appears without dispute that about 8 years ago Mr. Chandler was charged with assaulting a stenographer in his office about 10 o'clock one evening. I do not care at this time to review the details of the charge. The complaint was not before either the subcommittee or the full committee, but a good deal of hearsay evidence was examined. Mr. Chandler admits that he paid $3,000 to settle the matter. Apparently he chose to do this rather than to resist a determination of the issue in court. I do not pass any judgment as to the truth or falsity of the charge made. I do not think it would be entirely fair to do so, with the evidence presented before us in this manner, after a long period of years. I do not know why Mr. Chandler chose to pay this sum of money. He might have done so for the obvious reason of avoiding embarrassment or publicity, although innocent. If he did, it would not be an isolated instance. But, as I view it, it indicated a weakness of character that would serve to disqualify him for this appointment. Of course, if he settled the case for other reasons, it would definitely disqualify him. It may be that he was unfortunate. But I believe we have no right to indulge in speculation. The issue is too serious. Surely in the great State of Oklahoma there are many lawyers who are well qualified and whose appointment could be confirmed, and with respect to whose qualifications from every standpoint no doubt would exist.

When we realize that a United States district court judge has virtually a life office, and that he cannot be removed other than through the outmoded, archaic method of impeachment, and when we consider that he has almost exclusive power over the progress, liberty, and even the lives of our citizens, what more need be said concerning the importance of our action?

No graver responsibility could rest upon the United States Senate than its function of confirming the nominations of judicial officers. It should be exercised with the utmost care and scrupulousness. We have no privilege of speculation. We have a positive duty to reject whenever a genuine doubt exists.

For these reasons, I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler to be a United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments of the time of the Senate.

This position is a new Federal judgeship for the western district of Oklahoma. The western district has been served for 15 years by Judge Edgar S. Vaught, an outstanding jurist of my State of Oklahoma. Judge Vaught has tried more than 1,000 cases a year during the time he has been a Federal district judge.

About 3 years ago the conference of senior circuit judges met and decided that some new positions in the Federal judiciary were necessary to take care of the accumulated business. This conference decided that the western district of Oklahoma should have one of the new places, for the reason, as stated, that Judge Vaught was required to try more than a thousand cases a year, which is more than three cases a day, making no allowance for Sundays or holidays.

The bill was introduced in the House and came to the Senate for consideration. The Senate accepted the recommendation of the conference of senior circuit judges, and agreed to the House bill, and the new position was created.

As soon as the position was created my former colleague, Senator Lee, and I, submitted a recommendation to the Department of Justice for the filling of this position. The position was not filled immediately, but the nomination came to the Senate last session too late to secure action at the hands of the Senate. As I remember, the nomination came to the Senate on the 11th of December. The Judiciary Committee has a rule requiring a full week's time to be given for those who may desire to submit objections or to file protests. The time set last session was to expire December 22.

Congress adjourned on December 16. So the time for the filing of protests had not expired. Of course, with the expiration of the Congress, the nomination likewise died. Suffice it to say that no protests were filed from the State or from that district during that period.

At the beginning of the present session the name of Mr. Chandler was again submitted to the Senate for confirmation, and again a period of time was set by the Judiciary Committee for hearing complaints and protests. For the second time no protests were filed. The subcommittee made a report to the full committee, and the full committee, after due consideration, recommended confirmation at the hands of the Senate.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks a statement giving excerpts from recommendations in favor of the appointment of Mr. Chandler to be a Federal judge.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATA RELATIVE BACKGROUND OF NOMINEE

Born September 13, 1899, on a farm in Blount County, Tenn.

Moved to Oklahoma City in December 1908. Attended Oklahoma City public schools. Graduated from high school June 1916. Went to business college and worked as a stenographer.

In September 1917 entered the University of Tennessee, completing this first year cum laude.

September 1918 applied to Machine Gun Officers Training School. Was admitted and went to camp.

In January 1919 entered the University of Kansas, completing law course in June 1922 with LLB degree. Worked way through college as stenographer. Was on dean's honor roll each term during attendance at law school.

In June 1922 admitted to bar of Oklahoma and became associated with firm of Wilson, Tomerlin, and Threlkeld in Oklahoma City. Name present law firm is Chandler, Shelton, and Fowler. Has had more than 20 years active law practice in Oklahoma City.

Admitted to the Supreme Court of the United States, April 1926.

Member Rotary Club of Oklahoma City since 1926.

Member Oklahoma State and American Bar Associations.

Member City Planning Commission of Oklahoma City and Civic Beautification Committee of Oklahoma City.

In June 1922 married Margaret Patterson of Fredonia, Kans., his present wife, of which marriage there are three children: Frances Patterson Chandler, age 13; Stephen Chandler 3d, age 10; and Frank Patterson Chandler, age 4.

Member St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ENDORSEMENTS

The nominee was endorsed by both Oklahoma Senators for the appointment during the Seventy-seventh Congress. The nominee was endorsed by both Oklahoma Senators prior to his appointment in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

In order to be more specific, we have taken excerpts from letters of recommendation and endorsements and report same herewith and as follows:

Hon. Robert S. Kerr, Governor of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have been informed that the name of Stephen S. Chandler, of this city, has been suggested to your Department for appointment to the position of judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. It is also my understanding that other members of the bar are aspiring for this position; or, at any rate, the names

of others have been suggested by their friends and supporters. I have not taken any active interest as between candidates for this appointment in the sense of preferring one over the other, or urging the appointment of one as against the others who might be considered.

"* * * In justice to Mr. Chandler, I do want to state that I have known him for a number of years as a member of the bar and a citizen of Oklahoma City. During all of this period he has enjoyed the reputation of being a man of high character and standing at the bar and rated one of the prominent lawyers at the bar of Oklahoma City. * * * I regard him as one who, from the standpoint of qualification and character, is fully qualified to fill this position."

Hon. MIKE MONRONEY, Congressman from the Fifth District of Oklahoma:

"It is my understanding that Mr. Steve Chandler, of Oklahoma City, is being considered for the vacancy in the newly created judgeship in the western district of Oklahoma. I am writing to join Senator THOMAS in recommending Mr. Chandler for your most serious consideration for this position.

"I have known him for more than 20 years and I regard him most highly. He has long been recognized as one of the most able attorneys in Oklahoma, and has had an important and highly varied legal practice there. He is fitted by his personality and training to make an excellent judge, in my opinion, and would distinguish himself in that capacity.

"Mr. Chandler has long been a civic leader, has entered into the active life for the betterment of Oklahoma City and has, to my knowledge, taken an active interest in boys' work and other enterprises of a civic nature. At the present time he is president of the Oklahoma City Rotary Club, one of the leading civic organizations in our State.

"He has always been a loyal Democrat, and is sincerely interested in fostering the great principles of our party. Mr. Chandler is a graduate of the University of Kansas and was one of the honor students in that school. His family also is one of the most prominent in Oklahoma, and I am certain that his appointment would be greeted with strong approval there.

"Any consideration extended to him in this matter will be greatly appreciated."

CHURCH SUPPORT

Francis C. Kelley, bishop of Oklahoma City and Tulsa:

"I have met Mr. Chandler a number of times. He impressed me very favorably by his appearance and by his conversation. I have been told that he stands high in the community as a citizen and amongst the legal fraternity as a lawyer. He seems to be a quiet and thoughtful man. Qualities like that are needed where logic and judgment are required."

Rabbi Joseph Blatt, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Thursday evening, at a meeting of the Oklahoma City Men's Dinner Club, I had a talk with Stephen Chandler of this city. He told me of the possibility of his appointment to a United States Federal judgeship. I was very pleased to hear this because I have known Stephen for many years and highly esteem him, not only as an able young man, but also for his sense of fairness, his broadmindedness, and his good common sense. Of my own free will I offered to write to you about him. He seemed to appreciate the offer so much that this letter is the result. I do think that his appointment would be well merited."

Dr. Forney Hutchinson, pastor, Boston Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church South, Tulsa, Okla.:

"I write to commend to your favor Mr. Stephen Chandler of your city, who is being considered for the new judgeship recently created in Oklahoma. If you can use any of your wholesome influence to help him, I am sure you would never regret it. I have known him since he was a boy and think very highly of his character and ability.

"Thanking you for any consideration you may give this suggestion and regretting that I see so little of you in these last days, I I am * * *."

Dr. Clovis G. Chappell, pastor, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"This is just a brief note to tell you how happy many of us are that you are considering Mr. Stephen S. Chandler for commission of Federal judge. Mr. Chandler is a member of my church. He has personality, ability, and character. It is my firm and sincere conviction that he will fill with fidelity and honor the position for which he is being considered."

ENDORSEMENT BY LABOR

Harry Schwartz, president, Tulsa Federation of Labor, Tulsa, Okla.:

"Understand Stephen Chandler is being considered for Federal judgeship appointment for Oklahoma. I wish you would consider this as a complete endorsement in behalf of Chandler's appointment."

Walter Smith, president, Oklahoma State Federation of Labor:

"I understand Stephen Chandler is being considered by you for appointment as Federal judge. I wish to place my name in his column of endorsements knowing he will be fair and just to the laboring people."

Joe Campbell, former president, State Federation of Labor, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"My friend Stephen Chandler is qualified to serve as Federal district judge of western district of Oklahoma. His appointment would be pleasing to me."

Jack Woods, editor, Shield of Labor, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"We recommend Stephen Chandler for appointment to Federal district judgeship western district of Oklahoma."

Leonard H. Dickerson, chairman, labor council, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I want to add my personal endorsement of Mr. Stephen Chandler for Federal judge western district of Oklahoma. Mr. Chandler has been my personal friend many years. I have been associated with him in numerous civic affairs for which he has generously given himself. I have investigated him from the standpoint of organized labor and he is entirely satisfactory to us. We would appreciate earnest consideration of Mr. Chandler for this post."

Jack N. Hays, president, Local 217, Oil Workers Union, Tulsa, Okla.:

"Personal interview with Steve Chandler satisfied me as to his fitness for judgeship western district of Oklahoma. Would be pleased by his appointment."

J. Cline House, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"After thorough investigation Oklahoma City Trades and Labor Council by unanimous vote tonight endorsed Stephen Chandler for Federal judge."

Clyde McReynolds, president, and Dial Murphy, secretary, Oklahoma City Local Oil Workers Union 232, Oklahoma City, Okla.

"We respectfully request the appointment of Stephen Chandler as Federal judge of the western district."

OKLAHOMA COURTS

Judge Edgar S. Vaught, Federal district judge for the western district of Oklahoma:

"Have known Chandler for more than 30 years. Knew his family before him. He is a man of the highest integrity, splendid ability, educational qualifications and ranks among the brightest and most successful lawyers of this bar."

Justice Wayne Bayless, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I wish to advise you that the standing, ability, and reputation of Mr. Stephen Chandler is in all respects A 1. I consider Mr. Chandler honest, able, and conscientious, and he bears a splendid reputation as an active practitioner. I can truthfully say that I have never heard his honesty, ability, or ethics criticized in any manner."

Justice Thurman S. Hurst, member of the supreme court of Oklahoma:

"I have known of Mr. Chandler for a number of years and have been slightly acquainted with him for the past 3 years. It is my opinion that Mr. Chandler is well qualified for the Federal judgeship. I regard Mr. Chandler as a good lawyer and a gentleman of high standing."

Judge George H. Giddings, Jr., of the thirteenth judicial district, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Mr. Steve Chandler of Oklahoma City, I understand, has been prominently mentioned in connection with the new Federal judgeship for the western district of Oklahoma. In my opinion he is one of the best qualified members of this bar for this position. There is no question but what an additional judge is needed in this district. Steve is young, active, and alert and would be of inestimable value to this district in getting its legal affairs in shape. He would be a credit to Oklahoma and to his friends who are interested in his welfare and the welfare of the State.

"I hope you will not feel I am presumptuous in writing this letter and it is not being written at the request or behest of Mr. Chandler. He has been before me since I have been on the bench, many times, and I have had every opportunity to observe him in and out of the courtroom, and for that reason I am writing this letter."

Judge Lucius Babcock of the thirteenth judicial district of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"S. S. Chandler of Oklahoma City is an applicant for appointment as judge of the United States District Court being provided in Oklahoma by act of Congress. I have been quite intimately acquainted with Mr. Chandler over a period of approximately 15 years and am sure that he is eminently qualified, both professionally and personally, to fill that position with credit to the office."

Judge Clarence Mills of the thirteenth judicial district, State of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"The name of Stephen Chandler was mentioned yesterday in the local papers as one being considered for a Federal judicial position. May I be permitted to write you that I have known this man rather intimately for over 15 years, and during that time have formed an opinion of him as a man, as a citizen, and as a lawyer, based upon actual association and experience.

"He is now and at all times has been an upright, honorable, and industrious man, and a civic-minded, unselfish citizen. He is a lawyer endowed by nature and study with outstanding ability, and has absolutely unquestioned integrity. He bears a most excellent reputation in this community and enjoys the full and complete confidence and respect of the bench and bar, both Federal and State.

"It is a pleasure for me to write this letter. It is a patriotic duty to do so."

Judge Sam Hooker of the thirteenth judicial district of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have held public office in Oklahoma County since 1907, most of which has been in the judicial branch here, and I have known Mr. Chandler since he was a boy in is teens and I have never known or heard until this day anything derogatory of him. * * * I

know he is a good lawyer. I know he is a good citizen and a good man; and I firmly believe his appointment will be a credit to the judicial department of this Federal district. If I did not think so I would not write this letter."

Judge S. W. Hayes, member of the constitutional convention and former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Mr. Chandler's boyhood and young manhood were spent in a home just across the street from my own home and residence in Oklahoma City. I knew his father's family quite intimately, and knew Mr. Chandler as a boy, a youth, and a young man intimately. He comes from a fine family, and his life and habits as a youth and young man were exemplary. Since he matured into manhood and engaged in the practice of law, I have not come so frequently in contact with him as during his earlier life, but throughout the past 25 or more years, I can number him constantly among my intimate acquaintances, and have contacted him occasionally in his professional work as a lawyer.

* * * * *

"I was a member of the constitutional convention of this State, a member of its first supreme court, and served for a period of 7 years on that court, and have been a member of the bar of Oklahoma City ever since. I am at present a member of the board of directors of the Oklahoma City branch of the Federal reserve bank, and president of the chamber of commerce. I therefore have had, and now have, opportunity to know fairly well the standing of the more prominent lawyers at the bar of Oklahoma City and of the State.

* * * * *

"I recommend Mr. Chandler for the appointment of this position with the confidence that he will make a competent judge and will acquit himself with credit in this important position."

Judge Robert M. Rainey, former member of the State supreme court, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"We strongly desire to urge your favorable consideration of Stephen Chandler for district judge and sincerely trust that you will be able to recommend his appointment."

SUPPORT OF EDUCATORS

Miss Helen Ferris, teacher, Central High School, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have known him since he was just a lad. I was fortunate enough to be one of his teachers when he was in high school and I have kept in touch with him since. He is smart, quick, energetic, unafraid of work, and a most likable young man. I know of no better choice and I sincerely hope that the position will be his."

Dr. W. B. Bizzell, president, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.:

"I know Steve Chandler well and I regard him very highly. As you know, he has the reputation of being one of the best lawyers in Oklahoma City; and above all else, he is a man of high character. I think he has all the qualities required for a judgeship.

"Mr. Chandler has recently been elected president of the Oklahoma City Rotary Club, which is a fine recognition of his personality and popularity. There is no question that Steve Chandler's appointment would be a very popular one in Oklahoma."

John O. Moseley, dean of students, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.:

"I have just been interviewed by an investigator from the Department of Justice, from which I conclude that Mr. Stephen Chandler, attorney at law, Oklahoma City, Okla., is being considered for an important Federal position. I was happy indeed to be able to inform the investigator that Mr. Chandler was a student at the University of Tennessee in 1917-18, and that he took the regular liberal arts course while here, being on the dean's honor list with the notation 'cum laude.' In all respects Mr. Chandler was an exemplary student and showed the qualities of initiative, civic-mindedness and leadership which he has displayed since leaving the University of Tennessee.

"It occurs to me that during World War No. 1, you and I were members of the student detachment of the American Expeditionary Forces assigned for study in the British Isles. I was a Rhodes scholar at the time and a member of Merton College, Oxford University. While our paths did not cross and I am sure that you do not remember me, I use this association as an excuse to write a note directly to you concerning Mr. Chandler.

"I lived in Oklahoma 30 years, being a professor of Latin at the University of Oklahoma for nearly 20 years and president of the Central State Teachers College, Edmond, Okla., for 4 years, resigning the latter position on July 1, 1939, to become dean of students at the University of Tennessee. During that period of time I was personally acquainted with Mr. Chandler and know directly of the splendid reputation he has in that State. For many years he has enjoyed the highest rating as a member of the bar, is scrupulously honest, and has proved himself to be interested and altruistic in all matters pertaining to the civic welfare. He has never sought political office and outside of the practice of his profession, his efforts have been largely confined to nonpartisan movements for the benefit of his community. I feel that I can state accurately that Mr. Chandler's appointment would meet with spontaneous approval in all circles throughout the State of Oklahoma. Trusting that this appraisal will be of some service to you and hoping for an opportunity to meet you in the near future."

SUPPORT OF OKLAHOMA LAWYERS

Charles B. Cochran, member of the law firm of Ames, Cochran, Monnet, Hayes & Ames, of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I understand that Stephen Chandler, of Oklahoma City, is being considered for appointment to the recently created judgeship for the western district of Oklahoma. Mr. Chandler is one of the leading practitioners in the western district. In experience, ability, temperament, and character he is well qualified for appointment to this position, and I recommend his appointment."

Coleman Hayes, member of the firm of Ames, Cochran, Monnet, Hayes & Ames, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"It is my opinion, shared, I believe, by most of the other members of the bar, that Mr. Chandler is able, industrious, and ethical in his practice. I feel that he is well qualified to fill the position and that he is the type of man who, if he should be appointed, would take the responsibilities which accompany the office seriously and exert every effort to fill the position in the manner desired by you and all of us.

"I know of nothing which should stand in the way of his appointment and I commend you for the attitude you have taken with respect to it."

Henry S. Griffing, attorney at Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have observed in daily newspapers the proposed appointment of Mr. Stephen Chandler as judge for the newly created United States circuit judge for the western district of Oklahoma. I desire to submit my recommendations for your consideration.

"I believe Mr. Stephen Chandler is eminently qualified for this position. His intellect and temperament are ideal for the bench.

"I have known Mr. Chandler for the past 10 years. He is above reproach as a gentleman, scholar, and lawyer. He is considered one of the strong members of the Oklahoma Bar. He has held many positions of trust and responsibility in this community and has fulfilled the duties of such positions to the admiration of the entire community. In business and profession, he is known for his integrity, splendid ideals, and his adherence to a high standard of ethics.

"As a lawyer, he is known for his courteous and scholarly ability.

"In his private life, he is a devoted father and husband with an excellent family background.

"In my opinion, Mr. Chandler will be a distinct credit to the Federal bench of this Nation."

Tazewell Roger Upshaw, a prominent busiman in Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"The entire family joins me in addressing you on behalf of our very good friend and attorney, Mr. Stephen Chandler, of Oklahoma City, who is being considered for appointment as Federal judge of this district. I do not know what is usual in these matters but I do want to express the opinion of my entire family and, I am sure, the opinion of the community. We consider him most able in his profession, a gentleman in every respect, and a true loyal friend at all times and in all conditions.

"If appointed to this position we know that he will give the years of his life and his efforts to bring credit due to the position and to himself.

"I am writing without the knowledge of Mr. Chandler, merely out of friendship for him with the hope that such friendship of our family in some manner will assist him."

B. A. Ames, member of the law firm of Ames, Cochran, Monnet, Hayes & Ames, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have known Stephen Chandler, who is under consideration for appointment as United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, for many years. He is an able lawyer, thoroughly ethical, and eminently fitted for the place through training and experience

"I would be very much pleased to see him have the appointment, and want to urge you to do whatever you can in his behalf."

Earl Pruet, law firm of Hayes, Richardson, Shartel & Gilliland, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"It is my understanding that Stephen Chandler has the approval of both United States Senators from this State for appointment as United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, and that the appointment is at this time before the Department of Justice for its consideration.

"I have known Mr. Chandler and his firm by reputation for a number of years, and have known Mr. Chandler personally for something more than 3 years. His firm is considered one of the leading law firms in Oklahoma City. His former partner, John Tomerlin, was one of the grand old men of the local bar.

"Mr. Chandler has had a varied experience, both in State and Federal courts, in the active trial of lawsuits, and he has also had considerable experience as a counselor and office lawyer.

* * * * *

"I feel sure that if appointed Mr. Chandler will serve with credit to himself and honor to his Government in that capacity."

J. R. Keaton, law firm of Keaton, Wells & Johnston, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"The information has reached me that Mr. Stephen Chandler is an applicant for the position of United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

"I have known Mr. Chandler for a number of years. He is an outstanding lawyer, with a splendid reputation for integrity, ability, and industry, and I think he is particularly well qualified to fill that position. I recommend him for your favorable consideration."

B. B. Blakeney, member law firm Blakeney, Wallace Brown & Blakeney, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have known Mr. Chandler for many years; in fact, since his boyhood, and I am

writing this letter utterly unsolicited and without his knowledge. Of course, I am interested in the Federal judges, and I have looked over the State each time to find a candidate qualified and available for such appointment. I do not believe that there is any lawyer who has been mentioned possessing the qualifications possessed by Mr. Chandler. He commenced the practice of law in Oklahoma City, and has spent practically all his life here. I came here 20 years ago, and became acquainted with him soon afterward. He was then regarded as a young man of exemplary habits, and since then has diligently applied himself to the study and practice of the law. I think he has all the qualifications for a judge, and his ethical standards are very high. I, therefore, without reservation, recommend him for such appointment."

J. B. Dudley, member law firm Dudley, Hyde, Duvall & Dudley, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Mr. Stephen S. Chandler, of this city, is an applicant, as I understand, for this position, and I heartily recommend him for your consideration. I have known him for many years. He is a sound, seasoned lawyer, honorable, trustworthy, and reliable, and I believe would make a creditable Federal district judge.

* * * * *

"I am not writing this letter at his request or with his knowledge. I believe that I am reasonably well acquainted with the character and reputation of Mr. Chandler. I have been at the bar for many years and am much concerned in having good lawyers on the Federal bench, and indulge the hope that you will give consideration to the application of Mr. Chandler."

BUSINESS ENDORSEMENTS

Kenneth Quay, an accountant of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have known Steve ever since we were boys together in high school. Your assistance in securing him the appointment to the vacancy on the Federal bench should be appreciated by every person who believes in democracy and good government.

"He is honest, capable, and will fit the position of Federal judge honestly, capably, and will not discredit those who are urging his appointment."

Harry H. Turner, businessman, of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Mr. Chandler is, in my opinion, an able lawyer of unquestioned integrity and possesses a good reputation. He and the other members of his firm are highly regarded here as lawyers and gentlemen.

"If appointed to the Federal judiciary, Mr. Chandler would, in my view, occupy his position with dignity, sincerity, and ability."

Allen Street, businessman, of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Personally, I believe the appointment of Steve Chandler as United States judge to the western district of Oklahoma would be a very fine appointment and very happily received by the citizens of Oklahoma. I have known Steve for a long time, and believe him to be upright, intelligent, and well qualified in every respect."

H. M. Johnson, president of the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have known Mr. Chandler for about 20 years, as a boy and later as an attorney and citizen here in Oklahoma City. At one time his firm was employed by this bank. I have had a good opportunity to observe and know Mr. Chandler throughout a considerable period of time. His firm is, and has been for some time, considered one of the leading firms in Oklahoma City. They are all men of splendid character and excellent standing in the legal bar.

"As to Mr. Chandler personally, he has always merited the highest respect of the members of his profession and of the laymen of this city from a standpoint of his ability as an attorney as well as his moral and financial integrity.

"Mr. Chandler has a good background from a family standpoint. His parents came here in the early days and were estimable people. His wife is a splendid lady of ample means and he has a fine family of children.

"I feel quite sure that if Mr. Chandler is appointed to this position of trust he will discharge the duties of the office with credit to himself and honor to the Government which he will be serving. If I did not feel so, I would not write this letter."

John G. Harrington, banker, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Mr. Chandler is the senior member of the law firm of Chandler, Shelton, Fowler & Swinford, who are leading attorneys of our city. He has shown excellent ability in his profession and is a man of the highest integrity. I have known Mr. Chandler personally for 25 years and have the highest regard for him in every way. It is my humble opinion that he has the ability, character, and integrity to amply qualify him for a Federal judgeship."

Kent B. Hayes, vice president and trust officer of the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"In regard to Mr. Stephen S. Chandler of this city, who has been receiving consideration for appointment to the above referred to position, the writer wishes to state that it has been his privilege to know Mr. Chandler rather intimately for some 25 years, and in all that period has never known him to commit an act that would reflect to the detriment of his reputation, either morally, financially, or otherwise.

"Since his graduation from law school he has been a member of a rather prominent firm of attorneys, which has enjoyed a most excellent reputation as to ability, integrity, etc., not only with the bar association but the business interests of this community. Mr. Chandler is a man of sound judgment, both legally and financially, all of which causes him to enjoy a most excellent standing and hold the respect not only of his colleagues and friends, but the community at large.

"It is the writer's sincere opinion that should Mr. Chandler receive the appointment to the position he seeks he would discharge its serious responsibilities with credit to himself and the Government which he would be serving."

W. E. Hightower, vice president of the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"It is my pleasure to submit to you for your favorable consideration the name of Mr. Stephen Chandler, an attorney of Oklahoma City, whom I do not hesitate to recommend. He is one of our most able attorneys; an excellent citizen; a man of unquestionable integrity and enjoys a most commendable reputation throughout the State as well as among members of the bar association.

"Throughout his life he has been a most conscientious and loyal supporter of the Democratic Party, and I know of no one in the State who could be recommended more strongly than Mr. Chandler. He was born in this State and has practiced his profession in Oklahoma City since receiving his law degree."

Fred M. Carter, representing the Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Co., Bartlesville, Okla.:

"I have known Mr. Chandler for a number of years, and my acquaintance and association with him has been such that enabled me to know him intimately as a lawyer of ability and a gentleman of integrity.

"I shall appreciate it very much if you will lend your influence in support of Mr. Chandler's appointment to this position."

Moss Patterson, vice president of the Oklahoma Transportation Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"He is well qualified for the appointment, and I feel that if the matter were left to a vote of the people of this district, he would easily win, because he is one of the best-known and well-liked citizens in this part of the country. He has been very active in civic work, and only yesterday was elected president of the Oklahoma City Rotary Club.

"From my years of acquaintance with him, I have no hesitancy in saying that he is one of the most honorable men I have ever known. He has never represented me or my company in any litigation, but I have watched him in action in the courts of our State, and consider him tops when it comes to ability."

R. T. Fredericks, care of Daily News, Miami, Fla.:

"It has come to my attention that Stephen Chandler, of Oklahoma City, is being considered for Federal judgeship by the Department of Justice, which Department is checking his record.

"In all my life I have never interceded to help a man get a political appointment or a job, and it is not with the idea of helping Steve that I am writing this letter. I am writing this because I know that Steve Chandler is the sort of a man that President Roosevelt or you would select for an important job if you knew him.

"Steve is the sort that has worked hard and made a little money. Well bred and educated. He is the Roosevelt type of man, who is imbued with social consciousness and who instinctively recognizes human rights over property rights. Lowell, I know this fellow. I know his mind and his heart, and I know when he grows old, he will not become hardened or unsympathetic to the real problems of humanity. Steve is a man around 40 years old and experienced in the ways of law and life. He is decent, refined, and certainly one of the best lawyers in Oklahoma. I know that if you knew him like I know him, and I say I really know him, you would do everything in your power to see that this judgeship falls in his hands.

"As before said, Lowell, I am inspired to write this letter for the sole reason that I know that Steve Chandler presents the rare opportunity for us to perpetuate the liberal views that we mutually hold. I understand that Senator THOMAS is sponsoring Steve and that Lee is agreeable to his appointment and that the Attorney General looks upon it with favor. Thus, of course, he needs only the Presidential approval, which will likely be requested by the Attorney General very soon."

C. F. Urschel, of Slick-Urschel Oil Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I wish to take this opportunity to recommend Stephen Chandler of Oklahoma City, for your consideration for appointment to a Federal judgeship.

"I have just returned from New York City and while there the New York office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation contacted and interviewed me with respect to Mr. Chandler's qualifications, including character and general reputation in this community. It was through these channels that I learned he was being considered for possible appointment.

"My acquaintance with Mr. Chandler has extended over a long period of years and it was with the greatest of pleasure that I was able to recommend him most highly. He has been successful in his chosen profession and is most highly regarded by all who know him.

"I have no fear of the future of this country so long as our judiciary is composed of individuals of the type, character, integrity, and ability of Mr. Chandler."

Alvin Richards, representing the Pure Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.:

"For some time the press here has carried information of the probable appointment of three members of the Oklahoma bar as United States District Judges, namely, Royce H. Savage for the northern district, Stephen

Chandler for the new judgeship created in the western district, and Bower Broaddus for the roving judge in the event of appointment of Judge A. P. Murrah to the circuit court of appeals. I know all of these lawyers well and intimately, and have known them for a number of years, and I think I know their standing in Oklahoma and their standing as attorneys of the Oklahoma bar.

"I know these appointments have had your consideration for a long period of time and possibly nothing I would say about them would have any influence at this time, but it occurred to me that now, when the appointments are practically assured, there might be some satisfaction to you in having the information from me, unsolicited from any source, that in my judgment these appointments are meritorious and will meet with universal approval by the public and the bar. As a matter of fact I have heard no criticism or complaint from the lawyers about these proposed appointments, and my own judgment is that the selections are excellent.

"You possibly have a record of my statement to Federal Bureau of Investigation representatives, bearing out my statements here, but I am passing this information, trusting it will be of some assistance and that you will be glad to know your actions have met with approval in Oklahoma."

John Rogers, Tulsa, Okla.:

"I have just read statements in papers this morning that objections have been filed in connection with the appointment of Bower Broaddus as United States district judge for the district of Oklahoma, Royce Savage as United States district judge for the northern district of Oklahoma, and Stephen Chandler as United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

"These three men are of the highest type both from the standpoint of personal qualities and professional qualifications and I desire to give them my unqualified endorsement."

John H. Cantrell, businessman of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"Have known Stephen Chandler both personally and professionally and otherwise for a great number of years. Believe him to possess all requirements desirable for Federal judge. Strongly endorse Chandler and desire his appointment to be United States district judge for western district of Oklahoma."

Walter C. Dean, former mayor of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

"I have just learned that my esteemed friend, Stephen Chandler, is a candidate for Federal judgeship of the new district ordered by the Senate of the United States courts.

"I have known Steve Chandler for many years. He is a very competent and progressive lawyer, having been associated with the late Hon. John Tomerlin, and I am quite sure would be a credit to the Government if appointed to this position. Knowing that you have the power to make this appointment, I am quite sure if same is done by you it will redound to your credit."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Mr. Chandler be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma?

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hayden	Scrugham
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are detained in the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs where hearings are proceeding on the Puerto Rican bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present and voting. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Shortages.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," if present. The Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN].

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—37

Bailey	Hayden	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hill	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
George	Murray	Walsh
Green	Pepper	Wheeler
Guffey	Radcliffe	
Hatch	Russell	

NAYS—28

Aiken	Danaher	Nye
Austin	Davis	O'Daniel
Ball	Ferguson	Overton
Barbour	Gurney	Taft
Brooks	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Holman	Vandenberg
Burton	La Follette	Wherry
Bushfield	Langer	White
Butler	Lodge	
Capper	Moore	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Glass	Reynolds
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bone	McCarran	Smith
Brewster	McNary	Tobey
Bridges	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wiley
Downey	Murdock	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Reed	
Gillette	Revercomb	

So the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be advised forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and

the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock wartime.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1949 (reappointment)

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sumner T. Pike, of Maine, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1948 (reappointment).

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Laurence T. DuBose to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of September 1942.

Rear Admiral Charles P. Snyder, United States Navy, when retired on August 1, 1943, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Ensign Leslie G. Haverland to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 29th day of May 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, additional position.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

George B. Wilson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from October 3, 1942.

Ralph S Wentworth to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service while serving as commandant, Naval Operating Base, Iceland, to rank from April 24, 1943.

Charles M. Yates to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, Naval Operating Base, Oran, to rank from April 26, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William F. Killough, Alpine.

FLORIDA

Harry C. Green, Englewood.

GEORGIA

Lamar S. Smith, Bartow.

KANSAS

Alvin M. Johnson, Canton.
Herman D. Cornelsen, Hillsboro.
Albert Earl Elias, La Crosse.
Hugh W. Clemmons, Wadsworth.

VIRGINIA

Lois Tuck Long, Virgilina.

WISCONSIN

John Gertsch, Jr., Scandinavia.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of May 3), 1943:

POSTMASTER

Antoinette T. McKechnie to be postmaster at Gearhart, Oreg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1943.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Master of all love and mercy, wilt Thou invigorate the purposes of our souls with sincerity and earnestness; thus our decisions will pass into wise fruition; not by the blinding power of ambition nor by the sophistry of selfishness but by the virtues exemplified in the glory of the cross. By looking upon their beauty until their lines grow into our minds and their spirit is possessed by the affections of the heart, the delusions and vanities of life wither and fall.

O Divine One, whose heroism faced peril and rejoiced in self-denial, persuade us that on the heaviest cross hangs the brightest crown. He who has known the ministry of darkness has not been disciplined in vain but is led to a yearning desire for the light and finally to forgiveness in the ledger of God. Thou Son of St. Mary, who spoke comfort to the malefactor, mercy to Thine enemies, and sought to heal the misery of the crowd, let the day star of love arise in the camps of hate; O stay the tides of hostility which are floating on the breast of a pleading world. As the glad tidings of spring merge into the bounties of summer, so may our spirits be resolved into the teachings of our Saviour. With morning hearts, we pray that we may be eager to labor, toil, and sacrifice, to obey and even endure until young manhood and robust maturity lay hold on God. In the name of Him who gave His life as a ransom for the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 7, 1943, was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. IRA GREENLIEF HERSEY, OF MAINE

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the death of Hon. Ira Greenlief Hersey, of Maine, who served in this body with distinction for 12 years. He died in Washington May 6, 1943. Many of the present membership of this House served with Mr. Hersey, and knew him as an able lawyer, capable legislator, and fine gentleman. You also experienced his rugged individualism, independence of thought, strong convictions, and abiding loyalty to this country and its institutions. He served in this body from March 4, 1917, until 1929.

Mr. Hersey was the product of a small community. He was born at Hodgdon, in Aroostook County, Maine, March 31, 1858. He taught a country school. He studied law to become a leader of his profession, an ambition he realized in full measure. He served his beloved State of Maine as a member of its house of representatives, and of its senate, of which he was president.

Maine sent him to Congress, and after a distinguished career in Washington his fellow citizens elected him judge of probate for the County of Aroostook. His 30 years of public service is an unblemished record of devotion to duty.

Ira G. Hersey was a symbol of unswerving principle. To him an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution meant something more than a place on the pay roll. To the public service he devoted the full measure of his ability, energy, and loyalty.

Born to an inheritance of little money and much hard work, Mr. Hersey embraced the privilege of equality of opportunity, and by force of character, a strong will, and untiring effort marched on to high accomplishment. He was of a generation of men who had not heard of freedom from fear and want.

He had faith in constitutional government, and at all times was in the front ranks fighting the forces and influences that sap the stamina, character, and loyalty of our people and strike at the foundations of our Republic. The record of his life as a man and public servant is an inspiration to our people. His life was long and fruitful, and the State of Maine was justly proud of her son.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, including therein certain material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOBBS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED SURVEY OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution which is before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors to call for a study and survey of the Missouri River and its tributaries north of Omaha, from the standpoint of flood control, irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power. This supplements a resolution which was introduced by me over 4 years ago and which was approved on March 7, 1939, to make a somewhat similar study of the Missouri River. Since that time, however, three important factors have entered the picture: First, the development of manganese mines near Chamberlain, S. Dak. Second, a very serious spring flood this year which jeopardized military installations in cities in the valley of the Missouri River. Third, the fact that we are involved in a war and consequently must now reevaluate all of our river development measures in terms of whether they are helpful in our war program.

I urge other Members along the Missouri River and those in the Mississippi River Valley who are the final recipients of these flood waters, to join with me in urging the Rivers and Harbors Committee to approve of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Soutl. Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of this week, after the regular business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and following any other special orders that may have heretofore been agreed upon, I may speak for 20 minutes on the subject This Cradle to Grave, or Womb to Tomb Security Illusion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator, concerning the increased price of crude oil.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon on the reciprocal trade treaty program and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the National Youth Administration and to include therein a letter from the New York Times by the Very Reverend Edwin R. Moore.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIZED PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, last evening the people of the country who listened to the radio program We the People, heard Price Administrator Prentiss Brown state in part that by the Government paying subsidies to the packers and middlemen the housewife would save money because their Government would pay the difference. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Prentiss Brown who is the Government and how will subsidies be paid unless by taxation on the very people that must buy food, or does it mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Government press is about to start printing some phoney money? Is it not time that the Congress takes a hand in the granting of subsidies and to correct such unsound economical utterances such as Mr. Brown made when he said it would not cost you anything because your Government would pay the difference.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on the American mother.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of Sunday, May 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today we take up for consideration a joint resolution extending for 3 additional years the discretionary authority previously delegated to the Executive to enter into foreign-trade treaties in behalf of the United States without the formality of ratification by Congress and to reduce this country's tariff duties in accordance with such treaties without specific Congressional approval and without regard to any legislative standards.

I sincerely hope the Congress will restore Government by law in place of Government by men. We must keep this principle in mind while we are considering the pending resolution these next few days.

I believe one of the best ways to impress the people of other countries that a republic like ours functions successfully is for us to see to it that Congressional approval is necessary before foreign-trade treaties made by the Executive are binding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a column by Mr. Buckley Griffin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address recently delivered by Mr. Justice Rutledge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES NAVAL PLANES IN SOUTHWEST PACIFIC

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while listening to the radio comments of one Roy Porter, speaking on behalf of Ford Motor Co. last Saturday evening, I heard him read into the broadcast some correspondence from somebody down in the Southwest Pacific which he said had been cleared by the censors and which to me was a very devastating accusation against our Navy Department.

The verbatim text of part of the letter he quoted is as follows:

I am glad to know that Roy is still broadcasting. Will you please tell him for me, he to pass it along to the right people, that someone should do something about the happenings down this way. You can't fly these lads 8 hours a day from carriers or maneuvers, which is all we are having presently, without paying the toll. Ours has been heavy in operational losses without any replacements coming along. Tell him that it should be demanded that carrier flyers be trained at home and not be sent out here for qualification especially with planes at about $70,000

each and carrier landings difficult. We have had some mighty bad days not in losing pilots but in wrecking planes, simply because the youngsters are not qualified and even the oldsters cannot fly 8 hours daily and not "stale off" especially when they are not given liberty in some decent town to work off the natural exuberance of youth. Let him know for me that since the ship I am on left its base last November that we have shot down exactly 4 Jap reconnaissance planes while losing 63 of our own (here Mr. Porter said over the air "Seventeen times as many ships" which remark was necessary because of censorship rules). Copy this off and let him read it over the air.

I think that is a most serious accusation. In my opinion, it is something that the Naval Affairs Committee should check into very, very quickly. This is the time to kill Japs—not the youth of America—unnecessarily and unwisely. What are we going to do about it? Wake up, America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent address I made over the radio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article Renegotiation digested for busy company presidents, an analysis made by Prentiss Hall of the renegotiation statute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

"GOVERMENT GIRL" PLANES

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, there occurred yesterday in the city of Washington a very noteworthy incident. Two fighter planes were presented to the country's armed forces, one to the Army Air Force and one to the Navy. They were presented as the result of a contribution of $1 each by 157,000 Government girl workers, and the planes, an Army P-51 Mustang and a Navy F4U1 Chance-Vought Corsair, will be christened "Government Girl."

It will be of interest to the historians and should be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the suggestion for the "Government Girl" planes was made by a young woman on Capitol Hill, who has been a friend to every Representative in the House, Miss Agnes Richardy, the very able and efficient clerk to the liaison office for the Veterans' Administration. The suggestion was in the form of a letter by Miss Richardy to Jerry Kluttz's column, The Federal Diary, in the Washington Post. She wrote a letter and signed it "Government Girl," which said in part:

What do you think of the idea of Government employees, now that they have their pay raise, of contributing $1 each toward the purchase of a warplane, to be named "Government Girl"? I would be more than glad to send in my dollar and I'm sure thousands of others would be, too. The civilian employees here in Washington could set a good example for the rest of the Nation if they'd get together and buy a much-needed warplane with their own funds.

That was 10 weeks ago. Government girls responded beyond all expectations and not one, but two "Government Girl" planes were bought. Miss Richardy's suggestion and the response by the Government girls have been an inspiration to the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE MESSRS. WATSON, SCHUMAN, AND DODD OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest something to the membership of the House that I think has very, very serious implications. On the 21st of April a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee brought in a recommendation with respect to three persons employed in the Government, and in two of the cases the subcommittee recommended that they were unfit to continue in the Government service. Those two are employed by the Federal Communications Commission.

Five days later, on the 26th of April, the Federal Communications Commission had a meeting. They examined into the qualifications and the fitness of those on whom the congressional committee had already passed. Let me say that 3 of the Commissioners, of course, dissented, but 4 of the Commission concurred in this report, some 26 pages long.

The last sentence of that report is as follows:

In the light of the foregoing, we find no basis or reason for the dismissal of Watson, Schuman, or Dodd from employment of the Federal Communications Commission.

The question that this Congress is going to have to determine is, Are we going to tell the Federal Communications Commission what it must do or is it going to tell us what we shall do? If one agency prevails in a case of this kind, make no mistake, it will completely destroy the supervisory legislative power of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 227, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I presume that only a brief summary of what this resolution provides is necessary. The Members of the House no doubt know that it provides for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This act was passed in 1934 and authorized first the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof, and second to proclaim such modifications of existing duties or other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods of existing customs or excise treatment of any article as is appropriate to carry out agreements made.

The act provides, as a limitation on the authority, that no proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and the free lists.

Mr. Speaker, I presume there will be no argument that the rule should not be adopted so that the bill may be considered by the House. The bill is very controversial, of course, as it has been in the past. The resolution provides for 2 days of general debate.

So I do not think it is necessary to further take up the time of the House in insisting on the adoption of the rule.

Since thinking of the reciprocal trade agreements, however, it calls to my mind a matter that I think should be called to the attention of the Congress and the country—reciprocity for the United States from those nations which have received the benefits of our funds in the

construction of airports all over the different countries. It is a notorious fact that with American dollars, lend-lease funds principally, there have been constructed on three continents airports; airports used by the armed services of our allies and ourselves. Those airports were constructed at a tremendous outlay of the money of the people of this country. No agreement has as yet been made, that I know of, as to what will happen to those airports and the right to use those airports in the post-war period. There is no more important problem facing this country today than that of determining the right to use the airports in foreign countries, because at the close of the last war the subject debated at the peace table principally was who shall have the right to use the ports of the world—the water ports. For what purpose? Why, through which the commerce and the trade of foreign markets can flow.

My friends, at the end of this war, the knotty problem, the major problem, confronting those at the peace table, will be what disposition will be made or who shall have the right to use the airports. Airports will take the place that the water ports took at the close of the struggle in 1918.

This is the time, in my judgment, that our Government is best prepared to make arrangements, looking toward the granting to our commercial aircraft the right to land at airports that we are building with American money on the principal continents of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I wonder whether the thing that we have done in Canada is going to be the pattern that we are going to follow through the rest of the war. Before we could get to our airports through Alaska, over the back route, behind water route, as it is known, we had to build airports and air navigational facilities, to man airports, radio stations, and range stations. Before Canada would let us build those airports on Canadian soil, before she would permit us to put up navigational aids on Canadian soil, we entered into an agreement with Canada that 1 year after the close of the war the airport and all navigational aids would revert to Canada and that we would have no further right nor interest in those facilities. That might have been a good deal for Canada, in the opinion of some. In my opinion, it was not.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Who made those agreements to give up American money and American equipment, and what right did they have to do that?

Mr. NICHOLS. I am not sure who made the agreements, but I think it was the War Department or the Department of State, but under what authority I do not know.

Mr. FISH. The Department of State?

Mr. NICHOLS. But I do know this, that they apparently made it with authority of law or they would not have made it. If they did, then these same people have authority of law to enter into like agreements with other countries of the world, and it is their duty to at least say this: For instance, to Great Britain or to China or to France or to any other Allied Nation on whose soil we are spending money in the construction of airports, that somebody representing this Government should say now to Mr. Britain or to Mr. France that we are going to build those airports which will cost eight or ten or more millions of dollars, and after the war is over, inasmuch as the foreign market will be reached by air, you should say to us that you are perfectly willing that we should use those airports for commercial purposes. And, Mr. France or Mr. England, we are spending these millions of dollars in constructing airports today because we are allies, and now, while we are partners, while we are allies, it is time to enter into agreements so that after the war is over our airplanes can land on these airports, the same as your airplanes can land there. Now is the time that we should be getting landing rights from our partners and our allies upon whom we are lavishly spending American dollars, and if we do not do it we are spending American dollars to secure them a favored position in the foreign markets of the world at the close of the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I understand that our reciprocity would grant the same access to our own airports to those who want to use them commercially?

Mr. NICHOLS. I would say to my friend that if any of these countries come onto American soil and build airports with their own money, yes; I think they should have the right to use those airports.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are we putting out lend-lease money to gain trade advantages or are we using it to win the protection of our lives and our freedom?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; we are doing it for both purposes. We are the only Nation in this war that has no selfish material objective. I think we are in this war to make the future secure. I believe the only way you can make the economic future of this country secure is to protect the routes to the foreign markets and have access to foreign trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. There is no opposition to it that I know of. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] for his American speech. It is about time somebody looked after the interests of America. I admire the British Government and I admire Prime Minister Churchill because they always put the interest of the British Empire first. I admire Mr. Stalin and the Soviet Government because they always put the interest of the Communists first. Is it not about time that we put the interest of America first, last, and all the time?

The interests of the American people are primarily involved in these trade agreements. The stake of American wage earners is enormous in connection with the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act. We are willing to give away airports and our rights in airports almost without protest.

I hope that when this bill is debated, and particularly when it reaches the amendment stage, the Members on both sides of the aisle will consider the amendments from an American point of view, as to how they affect the American wage earners, American farmers, American business men, and American interests, when they vote on each separate amendment. Of course, it is for the committee and the Members of the House to present at the proper time any amendments they desire, but it is up to us as Members of Congress, regardless of partisanship, to consider those amendments on their merits and on the basis of how they affect the best interests of America. That is all I am pleading for at the present time.

I want to discuss certain aspects of these trade treaties. I believe almost every Member of the House is in favor of the fundamental principle behind the bill, that is, of reciprocal trade treaties that are mutually beneficial, beneficial to us and the nations with whom we are trading. If that were all that is involved, this extension would go through unanimously.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should like to have the gentleman's interpretation of whether or not these so-called reciprocal trade agreements are treaties within the meaning of that language of the Constitution requiring ratification or consent by the Senate to treaties.

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that I do not know that I have given sufficient study to that part of the bill to be a competent judge. I would prefer to put that issue squarely up to the Members of the Senate. They are the interested parties and if they are willing to surrender their constitutional power over treaties, then I should say that we need not worry ourselves unduly in the House of Representatives.

I have always thought that these agreements were in the nature of treaties and therefore should be ratified by the Senate, but I understand that amendments will be presented which will provide 90 days' leeway for the Congress to approve these reciprocal trade treaties, and I think that question should be very carefully discussed and acted upon by the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. By "the Congress" the gentleman means, of course, joint action by the House and the Senate, both branches?

Mr. FISH. That is right. These trade treaties have been very largely sold to the American public by sheer weight of propaganda on the basis of preserving peace. I take my hat off to the State Department and their propagandists

and to the New Deal propaganda machine which has been spreading at tremendous cost to the American public the idea that these trade treaties are synonymous with peace. They have no more to do with peace than cheese has to do with chalk. It is an economic question pure and simple, not one of maintaining world peace. There is nothing in the world that I would not do, even to the extent of giving my right arm, to preserve world peace. Large groups of women have been sold this peace propaganda, and some are writing Members of Congress that these trade treaties will maintain and preserve world peace. Such statements are sheer hypocrisy and buncombe and based on an erroneous conception of the trade treaties.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that I think there may be some misunderstanding growing out of his response to the gentleman from Montana with respect to the authority of the other branch of this Congress to set aside the fundamental principles of the Constitution. The gentleman said it might be a matter for the Senate to decide. To that I know the gentleman himself takes exception.

Mr. FISH. Of course, I meant to say, if I did not say it, that it is primarily a matter for the Senate to determine, and they will have to decide whether they are willing to surrender their constitutional authority to ratify treaties. Many of the new Members of the House were elected last November with a mandate from the people to restore representative and constitutional government in the United States. I prefer, however, not to discuss the constitutional issues involved under the rule.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I did not want the gentleman to get into that discussion now, but I do not want him to make a misstatement with respect to his attitude as I know it. The gentleman knows as well as I do that this House will determine the matter of initiating revenue, and if the Senate by virtue of what the gentleman may say today undertakes and assumes to take all the authority for running this business, it will just be out of luck.

Mr. FISH. I think there is a great deal in what the gentleman says, but I did not want to become involved in a constitutional question at this time, because I know it is going to be very thoroughly discussed by members of the Committee on Ways and Means and I do not believe it fair to encroach upon their time and their arguments.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Since the gentleman from Vermont has raised one question as to the interpretation of the gentleman's remarks, I should like to raise another. Would the gentleman want the RECORD to indicate that he thinks there is no relationship between the economic relationships of nations and world peace?

Mr. FISH. Of course not. I did not make that statement. I said these reciprocal trade treaties were sold to certain groups as assuring peace which in my opinion is nonsense and without any foundation of fact. I shall take this opportunity to discuss the peace phase in some detail.

We had a reciprocal trade treaty with Czechoslovakia. That was the most important treaty we had, outside of the British treaty.

Did that preserve Czechoslovakia from being involved in the war? We had one with Great Britain. Did that stop Great Britain from participating in the war? We had one with France, and the same thing is true of France. So, I am submitting honestly and in good faith, that so far as the claim is made that these reciprocal trade treaties have an overwhelming influence in preserving world peace, there is virtually no relation whatever to it. I will proceed further, and prove it to you. Why do foreign nations buy from us and why do we buy from them? Do you think we buy from them because we love them or vice versa? They buy from us because they want our goods and not because of friendship or brotherly love. And we in turn sell them goods because they pay for our goods, and not because of any affection for them. We buy from foreign nations the goods we want at the best possible prices but again not because of friendship for them. After this war is over, and we have won the war, as we will, and after Germany and Japan are defeated and crushed, Germany and Japan will buy from us if they have any buying power left, not because they love us, not because of any trade treaties, but because they want our goods. I am not opposing these reciprocal trade treaties, or their extension. I would support an amendment to reduce the time limit from 3 to 2 years. I do not think that we should tie the hands of the next Congress and the next administration, which most certainly will be Republican.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I do not think it would be fair to tie their hands by extending these treaties for a period of 3 years. I hope an amendment will be offered limiting the extension to 2 years, so that the incoming Republican administration, and the incoming Republican Congress can proceed and review the whole situation as it affects the interests of the American people.

What I am appealing for today is to urge the careful consideration of all proposed amendments from an American point of view, affecting American wage earners. Every American has a stake in it, and the whole country is involved. I have heard well known public officials who knew what they were talking about say that after this war there will be 20,000,000 people unemployed, including 10,000,000 soldiers. I have seen the figure placed as high as 30,000,000. There may be 30,000,000 unemployed, I certainly hope not. Do you mean to say we want to rush into trade treaties with Czechoslovakia where, after this war the wages will be a dollar or less a day, and bring Czechoslovakia labor and their industrial system into direct competition with the North and East and some parts of the South, where American wage earners are paid four or five dollars a day, and create more unemployment in America? This bill is one of the most important to come before Congress and should be extensively debated and considered. We know that we are going to win the war and just as soon as we do we will be faced with the greatest unemployment crisis in our history. These trade treaties will have no effect until the war is over. However once our wage earners are without jobs and the American markets are swamped with the cheaply produced goods of Europe and our factories are closed down then it will be somewhat difficult trying to explain to the American housewives why their husbands are unemployed and why they have no money to even buy clothing and food. We hope we will win this war within a few years, and if we do we know we will be confronted with one very serious issue, and that is the vital question of unemployment. If we are going to let goods made by cheap European labor come into the American market in competition with the products of free American labor to create further unemployment, of course, our wage earners, farmers, and businessmen have an enormous stake in any such proposal. That is why I am pleading with you that, regardless of party politics, when amendments are offered, consider them on their merits and from the point of view of the best interests of America and American wage earners and farmers. That is not too much to ask of the Congress of the United States.

My first remarks when I rose today were that I admired the British and the Soviets. Why? Because they always put the interests of their governments and people first.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. To further illustrate your statement that we do not buy because we love whom we buy from, I would simply ask this question: Did Japan over a period of 5 years, while she was getting ready for this war, buy 80 or 90 percent of all her war materials from us because she loved us?

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman that I offered a resolution on January 30, 1939, to prohibit the sale of scrap iron to Japan, 6 months before the war broke out in Europe. But of course Japan bought from us because she wanted war materials much of which she is now using against us. She will do it again. Every other nation will do it again. They all buy not from affection but from need. I concede all the credit in the world to the State Department and to the proponents of these trade agreements who have sold them on the basis of peace. Now we are engaged in

the greatest war in history. They had very little to do with maintaining peace and they will have very little to do with it in the future. Let us consider them as they should be as an economic problem. Let us consider our own interests along with the interests of other nations. I am for reciprocal trade treaties when they are mutually beneficial. But these treaties have a clause in them that when we make a concession to one nation we make it to all. When we make a concession to France or Great Britain it is carried to all the nations even where the wage scale may be 20 cents a day instead of one or two dollars a day as it may be in France or Great Britain. Those are the problems we have to consider if we are to legislate to protect the interests of the American wage earners. We are not opposing the principle of reciprocal trade agreements that are mutually beneficial. I am for all these South American trade agreements which are largely noncompetitive and the trade treaty with Canada, which has a wage scale nearly the same as our own, but when you make trade treaties with other nations that have a wage scale one-fourth of our own, then it is bound to become a menace and a danger immediately after the World War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

We hear a lot about post-war planning from members of both parties. They go about the country, parading around and telling the American people what we should do after the war. To my mind, that is the height of all hypocrisy, demagoguery, political humbug and ballyhoo. How can anybody talk about post-war planning when they do not know—and I say that to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and I hope he listens attentively.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am listening very attentively.

Mr. FISH. Neither he nor anybody else in this House knows the war aims and the peace aims of the British Empire or the war aims or the peace aims of the Soviet Government. Until we know their peace aims, how can we go out to the American people and talk to them about post-war planning? I do not have the faintest idea, not a Member of this House, not one person in America can say what the British peace aims are or the Soviet peace aims are, and until we know them we cannot talk with any degree of common sense about what the post-war aims of our own country should be.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The people who are advocating certain post-war aims for this country are of the opinion that we should force their post-war aims on the people of the rest of the world. Does the gentleman think that is possible?

Mr. FISH. I think some people in the country would like to have a glorified world W. P. A., which we would pay for, and have a world government with some Americans holding high office in it. Another experiment in New Deal regimentation and bureaucracy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my distinguished colleague who is probably better informed on tariff issues than almost anybody in the Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any information as to whether or not this Government has entered into any pacts with the United Nations as to territorial gains after the war?

Mr. FISH. I do not have any knowledge whatsoever. I read the papers. I have seen certain insinuations, but I have no definite knowledge. I hope of course that the administration has not done that, and has not followed in the footsteps of other nations in the last World War. If it has, it should be exposed, and it would be resented by all parties, certainly by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Should this country approve a program that calls for the Russianization of the Baltic?

Mr. FISH. I assume that most people believe that as a result of this war Soviet Russia is going to take all the Baltic states—those fine little republics, those fine little democracies, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. She has already said she intended to take them. We only have to read the papers to find that out. She has also said she is going to take about one-third of Poland. Those claims have already been made. We do not know what else she is going to take, but until we do know I do not believe any American should make any commitment on foreign policies for the United States. I do not believe anybody has the right to make any commitments during this war until we know what the British and Soviet war aims are. If they do, I am quite sure the American people will have something to say about it at the next election because this is a peoples' war and they have a right to speak for themselves.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think that amongst the governments in exile over in England there may be some arrangements about the division of Europe after the war?

Mr. FISH. It is not quite fair to put such a question to me—what I think. I do not know; I have no definite knowledge. I admit I am very suspicious about the proposed partition of Poland, but I have no definite knowledge, and until I have I do not want to make any post-war commitment. We are talking about trade treaties. Mind you, I am not opposing the extension of the trade treaties for a couple of years, but I do not want to tie the hands of the incoming Congress or the incoming administration beyond 2 years. I do believe, however, if we are to have any trade relations whatever with Europe, if there is to be anybody to buy our goods, if there is to be anybody to produce, the Congress of the United States has a definite obligation to do something immediately to feed the starving children in the occupied countries of Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Hoover made that plea a year or so ago. It has been utterly ignored. We have an abundance of wheat. We, a country of 130,000,000 well fed people with granaries bulging with wheat, have a definite obligation to use our influence to get relief ships through the blockade to Europe. I submit that if there are going to be any people to produce in Europe we must help save 15,000,000 starving children in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The children of Greece are now receiving food, powdered milk, and vitamins in Swedish ships. Who started it? It was started not by a Christian nation but by Turkey. Turkey insisted on sending them food ships; she led the way and showed that they could feed those poor starving children in Greece without giving aid or comfort to the enemy, without helping the German Army one iota. They have proved it. We proved it in the last war by sending relief ships to Belgium, then occupied by the German Army. I believe it is the duty of the Congress not to shunt this humanitarian problem aside any longer until these innocent starving children are dead. This issue is before us now and I hope it is brought up in the Committee on Foreign Affairs within the next few weeks. These nations have got the money; it would not even cost us anything. We can use their money to buy the food and wheat, buy it down in Argentina if we have not got it ourselves, and we can use Swedish ships but, Mr. Speaker, we must act now before it is too late. All I am asking is that when we consider the amendments to the pending legislation we consider them from the American point of view.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let us be frank about the situation and let us take the country into our confidence; not blow hot and cold and say, "I am for the bill, but—." For the bill, but with crippling amendments that if adopted will make the bill ineffective.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] made a very fine speech Tuesday upon the tax bill. He came before the House and told us directly and squarely where he stood. I admire the man. We all respect the man who makes a forthright statement, who takes his stand and says, "I am for it," "I am against it," without any qualifying "but's." How can one say, "I am against post-war planning, but I am for the feeding of the poor unfortunates of Europe"? How can the two be separated? If we are going to make plans for the poor

unfortunates of Europe in the future how can we get away from post-war planning? Do they say it is too big a job, it cannot be done? Did you see the announcement the other day that we are producing 6,200 planes a month? Do you remember how the President's suggestion that we produce 50,000 planes a year was laughed at and scoffed at at the time he made it? Yet today we are producing more than 6,200 a month. Let us look at the big objective we have in mind, the great over-all picture of winning the war.

The country might just as well realize now as later and appreciate that if crippling amendments are added to the bill and the legislation is thereby made ineffective it will be but an indication of what they may expect in the future. So far as the policies of the Republican Party in the House are concerned, we are going to have nothing but a continuation of the isolationism of the last twenty-odd years, political isolationism and economic nationalism, that is, if the Republicans on this hill follow the leadership of the Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee. Everyone knows that one of the main reasons for modern wars are those trade barriers that result in extreme economic nationalism. Those are causes of the war and have been contributing factors that have brought about some of the wars of the last several decades. After World War No. 1 the people generally hoped and prayed for peace, but we know that those hopes and prayers were destroyed on the rocks of extreme nationalism, envy, hatred, greed, and bitter political feelings, and we now know that the statesmen and politicians of twenty-odd years ago failed in their trust. Some tried hard to take the next step in the hard journey of mankind toward some kind of permanent peace, but the opposition divided public opinion and their noble efforts failed, at least for the time being.

The result—a contribution to the present war. If the right step had been taken twenty-odd years ago this war probably would not be going on today. Since the last World War another generation has been born. I served in the last war and many other men in this House also served, young men then; but another generation has come, another generation has been born and has grown up, and that generation is at war. Their fathers and mothers can thank, if they want to, but so far as I am concerned, I blame those intrusted with the responsibility who failed twenty-odd years ago the youth who are now engaged in the present war.

Twenty-odd years ago we could not look into the near future and see that the safety and the future of the next generation of youth was the issue involved, the issue at stake. A long time looking forward is 20 years, yet, only yesterday, as we look back. Today, youngsters play in our school yards, in our streets, on the farm, everywhere that children gather in their innocent moments of childish pleasure. Infants today are fondly watched over by their mothers. Yes; twenty-odd years ago many of the young men serving our country today were playful children or infants in the cradle or in their mothers' arms, but they are fighting today.

Twenty to thirty years is a long time in the life of an individual; yes, but it is only a second in its relationship to time itself. So far as the next generation is concerned it is the "tomorrow" of the youth today who are serving in the Army and the Navy, sacrificing their lives. A little over 20 years ago they were infants or children; yes, some less than 20 years ago, and twenty-odd years from now their children will have grown up. What will the conditions be—peace or war? What we do now and in the near future will determine that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yes, today becomes yesterday and tomorrow becomes today. We have got to be practical and realize that. The "tomorrow" that I refer to is the next generation of youth. Are we going to let them go along the usual way? That is a fair question. I respect those who honestly disagree with me. I am simply expressing my own views, and as I respect those who disagree with my views, I simply ask that those who disagree with me to respect my views.

Are we going to fail the youth of tomorrow as the statesmen and politicians of twenty-odd years ago did to the youth of today? I am thinking and talking about the children and the children's children of Americans of today; our own flesh and blood, not Democrats and Republicans, but our own flesh and blood, the infants and children of today, the children that will be born in the next 5 or 10 years. Yes, to some twenty-odd years like in 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922, may seem a long way off, but time passes quickly. So far as I am concerned, I prefer to be on the side of those who tried to do something to prevent the next generation from going through the destruction, the pain, and the suffering of this dreadful conflict than on the side of those who did not try.

This bill is definitely linked up with that future and it is an immediate one, because it concerns the next generation, which is only tomorrow in terms of generations. I realize there are some who will scoff at this thought, who will try to laugh it off, and others who honestly disagree; some who will present ingenious arguments to break it down, who will make appeals to create division and opposition to this important forward step of mankind. But men are human beings with a will power and a reason; yes, children of God, without regard to our creed. We are not animals in the woods, yet we are the only living species that tries to destroy one another en masse, and there are some who say we have got to continue on the road of war. Yet we have the will, the reason, the power to reason, and there are many who have the defeatist attitude that the human race cannot escape war. Somewhere along the line there must be some common ground upon which the peoples of the world can stand on one thing, peace at least for one generation.

Twenty-odd years ago there were men who successfully divided the people, and I remember it well. Different persons with different names today, but with the same arguments, dressed and colored up to fit the occasion, will try to divide and destroy progress toward an important goal in the painful journey of mankind, the goal of peace.

I am not thinking of ten generations or two generations hence. I am thinking of one generation—twenty-odd years from now. The last generation had the painful and destructive experience of a world war. This generation of youth are undergoing a more painful and destructive experience than was undergone by those of World War No. 1. Are we to go along doing nothing with the feeling always prevalent that world war No. 3 is bound to come, and is "just around the corner"? If we do nothing, we will. It is our duty and responsibility to take the proper and necessary steps, based on equity and justice, following the spiritual and the moral law, in cooperation with the nations of the world, to see that the next generation is freed from the fear of war. If we do that we have performed our trust. It will be the duty of the next generation of statesmen and political leaders of that day to profit by our experience and to improve upon the heritage of progress we have left to them in the direction of peace.

The passage of the pending bill without crippling amendments is a decided contribution toward that great objective.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to follow the great Democratic majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], my friend, whom we all love and respect. His address in regard to the future youth of the Nation impressed me, as it undoubtedly impressed all of you. As I sat and listened to him the thought arose in my mind of a letter that I received from a brilliant young man in the service who wrote to me that since the advent of the New Deal most of the young men now serving in our armed services have found nothing but C. C. C. work, W. P. A. work, and now war. It is my sincere hope that some of these administrative leaders will follow the words of wisdom of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and that something besides the C. C. C., W. P. A., and N. Y. A. will follow after the conclusion of this war. The young men now under arms are really the ones that we should be thinking of when we discuss this so-called post-war planning. It is of double pleasure to me that the eminent majority leader and myself are in accord in regard

to the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In view of the history of the past, is it not fair to assume that so long as the Democratic Party continues America will be at war every 25 years?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say in reply to that that the last two major wars we have had were both during the second term of the Democratic administration.

I would say that I favor the extension of these reciprocal trade agreements because of the abnormal times that we find ourselves in. We are at war, otherwise I would oppose the extension because, in my opinion, they are nothing more than a free-trade policy which, in my opinion, is detrimental to the best interests of our farmers, our laborers, and our manufacturers.

The Secretary of State has publicly come out and asked for the extension of this act, because he believes it is best for the unity of the Allies. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I am going to vote for its extension on the war ground solely, for the same reason that when the able chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. VINSON] comes in and asks an appropriation for the Navy, saying that it will bring the war to an early and successful conclusion, I would vote for that appropriation.

I remember, back in 1934, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, when members of the State Department came before that committee and insisted that unless we passed the reciprocal trade agreements there would not be peace throughout the world. Today, with American boys in thirty-odd countries of the world I wonder in what way the act has brought about peace. From that standpoint it has failed.

The reasons for that act of June 1943 are stated in the law itself, as follows:

> For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States, as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public.

Those were the purposes of that act back in 1934, and I ask anyone here today, whether in reenacting this legislation its purpose is to expand the foreign markets, whether its purpose is to restore the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, and in increasing the purchasing power of the American public. The answer is definitely "no." Today, those problems have been solved as a result of our entrance into war.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] came before the Rules Committee the other day and I asked them many times to give us the reason why they thought it was necessary to extend this act. I asked them if they thought it was necessary to increase the purchasing power of the American public or to expand our markets, and they in all frankness were not able to answer that particular question. The only reason to my mind at the present time is the purpose to bring about solidarity among our allies. That is the question and there is not any other.

We all know that Mr. Hull our most respected Secretary of State since he first entered the halls of this body, has been for a free-trade policy. He sincerely believes that is the best policy for our country, while a majority of us believe and history teaches us that since the formation of our Government the protective policy has given the people of this country the highest standard of living of any nation on earth. We have more than 60 percent of all the telephones, radios, and automobiles of the world. We have more life insurance than the rest of the world combined better school facilities, and more equitable distribution of wealth. Much of this benefit can be attributed to our protective tariff policy covering 75 years of Republican rule. Without that protection our farmers would have to compete with Mexican farmers whose land is worth $5 per acre and who pay but a few cents a day wage. Our manufacturers would have found it impossible to keep their doors open if they would be compelled to compete with foreign manufacturers who pay labor a few cents a day unless they did likewise—and God forbid that.

We know that in regard to the reciprocal trade agreements, that our farmers now have splendid markets. They are not particularly worried about the shipment of Argentine beef and cattle from Mexico at the present time and we know that the manufacturers, during this wartime, are not particularly worried about competition resulting from our receiving shipments of shoes from Czechoslovakia and other manufactured articles from countries where labor is receiving only a few cents a day. But after the war is over, when this great production program of armaments in our factories dies down, when the soldiers come back looking for work, when farm prices go down as a natural aftermath of war, then we know our manufacturers do not wish competitive manufactured articles coming into this country. Neither do these ex-service men who will be looking for work. Neither do our farmers who have patriotically entered a production expansion program desire agricultural produce entering this country under a free-trade program. Our farmers, our manufacturers, and our laborers have no desire to compete with cheap foreign labor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be many here today who will vote for the extension of these reciprocal-trade agreements merely on the ground that it is a war expediency, because they believe that the war should be brought to an early and successful conclusion. The Secretary of State thinks that it is necessary to do it, and I believe that many will vote in favor of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, not because they believe in the soundness of the present trade policy, but because they desire to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion and do not want to be listed as being opposed to that most laudable purpose.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am a bit amazed at the sort of politics that has been injected into this debate by my Republican friends. In this last argument I have just heard the most amazing statement made that I have ever heard on the floor of this House, an insinuation that amounts to placing the blame upon the present administration and the United States for the present World War. That is awfully cheap. To say that this administration has given this country nothing but the C. C. C. and the W. P. A. and war is absurd. What made the C. C. C. and the W. P. A. necessary? The mismanagement of the Republican administration, leaving the country in such economic straits that it was necessary to take Federal funds to pull the people out of the doldrums.

Is it the responsibility of the administration that Germany jumped on and overran Czechslovakia? Is it the responsibility of the administration that Germany overran Poland, Belgium, France, and Norway? Be there even a Republican with so little imagination that he would dare himself to say that it was the responsibility of this administration that Japan jumped on China? No. This administration, in its actions, had nothing to do with Japan jumping on the United States at Pearl Harbor.

This is no place for politics, but if the gentlemen on the other side want it, I am willing that they should have some of it. Make your charges where they will stand. Make them where they will hold water.

Somebody says the last two wars this country has gone into have come under Democratic administrations. There is nothing original about that, but let any man walk down into the Well of this House and point out what it was specifically that either of those administrations did that caused this country to enter either of those wars. Then your charges will be well founded. Back them up with facts. I challenge you to show me one thing that this administration in all of its parts, executive or legislative, did that caused this world to be now in the throes of war.

This is neither the time nor the place to fight the political campaign that will be waged in 1944. The words have been used, perhaps, until they are frayed, but still, we are at war, and we ought to be thinking considerably more about who wins the war than who will be elected President in 1944, and whether this will be a Republican or a Democratic House. I shame the man who continues to bring it onto the floor of this House for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Anderson, Calif.	Ford	Martin, Mass.
Anderson N. Mex.	Fulbright	Merritt
Auchincloss	Furlong	Merrow
Baldwin, Md.	Gale	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	Miller, Pa.
Barry	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Bates, Mass.	Gavagan	Murray, Tenn.
Bender	Gearhart	Myers
Bolton	Gerlach	Newsome
Boren	Gibson	Norton
Boykin	Gifford	O'Konski
Bradley, Pa.	Gore	O'Leary
Buckley	Gross	O'Neal
Buffett	Guyer	O'Toole
Burchill, N. Y	Hale	Pfeifer
Byrne	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Capozzoli	Harris, Va.	Pracht
Carlson, Kans.	Hart	Sabath
Celler	Heffernan	Sasscer
Cochran	Herter	Scanlon
Culkin	Izac	Scott
Dawson	Jenkins	Sheridan
Delaney	Jones	Smith, Maine
Dickstein	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Dies	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	King	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas	Klein	Stanley
Drewry	Kunkel	Starnes, Ala.
Eberharter	Lane	Steagall
Ellis	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Ellison, Md.	Luce	Towe
Ellsworth	Lynch	Treadway
Fay	McGehee	Wadsworth
Fenton	McGranery	Wene
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Winter
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Worley
		Wright

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. FAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time I have had the privilege of arising in this Chamber to open the debate on reciprocal trade agreements. The first occasion was in March 1934 on the enactment of the original bill; the second was on the extension in February 1937; the third was on a further extension in February 1940; the present debate is on House Joint Resolution 111, a bill providing for an additional 3-year extension.

The eyes of the world are focused today upon this legislative body. We have again arrived at a crossroads in the foreign policy of this Nation and our friends and enemies alike are watching to see which turning we shall take. If we continue to follow the road of economic cooperation, our friends and allies will be strengthened in our common fight for liberty and peace, and their confidence in us will be reassured, but if we turn away toward trade barriers and isolation, there will be jubilation in the chancelleries of Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini.

My reason for supporting trade agreements in 1934, in 1937, and in 1940—my desire for improvement in the foreign-trade conditions of the United States and for development of economic cooperation with other countries—has not been changed. My reasons for believing in the trade-agreements program, which I have enumerated from time to time, are as sound today as they ever were and even more necessary and fully justified by experience.

Before I touch on some new and additional reasons why House Joint Resolution 111 should be passed by this body, I shall refer again to the man who, more than anyone else, has been responsible for developing this outstanding program. As I have indicated on previous occasions, it has been the statesmanship, broad experience, wisdom, foresight, tact, and perseverance of our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, which have made the administration of the reciprocal trade agreements program so successful.

There is no doubt in my mind that Cordell Hull is one of the greatest Secretaries of State this Nation has ever produced and that history will accord him that distinction. I feel that his outstanding public service and untiring and intelligent efforts have improved our relations with all anti-Axis countries, and that his services especially entitle him to the unanimous acclaim of every citizen, not only of our country but of every peace-loving nation of the world.

When he was before our Committee on Ways and Means a few days ago, Secretary Hull said:

> International trade is regulated and is necessarily affected by the tariffs, regulations, and economic institutions of the various countries. What the trade-agreements program proposes is that this complex system of trade regulations, both our own and that of others, shall be administered and guided, as far as our influence extends, not in the direction of regimentation and scarcity, but in the direction of increased production, better distribution, and more abundant consumption.
>
> That is neither Republican nor Democratic doctrine. It is American doctrine, and the greater the extent to which we can get it accepted by other nations the better will be the prospect for our own future prosperity and peace. I am confident that the more the subject is discussed the more clearly these facts will be seen by all of us, and the more nearly unanimous we shall be in our support not only of the measure now before us, but of all measures that make possible, in our own hard-headed self-interest, fuller international cooperation against the common scourges of poverty, social and political instability, and war, and for greater abundance, social and political stability, and secure peace.

Many figures on the effects of the agreements on our foreign trade are available, although few new data have been added to those presented at the hearings on the extension in 1940. Those interested can examine the 1940 and 1943 hearings in detail and, therefore, I shall not burden the House at this time on that score, except to note that in the period 1938–39 United States exports to trade-agreement countries averaged 63 percent higher than did exports to the same countries in the 2-year period 1934–35, whereas our exports to non-trade-agreement countries had increased by only 32 percent. It does not seem to me to matter whether exports before the war totally changed commercial trade conditions had under the trade-agreements program been increased by 40, 50, or 60 percent; the exact percentage is not important. The evidence of gain in trade due to agreements is indisputable and has not been successfully controverted by any witness. There were many claims, allegations, and sleight-of-hand statistical performances intended to show that the increase in foreign trade of the United States since the inception of the program was due to some other cause than trade agreements.

With the same breath, those opponents who say that the trade-agreements program has done nothing to stimulate our foreign trade also cry out that this program has crippled large branches of American industry and agriculture or will certainly do so in the future. The plain truth of the matter is that neither of these contradictory arguments is true. The trade-agreements program has contributed very materially to a healthy restoration of our foreign trade, and it has accomplished this beneficial result without crippling any branch of American economic life.

There are cries that in the distant future great injury might come from trade agreements. We heard the same cries in 1934, we heard them in 1937, and we heard them in 1940. The woods are still full of ghosts that never become realities. Even the star witness for the opposition, Dr. John Lee Coulter, when he appeared before our committee at the recent hearings, stated that no serious repercussions had occurred from this program.

It has been argued that the trade-agreements program injures the American farmer. Being a farmer myself, I yield to no man in my zeal to advance and safeguard the interests of our farmers. My entire record of almost 32 years in this body will bear me out in this

statement. The American farmer is benefited by any act or program which inures to the benefit of our country as a whole. His prosperity must depend upon the prosperity of the entire Nation. If industry flourishes, if labor is receiving steady employment and good wages, if trade and commerce are prospering, the farmer will also share in these economic benefits. Conversely, when the farmer prospers, industry, labor, and commerce will be stimulated. No class will prosper long unless other classes are thriving.

In recent months, much has been written and said about post-war planning. All sorts of programs and formulas have been concocted. It is proper that attention should be given to post-war problems. In the trade-agreements program, however, we are not dealing with untried theories of future planning, but with a well-tested, scientific, and moderate instrument of international collaboration, proven by the acid test of 9 years' actual experience. Although I do not claim that this program is a complete blueprint for successful post-war cooperation among nations, it is a most important factor and it does seem to me that the choice between carrying forward this program or its abandonment is really the difference between the intention of following a line of economic cooperation and the definite intention of returning to a policy of economic isolation.

This is the clear cut issue upon which we must legislate. Shall we continue along the enlightened and progressive course which recognizes that our last hope of civilization lies in the development of international harmony among a family of nations, or shall we revert to the policy of nearsighted selfishness which has proved so disastrous in the past? We are called upon to decide between a wise and farsighted program of international cooperation and the thoroughly discredited policy of isolation.

I realize that some of my friends of the minority do not like to be termed isolationists. They say that they are not isolationists, and never have been. This measure affords them a chance to forever dispel the charge that they are isolationists.

They further claim that the tariff acts that followed World War No. 1, particularly the Hawley-Smoot Act, were not isolationist measures. They go further and allege that the Hawley-Smoot Act, passed after the 1928 political campaign which promised a limited revision of the tariff when the United States was supposed to be rolling in prosperity, had nothing whatever to do with the depression which followed. Apologists for this act have concocted the unique alibi that the depression really started back as early as 1926 or 1927. If they saw the depression coming as far back as 1926 or 1927 and still insisted on a tariff act which undoubtedly contributed and accentuated the depression, they are even less farsighted than we thought.

It should not be forgotten that the trade-agreements program was inaugurated as a constructive measure to modify not only the Hawley-Smoot Act, which had disastrous effects on the economy of the country and blighting repercussions throughout the world, but also the trade barriers of every kind that foreign countries had raised up against our exports of farm and factory products. I am going to call a few witnesses to testify on the relationship of the Hawley-Smoot Act to the depression. First is an editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 16, 1930, on the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930:

On the day the bill passed, Wall Street responded with a market drop which dragged several stocks even lower than in the November crash.

On the day the bill passed all grain prices fell to new low levels for the season—wheat went to the lowest price in a year, oats the lowest in 8 years, rye the lowest in 30 years.

On the day the bill passed, the price of cotton declined to the lowest level in more than 3 years.

On the day the bill passed, European dispatches reported that the copper interests of Great Britain, Belgium, and Germany had agreed to retaliate by withdrawing large orders in the United States for copper and nonferrous metals, whereupon the American Copper Exporters' Association frantically cut prices.

On the day the bill passed, the Mexican Government officially announced it would erect retaliatory duties, which followed similar retaliation against us by Canada and others.

On the day the bill passed, the United States Department of Commerce announced that American exports dropped in May to the lowest point in the last 6 years.

The great Republican publicist, William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., stated in the Emporia Gazette:

One of the things that brought about the depression was the Smoot-Hawley bill. The Gazette said so at the top of its lungs before the Smoot-Hawley law was finally formulated, while it was passing, and after it had become a law. That tariff was an offense against economic stability, not only in the United States but all over the world.

This is not the language of a so-called free trader, but of an outstanding Republican.

Another quotation which should not be overlooked is:

The Tariff Act of 1930, agitated in 1928, introduced in Congress in 1929 at the height of prosperity, and passed before the depression had become serious, intensified international difficulties. It gave the signal for the collapse of the tariff truce which had been prepared in Europe, and led to tariff retaliations in many countries.

This statement is from a book by Messrs. Garver and Hansen, written in 1937, after plenty of time for examination of the whole question.

I want to quote just one other statement:

From 1930 on, world conditions continued to get progressively worse. No one recognized this fact more clearly than President Hoover and the Republican Members of Congress. They saw that these world-trade barriers which restricted the intelligent flow of goods were causing the depression.

This last statement was not made by some irresponsible Democrat, but by your great minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 83, part 5, page 5319.

This question, however, has been rather fully debated during the last 15 years. I think that the judgment of the American people is correct in assessing the cause-and-effect relationship between the Hawley-Smoot Act and the depression.

I wish that every Member of this body would take time to read some of the many able statements presented to our committee by prominent people from all walks of life. I shall take time to quote from only a few of these. Representatives of several outstanding women's organizations appeared in support of the extension. As representative of these groups, I quote the following from the statement of Miss Emily Hickman, of the Young Women's Christian Association:

As the world becomes more closely knit in its relationship and as the United States comes to play a more and more determining role, as citizens, we are alive to whatever can add to the good influence of this country in the building of the post-war world. The planning of our trade relationships with other countries, in partnership with those countries, seems to us a most promising approach to the helpful exercise of American influence in establishing for all people a better economic future, the practice of cooperation between all, the abolishing of distrust and suspicion among nations, and the beginning of a happier age.

We on the committee were very much impressed by the well-nigh 100 percent unanimity shown by the most important and representative business organizations in the country in support of the trade-agreements program. For example, Mr. W. Gibson Carey, Jr., representing the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, stated, among other things:

The council is convinced that the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should not be made a political issue to be decided upon the grounds of congressional versus Executive power. It already incorporates numerous safeguards for the protection of the national interest in the negotiation of the agreements themselves by requiring public hearings, following a finding by the President that existing duties or other restrictions on either side are "unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States."

* * * * *

Until the principles of article VII of the Anglo-American mutual-aid agreement dated February 23, 1942 (and agreements of similar nature that have been made with other United Nations), can be implemented, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the only tangible assurance that we have that the United States will go into the post-war period with a constructive policy on which sound international trade relations may be built. It is the one guaranty for the future that we are not disposed to adopt policies that will force other nations down the road to extreme nationalism and trade barter. Our earlier tariff policy was undoubtedly one factor that led the British Commonwealth of Nations to set up the Ottawa agreements, which tended to close the markets of the British Empire to the rest of the world.

By this time the United States must have learned that in determining our own courses of action we cannot overlook the effects of those decisions on other nations. We have seen and felt the retaliation which other countries took when, after World War No. 1, we

adopted an isolationist economic policy that resulted in injury to them and to us.

Today the United States is facing the gravest of menaces to its economic security, to its economic and political institutions, to the very existence of all that makes up what we call the American way of life. We are allied on the battle fronts of the whole world, on the production fronts, and on the political fronts, with other countries which, like ourselves, believe in this way of life. Powerful though this country is, it needs now and will need after victory, the continued cooperation and confidence of other countries.

When Secretary of State Hull appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in the hearings on this bill, he said:

The foundations of international cooperation must be laid now and they must be built out of mutual confidence, mutual respect, and common interest. Today, we are engaged in the greatest cooperative enterprise in history. In this struggle for human freedom, 31 united nations, large and small, are banded together in a brotherhood of self-preservation, and 12 other nations are associated with them. While bending their utmost energy to the attainment of complete military victory and enduring the immense sacrifices which the war imposes upon them, these nations are meantime laying plans for the future.

Among the strongest reasons why this measure should be supported on both sides of the Chamber is the fact that the Axis Powers want it defeated. They know that defeat of this bill could be seized on by their propagandists as evidence of disunity—disunity among Americans and disunity among the United Nations. There is no use mincing words about it.

Several witnesses who recently appeared before our committee pointed out that we could ill afford not to extend the program because of the delicate international situation at the present time.

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, gave the following account of how the Axis Powers are listening in on American congressional affairs, and Mr. Rockefeller is not given to mere idle talk:

On the evening of March 10, 1943, the Berlin radio undertook to tell the American people what they should do about the important pieces of legislation which were coming before this session of Congress. Among other things, Berlin advised us to stop lend-lease and to forget about the Trade Agreements Act as being unimportant. Whatever else may be said about Berlin's propaganda, we know for a certainty that it doesn't waste its time on things which Hitler and Goebbels think are unimportant. I can assure you that if they think it is important that we should reject the trade-agreements program, it is a pretty good indication that they hope for and count on such action as a disrupting influence in the war unity and mutual confidence of our allies and friends, both in this hemisphere and throughout the entire anti-Axis world.

There is no question that an unfavorable vote and partisan debate on this question will give aid and comfort to the enemy. Surely, Members of this body would not want to do anything which in any way would give aid and comfort to those brutal gangsters with whom we are at war. There may be some Members of this House who feel that they have legitimate objections to some aspects of this program. I hope they will look beyond those objections to a greater end and help us pass this bill with a decisive majority, because our enemies want that evidence of disunity among us which any hesitation now would give.

There was considerable testimony before our committee to the effect that our allies and friends are watching our action on this issue with profound interest. It seems obvious that repudiation or any curtailment of this measure, at this time, might well weaken the ties which bind together the United Nations, not only for the future, but during the prosecution of the war.

No doubt many amendments to House Joint Resolution 111 will be offered; some may seem mild and innocuous. But this will be only the entering wedge by which those who are absolutely opposed to the program of trade agreements, or any other program which might lower a single tariff rate, hope to destroy the trade agreements.

In this connection I want to quote from the splendid statement of a new but able Member of this body, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, who appeared before our committee and said:

If certain groups in the populations in Europe and Asia and South America see us emasculating the trade-agreements program or destroying it or reducing it or subjecting it to too stringent controls, even by Congress, they cannot interpret that—I think it would be foolish for us to imagine that they would interpret it—as any other than a preliminary withdrawal from cooperation in the world.

Moreover, significant developments of vital importance to the United States are taking place in this hemisphere. It is obviously to our interest to maintain a workable mechanism for adjusting trade barriers between the United States and those countries to the south of us. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on this aspect of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. When this war is over, the United States will again face great opportunities and difficult adjustments in our relations with the other governments of this hemisphere. It should not be forgotten that 15 of the 27 countries with which we have trade agreements are Latin American countries, and that trade with these 15 countries make up 90 percent of the total United States trade with the other republics of this hemisphere.

I call your attention also to the fact that 16 of the 27 trade-agreement countries are our allies in the war against the Axis. Little Finland is the only trade-agreement country at war today with any of our allies, and she is not at war with us. Six of the remaining trade-agreement countries have broken off relations with Axis countries and are cooperating on our side in many ways. The remaining 4—Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Argentina—are neutral. It is no mere accident that these trade-agreement countries are lined up on the side opposing aggression. The nations which entered trade agreements with us did so because they were peace-loving nations seeking peaceful means of economic and political cooperation.

In a statement presented to our committee, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, pointed out that—

It is significant to note that the nations of the world which have resorted to the most extreme nationalist measures of embargo tariffs, bilateral trading, and trade controls—namely, Germany, Italy, and Japan—have become the extreme examples of absolute dictatorial power and complete governmental control of industry, labor, and agriculture.

I want to call attention to a statement presented to our committee by Mr. J. Raymond Walsh, director of education and research for the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Mr. Walsh said, in part:

Passage of this Trade Agreements Act is of the utmost importance * * * because it would have a salutary effect upon world opinion. It will state to those nations which look to us for leadership in the post-war world as they depend upon it now in the war itself, that we intend to fulfill our promises and work steadily and unflinchingly to establish international cooperation instead of competition, rivalries, fears, and their bitter sequel, wherein every nation attempts futilely to protect itself behind bristling armaments, periodically to burst into the flame of war.

In an impressive statement to the committee Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, asked:

What if Congress now, in the midst of the war, should reverse this policy by refusing to renew the authority for reciprocal trade pacts? In my opinion such refusal would shake to its very foundations the faith of our allies and of other nations in our leadership and our aims in this war; such action would arouse suspicion of our motives and cast distrust over our willingness to participate in the reestablishment of a just and equitable economic order after the war; such action would cast an indelible shadow over the post-war world, which like a ghost would haunt our every step in the post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation of the liberated peoples of the world.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, those are strong words—"shake to its very foundations the faith of our allies."

I cannot imagine Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Walsh, of the C. I. O., coming before our committee and advocating a policy which would injure the laboring man of this country, as some claim these trade agreements do. Surely these men, who have the duty of representing large segments of American labor, who have the experience and knowledge of labor that they have, and whose whole responsibility is to study labor problems and means of bettering the lot of the laboring man, would not come before us and recommend the continuance of a policy which was injurious to those for whom they speak.

I have quoted from but a few of the many outstanding witnesses who appeared before our committee in favor of this legislation.

Among others who appeared are Mr. Eugene P. Thomas, president of the National Foreign Trade Council of New

York; Mr. R. H. Patchin, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co.; Mr. H. H. Pike, Jr., vice president of H. H. Pike & Co.; Clark H. Minor, chairman of the foreign commerce department committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; B. C. Budd, of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Detroit, Mich.; and Mr. E. H. Lane, of the National Association of Manufacturers. It should not be forgotten that 85 percent of the newspapers of the country support the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

These men are not visionaries; they are men who have spent years in building up and conducting large business concerns in this country. Not one of them has any political interest in this legislation and, as a matter of fact, several of them confessed to being Republicans. All of them advocated the continuance of this legislation as being in the best interest of the United States, and it is notable that among them is the spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers, which has heretofore opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have sought to set forth some of the compelling reasons why this House should adhere again to the course which it chose in 1934 and which it has twice—in 1937 and 1940—continued to follow after most exhaustive consideration, investigation, and debate. The trade-agreements program has brought economic benefits to our whole national economy. That it has done this cannot be successfully or truthfully challenged or controverted. It stands as a symbol of national and international unity, and as such it is the target of hostility from the Axis Powers.

The winning of this war is our most urgent and immediate problem. But it is none too early for men of vision to plan and prepare for an era of peace and prosperity in a world where mutual trust and understanding among nations will replace the international suspicions, jealousies, and fears which led up to the present world conflagration. It will not be an easy task to eradicate these deep-rooted evils, but the trade-agreements program has made a substantial step in that direction, a step which is justified not only by humanitarian desires for a world of peace and prosperity, but by the cold hard facts of our own self-interest, and we must not, we cannot now turn away from this goal and go back to the discredited policy of isolation.

Our peace, our prosperity, our national well-being, as well as the peace, prosperity, and well-being of the world depend greatly upon the action we will take upon this momentous question.

If we should at this time either turn back or look back from this sound economic policy, which has so fully and indisputably justified itself, we could have and would have, in my humble judgment, no alibi for the serious and disastrous repercussions which I am convinced would ensue as a result of such unwise and regrettable action.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To ask the distinguished chairman of the committee two questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House has approved a bill to the House and it has now become law, to the effect that we extend loans to the extent of 90 percent of parity on agricultural products. There is one difficulty about this program that is bothering me. Suppose that becomes the established custom and that later on we get into trade agreements which reduce the duty in such a manner as to permit agricultural goods to come into this country in a manner which will interfere with that 90-percent parity of price. Has the chairman of our committee thought through that particular phase so that he can give us any comments upon it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have thought it through and have two ideas about it. The first is that in the 9 years since 1934 that this policy has been in operation, it is testified that there has been no serious repercussion whatever upon agriculture, or any industry of the country. I have discussed the matter with the Secretary of State, and I am sure and am convinced as a result of this discussion that since we have honest and capable men administering the laws we need have no fear of their doing anything which would adversely affect American agriculture or industry. I am a farmer myself, and what little I have to live on in my old age is invested in farm property. My whole life has been devoted to the livestock industry, and the growing of crops, and certainly I would not be willing to pursue a policy or advocate a policy or want Congress to adopt a policy that would be prejudicial or inimical to or that would in any way militate against the interest of agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: You will recall our recent conversation concerning the benefits of the trade-agreements program to American agriculture and your request that I set down in writing some of my thoughts on this subject.

There has never been the slightest doubt in my mind that American agriculture has as much, if not more, to gain from this program of reciprocal trade agreements than has any other major group in this country. This is so for two main reasons: The fact, so ably set forth by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, in the recent statement he submitted to your committee that by far the greater portion of American agriculture has a direct interest in the restoration of foreign markets; and the fact that high tariffs on industrial products that farmers need as producers and as consumers have squeezed American agriculture between high costs of things they buy and low prices of things they sell at home and abroad. Even those branches of American agriculture that have no direct interest in foreign markets are harmed by restrictive trade barriers here and abroad, because such barriers not only make the home market a poor one but also force other farmers, when they lose export markets for their customary crops, to turn to such things as dairy farming or beef cattle. Even these branches of agriculture stand to gain far more from a thriving export trade in agricultural and industrial products which helps to raise the buying power of the home market than they stand to lose by any moderate increase in imports of more or less similar products.

It is inconceivable to me that any farmer who remembers what happened to him and to American agriculture generally in the early 1930's, right on the heels of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, would continue to put a shred of faith in high tariffs on agricultural products or on anything else. American agriculture as a whole, the domestic-market branches as well as the great export branches, took a "nose dive" from which it had not recovered when another world war came along. Foreign markets lost in the early 1930's because of our own trade barriers, which cut down foreign purchasing power for our farm and factory products and the retaliatory and unilateral increase of import barriers in foreign countries against our exports of all kinds, could not be restored overnight. From the start of the trade-agreements program it has been an uphill fight, but it has been a worth-while fight, particularly from the point of view of American agriculture. The program has helped to restore foreign markets for our agricultural exports and, by helping to restore foreign markets and foreign purchasing power for our industrial exports as well, it has helped to improve the domestic market for all American farmers.

Those who still cling to the notion that American agriculture will be aided, rather than injured, by inordinately high tariffs overlook the above considerations and such plain facts as the following:

In 1929, when imports and exports of farm and other products were moving in large volume (exports being stimulated by large loans to foreigners), total United States farm cash income amounted to $11,296,000,000. The index of prices received by farmers (1935–39 = 100) was 138.

In 1932, the second year after the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act raised our barriers against innumerable industrial and many agricultural products to unprecedented heights, imports dropped, but so did farm cash income; it plummeted down to $4,743,000,000. The index of prices received by farmers hit a low of 61.

By 1939, with gradually increasing foreign trade helped along by reciprocal trade agreements, farm cash income had increased to $7,877,000,000 (not including Government payments). The index of prices was 87, having risen to a pre-war high of 114 in 1937, partly because of the price-increasing effects of drought.

In our trade agreements concessions have been obtained on nearly three-fourths (73.5 percent) of the trade-agreement countries' agricultural imports from the United States and on nearly one-half (47.7 percent) of trade-agreement countries' nonagricultural imports from the United States (on the basis of 1937 figures).

On the average for the 2 years, 1938–39, as compared with the average for the 2 years, 1934–35, our agricultural exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 49.9 percent whereas our agricultural exports to non-trade-agreement countries decreased by 26.4 percent.

Using the same periods for comparison, our dutiable agricultural imports from trade-agreement countries decreased by 1.8 percent whereas such imports from non-trade-agreement countries increased by 16.1 percent.

These facts alone provide sufficient answer to those who still try to attract attention by repeating the baseless charge that American agriculture has been "sold down the river"

under the trade-agreements program or who seek to propagate the idea that the trade-agreements program runs counter to the farm program.

With reference to the latter charge, which is equally unfounded, I may point out that it was generally recognized in 1933 and 1934 that American agriculture could not be lifted out of the morass of unsalable surpluses and ruinously low prices quickly enough through the effects of the trade-agreements program in restoring foreign markets for our farm products. It was therefore necessary to adopt various measures to aid American agriculture, such as crop loans and benefit payments, while the long-range, uphill job of reducing the barriers against our export trade went along.

The two programs have from the start been complementary to each other, both of them in the interest of American agriculture. This is recognized, I note, in the report of your committee to accompany House Joint Resolution 111 (H. Rept. No. 409, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 37). The Department of Agriculture, which is primarily responsible for administering legislation designed to aid farmers, plays a prominent part in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, particularly as regards agricultural exports and imports. This participation of the Department of Agriculture, together with the natural desire of everyone connected with the work of preparing for and negotiating trade agreements to help American agriculture, not harm it, insures on the one hand that no opportunity will be overlooked to obtain concessions of direct benefit to American agriculture and, on the other hand, that no concession will be granted on any imported agricultural product that would have the effect of retarding the progress of American agriculture toward its goals, including parity prices.

Great care has been taken to avoid granting, in the first instance, any concession on any agricultural product of a kind produced in this country which could do any real damage to American producers. Full opportunity is given to any producer to present his case in writing and orally before an agreement is signed, and his views receive full consideration. In some cases the existing duties have not been reduced at all, but merely bound against increase. In other cases, duty reductions have been made, but they have been too small to have any harmful effects. In still other cases the duty reductions have been restricted to certain seasons of the year—in general, the winter or early spring months—when supplies from domestic sources fall far short of needs or have been made to apply only to specified quantities in any year.

Furthermore, as pointed out in the report of your committee, to which I have already referred, the agreements provide flexibility for dealing with difficulties which might conceivably arise in the event of unforeseen developments. The report mentions the clause which leaves the way open for quotas on imports of an agricultural product if such imports should tend to render ineffective any domestic agricultural program for regulating market supply or raising prices to parity levels. What I here have in mind particularly are the more general "escape" clauses customarily included in agreements covering any more or less competitive products. These broad provisions permitting adjustments in case of need afford additional assurance that no domestic producer of agricultural or other products need fear that the door is closed to adjustments the need for which may appear after an agreement has entered into force.

Once more, let me emphasize that the trade-agreements program is not in conflict with, but is complementary to, the domestic farm program. Far from interfering with efforts to secure and maintain parity prices for agricultural products, it is calculated to assist, and, in fact, has assisted, to that end. It ought to be clear to anyone that a program which helps to reopen and expand export outlets for our great farm surpluses, as the trade-agreements program has done, must enable the growers of the great export crops, which are so large a part of our total agricultural production, to obtain a closer approach to parity prices, for a larger amount of output, than would otherwise be possible. At the same time, by creating a better market at home for farm and other products, and in other ways, the program operates to the benefit of other branches of agriculture as well. Moreover, it operates in a manner calculated to reduce rather than increase the necessity for governmental regulation of production.

In view of the foregoing, I have no hesitation whatever in stating that your committee's reaffirmation of its intention that the trade-agreements program "shall, as in the past, be administered in such a manner as to promote the progressive improvement of agriculture's position in the American economy" accords fully with my own views in the matter.

You are, of course, at liberty to use this letter in any way you may deem appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins, will he yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield briefly to the distinguished Member from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, in what he had to say particularly with reference to the Smoot-Hawley bill, and the part that he thought it contributed back in the days of the depression, to the depression, and today the Smoot-Hawley bill is still on the statute books. Has there been any attempt on the part of Congress that has been controlled by the New Deal for 10 years to repeal the Smoot-Hawley Act?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. They have not the courage to repeal it. They have taken the contrary course, and have chipped away at it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly to my good and able friend.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As I understand the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, he made a statement that the reciprocal trade agreements were a benefit to agriculture in this country. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. KNUTSON. I so understood him.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As I recall, the President of the United States, when a candidate for office in 1932, made a speech in Baltimore in which he said there were no excessive tariffs on agriculture.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that is true. Of course the gentleman must remember that the statements made by Candidate Roosevelt in 1932 were not the position of President Roosevelt, never have been and never will be. I may say that notwithstanding the President's promise to the American farmer in the campaign of 1932, his administration has lowered by an average of 46 percent some 234 items in the agricultural schedule alone, not to mention agricultural products in other schedules, such as sugar, wool, tobacco. How does that conform with his promise in Baltimore?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is it not a fact that the reciprocal trade agreements have been paid for by American agriculture and the mining interests of the West?

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. I was rather surprised at the position taken by the chairman of our committee. He is a farmer, as I need not tell you, and he should be up here fighting shoulder to shoulder with the rest of us for the protection of agriculture.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. Would the gentleman please inform the members of this committee whether or not the price of agricultural products has risen or fallen since the adoption of the reciprocal trade agreements, and will he answer that question categorically? Have they gone up or down?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am going to answer that a little later on in my remarks, and I shall call attention to how the exports have fallen and the imports of competitive products have risen. We cannot discuss prices when we are at war, when the war is acting as an embargo on all commerce, and the gentleman knows it well. I am not going to discuss the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum.

Mr. McMURRAY. Would the gentleman take the period from 1934 to 1939?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I shall be glad to put into the RECORD what the prices were.

Mr. McMURRAY. And answer the question whether the price of farm products rose from 1934 to 1939 or fell from 1934 to 1939.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think that is a very fair question, and at this point I shall put into the RECORD a table, which will not be very comforting to the distinguished gentleman, I may say, although I never was much of a hand to peddle bad news, but will let the RECORD speak for itself.

Average prices received by farmers for specified farm products, Aug. 15, 1939, and their percentage of parity price

Commodity	Average price, Aug. 15, 1939	Percentage average price is of parity price
Wheat, per bushel	54.5 cents	40
Corn, per bushel	45.7 cents	57
Oats, per bushel	25.4 cents	51
Barley, per bushel	34.5 cents	45
Rye, per bushel	34.2 cents	38
Buckwheat, per bushel	54.8 cents	60
Flaxseed, per bushel	$1.35	64
Rice (rough), per bushel	57.9 cents	57
Cotton, per pound	8.70 cents	56
Cottonseed, per ton	$16.24	58
Potatoes, per bushel	69.0 cents	81
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	90.7 cents	83
Peanuts, per pound	3.39 cents	56
Apples, per bushel	66.0 cents	55
Butterfat, per pound	22.4 cents	73
Eggs, per dozen	17.5 cents	75
Hogs, per 100 pounds	$5.47	61

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, surely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman permit me to supplement the answer of the gentleman who has the floor? In the statement we get from the Tariff Commission, farm exports have declined 30 percent in the 6 years from 1934 to 1940.

Mr. McMURRAY. I did not ask about exports. I asked about prices.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me answer the gentleman. United States farm exports declined 30 percent between 1934 and 1940, and have now practically stopped. That was 1940. Farm imports to the United States increased 57 percent in the same period.

Mr. McMURRAY. But——

Mr. KNUTSON. But what?

Mr. McMURRAY. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to have the price of corn, the price of wheat, the price of hogs, the price of cotton.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have inserted those prices in the RECORD.

Mr. McMURRAY. I am sorry that the people arguing this will not face that issue.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be interrupted any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would not have been interrupted if he had not acquiesced. The gentleman refuses to yield further.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, there is a limit to what the gentleman will put up with. Now, if I may proceed with my remarks.

During the debate on the resolution to extend for another 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Act, the membership of the House will probably be told that agriculture, labor, and industry are practically a unit in asking for the extension without protecting reservations. Such, however, is not the case. While it is true that William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, did appear before the committee and recommend favorable action, he had to admit under cross-examination that he did so in his private capacity. Contrasted with Mr. Green's position, it is significant that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor has asked for certain safeguarding amendments before the life of the act is extended.

Mr. Ed O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged renewal with slight modifications, and I think it should be called to the attention of the House that a number of State Farm Bureau Federations have asked for safeguarding amendments, such as were introduced in committee by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] and supported unanimously by the Republican minority.

The National Grange demands the adoption of safeguarding amendments, such as proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], before a further extension is voted, including congressional review of the treaties.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce also ask for the adoption of safeguarding amendments.

The hearings will disclose that representatives of the cattle and dairy industry are strongly opposed to the law as it now stands.

I merely mention these incidents in order to keep the record straight. The Members of this body should have all the facts presented to them before the final roll call is had.

It is fair to state that there are two groups vitally interested in this measure. One group, consisting of manufacturers of automobiles and automobile parts, machinery and office equipment, who do a large export business, strongly urge the extension of the Trade Treaty Act. No doubt these groups have been benefited by its operation.

On the other hand, agriculture, in all its branches, has been injured by the operation of the administration's foreign-trade policy. In support of that statement I call the attention of the House to the fact that from 1934 to 1939, exports of American farm products dropped from $733,000,000 to $516,000,000, while imports of farm products during the same period increased from $821,000,000 to $1,285,000,000. From these figures it can readily be understood why the American farmer is against extension of the Trade Agreements Act in its present form.

That should effectively dispose of any attempt to build up a foundation under the indefensible foreign-trade policy that the State Department is following at the present time.

The distinguished chairman, for whom I have a deep affection, read you a list of organizations and individuals who favor the extension of the act. Now let me read to you an impressive list of those who are opposed to an extension of the act.

National Grange, Fred Brenckman.

Independent Petroleum Association of America, Russel B. Brown.

Waltham Watch Workers Union, No. 72, A. F. of L., Walter W. Cenerazzo.

National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers.

Vegetable Growers Association of America.

National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, an organization that covers all the dairy interests in the country, very ably represented by Mr. Charles W. Holman.

Industrial Wire Cloth Institute, Ralph W. Bacon.

American Glassware Association, New York, H. L. Dillingham.

Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, Inc., James L. Fri.

Givaudan-Delawanna, Inc., manufacturers of essential oils.

Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association.

Manufacturing Chemists' Association.

Wool Hat Manufacturers Association of America.

Raw Materials National Council, Carl H. Wilkin.

Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of Georgia, who came before the committee and made a splendid statement, full of facts that could not be answered, asking either for safeguarding amendments or termination of the act.

Then we had Samuel Crowther, able economist and author, Sunapee, N. H.

American National Livestock Association. They have a membership in many States.

Continental Mills, Jenkintown, Pa., M. D. Brown.

Dr. John Lee Coulter, economist, Washington, D. C.

The chairman referred to Dr. Coulter, but he did not tell you that Dr. Coulter said there should be certain safeguarding amendments incorporated in the act, such as giving the Congress certain time in which to interpose a veto of any treaty that may be negotiated in the future; an opportunity for aggrieved persons to go into the Court of Customs for redress, and several other important amendments.

Then the Merrimac Mills, Methuen, Mass.

National Association of Wool Manufacturers, Arthur Besse.

United States Potters' Association, J. M. Wells.

Certainly, that list is sufficiently impressive to cause Congress to stop, look, and listen before it again blindly approves the present program.

I have here several telegrams which I wish to read for the information of the House:

Position of Minnesota Farm Bureau of January 17, 1940, while supporting generally the continuance of reciprocal trade agreements, we demand that no such agreements be consummated the effect of which may or would be to force or hold domestic prices on any farm products below parity level. Any other course would justify the condemnation of any such agreements by all agricultural groups.

1. No tariff concessions be made on items in any treaty or agreement the effect of which would be likely to reduce or hold the domestic price of any farm commodity below parity.

2. Full hearing be given to spokesmen for producers of agricultural commodities affected in any way by treaty concessions, with a guaranty of consideration of such representations, and assurance that no treaty shall be completed until a full and complete record of such hearings has been made available.

3. That the United States Senate must approve each proposed treaty or agreement in its entirety in order to make it effective.

MINNESOTA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
J. S. JONES, *Secretary, St. Paul, Minn.*

I now read a message from one of our leading dairymen, and president of the Twin Cities Milk Producers Association:

Trade Agreements Act should be defeated unless provision is made for congressional approval of all trade agreements; also should contain provision protecting American agriculture and industry from importation of foreign products at less than American costs. Your best efforts will be greatly appreciated.

W. S. MOSCRIP,
Twin Cities Milk Producers Association, St. Paul, Minn.

Then here is a telegram from our largest cooperative marketing association in Minnesota:

Trade Agreements Act should be defeated unless contain some form congressional approval. Also no importation of any articles at less than American costs.

N. K. CARNES,
Central Cooperative Association of South St. Paul, South St. Paul, Minn.

This organization is a cooperative livestock selling agency which handles the bulk of the livestock shipped to South St. Paul. Mr. Carnes is one of the country's greatest authorities on cooperative marketing and the farmer has no better friend than he.

Let me read a telegram from another outstanding farm leader, John Brandt, president of Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.:

Our group opposed to extension trade treaty agreements unless law contains provision requiring (1) congressional approval, (2) that no product be permitted imported under agreement at less than American cost of production, (3) treaties effective only with nations with whom treaties are made, which means elimination of most-favored-nation clause.

JOHN BRANDT,
President, Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

I now wish to read a communication from Charles W. Holman, the able and alert Washington representative of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, who is always out in front fighting for the dairy interests:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1943.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

To Members of the United States House of Representatives:

I am advised that the House will begin consideration on May 10 of House Joint Resolution 111, a resolution by Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON to extend for another 3 years the Trade Agreements Act.

Our organization has followed closely the workings of this act and has made extended studies as to its so-called economic benefits. Insofar as we know, no other agency, public or private, has attempted to measure the operations of the act by a study of the individual commodities as to which concessions were given or import duties lowered by the United States and the countries with which we signed agreements. Some of the results of these studies were presented to the Ways and Means Committee in connection with this particular resolution. We believe that your examination of the tables which are to be printed in the hearings will convince you that the economic benefits to the United States were dubious, to say the least. In our opinion, the agreements have worked adversely to the interests of the Nation and will become a post-war menace to the welfare of American farmers who depend upon the domestic market for their outlets.

Aside from the economic issues involved, we feel that the proposal to extend the life of the act presents to this Congress an issue which is transcendent. That issue is to require the Executive to submit future trade agreements to the Congress for approval. While our people believe that these agreements contain in them enough treaty material to require Senate ratification, the fact that they affect the national revenue makes it also necessary that there be at least consideration given by both Houses of the Congress and that no trade agreement be made effective unless approved by a majority vote of both Houses.

The reasons for such action are obvious and well known to all. They lie in the necessity of preserving the constitutional form of government.

We, therefore, urge that you vote against the extension of the act unless some form of congressional approval can be obtained.

We also urge that the act be further amended as follows:

1. To restore the right to citizens and State governments to enter court and protect their interests with respect to trade agreements.

2. To limit the application of concessions to the foreign countries with which we sign trade agreements.

3. To require a reform in the procedure, with particular respect to public hearings which now are but a dull travesty upon this necessary public institution.

4. To limit any concessions by this country so that competitive commodities cannot enter at less than American levels of production costs.

We are convinced that a careful examination by you of the act and operations under it will prove to you that it is an almost perfect example of totalitarian legislation.

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

Last, but not least, here is a letter from Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, copy of which all Members have received. It reads as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1943.

To Members of the House:

We trust that in passing on H. J. Res. 111, renewing the Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years, Congress may vindicate its ancient and fundamental right to be something more than a mere spectator in matters relating to the tariff and the formulation of our policies with reference to foreign trade. As we see it, that is the most important issue involved in this whole question.

Any plan that robs the chosen representatives of the people of one of their most important functions, reducing them to impotency, and which wrongfully delegates this power in its entirety to the executive department of the Government, cannot be successfully defended as liberal, constitutional, or American.

While one of the declared purposes of the Trade Agreements Act was to develop an outlet for our farm surpluses, as the act has been administered, it has had the opposite effect. Under the workings of this act farm imports have greatly increased, while our exports of agricultural commodities have shown a sharp decline. During the 5-year period from 1936 to 1940, both inclusive, our food imports averaged nearly 250 percent of food exports.

Many of the so-called concessions that we have received from foreign countries in the making of trade agreements have been nothing but mere gestures, while we have made the most substantial concessions and generalized them to the whole world. The Grange does not regard this as true reciprocity.

As an illustration of the lengths to which we have gone in sacrificing the interest of the United States in negotiating these agreements, the concessions we made to Argentina went into force 30 days after the exchange at Washington of the instrument of Argentine ratification and the proclamation of the President of the United States. But it was stipulated in the agreement that certain concessions made to us should become effective only by stages. Under this arrangement it was agreed that on certain articles concessions made to us by Argentina should not go into force until Argentine receipts from customs duties should exceed P270,000,000 in any calendar year. That sum represented the average annual tariff revenues of Argentina from 1931 to 1940. Under this plan the concessions made to us by Argentina on the particular articles in question have not yet become effective, although all of our concessions went into force on November 15, 1941. We do not believe that Congress would have sanctioned any such lopsided arrangement as that.

Various amendments are being suggested to the Trade Agreements Act to protect the interests of the Nation and to bring this piece of legislation into some semblance of harmony with the Constitution. From the beginning, the National Grange has taken the position that these trade agreements are treaties in reality, and that they should be ratified by the United States Senate before taking effect. At the very least, the act should be so amended as to make it possible for Congress to disapprove by a majority vote of each House trade agreements deemed contrary to the best interests of the American people.

The right of court review on the part of the citizen, as provided in the flexible provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, should likewise be restored.

In enumerating these two points we do not mean to imply that the act could not be greatly improved by amendment in other respects.

The people of the country have been greatly heartened by the stand that the legislative branch of the Government has taken during recent months toward recapturing its constitutional prerogatives, and we trust that Congress may reassert its rightful authority in this vital and fundamental matter.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Chairman, it is frequently charged that we have one of the highest tariffs in all the world. Figures submitted to us by the United States Tariff Commission show conclusively that such is not the case. On the contrary, we have one of the lowest tariffs. Let me give you a comparison of tariff rates between the various countries:

The figure for the United States is taken as 100 and the figure for each other country is expressed as a percentage of the United States figures:

1. Spain	465.0
2. Turkey	359.6
3. Germany	279.0
4. Brazil	239.4
5. Greece	166.0
6. Hungary	160.0
7. Italy	150.5
8. Mexico	149.0
9. Egypt	130.0
10. Switzerland	128.0
11. United Kingdom	118.3
12. Argentina	110.0
13. United States	100.0
14. Japan	98.0
15. Belgium	96.8
16. France	85.0
17. Canada	76.3
18. Netherlands	37.4
19. Sweden	32.8

From the foregoing table it will be noted that 12 countries have higher rates than we, while 6 countries have lower tariffs. It is significant that the United Kingdom has an average ratio of 118.3 as compared to our 100. At this point let me call to the attention of the House the Minority Report and more particularly the tables contained on pages 27 and 28 thereof. These are truly illuminating.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. These figures that you gave are so revealing on how much lower our tariffs are than those of countries like Spain, Brazil, and others, do I gather that you are pleading for low tariffs?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; but we are all the time hearing about how high our tariffs are, and I am simply attempting to show to the House that our barriers are much lower than many other countries.

Mrs. LUCE. Is it also not true that we have the highest living standards, and if we have the highest living standards, and the lowest tariffs, perhaps that is good procedure?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry that I was not more explicit.

Mrs. LUCE. I would be most interested to know, because it sounded like a low tariff argument.

Mr. KNUTSON. At the present time our tariffs are lower than the countries I mentioned. When we went into the New Deal they started chipping them down until they have got us down near hardpan. Certainly, the able lady from Connecticut will not contend, nor do I think anyone else within the sound of my voice will contend, that the living standards of the American people have gone up as our tariff rates have gone down under the New Deal.

Mrs. LUCE. I thought the gentleman was trying to prove that the living standards of other countries such as Spain and Brazil had gone down as their tariffs had gone up.

Mr. KNUTSON. No, and I am sorry if the able lady from Connecticut misunderstood me.

Reciprocity has long been one of the basic principles of the Republican Party. At his inauguration, the great William McKinley said that the object of reciprocity "is always to be opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend rather to increase their employment."

The Republicans in this House favor reciprocity of the kind advocated by McKinley, which goes hand in hand with, and supplements rather than supplants the traditional American policy of safeguarding domestic producers from unfair and destructive foreign competition by reasonable tariff protection. That position cannot successfully be assailed.

Many will argue that the war is acting as an embargo on peacetime commerce, hence there should be no hesitancy on our part to renew the Trade Treaty Act without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i."

It is true that the war acts as an embargo, but that war is coming to an end some day, and we all hope in the near future. It is then that we are going to need tariffs for the protection of the American producers on farm, and in factory and shop, as never before.

All of us recall what happened after the last war. While the war was in progress the war-stricken nations in other continents were obliged to pile up surpluses because of inability to secure transportation. When shipping became available, following the Armistice, these nations proceeded to dump their accumulated surpluses on the American market at prices that took little consideration of production costs. Indeed, the situation became so desperate, especially for the American farmer, that it was necessary for the Congress to pass the so-called Emergency Tariff Act in 1921, which was supplanted by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act the following year.

History has a way of repeating itself. It does not take a statesman with unusual vision to foretell what will happen when this war is over. Again there will be a mad scramble on the part of foreign countries to capture the American market and to establish dollar credits. If we do not surround the Trade Agreements Act with certain safeguards, such as have been proposed by many farm, labor, and manufacturing groups, we will find our hands will be so tied that we will be unable to give to our people that degree of protection necessary to save them from ruinous competition from abroad. Let us not forget that when the 11,000,000 boys in uniform return from the war they will need jobs at good pay. These jobs will not be available if we surrender the home market to others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield myself 10 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I prophesy if we pass this act in its present form that when the boys come home and they find themselves unable to secure jobs because of the enormous imports that are taking place, which will shut down factories and restrict agricultural production, someone is going to have a lot of explaining to do. The returning warriors simply will not stand for such an arrangement.

Let us examine the amendments submitted in the Ways and Means Committee by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. I may say at this point that these amendments were not presented with any thought of hampering the trade-treaty program; neither will they have that effect. They embrace the following propositions:

First. Congress should have the right to pass upon any trade treaties which may be negotiated under the act, such right to be exercised within 90 legislative days of their submission.

Second. It should be provided in the act that no reductions shall be made in the duties on competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products.

Third. It should be provided in the act that no reduction shall be made in the duty on any competitive foreign agricultural product when the domestic price of the comparable product is less than parity.

Fourth. It should be provided in the act that the concessions granted under trade treaties should be extended only to such nontreaty countries as do not discriminate against American imports.

Fifth. Congress should restore to American producers the right to litigate matters arising out of the trade treaties, which is now denied them under the present act.

Sixth. It should be provided in the act that nothing therein should be construed to authorize the modification of any law or regulation the purpose of which is to protect human, animal, or plant health and life.

The present Trade Agreements Act involves a complete surrender by the Congress of its exclusive constitutional authority over the tariff and foreign trade. The last congressional election has been properly construed as a mandate from the people to Congress to reassume its full legislative powers and recapture the authority which previous rubber-stamp Congresses have abjectly delegated to the Executive. It will be recalled that a unanimous Supreme Court invalidated the National Industrial Recovery Act on the ground that it was delegation of legislative authority "running riot." The Trade Treaty Act is an even broader surrender of discretionary legislative power to the Executive, contrary to the Constitution, and Congress should lose no time in reasserting its control over foreign trade policy, leaving to the Executive the purely administrative functions which the Constitution intends him to exercise.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my old-time friend.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I notice in the minority report the statement is made that of the 30 trade treaties made under this law, 26 had to be submitted to the foreign legislative bodies concerned for ratification and approval.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, I was about to touch on that matter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And in this amendment asking that the Congress have some say in approving these treaties, we are merely following what has been done in 26 other countries where 26 treaties have already been made?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

It is noteworthy that of the 30 trade treaties thus far negotiated, 26 had to be submitted to the foreign legislative bodies concerned for ratification and approval. Therefore, aside from the constitutional aspects of the matter, there is no justification for denying the right of the American Congress to pass on them.

Secretary Hull does not believe that the Congress can be trusted to pass on trade agreements. The Cuban Congress has the right to do so, you do not. The Colombian Congress has that right. You do not. The Congress of Costa Rica has that right. You do not. The Congress of Guatemala has that right. You

do not. In Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Uruguay some form of legislative ratification is necessary but the great American Congress is too dumb to be trusted with that great responsibility. Evidently the State Department does not hold your trustworthiness and intelligence in very high regard.

The State Department attempts to justify this discrimination against the American Congress by contending that these foreign countries have the parliamentary system of government, under which legislative approval of the acts of the head of the Government is a mere formality. In the first place, it is not true that these governments all have the parliamentary system. As a matter of fact, most of the South and Central American countries, at least, have a system of government patterned largely on our own. But even if it were true, that would be no justification for the State Department's position in opposition to congressional approval of the treaties, since we in this country do not have the parliamentary system, but a truly representative system, under which the legislative powers are vested exclusively in the representatives of the people in Congress. Any thought of one-man government, under which the legislative branch is a mere puppet in the hands of the Executive, is entirely foreign to our American ideals and institutions, and was discarded with the Revolution. Yet the State Department dares to suggest that we Americans pattern our Government on that system, at least so far as dealing with the subject of tariff and foreign trade is concerned.

The State Department overlooks the fact that the American people took the "rubber" out of Congress last November.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield gladly.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman, who has made a great study of this whole question, if it is not a fact that in the 26 nations with whom we have reciprocal trade agreements and under the laws of which those agreements must be submitted to their congresses and parliaments, in those countries the agreements are considered to be treaties, while in the United States they are mere executive agreements?

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course they are treaties. The mere fact that Mr. Hull calls them agreements does not change their character one iota.

Mr. MOTT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. They are treaties, and calling them agreements is nothing but pure subterfuge.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. Have any of these 26 nations with which we have reciprocal trade agreements any law on the subject of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, or is it a fact that in those countries the chief executive simply exercises his treaty-making power, without specific law, and submits it to the parliamentary body?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know as to that. I may say that all the countries that I named are Latin-American countries, whose governments are patterned on that of the United States.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice one particular objection that was raised by some of these groups, including the women's clubs, the League of Women Voters, and similar organizations was that of logrolling which they said existed in tariff making under both parties, and they implied that when this was handled by the State Department logrolling was absent. Conceding that this might be true at the moment, I should like to ask the gentleman from his great experience: Would there not be at least an equal chance for corruption and graft over in a department or agency, perhaps a greater chance than in the Congress where things are open and talked about and always in the eye of the public? The old saying is that a new broom sweeps clean and maybe for 3 or 4 years, particularly at a time such as the present when, due to the war, there is not much opportunity for trade it may appear to work all right, but it seems to me there is a terrific chance for corruption in a Government agency which would not exist if it were handled in Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe the gentlewoman from Illinois is absolutely correct. Any legislation that requires congressional action is more or less brought into the open. It was testified to in the hearings that these trade agreements are negotiated behind locked doors with only representatives of the State Department and foreign countries present.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there any place in the hearings where we can find the names of the negotiators who represent our Government in negotiating these treaties?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; and in this connection let me say that on the 15th day of April I asked Dr. Sayre, of the State Department, when he was before the committee, to insert in the RECORD the names of five or more practical businessmen who had ever met a pay roll, who were members of this interdepartmental body which negotiates the treaties. He hemmed and hawed and said it could be done. So I asked him to insert in the RECORD the names of five such men. He said he would. Only today, before I came over to the session of the House, I stopped in at the committee room of the Ways and Means Committee to ask the clerk if Dr. Sayre had complied with my request, and the clerk said he had not.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Perhaps he could not comply with the gentleman's request. The members of the agreement-making board are not named by name at all; they are certain functionaries in the several departments and they are not even named. I have correspondence here from the State Department, myself, and it was only on my very great insistence that the State Department finally came through and gave me the names of the people who actually negotiated these agreements. They are supposed to be secret.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do they have their being under names or under numbers?

Mr. MOTT. They have it under their office. One is a representative of the State Department; one is a representative of the Department of Agriculture. That is all the information you can get about it; they will not tell you who they are unless you get tough with them and then they finally will come through. I venture to say that not half a dozen Members of the House of Representatives know the names of the men who made the last reciprocal trade agreement with whatever nation it was made.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is just barely possible Dr. Sayre does not himself know. In that case I will absolve him.

Mr. MOTT. I think he does, but he will not tell.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in knowing what may be the ultimate fate of plans for making synthetic rubber out of farm products should this trade-agreements program be extended without any reservations or restrictions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Under the Peruvian agreement—some call them treaties—the State Department froze rubber on the free list.

Mr. CURTIS. For how long a time?

Mr. KNUTSON. For 2 years and as much longer as would be satisfactory to both countries, but at least for 2 years. That action was taken after Pearl Harbor. Under the British agreement it was frozen on the free list for 3 years. Here we have an American industry that promises in time to become as great as the automobile industry, that is going to employ hundreds of thousands of people, that is going to take the products of millions of acres. It has been estimated that it will take the products of as high as 30,000,000 acres, and yet Vice President Wallace, the heir apparent, says that when the war is over we must scrap the synthetic rubber industry in which we already have $750,000,000 invested—scrap it because it would not be neighborly for us to produce our own rubber.

Mr. CURTIS. In the event of the passage of this bill without any reservations, we delegate to the State Department or to the executive branch of the Government the authority to destroy or preserve the synthetic rubber industry, do we not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. Moreover, the gentleman must also realize that if we renew the act without safeguarding amendments all industry will be throttled immediately the war is over.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Does the gentleman happen to know whether a sovereign State in behalf of its citizens can go into the courts and contest whether

these trade agreements are constitutional as they are now negotiated?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. Our citizens used to have that right when the Republicans were in power, but the New Deal felt that it was not desirable. That power was abrogated in the First Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Now all you can do is whistle and pray for the return of sanity in 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not true that under the present arrangement these agreements are fully entered into without the general public knowing what they are all about?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly. Anyone who is going to take the floor to defend the administration's foreign-trade policy had better brush up on criminal practices before he does so.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. My colleague has spoken of rubber. In his district, as in mine, sugar is produced. Mr. WALLACE said it should not be produced in the United States because tropical labor could produce it cheaper. The biggest sugar mill in my district is not opening this year. Beets are grown in the gentleman's district. What assurances have our people that we will have a market for sugar under these treaties?

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, we must presume that the administration's purpose is to buy the sugar we need from abroad so as to promote the good-neighbor policy. Under the New Deal our first duty is to the rest of the world rather than to our own people.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. At whose expense?

Mr. KNUTSON. At the expense of the American producer and consumer, whether it be on the farm or in the factory, make no mistake about that. He is the forgotten man in these negotiations.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman will discuss the advisability of extending these trade treaties to 1, 2, or 3 years, and what the gentleman's recommendation would be as to making them 3 years, 2 years, or 1 year?

Mr. KNUTSON. If I had my way about it, I would extend the act, providing it is amended, for the duration because after this war is over there is going to be a lot of negotiating to be done, and if we go into these negotiations on a free-trade basis, with nothing to trade, as usual, we will come out of the small end of the horn.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with the statement it is true that the uncertainty which exists today in the making of these treaties and the change of conditions which we may be confronted with 3 years from now, so far as the nations are concerned, may be entirely different?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, conditions are changing daily and that is what makes me smile over all this talk in reference to getting ready for the postwar period. We do not know what is going to be the situation when this war is over. We do not know what Stalin will want—he is going to get what he wants, you can be sure of that—and we do not know what Churchill has planned for us.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Was there any evidence in the hearings that the State Department or the administration knew exactly what they wanted or what we are supposed to want in the postwar period with reference to trade or any other subject? I know we have had some splendid broad statements of principle, to which we all agree, as to international cooperation in the postwar period, but did they develop before your committee just what policies they were going to carry out if this act is extended?

Mr. KNUTSON. It has been intimated that the President is going to set up a glorified international W. P. A., but he is going to reverse the service. Where we used to make them come and get it, we will then have them sit down while we bring it to them.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman if he recalls of any concessions ever made by a foreign country under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? Has a concession been made to any American agricultural product? I have attended hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information probably a dozen times and I cannot recall that a concession was ever made, but I would like to know if the gentleman knows whether any have been made or not?

Mr. KNUTSON. The figures showing the decline of agricultural exports under the trade treaties certainly indicate that no tangible benefits have been received.

I have already referred to the fact that the State Department agreed to freeze rubber on the free list in the Peruvian treaty, which was negotiated some 7 months after Pearl Harbor. However, it will stand reemphasis. Where is that going to leave us when the war is over and we find on our hands a vast and highly developed synthetic rubber industry into which we have already poured $740,000,000. Shall we scrap that industry, as Vice President WALLACE suggests, in the interest of the good-neighbor policy? No; a thousand times no. The American people will never stand for it being scrapped even though a small protective tariff be necessary to keep it operating in a flourishing condition when peace comes.

It seems that everyone but the "cookie pushers" down in the State Department, and a few other starry-eyed dreamers who are out to make the world over, has learned a lesson since Pearl Harbor, and that lesson is that we must make ourselves absolutely independent in our supply of rubber, which today is one of the most vital essentials in our war effort and in both war and peace is absolutely indispensable. If Congress had had the veto power last year we would have insisted on rubber being taken off the "frozen" list so as to leave our hands absolutely free when the war is over. You can bet your bottom dollar that England and Russia will be absolutely free to act in all instances and on all questions, once the war is over, but Uncle Sam will find himself "hog-tied" with a lot of trade agreements that will run on indefinitely, or until renounced by the Chief Executive.

Let us examine the history of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a few moments. When Secretary Hull first came before the Ways and Means Committee back in 1934 and advocated that tariff-making powers, which are vested in Congress by the Constitution, be transferred to the President, he said it was necessary in order to expand our export markets. The figures I gave you a few moments ago prove that it failed to expand, but rather diminished the export market for agricultural products.

In 1937 Secretary Hull again appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to advocate that the Trade Agreements Act be extended for 3 years. He then assured us that it was necessary that we do so if the peace of the world were to be preserved. Mind you, that was a little more than 2 years before the outbreak of the present war and 3 years before Pearl Harbor.

In 1940 Mr. Hull again appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to advocate another 3-year extension of the Trade Treaty Act because it was needed to lay a foundation for peace. That was 3 years ago, and peace is not yet in sight. Indeed, Pearl Harbor came the following year.

On April 12 Mr. Hull again appeared before the committee to ask that the Trade Agreements Act be extended for another 3 years. This time he told us that it is to be a symbol of our purpose to cooperate in post-war economic rehabilitation.

The history of the Trade Act has been a succession of dismal failures. It failed to expand our export markets for agriculture, it failed to preserve world peace, and it has failed to lay a foundation for peace. Do not let the State Department deceive anyone into believing that the adoption of the West amendments will be regarded by any foreign country as an unfriendly act. As Walter Lippmann so aptly said recently in his column in the New York Times:

> Secretary Hull has persuaded the administration leaders in Congress to take the position that congressional action on the Trade Agreements Act should be made the test case of American foreign policy in the post-war world. There are excellent and compelling reasons for the extension of the act. But the effort to inflate its importance to a point where the fate of the world hangs upon whether Congress may pass on Mr. Hull's agreements is, surely, a grave error.
>
> For it is not true that the vote on the amendment proposed by Senator MCNARY is or can be made the test of our general policy.

To say that it is the test, to ask the rest of the world to regard it as the test, is to make much too much out of comparatively little and to have lost our sense of proportion.

If it be true that the good will of other nations may be bought with trade concessions why is not Japan a friend rather than an implacable foe? The President and State Department permitted the exportation of millions of tons of scrap iron and steel to her that she returned to us at Pearl Harbor in the form of planes, torpedoes, and other implements of death. Indeed the Japanese planes that dealt death at Pearl Harbor were powered with American gasoline.

No, my friends, friendship is not an article of commerce and it cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Let us emulate the policy of England and Russia in this instance. Whenever they give concessions it is to specific countries and they insist on full value in return. Let us not forget that the trade benefits conferred by the Ottawa conference were confined solely to the British Empire, whereas when we give concessions to one country such concessions automatically extend to all nations that do not discriminate against us. What folly!

In the course of the debate you will be told that you can trust that great American, Cordell Hull, to see to it that the interests of our people will have first consideration with him in the negotiation of future treaties. Do not be deceived. Secretary Hull probably is not consulted in any of these treaties until they have been negotiated and are ready for the signatures of himself and the President. These treaties are negotiated by a group of impractical theorists who are scheming to make the world over after the war, and along lines that have come to them in visions while they were dreaming.

At this point I call the attention of the House to pages 162–164 of the hearings, where I asked Mr. Sayre, of the State Department, how many practical businessmen have been members of the interdepartmental committees that negotiate these trade agreements. You will note that he hemmed and hawed, but finally promised, with considerable reluctance, to submit for the record the names of five or more practical members of the reciprocal committee who have had to meet a pay roll. But only this morning the clerk of the committee informed me that he has not done so, notwithstanding that he has had since April 15 to comply with my request.

His failure to furnish such a list, after having promised to do so, leads to the inescapable conclusion that there are no practical businessmen or dirt farmers who have a voice in the negotiations of these treaties.

I call this to the attention of the House because it goes to show that there are no members of the interdepartmental committee who have had practical experience, or have ever had to meet a pay roll. It is well to bear this in mind in the consideration of the resolution before us.

The fundamental question is whether our Democratic colleagues want to pave the path for "blacking out" Congress on at least 50 to 75 percent of the post-war international negotiations of this country.

I ask you, if Henry Morgenthau were Secretary of State, would you vote him the power proposed in this bill? You and I know you would not—no more than we are willing to follow the desires of the Treasury to permit the executive branch to dictate the details of a tax bill.

Cordell Hull is mortal. Conceding the high regard in which he is held by many, it is conceivable that a vacancy in the office of the Secretary of State might come about. And who would succeed him? Isn't it entirely logical to expect that President Roosevelt would permit his dear and personal friend, Harry Hopkins—the man he selected for his most confidential missions to other nations—to round out his somewhat erratic career by being Secretary of State? We might as well be realistic and recognize the possibility of Harry Hopkins being Secretary of State and think of that when you vote to black out the elected Representatives of the people in Congress. Who would be better equipped to put on an international W. P. A. than he?

Regardless of all other angles of this question, you are asked to vote to eliminate the Congress from the major decisions of the post-war period. To accede is unthinkable.

Those of us, including many on the majority side who want to see our Government function along constitutional lines, are disappointed that the administration has not paved the way for intelligent cooperation between the Executive and Congress on post-war problems by coming forward with administration-sponsored amendments along the lines of the amendment proposed by the minority leader of the Senate, Senator McNARY, which will be presented to the House by the minority.

Let us "turn on the light" by adopting the amendments to be offered by Mr. WEST. Congress has been blacked-out too long.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to use to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD].

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we come now to consider the question of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act at a time when catastrophe has overwhelmed the world, when we are engaged upon an adventure the results of which are by no means clearly to be seen. Unsteady as the world was 9 years ago when we passed for the first time the Trade Agreements Act, its plight today is unimproved. Confusion and uncertainty, joined now with a bitterness never paralleled in the world's history, present a greater need for the renewal of these agreements.

In considering the measure before us I am impressed with its vital importance. It is completely a part of the great drama begun as far back as 1784 when the United States made its first trade contact with China as the *Empress of China* anchored at Canton. It is reminiscent of John Hay's great declaration in 1899. Its effect upon the affairs of the world since the day when Mr. Cordell Hull first promulgated a policy of negotiating trade agreements at the London Economic Conference in 1933, has been gradually widening. It affects our foreign policy, and now that the myth of isolation has been dispelled it offers the only way by which we may improve our position in a world wherein all have become truly neighbors.

Frequently we are told, and more often do we read, that this country does not have a foreign policy. It is true that under our form of government we do not formulate a foreign policy which is so often the handmaiden of ulterior purpose such as has been the case in Germany since the Hitler regime, but nevertheless we do have a foreign policy. We have had that policy all through the years. Our foreign policy is the aggregate of our traditions, our history, our integrity, and our hard common sense. It is reflected in our way of doing business which has become a characteristic national mold of behavior. By far, the greater part of our foreign policy is our year-to-year relationships with other nations. Since World War No. 1, the importance of friendly relations with the nations of the earth has become paramount to all else. The greatest contribution to our policy in this respect has been our openly avowed purpose to provide markets for our surpluses elsewhere in the world, and to make it possible for our neighbors to market the things they produce here with us. When Mr. Hull 30 years ago laid the foundations for his monumental work in selling the world as well as his own country on the idea of reciprocal trade agreements we took the greatest forward step in the direction of improved relations which the world has ever known. These agreements vitally affect the peace which we so diligently are striving to attain.

I know that some Members are saying that we ought not to make this measure a test case on the attitude of the Congress of the United States toward all post-war cooperation. I think that most of us would be perfectly willing to treat the question of the renewal of these trade agreements as one thoroughly divorced from the problems of the peace. The trouble with that, however, is that other nations will never share such a high degree of confidence in us. If we fail to renew these agreements, or if in renewing them we so amend the act as to shake their trust in us, we shall do irreparable harm. We will render more difficult the writing of the peace no matter who writes it. Our sincerity at the peace table will not be measured by words. The world has grown weary of words. We shall be weighed, and we shall be found wanting in the balance if our works do not match our promises. The hope and the rejuvenation of the world lies only in sustained, continued, and consistent action—an earnest of our utterances, an unassailable proof of our intentions.

This legislation, in the beginning, was largely based upon economic needs. Today only those who have not given this subject serious thought can fail to see that the agreements have a very great

political significance. Although history has always recorded it, it has become crystal clear in latter days that military conflicts and all other serious international controversies are rooted in economic rivalries. It is out of this maw that modern war comes. The establishment of friendly and normal trade relations among nations will go far toward composing grievances and differences. Were these agreements restricted only to the economic sphere, the responsibility resting upon the House of Representatives would not be nearly so great as it is.

We have had 8 years of trade agreement. Shall we now demolish a system which has been directly responsible for the disappearance of barriers to trade and for the appearance of understanding in the field of trade? I can well understand the attitude of some of my colleagues who cling tenaciously to some past theory of tariff, for I am not prone to leave well-trodden paths and to adventure in untried fields. But the breaking down of isolation is so complete and lasting that we must remember that during the last 50 years the world has undergone far-reaching changes which have outmoded formulas which were simple and effective in the Victorian era.

Whatever may be the form or the approach to peace, or the agreement of the peace, I venture the prophecy here and now that the life of the peace and its observance will rest upon the course we follow in the handling of our trade relations with the rest of the world.

The open-door policy in China is a good example. That policy has grown, but it is still in swaddling clothes. When the war is over we must be sure to accord to that faithful ally a full measure of cooperation in the field of trade, and we must avoid misunderstanding. When Japan in the years that lie ahead attempts, as it surely will, to persuade the Chinese that we are after all Yankee traders in the clipper ships of old, we want to be able to point out with pride that there is no economic disaffection between our countries, that good will prevails and friction is unknown between us.

The outbreak of the war in 1939 crippled the carrying on of the program under the Trade Agreements Act; 1934 was not nearly early enough to set about to remove friction. Central Europe was not interested. Its program of unbridled, naked force obviously could not fit in with any idea of reciprocity. Nevertheless, the act has been of great value to the United States in Central America and South America. Its machinery has unquestionably improved our relations with the people in the lower half of this hemisphere.

Under our system we have laid the groundwork for abundance. Our capacity to produce is today startling the world. When peace comes again we shall be amazed at the new opportunities which present themselves. New materials, new inventions, and all the rest, products of the great laboratory which a modern war erects, will challenge us to be mindful of salutary lessons of the past and awake within us a realization of the usefulness of our policy and our trade program.

President Woodrow Wilson, confronted with the same problem in 1919, had this to say in his annual message to the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress:

> The problem is not an easy one. A fundamental change has taken place with reference to the position of America in the world's affairs. The prejudice and passions engendered by decades of controversy between two schools of political and economic thought—the one, believers in protection of American industries; the other, believers in tariff for revenue only—must be subordinated to the single consideration of the public interest in the light of utterly changed conditions. * * * The time has nearly passed for international governmental loans and it will take time to develop in this country a market for foreign securities. Anything, therefore, which would tend to prevent foreign countries from settling for our exports by shipments of goods into this country could only have the effect of preventing the exports from being made. The productivity of the country greatly stimulated by the war must find an outlet by exports to foreign countries and any measures taken to prevent imports will inevitably curtail exports, force curtailment of production, load the banking machinery of the country with credits to carry unsold products and produce industrial stagnation and unemployment. If we want to sell, we must be prepared to buy. Whatever, therefore, may have been our views during the period of growth of American business concerning tariff legislation we must now adjust our own economic life to a changed condition growing out of the fact that American business is full grown and that America is the greatest capitalist in the world.

Eighteen months later, confronted with the emergency tariff bill which he was compelled to veto, Wilson conveyed this admonition to the Congress:

> If we wish to have Europe settle her debts, governmental or commercial, we must be prepared to buy from her; and if we wish to assist Europe and ourselves by the export either of food, of raw materials, or finished products, we must be prepared to welcome commodities which we need and which Europe will be prepared, with no little pain, to send us. * * * I do not believe that the sober judgment of the masses of the people of the Nation, or even of the special class whose interests are immediately affected by this measure, will sanction a return, especially in view of conditions which lend even less justification for such action, to a policy of legislation for selfish interests which will foster monopoly and increase the disposition to look upon the Government as an instrument for private gain instead of an instrument for the promotion of the general well-being.
>
> Such a policy is antagonistic to the fundamental principle of equal and exact justice to all, and can only serve to revive the feeling of irritation on the part of the great masses of the people and of lack of confidence in the motives of rulers and the results of government.

Then again, at Cheyenne, Wyo., in September of 1919, conscious of the fact that political freedom and economic freedom are indissoluble and that the tyranny of uncertainty is no less than other forms of oppression, Wilson had this to say:

> I want to say, my fellow citizens, that there can be no exaggerating the importance of this peace and the importance of its immediate ratification, because the world will not and cannot settle down to normal conditions, either in America or anywhere else, until it knows what the future is going to be. If it must know that the future is going to be one of disorder and of rivalry and of the old contests of power, let it know it at once, so it can make its arrangements and its calculations and lay its taxes and recruit its armies and build its ships for the next great fight.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

I AM NOT FOR BYPASSING THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I share with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the questionable honor of having four times appeared in the well of this House to discuss these trade treaties, which never were anything but treaties, and never were and are not now war measures, the statutory authorization for which I have always opposed on the ground of its unconstitutionality. The clear letter of the law is plain.

I have always opposed and still oppose the attempt of the administration to bypass or/and to short circuit the constitutional provisions requiring that treaties be submitted to the United States Senate for consideration.

These agreements are treaties by whatever name they may be called—and a rose by any other name smells just as sweet to me.

The administration has undertaken to exaggerate the necessity for a continuation of these agreements without justification therefor. These agreements are not reciprocal, and if extended they should be amended in order that the people who suffer by reason of their provisions should be given an ample opportunity to be heard with respect thereto, prior to their ratification by the Senate of the United States, at least, as is provided by law.

There are a half a dozen other reasons which I will not take the time of the House to enumerate at this moment, but which I propose later to discuss and which are covered by the report of the minority. The reasons set forth in that minority report and which will be amplified by other speakers, substantiate my contention that while the Republican Party is for reciprocity as a principle it should be against the extension of these agreements, unamended, as opposed to an unlimited, post-war, free-trade program, contemplated because these agreements are not reciprocal, are negotiated contra to the fundamental law of the land, and are not emergent, so far as their renegotiation is concerned.

TRADE TREATIES

So, Mr. Chairman, I bespeak your indulgence as I discuss again a matter which, since 1934, I have talked about so often before, as I have suggested.

I have great admiration for the Secretary of State and for the manner in which he has conducted himself in that high office. I think he is one of the greatest statesmen who has ever discharged the duties of the high office of Secretary of State.

COMMENDABLE PURPOSE

I said once before, and in substance I say again, that the high-minded purpose

which has actuated men like the late Newton D. Baker, Frank B. Kellogg, and others to dare to think and to plan, in terms that lie outside political platforms and programs, a new formula for international relationships and the eventual establishment of an irrevocable policy that involves the abolition of war as a method of settling international disputes, entitles them to the commendation of everybody, and with their policy and program, idealistic as it is, none of us can quarrel.

They had the faith and they had the courage to follow an ideal, notwithstanding the disappointing result of their crusade. They set a standard of excellence toward which the world must press on until that brotherhood of men and nations and races they have dreamed about shall become a reality.

A DREAM OR A NIGHTMARE

But they were dreamers of dreams. The failure of the attainment of which dreams and ideals in their day and generation was a bitter disappointment. Although their hope did not end in fruition, it nevertheless was worth striving for. The ends which they sought to accomplish and the heights which they attempted to reach will be attained if, when, and only when the world catches up with them and men like them—these idealists, these men of vision, these dreamers of dreams. War is hell.

Carried away by their enthusiasms for what is right and good, too many people in these United States have been hypnotized by the words, and the voices, which have proclaimed the potentialities for recovery and relief and international good will, supposedly inherent in these trade treaties. Some day they will wake up and realize the fact and know, if not already too late to save themselves, that these trade treaties are two-edged swords, both sides of which will cut their throats. Now is the time to wake up.

No plan has been promulgated which will change human nature or bring about the millennium by contract. No covenant which has ever been made or will ever be entered into between and among nations will prove a perfect panacea for, or perfect preventive of, war.

IRREPRESSIBLE GREED

In trade agreements heretofore negotiated since the beginning of time and in trade agreements hereafter to be negotiated with their concomitant ramifications will always be involved man's irrepressible greed, and the cause for most of the ills which the world has suffered and will have to endure.

Power centralized in Washington under these agreements is more apt to be used as a means toward economic warfare than as a path to peace. Take Argentina as an example. I cannot help to suggest that Tacitus said, "Lust of power is the most flagrant of all the passions."

As Sumner Welles has well said:

> The people of the United States must assume their full share of responsibility for the creation of the kind of a world in which men and women * * * can be free from fear as well as the fateful consequences of economic aggression.

OUR OBLIGATION UNQUESTIONABLE

Dean Donham, of Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, was right when he said in 1933:

> Our primary obligation is to put our own national house in order, and by restoring our own balance to reestablish our great social groups. By so doing we shall make our best contribution to a sane and realistic internationalism. * * * A host of intelligent and idealistic men and women, in spite of the disillusionment of the last 15 years, still believe the only way to prevent another World War is the road of international cooperation, leading to gradual creation of a superstate. These lend their powerful support to current theories. I think this is the one sure road to war.

Back in 1936 I had the nerve to say that there is not a well-informed person in the United States who does not fear that war-torn Europe may eventually have to submit to triumphant Asia. There is not one of us who does not dread the day when the eventual struggle between the white and the yellow races will come, as come it will, and the result of which will spell either the triumph and the everlasting establishment or the end of our civilization.

CUT A MAN'S THROAT TO STOP HIS NOSEBLEED

At the time I made the above statement I was talking about the ineffectiveness of trade agreements as a war preventive and looking toward Japan, though I had no idea the dreaded day was so near at hand.

The cold, hard-boiled truth is, however, that as a panacea for and preventive of war, trade treaties work out just as inefficaciously as between nations as does the idealism and good intent as between individuals, when it is deemed best to cut a man's throat in order to stop his nosebleed.

But, Mr. Chairman, as against all this, the fact is we live in a practical age and world, in fact in a very realistic age, and whether we like it or not we must be reasonable and of the earth earthy.

I remind you again that no millennium can be created by contract. We cannot legislate a Utopia into existence. We have to be reasonable, whether we like it or not. It is perfectly all right to be striving to reach that star of good neighborliness, but we must not be swept off both feet or off the ground by the fantasia of idealism and sentiment. We must keep at least one foot on the ground as we try to "hitch our wagon to a star."

PRACTICAL AND REALISTIC

As Professor Borchard of Yale has so well said with respect to international cooperation:

> We must become more practical and more realistic, and observe and acknowledge the actual conditions in this world. Many things are wrong with it, and it takes a certain degree of philosophy to realize that there are some parts of that wrongness that we cannot do anything about; * * * But we can make our own country a little better; we can preserve it from becoming involved in these highly dangerous experiments which only make new enemies for the United States and cure nothing.

MUST BE AMENDED, OR ELSE

I am, therefore, constrained to oppose the trade agreements unless they are so amended as to permit the people to have a voice in the proceedings, for this is yet a government of, for, and by the people.

I am for reciprocity. It is my considered judgment, however, that the so-called trade agreements are, first, not reciprocal; second, neither are they war measures; third, they are treaties, which by the name of trade agreements do not smell sweet to me.

When I announced my candidacy for Congress in 1933, I said I was "opposed to the usurpation by the Federal Government of powers not delegated to it. I am for America first; for a reasonable protective tariff. To admit foreign goods indiscriminately would further depress the economic situation in these United States."

That is where I have stood and now stand, as opposed to an attempt to establish an unlimited free-trade policy under the guise of good neighborliness. "Good fences make good neighbors."

I have not changed my mind nor have I seen any real reason for so doing since this administration, contrary to the provisions of the Constitution, undertook executively to handle all matters respecting treaties between the American people and people of foreign countries through the channels of a bureau—viz, the State Department—rather than through Congress, the elected representatives of the people, as prescribed by fundamental law requiring senatorial approval. Such centralized control is not democracy. It has not led to peace. It has not been conducive to the preservation of the freedoms we are fighting for.

I have not altered my opinion, often expressed, that these trade agreements, under whatever name they may be called, are nevertheless treaties, the present renegotiation of which by the State Department functioning wholly outside the Constitution, under its delegated power, even though authorized by statute, is nevertheless contrary to the fundamental law of the land, for as much as all treaties are subject to the approval of the Senate as is provided in article II, section 2 of the Constitution, and it cannot be denied successfully.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ARE TREATIES

Right here and now I propose to call your attention to a speech made in Congress by Mr. Pinckney in January of 1819, a speech—or oration, if you please—than which none ever made in Congress is more renowned, or has more often been quoted. Mr. Pinckney, one of the greatest statesmen in the days of great statesmen, discussed the treaty-making power of Congress in reference, please note, to a commercial treaty with Great Britain. His speech is a powerful exposition of substantive law. I cannot believe he was wrong when he said:

> The Constitution has declared that whatsoever amounts to a treaty, made under the authority of the United States, shall immediately be supreme law. The power is left to the force of the generic term and is therefore as wide as a treaty-making power can be. It embraces all the varieties which it could be supposed this Government could find it necessary or proper to make, or it embraces none. It covers the whole treaty-making ground

which this Government could be expected to occupy or not an inch of it.

NOT RECIPROCAL

I still insist, and shall continue so to do, that the trouble with these so-called reciprocal trade agreements which have been negotiated is that in a majority of the cases they are not reciprocal. The proof is overwhelming. We are suckers.

There is no real reciprocity in a program which permits the negotiation of agreements which put the product of any foreign country free from duty into direct competition with those which are raised and manufactured by the people of our own country at such a price that our people cannot compete therewith and live. Such a policy, mistakenly called a good-neighbor policy, goes too far, in that it asks one to approve an agreement that deliberately and directly injures industry, destroys initiative, and robs the American people of their property. I am against that.

Reciprocity, as the layman understands it, means that I will let you bring in apples because I do not raise them, if you will let me take pumpkins into your country, because you do not raise them.

Theoretically "reciprocity" means a mutual advantage grows out of mutual concessions to each of the parties. You will supply what I cannot produce and have not, and I will supply you with those things you have not and cannot produce, and we will make the pact "right" because of the mutual consideration for each other's needs. It has not been done.

Reciprocity does not mean that I will let you bring in apples to compete with my home-grown apples, because you can raise apples cheaper than I can raise them.

Reciprocity does not mean that I will let you put my apple growers out of business because they cannot compete with your prices on apples, your price being made possible because it costs you less to raise and pick and pack—that is to say, I pay my laborers more and they live better than yours do. God save the United States.

It is not reciprocity, decidedly not, to destroy our industries, put our employees out of work, just to be a good fellow and a good neighbor. That is not reciprocity.

PROTECTION OF AMERICA

I am unalterably for the protection of America, and its people, by the people, whom they choose to represent it, and them, and elect so to do by law. I am for a government of laws not for a government of men.

OUR OWN BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, I take very little stock in the suggestion that an attempt on the part of the elected representatives of the people of the United States to follow their own procedure and to undertake to protect themselves by insisting that they have a right to be heard can or should disaffect any government with which we are dealing.

The importance of the extension of these agreements, identically as written, has been exaggerated in order to try to scare us, to bring pressure through fear to bear on those who do not know that the fate of the world does not hang upon this issue, which is in no sense a war measure.

NOT A TEST

It is not true—

Said Walter Lippmann, and I agree with him—

that the vote on the amendment proposed by Senator MCNARY is or can be made the test of our general policy.

It is very far-fetched to suggest that, as we undertake to run our own business according to our fundamental laws, by our vote on whether the President shall alone have the power to alter tariff schedules by treaty, contra to the Constitution, we are deciding whether or not the United Nations are to remain united to "organize the peace of the world." That is going altogether too far.

The suggestion that if we do not sign on the dotted line and extend the agreements the world will be told that because Congress insists upon its constitutional prerogatives is evidence that the United States will "not take part in safeguarding its own vital interests by organizing the peace," is not worth noticing for it is a threat, and moreover is not so.

POST-WAR GESTURES

Then, too, I am opposed to all this too early, preliminary, gesture-like, post-war agreement propaganda in the middle of a war, and with respect to trade and trade barriers at a time when the people most interested—and they are the people of the United States—are being excluded from an opportunity to protect themselves.

TOO MUCH EXCLUSION OF THE PEOPLE ALREADY

In the program that is being written by this administration along post-war lines, there is and has been altogether too much exclusion of the people and their representatives, too much camouflage and propaganda. I think that some folks have commenced to find that out. The end sought to be attained by these agreements as made does not justify the method employed in an effort to by-pass the constitutional provisions relative to the negotiation of treaties, nor does it warrant the delegation of congressional power and prerogatives to the President which shall authorize him, alone, to negotiate agreements international in scope which cover all agriculture, labor, and industry while vitally affecting every individual in the country, his life, liberty, and property.

It is time for Congress to recapture its prerogatives and to protect the people.

MEMBER OF GRANGE

In this connection let me read you part of a letter I, as a member of the Grange, received from Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, this morning. He says:

The people of the country have been greatly heartened by the stand that the legislative branch of the Government has taken during recent months toward recapturing its constitutional prerogatives, and we trust that Congress may reassert its rightful authority in this vital and fundamental matter.

And he goes on to say:

We trust that in passing on House Joint Resolution 111, renewing the Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years, Congress may vindicate its ancient and fundamental right to be something more than a mere spectator in matters relating to the tariff and the formulation of our policies with reference to foreign trade. As we see it, that is the most important issue involved in this whole question.

Any plan that robs the chosen Representatives of the people of one of their most important functions, reducing them to impotency, and which wrongfully delegates this power in its entirety to the executive department of the Government cannot be successfully defended as liberal, constitutional, or American.

While one of the declared purposes of the Trade Agreements Act was to develop an outlet for our farm surpluses, as the act has been administered it has had the opposite effect. Under the workings of this act, farm imports have greatly increased, while our exports of agricultural commodities have shown a sharp decline. During the 5-year period from 1936 to 1940, both inclusive, our food imports averaged nearly 250 percent of food exports.

Many of the so-called concessions that we have received from foreign countries in the making of trade agreements have been nothing but mere gestures, while we have made the most substantial concessions and generalized them to the whole world. The Grange does not regard this as true reciprocity.

As an illustration of the lengths to which we have gone in sacrificing the interest of the United States in negotiating these agreements, the concessions we made to the Argentine went into force 30 days after the exchange at Washington of the instrument of Argentine ratification and the proclamation of the President of the United States. But it was stipulated in the agreement that certain concessions made to us should become effective only by "stages." Under this arrangement it was agreed that on certain articles concessions made to us by the Argentine should not go into force until Argentine receipts from customs duties should exceed P270,000,000 in any calendar year. That sum represented the average annual tariff revenues of the Argentine from 1931 to 1940. Under this plan the "concessions" made to us by the Argentine on the particular articles in question have not yet become effective, although all of our concession went into force on November 15, 1941. We do not believe that Congress would have sanctioned any such lopsided arrangement as that.

You are absolutely correct, Mr. Brenckman, in your assumption—and the people know it. As a granger, I take notice and will govern myself accordingly, which you will say means I will do as I please.

LOWERING TRADE BARRIERS

It may well be, economically, that all trade barriers should be lowered. Let us wait and see. That is a matter for the Congress of the United States to discuss, eventually. There is no exigency.

Of course we should offer every opportunity to our friends everywhere to be good neighbors, we should be such ourselves, but charity begins at home. It is not true, however, that we should trade our independence for a mess of pottage. Especially is it true that we should not do it in advance of the end of a war which may come no man knows when or how.

Altogether too much time is being spent by this administration flying kites to four winds, building up tentative post-war programs before the war is won at the expense and sacrifice of time and effort that might be very well and much better spent in trying to win the war first.

STUFF AND NONSENSE

All this propaganda stuff and nonsense cannot divert the attention of the people from the mistakes of policy of the administration, which mistakes have cost us billions as they have tried out New Deal experiments and are undertaking to continue and to internationalize a policy that is unsound economically. Unless we are all out for unadulterated free trade with everybody, the devil take the hindmost—which is us—we had better stop, right now, this program of giving away everything we have or ever had or hope to have or to be. What doth it profit a man to lose his own soul?

WE ARE AT WAR

We are at war and the fact is that a lot of people in the administration are more concerned about post-war programs than they are about winning this war. They are more determined to hold their jobs and to set up an international New Deal than they are to win the game. That is the truth and the people who pay the bills should know it.

Until we win this war, they—the bureaucrats—and we had better soft pedal a lot of this molly-coddle nonsense which makes us look soft and putty-like and even foolish to those very people who expect and intend to profit by our hypocritical benevolence. I am opposed to selling out or down the river the American people, at any price, any time. What are we fighting for?

It will take a lot more reasonable argument and more and better reasons than have been advanced or offered to convince me that I should stultify myself to vote to extend these trade agreements, which are treaties, to insure the establishment of a free-trade policy in perpetuity.

I do not intend to buy a gold brick at the behest of the genial, able gentlemen, and high-powered salesmen of the international new deal and all-out advocates of free trade—trade of what and for what God only knows, for it can be determined only after we win the war.

NO OFFENSE INTENDED

I say again that the suggestion that other nations may be offended if we undertake to protect ourselves and to run our own business according to our own form of government is an argument reductio ad adsurdum. They follow their laws and submit these trade treaties to their legislative assemblies as required by their own laws.

THE PEOPLE HAVE SOME RIGHTS

So for these and other reasons, I am opposed to reenacting the trade agreements, as are, to cover an indefinite and positively indeterminate post-war situation, unless and until these people who would sell us out agree to an amendment which shall provide for the consideration and adoption of these treaties, constitutionally, or which shall limit their continuance for the duration or make possible their discontinuance by a concurrent resolution, or shall in some other way guarantee to the people of the United States the right to be heard under and by virtue of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which guarantees them that right.

We are at the cross roads. While I appreciate the enthusiasm of a lot of folks for a lot of good-neighborly things, I just suggest to them that they do not need to forget the Constitution altogether.

Approaching the subject from another angle—I might as well do it for I will be accused of partisanship anyway—let me say that of course I am a Republican. I am not, however, a high protectionist. I do nevertheless believe in real reciprocity while all the time opposed to selling my birthright and that of the people of the United States for a mess of pottage which has not yet been concocted or even brewed.

NOT AN ISOLATIONIST

I do not have to tell the Members of this House that I am not an isolationist. Neither do I have to affirm that I am for an America unlimited.

I do not have to swallow or to approve a program to set up a post-war international New Deal in order to establish either of my positions and shall not do it.

While I have supported the Commander in Chief in his war efforts, 100 percent, I have opposed and shall continue to oppose the attempts of this administration to continue the New Deal program here and to lay the foundation, economically, for the establishment of the post-war type of world government which they envisage and for which they are attempting to lay the groundwork now.

THEY ARE TREATIES

I may be stubborn, but all the arguments in the world cannot convince me that these trade agreements are not treaties, or that they should not be and have been negotiated as such.

As a representative of the people, I insist in their behalf that the people who are vitally affected should have and be given an opportunity through and by their lawfully elected representatives to have something to say about their lives, liberty, property, and their future which is so seriously involved in these so-called trade agreements.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that to extend these agreements, unamended, would be to agree to turn this government over to a bureaucracy and away from the people, forever. That surely for us would be worse than for somebody to be "mad at us" or offended because we happened to know enough to run our own business according to our own laws and our own ideas as to what is best for us.

NOBODY WILL BE OFFENDED

Of course, when you strip it to the backbone, the truth is that nobody will be offended at any action we may take with respect to these agreements which we initiated. They are not war measures. Everybody else knows it if we do not. There is no use trying to scare us into thinking that we are doing something or anything to disaffect our good neighbors. We are not, for their interest is ours, and to save them we must same ourselves first. They know it.

Obviously, and I admit it, I never have been for these agreements as negotiated, for reasons stated. I am not now. I shall not be for them until they are negotiated according to law, openly, freely, constitutionally, nor until the people most concerned at least have a chance to be informed as to the date on which their crucifixion is to take place.

THE PEOPLE'S NIGHTMARE

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is time for the people to have a nightmare, not over the question of the extension of these alleged trade agreements, which are treaties, but over what is being done to them in their name, after they have been put to sleep with a bedtime story. They had better wake up before the house is burned down with them in it.

I have said and I reiterate that I am for real reciprocity, a protective tariff sufficiently high or low to protect the American people, American industry, American individualism, and our form of government as against bureaucracy, collectivism, totalitarianism, and unadulterated free trade.

SELLING US DOWN THE RIVER

I am also bitterly opposed to the administration's attempt to take advantage of the war in order to sell us out and down the river, blindfolded, on such a basis.

I opposed the original enactment of the act permitting the negotiation of these trade treaties on the ground that the legislation was unconstitutional. In this connection I was interested to examine the statement which one Fred Brenckman, the Washington representative of the National Grange, made before the Ways and Means Committee on the 23d of April. He said in part:

THE GRANGE SPEAKS

The original amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930 which authorized the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements, approved June 12, 1934, was intended to be a temporary measure. It was passed at a time when there was a world-wide depression, and the act was made self-repealing at the end of 3 years. This act was twice extended by Congress for 3-year periods, and now, after the lapse of 9 years, it is again proposed to extend the workings of the act for another period of 3 years.

The Grange opposed the enactment of this law in 1934 on the ground that the sweeping delegation of legislative authority it contains was wholly at variance with the American concept of government, and that it violated both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. On each occasion when the act came up for renewal we opposed it for the same reason.

In 1934, certain groups of farmers supported this measure on the theory that it would enable us to do some "Yankee trading" and help us to get rid of some of our agricultural surpluses. But while the act has now been in force for 9 long years, and while under its provisions we have negotiated agreements with about 30 different countries, the hope that an outlet might be found for the surplus products of American agriculture has proved to be vain and illusory. As the act has been administered,

so far from stimulating farm exports, it has had the opposite effect, greatly facilitating agricultural imports. Many Members of Congress from the agricultural sections of the country have been well aware of this fact, but so long as the act remained in effect they were powerless to do anything but register futile protests. Under the plea that an emergency existed that could be effectively combatted only by the Executive Department of the Government, Congress had divested itself of one of its most important prerogatives under the Constitution.

REAL RECIPROCITY

In saying this, we do not wish to be misunderstood. The Grange has always been in favor of real reciprocity. But our attitude has been that in our dealings with other nations we should take from them the things that we need and do not produce domestically. Most emphatically, we should not make it easier for other countries to send us the things that we do not need and of which, in normal times, we have a surplus. It stands to reason that there is no advantage in exchanging identical or competing commodities, nor is there any advantage in trade merely for the sake of trade.

During the first half century of our national life practically all exports from the United States consisted of cotton and the manufactures thereof, tobacco, wheat, and flour. There were small amounts of naval stores, gums, and resins, together with small amounts of sawmill products, copper, and a few other items. But agriculture contributed the bulk of our national exports, which in turn, made possible the purchase of foreign goods and products.

One hundred years ago, 68 percent of all our exports were crude materials and an additional 18 percent were crude and manufactured foodstuffs. Less than 14 percent of our exports were manufactured products. From this it will be seen that agriculture provided practically the only foreign exchange available for the purchase of imported products, including tea and coffee, sugar, spices, and other exotic materials.

Agriculture, in fact, has throughout the history of our country been in favor of proper trade with the world at large. The Grange has only contended for the protection of the American market for the products of our own farms, and we still see no advantage in encouraging or even permitting the importation of agricultural products, including manufactures therefrom and substitutes therefor, like or similar to the products of our own farms and in direct competition with American farmers.

If the Trade Agreements Act is to be extended or renewed at this time for a new period of years, we are strongly of the opinion that the time has come to insist upon constitutional methods of procedure. The Constitution specifically provides that the Chief Executive shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. We believe that the extension resolution which is now pending before the committee should specifically provide for Senate approval of all trade agreements or treaties. Such provision certainly could not be misunderstood by friendly foreign nations. Nor should the charge of extreme nationalism or isolationism be hurled against those who are standing up for and demanding the preservation of our democratic system of government and the application of the fundamental principles laid down in the Constitution.

* * * * *

SHOULD BE AMENDED

In our judgment, if the Trade Agreements Act is to be renewed, it should be amended in several respects. In the first place, we believe that the agreements should be bilateral. In other words, the concessions which we may make should be limited to the nation which is signatory to such an agreement, and any concessions made by us should be matched by the other contracting nation.

Under the flexible proviso of the Tariff Act, first adopted in 1922, there was a provision for appeal to the courts, and this should be restored.

Congress should lay down a more precise rule for the lowering of duties or the making of concessions.

Concessions should be made only to countries that are the principle suppliers of the commodities involved.

Finally, all trade agreements should be subject to Senate ratification before taking effect.

The country has been heartened by the stand that this Congress has taken toward recapturing its constitutional prerogatives, and we trust it may reassert its rightful authority in this vital and fundamental matter.

I am inclined to agree with the philosophy of the down-to-the-dirt farmers of the country as expressed by the representative of the Grange.

After I had read the foregoing, I thought I would see what the Farm Bureau had to say about it. So I discovered that on the 24th day of April, Edward A. O'Neal, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, told the Ways and Means Committee, among other things, that:

THE FARM BUREAU TALKS

The present basic policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to trade agreements is embodied in a resolution adopted at the twenty-first annual meeting of the federation on December 7, 1939, which reads as follows:

GOOD GOD, GOOD DEVIL

"Recognizing the fact that our tariff policies had failed to protect the domestic price of basic farm commodities generally produced in surplus volume in this country, and further that such policies had contributed to the disparity that had developed between farm prices on the one hand and industrial prices and wages on the other, the American Farm Bureau Federation in 1934 authorized its board of directors to support legislation permitting the negotiation and consummation of reciprocal trade agreements with other nations; insisting, however, that in negotiating such agreements no concessions be made which might have the effect of reducing or holding the domestic price of any agricultural commodity below the parity level.

"The federation recently sponsored a study by recognized economists of the economic effects of all important existing trade agreements. This study seems to reveal that there has been a substantially larger increase in exports to agreement than to nonagreement countries, and that there has not been any appreciable difference in the percentage of increase in imports from agreement and nonagreement countries. Many factors have no doubt contributed to this increased trade, including our gold policy and a general upturn in world business. From all facts thus far available, it appears that while the greatest portion of increased exports has been in industrial products, from which agriculture has only indirectly benefited, yet this study, together with other information available to the federation, reveals that the net effect of the agreements has been helpful rather than hurtful."

GUESS WHAT

"In giving our support to the continuance of reciprocal trade agreements, we renew, with increased emphasis, our demand that no agreement be consummated, the effect of which might be to force or hold domestic prices for any farm commodity below parity level. Any other course would justify the condemnation of and opposition to such agreement by all agricultural groups.

"We further insist that in the negotiation of trade agreements, economic factors be given consideration equivalent to the weight accorded to the factors of diplomacy and statecraft. To this end we urge that the Reciprocal Trade Act be amended to provide that no agreement be consummated unless unanimously approved by the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture."

On April 16, 1943, the executive committee of the federation met in Washington and reviewed the federation's policy with respect to trade agreements and adopted the following recommendation with respect to the continuation of this program:

"That we go on record in favor of the extension of the President's power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements, but insist that methods of negotiation be modified to require adequate hearings and that a 30- or 60-day interval ensue following the signing and publication of the terms of a proposed agreement before it would become effective and that the statute should also require a provision in every agreement of an 'escape clause,' under which either government could amend or cancel any provision of such agreement after consulting with the other government whenever the government desiring to nullify such provision finds that this provision is resulting in injury to a domestic industry by reason of an unexpected volume of imports or other unforeseen conditions or circumstances.

"That we further insist that no agreement be consummated which would have the effect of forcing or holding the price of any farm commodity below the parity price."

SAFEGUARDS

As indicated in these two resolutions, the American Farm Bureau Federation favors the extension of authority to negotiate trade agreements but urges that methods of negotiation be modified so as to provide certain safeguards.

Specifically, the following safeguards are now recommended by our executive committee: Provision should be made to insure that adequate hearings, with due public notice, will be held before any proposed trade agreement is concluded. When a proposed agreement has been negotiated its terms should be given widespread publicity, and the agreement should not become effective for a period of from 30 to 60 days after the publication of the terms of such agreement, during which time the public would have opportunity to study these provisions and register their approval or disapproval of any provisions. Third, the statute should require also that all agreements hereafter contain an "escape clause," permitting either government to modify or withdraw in whole or in part any concession granted in such agreement whenever either government found that a concession granted by it would result in injury to domestic producers of such article or similar articles due to increased quanties of imports or other unforeseen developments and conditions. We insist that no trade agreement be consummated which would have the effect of forcing or holding down prices of any agricultural commodities produced in the United States below the parity price. It has long been the policy of government to restore and maintain the prices of agricultural commodities at parity levels. This policy should be fully recognized and carried out in the negotiation of trade agreements so that no concessions will be made in any agreements which will nullify or interfere with the effectuation of this policy with respect to our agricultural commodities. All proposed concessions, therefore, with respect to agricultural commodities, should be carefully scrutinized so as to avoid the influx of such a volume of agricultural imports as to either hold or force the price of the domestic commodity below parity. Any other course would justify condemnation of and opposition to such trade agreement by American agriculture.

ESCAPE CLAUSES, WHY?

Do you know, the Farm Bureau might just as well have opposed the enactment on the same grounds as did the Grange as to have "damned" the trade agreements with faint praise.

You know, the gentleman who made the statement for the Farm Bureau was not born yesterday. The so-called escape clauses he has included in his tentative approval of the extension of the agreements tell the story. Unless the escape clauses be included the extension would not be satisfactory, he says. To include them would defeat the purpose and intent of those who obstinately will not submit these treaties to the Senate for ratification as provided for by the Constitution.

There are a lot of ways to "skin a cat" and the gentleman who made the above statement is a past master at that business, if you ask me.

Then, after examining the statements of the Grange and of the Farm Bureau, I thought I would find out what the Commissioner of Agriculture in some State in the Union might think about all this business. I ran across the statement which one Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia and president of the national farm committee, ma le before the Ways and Means Committee. He said, among other things, that:

A COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE SAYS

Special trade agreements are not war measures. The act of Congress providing for special trade agreements was first passed in 1933. Any attempt to claim special trade agreements as a war measure is simply an effort to prevent meritorious arguments in opposition to this scheme to lower American agriculture to the level of other countries.

* * * * *

The question of special trade agreements, as well as the broader question of tariffs in general, is no longer a party question. Indeed we no longer have a political party in this country which in any sense represents the views and traditions of its founders.

* * * * *

These special trade agreements have the effect, the way they are applied by the Secretary of State, of flooding the United States with cheap agricultural products and other cheap raw products. They, thereby, cause cheap agricultural and raw products in this country.

They likewise force low wages for those engaged in producing agricultural and other raw products.

The same selfish greed that prompted high protective tariffs, and the same selfish greed that prompted the enactment of the act of 1903 to flood this country with cheap labor, is the same selfish greed that prompted the legislation of 1933 for these special trade agreements.

It is the same selfish greed and unlimited internationalism that is now seeking the power to extend these special trade agreements.

* * * * *

This desire to bring into this country cheap agricultural and other raw materials from foreign countries, fits in nicely with the desire of our internationalists to equalize all races and the peoples of all lands.

We have seen the effect of the Immigration Act of 1903 in bringing foreign immigrants into this country. Let us see how these special trade agreements attempt to flood this country with cheap agricultural products and other cheap raw products.

THE FARMER IS THE GOAT

You can search these trade agreements from cover to cover and you cannot find where they provide for lowering the tariff on any industrial products that the farmer buys. They are devoted entirely to shipping agricultural products in to compete with the American farmer.

Raw materials for industrial plants and agricultural products are the only items covered. No finished product for use of the farmer is included.

You can look over the hundreds and hundreds of items specified in these treaties and every item they cover are agricultural products.

Typical of the products brought into this country under these special trade agreements are cotton, cotton-seed oil, flaxseed oil, linseed oil, olive oil, palm-kernel oil, palm oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, sunflower oil, tung oil, and vegetables of many kinds; buttermilk, skimmed milk, whole milk, cream, dried buttermilk, malted milk, oleomargarine, and other butter substitutes; cheese, baby chicks, geese, guineas, pigeons, turkeys, barley, buckwheat, wheat, corn meal, grits, flour, oats, rice, rye, brand shorts, skimmings, soy-bean meal, tankage, apples, apricots, berries, cherries, citrus fruits, pineapples, plums, jellies, jams, marmalades, cow peas, cabbage, and many other vegetables, fruits, and farm products. Horse and mule meat for human consumption from Mexico are also included.

* * * * *

If any further proof is needed that these special trade agreements were intended to flood this country with cheap agricultural and other raw products, we have but to look to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 for this further proof.

The triple A was created in 1933 to limit production of crops in the United States. Those who sponsored the triple A program were not deceived about the facts. They new we had no overproduction of food but the shortage fitted into their over-all plan to destroy American agriculture. Congress was fooled and acted on the misinformation furnished them. Congress was laboring under the terribly mistaken idea that we had overproduction of agricultural products.

Congress was asked to create the triple A to limit farm production in this country. The same Congress was asked to pass and did pass the law providing for special trade agreements. These special trade agreements were passed to permit the importing into this country of farm products which the American farmers are not allowed to produce in sufficient quantity for our needs. Both acts were passed in 1933.

* * * * *

WHAT A PICTURE

We have seen the United States Department of Agriculture spending the farmer's money which is deducted from his parity price, to develop the production of agricultural products in Central and South America, in Cuba, and in all the islands of the sea.

We now see the Department of Agriculture has the brazen impudence to announce a plan to move a large portion of the farm population that is left on American farms to the industrial centers to be utilized in grinding out profits from industry in this great world monopoly of industrial enterprise.

Let us sum up the facts:

1. The Immigration Act of 1903 flooded this country with 12,000,000 immigrants from low-wage countries of middle Europe.

2. An effort was made to keep all these unneeded workers in a job by making a shorter working day, with increased prices per hour. This, of course, resulted in higher prices to farmers, white-collar workers, business people, and professional people.

3. The passage in 1933 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act resulted in reduction of crops and meat production.

4. The passage in 1933 of special trade agreements and increased imports under these agreements prevented us from realizing that we were far from self-sustaining, while we were being told by our Government that we had immense surpluses of food and fiber.

5. The millions of people in our great cities who are not farm minded have been propagandized into looking across the sea for cheap food and fiber and other raw products. They have been propagandized to forget that high wages and high prices of industrial products are due to special tariff protection which the farmer generally does not share.

6. The millions of people in our great cities have been propagandized to look to other countries of the world because this makes possible the carrying out of great international ideas of a few great international families with millions invested from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn and from high meridian to high meridian.

7. These billionaire internationalists, in their attempt to carry out this great international scheme, are but fellow travelers with the internationalist crackpots who infest some of the bureaus in Washington.

8. These special trade agreements, as they now operate, are but one cog in the wheel of unlimited internationalism which is intended, first of all, to crush the American farmer.

We pass a law in Congress to limit production by American farmers.

The same year we pass a law in Congress to flood this country with agricultural products from foreign lands.

THINK THIS OVER

We burn wheat in the field; we plow cotton in the ground; we throw hogs in the river; and then what do we do? We turn right around and make treaties to import wheat, to import cotton, and to import horse meat and mule meat from Mexico. Did ever a drunken sailor do anything more foolish than this?

We create high prices by artificial means of a protective tariff. We increase these artificially high prices by higher wages and shorter hours. We spend $210,000,000,000 in 2 years to pay for these artificially high-priced products to conduct the war and then, when the farmer asks for a little raise so that he may be permitted to do his part toward winning the war by raising food and fiber, the Chief Executive says, "inflation."

The Treasurer of the United States, with all the international gold for a foot-stool, says the farmer is causing inflation.

Bernard Baruch, as he commutes from international offices in New York to the seats of authority in Washington, sends out a parrot-like cry, "The farmer is causing inflation."

The President of the Senate, as he talks for the edification of those low-wage countries with which we have these trade agreements, repeats the echo, "The American farmer is causing inflation."

The Secretary of Agriculture, getting his cue from these internationalists, reechoes the cry, "The farmer is causing inflation."

This country was founded and set up by men who had courage of individual initiative and the determination to maintain their individuality at any price. If this kind of America is to survive, then the American farmer must survive. When the independent, God-fearing, liberty-loving, and freedom-maintaining American farmer is no more, then the America as we have known it and is worth saving, will be no more.

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

These trade treaties constitute a powerful cog in the wheel to destroy American agriculture. Surely the law providing for these agreements will not be reenacted by the Congress with the facts now before them.

That is a pretty strong statement for a southern Democrat to make, now, is it not? And why not? It is true.

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PROVIDES

So much for all the foregoing. I appreciate your patience in listening. but, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I just want to say that we men and women who were sent down here to legislate for the people should not forget, in the excitement and enthusiasm, that we are working under the Constitution of the United States. That document provides in article I, section 8, that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; to borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

Please note: To regulate commerce.

May I also direct the attention of everybody to the fact that so far as the negotiation of treaties is concerned the power and the prerogatives and the limitations of the President, that is the Chief Executive, are defined and limited by article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which I will only quote in part as follows:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

I call these things to your attention because each and every one of us is bound by an oath to support and defend the Constitution and the rights of the people. That oath reads as follows:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Too many of us take that oath as we are sworn in and forget it until we are sworn at by somebody for having violated it.

SOME OTHER REASONS

I would like to take time to say right here that, aside from the fact that the act known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, of date June 12, 1934, is unconstitutional because of its delegation of legislative power, and its failure to require Senate ratification of trade agreements which are ipso facto treaties, the act is objectionable and should not be extended because—

First. The act is based on the false premise that the decline in world trade in the early 1930's was the cause, rather than the effect, of the depression; and it overemphasizes the role of American export trade in connection with domestic prosperity.

Second. Lowering American tariffs and admitting more imports will hurt domestic industries but will not induce foreign countries to increase their imports of American products.

Third. The act gives the President too much power over tariff making, a power which belongs to Congress.

Fourth. The system of public hearings set up under the act is insufficient and unsatisfactory.

Fifth. The bargaining position of the United States is weakened by the generalization of concessions provided for under the act.

So far as I am concerned, therefore, in the premises, no temporary expedient can or will justify my stultifying myself. These trade agreements I have opposed primarily and consistently because they are and were in my opinion treaties. They have not been considered or acted upon or concurred in by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present in the Senate as is prescribed by the section of the Constitution to which I have referred above.

Since I still hold such positive and obstinate opinions, perhaps I need not have given other reasons for the action that I propose to take and shall take when I vote against the proposed extension of the alleged trade agreements, which are de facto treaties, made contrary to law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, those who in the past have supported the reciprocal trade agreement program have contended that the negotiation of mutually beneficial reciprocal trade agreements is the soundest and most practical way of preserving international trade on a democratic basis without regimentation at home and without ill will abroad.

In considering whether or not the Trade Agreements Act, which expires on June 12, shall be extended, the following pertinent facts cannot be ignored:

First. There can be no freedom from want in a static economy based upon regimentation. The alternative is an expanding economy based upon the distribution of the natural and processed resources of the world in a fair and equitable manner.

Second. There can be no freedom from fear in the midst of regimentation at home and international trade wars abroad.

Third. The natural resources of the world can be distributed in one of two ways only—through international trade, conducted by private individuals, known as the democratic way; or by nations, known as the totalitarian way—"East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet."

Fourth. We are conducting a global war to destroy the ideologies of totalitarianism and preserve the ideologies of democracy.

Fifth. In that war our first objective is victory; and our second, scarcely less vital, is an enduring peace.

Sixth. The action we take on the reciprocal trade agreements program will indicate to our allies whether our present lend-lease means permanent cooperation or temporary defense.

TARIFF HISTORY

Ever since that fateful day when the angel with the flaming sword announced to Adam and Eve, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," the primary struggle of mankind has been for three essential needs—food, shelter, and clothing. Inherent in that struggle has been the selfish desire of some to sweat less by making others sweat more; saddles for the backs of the masses; boots and spurs for the favored few. From the dawn of recorded history to the field of Runnymede the program of elevating in the social and economic order one man above his fellow men by using as a fulcrum the backs of the masses has been known as the divine right of kings. When the barons wrested from King John, Magna Carta, or the great charter of our liberty, a definite limitation for the first time in history was put upon the divine right of kings. For us the fundamental principle of Magna Carta was restated by Thomas Jefferson when he drafted our Declaration of Independence. That Declaration was further implemented by the first 10 amendments to our Federal Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

The essence of the age-old struggle for individual or group advantage has been embodied in every political battle fought in this country over tariff protection.

Aside from the desire of Washington and other Revolutionary War leaders to see the Thirteen Colonies welded into a strong and united nation, the tariff wars between the Colonies made that action imperative. In the first 3 years after the Revolutionary War all the States save New Jersey had placed duties upon imports. Referring to that fact, Patrick Henry exclaimed:

Why should we fetter commerce? Fetter not commerce, sir; let her be as free as the air—and she will range the whole creation and return on the wings of the four winds of heaven to bless the land with plenty.

The Constitution adopted in Philadelphia prohibited States from imposing tariffs. The free trade among the States of our Nation, which, as the Union grew, became the world's largest free-trade area, was a big factor in making the United States the richest nation in the world. We justify private profit by the contention that if a man or group of men deliver a commodity to a consumer cheaper than he could produce the commodity for himself, both have been enriched. The working time of the consumer is released for some effort in which he may excel. If we concede that to be a fair and just principle in the trade of the 48 States of our Union, it is difficult to deny it would not have worked on a world-wide basis. But the error of imposing unnecessary restrictions upon world commerce was made before our

day and generation and can now be only partly undone, if at all.

Alexander Hamilton, one of the ablest men of his day and time, favored a protective tariff, but in return for the benefit to be enjoyed by industry advocated compensatory benefits for agriculture in the form of export bounties. To Thomas Jefferson the idea of any kind of special privilege or subsidy was repugnant. He did not object to Hamilton's tariff views from the standpoint of capitalism. He drew a sharp distinction between capitalism and monopoly; always ready and willing to encourage the furnishing of capital to productive enterprise, he opposed the granting of any special privilege to capitalists as a class. By instinct and training, Jefferson was a natural free trader, terming tariff taxes "duties on consumption," which indeed they were and always will be. Jefferson likewise claimed that a tariff by artificially raising prices to the domestic consumer is a disposition of property by law—by political means, in other words, rather than economic means.

The Continental Congress had been plagued with debts which it was unable to pay. The second bill to be passed by the first session of the First Congress of the United States was a tariff bill to raise revenue. It imposed moderate import rates on sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, wines, salt, and some manufactured products, such as glass and iron. That bill was prepared by James Madison and for some unexplainable reason carried in its title the word "protective." Evidently, it was found by those seeking to establish the principle of protection that the use of that word in the title of a bill created a bad psychological atmosphere, as it did not appear in the title of another bill until the act of 1930, when reference was made to the protection of American labor.

On July 4, 1789, when the first tariff bill was passed, the Thirteen Colonies that formed the Union were predominantly agricultural. By 1824 American industry had grown strong enough financially and strong enough politically to make of their protective-tariff program a political issue. But even in New England it was not a one-way street to political preferment, as witness the following statement made by Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, in the House of Representatives in discussing the tariff bill of 1824:

> With me it is a fundamental axiom, it is interwoven with all of my opinions, that the great interests of the country are united and inseparable; that agriculture, commerce, and manufacturers will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

But some 4 years later Webster shifted his position, speaking for and voting for the tariff bill of 1828, the increased rates of which raised such a storm of protest it became known as the tariff of abominations. That tariff bill was the entering wedge between the industrial North and the agricultural South. As that breach perceptibly widened, Webster expressed the hope the sun would never shine upon the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union, upon a land torn by civil strife and drenched in fraternal blood. He foresaw the tragedy of 1861–65; he lacked the statesmanship to avert it.

In 1908 President Theodore Roosevelt had named his friend, Taft, as his successor and Taft had promised the American people a square deal. In furthering the promised square deal to the consumers in America, President Taft, in a letter dated January 10, 1911, proposed to his friend, Roosevelt, a program of trade with Canada that amounted to substantially free trade between the two countries. On the following day Roosevelt wrote President Taft as follows:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I at once took in your letter and went over it with the Outlook editors. * * *
>
> It seems to me that what you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint. I firmly believe in free trade with Canada for both economic and political reasons. As you say, labor cost is substantially the same in the two countries, so that you are amply justified by the platform. Whether Canada will accept such reciprocity I do not know, but it is greatly to your credit to make the effort. It may damage the Republican Party for a while, but it will surely benefit the party in the end, especially if you tackle wool, cotton, etc., as you propose.
>
> Ever yours,
>
> THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The trade treaty proposed by Taft was ratified by the United States Senate but was not ratified by Canada.

The fight between Taft and Roosevelt in 1912 over the Payne-Aldrich tariff, which had been signed by Taft, resulted in the election of their Democratic opponent, Woodrow Wilson, Taft in that campaign carrying only two States—Utah and Vermont.

In keeping with his promise of a new freedom, Woodrow Wilson recommended to the Congress tariff revision downward, with equal justice to all. In his message to the Congress he said:

> It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or any kind of artificial advantage. And put our businessmen and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world.
>
> Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably cannot, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

In the Underwood tariff of 1913 the rates of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act were measurably lowered. But soon dark clouds arose on the international horizon. World War No. 1 started in August 1914. We entered the conflict in the spring of 1917. An armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, and the Versailles Peace Treaty about 2 years later. During our participation in World War No. 1, the inspiring words and high idealism of Woodrow Wilson lifted the people of this Nation to an all-time high in the realm of unselfish patriotism. After the war came a most unfortunate, and we might say tragic, reaction. The unselfishness and the high idealism of the war effort were shortly supplanted by a spirit of gross materialism. Woodrow Wilson's plans for an enduring peace based upon international cooperation, and a policy of live and let live were discarded. We adopted a policy of isolation, refusing to join the League of Nations and the World Court.

As stated last December by Dr. Robert A. Millikan, of the California Institute of Technology, and published this year by the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America:

> We in the United States did much to win the last world war and much to lose the ensuing peace. Civilization, I fear, will not survive a second mistake of that kind, but to prevent it we have a lot of "educating of America" still to do.

When the Republicans came into power again in 1921 the higher rates of the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 were substituted for those in the Underwood tariff, and in the following year by the still higher rates of the Fordney-McCumber Act. The restrictive effects of these tariff measures on our foreign commerce in the twenties were hidden by private loans abroad totaling six or seven billions of dollars from 1919 through 1929. Americans put their money in foreign stocks and bonds of every description and this money was used, very largely, to pay for American exports. When that support to exports failed, the Congress in 1930 passed the highest restrictive tariff in history, namely, the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930. In the year previous to enactment of that tariff bill our foreign trade had amounted to approximately $10,000,000,000. That tariff act immediately touched off an international trade war, all the major trading nations of the world retaliating by means of higher tariffs, embargoes, and currency manipulations. As a result of that trade war, our foreign commerce dropped like an elevator with a broken cable, from nearly ten billion to about $3,000,000,000, and was followed by the greatest depression in our national history. It would, of course, be unfair, considering the great destruction of men and property in World War No. 1 and the subsequent orgy of speculation and unsound investment, to say that the Hawley-Smoot tariff was the sole cause of our depression. It is fair, however, to say it was a major contributing factor in view of the fact we sank lower in the depression than any other major nation and recovered slower.

A STATIC ECONOMY

In our effort to alleviate the unnecessary severity of that depression, we resorted to domestic policies which were not in harmony with Jefferson's principles on the subject of subsidies and special privileges nor with the foreign trade policy adopted in 1934. Proceeding upon the assumption that our economy was static, would never expand, and those already in a given industry should

be frozen in that industry, organized labor proposed and secured the adoption of legislation, the dominant note of which was restriction and the definite effect of which was monopolistic. At least two-thirds of labor was not embraced in the domestic subsidy program, although for the benefit of all workers engaged in interstate commerce the Congress provided an indirect subsidy with respect to hours and wages in the passage of what was called a Fair Labor Standards Act. Hand in hand with the labor-subsidy program went a subsidy program for agriculture known as the A. A. A. program. Farmers were promised price parity but did not get it until war spending commenced and an outlet for surplus farm products was found in the lend-lease program. A further subsidy was provided for labor in the passage of the Bituminous Coal Act, although that subsidy was likewise extended to the producers of coal. That act was nothing short of a domestic tariff on coal, which has cost the consumers of the Nation millions of dollars.

Our domestic program has resulted in the regimentation of industry, which will be consistent with nothing short of the regimentation of international trade. A domestic wage scale artificially supported can go so high no foreign commerce is possible. Labor laws can be made so one-sided venture capital takes refuge in Government bonds, or else piles up in demand bank deposits; experimentation, on which the vision of new horizon depends, ceases and regimentation for farm and factory commences.

The domestic tariffs have satisfied no one, and have proven to be an inadequate substitute for an economy of abundance. Labor complains of the high cost of living and we pour a little more water into the labor wage barrel. Farmers complain of the high cost of production, and we pour a little more water into the farm price barrel. In each instance, of course, what is poured in comes from the consumer, who remains the forgotten man. In opposing any form of subsidy, Jefferson's trade philosophy called for a free and unobstructed pipe line connecting all the various barrels, permitting the natural economic laws and forces to produce the equilibrium. Jefferson's life was devoted to service of the masses but he did not believe distribution of property by law instead of economic means would produce the more abundant life.

> Could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce—
>
> Said Thomas Jefferson—
>
> and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the number of mankind would be increased, and their condition bettered.

What boots it to cling to Jefferson's opposition to regimentation if we are to be driven into the arms of regimentation through the repudiation of Jefferson's trade principles?

BENEFITS OF FOREIGN TRADE

In a period of war, concessions, of course, must be made to the necessity for war controls. Certain liberties and freedom of individual action, so desirable in times of peace, must yield to war needs. But many citizens are asking, will these wartime regulations and restrictions be eliminated when the war is over? One answer to that troublesome question lies in what the Congress decides to do in the post-war era with respect to foreign trade. New horizons at home will be found in the post-war era in the new horizons of international trade, provided both domestic commerce and foreign commerce remain on the basis of private enterprise. Instead of tackling the heart of that problem, some of our post-war planners are dreaming dreams about a vast public works program with a cradle-to-the-grave security for those outside of organized labor, financed from the public till, and our foreign commerce conducted and controlled by some such Federal agency as the Board of Economic Warfare.

Previous to the trade wars started by the Hawley-Smoot tariff, our exports accounted for about 10 percent of our domestic production. For such items as automobiles, electrical appliances, and office equipment, it was more than 10 percent and for certain farm products far more. We previously exported about 40 percent of our cotton, 20 percent of one type of tobacco, and 40 percent of another, about 20 percent of our wheat, about 20 percent of our lard, apples, and so forth. The thirty-odd million population in what is called the farm group is the biggest single market for manufactured articles. When that group cannot buy, the wheels of industry cease to turn. From two standpoints, therefore, the restoration of foreign trade in the post-war era is of vital consequence to us. In the first place, it means an economy of abundance, as distinguished from an economy of scarcity. In the second place, it means a continuation of our system of private enterprise, as distinguished from the system of regimentation. At the moment our foreign trade is in the hands of the Board of Economic Warfare, which controls both exports and imports. If we be unable in the post-war era to break down international trade barriers in order that private citizens of one country may trade with private citizens of another, the trade of the world will be handled by the various governments of the world, and our trade might be handled by such a national agency as the Board of Economic Warfare. When a governments exports it can only sell to another government. When a government imports the private importer moves out of the picture. That is Hitler's system.

When that great statesman, Cordell Hull, proposed in 1934 to break down international trade barriers by means of the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements, he proposed the only logical and effective means of accomplishing that purpose. In negotiating such an agreement in which we make tariff concessions, we not only demand concessions from the contracting nation with respect to tariffs, we likewise demand assurances with respect to currency manipulations. They can affect more disastrously than tariffs the free flow of commerce.

With respect to the incorporation in such trade agreements of the unconditional most-favored-nation policy, the distinguished Republican, William S. Culbertson, has said:

> Fundamental in Mr. Hull's program of enlarging the volume and simplifying the flow of trade is the unconditional most-favored-nation principle. A principle introduced into our treaty structure by Chief Justice Hughes when he was Secretary of State, extended by both Mr. Kellogg and Mr. Stimson when they were in charge of our foreign affairs, and now transformed into an active policy by Mr. Hull.

The negotiation of trade agreements has resulted in lowering the Hawley-Smoot rates on some eight hundred dutiable items of manufacture, an average of about 25 percent—a fine break for the consumer without doing violence to any producer. Our foreign commerce was immediately stimulated with the most marked increase in exports consisting of agricultural products.

The war brought that program to a halt. We expect to win the war and when won the American people want a peace commensurate with the price to be paid in blood, sweat, and tears. The rank and file of the American people favored the reciprocal trade agreements program before we had the broader lend-lease war program. It had been tested and proven worthy when continued in 1940. It was then and still is a cornerstone for the edifice of peace. Responsive to the public will, the Congress in March of this year, by an almost unanimous vote, continued the lend-lease program. Will the Congress reverse that stand on international cooperation by repudiating the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Ever since the days of Jefferson and Hamilton the subject of international trade has been a political issue in American politics. The people now recognize that it is an economic issue. If the Seventy-eighth Congress treats it as a political issue, the people, in 1944, will apply with reverse English Lincoln's epigram, "Trade knows no politics."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am rather amazed to hear the gentleman from Virginia say that the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was responsible for the depression, inasmuch as it was not enacted until 18 months after the depression set in. If the gentleman will refer to the London Conference, which Mr. Roosevelt torpedoed, he will find the economists say that was a contributing factor which prolonged the depression so long.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman is absolutely wrong. We did not hit rock bottom until 2 years after the Hawley-Smoot Act was passed. We were at the peak in 1929. We boasted about what happened in 1929. That was when we

had $10,000,000,000 of foreign commerce. We were doing fairly well in 1930, but immediately after the passage of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 we started going down as though on a toboggan and a slippery trail in front of us, and we did not stop until we hit the bottom of the worst depression in our Nation's history.

I was careful to say, and I did not charge, that the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act has been the total cause of the depression, but I do say, and I am supported in that statement by all the responsible economists of this Nation, that it was a major contributing factor. I know it is embarrassing to those who voted for that act to hear that statement made, but it is true and I stand by it.

Mr. KNUTSON. If that is true, why has it not been repealed? You have had 12 years within which to take action.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Simply because we realized, when writing the platform in Chicago in 1932 the futility of writing a tariff bill, so in that convention we adopted a platform, and I was fortunate enough to be a member of that convention and to vote for a platform which we approved, which approached the problem from a better, more efficient, and more scientific angle. We said in that platform that we would reduce the inequities of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act by means of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. That is the program we have followed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is it not a fact that during the consideration and the preparation of the Hawley-Smoot Act that more than a thousand outstanding economists of the country told the Congress and the country what would happen if that bill was enacted, and that is just what did happen, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There were 1,015 economists, I think, to be exact.

While we were conducting the last hearings, 1,200 economists, who had been studying this program, outlined to us what had been accomplished, and viewing the future of our international relations they urged upon us and urged upon the Congress and urged upon the minority members that they get behind solidly and support this program and stop trying to make of it a partisan matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is one of our distinguished jurists. I would like to ask him this question. There has been some discussion of it. Would the reenactment or the continuation of this reciprocal-trade agreement law give to the President the power to again reduce duties on commodities 50 percent more if they have already been reduced?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think it would. It has been argued that it would, but I do not think so and the State Department has interpreted that it does not give to it the power to make a reduction upon a reduction.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. There is no doubt about it. This relates to the Tariff Act of 1930. The discretionary authority is granted there. Under the flexible provision that was adopted in the Fordney-McCumber Act, under a Republican administration, the President may reduce the rate not to exceed 50 percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was my understanding, but I think it is a good thing to have it cleared up.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield further—on the gentleman's statement about the position of the economists, I believe that on reflection the gentleman will find that there were 1,500 economists from every State of the Union, representing 250 of the leading universities and institutions of higher learning in this country, who signed this appeal to the committee to continue this program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the gentleman refer to the last one?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; that is my recollection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not count the names. I just read in the paper how many there were. The paper said 1,200, and I thought that was pretty good, but I am glad to accept the correction that there were 1,500 of them. I do know that on checking through the list I found that it contained the names of the leading economists throughout this Nation. It was a very long list and published in the hearings. Of course, I realize the Members of the House have been so busy they have not had time to read the hearings. I am afraid they have not had time to read the committee report, and I am also afraid they do not have time to listen to the debate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We are having some difficulty with economists down in the O. P. A. and other agencies. Does the gentleman feel that the economists are always right?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; but if I had the privilege of picking the economists serving the O. P. A., I think we would have had a better job done down there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with that.

The gentleman mentioned that the duties had been cut about 25 percent on 800 industrial products. Will the gentleman mention the number of agricultural items that have been cut and the approximate percentage of cut in duty?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I head the number stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the amount of the cut that he stated. I do not have the figures but I think he is wrong in his contention agriculture has been injured. No cut on our principal products like corn and wheat has been made at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; they have not been cut, but 163 products have been cut.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There may have been some minor things like babassu nuts and things like that that were cut, if you call them agricultural products, but only a few bushels of them come in and nobody knows what they are unless he looks it up in the dictionary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will give the gentleman a few of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes, and I should like the gentleman to make some observation on the question of whether or not he thinks we can amend this bill satisfactorily.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I feel about the amendments that have been proposed—and I reckon that will cover all there will be offered—just as I would about telling a man, "I will pat you on the back and I want to see you enter this race, but let me cut off one leg first."

I find this. Only those who were opposed to this program from the start are opposing it now. There are a few who opposed it from the start who are now for it, like the National Association of Manufacturers. They opposed it up until this year. That is the finest group of businessmen in the world, and they are 100 percent for the program.

The United States Chamber of Commerce is another fine organization. They have been either in opposition or lukewarm up until this year, but Mr. Minor of that association gave one of the clearest and finest and best-reasoned statements for continuing this program that any witness gave us. I am sure my distinguished friend from Minnesota will recall his cross-examination of Mr. Minor and his efforts to break him down, and I think he will agree with me that the more Mr. Minor was cross-examined on his position the stronger he developed reasons for his position.

I invite the Members of the House to read the testimony of Mr. Minor, speaking for the United States Chamber of Commerce, a great group representing business interests in all the 48 States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not the United States Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Virginia is absolutly correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do not challenge me on things that happened in the committee, because I can remember those. There might be some things that I do not remember.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Will not the gentleman comment on the possible effect on the reciprocal trade agreement program if an amendment is adopted calling for

Senate ratification or a House and Senate veto of these agreements.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The effect will be this. We will negotiate very painstakingly, and you will have to admit, those who are familiar with all that happens, that these agreements are painstakingly negotiated. We have the fullest sort of hearings before the Committee on Reciprocity Information, and then we have the experts of the Tariff Commission, and of the State Department, of the Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce, all sitting in, thinking how it will affect business, how it will affect agriculture, and international relations, and everything that we ought to consider. Every man gets notice of what is going to be proposed. He has full opportunity to appear. Then of course in the final negotiations, they are in what we call executive session. It is secret, and has to be. If we required those final agreements to be brought out into the light of day, and kicked around here in the House for 3 months, no foreign nation would lay its cards on the table, because they have to make concessions in order to get concessions, and while we would discuss their program, all their political enemies at home would be accusing them of making some concession at a time when they did not get any benefit. My first point is that the foreign nation would not make any concession if its cards had to be laid on the table 3 months in advance. Then we would be up against all the old log-rolling from within, and group pressure from without, that marked and marred the tariff history of this Nation. I would like to have time to discuss with you in detail the tariff history of this Nation. It has not been anything for us to be proud of—considering the politics and log-rolling that has been involved. We are trying to get away from that. We are dealing with an economic issue, and trying to deal with it in a technical, efficient way. I do not know of any better way to handle it than the way we have handled it, and as we are asking for it to be handled in the future. These amendments are brought forth and supported by those who would have strangled the program to death back in 1934, before they ever tried it, if they had gotten a chance, and that have always been opposed to it. These amendments are not offered to help the program, they are offered for the purpose of nullifying it, and of indirectly killing it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand it, 23 out of 26 nations with which we have agreed had to lay their cards on the table before their legislative bodies. Were they injured in doing that, or were they prevented from negotiating?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They put the contract into effect. Take the United Kingdom, for instance. It is then subject to ratification by the Parliament, and if the Parliament did not ratify what Mr. Winston Churchill did, he would have to resign and the Government would fall, and they would have a general election, and they have not had a general election since 1935. Congress can repudiate the President whenever it sees fit, and that makes Congress free to do with the program what it pleases. There is no analogy between what might happen here, and what would take place in foreign nations.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I have to ask about the same point the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] called to the gentleman's attention. I had this personal experience. I had constituents who wanted to know what was in a certain treaty, one of these treaties which had been negotiated. We were unable to get that information from our own State Department, or any other state department, but I succeeded in getting it from an Ambassador of a foreign country here, because in the foreign country that treaty had been laid on the table, and was being discussed by the foreign nation, before they were bound by it. We were bound by it. We could not investigate, could not get information of what we had agreed to, while the foreign South American country was discussing whether or not it was to their advantage to enter into such an agreement with our country. Would the gentleman, in the light of that, say that it does not make any difference if they had placed their treaties on the table for inspection, before they are bound, and we did not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. When the gentleman asks me "in the light of that," I may say that I do not agree with that, and I do not agree that that throws any light on it, for this reason. They have a date when they can make a release of information, and the gentleman did not get his information from the ambassador until that release date had occurred, and there evidently was some administrative delay or break-down in the State Department that it did not get that information to the gentleman by the time the foreign ambassador was privileged to release it. They have a release date for the information, which becomes available then to the people of both countries.

Mr. MILLS. And in connection with the ratification of trade treaties, it is not a fact that there have been only three trade treaties ratified by the Senate in our history?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true. In the Taft administration we negotiated a trade agreement with Canada, and that was approved by the Congress, but Canada did not ratify that agreement. But there has never been a reciprocal trade agreement ratified by the Senate, not one; and there will not be. Those who are trying to get Senate ratification know it. I think it would be much more forthright and intellectually honest if they would just say, "We do not want your program, and on this issue we vote 'no.'" Do not say, "Oh, I want it, but so and so." In my opinion, that is not being intellectually honest, because a provision for Senate ratification nullifies the whole program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. On the point mentioned by the gentleman with respect to trade agreements, there were but 12 such agreements negotiated, the so-called Quezon agreements under the administration of President McKinley. Not one of them ever came to a vote in the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. After McKinley's assassination, his splendid successor, Theodore Roosevelt, tried until 1903 to get the Senate to act and he gave up in despair, and privately he said, "in disgust."

Mr. COOPER. Even though both President McKinley and his successor, President Theodore Roosevelt were both trying to get them ratified by the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. I want to tell you what he wrote to President Taft in January 1911, showing how he felt. He said:

> Dear Mr. PRESIDENT: I at once took in your letter and went over it with the Outlook editors.
>
> It seems to me that what you propose to do with Canada is admirable from every standpoint. I firmly believe in free trade with Canada for both economic and political reasons. As you say, labor cost is substantially the same in the two countries, so that you are amply justified by the platform. Whether Canada will accept such reciprocity I do not know, but it is greatly to your credit to make the effort. It may damage the Republican Party for awhile, but it will surely benefit the party in the end, especially if you tackle wool, cotton, etc., as you propose.
>
> Ever yours,
>
> THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Canada has approved our reciprocal trade agreement; their Parliament has.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. In view of the facts submitted by the gentleman, do you interpret a vote in favor of Senate ratification of trade agreements as equivalent to a vote against continuation of the act?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think there is any doubt about it. If you vote for Senate ratification you vote to kill the program. There is no use trying to camouflage it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman support an amendment to guarantee the American farmer cost of production?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; because you have no way—we have gone into this fully in the committee and elsewhere—we have no way of knowing exactly what the cost of production is either for manufactured articles or for the American farmer.

Mr. KNUTSON. How can the gentleman find out that it costs 10 cents a pound more to raise turkeys in Virginia than in the Argentine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We did not know what it cost to raise them in Argentina. All we know is what they sold them for, delivered on the Atlantic coast. That is

all we know. If you go into the cost of production you cannot even tell what the cost of production is in the entire United States, because it is one thing in Virginia, it is one thing in Minnesota, and it is one thing in Texas. It varies. Manufactures are the same way in the United States. Some are efficient and some are inefficient. They vary. If you are dealing with an article that is produced by more than one foreign country, you are in for an interminable task to find out what the cost of production is.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senate of the United States been wrong in every one of those refusals to ratify trade agreements? Why is it that we so mistrust the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It depends on your viewpoint. If I had some industry that had the benefit of high protection I would say the Senate has been right every time they refused to ratify one of these programs, but if I were a consumer or if I were interested in the broader picture of international trade I would say the Senate was wrong every time it refused to ratify them. That would be my position.

Mr. COOPER. Evidently President McKinley and President Theodore Roosevelit both thought the Senate was wrong, because they were urging the Senate to ratify.

Mr. CURTIS. But I am asking why you do not trust the Senate now?

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is not a Democratic program. It is not a New Deal program. Reciprocity was developed under Republican leadership. The most-favored-nation principle in the negotiation of treaties was by your great New Englander, James G. Blaine. He developed that as Secretary of State under President Harrison, I think it was.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised at the attitude taken by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for whom I have a real attachment. He is a valuable member of our committee. In answer to a question of mine he virtually stated that he would not be inclined to favor an amendment that would guarantee the American farmer cost of production. It is only about 3 years ago, when it was first published that Mr. Hull was negotiating a treaty with the Argentine, that the gentleman from Virginia went down to the State Department and protested a cut on the turkey rate from 10 cents a pound to 6 cents a pound, because he said the Virginia turkey grower could not possibly compete with a 6-cent duty, and that they would be driven out of business. He went down there notwithstanding the fact that the imports of turkeys as compared with the domestic production were only about one three-hundredths of 1 percent.

Consistency, thou art a jewel, but thou dost not shine very often in this body.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is is not a fact that the State Department, when I and 42 other Members of the House and Senate—and that is how many were down there that day—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] was there, I remember, speaking for his turkeys. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] was not there.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. I do not believe in log rolling.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This was the Committee on Reciprocity Information, set up for those to be heard when they have some facts and not logs to roll.

And we showed them not what it cost to produce a turkey in Argentina but what they were laying them down on our Atlantic coast for and what they could lay them down for without any tariff. The fairness of the program was shown by the fact that they did not reduce that rate. I contend we do not need the gentleman's amendment because that has been the fixed policy, not to let any imports of competitive farm products come in in sufficient volume to break our domestic market.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. The gentleman's defense reminds me of a definition that was once made by a very able Member of this body. He was discussing a certain class of appropriations. He denounced them as "pork" in a very vigorous manner. Some Member asked him if he would define "pork." He had been referring to "pork" all through his speech and I guess it was a nice big fat juicy piece of "pork." This Member's definition of "pork" was: "Money spent for public improvement in some other Member's district." Some Members think of the tariff in the same light. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia wants full protection for his turkeys but he wants to stop there. I would not. I believe that all American interests should be treated on equal terms.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to keep the record straight. The gentleman from Virginia said that the duties on farm products had not been cut very much, just a few of them. It is somewhat interesting to note that in the first 22 trade agreements there were 163 duties cut on farm products. I will give you a partial list of them: Cattle, hogs, pork, bacon, milk, cream, cheese, chickens, ducks, turkeys, eggs, honey, barley, corn, oats, rice, apples, berries, clover, alfalfa, cabbage, potatoes, and other vegetables. If these are minor products of agriculture, then I would like to know it. The duties on these commodities were cut from 25 to 50 percent. In peacetime, this country produces surpluses of the farm products which I have mentioned.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. They cut the duty on apples, but they put such a restriction on the quota that it never affected the national market. They cut the duty on cheese, but it was less than 1 percent of the total consumption. The price of cheese, we can show, went up all the time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, no.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The only complaint of cheese producers was that it did not go up as fast as it might have gone up if there had not been any cheese brought in, but that was a hypothetical argument. The Farm Bureau Federation said they could not find anybody who had been hurt by it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield further; I am sorry, but I just want to say further in this connection that apples from Canada flooded the market in the State of Washington and elsewhere so that they had to turn domestic apples over to relief agencies. United States relief agencies have purchased $22,000,000 worth of apples for relief distribution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman said duties on cattle were cut.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. My State, Montana, ranks third in this country in the production of cattle and sheep, but we cannot compete with the South American people in the production of cattle.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Nor with Canada.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Nor can we compete with them in the production of sheep or wool for the reason that our taxes are higher and we pay our hired help 90 percent higher wages. Everything else is higher in proportion, and let me say in addition to that——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Just let me answer the gentleman's question. From 1933 to 1940 2,568,610 head of cattle were imported, for which we paid $66,079,000. Had they been produced in this country the American farmers would have received $99,079,000.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] said that as a result of the pleas of himself and others the negotiators of the Argentine treaty did not reduce the tariff on turkeys. I wanted to ask the gentleman who was there with the gentleman from Virginia and himself how the gentleman's memory in that regard corresponds with the facts.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, they cut the duty on dressed turkeys, not on live ones.

Mr. MOTT. That is right; and that is what the argument was about.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It must not be overlooked that during the first 7 years under the reciprocal trade program, our Government under the A. A. A. spent billions of dollars in payments to farmers to decrease production of farm

products. During these years the President drastically reduced the duties on surplus farm products, and literally invited foreign farmers to produce more of such products for shipment into the United States. I will leave you to figure that one out for yourself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, in listening to some of the statements of my very distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] I noted he said it would be impossible to carry on treaties or to make agreements with foreign countries and have them spread about in the Halls of this Congress, that no one would want to enter into negotiations with us. I cannot understand that because the very same thing happens in the parliaments or public representative bodies of the other countries and for this reason I cannot see that that type of amendment, which I understand is one that will be proposed, granting a period in which the Congress might express itself, would in any way be hurtful to these reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that the suggestion has been made by our distinguished Secretary of State, and repeated here in the debate, that the position taken by Members of Congress on some of the amendments of the pending resolution to extend the reciprocal trade agreements act will express our willingness or unwillingness to have the United States participate in post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation. By such a suggestion the administration has invited the nations of the world to place a construction on our action here which has no foundation of fact. The world has been invited to treat a domestic issue as an international issue.

I fully realize, as I am sure do many of my colleagues, that the United States has a responsibility in the establishment of a just peace and in the reconstruction of a world ravished by war. It is an inescapable responsibility. For the United States to refuse to participate in world reconstruction would constitute a repudiation of our own achievements in victory over the enemies of freedom. For my part, I shall continue to work for the development of ways and means of our participation on a sound and constructive basis, that no country profits at the expense of another but that all enjoy reciprocal benefits.

I am especially interested, Mr. Chairman, in the amendment to be offered that will give Congress a period within which to express itself, favorably or unfavorably, on the trade agreements negotiated by the executive departments. The proposed amendment does not raise an international question. It has no bearing whatsoever on the role the United States should or will play in world affairs, now or in the future.

The proposed amendment raises purely a domestic question as to whether the people's representatives in Congress shall have the right to pass upon agreements that so directly affect their daily lives. I cannot imagine any foreign government misunderstanding the desire of the people's Congress to have that right. I am sorry indeed that the administration has tended to create a misunderstanding foreign governments would not otherwise have.

As a result of the war, innumerable problems of an economic character will arise requiring world cooperation for a solution. These problems will be just as important to our own national well-being as to any other nation of the world. We must give consideration to the employment of sixty-odd-million fellow citizens now engaged in industrial pursuits, and in addition find employment for our returning soldiers and sailors. Employment can be found by no other means than business activities, and business activities must take into account the stimulation of world trade and the development of an economy of plenty, not only in the United States but in all the nations of all parts of the world.

Take, for instance, China with its population of four or five hundred million souls. Through the sufferings of war that old civilization has had western methods and the use of modern machinery brought to it in a hard way. No longer does a Chinaman regard an airplane as some dragon or a tank as some devil wagon. They can conceive of the future use of the airplane as a means of transportation over their vast continent and the tank divested of its armament as a tractor for the development of their farms. China needs machinery and finished goods. China needs great quantities of agricultural commodities to feed itself, but China can pay for these with many raw materials that we ourselves do not produce and that our industry requires.

In order for China to buy she must be able to sell. In order that China can buy it is our job to aid her to produce those articles which she can sell. That is real reciprocity. I concede that the Secretary of State and the executive departments should have the power to negotiate really reciprocal trade agreements. But I do not concede that the Congress should be entirely bereft of its rights, in fact its constitutional duty, to express an opinion if the contracts made are contrary to the interests of the American people as a whole.

If it is admitted that employment can only be found and the possibilities of inflation halted by a policy of plenty, any concerted effort by consortiums, either public or private, that might attempt to restrict production of the necessary commodities entering into industry should be curbed.

During the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee I queried a number of the witnesses as to the effect of the so-called cartels on foreign trade. Assisted by their testimony and personal study, I came to the conclusion that the cartels as now operated were an invisible government making private and secret deals, which in many cases completely circumvent the reciprocal trade agreements of the recognized governments. I therefore offered in committee a brief amendment authorizing the President to suspend reciprocal trade agreements where he finds that an international cartel is operating in such manner as to circumvent the agreements. This amendment was adopted.

It was argued by some of the members of the committee that the President already had such powers. That is true, but international cartels have been in operation without much attention given them during the 9 years the reciprocal trade powers have been in effect. The purpose of the amendment is to serve notice that the Congress of the United States is opposed to the cartel operations of private parties and, in fact, governments themselves, which in effect tend to nullify the trade agreements and obstruct international trade. The purpose of the amendment is to make it crystal clear that the Congress wishes special attention given to the operations of international cartels, which hinder production, obstruct the flow of trade, and tend to breed wars.

Cartels are not in their inception a product of the twentieth century. Their growth in Europe has been the result primarily of opposition to free private enterprise not only by governments, especially the authoritarian regimes of Germany, but also of the feudal outlook on economic life which has characterized so much of Europe's economic development. In general, the cartel movement in Europe paralleled the development of trusts in this country, with the difference that, particularly in Germany, national cartels have enjoyed the protection and subsidy of government.

Cartels are usually based upon the efforts of small groups of powerful monopolies to corner supplies of raw materials, to amass huge patent structures and to employ their financial strength to "regulate" output, divide markets, allocate fields of production and maintain monopolistic price levels. From the point of view of cartels the whole world market is the area of exploitation.

The industries and markets in which cartels and cartel agreements exist are too numerous to analyze in detail. Among the major industries in which international cartels have disrupted the free flow of commerce between the United States and the rest of the world are the electrical equipment industry, the heavy and organic chemical industries—including such fields as explosives, fertilizers, vital drugs and pharmaceutical products, dyestuffs, plastics, military optical goods—international cartels and agreements in the metallurgical industries such as magnesium, beryllium, zinc, and tin in particular consistently interfered with the free operation of our foreign trade both export and import by dividing up world markets, limiting output and preventing the introduction of new materials and processes. Trade policies which endeavor to adjust tariffs in order to stimulate the interchange of commodities between the United States and other nations can be completely nullified by the existence of international cartels.

Take one of many possible examples: For many years the production, price,

and international trade in tin have been controlled by a British-dominated cartel known as the International Tin Committee. In 1938 this international cartel renewed for a period of 5 years its control scheme limiting tin output. With the outbreak of war some concessions were made in the production of tin but the cartel was successful in maintaining its price structure in the agreements made with the various governments dependent on the cartel for tin.

On September 9, 1942, an agreement was signed by representatives of Great Britain, Bolivia, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the International Tin Committee to preserve the machinery for post-war control of the production and price of tin. Commenting on the agreement the London Economist in the issue of October 3, 1942, stated that—

The new scheme, like its predecessors, is a scheme aiming at the prevention of surplus supplies.

That is only one of many examples that could be presented as to the operations of international cartels and the manner in which they tend to defeat the very purposes of reciprocal trade agreements. The dumping policies of cartels can quickly undermine any program for reestablishing the conditions of trade necessary to the maintenance of our position in world economy. It should also be pointed out that cartel agreements have not only prevented domestic industries from exporting even to our good neighbors in South America but in some cases have prevented us from even creating new industries in the United States itself.

The stabilization of world economy depends upon the maintenance of full employment, the development of national resources, and the expansion of both domestic and world markets looking toward a general increase in standards of living both here and abroad. I believe that reciprocal trade agreements can make a contribution to that end. International monopolies which restrict production, maintain artificial and exorbitant price levels, and attempt to segregate spheres of influence among themselves can effectively defeat the best intentions. It is for this reason that I believe special attention must be given to international cartels in our efforts to stimulate world trade, and it is for this reason that I sponsored the amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, the resolution providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and reported as House Joint Resolution 111, is a matter that should at this time receive our most serious consideration. We must adopt a realistic and sensible policy devoid of illusions, and the adoption of one that will not be misleading to the nations of the world is of vital importance. To extend the power granted by Congress to the President on June 12, 1934 and extended for two consecutive 3-year periods since such time, without giving to our allies and to all nations of the world an indication as to what our future conduct will be, is misleading and likely to produce hostility. It could eventually be, at least partially, responsible for another great world war.

It is, therefore, of vital importance that we act at this time with caution and with due regard for the future welfare of our Nation and of the world. We should give to the world full and complete notice that we are willing to assume our responsibilities and duties in the family of world nations; that we propose to do everything reasonably possible to assist in elevating the standards of living in other nations; that we shall aid in feeding and in rehabilitating other nations; that we shall not shirk or evade any just responsibility that we may now have or may incur as the result of the present war, and at its end we will enter into negotiations having for their objective the establishment of a sound and just world order, wherein trade barriers between nations will eventually be removed and a freer exchange of goods and services be permitted upon a basis that will be mutually beneficial. On the other hand, for us to create an ensnarement, leading the nations of the world to believe that the United States is to materially lower its standards of living and surrender its sovereignty will result in dire consequences at the peace table, and thereafter. I believe it should be made clear, as a national policy, that the primary interest of the Government of the United States will be to protect its citizens; to preserve its solvency and economy; to maintain its established living standards, and to assist in elevating the living standards of other Nations throughout the world where inferior standards of living exist. We can follow the rational policies that Great Britain has laid down which is a sound and logical criterion. Among them are the following:

BRITISH VIEWS ON TARIFFS

The association recommends reduction in tariffs as far as practicable, but recognizes that tariffs or other measures designed to afford an orderly dispersal of goods, cannot be dispensed with entirely so long as the problem of the low-cost-of-living nations remains. A contributory factor would be the education of such nations in the improvement of the living standard of their peoples so that they would be able to absorb a larger amount of their own production, and in course of time be able to increase their purchases of manufactured goods from the rest of the world. (Post-War Industrial Reconstruction. The Association of British Chamber of Commerce, May 1942.)

The policy of the United Kingdom must be designed to help in the achievement of that objective (world rehabilitation), and the world systems must be of such a nature as to facilitate the economic prosperity of the United Kingdom. (Reconstruction, the Federation of British Industries, May 1942.)

The basis of consideration for the free entry of goods be the general standard of the country producing them, i. e., that unless it can be adequately demonstrated that the goods have been produced under satisfactory conditions of national life, then leveling imports to be permitted. It should, however, be observed that satisfactory conditions of life must be relative to the country concerned * * * It is desirable that the qualifying standard in every country should be determined by conditions within each country, subject to the provision within that standard of wages providing adequate food, clothing, shelter, and cultural facilities according to the developing needs of the people. (Interim report on British export and import reconstruction. The Institute of Export.)

This clearly indicates that Great Britain is willing to do business with every nation on earth upon a fair and equal basis, provided that nation maintains for its people the standard of living as maintained in Great Britain. In the making of trade treaties we could not adopt a more fair rule.

We cannot allow a commodity to enter this country from a foreign nation, where the labor cost is the principal item in the production cost, and where such labor is paid 10 cents per hour, in competition with a like product manufactured or grown in the United States where the minimum labor cost is 40 cents per hour, as established by our wage and hour law. To do so, will inevitably break down the American standard of living and in order to compete with foreign-made products the American wage rate must necessarily be reduced to meet the wage rate of the country in which such import originated. If free trade is desired, we can eventually attain it, but only when all the Nations of the earth exporting into this country competitive commodities, produce such under conditions similar to those existing in this country. Free trade is not attainable without the destruction of American industry, agriculture and the standard of living of the American people, until the other nations, with ambitions for commercial relations with this country, will lift the standard of living of the people of such nation to that comparable with that in the United States.

During the past 10 years floors have been created upon wages, working hours have been shortened, and other conditions attained that have improved the living standard of the people of the United States. This policy has not been criticized. It is sound. The resources of our Nation, as well as its creative and inventive genius have made this possible. It is our hope that such will continue and over the years to come will be vastly improved, even over the present status. Undoubtedly immediately following the war, with our accelerated rate of production in every line of human endeavor and with our capacity to produce increased, we shall live in comfort and with security. It is imperative that this accomplishment be protected.

The American manufacturer does not want a preferential market either within this country or in any part of the world. I believe the view of the American manufacturer is best expressed by Mr. Joseph M. Wells in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Wells is president of the United States Potters Association which manufacturers 95 percent of the chinaware made in this country, and in his testimony expresses the attitude of the

American manufacturer in the following language:

Please understand that our industry has never asked for a tariff rate that would exclude imports and give a monopoly of the American market. All we want is a chance to meet the prices of imported wares of the same type. We are strongly confident that, given an even break, we can, through superior quality and design, capture our proper share of the business in our own country. We know beyond peradventure of a doubt that we cannot get that break so long as the State Department of the present administration is writing our tariff rates. * * * Everyone knows that one of, if not the chief, objective of the State Department in negotiating these trade treaties is to lower the American protective tariff rates and to permit ever-increasing imports of competitive merchandise. The desire to increase American exports seems entirely secondary. Certainly there could be no better proof of this than the lopsided treaties that have been made. This total disregard for American labor's work opportunities becomes even more glaring when the trades that have been made are measured in man-hours of labor and that, I maintain, is the only proper way to fairly gage concessions in tariff rates.

The position of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, composed of thousands of American men and women, is set forth in a telegram from Mr. Harry H. Cook, president, to the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, Member on the Ways and Means Committee, under date of April 22, 1943, in the following language:

TOLEDO, OHIO, *April 22, 1943.*

Hon. THOMAS JENKINS,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives:

The American Flint Glass Workers' Union supports the American policy and position of the American Federation of Labor in opposition to the landing in American markets of foreign competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The American Flint Glass Workers' Union is unalterably opposed to continued authorization for trade treaties unless said authorization provides for congressional approval of Senate ratification that such trade treaties be terminated at the conclusion of the present war or that no provision be made for the entry into American markets of foreign-made competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The position of the American Federation of Labor presented to the platform committee of both political parties has not been changed by any authorized action. We are forwarding to you a copy of the position of the American Federation of Labor on restrictive immigration and on tariff legislation. We would appreciate your placing our position before the Ways and Means Committee.

HARRY S. COOK,
President, American Flint Glass Workers' Union.

Mr. James M. Duffy, president of National Brotherhood of Operative Potters; Mr. Walter M. Cenerazzo, president of Waltham Watch Workers' Union; and numerous other organizations representing manufacturers, farmers, and workers have expressed themselves before the Ways and Means Committee and publicly in support of the position of Mr. Wells and Mr. Cook.

Mr. Cook does not ask for advantages for his workers. He asks for agreements negotiated and entered into with equal opportunity to compete with workers in foreign countries. All are opposed to such agreements unless they are ratified by the Senate, terminated at the conclusion of the war, or within a reasonable length of time following the closing of the war, and that no provision be made for the entry into the markets of the United States of foreign-made competitive goods from countries where cost of production is less than the cost of production in the United States. This is a fair and reasonable request; one that, I believe, in justice, cannot be denied; but, unfortunately, a policy that has been ignored in the making of such treaties and to the great detriment of American workers.

It has been advanced as a reason for the making of such treaties that trade barriers were responsible for war. The present reciprocal trade-making policy was originally adopted because it was represented as a panacea for wars. Even though we have been very benevolent with all the nations of the world in our policy in the making of such agreements, a most tragic war followed. Other nations did not share our views nor did they share in our spirit of benevolence.

I believe a careful study of our relations with Japan will clearly disclose the fallacy of such argument and the unreasonableness of such policy. Japan was a most-favored nation. Statistics disclosed that we shipped to her immense quantities of cotton, petroleum, scrap iron, copper, machine tools, trucks, and various other commodities, and in return received chinaware, silks, and various other commodities from Japan. This was under peculiar advantages given to Japan by our reciprocal-trade policy. It permitted her to export into this country large quantities of competitive commodities which were disastrous to and destructive of American industry and agriculture. It also permitted her to import from this country vast quantities of articles that were vital to her plans of aggression and conquest. With these, she armed herself at a rapid and dangerous rate. I personally called this to the attention of Secretary Hull in May 1939. I called it to the attention of this House in a speech on October 19, 1939, in the following language:

War has prevailed in China for 3 years. The peace-loving, philosophic people of that part of the world have pleaded for assistance against the ravages of an unwanted war. We have shipped to the aggressor in a war of conquest the means to continue that warfare against a people who are stanch friends of our country. We have turned a deaf ear to their appeals. In the meantime, we have supplied the aggressor with all means of warfare. Steel, scrap iron, trucks, cotton for gunpowder, copper, and other essentials of war were shipped, all for profit. The consequences of our turning a deaf ear and closing our eyes to these appeals and to this dismal picture will be visited upon us for many generations to come. Soon the white man and his commerce will be extinct in Asia.

How prophetic!

Pearl Harbor and its tragic fate spells the sum total of our policy towards this Nation. We gave all, received little, and, in turn, was given the most treacherous, dastardly, and destructive treatment ever accorded a civilized nation by another supposedly civilized nation.

Surely our mistakes of the past ought to be a guidepost to prevent a repetition in the future. Let me urge that we be realistic, sensible, and honorable. I do not mean to infer that we should discontinue the making of trade agreements at this time. I do mean that we should treat this subject in a fair and rational manner, with full consideration for the rights and responsibilities that we, as one of the leading world nations, have. We should give notice to all nations of the world that we shall not be bound by this policy at the conclusion of the war; that these agreements are to be terminated 6 months after the war is over, and, in the meantime, they will be submitted for congressional approval.

Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, in a speech at Toledo, Ohio, is quoted as saying:

If the United States repudiates the Trade Agreement Act, either outright or by crippling amendments, if it thus repudiates the idea of economic nonaggression, it will have destroyed the stuff of which peace is made, it will have struck a heavy blow at the hopes of mankind for ridding this world of the scourge of war and for creating a just, a workable, and lasting peace.

If this Congress permits the policy of trade-making agreements to continue as the same have been negotiated, and the world is led to believe that such will be a permanent policy, whereby we shall destroy the American standards of living, and at a later date a subsequent Congress, recognizing its full duty to our country and to its people, repudiates such policy, it will be a tragic blow to peace. It is, therefore, imperative that we get the record straightened out at this time so that there shall be no misunderstanding about our future policy. This is most imperative, not only for our welfare, but for the welfare of the world, and by dealing in an honorable, straightforward, American manner, we will make a substantial contribution to a better understanding among nations and to the establishment of a durable and permanent peace.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY].

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, all over the land the people are fearful that the Congress is losing its legislative powers granted by the Constitution of the United States. The underlying reason in the election last November for the large increase in the minority party was due to the firm demand by the people that the Congress cease abdicating its powers. The people have faith in the Constitution, but they have no faith in government beyond the Constitution and even in defiance of it.

The measure we are considering today furnishes an apt illustration of what I mean. Secretary Hull came before the Committee on Ways and Means to urge the extension for 3 years of a policy very dear to his heart. Secretary Jones also testified before that committee in urging the extension of these agreements. But

we are faced with the startling fact that neither Secretary Hull nor Secretary Jones could deny the fact that as things stand today they have no power whatever over these trade agreements. For the truth of the matter is that the President of the United States, by virtue of the authority vested in him by the First War Powers Act, approved December 18, 1941, authorized and directed the Board of Economic Warfare to have full charge of these matters by Executive Order No. 9128, proclaimed April 13, 1942. By this order the Board of Economic Warfare was authorized to—

(d) Provide and arrange for the receipt by the United States of reciprocal aid and benefits (other than arms, munitions, or weapons of war as defined in the President's proclamation of May 1, 1937, as amended) from the government of any country whose defense shall have been determined by the President to be vital to the defense of the United States pursuant to the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11, 77th Cong.), and determine the terms upon which such aid and benefits shall be received, including the authorization of other governmental agencies to receive such aid and benefits.

(e) Represent the United States Government in dealing with the economic warfare agencies of the United Nations for the purpose of relating the Government's economic warfare program and facilities to those of such nations.

It has been claimed that Public Law No. 11, known as the Lend-Lease Act, established a government outside of and beyond the Constitution of the United States. Whether or not this be true, the fact remains that the Board of Economic Warfare and not the State Department, and certainly not the Commerce Department, has charge of our foreign trade relations at this time. It must, therefore, be apparent that there is no need of extending these trade agreements.

It has been charged that the only function left remaining in the hands of the Congress is the power to appropriate money. The sting of this charge was keenly felt by the Congress elected last November and it can be truthfully said to the credit of the Seventy-eighth Congress that we have corrected this loss of prestige, power, and authority by reclaiming our powers in several notable instances. The opportunity to continue this course is afforded us today. We can assert the firm insistence by the Congress that no further delegation of authority will be given over the important subject matter of our tariff regulations and the means and methods of raising revenue. It is not difficult for us to thus regain our powers when we stop to think of post-war realities. We all know the conditions of our farmers and the terrific burden under which they are laboring to supply us with adequate food, and if there is to be any domestic market left to the farmer after this war is over, certainly we must prevent the importation of competitive foreign-produced farm products.

You can say that I am lacking in the good-neighbor policy, but I am ready to stand or fall on the proposition that no man can be a good neighbor who does not first take care to the best of his ability of his own household. Our first duty is to protect the home front and that never ceases either in war or in peace. We must have a strong, virile people if we are to wage successful warfare and certainly there is nothing un-American in insisting that we do for our own people what every other nation in the world is doing for theirs. After the war we will face a great unemployment problem, and certainly what few jobs remain for civilian production must not be bartered away by the importation of foreign-manufactured products, made by workers who receive meager wages, and millions of whom operate under slave conditions.

All over the Nation today a steadily increasing demand is coming from the people that the Members of Congress stand up for America and quit these delegations of authority to bureaucrats and boards that are working on schemes of internationalists. This tendency to sell the civilian population down the river has gone so far that at this hour we face a great domestic crisis. It must not continue. It is our solemn duty to vote against the extension of these trade agreements, and most emphatically should we do this, when the real power over our foreign trade rests in the hands of a board created by Executive order, and over which we have no control.

Today we are confronted with a great issue which will determine the future of this Republic. The very life of the Congress of the United States hangs in the balance. The President by this measure is asking the Congress to give him legislative authority to commit this Nation to whatever policy he may desire in fixing the economic relations of this Nation to foreign nations. In the field of foreign relations he already has the power to negotiate treaties, but the Constitution of the United States provides that these treaties shall not be binding upon the United States until they are ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. In the field of foreign relations it is safe to say that the Senate of the United States will never surrender the constitutional right to ratify such treaties. If we extend the authority of the Secretary of State to make reciprocal trade treaties with foreign nations, then we will be committed until 1946 with regard to our economic policies.

Today there is no foreign trade. We are at war and there is no free exchange anywhere. We have no right to tie the hands of those who will represent the people of the United States after the war. It is our sworn duty under our oaths of office to terminate these trade treaties so that the post-war policy can be decided free from these entangling commitments. We must make it clear to all the world that we are living under a written constitution and that the final determination of our foreign policy rests with the Senate of the United States

It is now generally admitted that the President will seek a fourth term. If we grant the authority contained in this measure, the argument will be made that we dare not change our Presidents because of the secret agreements he has made with other nations and that to do so would result in the loss of the war. It is our solemn duty to clear the way for the next President of the United States who will also be the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and carry this Nation to a glorious victory over all of our enemies.

We should thank God for this opportunity. The termination of these trade treaties, by the very language of the statute by which they were originated, is now at hand. The cessation of foreign trade makes it easy for us to do our duty at this hour. This is in no sense a war measure. Whatever may be the effect of these trade treaties, they will not operate until after the war when foreign trade is again revived. I repeat that we should thank God that this opportunity to uphold the Constitution of the United States is offered to the Members of this Congress. Only distrust and misunderstanding can come to us if we do not now clearly proclaim to the nations of the world that the Executive under our Constitution has no power to make final commitments with reference to either our foreign relations or our economic relations.

All over the Nation there are groups advocating our membership in a world organization to join which we must surrender our sovereignty as a free people. They argue that we must surrender only a part of our sovereignty. As a matter of constitutional law, I want to here and now emphasize that there is no such thing as a partial surrender of our sovereignty, for if we surrender in part we have surrendered all, for the simple reason that the obligations assumed by such a partial surrender would entail the loss of our independent sovereignty. The Constitution of the United States denies forever the supremacy of any law save the Constitution, for by its very terms it is ordained in article VI that:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

It is, therefore, plain that any scheme, arrangement, or agreement lacking the force of constitutional authority is utterly null and void. The language of the Constitution would be meaningless if we permitted certain departures to have the sanction of constitutional authority and then insist that the Constitution was in full force and effect in all other respects.

George Washington expressed this truth in his Farewell Address:

This Government, the offspring of your own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.

Officers in the Government come and go, but the people's government goes on forever. No man or set of men can alter the fixed purposes and objects of the people's government. Wise provision in the great, inspired charter of liberty—the Constitution of the United States—has placed it far above the hand that would dare to blot out a word of it. It will remain forever the Government of the people and the people alone can change it.

We insist that the Senate of the United States must have a voice in making international trade agreements. This whole subject matter is so involved in our future foreign policy that we dare not further abdicate to the Executive. The future of the United States must be determined in the manner ordained and established by the people in their Constitution and not according to the judgment or fancy of any one man. It is a sincere privilege to uphold the obligations of our oath of office and to vote against this measure today.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, the whole question of foreign-trade agreements is shrouded in mystery for the average man and woman. The people generally realize that tremendous powers to commit them to contracts with other countries are hidden in the Trade Agreements Act. They also realize that these agreements are arrived at through intricate processes of a most mysterious nature to the average man, and that the people have to depend upon their special instrument of control over their Government—the Congress—to protect their interests, and to see that the vast powers possessed by the Executive under the Trade Agreements Act are not mistakenly used to the injury of the citizens of our own country.

In the Ways and Means Committee, we have been earnestly deliberating these very questions. Many of us believe, as the people believe, that the Congress ought to know the details of these trade agreements; to what actions they are being committed; and how difficult of fulfillment may be the commitments to which they, without their knowledge, are being made a party, before these agreements are irrevocably entered into.

Under the act, all agreements entered into by the Executive become immediately effective, and not until 3 years later are they subject to a 6 months' abrogation notice by either of the two contracting parties. Consequently, after an agreement has become effective, no change can be made therein for 3½ years without the consent of both parties, regardless of how injurious it proves to be to either.

A point involved which has been a very difficult one is the most-favored-nation clause in these agreements. Whereas most of the other nations dealing with us accord to us alone any advantages of trade, we, in following the most-favored-nation clause, grant to all other nations, except those with whom we are at war, all of the advantages we grant to the nation entering into an agreement with us. This in effect operates to cause the United States to give away all of its trade advantages to countries which are not granting us any advantages in return, so that when we come to negotiate with them we have left no stock with which to trade.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman say that the trade advantages are granted to all nations, including the nations with which we are now at war?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I said, "Except the nations with which we are at war."

Fourteen nations with whom we have trade agreements permitted no part of the treaty to go into effect until their legislative bodies had approved them. Twelve other nations permitted only a tentative and temporary operation of the agreements until their legislative bodies confirmed them. Four little countries only, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, and Peru permit their executives to have the power given President Roosevelt—the sole power to put the agreements into effect. This means that 26 of the 30 agreements now in existence are with nations who required legislative knowledge and action before they could become finally effective. Mr. Chairman, I include for the record at this point a lits of these nations and other information relative to our trade agreements with them.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON TRADE AGREEMENTS BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

I. Agreements not requiring foreign legislative action:
1. Belgium.
2. Cuba.
3. Ecuador.
4. Peru.

II. Agreements put into effect provisionally, subject to eventual foreign legislative action:
1. Argentina.
2. Canada, first agreement.
3. Canada, second agreement.
4. Canada, fox-fur agreement.
5. Canada, supplementary fox-fur agreement.
6. Czechoslovakia.
7. France.
8. Netherlands.
9. Switzerland.
10. Turkey.
11. United Kingdom.
12. Venezuela.

III. Agreements which did not become effective until after foreign legislative action:
1. Brazil (10 months, 29 days between signing and effective date).
2. Colombia (8 months, 6 days).
3. Costa Rica (8 months, 4 days).
4. Cuba, first supplementary agreement (4 days).
5. Cuba, second supplementary agreement (12 days).
6. El Salvador (3 months, 11 days).
7. Finland (5 months, 14 days).
8. Guatemala (1 month, 21 days).
9. Haiti (2 months, 5 days).
10. Honduras (2 months, 12 days).
11. Mexico (1 month, 6 days).
12. Nicaragua (6 months, 19 days).
13. Sweden (2 months, 10 days).
14. Uruguay (5 months, 10 days.)

Source: State Department mimeograph dated March 5, 1943.

Mr. Chairman, the question arises as to why this rule, which applies to 26 of the above instances, should not apply to the United States. In other words, why should not the American Congress know the details of, and have the power to prevent, if it so desires, the culmination of these trade agreements exactly the same as those noted?

Mr. Chairman, the American people ought to be made aware that great power is vested in the President, and by him in turn in the State Department, under the Trade Agreement Act. Therefore, since these agreements have an effect upon the lives and the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation, certainly it would appear that the Congress ought to know how far these powers are being carried, and in what far-reaching commitments the United States may become involved through the Chief Executive.

The American people ought also to be made aware that if the Congress refuses to renew the Trade Agreements Act, that action would not cancel or bring to an end, any of the trade agreements we now have with other nations. Nothing along this line can be done for 3 years after they go into effect. Those agreements would remain in effect until one or the other country had given 6 months' notice of intention to discontinue the agreement. The President is the only individual or official authorized to so function on behalf of this country.

About the only reason for continuing the act at this time is the possible psychological effect upon other countries allied with us in the war effort. For some years after the war ceases, there probably will be little or no such thing as foreign trade conducted as it has been in the past. All trade possibly may be governmentally managed and directed. The power thus to control all trade is enormous. Such power is susceptible of abuse, or of mistaken, though sincere, misuse, and commitments could be made which would deeply involve the American people in responsibilities which might easily prove difficult, and perhaps economically impossible, to carry out. There are many Members of the Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, who sincerely believe that such broad powers, carrying with them the ability to involve the American people in far-reaching and disastrous commitments, is too great to be entrusted to any one man and that Congress should renew its constitutional powers and pass upon these treaties before they are carried into effect.

Mr. Chairman, while our citizens generally—workers, farmers, businessmen, most professional, and other groups—have been busily engaged in the task presented for prompt and effective action—the winning of the war—the professional internationalists—bankers, foreign traders, economic and social theorists, and others—aided by political cooperators in Washington, have been busily engaged in securing special advantages, and in promoting their views without the slightest regard for the maintenance of our present form of government, and our wage and price levels. Neither are they concerned about maintaining our American living standards when peace comes, nor the preservation

of the home market for the products of our labor, agriculture, and industry. If American citizenship and opportunity mean what we have always believed, it must be agreed that the producers of this country are entitled to the American market to the extent of their ability reasonably to supply that market. In the last analysis, any other course would involve being dragged down to the lower standards so general elsewhere in the world.

Under his powers and his interpretation of the so-called Lend-Lease Act of 1941, the President—through the State Department—has entered into a series of Executive agreements with Great Britain, Russia, China, and other countries, designated by him as members of the United Nations group, in which detailed pledges are made as to economic relationships during the post-war period. Among these pledges are found acceptance of the vague provisons of the so-called Atlantic Charter, and the opening of the American market to the trade of these countries on terms not authorized in any legislation on our statute books, and without the consent of Congress or the approval of the Senate.

Although the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, was passed specifically as a program to aid in the development of peacetime commerce of mutual advantage to both parties, and as expressed by Congress "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States," the President—again through the State Department—has been busily engaged in negotiating a new series of trade agreements with the Latin American countries, under wartime conditions, in direct conflict with all of the early protestations of justification of these agreements. Again Congress, the Senate, and the people in general are left on the side lines.

Thus, although the Trade Agreements Act is due to expire on June 12 next, unless its provisions are extended by further action of the Congress, we find the country loaded down with this new series of Executive agreements with foreign countries, as well as with all those previously consummated under the act, binding, or purporting to bind, our conduct through all the years to come, or until each agreement is terminated as provided in the act.

They are committing this country to the terms of the Atlantic Charter without public discussion or action by Congress, or approval by the Senate, as in the case of treaties. This is utterly foreign both to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and represents one of the most vicious and unwarranted examples of seizure of power by the present Executive, and his carefully selected subordinates, who further add to the list of trade agreements under the abnormal conditions of war, when all foreign trade is in a strait jacket, under license, permit, quota, or exchange, and other Government controls. One would almost think that, with some folks at least, a wish carried all the authority of law.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, the following colloquy between Secretary Hull and myself took place in the Ways and Means Committee during the hearings on the measure under discussion. It may be of interest to the membership of the House. I present it for the RECORD:

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Secretary, on February 8, 1943, before the House Appropriations Committee, on page 4 of the hearings, you stated:

"It seems inconceivable that the Trade Agreements Act will not be extended by the Congress before that date (of course, speaking of the date of expiration) because such legislation will be vitally needed (a) to open up foreign markets for American products during the post-war period and thereby (b) help maintain domestic prosperity and full employment during the difficult post-war readjustment period, and (c), in the light of the program and principles subscribed to by this Government in the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations declaration, and article VII of more than a dozen lend-lease agreements."

Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Secretary, is there any congressional authority for the Department of State or any other agency of our Government to enter into any agreement or to subscribe to any declaration whereby this Congress is bound to reduce its present tariff rates?

Secretary HULL. In the first place, you may not know that I appear each year before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. When I conclude my discussion about the appropriation, somebody asks me a random question here and there, and I make an offhand answer to the question. Now, as to whether my answers are full and complete to the question, I do not know; at any rate, that is the last I heard of that—just speaking informally.

Now coming to your question: I am not trying to sidestep anything I am charged with having said, although I have not revised it myself. But that is neither here nor there and I assume responsibility for anything I am quoted as saying, with that explanation. On the other hand, again you will understand there is no relation between the lease-lend policies and the trade-agreements policies.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I so understand.

Mr. HULL. Except that lease-lend in a very general way, under article VII, commits the nations to the general policy of reciprocal trade, based on liberal commercial considerations.

Now, is that what you had reference to, or not?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Not entirely, Mr. Secretary. I would like to know if there is any provision in the lend-lease bill which would authorize any agency of this Government to commit the Government to any particular tariff policy?

Secretary HULL. There is nothing official. You will understand, I am sure, that the Atlantic Charter itself is a declaration by the heads of governments of what they would do. It does not commit the future governments to the extent that a statute would; it is a declaration of policy. It is the purpose and the duty of the present governments, ours included, to carry out scrupulously the economic provisions of the Atlantic Charter and article VII of lend-lease.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, Mr. Secretary, does it commit this Congress or this Government to any particular policy along that line?

Secretary HULL. If I may repeat with a little more emphasis, if possible, it does not commit anybody to anything expressly in the binding way a statute would. It is a declaration of policy by the heads of governments and carries the strongest possible moral obligation for its faithful performance.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Then you do not contend that because of any understanding, which may have been reached at the Atlantic conference and which may not come to the ears of the public, that it in any way binds the Congress to any specific action?

Secretary HULL. No more than the Monroe Doctrine would bind some succeeding Congress or the Government, keeping always in mind the moral obligation I have mentioned previously. It is a declaration of policy. If it is sound, it ought to be carried out and that is what we are trying to do, in a sense.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will say, Mr. Secretary, your response to that is very satisfactory. Now, let me ask this question: Is there any congressional authority for the Department of State or any other governmental agency to bind the United States to article VII, which you speak of, in certain trade agreements?

Secretary HULL. No. As I say, that is a declaration which further embodies the doctrine of the Atlantic Charter, and we are still further attempting to carry out its principles by this act.

Mr. Chairman, it seems very clear from the Secretary's responses that he at least knows that agreements reached at secret conferences without authority of law bind neither the country nor the Congress.

The general impression has prevailed in certain administration circles that once these several vague agreements and commitments—under Lend-Lease, the Atlantic Charter, and the Trade Agreements Act—had been entered into without public discussion, act of Congress, or Senate approval, it would in the future be necessary only to rush through Congress a joint or concurrent resolution granting continued or greater authority to the Executive to bind completely and make permanent all of these unauthorized post-war commitments or schemes without submitting them frankly and openly to Congress and the country for approval.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about the effort having been made in the closing days of the Seventy-seventh Congress to secure this broad grant of power for the Executive to deal with matters affecting tariffs, immigration, and communications. This effort failed completely, however, when the Ways and Means Committee refused unanimously to report the measure requested, or even a modified version thereof, or to consider it further. That a similar request may be repeated is to be expected. It behooves the Congress to be constantly on guard.

On October 12 last, in addressing the House, I outlined the attempt of the administration since 1933 to put over its free-trade policy on the country without submitting the matter to Congress or to the people. My remarks today are intended to supplement those remarks and to bring them down to date.

A message to the country broadcast by Vice President WALLACE on Monday, December 28, is important chiefly because it heralded an approach of administration proposals to come, as his messages sometimes have done in the past.

It will be recalled that Mr. WALLACE was an early advocate of depending solely upon foreign sources of supply for our rubber, and other important materials, rather than develop our own supply within the country. The effect of this

policy now is so deeply impressed upon the minds of the people that it needs no elaboration.

Similarly, among other things, Mr. WALLACE has heralded changes in our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Supreme Court, which so far, at least, the people have not accepted. Now he urges internationalism in its most extreme forms, which, if adopted, would mean abandonment of our sovereignty and the adoption of free trade, or a near approach thereto, throughout the world, regardless of the ill effects upon our wage and price levels—and our living standards, to which he resolutely closes his eyes. How completely the President approves the statements of Mr. WALLACE is not known, but one can hardly believe Mr. Roosevelt would send the Vice President throughout Central and South America as a roving ambassador if they were in disagreement on these matters.

On October 19, 1939, in an effort to assist the administration in its announced purpose of securing better prices for the farmers, I introduced a bill the purpose of which was to restrict imports of competitive farm products at less than parity prices. Later in the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on October 8, 1940, I introduced another bill to provide for the economic defense of the United States, which, among other things, contemplated the restriction and regulation of all imports. Upon numerous occasions I urged hearings upon this measure, but without avail. The reasons now are obvious. The administration was intent upon bringing about lower tariffs generally, through the device of the Trade Agreements Act, and otherwise, until now lower tariffs or free trade is admitted as a part of the administration program for the new world order following the war. The effort to commit our country to a destructive policy without sanction of Congress has been clearly demonstrated in the various treaties, masquerading as agreements, to which I have referred, and by numerous statements of responsible members of the administration.

I have reintroduced the above-mentioned bill, and it now is available to all Members of the House. It is H. R. 2589, and I hope it may receive their early and thorough consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the people indicated in the last election that they have had enough of government by bureaucratic decree. They want to know what is going on and to have their say. My effort is to assist them in the true American way to decide on this all-important question of their living standards—wage and price levels—in the future. Their decision must govern. I shall vote for amendments to the Trade Agreements Act which will accomplish this objective.

This question must not be permitted to become confused with the political aspects of the peace—this is an internal affair of our own, for us to decide for ourselves, free from foreign influence.

Mr. Chairman, it was a most submissive, self-effacing, New Deal Congress which originally approved the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934. At that time, the executive department urged the legislation upon the theory that it was necessary to the rebuilding of our foreign trade. Statistics are such that the then proponents of the measure must be overwhelmed with confusion when they ponder the actual results.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I desire to insert in the RECORD a short statement from the testimony of Samuel Crowther, the noted writer and economist, relative to this situation, together with a table of exports and imports during the 10-year period from 1922 to 1932, while the Republican Party was administering the affairs of the country, and during the years 1932 to 1941, during which period the New Deal has been handling our affairs. A careful comparison of those two decades, Mr. Chairman, will convince the most skeptical that the original claims were based upon wishful thinking and nothing else. I ask the Members of the House to give more than passing consideration to the details incorporated in this table:

Mr. REED. Mr. Crowther, there has been a great deal of bandying of figures around here in the effort to show that we were behind a Chinese wall when we had a tariff system such as the Fordney-McCumber and Hawley-Smoot bills. I have before me here a record which I had checked by an expert in the Tariff Commission, and while we have had these so-called high tariffs, what they called the high tariffs, I notice in the year 1922 that our exports were $3,831,707,000 and that our general imports were over $3,112,747,000.

In 1932 our exports were $4,167,593,000 and our general imports $3,792,066,000.

In 1924 our exports were $4,590,984,000 and our general imports $3,609,963,000.

It runs all the way like that along down, running from $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 until we get to 1930 and 1931, when we commence to get over into the years of the New Deal, starting with the trade-agreements period of 1935. There I find that our exports in 1934—I do not mention that with the idea that much happened during that particular year under the trade agreements because it was not adopted until June, but in 1935 our exports were $2,282,874,000 and our general imports $2,047,485,000.

In 1936 our exports were $2,455,978,000 and our general imports $2,422,592,000.

In 1937 our exports were $3,349,167,000 and our general imports $3,083,668,000.

In 1939 they run $3,177,178,000 for exports and for imports $2,381,081,000.

In 1940 we were still, of course, shipping a vast quantity of war material, and we jumped to $4,021,564,000 in exports and $2,625,445,000 in general imports.

In 1941—it was about that time that we have been unable to get any figures from the Department of Commerce. We do not know really what has been happening down there, but our exports have been dropping, and the figures for 1941 are: Exports $3,317,595,000 and general imports $2,417,307,000. These have all been checked, and it is a rather informative graphic chart, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to put it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will go in the record.

The matter above referred to is as follows:

"UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE EXCEEDED $128,000,000,000 IN THE PERIOD 1922–41

"This is the greatest record ever achieved by any country and proves conclusively that the United States of America has not been a 'hermit nation'; that its tariffs have not been 'unsurmountable barriers'; or that the policy of our people has been that of 'isolationism.'

"For the past 20 years the United States of America has been the world's most generous foreign trader, exporting over $70,000,000,000 worth of merchandise and importing over $58,000,000,000 worth—a total in foreign trade of $128,000,000,000.

Year	Exports	General imports
1922	$3,831,777,000	$3,112,747,000
1923	4,167,493,000	3,792,066,000
1924	4,590,984,000	3,609,963,000
1925	4,909,848,000	4,226,889,000
1926	4,808,000,000	4,430,888,000
1927	4,805,376,000	4,184,742,000
1928	5,128,356,000	4,091,444,000
1929	5,240,995,000	4,399,361,000
1930	3,843,181,000	3,060,908,000
1931	2,424,289,000	2,090,635,000
1932	1,611,016,000	1,322,774,000
1933	1,674,994,000	1,449,559,000
1934	2,132,800,000	1,655,055,000
1935	2,282,874,000	2,047,485,000
1936	2,455,978,000	2,422,592,000
1937	3,349,167,000	3,083,668,000
1938	3,094,440,000	1,960,428,000
1939	3,177,178,000	2,318,081,000
1940	4,021,564,000	2,625,445,000
1941	3,317,595,000	2,417,307,000

"The above are U. S. Treasury Customs Report figures."

The only possible reason the majority can advance for the—to them—rather embarrassing showing made by the above table is that the figures for the last 10 years are those of the depression years. To those who would advance this argument I merely suggest that they consider the exports and imports by percentages. Further, it seems pertinent at this time to remind the House that 3 years ago the League of Nations, in reporting on the degree of recovery from the depression taking place among the seventeen more important nations of the world, showed the United States of America was seventeenth and last. Everyone, I think, will agree that in this great country of ours we are better equipped by fertility of the soil, raw materials of every kind, manufacturing equipment, scientific genius, and every other element which could contribute to recovery, than any other nation in the world. The fact we were seventeenth in point of recovery compels us to believe that New Deal policies, the mishandling of our affairs generally, and nothing else were directly responsible for our miserable showing in this respect.

In 1937, when the first demand for the extension of the act was made, the proponents apparently had completely abandoned their former opinions and based their desire for extension on something quite different. After assuring the Ways and Means Committee that we had received great benefits under the act, and being pressed by a number of the Republican members of the committee to identify such benefits, Secretary Hull, for whom I have great respect, stated, "It has resulted in the softening of the minds of the world toward peace."

Every Member of this House will recall President Roosevelt's famous "quarantine" speech in Chicago in the fall of 1937. There could have been only one excuse for so belligerent a speech by a President of the United States, and that

was a desire to allay or to stop the rapidly spreading warlike activities throughout the world.

In 1940, when the act was again up for extension, it was apparent that the trade treaties not only had failed to preserve the peace of the world, but also had failed in bringing about a restoration of foreign trade or economic recovery in this country. The proponents urged the Congress to still further extend the act "as a part of the foundation of any stable and durable peace." Just how, when this policy had so completely failed in the instances enumerated above, it is now necessary "as part of the foundation of any stable and durable peace" has not as yet been disclosed.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House knows full well that under Republican policies our markets have been opened freely to every nation to bring into this country everything they produce that is noncompetitive with American products. It is well known that approximately two-thirds of all imports come into this country free of duty. We have placed import duties on agricultural, manufacturing, and certain other products competitive with our products. In no instance so far as I know have we placed tariffs so high as to completely shut out of this country competitive articles of like character. In the case of agricultural products, for instance, we repeatedly note that when the price of those products reaches a point where the farmers can make a profit on their year's operations, cargoes of competitive products are brought in, the tariff paid, and the goods thrown upon the market, whereupon the market price is substantially and immediately reduced. The case of butter is a notable one.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that charity begins at home and that, as I have said before, the American producer is entitled to the American market so far as he can reasonably supply that market. Notwithstanding this, the fact two-thirds of all imports are brought in without payment of any duty whatsoever indicates we trade with our world neighbors on a basis of generosity in which they do not always reciprocate. Many nations exact tariff duties on products which in no wise compete with theirs, the motive usually being collection of revenue. We do so only with imported luxuries.

The claim that the Republican Party is an isolationist party and that we do not believe in seeking and expanding foreign trade is belied by statistics available to every person. For instance, in the 20-year period 1922-42, our foreign trade exceeded $132,000,000,000. During the first decade when the Republicans were in power, our foreign commerce amounted to $83,601,302,000. In the latter decade, during the New Deal regime, it amounted only to $48,475,000,000. During this time, we imported more than $61,000,000,000 in goods, and exported more than $71,000,000,000. Many people take a look at our exports and imports and unthinkingly believe the difference in the amounts represent our trade balance. This is not, however, the full picture, because, during the same period of 20 years, our people patronized foreign shipping to an extent of several billions of dollars in freight charges and several billions in passenger fares.

During this same period, we sent several billions to relatives in foreign countries. American tourists spent more than two billions in foreign lands. In addition, we invested many billions in foreign securities in the years following the World War. The total of these invisible items of expenditure in foreign services and investments makes up more than the $10,000,000,000 difference between our exports and imports, so instead of a balance of that sum we probably had a small deficit for the period.

Of the products which came in on the dutiable list, two-fifths came in under duties of less than 40 percent ad valorem. Any unbiased person will concede, I think, that our tariffs have not been excessive. Certainly they have not been prohibitive. Further, they do not and have not represented an insurmountable trade barrier. A close inspection of our imports during this period will substantiate this statement. The figures outlined here are such as to completely refute charges that the Republican Party has been in the slightest degree isolationist. It is amazing what individuals, especially politicians, will resort to when they find their castles in the air tumbling about their ears.

Mr. Chairman, every person realizes that we cannot completely open our markets to competitive imports without submitting them to tariffs which will put them on at least a competitive basis with American products. If we do this, American commodity and labor costs will be ever forced downward. As prices of labor and commodities are reduced, the American standard of living is thereby automatically reduced. In view of the tremendous increase in domestic costs of production during the past 3 or 4 years, and in the absence of such increases in other countries where costs are far below those here, it seems clear that a policy of further reductions of the tariff will constitute a most serious hazard for our farmers, our labor, and our manufacturers. The present administration seeks to destroy all existing barriers to free exchange of commodities between the countries of the world. It goes without saying that if they are successful, our boasted standard of living, our freedom of enterprise, our opportunity to succeed in life, yes, even the name given us by the downtrodden of the world—"the land of hope"—will disappear, and we then will know something of what other peoples have lived during the past few generations.

I realize fully that at this time, and perhaps for a short period following the war, or until other countries get fully into peace production, I will have no reason to be apprehensive, because neither production nor shipping will be available to bring such commodities to this country in amounts dangerous to our economy. However, before this debate is finished the Members of the House will, I hope, be fully conversant with what has been done looking to the elimination of our tariff barriers and will seriously consider the things outlined in the debate before they decide to extend the act without restoring to the Congress those powers which are ours under the Constitution and which we have no constitutional right to surrender to anyone.

We are dealing with a question which goes directly to the Constitutional right of every citizen to exercise unhampered the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. I urge every Member of the House to exercise wisdom and courage in voting upon the amendments which will be submitted.

Weigh them well before you decide to vote against them.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss at this time two questions: first, can the validity of the Trade Agreements Act be tested in the courts and, second, has the Trade Agreements Act deprived the American producer of any right to litigate?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am very glad that the gentleman is going to discuss those questions because the rest of us have not been aware of our ability to litigate.

CAN THE VALIDITY OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT BE TESTED IN THE COURTS?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly asserted that the provision of section 2 (a) of the Trade Agreements Act, to the effect that section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall not apply to any article included in a trade agreement, precludes a judicial determination of the validity of the Trade Agreements Act. These assertions are probably based on the fact that every case which attempted to bring to the courts the question of the validity of the Trade Agreements Act was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, or the question was not considered by the courts on various grounds. The leading case among these is that of *Fletcher* v. *United States* (92 F. (2d) 713), in which an American producer, being prevented from instituting litigation by means of an American manufacturer's protest under section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, assumed the cloak of an importer and imported a quantity of pineapples from Cuba and then protested, as an importer, under section 514 of the tariff act, against the assessment of the duty proclaimed by the President pursuant to the trade agreement with Cuba as being unlawful on the ground that the Trade Agreements Act was unconstitutional.

The United States Customs Court held that since the importer was not shown to have been injured by the assessment of a lower rate than he thought applicable he was not entitled to a review of the

action of the Collector of Customs in assessing the lower rate of duty. The decision of the lower court was affirmed by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals on November 22, 1937. Thus, under the principle of this case, it is claimed that since trade agreement items which are imported into the United States are invariably the subject of duty concessions made by the United States, it is impossible to make a case wherein the importer could show injury or damage.

It will be admitted that if an American producer is precluded from taking advantage of the privileges of section 516 (b) of the tariff act with regard to an article included in a trade agreement, there is nothing to prevent him from bringing section 516 (b) action in the courts in the case of an article not specified in a trade agreement. However, the question is, would it be possible to institute an action in the Customs Court under section 516 (b) which could bring into question the validity of the Trade Agreements Act? It is submitted that such an action has been possible since 1936.

In the trade agreement with Switzerland, made effective February 15, 1936, by Presidential Proclamation, concessions in duty were made on four classes of machines provided for in paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act. No concession, however, was made in that agreement or in any other agreement on parts of the machines specified in the Swiss agreement. One of the concession items consisted of "machines, not specially provided for, finished or unfinished, for determining the strength of materials or articles in tension, compression, torsion, or shear." The duty of 27½ percent applicable to such machines under the Tariff Act of 1930 was reduced to 20 percent ad valorem. A decision of the United States Treasury Department—TD 48299—dated May 9, 1936, included a summary of a Bureau of Customs ruling which read as follows:

> Parts of certain testing machines dutiable under the fourth item listed under paragraph 372 of the trade agreement with Switzerland at the rate applying to the testing machines of which they are parts, viz, 20 percent ad valorem, in view of the note at the beginning of schedule II of the trade agreement when read with the proviso to paragraph 372, Tariff Act of 1930

This ruling was published in the weekly Treasury Decisions of May 14, 1936, and was addressed to collectors of customs and others concerned. Thus, since May 14, 1936, importers and others concerned had public notice of the Treasury Department's practice of classifying parts of the machines described heretofore at the reduced rate of 20 percent ad valorem because the machines of which they are parts are dutiable at that rate under the Swiss trade agreement.

The first proviso to paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That parts not specially provided for, wholly or in chief value of metal or porcelain, of any of the foregoing, shall be dutiable at the same rate of duty as the articles of which they are parts.

This proviso was not incorporated in the Swiss trade agreement as it was in the trade agreement with the United Kingdom in which concessions in duty were made on various other types of machines provided for in paragraph 372 of the tariff act. Thus, parts of testing machines are assessed at the 20-percent rate, not because such parts were included in a trade agreement concession, but because of a proviso to the Tariff Act of 1930 which was not included in the trade agreement with Switzerland.

If an American producer desired to test the validity of the trade agreements act there would appear to be nothing to prevent him from filing a protest under section 516 (b) against the assessment of the 20-percent rate on the ground that it was based upon a reduction in duty made by virtue of a trade agreement which was invalid on whatever grounds the protestant desired to allege. Since parts of testing machines are not described in the Swiss trade agreement, the prohibition against section 516 (b) actions in section 2 (a) of the trade agreements act would be inapplicable.

There is still another way in which a test could be made of the validity of the Trade Agreements Act. In the trade agreement with Canada effective January 1, 1939, the duty on silver- or black-fox furs provided for in 1519 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 was reduced from 50 percent ad valorem to 37½ percent ad valorem. In a supplementary agreement effective January 1, 1940, the duty was further reduced to 35 percent ad valorem, but an absolute quota on the importation of silver foxes and furs was imposed. A revision of the quota provisions was made effective December 20, 1940, but the absolute quota provisions were retained. An importer could have attempted to import silver-fox furs in excess of the quota, and upon the refusal of the customs officer to permit the entry thereof the importer could have filed a protest against such refusal on the grounds that the imposition of the quota, pursuant to a trade agreement with Canada, was invalid.

It therefore appears that there is no justification for the assertion that no way is open for testing the validity of the Trade Agreements Act.

HAS THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT DEPRIVED THE AMERICAN PRODUCER OF ANY RIGHT TO LITIGATE?

Section 2 of the act of June 12, 1934—Trade Agreements Act—provides that the provisions of section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 "shall not apply to any article with respect to the importation of which into the United States a foreign trade agreement has been concluded pursuant to this act, or to any provision of such agreement."

Section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 authorizes an American producer to protest against a collector's decision as to the classification of, or rate of duty applicable to, imported merchandise, and provides for the litigation of issues raised in such protests in the customs courts in the same manner as protests of importers. Actually it is in the nature of an appeal from a decision of the Secretary of the Treasury adverse to an American producer's contention. Prior to the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1922, no such privilege was ever granted to domestic producers.

The right to challenge the action of customs officials in connection with the importation of merchandise was historically limited to importers, and rested originally on the common-law right of action against a collector of customs to recover money illegally exacted by him. *Arnson* v. *Murphy* ((1883), 109 U. S. 238, 240). This right was taken away by Congress by the act of March 3, 1839—Fifth Statute 348—and a suit was brought contending that the act of 1839 was unconstitutional in that it deprived the citizen of his right to resort to the courts of justice—*Cary* v. *Curtis* ((1845), 3 How. 235, 244). The Supreme Court threw out this contention on the ground that since the Government cannot be sued in its own courts without its consent, there was no deprivation of any right. (Ibid.) No principle is better established than that the United States may not be sued in the courts of this country without its consent—*Louisiana* v. *McAdoo* ((1914), 234 U. S. 627, 628). And once having consented to be sued, the right of the Government to withdraw its consent cannot be challenged—*Kline et al.* v. *Burke Construction Co.* ((1922), 260 U. S. 226, 234). In this case the Supreme Court stated:

> A right which thus comes into existence only by virtue of an act of Congress, and which may be withdrawn by an act of Congress after its exercise has begun, cannot well be described as a constitutional right.

A proceeding instituted under the provisions of section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 is primarily a suit against the Government.—*Feltex Corp. et al.* v. *Dutchess Hat Works* ((1934), 21 C. C. P. A. (Customs) 463, 473). In *Reed & Barton et al.* v. *United States* ((1933), 63 Treas. Dec. 941), the United States Customs Court held—page 946—that "section 516 is a grant of an extraordinary privilege," and that—page 945—in order to obtain the benefit of the "privileges therein granted" the procedure set forth therein "must be strictly adhered to."

It is therefore clear that the authority granted to domestic producers by section 516 (b) to protest against the classification of or the rate of duty imposed on imported merchandise is not based upon any constitutional right to litigate such matters, but is a grant of a special privilege which may be granted or withdrawn according to the will of Congress. Consequently, it cannot be said that the Trade Agreements Act deprived the American producer of a right to litigate.

The adoption of an amendment permitting an appeal from action of trade agreements to courts on the ground of injury, present or future, would confer a privilege upon our citizens that has never existed, heretofore, in the law. The Trade Agreements Act never took from anyone any such right for no such right ever existed.

Section 516 (b) gives no such right or privilege. It merely gives the opportunity to complain of and to have corrected an administrative action which is considered erroneous as a matter of law, namely, the application of one rate to an

import item when another rate should apply.

Furthermore, on the question of suit for injury, the Supreme Court has held that no one has a legal right to the maintenance of the existing rate or duty—*Norwegian Nitrogen Co.* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 294, 318).

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the bill extending the power of the President to make reciprocal trade agreements is now before the House. I desire to express my views on certain phases of that policy as administered by the present administration.

The views I express are not those of a tariff expert, but are views which appeal to me from a common-sense point of view rather than from a technical angle.

FOREIGN TRADE IN THE OLD DAYS MEANT TRADING SURPLUSES FOR SURPLUSES

I want to take you back—yes, way back—to the days when sailing vessels first engaged in foreign trade. If we were living in the days of Columbus we would see an old-fashioned shipowner loading his ship with a cargo of American wheat, of which we had a surplus. He would take that wheat down to Brazil, trade it for coffee, of which Brazil had a surplus, and bring it back to America, where no coffee is grown. He might take a cargo of manufactured goods to Russia, trade them for some sort of raw material, which he would carry to Japan and trade that raw material for a cargo of tea, which he would bring back to America, where no tea is grown.

The foreign-trade practice at that time was for a shipowner to take a cargo of products, of which his home country had a surplus, to some other country that needed these products or goods, and then bring back a cargo of something that his country did not grow or produce.

Christopher Columbus discovered America trying to find a new route to India to which he could take products of which Spain, Italy, and other European countries had a surplus, and bring back spices and other goods which were not produced in Europe.

IT IS FOOLISH TO BUY OR IMPORT MORE WHEAT, MEAT, BUTTER, POTATOES, AND OTHER PRODUCTS WHEN WE HAVE MORE THAN WE CAN CONSUME

Let me give you a common-sense illustration. If you had five cows and had only enough feed, and could only sell or use the products of two cows, you would, obviously, be foolish to buy more cows. If I had three horses and only needed two, by the same rule, I would be foolish to buy more horses. But, if I needed cows and you needed a horse, it would be good business for you to trade the cows you did not need for the horse you needed, and it would be good business for me to trade the horse I did not need for the cows I needed. That is simply ordinary common sense.

Nationally, it is not only foolish but ruinous to the wheat market to import more wheat when we have more wheat than we can consume and when our national granaries are overflowing with wheat. It would be, obviously, foolish to import more meat when we have more meat than we can eat and when our national larder is filled with meat or to import more apples, cherries, and potatoes when we are producing more than we can consume. We all know that when we produce a little less or just about the amount we can consume the prices of the products bear up fairly well. But, the moment that we have a surplus prices go down, and when we add to that surplus by importing more of the same goods the result is ruination for the producers of those goods, whether they be farm products, the products of the factory or the mines.

Before World War No. 1 Michigan produced, I was informed, as high as 80 percent of the white pea beans consumed in America. This crop contributed greatly to the prosperity of the Michigan farmer and helped to utilize the excess labor. When World War No. 1 came, Japan was permitted to ship into this country beans which were produced at a fraction of the cost of production of the Michigan bean. Many people bought these Japanese beans thinking they were buying American produced beans. The result was that the acreage was gradually reduced until no beans were produced on Michigan farms.

NEW DEAL RECIPROCAL-TRADE POLICY SPELLS RUIN FOR THE FARMER

The following is taken from a speech made in the House of Representatives by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

The following record of several foreign farm imports to the United States for the first 7 New Deal years is rather revealing:

Product		Imports (7-year total)	Gain to foreign farmers	Lost to American farmers [1]
Cattle	number of head	2,568,610	$66,079,238	$90,079,238
Beef, pork, poultry	pounds	885,993,786	163,974,550	219,974,550
Dairy products	do	518,067,547	97,760,243	130,313,000
Wool and mohair	do	1,425,060,292	290,103,938	385,000,000
Hides and skins	do	1,972,141,987	329,276,751	439,034,751
Barley malt	do	1,498,553,097	39,820,586	53,093,000
Barley	bushels	19,430,020	16,855,522	22,470,000
Corn	do	165,063,882	94,703,172	126,237,882
Oats	do	20,327,193	6,307,511	8,407,511
Flaxseed	do	120,343,301	135,293,478	202,293,000
Molasses	gallons	1,580,046,530	75,043,141	100,057,000
Eggs and poultry products, value			17,610,216	26,410,216
Potatoes and other vegetables, value			129,903,449	173,903,000

[1] Last column shows United States dollar value American farmers would have received for imported products if produced on their farms.

United States farm exports declined 9.2 percent 1933-39, and have now practically stopped. Competitive foreign farm imports to the United States increased 30 percent in same period.

The Agricultural Adjustment Agency required American farmers to take 40,000,000 acres a year out of cultivation to produce less. Total reduction, 7 years, 280,000,000 acres. Foreign farmers used over 400,000,000 foreign acres in the first 7 New Deal years to produce competitive farm crops, valued at billions of dollars, which were sold in the United States. The 1938 acreage in the United States for 45 main crops was 342,000,000 acres. New Deal generosity gave foreign farmers our markets for their products for more than 1 year's acreage out of the last 7.

Results of 7 years of New Deal planning: Glutted markets, low prices, and billions of dollars in lost income for domestic producers. American farmers will not be deceived. They now know that the first step for agricultural recovery is to protect our home market from cheap foreign competition and that this promised and necessary protection has not been given by the New Deal.

I note in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, page 557, Dr. Coulter, a former member of the Tariff Commission, responding to an inquiry from an esteemed colleague, Congressman WOODRUFF, stated:

The only reason Cuban cane can compete is because of their very low wages and no schools and all the other things that they do not have. I think if they were put on a straight competitive basis—fair, even competitive basis—the beet growers of the United States would put Cuba entirely out of cane growing. If the minimum wage and maximum hours and other laws of this country were made to apply to the labor used in producing cane for import, if you just said that any commodity of a foreign origin offered for sale in the American market must have been produced under conditions equivalent to those required by law in the United States, they would have to raise their wages and provide schools and all that sort of thing for their children, and I do not believe they could compete with you without any tariff at all.

May I call to the attention of the manufacturing area, particularly the automobile industry, a few facts. Prior to 1929, I lived in a small county of about 8,000 people. When butterfat was 45 cents a pound, potatoes and wheat and other farm products were up in prices, the Ford agency in that little town sold 123 Ford cars and trucks. When eggs went down to 15 cents a dozen, potatoes went down to 20 cents a bushel and butterfat down to 20 cents a pound, that same Ford agency sold just 13 cars and trucks which meant that 110 less cars and trucks were produced in the city of Detroit than in the year of prosperity. The domestic market, in my judgment, should be conserved and the welfare of the group who create the market should not be sacrificed to any foreign market.

UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE WE IMPORTED FROZEN FISH FROM CANADA AND THEN HAD THE SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION BUY BACK THAT SURPLUS

May I quote from remarks that I made on the floor of the House on March 24, 1937, when a bill came before the House

giving to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation authority to spend $1,000,000 to buy surplus fish:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration reads, in part as follows:

"That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the funds available to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation may be used by such Corporation for the purpose of diverting surplus fish (including shellfish)"—

And so forth. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] told us of the tremendous amount of surplus fish—not only frozen but other fish—now on the American market. We have here a beautiful illustration as to how the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, which reduced the tariff on fish, is working out. In 1935 the total importations of all fish and fish products into the United States amounted to 324,731,432 pounds. During that year the Canadian reciprocal trade agreement was passed and the agreement was effective as of January 1, 1936. During the year 1936, January 1 to December 31, there were imported 371,205,567 pounds of fish products, or an increase of 46,474,034 pounds over 1935, or nearly twice the amount of surplus frozen fish. During the year 1935 there were imported in fresh and frozen fish, including lake trout, white fish, pike, yellow pike, 127,623,862 pounds. During the year 1936, the first year the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada was in force and effect, we increased that amount to 155,229,330 pounds, or an increase of over 28,000,000 pounds during the first year. This increase is approximately 4,000,000 pounds more than the total surplus of frozen fish.

During the month of January 1935 and prior to the effective date of the reciprocal trade agreement we shipped into the United States 10,045,000 pounds. In January 1937 there was shipped in 12,918,013 pounds, or an increase of almost 3,000,000 pounds. We are permitting the importation of millions of pounds of fish, creating a surplus, and now we are asked to buy that surplus which we created under the reciprocal trade agreement and under a reduced tariff. Ninety-eight percent of these fish come from Canada.

In the old days when we called a State hospital an insane asylum and before we used modern methods of treating insanity we used certain tests. An insane person would be placed in a room in which there was a water faucet. He was then given a mop and the faucet was turned on. If that insane person shut the faucet off before he began to mop the floor, it was an indication that he had some sense; but if he let the faucet run and mopped up the floor at the same time, they knew he was crazy. That is exactly what we are doing in this case. We are trying to mop up the floor with a million-dollar mop and letting the Canadian fish faucet run. The reciprocal trade policy of this administration has ruined the fish market, and now we are told that we have no alternative but to purchase the surplus we created if we would save some 500,000 fishermen from complete economic ruin. I want to help these folks. I want to save them from the ruin that this policy is bringing on them. It is for this reason that I am supporting this bill. However, I do sincerely hope that some time, some day, the present administration will see the light and shut off the faucet before we are asked to buy any more million-dollar mops.

AMERICAN LABOR CANNOT COMPETE WITH CHEAP FOREIGN LABOR

The late Henry T. Rainey stated—I quote:

Lower the tariff drastically? You Republicans won't do it, and we Democrats dare not do it with conditions as they are. We do not want this market flooded with the cheap labor in the other countries.

That is what he said and that is what I believe every Member of this Congress will reecho.

When tariff duties levied on competitive products of workers in foreign countries are less than the differences in cost of production, it is simply a case of transferring the job opportunities of our industry workers, and the opportunities for the production of our farmer to those in other countries.

Again, such loopholes nullify such protection accorded our workers under the restrictive immigration laws.

Labor in America, after years of struggle, has secured certain benefits, including workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors' insurance, old-age assistance, railroad retirement, and other similar laws, and these all add to the cost of products manufactured in America. Some of these laws were enacted by States, some by the Federal Government, some under Democratic administration, and others, like the law creating the Department of Labor, were enacted by the Republican administration, President Taft having signed that bill. But wherever and however enacted, they do add to the cost of production and have increased our wage and, of course, our living standards.

When I was in France during the First World War, I recall seeing the French employing Anamites and other oriental laborers. These orientals, I was told, received a nickel a day, a bucket of soup, a chunk of rice, and a cup of tea. When they received the bucket of soup they did not receive the chunk of rice or the cup of tea. When they received the chunk of rice and the cup of tea, they did not receive the bucket of soup, and they were not always paid the nickel a day. We still have many of these conditions existing in oriental and other countries. Taking down all trade barriers means that the American farmer and laborer must compete with that type of labor.

Millions of pairs of shoes have been imported while our people in the shoe industry were unemployed. Hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of pottery was imported while the pottery business was being destroyed. Watches were being imported into this country while the employees of watch industries were on relief.

WE CLOSE THE IMMIGRATION DOORS TO CHEAP FOREIGN LABOR BUT PERMIT THE IMPORTATION OF THE PRODUCTS OF THAT SAME CHEAP FOREIGN LABOR

If anyone were to attempt to throw open the immigration gates and permit the importation of foreign labor, a protest would be heard in every corner of the Nation. Yet, we are permitting, under this policy, the importation of the products of cheap foreign labor and find that policy has many supporters. In all fairness, if we are to have foreign made goods, would it not be better to import the labor? Then the farmer could at least grow products to feed that labor rather than to import the products of that cheaper labor and have the food he eats grown and furnished by the foreign country in which he is living. Abraham Lincoln once said: "A dollar spent in America is being respent and keeps going around in America, but a dollar spent in a foreign country doesn't come back."

In spite of all these facts the President asked for power to suspend both the immigration and the tariff laws and, I am informed, the Ways and Means Committee refused unanimously to give him that power and yet that same committee, and those in it, will give him the power under the Reciprocal Trade Act to make agreements which will permit the importation of foreign products and to reduce the tariff laws.

Summarizing, I have come to the following conclusions:

First. There is no justification for bringing into this country the products of foreign factory at less than our cost of production.

Second. There is no reason why the American producer, either on the farm or in the factory, should be denied an equal opportunity to dispose of his products on our American market.

Third. Congress is charged with the responsibility of enacting legislation which would be in the best interests of all concerned and particularly to protect the farmer and the laborer, as well as other interests. Trade treaties and trade agreements which permit any competitive product to be delivered into our markets at less than our cost of production is, to my judgment, contrary to congressional intent.

Fourth. To protect both the farmer and the laborer and small business, trade treaties should be approved as other treaties are approved under the Constitution, by the Senate, before they become effective.

Somehow, it is difficult for me to understand a policy which permits a foreign government to bring into this country a product manufactured or grown by cheaper foreign labor; a policy which permits foreign goods to undersell our American producers and throw out of work American labor and rob the American farmer of the American market, to which he is entitled. The reciprocal trade policy as administered by the present administration will spell ruin to the American farmer and the American worker when peacetime comes.

I favor the principle of reciprocal trade agreements. I am opposed to the present administration's method of administering such policy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, certainly protective amendments should be made safeguarding the negotiation of these trade agreements.

In discussing the trade treaties it is always interesting to note the attitude of the Representatives from the different States. The fundamental objection to the reciprocal trade treaties is that Congress is giving away the rights of the people. This delegation of power by the legislative branch of our Government to the executive branch is not in conformity with the teachings of Jefferson, nor is it in conformity with the spirit "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Anyone who supports such a program is shirking his own responsibilities and is willing to submit to the dictates of political bureaucrats the power that should rest on the shoulders of the elected representatives of the people.

Let us take Virginia, the home of Jefferson, as an example. Here we have a State which is at the door of Washington, a city which affords one of the Nation's best markets for agricultural products. Let us analyze the crops that are grown in this State and the attitude as expressed by its Representatives regarding the reciprocal trade treaties.

Let us appreciate the fact that Virginia is the home of many of the so-called gentlemen farmers who have large estates. I call your attention to the fact that Virginia has 2.03 percent of the population of the country but produces only 1.3 percent of the food and fiber of the Nation. This should provide a domestic market for the products of the farms any time its economy is such that the farmers wish to produce them. What are the major crops raised and what is the domestic and foreign legislative relationship to these crops?

TOBACCO

First, let us take tobacco. Virginia has been the third and fourth State in the Nation as far as acreage is concerned. The following table will give you the picture of the tobacco crop and the exports and imports of the product from 1899 to 1940:

TABLE 202.—*Tobacco: Acreage, production, value, and foreign trade, United States, 1899–1940*

Year	Acreage harvested	Foreign trade, year beginning July 1		
		Domestic exports	Imports	Net exports
		1,000 pounds	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*
1899	*1,101,460*			
1899	1,102,000	344,656	19,620	326,939
1900	1,086,000	315,788	26,851	290,915
1901	1,098,000	301,007	29,429	273,770
1902	1,189,000	368,184	34,017	337,902
1903	1,212,000	311,972	31,163	286,335
1904	1,026,000	334,302	33,288	304,694
1905	1,103,000	312,227	41,126	273,912
1906	1,123,000	340,743	40,899	302,506
1907	1,042,000	330,813	35,005	297,657
1908	1,009,000	287,901	43,123	247,155
1909	*1,294,911*			
1909	1,292,000	357,196	46,838	313,085
1910	1,398,000	355,327	48,203	309,171
1911	1,133,000	379,845	54,740	327,199
1912	1,335,000	418,797	67,977	353,575
1913	1,284,000	449,750	61,175	391,196
1914	1,258,000	348,346	45,809	306,436
1915	1,419,000	443,293	48,078	400,624
1916	1,483,000	411,599	49,105	370,987
1917	1,616,000	289,171	86,991	211,962
1918	1,720,000	629,288	83,951	577,323
1919	*1,867,480*			
1919	1,958,500	648,038	94,005	570,868
1920	1,934,800	506,526	58,923	456,477
1921	1,339,500	463,389	65,225	403,492
1922	1,616,200	454,364	75,786	384,223
1923	1,855,000	597,630	54,497	548,287
1924	*1,637,843*			
1924	1,702,300	430,702	76,870	355,739
1925	1,750,700	537,240	69,974	468,958
1926	1,628,400	516,402	92,983	424,651
1927	1,555,900	489,996	81,045	411,366
1928	1,864,400	565,925	79,284	489,149
1929	*1,888,365*			
1929	1,980,000	600,181	63,181	541,312
1930	2,124,300	591,035	75,425	517,388
1931	1,987,200	432,361	73,375	359,374
1932	1,403,800	399,967	59,545	341,455

TABLE 202.—*Tobacco: Acreage, production, value, and foreign trade, United States, 1899–1940*—Continued

Year	Acreage harvested	Foreign trade, year beginning July 1		
		Domestic exports	Imports	Net exports
		1,000 pounds	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*
1933	1,738,400	472,630	55,784	416,846
1934	*1,237,117*			
1934	1,278,500	374,658	58,270	316,388
1935	1,437,100	432,668	67,895	364,773
1936	1,438,300	416,884	69,309	347,575
1937	1,750,600	459,564	68,021	391,543
1938	1,599,300	473,757	76,085	397,672
1939	2,004,700	342,153	80,731	261,422
1940	1,410,800	179,626	77,843	101,783

Agricultural Marketing Service and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Italic figures are census returns. For earlier years, see Agricultural Statistics, 1941, table 223.

During the 8 years, 1925-32, there were net exports of 3,553,653,000 pounds of tobacco, and during the 8 years, 1933–40, the net tobacco exports were only 2,598,002,000 pounds. Evidently the reciprocal trade treaties did not help tobacco exports. The 1930, and even the 1932 exports compare favorably with any exports since that time. Of course, since 1933 domestic subsidies have been paid. The duty has been reduced on some grades of tobacco but there is still a duty of $1.20 a pound on wrapper or filler tobacco when mixed with more than 35 percent of wrapper tobacco. The filler tobacco from Cuba has a duty of 14 cents a pound. The average price of tobacco received by the American farmer was only 15.4 cents per pound in 1939 and only 16 cents per pound in 1940. The foregoing table shows that the net exports of tobacco have not increased during the reciprocal trade treaty years.

The following table shows the domestic subsidies received by the tobacco farmer since 1933:

Payments under agricultural adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Tobacco:										
Adjustment or conservation	$2,059,000	$43,930,000	$16,020,000	$15,380,000	$11,471,000	$10,622,000	$7,476,000	$12,573,000	$11,687,000	$7,936,000
Parity									4,580,000	603,000
Total										8,539,000

The total subsidies for these years amount to $145,837,000. Since 1933 the tobacco farmer has had adjustments for his acreage and in 1941 and 1942 in the price as well. You will note that in 1934 the tobacco farmer received an adjustment of $43,930,000 out of the Federal Treasury for controlling his crop and the tobacco crop for that year was only worth $224,699,000. This would be an 18-percent domestic subsidy. You might also note that even in 1942 tobacco farmers received over $7,900,000 for adjusting their acreage and that they also received checks of $603,000 because the tobacco crop did not bring enough in the market place. Many, many million pounds of tobacco have been disposed of under lend-lease allocations as well.

COTTON

Then, let us look at cotton. We must take the domestic trade in these commodities into consideration as well as the foreign market. While Virginia is not a very large cotton-producing State, she has enjoyed her fair share of the subsidy funds for this crop. In the United States, this crop has had the following subsidies since 1933:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Cotton:										
Adjustment or conservation	$181,025,000	$115,226,000	$120,451,000	$86,884,000	$68,742,000	$142,595,000	$118,817,000	$102,564,000	$97,251,000	$78,833,000
Parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	96,195,000	95,752,000	87,706,000	
Total	181,025,000	115,226,000	120,451,000	126,655,000	68,742,000	265,595,000	215,012,000	198,316,000	184,957,000	78,833,000

The total subsidies for cotton for these years amount to $1,544,812,000. You will note that even in 1941 $97,000,000 was spent for adjusting the acreage and $87,000,000 was spent paying the cotton producer of the country because the cotton did not bring enough in the market place.

PEANUTS

The legislative situation on peanuts, as far as the foreign market is concerned, is as follows:

Tariff rates, peanuts

[Per pound]

	Not shelled	Shelled
	Cents	*Cents*
Tariff Act of 1909	1½	1
Tariff Act of 1913	1½	¾
Emergency Tariff Act: 1921	3	3
Tariff Act of 1922	3	4
Presidential proclamation, sec. 315, Tariff Act, 1922 (effective Feb. 18, 1929)	4¼	6
Tariff Act of 1930 (effective June 18, 1930)	4¼	7

This increase in the duty on peanuts from 4 to 6 cents a pound was made through congressional influence, through President Coolidge, who was asked to increase this duty by the full 50 percent, which he did. In the Tariff Act of 1930, the duty was raised to 7 cents per pound. Here, surely, is one high duty of the Tariff Act of 1930, when they placed a duty of 7 cents a pound on peanuts, which is more than the cost of producing the crop. The fact that Virginia raises around 150,000 acres of the million acres of peanuts picked and threshed in the United States indicates that this is quite an important crop to Virginia. I have never heard anyone from Virginia asking for this duty to be reduced in order to help along the good-neighbor policy.

The domestic subsidies for peanuts, through adjustment or conservation payments, from 1935 up to the present time, have been as follows:

Year:	*Amount of payments*
1935	$3,713,000
1936	1,251,000
1937	871,000
1938	1,217,000
1939	625,000
1940	464,000
1941	1,064,000
1942	702,000
Total	9,927,000

You will note that this crop has not only had a 7-cent-per-pound duty, greater than the price received for it, but in addition has had a domestic subsidy of $9,927,000.

The average price of picked and threshed peanuts for the United States has never been 6½ cents a pound since 1919, and this would indicate that this crop has a duty that even exceeds the price that the product has brought at any time from the years 1919–41. It is easy to see why a Representative from a peanut-producing area would not want to take the initiative in lowering this tariff. In fairness, however, it does not behoove a Representative from a peanut-producing area that has a duty on a product raised in his area of more than the cost of producing the crop to show so much fervor in supporting a tariff program that reduces the duty on livestock and livestock products. The duty on hogs was reduced from 2 cents per pound to 1 cent per pound. If it costs 10 cents per pound to produce hogs and if hogs had a duty comparable to the duty on peanuts, the duty would be 10 cents per pound or more, instead of 1 cent per pound.

CRABS

It might be well, at this point, to call your attention to the situation as far as crab meat is concerned. If you will read the hearings before the great Committee for Reciprocity Information in January 1940 you will find that this product had congressional support. You will also find that the duty was increased by 50 percent, or the limit possible. This is one more example proving that the tariff is a local affair and that it makes a lot of difference whose ox is being gored. Who is there that can say our southern friends do not wish to enjoy high duties when they apply to the products of their section?

THE WASHINGTON MILKSHED

What is always interesting to note here in Washington is that the same people who are so anxious to support and condone the reductions in the import duties on manufactured dairy products are very desirous of maintaining a Chinese wall around the milkshed of the city of Washington. You no doubt remember that 4 years ago they arrested people and were going to put them in jail for bringing milk into Washington from Indiana and other Midwestern States. It happens that Washington is the only city in the United States over whose milk supply Congress has any direct control. If one is so interested in a good-neighbor policy, it might be well to try it out at home. Why compel the people of Washington to pay 14 cents per quart for milk when milk was not bringing over 2 cents per quart in some of the real dairy districts of our country, like the States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin in 1939. It is mighty difficult to justify this Chinese wall around this milkshed and then show so much eagerness in lowering the tariff on hogs and cattle and on livestock products.

Until the Representatives of Virginia repudiate the domestic subsidies which they are receiving out of the United States Treasury for future generations to pay; until they are willing to propose an equal reduction in the duty for imports of cotton, peanuts, and tobacco; until they quit using their legislative influence to increase the duty on commodities as they did for crab meat, a product particularly interesting to them; and until they remove the Chinese wall around the milkshed of Washington, any comments that they make and any statements that they make trying to justify the unfair rulings that have taken place by the Committee for Reciprocity Information to crops and products that are raised in abundance in the Midwest and the great Northwest, I doubt if any of their vocal pronouncements about foreign trade merit much consideration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, everybody is for reciprocal trade, for winning the war, for a durable peace, for international cooperation. Nobody here will admit he is for absolutely free trade, with no protection against dumping and discrimination. The real issue here is this: Is Congress good enough to participate in shaping post-war policies, or is Congress so inefficient, so unintelligent, so corrupt that it does not dare trust itself? That is the question.

Every effort has been made by carefully organized propaganda to distort and obscure this question. I wish the New Deal would apply grade labeling to its own policies, for the New Deal is once more pushing a popular label which does not describe the product. Are you for reciprocal trade? Then you must vote to tie the hands of Congress. Four years ago, neutrality was popular and, therefore, the administration had a neutrality bill. If you were for neutrality, you were supposed to vote for the Bloom neutrality bill. Two years ago, it was lease-lend. If you were for reciprocal war trade, consisting of our furnishing arms and others furnishing the fighting, you must vote for lease-lend. We now know that we are not leasing or lending anything. Three times Congress has tied its hands in the name of reciprocal trade in order to expand our peaceful trade and to promote peace, and for 9 years the program has failed.

The labored manipulation of foreign-trade statistics used by the proponents of this extension are not very impressive. Everybody knows that world trade and our trade shrank with depreciation in the currency all over the world; that half of this shrinkage took place before the effective period of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, which is made the scapegoat of all our sins; that recovery in world trade and our trade started before the Hull trade agreements were made; that a slump in world trade and our trade occurred in 1938 at the peak of the Hull efforts, and that the increase since 1939 has been due to war. If this policy was "a powerful instrument of economic appeasement and stability," as the President described it in 1937, the amazing thing to me about the whole policy is that it has been so ineffective. The most powerful nation on earth, with this powerful instrument in its hands for 9 years for promoting peaceful trade, finds itself at war and with no normal trade left at all.

Whatever the extenuating circumstances, the policy failed of its objectives. Whatever the extenuating circumstances, Secretary Hull's State Department has been recognized by the President as unfit to administer our foreign affairs. Our Department of Foreign Affairs should have charge of trade negotiations and economic agreements in peace or war. We find, however, this is not the case. Ten other agencies administer export and import control. The power to administer and control imports has been turned over by

the President to at least six other agencies. The Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, Agriculture, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may purchase war materials and request their admission free of duty. The Board of Economic Warfare has thousands of men all over the world negotiating for imports which are made by private American firms. It has a budget of $5,000,000. It is making agreements which will profoundly affect our foreign trade, by negotiating minimum wage standards in foreign countries for their contracts. Congress has recently reviewed the Lease-Lend Administration, which is described as fundamentally a reciprocal trade proposition, with an $18,000,000,000 budget, and we have been told of the reciprocal benefits we receive for our lease-lend exports. Eight different agencies, in addition to the State Department, are controlling and coordinating and promoting and demoting our exports; namely, the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, Agriculture, the Maritime Commission, the Office of Imports of the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and the Lend-Lease Administration.

It will be said that these agencies are engaged in war activities. Why should the control of our international economic and political activities, involving high diplomacy, he taken away from our State Department in wartime any more than in peacetime? These activities are shrouded in secrecy, but the only conceivable reason is that our President, who is in on the secrecy, thinks that the State Department is not fit to carry on these activities.

The post-war activities of our Government are under way. International conferences are being held on refugee, food, and monetary questions. They are shrouded in secrecy. If we require Congress to be informed of the terms of post-war trade agreements by reserving the right to approve them, we will insure that, at least in this field of activity, Congress and the people will not be in the dark. Objection is made that Congressional approval involves logrolling. We all know that an enormous amount of international logrolling is going to take place in these various conferences, but it will be in secret. Congressional approval will at least bring the logrolling, domestic or international, into public view. We are told that Congress is too unintelligent to understand the details and technicalities of international tariff making. Congress has been able, with the advice of witnesses and its own experts, to master the details and technicalities sufficiently to pass laws governing taxation, currency, military and naval affairs, interstate commerce, and many other technical and detailed subjects. Congressman GORE, who claims "vicarious paternity" for the Hull program, says that "restrictive amendments would surely undermine confidence in the nobility of our war aims." This is not the issue, when we reserve to Congress the power to review trade agreements. The real issue is whether we shall once more "undermine confidence in the nobility" of representative government by tying our hands in advance of the post-war period.

Of the 26 nations with which we have trade agreements, 23 require legislative approval. I believe the American Congress is as good as the legislative bodies of those 23 nations. Only 3 nations have the low opinion of their legislatures that Mr. Hull has of Congress. I believe that extending the power to negotiate trade treaties subject to congressional approval will pledge to the world our stable post-war cooperation under law, functioning as a republic.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report from the committee established under House Resolution 98.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three occasions and include therein excerpts from three different editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter received from Secretary of State Hull on the reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and, further, that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include therein certain tables, if I so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I shall make on House Joint Resolution 111 tomorrow and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein parts of an address recently delivered by Mr. Alfred E. Mallon, vice president and treasurer of the Pillsbury Flour Mills Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein resolutions adopted by the Twelfth Annual Encampment, Department of Massachusetts, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JOHN E. SHERIDAN (at the request of Mr. MCGRANERY), for 10 days from today, on account of personal affairs.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for May 10 and May 17, on account of official business.

To Mrs. SMITH (at the request of Mr. FELLOWS), for 4 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 11, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, H. R. 838, H. R. 2209, H. R. 2210, and H. R. 2484, and various bills for the purpose of taxing Federally owned land and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

A meeting of the Committee on Flood Control will be held in the committee room on Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of hearing the testimony of Col. Lewis A. Pick, division engineer, Omaha, Nebr., on the recent floods along the Missouri River. Colonel Pick should give to the committee valuable information respecting the operations of the Fort Peck Dam and respecting flood control along the entire Missouri River.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on old bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act, H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

405. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $4,934,725,000 cash and $9,000,000 contract authorization (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

406. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting appropriation estimates for the Division of Central Administrative Services of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944 in the aggregate amount of $10,696,880 (H. Doc. No. 199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

407. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $307,700, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 200); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

408. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $150,000 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

409. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the St. Francis River watershed in Missouri, made by this Department pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Upper Susquehanna River watershed, New York and Pennsylvania, made by this Department pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

412. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C. secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Second interim report of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the petroleum-supply situation in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2583. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HEFFERNAN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2584. A bill to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2587. A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the Line and Staff Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes," without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOREN: Special Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions of Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Preliminary report pursuant to House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison; with amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; with amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1379. A bill for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor; with amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son; with amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; with amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2661. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to make

a survey of the need for a system of airports throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2662. A bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2664. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2665. A bill amending the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616, 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a), and providing benefits under said act be paid to dependents in case of death of soldier entitled thereto; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2666. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2667. A bill to place special-delivery messengers in the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2668 (by request). A bill to include veterans of the global war and their dependents under the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 2669. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2670. A bill to regulate certain dual salary payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GUYER:

H. R. 2671. A bill to remove payments of family allowance for dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States from consideration in determination of annual income affecting allowance of benefits to war veterans or dependents of war veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2672. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 2679. A bill to include veterans of the present war and their dependents under the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations issued pursuant thereto, as amended; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. Res. 232. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate truck shortage and fix responsibility; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to respond for aid and the needs of materials for the fighting forces in the South Pacific and China; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to act immediately in finding even temporary havens of refuge for the homeless and persecuted Jews who can now be rescued; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2673. A bill for the relief of Anastacio Lopez; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2675. A bill providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616, 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Will Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2677. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2678. A bill for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

700. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. Edgar Braddock and 19 other citizens of Canby, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

701. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Mrs. Al Sorenson, of Lemmon, S. Dak., and community, urging action on House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of liquor for the duration of the war and until termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

702. Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Underwood, S. Dak., and community urging Congress to pass House bill 2082 to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war and termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

703. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution presented by Onie Dean, president, and W. E. Pemberton, secretary, of local union No. 104 of the Progressive Miners of America, Eldorado, Ill., urging that the National Youth Administration be continued and that a sufficient appropriation be made for this purpose; to the Committee on Appropriations.

704. By Mr. SIKES: House concurrent resolution No. 5 of the Florida State Legislature; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

705. Also, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the Florida State Legislature; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

706. By Mr. GREEN: Petition of Henry H. Carter, A. Lincoln Shute, and 100 other citizens of Penny Farms, Fla., urging passage of House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

707. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

708. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petitions of Grace O. Derby and Mrs. Robert A. Williams, of Niagara Falls; Mrs. Florence Reef, of Gasport, N. Y.; Mrs. J. G. Chaplin, of Kenmore; Mrs. Ray Bailey, of Buffalo; Arthur Griffen, of Lockport; Margarter Cappock, of Niagara Falls; Everett Chase, of Gasport; Ida Morey, of Lockport; Hazel Steel, of Tonawanda; Mrs. S. J. Linton, of Tonawanda; Thomas Walters, of North Tonawanda; W. A MacLaren, of Tonawanda; Rosetta Gilmore, of North Tonawanda; Harold Pearce, of Buffalo; Grace Herr, of Lockport; Rev. E. E. Schwerger, of Niagara Falls; Margaret Roberts, of Buffalo; Mrs. A. J. Strickland, of Buffalo; A. Basil Brittain, of Buffalo; Mrs. A. B. Franks, of Kenmore; all of the State of New York, containing in all 732 names favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Lela M. Everett, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 18 others; Hannah Rideout, of Washburn, Maine, and 20 others; Amelia Shapleigh, of Lebanon, Maine, and 19 others; Bertha Lawson, of Eliot, Maine, and 14 others; Gertrude N. Paul of Eliot, Maine, and 19 others; Mr. and Mrs. M. E. Ward, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 14 other; Mildred E. Quiggey, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 13 others; C. D. Wentworth, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 29 others; Idella Smith, of Presque Isle Maine, and 14 others; Florence Nightingale, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 15 others; Soelie Mc. Curtis, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 29 others; Lewis E. Libby, of Presque Isle, Maine, and 23 others; Eva L. Morris, of Presque Isle, and 30 others; Mabel G. Hamlin of Caribou, Maine, and 20 others; Keith K. Thompson, Presque Isle, and 26 others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs Abbie Berry, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 75 residents of the city of Middletown, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 2082, and stating that through its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary

711. Also, petition of Rev. William M. Barr and 37 other residents of Pleasant Valley, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, and stating that by such action untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

712. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. Harry A. Flint and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

713. By Mr MONKIEWICZ: Petition of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, to name a battleship "Connecticut" in honor of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

714. By Mr. ROLPH: House Resolution No. 166 of the State of California, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to defer members of police and fire departments, members of scavenger or garbage departments or associations, and members of the various sheriff's offices throughout the State and members of the California highway patrol, under selective-service laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

715. Also, resolution of the Allied Printing Trades Council of San Francisco, relative to amending the National Social Security Act so as to include all cemetery employees within the benefits and provisions of this act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

716. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 43 of the State of California relative to increasing the quota for Portuguese immigration from Portugal and the Azores as an aid to milk production in California; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

717 Also, resolution of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, American Federation of Labor, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning the President and the Congress to dissolve Executive Order No. 9328; to the Committee on Labor.

718 Also, resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, adopted April 30, 1943, opposing poll tax and supporting House bill 7; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

719 By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study and formulate plans for the enforcement of world peace by and through international cooperation and a council of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

720. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Resolution of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, memorializing the members of the United States Congress to do all in their power to make immediately available sufficient metals and other critical materials to build and equip as many factories as are needed to produce annually a minimum of 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

721. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. M. H. Moore and large number of residents of Moundsville and Glen Dale, W. Va., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United State for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

722. By Mr SCHUETZ: Resolution of the Executive Board and Directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, appealing to the Members of Congress, the press and radio commentators, that in considering and commenting on post-war solutions they insist that no injustice be done to Poland which first dared to oppose the Nazis and which at all times during her long and glorious history, fought valiantly for her liberty and the liberty of the nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

723. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 160 persons, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary

724. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

725. Also, petition of Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, of Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Raphael Hai Melamed, rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel, Elizabeth, N. J., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, who art the source of our life and our liberties, we thank Thee for our privilege of meeting here this day as the representatives of a great and free people, dedicated to the task of governing this Nation in wisdom, in justice, and in the spirit of a common faith founded on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Grant that this Nation shall forever be free and united; free from tyranny, intolerance, and hate; united in purpose, good will, and the preservation of our democratic way of life.

Vouchsafe Thy strength to the armed forces of our Nation and our allies in battle. Bring speedy victory to them and to all who, on their farms and factories, in their homes, schools, and churches, battle on the home front to destroy the forces of wickedness in the world. Grant redemption to the victims of the inhumanity of our foes, lingering in concentration camps and behind ghetto walls. Bring them from darkness unto light and from slavery unto freedom.

Bless Thou the Chief Executive of our Nation and all who with him share the responsibilities of leadership in these days of crisis. Endow them with strength and wisdom commensurate with the burdens of war, and grant that under their guidance our Nation shall lead mankind into freedom and security. Help us to establish on earth Thy kingdom and Thy sovereignty so that we may behold in our day the era visioned by our ancient prophets, when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 885. An act to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 8 to the foregoing bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 1, 2, 17, 18, and 26 disagreed to by the House to the above-mentioned bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today, and include certain quotations and data, which I shall use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley made at the Mother's Day services at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier on Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the Honorable CARTER GLASS, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, signed by three Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, almost every day letters reach my desk inquiring about the congressional investigation of rent control. Members of the House subcommittee looking into rents are Representatives JOHN J. DELANEY, FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., and JOHN JENNINGS, Jr. Our colleagues are to be commended for the open-minded and sensible way in which they are approaching this vexatious problem. The subcommittee has been holding hearings. I am sure they will agree when I assert that ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the property owners throughout the United States are not seeking large profits. But at the same time they do not want to go broke. The House inquiry has but one objective in view—fairness to tenant and owner alike. Practically without exception my correspondents feel that local boards of review, composed of responsible citizens

familiar with real estate will be beneficial.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday next, after the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore granted, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

KEEP PRICES DOWN

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by me at the American Road Convention in Chicago on May 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and include in one a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE VICTORY IN NORTH AFRICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do this to say what I think is the most important thing that could be said today. I rise to pay a sincere tribute, in which I am sure the whole membership of this House will join me, to those men of the American armed forces, who have won in the last few days in north Africa, one of the most signal victories in the glorious military history of this country. We can all unite in profound thankfulness to God for the outcome of this battle and I think it is well for the House to pause for a moment for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SERVICEMEN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the House on the continuing service of a man who gave both legs for us in this present war. He was able to leave the hospital, and a woman—his former employer—who is making war supplies, found a place for him in another department in the same organization where he worked before the war, something he could do from his wheel chair. That man's output was greater than anyone else in his section for a recent week. It was not enough for him to give his legs for us, but he was so anxious to serve the country by speeding production that his output was greater than that of any person in his section of that industry. He knows full well the value of speed in production in winning the war. And he gives without stint the great service of his mind, his hands, and his heart. He is a great patriot. He sets a great example.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]. He has quoted the retail price of certain foods that the people of Pittsburgh must buy. I believe he said that potatoes were quoted from 6 to 12 cents per pound. At least that is the price the stores of Washington are now quoting as the selling price for potatoes. Even at that price, there are few potatoes available. I want to call the attention of the House and the country to the price that the growers received for potatoes in western Nebraska. Western Nebraska shipped out about 10,000 carloads of potatoes. I am informed that at least 8,000 carloads were sold from 80 to 90 cents a hundred. The farmers in this section lost money in the raising of these potatoes because of the high cost of labor, machinery, and the equipment to harvest the potatoes.

The O. P. A. set a ceiling on potatoes, but let me remind you that this was a ceiling and not a floor. The middleman bought the No. 2 potatoes at far less than the ceiling price. Most of us eat No. 2 potatoes.

The consumers in the East, including the gentleman from Pittsburgh, are inclined to blame the farmers for the high cost of potatoes and other food products. The farmers in western Nebraska actually took a loss on the selling of their potatoes. Most of the difficulty is in the distribution of the potatoes and other foodstuffs including the cost of handling and getting the food to the consumers. The people of the East and the consuming sections of the country had better wake up and guarantee the farmer a fair profit for the things which he raises or the consumers in the East may go hungry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEALL was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include an article from Nation's Business and in the other an article from Fortune Magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "Stalin's Sweet Note" which appeared in the New World, New York, on Friday, May 7, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in one or two speeches just made on the floor regarding the prices of farm commodities and the prices that the consumers of this country have to pay for farm products.

I want to say to you that the major problem in the past and at this time confronting the farmers and consumers is the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed in this country. It is nothing but waste and highway robbery. I am hopeful that the day is not far away before we will have an opportunity to consider House Joint Resolution 38, which has for its purpose going into a thorough investigation from the rural areas on through, from every angle, up to the ultimate consumer, of the present marketing and distribution of farm products that we may be able to do something about this waste and expense on the farmers and consumers of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent editorial from the Norwich Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address on the contributions of the Czechoslovakian people to mankind.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVAL AUXILIARIES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2581) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 438), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in support of H. R. 1548, a bill I introduced on January 27.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in its far-reaching consequences to the present and future welfare of this and other countries of the world this is in my opinion the most important measure that could receive the attention of Congress at this time.

The pending House Joint Resolution 111 is for the purpose of extending the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 for 3 more years. It was extended in 1937 and again in 1940, but this is the most important extension of all because of the existing conditions throughout the world. We are now engaged in the greatest and most serious war in all history; we are fighting for our lives and for our freedom, and for a decent world for the generations of the future. To even falter in taking the step now contemplated by this resolution would be the most serious mistake that could be made. I had hoped that in this critical time of our country's struggle for freedom we might consider this important international policy in a nonpartisan and united spirit. It soon became apparent, however, during consideration of this resolution in the committee that much of the old-time partisan opposition was still to be exerted. I am fervently hoping that the opposition may again examine its position and that in view of this great crisis and the transcendent importance of this measure we may still reach that degree of unity so necessary at this time.

This is a legislative policy adopted by the Congress in the act of 1934, and this is the third time that Congress has reviewed the operation of this great policy which has been carried forward for the last 9 years by cooperative action of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. These frequent and periodic examinations of the program by Congress affords ample legislative supervision and is one of the strongest reasons why legislative approval of each trade agreement entered into is not necessary.

An examination of the cold facts of the record clearly shows that this program has been an outstanding success even under the most difficult conditions existing throughout the world. The outstanding objectives of the program as stated in the original act have been accomplished in a remarkable degree. Our foreign markets have been expanded for the industrial and agricultural products of the United States and thus we have created added employment and increased income in this country. The program has not opened the floodgates to the mass importation of foreign-made goods as was feared by some when it was first adopted. Our imports from trade-agreement countries compared with non-trade-agreement countries remained rather stable from 1934 through 1939, but our exports to trade-agreement countries almost doubled in comparison with our exports to non-trade-agreement countries. In the 2-year period, 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries averaged 63 percent higher than our exports to the same countries in 1934–35; and during the same period our exports to non-trade-agreement countries increased only 32 percent.

As stated by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, when he appeared before our committee—and I want to say that he made one of the most impressive statements that I have ever been privileged to hear, and I commend it to the reading of all the Members on this important subject:

In the light of these facts, I submit that labor in the United States has not suffered, but gained, from the application of the reciprocal trade policy. This policy enabled the United States to extend world markets for both agricultural and manufactured products.

He also stated that the policy has been administered with "judiciousness and integrity."

I realize that interest is expressed here for agriculture. Coming from an agricultural district, I am especially interested in the welfare of agriculture. The fact that both agriculture and industry have benefited from the trade-agreements program is borne out not only by the statements of many witnesses before the committee but also by the official trade statistics. On the average, for the 2-year period, 1938–39, as compared with the average for the 2 years, 1934–35 agricultural exports to all countries increased only one-tenth of 1 percent; whereas during the same periods agricultural exports to trade-agreement countries increased about 50 percent and comparing the same periods agricultural exports to non-trade-agreement countries decreased 26½ percent. As stated by the Secretary of Agriculture in his appearance before the committee—and I commend his statement to you for most careful consideration:

Extending the Trade Agreements Act would be of real benefit to farm people. Rejection of the bill would bring most serious consequences for agriculture.

Again quoting the Secretary of Agriculture:

Each one of our trade agreements has resulted in better treatment for our agricultural products in foreign markets. To name one example, the agreement with Great Britain improved the position of pork products in the British market, entirely removed the Empire preferences on wheat imports into the United Kingdom, and made a long list of reductions in Empire preference on agricultural imports into both the United Kingdom and the British colonies.

The Secretary of Agriculture gave the explanation for one of the points raised in the debate here with respect to corn when he said:

During the drought years our imports of corn were much larger than normal, even though our duties on corn were not lowered by trade agreements. In those years we needed foreign corn to help feed our livestock, and I do not know what the livestock producers would have done without the imports.

I would like to call particular attention to the strong endorsement of the program by the American Farm Bureau Federation, one of the largest and most representative of the national farm organizations in this country. The state-

ment submitted by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president, emphasizes that—

The continuation of a trade-agreement program on a sound basis is of vital importance to agriculture and the entire Nation.

I would like to also especially invite attention to the statement given to the committee by Dr. T. W. Schultz, professor of agricultural economics of the Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa. It will be recalled that in 1940 the American Farm Bureau Federation took the trade agreements to Dr. Schultz and secured the services of his organization there at Iowa State College to analyze all of them and then make a report to the Farm Bureau Federation of the effect of the trade agreements on agriculture. Dr. Schultz and his staff made that study and reported to the American Farm Bureau Federation that not only had the trade agreements not hurt or harmed agriculture but had been very beneficial to agriculture.

During the hearings this time I inquired of Dr. Schultz if he had analyzed the additional trade agreements and was prepared to give the committee an opinion on that point and he said that he had and the same statement held true now that he made in 1940; that is, that the trade-agreements program has been decidedly beneficial to agriculture.

I would also like to invite attention to the hearings held on this bill by your Committee on Ways and Means. In the period of time that it has been my privilege to serve as a member of that committee, which is longer than any Member who participated in the hearings except our chairman—our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULLEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], were detained on account of illness—I heard every witness who appeared, and I say to you that the record presented during the hearings on this bill is the strongest, the most conclusive, and most convincing that I have ever heard.

I invite your attention to that long list of outstanding organizations and individuals that appeared in support of this program, the outstanding industrial leaders of the Nation, the outstanding labor leaders of the Nation, some of the outstanding leaders of agriculture of the Nation, a long list of witnesses, including many women's organizations. It is of interest to read the strong statements made by the United States Chamber of Commerce representing the business interests of this country, also the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and other organizations primarily interested in commerce. The National Association of Manufacturers, an organization that has always opposed this program in the past, appeared and strongly endorsed it this time and urged that it be continued.

I do not believe I have ever heard a more impressive statement than that made by Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, as well as many other witnesses who appeared in support of this program.

I also invite your attention to the fact that about 85 percent of all the newspapers of this country are in support of this program and urge its extension for the 3-year period that is provided for by this resolution.

The enactment of this resolution is most important in our war effort. Of the 27 countries with which we have trade agreements only little Finland is at war with any of our allies and she is not at war with us. Sixteen of these nations are fighting side by side with us against our enemies. Six have broken relations with the Axis and are assisting us. The remaining four are neutral.

We should bear in mind that two important steps have been taken, first, a legislative step, the extension of the lease-lend program, second, an Executive step, the Atlantic Charter, and the third important step is passage of this resolution. We must keep faith with our allies, we must keep the promises made. Extension of the Trade Agreements Act is the strongest possible evidence that we can give of our sincerity and our fidelity.

Let us visualize for a moment what might happen if we fail to take this important step at this time, with the eyes of the entire world focused upon this historic Chamber, with our allies depending upon us to keep the promises and assurances that have been given them, with our enemies watching to see what result will come from the consideration of this measure. I want to invite attention to a splendid statement made before our committee by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller.

I had never had the privilege of seeing him before, but I do not think I have ever been more favorably impressed by any statement than that made by him to our committee.

He called attention to the fact that the radio of Berlin had been calling for the defeat of this program and urging that its extension was not important.

This program is important in our post-war efforts. It presents clearly to us the question of the choice that we shall have to make, whether we are to continue during the post-war period through governmental control, such as that which is now exercised by the Board of Economic Warfare. That is a governmental agency controlling the imports of products of this country. Now the question is whether we want to continue, through the post-war period and the future, through governmental control or whether we want to have free enterprise.

The trade-agreement program is in the interest of free enterprise. It means, in effect, that the businessmen of this country may engage in the manufacture of their products, and agriculture may continue to produce its products and the surpluses may be sold in the foreign markets of the world.

This program is so vitally important to our free-enterprise system that if it should be discontinued the only alternative is to have some type of governmental control, and I do not believe we want to see that adopted as a permanent policy in this country.

This program is of greatest importance in our peace efforts. It has been truly said that if goods cannot cross international borders, armies will.

I would like to quote in this connection from the sound statement made by Secretary Hull to the committee:

As we look into the future, it is this theme of international cooperation that should be uppermost in our minds, if we really want to make sure that another world conflict is not to be ahead of us after we win this war.

When the day of victory comes we and other nations will have before us a choice of courses to follow. Basically, that choice will be, as it was in 1918, between, on the one hand, extreme nationalism, growing rivalries, jealousies, and hatreds, with the ultimate certainty of another and even more devastating war; and, on the other hand, increased international cooperation in a wide variety of fields, and at least the hope of secure peace for our children.

No one can give a promise that secure peace will really prevail. It is much harder to make the peace secure than it is to wage successful war. Many wars have been fought and won, by many nations, but not yet has any nation made its peace secure and enduring. No one nation, no two nations, can do this, for war is an international affair; in a world of many nations its prevention requires international collaboration. In the new world of the airplane all nations are the near neighbors of all others. In such a world any one strong industrial country has power to plunge the world into war with devastating suddenness and violence. To keep the peace secure will require the resolute and continuous collaboration of all law-abiding nations. It is a hard way and a long way, but it is the only hopeful way there is to prevent war.

Of the various necessary fields of international collaboration, one of the most essential is the field of economic life. The goods and services by means of which men live must be abundant, and they must be well distributed. If the material basis of civilization fails, we must not anticipate that human beings will be civilized or peaceful. Solid and lasting friendships between large groups of people require mutual willingness to cooperate in the fundamental business of earning a living. That is why it is so essential, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security." This objective and the balance of the charter have now been endorsed by all of the United Nations. That action was taken by the hard-headed and realistic men who guide these governments, not by reason of humane sentiments alone but because they recognize that the only way to attain these ends is through cooperative action.

Stable peace and economic warfare will not mix. We know that now from bitter experience. Just as we must work together to set up and operate the necessary machinery to maintain peace, we must work together to make the years of peace fruitful for ourselves and for others.

One of the most essential subjects of international cooperation in the years that lie ahead is this very one of trade and the various trade restrictions to which the act refers. What happens to international commerce has an intimate effect on many of the things that lie closest to the minds of the people of every country. The price of crops, the chance of paying off the mortgage, or of getting or holding a job, the supply and price of common articles on merchants' shelves; these are the things that foreign trade affects in every country. If both reason and experience teach anything, they teach the necessity for more trade between nations.

It has long since become axiomatic that international trade cannot be a one-way affair.

The problems which it presents can, therefore, be dealt with wisely only by international cooperation of governments and of peoples.

Nations have various ways of managing the production and exchange of goods and services. In this country we prefer that our combined domestic and international economy rest primarily on a system of free enterprise. The trade-agreements program is designed to promote this end.

International trade is regulated and is necessarily affected by the tariffs, regulations, and economic institutions of the various countries. What the trade-agreements program proposes is that this complex system of trade regulation, both our own and that of others, shall be administered and guided, as far as our influence extends, not in the direction of regimentation and scarcity, but in the direction of increased production, better distribution, and more abundant consumption.

That is neither Republican nor Democratic doctrine. It is American doctrine, and the greater the extent to which we can get it accepted by other nations, the better will be the prospect for our own future prosperity and peace. I am confident that the more the subject is discussed the more clearly these facts will be seen by all of us, and the more nearly unanimous we shall be in our support not only of the measure now before us but of all measures that make possible, in our own hard-headed self-interest, fuller international cooperation against the common scourges of poverty, social and political instability, and war, and for greater abundance, social and political stability, and secure peace.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the main effort to kill this measure is by way of amendment. That became quite apparent in the Committee. Judging from the discussions during the debate here in the House, it is quite evident that the real purpose of the opposition is to try to kill this measure and destroy its effectiveness by way of amendment.

I submit to you that if the program has failed, if it is not worthy of your support and you do not desire to continue it, then the thing to do is to vote against the bill, but not resort to a scheme of trying to cripple the program, and kill its effectiveness by way of damaging amendments. I think certainly the sound position for us to take is to vote down all of these amendments and to continue this program as it is for 3 more years and thereby make a great contribution to our war effort and the effort of securing peace in the future.

I submit again that when we view this program on the basis of the record, when we analyze its accomplishments, we must reach the inescapable conclusion that it has worked well, that it has benefited all American interests, that it has benefited agriculture, it has benefited industry, it has benefited labor, and certainly considering it on that basis, that it is worthy of the continued support of the House of Representatives.

On the other hand, let us bear in mind the effect that would certainly result if it should not be continued in its present form at this critical time.

We know of the commitments that have been made through the Atlantic Charter, of commitments made through the lend-lease program. Our allies stand shoulder to shoulder with us in this struggle for life, liberty, and freedom and are looking to us today to see the course that we are to take, and the passage of this resolution will reflect to them our sincerity in the promises that we have made in our desire to go forward in our further cooperation in the interest of winning the war and in the interest of preserving peace for the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it was on June 12, 1934, that President Roosevelt signed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This act empowered the President to negotiate trade treaties with foreign countries for a period of 3 years. To be more specific, the President was empowered to negotiate these treaties with individual foreign countries without the advice and consent of the Senate; to raise or lower rates of duty by not more than 50 percent without congressional ratification and without definite standards established by Congress; to fix preferential tariffs for the duration of each agreement, and to extend or generalize these preferential rates to other nations.

Under the powers so granted to President Roosevelt in the original Trade Agreements Act and the 1937 and 1940 extensions the United States has entered into trade treaties with a total of 26 nations.

I am sure that no person will deny that such a wholesale delegation of such far-reaching discretionary powers to the President by Congress relative to the method of negotiating treaties was revolutionary in character. It was never intended that Congress should delegate its powers under article I, section 8, which provides that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that Congress cannot lawfully delegate this power without defining the proper standards to which the delegated agent must conform. Otherwise Congress is abdicating its constitutional functions. The Court held, however, that Congress can fix minimum and maximum rates so long as it clearly defines under what conditions they shall apply and sets up the definite legislative standards for their application. No such standards are set up under the Trade Treaty Act.

The Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, passed under Republican administrations, were examples of the proper delegation of power. These acts were upheld by the Supreme Court. In these measures the President was given power to raise or lower rates of duty not more than 50 percent. However, he could do so only after the United States Tariff Commission, as agent of Congress, had made an investigation of the relative costs of domestic and foreign production and had recommended a rate of duty which would compensate for the difference between domestic and foreign costs of production. Thus, Congress clearly defined under what conditions a rate of duty could be raised or lowered. It also clearly established the proper standards on which such action could be taken. It did not leave these matters to the absolute discretion of the Executive. In the present act there are no such safeguards. The 50 percent limitation on reductions is not a rate-making yardstick but simply a limit within which his discretionary power may be exercised.

I recall distinctly the controversy that arose under the flexible provisions of the Fordney-McCumber Act, and more especially the dramatic protest made by prominent Democratic leaders when it was sought to amend the 1930 Tariff Act to provide that the United States Tariff Commission shall investigate the cost of production as the preliminary step to acting on a petition for a change of duty, this to be done on the request of the President, either House of Congress, upon the Commission's own motion, or upon the application of any interested party. It was a delegation of a limited power and did not confer legislative power. Yet, a great Democratic leader, our present distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Representative DOUGHTON, took the floor and with penetrating vision, in the light of what has since transpired, delivered these prophetic words:

My friends, this is too dangerous and alarming to contemplate. With all this power vested in the President of the United States he becomes a colossus. This is too much authority to lodge in any man who ever has been, is now, or will ever be President of the United States. In fact, with all this unrestricted and unlimited power he would be in better position to overthrow our form of government and proclaim himself king than was the first consul of France, the great Napoleon, when he overthrew the French Government and proclaimed himself Emperor.

It seems that the more power men are given the more they are obsessed with a morbid gluttony for increased power. My friends, it is time to pause and call a halt, to stop, think, look, and listen before we go over the yawning precipice just ahead of us.

I congratulate our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on his powers of divination. I am not indulging in any sarcasm, but rather I am complimenting him for his patriotic zeal in defending a free people from any possible encroachment on their rights by an over-ambitious Executive, clothed in too much authority. I insist that it was a commendable attempt on Chairman DOUGHTON'S part to forestall the dangers to his country which he then envisioned as likely to occur at some future time.

I turn now to the philosophy of government as expounded by Secretary Cordell Hull when as a Senator he was discussing the flexible provision of the Tariff Act. He said:

The proposed enlargement and broad expansion of the provisions and functions of the flexible clause is astonishing, is undoubtedly unconstitutional, and is violative of the functions of the American Congress. * * * As was said on a former occasion, "This is too much power for a bad man to have or for a good man to want."

He also said:

Not since the Commons wrenched from an English King the power and authority to control taxation has there been a transfer of

the taxing power back to the head of the Government on a basis so broad and unlimited as is proposed in the pending bill.

It is significant that Mr. Hull should refer to "the taxing power." The exclusive authority of Congress over taxation is found in the same sentence of the Constitution which gives it the exclusive power to levy tariffs. The people have been told by the new dealers for a long time that Congress is incompetent to exercise its tariff-making authority, and that only the Executive can make the necessary adjustments on a scientific basis and without undue delay. We have heard the same thing with reference to other matters, and we may expect to hear the same thing in reference to the taxing power of Congress. It will be said that Congress takes too long to write a tax bill, and that with so many Members in both branches it is difficult to arrive at any agreement. How much better it would be, these new dealers will say, for the President to have this power. He could make instant decisions in regard to tax matters, fixing exemptions and rates, and selecting the objects to be taxed.

You may say, "Oh, Congress will never delegate its taxing power to the President." But, my friends, there would be just as much sense in delegating the taxing power as there is in delegating the tariff-making power, and it is therefore just as wrong to delegate the tariff-making power as it would be to delegate the taxing power.

The dictators sneeringly tell us that a democracy is slow and inefficient. The new dealers who ask that the tariff-making power be placed in the hands of the Executive are playing right into the hands of the totalitarian dictators. It gives them an opportunity to say, "See, America realizes that her democratic system is a failure; the Congress is being asked to surrender its powers to the Executive, and Congress will be only a puppet in his hands. This is an admission that we are right."

Congress has an opportunity here and now to recapture its power over the tariff and stop this trend of abdication in favor of the executive branch. It has an opportunity to show Mr. Hitler and the other totalitarian dictators that they are wrong, and that our representative system can function successfully, as it has for a century and a half.

How well I recollect the day when Vice President Garner, then Speaker of the House, left his chair, took the floor, and in a flood of fiery eloquence and patriotic zeal denounced the flexible tariff provision because of its delegation of power to the Executive.

He said:

Remember this, gentlemen, when the legislative body surrenders its tariff powers and obligations to the Executive—under our system of government a majority can do that—but you can never recover them except by a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate. Remember that when you surrender this power of taxation you surrender it for all time to come or until the two bodies by a two-thirds vote can take it away from the Executive. If an ambitious man is in the White House he will not surrender it. If a wise and patriotic man is in the White House he will have a want of confidence in Congress, so neither of them will be willing to give up the power.

I may add that the provision then under discussion did not require Congress to surrender its right to levy taxes. I know that the overwhelming majority of the people want their constitutional rights recaptured. I say that a free people are tired of having their markets taken by foreign competitive imports. Those who have suffered injury have been deprived of their day in court. They have no forum in which they can appeal for relief either before or after a trade agreement has been consummated.

The people have seen the operation of the totalitarian technique abroad, under which legislative bodies disappeared. Instead of laws the people found themselves dominated, regimented by rules, regulations, decrees, edicts issued from interdepartmental groups, commissions, bureaus, and other agencies, none of which was responsible to the people either through representation or otherwise. This is not the American way of life. It is a system which lends itself to a form of totalitarianism repugnant to our form of government.

When Representative Doughton, Speaker Garner, and Senator Cordell Hull protested the delegation of power to the Chief Executive they were expressing the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

It would be a dangerous delusion if overconfidence in the men of our choice should silence our fears for the safety of our rights. Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free government is founded on jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power. Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence will go. In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

Why the deep concern displayed by our great statesmen whenever the question of delegating discretionary power to the Chief Executive arises? The reasons were well and clearly stated in the early days of our Republic by one of the ablest men who sat in the Constitutional Convention. He said:

Men, frail and imperfect as they are, must be the instruments by which government is administered. But, in order to guard against the consequences of their frailties and imperfections, one effort, in the contrivance of the political system, is to provide that for the offices and the departments of the state, the wisest and the best of her citizens be elected. A second effort is to communicate to the operations of government as great a share as possible of the good, and as small a share as possible of the bad propensities of our nature. A third effort is to increase, encourage, and strengthen those good propensities, and to lessen, discourage, and correct those bad ones. A fourth effort is to introduce, into the very form of government, such particular checks and controls as to make it advantageous even for bad men to act for the public good. When these efforts are successful and happily united; then is accomplished what we truly mean, when we speak of a government of laws, and not of men; then every man does homage to the laws; the very least as feeling their care; the greatest as not exempted from their power.

The time has now arrived when this Congress can recover and recapture the rights of the people by amending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act so as to give Congress the right to approve or disapprove trade treaties negotiated under the act. The Congress will have an opportunity to restore the right of court review in all cases arising under the trade treaties.

Mr. Chairman, I shall now turn to a discussion of the operation of the trade treaties and their failure to achieve the objectives which were to expand our foreign trade and to keep us out of war.

A fair question to ask is, Have the trade treaties increased our exports, which was one of the objectives sought to be attained? The only yardstick by which world trade prices and values can be accurately measured is to use gold. It is the only common denominator among all countries of the world. What do we find by the use of gold as a yardstick to measure the value of export trade? In 1938 the gold value of exports of all countries was 40.6 percent of the 1929 level, while the gold value of the United States exports was 35 percent of that level. That same year—1938—the United States ranked fourteenth among the leading nations of the world in point of recovery in gold value of exports.

But even when measured in terms of dollars, American exports to all countries in 1938 were 60 percent of the 1929 level. Considered in the light of the concessions made to foreign countries by the New Deal to encourage United States exports, it is a depressing result to find that the United Kingdom exports in 1939, measured in its currency, were 65 percent of the 1929 level, and exports from Argentina were also 65 percent of the 1929 level. Canadian exports were 72 percent of the 1929 level; Australian exports were 77 percent of the 1929 level. The dollar value of our agricultural exports, however, declined 9.2 percent between the fiscal years 1932 and 1939. I have presented these figures during a period when war materials could not be used to pad export figures.

The great hue and cry of the new dealers in 1934 was that the trade treaties would increase exports of American farm surpluses, but what are the facts? The dollar value of our agricultural exports declined 9.2 percent between the fiscal years 1932 and 1939; in terms of volume our agricultural exports, during the same period, declined 36 percent. To mention specific items, the volume of our cotton exports declined 58 percent; wheat and flour exports 15 percent; cured pork 22 percent, and lard 56 percent.

Aside from the failure of the trade-treaty policy to expand our markets for agricultural surpluses, this whole foreign free-trade policy of the New Deal has had a demoralizing effect. Facing abject failure in disposing of the farm surpluses it resorted to a program of subterfuge to move the surpluses. I refer to the New Deal export subsidy program. To move 116,293,000 bushels of

wheat into foreign markets the taxpayers were called upon to pay a subsidy of approximately $32,871,000. From July 27, 1939, through November 1939, 4,340,297 bales of cotton were exported at a cost to the taxpayers, for the subsidy alone, of approximately $34,844,000. This piece of deception cost the taxpayers directly $67,715,000 during a period of 16 months, a period from August 1938 to and through November 1939.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Have any of the proponents of extension who have heretofore spoken, called attention to these enormous cash subsidies that we paid in order to stimulate foreign commerce?

Mr. REED of New York. Not so far as I have observed.

Without disclosing to the taxpayers that it was money out of their pockets which moved the surplus wheat and cotton out of the United States, the New Deal loudly proclaimed to the public that these exports were the result of the operation of the trade treaties.

The irony of all this propaganda, extolling the virtue of the trade-treaty program is that surpluses of farm products increased. Furthermore, agricultural exports have declined, and in the fiscal year 1939 agricultural exports as a percentage of total exports reached the lowest point in the history of the United States. Rather than let the public know the extent of the failure of the trade-treaty program, every possible deceptive device has been used to make it appear in a favorable light. The New Deal under its inept leadership, having gradually blocked every export outlet, turned to Government speculation in farm products, and even pegged prices above world levels. Then facing failure at a time when the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act would have to be renewed, the Commodity Credit Corporation wheeled its loan battery into action. Although widely advertised as a self-supporting program, the real truth is that as of January 1, 1940, taxpayers had already contributed $214,000,000 to restore the impaired capital losses the Corporation had suffered between the fiscal years 1934 and 1939.

Here let me present the bureaucratic or interdepartmental stupidity raised to the *n*th degree. Just listen to this:

The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, during the fiscal years 1938 and 1939, spent $30,479,112 for the surplus removal operations of 20 commodities, yet the State Department reduced the tariff on many of these commodities 50 percent. Please listen. Over the same period, imports of these same commodities were valued at $92,298,000.

We have heard the free-trade bureaucrats and the New Deal Democrats rave about the inequities of the Hawley-Smoot Act. They refer to it as the cause of war, pestilence, and famine, yet, after being in full control of both branches of Congress since 1933, not a move has been made to repeal this tariff act.

As far back as 1931, you Democrats were in control of Congress, which was prior to the advent of the New Deal, at which time Henry T. Rainey was Democratic majority leader. When reminded by a Republican Member that the Democrats had promised that, if elected, they would lower the tariff rates in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, he hurled this defiant reply:

> Lower the tariff drastically? You Republicans will not do it, and we Democrats dare not do it with conditions as they are. We do not want this market flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries.

To still rail against a tariff act, knowing full well that the New Deal administration has had the necessary majority in both branches of Congress with which to repeal the act of 1930, is the rankest kind of hypocrisy.

There is nothing that has appeared on the surface of our national affairs which more clearly demonstrates the danger to representative government than to have half truths as well as false statements relating to public questions disseminated by an international-minded propaganda organization. The irony of it is that the taxpayers of the United States are financing such a propaganda organization to the extent of $27,000,000 annually.

A highly organized group of foreign experts, bent on the ruination of our foreign trade and prestige among nations, if left undisturbed to their cunning and treacherous devices, could not have done more than was done by those who, in desperation, sought to build up our export figures by suffering and permitting the shipment of scrap iron, copper, tin, oil, gasoline, machine tools, and other essential war materials to our potential enemies. It was known, of course, that the war materials exported to Japan were to be used to murder our friends the Chinese; furthermore, the vast amount of the shipments of such war materials, in the light of developing events, should have put this administration on inquiry. But even the exports to Japan from the United States during the period of 1936 to 1940, inclusive, amounting to 7,246,721 tons of scrap iron, 740,752 tons of steel ingots and blooms, 4,582,472 tons of refined copper, 18,347 tons of scrap copper, 92,427 tons of tin plate, 55,251 tons of tin-plate scrap, petroleum and products valued at $219,856,062, 4,674,782 bales of cotton, aircraft and parts valued at $18,774,823, machine tools valued at $37,035,056, when added to the export figures failed to produce an amount of exports sufficient to enable the special pleaders to make out a case for the New Deal's foreign policy. Japan, I may add, required no trade treaty with the United States, because she had the benefit of every reduction in our duties under the 26 trade treaties entered into by the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman mind giving us the period of time covered by these enormous exports to Japan?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; from 1936 to 1940, inclusive.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. During the period that the gentleman has referred to, say 1934 to 1939, this country purchased over $700,000,000 in gold from Japan and paid a premium on it of nearly $300,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is doing such a splendid job I yield him 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, an examination of a majority of the trade treaties already entered into by the United States with foreign countries will fail to disclose wherein provisions have been made to require the nations to cease and desist from unfair and discriminatory trade practices. It is well known to all informed persons that the Trade Treaty Act empowers the President to suspend generalization of any benefits granted by the United States in a treaty with an individual country to other countries which discriminate against American commerce. An examination of United States Tariff Commission reports will show that since January 1, 1935, the countries of the world have concluded over 800 basic bilateral agreements and 559 supplementary bilateral agreements, of which many discriminate against our trade. Yet in the face of these deliberate violations of good faith toward the United States, the President has refused to use his power to protect American commerce against such discriminations, save in the one instance, viz, Australia.

When the Trade Treaty Act was passed in 1934, and when it was extended in 1937 and 1940, one of the chief arguments of its proponents was that it would prevent wars. This, of course, made a terrific appeal to millions of mothers and others. Now, on the occasion of the third request for an extension of the act, when we find practically all nations at war, many of them at the throats of their former best customers, the New Deal proponents of the trade-treaty program have finally discarded this discredited theory. It all comes back to the sound philosophy of George Washington, that no nation may expect disinterested favors from other nations.

The attempted prostitution of every agency of opinion to the will of the New Deal, the extinction of all free discussion, and the suppression of all criticism have been the characteristics of the present Roosevelt regime. The press is now feeling the impact of secret covenants, secretly arrived at, by being deprived admission to the international food conference. If the press had been as zealous and vigilant in battling for the rights of American citizens to have an opportunity to be heard through their elected Representatives before the consummation of trade treaties, the present un-American method of star chamber procedure in dealing with our vital domestic and foreign affairs would long since have been abolished.

LIQUOR IMPORTS AND TRADE TREATIES

There are millions of persons in this country who feel that there is something virtuous, highly moral, and spiritually satisfying in the trade-treaty program. It has been heralded as a political Sermon on the Mount. The pious platitudes in support of the trade-treaty program, printed at Government expense and widely distributed throughout the Nation to women's clubs, are noteworthy for what is suppressed rather than for what the documents contain. Not one word appears in all this propoganda, sent out to the good Chritsian men and women who are opposed to flooding this country with hard liquor from abroad, with reference to the reduction in tariffs on liquor. The Congress, representing the sentiment of the temperate citizens, has from time to time placed a high duty on whisky, rum, gin, brandy, cordials, bitters, champagne, and other liquors. These high rates of duty on liquors, enacted by Congress, kept the flow of foreign whisky, gin, and other liquors from flooding the United States. The petitions from the people protesting against the evil, especially against permitting the liquor traffic in and around our military camps, have been presented to the Congress by the thousands. Instead of respecting public opinion on this question, as Congress had done by enacting high rates of duty to keep foreign liquor out of this country, the administration ignored public opinion and secretly entered into trade treaties with foreign countries reducing the duty on liquors, as follows:

Articles	Rate changed	Modified rate
	Per proof gal	*Per proof gal.*
Whisky of all types	$5	$2.50
Rum:		
Cuban	4	2.50
Other than Cuban	5	2.50
Gin	5	2.50
Brandy	5	2.50
Cordials, etc	5	2.50
Bitters containing spirits	5	2.50
	Per gal.	*Per gal.*
Champagne	$6	$3.00

This lowered the floodgates for liquors, and even with the shortage of ships to fight the war, there seems to be space in some of them to import booze.

The average annual importation of liquors during the period 1931 to 1935 was 8,590,000 gallons. This was before the Trade Treaty Act. Under the Trade Treaty Act, the average yearly importation has amounted to 17,907,000 gallons. For the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive, under the New Deal trade-treaty program, a total of 89,537,000 gallons of liquor were imported.

Was this lowering of duties on whisky, gin, and other liquors done in the open? Not at all. Did any one of the millions of persons, urging Congress to suppress the traffic in and around military camps rather than increase it, have an opportunity to be heard? They did not. Did foreigners sit in on this secret conclave when the revenue was being bartered away and the liquor barrier was being lowered? Yes, the representatives from 26 foreign countries sat in this liquor huddle, but millions of American citizens and their elected representatives were denied a voice in the formulation or consummation of these trade treaties. I say that such a procedure is un-American; it invites the practice of deception, intrigue, and fraud.

What I have said with reference to the star-chamber methods of procedure in reference to liquor applies to the vital interests of agriculture, industry, and labor.

When the original act was before the Ways and Means Committee for consideration back in 1934, it was contended that the Congress should give the Executive complete authority over the Trade Treaty Act without reserving any right of approval or disapproval, so that he would be able to deal with the problem on an equal footing with the representatives of foreign governments, who, it was said, had similar blank-check authority. But what have we found since the act has been in operation?

It now appears that in the case of the 30 trade treaties heretofore entered into, 26 have been subject to approval by foreign legislative bodies, while the Congress of the United States, which has the exclusive constitutional authority to deal with the problem, has been totally ignored.

We, who are the elected representatives of the people, have no authority whatever under the Trade Treaty Act to disapprove a treaty, no matter how adversely it may affect our respective districts or the country as a whole.

We have no right to pass upon these treaties, but the Brazilian Congress does. We have no right, but the legislative body of Mexico does. We have no right, but that right is reserved by the legislative bodies of Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Sweden, and Uruguay.

In each of these countries legislative approval by the foreign legislative body was a condition precedent to the treaties going into effect.

We have no such right, but the legislative body of Argentina retains a veto power. So do the Parliaments of Canada and the United Kingdom. The French treaty, the Czechoslovakian treaty, the treaties with the Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela were all subject to the veto power by the legislative bodies of those countries.

Is it not time that we, the representatives of a sovereign people, should insist upon our constitutional authority over the tariff and to expressly reserve the right to protect the interests of our country if jeopardized by any treaty negotiated by a few bureaucrats sitting in star-chamber sessions with representatives of foreign countries, eager to get as much as they can of the rich domestic market without giving us anything tangible in return?

Let us this day halt this drift of our free government toward complete one-man rule, lest it be written by some future historian, as was written of a former great nation:

> Taxation was crushing; the tyranny of a swollen bureaucracy unendurable; the middle classes, overloaded with unpaid social services, were disintegrating; the upper classes had seen their fortunes go to a state whose demands were no longer satisfied by ordinary taxation; the farms were breaking up; the laborers were flocking to the cities; the standards of art and morals were declining. Side by side with this picture of a society in its death throes was a vulgar display of officialdom, vast public doles, and huge building enterprises which became bigger and more pointless as the state became poorer.

Mr. Chairman, the highest glory of the Anglo-Saxon comes from this fact, that he has made himself champion of intellectual freedom and has for centuries asserted and maintained man's privilege to speak and write his thoughts. The American people will remain free just so long, and no longer, than they are permitted to seek redress and participate in government through their elected representatives. I thank God there are businessmen who still have the Anglo-Saxon spirit and courage, few though they may be, who dare to appeal to the Congress for redress of grievances, at the risk of having the persons and organizations whom they represent subjected to all the tormenting regimentation that goes with a system of government by coercion. I respectfully present to the House an analysis of testimony presented to the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to the Trade Treaty Act.

Following is a brief presentation of some of the salient points of evidence offered in public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee considering House Joint Resolution 111, by opponents of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. These excerpts from testimony establish that the operation and administration of the act to date has unfavorably—and in many instances injuriously—effected American agriculture, American labor, and American industry:

(All page citations in the following excerpts are from the unrevised committee print of hearings on H. J. Res. 111.)

ALFRED C. GAUNT, PRESIDENT, MERRIMAC MILLS, METHUEN, MASS.

Mr. GAUNT. As a small businessman myself, the first president of the New England Small Businessmen's Association, the chairman of the National Advertising Council of Independent Small Business, a member of Floyd Odlum's committee on contract distribution to small business, and having a deep conviction that the small farm and small business typify that cause of freedom for which we fight, I should most earnestly like to oppose the renewal of the reciprocity acts, unless with modification which will promote worldwide preservation of small homestead farms and small independent businesses—our best insurance for post-war recovery and lasting peace (p. 593).

The present act has worked out badly in respect to the pottery industry in the Central States, in respect to the paper and textile industries in the East and South, and in respect to agriculture in the Middle West and the coast. Unemployment increased in all these and other enterprises where the tariff

concessions destroyed the ability of Americans to compete. If corrections can be put into this bill that will avoid that contingency, this bill may not be so bad (p. 595).

An agreement was made with Belgium reducing the rate on paper products. Italy and England were the principal gainers (p. 595).

An agreement with Finland, also on paper products, redounded more potently to the advantage of Sweden (p. 595).

Incidentally, Sweden sold for export at 1 cent a pound less than the price increase, and the Secretary of the Treasury ruled this was not a violation of the antidumping feature of our law (p. 595).

Under another agreement with England, Japan benefited and jumped her shipment of hat bodies from 1,155 dozen in 1934 to 385,511 dozen in 1937, and we suffered the complete prostration of an entire industry in this country (p. 595).

There is a town near me up in Massachusetts where 65 percent of their population depended upon the hat manufacturing there, and when this flood of Japanese stuff came in 65 percent of the people were just thrown completely out on the street (p. 595).

This little woolen mill of mine that struggled through the depression was just barely able to get by. Before the war came on, it was nip and tuck whether or not we would survive. The blow that hit us when we were pretty well down, anyway, was that Japan began to ship yarn and cloth and she came 10 to 15 percent under our costs, shipped all the way across the water and landed them here. If we knocked off all our overhead, there would be no profit, and she was landing them in quantities at 10 to 15 percent less than we could make them.

Imports of woolen textiles jumped from 4,400,000 yards to 12,000,000 in 1939 and bankruptcy, and disintegration in our textile industry developed to such an extent that there was only barely enough machinery remaining in operation here at the outbreak of the war in operating condition to clothe our Army. Had the same tendencies continued, the same tendencies of disintegration, and had Pearl Harbor come in 1945 instead of 1941, our Army would have gone without enough blankets and enough clothes to cover itself and keep itself from exposure (pp. 595–596).

Mr. REED. You remember the history of the dye business in this country, how they tried to establish the dye business, how it started to build up, and then they dumped their dyes in here from abroad and bore down upon them until they practically destroyed them.

Mr. GAUNT. Well, you see, that is another good reason why our hands should be left free to act as the exigencies may indicate at the end of this war. If our hands had been tied by 3-year treaties at the end of the last war we perhaps could not have promoted the dye industry, which has just been a salvation to us since then, and since the outbreak of this war. Munitions go with dyes (p. 602).

Mr. REED. * * * Don't you think it would be better and safer to restrict these trade agreements at least to a year or so, and then come back and report the results in the light of circumstances at that time?

Mr. GAUNT. Most certainly so. We will be throwing away our most precious asset if we throw away our home market, our domestic market, and make it the object of exploitation and raiding by other people (p. 608).

ARTHUR BESSE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS

Mr. BESSE. The primary fallacy of Mr. Hull's theory of foreign trade is that we can secure a net gain by increasing the amount of goods we import with a corresponding enlargement of the volume of our exports. I think we can all agree that if we increase our imports we will be able to increase our exports. But from the viewpoint of domestic activity it just balances, since the increased imports displace approximately the same amount of production that we gain somewhere else from our increased exports.

When the agreement with Great Britain was under consideration in 1938 the wool-textile industry expressed to the State Department its concern that a reduction in the duty on wool fabrics would result in a large increase in the importation of woolen goods. The State Department's answer was that it proposed merely to take a little off the top and that the increase importations would be too small to seriously affect American mills. The very substantial jump in imports during the first part of 1939 after the British agreement became effective gave indication that the reduction made in duty rates in the wool schedule might have proved much more serious than the State Department expected.

However, England's entry into the war in September of that year prevented any accurate judgment of the actual effect of the cut. But the point is this: If the cut was so small that imports were not substantially increased or domestic mills affected, there could have been no appreciable increase in the number of American dollars available to foreign countries which they could use for the purchase of our surplus products (pp. 628–629).

As a matter of fact, this country has for years imported all the products of any kind needed. Therefore, since exports must be in the long run limited by what we want to import, it follows that we can force our exports only by importing things which in an economic sense we do not need. This is a stubborn fact but one which the State Department refuses to face (p. 629).

Unfortunately, Mr. Hull does not see the picture this way. He regards tariff rates which have not been reduced by the maximum percentage permitted by the Trade Agreements Act as ammunition which he can use in an effort to get concessions in the tariff rates of other countries. This means that other nations, rather than we ourselves, will decide what we shall import and, as a corollary what we shall make. It is precisely because I believe that the State Department should not be in a position to control the decision as to what this country is to make and not make after the war that I feel so strongly opposed to the idea of having the Congress relinquish its control of tariff policy to the State Department.

Naturally we hope that this is the last war, but we cannot afford to take chances. It is far more likely to be the last war if we are not dependent for vital supplies on other nations and hence not in a position of vulnerability if our supply lines are cut (p. 630).

CARL H. WILKEN, ECONOMIC ANALYST, RAW MATERIALS NATIONAL COUNCIL, SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. WILKEN. In comparing relative price levels, using the United States as a hundred, Great Britain is 50 percent and Japan less than 10 percent. Actual records from the Ministry of Labor in England give the average wage in 17 leading industries as $1,060 per year on the basis of a 52-hour week, as compared to 27 leading industries in the United States paying an annual wage of $2,060 on the basis of an average of 43 hours per week.

Applying this ratio to our own Nation as a business, we have the following result: In 1942 the United States had an income of approximately $120,000,000,000 with a price level of approximately 100, using the year 1926 as an index of 100. Simple arithmetic proves that with 50 percent of the price level in 1942, our income would have been only $60,000,000,000. This represents a difference of $444 annually for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

That is what I meant, Mr. Chairman, when I stated that the matter of trade agreements is of tremendous importance. Any legislation that might mean a loss of $60,000,000,000 a year to the people of the United States ought to be important, especially so with the Nation facing a $200,000,000,000 debt as a result of the war (p. 745).

Now, then, we spend a lot of time on this foreign trade thing, studying the possibilities of increasing 5 percent of our volume, and we seemingly forget the 95 percent of domestic trade; and in answering your question (question by Mr. KNUTSON) I am going to point out to you what it has done to the 95 percent. In answering your question I would like to get on a sound premise, and I want to point out that the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill as such did not bring about the depression. In fact, if it had been properly written it would have prevented the depression. And I think the present administration agrees with that contention—that it did not bring about the depression, because, after 10 years of the administration, they haven't repealed it.

The second point that I wish to make is that the trade agreements were brought into the picture and sold to the American people as a means of disposing of a surplus of farm production. Now, then, it happens that the record discloses that we did not have any surplus production to export. We had a few crops, such as cotton and wheat, but I am talking of the picture over-all.

* * * The reciprocal trade agreements did not expand exports of farm products, and the over-all picture, comparing industry with the farm, is this: In the period from 1934 to 1939, industry exported approximately $10,000,000,000 of manufactured goods, and we imported approximately $3,000,000,000 of manufactured goods. The farmer, on the other hand, who was to get the benefit, exported $6,000,000,000 of farm products and was faced with an import of $10,000,000,000. In other words, during that period we had a net import of about $670,000,000 per year, which, when translated into American dollars and production, was the equivalent of about 50,000,000 acres annually (pp. 753–754).

(From testimony of James M. Duffy, East Liverpool, Ohio, representing the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters and the American Wage Earners' Protective Conference, delivered before the Ways and Means Committee December 2, 1942, in connection with hearings on H. R. 7832, inserted in the record of hearings on H. J. Res. 111 by Mr. JENKINS.)

Mr. DUFFY. In closing, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, we respectfully urge that your committee be consistent, and as you have very wisely voted to reject the authority sought to suspend our immigration laws, likewise we urge that you reject the authorization requested to suspend our tariff laws (p. 758).

The American Flint Glass Workers' Union supports the American policy and position of the American Federation of Labor in opposition to the landing in American markets of foreign competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The American Flint Glass Workers' Union is unalterably opposed to continued authorization for trade treaties unless said authorization provides for congressional approval or Senate ratification, that such trade treaties be terminated at the conclusion of the present war, or that no provision be made for the entry into American markets of foreign-made competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The position of the American Federation of Labor presented to the platform committees of both political parties has not been changed by any authorized action. (Telegram inserted in the record of hearings by Mr. JENKINS, sent by Harry H. Cook, president, American Flint Glass Workers' Union, p. 783.)

The American Federation of Labor has not changed its position as set forth by Presi-

dent Green and members of the executive council when they appeared before platform committees of both major political parties in June 1940 and urged proper safeguards to the employment opportunities of America's wage earners against unfair competition of the products of low-wage workers and depressed standards of foreign countries.

No one has been authorized to repudiate the 1940 stand of the American Federation of Labor that so vitally concerns so many of its members. (Telegram inserted in record of hearings by Mr. JENKINS, sent by James M. Duffy, president, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, p. 783).

CHARLES W. HOLMAN, SECRETARY, NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCTS FEDERATION

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point, will you put in your remarks approximately the total number you represent?

Mr. HOLMAN. Approximately 275,000 to 280,000 dairy farmers residing in 41 States—about half of whom supply the fluid milksheds of the country and the remainder engaged in selling butterfat or cream for manufacturing purposes by such concerns as the Land O' Lakes creameries of your own State (p. 786).

(After citing resolutions against the Reciprocal Trade Act adopted at the 1939, 1940, and 1941 conventions of the federation, Mr. Holman went on:)

Resolution adopted by the twenty-sixth annual convention of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation in Chicago, Ill., December 4, 1942:

"We reiterate our position of last year in opposition to all efforts to push legislation through the Congress, which has as its purpose the vesting of unlimited discretion in the President or his designates to repeal, suspend, or modify tariff duties, immigration, and other import or export restrictions.

"We urge the Congress to retain its control over tariffs, immigration quotas, and similar restrictions, and liberalize on these only when the need for liberalization is unequivocally demonstrated and specifically pointed out.

"We have confidence in the integrity and patriotism of Congress to deal intelligently and swiftly with individual situations calling for the repeal, suspension, or modification of such restrictions when the need for such action has been established and by way of the orderly legislative processes" (pp. 786–787).

Discussing action by his federation against the so-called Argentina Sanitary Convention, Mr. Holman said in part:

"Pursuant to action of previous national conventions, in 1937 the federation drew up a simple bill to provide that no persons should import dairy products into the United States unless such dairy products had been produced from milk or cream of animals which were either free from tuberculosis or which were under official test for that disease. This proposed draft was placed in the hands of a member of the Agricultural Committee of the House, and then the chairman of the committee wrote both to the Secretary of State, asking for an official opinion as to the policy of the administration with respect to this proposed legislation. * * *

"In the letter from the Secretary of State, specific reference is made by Mr. Hull to the fact that legislation of this character would be 'contrary to the established commercial policy of this administration.' Under the circumstances, would not the President veto the proposed legislation even if Congress should pass it?" (p. 791).

Telegram inserted in the RECORD by Representative WEST, of Texas:

"Would appreciate your representing the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association at hearing on the reciprocal treaties. Our attitude is expressed in a resolution passed by the convention last month as follows: 'This association is strongly opposed to a further departure from established American principles and laws in the making of treaties or other agreement with foreign countries and protest against further extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and protest against any treaty or agreement being made without the consent and concurrence of the Senate of the United States.'" Telegram addressed to E. E. Mollin, Washington Hotel, by Claude McCan, president, Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association (p. 839).

RUSSELL B. BROWN, GENERAL COUNSEL, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

In discussing reciprocal agreements entered into by the State Department with Venezuela and Mexico, Mr. BROWN said in part:

"As a result of this tax, which became effective in June 1932, the importation of petroleum into the United States fell from an average of 235,000 barrels per day for the year 1931 to 105,000 barrels per day for the last half of 1932. Under this provision, the domestic petroleum industry began to improve and exploratory efforts became active, with the result that from the year 1935, according to the report filed with the Petroleum Administrator by the Petroleum War Council, there was discovered in the United States from new fields approximately 772,848,000 barrels. In 1936 we discovered 704,000,000 barrels; in 1937, 928,742,000 barrels; and in 1938, 810,493,000 barrels.

"During this period of time the law was passed authorizing trade agreements and evidence of determination to effect such agreements with oil-producing countries in South America was apparent. The effect on the domestic producing industry was one of discouragement. Instead of continuing to expand their efforts in the discovery of new oil, less oil was discovered than in previous years. In the latter part of 1939, a trade agreement was executed with Venezuela, the principal oil-producing country of South America, reducing the tax on imports by 50 percent. By virtue of the favored nations clause, this reduction was made effective in other countries importing oil into the United States, including Mexico.

"The discovery of oil from new fields for the year 1939 as contrasted with the previous years shown, according to the same authority was 340,667,000 barrels. In 1940 it was 286,338,000 barrels; in 1941, 429,974,000 barrels; and for 1942 it reached the lowest point in our modern history of the petroleum industry, of approximately 200,000,000 barrels" (pp. 855–856).

Discussing the present serious oil shortage in this country, Mr. Brown said in part:

"At the time of the renewal of this trade agreement authority in 1939, it was urged that the effect of the trade agreement on petroleum might seriously affect the future of the petroleum industry and particularly the independents of the industry. So seriously was this urged, that the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, took notice of the situation and directed a letter to the chairman of this committee, in which he gave assurance of remedial action by those in charge of the trade agreements in the event of a threat of injury to the industry.

"Evidence of the danger of entrusting the department or bureau with this serious responsibility is illustrated here. There was probably no Cabinet officer of recent history who has the greater confidence of the American people than has Cordell Hull, yet in spite of the respect and confidence we have for him we have found the trade agreements section of the State Department in utter disregard for the evident intent of Congress, and a disregard for the express purposes as stated by the Secretary of State" (p. 858).

Mr. DISNEY. Referring to the agreement with Mexico, I paid a great deal of attention to that when the act was extended in 1940. We had a very serious discussion with the Secretary of State about it. Certainly I didn't get the impression at that time that the removal of all quotas would be contemplated within 3 years from the time we were having the discussion, or that the tax would be reduced 50 percent. Did you get any such impression in the negotiations we had?

Mr. BROWN. At that time it was rather definitely indicated that there would be no relaxation of the quotas with Mexico until after the war situation had clarified.

Mr. DISNEY. It was said in every way I know how it could be said except in writing, as I remember it, but that was the object of our discussion, in connection with the Venezuelan trade agreement, which we pointed out was likely to be the forerunner of a deal with Mexico. I had the definite impression there would be no such deal made with Mexico without some type of consultation and an opportunity to file objections to it.

Mr. BROWN. That was our impression. There was at that time imposed on the importation of Mexican oil a very stringent restriction as to quota. They could not bring in very much—but now that has been released (p. 860).

Mr. DISNEY. I have a few other questions that I want to ask. Mr. Brown, do you know off-hand what price the imports from Mexico are bringing?

Mr. BROWN. No; because the figures of oil that comes from Mexico are treated as confidential, both as to amount and price.

Mr. DISNEY. Price? Why? Is there some reason?

Mr. BROWN. I don't know. It is a restriction from some war agency. We don't get those figures (p. 908).

FRED BRENCKMAN, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. BRENCKMAN. In 1934 certain groups of farmers supported this measure on the theory it would enable us to do some "Yankee trading" and help us get rid of some of our agricultural surpluses. * * * As the act has been administered, so far from stimulating farm exports, it has had the opposite effect, greatly facilitating agricultural imports (p. 919).

Under the flexible proviso of the Tariff Act, first adopted in 1922, there was provision for appeal to the courts, and this should be restored Congress should lay down more precise rules for the lowering of duties and the making of concessions. Concessions should be made only to countries that are principal suppliers of the commodity involved.

Finally, all trade agreements should be subject to Senate ratification before taking effect (p. 924).

JOHN H. CONNAUGHTON, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOTHOUSE VEGETABLE GROWERS; SPECIAL COUNSEL, VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The United States Tariff Commission has issued a report in which they disclose that fresh tomatoes can be produced in Mexico and Cuba, using their peon labor, and delivered on the New York and Chicago markets at 3 cents per pound less than the American vegetable grower can, using American labor.

Nevertheless, under the present trade agreements, fresh tomatoes are imported into the United States from Mexico at 1.5 cents per pound and from Cuba at 1.2 cents per pound.

Granted for the sake of argument that we must have additional fresh tomatoes from Cuba and Mexico—which is not true—yet why prefer the Mexican and Cuban peon to the American citizen? (p. 965).

The trade-agreement authority was due for renewal in 1940 and would have expired by its terms in June 1940. The result was that the Argentine agreement was not consummated. The trade-agreement authority came up for extension in the early part of

1940 and Members of Congress, some of them on this Ways and Means Committee, charged that it was the intention of those who had charge of administering this authority to immediately take up the Argentine agreement and enter into practically the same agreement which they had refused in late 1939.

These officials vehemently denied any such intention. That is a matter of record. However, the ink had hardly dried upon the resolution extending this authority to the present time, until notice was given of a hearing upon a proposed trade agreement with Argentina along the exact lines of the one proposed in 1939 and refused. The same farmers' organizations, and many of the same Members of Congress joined by many others, appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and as bitterly assailed the proposed agreement.

However, secure in their entrenchment in having this authority extended for another 3 years or to the present time, this same group of bureaucrats who had refused the Argentine trade agreement when their authority was in danger in 1939, in 1940 after the extension proceeded to entirely disregard the supplications and appeals of American farmers and Members of Congress and consummated the Argentine agreement on practically the same terms which they had refused in 1939 (pp. 967-968).

WALTER W. CENERAZZO, PRESIDENT, WALTHAM WATCH WORKERS UNION, NO. 72, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. CENERAZZO. In 1936, 2,228,686 watches imported with 26,743,272 man-hours lost, or 16,715 years of employment lost.

In 1937, it went up to 3,127,274 watches imported, with 37,527,289 man-hours transferred, or 23,455 years' work lost.

In 1938, it went down to 2,386,226 watches imported, with 28,634,712 man-hours transferred, or 17,760 years' employment lost.

In 1939, it went up to 2,919,147 watches imported, with 33,029,764 man-hours transferred—20,643 years lost.

In 1940, 3,536,982 watches imported, or 42,443,784 man-hours transferred, or 26,625 years' employment lost (p 978)

Mr. WOODRUFF. I have before me a copy of the statement of the American Federation of Labor, and I am wondering how any official, especially the president, of that great organization can appear before a committee of Congress and present views in opposition to the views expressed by the national convention of that organization.

Mr. CENERAZZO. That is what I would like to know, and I think a great many trade-unionists in this country would like to know how any man who is holding office can separate himself from his official position when the only reason he gets the courtesy he gets is because of the position which he holds, to come down here and set himself aside and express an opinion which is not the position of the organization he represents, because the position he represents is formulated by convention assembled, and I think that is something Mr. Green will have to answer for eventually (pp. 979-980).

Much has been made of the argument by proponents that to make any change in the act at this time would have a bad effect upon our allies in the present war.

On the other hand, foreign countries, particularly those in Europe, know our people inherently and by national psychology are opposed to secret agreements and pacts.

Those who came to these virgin shores more than two centuries ago were to a great degree actuated by a strong desire to get away from the constant turmoil, wars, depression, and starvation brought about in the Old World by such practices. They bred that dislike and distrust of such practices into the very marrow of their descendants, who, in turn, passed it on to following generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my statement with this observation: The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in course of the debate yesterday, said the fact that both Britain and Czechoslovakia were at war proved that trade agreements did not prevent war. That might be valid if the United States was at war with Britain or Czechoslovakia, but since we are not at war with these nations, the gentleman's argument falls flat. As a matter of fact, the three nations with whom we are at war are three nations with whom we had no trade agreements. It is just about as sound as his challenge on the floor of this House during a debate on one of our preparedness measures when he challenged any member of either the Military Affairs Committee or the Naval Affairs Committee to name any nation that would dare attack the United States. Well, Japan gave him his answer.

So much has been said, much of it so well said, that it seems almost like illustrating the obvious to attempt to point out in a brief floor statement the overwhelming importance of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for an additional 3 years.

Let me point out that the importance of the extension of these trade agreements is fully realized by the individual chambers of commerce all over the Nation as well as by the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is the parent organization of these important trade bodies.

Aside from a few discordant groups, business generally is in favor of these agreements. The reasons for this almost unanimous support, as I have previously pointed out, are as follows:

THE PURPOSES ARE WORTHY

The primary purpose of the trade-agreements program is to increase opportunities for free, private enterprise in promoting international trade. This purpose is sought through reciprocal reduction of trade barriers. The general objectives of the program are to substitute economic cooperation for economic warfare in our relations with other countries; to give economic substance to our good-neighbor policy; and to create international economic relations upon which a structure of durable peace can be erected.

The historical background further strengthens this demand on the part of business. The enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 by the United States initiated a world-wide tariff war. Every leading nation raised its duties, with especially heavy increases on United States products. Subsequently a number of these nations made agreements reducing duties on one another's commodities. For example, Canada raised its duties in 1930 and England in 1931. Then, in 1932, these nations, in the Ottawa Agreements, reduced tariffs on goods originating within the British Empire.

Under these conditions of increasing tariffs and discrimination the foreign trade of the United States not only declined but declined faster than the trade of other nations.

This decline had serious repercussions on our whole economy. Normally this country produces more of a great number of farm and industrial products than can profitably be sold in our own markets. In some cases cotton and tobacco, for example, the percentage of exports to total production amounts to 40, 50, or 60 percent.

When large quantities of such goods cannot be exported, they pile up in unmarketable surpluses and our industrial production slows down. The result is felt throughout the country in depressed prices, unemployment, reduced wages, and poorer home markets for American producers.

Similarly, other nations normally produce surpluses of certain commodities and profitable marketing of these goods in foreign trade is necessary to help maintain the currencies, solvency, and buying power of these nations.

SAFEGUARDS ARE AMPLE

The act as it stands today carries ample safeguards and any limiting amendments would be fatal. The principle of reciprocal-trade agreements was embodied in the three tariff acts prior to our present Tariff Act of 1930. In fact, the Trade Agreements Act limits the President's powers—granted by the 1930 act—to adjust duties. Section 336 of the basic tariff law, enacted in 1930, gives the President authority to raise or lower duties by 50 percent. The Trade Agreements Act does not add to this power. It merely sets up machinery for entering into negotiations with foreign nations with a view to persuading them to reduce duties on our exports in return for reductions which we may make on their products.

On the other hand, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does limit the President's tariff-making powers by providing, first, that adjustment of duties must follow the principle of the "chief supplier" and, second, that a compensating concession in tariffs on American goods must be granted by the foreign nation with which we will make an agreement. No product may be removed from the dutiable list to the free list and no reduction may amount to more than 50 percent of the duties established in the Tariff Act of 1930. Finally, no agreement to reduce duties may be made until after the Tariff Commission and the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture have been fully consulted and until public hearings have been held to permit interested parties to present facts and register opinions.

The agreements made under the act may be terminated upon 6 months' notice from either party. In case of discrimination against the United States by a nation with which we have made an agreement, the agreement may be immediately suspended by Executive order. In recent trade agreements provision is also

made for suspension by Executive order in case of currency discrimination.

Under the act the powers of Congress in tariff making are only abridged to the extent that this body feels bound by our Government's promise to give 6 months' notice to treaty nations when it wishes to change duties on commodities covered by the agreements. During the making of an agreement, furthermore, Congress can enter into the process by tariff enactments concerning commodities likely to be affected.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

The unconditional most-favored-nation principle is a further necessary safeguard of United States interests. The need for this policy arose from the fact that other nations were making frequent agreements with one another providing special concessions on one another's products. By these agreements, United States products were rapidly being excluded from world trade. The most-favored-nation provision protects us against such discrimination by nations with whom we have agreements. In fact, without it an agreement would have little permanent value to this country, since subsequent agreements by other nations with one another could nullify the effects of our own agreements.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

Under the reciprocal trade agreements program, our Government has negotiated agreements with 26 countries affecting more than 60 percent of our export and import trade. From the beginning, the program has acted as a stimulus to our export trade. The increase in our exports to the trade-agreement nations before the outbreak of war was considerably greater than the increase in exports to nonagreement nations. The increase was especially notable in the case of certain agricultural products. The increase in our imports from the nations with which we have made agreements was somewhat greater than the increase in imports from nonagreement nations, but the difference was considerably less than in the case of our export trade. This refers to conditions prior to the autumn of 1939.

CALIFORNIA PRODUCTS BENEFITED

Of special interest to my own State is the fact that California's leading products have enjoyed many benefits from concessions obtained in the trade agreements negotiated. Canned and dried fruits have enjoyed reductions in duty and other concessions in practically every agreement. Likewise benefited in half or more of the agreements have been canned sardines, honey, oranges, grapefruit, fruit juices, walnuts, raw cotton, tires and tubes, iron and steel manufactures, machinery, oil-well equipment and many other products. Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor exports of these have shown large increases in 1938 as compared with 1936, that is, canned sardines, 26.5 percent; honey, 152.1 percent; fruit juices, 41.5 percent; walnuts, 49.1 percent; field and garden seeds, 89.3 percent; tires and tubes, 79.0 percent; rubber manufactures, 88.6 percent; iron and steel manufactures, 249.9 percent; oil-well and refinery equipment, 114.2 percent; and industrial machinery, 182.3 percent; oranges, 83.8 percent; grapefruit, 84.5 percent; dried fruits, 69.6 percent; and canned fruits, 18.1 percent.

Recent developments have made California, and especially Los Angeles County, increasingly dependent on foreign markets as outlets for the products of our industry and agriculture. After the war the maintenance and expansion of these markets will be essential to maintain employment for our workers and to provide peacetime opportunities for our enterprise and capital. As one of the Nation's leading seaports, as a distribution center for the Western States, as a manufacturing center dependent on foreign sources for much of our raw materials and foreign markets for our sales, as a center for tourist travel, and as a leading center of air transportation, Los Angeles should lend every support to the reciprocal trade agreements program for expanding our international trade.

LATIN-AMERICAN TRADE

Widespread opinions are expressed of the great possibilities existing for us to increase our trade with Latin America, especially in view of the fact that our neighbors to the south have been cut off from their former supply in Europe. However, Latin America cannot buy from us unless its people can sell some of the products that Europe has heretofore been buying from them. Hence it will be necessary for the United States to purchase some of these products if we are to capitalize on potential trade in the Latin-American countries. The trade-agreement program furnishes a method by which this process can be worked out with the least disturbance to our domestic economy.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL NOT NECESSARY

It is sometimes argued the reciprocal trade agreements are treaties and that as such should become effective only with the approval and consent of the Senate. From the point of view of constitutional law, however, the validity of executive agreements entered into under the authority of Congress but not subject to Senate ratification is clearly established by precedent and judicial decision. This Government has, from its earliest days, entered into such agreements, over 1,000 altogether, covering matters such as commercial and consular relations, patents, trade-mark and copyright protection, postal conventions, navigation, radio and aviation arrangements, and the settlement of claims. The courts have upheld the validity of such agreements in every case in which the question has come before them.

Reciprocal trade agreements belong in this category of executive agreements, as distinguished from treaties. Treaties which require Senate ratification as provided for by the Constitution of the United States embrace the broad divisions of the exchange of the equal rights of the citizens, corporations, shipping, and so forth, in the respective countries.

The reciprocal trade agreements, or executive agreements, are more limited in scope and have for their purpose removal of trade barriers only.

In this connection it should also be pointed out again that the tariff law, enacted in 1930, gives to the President the power to raise or lower duties by 50 percent without consulting Congress. It would appear scarcely necessary to require Senate ratification when this authority is used to persuade foreign nations to reduce their tariffs along with us. When the President does not need Senate ratification to reduce our duties and when the foreign nation does not need the consent of our Senate to reduce its own duties, under these circumstances, considering the safeguards in the existing agreements, why should congressional ratification be needed for our Executive and the foreign nation to act in concert?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I am so much interested in the extension of our Trade Agreements Act that I feel that I would be remiss in my duty not to go upon record in respect to this legislation. There can be no controversy about the fact that the United States of America is doing and has been doing for a number of years one-half of the business done in this world, and there can be no doubt about the fact that our production of both agricultural commodities and manufactured products far exceeds our domestic demands and cannot be disposed of except in foreign markets. Under our present Trade Agreements Act our export trade has increased more than 60 percent with those countries who have entered into trade agreements with us, and in other countries that have no such agreement our business has not increased more than 30 percent. It is true that wartime restrictions which have been imposed on all of the world since our war began is having adverse effect at this time upon both our export and import trade; and it is safe to assert that after this present world war the proposed continuation of our reciprocal trade agreements with other nations will not only enable the nations to overcome the effect of the war, but it will largely wipe out the hatred which has been engendered by this war and will hasten the recovery of normal and better economic and political relationships between all the nations of the world. Certainly the condition of the present Trade Agreements Act is, in my opinion, more important than ever before. Aside from its economic value it will create a spirit of economic friendship and enable the United States to fulfill its obligations and responsibility in the readjustment of world plans. It is self-evident that no nation can sustain prosperity save in a world of peace, and I have an abiding faith that the establishment of sound international trade relations is most essential to post-war reconstruction and international friendly solidarity.

The author of this great act and its inspiration is the present Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull. He is the

greatest authority on tariff laws that this Nation ever produced. It has been his life study, and he has consecrated his efficient life to the problems involved in these international matters. No selfish motive has ever crossed his vision and he has rendered a service to this Nation that but few other public men ever approached, and I indulge the sincere hope that this Congress and this Nation will not falter to follow such a leader.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the broad question of whether the trade-agreements program should be continued, for I cannot believe that there is any doubt, under prevailing circumstances, of the wisdom and justification for such action.

Those on the committee who have preceded me have amply demonstrated the future benefits that will accrue from the program and the harm that will result from adverse action.

However, permit me to suggest that this entire problem must not be viewed in the light of a domestic issue, as was the Tariff Act of 1930. World-trade issues transcend national boundaries and concern the interests of all peoples throughout the world.

If we assume that tariffs were, in the beginning of our national history, domestic issues and that they remained such as long as we were a debtor nation, the effect of the Smoot-Hawley Act clearly demonstrates that tariffs are not domestic issues when a nation becomes a creditor. In modifying the rates of the 1930 act through trade agreements, the present administration recognized the validity of this salient fact. Today, tomorrow, as in our recent past, we can only trade with the world as a creditor nation. Clearly a return to tariffs with excessive rates, disregarding the effect on other countries, for the purpose of carrying out the slogan, "American markets for American producers," will result in the complete loss of all the world markets and good will gained since the depression years. To now attempt to make the matter of tariffs a domestic issue disregards modern-day history. We cannot give such an answer to the world and have it stick.

As was the philosophy of the great Republican President, William McKinley, my slogan is, "World markets for American producers" rather than "American markets" only.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it the gentleman's thought that we should go on to a free-trade basis and also let down all immigration bars?

Mr. MILLS. Of course, the gentleman knows that is not my thought.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am just asking. I am sure that the House would like to know.

Mr. MILLS. I can assure the gentleman that such is not my thought.

It is possible to defeat the program by adopting ill-advised amendments, improperly conceived and high sounding though inflexible and hindering by nature. For this reason, I purpose to address my remarks to the reasons why the bill reported by the committee should be adopted by the House without amendments offered on the floor.

Some opponents of the trade-agreements program have gone so far as to assert that renewal of the trade-agreements authority will give to the Executive the "arbitrary and absolute power to form a present and post-war United States according to his judgment, or his fancy" without congressional participation or control. As a result of this reasoning they propose amendments to restore powers to Congress which they say previous Congresses have unjustly given the Executive in the field of foreign trade.

Such a charge places far too much emphasis on the pending resolution to extend the trade-agreements program. It is true that the Trade Agreements Act has been, and if extended will continue to be, an important, although limited, phase of the foreign policy of the United States. However, nearly 9 years' experience under the act shows clearly that there is no justification for suggesting that "arbitrary or absolute power to form a present and post-war United States," is granted by the Trade Agreements Act. The act is too limited in scope to warrant such a charge. Under it the President is authorized, within clearly defined limits, to enter into agreements with foreign countries under which reductions are made in United States tariff duties in return for reductions by foreign countries of their tariffs and other barriers to American exports. The principal limitations on this authority under the present act, now up for renewal, are as follows:

First. The President must find, before concluding a trade agreement with a foreign country, that existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or the foreign country are "unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States."

Second. Existing duties may not be changed by more than 50 percent.

Third. The President cannot transfer articles between the dutiable and the free lists.

Fourth. The President is required before entering into a trade agreement to give reasonable public notice of his intention to negotiate, in order that interested persons may have an opportunity to present their views.

Fifth. Before concluding such an agreement, he must seek information and advice from the Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as may be deemed appropriate.

There is, of course, no foundation to the charge that, since individual agreements are not approved by Congress, Congress has abdicated its legislative functions. In the first place, it must be kept in mind that no trade agreement is made without the approval of Congress, since the President can only conclude such agreements pursuant to the procedure and within the scope of the policies and limitations previously prescribed by the Congress.

Moreover, congressional control is not limited to the prior authorization and prescription of policies and limitations set out in the act. Congress has reserved in the act itself and it has now on three occasions exercised its right to review the administration of the act and the agreements which have been concluded. The Trade Agreements Act originally, and as extended in 1937 and 1940, and as now proposed for further extension, limits the authority to conclude agreements to 3 years. In short, the Congress reserves the right to review periodically the operation of the act. No better proof of the thoroughgoing nature of this review can be found than the actual record of the hearings which have been held before congressional committees in 1937 and 1940, and now again in 1943. The bulky volumes which contain the record of these hearings are in themselves convincing arguments that this has been no perfunctory review.

This periodic check-up is a form of subsequent congressional approval which is both practicable and in accord with the proper function of the Congress. One of the principal purposes of Congress in setting up the trade-agreements procedure was to free Congress from the burden of attempting the impossible task of passing on each minute detail involved in keeping the tariff adjusted to current needs. The Congress had the same purpose in mind in the enactment of the flexible provisions of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930 and action taken by the President under that authority is not made subject to subsequent congressional approval. Similarly, in the case of the numerous administrative agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission which Congress has set up to administer specified policies, their rules, regulations, and actions are not made subject to subsequent congressional approval. To do so would simply render Congress ineffectual to do its real job of establishing policy through legislation.

Some individuals have pointed to the Atlantic Charter, the declaration by the United Nations, and article VII of the master lend-lease agreements as evidence of the administration's desire to commit the United States to definite post-war settlements without participation by the Congress. According to some of these persons, the request for extension of the trade-agreements authority is further evidence of the administration's plot to circumvent Congress.

There is, of course, absolutely no basis for such fears. There is, of course, a similarity between the broad objectives set forth in article VII of the lend-lease agreements and the trade-agreements program. What must be kept in mind is that the objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter and article VII of the master lend-lease agreements constitute goals toward which we are looking; they constitute a recognition, both on our part and on the part of the nations joined with us in the fight against the common

enemy, of the economic principles which must be established to govern international commercial relations if a stable and secure peace is to be built. So far as this country is concerned, the decision to convert these objectives into living reality remains with Congress.

Secretary Hull, in his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the recent hearings, left no doubt on this point in reply to questions by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]:

Mr. WOODRUFF. * * * Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Secretary, is there any congressional authority for the Department of State or any other agency of our Government to enter into any agreement or to subscribe to any declaration whereby this Congress is bound to reduce its present tariff rates?

Secretary HULL. * * * You will understand there is no relation between the lease-lend policies and the trade-agreements policies.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I so understand.

Secretary HULL. Except that lease-lend in a very general way, under article VII, commits the nations to the general policy of reciprocal trade, based on liberal commercial considerations.

Now, is that what you had reference to, or not?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Not entirely, Mr. Secretary. I would like to know if there is any provision in the lend-lease bill which would authorize any agency of this Government to commit the Government to any particular tariff policy?

Secretary HULL. There is nothing official. You will understand, I am sure, that the Atlantic Charter itself is a declaration by the heads of governments of what they would do. It does not commit the future governments to the extent that a statute would; it is a declaration of policy. It is the purpose and the duty of the present governments, ours included, to carry out scrupulously the economic provisions of the Atlantic Charter and article VII of lend-lease.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, Mr. Secretary, does it commit this Congress or this Government to any particular policy along that line?

Secretary HULL. If I may repeat with a little more emphasis, if possible, it does not commit anybody to anything expressly in the binding way a statute would. It is a declaration of policy by the heads of governments and carries the strongest possible moral obligation for its faithful performance.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Then you do not contend that because of any understanding, which may not be coming to the ears of the public, at the Atlantic conference, may I say, that it in any way binds the Congress to any specific action?

Secretary HULL. No more than the Monroe Doctrine would bind some succeeding Congress or the Government, keeping always in mind the moral obligation I have mentioned previously. It is a declaration of policy. If it is sound, it ought to be carried out and that is what we are trying to do, in a sense.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will say, Mr. Secretary, your response to that is very satisfactory. Now, let me ask this question: Is there any congressional authority for the Department of State or any other governmental agency to bind the United States to article VII, which you speak of, in certain trade agreements?

Secretary HULL. No. As I say, that is a declaration which further embodies the doctrine of the Atlantic Charter, and we are still further attempting to carry out its principles by this act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was there anything in the testimony at that particular moment which stepped further ahead, wherein the Secretary of State made any remarks with reference to specific commitments related to the point just developed that we may be making through the consummation of the master agreements, particularly with reference to title VII?

Mr. MILLS. I do not recall that there was anything definite in the hearings on that point. The Secretary did insert in answer to questions by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a statement which I should like to read. I think it bears on the gentleman's point.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only reason I bring up that point is that title VII of the master agreements, as I understand, positively ties together the master lend-lease agreement and the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. MILLS. As a definite policy of government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Let me proceed on that point.

In a memorandum placed in the record of the hearings by the Secretary of State, in response to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the following statement was made—page 64 of the unrevised committee print:

Article VII is not a commitment to detailed and specific measures. No one was wise enough to write the necessary measures at one stroke, nor influential enough to get them accepted by the public and legislative bodies in all the countries concerned. The commitment is to negotiate on stated general principles and to stated general objectives. The objectives are important, and their agreed statement enlarges the common ground of our alliance. The agreement to seek, by common action, agreed methods of attaining them is also of importance. But it is not a commitment to any detailed measure And it does not purport to bind the Congress or the people of this country to accept the detailed measures when presented.

The international discussions contemplated by the article are starting. The Secretary of the Treasury has informally consulted the appropriate committees of both Houses in connection with his suggestions for stabilizing currencies. A somewhat different plan for the same purpose has been published in London. A conference of agricultural experts has been announced. Other meetings are suggested. Public discussion is under way in many countries. From all these discussions projects in many fields will undoubtedly emerge. They will necessarily take many forms—some treaties, some proposals for legislative action, some perhaps executive agreements. As they emerge and can be put in form for action, they will be submitted for decision to the appropriate authorities in this and other countries, according to our various constitutional arrangements. Obviously article VII could not—and very clearly it does not purport to—change the regular constitutional divisions of governmental power in the United States or in any other country. The article is a promise and a hope of better things to come. Whether it becomes reality depends on the wisdom and the steadfastness of the people of all the countries concerned, and of their servants.

The fear which some have expressed that trade agreements restrict our field of action in post-war reconstruction, since often their initial term runs for 3 years, is likewise without foundation. The agreements contain numerous safeguarding or escape clauses, which is the best evidence that our hands have not been tied.

For example, article XI of the recent agreement with Mexico provides that if the President of the United States finds that as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concessions granted in the agreement on any article, such article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to United States producers of like or similar articles he shall, if he finds such action to be in the public interest, withdraw or modify the concession on such article, either by quota or otherwise, to the extent and for the time necessary to prevent such injury. The Mexican Government, of course, has the same latitude.

The responsibility which rests on Congress with respect to the question whether the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries should be extended for another 3 years is a grave one. The eyes of the world are focused upon us. The splendid record which the trade-agreements program has made in the 9 years that it has been in operation recommends its passage without amendments. Failure to pass it or to cripple it by amendments will serve as notice that the United States while willing to do its part on the battlefield is unwilling to accept its share of responsibility in post-war reconstruction. Failure on the part of Congress to recognize this responsibility will play directly into the hands of Axis propagandists.

As the committee report states:

It is desirable to make the vote as large and as bipartisan as possible in order that our allies and the citizens of the United States may be assured that international cooperation in post-war reconstruction is not a party matter.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has stated that Congress should be a policy-making body, and has described in the Atlantic Charter and article VII of the master lend-lease agreements policies which the Secretary of State said were political commitments and not legal commitments. Does not the gentleman think that for the sake of stability it would be a good thing to have Congress, the policy-making or ratifying body, approve these policies which now have no legal sanction at all?

Mr. MILLS. In answer to the gentleman I may say that, as he well knows, there are certain phases of article VII of the lease-lend agreement and of the Atlantic Charter that call for Executive action. There are certain other phases of the program that cannot go into effect without legislative action. Those actions will have to be taken by the legislative branch before they can become

permanent. This legislation is an example of this latter phase. We are here legislating policy. This is the time and place for Congress to exercise its control over the program. Those who feel it is bad policy can vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, as has heretofore been suggested during the course of the debate, the joint resolution under consideration would extend for 3 additional years—or until June 12, 1946—the discretionary authority delegated to the Executive, first under the act of June 12, 1934, and extended and renewed by the Congress in 1937 and again in 1940, authorizing the Executive to enter into binding foreign trade treaties in behalf of the United States without the formality of Senate ratification, and to reduce the country's tariff rates in accordance with such treaties without specific congressional approval and without regard to any legislative standards for rate-making.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there are those in this country—and I regret to say, some in the legislative branch of the Government—who have intimated and insinuated that anyone who dares oppose the extension of these treaties at this time, or support amendments thereto, is to have his patriotism questioned, and I assume will be subjected to a smear campaign by some of those groups who have heretofore undertaken to define and prescribe a course of conduct for everyone to pursue if he is to be found worthy of their approbation as a patriotic citizen.

Be that as it may. Coming from a great agricultural State and particularly one of the richest agricultural districts of that State, in fact one of the richest agricultural districts in the whole of the United States, especially in the production of wheat, oats, barley, grain sorghums, beef and dairy cattle, dairy products, poultry and poultry products, I would consider myself derelict in my duty to the people I represent if I rubber-stamp this proposal and authorize these secret treaties affecting the property rights and the very existence of my people, without attempting to safeguard them by appropriate amendments.

My State is second in the production of wheat in the United States, 60 percent of which grows in my congressional district. My district is rich in the production of oil and gas. My home county comprises a part of the largest natural gas field in the world. Every farm commodity grown in my State is affected by these trade agreements heretofore made, and during the time these agreements have been in effect the duty on every farm crop produced in my district has been reduced, thereby offering a competitive like product in competition with every man who tills the soil, raises a cow, hog, horse, or sheep in my State and district. Likewise, everyone who produces a cubic foot of gas or a barrel of crude oil.

The number of reductions in duty made by trade agreements and in effect on February 1, 1943, amount to 1,180. In addition to these reductions, certain rates have been bound. The United States has guaranteed in trade agreements not to raise the tariff rates on certain specified imports. At the present time, 58 such bindings are in effect; and this figure does not include bindings on the free list, rates that were reduced and subsequently bound, and rates that were bound and later reduced.

The number of rates reduced and the number of rates bound by trade agreements and in effect on February 1, 1943, are in part, as follows:

Agricultural products and provisions:	
Total number of rates reduced and bound	249
Number of rates reduced	234
Number of rates bound	15
Metals and manufactures of:	
Total number of rates reduced and bound	245
Number of rates reduced	232
Number of rates bound	13
Wood and manufactures of:	
Total number of rates reduced and bound	80
Number of rates reduced	76
Number of rates bound	4

There are many others included in the total of 1,180 which affect my State, but the above are the principal ones.

Of course, none of us are going to do anything that we think will hinder or in any manner retard the war effort, or bring about a situation with our allies or our friends throughout the globe that will cause them to question our integrity or the good faith of our intentions now or after the war is over; and if I had any reason to believe that the failure to extend these trade agreements without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" would cost the life of one additional American boy in this war, or would embarrass our Government in any manner at the peace table, then I would be willing to go along without raising my voice in opposition thereto; but I do not believe such will be the case. In fact, I think the other nations of this world will have more respect for this country when they understand that we in the Congress have enough backbone and stamina to preserve the fundamental rights of our people and see to it that this Republic functions in the manner that was intended by the Constitution and in the manner in which it did function for 150 years, under which we have grown strong and great, and which has made possible the part we are playing today in attempting to save the rest of the world from totalitarian dictators.

No one can rightfully charge that those of us who believe that some safeguards by way of amendments should be provided for in this bill, are opposed to a policy of mutually beneficial tariff reciprocity with foreign nations. We do not disagree with the general policy of reciprocity, but we do disagree with the arbitrary and what many of us believe to be the unconstitutional and arbitrary manner in which the original act has been construed and the manner in which it operates and will continue to operate unless safeguarded by amendments which will permit the Congress of the United States to function as it was intended to function in matters of this character.

A good case can be made for complete repeal of the basic act and against extending it in any particular. The program has not only failed to expand exports—which was one of the principal arguments made for the program—but has resulted in drastic increase in imports of foreign products that compete with and displace our own.

This administration promised the American farmers in 1932 during the campaign that no agricultural tariffs would be reduced. Yet, as heretofore pointed out, under this act, already 249 rates on competitive foreign agricultural products have been reduced under trade treaties, many by as much as 50 percent.

It is inconsistent to curtail American production of farm products, and then permit the importation of the same products from abroad which increases our surplus and further depresses prices.

It is inconsistent to spend the taxpayers' money to buy up domestic agricultural surpluses and import the same products from abroad under reduced tariffs.

Every competitive article which is imported means that much less produced in the United States.

The importation of competitive products from abroad takes markets away from American farmers and jobs away from American workers.

American workers cannot be expected to compete on equal terms with the low-paid labor of Europe and the Orient.

The Trade Treaty Act places in the hands of one man the absolute power of life and death over every domestic industry which is dependent upon duty protection for its continued existence.

The Constitution places the regulation of foreign trade and the adjustment of tariff rates exclusively in the control of Congress. Under the New Deal trade treaties this authority has been centralized in the Executive.

Congress has no opportunity under the Trade Treaty Act to approve or reject these treaties or any of them, no matter how injurious they may be. Once they are signed by the President, they are effective so far as this country is concerned; this, notwithstanding the fact that most of the foreign legislative bodies reserve the right of ratification.

These treaties are entered into in secret, their terms are never made public until they become effective. No hearings are ever held on the completed treaties. The only hearings which take place occur prior to the time the treaties are negotiated and they are held before a buffer committee and not by those who actually conduct the negotiations with the foreign government. They appear to be held only for the purpose of attempting to convince the American producer that he has been given a hearing.

If we believe in the Constitution, certainly we will require some congressional approval of these treaties. It is no argu-

ment now to say that just because a submissive and rubber-stamp Congress in 1934, 1937, and 1940 evidently lacked faith in the House Ways and Means Committee and voted to delegate the powers of the legislative branch of our Government to the executive branch, that we of the Seventy-eighth Congress should continue to endorse such a program.

Think of it. We are saying to the people's elected representatives, we are saying to a great committee of this House, "We have not any faith in you, we cannot trust you; we are going to delegate your authority to a committee for reciprocity information, an appointive committee coming from the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the United States Tariff Commission"—none of whom were elected or selected by the people themselves.

This Congress has had enough backbone already during this session to refuse to extend to the executive branch of the Government power to devaluate money. Why do we not have the backbone and courage to exercise our constitutional prerogatives in this matter? Would you delegate the authority in the Congress and the Committee on Ways and Means to write a revenue bill to a committee for tax information if one were appointed and selected by the executive branch of the Government? Would you be willing to vote to delegate the powers of the Congress and those vested in the Judiciary Committee of the House to a committee for judicial information appointed and selected by the executive branch of the Government? Would you be willing to delegate the legislative constitutional powers of the Congress and of the Committee on Agriculture to a committee for agricultural information appointed and selected by the executive branch of the Government?

Why not have a committee for labor information, a committee for interstate and foreign commerce information, a committee for appropriations information, a committee for banking and currency information—all selected by the Chief Executive—and have them function in a similar manner to that of the committee for reciprocity information?

If there was ever a time in the history of this country when the people's Congress should be on the alert, certainly it is now. Every day we see power delegated now misused and abused by the Executive. The radio and the press have advised the country that the Office of Price Administration intends to subsidize the food program, notwithstanding a committee of this Congress has said there will be no subsidies for such a program. You heard the O. P. A. Administrator state over the radio Sunday evening that a food-subsidy program was to be put into effect.

In the name of high heaven, will Congress continue to completely abdicate and submit to a complete dictatorship in these matters which are not a part of the war program but are a part of our domestic program?

The founders of this Government wrote into the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises and to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

This bill and the extension of it disregards and annuls this provision of our Constitution, takes this matter away from the legislative branch of the Goverment and turns it over to the Executive. No legislation or no Congress, prior to the advent of the New Deal, whether Republican or Democratic, has ever given the President a free hand in tariff-making; in no past legislation has it authorized him under general powers to conclude reciprocal foreign trade treaties, without also requiring that before becoming operative such treaties should first be ratified by Congress; and in no past legislation has it given the Executive specific power to make reciprocal trade concessions without first providing the instruments that he could use in tariff bargaining.

The effect of these agreements so far has been to take the home market which rightfully belongs to American farmers, away from them and give it to foreign producers; and these cheaply produced foreign products have been sold in the United States in competition with domestic production.

If this loss of the home market continues after the war, when millions of our boys return from foreign battlefields, we will again see unemployment rampant and the farmers and workers of this country will be reduced to the standards of living of many European and Asiatic countries. This is not partisan argument; it is American argument. Our leaders should forget political partisanship in the drafting of a sound and beneficial program for the future welfare of American agriculture, and for the future welfare of American labor.

When the war ends in Europe and Asia, and millions of men now engaged in military purposes get back in productive employment, disaster will face all America unless we take action to prevent it. Our first duty is to protect the future welfare of American citizens, and to do so before it is too late.

Therefore, to paraphrase Mr. Churchill, I do not believe that the people of my State and of my congressional district expect me, as their representative, to rubber-stamp a program and surrender my prerogatives as a Member of Congress which may liquidate the producers and the industries of my State and country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was interested to hear the gentleman state that everything produced in his district has had the duty on it lowered.

Mr. RIZLEY That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am wondering if that has not something to do with the gentleman's being here.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the gentleman that in my humble opinion it has a lot to do with my being here.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman feel that sometimes some of the people who are advocating this policy are getting some personal benefit out of it?

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot help but feel that.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I observe that the Committee on Ways and Means at this session denied the President the right to suspend the tariff law.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right.

Mr. MOTT. They were not ready with their propaganda at that time so they were caught unawares. Between that time and this, a great deal of propaganda has been spread over the country in an effort to make the people believe the continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements program has something to do with the war effort.

Mr. RIZLEY. There cannot be any question about it. It has been continuous, weeks and weeks and months of propaganda, through the press, through the radio, and otherwise, to the effect that if we do not extend these trade agreements we are not in favor of winning the war. They almost go that far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, as we look back over the events of the past decade, the gathering of the storm clouds of war, then the bursting of the fury of international discord upon the world, we find many errors of foreign policy pursued by ourselves and our allies and we cannot but wonder what the effect would have been had this or that change of policy been made.

However, as we take this backward glance, we find one program, basically sound, that stands out as a beacon light in all the dark blundering and machination of that era. It is the Cordell Hull effort toward uninterrupted and free trade among free and friendly nations.

It was not sufficient to prevent the great calamity of war that engulfs us because it was not inaugurated until after the doctrine of aggression and selfishness, might makes right, culminating in international gangsterism, had gained too much momentum, but this program of reciprocal trade agreements was able to accomplish more than any diplomacy by bringing the democratic nations of the world closer together and finally uniting them against the enemies of free government and free trade. Especially has it blazed the trail for our good-neighbor policy in Latin-America, and today the reciprocal trade program points the way toward a lasting peace and friendship after this war is over.

Mr. Chairman, it is my humble opinion that we have under consideration today the most important question that could possibly come before us this session. Its importance is not because of

any immediate need for tariffs or trade agreements, for all of us know that during this World War international trade is either at a standstill between most countries, or artificially stimulated by the lend-lease program, but the very first post-war need of the world will be the immediate revival of world trade, indeed a revival of trade will be essential, and these reciprocal trade agreements offer the one hope of its accomplishment.

Without prosperous trade between nations any foundation for enduring peace will become precarious and ultimately destroyed, for the economic warfare caused by the continuous erection of trade barriers and tariff walls destroys trade, ruins production, employment, prices, values, and standards of life within nations, and is the most powerful factor of rivalry, dissension, and strife between nations.

Let us review for a few moments what has happened since the enactment of our last tariff law. The Hawley-Smoot Act was passed in 1930. It was a highly protective act, imposing high import-duty rates on more than 3,000 items; yet on its free list we find many items produced by our farmers and small industries, one such item being oil seeds and copra or coconut meat, from which vegetable oil is derived. The failure of this tariff act to protect American cottonseed, the source of half our cooking and table oil and oleomargarine, resulted in the decline in the price of cottonseed from 80 cents per bushel to less than 40 cents. Immediately after the passage of this act the nations of the world with whom we enjoyed a fine trade, began to retaliate by passing similar high tariff walls against us. Even Great Britain, a country that had for more than 2 centuries advocated free trade, passed a high tariff law and built trade barriers against us.

Under this high-tariff Smoot-Hawley Act our foreign trade immediately started declining, resulting in the piling up of surplus manufactured stocks and agricultural products, the closing down of factories, and unprecedented unemployment. By 1932, in only 2 years, our foreign trade had suffered a 70-percent decline from the 1929 level, and had reached the low figure of $2,934,000,000. Secretary Hull, long a member of this committee, had given years of his life to the study of world trade and commerce, and we were fortunate in having the right man at the right place He believed that as most of the world had already built high-tariff walls against American goods and products in retaliation for the Hawley-Smoot Act, it would be more beneficial to our commerce to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with these countries under the most-favored-nation policy, thereby inducing them to lower their tariff walls in exchange for like treatment by us, than to write a new general tariff law. You are familiar with what followed. In 1934 Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, empowering the President, through the State Department, acting with the Tariff Commission, to make these trade agreements for a 3-year period. This act was extended for another 3-year period in 1937, extended again in 1940, and is now up for extension again in 1943.

And now my friend who just preceded me talks about Congress not passing on this matter. This is the third time that Congress has passed on the reciprocal trade agreements, and the power given in the Trade Agreements Act is no different from the flexible policy placed in the Hawley-Smoot Act itself.

Reciprocal trade agreements have been made with 27 countries since 1934. Our foreign trade in 5 years increased from $2,934,000,000 in 1932 to $5,495,000,000 in 1939. More than half of the lost ground has been regained.

To those who say these treaties will have no effect on the future peace of the world, I would like to call their attention to the remarkable fact that of the 27 countries of the world with whom we have concluded these agreements none of them are at war with us, 16 of them are at our side as allies in this war, 6 have broken off relations with the Axis Powers and are cooperating with us in many ways and 4 are neutral. The other one, Finland—"tragic Finland," as Mr. Hull called her—is at war with one of our allies; she is not at war with us. The remaining 4 countries are neutral.

There has been some complaint of agricultural products coming in to compete with the products of American farmers, and the figures of their value might impress one at first sight, but when you analyze these figures you find that they include oil seeds and copra that come in duty-free under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act and not under any trade agreement, coffee, rubber, tea, hemp, and many items that are not competitive. When you deduct these items the figures are not so impressive. And then there is this fact that is overlooked by many of our people: If our American factories can be kept busy, American workmen drawing high American wages can buy our agricultural products. I always found that Georgia peaches sold best when unemployment was lowest. A white-collar worker will eat half a peach at breakfast with cream; a machinist or working man will buy a peck, and he and his wife and children consume them with delight in a day.

Another thing, we have so progressed in mass-volume manufacture that despite our high standard of wages we can compete with any country in the world in the low-cost manufacture of automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and many such items.

As most of the world's gold is already in America we must trade with other nations for their goods and products if we would sell them our own.

In the good old days when America produced most of the world's cotton, we could afford high tariffs, for cotton was "king," and its exportation guaranteed us a favorable trade balance for more than a century. But we no longer enjoy that cotton monopoly. We must find markets now for our cotton—in other words, we must compete with every other country that produces it.

Had you thought of this fact: For every passenger automobile exported from the United States, 62.4 pounds of lint cotton and 2 pounds of linters is sold. Each truck exported carries 86 pounds of lint cotton and 4 pounds of linters. Each separate tire exported carries an average of more than 5 pounds of lint cotton. Besides the cotton—manufactured cotton, not raw cotton—of course, there is the steel and all other things.

In this way, during the year 1939 more than 50,000 bales of high-grade cotton and 1,000 bales of linters found a market in our foreign sales of automobiles, trucks, and tires, and two-thirds of our automotive exports are to countries with whom we have trade agreements, all of whom gave us concessions on automobiles, trucks, parts, and accessories.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that no political issue is made of this subject. Let us not do grave damage to our country's prestige and world influence at this time. Let us not destroy the work of Cordell Hull, one of America's first statesmen.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, once again the administration resorts to high-sounding slogans in its efforts to secure passage of its "must" legislation without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," and apparently without regard to questions of its constitutionality.

Unfortunately, this entire trade program has been falsely advertised through slogans and high-pressure salesmanship as a cure-all since 1934. It has repeatedly failed on its merits and to live up to its slogans, because it has traveled under false colors. It has merit as a policy in the commercial and business field, and where truly beneficial to the contracting parties friendly relations will follow.

Thus in 1934 Congress was told these trade agreements would bring prosperity to our farmers and others; in 1937 they would preserve peace in the world; in 1940 they would keep us out of the war; and now the slogan in 1943 is that they will win the peace. All were ambitious programs.

Instead of bringing prosperity after 1934, the depression with its huge relief rolls, and the so-called farm program with benefit payments continued till the war boom; in 1937 instead of keeping the world in peace, we had a World War; shortly thereafter, in 1940, instead of keeping us out of the war, we entered. Whether the present slogan, a bait for votes, will succeed is problematical. Certain it is that if past performance is the criterion it will fail again. Certain, too, it is that unless there is full and complete honesty in our dealings with other nations, we will make enemies rather than friends. To the extent that these trade agreements and the method of their adoption misleads other nations into be-

lieving them to be an expression of our way of settling post-war problems, they are false, misleading, dishonest, and not worthy of this great country. The Congress and the Congress only must determine our post-war policies.

It is my opinion that no Member of this body subscribes to a belief that Congress should or could now delegate to a department of government the necessary authority to determine, fix, and announce to the world our post-war policy, thus seeking to bind this and future Congresses. And yet we border on that in this legislation, if Mr. Hull's statement to the committee is understood. He said, referring to this resolution, and I quote:

> What we do about it will be looked upon as a signpost pointing to the path they can expect us to follow.

We look further to determine that path and its pitfalls.

Mr. Hull is correct—the purpose of this general grant of power to the President is to mark a path for the post-war era. It is to be marked not by the people's chosen representatives but by political appointees. They will inform the world of our policy, of our method of handling foreign affairs, they will represent to our friendly neighbors that they can bind Congress. We know they cannot, and our misled nations now friendly will find that out to their disappointment and our mutual regret. Once 25 years ago another President sought to commit the Congress and the American people, with disastrous effect.

Again I quote Mr. Hull:

> Extension of the program without change will mean not only that we understand the kind of commercial relationships which from a purely business point of view, lead to our mutual well-being, but that we recognize the deeper implication of our great strength and commensurate responsibility for good or ill in the world.

Now, the first part of that statement referring to commercial relationship is of little or no significance today—for there simply is no foreign trade in the commercial sense. Business between nations is lease-lend, it is rationed, controlled, limited, directed, and otherwise restricted. A nation today buys elsewhere or borrows from us what it must have. Unrestricted and competitive international trade is closed for the duration.

The abnormal conditions brought about by a state of war furnish no guide for the coming days of peace and reconstruction.

But the latter part of Mr. Hull's statement that these trade agreements will be interpreted by the world to mean we, and I quote, "recognize the deeper implications of our great strength and commensurate responsibility for good or ill in the world," is significant.

Perhaps this is a proper statement of what our international policies should be in the post-war world. I think it is, but I do not know for Congress has not spoken. The implications to which Mr. Hull refers are the result of attempts to do by indirection those things Congress must eventually do directly.

And who can say what administrative policy will prevail in the future?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The trade program, as I understand it, is based upon the theory that we go out and buy friendship and export subsidies, and greatly reduce tariff rates.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That was announced as one of the major purposes. As I said earlier, we were originally told they were justified upon the basis of bringing prosperity here. They now incline to the belief that these agreements will help us win the peace.

Mr. KNUTSON. And we are the only ones who are big enough saps to believe it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The danger that a neighbor nation will make wrong implications and draw wrong conclusions from these trade treaties is very real and very great. If perchance the agreement is unduly favorable to us, and we were told "Yankee traders" make them, the implications will be that we are Uncle Shylock; if on the other hand we as usual are outtraded, the implications will be we are their Uncle Sap.

We can avoid in part the dangers and pitfalls in this field of international policy fixing relations to which these trade agreements have graduated, and at the same time retain and strengthen their benefits. We can do so by adopting the amendment which recognizes a right in Congress to stop any proposed trade agreement of which it does not approve.

Mr. Chairman, do the Members of Congress realize that under the terms of this act, a trade agreement binding on this country, a trade agreement implying our post-war policy, binding in the indefinite future, can be entered into—and that it can be done though every single Member of Congress disapproves. Surely in this year when representative government fights for its existence we will not abjectly surrender the people's rights.

Surely we will not deliberately tell the nations of the world that our post-war policies will be made known to them indirectly. Let us speak up, and approve or disapprove these policy-making agreements.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, I am not so conceited as to think that whatever I can add to this debate might change a single vote in this House. Nevertheless, I am constrained to tell you of an experience I had in this Capital City 25 years ago.

During the summer of 1918 I attended a convention here. A part of the program was a trip down the Potomac to Mount Vernon. As we sailed down the river I was seated alone on a remote part of the deck. A young man sat down beside me. Conversation soon convinced me that he was a stranger in these parts. I asked him where he was from—

"From Sidney, New South Wales, Australia," was his answer.

"And are you doing America in these wartimes?" I asked.

"I'm on my way home."

"On your way home from where?"

"From France."

"And were you in it?"

"Yes; I was in it for 2 years. Now I'm going home to attend to some business. Then I want to go back, for I want to be in at the finish."

"And when will the finish be?"

"When you have 2,000,000 men in the trenches."

He hesitated for a moment, then said:

"Oh, that the American people might realize the position they hold in the world. We were looking your way for help. Our eyes continually looked westward. We were hoping you would come, but feared you would not. Finally you came.

"You cannot imagine what it meant to our soldiers—the soldiers of England and of France—when we realized that you had come.

"You can't conceive of the improvement in our morale, of how our spirits were buoyed up, how our hearts rejoiced when we saw real American soldiers on the streets of France. It gave us renewed hope, renewed courage, and we fought as we had not fought for weeks. Then when you entered the trenches and began to fight side by side with our boys, there was no longer any question as to who would win this war. It will soon be over now."

Again he paused.

Then, his eyes flashing, he exclaimed, "If only America will realize her position when the war is over. Even now the world is looking this way in the hope that America will lead in making a lasting peace—such a peace as will make future wars impossible."

Then we landed at Mount Vernon and I became separated from my Australian friend. As we wended our way upward through the ravine, I was pondering over what the young man had said.

When we reached the tomb of the Father of his Country and we stood about with bowed heads, I do not know what the rest were thinking of, but as for myself, I just breathed a little prayer, and I said:

"O God, grant that America may live up to that which the world expects of her."

That prayer was not answered. Because it was not, we are now engaged in the Second World War.

History is repeating itself. Again the eyes of the world are looking this way. Will America be equal to the occasion this time?

My colleagues, today we are taking the second step. The first was when we voted to continue lend-lease. We were all agreed on that; we should take the second step with the same unanimity.

These pacts were made in good faith. The various nations accepted them in good faith. If we repudiate them now, even if we modify them now, the world

will say, "America is about to fail us again."

It will throw consternation into the hearts and souls of our allies. It will bring about discouragement, doubt, fear, and despair. No longer will the nations struggle on courageously and hopefully. Courage and hope will come to our adversaries. Indeed, the result may be that the war will be prolonged, perhaps lost. Do you say that the agreements have not proven a profitable investment? Let me remind you that the sacred promise of America cannot be measured in dollars and cents. I call upon you to stand by our promises, no matter what your opinion is of those who made the pacts. They are the sacred words of promise on the part of America. America cannot afford to repudiate them. If her lawmakers should do so, their act would spell chaos, the wreck of civilization, the end of justice and righteousness in the world.

Again I say this is the second step. Let us take it aright. Let us convince the world that this time America will not disappoint her allies, but will continue to join them in winning the war and in making a permanent, a blessed, a glorious peace.

Do you call this visionary? And I say a nation without vision will perish.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration a proposal to continue the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This act authorizes the President:

First. To enter into foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

Second. To proclaim such modifications of existing duties or other import restriction, or such additional import restrictions, or other continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article, as is appropriate to carry out agreements made.

The act provides, as a limitation on the authority:

> No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists.

The present proposal under consideration intends to extend the present trade agreements for another 3 years and to be effective unless terminated upon not more than 6 months' notice.

I think it should be made clear, and undoubtedly it is known to our good neighbors and others, that this very question has been the subject of many national political debates in this country, and in fact was for years a political question upon which our people divided themselves into the two major political parties. The Republican Party was known as the high-tariff party, the position of the Democratic Party has been one of from free trade to one of revenue for the support of the National Government.

I am willing to admit that in the early days of our history, when we were endeavoring to build an industrial nation, that the tariff was instrumental in protecting our infant industries and protected our workers from the cheap, low standard of living of the foreign workers of other nations and contributed a good deal to our present American standard of living. On the other hand I believe an unreasonably high protective tariff also worked to the disadvantage of our people in that it created competition in tariff prohibitions among many nations and did discourage peaceful and legitimate trade among the nations of the world.

With the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress delegated to the executive branch of the Government the right to negotiate trade pacts, enlarging the flexible provisions of the previous act, in that the President could modify tariffs not to exceed 50 percent, so that now, when the Congress of the United States authorizes the extension of the agreements as proposed in the resolution under discussion, it has nothing to say about it for another 3 years. Frankly, I believe that this method of tariff-making is superior to anything we have yet tried, but I do think the Congress of the United States should retain the power of veto. It is my understanding that such an amendment will be offered, and it is my intention to support it. Should that amendment fail of passage, I shall offer one of my own that I hope to have an opportunity to explain at a later time. Of course, if the amendment to which I refer is adopted, my amendment would be unnecessary.

It is the natural function of the executive branch of the Government to be concerned with problems affecting the whole Nation and determine its actions upon the question of what is best for the greatest number of its people. It may be argued that the present trade agreements do the greatest number the greatest good, and that may be a good argument, but we as a Congress cannot close our eyes to the conditions as they exist in our 435 congressional districts which we represent. I come from a district predominating in agriculture and mining, and as I look over the trade agreements, it is very apparent that the downward revision of the tariffs are on most of the farm products and other raw material we produce. This is true of many, many other districts and it simply means subjecting our people to the competition of commodities produced by farmers and workers from other countries whose general standard of living is much below that of our own. While we boast of our high standard of living, through recent years it has been discovered, to our amazement, the great number of low-income farm families and workers who receive and consume less than $600 a year. Truly they are ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed. Do we want to subject this portion of our population to a lower standard of living, or has it been the aim of this administration to raise their standard of living? I ask you, what class of people benefits most through these reciprocal trade agreements? Not the farmer, not the livestock interests, nor producers of commodities that are in direct competition with foreign imports.

To satisfy those who are affected most by trade agreements, they should be given an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of any trade pact they think may be disadvantageous to them, and the only way it can be expressed is through their representation in Congress. While I have great respect for and confidence in the present Secretary of State, I think the best interests of all our people would be best served if the Congress should reserve unto itself the right to express its view when the agreements are up for final approval.

In taking this position I share no isolationist view and I do not think this point of view should be interpreted as such. No one could successfully accuse me of being an isolationist. I campaigned for the League of Nations after the last war and during my time here in Congress I have voted for every measure to prepare our country for war, and have consistently supported the war effort before and since Pearl Harbor. I still believe we should and will cooperate with other nations, both in our trade agreements and in preserving the peace. However, I believe all our friends and neighbors are more concerned at this very moment in successfully ending the war than they are concerned with any amendment that we consider necessary to safeguard our own interests. This is no departure from our way of doing these things; in fact, it is the long-accepted democratic way under our form of government. I believe this is a safeguard which should be maintained and I contend it can function within the framework of our good-neighbor policy, as well as in the framework of the "four freedoms."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. If it be true that we have surrendered the American market to maintain world good will, then we are in a bad way, are we not?

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman is right.

In reading the report of our distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, and also reading the speech of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] they seem to make a considerable point of the fact that if this resolution were defeated or amended as I have indicated, it would be interpreted by the other countries that we were antagonistic to the good-neighbor policy. Of course, I do not want to see the resolution defeated as that may be interpreted in the wrong light, but to permit the Congress to discharge its duty should not be questioned or misinterpreted by anyone. They seem to take the view that the good-neighbor policy only works one way, indicating that we need the friendship of everyone else, but that other nations do not need our friendship. I say it is a two-way affair and perhaps the rest of the nations need our friendship, help, and sympathy just as much as we need theirs. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that of the nations with whom we signed trade agreements, that the vast majority of those countries required their agreements should be approved by

their representative bodies? We do not complain about that.

During the past few years much has been said here and in the press bemoaning the fact that Congress has abdicated and surrendered its prerogative to the executive branch of the Government. Now the contention is, and evidently admitted by Members of the House, that the Congress cannot be trusted when it comes to dealing with trade treaties. The answer to this argument is that the Congress has definite, delegated responsibilities which it is their duty to perform. It also still represents the people and if it fails to do that, there should be a new Congress.

What has been the record of the people of this country in cooperating with the people of other nations? In the past when there has been pestilence, famine, flood, or war, no people on earth have demonstrated their faith and charity toward suffering people as have the people of the United States, regardless of the race or country. Our people have never neglected their Christian responsibility. When a great war was on before, we fed the hungry, spent our fortunes and our blood in a common effort to stop a war lord of that day. When victory was won, we buried our dead and came home asking no reparations, no territory, but only that peace would come to the world and that our democracy might continue.

The criticism is made that the legislative branch failed to follow through in cooperating in the establishment of a lasting peace. We are aware of this mistake and it is up to the people to see that it does not happen again. So long as we have our present form of government, our legislative and executive branches of the Government will continue to come and go at the express will of the people, and while some may doubt it, the people still rule. So I say in conclusion, that an established peace or a trade agreement is no more secure than the will of the people.

Our great Nation, in cooperation with our friends and neighbors, is now engaged in the task of defeating our common enemies and we will spend our money and our blood to build a better world. When this is accomplished, we know that our country will have played its part in winning the war and will be one of the chief cornerstones upon which a lasting peace will be built. But if there is lack of "mutual faith and confidence—one people with another and likewise one government with another," the peace structure will be built upon the sand "and when the rain descends and the floods come, and the winds blow and beat upon it, it will fall and great will be the fall of it."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I shall use the 5 minutes. I feel personally very strongly that there should be no amendment to the existing resolution. In the first place, and I say this particularly to my colleagues in my own party, I believe that its renewal, so far as the trade situation is concerned in the next few years, is purely academic. I think every one of us realizes that this great country will not be able to produce enough either through agriculture or manufacture to take care of the needs of the world during the next few years after the war, and I am not alone in that conviction. I have many letters supporting my theory, from important members of the Republican Party, as well as the Democratic Party. I have, for instance, a letter from former Governor Landon, who was at one time the titular leader of the Republican Party, and still I hope is an important influence therein, in which he advocates that for the present no amendments and no tampering with the trade treaties be made. I have, and this is important, a letter from the national chairman of the Republican Party, who also advocates the same thing. He points out as many of my good friends have pointed out, that the treaties might be perfected, and, I, as a Republican, refuse at this time to admit that within the next 3 years the Republican Party will not be in the executive branch of the Government, which will have something to do with the drawing of the treaties.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the gentleman would read the letter that he received from the chairman of the Republican Party.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. That is my intention. I will read the full letter because it contains arguments which have been used on my side of the House, which are recognized by the national chairman, Mr. Spangler:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BALDWIN: I am happy to have your letter of recent date in which you enclose copy of your speech which you gave in Philadelphia on Saturday, February 13. You covered your subject in a very thoughtful way

I support the traditional policy of our party in reference to reciprocal trade as initiated by Blaine, McKinley, and President Taft. Their ideas, as I understand it, of reciprocal trade agreements were based on a reasonable protective tariff as a background. On the other hand, many of the reciprocal trade agreements as initiated by Mr. Hull and Vice President WALLACE entirely lose track of the idea of protection by basing their treaties on the idea of free trade.

A real investigation as to the trade agreements made by Mr. Hull from 1935 to the outbreak of the war indicates many of them were not helpful and they certainly did not have one of the results proclaimed by their sponsors, the preservation of peace throughout the world. Since the outbreak of the war, with trade practically eliminated, the subject of these treaties has become a moot question and it is my personal opinion that with the situation as it is we should not attempt to disturb them, at least during the war and sometime thereafter. This, I understood, was in accord with your idea as expressed in our pleasant conversation of a few days ago.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. SPANGLER.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know that no foreign agreement is necessarily perfect. The intent in this act is obvious. If it has not always been followed, the general result has been excellent and the proof is the increase in our foreign trade. We cannot get away from the foreign trade. We fought war after war for the freedom of the seas because we know it is important to us. There are others who can develop that theory even better than I can. The purpose of this act is to extend foreign markets for the products of the United States. I want to say here, and I can say it with some knowledge because I have traveled in most parts of the world, I do not know a country in the world where American products, if they can get into that part of the world free of duty, cannot outsell any other product made by anyone, because we can make them better and we can grow them better here. It is the result of the high tariff policy, the result of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, that brought about these tariff walls. It is my deep and sincere personal conviction that if we amend this resolution, which applies to reciprocal trade treaties, we may well be losing the peace for ourselves, and certainly we will be establishing a situation which may produce further wars and more loss of American lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute

Of course, it is very interesting to know how Mr. Spangler feels, but, after all, he took great pains to say that he was speaking in his personal capacity.

There are many of us who believe that notwithstanding the fact that we are at war we have some obligations to the home folks to maintain the American standard of living as high as is possible under this administration, which God knows is not very high.

Of course, Mr. Spangler has a perfect right to feel as he does, just as the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], an able Democrat, who feels exactly the opposite way, or the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], another able Democrat, and almost the entire delegation from a State in the deep South. On this preponderance, I am perfectly willing to rest our case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to see how this debate cuts across party lines. In reality, it should do so, because what we are concerned with here is an economic question, which knows no partisanship and is not confined by party lines.

I happen to be one of those who believes that the resiprocal trade agreements have not worked for the best interests of the people of the United States. I recall that comparing the year 1934, the year in which this act was first passed and became effective, with the year 1938, the last normal year preceding the war in Europe, and excepting those countries at war or preparing for

war, whose trade was consequently abnormal, the percentage of increase of exports to non-trade-agreement countries, as well as the total increase, was greater than to those countries with which we had trade agreements. I have previously put into the RECORD the figures, in a speech which I made last week, but in order that we may have them here, I shall repeat them now.

With the 16 trade-agreement countries with whom we had trade agreements in 1938, our exports increased 58 percent, that is, 58 percent over what they were in 1934 in the depths of the depression.

With the non-trade-agreement countries, excepting those at war or preparing for war, the increase was 61.2 percent.

The total increase in dollars amounted to $421,068,000 with the 16 trade-agreement countries, whereas our exports to the non-trade-agreement countries, excepting those at war or preparing for war, in the same period of time, increased $553,666,000. Faced with those statistics—and they come from the Department of Commerce of the United States, and they have been submitted to and verified by the Tariff Commission—I do not see how anyone can say that the trade agreements have helped in world recovery. That is what, according to their proponents, they were originally intended to do, but they failed in that purpose.

Then we came along to the period of time when they were to be renewed. I happened to be a Member of this House when the second renewal was under consideration. I recall very distinctly it was said, "If we will but renew these trade agreements, we will keep the United States out of war." Well, it failed in that purpose.

The trouble with these trade agreements has been that they are not, as their name indicates, reciprocal. The reason they are not reciprocal is that we do not require from the countries with whom we have thes agreements equal advantages to our commerce in those countries that we give to them in our country. That is the only basis of reciprocity. These trade agreements have been used for the purpose of gradually sliding the United States to a free-trade basis.

We all know what the record of Secretary Hull was in this House before he went to the United States Senate and thence to the office of Secretary of State. He was a convinced free-trader. I have no quarrel with any man's sincere convictions, and I know that Secretary Hull was sincere, but he has remained sincere, and he is using the reciprocal trade-agreement law and the authority given under it to gradually slide the United States on to what is approaching a free-trade basis.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I shall not yield until I have finished.

Now, that has been the way the thing has operated, and as a result we have lost here in our own markets a tremendous amount, hundreds of millions of dollars, to say the very least. That would be a conservative estimate.

For instance, I am informed, and I have since had it confirmed, that in the trade agreement with Belgium, entered into in 1935, we reduced the tariff on steel fabricated articles to such an extent that Belgian steel took the markets of the United States along our seaboards clear up to the line where increasing freight rates leveled off the difference in the cost of production between Belgian and American steel products.

That line was drawn not very far east of Pittsburgh, the center of the steel industry of the United States. I am told, and I have since confirmed it, that you could not buy a square yard of American woven wire fence in the whole State of Florida because all of Florida could be invaded by this cheap Belgian steel from both its east and west coasts, and consequently American wire fence could not be sold anywhere in the State of Florida in competition with the Belgian product.

What else has happened? I represent a district which is the center of the pottery industry of the United States. Many of our potteries were, in the recent past, closed down or their product greatly reduced due to the fact that we cut the tariff on pottery by the trade agreements with Czechoslovakia, France, and Britain to such an extent that we could not produce that pottery and sell it in East Liverpool, Ohio, in my district, the center of the pottery industry of America, as cheaply as, for instance, the Japanese, who got the benefits of every one of these reductions granted to other countries, could manufacture their pottery, transport it across the Pacific, pay the railroad freight to East Liverpool, Ohio, and sell it to the merchants in East Liverpool. Now if that policy is for the good of America, if that increases employment, if that gives productive use for capital, if that is building America, then I do not know what these terms mean, because I say to you, my friends, that is tearing down America, it is creating unemployment, it is destroying industries, and it is altogether an unsafe and unsound policy to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, just let me give you an indication of how inaccurate and erroneous the statements of the gentleman from Ohio were. He said that we had lost more concessions than we had ever gained. I just want to say that the fact is that we received more concessions in one trade agreement than we have ever granted to all countries of the world.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, if I had voted against the initiation of this Trade Agreement Act in 1934 and had voted against its extension in 1937, and again in 1940, I would nevertheless today, in consideration of the situation in which I find my country, decline to vote against it or to kill it by amendments. I do not think it is an idle thing that you gentlemen on the left of the aisle have heard read a letter from the chairman of your party in substance appealing to you to remember that this country is in a great war, and that for the primary reason of the security of our men at the front you ought not to undertake to kill this agreement of good will among the nations of this earth on this occasion. I am not a free trader; neither do I believe in a high protective tariff, but I do not conceive it to be at all informing that I split hairs on those considerations in this time when you and I sit in the Halls of this Congress while our men and boys are fighting upon the battle fronts of the world and many of them going down to death. I conceive it to be the duty of every Member of this House to forget the minor things and to remember the highly important consideration that we want good will, we want to retain good will of all our allies. I do not apprehend that they will at once turn against us if we fail here to show our appreciation of their part in this great struggle for liberty and freedom which means so much to us, but I do suggest that it is very helpful that we show to them that we continue to be and, more than ever, propose to be the friends of those who are in the struggle with us for our very lives, and our liberty, and our institutions.

As we view the world today, the theme of international cooperation becomes more impressive, perhaps, at this time than ever before. If we really wish to make sure that another world conflict after this war is not to be ahead of us, this international cooperation must surely be uppermost in our minds.

I cannot say why we forget, but too often we act as though we did not believe that scriptural warning, "No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself." It may be that we would be more definitely impressed if the Scripture read, "No man can live to himself, and no man dieth unto himself." The same God who created men in the United States and North America created the men in Great Britain and France, and India, and China, and Russia and Poland, the Lowland Countries, South and Central America, and in the uttermost parts of the world.

The reason Germany, Japan, and Italy must die is because they deny the brotherhood of man. They are in opposition to the good-neighbor doctrine; they are opposed to cooperative effort; reciprocal benefits have no appeal to them. Therefore, these governments must die.

When the day of our victory comes, we and other nations will have the choice of two courses to follow—extreme nationalism, growing rivalries, selfishness, with jealousies and hatreds, on the one hand, and on the other, increased international cooperation in every legitimate field, the former to result in another devastating war, the latter in at least the reasonable hope of peace and good will.

Can we not understand that an honest determination on our part that India and China, our South American neighbors, and all others the world over shall

enjoy a higher living standard in contribution to their greater happiness will, in its accomplishment, be to us as bread cast upon the waters?

Concretely, is it not to our advantage that instead of India's lying on beds of straw, they shall be helped by us to enjoy the comfort of springs and mattresses, lifted from the ground and placed on steads of proper height, making for a stronger body and a happier soul? This has its application the world over.

I am persuaded that this is the most propitious time we have ever had to teach, and with the hope of successful result, the value of the doctrine of reciprocal aid and helpful cooperation. We have the necessity of eliminating only three obstinate and unwilling pupils—Germany, Italy, and Japan. This we must do, then; not neglect to take a man's part in teaching and practicing the doctrine of peace on earth and good will among men.

It is not fanciful to say that looking into the post-war period two broad alternatives face us—one, a world based on economic nationalism and autocracy, a Hitler world; the other, a world based upon international cooperation, with sensible mutual helpfulness—not a hopeless, selfish isolationism, but reciprocal aid, with understanding.

The original and continuing purpose of the act of 1934, which has been by Congress continued each 3 years since, was to expand foreign trade for the products of the United States, and to create added employment and added income in this country; this to be done by a process of negotiations and agreements, by which this country would obtain reductions in foreign restrictions against American products and the granting of similar reductions in American restrictions against the products of foreign lands. They are trade agreements, so ordered as to be most helpful to each of the agreeing parties.

The trade-agreements program is not only a thoroughly tested instrument but also a flexible one.

I stop to observe that one of the friends on my side of the aisle, I think, makes a mistake in assuming that the trade agreements cannot be amended if we do not amend this act. In that we understand he is entirely in error, because these are matters to be determined from time to time by those to whom we have committed this power and authority, the right to make these agreements and to modify them within the limitations which we have provided as the exigencies of the case may require from time to time.

To you on my left, who from time to time have shown a disposition of spite, with constant interference with our President in his every effort to provide for our country, I profess that if, in an unguarded moment, the people shall decide to elect a Republican to the Presidency in 1944, I will not indulge in a program of interference to his efforts, but will help him all I can.

And, too, let me remind you who, for some reason, or on some pretext, manifest an unaltering dislike for our President, that the President does not alone make these agreements, nor does the Secretary of State alone do so. The Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission, who is Chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information; the officers and staff of the Tariff Commission; the Department of Commerce; the Department of Agriculture; the Treasury Department provide, together, the knowledge, the figures, and the business judgment that lie at the basis of the program; and these trade agreements are reciprocal and made on our part by patriotic Americans.

This subject Reciprocal Trade Agreements cannot be made a political or party question. It is too sacred. I would quote from the Republican Party platform of 1932 on the subject:

> The historic American policy known as the most-favored-nation principle has been our guiding program, and we believe that policy to be the only one consistent with the full development of international trade.

This means that we will not adopt the narrow, selfish and dangerous policy of exclusive preference for exclusive preferences in return.

Trade agreements, under the act, have been made with 27 countries. All but 4 were made before Pearl Harbor. Of the 27 countries involved, 16 are among our allies in the war. Of the 11 remaining, 6 have broken off relations with our enemies and are helping us in many ways. Four of the remaining 5 are neutral—Argentina, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey. Poor Finland. She would like to be neutral or on our side.

With others of the United Nations we have as yet no trade agreements. We have none, among the British countries, with Australia or India or New Zealand or the Union of South Africa, nor, in Europe, with Greece or Norway or Poland or Yugoslavia, nor, in this hemisphere, with Panama or the Dominican Republic, nor with our great friend in Asia, the Chinese Republic, nor with that great and powerful ally whose resources reach from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean, and from the Black Sea to the Arctic, the Soviet Union. We do not discriminate against the products of these countries; we accord them most-favored-nation treatment and expect the same from them. But we have not yet sat down with them individually and in detail and signed the special list of mutual commitments which can make our trade most fruitful to us both. Some day we shall do that with many of them, perhaps even with all. Those days will be good days for the United States, and for the world. I have assumed, you see, that the act under which this can be done will be renewed.

This is no longer a question on which Republicans and Democrats, as such, have different views. It is no longer a question even chiefly of high tariff against low. It is a question of the fundamental basis and direction of our foreign policy, upon which we are first of all Americans. When we have talked over and settled that fundamental basis and direction we shall know where we stand on the details.

If I should think it wise to enter into debate as to offering restrictive amendments, providing the requirement that any or all trade agreements should be subject to Congress' approval, I might urge that if we do this, we might as well do away with the Reciprocal Trade Act and return to logrolling with all its sectional considerations and harm following. But we are at war. How long we shall continue to be I do not know, nor do you.

Our position, our strength and power, bring the responsibility that we shall be in the forefront in pointing the way to victory and a better world following. Here is an outstanding opportunity to show the world that we are great or that we are little and selfish. I think the Washington Post told the story when it said:

> It is not Mr. Hull, but the history of the last 20 years that has made the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act a test case.

It must be continued, and without restrictions, to make our action valuable in the hour of stress and danger. The subject is too sacred to bring into it considerations of party advantage, but I warn that any party which undertakes to scuttle this ship of state for deemed favorable party position has placed too low an estimate on the intelligence and patriotism of the American voters.

Not as a party man, but as an American, I beg you to vote unanimously for this bill, and without reckless amendments.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in considering the wisdom of a renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act, I think it is highly important that the significance of this act with regard to our fundamental foreign policy should be given special emphasis. This act is simply one phase of our over-all relations to the other nations of the world; and if we exclude from these considerations every element other than the direct effect upon individual citizens of this country, we will not get a true picture nor arrive at a sound judgment. The fundamental consideration is, of course, our own welfare, but our self-interest must be enlightened and must look to the future rather than the immediate present if we are to make true and lasting progress.

The advocates of a high-tariff policy, who oppose this act, generally argue that this country became strong because of high tariffs and, therefore, we must continue high tariffs. This conclusion is not justified by this line of reasoning. In view of the enormous changes that have occurred during the last 30 years, practices which may have been valid 30 years ago probably are as out of date as the one-horse shay. What we are primarily interested in, especially in economic matters, is not what was successful 50 or 100 years ago but what will be successful in the next 50 or 100 years.

It may be admitted that during the youth of this Nation, while we were developing our agriculture and our industrial system, high-tariff protection was a

beneficial policy. It is analogous to the care and protection that is necessary for the education and preparation of our children for adult life. But after the nation or the child has reached maturity it does not follow that the continuation of the protection or coddling is beneficial. On the contrary, it is more likely to induce inefficiency and degeneration of character. This Nation has surely reached that stage of industrial maturity when the solicitous and tender care of the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy is no longer necessary for continued prosperity. We all recognize, of course, that consideration must be given to the extreme differences in cost of production, depreciated currencies, and other elements, which unduly interfere with fair international competition. The reciprocal trade agreements provide safeguards against these conditions. No one is advocating absolute free trade.

As I said before, this act should be continued as a part of our foreign policy. Since 1920 we have conscientiously pursued a policy of isolation from the rest of the world. High tariffs are consistent with that policy. But in view of our present war, it seems to me that we must admit that isolationism is an unsound, an unrealistic policy. Having failed in this policy, I cannot believe that we will persist in our folly. Even a dog usually changes his habits after the second kick.

I believe that the people of this country have learned by this second kick that we must give up our isolationism and participate actively in an effort to prevent wars in the future. While I do not agree that post-war international cooperation will be completely wrecked by amendments to this act, yet I do think such amendments might well obstruct and make more difficult the economic and political reconstruction after this war. It is going to be difficult enough without this added burden.

The greatest effect of a substantial change in this act at this time would be to make it more difficult to persuade our allies that we intend to cooperate with them after this war. Such action may very well be interpreted as an indication that this Congress is still isolationist and has learned nothing from the experience of two world wars. This interpretation will certainly not be weakened by the fact that some of the strongest opponents to the bill in its present form are the outstanding isolationists of the pre-war era. The same men who violently opposed preparedness for the war and who strongly supported the neutrality legislation. This coincidence lends considerable color to the interpretation suggested by supporters of the act.

When we consider that during the war our foreign trade is largely subordinated to the necessities of war and that, on the whole, there is a great shortage of consumer goods in this country, I think it is clear that no material harm can result to our industry from a renewal of the act for 3 years. On the other hand, no one can deny that any substantial restriction on the act certainly will raise doubts as to our good intentions in the minds of our friends. I think we need these friends not only to win the war but to win the peace, so I hope the act will be renewed without amendment.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if we keep faith with the men who are fighting this war, we have got one primary job to do, and that is to lay the basis insofar as it lies within the power of this Congress to do it for the future peace of the world. There are, I know, people who say that cannot be done. To them I would only reply that when mankind is confronted with things that must be done for the sake of the survival of the race, God has somehow put something in us to enable us to do the tasks, even though they may appear impossible.

Even more important than consideration of the machinery of enforcing peace is the removal of the causes of international conflict. In the first place, I think most people will agree that dynamic as the slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor" is for fighting this war, when it comes to a consideration of the course to be followed by our own Nation and other nations after the war, it will be even more important to remember the Japanese excursion into Manchuria, to remember the conquest of Ethiopia, and to remember Hitler's march into the Rhineland. In other words, one thing that will be essential will be the means of preventing aggression from ever getting started again. In the next place, I think it is of great importance to consider what true freedom for the great peoples throughout the world really means. For one thing, freedom for the Chinese people means the withdrawal of all extraterritorial rights, not only kicking the Japanese out of their land, but also the withdrawal of all extraterritorial rights on the part of other people. True freedom for any nation any place in the world necessarily implies the opportunity for that nation of the fullest and best balanced economic and industrial development of which its people are capable.

I believe after this war is over that we will see much less of a distinction between some nations on the one hand which are industrial and exploitive nations, and nations on the other hand which are simple agricultural nations supplying only the opportunity for markets and sources of raw material. But if we are to do our part in assisting the nations of Latin America, for example, or the nations in other parts of the world, in achieving a better balanced economy, then two things, it seems to me, are absolutely essential for us to do ourselves. For unless we do them our people will still fear the economic effects of the industrial development of other nations.

First, we must make certain that our own people are enabled to consume in proportion to their ability to produce. I have talked about that a good many times and I am not going to do so today. Suffice it to say that a truly constitutional and scientific monetary system is essential to its accomplishment. The second thing that is necessary is the establishment and promotion of a truly mutually advantageous trade between the peoples of the world.

Development of international trade is not a solution to the problems of the peoples of the world but it is indeed one of the necessary elements in such a solution. For without it there is bound to recur world rivalry and conflict between militarily powerful nations attempting to stake out for themselves areas in the world where they can artificially control trade and commerce and assure themselves of raw material to the exclusion of other peoples and take for themselves the major share of the markets thereof. The only alternative to such a situation is the development of a trade and commerce which will be of two-way advantage to those engaged in it.

I have always been opposed as much as I am to anything else in the world to the export of capital out of a country. What I mean is this: I regard as positively dangerous the device whereby surplus capital within our Nation, instead of remaining within our Nation for its development, is taken by its owners to some other country, between which and our country high barriers of tariff exist. Then this capital builds in that country mills or factories, taking advantage of cheaper labor in that country, exploiting that cheap labor, enhancing the profit of a few individuals while at the same time underselling the very people of their own country. I believe that mutually advantageous foreign trade with reduced tariff barriers is the answer to that problem. For it removes one of the reasons for such activities.

It is with these ideas in mind that we must approach the problem of the reciprocal trade agreement program. Before I do so, I would like to give just a little historical background for our thought.

Immediately after the First World War, with the world, particularly the United States, confronted with certain problems that had to do with the increased industrialization of some of the nations, the United States found herself a great creditor nation for the first time in history, whereas before that she had been a debtor nation all of her existence. Under these circumstances it seemed to us important to maintain our foreign trade. But how did we attempt to do it through the period of the twenties? Well, we attempted to do it by lending money, a lot of which was based on foreign-bond sales in the United States, which eventually proved worthless to the investor.

These foreign loans ran on an average about $1,000,000,000 per year, practically none of which was ever repaid to us; in other words, we were giving goods away. That is one way to have exports. It is not a very good one, I think.

Subsequently, in order to induce trade, and to maintain exports, without corresponding imports, we bought all kinds of gold. I have heard many Members rise on this floor and complain about the purchase of that gold. But, remember always that the purchase of that gold was to keep up the program of main-

taining a high level of exports without a balance of trade.

In addition to this, however, following the crash of 1929, the trade barriers of many nations were raised. Our own were increased by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, to the very highest they had ever been in the history of the United States. The trade of the United States fell from nine and a half billion dollars in 1929 to a mere $2,270,000,000 in 1934. If you were to plot the curve, of imports and exports, you would find they parallel one another in this decline. Both went down together.

I am not undertaking to say that the depression was caused by the decline in our foreign trade, but I do say that these enormous tariff barriers, raised not only by our Nation but by other nations, were one of the chief obstacles standing in the way of recovery.

In 1934, what to me was a truly great thing happened. In the midst of the situation I have described, the United States of America stepped forward and said that she was ready to take steps that would result in increasing the exchange of goods between the nations. It was this Nation that took the leadership in that situation which, I believe, was of tremendous consequence. In 1934 the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed by Congress and put into effect. This is the step to which I have reference.

The results of this program were the steady increase of trade of the United States with other nations, particularly those with whom reciprocal trade agreements were entered into.

Our exports to Canada, on the whole our chief customer, increased 142 percent, from a low point in the early thirties, before the agreement was entered into, to a high point in 1939.

Employment for workers in industries, those engaged in production of goods, was also affected by the trade agreements, with an increase of from 20 percent to 200 percent in the same period.

So far as some of the products of the far West are concerned, in the case of citrus fruits, as a result of the trade agreements, exports to Canada and Great Britain increased by about 50 percent.

For reasons which I have already suggested economic recovery was slow. This was due primarily to our faulty system for creating and distributing buying power in our country. But by no stretch of imagination can this be used as an argument to prove that the handling of our foreign-trade policy through reciprocal trade agreements was not far superior to the old method of passing tariff laws through the Congress with several thousand items involved, and with every special interest attempting to get as high duties as it could for its particular product. As a result of this war this Nation will be overwhelmingly the creditor to many other great nations of the world. Only by means of balanced trade program will it ever be possible for the nations of the world to square their accounts with us. Furthermore, there will be tremendous need for products of American industry and agriculture, to which I have previously referred.

A number of points of misunderstanding seem to have risen in connection with this program. For example, it is argued that the most-favored-nations clause is a bad thing. I would like to point to the fact that the most-favored-nations clause coming in connection with this program is a means of defense against bilateral trade agreements between two other foreign countries in connection with which agreements our own trade would be discriminated against. But under the most-favored-nations clause we have a defense against such action; we can always insist that we are given the same benefits under such agreements that are extended to other nations, and that our goods are not discriminated against, and also that we are given full advantage of any benefits that are granted as between the two nations making the agreement. For instance, in the case of Canada, as a result of the application of this clause, against which so much has been said, we have received benefits of reduction on 700 items.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Because of the fact that Canada, before she made the agreement with us, had a trade agreement with Great Britain under which there was marked discrimination against our products. But since the trade agreement went into effect, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we have received reductions, as I said, on 700 items.

Nor again is it here proposed to completely abolish all import duties. The proposal is not made, nor is it implied in this program.

It is said that the Executive can reduce the tariff duties under the reciprocal trade agreements program. He can—by 50 percent. But the power of the Executive is precisely as great and no greater than that provided in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which gave the Executive the power to decrease tariff rates by 50 percent. So that any argument made against that provision in the reciprocal trade agreements program will apply equally and with precisely the same effect against the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, because there again the Executive was given this same power.

The truth about the business is that, so far as I have been able to discover in my studies of the question, the executives of most of the important nations of the world customarily make agreements of this sort with other nations, and do it on the basis of executive agreements.

Furthermore, case after case has been brought before the courts throughout our history to test whether or not agreements of this sort require ratification by the Senate. I do not know of a single such case that ever was decided to the effect that the Executive had exceeded his power in making such an agreement.

I think it important that we distinguish between the making of an agreement which applies only to the question of tariff rates, on the one hand, and a treaty, which applies to large considerations, on the other.

In conclusion, may I say that although many Members have stated that they do not like to have it suggested that the action of Congress on this bill will have an important effect on the attitude of other nations, nevertheless we cannot alter facts, and the facts are that our action here on this bill will be regarded throughout the world as an indication of what the general course will be that America proposes to follow. I believe that for this Congress to pass this bill without serious amendment will be regarded, to put the matter constructively, by the nations with whom we are fighting this great war as an indication that the United States of America proposes to live in the world with them, to attempt to work out economic as well as political problems after the war with them—a thing which was not even considered after the First World War—and that we do recognize that as a great exporting as well as a great importing nation this Nation is ready to take its place in the future alongside the other nations with whom we are now struggling. It seems me that that is perhaps the most important consideration that comes before us in connection with this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we are all interested in improving the standard of living of the people in the other countries of the world, but the gentleman knows that virtually the same persons and the same families and the same corporations who owned the resources of the world at the time the last peace was negotiated are still the owners of them. Can the gentleman figure out any way so that when trade is revived after this war the benefits going to the owners of these resources will trickle down to the people, so that the rank and file will get the benefit of them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly can. I can give the gentleman a whole program to do that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to hear the gentleman on that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think we ought to have a really sound system of taxation based all the way down the line on the basis of ability to pay. I think we must establish a monetary system whereby the volume of money needed to maintain a full home market can be brought into circulation without incurring debt. I think we ought to broaden our social-security system until it includes a national old-age pension, provision for widowed mothers and little children, disability, health, and accident insurance, and a Nation-wide nutrition program for school children. I think we must enforce the antitrust laws of this country more vigorously and effectively than we have ever done before. I think

we have to be alive to the danger of international cartels. I am glad the committee adopted the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] on that point. I could go on speaking in answer to the gentleman for some time but my time is up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] may be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have before us House Joint Resolution 111, providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act which expires on June 12 for a period of 3 years. This act was pushed through Congress by the administration in 1934. The administration had a top-heavy majority in the House and Senate. This act took away from Congress its constitutional powers under article I, section 8, to levy and collect taxes and fix the duties and tariffs on imports, and placed this power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. The administration insists that the Congress renew this act without the slightest amendment or change in any respect. The Congress was told when the act was passed that it would expand our foreign markets for our commodities. The results were just the opposite. When the act was passed we had a favorable trade balance of $478,000,000. By January 1, 1937, the trade balance in favor of the United States had been cut down to less than $35,000,000, and for the first 6 months of 1937 we had a trade balance of $200,000,000 against our country and in favor of foreign countries. There is no telling how much in the red our country would have gone on foreign-trade balances against the United States but for the opening up of the Jap-Chinese war.

In 1937 we began shipping hundreds of millions of dollars annually in oil, gas, scrap iron, steel, and other munitions of war and supplies to Japan, and we continued these enormous shipments of war supplies to Japan until the early summer of 1941. In fact we furnished Japan more than 53 percent of all her war supplies, and we bought hundreds of millions of dollars of gold from Japan for which we paid her $35 per ounce under the Devaluation Act put through Congress by the administration. The market value of this gold was about $21 an ounce. By this operation, we paid Japan hundreds of millions of dollars in bonuses. All in all, we helped to finance and build up the Army, Navy, and other defenses of Japan, and in about 1938 we began to ship great quantities of scrap iron, oil, gas, steel, and other munitions of war to Italy and Germany, and now our Democratic friends boast of this foreign trade as being brought about by the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman said that our exports were reduced during 1934 and 1935.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not yielding for a speech. I have very little time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the gentleman if he has read the minority report submitted on February 16, 1940, which shows that the exports increased 41.1 percent during that period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I was talking about your agricultural exports, the things that we are deeply concerned about.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman will see that the exports increased 41.1 percent.

Mr. KNUTSON. War materials, of course.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It did not increase in 1934, in 1935, 1936, or 1937, but when the countries across the sea began to believe and see that they were about to be involved in a great war, then that export you are talking about started—started in 1937, when we had wiped out the balance of trade in favor of the United States, and it was then we began to ship millions and millions of dollars worth of oil and steel and scrap iron to Japan. And it went on in that way.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Wait a moment. We began to ship those war materials to Japan, to Italy, to Germany, to France, and to Great Britain. That is where you get your increase.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The figures for the years that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has just referred to should be written in tears and blood.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No. I believe one of the reasons why the administration embarked on the shipping of that oil, scrap steel, and gasoline to Japan was because our balance of trade was wiped out under the reciprocal trade agreements, and we were looking for trade, so that the shortcomings of the trade agreements would not be laid bare to the American people, and as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] says, every ton, every shipment that we sent to Japan we ought to shed tears for. God only knows what it has cost us and the world to have that bit of foreign trade that you are now claiming credit for. We ought to be ashamed of it because without it, Japan could not have overrun China, and without it, Japan could not have taken charge of the great Pacific area, and run us out of the Philippines—all for this trade that you are now bragging about, that amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was that trade that made Pearl Harbor possible.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Absolutely. So, in peacetime your trade agreements have not added to our foreign trade. Now we are told, renew them, and that will mean that we will insure a peaceful world after the war. In 1936 and 1940, when everybody knew that the Reciprocal Trade Act had not increased our foreign trade, the administration and Mr. Hull boasted that this act would keep us out of war, and in 1936 it was boasted that this act had contributed to the peace of the world, and it was urged by Mr. Hull and others in 1940 that this act had kept us out of war and would continue to keep our country out of war, but, like most predictions of the administration, we were doomed to disappointment. The world and this country found itself in the greatest war of all history. Now, with this record, it is insisted that we must renew this act another 3 years in order to promote a post-World War program and promote the peace of the world after the war. It is insisted that we must not change a single word in this act—we must not cross a "t" or dot an "i" and if we do it will be construed as an unfriendly act by our allies in this war and that we are unwilling to cooperate with other countries.

Last year Great Britain expended $22,500,000,000, Russia about $15,000,000,000, and China about $5,000,000,000 to carry on the war. We spent more than $75,000,000,000. Great Britain has planned to spend $20,500,000,000 this year. The President has asked us to spend more than $110,000,000,000. The American people are paying higher taxes than the people of Great Britain, Russia, or China. If you will look at the recent report of the Treasury Department, you will observe that, although we have paid enormous taxes, we have increased our national debt in 1 year nearly $72,000,000,000, and our national debt is growing by leaps and bounds.

We recently increased our national debt limit to two hundred and ten billions and it is now predicted that our national debt at the close of this war may reach three hundred billions. We have perhaps nearly twice as many men in our armed forces as Great Britain and more men than China and nearly as many as Russia. Our men throughout the world today are fighting on foreign soil for our allies.

Congress has authorized the President to give away to any nation or nations to whom he may desire more than sixty-three billions. Great Britain, Russia, and China have cut down on their expenditures this year. Our country will spend three times as much as Great Britain, Russia, and China. The American people will pay three times as much in taxes as the people of Great Britain.

How can anyone say that the people of the United States are not doing their full share in this great war, and that we shall be considered as not cooperating if we amend this act to protect the American farmer, American laborer, and American industry, and restore to Congress the constitutional power set forth in article I, section 8 of the Constitution? Every Member of this House has been doing his full share in voting for measures to aid the war effort and bring victory to

American arms at the earliest moment possible.

We want our 11,000,000 men who have and will sacrifice so much to come back to our country with their constitutional rights preserved and with our farms, shops, and factories protected from the dumping of the cheaply produced commodities of the countries of the world, come back to profitable employment. They will not be satisfied with either doles or hand-outs. They will expect and deserve opportunities, positions, and jobs with decent American wages and salaries.

I FAVOR HELPFUL AND PROTECTIVE AMENDMENTS

We have 10 very able and experienced Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee that had this resolution under consideration for a long period of time. Neither their ability, statesmanship nor patriotism can be questioned. They are united in their stand that this Trade Agreement Act should be amended. Joining with them in this opinion is our very able colleague, Mr. WEST, a Democrat of Texas, also a member of that committee.

Under general debate, I am calling attention briefly to these proposed amendments. These 10 Republicans and 1 Democrat insist that this act if extended at all should be limited to 2 years instead of 3 years. I favor this amendment.

They urge that it be amended so that the House and Senate have 90 days to consider and reject any trade agreement a majority of the House and Senate may believe is not in the best interests of the people of the United States. Of the 30 countries with which we have made trade agreements, the legislative bodies of 26 retain the right to pass on such trade agreements. Why should not the American Congress have the right to do so?

It is also proposed to amend the act so that the tariff or duties on any article embraced in the trade agreement should not be reduced to that point where cheaply produced industrial and farm products could be brought in from foreign countries and sold here below the cost of production in the United States. That merely means we want to preserve the American markets for American industry, labor and agriculture, and maintain the American standard of living.

Another amendment proposed provides where we make trade agreements with other countries the duty should not be placed so low on imported farm commodities that they can bring their cheaply produced commodities into this country and sell them below parity prices we have set up for American farmers. This is to preserve parity prices and a decent living for American farmers and farm workers.

Under the so-called favored-nation clause any trade agreement made by the United States with any foreign country guaranteeing to such foreign country certain benefits, these benefits at the same time become available to every other country doing business with the United States except Germany, even though we had no trade agreement with the other countries and they had made no concession to us. For instance, if we make a trade agreement with Canada and guarantee certain concessions on tariffs and duties for benefits we might receive from Canada, under this favored-nation clause all other countries of the world, as it has been carried out, except Germany, will receive like benefits, even though we have not entered into any trade agreements with them and they have made no concession to us. We made a trade treaty with a certain country that gave especial consideration to that country in tariff or import duties on textiles before the present war. Japan did not make any trade agreement with us but she benefited just the same as the other country with which we made the agreement.

The Republicans and Mr. WEST on the committee feel the act should be amended so as to provide that the concessions granted by this country under any trade treaty should not be extended to such nontreaty countries as discriminate against American imports.

Under our tariff laws the American producers had the right to go into court and litigate matters arising out of trade treaties. Under this Reciprocal Trade Act this right is denied them. An amendment is proposed to give the American citizen the right to go into court and determine the justice of their cause.

It seems to me all these amendments are most desirable and only fair to the American people and to the producers of our country in industry and agriculture and very essential to protect both of them as well as the American workers.

In recent months many bills have been introduced to pull down and open wide the gates of our immigration laws and a tremendous drive has been on to pass these bills. They say it is necessary to show our friendship and neighborly cooperation with the other nations of the world. We have given to the other countries our boys, our markets, billions of lend-lease, billions in equipment and supplies, and now they insist we must, after this war is over, turn over our markets to foreign countries and fill up our country with persons from foreign lands.

If we surrender all these precious rights, privileges, and opportunities, and our millions of boys return to their homeland disappointed and without opportunities, what do you think they will say about you and me for failing to protect them while they were making such a heroic defense for our country and our allies?

I shall discuss these amendments when they are offered on the floor and set forth more in detail my reasons for supporting them.

I have always strongly favored restrictive immigration and protection for American industry, agriculture, and labor, and shall continue to do so, and if such salutary amendments for the benefit and protection of our country and our people are not adopted, I shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY].

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that surprises me most about my fellow men is their continuous and ever-present willingness to believe things that are not true, and often their unwillingness to accept things that are patently true. I have listened here to a great many words on the subject of tariffs. I have heard a great many direct statements made about tariffs, and a great many inferences and implications about tariffs. There are a few fundamentals on the subject of tariffs which everyone ought to understand. Tariffs do not, as has been stated so many times on this floor, protect a standard of living of a whole people living within the tariff walls. A standard of living cannot be raised by means of a tariff. If the standard of living is affected at all, it is always lowered. These statements can be proved mathematically, and are not subject to debate among those who are economically literate. The fact is that a tariff does not, never has, and never will protect a standard of living of a whole people living within the boundaries of a political state. A tariff can and does protect a price level, but price level and standards of living are not the same thing. The result of a tariff is a subsidy enforced by governmental authority and collected by one group of citizens from another group of citizens. It is a method of redistributing wealth, and it is significant that this redistribution produced by tariff usually takes money from the many and gives it to the few. It robs Peter to pay Paul. It takes money out of one pocket and puts it into another pocket, but it is well to remember that these two pockets are in different pairs of pants. I do not see how we can deal intelligently with the subject of tariffs unless we all accept what is patently true, that is, that standard of living and price level are not synonymous.

I have not the time nor the energy to quarrel with my colleagues here about this. I am afraid many of them will not change their minds no matter how many facts are marshalled in support of what I have said. I want to address myself for the very few minutes I have to the basic implications of this piece of legislation. It has been iterated and reiterated here many times that this legislation is an important instrument of foreign policy. This, I believe, to be true, because of the direction in which this legislation leads us. This act in itself cannot and will not keep the peace, but it is a step, and an important step in the right direction. We are dealing with a subject of importance in a world at war.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCMURRAY. Just let me finish my statement, please.

We live in a world which is doomed to more or less continuous conflict until we the people of the United States and of the rest of the world begin to understand the basic causes of war. War is the great devastating disease of modern civilization. It is a cancer on the body politic which if not cured will destroy all those values which we have developed and have learned to hold dear throughout the period of the past 2,000 years.

The causes of war are, of course, many, but it is my contention that all these causes may be cataloged under one of three general theories. Each explanation, of course, is given in many ways and has many advocates. It is my contention that we have war because we have refused to study and understand those causes, and to do what is essential to remove the germs which create the disease. If we treat the wrong disease the patient will not be cured, and if we fail to diagnose the disease correctly the patient will certainly be destroyed. It is imperative to seek the root cause of war in our world and to do what is necessary in order that our children and our children's children shall not be inevitably doomed to mass conflict more frightful and destructive than that through which we are now passing.

The first general theory of war may be stated briefly in the following terms: War is natural; it results from the fact that man is greedy, selfish, pugnacious, and brutal. You have heard this theory expressed in different ways at different times. Some say, "We have always had war and we will always have war." Others say, "As long as man's nature is what it is we will fight." I call this the original-sin doctrine of war, a doctrine which says that war is inherent and natural in man. These are different ways, of course, of saying that the causes of war are primarily psychological, and man being what he is, nothing can be done about it. Let us examine this theory and these statements. Will anyone contend, if he will take a careful look at his world, that war is simply the result of the nature of man? Is it not evident that all kinds of people live all over the world? There are good people and bad people in the city of Washington, but they do not resolve their difficulties by the use of violence. There are good people and bad people in the State of Virginia, but they do not fight each other. There are good people and bad people in the United States of America, but force is not used between them. There are good people and bad people within the confines of the political boundaries of every nation-state on earth yet within these boundaries differences which arise between men are not resolved violently. This devil theory of war simply is not adequate to explain war as we have it in the modern world. War is not simply and primarily a result of the nature of man, it is not primarily psychological, it is not a result of the simple fact that some people are good and some people are bad. Even in the midst of this great conflict we know and we can admit that all of the people with horns are not confined within the political boundaries of certain nation-states, and all of the people with wings confined within the boundaries of certain other nation-states. We must, therefore, rule out as the fundamental cause of modern mass conflict the theory that war is natural, and that its causes are innate in man. I do not deny, of course, that there is room for improvement in man's nature. If we all lived by the Golden Rule there would be no war, nor would there be need for any of the institutions of social control which are present in all organized society. You would not have any government because you would not need it, nor would you have churches or schools, because you would not need them.

The second general explanation for war is economic, and it is my intention to show you that both phases of this theory are essentially false when used to explain war as an institution in modern society. The first part of this argument goes something like this. You have heard it many times, and many of you have believed it. Stated simply this theory explains war as the result of the maldistribution of economic goods and services. It is most often stated in the following terms. As long as there are "have" and "have not" people on earth you will have war. This is evidently not true. There are "have" and "have not" people in the city of Washington, in the State of Virginia, in every State of the Union. There are rich and poor people in the United States of America, and in every other nation-state on earth. Yet within these States war has been abolished. I make no plea for nor do I justify the present maldistribution of economic goods among men. I happen to be one of those who believes that a better distribution of wealth is imperative, and that we should take all reasonable steps to this end. Yet I know and you know that this maldistribution, as vicious as it is, is not the primary cause of war in our world.

The second part of the economic explanation of war is the so-called Marxian theory which says in essence this: War is a result primarily of the capitalistic organization of economic society. There is a tendency, so this theory goes, for capitalism as it matures to develop into monopolies—huge concentrations of economic power which tend to use the political state for their own purposes, and that in the competition engendered between the capitalists of one part of the world, and the capitalists of another part of the world, the root cause of war may be found. One does not need to deny the truth of the tendencies within nations toward the concentration of wealth within fewer and fewer hands, nor need one deny that this economic power is used to control the policy of government in some cases.

Yet war cannot be blamed primarily on capitalism, or on any other form of economic organization known to and used by modern man. War is not a result of economic competition as such. The capitalists of Chicago and the capitalists of New York are much more competitive, have many more conflicts of interest, than do the capitalists of New York and the capitalists of Berlin. Yet Chicago and New York have never gone to war with each other. Twice within our own generation, New York and Berlin have fought. That conflicts of economic interest are present cannot be denied, but these conflicts of interest are not in themselves a fundamental cause of war. The capitalists within the confines of the political boundaries of a modern nation-state may compete vigorously and sometimes even viciously, but they do not fight each other. It is only when these conflicts of interest cut across the boundaries of nation-states that war is engendered. People who accept the simple Marxian theory as the primary explanation for war will perhaps have trouble in explaining the fact that the two countries in this present war who have fought most bitterly are neither of them capitalistic in their economic organization. Russia is not a capitalistic state nor is Germany a capitalistic state. I do not see how one can blame capitalism for war in this particular case.

There is one thing that is natural about war as it is natural about almost all forms of human activities. There are conflicts of interest between people when people come into contact one with the other. These conflicts may be economic or social or racial or ideological or of any other origin. Men do differ about things and ideas. When two men want the same wife, or the same job, or the same piece of property, or the same raw material, or the same markets, they have conflicts of interest about these things. It is easy to understand, however, that these conflicts, no matter how serious, do not lead to war except under certain conditions. I submit it is these certain conditions, which I am about to explain, that constitute the primary and fundamental cause of mass conflict in modern society.

If war is not psychological primarily in its origin, or is not economic primarily in its origin, it must be political. War is essentially a result of anarchy, and anarchy is a lack of government. Where men's interests conflict within organized political society these conflicts are resolved by methods short of war. If we understand war and peace, we can learn how to keep the peace. Peace is not just an absence of conflict; it is a planned way of living among men. It has been achieved when men organize political societies and substitute reason and justice for force in the settlement of the differences which naturally arise among them. Let me repeat, peace is a planned way of living; it is a creation of man. It is a result of the institutions built by man. Men have peace when they substitute law for force in settling their differences. Peace is, therefore, a result of law, and law is a result of government. There can be, let me repeat, no peace in this world of ours without law, and there can be no law without government.

Mr. Chairman, it is trite to state that our world is interdependent. It is significant, I believe, that a candidate for the Presidency in 1940 has just published a book entitled "One World." Our world is one, and we ought to realize that even Hitler and his advisers know this. They know that the world is going to be ruled from a common center. They know that the differences which arise between peoples from the four corners of the globe must be settled under common rules. This war is not being fought to unify the world; it is being fought rather between those who want to unify it on a master-slave basis, and those who think that it must be unified on the principle of democratic consent.

War cannot be eradicated unless we build a government which has power coextensive with the needs of modern industrial man. Modern industry draws its materials and sends its products throughout the world, and unless we substitute law for violence in the settlement of the conflicts of interest which inevitably arise we are doomed to perpetual warfare.

Mr. Chairman, it is because the act under consideration is an honest attempt to alleviate the differences which arise between men in their necessary economic relationships that I have used this time to discuss the subject of war and its causes in this House. Let me repeat, this Reciprocal Trade Act is a step in the right direction. True, it is only a very small step. It has often been true in the past that men have been able to achieve political unity if they have learned to deal economically one with the other. For this reason I consider the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as perhaps the most important piece of legislation which has come before this Congress since I have been a Member of it. If we pass this bill we tell the world that we are willing to admit that we live in an interdependent world which must learn to cooperate if it is to survive. If we defeat this act, we tell the world that we will insist upon a return to our isolationism, that we will let Asia solve Asiatic problems and Europe stew in its own juices until the conflicts which will inevitably arise there will again reach our own shores and will again engulf us as we have been twice engulfed within the memory of almost every Member within this House.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that our country can stay out of war unless we build a world government. I do not believe that we can remain independent and irresponsible in an interdependent world. I do not believe that peace is any longer possible unless modern man accepts the responsibilities of an industrial age. In the long course of human events only the fit will survive, and the fit are those who know that the developments of modern technology have created an interdependence among the people of this earth which cannot be undone, and which cannot be ignored. Wishful thinking will not save us. It is only by doing and acting in an intelligent manner that the problems of our day may be solved and that we may make ourselves fit for survival. This is the great question of our time. The great debate of our generation. It is not dream stuff, it is not utopia, it is not a question to be faced sometime in the distant future. It is the critical decision which our generation must make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. O Reciprocity, what tripe is uttered in thy name!

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] such time as he desires.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties for a few minutes, primarily from the standpoint of the effect upon our economy with relation to the Pacific nations, and also from the standpoint of our prospects for good, peaceful, secure political relations after the war, because it seems to me those are the two main things in which most Americans are interested—one our prosperity, and the other our peace and security.

We all know that after every war there is a tendency to a depression and deflation. During the last war, when the men of Europe could not be working in their own factories and their own fields, because they were in the trenches, they had to turn to us to produce food and materials for them. Out in Nebraska, where I was born and brought up, we took a lot of land that should never have been anything but grazing land, plowed it up and planted it to wheat, because the price was $2.25 a bushel. We enormously expanded our industrial facilities to take care of war needs.

But the war did not last forever, and this one will not. When the war ended and the people of Europe came back to their own fields and to their own factories, they could produce for themselves most of what they needed in both agricultural and manufactured products. They did not have to get so much from us, and we were left with an overbuilt plant, an excess productive capacity both agricultural and industrial. Of course, we were not producing more than we really needed, but more than we could buy and pay for.

We stalled off the inevitable day of reckoning by two main devices. One was installment buying, which was internal loaning; the other was extending foreign loans and credits. We postponed the day of reckoning, but eventually, in 1929, it caught up with us, as it had to, and we went into a depression which lasted over 10 years, until we got out of it by the artificial device of Government spending for armaments which, of course, is not sound economy and cannot be maintained indefinitely.

I have often wondered why this depression and unemployment lasted 10 years, and would have lasted longer if it had not been for the war and the armaments program, whereas most of our other depressions lasted only 2 or 3 years. I think the biggest reason was this, that after the previous wars the unemployed soldiers, the people turned out of factories because their excess production was no longer needed for war purposes, could move out into the great undeveloped areas in our West and South, and there built up a new area of demand for money, labor, and products. That would spell us for a while until we more or less saturated that new area and then we would have another depression, and the idle men and dollars would move on again.

I think the biggest reason for the length of this last depression was that this time we did not have a great undeveloped West of our own to which the unemployed dollars, and the unemployed men could go, and that is why some of us who lived in the Far East during those years wondered if developing the great potential markets of Asia and of South America might not have been then, and may not be to us after this war, more nearly what our own West was to us after our previous wars.

After years of fumbling and frustration because of her internal difficulties, China finally became, beginning in 1931, pretty much unified under a stable central government with sound, able leadership. America's commerce with China began to boom and we achieved for the first time No. 1 position in China's trade. We were just beginning to get into stride when Japan started the war which, of course, was one of the reasons why she started the war.

America is going to have gigantic productive capacity after this war is over. Unless we can find some place, especially during the period of readjustment, to send technicians, a good many of them, and engineers and construction men, and to send machinery to help get these people rehabilitated after the destruction of war, and help get them onto a sound economic basis, we will have piling up here at home excessive surpluses of men and goods which will lead to reduced wages and reduced prices, and as demand and prices go down, more people will be turned off, there will be still less purchasing power and still more unemployment.

I do not see that we can escape disaster unless we have, in addition to demobilizing as gradually as possible while building up our internal peacetime economy, some outlets for the great surpluses that we can produce over what we consume and which we are now sending abroad for war purposes.

Our past was in Europe, but our future, insofar as our country has a future abroad, must be to our west and to our south; and I believe the trade agreements are one of the best weapons yet devised for carefully, progressively building up better relations and trade with other nations. They are not perfect by any manner of means, but it seems to me they are the best method we have that is perfectly realistic toward helping America be ready and on the ground floor of world trade after the war is over. We want to be in a position to help guide that trade into the sort of channels we believe in rather than along the totalitarian patterns of blocs, cartels, quotas, cutthroat discrimination, and so forth, as we begin the struggle to make peace and build up a new, sound economy, with greater prosperity than anything we have known in the past.

May I sum up this point by saying that to have the lion's share, as we can if we are far-sighted now, in helping develop those gigantic markets of Asia and South America, and then the lion's share in helping satisfy those markets, will be the single biggest foreign backlog America can have against disastrous post-war depression, and one that will last at least 50 years after this war.

In addition to access to those gigantic potential markets, the largest remaining undeveloped markets in the world, America needs to make sure that there is no slave labor anywhere providing unfair competition in the markets that already exist. This was one of the reasons many of us so strongly opposed arming Japan. During the thirties people would

sometimes say in America, "Do not worry about the Japanese. They will go in and organize the Chinese and develop their markets perhaps more rapidly than we could and we will sell to the Chinese through Japan. It doesn't make any difference whether we sell to China direct or through Japan."

That notion was based on the naive idea that the Japanese would, of course, do in China what we would try to do if we were going into China—as in fact we did do in the Philippines—namely, try to produce an enlarging, expanding economy, new developments, more jobs, higher wages, more purchasing power, greater markets, and therefore more sales to China. But the Japanese never had that idea. Their goal was not so modest as just to seize and develop and then satisfy the markets of China. Their goal was to use China as an economic and industrial base for seizure of world markets. Therefore the purpose of the Japanese militarists was to produce in China not an expanding but a contracting economy, to reduce the Chinese systematically to economic slavery, which is far worse than political slavery, chattel slavery.

We fought a civil war in this country at one time over the system of chattel slavery which existed here. Bad as it was, it had at least one redeeming feature, namely that when a man bought a slave he had an investment in him. It was not to his own interest to beat the slave to death or work him to death or starve him to death, because he would lose his own investment. But under economic slavery, what difference if the man dies of tuberculosis or starvation on account of the impossible conditions under which he works? The conquerors have no investment in him. There will be others driven by the economic pressure under which they live to come and work until the time when they, too, are laid on the shelf. So Japan's purpose was not to increase, but to reduce, the standards of living and of wages in China, to build on China's seized raw materials and on slave labor an industrial set-up that could flood the world's markets with products at a fraction of the cost at which we or others could produce them.

Now, if the Japanese were able to underbid us on a basis of superior efficiency we could have no legitimate objection; but when Japan planned to underbid American products on the basis of human slavery, then it was our business. We Americans who lived out there, whether businessmen, doctors, teachers, missionaries, diplomats, or military and naval men, were practically unanimous in realizing that America was following a policy that got immediate profits but was suicidal in the long run.

Therefore we must do more than just defend America; we must go on through to win this war, because with Europe's manpower on a slave basis, and Asia's manpower on a slave basis, it would be impossible for us to maintain for long an island of high standards of living. High tariffs in that sort of situation treat one of the results, the symptoms of the disease, but not the cause. The basic cause is this: The same identical product thrown on the world's markets at such radically different costs of production. Three to seven dollars a day for American free labor, 3 to 7 cents a day for Chinese slave labor. In the last analysis, if the standards of living and costs of production around the world do not come up nearer to ours, ours have to go down nearer theirs; and it is because I do not want ours to go down that I urge that we do everything we can to help bring theirs up.

The alternative would be to scrap the enormous part of our agricultural and industrial plant that produces more than we consume. That, too, would lead to drastically lowered living standards.

This is a fundamental American concern as I see it. One of the hard-headed reasons why many of us have worked in and for China was because we believed it was also the best way in which we could help American prosperity in the long run.

In addition to the economic considerations involved in these trade agreements, I should like to say a word about the political considerations. America, to win the war, has to have the confidence of the other nations of the world. Some of them are a little uncertain, not because of what we have done but because of what we have not done; not because of what we have said but because of what we have failed to say. If certain groups in the populations in Europe and Asia and South America see us emasculating the trade-agreement program or destroying it, or reducing it, or subjecting it at this time to new controls even from Congress, they cannot interpret that—I think it would be foolish for us to imagine that they would interpret it—as anything other than a preliminary to withdrawal from cooperation with the world; that we are cooperating temporarily to bribe them, so to speak, to help us win the war, and that after it is won we intend to try to go it alone again.

It is not a question of whether we think that opinion would be justified or not. It is a question of what the effect on them is almost certain to be. We have to have their confidence if we are going to stay united to win the war. We have to have their confidence if we are to be strong after the war. We learned recently that we lost 12,000,000 tons of shipping last year. After this war, at that rate, America is going to be practically stripped of reserves of several vital materials. Zinc is almost gone, copper and lead will be scraping the bottom of the barrel in 10 years or so, tin and nickel we do not have, bauxite or aluminum resources we are using up like mad, mercury is practically gone, dependent on other countries for adequate tungsten, chromium, and so forth. Some people believe that the end of our oil reserves is only a few decades away.

America is going to need materials after this war, and we cannot get them except on a basis of quid pro quo. Personally, I suspect that if we are not going to do our utmost to build up world trade, there might be some wisdom in our importing more of these raw materials from abroad now and husbanding our own resources, rather than using up what we have here and making all the money we can, and then perhaps come to a third war without enough to win it and without friends from whom to secure the essential materials. It would injure some businesses now if we were to reduce our mining of copper or iron for example. But we must think ahead. We must have either reserves ourselves, or friends. I am afraid that one day we might come up against disaster and be dependent upon other peoples for a whole lot of raw materials and they would not help us if they feel that we have just tried to bribe them with a 1-year extension, or only until 6 months after the war is over which to them cannot mean anything except that we are just going along temporarily until we can walk out on them.

I hope you will not misunderstand my saying that. I am just trying to project myself over into their minds, and think how it inevitably will look to them, even though you and I will not regard it in such a light. We are only 130,000,000 of people. There are almost 200,000,000 Russians that are awake today, and they are going places. They have devotion to ideals as they see them that is just as passionate as was the devotion of our ancestors in 1776, and of the French at the time of their revolution. The Chinese are alive with germinating ideas, 450,000,000 of them. Almost 400,000,000 Indians are stirring. There are 150,000,000 in South America. And here we Americans are only 130,000,000. It is hard for us to realize our position in the world has drastically changed.

America was able, in the past, to get security by separation from the world. We had two wide oceans; and then we ourselves destroyed the oceans. We invented the steamboat, we invented the airplane, we invented the submarine ourselves. I oftentimes wish we had a planet all to ourselves, but if we did have such a planet we Americans would lie awake nights until we could think up some way to bridge the distance to other planets to begin carrying on trade with those other planets, and then wonder why we did not have the security that came from the former isolation.

Our physical separation is gone. America has to be realistic. She is going to have to have friends in the years ahead, and you do not make friends by giving them the impression that you are going to pull out on them.

If our trade treaties had worked badly, if we could produce evidence where they had hurt agriculture or major industries badly, or without compensating over-all gains, it would be a different thing. But I have seen no such evidence. I personally hope that the Congress will vote to extend the program the usual time—3 years. Everybody admits not much normal trade is going on now during the war. I do not believe anybody can predict, on the basis of the careful way in which the program has thus far been handled, that we are likely to have disaster for our country from this program in the next 3 years.

I hope we will not at this time give Congress a veto power on individual agreements. I think the reconsideration of the whole program every 3 years is a better

veto power. If we allow immediate veto power there will always be tremendous sectional pressures. In any such adjustments of give and take, some interests are hurt. But that is the law of life and growth and progress. When the bridge was built the ferry people complained because they lost their livelihood. When the railroad was invented it put the stagecoaches out of work, and their first reaction was violently against it. Then they found that in the long run it brought enormously greater employment and prosperity, not less.

When the bus and automobile came along the railroads fought hard because it hurt them immediately. But in the long run it benefited the country. Now, when the airplane comes along all the others oppose it, because it, too, hurts at first.

If we in Congress have immediate veto power, we will be inclined to decide, we will be under pressure to decide on the basis of immediate gains or losses to specific interests in our districts, whereas surely the Congress of the United States and the Executive of the United States have to think primarily from the long-term standpoint of the country as a whole. I believe profoundly that sound national policies when executed carefully and gradually always operate to the long-term advantage even of those interests which at first suffer somewhat.

It is perfectly clear that my State, Minnesota, cannot have prosperity except as the States around her have prosperity, so that they can buy our butter, our iron, our wheat, our flax, and so forth, and thus enable us to buy the things they produce more efficiently than we. And I am perfectly sure in my own mind, that America can never again be sure of her security and of her prosperity unless the world is something other than an economic and political jungle; unless we are doing our level best to carry our rightful share—not more than our share, but also not less than our fair share—in building up other people's security and prosperity, too; not to take prosperity away from us but to bring more to us; not to give away America, but only to save the kind of America that we know and want her to continue to be, an America of growth and expansion.

With every change there is a risk of losing something that we have, but there is also the glorious possibility of getting something enormously better than we have. Trying just to hang on to the status quo, to hug our money bags to us is the way of death. America cannot live just by defending yesterday. She can live only if we reach out boldly with the confidence our forefathers had to win the future.

I think Americans are the only people in the world who do not fully realize how powerful this land is. We sit down and say, "What will the British do?" "What will Russia say?" And everywhere else in the world the first question people ask is, "What will America do?" All America needs to do is recognize her own strength and lead out. No other nation is in a position to put something dire over on us in a trade, unless we are incredibly timid; and if we are not able to hold our own when we are participating in the trading, then we certainly cannot escape their ganging up to put things over on us if we refuse to participate.

I think, if we examine the fears that were expressed in 1934 and 1937, and in 1940 as to what might happen under this trade-agreements program, it is clear that, after all, none of those terrible things predicted has actually occurred.

May I introduce in the RECORD part of a letter that I received recently? It is from a man who was for 12 years a Member of Congress, a good Republican, now vice president of General Mills, Inc., of Minneapolis. He writes, referring to extending the power of the President to make trade treaties without Senate approval:

> The present situation, it seems to me, is one of expediency rather than one of principle. Our export departments—

And General Mills, Inc., is the biggest flour and grain products concern in the whole Northwest—

> are the ones who know about these matters and who feel the effects of them if they are adverse. I thought it worth while to indicate to you that our experience under the treaties thus far negotiated has been quite satisfactory.

Officers of the Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., and other milling companies, of Minneapolis, have also expressed themselves in favor of extending the powers granted the President under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In summary, I think personally that there are positive advantages, from both economic and political standpoints, in continuing the present program. But if others do not agree that there are positive economic advantages, still surely we must admit that there have been no serious losses or disadvantages during these 9 years. I think we can agree that the State Department has handled very wisely the power given it and has not been out-bargained by and large; that on the whole, the advantages to us have been greater than the disadvantages.

I think we can agree further that if we continue for 3 years it cannot possibly wreck this country, especially in the 3 years when there is not likely to be very much nonwar trade going on. Therefore I believe that there are no serious dangers economically in continuing the program as at present, and that there are serious dangers politically if we destroy or cripple or restrict the program as it exists today.

When the risks of going on are so small and the risks of stopping are so great, it seems to me that the part of wisdom dictates that we take the lesser of those two risks and renew the act without changes at this time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, for clarity in our thinking, both here at home and abroad, I believe it should be recognized that the pending bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years presents two general questions, one pertaining to policy and the other pertaining to procedure. The one may be said to be international in character and the other purely domestic. Failure to make the distinction leads only to confusion and misunderstanding.

From the discussions that have taken place on the floor of the House there seems to me to be little doubt but that the House as a whole approves the policy envisaged by the trade-agreements program. I am not thinking of the complaints that have been made against this item or that item of this particular agreement or that agreement. There will always be such complaints and no Member or individual is to be criticized for making them. That is how democracy functions. There were complaints when Congress itself wrote the voluminous tariff rates. But I am thinking of the broad aspects of the policy of fostering world trade for the development of world markets and the full utilization of our productive capacity.

It is an undisputed fact that nationalism finds expression in trade barriers and economic warfare, creating maladjustments that ultimately lead to military conflicts such as we are experiencing today. I believe that a properly administered trade-agreements program for removing restrictions on the mutually profitable exchange of goods can contribute much not only to our own national welfare but to the world at large. A sound international commercial policy is essential to an enduring peace.

Mr. Chairman, I approve the policy of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. And, frankly, I believe the program can best be carried out by vesting in the President, acting through the Secretary of State, the power to make these trade agreements.

This brings us to the domestic aspect of the legislation, which, I must emphasize again, is to be clearly distinguished from the international aspect. If the Congress endorses the policy of the reciprocal trade agreements by authorizing a continuation of the program, it cannot be argued that a domestic change in procedure will create mistrust on the part of other nations. Can it be said that other nations will mistrust us, will question our willingness to cooperate for economic betterment, simply because the American people's Congress seeks to preserve a constitutional right? As a matter of fact, it behooves us to demonstrate to the world that democracy actually exists and functions successfully in our republican form of government.

I have frequently opposed delegations of power to the executive branch of the Government. Such a policy gradually undermines our system of government. It creates a government of men instead of a government of law. It creates a costly bureaucracy of red tape, duplications, conflicts, and confusion. This has been, and is today, one of our greatest problems. Nothing can be more encouraging to the American people than to see their representatives in Congress reassert their constitutional rights and prerogatives. They have had enough—too much—government by regulations and executive orders and directives.

They wish a government by law in which they have a voice.

In general, that is the domestic issue raised by the pending bill. I endorse the policy of the trade-agreements program. I concede that it would be advisable to authorize for another 2 or 3 years, and I prefer 2 years, the negotiation of trade agreements by the President. But, Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the Congress have the right to pass judgment on the trade agreements negotiated. I am not saying that Congress should write the agreements. That can best be done by the Executive. I am not saying that Congress should be able to amend the agreements. That would lead to the abuses of logrolling. I am simply contending that Congress should at least have a check on the exercise of the power delegated.

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution vests in Congress the power to levy duties. It is part of the taxing power and, as history has abundantly demonstrated, one to be jealously guarded in the interests of the people. Indeed the founding fathers considered this power so important that they provided that all revenue or taxing measures must originate in the House.

In making this delegation of power to the Executive not only should we bear in mind the importance of the power itself, but it must also be emphasized that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act contains a provision which denies citizens access to the courts. Section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 gave an aggrieved citizen a system of relief by which he could carry his case through the customs court to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and in certain instances obtain a further review by certiorari before the Supreme Court. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act completely suspends this system.

Thus cut off from all special remedies there is no way by which a citizen can litigate in the courts matters arising out of the trade-agreements. He would have to surmount the rule established in the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447), that a party invoking the power of a Federal court under the Constitution must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained some direct injury as the result of its enforcement and not merely that he suffers in common with the people generally. He would also have to surmount the rule in the case of *Louisiana* v. *McAdoo* (234 U. S. 627), where the Supreme Court held that the State of Louisiana, in its capacity as a producer of sugar by convict labor, did not have a sufficiently substantial interest to protest a reduction in the tariff on Cuban sugar.

Not being able to invoke the general jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and denied special remedies by the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Congress alone remains the protector of the people. It is thus extremely important, Mr. Chairman, that in delegating this power to reduce tariff rates that the people's Congress retain in itself the right to set aside, within a period of 90 days after submission, any agreement it may consider against the best interests of the country as a whole.

Probably the Congress will never have occasion to take such action on any trade agreement. Nevertheless, the mere fact that it may have such occasion is in itself sufficient reason for the existence of such power in Congress. Surely we have not reached the point in our history where the American doctrine of checks and balances has become outmoded.

It has been argued that trade agreements are in the field of foreign affairs and in that field the President has broad discretionary powers. The argument is advanced to justify the broad authority delegated by the act. If trade agreements come within the category of foreign affairs, it follows that they should be treated as treaties and as such be submitted to the Senate for ratification as provided by the Constitution. But the administration has always denied that the trade agreements are treaties and has never submitted them for ratification.

If not treaties, then they must be in the category of tariffs, the writing of which is a legislative power. In that category the act must be made to follow established principles for delegations of legislative power. When Congress delegates power, it must prescribe limits, set standards and retain in itself some means by which it can check the arbitrary or unwise exercise of the power delegated. Only in that way can constitutional government be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, this is the greatest deliberative body in the world. There is not a single Member of this Congress who should feel that he is not competent to exercise good judgment in determining the fairness and wisdom of trade agreements made by the Executive.

Should perchance any Member be affected with an inferiority complex and feel that he is still a "rubber stamp" and that he is unable to pass judgment as to the wisdom or fairness of such trade agreements, it is high time he be given at least the opportunity again to exercise that judgment. This great deliberative body should here and now give him that opportunity and thereby rid itself of this paranoidical condition. Congress lately has made great strides in breaking through its once threatened encirclement of inferiority complexes and "rubber stampism."

I call for a day-by-day exercise, use of courage, and independence of action by the fine membership of the Congress, of the greatest Republic in the world, that we may win the victory of constitutional government on the home front. I plead for the same day-by-day fighting courage here at home, that our fighting men are using day and night to win our victories on the battle fronts abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I favor this bill as a matter of policy but in the interests of the people I represent I shall also vote to retain in Congress the right to pass upon the trade agreements. The United States will play an important part in the post-war era. Congress should make it clear now that it recognizes international cooperation essential for world peace and security, but it intends to have some say in the commitments that are made.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of continuing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years. For 4 years I vigorously opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for two outstanding reasons:

First. I felt that the Wisconsin dairy interests were discriminated against.

Second. I felt that not enough notice was given to interested parties affected by these treaties, and that at the hearings they were not given sufficient opportunity to present their side of the case.

These two reasons justified my position in opposing the bill although I felt that reciprocity was a better policy for foreign trade than either high tariff or free trade.

Commerce, whether with foreign nations or between States, has always presented some controversial subjects. Because this act treats of foreign commerce, I shall confine my remarks to that part of the subject.

CONFLICTS ABOUT COMMERCE

For 250 years, restrictions and regulations on commerce abroad have created differences of opinion and at times caused intense bitterness. It was the hated navigation acts which in colonial times stirred up so much bitterness that it eventually resulted in our independence. After this country attained its independence, under the guidance of Alexander Hamilton, it set up tariff regulations. The manufacturing North was strongly in favor of protection, while the agricultural South was just as strongly in favor of free trade. The protection acts fostered in the past levied a higher and ever higher tariff until it reached its culmination in 1930 with the Hawley-Smoot bill. So intense was the feeling aroused against the United States by this high protective measure, that retaliation followed by every country that had any substantial commerce with us.

I quote from a dissertation by Joseph Marion Jones, Jr., presented to the faculty of the graduate school of the University of Pennsylvania. On page 258, Mr. Jones makes the following statement:

THE HAWLEY-SMOOT TARIFF

The Hawley-Smoot tariff went into effect in June 1930, in the full blast of the depression. Under the circumstances there was great indignation and resentment on the part of the majority of the countries of the world, but that of the debtor countries of Europe was extreme. This intense indignation, coupled with the absolute necessity of securing a favorable trade balance, could result in but one course of action: Retaliatory tariff increases against the United States, the multiplication of import restrictions of all sorts, and negotiations with other countries to secure increased markets for commodities. But this necessity was general and everywhere markets were restricted. In this situation the necessity arose for reciprocity in foreign trade. Negotiations were undertaken for the exchange of surpluses. The maintenance of a balanced trade became the supreme object of commercial policy, and in cases where most-favored-nation treaties obstructed the carrying out of this policy, such treaties were circumvented, annulled, or violated in vari-

ous ways. These nations were determined, of necessity, that the United States and other nonreciprocating countries should not receive the benefits of their desperate bilateral negotiations. Thus out of the necessity for reciprocity grew the disrepute of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause and the clamor among powerful groups in each state for its abandonment. Further, this situation goes a long way toward explaining the various trends and movements in the international field during the depression period. It throws a great deal of light upon the reception given to Briand's proposal for an economic federation of Europe, upon the failure of the two international conferences for concerted economic action, upon the crystallization of the central and eastern European agrarian bloc with their proposals for preferential treatment, upon the whole movement for regional agreements, and, finally, upon the growth of preference within the British Empire.

To summarize, the passage of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act disrupted not only our commercial relations with other nations but, in addition, it created strained diplomatic relations which made other nations suspicious and bitter toward the United States. As a result, retaliation followed. Other nations raised barriers against our trade, consisting of tariffs, quotas, and cancelation or evasion of most-favored-nation treaties with the United States, while suspicion, indignation, and growing discrimination against us mounted in many foreign countries. It was sought to overcome this friction and allay bitterness by entering into bilateral and multilateral agreements with other countries, and so the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed empowering the President to make such agreements with foreign nations.

As I said before, while favoring neither the high protective tariff nor free trade, because the former levied an unjust tax on our people for special privilege and the latter subjected our labor to the competition of cheap foreign labor, I felt that trade agreements were the best solution, but that too much agriculture was being sacrificed in agreements we made for the sake of manufactured products. Hence I opposed them.

FOREIGN COMMERCE GOES ONE WAY

However, foreign commerce today is a one-way traffic. Everything we can possibly raise or produce can be consumed abroad, if we can only furnish the transportation. The bottle neck in our foreign commerce consists in our inability to ship the goods. In 1942 the U-boat campaign against our shipping was entirely too successful—1,000,000 tons of shipping being sunk by U-boats every month. We are now being assured that the U-boat campaign is slowly but surely being overcome and that our supplies in ever-increasing volume are reaching foreign ports. In the light of these facts it would seem that our foreign commerce is not affected by treaty agreements so much as by our difficulty in delivering the goods. I, therefore, reach the conclusion that the passage of this act, on the evidence before us today, is not at all a question of protective tariffs but rather a question of national defense.

A QUESTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Because I became convinced that the war had completely changed our commercial relations abroad, I wrote the Honorable Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, some months ago when I started work on this question, requesting information as to what countries were our allies with which we had made reciprocal trade agreements. I quote Secretary Hull's reply in full:

MY DEAR MR. SAUTHOFF: I have received your letter of March 22, 1943, in which you inquire what countries, signatory to reciprocal trade agreements with the United States, have alined themselves in the war effort with the United Nations.

Reciprocal trade agreements have been signed with 26 countries; 16 of them are at war with the Axis Powers, 5 others have broken diplomatic relations with those powers, 4 are neutral, and only 1 is alined with the Axis Powers. Those at war with Axis Powers are: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, France (Fighting France), Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, and the United Kingdom. Although the Vichy government concluded an armistice with Germany and Italy in June 1940. French forces independent of Vichy have been and are actively engaged against the Axis Powers. The commercial agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union is closely related to the trade-agreements program, but since it was not concluded under authority of the Trade Agreements Act, the Soviet Union is not included in the above list.

The five trade-agreement nations which have broken diplomatic relations with the Axis Powers are Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The four which are neutral are Argentina, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey. Finland, the only trade-agreement country which has alined itself with the Axis Powers, is at war with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, but not with the United States.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Surely, no one can disregard the tremendous importance of retaining the good will, the friendship, and enthusiastic cooperation of the nations mentioned in the above letter. It would seem to me the height of folly to appropriate billions upon billions of dollars under the Lend-Lease Act in order to aid our allies and at the same time slap them in the face by breaking off commercial treaties under which we are and have been operating for a number of years. These friendly nations must be treated in a friendly manner; even the neutral nations must be treated in a friendly manner, because the United States is engaged in a war with two of the world's most powerful and most ruthless enemies, and to deliberately break off friendly relations with other nations in the face of that situation is unthinkable. On the contrary, we ought and must continue to make sacrifices to retain their good will.

IF NOT THIS ACT, WHAT?

Let us say, for the sake of the argument, that we should not continue the reciprocal trade agreements for another 3 years. What would we have left? Why, we would go back to the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, which has never been repealed. We would then be in the very undesirable situation of having sacrificed the good will of our allies and substituted in the place of good will, suspicion and distrust. With our boys fighting on 54 fronts, subject to every type of attack by skillful and resourceful enemies, could we afford to make the nations on whose soil these boys are fighting resentful of our conduct, suspicious of our motives, and bitter toward our men? Even if our commerce were suffering under these acts, I would nevertheless say that it was a low price to pay for the protection of our men abroad. And let me say in passing that the regulations of the Office of Price Administration are affecting our economy 100 percent more than the agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Acts.

This extension is for 3 years, and I am absolutely convinced that our enemies will not be conquered before the end of those 3 years. Hitler, yes; Japan, no. Therefore, for the sake of the friendship of foreign nations, for the sake of our sons on foreign soil, and for the sake of better feeling and a kindlier attitude toward us when the peace is being made, I firmly believe that we should vote for this extension without undue restriction.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, before it was converted to war production, the manufacture of automotive products was not only the chief industry of the State of Michigan, but the biggest single industry in the United States in point of value of its products, average number of employees, and consumption of a number of important foreign and domestic raw materials, agricultural products, and semimanufactured articles.

My State of Michigan, of course, produces other things than automotive vehicles. Our iron and steel products rank second, in normal times, to our automotive industry. In peacetime electrical refrigerators and other electrical equipment are important products of the State, as are machine and precision tools. Michigan is an important agricultural State, especially in the production of fruits and vegetables.

Like the automotive industry, Michigan producers of all these commodities have shared in the benefits of foreign trade and of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Not only have the agreements resulted in concessions from foreign countries for all these products, but the domestic market for them, in Michigan itself and throughout the United States, has been improved when American products of all kinds were finding foreign markets.

The automotive industry, including its branches engaged in the manufacture of bodies, parts, and accessories, centers in the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and California. But its significance touches every State in the Union and many foreign countries.

The cotton farmers of the South, the lumbermen of the Northwest, the miners of coal, copper, iron, zinc, lead, and silver; the petroleum producers, the producers of wool and hides, the flaxseed growers of Minnesota, the glass manufacturers of the Middle West, and producers in dozens of other lines, market

important portions of their products to or through the automotive industry.

On the other hand, all these producers are customers of the automobile industry. When they prosper the automotive industry prospers and its prosperity contributes to their welfare.

The relationship of the automobile industry to other industries of the United States is a perfect example of the effects of reciprocal sales and purchases. In order to sell to other industries, each one must buy, either directly or indirectly, from them.

On March 20, 1936, I pointed out this relation in the following words:

> The industry uses 75 percent of rubber imports, 70 percent of all plate glass manufactured, 57 percent of all malleable iron, 40 percent of the supply of leather for upholstering purposes, 40 percent of all mohair made, 40 percent of all lead, 30 percent of the nickel consumed, 20 percent of the American steel output, 15 percent of all aluminum, 13 percent of the Nation's cast iron, 13 percent of the country's tin, and 12 percent of the zinc output.
>
> The automotive industry over and above this purchases yearly * * * 500,000 bales of cotton, * * * 10,000,000 gallons of paint, 13,000,000 yards of upholstery cloth, 35,000,000 pounds of hair and padding, and * * * 500,000,000 board-feet of lumber. Over and above that, the purchasers of automobiles step into the oil and gas business to the tune of 460,000,000 gallons of lubricating oil and 15,300,000,000 gallons of gasoline.

And again on February 21, 1940, I said:

> So the farmer's life has been made easier by the automobile he drives over roads thus made necessary by that automobile. Each year he sells to the industry and to the employees of the industry millions of dollars' worth of agricultural products. * * * He is helped to sell more exports. But, in addition, because an industry has been helped through similar exports that same farmer is helped to sell more products, both directly to the industry and indirectly to the employees.

This giant among industries got its growth through the ingenuity, industry, and enterprise of its leaders, as well as through the availability of the materials which it needs. It not only has supplied practically 100 percent of its home market but it has reached out to dominate the world market for automotive products. It competes anywhere in the world with any and all foreign manufacturers and at the same time pays higher than average wages in all industry to the largest single group of employees. It meets foreign competition on foreign ground and comes out on top. The suggestion that the industry grew to its present great stature under a benevolent protective tariff will not stand up under scrutiny. Even if that were true, it would have to be admitted that the automotive industry at least knows when it has grown up and recognizes that United States tariff walls bar United States products from foreign markets as effectively as they bar the products of other countries from the United States.

The automotive industry could never have made its great progress if it had not been able to sell a considerable portion of its production in foreign markets. If only the so-called domestic market had been available, it could never have been the employer that it has been or the customer of other industries that it has become.

In 1929 this industry sold abroad 13 percent of the motor vehicles it produced. Its exports of all automotive products in that year were valued at $532,000,000. That meant exporting American cotton and wool and hides, metals and lumber, paints and glass, in the form of automobiles. It meant giving jobs to American workmen and income to American producers and making them better customers in the domestic market for the products of every other industry of the United States.

But in 1930, when the United States, through the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, shut off imports, it automatically shut off at the same time a corresponding part of this export market which had meant jobs and wages and incomes to hundreds of thousands of American farmers and workers. In 1933, exports of United States automotive products were valued at only $91,000,000, or about one-fifth of the 1929 exports. Production was valued at $1,662,000,000, a drop of two-thirds. In 1933 only 7 percent of the motor vehicles produced were exported. These figures only serve to point up our unhappy memories of the situation in 1932 and 1933—closed factories, men in bread lines instead of at benches, shut-down mines, collapsed farm prices, and all the rest of it.

The figures for 1937 are better. In that year total production of automotive products was valued at $4,983,000,000 and 10 percent of the motor vehicles produced in that year were sold abroad. Exports of all automotive products were valued at $348,000,000. Once more farm products, natural raw materials, and semimanufactures were being sold in foreign markets and the men who were at work in the automobile factories were back in the domestic market buying the goods of all other American producers.

In 1939, notwithstanding that European countries had been preparing for the war that broke out late that year, the United States automotive industry's production was valued at $3,776,000,000 and 6 percent of the vehicles produced were exported.

When, in 1940, I discussed the value of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and the relation of the reciprocal trade agreements program to the improvement that had taken place in the automotive industry, I said:

> Because economic restrictions such as quotas, exchange control, and high duties imposed by foreign countries greatly limited the exportation of automobiles in the past years. But now, under the trade-agreement program, these restrictions have been reduced.

I have seen nothing since 1940 to change my conviction that this program has helped substantially in clearing the way for foreign business in automotive products and, as I have pointed out, to make the automotive industry a more potent force in the welfare of the whole national economy.

Under this program concessions on automobiles, trucks, busses, engines, parts, and accessories have been obtained in trade agreements with 23 countries—all except three of the countries with which we have agreements. Czechoslovakia, with which the agreement has been suspended, also granted certain concessions. Fifteen of these countries have reduced their barriers—either tariff, quota, exchange, or other restrictions—and the other eight have guaranteed not to impose restrictions more heavy than their present moderate ones.

The 15 countries which have reduced their tariffs on other charges, enlarged their quotas, or otherwise improved their customs treatment of automotive products from the United States are, in the order in which the agreements were concluded: Cuba, Brazil, Belgium and Luxemburg, Canada, Colombia, Switzerland, Guatemala, France, Ecuador, Turkey, Argentina, Uruguay, Mexico, and Iran.

The eight countries which bound their moderate existing customs treatment against increase are, in the same order: Haiti, Sweden, the Netherlands, Honduras, Finland, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, and Peru.

I might point out that in the case of Canada, by far the major foreign market for United States automotive products, the tariff reduction came about through the operation of the most-favored-nation provision of the trade-agreements program. Likewise, in the case of Belgium, reduced rates of duty obtained through the trade agreement were still further reduced when Belgium later granted new low duties in an agreement with France and extended the additional reductions to United States products in conformity with the most-favored-nation principle.

It was not coincidence that the concessions on United States products in foreign markets that were obtained through the reciprocal trade agreements were followed by increases in our exports of such products. It is perfectly true that between 1934 and the outbreak of the present war many factors were at work toward economic recovery in this country and abroad. Nevertheless, it simply makes common sense that when tariff and other barriers against imports from the United States were removed or reduced by foreign countries, the foreign markets for those products were enlarged and improved.

During the first 5 years of the trade agreement with Cuba that country's imports of passenger cars from the United States averaged nearly $2,000,000 annually as compared with an average of about $450,000 a year during the preagreement years 1934 and 1935. Imports of American trucks into Cuba in the same period averaged $225,000 a year as compared with $33,000.

Canada's imports of passenger cars from the United States averaged $9,242,000 a year during 1936–39 as compared to an annual average of $1,700,000 in the preagreement year 1935. Canada's imports of automobile parts from this country averaged $25,600,000 compared with $15,700,000. Brazil's imports of passenger automobiles from the United States increased from $5,500,000 in the preagreement year 1935 to $6,900,000 in 1938, the latest year for which detailed figures are available. Brazilian imports

of chassis for motortrucks increased from a value of $3,950,000 to $4,700,000.

In 1940 during hearings on the renewal of the authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements, Mr. Burton C. Budd, a member of the export committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association and vice president and general manager of the Packard Motors Export Corporation, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee, said:

Believing export trade an element essential to our domestic prosperity, the Trade Agreements Act has, in our opinion, contributed substantially to both.

Mr. Budd appeared again last month at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee and again he said:

The Automobile Manufacturers Association again wishes to endorse the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and respectfully urges that House Joint Resolution 111, renewing the act, be favorably reported by this committee and passed by the Congress.

As I said in the beginning, the tremendous automotive industry of the United States is now, of course, entirely engaged in the war. Jeeps, tanks, planes, and gun mounts are coming off the assembly lines instead of sedans, busses, trucks, and trailers. The battle fronts of global war in the Arctic, the desert, and the jungle are today's export markets for the automotive industry of the United States, and those exports make up a far higher proportion of the total market than they ever did in peacetimes. But victory will come, and peace again, with much of the civilized world to be rebuilt from ruins.

The great national economy of the United States must face those facts. Not only must it bear its share in readjustment from war to peace and in reconstruction of a world economy, but it must take the leadership in that reconstruction. If it is to do so, this country must join with other countries of like mind in the tremendous task of working toward the objectives set out in the mutual-aid agreements into which we have entered with other United Nations and which provide for agreed action "directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

In this task the automotive industry, so important in the economy of the United States, will play a major role.

First, of course, will come its own problems of converting plants and processes from production of war materials to production of peacetime goods and of providing the maximum employment of men who have been in the armed forces. This will demand vast and continuing expansion of markets for the things the industry will produce after the peace—not a shrinkage of that market such as occurred after the enactment of the restrictive tariffs of 1930.

If the automotive industry is again to employ men and is again to buy great quantities of the products of American farms, mines, forests, and factories, if it is to be once more a strong pillar in the economic structure of this country, it cannot be hampered and circumscribed by excessive trade barriers between countries. The domestic market alone—which was never large enough to insure full production and employment in the automotive industry—will again be inadequate and foreign markets will be doubly necessary.

Again I urge that it is not just the welfare of one industry—even though it is the country's largest single industry—which depends on foreign trade. I have made abundantly clear how prosperity in this industry creates and increases prosperity in others.

When Mr. Budd appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in this year's hearings, he presented the considered statement of a great group of industrial leaders. He said, in part:

Fully engaged in the manufacture of articles of war, and realizing that victory must first be won, we nevertheless look forward to its successful conclusion and the resumption of our usual activities, mindful of the reconstruction period and new responsibilities that will come at that time.

* * * * *

Between 1925 and 1940, these outlets in other countries absorbed approximately 10 percent of our production. * * * This volume has contributed substantially to the industry's prosperity and our ability to continue to produce a better product at a lower cost.

We have not, however, fully realized the potential possibilities of our export sales. In no country in the world have motor cars and trucks been so extensively used as in the United States, although through the building of roads, the opening of new territories and steadily growing industrialization, these foreign outlets are constantly enlarging, and many may approach our percentages some time in the future. We, accordingly, look to them as a means of expanding volume.

In endorsing the renewal of this act, we are not thinking solely of our foreign sales. To the contrary, we are thinking of our total sales with the knowledge that the home market still absorbs 90 percent of our output. Naturally we would not favor legislation which benefited exports alone and adversely affected conditions at home.

In our opinion the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has benefited the whole economic structure of the country by providing wider foreign outlets for surplus production, and thus making possible greater internal consumption.

As we contemplate post-war conditions with the return of many millions of people to their normal pursuits, the rebuilding of world economy, and the restoration of prosperity and peace, nothing seems more vital than a firm foundation for international trade.

It will take more than our own efforts to quickly restore this trade to effective proportions. In fact, it will take the cooperation of every country we can rally to the cause. The 27 countries that have signed reciprocal trade agreements with the United States and the others that have endorsed the same principles in the declaration by the United Nations and the lend-lease agreements can, through mutual endeavor, not only start this restoration but induce others to follow.

Should we fail to renew this act at this time, it could only be considered as a renunciation of the policy we have pioneered and the abandonment of the other countries who have joined with us in this difficult task. It is highly important both for our own planning, and that of the rest of the world that we do renew it and announce that we have done so.

In the past the reciprocal trade-agreements program of the United States has benefited the automotive industry—the chief industry of this country—and all other export industries. Those benefits have been handed on and distributed through both direct and indirect channels to the American producers of innumerable important commodities. Only with the foreign markets which the agreements have helped to open and improve, could American industry have reached its present stage.

Necessity for such foreign markets will be multiplied manyfold in the post-war years, if the automotive and other export industries are again to support the American economy as they have done in the past.

The rest of the world will look to the United States for leadership when the war is won. This Nation has already taken measures toward assuming that leadership and the responsibilities which go with it. Renewing the reciprocal trade-agreements program is the next step in that direction. If we do not take that step we create in the minds of other nations grave doubts as to our intentions for the future. We invite them to consider alternative plans for their own economic programs and alternative alliances among themselves—plans in which we will have no part and alliances from which we, who sought economic isolation after World War No. 1, will find ourselves isolated whether we will or no.

Our own self-interest, the true protection of our industry and our economy and our way of life, demands the renewal of the authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements by means of the same mechanism which for the past 9 years has been tried and found practical through the test of results.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I brought up two problems in connection with reciprocal trade treaties. One of them was the fact that we have subsequent legislation which provides for 90 percent of parity floor price. This is provided in the price-control bill. It provides for 2 years or more after this war is over we are to have a 90-percent parity price. I think that is something that should be taken into consideration before we enter into any more trade treaties. If thousands of hogs were imported in 1939 when they were 61 percent of parity, what could we expect with 90 percent of parity floor? I also brought out the fact, and I was reminded of it by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] that if it is for the best interests of the United States to make this purely an industrial country, let us go ahead and say so and be honest and be sincere with the American farmer. Let us not make him believe we are doing something for him when we are not doing anything for him, because I think that is wrong in principle and we should not follow that practice.

Let us get these things straightened out. As far as agricultural imports are concerned, we have maintained our percentage of agricultural imports year after year under four different tariff acts. We have gradually lost our agricultural exports for 20 years. In 1940 we were down to 12 percent, the lowest of any year in the last 52 years. If there is anyone who wants to question any of these figures I yield for that purpose at any time. I call your attention to the fact that a lot of this talk about how wonderful this tariff act or that tariff act has been, and how bad the other one has been, made me take considerable time. I studied up these different tariff acts and what duty was imposed for different products under the various acts.

After I studied that, what did I find? We have heard time after time about the most-favored nations. I have come to the conclusion that our interest should be diverted today to the most favorable crops. I started out and I took them out of the book as they appear. I started with cotton yarn. Just follow these through in the RECORD tomorrow because I will not have time to go through all of them. I took them just as they came.

Under the Tariff Act of 1913, 20 percent; under the Tariff Act of 1922, 20 to 24 percent; under the Tariff Act of 1930, 23 to 28 percent, and under the reciprocal-trade treaties 23 percent. Is there much of a change?

Take the next one, 22 percent, 20 to 25 percent, 29 to 31 percent, and 25 percent.

I will not go through the rest of the cotton list, but they are all on the same basis. I wonder who is being deceived? I wonder if some people think we cannot read the English language? If this particular brand of foreign commerce is so good, I would like to know, and I say this without any personal feelings toward anyone or any State or any section, why do they not try it on the cotton business? Why pick out some other agricultural product? There has not been a Member stand up here and try to defend these who came from a State that could feed itself. The people of those States are depending on other States to feed them as well as to furnish food for lend-lease, yet they want to give the markets of the real agriculture away to someone else. That is how generous they are.

We will drop down to tobacco. The lowest tariff duty that you can find on tobacco is 14 cents a pound and that is scrap tobacco coming from Cuba. Fourteen cents is more than the tobacco has brought year after year. In 1938 it was 15.4 and in 1939 it was 16 cents a pound. So they have a protection of practically the full value of their cheapest kind of tobacco and then they come in here and say, "You should be thankful we have given you this or that kind of a tariff act." Any crop that has a domestic subsidy of $145,000,000 like tobacco has, may not be so sensitive to the foreign policy for this crop.

They came out to Wisconsin, and took off 2 cents a pound on cheese. It worked pretty good. They took off another cent, when the product was not bringing two-thirds of parity at the time they reduced the tariff on it either time. Do you believe it is a good public policy to reduce the duty on a product that is below parity?

There is one thing that every one should decide. These trade treaties and these tariff acts are not being operated except on a political and a sectional basis. Let me call your attention to crab meat that is produced here in the great State of Virginia, Jefferson's State, right here where the best market in the United States is located, the city of Washington. What happened?

In January 1940 they wanted to raise the tariff on it. Did they have any trouble raising it 50 percent? Why do we not try that on things that are produced in the northern half of the United States? Are they sectional and political? Look at the products raised in the southern part of the United States, outside of livestock and livestock products. Have you of the South had the tariff reduced on any products during the past 10 years? If so put them in the RECORD.

Let us go to the crop known as peanuts, and we have heard a lot about peanuts around here. In 1913 the rate was three-quarters of a cent, then 4 cents a pound in 1922 and 7 cents a pound in 1930, and it is still 7 cents a pound.

It so happens that the people from Georgia get up here and tell you how they want to give your market away, but until some one from Georgia tells me he wants to lower the tariff on peanuts when the tariff is more than the crop has brought any year in the last 20 years in this country, he is not making much of an impression on me. He is just convincing me that he wants to give somebody else's market away. Why does not someone from Georgia suggest a lowering of the tariff for tobacco and cotton?

Let us consider the opposite to this. What has been done with the livestock industry? My grievance is not with the reciprocal trade treaty. It goes back to 1913.

We have been carrying on a policy of lowering the duty on livestock and livestock products. That has been implemented in the last few years by additional reduction of the duties on livestock and livestock products. We invite livestock imports. We turn around and spend millions and billions of dollars in subsidizing soil-depleting crops. We have imported in 8 years' time pretty nearly $5,000,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products that should have been raised in this country, such as livestock and livestock products. Then we have turned around and expended from $400,000,000 to $800,000,000 each year to subsidize soil-depleting crops. To me that just does not make sense.

I will give you another one to answer. Get this one. Do you think people cannot read? What do you think they do with the money as it rolls off these imports? They take 30 percent of these customs receipts, according to section 32 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. So, they are getting the 30 percent of these customs receipts, turn around and subsidize the exports of such crops as wheat, cotton, and other crops.

They have used $22,000,000 out of this money to buy and distribute apples for domestic distribution. Over in the State of Virginia, right next to the best market in the world, they have stepped in and used $3,000,000 to buy apples and used these section 32 funds for this purpose.

We must have an agricultural—domestic and foreign agricultural policy. First of all, let us base it on common sense, and, secondly, let us base it on some kind of justice between the different sections of our own country. In order to help two, like cotton and tobacco, is it just that we raid the Treasury of the United States, as we are doing? What difference does it make what kind of foreign agricultural policy we have if it means we have got to turn over the keys of the United States Treasury in support of a domestic agricultural policy?

I will say that as far as I am concerned, with regard to the reciprocal trade agreements, the automobile industry can try to convince the people of this country that it is for the best interest of the country to make it an industrial country, but do not try to convince the rural people of this country that it is for their benefit when they have seen, year after year, the duties reduced on the products they produce with the result that the percentage of competing agricultural imports is gradually getting larger and larger.

DUTIES ON VARIOUS CROPS AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

So much has been said and written about the duties levied on various crops and products, I thought it might be of educational value to study the rates or duties that were imposed under the different tariff acts. The sources of information are the Comparison of the Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930, prepared for the Ways and Means Committee, and the Changes in Import Duties Since 1930, issued by the United States Tariff Commission.

Below are some of the important farm crops and products under the various tariff acts:

Product	Tariff Act of 1913	Tariff Act of 1922	Tariff Act of 1930	Under reciprocal-trade treaties	Comments
Cotton:					
Cotton yarn, in any form, not bleached not exceeding 90[1-(a)], from 60 to 80.	20 percent ad valorem.	13 to 17¾ cents per pound or 20 to 24¾ percent ad valorem.	23 to 28.7 percent ad valorem.	23 percent ad valorem.....	This is not much of a change.
Cotton yarn, from 80 to 90.....	22½ percent ad valorem.	18¼ cents per pound or 25 percent ad valorem to 20¾ cents per pound or 25 percent ad valorem.	29 to 31.7 percent ad valorem.	25 percent ad valorem.....	This is an insignificant change in duty.

Product	Tariff Act of 1913	Tariff Act of 1922	Tariff Act of 1930	Under reciprocal-trade treaties	Comments
Cotton—Continued					
Cotton yarn, exceeding No. 90	22½ percent ad valorem.	20.5 cents per pound, or 25 percent ad valorem.	32 percent ad valorem.	25 percent ad valorem	This is about the same as the 1922 act.
101-B cotton yarn, etc., No. 60-80.	do	16 cents to 21.7 cents per pound and 25 to 29.75 percent ad valorem.	28 percent and three-tenths of 1 percent for each number above 60.	28 percent and one-tenth of 1 percent ad valorem for each number over 60.	This is a token offering.
Numbers exceeding No. 80 but not exceeding No. 90.	25 percent ad valorem.	22 to 25 cents per pound or 30 percent ad valorem.	34 percent ad valorem and three-tenths of 1 percent ad valorem for each number above 80.	30 percent ad valorem	This is higher than the 1922 rate.
Tobacco:					
Par. No. 601, wrapper tobacco and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 35 percent of wrapper tobacco:					
Unstemmed	$1.85 per pound	$2.10 per pound	$2.75 per pound	$1.50 per pound (other than Cuban).	The lowest duty on tobacco is still more than the tobacco farmer received for his crop many of the past 30 years.
Stemmed	$2.50 per pound	$2.75 per pound	$2.925 per pound	$2.15 per pound (other than Cuban).	
Par. No 603, manufactured or unmanufactured, not specially provided for.	55 cents per pound	55 cents per pound	55 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	
Scrap tobacco product of Cuba	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	14 cents per pound (from Cuba).	
Crab meat: 721A	Free	15 percent	15 percent	22½ percent ad valorem	This is a 50-percent advance in duty.
Peanuts: Par. 760. Shelled	¾ cent per pound	4 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	Why continue this higher duty, which is more per pound than this crop has brought any year the past 2 years.
Livestock:					
Par. 703. Hogs	Free	½ cent per pound	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	Hogs at 9-cent price or 1939 parity would make 11½ percent ad valorem when other products have 25 percent ad valorem.
Par. 701. Cattle weighing less than 700 pounds.	do	1½ cents	2½ cents	1½ cents	Same as in 1922
Wheat: Par 729	Free	30 cents	42 cents	42 cents	Near embargo—only 800,000 bushels of wheat and 4,000,000 pounds of flour can be imported each year.
Corn: Par. 724	do	15 cents	25 cents	10 cents per bushel (from Cuba), 25 cents to remainder of Nation.	This is 25 percent over present parity and evidently out of line with duty on hogs, except for Cuba.
Wool	do	31 cents	34 cents	17 cents	This reduction is on coarse wools and not applicable to most of United States production.
Clean content			32 cents	13 cents	
Eggs:					
Eggs in shell	3 cents per pound	8 cents per dozen	10 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	Here is a 50-percent reduction to an industry that has avoided all domestic subsidy programs.
Dried eggs	10 cents	18 cents	{18 cents / 27 cents per pound}	±27 cents per pound	Evident increase due to study of costs in United States and other countries.
Barley	15 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel	15 cents	
Rye	Free	15 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	12 cents per bushel	This crop has not been up to parity for many years.

If the fact findings of the United States Tariff Commission found on July 24, 1931, section 336—T. D. 44997—that cost of production of eggs in the United States justified an increase of 50 percent in the duty as of July 24, 1931, why was the duty on the fresh eggs reduced by 50 percent on January 1, 1939?

If it takes 3.5 to 3.75 dozen eggs to produce 1 pound of dried eggs, the 18-cent duty rate represents about 5 cents per dozen and the 27 cents per pound duty on dried eggs would represent 7½ cents per dozen duty. Again, granting that the fact findings of the United States Tariff Commission are of value and are to have any consideration, why was this duty reduced by 50 percent on eggs in the shell? This is a fair question and deserves a fair answer.

THE IMPORTS OF SUPPLEMENTARY, OR COMPETITIVE, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND THE TOTAL AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

The following official table and statements from volume 42 of the June 14, 1941, Foreign Crops and Markets, United States Department of Agriculture publication, shows how the importations of farm products that are supplementary, or competitive to the United States producers, has compared with the exports:

Value of foreign trade in agricultural products, 1923–40

Year ended Dec. 31	Domestic agricultural exports	Supplementary agricultural imports	Supplementary imports as percentage of agricultural exports
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*	*Percent*
1923	1,820	1,094	60
1924	2,110	984	47
1925	2,136	1,001	47
1926	1,817	973	54
1927	1,885	996	53
1928	1,863	955	51
1929	1,693	1,017	60
1930	1,201	701	58
1931	821	447	54
1932	662	296	45
1933	694	365	53
1934	753	413	55
1935	747	589	79
1936	709	695	98
1937	797	868	109
1938	828	477	58
1939	655	526	80
1940 (preliminary)	517	543	105

Excerpts from this volume follow:

Domestic agricultural exports in 1940 reached the lowest point in 52 years. In fact, not since the United States began to emerge as an important agricultural surplus-producing country in the second half of the last century, have farm exports been at the low level of only slightly more than $500,000,000, reached in 1940. Imports of supplementary agricultural products, on the other hand, in spite of some low months, tended to rise in 1940.

* * * * *

Cotton experienced the most abrupt change of any of the commodities within the year. In the first part of 1940 cotton exports boomed in response to the double stimulus of the export subsidy program and the desires of a number of European countries not only to restore stocks depleted in the year before but also to lay in reserve stocks while shipping conditions were unfavorable. These factors in the early 1940 situation were indeed characteristic of nearly the whole of the August–July season of 1939–40, the consequence of which was that exports from the United States ran far ahead of the consumption of American cotton abroad and that stocks abroad were built up by the amount of the excess.

* * * * *

In the classification of foreign trade into agricultural and nonagricultural groups, forest products and distilled liquors are considered nonagricultural. In the classification of agricultural imports into supplementary and complementary groups, supplementary consists of all imports similar to agricultural commodities produced commercially in the United States, together with all other agricultural imports interchangeable to any significant extent with such United States commodities. Complementary agricultural imports include all others, about 95 percent of which consist of rubber, coffee, raw silk, cacao beans, wool for carpets, bananas, tea, and spices.

There are several factors to be considered in analyzing this table. First, the export subsidy is not deducted from the agricultural exports. If they had been, the exports would have been in a still more unfavorable position. Second, the relationship is shown in dollars and this does not fully present the true relationship between the imports and the exports. The imports are figured on the basis of declared value at the source of origin and the exports are figured on the basis of value in the United States in the market place. Third, the 6 years of 1935–40, after the changes in duties showed that the imports of competitive agricultural products—without deducting the export bounties paid—were over 88 percent of the total agricultural exports, and this includes reexports as well. The 6 years immediately preceding the changes in our foreign agricultural policy, or the years 1929–34, showed the imports of competitive agricultural products to be only 55 percent of our exports and the period of 1923–34 showed the imports of competitive agricultural products to be only 53 percent of our total agricultural exports in dollars.

The importance of these huge imports of competitive agricultural products which could be raised in our own country efficiently, is all the more significant when we realize that while we imported $4,476,000,000 worth of these competing products and crops in 8 years, 1933 to 1940, while we carried on a domestic-control program that cost, or will cost, the future taxpayers of America from $400,000,000 to $800,000,000 a year. This is the picture. These are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE].

Mr. GALE. Mr. Chairman, the United States cannot get along without foreign trade. In spite of wishful thinking, false pride, and Fourth of July oratory, we are not self-sustaining. The war has rudely proved this point to our sorrow. Furthermore, we not only are not self-sufficient now, but we have not been self-sufficient in the past and will be even less so in the future.

The proof of this is very simple. In 1938 our total world trade, export and import, was $5,054,868,000, and even in a war-conscious world, desperately getting ready to fight, we imported $1,960,428,000.

Incidentally, the United Kingdom in 1938 bought $576,398,000 worth of exports, and Canada $424,008,000. But the traffic was not all down a one-way street, because we bought from the United Kingdom $140,659,000 and from Canada $258,625,000.

Certain foods we have needed and still need from the Tropics. Likewise, certain metals and commodities from the Tropics. From the Malaya States in 1938, $97,328,000; from Mexico in 1938, $125,396,000; from Venezuela—mostly oil—in 1938, $35,271,000.

In other words, the self-sustaining, self-sufficient United States endowed with everything, including a heritage of what we like to think of as inexhaustible resources, completely independent, imported a substantial flow of goods from 33 principal countries in 1938 and likewise exported to the same group.

In my own State of Minnesota the high grade iron ore deposits making up 75 percent of the country's supply are going to be very shortly nothing more than a happy memory. At the present rate of mining, 5 years and we look somewhere else for ore.

United States copper is good for about 10 years—lead for 5 years—zinc and mercury are critically short now. Aluminum is taken for granted, but how many realize that aluminum comes from bauxite and that bauxite was never plentiful? Two to three years for American bauxite deposits.

No new American oil fields in the offing. New wells brought in every day, yes, but new fields, no. Fourteen years for domestic oil.

These are nonrecurring assets—going, going, and very shortly gone. Some assets we never did have. Tin, nickel, chrome, nitrates, rubber. Hundreds of agricultural products we either lack completely or lack in part. Coffee, tea, cocoa, spices, bananas, oils, hemps, hides, and even wool. Flax was brought in over a high tariff and in drought years Argentine corn, Polish rye, and New Zealand butter. Why? Because we needed all these things—needed them badly to carry on our economy which is another way of saying we needed these things to keep the American standard of living.

After the war we are in for tough sledding. In a very uncertain world, this fact is certain. To keep life going, factories working even part time, to keep farmers farming, we are going to export. The demand from a world sucked dry of everything will be enormous.

But likewise we are going to import. The demand from this country will be enormous—the demand for the things we do not have, for the things which we used to have and will not have any more, the demand for replacing natural resources which were shot up, flown off, and sunk.

Now in theory it would be very nice to sell our goods elsewhere at a nice profit—and just get paid in cash. Actually, it does not work that way. It is basically barter. If we sell, we buy, if we buy, we sell.

After the last war we found out that one-way commerce did not work. We ended up with a lot of nice, yellow gold which meant nothing—ended up holding the bag—a very large bag—because we would not barter, would not accept goods.

If Mexico buys tractors in Chicago, paying up in bales of Mexican money, what good would that do? Who would accept Mexican money? But if Mexican hemp is sold here and thus converted into American dollars, that in turn gives the Mexicans something with which to pay for the tractors.

Moreover, if there are no artificial tariff barriers, an unbalanced trade situation automatically corrects itself.

During the thirties a frenzy of world nationalism led to an orgy of trade barriers which in turn prolonged the depression but hurried up the war. As someone aptly remarked, "International trade must move across international borders or armies will."

We cannot afford the luxury of turning back to an old policy which failed. We cannot afford the luxury of kidding ourselves, of nursing the illusion that we are independent of the world—because we are not independent of the world any more than one State is independent of another State, any more than we could maintain our standard of living if the people of New York State could not do business with the people of Minnesota.

Some may ask, What about our standard of living when we compete with cheap labor, when we are a dumping ground for cheap foreign produce?

The answer to that one is, Why does not cheap labor in Mississippi ruin the State of Ohio? Why does not the South dump in the North?

As a matter of fact, an increase in the standard of living in foreign countries is to be greatly desired because it means purchasing power. If we buy from Mexico, maybe the wage level will go up and the Mexicans will start wearing shoes which they will buy from us.

After all, our greatest prewar trade was with Canada and the United Kingdom, comparatively high standard countries. There is no limit to human demands and the only drag is purchasing power. Increase the standard of living throughout the world and we all benefit, if we can interchange goods.

So at last we come to the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements. Not starry-eyed, not wide open, bars down free trade, not a prelude to the death of American industry and American agriculture, but a sane, intelligent policy, the trade agreements have paid dividends, and when the current shooting is over they will again pay dividends. "You be nice to me, I will be nice to you, and maybe we can do a little business."

From 1934 to 1940 all American foreign trade rose 22 percent. Foreign trade with agreement nations rose 36 percent.

Trade agreements provide a maximum possible tariff reduction of only 50 percent, and, of course, no concessions unless we get concessions. Trade agreements do not mean a sudden, wide-open free trade, which is Utopian, but which certainly is not to be obtained in 1 brief day.

Trade treaties are like lowering rail rates, which usually benefits commerce, but which does not mean free transportation. So lower tariffs in special cases do not mean free trade.

We exported and imported before the war $5,000,000,000 worth. After the war, to take up post-war slack, we must continue to export and import. What better, more practical approach than the trade agreements, which we know are not an experiment, not untried, not just a bright idea, but which have worked?

Not always, but certainly in this instance, it is perfectly fitting for Congress to delegate to the Executive authority to negotiate and conclude these trade agreements. Five hundred and thirty-one or even 96 legislators cannot in the very nature of the task negotiate treaties, just as a board of directors cannot make every sale or sign every corporation contract.

Congress has always had a tough time with tariff details and schedules and the pressure of interested groups has always been felt in every tariff act. Pressure which has undoubtedly benefited a small group who were intensely interested in special consideration. But pressure which undoubtedly did not benefit the people as a whole.

Moreover, the intricacies of trade are marvelous to behold and the delicacy of tariffs is nothing to be attacked, armed only with good intentions, let alone an armament of selfish interest. Hides, for example, we imported hides because we do not raise enough animals. If we raise enough hides, it means too much meat and the cattle market would go down. All our economy is finely adjusted with balance and counterbalance, action and reaction, closely related and interwoven. Sometimes, it would seem that for Congress to tackle the details of a tariff act is like a watchmaker fixing a watch with woolen mittens on his hands. His intentions might be excellent—but.

For Congress to have veto power over trade agreements negotiated by the Executive, through the State Department, would in effect mean no agreements. Who among nations would sign an agreement knowing it might be null and void in 3 months or 6 months? Knowing the history of capricious congressional tariff policy, who among nations would sign an agreement that was not not an agreement?

What firm would sign a contract that could be canceled by the board of directors?

No, Mr. Chairman, too much congressional veto means knifing the trade agreements, means trade agreements in theory but a joke in practice, means turning loose the group and special interest forces, means an engraved invitation to logrollers and back scratchers. If we want to drop the trade-agreements policy, which would be exceedingly unwise, let us kill it painlessly and humanely. Let us not slowly strangle it by adding amendments.

Again I say we must have international commerce and doubly so after the war to take up post-war slack. We must export and we must import. It is not "What will happen to our standard of living if we do this," it is "What will happen to our standard of living if we do not?"

America, whether it wants to or not is stepping out into the world, in spite of wishful thinking, furry thinking, or no thinking at all. To make a mistake is human—to make the same mistake twice is inexcusable. We made our mistake after World War No. 1. Let us not make it again after World War No. 2.

Renewing the reciprocal trade agreements is the first step and therefore the most important step in following the inevitable, in following American destiny, a destiny of great hope and unlimited promise—if we play it right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman. I think the Members ought to be here to hear this discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	Myers
Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Nichols
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Norton
Barry	Gavagan	O'Konski
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	O'Neal
Bell	Gibson	O'Toole
Bender	Gifford	Pace
Bolton	Goodwin	Pfeifer
Boykin	Gore	Phillips
Bradley, Pa.	Gorski	Ploeser
Buckley	Gross	Pracht
Bulwinkle	Guyer	Sabath
Burchill, N. Y.	Hariess, Ariz.	Sasscer
Carlson, Kans.	Hébert	Satterfield
Celler	Heffernan	Shafer
Clason	Hendricks	Sheridan
Cochran	Herter	Smith, Maine
Coffee	Horan	Smith, W. Va.
Courtney	Izac	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	Jennings	Spence
Cullen	Judd	Stearns, N. H.
Curley	Kee	Stockman
Davis	Keefe	Talbot
Dawson	Kilburn	Taylor
Delaney	Kleberg	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Lambertson	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	Lanham	Tolan
Douglas	McGehee	Treadway
Drewry	McKenzie	Van Zandt
Durham	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Elliott	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Elmer	Mahon	Wadsworth
Fay	Marcantonio	Whelchel, Ga.
Fellows	Mason	White
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flannagan	Monkiewicz	Worley
Fogarty	Morrison, La.	Zimmerman
Ford	Mruk	
Fulbright	Murray, Tenn.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I received the following telegram:

> Michigan needs extension of Trade Agreements Act. You can do much for your State by passing House Joint Resolution 111—without amendments.
>
> CHARLES M. SREENAN,
> *Secretary, Detroit Board of Commerce.*

I have likewise received many letters and telegrams from numerous business organizations, manufacturers, and merchants, all of them unanimous in their support of House Joint Resolution 111 without amendments.

The Democratic Members of Congress from Michigan are unanimously supporting this resolution, and I want to say to our Republican colleagues from Michigan that this vote is mighty important to our State. The chamber of commerce, the manufacturers' organizations, and the business houses so strongly supporting this resolution are all Republicans. They are for House Joint Resolution 111 because it has given them a new birth of freedom from Republican Congressmen petty politics, logrolling, and hog swapping. They remember the good old days of Republican tariff politics, when they had to station paid lobbyists with barrels of money to protect their rights to do business with the world. They do not want to revert their business to those good old Republican days.

Cordell Hull, the State Department, together with the other departments, charged with the responsibility of working out this program, have done a splendid job. They realize that the Government can be trusted to do what is right and equitable. Industry in Michigan wants economic world peace and not international trade warfare. They have shown that they are going to support the principles of the "four freedoms" and are ready to assume the position of world leadership after the war—a position that all the world expects this country to take after this war.

Those Republican Congressmen who have spoken on this bill, saying, "I am in favor of it, but with reservations, with amendments," are not kidding anybody; least of all the industrialists, manufacturers, and business people of America. This is one of the most important bills to come up before this Congress. It means increased trade for business, increased work and pay rolls for labor, and increased agriculture production and consumption, which will benefit the

farmers. Last week I spoke to some labor leaders—U. A. W.-C. I. O., from Detroit. They likewise join with industry and management in support of this resolution. They realize that what helps industry helps them. There has never been a bill brought up in this session of Congress that has had such unanimous support back home as House Joint Resolution 111, and it is going to be plenty tough for those Republican Congressmen who will try to but, amend, reserve, or recommit their way out of this one. They might as well realize right now that business definitely will not stand for petty tariff politics by Congress. American business intends to take world leadership in international trade and commerce without being tied down with congressional politics.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I desire to submit the statement made by the Detroit Board of Commerce to the Ways and Means Committee on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT ON BEHALF OF THE DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE

To the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN: The Detroit Board of Commerce endorses the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and respectfully urges that House Joint Resolution No. 111, renewing the act, be favorably reported by your committee, and passed by the Congress.

Detroit and Michigan has as much interest in the trade-agreements program as any other area in the country. The importance of foreign trade to this section can best be judged by the following facts:

1. Detroit in peacetime is the largest United States producer of manufactured products for export.

2. Eight hundred industries in Michigan are engaged in exporting.

3. During peacetime, $1 out of every $7 spent in this area is derived from foreign-trade sales.

4. Necessity of securing certain commodities that are not obtainable in this country, for industrial uses.

The present reciprocal trade-agreement plan should receive the approval of both Republicans and Democrats. It is a sound plan, based upon economics, rather than politics.

The power of the President to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements goes back as far as section 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890. Section 3 of the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 provided that the President, in part, might conclude reciprocal commercial agreements without Senate approval. Several agreements were completed under both of the above acts.

To require that all our trade pacts be submitted to the Senate for ratification would constitute a catastrophe. It would ruin the plan of rehabilitation of our foreign commerce and curtail the incentive to expand our foreign trade. It would revive the old logrolling methods of tariff making.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN TRADE TO MICHIGAN AND DETROIT

Michigan is predominantly a highly industrialized State, although the contributions made by agriculture to the State's total economy are important. Michigan's great industries have a vital stake in foreign trade. Losses of foreign markets, or failure to expand existing ones throw thousands of men out of work and impair their purchasing power. This affects the domestic markets for local farmers. Even the Michigan farmer has a fairly direct interest in the Michigan industries' attempt to secure a free movement of goods in foreign commerce. Detroit industries believe the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements will greatly assist them. We believe this opinion is shared by businessmen in other Michigan cities.

While the opponents of the trade agreements fully realize the value of foreign trade, they argue that our economy depends so little on exports that our domestic consumption should not risk impairment. Opponents say, "Foster and encourage exports, but not at the expense of domestic consumption." No one can quarrel with that theory. Let's see how the foreign and domestic welfare interlace.

Much attention is directed toward the No. 1 industry in Michigan—the automobile plants, which produce more than one-half of the country's total production. It is alleged that the real question is whether these agreements are beneficial to the country as a whole when they enable more automobiles to be sold abroad but retard such interests as the bean growers and the copper industry in the Upper Peninsula. It is a question, they say, of selling less automobiles in the Upper Peninsula or more abroad. This contention justifies analysis.

While the automobile industry is interested in maintaining all its markets it is also interested in maintaining and expanding the markets in foreign lands for our agricultural commodities. The reason for this is that more cars are sold in the agricultural areas of the United States than in all the foreign markets of the world. More cars were sold in the States of Illinois and Iowa in 1937 than in all the foreign markets combined. It is common reasoning that if the American farmer produces more and finds more markets abroad for his products, his group will be in a better position to buy more automobiles. Automobile manufacturers would not jeopardize their biggest market for the sales abroad.

The automobile industry employed practically 50 percent of the wage earners in the State of Michigan for 1939. That year the United States produced $4,039,931,000 worth of motor vehicles, motor vehicle bodies, parts, and accessories. Michigan alone produced $2,284,666,539 or 56.5 percent of the country's total. Exports for the country amounted to $269,915,785. By taking the same percentage of the country's production of the exports, we find that Michigan exported $152,502,418 worth of automobiles and equipment. The serious effect upon Michigan economy of not fostering and encouraging foreign markets can readily be visualized.

Passenger cars, chassis, trucks, busses, have received reductions in duty ranging from 6 percent to 50 percent. Those reductions helped farmers as well as auto workers. It is a two-way proposition—if the farmer exports a greater amount, the automobile industry sells farmers more cars. And if the automobile firms sell more cars, their employees buy more products of the farmers. Therefore, to assist the farmers and industry, new markets must be developed abroad. This can best be accomplished by eliminating trade barriers.

Michigan outranks all other States in the value and variety of its production of machine-tool accessories and machinists' precision tools. In 1935 the State's production represented practically one-half of the total for the United States. In 1939, Michigan's machine-shop products, not elsewhere classified, amounted to $50,803,932 and provided employment to 10,500 people. The country's total output was $360,334,229. Concessions were liberally granted these commodities in several of the trade agreements.

The increased sales abroad can be noted below:

1936	$41,847,000
1937	59,880,000
1938	97,289,000
1939	112,572,000
1940	246,535,000

Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations production was $364,985,404 for the entire country in 1939. Of this amount, Michigan produced $49,953,116. Several of the agreements contained concessions in duties on various drugs and medicines. Exports increased in the following proportions:

1936	$14,394,000
1937	17,980,000
1938	17,080,000
1939	22,317,000
1940	29,269,000

The manufacturers of chemicals and related products in Michigan are interested in the concessions obtained in at least 16 agreements. Chemicals, not elsewhere classified, was the fourth ranking industry in Michigan. In 1939 this industry employed 6,500 people and produced $59,518,193 worth of material. The whole country produced $839,750,356 worth for the year.

Michigan is the largest producer of household electric refrigerators and ice-making apparatus in the country. The domestic refrigerator and complete air-conditioning industry in Michigan produced $51,805,725 worth of goods and employed approximately 7,500 people. The entire country's production of these commodities was $278,645,540. Canada, along with 9 other countries, reduced the duty on household refrigerators as a result of trade agreements. Note the increase in exports to Canada:

1937	$2,396,000
1938	2,284,000
1939	2,886,000
1940	3,271,000

There has been some talk that imports of agricultural products would ruin the American farmer. Let us look at the farmer in Michigan. Figures show that the cash income our farmers receive from sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products follows the same trend lines as Michigan imports. This completely disproves the contention that the flow of imports curtails the income of farmers in Michigan. (We have the figures, but believe it is unnecessary to include them.)

The Government records also clearly demonstrate that imports increase and decrease in the identical proportion with factory employment and industrial production.

There has been no great flood of imported farm products since enactment of the reciprocal trade agreements. The following table shows that the imports have not seriously affected the income of the American farmer. It must be remembered that the huge 1937 figure was to offset the losses suffered from the 1936 drought.

Year	Value of imported vegetable food products	Farm cash income from marketings (includes crops, livestock, and livestock products but excludes Government payments)
1931-35 average	$424,200,000	$5,957,400,000
1936	568,222,000	8,284,000,000
1937	663,467,000	8,809,000,000
1938	428,685,000	7,648,000,000
1939	449,269,000	7,851,000,000
1940	435,741,000	8,354,000,000

The picture of dairy products and cattle-raising groups reflects the same situation. The income derived from past sales of both of these groups shows that they have not suffered from imports.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS DO HELP FOREIGN TRADE

The average yearly exports for the 5-year period from 1931 to 1935 was $1,142,000,000 to agreement countries (56.4 percent of total exports) and $883,000,000 to nonagreement countries (43.6 percent of total exports). The average yearly exports of the 5-year period of 1936 to 1940 were $1,975,000,000 to agree-

ment countries (61.4 percent) and $1,244,000,000 to nonagreement countries (38.6 percent). To agreement countries there was an increase of 72 percent in the second 5-year period average over the first 5-year period, with but 43-percent increase to nonagreement countries.

Imports were similar. There was an increase of 50 percent in the second 5-year period from trade-agreement countries, whereas from nonagreement countries there was an increase of 37 percent.

Michigan has benefited indirectly, as well as directly, from the program. Concessions granted by any foreign country that help farmers and manufacturers anywhere in the country to ship their surplus production to foreign markets are advantageous to Michigan producers.

An extension of the act at this time is urged because we believe the benefits already gained should continue. Therefore, the Detroit Board of Commerce urges that the Ways and Means Committee favorably report the bill and recommend continuance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Respectfully submitted.

R. W. GIFFORD,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.

Approved by board of directors, Detroit Board of Commerce, April 22, 1943.

HARVEY CAMPBELL,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I also wish to submit the statement made by Eugene P. Thomas, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc.:

STATEMENT BY EUGENE P. THOMAS, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL, INC., IN SUPPORT OF THE RENEWAL OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT, WHICH EXPIRES JUNE 12, 1943

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House Ways and Means Committee, I appear here on behalf of the National Foreign Trade Council to support the demand of American foreign traders generally for continuance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years.

The council membership comprises manufacturers, merchants, exporters and importers, rail, sea, and air transportation interests, bankers, insurance underwriters, and others concerned in the promotion and expansion of the Nation's foreign commerce.

The council is a nonpartisan organization which aims primarily, in respect to foreign commercial policy, at what is considered to be best in the national interest. From this standpoint its membership supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act from its inception in 1934, and has consistently advocated and supported its continuance in succeeding triennial periods when it came up in Congress for renewal. Its continuance we consider to be indispensable to the safeguarding of our international trade interests, now and following the war.

The annual National Foreign Trade Conventions of the council, which have an average attendance of about 1,000 delegates from all parts of the Nation, have endorsed from the beginning the reciprocal trade-agreements program. At the last National Foreign Trade Convention, which was held in Boston, October 7–9, 1942, the convention unanimously passed a declaration, from which I quote as follows:

"A formula should be agreed upon for the abandonment of discriminatory bilateral trading and the adjustment of uneconomic tariffs, having proper regard for the maintenance of the standards of living in the participating countries. The convention believes the reciprocal trade-agreements program should be continued in force."

The act was passed in 1934 to meet a crisis of exceptional dimensions, following the economic and financial disaster of 1929, when our exports fell by two-thirds and millions of our workers were unemployed. In 1933, our total foreign trade had dropped to slightly over $3,000,000,000, contrasted with a total of more than nine billions in 1929. In 1937, when the act was only 3 years in operation—under conditions unfavorable to its success—the total trade of the United States had risen to a value of nearly six and one-half billion dollars. In that period—when the Axis Powers were secretly preparing for a war of political and economic conquest and world domination, and devising economic policies to further this end—our exports to countries with whom trade agreements had been made increased by 61 percent, as compared with the value in the years 1934–35, while our exports to nonagreement countries showed an increase only of 38 percent. That was a period also of numerous restrictions on multilateral trade.

In response to Senate Resolution 325 of January 28, 1933, a study was made by the United States Tariff Commission which reported in respect to a wide range of dutiable items in our tariff which were more or less noncompetitive with, or unsuited for, domestic production; and in respect also to those imports which represented less than 5 percent of our total domestic production. Lists of over 1,000 items filed in these categories were published at the time and were accepted as evidence that numerous import concessions could be made by the United States in order to provide for an expanded production in our export industries.

After this war we shall face an emergency different mainly from that of 1933 in the more vastly complicated nature of the recovery problem. When resistance to the United Nations is crushed in Europe and Asia, we must supply vast quantities of food, medicines, and relief to those continents. The program of relief and rehabilitation will merge insensibly into the problem of reconstruction of the foreign trade of the world. In that process of reconstruction we shall have to give and take. We shall have to examine every possibility of taking goods and services from abroad which will add to, rather than detract from, the general welfare of this country, which must be preserved as a chief factor in world rehabilitation.

Consequently, we shall have to deal with other governments looking for the greater development of international trade. Unless, therefore, the executive power of the Nation is given the right to make trade agreements with other nations, we shall have our hands tied when it comes to the settlement of post-war international trade. There is no other mechanism established by the laws of the United States to perform the particular function of cooperative removal of trade barriers by reciprocal bargaining. This Trade Agreements Act does provide the authority or the bargaining power necessary to induce any other country to lower or remove its tariff barriers against our trade on the quid pro quo basis of corresponding adjustment on our part.

The Secretary of State and other Government officials have appeared at these hearings and presented figures showing the definite advantages to American industry, agriculture, and labor from the agreements entered into with 31 countries.

The facts in the case having been clearly established, Congress now may arrive at a sound conclusion based upon these facts. The record of 9 years' progress under the act shows conclusively that its operation has been beneficial to the welfare of the United States. As the war draws to a close, we shall again be facing emergency conditions as they affect our foreign trade. It is the firm conviction of the great majority of American businessmen engaged in foreign trade that Congress should not at this critical time reverse its tariff policy.

While it is clearly in the self-interest of the United States to participate actively with others of the United Nations in the world leadership that is demanded of us, it will likewise be in the best interest of other nations to know, in face of a disrupted world economy, that the United States is prepared to continue unequivocally its present foreign-trade policy in a cooperative program of world economic reconstruction. No alternative to the present trade-agreements policy has yet been devised which can meet so effectively the crucial days that lie ahead, nor should the soundness and permanence of this policy be qualified by limiting its duration to less than 3 years.

The act does not tie the hands of Congress, if at some future time circumstances should arise to compel the adoption of other measures. It is evident, however, that the industrial and agricultural interests of this country should not be subjected to disturbing changes relating to tariff-making powers, which would detract from the paramount task of winning the war and the planning for post-war foreign trade reconstruction. Reversal of our foreign commercial policy at this stage would inevitably tend to disturb our future economic relations with our allies and counteract efforts in Latin America to establish a solidarity of interest in the winning both of the war and the peace. It would be highly unfortunate at this time to create serious doubt in the minds of the other United Nations as to our willingness to cooperate in developing sound world economic relations in the post-war period. Nor would some foreign countries fail to point out that we have abandoned a policy which has served to augment and liberalize trade for 8 years, and stand before the world without any alternate acceptable substitution for reciprocal and nondiscriminatory trading.

Flexibility in tariff concessions has been recognized by both our political parties as an indispensable requisite of tariff making. If the United States is to make her foreign trade contributory to domestic economic stability. The history of the past 8 years shows that the executive agencies have provided an efficient machinery for the breaking down of barriers to our trade with other nations by a method of friendly bargaining, rather than by provocative unilateral reprisals. We can have no good-neighbor relations with the rest of the world unless we have good trade relations.

The tremendous pressure upon our domestic economy, as a result of this global war, is a challenge to the resources of American statesmanship. Foreign trade interests, including millions of people dependent on post-war overseas trade, look to this committee to recommend the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act beyond its expiry date. This would avoid any crippling of the authority of the Government in its collaboration with the other Allied Governments in translating into working agreements the principles of post-war reconstruction agreed to in article VII of the Mutual Aid Agreement of February 23, 1942.

The United States is a leading partner in the task of world trade reconstruction. No really effective contribution can be made by the United States toward world rehabilitation except through a policy of greater liberalization of international trade amongst all nations. It is the firm conviction of the membership generally of the National Foreign Trade Council that the continuance of the act is indispensable, if we would avoid serious complications and delays in respect to the reestablishment throughout the world of orderly commercial and economic relations.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss the amendment which I understand is to be proposed, and which is intended to give the Senate the sole right to approve any and all actions in connection with the Trade Agreements Act, but I trust I may get 5 minutes, under the rule, when this proposal is actually made.

In the meantime I should like to discuss as my subject the possible competitive position of natural and synthetic rubber in relation to trade-agreement binding of natural rubber on the free list.

Rubber is a vital and essential commodity, without which the automobile capital of the world could not easily exist. Every Member of this House and his entire constituency are directly interested in this basic product. Therefore, we must treat the subject honestly, fairly, and objectively. There must be no misrepresentation for selfish or political reasons.

Mr. Chairman, some outspoken opponents of renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, in their great zeal to discover and exaggerate what they choose to regard as sins of commission in carrying out the act, have expressed considerable and feigned fear that trade agreements are being used to sabotage and destroy the synthetic-rubber industry in this country after the war. The charge is made that binding of crude rubber on the free list, in various trade agreements, will seriously threaten this Government's investment of some $650,000,000 in synthetic-rubber plants and curtail work opportunities for thousands of our citizens after the war. They point particularly to the binding of rubber on the free list in the trade agreement with Peru, signed on May 7, 1942, some months after our entry into the war. These critics of the act would have us believe that the trade-agreement binding of crude rubber on the free list would be a permanent hindrance if tariff or other protection is needed by our domestic synthetic industry after the war. A careful examination of the facts and the application of some common-sense reasoning should easily dispel the fears expressed by these alarmists.

Let us examine first the present and possible future position of our synthetic industry in its relation to the importation of crude rubber.

At the present time it does not appear, nor can it be proved, that the synthetic industry will need any sort of governmental assistance after the war, or that, in the event assistance will be needed, that a tariff on natural rubber will be the best way of giving such assistance. On the contrary, such evidence as there is makes it seem unlikely that any assistance will be required. The synthetic rubber output of this country was steadily increasing prior to the outbreak of war because of the discovery of many new uses for special-quality types. There was a sharp rise in this production during 1941 owing to increased consumption of special-purpose synthetics. Some companies had already begun production of Buna-type rubber in 1940. By the end of 1941, the actual and planned capacity of the synthetic industry in this country was equal to about one-seventh of the normal prewar rubber consumption in the United States.

This steady development of synthetic rubber was taking place without tariff protection or Government subsidy, nor was there any demand for such protection by the producers, and no such demand has, to my knowledge, yet been made. It should also be noted that the costs of producing synthetic rubber were decreasing at a rapid rate. Although the exact figures on this are confidential, it is known that the cost of producing butadiene, a principal synthetic rubber chemical, dropped about 80 percent in a period of 3 years prior to 1942. The increased production of synthetic rubber in those years, prior to governmental aid and planning, was apparently due to two important factors which will play a large part in post-war development of the industry: First, constantly increasing uses, special and otherwise, of the synthetic product as against crude rubber, and, second, consistently decreasing costs as improved methods were developed and production increased.

Production of synthetic rubber in this country, though it is now being undertaken and planned on a tremendous scale compared to pre-war efforts, will for some time yet fall short of the total rubber output considered necessary for our national safety, and natural rubber will continue to be needed by our war industry. Any unnecessary or premature step taken by this Government which might tend to discourage the production and importation of crude rubber—particularly from other areas in this hemisphere—in the near future would have been most ill advised.

It is estimated that United States capacity will account for about 80 to 85 percent of the world synthetic rubber production after the war. But it does not follow that the peacetime capacity of this huge potential production will be unable to compete in the open market with natural rubber. Many post-war factors will be operating toward greatly increased consumption of rubber in the United States, and in the world generally. There will undoubtedly be a much larger use of automobiles and other mobile equipment, such as the use of rubber for farm machinery, which was just being undertaken on an increased scale prior to the war. The finding of many new uses of rubber will be another factor, particularly in special fields where synthetic is definitely superior and preferable to natural rubber in spite of possible price disparity. A consistent increase in the use of general-purpose synthetic, as well as crude rubber, is also to be expected in the manufacture of various mechanical products and other miscellaneous uses. All these factors, leading to general increase in rubber consumption, will assure synthetic rubber of an important, and, in many cases, indispensable place in post-war development of rubber industries of all types.

Synthetic rubber is superior to the natural product in many ways and such superiority will tend to offset the possible advantage crude rubber might have because of price. The quality of synthetic rubber can more easily be adjusted to the specifications of manufactured products than can that of natural rubber. This results in obvious economies of production and thus aids permanent establishment of a large use of synthetic even though it may be higher priced than crude rubber. Manufacturers of rubber products, making their own synthetic, will have special advantages in this way. Disparity in prices between synthetic and crude, if it is significant, will by no means be the sole measurement of the ability of synthetic to compete with crude without governmental assistance. For special-purpose types, the properties of the product will determine its utilization more than will its price. For general-purpose synthetic types, such as Buna S, there will be considerable demand, in spite of prices higher than crude, because of preferred use in some products and its use in blending in others where neither crude nor synthetic alone supply the quality desired.

A competitive advantage of synthetic rubber of all types in the open market will be ever-decreasing costs of production as compared with natural rubber. The cost of the latter will tend to rise after the war, due to rising wage standards, replacement of equipment, planting of new trees, and so forth, in the Far East and, in Latin America, to costs of shifting from wild rubber to plantation rubber. Costs of synthetic, however, will decrease steadily because of new processes, improvement of old processes, "tailor making" of grades within types, and so forth. This will reflect the same American ingenuity and mass production capacity which have been the bases for success in previously developed new industries. It is even quite possible that the United States synthetic rubber industry, without subsidy in any form, may eventually relegate natural rubber to a secondary position. Anyone unduly fearful of the fate of our synthetic industry in open-market competition after the war is apt to be also unduly forgetful of the inherent American characteristics of inventiveness and the economies of mass production.

Now let us examine the present and probable future of natural rubber as it relates to our war needs and to possible competition with our domestic synthetic industry.

It will certainly be some time before natural rubber from the far eastern plantations again becomes available to the United Nations. Therefore, it will be at least that long before natural rubber is again plentiful enough on the market to offer any significant competition to the synthetic industry. Even when these plantations are regained, there will probably be a considerable period of reconstruction necessitated by enemy destruction of property.

Latin-American production of crude rubber has never in recent decades been large compared to world production and consumption. For several years yet this production will not increase greatly because of inaccessibility and scarcity of wild rubber and because of the time

needed for bringing plantation trees into bearing. While far eastern rubber is under enemy control, and while our synthetic industry is growing, we will continue to need all available natural rubber from Latin American sources, not in competition with our synthetic program but in combination with it, as evidenced by this Government's policy of contracting for all available Latin American crude rubber until 1946.

When the above facts and probabilities are carefully weighed, it seems safe to assume that, for several years yet this country will continue to need and use crude rubber from all possible sources. It has not yet been duplicated exactly by synthetic for many purposes and it continues to be necessary for blending with the synthetic product for many uses.

Some years will probably yet elapse before the question of Government assistance to the domestic synthetic rubber becomes pertinent. Any attempt to force this question to the fore at the present time is therefore premature.

Those few vociferous critics who, while ignoring the possibility or even probability that synthetic rubber production in this country can stand on its own feet, go on to condemn the free-list binding of crude rubber in various trade agreements—particularly the one signed with Peru—are apparently ignorant of, or choose to ignore, the flexible nature of such agreements and of the status of the domestic synthetic industry at the time such agreements were concluded. For the benefit of such critics, let us review a little of the history of this binding of natural rubber on the free list.

When trade agreements were signed with the United Kingdom—November 17, 1938—and with Brazil—February 2, 1935—the production of synthetic rubber in this country was not large and no governmental plans for an extensive expansion were under consideration. Any possible future need for governmental assistance could hardly have then been foreseen, for the synthetic manufactured at that time, though more costly to produce than natural rubber, possessed special qualities not found in the natural product and was being largely used for special purposes. The question of competition between the natural and synthetic products therefore did not arise, and there is no record of any manufacturer of synthetic rubber having requested tariff protection or having objected to the binding of natural rubber on the free list.

Later, May 7, 1942, when the trade agreement with Peru was signed, the Government program for producing all-purpose synthetic rubber was still largely in the planning stage. Also, our national program for obtaining rubber at that time included financing of increased output of wild as well as plantation rubber in many Latin-American countries, including Peru. Throughout 1942, under the stimulus of the national rubber emergency, this Government was entering into agreements with the other American republics to buy all available natural rubber at higher than prevailing prices, and bonuses were being offered for production in excess of stipulated amounts in order to bring forth every possible pound of this vitally needed product for the war program. By November of that year such agreements had been concluded with practically all Latin-American countries able to supply rubber, to terminate at the end of 1946, or more than 2 years after the end of the initial period of the trade agreement with Peru. In view of this concurrent action at the time the Peruvian agreement was concluded, a refusal by this Government to continue to bind rubber on the free list in the trade agreement would certainly have had a most discouraging effect on the program for obtaining as much natural rubber as possible from Latin America in the shortest possible time.

Other pertinent circumstances concerning the Peruvian trade agreement should be noted. No opposition to the binding of rubber on the free list was expressed in any brief or at the public hearings at the time the agreement was under consideration. Furthermore, since the Peruvian agreement was for an initial period of only 2 years, it could not be considered that the duty status of natural rubber was being fixed for a lengthy or indefinite period without the possibility of change. The short initial period of the agreement, plus the "escape" clauses included in it, certainly offer sufficient assurance that if a change in the duty status of natural rubber rather than some other form of governmental assistance is found necessary in the national interest, the agreement with Peru, or those with other countries, will not preclude such a development.

I also believe that some mention has been made of the Mexican trade agreement as a danger to our domestic rubber industry. Such an attitude is ridiculous in view of the facts of the case. The Mexican agreement, signed December 23, 1942, binds only guayule rubber on the free list. In the over-all picture of rubber, guayule will never be a serious competitor of our synthetic industry because of its small quantity in the total rubber output and because of costs of processing. At the time the trade agreement was being negotiated the United States Government was encouraging Mexico to develop guayule production as a part of the general program to obtain every possible product to replace plantation rubber from the Far East and to supplement the inadequate supply of synthetic rubber. Therefore, it would seem imperative that guayule production in Mexico should at least be accorded continuance of duty-free entry. It should be noted, too, that the "escape" clause in the agreement is adequate assurance of flexibility should the necessity ever arise for a change in the tariff status of guayule.

In view of the foregoing facts which I have placed before you, especially for the edification of those few carping critics and alarmists who presume to foresee the ruination of our domestic rubber industry through the trade-agreements program, let me emphasize two conclusions:

First. The present is not the time to determine whether or not governmental assistance of the domestic synthetic rubber industry will be necessary through tariff restrictions on the importation of natural rubber or otherwise. In fact, it is impossible now to resolve such a question. The type and extent of such assistance, as well as its necessity, can only be determined after the war in light of the facts available at that time when the question may, or may not, become pertinent.

Second. The past binding of natural rubber on the free list in various trade agreements was certainly justified at the time the agreements were made and, furthermore, such binding will not hinder governmental assistance to the domestic industry in some form or other, if and when such assistance may be considered necessary in the national interest.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I was intensely interested in the gentleman's very interesting address in connection with rubber. I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency that sponsored the legislation whereby the House finally enacted legislation providing the $650,000,000 for constructing synthetic rubber plants. I wonder if the gentleman could tell the House how far the synthetic rubber program has advanced in the matter of production of synthetic rubber?

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry to say that I cannot answer that question in any specific way except to say that from what I hear in official circles the production of synthetic rubber under the able leadership of Mr. Jeffers has attained a place where within another year the rubber situation will be completely licked.

Mr. ROLPH. We made provision for the production of some 800,000 tons per year. I was just wondering if the gentleman knows how many tons we are producing at the present time?

Mr. DINGELL. I understand we are producing upward of 175,000 tons of synthetic rubber in this country this year. It may be far in excess of that, but I am told that is a conservative estimate.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman have any information as to the cost of production of synthetic rubber made from oil as compared with that made from grain?

Mr. DINGELL. No, I do not; but I understand that the oil production process and method are less costly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity as a Member of this distinguished body to make an observation on the debate which took place in the House yesterday when it was called to our attention by a distinguished Member on the other side of the House the position of the English Parliament on trade treaties. And I quote from the RECORD:

> Take the United Kingdom, for instance. It is then subject to ratification by the Parliament, and if the Parliament did not ratify

what Mr. Winston Churchill did, he would have to resign and the Government would fall, and they would have a general election, and they have not had a general election since 1935. Congress can repudiate the President whenever it sees fit, and that makes Congress free to do with the program what it pleases.

Now I ask the Congress, What is the matter with our system? I think that is what Congress should do and this is in keeping with our constitutional form of government. Since when is it necessary for the American Congress to pattern after the British Parliament? We declared our independence on July 4, 1776, and I would say that we have made considerable progress and done quite well by ourselves with our democratic and constitutional form of government.

As far as I am concerned this Republic and its system is good enough for me. The present set-up, our democratic form of government, which we have enjoyed since the inception of this Nation is a system that has built without question the greatest nation that the world has ever known. It has stood the test of 150 years of trial and experiment under changing conditions, and, my colleagues, let me tell you that during this time it has created more wealth and distributed it more widely, wisely, and equitably than any other system in the world. In comparison with the English Parliament and the British Government and their procedure, I am satisfied with the American Congress and its procedure. It has done a remarkably fine job over the years.

It was also called to our attention that the United States Chamber of Commerce heartily endorsed the reciprocal trade treaties as presented. I quote a statement made yesterday by the distinguished Member from Virginia:

> The United States Chamber of Commerce is another fine organization. They have been either in opposition or lukewarm up until this year.

Now, for the benefit of the Members of this House, I want to read a letter from James C. Ingebretsen, director, department of governmental affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, dated May 10, which states, in a very definite manner, their position on this matter. This merely to clarify the inference made yesterday before the Members of this House that the United States Chamber of Commerce heartily endorses the present set-up:

To Members of the House of Representatives:

The following declaration of policy with respect to the Trade Agreements Act was approved by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at its thirty-first annual meeting, April 27-29, 1943:

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

"The policy of the Trade Agreements Act should be continued. This policy gives adequate authority for the Government through its established agencies of negotiation and administration to reach effective agreements for the reciprocal and selective adjustment of tariffs and other barriers to trade, including quota restrictions and other obstacles to the reasonable flow of goods and services. There should be appropriate safeguards in legislative provisions for ample public notice and open hearings, and clauses in the agreements providing in case of unforeseen developments, for the modification or withdrawal of concessions, in order to prevent serious injury to domestic producers. Neither in the original form nor in practical application by reason of events that were not contemplated should agreements be permitted to cause destructive competition in American agriculture or industry."

The policies of the chamber are determined by some 1,800 business organizations, with an underlying membership of three-quarters of a million business and professional men, geographically representing all segments of our business economy.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. INGEBRETSEN,
Director, Department of Governmental Affairs.

I am in receipt of a letter from a nationally known organization which commands the respect and admiration of the American people in which they state "that the Congress should vindicate its ancient and fundamental right to be something more than be a mere spectator in matters relating to tariff and the formulation of our policies with reference to foreign trade." As they see it, that is the most important issue involved in this whole question. Any plan that robs the chosen representatives of the people of one of their main functions reduces them to impotency and which wrongfully delegates this power in its entirety to the executive department of the Government cannot be successfully defended as liberal, constitutional, or American. The people of the country have been greatly heartened by the stand the legislators have taken during the recent months toward recapturing its constitutional prerogatives, and they say that they trust that the Congress may reassert its rightful authority in this vital and fundamental matter.

Although I am of the opinion that this Trade Agreement Act should be renewed because of the emergency of the war, certain reservations should be made to give the Congress an opportunity to voice its opinions whenever the occasion should arise to protect our 135,000,000 people and the economic, the industrial, and agricultural life of the Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to vote for the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties, but I should like to see the safeguard of congressional approval written into the bill, and further I should like that the life of the agreements be limited to 2 years or for the duration.

I feel certain that these agreements becoming operative in 1934 have not accomplished the purpose for which they were intended. Government statistics clearly indicate to me that they have depressed rather than stimulated business, that they have curtailed our volume of exports and increased imports as a burden on the home markets of the farmer and the American manufacturer, displacing American labor by reason of goods imported to a larger degree produced by foreign labor at lower prices.

With proper safeguards there is one reason that causes me to favor the agreements. An extension would indicate to our allies that we are willing to go along with them commercially as well as in a military way. That might help some at the present time but I fail to attach to this reason the importance given to it by some Members.

I think, and there are able independent writers like Walter Lippmann, and many able men in this House and the Senate who believe that Secretary of State Hull has made a mistake in attempting to tie this legislation in as a fundamental part of our post-war policy. These agreements it would seem to me hold no more importance now in our scheme of international cooperation than they contained when enacted in 1934. In fact they hold less now because they have in my judgment failed to prove of any great merit.

I believe they should be subject to congressional review. The very fact that they were subject to congressional review would cause the negotiators for our American people to be more careful in their agreements and commitments. It would give the negotiators a powerful trading leverage in dealing with foreign nations. It might cause them to be a little less arbitrary in their demands if our negotiators could say to them, "Gentlemen, after all, these agreements must be approved by the Congress."

You who urge the policy of excluding Congress from a right to review and approve these trade treaties are refusing democracy the right to work or function. You will never settle this matter right as long as you insist on the exclusion of the Members of Congress, who are the duly elected representatives of the people. If you will write into this bill the necessity for Congressional approval, this policy can continue to slide on from one administration to the other so smoothly you will not need to put a time limit on the act of 2 years, which will mark the date of a change from the present administration to a Republican administration, and you will take this thing out of politics.

If you provide for the approval of Congress, the work and agreement of the negotiators could immediately be turned over to the able Ways and Means Committee, which after a prompt review would bring their recommendations to the House and it is my judgment that this Nation needs the applied wisdom on such matters, of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and that the House would speedily endorse the recommendations of such a committee.

And, gentlemen, I believe such agreements should be approved by the Congress, the representatives of the people. I can see where these agreements can be made to work fairly, equitably in the main, and satisfactorily to the people and the Congress, if we provide for congressional review.

For if this procedure is provided, the administration doubtless would place more emphasis on, and possibly expand and improve their panels of negotiators giving the reciprocal policy a more permanent place in our scheme of international trade. It would seem to me that the administration by the welcome of such cooperation by the Congress could

pave the way toward a permanent policy if over a period of years it justified meritorious continuance.

I deem it a mistake for leaders of the administration to take the position that Congress cannot be trusted to sit in and function on these agreements. Such a position is a further move toward centralized government, which has already raised a fear in the minds of the people and the Members of Congress.

When the constituted parliaments of all other nations have the right to, and do, pass on these commitments, can it be said that the legislative branch of this great leading Republic of the world is so impotent that it cannot be trusted to review and approve the work of an appointed commission or governmental agency. The Members of Congress under our form of government are the voice of the people. Do you want to take away the voice of the people? That is what you are doing when you set up a commission of men not elected by the people and refuse to allow their work to be reviewed and approved by the Congress.

On Monday the President of Bolivia spoke to this body. I quote a part of his address. Listen to what he said about our Congress. Do you want to make him, his nation, and like nations believe he was wrong? I quote him, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is indeed a great honor for me to come into this shrine of American liberties

I assure you that I am sincerely moved, because I consider you the true representatives of the American people, and know that through you I am speaking to them. I am grateful, therefore, for this honor, and I thank you in the name of my country as well as in my own.

The Congress of the United States has always played a significant role in the historic and political life of this great Nation. It stands, essentially for the sovereign power of the people, and today, especially, it symbolizes to the world at large not only the objective manifestation of that power, but a real assurance that all freemen—within and without the United States—will find in its midst stanch defenders of justice and right.

This Congress is the best example of that admirable system of checks and balances which makes it possible to safeguard and preserve a sovereign power that is zealous of its rights and, at the same time, respectful of the limitations of its own privileges.

Gentlemen, let us have the courage to attempt to make democracy work by settling this controversy once and for all and settle it right. It will never be settled right until Congress has the power to review and approve these agreements or treaties.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I read a book by Prof. Raymond Moley, a one-time New Deal "brain truster" and White House intimate, who has long since been banished into the outer darkness of enlightened capitalism. In it he told all—at least, all that he knew—about the early days of the New Deal revolution. One phrase in that book haunts my memory. I may not be quoting it accurately, but I believe I can quote it accurately enough. Said the disillusioned professor:

Never at any given moment did the President care what the facts were; all he cared about was what the people thought the facts were.

Now, the good professor may or may not have been correct in his analysis of the Roosevelt mind. The point is that the author assumed that in taking action on any question a man in high office should at all times care about both—care not only about what the facts really are but about what the masses of people think the facts are. If this is important for a great statesman to do this, it is no less important for us minor statesmen.

Now as to what the ultimate facts about the reciprocal trade treaties are, irrespective of public opinion concerning them, I do not pretend to know. There are experts, great experts, on the workings of industrial and agricultural tariffs in this House; men who could never hope to read into the RECORD, in 1 day's debate, nor in 1 month's, all they have learned in a long lifetime of experience about the effects of past tariff policies on our domestic economy. They can tell you down to the last bristle on the tail of a pig what the lowering or raising of tariffs by even a fraction of a cent have done, for instance, to the hog industry in this country. Armed with their statistics and facts they could make sausage meat of me, as they made sausage meat in these past weeks of a number of witnesses who appeared before them at the hearings to plead emotionally for the unamended passage of the bill. But even they do not claim to know all there is to know about the facts of these trade agreements. Their very great wisdom has made them, in this infinitely complicated world, too humble to claim cosmic knowledge about anything, even about such measurable matters as the price of cheese, butter, eggs, and coffee cups. For instance, they are never quite prepared to say, at exactly what point our trade policy abroad began to play mischief with our domestic economy, or at what point the blame had to be taken instead by our unsound domestic policies in the home markets. It is my own impression that if leading villain there is today in the agricultural and industrial picture of America, that villain does not wear the slick mustachios of the foreign importer, but the blurred spectacles of the domestic, home-grown New Deal bureaucrat who has never, as the expression goes, met a pay roll. It is his many experimentations with American economy at home which have wrought such havoc, that though the trade policies of Mr. Hull were 10 times fairer and more desirable than they have been, the over-all picture would still show a decline in our foreign import and export trade.

I am one of those who believes that America can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Now the overly partisan proponents of this bill will declare that America can never be strong at home until she is first strong abroad. But which comes first, a foreign policy or a domestic one, is a chicken and an egg argument. All important arguments are unavoidably so because this is a chicken and egg world. Economically, as well as biologically. Cause and effect in both are impossible to assess, unless we can work our way back, so to speak, to the Garden of Eden. where it is to be presumed, the Adams family life began in a free trade economy—except for apples. Yesterday, for example, the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], whose discourses always give me rare pleasure, wholly apart from his political or economic views, because I appreciate as a playwright the pungency of his dialogue, and the mischievous play of his wit, introduced into the RECORD a set of statistics to show that Germany, Spain, Italy, and most of the war-torn countries of Europe, including our British Allies, have had far higher tariff walls than we have. I assume he also introduced into the RECORD the fact that Sweden had a tariff wall two-thirds lower than our own. Now look at the shape Japan, Germany, and Italy—and even Great Britain—are in. A mere layman arguing from effect to cause might be pardoned for jumping to certain rather sweeping conclusions, on the basis of these facts alone. He might deduce that since we are still the highest living standard country in the world, and since Sweden whose tariffs are even lower than our own, is one of the few countries that has remained neutral, even with a World War proceeding in her own back yard, the lower a country's tariff the better chance it has to raise its living standards—and stay out of war. At this point the gentleman from Minnesota might well claim the right to interpret those figures as he thinks they should be interpreted. Thus we see that although it is well for us to know what the facts are—it is equally important for us to be able to interpret them correctly. Above all, in this particular matter of the trade treaties, it is important for us to know what the people believe the facts to be, and how they interpret them. And it is on the basis of how they do so, I feel we must extend this act.

Mr. KNUTSON rose.

Mrs. LUCE. I yield, although with some trepidation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not catch the point of the gentlewoman's observation. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I have yielded, fearfully.

Mr. KNUTSON. I accept it fearfully.

May I call the attention of the gentlewoman to the fact that Switzerland, which is surrounded on all sides by hostile nations, has——

Mrs. LUCE. Switzerland also has some exceedingly high mountains which have served her rather better to keep war out than her high tariff barriers.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it the gentlewoman's thought, then, that tariff barriers should be in relation to altitude? That is very good.

Mrs. LUCE. Well, whether good or bad, right or wrong, the people of this

country believe that these agreements have on the whole worked to the advantage of the country, and will continue to work to its advantage for the next 3 years. They have even come to believe that peace may be largely assured if we pass them, that war will be certain if we defeat them—and certainly more likely if we cripple or hamstring them with amendments. Millions of Americans are convinced that these agreements and their unqualified approval is the key—indeed the greatest key—to unlocking the door of world cooperation. You and I know that that is not true. Think of the titantic problems that will confront us with the coming of peace, the vast complicated job that all of us, every one of us here, will have to undertake, if we are to rehabilitate war-stricken countries and bring a measure of peace to the world; the agreements we will have to make on food, international loans, military alliances, stabilization of currency, securing of air bases and naval bases, the keeping or disbanding of armies, not to mention the gargantuan task which faces us of dealing with the recurrent problem of unemployment at home, and the rehabilitation of our own free enterprise system. We know that we may make many false moves in these matters, any of which might set us again on the road to war, though today Mr. Hull and the State Department have their way without one more word of dispute on this floor.

In short, the passage of this act is only one of the small steps which we must take if we are to insure peace for our children. Yet, small though the step, it is, nevertheless, a step in the right direction. And we have not taken many such steps in the last 10 years. And whether rightly or wrongly, the renewal, unamended, of this act has become the symbol today both at home and abroad of this Congress' willingness to take rapid, patriotic, unified action, of its own free will in the direction of liberal, enlightened world collaboration. Let us even admit—which I personally do not—that we may lose, economically, something as a nation in passing it. But all that we may lose in passing it, we may well gain a thousand times over, from the renewed collaboration Congress will receive from public opinion at home and over the world. We will then have on our side the confidence and good will of millions, when—which I hope will be soon—we start to legislate to put our own domestic economy in order.

I repeat, our foreign-trade policy is not today the Nation's only important question, and never was.

For example, I have heard the Members of the Democratic side of the House tell us over and over, how the Hawley-Smoot tariff set the stage for World War No. 1. I have heard none of them refer to the fact that this administration's scuttling of the world economic conference 3 years later made the war that the Hawley-Smoot tariff made possible—perhaps inevitable. On the day when Mr. Roosevelt, while fishing on his pretty sloop off the shores of Maine, sent the telegram to London which scuttled that conference, he launched the New Deal on its disastrous policy of economic isolation from Europe and Asia which has cost the world so much suffering and bloodshed. No; I respectfully submit that no one action of any one party has brought about this world war, or will make the world peace. There must be a great symphony of actions and deeds—which in the years to come it will be our great honor and privilege, both Democrats and Republicans, to take part in, if we are to assure our own prosperity and help to establish a trend in that direction among our European and Asiatic neighbors.

Now, I certainly would not plead the passage of this act simply because the people thought it was good for them. I am not so unmindful of my duty to the Nation. For we must legislate for, as well as with, our constituents. But all the testimony I have taken, by reading the committee hearings, reading the newspapers, listening to the national radio, corresponding with my own constituents, leads me to believe that the peoples of this Nation, like the peoples of the United Nations, are right—the act should be passed. And they are right, too, to look upon any adverse actions of ours here, as a very definite straw in the wind—a straw which in their minds will point to an unwillingness to collaborate in the post-war world. No one despises more than I do the attempt of the administration, and certain overly nervous and uninformed foreign sources, to call every action of ours which does not supinely coincide with the administration wishes "isolation." And I think that the people also despise such attempts. But I fear that, nevertheless, far too many of them will nevertheless construe adverse action on this bill—as a marked trend on our part toward isolation. Let us then, since world collaboration and not blind isolation is the true wish of our hearts, quickly ratify this symbol, hand the people this key they plead for, and then go on vigorously to oppose those things which are worth opposition—the vast attempts of the New Deal to put agriculture and industry out of business at home.

In closing, may I read to you a letter from a great Republican who in his day had campaigned for protective tariffs. He wrote to a gentleman called Dr. Edward Wallace, who had inquired his views concerning the further raising of tariffs. It happened in that time, as in this, America was on the eve of a crisis, even more grave than the one we are now facing. And always in times of crisis the good will of foreign countries is something every wise statesman had to bear in mind. He wrote:

MY DEAR SIR: You inquire my tariff views, and suggest the propriety of my writing a letter on the subject. I was an old Henry Clay tariff Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject than on any other, I have not since changed my views. I believe yet if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted, protective tariff, so far acquiesced in as not to be a perpetual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us. Still, it is my opinion, that just now the revival of that question will not advance the cause—itself, or the man who revives it.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

CLINTON, *October 1858.*

In wishing us to pass this act, without amendment, I believe that the people believe that we will be fulfilling A. Lincoln's tariff specifications for a time of crisis—we will bring about, "A moderate protective tariff, so far acquiesced as not to be a perpetual subject on this floor of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties." And that it will be better for us. Above all, I believe, as he did, that the bitter revival of this question will not advance the American cause itself, or the man who revives it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, anything that I may say following the very forceful presentation of this subject by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] would be an anticlimax. She concluded her statement by reading a letter from a famous and greatly beloved Republican, our Civil War President of the United States. I want to read a few excerpts from a speech made by another well-known and intelligent Republican. Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich, who is the chairman of the board of directors of the Chase National Bank, made a speech before the midwinter banquet of the Connecticut Bankers Association, in which he discussed the problem of whether this country would be able to carry and eventually liquidate the very heavy national debt we will have when this war is over. The gist of his speech was that we could follow one of two policies: First, that we could repudiate the debt, which, of course, would be unthinkable, and would probably mean the end of our form of government as we know it; or second, that we could pay the debt, but in order to do that, we had to keep a very high national income. He concluded that the best method, and, in fact, a very necessary course, for us to follow, if we are to maintain a consistently high national income is to increase our foreign trade, and he had this to say:

Real national income can also be increased and the burden of debt correspondingly reduced if the channels of international trade are reopened. This means that trade and tariff barriers must be reduced, foreign-exchange controls removed, and multilateralism substituted for the bilateralism of the past decade.

* * * * *

In stimulating world trade and its concomitant of real national income, the United States can play a decisive role. Its trade policies will set the pattern for those of the world. Even now the United States has a unique opportunity of exercising its leadership in the direction of more liberal trade policies. I refer to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which, unless renewed, expires in June of this year. First enacted in 1934, this act was extended for 3-year periods in 1937 and in 1940. Under the authority granted, trade agreements have been entered into with 25 nations, and agreements with 3 additional nations are pending. The trade-agreements program has made a constructive contribution toward a liberalization of world trade and toward a reduction in excessive and unreasonable trade barriers.

It is to be hoped that this act will be renewed by the Congress, not only by reason of the highly significant results already achieved but also by reason of the fact that its renewal will demonstrate to the world that this country is ready and willing to col-

laborate with other nations in the reshaping of the post-war world. We will have given tangible evidence that we have renounced those unrealistic policies of economic and political isolationism which governed our foreign attitudes immediately following the First World War.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have heard that statement so many times, and this afternoon I tried to point out that that idea has been sold the American people, and pretty well sold abroad, but the facts do not substantiate the statement, because while they are lower than the 1930 act, yet if the gentleman can find in any tariff revision where the present duties are any different than they are in the 1922 act, I would like to have him put them into the RECORD. I cannot find them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman apparently has not tried to find them, but I shall talk about what the trade-agreements program has done in a few moments. Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich is the son of former Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, who was the sponsor of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and was considered one of the foremost contenders for high tariffs during the time that he was a Member of the United States Senate and chairman of the Finance Committee of that body. I am also informed that a brother of Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich was at one time a Member of the House, and that he served with many who are here today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COOPER. He was also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very prominent Republican member of that committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. All of which shows, and it is an encouraging sign that members of the minority party, the Republican Party, and sons of members who were high protectionists, are seeing the light, and are realizing that for our own domestic betterment we have to have increased foreign trade. That is the reason such organizations as the Manufacturers' Association, which is predominantly Republican in membership, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, a majority of whose members, I am sure, are Republicans, are wholeheartedly in favor of a renewal of this trade-agreement program.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that before this debate is ended today, certain inaccurate and very misleading statements which were made here on the floor this afternoon should be corrected.

The fact is as I have listened to the statements, I think I have never heard so many misleading statements as have been made by some of those who are opposing the renewal of the trade-agreement program.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] for whom I have a very high respect, stated this afternoon, and made a very convincing argument, if his facts were true, that experience had demonstrated that the trade-agreement program retarded exports rather than increased the amount of exports. With much emphasis he said that for the period 1934 to 1938 exports had only increased 58.1 percent with trade-agreement countries, whereas in nontrade-agreement countries the exports had increased 60.8 percent. He argued very vigorously that this demonstrated that nontrade-agreement countries showed a better result in the matter of exports than trade-agreement countries. I know that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] would not mislead anybody if he had the facts, so I went to him and called his attention to the fact that somebody must have given him the wrong information, because I know he would not state anything on the floor that he did not think was true.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In just a moment. I showed the gentleman the minority report of February 6, 1940, which was reported by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], page 18, which shows that his statement was entirely inaccurate, that it was misleading and confusing.

Upon showing that to the gentleman he asked permission to revise his remarks, and I am sure his remarks will reveal the true situation. The correct facts are that the total increase of exports of trade-agreement countries from 1934 to 1938 was 58.1 percent; that the total increase of nontrade agreement countries was 38.3 percent. The way the gentleman arrived at his figure of 60.8 percent as being the increase for nontrade-agreement countries, was by taking a percentage of increase after omitting certain non-trade-agreement countries, to wit: China, Japan, Manchukuo, Spain, Italy, Ethiopia, Albania, Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. But if you include those countries, then the non-trade-agreement exports increased 38.3 and the trade-agreement countries 58.1 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one other statement. Also other Members opposing renewal have made the statement that during this whole period of time there had not been any increase; that nontrade-agreement countries had increased more than trade-agreement countries. On page 24 of the minority report is a table which shows for the years 1934 to 1940 the increase in trade-agreement countries has been 55 percent and in non-trade-agreement countries 32 percent. So that there is no foundation for the argument, and I am glad the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] is correcting the RECORD so as to show the true facts.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that the figures I presented show the figures of those countries that were not thrown out of balance by the war. The countries that the gentleman has named, every one of them, at some time during that period between 1934 and 1938 were at war or preparing for war, and because of the extraordinary effect of war or preparations for war upon their economy, in order to arrive at the true figure as to the effect of these trade agreements with the normal commerce of countries in a normal state throughout the world, five of those countries, which the gentleman named, were omitted from that table. That was the reason that the figures were given as I gave them, and they are true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation and I am glad that we now have the matter clarified.

The trade-agreements program is heartily approved by the great majority of the American people. The continuation of this program is vigorously requested by the preponderant majority of farmers, laborers, and businessmen. It is regarded as necessary if the United States is to take its place as the first nation of the world in bringing about international good will, commerce, and understanding, which elements are required if we are to avoid the recurrence of another world catastrophe. The record shows that the trade-agreements program has proven to be a good American policy when viewed from an entirely selfish interest. No one can contend that it is not a good international policy if we have in mind helping bring about an understanding between the peoples and nations of the world which will give us peace and a stable international program in the years to come.

Not being able to deny the general demand for the renewal of the trade-agreements program, those opposed to it resort to subterfuge. They say they are willing to have the program continued, but want it subjected to crippling amendments which would make it unworkable.

I am advised that the opposition will center most of its effort for adoption of an amendment having Congress pass upon trade agreements, either before or after they have been negotiated. On page 4 of the minority report, the intention of the minority is stated, as follows:

> The Trade Treaty Act is an even broader surrender of discretionary legislative power to the Executive contrary to the Constitution and Congress should lose no time in asserting its control over foreign trade policy, leaving to the Executive the purely administrative functions which the Constitution intends him to exercise.

History shows that the policy recommended by the minority of having Congress handle, to the exclusion of the Executive, the problem of making trade agreements and tariffs has never worked satisfactorily. Only the Executive can negotiate with foreign powers in the matter of tariffs and trade agreements. I think it was intended by the framers of our Constitution that Congress should lay down certain standards and rules for the making of trade agreements and that within the bounds of these limits the Executive should be able to negotiate and conclude agreements with foreign

countries. In modern days when currents of trade and fluctuating currency shift rapidly, when almost overnight exporters may find their customary markets gone, it is imperative that the President be able to enter into and give effect to international agreements with expedition and certainty. To have to submit such agreements for congressional ratification would defeat the very purpose of the agreement. Time is of the essence. Practically all of the important commercial nations of the world can take prompt action with regard to tariff adjustments. In negotiation of a trade agreement concessions are made back and forth on various items. If the tariff on one item is upset, the whole program would have to be renegotiated. If we are to take the lead in fostering world trade, we must clothe our Executive with power to operate and to speak for the Nation he represents. So far the State Department has done this successfully.

Let us go back to the precedents. Earlier I stated that this program was in conformity with the Constitution, and certainly the validity of trade agreements is sustained by a long and well-considered line of decisions by our Supreme Court.

In 1794, when many of the makers of our Constitution were still living and were Members of the Congress, the Congress authorized and empowered the President, whenever in his opinion the public safety so required, not merely to issue regulations controlling foreign trade, but actually to "lay an embargo on all ships and vessels in the ports of the United States under such regulations as the circumstances of the case may require." This was by act of June 4, 1794. Throughout the closing years of the eighteenth century, and the first half of the nineteenth century, similar enactments were made by Congress conferring upon the President large discretionary powers to affect or regulate commerce. There is still on the statute books the act of 1878, revised statute 4228, a rewriting of earlier statutes, an act which provides for the suspension of discriminatory tonnage and related duties with respect to the vessels of any foreign nation—"upon satisfactory proof being given to the President that such nation levies no discriminatory duties upon American vessels."

The McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 authorized the President to enter upon a comprehensive program of tariff bargaining with other countries. Section 3 of this act gave the President power to suspend certain free importation of commodities from countries that did not reciprocate with us. The constitutionality of this provision of the tariff act was questioned in the case of *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649). The United States Supreme Court, however, upheld the validity of the legislation, and speaking through Mr. Justice Harlan, the Court said:

> What has been said is equally applicable to the objection that the third section of the act invests the President with treaty-making power.
>
> The Court is of opinion that the third section of the act of October 1, 1890, is not liable to the objection that it transfers legislative and treaty-making power to the President.

The Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 by section 3 gave the President the right to enter into Executive agreements to impose lower specified rates of duty on certain articles. Many agreements were concluded, and none were submitted to the Senate for confirmation. The validity of these agreements were sustained by a number of Federal cases.

In the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 again Congress conferred upon the President wide discretionary power within the field of tariff adjustment. The President was authorized to modify tariffs upward or downward within a 50-percent limit in order to meet changing needs and conditions. Again, the cry was raised of unconstitutionality. The issue was carried to the Supreme Court and in the case of *Hampton & Co.* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394) it was claimed that section 315 was unconstitutional on the ground that the grant of so wide a power to the President constituted an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. Mr. Chief Justice Taft in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of section 315, said:

> The same principle that permits Congress to exercise its rate-making power in interstate commerce by declaring the rule which shall prevail in the legislative fixing of rates and enables it to remit to a rate-making body created in accordance with its provisions the fixing of such rates, justifies a similar provision for the fixing of customs duties on imported merchandise. If Congress shall lay down by legislative act an intelligible principle to which the person or body authorized to fix such rates is directed to conform, such legislative action is not a forbidden delegation of legislative power.

In other words, the United States Supreme Court has laid down the doctrine, and consistently followed it, that a delegation of power by Congress to the President is not unconstitutional if Congress shall lay down by legislative act "an intelligible principle" to which the Executive is directed to conform.

Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State Blaine, President McKinley, and President Theodore Roosevelt, all urged the policy of tariff reciprocity. They all urged that the Executive must be given leeway to negotiate trade agreements. The Supreme Court has at all times sustained the constitutionality of the President's powers under the various trade-agreement acts.

But, if anyone could have doubt about the legality of this program, their doubt would be dispersed upon a reading of the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304). That case definitely established that, in providing for the carrying out of legislation affecting the foreign relations of the United States, Congress may constitutionally vest in the President far greater discretion than would be permissible in the case of enactments which relate solely to domestic matter. The court recognized that congressional legislation which, like the present act, "is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved." The Court then reviewed a long list of statutes authorizing action by the President with respect to our foreign relations, and declared:

> Practically every volume of the United States Statutes contains one or more acts or joint resolutions of Congress authorizing action by the President in respect of subjects affecting foreign relations, which either leave the exercise of the power to his unrestricted judgment, or provide a standard far more general than that which has always been considered requisite with regard to domestic affairs.

The Court finally concluded that—

> The uniform, long-continued, and undisputed legislative practice just disclosed rests upon an admissible view of the Constitution which, even if the practice found far less support in principle than we think it does, we should not feel at liberty at this late day to disturb.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the constitutionality question is only a camouflage to hide opposition to this program based upon selfish and unwholesome interests.

America is making a tremendous sacrifice, both in blood and money, to bring this war to a successful conclusion, and even greater sacrifice will have to be made. The action taken in the House on this question today may largely determine whether we are to receive a lasting benefit from that investment. What we are doing will be utterly futile and foolish unless we are to take our place as the first nation of the world in preventing a recurrence of this conflagration. The eyes of the world are upon us. People everywhere are looking toward America with hope that we will take the lead. They have been inspired by the tremendous effort we have made since December 7, 1941. They are now rallying to our cause. The Old World is tired and is looking to the people of the New World to build an international economy based upon good will and understanding. Whether we will do that or whether we will again follow the course of isolationism will be determined by what we do with respect to the trade-agreements program. It is unbelievable that this Congress will turn its back upon the lessons of the past. This is not a party issue. It is an international issue. Nothing we could do would bring more distress to our people and to our allies than would repudiation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks at this time, I wish to include excerpts from an article written by me and published in the April 1943 edition of the Tennessee Law Review:

> No one doubts that the President has power, without submission to the Senate, to make any binding international agreements. All of our Presidents since Washington have done so. Many efforts have been made to state the limits of this power.
>
> Many agreements have been entered into with foreign countries independent of any legislation by Congress. John Marshall once said: "The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations and its sole

representative with foreign nations." Pursuant to broad constitutional powers over the executive department, the Army and Navy, and foreign relations, Presidents have entered into numerous agreements which became effective without congressional authorization or subsequent senatorial approval. In 1898 the President entered into preliminary articles of peace with Spain, which not only provided for the suspension of hostilities, but in which Spain agreed to relinquish all claims of sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico to the United States. Other examples of Executive agreements made, independent of legislation, have included the open-door policy in China, various agreements regarding fisheries, joint military occupation of islands, and acquiring bases for hemispheric defense.

The precise question for present purposes is: What sorts of agreements may be made by the President by his authority as President, coupled with a grant of authority from the whole Congress, without separate submission to the Senate?

Reduced thus to reality, the issue does not seem very doubtful. The power of Congress over the tariff is complete, and the power of the President over foreign affairs, including international agreements, is very broad indeed. When they work in harness, it would seem to be enough to assure validity, certainly for an agreement so limited in time as those permitted by the Trade Agreements Act. An agreement that binds the United States forever, about any important matter, looks much more like a treaty than one that binds it for 3 years.

* * * * *

Two recent and striking cases should be mentioned. *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324), and *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203), both involved an Executive agreement, November 16, 1933, between the United States and the Soviet Union under which the United States received as assignee the claims of the Soviet Government against American insurance companies and banks, arising among other things from the nationalization by Soviet decrees of the property of Russian companies, which latter had placed funds on deposit in this country. The combined effect of the decrees and the agreement, if they were valid, was to assign to the United States Government all the intangible property in the United States of these old Russian companies, to the exclusion of foreign creditors of the companies themselves. The courts of New York held that under New York law the rights of the old creditors were not extinguished. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed the New York courts, holding that the agreement, like a treaty, overrode the New York law. As to the President's power to make the agreement the Court said:

"The powers of the President in the conduct of foreign relations included the power, without consent of the Senate, to determine the public policy of the United States with respect to the Russian nationalization decrees. * * * It was the judgment of the political department that full recognition of the Soviet Government required the settlement of all outstanding problems including the claims of our nationals. Recognition and the Litvinov assignment were interdependent. We would usurp the executive function if we held that that decision was not final and conclusive in the courts."

If the President has the power, without action either by the Senate or by Congress, to accept a foreign uncompensated nationalization of privately owned property, to take for the United States an assignment of the claim of the foreign government resulting from that nationalization, and thereby to override State laws and exclude private creditors from funds on deposit in this country, is there any doubt that, with prior express authority from Congress he can make a binding promise to maintain a stated tariff status in effect for a period not longer than 3 years? It must always be remembered that no one has a private right to any particular level of tariff protection. What shall be subject to duty and what not, and at what rates and for how long, are wholly public questions. They rest with the President (because he is responsible for international relations) and Congress (because it is responsible for taxes and the regulation of foreign commerce). When these two act together all the applicable authority of the United States has been exerted. No further action, either of the Senate or of any other body, is required.

There is, therefore, no real doubt as to the power of Congress to continue the authority it gave the President in 1934 nor of the power of the President to act under it. What Congress should do, and what the President should do, are questions of policy and practice on which Americans can take their stand as their knowledge and their judgment dictate, unencumbered by doubts about the constitutional correctness of their action.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be given until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 796, relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and in one to include a speech which he recently delivered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin and a resolution of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon a report on the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] had a special order of 30 minutes this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that his time may be transferred to next Tuesday, May 18, that he then have permission to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some biographical and statistical records.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain excerpts; and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on another subject and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent radio address by Dorothy Thompson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an address by Dr. David J. Price in Chicago on wartime fire protection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF CLARK AGAINST NICHOLS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1943.

The Honorable The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: That there is in progress, under the provisions of the statutes, a contest growing out of the election held November 3, 1942, for the seat in the House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, is made apparent by the filing in the Clerk's office of the following communications, viz:

(1) On December 8, 1942, for information only, by Hon. E. O. Clark, of a notice of his intention to contest the election of Hon. JACK NICHOLS as the returned Member from

the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

(2) On February 5, 1943, for information only, by the contestant of a copy of the amended notice of contest.

(3) On May 6, 1943, of a letter dated May 5, 1943, from the contestee, Hon. JACK NICHOLS, raising the question as to whether or not the contestant is barred from proceeding further in the House of Representatives with his contest against the right of the contestee to a seat in the House of Representatives and setting forth the reason therefor, in his opinion, as the contestee.

(4) On May 7, 1943, by the receipt of an express package indicating on its face that it contains depositions taken by A. A. Nelson, notary public and commissioner in the contested-election case of Clark against Nichols from the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma on behalf of the contestant.

Since the letter of the contestee, Hon. JACK NICHOLS, dated May 5, 1943, addressed to the Clerk (item No. 3) requests the Clerk to refer this matter to the House of Representatives for appropriate action, and further, since the question raised by the contestee in this communication, if pressed, would ultimately have to be decided by the House itself, the Clerk is transmitting this communication herewith for consideration by the appropriate committee pending further action in this case.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1943.

Hon. SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: On the 21st day of November 1942 the State election board of the State of Oklahoma issued to me a certificate of election to the House of Representatives of the United States from the Second Oklahoma Congressional District.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of title 2 of the United States Code, 1940 edition, E. O. Clark, of Stigler, Okla., served notice on me, in writing, on December 5, 1942, of his intention to contest my right to occupy the seat in Congress from the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

Section 202 of title 2 of the United States Code provides that I should, within 30 days from the date of the service of this notice upon me, answer said notice and serve the same upon the contestant, E. O. Clark. Accordingly, on January 5, 1943, I served on the said contestant, E. O. Clark, my answer, denying the allegations contained in said notice and the grounds therefor.

Section 203 of title 2 of the United States Code provides that the contestant shall have 40 days from the date on which the contestee's answer is served upon him (January 5, 1943), within which to take testimony or depositions in support of the allegations contained in his notice. Accordingly, the contestant completed the taking of his depositions on February 16, 1943, which was the expiration of the 40-day period after the service of my answer upon him.

Section 203 of title 2 of the United States Code further provides that the contestee shall have 40 days from the expiration of the 40 days allowed the contestant within which to take his testimony or depositions. In this case I took no testimony at all. Therefore, the second 40 days for the taking of testimony expired March 26, 1943.

Section 203 of title 2 of the United States Code further provides that the contestant shall have an additional 10 days from the expiration of the time for my taking testimony, which shall be used only for the purpose of taking rebuttal testimony. Since I, the contestee, took no testimony, of course this additional 10 days was not available to the contestant, and there was no testimony taken within that time.

The first paragraph of section 223 of title 2 of the United States Code provides as follows, to wit:

"All officers taking testimony to be used in a contested-election case, whether by deposition or otherwise, shall, when the taking of the same is completed, and without unnecessary delay, certify and carefully seal and immediately forward the same, by mail or by express, addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.; and shall also endorse upon the envelope containi .g such deposition or testimony the name of the case in which it is taken, together with the name of the party in whose behalf it is taken, and shall subscribe such endorsement."

Rule 8 of the rules of the Committees on Elections of the House of Representatives reads as follows:

"8. The words 'and without unnecessary delay' in the third line of section 127 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 2, 1887, shall be construed to mean that all officers taking testimony to be used in a contested-election case shall forward the same to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days of the completion of the taking of said testimony."

Section 127 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 2, 1887, is the identical section referred to above as section 223 of title 2 of the United States Code.

When rule 8 of the rules of the Committees on Elections of the House of Representatives is applied to the first paragraph of section 223 of title 2 of the United States Code, it will be discovered that on April 26, 1943, the time for the filing by the contestant of the transcript of his testimony or depositions with the Clerk of the House of Representatives expired.

April 26, 1943, being 30 days from March 26, 1943, which was the last day given to the contestee for the taking of testimony or depositions, and since the contestee took no testimony or depositions, April 26, 1943, became the last day on which any testimony or depositions could have been taken.

Therefore, since the time has expired within which the contestant can, under the statutes and the rules of the Committees on Elections of the House of Representatives, file the transcript of his testimony or depositions, and since no extension of time has been granted to the contestant for the filing of said transcript by the House of Representatives, it is the opinion of the writer, being the contestee in the above case, that the contestant is barred from proceeding further in the House of Representatives with his contest against the right of the contestee to a seat in the House of Representatives of the United States.

In order to remove any doubt as to my right to the seat which I now occupy in the House of Representatives, I respectfully request that you refer this matter to the House of Representatives for appropriate action by that body.

Sincerely,

JACK NICHOLS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. KINZER), on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 885. An act to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

A meeting of the Committee on Flood Control will be held in the committee room on Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of hearing the testimony of Col. Lewis A. Pick, division engineer, Omaha, Nebr., on the recent floods along the Missouri River. Colonel Pick should give to the committee valuable information respecting the operations of the Fort Peck Dam and respecting flood control along the entire Missouri River.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m., Friday, May 14, 1943, to consider H. R. 2113, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on old bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act, H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

413. A letter from the War Food Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

414. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting several communications and accompanying papers relative to a contest growing out of the election held November 3, 1942, for the seat in the House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 229. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 85. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 796. An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Herbert B. Holloway, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to Capt. Elwood Joseph Euart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2681. A bill to protect employees engaged in war production; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 2682. A bill to provide that during the present war all persons in the armed forces shall have in force national service life insurance of not less than $5,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 2683. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 2684. A bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2685. A bill relating to the period for which back pay ordered by the National Labor Relations Board shall be included in gross income for the purposes of the individual income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2686. A bill to provide for the immediate construction of a petroleum pipe line from Albany, N. Y., to Worcester, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2687. A bill exempting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Clarence H. Miles, Mrs. Mollie Miles, and Hardy Miles, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2693. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2694. A bill for the transfer of funds to the city of Klawock, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2695. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide double credit for enlisted service outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2696. A bill to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution providing food and clothing to purchasers at fair and reasonable prices and guaranteeing farmers fair and reasonable prices for their crops; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to extend for a period of 90 days the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 and the provisions of section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a boundary line between Iowa and Nebraska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the aid of Portuguese immigration for the aid of milk production in California; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to auditing the accounts of the Department of Employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Pete Paluck; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2690. A bill for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Tom S. Steed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 2692. A bill for the relief of the beneficiary under the national service life insurance policy upon the life of Theophil F. Schreckenberg, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

726. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 39 citizens of Butler County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

727. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Zach Masterson, of Burnt Prairie, Ill., one from Gwin F. Davis, of Harrisburg, Ill., and one from J. C. Auxier, of Dahlgren, Ill., urging the continuation of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

728. Also, petition presented by Pat Butler, board member, and Joe Poole, alternate board member, district No. 11, of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, of Harrisburg, Ill., urging the continuation of the National Youth Administration and that sufficient funds be appropriated therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

729. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Gertrude D. Wheeler and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

730. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Rev. Kenneth W. Beatty and 49 other citizens of Delanson and Quaker Street, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

731. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Illinois Asscciation of Colored Women, signed by Viola M. Garrett, president, Centralia, Ill., and Clara M. Kirk, secretary, Marion, Ill., urging the continuation of the National Youth Administration and that sufficient funds be appropriated to continue same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

732. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Clara T. Sawyer, Thomaston, Maine, and other citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. Also, petition of Hattie F. White, of Wayne, Maine, and other citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman and Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to retention of Hon. Robert M. Lovett as Government secretary of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1943

Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father of us all, in whose purposes is the destiny of men, races, and nations, we pause at this noon hour to place ourselves in harmony with Thy purposes for us and for our Nation.

We thank Thee for the refreshment and encouragement of prayer and the practice of silent moments. Help us to hear Thy voice speaking in o r minds and consciences above the noise of storm and strife.

With evil so rampant in our world, Thou who art righteousness, grant us the power to be honorable. With cruelty so casual, Thou who art mercy, grant us the power to have courage without hate. With dark days about us, Thou who art the source of all light, grant us the power of Thy eternal presence.

Give wisdom to the leaders who gather today in the White House and in the Congress. Bless our fathers and mothers, our children under new temptations, our brave young men and women everywhere.

So may the peace of God which passeth all understanding guard our minds and hearts. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 10, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Bone	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting for the consideration of Congress a reduction in an estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $23,342,000, and also a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $250,000, for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1944, in the form of amendments to the Budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of Justice, Navy, and Agriculture (2), Federal Works Agency, the National Archives, and Federal Communications Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the chairman of the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by that council (bill No. 39) recommending that Robert M. Lovett be retained as Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, despite any charges which may have been preferred against him (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill for the wartime control and regulation of the liquor traffic, House bill 2082 to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Burden, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 10th instant,

Mr. HATCH, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, on the 11th instant filed his individual views on the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, which were ordered to be printed as part 3 of Report No. 120.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS ON CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 10th instant,

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, as a member of the Committee on Finance, on the 11th instant, filed his individual views on the

bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 221.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 35. A bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States, with an amendment (Rept. No. 223).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, all without amendment:

S. 973. A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 224);

S. 995. A bill to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities (Rept. No. 225);

S. 1064. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 226); and

S. 1067 A bill to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind (Rept. No. 227).

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE JUDICIARY AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH: AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 222) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, on page 10, after line 3, insert the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the third paragraph under the heading "Clerical assistance to Senators" of section 1 of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928 (2 U. S. C. 92a), in the case of the death of a Senator during his term of office, his clerical assistants on the pay roll of the Senate on the date of such death shall be continued on such pay roll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed 60 days: *Provided*, That any such clerical assistants continued on the pay roll shall, while so continued, perform their duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and he is hereby authorized and directed to remove from such pay roll any such clerks who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued.

I also submit, for appropriate disposition, an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 2409, the judiciary and legislative branch appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland will be printed and lie on the table.

(For text of the amendment above referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will say a brief word about the proposed amendment, so that Senators may not feel that it is something of transcendental importance.

In the case of the death of a Senator it has always been the custom to allow his secretary to remain on the pay roll for 30 days after his decease. That is, of course, because it is necessary to have some one familiar with a Senator's papers and effects who can turn them over to his widow, or children, or the representative of his estate.

I think it is provided in the House of Representatives that a Representative's office force shall remain on the roll for 90 days, the idea there being that when a Member of the House dies he cannot be replaced until his successor is elected, whereas in the case of a Senator, usually within 30 days, or certainly within a short period, in many States his successor is appointed by the Governor.

However, in order to avoid hardship in a case where a Senator has been a Member of this body for a long time—for instance, in the case of a Senator such as the late Senator Borah, who was in the Senate for 25 or 30 years—it would be a shame if his papers had to be disposed of in a hurry. The amendment I expect to propose will provide that the secretary of a Senator who has died may remain on the pay roll, not for 30 days, as now provided, but for not more than 60 days if the extra time is needed.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, the proposed amendment relates not merely to the secretary of a deceased Senator, but to his entire staff.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct; it relates to the office force, insofar as is necessary to wind up the affairs of a deceased Senator.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report an original resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 149) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing, or any subcommittee thereof be, and is hereby, authorized during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it without amendment and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1091. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1092. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1093. A bill for the relief of Fermin Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1094 (by request). A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; and

S. 1095 (by request). A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1096. A bill to establish a Bureau of Vital Records in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1097. A bill to amend Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943, with respect to the payment of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act without regard to income and resources arising from agricultural labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Benjamin E. Cook, administrator of the estate of Cam C. Boyd, deceased; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1099. A bill to amend section 212 of Public Law No. 212, Seventy-second Congress, with respect to persons giving medical examinations to persons inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. JOHNSON of California):

S. 1100. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1101. A bill to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. J. Res. 58 (by request) Joint resolution to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DAVIS and Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for the Finance Committee) each submitted an amendment intended, respectively, to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANGER. I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate various telegrams received by me in behalf of the Farm Security Administration and other agricultural agencies, and on behalf of the farmers of the Northwest requesting that the Senate reinstate certain appropriations taken out of the agricultural appropriation bill by the House of Representatives.

The first telegram is from Gladstone, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

GLADSTONE, N. DAK., *May 11, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

We expect your support Agriculture Adjustment Act on wheat loans soil conservation and parity payment supervised by county committees.

LORENTZ DASSINGER.

The next is from Cartwright, as follows:

CARTWRIGHT, N. DAK., *May 10, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We in special session ask for your wholehearted support in helping to save our triple-A program and all of its benefits to agriculture. We know you will put up a gallant fight in our behalf. Power to you from 150 farm members.

SIOUX FARMERS UNION, LOCAL No. 639.

I have received a telegram from Edmore, N. Dak., reading as follows:

EDMORE, N. DAK., *May 7, 1943.*

Hon. WM. LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Ninety members of Newland local urge your support for continuation of Agricultural Adjustment Agency and Farm Security Administration crop insurance incentive payments and parity payments.

OLLA I. KIRKREITZCY.

The next telegram is from Fillmore, N. Dak., as follows:

FILLMORE, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of the following legislation, continued soil conservation and Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs run by farmers, ample funds for Farm Security Administration, crop insurance, incentive payments, and nonrecourse loans for essential crops and parity payments. This local of Farmers' Union—100 members.

S. CLIFTON MARPLE,
Secretary.
L. S. POTTENGER,
President.

Here is a telegram from Selfridge, N. Dak.:

SELFRIDGE, N. DAK., *May 6, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Want farmer-control program, wheat-loan adjustment, incentive parity payments.

ANTON ENGEL.

Mr. Engel is one of the best-known farmers in the Northwest.

I have also received a telegram from Venturia, N. Dak., reading as follows:

VENTURIA, N. DAK., *May 7, 1943.*

Hon. SENATOR LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Do your utmost to appropriate adequate funds for farm programs.

G. G. DRIETLING.

Mr. Drietling is a well-known farmer at Venturia.

I have another telegram from Carpio, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

CARPIO, N. DAK., *May 7, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Plain Farmers' Union local, representing 50 farm families, demand your support of the agriculture programs as they were.

Mrs. MARCUS GILBERTSON,
Secretary.

The next was from Ashley, N. Dak., reading as follows:

ASHLEY, N. DAK., *May 7, 1943.*

Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers depending on you to restore funds for farm programs.

SAMUEL DREFS.

I might add that these telegrams come from every section of the State of North Dakota, and in my judgment truly represent the feeling of that State.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD ACT NOW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Why Congress Should Act Now," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah in opening the discussion on a program entitled "United Nations Today and Tomorrow Discussion Series," at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGHWAYS TO INTER-AMERICAN UNITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Highways to Inter-American Unity," delivered by Senator CHAVEZ before a meeting of the American Roadbuilders Association, Chicago, Ill., May 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the withholding and pay-as-you-go tax plan adopted by the majority members of the Senate Finance Committee, delivered by Senator LUCAS, May 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A VICTORY ESSENTIAL—FREEDOM OF THE PRINTED WORD: ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Victory Essential—Freedom of the Printed Word," delivered by him at the auditorium in Milwaukee on May 10, 1943, at a meeting arranged by the Graphic Arts Association of Milwaukee, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PARTY OF TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Party of Tomorrow," delivered by him at Columbus, Ohio, May 7, 1943, before the spring conference of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREE ENTERPRISE IN THE POST-WAR ERA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Free Enterprise in the Post-War Era," delivered by him at the annual convention of the American Roadbuilders Association, at Chicago, Ill., May 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO ELBRIDGE W. PALMER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief history of the life of Elbridge W. Palmer, president of Kingsport Press, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LT. GEN. FRANK M. ANDREWS—EDITORIAL FROM NASHVILLE (TENN.) BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Andrews—A Loss Indeed," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENSORSHIP OF THE NEWS—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) DAILY STAR

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial discussing Government censorship of the news, published in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORIENTALIZATION OF WORLD—ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Orientalization of World," by Col. Robert R. McCormick, from the Chicago Tribune of May 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW LONG WILL OUR CORN LAST?—ARTICLE BY RUSS CUNNINGHAM

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Long Will Our Corn Last?" by Russ Cunningham, from the Prairie Farmer of April 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATE LAWS REGULATING VOTING HOURS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of the State laws concerning the polling hours for voting in Federal elections, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTING BY WAR WORKERS—GALLUP POLL

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by George Gallup, entitled "Low Voting Turnout of War Workers Poses Serious Problem for Democrats," which appears in the Appendix.]

DIRECT OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AS COLLATERAL SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take from the cal-

endar order of business No. 217, Senate bill 1041, and proceed to its consideration. I am sure no Senator will object to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1041) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that I wish to have Calendar No. 219, Senate bill 658, taken up at the same time. Senate bill 658 would amend another section of the Federal Reserve Act very close to the section proposed to be amended by the bill referred to by the Senator from New York. I think the bill to which I refer also is not controversial. It has the approval of the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board. I hope both bills may be considered, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who I know really has the right of way today.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am willing that these bills shall be brought before the Senate for action, but the two bills cannot be intermixed. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] might obtain the permission of the Senate to have his bill considered. Following action on that bill the Senator from Ohio would have the right to make a similar request concerning his bill. The two bills cannot be coupled together, however.

Mr. TAFT. Before giving my consent to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from New York, I wish to ascertain whether it will be satisfactory to have my bill considered. I can also move to have Senate bill 658 considered. If that is not satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia, I should not want to agree to any bill being taken up at this time, other than the bill sponsored by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McNARY. There are a number of Senators present in the Chamber, and the request must be satisfactory to the last one.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to make any objection. I have conferred with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] regarding the two bills referred to, and also with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] regarding a bill which he would like to have considered. I should like to make the general statement that I hope no request will be urged to consider bills which will lead to debate. If the measures in question can be disposed of without controversy, I shall be glad to have them brought up for consideration.

Mr. McNARY. If the able Senator from Georgia would have his bill made the unfinished business, then he could yield temporarily to permit the taking up of the bills referred to, and if argument should ensue concerning them, or any of them, the Senator from Georgia could move the regular order, and thereby protect himself.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2570. I should like to say that I have no disposition to forestall consideration of bills which will not lead to controversy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 2570 is under consideration. The committee amendment to the bill is in the nature of a substitute for the bill, and, under the precedents of the Senate, will be regarded for the purpose of amendment as an original question.

DIRECT OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AS COLLATERAL SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for the present consideration of Senate bill 1041?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I understand this bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency only recently. I have had no opportunity to consider the bill. I remember that in the closing days of the last session the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] occupied considerable time on the floor of the Senate discussing the silver question, and I understand the silver question is involved in this bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is mistaken. The bill has nothing to do with the so-called Green bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It has nothing to do with the so-called Green bill?

Mr. WAGNER. No, nothing at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, Mr. President, I should like to have a statement made with respect to the bill so we can have an understanding of what it contains.

Mr WAGNER. Mr. President, the bill extends for another period of two years the provision of the law, enacted first in 1932, the purpose of which was to authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve notes backed at least by 40 percent gold and 60 percent of either Government obligations or commercial paper. Since at that particular time gold was not plentiful, and since commercial paper was also not plentiful, it was necessary, in order to secure the issuance of Federal Reserve notes, to use some Government obligations as collateral. A little while thereafter gold became quite plentiful, and although each 2 years the right to issue such Federal Reserve notes was extended, it was not utilized until the past year. Now that the circulation of currency has increased and the deposits of banks with the Federal Reserve bank have increased there is not sufficient gold as 100 percent collateral for the Federal Reserve notes. Therefore the amendment to the act proposed by the bill is needed. There being practically no commercial paper, the Federal Reserve banks will need a portion of Government obligations as collateral for the Federal Reserve notes. That is the sole purpose of the bill. If there are any questions to be asked I am quite willing to answer them.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to say that in the future when similar bills are brought up I think there should be an explanation made of them when the request for consideration is made, because I was under a misapprehension as to the purpose of the measure. I know it is true that we have in circulation now a little more than sixteen and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. WAGNER. Thirteen billion dollars are Federal Reserve notes, with which we are now concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I understand. It is also true that we have gold in the Treasury to the extent of about twenty-two and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. President, I have no objection to this particular bill. I think it should pass. I do not want the silver bill to come up, however, in the absence of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. That was my only purpose in raising a question a moment ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1041) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1943" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1945."

REPEAL OF SIXTH PARAGRAPH OF SECTION 18 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 219, Senate bill 653.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 653) to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The amendment was on page 1, line 6, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. All Federal Reserve bank notes issued under the authority of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, received by any national bank or by any Federal Reserve bank, shall be promptly presented to the Treasury for payment, and upon payment shall be retired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933, is hereby repealed.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the passage of Senate bill 658, Calendar No. 219, the committee report, inasmuch as there was no discussion of the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 217) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, having considered S. 658, reports the bill back to the Senate with an amendment, and recommends that as so amended it be passed. This bill, as amended, provides only for the repeal of the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933. The paragraph which is repealed authorizes the issue of Federal Reserve bank notes, as distinguished from the Federal Reserve notes which now form the bulk of our currency. The amended section was passed in 1933 to provide for a supply of additional currency during the banking crisis of that year. It is wholly unnecessary at this time, because Federal Reserve notes can be issued against the deposit of Government bonds, a power which is being extended for 2 years by S. 1041, a bill today recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Some months ago the Federal Reserve System availed itself of the power given by this section to issue approximately $660,000,000 of old Federal Reserve bank notes which had been printed at the time of the 1933 emergency and never used. While the legality of the issue was questioned, the Federal Reserve Board defended its action by pointing out that it was saving several hundred thousand dollars of printing expense and relieving the overburdened Government Printing Office of additional printing. The net result of the Board's action, however, was to place in circulation wholly unsecured notes against which no reserve is required. While the amount involved is not serious, it is clear that if the power exists, it is a power to issue these notes in unlimited quantity, and avoid the reserve requirements and other restraints placed on the issue of Federal Reserve notes.

Both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board agree that this paragraph should be repealed, but since the notes have been issued they feel that they should be allowed to circulate until worn out in order to save printing and other expense. The committee has, therefore, eliminated section 2 of the bill, which provided for their prompt retirement. In normal course they will wear out in several years, and this type of currency will disappear.

The reports received by the committee from the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department are as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 20, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: This is in response to your letter of February 5, 1943, requesting an opinion as to the merits of S. 658, a bill to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act and to require all Federal Reserve bank notes issued thereunder, received by any national bank or by any Federal Reserve bank, to be promptly presented to the Treasury and retired.

This proposed bill apparently arises out of the recent action of the Board announced in a statement to the press on December 12, 1942. The reasons for and legality of that action are set out in the enclosed statements.

The Board's action referred to authorized only the use of the existing unused stock of Federal Reserve bank notes, which are identical with those previously outstanding. The notes issued from this stock will be retired in due course as they become unfit for further circulation. Section 2 of S. 658, if enacted, would result in the retirement of these recently issued Federal Reserve bank notes before they become unfit for further use and would necessitate their replacement by additional newly issued Federal Reserve notes. The Board is strongly opposed to the enactment of such a provision since it proposes a needless waste of new currency presently in circulation. This destruction of new currency before it has been worn out would waste many thousands of man-hours and many tons of vital war materials at a time when both are urgently needed in the war effort. In terms of labor and materials the issuance of the Federal Reserve bank notes in question saved 225,000 man-hours in printing alone and 90,000 pounds of paper in addition to a substantial amount of nylon and ink.

For some time past it has been evident that there is no need for the continuation for the authority contained in paragraph 6 of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and the Board has no objection to its repeal, which action section 1 of the bill would accomplish.

Very truly yours,

MARRINER S. ECCLES,
Chairman.

MARCH 3, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Further reference is made to your letter of February 5, 1943, inquiring the opinion of the Treasury Department with respect to the merits of bill S. 658 to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act.

Section 1 of S. 658 repeals the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended by section 401 of the act approved March 9, 1933. The effect of this repeal is to strike from the statute all authorization for further issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes.

The Treasury Department has no objection to the repeal of the legislation providing for the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes. This is, however, a matter with which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is more concerned than the Treasury, and I assume you will ask it for a report.

Section 2 of S. 658 provides that all Federal Reserve bank notes issued under the authority of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act shall be promptly presented to the Treasury for retirement whenever received by any national bank or by any Federal Reserve bank.

The Federal Reserve banks have already deposited lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the retirement of all Federal Reserve bank notes now outstanding and intend to deposit funds for the retirement of the remaining unissued stock of such notes as rapidly as this stock is placed in circulation in response to the currency demands of the country. After this operation is completed, there will be outstanding only about $680,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes (including about $18,000,000 remaining from those issued in 1933 and earlier years). These notes will be retired as rapidly as they become unfit for circulation—their average life being estimated at about 18 months.

As is explained in the enclosed statement issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for release in morning newspapers of Sunday, December 13, 1942, the present issuance of the stock of about $660,000,000 Federal Reserve bank notes remaining from those printed in the early thirties is entirely an economy measure and has resulted and is resulting in an important saving of money and a more important saving of scarce labor and materials, which saving cannot be adequately evaluated in terms of money. The Federal Reserve bank notes in circulation have merely displaced an equal amount of other forms of money and have had no effect upon the aggregate amount of money in circulation.

The enactment of section 2 of S. 658 would result in the loss of most of the savings in money and in scarce labor and materials secured by the issuance of the stock of Federal Reserve bank notes printed in 1933, and would result in no monetary advantage whatever. The Treasury Department is therefore of the opinion that this section of S. 658 should not be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

RELIEF OF ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 207, Senate bill 981.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 981) to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection, to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have objection. I wish to ask the able Senator from New Mexico whether the committee unanimously reported the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs reported the bill unanimously.

Mr. McNARY. And is the bill the result of the visit of the subcommittee to Puerto Rico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Partly the result of the visit of the subcommittee to Puerto Rico,

and partly the result of recommendations by General Fleming, who investigated conditions for the department he heads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 2, line 5, after the word "unemployed", to strike out "laborers" and insert "persons", so as to make the section read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the Federal Works Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized, subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to use the funds appropriated pursuant to this act for the purpose of providing useful work for unemployed persons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands on Federal projects, and on non-Federal projects sponsored by public agencies, which are approved by him for the purposes of this act. The Administrator shall only authorize that type of non-Federal project which provides the greatest amount of work to unemployed persons, and preference shall be given to projects certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as being important to the war effort.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 8, to strike out the first paragraph, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) On each non-Federal project there shall be expended for labor costs a sum not less than 95 percent of the amount authorized to be spent from the funds appropriated pursuant to this act.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Expenditure authorizations for other than labor costs for all non-Federal projects prosecuted under this act shall not exceed an average per fiscal year of $6 per month per worker.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph (b) of section 2, page 2, line 16, after the words "case of", to strike out "any"; in the same line, after the words "non-Federal", to strike out "project so" and to insert "projects"; in line 18, after the word "total", to strike out "labor", and in the same line, after the word "such", to strike out "project" and insert "projects"; and in line 21, after the word "such", to strike out "project" and insert "projects", so as to make paragraph (b) read:

(b) In the case of non-Federal projects approved by the Administrator, not to exceed three-fourths of the total costs in connection with such projects shall be borne from the funds appropriated pursuant to this act, and not less than one-fourth of such total costs shall be borne by the sponsors of such projects: *Provided*, That the limitations contained in this subsection shall not apply with respect to any emergency project undertaken, with the approval of the Administrator, for the purpose of averting danger to life, property, or health in the event of disaster or grave emergency caused by war, flood, storm, fire, earthquake, hurricane, drought, or similar cause.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph (c) of section 2, page 3, line 4, after the words "sponsors of", to strike out "non-Federal", so as to make paragraph (c) read:

(c) The Administrator is authorized to receive from sponsors of projects contributions of money. All money so received shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States and shall be utilized or expended for the project sponsored.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 3, line 17, to strike out paragraph (f) as follows:

(f) The members of any one family unit shall not be entitled to receive out of the funds appropriated pursuant to this act more than $250 in any 12-month period: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to those engaged as skilled laborers not exceeding in number 10 percent of the total laborers employed.

And to insert in lieu thereof a new paragraph (f), as follows:

(f) In order to distribute the work on non-Federal projects to the greatest number of unemployed persons, the Administrator shall require that the hours of work for persons, other than skilled and supervisory workers, engaged upon such projects shall not exceed 130 hours per month, except that the Administrator may require a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of unskilled workers. The Administrator may authorize exemptions from the provisions of this subsection on projects certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy; to protect work already done on a project; in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare, and on other emergency projects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 6, line 4, after the word "Agency", to insert "including its constituent administrations", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. The records, property, facilities, equipment, and supplies of the Federal Works Agency, including its constituent administrations, may, to the extent required by the Administrator, be utilized for carrying out the purposes of this act without exchange of funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, on page 6, line 16, after the figures "1944", to insert "to be, however, immediately available"; and in line 17, after the figures "1945", to insert "both sums", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, to be, however, immediately available, and the sum of $25,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, both sums to remain available until expended, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the employment of engineers, architects, and consultants without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the civil-service laws, and the Classification Act, as amended; personal services and rental in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; supplies and equipment; travel expenses, including transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c-1); purchase, repair, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding, and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question before the bill is passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any relationship between the pending relief bill and the $15,000,000 direct relief appropriation bill which was under consideration in the House and which was reported at one time by the House Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; there is no relationship whatsoever between that bill and the pending bill. The pending bill was sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and myself, as a result of the visit of the subcommittee to Puerto Rico, and after consultation with the Government agency headed by General Fleming, handling relief work in Puerto Rico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am asking the Senator is whether the pending bill is a substitute for the $15,000,000 relief appropriation which the House has had under consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee never had any doubt at all. The pending bill is a brand new bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan is, "No." In Puerto Rico we have been spending approximately $1,400,000 a month on W. P. A., and that program is now continuing and will continue until the first of July. The relief bill in the House is a different relief bill, and it puts the control in the insular government, as I remember the circumstances.

The pending bill proposes to continue the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico—although it is to be abolished everywhere else—because of the fact that the war has increased the hardships and the unemployment in Puerto Rico, instead of decreasing them.

The administration of the bill is to be in the hands of the W. P. A. I think it is fair to say that we found that the administration of the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico was probably as efficient as was that of any other governmental bureau. It is entirely independent of the insular government, and it operates its own affairs.

This is no longer a W. P. A. matter; because it is put directly under the Federal Works Administrator who administers it from Washington and makes the rules.

So I think the answer is that the pending bill has no relation to the additional relief bill which was designed to relieve distress due to food shortage, but merely proposes to continue the W. P. A. at approximately its existing rate of operations in Puerto Rico—the rate at which it has been operating there during the past 2 years—although after the 1st of July the W. P. A. is to be abolished everywhere else in the United States.

However, the pending bill has no relation to the other bill. The $15,000,000 was to be in addition to the W. P. A. expenditures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So we might still contemplate the passage of the $15,000,000 appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think no such additional appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point.

Mr. TAFT. Our committee felt that we should continue the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point I was trying to reach.

Mr. TAFT. And with the other normal expenditures which are made by the Federal Government, and such relief expenditures as are authorized by the insular government, Congress should not be asked for additional money for relief for Puerto Rico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Therefore, since the pending bill provides for an independent administration of Puerto Rican relief, it would be unnecessary for us to consider the amendment adopted by the House committee, which made the payment of any relief contingent upon the retirement of Governor Tugwell; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion, it would be wholly unnecessary to consider any further appropriation of that kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 981) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, there are pending today before the Congress bills which have for their purpose a continuation of existing legislation which regulates the bituminous-coal business of this country. They are Senate bills 147 and 822, and House bills 356 and 1454.

The existing legislation regulating the bituminous-coal industry would have expired at 12:01 a. m. on April 26, 1943, had not a continuing resolution been adopted by the Congress. The House of Representatives passed a resolution which would have continued the existing legislation in effect for a period of 120 days beyond its original expiration date. The Senate passed a similar resolution, continuing the legislation for 30 days, to which resolution the House agreed.

The net result is that the existing Bituminous Coal Act will expire at the close of May 24, 1943, unless a new bill is enacted, or unless there is an agreement as to an additional extension.

The first Coal Act was passed by Congress in 1935. It later was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of certain labor provisions contained therein. A new act was presented and adopted by the Congress in 1937. It conformed to the Supreme Court's decision. That act has been in effect ever since.

As 51 Members of the United States Senate at that time are no longer Members of this body, I may fairly assume that the 51 who have succeeded those who were here in 1937 are not familiar with the hearings which were held when the Coal Act was before Congress, or of the intent and purposes of that act and the necessity for it. In view of the necessity for the continuation of this legislation, I think I might also attempt to refresh the recollections of the 45 Members who were Members of the Senate at that time.

The bituminous-coal industry is composed of many relatively small units. There are now in operation approximately 15,000 mines, operated by 13,000 corporations, partnerships, and individuals. No commercial coal company has ever produced as much as 3 percent of the total production. That accounts for the highly competitive situation in the industry during periods of normal or reduced demand.

Bituminous coal is produced in 26 States—Pennsylvania, on the east, Washington on the west, Alabama on the south, and Montana on the north. Coal produced in any one State competes directly with that produced in other States.

The investment in the bituminous-coal industry has been estimated at from two billion to three billion dollars. A recent report of the Director of the Bituminous Coal Division mentions the two and one-half billion dollar investment in the industry.

The bituminous-coal industry was under investigation almost continuously between 1914 and 1937.

There were 23 hearings and investigations by congressional committees and 15 investigations and reports by other Federal agencies.

I have had prepared for the convenience of the Members of this Congress a statement of the various hearings and investigations, into all aspects of the bituminous-coal industry, held during that period, which I request be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND REPORTS ON BITUMINOUS-COAL INDUSTRY BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

1. Hearings before Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on mining and transporting of coal, Sixty-third Congress, H. R. 13305, 1914.

2. Hearings before Committee on Mines and Mining on conditions in coal mines of Colorado, Sixty-third Congress, H. R. 387, 1914.

3. Investigation of Senate Committee on Education and Labor on Paint Creek coal fields of West Virginia, Sixty-third Congress, 1913–14.

4. Hearings before Committee on Interstate Commerce on price regulation of coal and other commodities, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, S. 2354 and Senate Joint Resolution 77, 1917.

5. Hearings before Committee on Labor on wages and living conditions in coal mining, Sixty-fourth Congress, H. R. 354, 1917.

6. Hearings before Senate Committee on Manufacturers on shortage of coal, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, Senate Resolution 163, 1917–18.

7. Hearings before Committee on Interstate Commerce on increased price of coal, seasonal coal rates, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, Senate Resolution 126, part 1, 1919–20.

8. Hearings before Select Committee on Reconstruction and Production on coal and transportation, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, Senate Resolution 350, 1920–21.

9. Hearings before Committee on Manufactures on publication of production and profits in coal, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, S. 4828, 1921.

10. Hearings before Committee on Education and Labor on conditions in the West Virginia coal fields, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, Senate Resolution 80, 1921.

11. Hearings before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on the coal problem, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, S. 41, S. 42 and S. 824, 1921.

12. Hearings before Committee on Labor on investigation of wages and working conditions in the coal-mining industry, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, H. R. 11022, 1922.

13. Hearings before Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Federal Fuel Distributor, Sixty-seventh Congress, H. R. 12472, 1922; and final report of Federal Fuel Distributor.

14. Hearings before Committee of the Whole House on interstate commerce in coal, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, H. R. 13882, 1923.

15. Hearings before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on coal legislation, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, 1926.

16. Hearings before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on conditions in coal fields of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, Seventieth Congress, first session, Senate resolution 105, 1928.

17. Hearings before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on Bituminous Coal Commission, Seventieth Congress, second session, S. 4490, 1928–29.

18. Hearings before Senate Committee on Manufactures on conditions in coal fields in Harlan and Bell Counties, Ky., Seventy-second Congress, first session, S. Res. 178, 1932.

19. Hearings before Senate Committee on Mines and Mining to create a bituminous coal commission, Seventy-second Congress, first session, S. 2935, 1932.

20. Hearings before subcommittee of Committee on Interstate Commerce on stabilization of bituminous coal mining industry (Guffey Act), Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, S. 1417, 1935.

21. Hearings before subcommittee of Committee on Ways and Means on stabilization of bituminous coal mining industry, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, H. R. 8479 (H. R. 9100), 1935.

22. Hearings before Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on a bill to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, on S. 4668, 1936.

23. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on a bill to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, on S. 1, 1937.

INVESTIGATIONS AND REPORTS ON BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

1. Investigation and report of United States Coal Commission into labor difficulties in the coal fields of Colorado during 1914 and 1915.
2. Report of Distribution Division of United States Fuel Administration, 1918–19.
3. Report of engineers committee (Cyrus Garnsey, Jr., R. V. Norris, and James H. Allport) of United States Fuel Administration, 1918–19.
4. Investigation and report of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics on hours and earnings in bituminous coal mining, 1919–20–21–22–24–26–29–33.
5. Investigations and reports by the United States Federal Trade Commission into costs, prices, and profits in the mining industry, 1917–20.
6. Investigation and report of United States Bituminous Coal Commission appointed by the President in 1920.
7. Report of Interstate Commerce Commission to Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in response to Senate Resolution 374 on bituminous coal situation, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, 1920.
8. Report of United States Bureau of Mines on operating regulations under Public Act No. 146 of Sixty-sixth Congress, 1920–21.
9. Report to Congress of Commission of Labor Statistics on conditions in bituminous coal fields, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, 1921.
10. Report of Children's Bureau of Department of Labor to Secretary of Labor on welfare of children in bituminous coal-mining communities in West Virginia, 1922.
11. Report and letter of Federal Trade Commission on investment and profit in soft-coal mining, 1916–21, inclusive, referred to Committee on Education and Labor, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, 1922.
12. Investigation and report by the United States Coal Commission appointed by the President by authority of Congress, 1922–23.
13. Various hearings, investigations, and reports in connection with the National Recovery Administration, 1933–35.
14. Report of National Resources Board to the President in accordance with Executive Order No. 6777, submitted December 1, 1934.
15. Various hearings investigations, and reports of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, created under the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935, 1935–36.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in these investigations and hearings Congress has inquired into and obtained information covering every aspect of the bituminous coal industry. Some of the earlier investigations concerned shortages of coal and high prices. The shortage occurring during the last war impressed everyone with the importance of a constantly adequate supply of fuel.

For a time lack of coal became a limiting factor in the military program. We had heatless days, lightless nights, and closed factories. Prices reached theretofore unknown levels; small consumers in the industrial sections of the East, where the shortage was most evident, frequently paid as high as $20 a ton.

Late in 1917 Dr. Harry A. Garfield was appointed fuel administrator and exercised complete control of prices and distribution of coal until the end of the war.

Investigations after 1923 dealt with the disastrous effects of destructive competition in the industry.

In these hearings the plight of the industry, the surplus capacity, the destructive competition, price cutting and wage cutting, the consequences of the breakdown of the machinery for collective bargaining, the continuous and heavy financial losses, and the violence, disorder, and poverty in the mining districts, were all fully revealed.

Prior to 1940 honest, capable, and experienced mine operators saw their entire wealth melt away to the point of disappearance under the succession of years when their costs exceeded realization.

These men, perceiving their only chance for salvation of any of their investments to lie in increasing the production of their mines and thereby lowering their costs, threw more and more coal upon an already glutted market, with a consequent vicious downward spiral of prices.

One by one, group by group, the higher-cost mines were taken from their original owners by their creditors and sold at sums representing only minute fractions of the amounts invested in the tipples, machinery, and other equipment.

The new owners were thus enabled further to cut their prices, bringing more of their competitors to their financial ruin.

The industry lost money continuously from 1923 until 2 years ago, when the present Bituminous Coal Act became actually operative. It had lost heavily its proportion of the total energy produced in the country.

That shrinkage in tonnage did not tend to business concentration in coal. It intensified the struggle between competitors to remain in business.

Losses in the industry from 1925 to 1940, as shown by the Treasury Department reports, ranged from $10,000,000 to $44,000,000 a year. There was no year in that period in which the industry operated without loss.

A relatively small number of the producing units paid income taxes in some of the years, but on the whole this industry showed losses, even during the prosperous years for industry generally.

Conditions in this industry were characterized by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1933 as "indeed deplorable." It was the same condition that Justice Cardozo in 1936 called "not merely a menace to owners and the mine workers," but also a "menace to the public" (298 U. S. 331).

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Company* v. *Adkins* (310 U. S. 381, 395 (1940)) stated:

> If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic conditions which have prevailed in it do not justify legislation, it is difficult to imagine what would.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reported in 1941 that these conditions had also—

> led to reducing the purchasing power of a large number of our people with resulting damage to agriculture, industry, and the Nation generally.
>
> In addition, the lack of financial resources, because of continued operation at a loss, has prevented coal operators from installing safety devices and taking steps desirable to prevent mine accidents.
>
> Sales of coal below cost have also resulted in waste of this precious natural resource because operators could not afford to mine less accessible coal. Coal left in the mines is, for all practical purposes, lost forever.
>
> In every coal-producing country, except the United States, conditions created by the surplus of coal have led to nationalization or to governmental subsidies or other forms of financial assistance.
>
> In this act the Congress has provided a method by which the bituminous coal industry in this country can assume its rightful place in our economy without resort to any of these methods.

Events of the past 2 years have proved conclusively that this country needs a solvent coal industry.

The experience of almost 20 years prior to the operation of the Coal Act showed that the coal industry cannot be in a solvent position in peacetime without Government regulation.

The Bituminous Coal Act has enabled the coal operators to develop and maintain their mines in good condition and has helped the industry to meet the vast war requirements of the Nation.

The Bituminous Coal Act has stopped waste and will help in the conservation of a vital natural resource.

Allowing for every difference of opinion as to the best remedy for the unmistakable ills of the industry, it is a fact that the Bituminous Coal Act has stabilized the industry and has eliminated the cutthroat competition and other chaotic conditions that made the industry a veritable cancer on the economy of this country.

Even though industrial activity occasioned by defense efforts had stimulated the demand for industrial sizes of coal to a point where the prices of such coals tended to rise above the minimum prices, there still continued, until recent months, to be many sales at minimum prices.

The Coal Division reported recently that the weighted average realization of all the bituminous coal shipped during the year ended June 30, 1942, was $2.305 a ton.

This is about 9 pounds for 1 cent. What other commodity is sold in this country at 9 pounds for 1 cent?

For several years prior to 1942 the railroads of the country were paid more for transporting coal than the producers received for it.

In 1942 the amount paid to the producers of coal was equal to that paid to the railroads for its transportation

I am not advocating that the railroad charges for transporting coal be lowered. I mention this to show the depths to which the coal industry had fallen before the Coal Act became operative.

The Bituminous Coal Act introduced the idea of making provision for the representation and protection of the consumer through establishing the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, with the

duty of representing the consuming public in any proceeding before the Bituminous Coal Division, and of conducting independent investigations of matters relating to the coal industry.

The Consumers' Counsel has exercised his duties vigorously through participation in practically all proceedings before the Coal Division. The minimum prices apply alike to small and large consumers.

The evil of quantity discounts has been entirely discontinued. The Consumers' Counsel has participated in many cases affecting coal rates before the Interstate Commerce Commission. He has been particularly helpful through the dissemination among consumers of technical information relating to coal, and especially through his action in initiating and cooperating with producing, distributing, and transporting interests in the successful "Buy-coal-now" campaign of 1942.

The "Buy-coal-now" campaign was conceived to avoid, if possible, the acute coal shortage of the First World War.

That the campaign was successful is evident now in the spring of 1943, when the supply of coal has outlasted a severe winter, even with the additional burdens which have been imposed upon it through fuel-oil rationing and decreased manpower.

The records and personnel of the Coal Division in Washington, and of the 22 district boards throughout the country which were established under the Bituminuous Coal Act, have been used in arranging for coal supplies for new and enlarged Army and Navy stations, new industries, and those unable to secure sufficient oil and gas.

There is a constantly increasing number of industries, as well as business and residence buildings, which are discontinuing the use of oil, and turning to coal. But up to this time no coal burning plant in the country has been forced even to reduce its operation through inability to secure coal.

The coal act has been of material assistance to the Office of Price Administration in establishing maximum prices on coal at levels many dollars a ton less than the prices which prevailed during 1916, and until late in August 1917, when maximum prices were established.

Up to this time the country, the Government, and the consuming public have had almost all the benefits from the operation of this law.

Under the operation of the Bituminous Coal Act every transaction in carload lots is reported immediately to the field offices, and any sale at higher than maximum prices, or lower than minimum prices, is immediately detected.

Sales by producers in truckload lots are reported and checked at frequent intervals.

While every day there are thousands of transactions in coal, there have been very few violations of the maximum price regulations.

The maximum price regulations on coal lean heavily upon the size groupings and classifications in the minimum price schedules of the coal division, and contain many provisions designed to assure that the maximum price regulations will be consistent with the minimum prices marketing rules and regulations.

The bituminous coal division investigates all reports of violation of maximum price regulations. This arrangement was made because the coal division has a compliance staff with the specialized training needed for the task.

The coal division performs another important task in connection with the establishment, enforcement and maintenance of maximum bituminous coal prices. It makes recommendations to the O. P. A. on all requests for adjustment, exception, or amendment of the maximum prices or regulations.

The Bituminous Coal Act has not cost the Government anything for its administration, but instead, has returned to the Government a substantial revenue. The entire expense of administering the act is paid directly by the industry.

The act imposes a one-cent-per-ton excise tax upon the sale or other disposal of bituminous coal by the producer thereof.

From June 21, 1937, when the taxes first became effective, to June 30, 1942, the Government collected a total of $20,555,232 under these provisions.

During the same period, the Government expended $16,306,000 for the maintenance of the bituminous coal division, and the bituminous coal consumers' counsel.

Thus, the Government has obtained a net revenue of $4,248,816 from the existence of the Bituminous Coal Act in the first 5 years of its operation. Continuance of the act will produce additional net revenue to the Government at the present increased rate of production of coal, and at the present tax rate.

It is estimated that the one-cent-per-ton tax on 1943 production will amount to $5,540,000. The estimated combined expenses of the Coal Division and the Consumers' Counsel for that year, if the act is extended, is $3,200,000, or a net estimated profit of $2,340,000.

For the calendar year 1940 reports of the Bituminous Coal Division show a profit for the industry of a little over six-tenths of 1 cent per ton, the first profit the industry had in 15 years.

For the calendar year 1941 the profit was slightly less than 7 cents per ton.

Profit for the 12 months' period ended June 30, 1942, was slightly less than 9 cents per ton.

As the cost items specified in the law do not include taxes on undeveloped coal lands which will not be reached for 30 years, interest charges, bad debts, demurrage charges, cost of carrying idle and abandoned mines, and cost of mines under development, which the industry must assume, the actual profit was less than the figures published, and this before income and excess-profits taxes.

The reenactment of the Bituminous Coal Act is necessary to assure a sufficient supply of coal for the conduct of the war.

It serves as an incentive to operators to continue to bear the expense and other burdens of keeping their mines at maximum productive capacity.

It promotes the interests of the consuming public.

It is turning the bituminous-coal industry from a national liability into a national asset.

It provides the Government, the public, and the industry, with accurate and complete information on the productive capacity of the various producing districts in the several States in which coal is mined.

Its reenactment will prevent a return, when the present war is over, to financial distress among producers, poverty among miners, and disruption of trade, all of which existed continuously for 15 years prior to the operation of the present Coal Act.

While the coal reserves of this country seem to be unlimited, the deposits of the better-grade coals such as are used for the production of steel, as well as for other special purposes, and of the more cheaply produced coals such as those in thick seams with good roofs and other advantages in mining, are extremely limited. Today the steel industry is accepting coals which only a year ago would have been barred from such use because of their relatively high ash or sulfur content.

Today mining is being conducted underground extensively in seams 30 inches and less in thickness. Conservation of the remaining higher grade and the more cheaply produced coal is, therefore, of immediate public interest.

The law has not as yet had an opportunity fully to demonstrate its usefulness and weaknesses.

Minimum prices and rules and regulations became effective October 1, 1940. Since that time there has been a gradual increasing demand for coal which, at the present time, requires full-time, 6-days-per-week operation of the entire industry.

The demand for coal in 1938 amounted to 349,000,000 tons.

In 1939, 395,000,000 tons.

In 1940, the year in which minimum prices became effective, 461,000,000 tons.

In 1941, the year in which the present act was extended for 2 years, 514,000,000 tons.

In 1942, 580,000,000 tons.

There is every indication that the country will need at least 600,000,000 tons this year.

The ability of the industry to expand its production to meet the increased needs of the country was preserved by this act.

During the First World War there was an acute shortage of coal at many consuming points. During this war there has been no shortage at any point, and it is anticipated that there will be no shortage if the law is extended.

The heatless and lightless days and the fuel shortages in vital industries suffered in 1917 and 1918 were not a result of lack of coal at the mines. They were a result of lack of knowledge and governmental machinery sufficient to overcome the problems of increased de-

mand upon coal and the transportation system occasioned by the war.

It was not until the war was many months old that the Government was able even to establish a Fuel Administration for the purpose of handling the situation.

It was then not until April of 1918 that the administration effected the drastic zoning system of coal shipments which was designed to relieve the national distress.

And then, because of the absence of an experienced personnel equipped with adequate information in regard to the characteristics of the hundreds of different grades and sizes of coal and their natural distribution, the war ended before there was any decisive control of the industry in the public interest, except as to price.

Thus the First World War was fought without any full mobilization of the great, basic bituminous coal industry.

The Nation has entirely escaped this tragedy in bituminous coal during the present war.

The efforts of the producers, the miners, and the transporters of coal have primarily contributed to this result.

These efforts, which by themselves were unavailing in the former conflict to prevent cold, idleness, and inflation, could not have been successful in the present war without the full information of quality, characteristics, costs, and distribution currently collected, compiled, and analyzed by the Bituminous Coal Division.

The act's extension will prevent a return, when the present war is over, to the financial distress among producers, poverty among miners, and disruption of trade, which have pervaded the industry in the absence of Federal regulation almost continuously since the First World War.

When the war closes the consumption of coal will decline abruptly from the peak it has attained.

The reversion of coal to its more nearly normal levels of consumption will leave a large surplus productive capacity which has been developed to meet the wartime demand.

Unless this act is extended, the stage will be set for the general disorganization of the industry. Bankruptcies, idle men, and deserted communities, and the national problem of what to do with the coal industry will have returned, manifested in all its evil aspects.

Should the Bituminous Coal Act and the authorities and its personnel existing under it be abolished through failure to extend the law, most of its functions would be required to be continued under O. P. A. if the effectual administration of maximum prices on coal is to be continued during the war.

Without assurance of regulations to keep the industry from having serious losses after the end of the war, such as it experienced for years, coal producers, with relatively high-cost mines, will naturally discontinue spending the money necessary to maintain their equipment and extend development to keep the capacity of their mines equal to their present production.

The country will need all the coal that can be produced so long as war consumption continues.

As the law was enacted after years of consideration and investigations, it should be continued in effect long enough to give to Congress, to the industry, and to the public in general an opportunity to observe the results of the operation of the act under varying conditions and during periods of low and normal demand so that intelligent conclusions may be reached as to the advisability of then modifying or further extending the law.

A trial of the benefits or disadvantages of all of the work that has been done in connection with the act would be inconclusive if the results of at least 2 years of normal competitive conditions were not obtained.

Mr. President, I have this morning a letter from Secretary Ickes, Solid Fuels Administrator for War. The Government recently had to take over and operate the coal mines. Secretary Ickes has written me to the effect that had the Bituminous Coal Act not been in existence it would have been impossible for him to take over and operate the mines with the speed and smoothness with which this was done. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary Ickes be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point, and I also ask that a letter written by the Consumers Counsel to the editor of the New York Times, in answer to an editorial in that newspaper, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 12, 1943.

MY DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: The Congress of the United States has extended the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 to May 24, 1943, the United States Senate having refused to acquiesce in the 120-day extension passed by the House of Representatives on April 21, 1943. The Coal Act will therefore expire on May 24, in the absence of a further extension prior to that date by congressional action.

I appreciate the many important measures which have been pressing for the attention of the Congress. However, the consequences of a failure of timely extension of the Coal Act would be so severe and so fraught with prejudice to our war program that I desire to recite them in summary form.

A failure to renew the Coal Act would seriously jeopardize the production of bituminous coal in a sufficient quantity to fuel the war program of the Nation. The willingness of this industry to make the investment necessary to accomplish this production has resulted largely from the assurance afforded it under the Coal Act that the weighted average cost of its product would be returned to it by virtue of the established minimum prices. Production goals will not be achieved if that assurance is withdrawn and there is substituted in its stead the prospect of cutthroat competition at below-cost levels immediately following the war. Instead we may expect mines now in full production to be closed and the operation of others to be restricted substantially.

The Office of Solid Fuels Administrator for War, during the past year, achieved, with outstanding success, a "buy now" stocking campaign. Keeping production at a high level throughout the year, contrary to the normal production and buying habits of the Nation, and making the fullest possible use of transportation facilities are primarily responsible for the effective avoidance up to this time of any major solid fuels shortages. The Office of Solid Fuels Administrator for War is about to launch its program to stock coal for the coming year. If the cost floor base provided by established minimum prices is caused to disappear by failure to renew the act, consumers would be inclined to burn coal now in storage with the hope of purchasing current needs at some future time at the lower cost incident to the return of below-cost competition. This inclination may very well defeat the entire program and result in inadequate production and transportation capacity during the coming fall and winter.

The Bituminous Coal Division, which administers the Coal Act, has been the primary instrument for maximum price controls on bituminous coal and the established maximum prices were erected principally on the minimum price structure. The Office of Price Administration has not duplicated the experienced personnel and technical data of the Division but has relied on the facilities of that agency. If the Division were allowed to disintegrate, the effective preservation of adequate maximum price controls on this basic commodity would be seriously endangered.

Thus far the Nation has avoided the necessity for allocation, rationing, or any other form of emergency distribution program for bituminous coal. Whether it can successfully avoid taking such steps during the coming year in the face of manpower shortages and other deterrents to maximum production is problematical. If the occasion for Government control of distribution arises, the Bituminous Coal Division is available as a storehouse of all of the technical data and experience so necessary to a well-conceived program with a minimum disruption to the normal processes of industry. If the Coal Division ceased to function, the difficulties of a prompt initiation of a Nation-wide program would be virtually insuperable.

One dramatic example of the vital role of the Bituminous Coal Division in wartime America has been furnished within the last 10 days. It is frightening to think of the blow that would have been struck at our industrial front if the still threatening suspension in the bituminous coal fields, engendered by the current wage controversy, had occurred. The 30-day extension of the wage contract was scheduled to expire on May 1. After having been in conference for almost 2 months the representatives of the miners and operators had been unable to agree upon a new wage contract. Although the controversy had been certified to the National War Labor Board, that body had not proceeded to a determination of the dispute, the representatives of the United Mine Workers of America having refused to participate in its proceedings. Several days prior to the scheduled expiration of the 30-day extension, stoppages gradually and increasingly occurred throughout the Nation. It was clear that on May 1 the Nation would be confronted with virtually a Nation-wide cessation. The President took forthright action and directed me to take possession of the bituminous coal mines throughout the country at which a stoppage had occurred or was threatened. Thus, on Saturday morning, May 1, I took possession for the Government of several thousand large bituminous coal mines throughout the country and issued instructions that operations were immediately to be resumed at such mines and that

the United States flag was to fly at the premises. Sunday night the President made his dramatic radio appeal to the coal miners of the Nation to return to work under the United States flag, and by the night shift on Monday miners were beginning to mine coal, the officials of the United Mine Workers of America having declared a 15-day truce. On Tuesday morning full production was resumed at the mines. The menace to our war program had temporarily been avoided.

We can only conjecture as to whether the stoppage would have continued, and for how long, if the Government had not taken possession of the mines. What is clear is that because the Government was in a position to act quickly the situation was temporarily resolved. The success of the Government in meeting the immediate problem is so largely a reflection of the effective operation of the Bituminous Coal Division, that I want to tell you in some detail of the role that that agency has played in the overall program.

Upon receiving instructions from the President to take over the mines, I immediately called in the 11 field office managers of the Bituminous Coal Division, and, after comprehensive discussion of the operating problems incident to governmental possession of several thousand bituminous coal mines, and with a full realization that the administration of the project required regionalization, I established these managers as regional bituminous coal managers to supervise the activities of the operating managers of each of the mines, possession of which had been taken. I appointed, as members of an advisory council to each regional bituminous coal manager, the chairman and labor member of each of the district boards, established under the Coal Act, covering operations within the territorial jurisdiction of the manager. Furthermore, the Secretary of War designated a military official to serve as liaison officer at the offices of each of the regional managers for the purpose of consultation and joint recommendation with the regional manager concerning any requests for military protection that might be forthcoming from the operating managers.

By Monday morning these regional managers were back at their stations throughout the United States. Each had immediately available to him his entire field staff, experienced as a result of Coal Act administration, in the operations of all the mines which had been taken over, and trained in the process of investigation and report so as to be able, through the regional managers, to keep me thoroughly advised as to the progress of operations at the individual mines. As day-to-day problems have presented themselves, since the governmental take-over, I have had a ready source of information. The compliance officers assigned to the various field offices have been circulating among the mines throughout the Nation and keeping me thoroughly advised.

The ready availability of the field units of the Bituminous Coal Division made possible prompt integration of the activities of these units under the supervision of the Washington staff of the Division. When I received my instructions to take over the mines, I was immediately confronted with innumerable questions, such as what mines should be taken over, their location, the character of operating officials who were available to serve as operating managers for the United States, etc. All of these pressing questions, failure of prompt answer to which would have made the program impossible, were quickly answered by Division experts in Washington in reliance upon the comprehensive data currently maintained by the Division under the Coal Act. Marketing and distribution experts of the Division were available to advise on operating problems, its statisticians and economists offered prompt response to all demands for data and information, its lawyers were immediately pressed into service for the drafting of the necessary documents and the processing of all requests for interpretation from the industry, and its executive personnel supervised the undertaking and geared the whole Division to its enormous task.

No one knows for how long a period it will be necessary for the Government to operate the mines. However, this much is clear: Government supervision must continue until such time as there is adequate assurance that upon return of the mines to private operation full production will not be interrupted. The essential character of the contribution which the Bituminous Coal Division is making to Government operation cannot be overemphasized. For example, one of the first things I did after taking possession of the mines was to issue instructions to all the operating managers to operate their mines 6 days a week. I further indicated that it was my intention to recommend to the Office of Price Administration that the maximum price increase, to cover increased costs of operation incident to the 6-day-week operation inaugurated several months ago, be rescinded as to any mine that failed to comply with the order. The practicalities of the situation required that an application for exemption from the order might be filed by any mine which found that a 6-day-week operation was not feasible. Many of these applications have been filed. Each of them requires speedy but careful processing by experts fully familiar with the operating problems of the mine and in a position to recommend whether the grounds assigned are persuasive or whether a suitable recommendation for rescission of the maximum price increase should be made to the Office of Price Administration. This function is being performed by the division experts who, in addition, are constantly making careful studies as to the over-all operating and distribution situation in the industry for the purpose of advising me whether any emergency program of distribution, whether of allocation, rationing, or otherwise, is required in order to insure equitable distribution of the available supply of bituminous coal.

I am sure the Nation must have drawn a feeling of confidence from the well-coordinated program instituted as part of the Government's action with reference to the threatened controversy. As a result of prudent and far-sighted planning by Division employees, acting for the Office of Solid Fuels Administrator for War, a comprehensve program was launched, creating a pool of bituminous coal which was in railroad cars on track at or about the time of the suspension. Weeks of prior planning, with the constant and sympathetic cooperation of the officials of the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, put the Government in a position where on a few hours' notice, and with the patriotic participation of the railroads, a pool of several million tons of coal was immediately provided, available for release to consumers with less than a 10-day supply of coal. Similarly, within several hours after the 2-week truce was announced on Sunday night, the railroads having communicated their desire to have these freeze orders immediately rescinded so as to avoid possible interruption of the most effective utilization of transportation capacity, this release was accomplished at midnight Sunday, May 2, 1943, after discussion at that hour with the officials of the Office of Solid Fuels Administrator for War, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am very proud of the manner in which the entire program has been handled. Its success, in very great measure, is a reflection of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Bituminous Coal Division. I have used its entire organization, and I must have it available to me in the future if the Government is to act with the promptness and competence which the delicate character of the situation requires. If the Coal Act were to lapse and the Coal Division to disintegrate, the effective operation of the mines under Government supervision would become practically impossible because of the unavailability elsewhere in the Government of the experienced personnel and technical data necessary for the task.

The 1-cent-a-ton tax levied by the Coal Act not only enables it to pay its own way, but contributes several million dollars a year in excess to the United States Treasury. If the act is allowed to lapse and the Division were to disintegrate, not only would the Government lose the several million dollars' excess in tax collections, it would also have to appropriate funds immediately for the building of elaborate coal staffs at the Office of Price Administration, Office of Solid Fuels Administrator for War, and other Government agencies at a combined cost far in excess of the cost of maintaining the Bituminous Coal Division. The Government, therefore, stands to lose between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 annually by allowing the Coal Act to lapse.

A failure to extend the Coal Act would undoubtedly diminish the possibilities of reasonably expeditious resolution of the wage controversy now pending between the operators and the mine workers. The history of labor relations in this industry has conclusively demonstrated that the turbulence of those relations has been a direct product of the inability of the industry to secure a return of its cost of production. An assurance of that return is provided by the Coal Act. The withdrawal of that assurance would inevitably delay and perhaps make impossible satisfactory resolution of the differences now separating the operators and mine workers.

A failure to renew the act would necessarily carry with it post-war chaos for the bituminous industry comparable to that which followed the termination of the last war. This industry, geared to a 600,000,000-ton production, could not easily readjust itself to a 450,000,000-ton demand. In the process of that readjustment we could look for all of the turmoil, impoverishment, and unemployment which featured the coal industry during the twenties unless the assurance of the return of the cost of production provided by the Coal Act is continued.

In light of the fact that over $25,000,000 have been invested in the congressional program embraced in the Coal Act, and the further fact that this program has so well achieved the objectives of stabilization which prompted its enactment into law, little justification can be offered for allowing the act to lapse, particularly during a time of war, when the additional functions performed by the agency engaged in its administration are so indispensable to the achievement of an effective solid-fuels program.

A failure by Congress, prior to May 24, 1943, either to complete consideration of the merits of reenacting the Coal Act or to provide for a further temporary extension sufficient to enable that consideration to be completed would leave the Department of the Interior and the executive branch of the Government absolutely without recourse and the purpose for which the Coal Act was temporarily extended to May 24, 1943, would be defeated. It is my earnest hope that this may be avoided.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate.

APRIL 28, 1943.

Mr. CHARLES MERZ,
Editor, New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MERZ: As United States Bituminous Coal Consumers' counsel, I feel it is my duty to answer the editorial, "Why Extend a Bad Act," in your columns of April 21. In general, your charges against the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended, are not factual and the omission of collateral facts tends to paint a distorted picture of the act. And throughout you give the impression the act puts "an extra charge on consumers everywhere for the benefit of a special group."

It is true, the Guffey Coal Act of 1935 was sired by doubt and born amid confusion. However, permit me to recall the situation which gave rise to doubts in the minds of lawyers as to the constitutional question of the act. On the one hand, the Court had just declared the National Recovery Administration unconstitutional in a sweeping decision, the implications of which were a matter of widespread speculation at the bar. On the other hand, the Court in 1933—with the same judges sitting—had upheld the legality of Appalachian Coals, Inc., a privately organized corporation of coal operators who proposed to control prices by concerted action.

With these doubts prevailing, the President wrote the celebrated letter. It is true, as you stated, that the Supreme Court declared the first Guffey Coal Act unconstitutional. It is also true—as you neglected to state—that the Supreme Court held only the labor provisions unconstitutional and specifically left open the matter of price control. Congress promptly passed a new act, omitting labor provisions, and this new act was upheld by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in 1940—another fact which you omitted from your editorial.

Coal stands unique among our natural resources. It is the greatest single source of energy for the Nation. Without coal, there could be no effective functioning of industry, processing of food, maintenance of homes, and transportation of goods. Therefore, coal must be available in the amounts needed and at the hours needed. Unbridled and desperate price competition—characteristic of the coal industry before enactment of the act—is inimical to the best interests of the Nation. Under such conditions, there is a tragic waste of this great natural resource. It also must be remembered that the chemistry of bituminous coal is in its infancy and that the wealth of these deposits is magnified with each new discovery of usefulness. We cannot permit a return to the era of price competition that resulted, according to estimates, in the waste of one ton of coal for every two produced.

Coal alone will not win the present war, but we cannot win the war without it. One and one-half tons of bituminous coal must be mined for every ton of steel manufactured for battleships, tanks, or planes. Bituminous coal is the backbone of all our industrial effort. It provides the power that drives four out of five railroad locomotives, generates 55 percent of our electricity, and furnishes heat for approximately 40 percent of all occupied space-heated dwellings in the United States.

The act stands as a sturdy barrier against the return of conditions that turned the coal industry into a chaotic state during the First World War. Then, because of an acute coal shortage, only the most essential industries were permitted to operate. A million workers were forced into idleness because of the coal shortage. Thousands of homes were heatless, prices skyrocketed, and there was considerable suffering in the northern part of the country.

After the First World War the bituminous-coal industry underwent a period of price cutting which temporarily led to cheaper prices of coal to the consumer, but which threatened to wreck the coal industry. This, in the long run, would have greatly harmed the consumer. The act was designed to bring order into the industry and to prevent a return to such ruinous conditions in the future. Specifically, the act was designed to (1) eliminate waste of the coal resources of the Nation; (2) eliminate unfair methods of competition; and (3) stabilize the industry through the establishment of minimum prices and, when necessary, maximum prices.

You charge there is some inconsistency in maintaining minimum prices on coal at a time when "the Government is everywhere else trying to fix maximum prices." Of course, we have maximum prices on coal today. These maximum prices were born in the very Coal Act which you attack. The Coal Act, as you neglected to point out, makes provision for maximum prices as well as minimum prices. Six months before Pearl Harbor, and long before the Price Control Act was passed by the Congress, I, as consumers' counsel, instituted a proceeding before the Bituminous Coal Division for the establishment of maximum prices on coal. When the Price Control Act was passed the coal record was complete. Without these records of the Bituminous Coal Division and consumers' counsel, I shudder to think of the grief that would have been encountered in the attempt to establish maximum prices for such a heterogeneous commodity as bituminous coal. The cost-of-living indexes show the increases on coal have been much smaller than those of most other important items in the family budget.

In referring to the coal industry as an "industry on stilts," you may create the impression that minimum prices are high prices. The act provides that minimum prices shall return only average costs of production. These costs do not include any return on capital or any allowances for interest on funded debt, or for income or excess-profits taxes. The costs, as defined by the act, include generally the operating charges rather than capital costs.

It is true the act guarantees to the producers as a whole floor prices which will return the average cost of production. This does not insure any particular producer against loss. How can it be "economically unsound" for the Government to prohibit sales below cost, particularly when such a situation inevitably results in the waste of a most valuable natural resource?

No authority on bituminous coal would be so bold as to assert—as the editorial did—that the industry is monopolistic. A few days at hearings before the Coal Division, where producers and district boards often are in tense disagreement, would change your viewpoint. Furthermore, only a small proportion of the total-cost tonnage is produced by the large companies. There is probably less concentration of ownership in coal than in any other large industry. The act provides for the formation and functioning of marketing agencies, but it must be remembered that the Appalachian Coals, Inc., the largest of all marketing agencies, was functioning prior to the passage of the act and with the blessing of the United States Supreme Court.

By statute, the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel is charged with protecting and representing the interests of the consumers of bituminous coal. In the course of a year, the agency is in contact with thousands of consumers. Therefore, I should be in a position to express the viewpoint of the consumer toward the act. I have found that consumers realize the coal industry could not operate at a loss forever and that it was in their interest, as well as national economy, to return the industry to economic health. The consumers agree, in general, that Federal control is essential to hold in check the tide of bankruptcy and chaos that marked the coal industry for more than a decade before Federal regulation first was introduced. The consumers ask of Federal regulation the promise that both the destructive price-cutting in the 10 years prior to 1933 and the skyrocketing price level of the First World War and the post-war years be outlawed forever. Furthermore, they ask that a marketing pattern be followed that will prevent a return to the wasteful methods of production and distribution so largely responsible for the chaotic history of coal, and which, in many instances, materially added to the total costs of coal before 1933.

The Coal Act has not been a financial burden to the Government. It is estimated the tax collections from the coal producers for the fiscal year 1943 will be $5,543,000. The combined expenses of the Bituminous Coal Division and the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel will be $3,200,000—showing a profit to the Government of $2,323,000. For the period, May 17, 1937, to June 30, 1942, the profits totaled $4,248,000.

The Coal Act has been a means of stabilizing this most essential industry. Had the industry been permitted to continue as in the years immediately preceding the act, this Nation today would not be turning out the guns, tanks, planes, and ships in the quantities so necessary to win the war.

The act still has not faced its big test. It hasn't faced a major trial in the type of depressed market which gave rise to the industry's troubles in the years past. The test will come after the war when the demand for bituminous coal on the industrial front is expected to slacken. And, looking immediately beyond the close of military operations, I am convinced the act is absolutely essential to the national welfare in conserving a natural resource, to the survival of the bituminous coal industry, to the economic interests of millions of people directly, or indirectly, dependent upon bituminous coal for a livelihood, and to the 60,000,000 consumers who use bituminous coal in the home for heating and cooking purposes. The act has helped make coal one of the best-handled problems of the war rather than a principal problem child—as in the First World War—and it will function just as effectively in the years after the war.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER HARR.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the exacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) this act may be cited as the "Current Tax Payment Act of 1943."

(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

SEC. 2. Collection of tax at source on wages.

(a) In general: Chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employment taxes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subchapters:

"SUBCHAPTER D—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

"SEC. 1621. Definitions.

"As used in this subchapter—

"(a) Wages: The term 'wages' means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay includible in gross income, or

"(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, or

"(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or

"(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or

"(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, or

"(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, or

"(8) for services for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in sec. 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States, or

"(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in sec. 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"(b) Pay-roll period: The term 'pay-roll period' means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer, and the term 'miscellaneous pay-roll period' means a pay-roll period other than a weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual pay-roll period.

"(c) Employee: The term 'employee' includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term 'employee' also includes an officer of a corporation.

"(d) Employer: The term 'employer' means the person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, except that—

"(1) if the person for whom the individual performs or performed the services does not have control of the payment of the wages for such services, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person having control of the payment of such wages; and

"(2) in the case of a person paying wages on behalf of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, not engaged in trade or business within the United States, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means such person.

"(e) Single person: The term 'single person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"(f) Married person: The term 'married person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims half of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming not more than half of such exemption.

"(i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this subchapter.

"(j) Head of family: The term 'head of a family' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is the head of a family.

"(k) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 1622 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"SEC. 1622. Income tax collected at source.

"(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages to any individual shall withhold and collect upon such wages a tax equal to the greater of the following:

"(1) Twenty percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the family status withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), or

"(2) Three percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the Victory tax withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"(b) Withholding exemption.—

"(1) In computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as a withholding exemption with respect to the wages paid for each pay-roll period—

"(A) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (1), a family status withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Family status withholding exemption

"Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12	$24	$12	0	$6
Biweekly	24	48	24	0	12
Semimonthly	26	52	26	0	13
Monthly	52	104	52	0	26
Quarterly	156	312	156	0	78
Semiannual	312	624	312	0	156
Annual	624	1,248	624	0	312
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

"(B) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (2), a victory tax withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Pay-roll period:	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, at the election of the employer the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period may be used in computing the tax required to be withheld.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(c) Wage bracket withholding.—

"(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a):

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than					Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$10	$1.00									
10	15	2.50	$1.30	$0.10							
15	20	3.50	2.30	1.10	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	> $0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.50	3.30	2.10	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.50	4.30	3.10	1.90	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20	1.00	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20	3.00	1.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20	5.00	3.80	2.60	1.40	1.30
60	70	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20
70	80	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20
80	90	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20
90	100	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20
100	110	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20
110	120	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20
120	130	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20
130	140	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20
140	150	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20
150	160	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20
160	170	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20
170	180	35.00	33.80	32.60	31.40	30.20	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20
180	190	37.00	35.80	34.60	33.40	32.20	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20
190	200	39.00	37.80	36.60	35.40	34.20	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus									
		$40.00	$38.80	$37.60	$36.40	$35.20	$34.00	$32.80	$31.60	$30.40	$29.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $1.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
At least	But less than					No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.60	$0.20							
30	40	7.00	4.60	$2.20	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.60	4.20	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.60	6.20	3.80	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40	2.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40	6.00	3.60	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40	10.00	7.60	5.20	2.80	2.60
120	140	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40
140	160	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40
160	180	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40
180	200	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40
200	220	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40
220	240	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40
240	260	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40
260	280	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40
280	300	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40
300	320	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40
320	340	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40
340	360	70.00	67.60	65.20	62.80	60.40	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40
360	380	74.00	71.60	69.20	66.80	64.40	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40
380	400	78.00	75.60	73.20	70.80	68.40	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40
$409 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.60	$75.20	$72.80	$70.40	$68.00	$65.60	$63.20	$60.80	$58.40

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.40 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than					Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.40								
30	40	7.00	4.40	$1.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.40	3.80	1.20	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.40	5.80	3.20	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.40	8.80	6.20	3.60	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	18.00	15.40	12.80	10.20	7.60	5.00	2.40	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	22.00	19.40	16.80	14.20	11.60	9.00	6.40	3.80	2.50	2.50
120	140	26.00	23.40	20.80	18.20	15.60	13.00	10.40	7.80	5.20	3.10
140	160	30.00	27.40	24.80	22.20	19.60	17.00	14.40	11.80	9.20	6.60
160	180	34.00	31.40	28.80	26.20	23.60	21.00	18.40	15.80	13.20	10.60
180	200	38.00	35.40	32.80	30.20	27.60	25.00	22.40	19.80	17.20	14.60
200	220	42.00	39.40	36.80	34.20	31.60	29.00	26.40	23.80	21.20	18.60
220	240	46.00	43.40	40.80	38.20	35.60	33.00	30.40	27.80	25.20	22.60
240	260	50.00	47.40	44.80	42.20	39.60	37.00	34.40	31.80	29.20	26.60
260	280	54.00	51.40	48.80	46.20	43.60	41.00	38.40	35.80	33.20	30.60
280	300	58.00	55.40	52.80	50.20	47.60	45.00	42.40	39.80	37.20	34.60
300	320	62.00	59.40	56.80	54.20	51.60	49.00	46.40	43.80	41.20	38.60
320	340	66.00	63.40	60.80	58.20	55.60	53.00	50.40	47.80	45.20	42.60
340	360	70.00	67.40	64.80	62.20	59.60	57.00	54.40	51.80	49.20	46.60
360	380	74.00	71.40	68.80	66.20	63.60	61.00	58.40	55.80	53.20	50.60
380	400	78.00	75.40	72.80	70.20	67.60	65.00	62.40	59.80	57.20	54.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.40	$74.80	$72.20	$69.60	$67.00	$64.40	$61.80	$59.20	$56.60

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.60 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
At least	But less than					No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$40	$4.00									
40	50	9.00	$3.80								
50	60	11.00	5.80	$0.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	13.00	7.80	2.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	15.00	9.80	4.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	18.00	12.80	7.60	2.40	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	22.00	16.80	11.60	6.40	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	5.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	30.00	24.80	19.60	14.40	9.20	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	36.00	30.80	25.60	20.40	15.20	10.00	4.80	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	44.00	38.80	33.60	28.40	23.20	18.00	12.80	7.60	5.00	5.00
240	280	52.00	46.80	41.60	36.40	31.20	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	6.20
280	320	60.00	54.80	49.60	44.40	39.20	34.00	28.80	23.60	18.40	13.20
320	360	68.00	62.80	57.60	52.40	47.20	42.00	36.80	31.60	26.40	21.20
360	400	76.00	70.80	65.60	60.40	55.20	50.00	44.80	39.60	34.40	29.20
400	440	84.00	78.80	73.60	68.40	63.20	58.00	52.80	47.60	42.40	37.20
440	480	92.00	86.80	81.60	76.40	71.20	66.00	60.80	55.60	50.40	45.20
480	520	100.00	94.80	89.60	84.40	79.20	74.00	68.80	63.60	58.40	53.20
520	560	108.00	102.80	97.60	92.40	87.20	82.00	76.80	71.60	66.40	61.20
560	600	116.00	110.80	105.60	100.40	95.20	90.00	84.80	79.60	74.40	69.20
600	640	124.00	118.80	113.60	108.40	103.20	98.00	92.80	87.60	82.40	77.20
640	680	132.00	126.80	121.60	116.40	111.20	106.00	100.80	95.60	90.40	85.20
680	720	140.00	134.80	129.60	124.40	119.20	114.00	108.80	103.60	98.40	93.20
720	760	148.00	142.80	137.60	132.40	127.20	122.00	116.80	111.60	106.40	101.20
760	800	156.00	150.80	145.60	140.40	135.20	130.00	124.80	119.60	114.40	109.20
$800 or over		20% of the excess over $800 plus									
		$160.00	$154.80	$149.60	$144.40	$139.20	$134.00	$128.80	$123.60	$118.40	$113.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $5.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
				Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents		
				.Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—							
At least	But less than			No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents		
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period									
$0	$1	$0.10									
1	2	.30	$0.15								
2	3	.50	.35	$0.15							
3	4	.70	.55	.35	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.90	.75	.55	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	1.10	.95	.75	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	1.30	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.45	.30	.15	.15	.15
7	8	1.50	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.65	.50	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.70	1.55	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.70	.50	.35	.20
9	10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.05	.90	.70	.55	.35
10	12	2.20	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.65
12	14	2.60	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.05
14	16	3.00	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.65	1.45
16	18	3.40	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.05	1.85
18	20	3.80	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.25
20	22	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.85	2.65
22	24	4.60	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.25	3.05
24	26	5.00	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.65	3.45
26	28	5.40	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.04	3.85
28	30	5.80	5.65	5.45	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.45	4.25
$30 or over		20% of the excess over $30 plus									
		$6.00	$5.85	$5.65	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$5.00	$4.80	$4.65	$4.45

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $0.15 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05 to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, at the election of the employer the amount to be withheld shall be determined under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, and for such purpose the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(d) Tax paid by recipient: If the employer, in violation of the provisions of this subchapter, fails to withhold and collect the tax under this subchapter, and thereafter the tax against which such tax may be credited is paid, the tax so required to be withheld and collected shall not be collected from the employer; but this subsection shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for any penalties or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to withhold and collect.

"(e) Nondeductibility of tax in computing net income: The tax withheld and collected under this subchapter shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income for the purpose of any tax on income imposed by act of Congress.

"(f) Refunds or credits.—

"(1) Employers: Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this subchapter, refund or credit shall be made to the employer only to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not withheld and collected under this subchapter by the employer.

"(2) Employees: For refund or credit in cases of excessive withholding, see section 322 (a).

"(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any pay-roll period of not more than 31 consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such pay-roll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"(h) Withholding exemption certificates: Every employee receiving wages shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (b) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection. In case of a change of status, a new certificate shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. Such certificate—

"(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the first status determination date which occurs at least 30 days from the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any previous payment of wages made on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate. For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'status determination date' means January 1 and July 1 of each year.

"(2) If furnished on or before the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect as of the beginning of the first pay-roll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a pay-roll period on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.

A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding.

"(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"(1) with respect to a pay-roll period or other period, any part of which is included in a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"(2) without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year, the manner of withholding and the amount to be withheld under this subchapter shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary under which the withholding exemption allowed to an employee in any calendar year shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

"(j) Withholding on basis of average wages: The Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, authorize employers (1) to estimate the wages which will be paid to any employee in any quarter of the calendar year, (2) to determine the amount to be withheld and collected upon each payment of wages to such employee during such quarter as if the appropriate average of the wages so estimated constituted the actual wages paid, and (3) to withhold and collect upon any payment of wages to such employee during such quarter such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually withheld and collected upon the wages of such employee during such quarter to the amount required to be withheld during such quarter without regard to this subsection.

"SEC. 1623. Liability for tax.

"The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be withheld and collected under this subchapter, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"SEC. 1624. Return and payment by governmental employer.

"If the employer is the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, the return of the amount withheld and collected upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, Territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose.

"SEC. 1625. Receipts.

"(a) Requirement: Every employer required to withhold and collect a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this subchapter in respect of such wages.

"(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be in lieu of the return required to be furnished by the employer in respect of such wages under section 147 and shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

"(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the Secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished to employees under this section.

"SEC. 1626. Penalties.

"(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10.

"(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 1622 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information

thereunder which would require an increase in the tax to be withheld under section 1622, shall, in lieu of any penalty otherwise provided, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1627. Other laws applicable.

"All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the tax imposed by section 1400 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, be applicable with respect to the tax under this subchapter.

"SUBCHAPTER E—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1630. Verification of returns, etc.

"(a) Power of Commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under this chapter shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required.

"(b) Penalties: Every person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"SEC. 1631. Use of Government depositaries in connection with payment of taxes.

"The Secretary may authorize incorporated banks or trust companies which are depositaries or financial agents of the United States to receive any taxes under this chapter in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as he may prescribe; and he shall prescribe the manner, times, and conditions under which the receipt of such taxes by such depositaries and financial agents is to be treated as payment of such taxes to the collectors."

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) Amendment to section 34: Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended by striking out "453, 454, and 466 (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "453 and 454."

(2) Amendment to section 322: Section 322 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Tax withheld at source: For refund or credit in case of withholding agent, see section 143 (f). For refund or credit in case of employer required to withhold tax on wages, see section 1622 (f)."

(c) Expiration date for withholding at source on wages under subchapter D of chapter 1: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by subchapter D) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. Expiration date.

"The tax imposed by part I of this subchapter shall not apply with respect to any taxable year commencing after the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war. The tax imposed by part II of such subchapter shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943."

(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

SEC. 3. Credit for tax withheld at source.

Section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit for tax withheld on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Credit for tax withheld on wages.

"The amount withheld and collected as tax under subchapter D of chapter 9 during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for taxable years beginning in such calendar year."

SEC. 4. Refunds.

(a) Excessive withholding, etc.: Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under part II of subchapter D or subchapter D of chapter 9 exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 35 or 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be credited against any income tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance thereof shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.

"(3) Credits against estimated tax: The Commissioner is authorized to prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary, regulations providing for the crediting against the estimated tax for any taxable year of the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Commissioner to be an overpayment of the tax for the preceding taxable year."

(b) Presumption as to date of payment: Section 322 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to presumption as to date of payment) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section, any tax actually withheld and collected at the source during any calendar year under part II of subchapter D or under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him on the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35 or section 466 (e); except that in the case of a nonresident alien individual, it shall be deemed to have been paid by him on the fifteenth day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year. For the purposes of this section, any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid on the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year, or in the case of a nonresident alien individual, on the fifteenth day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year."

(c) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: Section 3770 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make refunds) is amended (1) by striking out "(4)", at the beginning of paragraph (4), and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)"; and (2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate, with the approval of the Secretary, to collectors any authority, duty, or function which the Commissioner is authorized or required to exercise or perform under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) in respect of any individual, estate, or trust, where the amount involved does not exceed $1,000."

(d) Overpayments: Section 3770 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make credits and refunds) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Rule where no tax liability: An amount paid as tax shall not be considered not to constitute an overpayment solely by reason of the fact that there was no tax liability in respect of which such amount was paid.

"(d) Tax withheld at source: For the date of payment in respect of tax withheld at source under section 466 or under subchapter D of chapter 9, see section 322 (e)."

(e) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund under the internal revenue laws shall not, except as provided in chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States."

SEC. 5. Current payment of tax not withheld at source.

(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

"(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in section 465);

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) reasonably be expected to exceed $3,500 for the taxable year; or did when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) for the preceding taxable year, exceed $3,500 for such preceding taxable year; or

"(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 465).

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51 or 455; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"(1) the amount which he estimates as the amount of tax under sections 11 and 12, or 400, as the case may be, and section 450 for the taxable year, without regard to any credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e);

"(2) the amount which he estimates as the credits for the taxable year under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e); and

"(3) the excess of the amount estimated under paragraph (1) over the amount estimated under paragraph (2), which for the purposes of this chapter shall be held and considered the estimated tax for the taxable year.

The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying

out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"(c) Joint declaration by husand and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated tax for such year may be treated as the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations and paying the estimated tax, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than 6 months.

"(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"(h) Publicity of declaration: For the purposes of section 55 (relating to publicity of returns), a declaration of estimated tax shall be held and considered a return under this chapter.

"SEC. 59. Payment of estimated tax.

"(a) In general: The estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that—

"(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment.

One installment of the estimated tax shall be paid at the time of making the declaration, and an installment thereof shall be paid on the 15th day of the last month of each succeeding quarter of the taxable year. Payment of any installment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"(b) Assessment: The estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the 15th day of the last month of the taxable year.

"(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September, 1943, shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. In either case installments of the estimated tax for such taxable year payable after September 1, 1943, shall be ratably decreased to reflect the payments on account of a taxable year beginning in 1942 which are treated as payments on account of the estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1943."

(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax.

"(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated tax: If 80 percent of the tax (determined without regard to the credits under secs. 32, 35, and 466 (e)), in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or 66⅔ percent of such tax in the case of such farmers, exceeds the estimated tax (increased by such credits), there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to such excess, or equal to 6 percent of the amount by which such tax exceeds the estimated tax so increased, whichever is the lesser. This paragraph shall not apply to the taxable year in which falls the death of the taxpayer."

(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after "return" wherever appearing therein the words "or declaration," and (2) by inserting before "tax" wherever appearing therein the words "estimated tax or."

(d) Payment by installments: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to installment payments) is amended by striking out "The" at the beginning thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "Except in the case of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien), the."

(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 6. Relief from double payments in 1943.

(a) General rule: The liability of any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 shall be discharged as of September 1, 1943, except that (1) interest and additions to such tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as, and as a part of, the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943, and (2) this subsection shall not apply in any case in which the taxpayer is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for the taxable year 1942 or in which additions to the tax for such taxable year are applicable by reason of fraud.

(b) Special rule where 1942 tax greater than 1943 tax: In the case of a taxpayer any part of whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), if such tax (determined without regard to such subsection, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source) is in excess of the tax for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source), the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by such excess; except that if such taxpayer enters upon active service in the military or naval forces of the United States during the taxable year 1942 or 1943, the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall not be increased by any portion of such excess which is attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)), as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(c) Special rule where increased income.—(1) Tax for 1942 less than that for 1943: In the case of a taxpayer whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), and (in cases in which the tax for such taxable year, determined in the same manner as under subsection (b), is less than that for the taxable year 1943, similarly determined) whose surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1942, the liability discharged under subsection (a) shall be limited to an amount equal to a tentative tax computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for such taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 constituted both the surtax net income for such taxable year 1942, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income;

(2) Tax for 1942 not less than that for 1943: In the case of a taxpayer whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), and (in cases in which the tax for such taxable year, determined in the same manner as under subsection (b), is equal to or less than that for the taxable year 1942, similarly determined), whose surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1943, the liability discharged under subsection (a) shall be limited to an amount equal to a tentative tax for the taxable year 1943 computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for such taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income.

The portion of the liability which is not discharged under subsection (a) by reason of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be

discharged, but the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by an amount equal to such portion. The portion of the liability which is not discharged under subsection (a) by reason of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be discharged, but the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by the excess of such portion over the amount by which the tax for such taxable year is increased under subsection (b). For the purposes of this subsection "base year" means any one of the taxable years 1938, 1939, or 1940, to be selected by the taxpayer. The amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased by reason of this subsection shall not be held or considered to be a part of the tax for such taxable year for the purposes of sections 58, 59, 60, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. This subsection shall be applied in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(d) Extension of time for payment of increase in 1943 tax under subsection (c): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to the increase therein under subsection (c), in which case such portion shall be paid in four equal annual installments, the first of which shall be paid on the 15th day of the 15th month following the close of the taxable year, and of the remaining installments one of which shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding 12-month period, except that any installment may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. The Commissioner may condition the extension upon the furnishing by the taxpayer of a bond in such amount, not exceeding the amount of such increase, with such surety or sureties as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of such amount in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the time for the payment of such portion is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on each installment at the rate of 4 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date prescribed for the payment of the tax for such taxable year and ending with the date on which such installment is paid or the date on which it is payable, whichever is the earlier. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, there shall be collected, as part of the tax, interest on such installment at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date on which such installment is payable and ending with the date on which it is paid.

(e) Rules for application of subsections (b) and (c): The credit against the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 allowed by section 31 of such chapter (relating to taxes of foreign countries and of possessions of the United States), shall be determined without regard to subsections (b) and (c). Sections 105, 106, and 107 of such chapter (relating to limitations on tax) shall be applied without regard to subsections (b) and (c). If the taxpayer either for the taxable year 1942 or for the taxable year 1943 makes a joint return with his spouse, the taxes of the spouses for the taxable year for which a joint return is not made shall be aggregated for the purposes of subsections (b) and (c), and in case the taxable year for which a joint return is not made is the taxable year 1943, the liability for the increase in the tax for the taxable year 1943 under subsections (b) and (c), shall be joint and several.

(f) Special rule where taxpayer dies in taxable year 1942: If the individual dies during the taxable year 1942, subsection (a) shall not apply.

(g) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax: Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon a taxpayer any part of whose liability for such tax is discharged under subsection (a) shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commissioner prior to such date, payment of the portion thereof which if such extension had not been granted would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to such date shall be made notwithstanding subsection (a), but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall apply to any such payment. In case the taxpayer becomes delinquent, prior to September 1, 1943, in the payment of such tax or any installment thereof, subsection (a) shall not relieve the taxpayer of his liability for the tax, but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to payment of such liability. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for such taxable year, and such payment is considered as a payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943, such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

(h) Use of term "taxable year": For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1938", "taxable year 1939", "taxable year 1940", "taxable year 1942", and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1938, 1939, 1940, 1942, and 1943, respectively; and "taxable year" as applied to the taxable year 1942 or 1943 shall not include any period of less than 12 months unless occasioned by the death of the taxpayer or unless there is no taxable year of 12 months beginning in such calendar year.

SEC. 7. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 8. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT U—ABATEMENT OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH

"SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax under this chapter (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)) received or accrued by him shall not be assessed, and if assessed, the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment, in the following amounts and for the following taxable years:

"(1) if such individual entered upon such service before the commencement of the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for the taxable year in which falls the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; and

"(C) that portion of the tax so attributable for the taxable year last preceding the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so attributable as the number of quarters in the taxable year described in subparagraph (A) subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, bears to four; or

"(2) if such individual entered upon such service during the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943, reduced by the increase under section 6 (b) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so reduced as the number of quarters in such taxable year subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service bears to four, to the extent that such portion is so attributable; and

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; or

"(3) if such individual entered upon such service after the close of the taxable year beginning in 1943, the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all taxable years during the whole of which he was in such service.

"The computations required by this section shall be made in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. For the purposes of this section, a fractional part of a quarter shall be disregarded unless it exceeds 15 days, in which case it shall be considered a quarter."

SEC. 9. Assistant Commissioners.

Subchapter B of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER B—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS

"SEC. 3905. Appointment.

"There shall be in the Bureau of Internal Revenue two Assistant Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"SEC. 3906. Duties.

"The Assistant Commissioners shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Commissioner or required by law."

SEC. 10. Extension of time in connection with release of powers of appointment.

Section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1944"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release on or before March 1, 1944.—

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before March 1, 1944, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1944 and to that part of the calendar year 1944 prior to March 1, 1944."

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. There are a number of Senators who would like to hear the Senator from Georgia, and I wonder if he would yield to me to make a point of no quorum?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose in a few moments. I ask that the bill (H. R. 2570) be read first for committee amendments. In that connection, I call attention to the fact that the Chair has already announced that, since the Finance Committee has reported a substitute striking out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, the substitute is regarded as the original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to make a parliamentary inquiry, but I think the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance probably covers what I had in mind. In a case such as this, where a complete substitute is offered, so far as amendments to and modifications of the bill are concerned, under the parliamentary rules it is in the same position as the original bill.

Mr. GEORGE. It is in the same position as the original text. That ruling has been uniformly made, as I understand; the Chair made that ruling this morning, and it is part of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not hear the ruling, and I was anxious for the Chair to make such a ruling or make a confirmation of that statement.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Bone	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the current tax-payment act of 1943. The title is significant, because the bill does not deal with rates directly, nor does it affect the burden imposed under varying rates upon the taxpayers. It is an attempt to enact a current tax act. The report, which is rather full, is on the desks of Senators, and that report may, of course, be used to better advantage than what I am about to say, in ascertaining the full meaning of this particular bill.

Mr. President, this general subject has been under consideration in the House of Representatives since the early part of February and was the subject of prolonged hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. It is imperative that this legislation be enacted as soon as possible. In his appearance before our committee, Mr. Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, emphasized the need of prompt action in order to permit current collection to start by July 1 of this year. In this connection he stated that—

> The Bureau of Internal Revenue has already taken preliminary steps to prepare for speedy inauguration of the current collection system, should the Congress complete its action by May 15.

And that—

> It is vitally important both from the standpoint of the taxpayer and the standpoint of the Government to have collection at the source under way by July 1.

In view of the urgent need for the immediate passage of this legislation, and the fact that prolonged public hearings on this subject had already been held in the House, our committee decided it would be unwise to further delay the bill by holding public hearings.

In discussing this problem, the main difficulty with which we were faced, was the treatment of the 1942 liability in the transition year to a pay-as-you-go system. Under the House bill, complete cancelation of the 1942 liability was granted to those in the first surtax bracket. Those above the first surtax bracket rate do not become current as to the upper part of their income-tax liability, and will have to continue partly under the old system and partly under the new system. If those in the brackets above the first surtax bracket desire to become current, they will have to pay the upper bracket liability for the current year. To become current, in many cases, these taxpayers will have to pay an additional amount, which will in many cases, exceed their net income for the entire year. For example, if a person with a $100,000 net income desires to become current, he would have to pay a tax of $114,956. Any system which makes such a discrimination between various taxpayers is believed by the majority of the committee to be unsound.

There are approximately 4,000,000 taxpayers above the first bracket who, under the House bill, will be partly on a current basis and partly on a prior year basis. An analysis of the House provision with respect to the part of 1942 tax liability canceled, shows that the House provisions in canceling only that part of the tax attributable to the normal tax, surtax, and Victory tax, discriminates between different groups of taxpayers. For example, married persons without dependents with net incomes ranging from $1,200 to $3,200, have 100 percent of their tax liability canceled, while from that point on the cancelation decreases as the net income increases. A married person with a net income of $25,000 has less than 50 percent of his 1942 tax canceled and a married person with a net income of $1,000,000 has only 22 percent of his 1942 tax liability. In view of the fact that this plan does not result in equality of tax treatment and forces many taxpayers to continue on a partly current and a partly back-tax system, the committee was unable to agree to the House bill, which abates 76 percent of the tax liability. With the windfall provisions in the committee bill, there is recouped to the Government one and three-tenths billions of the 1942 liability while the House bill recoups only two and two-tenths billions, a difference of only nine hundred million.

There was no disagreement in our committee as to the methods to be adopted in placing taxpayers upon a current basis. The only disagreement was as to how much of the 1942 liability should be canceled.

The bill places all taxpayers upon a completely current basis for 1943 and subsequent years. Taxpayers receiving practically all of their income from wages of not more than $2,700, if single, and $3,500 if married, will be placed upon a current basis through collection at the source. This group consists of about 70 percent of the taxpayers, leaving only 30 percent, or 14,000,000 taxpayers, out of a total of 44,000,000 taxpayers. The remaining 14,000,000 taxpayers are placed upon a current basis by making a declaration of their estimated tax.

I will first discuss the withholding provisions and then the provisions for making declarations of the estimated tax.

Under the bill a new withholding system will be inaugurated as of July 1, 1943, with respect to wages and salaries only. Taxpayers who are liable to both the income tax and the Victory tax will be subject to withholding at the rate of 20 percent. Of this 20 percent, 3 percent applies to the Victory tax and 17 percent to the ordinary income tax. This 20 percent does not apply to the gross wage but only to the amount of the wage in excess of the withholding exemption. The withholding exemptions are $624 in the case of a single person, $1,248 in the case of a married person, and $312 in the case of each dependent. These withholding exemptions are selected because they are readily divisible on a weekly, monthly, or semimonthly basis. For example, a single person with no dependents is entitled to a weekly exemption of $12 and a monthly exemption of $52; a married person with no dependents is entitled to a weekly exemption of $24, or a monthly exemption of $104.

The employer subtracts the withholding exemption from the wage payment and computes the 20-percent rate on the remainder. There are some taxpayers who are subject to the Victory tax but not to the income tax. There are approximately 12 million taxpayers in this group. In the case of this group, the 3-percent net Victory tax will apply to that part of their wages in excess of $624. It

should be remembered that the Victory tax is imposed at a rate of 5 percent. However, there are allowed against this tax certain current credits for the payment of debts, payment of insurance premiums, and the purchase of Government bonds. It is believed that a great many taxpayers—in fact, nearly all of them—will take advantage of these current credits. Therefore, by withholding on a net basis of 3 percent, many adjustments and refunds in connection with the final return will be eliminated.

We were able to adopt several withholding provisions which will be of valued benefit to the employer in adjusting himself to the new withholding system.

The employer, for purposes of withholding, is permitted to round the employee's wage to the nearest dollar. For example, if the employee's weekly wage was $20.30, the employer may treat such wage, for purposes of withholding, as $20. In many cases, due to overtime, and so forth, it is impossible for employers to determine the exact amount to be paid to an employee over a stated period. To overcome this difficulty, the Commissioner may permit the employer to withhold at an estimated wage level for a quarter, with adjustments to be made at the end of the quarter for the actual payments received. The employer does not have to make an exact computation of the amount to be withheld from each employee. If he desires to do so, he may elect to determine the amount to be withheld through the use of tables, incorporated in the law. Under those tables, the income tax and the Victory tax are combined in a single amount to be deducted from each wage payment. We were able to reduce the wage tables used in the House bill from 25 to 5. These five tables cover daily or miscellaneous, weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, and monthly pay-roll periods. The tax is computed according to the status of the taxpayer, that is, whether he is single, married, the head of a family, or has dependents.

In order to give the employer ample time to adjust his pay roll, changes in status may be recognized on either January 1 or July 1 as the case may be. This permits the employer to withhold on the basis of the old status until the change in status is recognized. The employee must file a signed withholding exemption certificate with the employer to inform him of his personal status. If you will turn to the weekly withholding table in the bill, you will find out how the employer paying on a weekly basis determines the amount to be deducted from his employees' wage payments. For example, assume that John Smith is a single man, without dependents, earning $75 per week. To determine the amount to be withheld, the employer will look at the weekly table on page 69. By looking at the first two columns of the table, we find that his wage falls in the $70-but-less-than-$80 group. In the column opposite that group, applicable to a single person with no dependents, we find the figure $12.60. That is the amount he must deduct from this employee's wage check. There are certain types of wages which are exempt from withholding. They include, first, compensation of members of the armed forces; second, agricultural labor, compensation of domestic servants, and so forth. It was not deemed practical to require withholding in such cases. We also exempted from withholding, compensation of ministers of the gospel. The employer is required to furnish each employee with a written receipt showing the wages paid during the calendar year and the amount of tax withheld.

Your committee found it impracticable to apply withholding at the source on incomes from other than wages and salaries.

Therefore, in order to provide current payment of taxes for those taxpayers receiving income from rents, royalties, interest, dividends, business and professional, farming, and other types of income, and for those whose salaries and wages were subject to rates above the first surtax rate, it was necessary to devise a system whereby they could be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

To accomplish this much-desired result, the bill provides that such taxpayers must prepare and file a declaration estimating his tax for the current year and pay such estimated tax during the year.

Under the conditions set forth in section 58 (a), every individual who, at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration, is single or is married but not living with husband or wife shall make and file a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

First. His gross income from wages—as defined in section 1621—can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or

Second. His gross income from wages—as defined in section 1621—did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

Third. It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year his gross income from sources other than wages—as defined in section 1621—will exceed $100 and his gross income from all sources will amount to $500 or more; or

Fourth. His gross income for the preceding taxable year from sources other than wages—as defined in section 1621—did exceed $100 and his gross income from all sources for the preceding taxable year was $500 or more.

Every individual who, at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration, is married and living with husband or wife shall make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

First. It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year such individual will receive gross income from wages—as defined in section 1621—and the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from wages will exceed $3,500; or

Second. In the preceding taxable year such individual received gross income from wages—as defined in section 1621—and the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from wages exceeded $3,500; or

Third. It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year such individual will receive gross income from sources other than wages—as defined in section 1621—the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from sources other than wages will exceed $100, and the gross income of such individual and such spouse from all sources will amount to $1,200.

Fourth. In the preceding taxable year such individual received gross income from sources other than wages—as defined in section 1621—the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from sources other than wages exceeded $100, and (a) the gross income from all sources of such individual for the preceding taxable year exceeded $624, or (b) the aggregate gross income from all sources of such individual and such spouse for the preceding taxable year was $1,200 or more.

Of the estimated 44,000,000 taxpayers, only about 30 percent, or about 14,000,000 taxpayers, will be required to make such declarations of estimated tax. The remaining 70 percent will be covered by the withholding provisions.

Every individual required to file such a declaration and estimate of his current tax must do so on or before March 15 of the taxable year. This estimate may be revised at the election of the taxpayer during the taxable year, and if so revised, it must be filed on or before June 15, September 15, or December 15, respectively.

The situation of our farmers being substantially different from that of any other class of income taxpayers, since their income is never realized until the harvest and sale of the crops, which is usually in the latter part of the year, it was felt unwise and unfair to require farmers to file such a declaration of estimated tax on March 15, and therefore a special rule is provided for farmers, 80 percent or more of whose gross income is derived from farming. They will be allowed to file such declaration of estimated tax at any time on or before December 15 of the taxable year.

Taxpayers filing such declarations of estimated tax will pay the tax in quarterly payments, and are required to pay not less than 80 percent of the actual tax for such taxable year or, in the case of farmers, 66⅔ percent. If 80 percent of the actual tax, or 66⅔ percent in the case of farmers, exceeds the estimated tax increased by the amounts withheld at the source, there is added to the tax an amount equal to such excess, or equal to 6 percent of the amount by which the tax exceeds the estimated tax so increased, whichever is the lesser.

In other words, a penalty of 6 percent on the amount by which the actual income exceeds the estimated income if the estimate is more than 20 percent out of line with the facts, in all cases except in the case of the farmer, on whom the penalty is not imposed if his estimate is 66⅔ percent correct—that is, if he does not underestimate his actual income by more than one-third.

For the year 1943 those required to file declarations of estimated tax must

do so on September 15, and the payments made in March and June will be treated as payments of their estimated 1943 tax.

Mr. President, I now come to the essentially controversial feature of the bill as reported by the committee.

TREATMENT OF 1942 LIABILITY

Technically the committee bill cancels the 1942 individual income tax. However, to avoid the cancelation of the tax on windfalls, two provisions have been inserted in the bill which have the effect of adding a certain sum to the 1943 tax.

The first of these is effective when the 1942 tax is greater than the 1943 tax. In such cases the tax for 1943 is increased by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax. The effect of this provision is to cancel an amount equal to the 1943 tax. To avoid working a hardship on a taxpayer who entered the armed service during the taxable year 1942 or 1943, and whose income in 1943 might be considerably less than in 1942, this rule is not applied in such a case with respect to that portion of the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax which is attributable to earned net income, defined as income from wages, salaries, professional fees, and other amounts received as compensation for personal services, just as it is in the present law. All net income below $3,000 is considered to be earned net income, and in no case shall earned net income be considered to be more than $14,000. Under this provision, therefore, persons in the armed services would have their tax on earned net income abated for the higher year 1942 instead of the year 1943.

What I have just said about the first windfall provision may be summed up—with the exception of the provision relating specifically to the men and women in the armed forces and services—in this statement: While the 1942 tax is technically abated, the effect of the provisions of the bill is to collect from the taxpayer the higher of the taxes for either 1942 or 1943.

A second windfall provision was inserted to avoid canceling a tax on substantial increases in income over the income of pre-war years, such as those which have been received by certain war contractors and others. Under this provision a special tax is imposed where the surtax net income for both the taxable years 1942 and 1943 exceeds by more than $10,000 the highest surtax net income for 1938, 1939, or 1940. The taxpayer will, of course, select the highest income received in the 3 named years. Under this rule, if the tax for 1942 is less than the tax for 1943, the amount of the 1942 liability is, in effect, canceled only to the extent of a tentative tax computed on an amount equal to the surtax net income for the base year increased by $10,000. The excess of the 1942 liability over the tentative tax is added as a part of the tax for 1943.

If the tax for 1943 is less than the tax for 1942, a tentative tax on an amount equal to the surtax net income of the base year increased by $10,000 is computed at the 1943 rates. The 1942 tax is, in effect, discharged to the extent only of this tentative tax, and the balance of the 1942 liability, after deduction of the amount already added to the 1943 tax by the first windfall provision, is added as a part of the 1943 tax.

What I have said regarding the second windfall provision in the committee bill may be stated simply, according to effect, as follows:

The committee did not intend to forgive the tax equivalent to abate the entire tax for the lower year, 1942 or 1943, if the surtax net income for the lower year plus $10,000 was less than surtax net income for such lower year.

The committee intended to cancel only that part of the tax which was equivalent to a tax at the rates for the lesser year on an amount equivalent to the surtax net income for the normal year, plus $10,000.

It was realized that payment of amounts added to the 1943 tax by reason of the second windfall provision might in some cases cause undue hardship to a taxpayer. To relieve this hardship we have provided that upon request of the taxpayer the commissioner should extend the time for the payment of this addition to the 1943 tax. Under the terms of the extension the taxpayer is given the privilege of paying the additional amount in four equal annual installments, the first on the 15th day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year. Any installment may be paid in advance of the date due, however. The bill provides for collection of interest on each installment at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

The following examples will show the effect of the first windfall provision. More examples will be found in the report. The first example is of a civilian.

If an individual's tax for 1942 is $405 and his tax for 1943 is $188, he will be required to pay $405 as his tax for 1943. Thus, he is not forgiven the tax for the higher year.

Under the technical language of the bill, the actual abatement is of the 1942 tax, but that is so drawn for easy administrative handling of the problem involved. I need not elaborate why this windfall provision has been inserted in the bill. It is quite obvious.

From time to time the attention of the country has been called to exceedingly high earnings of a great many men who had Government contracts, or rather who were acting as brokers in the procurement of Government contracts. It is believed by the public that there will be no recurrence of any such large earnings by the taxpayer. Someone may have received several hundred dollars in 1942. In 1943 he may have made nothing, and if there were a direct abatement without the windfall provision of the tax liability for 1942, an unjust enrichment would follow, of course, in his case.

The second example is of a soldier or sailor entering active service during 1942 or 1943.

Assume a married man with a salary of $10,000 was liable to a tax of $2,152 for the year 1942, and he entered the service as a private in 1943. He had no tax to pay for the year 1943. The effect of this relief provision would be to cancel his entire $2,152 tax.

Assume a similar married man had a net income of $100,000 for 1942, arising solely from compensation for services, and that his tax for that year amounted to $64,000. He also entered the service in 1943. His net income for that year amounted to $5,000, and his tax amounted to $746.

The effect of the bill would be to cancel only that part of the 1942 tax in excess of the 1943 tax which is attributable to earned net income.

The following example, taken from the report, will show the application of the second windfall provision:

Taxpayer A had a surtax net income of $5,000 for his base year. In 1942 he had a tax liability of $13,002. For 1943 his tax without regard to this section amounted to $14,000. His surtax net income for 1942 was $30,000 and was composed entirely of dividends and interest. By taking the amount of his surtax net income for his base year of $5,000 and adding to it the sum of $10,000, a tentative tax for 1942 for income thus constituted would be $4,680. Thus the amount by which the tax for 1943 is increased is the difference between $13,002 and $4,680, or $8,322.

I come now to a provision in the bill which is somewhat difficult to explain, because it is difficult to understand. However, the Treasury explanation contained in the report is very full and very exhaustive. I refer to soldiers' and sailors' relief.

For taxable years ending after December 31, 1942, your committee has excluded in the case of members of the armed forces so much of their military or naval pay as does not exceed $1,500. This exclusion is allowed in the case of all members of the armed forces, without distinction as to rank, and without distinction as to the area in which the service is performed. Since this is in addition to the personal exemption and credit for dependents, a married individual with no dependents would be entitled to a total exemption of $2,700; with one dependent, to a total exemption of $3,050; a single person, to a total exemption of $2,000; and a single person with one dependent, to a total exemption of $2,350. Under existing law, an exclusion of $250 was allowed in the case of a single person, and $300 in the case of a married person. This made the total inclusion $1,500 in the case of a married man without dependents, and $750 in the case of a single man without dependents. However, under the existing law, exclusions of $250 and $300 were confined to individuals below the commissioned rank.

Your committee also exempts from income-tax payments members of the armed forces who were killed in action. The exemption is limited to the tax on earned net income which, under the law, cannot exceed $14,000.

Your committee has also provided by amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for the appointment by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, of two Assistant Commissioners in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The salaries are not fixed but are automatically applicable under the Civil Service Classification Act. At present the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has an Assistant to the Commissioner.

The proposed amendment authorizes the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners in lieu of one Assistant to the Commissioner. Therefore, it actually increases the number of officials by one.

The facts were presented to your committee; and your committee believed that in view of the increased burden placed upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the request for two assistants rather than one assistant, which he now has, was reasonable, and provision for the extra assistant has been inserted in the bill.

We have had a great deal of complaint about the provisions inserted in the Revenue Act of 1942 relating to the release of general powers of appointment under the estate- and gift-tax provisions. The time in which such powers may be released without being subject to estate or gift taxes has been extended to March 1, 1944, in order that further study may be given to this problem. That is the final provision of the bill.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have submitted the report for the majority of the members of the Finance Committee, and in doing so I have specifically called attention to the fact that regarding the disposition of the tax liability for 1942 the committee was in disagreement. The majority of the committee ordered the report of the bill prepared and presented. I may say that the minority members are, perhaps, not in unanimous accord as to the treatment of the 1942 liability because some believe, perhaps, that no abatement should be made of the tax liability of any year, while others believe that some abatement should be made in order to place all individual income taxpayers upon a current basis. I, myself, was numbered among the minority, and I think it would be perfectly fair for me to say, in this connection, that it will be my purpose to offer, as an individual member of the committee and not as a committee amendment in any sense, a substitute for a portion of section 6 of the bill. I have not as yet prepared the substitute but, in substance, it will provide for an abatement of 75 percent of the tax liability for 1 year, retaining the just windfall provision of the committee bill, and eliminating the second, and will provide for the carrying over of 25 percent of each individual's tax for the lesser year for a period of 2 years. That amendment, Mr. President, I shall take occasion to argue or to present briefly as soon as I have prepared it. I expect, of course, that there will be some discussion on the bill itself.

Mr. President, I know of nothing else that I can add and particularly nothing that can be added by way of explanation that is not contained in the committee report which is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the committee is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, over the course of the last 6 months I can safely say that I have received, conservatively speaking, thousands of letters in my office with reference to the 1943 revenue tax bill. During the years of my service in the Senate, I believe—and I say this humbly—that I have become able to ascertain, with a fair degree of accuracy, the origin of letters, by which I mean whether the letters are of spontaneous inception or are inspired by organized propaganda agents or organizations. In my judgment, 90 percent of the letters I have received on the tax bill are from individuals who have taken time out of their busy lives in all sincerity to express to me their honest views and judgment on what they personally feel is the best approach to the admittedly complex problem of taxation in the immediate future. I am very happy and proud to say, moreover, that very few letters indeed show the slightest effort or attempt on the part of the writers to evade the responsibility of doing their full share; all they ask is that the Congress enact a tax bill on its merits alone, without fear or favor in any quarter.

The American people have had plenty of time to study this problem, and in the main they have studied it. Moreover, I feel that their considered conclusions are very preponderantly in favor of the so-called Ruml plan, the, to me, unjustified and unduly labored opposition of the Treasury to the contrary.

So, I would like to say right here and now that it is my sincere hope that out of the forthcoming tax debate will come in no uncertain terms an ultimatum from the Members of Congress themselves, as the direct representatives of the people themselves.

There may be times occasionally in a democracy when the legislators may have some possible justification for not following the voice of their constituencies but that could only be when the public has not had sufficient time to study or understand a given problem thoroughly. When the public has had an opportunity, however, to study and digest any given important national problem, it is not the part of true representation to turn an unheeding ear to its considered demands. Anyway, I am convinced that my State, 10 to 1, is back of a pay-as-you-go tax plan, with emphasis on the word "pay" and the word "go." I might add so am I personally and have been from the very beginning. In other words, most of us now realize that we must get on a current basis by having our taxes deducted from our current income, while we still have an income. By this I do not mean any abandonment of the recognized American principle of ability to pay. The Ruml plan is no invasion of that principle, and it is eminently unfair to try to make it so appear.

The one straw man which seems of paramount importance to the opponents of the Ruml plan is the so-called abatement, or forgiveness, of taxes for any particular group of people. I have endeavored conscientiously to study this particular phase of the bill because, of course, I do not want anyone or any group or groups to be singled out for any special windfall or forgiveness of any taxes which they should pay. Anyway, the effect of any abatement does not come until some time in the future; first, when our Government ceases to exist—and when that occurs, which I am sure it never will, it will not make any difference what type of tax bill is passed—and, second, when the individual taxpayer loses his ability to pay, through adversity or death.

The real point is that the individual, whoever he may be, pays his taxes annually just as he does at the present time, but on a current basis. It is this vital point of getting our taxes on a current basis that, after all, is the crux of the whole matter. If anyone is against that, well and good; he has entire justification for opposing the Ruml plan or any other plan along similar lines.

In my own case, however, I certainly believe that the best interests of the Government will be served if the new tax law requires that taxes be paid while the taxpayer has the money to pay them; but this confronts us with an obviously major difficulty, namely, that in making the transition 2 years' taxes must be paid in a single year. And this is simply impossible. So we must recognize the inescapable necessity of abating or deferring all or a major portion of the tax on 1 year's income.

When the tax bill was first considered 2 months ago in the House of Representatives, many Members were against any abatement or deferment. But, in the final debate and passage of the bill which is now before the Senate for consideration, I notice that many who advocated no abatement have changed their positions. And a shift of three votes on its final passage would have changed the story, and the Ruml plan would have won. The reason for this right about face is easily discernible: We are dealing with a principle which does not lend itself to compromise.

As yet I have not heard the proponents of the bill passed by the House of Representatives give an estimate of the cost to the administration of collecting the deferred payments which would be necessary if their bill became a law. No estimate has been made of the potential losses which are bound to occur over a 3-year period, and perhaps over a longer period in hardship cases. No estimates have been given as to the extent deficiencies may reduce the amount realized.

My good friend the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative DONALD H. MCLEAN, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and who has for many years served his district in New Jersey with great distinction, illustrates very well by a story he recounted in a most able and compelling speech he delivered on the floor of the House in support of the Ruml plan, the cost of the plan. The Representative's story is as follows:

> I am reminded of a story that used to go the rounds in the business world about an individual who went into the business of refining oil. He got a number of his friends to purchase stock in the company and when the plant was built he invited the stockholders to an inspection. A very fine buffet luncheon was served. The stockholders were taken through the plant and shown the beautiful white-tiled floors, the plate-glass partitions, the nickel-plated furnishings, and the machinery all running smoothly and perfectly. One of the stockholders asked the

quantity of oil refined, and the number of barrels sold in a given period, whereupon the refiner replied: "We don't sell any oil. It takes all we refine to run the plant."

I think this illustrates very well what I said previously as to ascertaining the cost of administration by the Government of the bill which has passed the House.

If the principle of a pay-as-you-earn tax is recognized here today, and I am sure that it is, the Ruml plan should be adopted, especially as the change in the method of tax collection will unquestionably increase the flow of revenue to the Treasury. It will protect revenue not only now, but for all time to come. As against other proposals, it provides the most economical system of administration. It recognizes, above all else, the ability of the taxpayer to pay when he has the funds with which to pay, and, after all is said and done, is not that exactly what we are endeavoring to accomplish?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the matter before the Senate, and it will be brief, because I desire to contribute, so far as I may, to the speedy conclusion of the issue before us, so that under the Treasury's earnestly expressed desire, the legislation may be perfected in time for application on July 1.

The thing which the majority of the committee has here done, as has been very adequately submitted by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is to implement the so-called Ruml plan, with added protections, for putting the individual income taxpayers of the country on a pay-as-you-go tax basis.

There is far less controversy in the Senate Finance Committee bill than might be imagined from the long and noisy battle that has raged around it for many irritating weeks, or than might be associated with some of the vocal violence with which it has been, and will be, assaulted by congressional orators, whose heat is more obvious than the justification for it.

As a matter of fact, the issue is comparatively simple. Certainly it is in reality a very narrowly confined issue. I am not speaking of that very small minority in either the House or the Senate which is deeply, conscientiously opposed to all abatement in this emergency, and which has nothing but total opposition for the entire abatement theory. Between them and the rest of us the gap is wide and unbridgeable, but, I repeat, they number only a very few. I am speaking of the preponderating congressional majority which favors some measure of abatement but which has been quarreling so bitterly over the degree and the formula. I repeat, the issue is relatively narrow and confined. Now, let us see if this is not so.

First, we all agree, with the Treasury emphatically included, that the heavy burden of financing the war requires substantial "withholding taxes," collected at the source. There is no controversy upon that score. This accounts for about 90 percent of the text in the pending bill, entirely beyond controversy, entirely acceptable to all concerned. Except as to minor and relatively inconsequential details, there has been and there is no quarrel whatever at this point.

Second, we all agree that if we start on July 1 to "withhold at the source" a part of 1943 wages and salaries to pay a part of 1943 taxes, while at the same time the same taxpayers are paying up their 1942 taxes out of 1943 income, it suddenly multiplies the current tax take from the taxpayer; and, in view of the new, high income rates in the 1942 tax law, which already stretch the resources of most taxpayers to the limit, the burden would be insufferable; indeed, the collection would often be impossible.

Therefore, 95 percent of us—I think that is a conservative statement of the percentage—95 percent of us in the House and in the Senate agree, first, that there must be withholding taxes in order to meet the necessities of the Treasury; and, second, that these unavoidable withholding taxes cannot be applied without crucifying the American people, unless, so far as is humanly possible, the taxes are put on a pay-as-you-go, current-obligation basis.

Mr. President, we all agree that in order to apply withholding taxes we must put individual income taxpayers on a current basis, which is to say that 1943 tax payments and 1943 tax withholdings shall settle current 1943 obligations, as I have indicated.

Thus, at the end of the year citizens will be out of current debt to their Government, a tax ideal which has long been abstractedly approved but never until now achieved, and achieved now under the terms of the recommendations of the Senate Finance Committee on a basis which is practically total in its application to the whole citizenship of the United States.

I repeat, Mr. President, that up to this point the vast majority of us are in general agreement, up to this point the Treasury is in agreement, up to this point no piece of major legislation has ever been less controversial than the one which now pends.

Now we come along to the final question, and the only thing which is in controversy in this forum this afternoon, namely, How shall these objectives be reached? Here the fight starts, but I say once more that even here the difference amongst most of us is more seeming than real. The only difference is not one of principle, the only difference is one of detail. Again I say that I am referring to the preponderating majority of us, and not to that very small minority which is totally opposed in its conscience to all tax abatements whatsoever.

Mr. President, let us now see just how narrow the issue really is. A majority of the House Ways and Means Committee, speaking for the administration, and with the Treasury's approval, reported a formula which would have canceled about $4,700,000,000 of 1942 taxes, and made some 7,000,000 taxpayers current. I am speaking now about the original House Ways and Means Committee bill. They approved, mind you, the abatement principle, and that is the important thing I am stressing. They approved the abatement principle, and by "they" I am referring to those who now criticize the pending proposal of the Senate Finance Committee. They approved the abatement principle, but they withheld its benefits from some 37,000,000 taxpayers owing $4,800,000,000. They discriminated against the great majority of our taxpayers. The principle was good for some, but not for all.

The House declined to agree, and as we proceed with this very brief analysis Senators will find the issue again narrowing and ever narrowing. The House declined to agree. It could not stomach quite so much discrimination. So it altered the formula, and the alteration ultimately was approved by the votes of all administration spokesmen. It agreed to cancel $7,200,000,000 of 1942 taxes, leaving $2,214,000,000 outside the safety zone. This was a great advance in the application of the theory that our American system promises equal justice to all and special privileges to none, but it still fell short of par.

Thus the bill came to the Senate Finance Committee, and all in the world the majority of the Senate Finance Committee have done is to carry this rapidly narrowing controversy to its logical conclusion, so that we reach par in the treatment of our citizenship all alike in respect to this matter of tax abatement.

In the final analysis, speaking generally, that is precisely what the Senate committee has done. It has reached par in its fidelity to the principle which practically all the Members of the House and Senate have endorsed. The Senate committee bill abates all taxes for 1942 or 1943, whichever is the lower, and then recoups about $1,500,000,000 in windfall provisions.

The Senate committee took the principle of abatement as bequeathed to it by the House, and as now approved by the Treasury, and has applied that principle to every American taxpayer under the flag. It wiped out the last lingering trace of discrimination. It took the final logical step on the road which the House correctly shows as the necessary highway for us to travel in this critical, fiscal hour. If the House was justified in taking the first step, we are justified, yea, we are commanded by American equities, to take the last step. There is no such thing as partial virtue in this connection.

Thus, Mr. President, I submit the final proof that the issue here in the Senate is an extremely narrow one, except so far as the position is involved of those who are totally opposed to the entire arrangement. It is not a question of whether we shall have 1942 tax abatement as a means effectively to put the country on a current tax-paying basis. That question has been settled by all of these other decisions so far as at least 95 percent of us are concerned. The sole question here pending is whether we shall do it by the House method, which cancels some $7,200,000,000 of 1942 tax liabilities, leaving a small minority of our citizens in double jeopardy, or whether we shall do it by canceling the total $9,451,000,000 of 1942 tax liabilities, treating every citizen alike, and then recouping some $1,500,000,000 from windfalls.

This is not a partisan question, Mr. President. It is a bipartisan majority of the Senate Finance Committee which has reported this amended bill which says in effect that there shall be equal justice for all in respect to tax treatment. We have tightened up the first so-called windfall provision in the bill. Every taxpayer, no matter what his income, pays full taxes on his 1942 or his 1943 income, whichever is the greater. His abatement is for the lesser of these two years. Remember this cardinal fact: no taxpayer actually pays less in 1943 than he would under existing law. I want to repeat again that abatement is not proposed for the sake of abatement. Abatement is proposed because it is absolutely prerequisite to put the Treasury in a position to withhold taxes in their current collections.

A second windfall provision reaches back to stop any special advantage to taxpayers who may have found a previous bonanza in our war effort. It virtually applies so far as these are concerned, the theory and principle of the excess-profits tax to individual incomes. The loopholes are closed. The resulting question is simple, namely, in the unavoidable process of establishing a system of withholding taxes and of putting American citizens upon a current basis, shall we stop short of total justice for our whole people; shall we stop short of equal treatment for all? It is but a short step from the House bill to this final recommendation of the Senate Finance Committee, but it is a tremendously long step in the direction of American fair play.

Mr. President, I now comment only briefly on the charge heard outside this Chamber that the pending bill is built to aid the rich. Why? Well, the real reason, when you analyze it, is because it does not discriminate against any class of taxpayers, and particularly because it declines to discriminate against those income-tax payers who always have and always will pay incomparably the highest rates—rates running up to 90 percent.

External critics of the bill are not to be blamed for echoing this prejudicial attitude, because the Treasury Department itself has set them a specific precedent in its own prejudicial class-baiting arithmetic upon this subject. This is a poor time to divide America along these lines. I decline to be any part of it. Obviously larger taxpayers get larger abatements than smaller taxpayers Why? Because they pay larger taxes, and not because this bill is extending any special privilege to them. One item unavoidably balances the other. This bill does not change our established system of graduating income taxes according to the ability to pay. It still leaves larger taxpayers paying infinitely larger tax percentages than smaller taxpayers, as, of course, they should. We do not alter these percentages. We leave them as they are, and that is the gist of this class-baiting complaint. Whatever a taxpayer has paid remains the basis of his abatement without discrimination. The complaint is as a matter of fact, that we do not discriminate. But if we start discriminating, Mr. President, where shall we stop? The man who earns $5,000 a year pays more taxes and at higher rates than the man who earns $1,000 a year. Since what he pays is the measure of his abatement under this bill, his abatement is larger. So it goes on up the scale.

The Treasury says that this is quite all right for the $5,000 men and the $10,000 men, but that somewhere up the scale it becomes all wrong. Why? If there is any logic or equity in discrimination, why not make a good job of it and discriminate against everyone who earns more than $1,000 a year? Why not level off everything at that point? That would be good, thorough-going communism. But, of course, the Congress would not think of doing such a thing. Neither would most of these critics. So they insist that the discrimination should start higher up. Well, Mr. President, it is still discrimination, dress it up as you please. I simply remark that one of our great founding fathers was on firm ground when he warned us not to adopt expedients which, however persuasive at the moment, can warrant upon some other day the very destruction of the American system itself. I hope we shall never discourage an American system of freemen and free enterprise under which all our people may strive for extra rewards for extraordinary effort and achievement.

Aside from that external criticism which I think is unwarranted and unfounded, I repeat the conclusion that the issue here drawn is utterly narrow insofar as the great preponderance of both the Democratic and Republican Members of the House and Senate are concerned. The primary purpose of tax abatement is to prevent double taxation by withholding payments at the source. The principle has been approved in one degree or another by virtually all Members of the House and the Senate. At present the issue is entirely one of degree. It is whether net abatement shall be 76 percent under the House bill or a net abatement of 88 percent, after recoupments, under the Senate Committee bill with all taxpayers current. The sole issue is whether we shall stop before we have done total justice and given equal treatment to all citizens alike.

The pending Senate Finance Committee recommendation puts more taxpayers on a current basis than does the House text; yet it would collect and turn into the Treasury more money than would the House language. That, according to the report of the committee filed today, continues on down into 1944, 1945, and 1946. In other words, the recommendation of the Senate committee more equitably treats more citizens, and yet more generously treats the Treasury. Mr. President, I think that is a dual achievement well worthy of the commendation and approval of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment? I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. HILL. A number of Senators who are not now on the floor would want to hear the Senator's remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. The difficulty is that I cannot keep them here after they come.

Mr. HILL. Be that as it may, Mr. President, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Bone	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I suggested to the Senate, at the moment I am not as well prepared to discuss all the details of the pending measure as I should like to be. For that reason I shall reserve some remarks until a later time in the discussion. However, I cannot resist the temptation, even at this early time in the debate, to contest some of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to the philosophy and the justice implied in the pending measure.

Mr. President, today the United States Government has the heaviest bonded indebtedness it has ever had in its existence. Every dollar of that bonded indebtedness is a mortgage or the income, resources, and initiative of every citizen under our flag. Some time, somewhere, out of the earnings of the people, that debt must be paid.

Today the demands upon the Treasury of the United States for the prosecution of the war day by day are greater than any demand that has ever been made legitimately upon the Treasury of the United States. Yet, in the face of that situation, we have in the Senate of the United States a bill to give away—for that is what it means—$9,000,000,000 which has already been assessed on the tax books of the United States and has

been settled as a legitimate and lawful demand upon the taxpayers of the United States.

I find myself in a small minority. I am not in favor of remitting or "abating." That is the new word. That is a softened word. It is not giving away. It is not remitting. It is "abating." But, Mr. President, if we analyze "abating," "giving away," and any other expressions of that character under the microscope of the philologist, we find that they all mean the same thing. The Government is going to lose the money, and if it loses the money, somebody is going to get it.

It is said that we must place the collection of income taxes on a current basis. I may be ignorant, and apart from the currents of information, Mr. President, but we have had the income-tax law in the United States since 1913, and until Mr. Ruml barged into the press and into the Committee on Finance I never heard any insistent demand from any source that we place the collection of income taxes on a current basis, and I have been here for about 25 years.

The demand is for payment of income taxes from current income. It is said that there are many small taxpayers who never have paid any income tax; that they have not been accustomed to making returns; that they are now making a great deal of money in war plants, and if we do not get their taxes in installments in advance, we will not collect them.

Mr. President, I have no objection to putting into effect at the earliest possible moment—on the first day of July, or June, or whenever it may be practicable—a deduction policy, by which, from the income of every salaried man and every wage earner, there shall be deducted whatever is necessary in the way of taxes according to sensible estimates, in order to meet the tax bill when it is due. Let the taxpayer be credited in advance with those amounts, and when the tax-paying period comes, it is only a matter of mathematics to say whether he owes the Government an additional amount or whether the Government has been overpaid.

But, under the pretext of taking care of those few almost inconsequential cases, I am not in favor of handing over to the great and powerful taxpayers in the United States $9,000,000,000 which is due the Treasury of the United States. I will not do it under any pretext of that character.

We talk about discrimination. I am not in favor of discrimination. I am in favor of every citizen who owes the Government a debt paying it in full. Because we give some little fellow with a workingman's cap on his head $5 is no reason why we should give $500,000 to some other taxpayer whose income is regular over the years. That is the kind of discrimination which the bill embodies.

I do not wish to make any commitments at this time. I shall probably offer as a substitute for the Senate committee bill the original House Ways and Means Committee bill, known as the Doughton bill. If that fails, I shall reserve the right to vote for the least harmful measure—very likely the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; but I want the Senate and the country to know that I am not in favor of any wholesale gift of taxes in this period of world crisis.

It is said that the proposed abatement would not result in any loss to the Government, and that a taxpayer would pay in 1943 anyway. Let us see whether we would lose any money.

If the taxpayer pays his 1942 taxes, and also his 1943 taxes, the Government of the United States collects taxes for 2 years. If he pays only his 1943 taxes, and does not pay his 1942 taxes, the Government does not collect taxes for 2 years, and it will never collect the tax for the other year. In no event can we ever justify the abatement. We can soften the word all we please, grease it, perfume it, and bedeck it with flowers and oratorical metaphors, but it is still a gift. We cannot avoid that conclusion. If it is not a gift, why is anyone in favor of it? If it were not a gift, there would not be so much clamor for it. If it were not a gift Mr. Ruml would not be excited.

Think about Mr. Ruml. He wants the payment of his income tax to become current. Is he one of the wage earners who is so anxious to become current that he thinks we must deduct his income tax from his salary? Everyone knows who Mr. Ruml is. He is one of the heads of Macy & Co., and one of the officials of the Federal Reserve bank. Mr. President, can you not picture Mr. Ruml being in such a fix that we must deduct a little something out of his pay envelope in order that the Government may collect income taxes from him?

I will admit that this is a tempting sort of thing. We are told that the Government will not lose a cent, that income-tax collections will be on a current basis, that we shall all be happy, and the Government will receive just as much money as it previously received. Mr. President, that is not true. I challenge anyone to bring the mathematicians and professors before us to demonstrate that a man can keep in his pocket $600,000 which he owes to the Government, and that the Government will be none the worse off. If that can be demonstrated, I will withdraw these remarks.

What does the bill do? I hold in my hand a table entitled "Amounts of tax cancelation at selected income levels, and total amount canceled for all taxpayers under different plans."

Under the bill as passed by the House a man with a $2,000 income is forgiven $140 in taxes, under the Ways and Means Committee bill $100, under the 50-percent uniform cancelation he would be forgiven $70, under the 75-percent plan he would be forgiven $105, under the Senate committee bill he would be forgiven $140. He would get it all back. Santa Claus is here. He is supposed to come on the 25th day of December each year, but, according to this bill, he will come every day during the year 1942. Every day in 1942 old Santa Claus will be coming around with a Government present and saying, "My dear sir, your income is a million dollars. It has been a million dollars all the time, but now, in order to place the payment of your income taxes on a current basis, I will give you $600,000. [Laughter.] I am just going to make you a present of it because I want you current." I am informed I made a mistake. He is to be given $854,000—$854,000 to the man with a million-dollar income. His chauffeur is dodging taxes, and we have to place him on a current basis, so we will give the old man $854,000 back, and get $1.87 out of the chaffeur, through deductions. [Laughter.]

Let us take a man with a $5,000 income. Under the bill as it passed the House he would be forgiven $691. That is a pretty good dividend, is it not? It is a dividend on what? A dividend on dodging a year's taxes.

Under the Ways and Means Committee bill this taxpayer would be forgiven $388. Under the 50-percent deduction plan he would be forgiven $373. Under the 75-percent plan he would be forgiven $560. But under the Senate committee bill he would be forgiven $746 on a $5,000 income.

Let us take the case of an income of $10,000. Senators ought to be interested in the $10,000 income bracket. Under the bill as passed by the House a man with a $10,000 income would be forgiven $1,614. Under the bill of the Ways and Means Committee he would be forgiven only $860. Under the 50-percent plan he would be forgiven $1,076. Under the 75-percent plan he would be forgiven $1,614. But under the bill of the Senate Committee on Finance the man with a $10,000 income would get $2,152 remission in order to place him on a current basis.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do not make it hard.

Mr. WILEY. Now that the Senator from Texas has mentioned the question of payments of taxes by Senators——

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely said that they should be interested in that bracket.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate that. The question which I desire to propound will be a very simple one. Let us assume a tax liability of $2,100, and that I have paid that tax. I want to know what it means when the Senator calls it current. Would it mean that during this year, instead of paying it in a lump sum in January, I would pay the entire $2,100 in 12 monthly installments? Would that make it current, or what is the proposal,

Mr. CONNALLY. The theory is that the Senator would not pay any in 1943, but he would pay it in deductions.

Mr. WILEY. In December 1943, would I have paid out the $2,100, the same as I have paid it out already, and having paid it, if the proposed bill shall become a law, will I gain anything by that payment?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will get back what he paid on 1942 income, should the proposed bill pass. Am I correct in that?

Mr. WILEY. I do not so understand it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Texas certainly does not mean to make any such statement as that which he has made.

Mr. CONNALLY. He would not pay it twice.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No one would get a refund. The only difference is that the payment made on the 1942 taxes would be credited on the 1943 taxes. The taxpayer would not receive any refund of any sort.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Wisconsin asked me whether, if he should pay his taxes by the month, and had paid the full amount by the end of December 1943, he would get it back in 1944.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Texas replied that the Senator from Wisconsin would get the money back, but he would not.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I meant he would receive a refund on 1942 taxes, and if he did not, there would be a fraud in the pending bill. As I understand, he is forgiven the 1942 taxes which he has paid. Let us say I have paid the tax in monthly installments and I am as current as I ever will be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit me, I do not want to interrupt the current of his thought, but what would occur is that if the 1943 or 1942 tax, whichever is the lower, were remitted——

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And the taxpayer paid on the 1942 or 1943 tax, whichever is the higher——

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The payments made heretofore on the 1942 tax will be credited on his tax payments for the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, whichever it may be in each taxpayer's case.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no such thing as a refund.

Mr. CONNALLY. My statement concerning a refund was predicated on the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin that he went ahead and paid up to December 1943, by the deduction method. If he did that, then he would be entitled to whatever he had paid on the 1942 taxes, as a rebate or refund.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If he paid in excess of the higher year, 1942 or 1943, subject to the then current deductions.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been so much confusion in the newspapers and otherwise that I will put the question in this way: Assuming the same income in 1943 as in 1942, what the people are interested in knowing is, how much less the taxpayer will be out of pocket in January 1944 under one plan or the other. Having paid my 1942 tax in March 1943, as I understand the matter, I shall be the same amount out of pocket under the pending bill as I would be under the other provision, because the only difference is that I pay it in 12 monthly installments, and in January 1944 I would still be $2,100 out of pocket. Is that correct? There has been much talk about refunds and rebates, and that kind of thing, which does not mean anything when we come down to the question of dollars and cents.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, if it did not mean anything, there would not be any Ruml bill here.

Mr. WILEY. The argument for the Ruml plan, as I understand it, is that payment of taxes would be made what is called current, so that if one pays his income tax by monthly installments during the year and dies during the course of the year, there will be certain advantages accruing to his estate.

I want to know who can answer this question, putting it concretely: Assume I have paid my tax of $2,100 in a lump sum. Having paid it, in January 1944, do I gain anything under the proposed plan if I pay it currently month by month, or in January 1944 shall I be out $2,100 the same as I am today?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia. I should like to know. I think the people of the country want to know, because there is so much bunk and bunkum about the thing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Wisconsin think that I cannot answer him? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. No; I do not imply that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Georgia shall answer the question.

Mr. GEORGE. If I understand the situation, the taxpayer has paid his 1942 tax in full. The withholding provisions of this bill, if it passes as the committee has recommended, and as the bill stands before the Senate at the present time, would apply beginning with July 1. They would apply to the salary and wages of a taxpayer who had paid his tax liability in full as well as the taxpayer who is paying on the installment basis. However, the adjustment would be made in his final return for the year 1943. In other words, it may be assumed that I, for example, paid my tax in 1942 in full on March 15, and that I had only a salary income, and that my 1943 income will be only the same salary income. Beginning with July 1 of this year, under the pending bill, I would have withheld from my salary 20 percent of the amount in excess of my withholding exemption. The withholding exemption in my case will be $1,248. That 20 percent would be accumulated to my credit and in my final return that I would make for the year 1943 I would have an adjustment, and if I had overpaid the 1943 tax, which would be the case, of course, if the 1943 income were identically the same as the 1942 income, derived from the same sources, and so forth—when I make my final return I will have an adjustment and receive credit for the amount overpaid.

Mr. WILEY. As a matter of fact, though, the taxpayer would be the same money out of pocket, would he not, as if he had paid it in March or whenever he had made the adjustment?

Mr. GEORGE. He would be, and he would get it back only if he overpaid his tax.

Mr. WILEY. But the confusion is about the word "abatement," or "forgiveness," which is applied to the other question as to how much the taxpayer will be out of pocket or how much he will gain by it. The answer, as I get it, is that he will pay the same in January 1944 or in March 1944, whenever the adjustment is made, as he would have paid if he paid a lump sum in March of this year.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly; that is true, provided his tax liability is the same.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; provided it is the same.

Mr. GEORGE. The payment made in March of this year, if the bill passes, will be credited against 1943 income tax, and the liability for 1942 will be discharged.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to trespass upon his time for a moment——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin listen to me. The Senator may have paid the same in 1943 under either system, either the current system or the system proposed by the bill reported by the majority of the Finance Committee, but there is this essential difference, that in 1944 he would be paying on 1944 income while under the present system he would be paying on 1943 income. In other words, he would be current with his taxes instead of being a year behind, while under the present system he would always have a tax debt hanging over him from year to year.

Mr. WILEY. So the only year in which a taxpayer could win would be the year in which he died.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Texas will permit one other observation, let me say that I have never believed that there was any forgiveness or any personal advantage to anybody in the system. I believe there is great governmental advantage in having everyone current with his taxes, and having the Government able to collect the taxes as the taxpayer earns them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield briefly to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Wisconsin suggested that the taxpayer would gain only if he died. Is it not a fact that if a man had a war contract and was making $100,000 in 1942, and in the year 1943 he made the same amount, he would pay the same under the Senate committee bill as he would have paid otherwise, but if he did not make anything in 1944 he would not have to pay any tax? In other words, the Government would lose the tax on $100,000 made under a war contract.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is right. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin, who seems to be worried, that the taxpayer has already paid his 1942 tax.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is putting words in my mouth; I am not worried.

Mr. CONNALLY. Nobody is worried if the tax is paid, of course, but he will not have to pay any tax in 1943 unless his 1943 income was higher than his 1942 income; or if he decides he would rather pay on 1943 income he pays on 1943 income, and draws back from the Treasury what he has paid on 1942 income. In other words, upon the payment of $2,150 he satisfies, in effect, both 1942 and 1943 taxes; under the present system one payment satisfies only for 1942.

Mr. President, if you had in your house a tenant who was paying you $15 or $25 or $100 a month rent, if he should skip a month you would know it, would you not? If he should skip a month, and should not pay the rent, you would be out a month's rent—I care not whether he was paying on a current or any other basis.

I have a dollar bill here in my hand—the first one I have had for some time. [Laughter.] When that dollar bill goes into the Treasury of the United States it reduces the burden of the Treasury by a dollar. Mr. President, do you suppose there is anybody in the Treasury who gets out a microscope and tries to examine that dollar and see whether it is current or is not current? It is a dollar; it is an asset to the Treasury of the United States; it is worth a dollar; but when this bill proposes to forgive $854,000 in one lump sum to a million-dollar taxpayer who does not come within the windfall provision, who is not a war profiteer, who has a steady income of a million dollars every year, the result would be to hand over to him for 1942 taxes which are already due, which are already assessed, and which in part have probably already been paid, $854,000, and the Government would kiss that $854,000 good-bye; it would never see it again.

What about inflation? What effect will that have? The freeing of all this money which would otherwise be paid in taxes is bound to have an inflationary effect. The one who benefits says, "I was not looking for that; Congress knocked $100,000 off my taxes; I have $100,000 to spend for something; I am going to have a good time; I am going to squander a little money." That is the reaction of everyone when he gets some easy money. Those who live in horse-racing States, Kentucky and other States, may feel like betting on horse races and making a big killing, or spending it in some other way. So, Mr. President, it has a bad effect on inflation.

However, I desire to continue the comparison as to what we are giving up. I am going to take that dollar and put it in my pocket; I am not concerned whether it is paid by a current taxpayer or by an uncurrent taxpayer; to me it is just a dollar, a part of my salary from the United States Government.

Now let us see what we do for the $100,000 man. It is desired to make him current. He has a $100,000 income, and it is a terrible thing that he is not paying taxes on it every day. He ought to figure his taxes every day; at night he ought to put in a box enough money with which to pay his tax. He has only a $100,000 income. In order to help him out let us see now what it is proposed to do for him. Even the House bill gives him $18,690; the Ways and Means Committee bill, $11,357; a 50-percent forgiveness amounts to $32,030; the 75-percent plan amounts to $48,045. But that is not enough; no, that is not enough. He is a nice fellow, and we want to make him current. He has a $100,000 income, it is true; but we are going to give him $64,060 in order to make him current. He owes that money right now to the Treasury of the United States; it does not belong to us to squander; it does not belong to the Senate of the United States to give away; it is a sacred trust and, under the Constitution of the United States, no power in this Government can give it away except the Congress, because it is the property of the United States, under a tax assessment that has been levied, determined, and adjudicated. It is the property of the people of the United States, and we have no moral right to remit it. We have a legal right or we have the naked power; yes, we have the naked power to do it; we have the cold, inexorable authority to do it, but we have no right to do it, and furthermore we will have to get that money back in another tax bill. Where are we going to get it? I warn Senators that every dollar they give away in this bill will sooner or later have to be collected out of the taxpayers of the United States.

The President has already called upon us to pass a tax bill to provide $16,000,000,000 new money, not forgiven taxes for 1942—the beneficiaries of the forgiven taxes will be under the shed and they will not be bothered—but $16,000,000,000 of new taxes, in addition to those we have already levied. Where are they to be obtained? We have already taxed the larger incomes in the higher brackets so heavily that they do not constitute a source for further productive revenue. Where are we going to get the money? We will have to get it out of the $3,000-a-year men, the $5,000-a-year men, the $10,000-a-year men, the $15,000-a-year men, the $20,000-a-year men, and the $25,000-a-year men; we will have to get the money out of the taxpayers in the lower and the medium brackets of income. That is the source from which it has got to come. Every dollar given away in this bill must be recouped from those least able to pay it. How many little men will the $854,000 it is proposed to hand to a man with a million dollars income represent? How many little taxpayers will have to dig up out of their earnings, out of their toil, out of their hardship, out of their deprivation, to make up for the $854,000 which it is proposed to hand to one taxpayer in order to get him current? We have to get him current.

Why is it not proposed that we make the corporations current? The bill does not disturb the incomes of corporations. I am not speaking for corporations, but some of those who are to have their taxes remitted under the bill are interested in corporations. The bill would tax corporations in the same old way. The corporations pay their taxes on the 15th of March. It is not proposed that we make them current. Why should we not make them current, if currency has such an appeal? If it is so necessary that we have a current system of deductions each period, why should we not apply it to corporations as we do to individuals? Of course, that may come a little later. I admit this may break the ice, and then we will do that. It may come later.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the theory and justification for the whole plan of making the Nation current in its tax payments is that it will enable the Treasury to make collections at the source and will go to the point of making the Nation able to come to a pay-as-you-go plan. Of course, no one has suggested any plan—and if I knew one which would be feasible, I should be in favor of it—no one has suggested any plan whatever by which it is possible to undertake the collection of a corporation's taxes at the source, because a corporation cannot possibly before the end of the year know what its taxable income may be. It cannot tell as to any particular contract what its taxable income may be. The plan now proposed has never been suggested as applicable to anything except personal income, because the tax on income which comes into a man's hands may be collected at the source, a practice which every other intelligent nation in the world has already adopted.

If the Senator will permit me a word further, I see no analogy whatever between collection of the tax on personal income at the source and the collection of the tax on corporation income at the source, because the latter is not possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. In reply to the Senator from Missouri, let me say that the men with great incomes, even under the pending bill, will not pay at the source, because they do not draw salaries or wages. There is nothing withheld except from salaries and wages, so that if I have an income of a million dollars from stocks, and bonds, and manufacturing concerns, and such things, although I do not pay currently, yet, on the theory that we are to collect from everybody, I get back $854,000. I should be ashamed of myself. The men who help me do that should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. President, what does the bill accomplish? It is said it does not give away anything. It does not? Under the bill as it passed the House it would remit—and I want the Senators to listen to this—it would remit, or abate, a large amount of taxes. Senators can take whatever word they desire; if "forgive" does not suit a Senator, if that is harsh to his tympanum, he can use "abate," or some such delicate word. Then let us say "abate"—and many have grabbed the bait. [Laughter.]

The House bill abates, or gives away, or forgives—and if the bill shall pass there will have to be a great deal of forgiveness between now and the next election—the House bill gives away $7,238,000,000, which the Treasury needs more

badly today than it has ever needed it since George Washington sat in the President's chair. Shades of Alexander Hamilton! I invoke them. Shades of Alexander Hamilton, who was trying to redeem the credit of the Nation by his assumption bills, and other legislation to make the Government strong in its finances. I invoke the shades of Alexander Hamilton, when, at the time of the worst financial crisis in our history, when we face more militant and aggressive and dangerous enemies than ever congregated upon any field of battle in all the long and historic past, the Government of the United States, while begging its people to give it $16,000,000,000 more out of their incomes, turns around and hands out to taxpayers, who have already been assessed, from whom the money is already due, under the bill as it passed the House, $7,238,000,000; under the Ways and Means Committee bill, the Doughton bill, $4,672,000,000; under the 50 percent plan, $4,908,000,000; under the 75 percent plan, $7,361,000,000; and under the Finance Committee plan, the amendment now before us, there would be handed out to them $9,815,000,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, whether he has any schedule which shows the cash position of the United States this year, or next year, under these various plans. In other words, it seems to me what the people of the United States are now concerned about is what will be the actual cash in hand, on the part of the Government of the United States, this year, or next year, or the year after, rather than what might be the contingent claims of liability against taxpayers, which could only be collected at judgment day, and which might then be defaulted under insolvency. I should be interested to have the Senator get his young man from the Treasury Department, who has always opposed——

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from the Treasury Department is here at my request, and I hope the Senator will not criticize him; I do not think he is subject to criticism.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not criticizing him, but I am suggesting that the Senator from Texas get the young man from the Treasury Department, who has appeared before the Committee on Finance presenting the view which the Senator from Texas is now presenting, who is an expert at figures, prepare a schedule showing the cash position of the Government under the present law, and under the various plans which have been suggested for changing the present law. In other words, it seems to me that in these parlous times what we should be actually considering is how much money the Government of the United States is going to have in hand this year, and next year, and the years during the continuance of the war—which I hope may be short, though they may be long—rather than counting contingent liabilities which may or may not be collected.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I do not need to call on the Treasury experts to answer that question. I can call on one of the page boys and he can tell me that if I owe 2 years' taxes and the Government forgives one of them, I am better off than I was before. I do not need the Treasury to answer that question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I think one of the page boys here could probably make a much more intelligent answer than many which the Treasury Department made to the inquiries which have been propounded in the Committee on Finance. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be, but the answers seem to have had a strange influence on the Senator from Missouri, who has been going in the other direction ever since the statements were made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; by reason of what was stated to be the basis for the Treasury recommendations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not always agree with the Treasury. In fact, I do not always agree with anyone. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator certainly did not agree with the Treasury on the matter of the community property tax and a great many other things.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Therefore it seems remarkable to me that the Senator from Texas constantly holds up his hand in reverence at any suggestions made by the young men from the Treasury Department.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; the Senator from Missouri is wrong about that. That is the attitude of the Ruml-ites. They say, "O Mr. Ruml, give us our daily bread. Mr. Ruml, give us our abatement, give us our forgiveness."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Texas does not touch the matter of community property.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. I am not frightened by those things. I meet every issue when I come to it. I am not a devotee of the Treasury. I frequently disagree with the Treasury. The fact that I happen to agree with the Treasury in this instance is no sign that I am following the Treasury any more than the Treasury is following me. The Treasury might be following me. I am not at all sure about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When the Senator follows the Treasury he is not exercising his usual acumen.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When he follows the Treasury the Senator is not so acute as he usually is.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has been heaping obloquy on the Treasury. Now, as I understand him, he says that I am not acute when I do not follow the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; on the contrary.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the bill do, Mr. President? Call it abatement, if you want to do so, but if I should pawn my watch at the pawnbroker's and fail to redeem it, I would not call that abatement. I should consider my watch as having gone. When it is proposed to give away $9,000,000,000 those who propose to do so cannot soften it, cannot cover it over with sugar and a little chocolate, and make the people of the United States think that the $9,000,000,000 is not being given away.

Let us consider an example. Let us take the case of a married person without dependents, with a steady net income each year of $100,000. I am not talking about windfalls. A great deal is said about windfalls. The Treasury will get a little money as a result of windfalls; the Treasury will get a little money from speculators, and get-rich-quick fellows, and adventurers, and war contract brokers, and a few fellows of that ilk; but the income taxes of this Nation on the whole are paid by the men with large steady incomes. I see some of them over on the Republican side. I wish we had some on the Democratic side. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is the Senator from Texas supporting any of the bills which propose to forgive taxes?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not personally in favor of any of them. I should rather support some of them in preference to others, however, because they are less harmful, but if I had my way I would not give away one dollar of taxes. I should favor beginning the imposition of taxes on salaries and wages at the earliest moment, and crediting the taxpayer on whatever is deductible from his tax when it is due.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of all the bills, toward which is the Senator most favorable?

Mr. CONNALLY. The House Ways and Means Committee bill, the Doughton bill because it does less harm to the Treasury.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to add one more word. I do not think that the fact that we have horse racing in Kentucky should make any difference in our consideration of the tax bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, by what I said, I meant no reflection on Kentucky. Most of those who bet on the races run in Kentucky come from outside the State and go to the Derby in Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. No, I do not think so. Texas tried racing, and for some reason did not make a go of it. Horse racing in Kentucky began a great many years ago. I do not think horse racing, however, should have anything to do with the tax bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. I merely meant to say that if any easy money came to a man, the tendency would be for him to go out and have a good time and spend it.

Mr. President, I pay my respects to Kentucky. Kentucky is a State of beautiful horses, and God knows I admire them. There is nothing finer than a beautiful horse. God Almighty made him. He is not an artificial product. He is not made by statute. He is not

the subject of cloakroom negotiations and Finance Committee deliberations. A race horse is a beautiful creature. I thank God that he can run. I thank God for his speed. I have been thrilled as I have seen him on the race course. No one blames Kentucky for running beautiful horses, fine horses. God bless them. I wish we had more of them and less automobiles.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the junior Senator from Kentucky is the worthy representative of that great State.

Mr. President, let us consider an example of a married person without dependents with a steady net income each year of $100,000. One hundred thousand dollars a year is a pretty comfortable income, is it not? The man with such an income is in a terrible strain about his income tax. He gets "current" pains about March 15 each year. He feels he must become current. What benefits will the man with an income of $100,000 a year receive under the Senate Finance Committee bill? The amount of forgiveness—Mr. President, I should have said "abatement"—I keep using that offensive term "forgiveness." I do not mean to offend, Senators. "Forgiveness" implies that something needs to be forgiven, that some wrong has been committed. I do not mean that. I mean abatement, so please bear with me on that. The amount of abatement is $64,060. Here is an income of $100,000 written down on the tax books. The income tax on that amount has already accrued. It belongs to the United States. It is a debt from the taxpayer to the Treasury of the United States. This bill says to that taxpayer, "You do not need to pay a cent of it. You do not need to pay a nickel of it."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator have the figures to show how much the man with such an income would pay in 1943? How much money would actually go into the Treasury of the United States that could be used for building battleships, tanks, guns, and so forth?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I can tell the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under the proposed law how much would come in, compared with what would come in under the current law?

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the current law the Treasury would receive $64,060 for 1942.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not necessarily.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; that is true. But I am speaking of this year.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is when he is going to pay it. He does not pay it until March of this year. So that would come in to the Treasury for 1942, and then in 1943 we would get another $64,060.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; the Government would not get that in 1943. It would get it in 1944 under the current law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; at the end of the current year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and the Government would always be a year behind in its taxes. The Senator talks about a lot of old tax liabilities. Instead of those old tax liabilities, which never would be collected, how much will the Government actually receive in cash money this year, in the particular tax period the Senator is talking about, as compared to the amount which would be received under the present law.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will try to answer the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. CONNALLY. The man in question has a steady income, as the statistics show. The Government would receive $64,060 each year until Congress changed the law. The Government would receive that amount in cash each year. Mr. President, no windfall provisions apply to reduce this amount, because it is a steady income. Do not be misled by the word "windfalls." They are windfalls, yes, but they are mighty little windfalls—more "wind" than "falls." The amount of $64,060 forgiven—I want Senators to listen to this—is 178 percent of the $35,940 of income after taxes. In other words, when the man pays his taxes under the old system, out of an income of $100,000 he would retain $35,940. Now, in order to make that taxpayer fully current it is proposed that we give him 178 percent of what he would have left under the old system after paying his taxes.

Thus the forgiveness adds to the amount at his disposal to spend, or to save, the equivalent of 20 months of additional income after taxes. The wartime tax increases on a $100,000-a-year income, under the Revenue Acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942, amounted to a total of $62,833 for the 3 years. In other words, under the tax bills of those 3 years the liability of the $100,000-a-year man over those 3 years was increased to $62,833 for the 3 years. The tax cancelation of $64,060 is $1,227 more than this total of wartime increases. We are asked to give this man back in 1 year all the increases which we have included in tax bills for 1940, 1941, and 1942, and in addition $1,227. This taxpayer would thus be better off by $1,227 than if he had been entirely exempted from all tax increases since 1939.

This taxpayer during his lifetime will pay $64,060 less than under existing law. His actual payments will reflect this at such times as his income declines, or, if a decline in income does not occur before his death, at his death.

Mr. President, there is so much that can be said and should be said with regard to the bill that I cannot find the time to do so, and I do not dare to trespass upon the time and patience of the Senate in order to present it; but I want to state a few other figures.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. From the Senator's statement I understood that what he called the forgiveness or abatement provision would result in the forgiveness or abatement of about $9,000,000,000. Does the Senator have the break-down to show the total, for instance, from the $1,500 income class up to the $100,000 income class? The Senator will remember that in a recent controversy in the Senate, evidence was put into the RECORD showing that there were only 3,200 persons in the United States who would have a salary of approximately $67,500 or over. I was wondering how the $9,000,000,000 forgiveness or abatement about which the Senator spoke would affect certain classes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not have that information at the moment.

Mr. WILEY. Probably the Treasury can obtain it.

Mr. CONNALLY. But before the debate is over I shall try to get it for the Senator; because the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has the figures made up from time to time, but usually it is a year or two after the tax year before they can obtain the information.

Mr. President, let us discuss very briefly the House version of the bill, particularly in connection with its currency features. The only difficulty about the Senate committee recommendation is that the United States would be shy $9,000,000,000 in currency and the taxpayers would have $9,000,000,000 more currency than they would have had if the bill were not passed. That is the chief currency item which I see in the bill.

The House text would have made 90 percent of all taxpayers current, and 99 percent of all taxpayers current to the extent of at least three-quarters of their tax liability. If we take the House version, which as I now recall figures only $4,000,000,000——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that the House text would forgive aggregate taxes of $7,200,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I stand corrected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator mean the bill which the House sent to the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I stand corrected; I was thinking about the Forand version.

The bill as passed by the House would have made 90 percent of all taxpayers current, of course, because the House bill would have omitted entirely the 6 percent normal tax and the 13 percent surtax rates, which in practical effect would have remitted the taxes for 90 percent of all taxpayers and would have made 99 percent of all taxpayers current to the extent of at least three-quarters of their tax liability.

So if currency is what we want, if we want to make the taxpayers current, the House version makes practically all taxpayers current; it makes all of them current except those having the larger incomes, those who do not need to be made current. Yet we shall save $2,000,000,000 by passing the House version of the bill rather than by adopting the Ruml plan.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the Senator for the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am for the bill as passed by the House in preference to the Senate committee recommendation. I am not for either one of them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Senator advocated the House bill in the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have not advocated the House bill. If I had my choice I would take the original House Ways and Means Committee bill. However, I cannot get what I want. What I want is not to remit these taxes, not to give them away. There is no measure which would do what I want except the present law; and before I shall vote for giving away the taxes I will vote for the present law. But if I have to make a choice as between giving away 75 and 100 percent, of course I will choose the 75-percent plan.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator tell me what percentage of the national income is included in the so-called wage or earned income brackets?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot tell at the moment.

Mr. WILEY. Can the Senator tell us approximately what the figure is?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will get the information for the Senator; I do not have it at the moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, can the Senator tell me how many persons in the United States had an income of more than $1,000,000 last year?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Treasury expert says 94. I do not know any of those gentlemen; I am not acquainted with any of them, and I am not prepared to state who they are.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator knows that I am anxious to ascertain how many persons in the United States had an income last year of more than a million dollars.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Treasury expert now tells me that the number was 60, not 94.

Mr. CHANDLER. Sixty persons in the United States had an income of more than $1,000,000 last year; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; 60, so I am informed.

Mr. President, of the 44,000,000 taxpayers estimated for 1943—and these are the ones who will be made current—only 4,000,000 will have surtax net incomes in excess of $2,000; that is, in excess of the first surtax bracket. That is shown in the attached table No. 1.

Of the 40,000,000 taxpayers made fully current by the House bill, 30,000,000 would become current through collections at the source from wages and salaries, and the other 10,000,000 would become current by estimating their annual income and by currently making quarterly payments on their estimated current year's income. The figures in table 2 show that of the 44,000,000 taxpayers estimated for 1943, nearly 39,000,000 taxpayers would have all their tax liability discharged currently, and only 300,000 taxpayers would have more than a maximum amount of $90 of taxes not discharged currently.

Mr. President, bearing somewhat on the question asked by the Senator from Wisconsin is a table setting forth individual net incomes for the estimated number of taxpayers for the income years 1942 and 1943, by size of surtax net income and type of income. The table shows the figures for the estimated number of taxable recipients whose incomes are from wages and salaries, with not more than a nominal amount of other income, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD. To read it would be somewhat tedious, and I do not desire to weary the Senate with it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Individual net income tax: Estimated number of taxpayers for the income years 1942 and 1943, by size of surtax net income and type of income*

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF TAXABLE INCOME RECIPIENTS [1]

[In millions]

Type of income	1942			1943		
	Total	Surtax net income		Total	Surtax net income	
		Not over $2,000	Over $2,000		Not over $2,000	Over $2,000
Wages and salaries with not more than a nominal amount of other income	28	26.5	1.5	32	30	2
All other [2]	11	9.0	2.0	12	10	2
Total	39	35.5	3.5	44	40	4

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF TAXABLE RETURNS [3]

Wages and salaries with not more than a nominal amount of other income	25	23.5	1.5	29	27	2
All other [2]	10	8.0	2.0	11	9	2
Total	35	31.5	3.5	40	36	4

[1] Number of individuals receiving net income in excess of exemption.

[2] Including sources other than wages and salaries, and also wages and salaries combined with more than a nominal amount of other income.

[3] Number of returns that will be filed on which a tax will be due. This is less than the number of taxable income recipients because of the filing of joint returns, including the income of more than 1 taxable income recipient, particularly in the smaller income classes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Likewise, Mr. President, I make the same request with regard to table No. 2, which is a somewhat involved table. I do not want to take the time of the Senate to read the table at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Approximate distribution of income recipients taxable in calendar year 1943 by percentage of total liabilities discharged currently under the House bill*

Percentage of total liability discharged currently	Number of taxable income recipients (millions)	Percentage of all taxable income recipients	Cumulative percentage of all taxable income recipients	Maximum amount of tax not discharged currently
100	38.7	88.8	88.8	0
90–100	4.2	9.6	98.4	$90
75–90	.3	.7	99.1	550
50–75	.3	.7	99.8	4,200
25–50	.1	.2	100.0	115,000
Less than 25	.002	.005	100.0	
Total	43.6	100.0		

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have already mentioned the fact that cancelation would have a very harmful effect upon our campaign for price control, inflation control, and similar programs. I do not care to take up more of the Senate's time at present; but I seriously and earnestly request the Senate to consider the impact and the consequences of passing the pending bill. It seems to me that, of all times in our history, now is not the hour to forgive $9,000,000,000 of much-needed revenue. We need it. In a short time we shall go forth on a hunt for more revenue in the form of another tax bill. I ask the Senate where are we to get the money except from the small-income taxpayers and from those in the middle brackets? Every dollar of the $9,000,000,000 which we forgive, which we pass out at the window to the large taxpayers, must come back into the Treasury from the taxpayers having small-sized and medium-sized incomes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that under any form of tax we have before us, the amount of money which will actually be paid into the Treasury—that is, revenue to the Treasury—must be mathematically more than the amount of the tax for 1942, when does the Senator consider that the impact of this abatement would occur, so that the Federal Treasury would feel it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that we are now on a rising income basis; incomes are increasing; incomes of the people of the United States for 1942 were greater than at any other time in the history of the Republic. But when the war ends, and war contracts pass out of the picture, we shall enter a period of declining incomes and declining income taxes. In my opinion, the impact of what we propose to do today will come when that decline in revenue and income comes upon us. I am not an expert. I am not a financier, or a statistician. However, according to my "cornfield" methods of thinking, the impact will come when the decline in revenue and income arrives.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Assuming that there may be a scale of descending national income and average personal income, would not the Government be infinitely better off in that period to have once gone upon a basis of current taxation and collection at the source, so that it would receive the money when the money was earned, or when the income actually accrued, rather than always being a year behind in its collection of taxes as it is under the system which we now have?

If the Senator will permit me, I recall the case of one of the du Ponts, which was testified to before the old Munitions Committee. As I recall, Mr. Alfred I. du Pont had had an income of more than $4,000,000 in 1 year during the last war. I cannot be certain as to the exact figure. He did not have to pay his income tax for that year until the year following. In the meantime, he had lost enough in stock transactions so that he did not have to pay anything at all. He died about that time, and his estate did not have to pay anything.

Answering what the Senator was just suggesting with reference to a prospective scale of declining income, would not the Government be very much better off in any year, as a matter of dollars and cents, whether the scale of incomes were ascending or descending, if the Government had taken the money at the source, so far as possible, in the year in which the income was earned, rather than leaving it for dissipation in a scale of ascending incomes, or actually not having the money in a scale of descending incomes? Would not the Government be better off year after year if it should take the money out of the income as it accrues, rather than to depend upon collection in the following year?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Missouri wishes to know whether the Government would be better off if it received payment every year. It now receives payment every year.

Mr CLARK of Missouri. For the previous year.

Mr. CONNALLY. No matter what year it comes from it now receives payment every year on income taxes.

The case cited by the Senator from Missouri does not apply to the discussion of the bill. Mr. du Pont did not have his salary or wages held out. That is all the bill would do. It would not hold out the income of the millionaire. Mr. du Pont would never have been touched by the bill, except for getting back a year's income taxes. That is all it would have done to Mr. du Pont. It would not have resulted in the collection of a cent currently from Mr. du Pont, because the bill applies only to salaries and wages. It does not apply to incomes from estates.

Mr. President, the Government of the United States receives income-tax payments every year. What difference does it make whether they are paid from 1942 or 1943 income? If a person owns a bond and is paid regularly, clipping the coupon on the 1st day of every January, what difference does it make to him whether the money is collected out of current revenues or out of some surplus which the company has accumulated? The main thing is that he receives income, and does not "forgive" it.

We hear talk about making the payment of income taxes current. The whole argument is predicated on the theory that there are many small income taxpayers, and that if the Government does not collect the tax by deducting a part of it each month, it will not receive it. These taxpayers have never been in the habit of paying income taxes. I am in favor of deductions in such cases. The original House Ways and Means Committee bill provided that deductions to the extent of 20 percent should be made from wages and salaries. That money would be impounded and placed to the credit of the taxpayer; and when the time came for him to pay his income tax, he would have to pay only the balance which was due, or he would receive a refund.

Mr. President, I do not wish to appear as a hard man who would grind the taxpayers into the dust. However, let me invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the civilians back home are the only ones who can provide the sinews with which to carry on this great war. Our men yonder on the far-flung battle lines are giving up their blood and their lives in order to carry the flag of this Republic to triumph and to crush our militant enemies. They must have arms and supplies. We are piling up here, for your grandchildren and great grandchildren and mine, a debt so colossal as to stagger the imagination of those of us who belong to the previous generation. In the face of this impending debt, in the face of this colossal demand upon the Treasury of the United States, is the fact that we have already assessed these taxes. They have been appraised and adjudicated. They are the debts of taxpayers to the Government of the United States. They are assets of the Government.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate, at such a moment, not to forgive, abate, or give away $9,000,000,000 of the Nation's treasure on some pretext that we want to make the payment of income taxes current. Remember that back there in the shadows is the army of the masses of common people who, under the new tax bill, will have to bear a heavy increase in their burdens. We shall be doubling and trebling income taxes in the $5,000 and $10,000 brackets. A man with an income of $2,000 will have to make his contribution.

For all we know, there may come a time when we shall have a sales tax, when the tax gatherer will stand beside the hungry man and pluck a sales tax out of the price he pays for food and clothing. We may enact some sort of tax by which the Government will lay its hand upon every natural want of the citizens of the United States. What are we to say to the taxpayers when the Government reaches out and searches their purses and extracts the few dollars they have left, when they remind us that because of the largesse of statesmen who wanted to make income-tax payments current, they reached into the Treasury of the United States, where their hands have no business, and handed out $9,000,000,000 to persons who did not need it, and who justly and fairly owed it to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no intention of trying to entertain my colleagues. However, I have in mind a few facts which may be of importance to our thinking.

I was a member, together with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], of a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance which last year, for nearly 2 weeks in executive session, considered the withholding plan as it came to us in the 1942 tax bill, together with the Ruml plan and its variants. The subcommittee had before it Mr. Paul, general counsel of the Treasury. Mr. Ruml kindly came down from New York. We had before the subcommittee representatives of the Brookings Institute, and Commissioner Guy Helvering. In fact, Mr. President, I think I may properly say that we had the cooperation in the subcommittee of all interested parties, both in the Government and out, who were in position to be of assistance to us in our consideration of the problem.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], reported favorably to the full committee. However, at that time the Committee as a Whole did not see fit to adopt the recommendations of the subcommittee. I have every reason to believe that at this moment the Treasury Department itself wishes the Senate and the House had adopted the plan last year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has mentioned the activities of the subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. Last year it originally considered and recommended the general principle contained in the Ruml plan as applied to taxation, in order to make the Nation current in its taxes and place it in a position to collect them at the source. To my mind that is the essential requirement of the whole tax situation.

I should like to have my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, yield to me for a moment longer to say that, having in mind the consideration of that matter in the subcommittee and in the full Finance Committee last year, I regard it as being extremely unfortunate that the consideration of this same principle in the House of Representatives was ever made the subject of partisan activity or partisan consideration. In the subcommittee of the Finance Committee to which the Senator from Connecticut referred, as well as in the full Finance Committee, there was never the slightest suggestion of partisanship. This question should not be subjected to partisan consideration. It is a matter which concerns all the people of the United States. I regard it as extremely unfortunate that in the consideration of this measure in the House the question of party consid-

eration ever entered into it; and I very sincerely hope that such a situation will not develop in the Senate. I know it did not occur in the Senate Finance Committee when it considered the measure, because on the motion which was originally made to adopt the general principle of the Ruml plan there were as many Democratic votes for the motion as there were Democratic votes against it. I hope the same principle may pervade the discussion of this question in the Senate, because it should not be a partisan question.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his helpfulness and cooperation throughout our consideration of this matter, both last year and the present year. I will say to my colleagues that there is certainly no partisan approach involved in my own presentation of the matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have my able colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, in his own time explain to me the proposal to forgive taxes, and how badly off the Government would be if, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said, we should forgive a considerable number of persons their tax obligations.

For example, take a man who makes $10,000 a year. If the pending bill should become a law, after the 1st of July he would be subject to a 20-percent withholding tax and a 5-percent Victory tax, which would take from him, from July 1 through December, $1,250. It is difficult for me to understand how he would be forgiven anything for that period of time, because under ordinary conditions the tax payment which would ordinarily be assessed or levied would not be due until March 15 of next year. Many taxpayers will not pay their income taxes because they will not have the money with which to pay them. Many of them are new taxpayers who have never before filed an income-tax return. As the Senator from Texas has said, there are approximately 60 persons in the United States who will have incomes of more than a million dollars each in 1942. Are we for that reason to deprive many thousands of taxpayers of the opportunity of becoming current in their income taxes and paying their taxes out of salaries as they go along, paying their obligations to the Government when they have the money with which to pay?

I do not want to vote to give away the tax money of the United States at a time when it needs it. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether, in his judgment, the Treasury would not be better off financially if it could collect the taxes currently rather than to incur the risk of all the contingencies which may arise, resulting in the loss of millions of dollars in tax money which the Government may never collect.

Those are some of the questions which the Senator from Texas has raised in my mind, and I should like to have the Senator address himself to them at his convenience, if he will be good enough to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for high-lighting the points emphasized in his mind. I hope to address myself to them and develop answers which I trust he will find adequate.

Mr. President, if we choose to do so, we can reject the pending plan, or any other plan, and retain the present law. If we decide to retain the present law, every one who became liable for the payment of an income tax on income earned or received in 1942 will have to pay a tax. We do not have to change the present law. And so in 1944, every one would be liable to pay an income tax on income received in 1943.

The pending legislation would not affect, as the Senator from Texas would have us think, only those who receive income from vast estates. Nor would its effect be limited, as another Senator may have implied, to those who have income derived from salaries and wages. Quite the contrary, Mr. President, the bill in its present form would apply to all income which is today taxable under the income-tax laws of the United States. It would apply to all net taxable income subject to tax, from whatever source derived.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has submitted a statement of individual views, a copy of which lies on the desk of each Senator. It is a very valuable contribution to our thinking in our approach to the question solely from the standpoint of policy.

Do we want to make the shift? If we do, what will be the effect of it? The Senator from Wisconsin correctly points out that under the present law the Treasury estimates that revenue from individual incomes in the fiscal year 1944 will amount to approximately twelve billion nine hundred-odd millions of dollars. But, Mr. President, if we try to make people current with the tax year by requiring them to pay during the tax year out of income received during the year, we must necessarily ask the question, Are the people able to bear so substantial a burden? On the question of policy, there is not only the desideratum of making people current, but there is also the question of how it is to be accomplished.

Mr. President, first let us take up the question of the desirability of becoming current. On that point I refer my colleagues to the statement of Mr. Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury Department. I quote from his statement:

> Before this committee I need not dwell on the importance of placing taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis and eliminating for the great mass of taxpayers the 1 year lag which now exists in our present system of individual income tax payment. With rates at wartime levels, taxpayers, especially those in the lower income tax groups, find it difficult to accumulate in advance the funds needed for quarterly lump-sum payments. They may suffer actual hardship in the case of a drop or failure in income because of the lag in income tax payments. It is now universally recognized, I believe, that tax payment will be made easier, and that hardship will be avoided, if tax liabilities are discharged currently out of pay envelopes instead of waiting until the year following the receipt of income. At the same time current collection will more adequately protect Treasury revenue, and will guarantee a more prompt and more certain flow of revenue to the Government than does the existing method of collection. By promptly withdrawing purchasing power from the income stream before it can exert an upward pressure upon prices, a pay-as-you-go system will strengthen the Government in its critical fight against inflation.
>
> The advantages stated accrue both to taxpayers and Government. With overhanging income tax debt eliminated for the great majority of taxpayers, and with taxes budgeted more certainly and smoothly, taxpayers are better prepared to meet the demands that may be made on them by the necessities of war finance. An income tax payment system putting the great majority of taxpayers on a current basis will better prepare the income tax for its role in the enormous job of financing this total war. These points, I believe you will agree, settle beyond dispute the importance of the pending legislation.

I call to the attention of the junior Senator from Kentucky the statement of Randolph Paul on the first point involved, namely, the advantage of making income taxpayers current, if we agree that it is desirable and advantageous to make income recipients current, with the year in which they receive the income.

The only other question which remains is, How are we going to do it? It seems to me that the advantages are all that Mr. Paul claims, and it has seemed so to me right along.

Let me next take up, please, the question of cancelation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Was there any serious disagreement in the committee with respect to the policy the Treasury said we should establish of putting the Nation on a pay-as-you-go basis?

Mr. DANAHER. I do not recall that there was any disagreement on that point, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky. Even in the House it has always been a question of method.

As we listened to the Senator from Texas a while ago we heard him say he does not want forgiveness; he does not want to give the people this money. Mr. President, whatever other reason there may be for denying this legislation, it certainly does not lie in any such assertion. Let us take a case of a Senator who is elected to the Senate whenever he can qualify, which is at the age of 30, and let us suppose that he remains in the Senate so long as he lives, whether it be 30 or 50 or 60 years—and I hope all my colleagues who wish to do so may stay here that long—if he earns constantly, or receives constantly—I even make that distinction—$10,000 a year income, the Government gets exactly the same tax every year; there is no abatement and there is no forgiveness. The only question of abatement that is involved is that, as a matter of law, a collector of taxes stands charged in the eyes of the Government with a certain tax liability which is set up on his books. That tax liability at present, Mr. President, was incurred in 1942. So far as the individual assessments are concerned, they all appear on the collector's books and he is liable for them annually.

If by a stroke of the pen, just as a Senator can do at the head of a letter he writes, we simply strike out "1942" and insert "1943" and say, as a matter of law, that warrants of distraint and all other remedies available under the law are available now and shall be available in the future in exactly the same way as they were to taxes payable before we struck out "1942", that is all this would do on the face of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator says; there is no abatement, no forgiveness. I think, however, the Senator should add that under the proposed system there would be no loss, because the Government would be able to collect the money as the money is earned, instead of losing hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes from people who have lost their incomes and on which, therefore, the Government is unable to lay its hands, or who do not have the money to pay a tax on the income in the year in which the income tax should be paid.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, the Senator from Missouri is right. The fact of the matter is the Treasury collections will go up annually rather than down, and particularly will that be true with reference to the years 1942, 1943, and 1944.

There is another angle, Mr. President, which, so far as I am aware, no one has mentioned, and that is that now we have some forty-odd million people working in war industries, devoting all their time in these days to production for war, but some day, when the war is over, and production for war purposes terminates, unless those people are current, they will be owing taxes the year following their cessation of employment, and they will find themselves burdened with an enormous tax debt, conceivably, at least, or as a national aggregate it will be an enormous tax debt, and the country will not be able to collect it, because they will not be working. So, unless we can put them on a current basis, and impose a current withholding system to the end that the tax be collected as earned in the year for which it is due, we face that additional derangement to the economic system at some time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question bearing upon what seems to me to be a fundamental point which is involved in the money itself about which he is talking. If a dollar should not be taken from the taxpayer for 1942, for example, would that signify anything as to the fundamental question of where that dollar would do the most good for the time being? Assuming that a dollar is taken from the taxpayer at this time for use in the Federal service, does not the Senator recognize that there is nothing about this so-called forgiveness that affects the fundamental doctrine which I think some other States besides Vermont—I do not know but what the State of Connecticut has made a similar declaration—have declared is the foundation for all taxation? May I include that in my question? I call attention to section 9 of the declaration of rights of the State of Vermont, reading as follows:

> And previous to any law being made to raise any tax the purpose for which it is to be raised ought to appear evident to the legislature to be of more service to the community than the money would be if not collected.

In other words, do we not have to recognize that this is not merely a question of abatement or forgiveness for a certain year, but do we not also have to take into account the question of whether the money which would be collected under the new suggestion would be of more use in promoting the successful prosecution of the war than if we pursued the old course?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say that the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont is novel to me as bearing upon the particular problem we are discussing, but most cogent, nonetheless. It is perfectly apparent that instead of predicating our course on estimates, we would base it on knowledge. In addition, the Government would have the current use constantly of all funds withheld. It undoubtedly would reduce borrowing, and hence reduce costs to the taxpayer. I think that the incidence of the problem suggested by the observation of the Senator from Vermont is most interesting, and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. AUSTIN. In other words, the question simplified is, would the money which would be obtained under the form of taxation contained in the committee bill be of more use to the community than the money which would be raised in the other forms presented?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, my father used to remark to me that a bird in the hand was worth a whole bushful, which is an elaboration of the old maxim, and I certainly think it applies by way of rejoinder to the Senator.

Let us take one angle of this matter upon which the Senator from Texas dwelt in terms of forgiveness. He said that we would abate $9,500,000,000, and that he did not want to be a Santa Claus, giving people any such amount of money.

Mr. President, if on the basis of earnings in 1942 there was an income tax liability of $9,500,000,000, and if identically the same people earned identically the same income, which would yield, under the 1943 rates, identically the same amount of taxes, the Government would collect $9,500,000,000 in taxes in 1943, but would credit it on the account of the tax liability accruing this year by virtue of our adoption of the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Texas said he would favor the George proposal, but that proposal would, to adopt the language of the Senator from Texas, cancel $7,200,000,000, and even the Doughton bill, so-called, would result in a 50-percent adjustment.

Let us take a case. Under the suggestion of the Finance Committee, which I shall take first, we have two windfall provisions: First, that which deals with a requirement that the tax be collected on income received either in 1942 or 1943, whichever is higher. So that in the first case the incidence of the tax is on the higher income, and hence will yield a higher tax.

The second of the two windfall provisions is designed to recapture the type of income which might be lost under a case which I shall hypothetically propose. In 1942 a man operates as a defense contractor, let us say, and earns $100,000 of net taxable income. In 1943 he does exactly the same thing, let us say building additional cantonments, or defense housing projects. Under the language of the bill as it comes from the Senate Committee on Finance it would appear that such an individual would not have to pay to the Government a tax on $100,000 for 1 of those 2 years. But suppose that in 1938 the same man earned $5,000, and in 1939 had a net taxable income of $6,000, and in 1940 had an income of $10,000. We say, "You may elect which 1 of those 3 years you will consider as a base earning year for you. We will agree that since you have had to pay an income tax already on what you then earned, we will give you a statutory credit in the amount of $10,000 of earned income." So we would add the $10,000 of the credit to the $10,000 which he earned in his base year, making an aggregate of $20,000.

If in 1942 his earnings were $100,000 net, a tax rate of 64.1 percent applied against that amount would yield a tax of $64,100. The tax on the $20,000 would have been at the rate of 32.3 percent, or $6,460. Thus under the bill as it comes from the committee there would be deducted from the $64,100 the amount of credit of $6,460, and we would add the difference, $57,640, to the whole tax on the whole $100,000 for 1943, and that individual would owe Uncle Sam $121,740, which is $21,000, plus, more than he earned in 1943.

Mr. President, is that forgiveness of anything? Is it not obvious that we are in that fashion recapturing, through that windfall provision, any loss which might otherwise inure against the Treasury, in the event we had failed to take into account these wartime profiteers, to whom the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] made reference? That is a specific reply to the Senator from Arizona. I know the Senator did not receive an answer from the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let us suppose a man received $100,000 in income in the year 1942, and received an income of $100,000 in 1943, 1944, and 1945, and it stopped in 1946. What would be the situation?

Mr. DANAHER. It is a chance all of us take, to be sure, that we will not always earn $100,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator, would the Government lose the tax on the $100,000?

Mr. DANAHER. There is no question that for one of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943,

in a case where there is a stipulated 5-year period of earnings, as in the case the Senator mentions, a loss of taxes would ensue for 1 year; that is correct. But over the lifetime of the earnings of the individual taxpayer, multiplied by 49,000,000, or 50,000,000, or whatever number of taxpayers there ultimately will be, that particular loss will not become apparent, nor will that particular loss result in a net loss to the Treasury; quite the contrary.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure that I understand the two Senators. The Senator takes a 5-year period.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. He assumes an income of $100,000 in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946, and then it drops off from $100,000, let us say, to $10,000. The only thing the Government will lose, as I understand, will be the difference as provided in the second windfall provision, between what he would pay as taxes for 1942 under the present rate, and what he expects to pay and would pay under the windfall provision. In other words, we put him on a current basis for the 5-year period, and the only thing the Government would lose in the 5-year period would be the difference, as the Senator has explained, under the second windfall provision. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. What the large taxpayer will be compelled to pay under the second windfall provision will be a considerable sum. The Senator stated a moment ago in his example that if the income increased as cited by the Senator, the taxes for this year would be more than the income the man would receive in 1943. Before I take my seat I wish to point out to the Senator—though no doubt he will discuss it later—that it undoubtedly is a hardship case, when a taxpayer has to pay more in 1 year than the total amount of his income. So we have provided in the bill that the 1942 tax, whatever it may be, can be paid in installments over a period of 4 years.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that if we did not change the law at all, this particular man would pay $64,100 of tax for 1942 and 1943, but in view of the fact that we are making him current and are going to impose an additional burden on him to find the ready money with which to pay this tax, we gave him the base credit. The net result of giving him the base credit was that with the base credit, amounting to only $6,460, he has to pay $57,640. At that point the Senator from Illinois himself brought out that there might very well arise many hardship cases and that a considerable period would be required to alleviate the distress, and therefore he moved that the period within which to pay the additional $57,640 be extended over a 4-year period, with a rate of interest, as finally imposed by the committee, at 4 percent on any unpaid installments. The result might otherwise be that we were levying a tax in 1943 of $21,740 more than the man's earned net income for the coming year, and nearly double the amount of the tax liability in the first place.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I will yield to the Senator in a moment if he will bear with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. I wanted to say simply that in the same case, with the identical figures commented on by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said he would subscribe, there would be an abatement of $48,075 of the 1943 tax. In other words, the 75 percent forgiveness recommended by the Senator from Georgia would result in a tax liability of only $9,565.

It is perfectly obvious, in other words, that the Senator from Texas in decrying this so-called abatement—and I use his word—is not talking about any deep-dyed underlying fundamental question of principle. He is simply haggling over terms.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say one word on that point, because I think it is essential to emphasize it? The Senator from Texas did say that he would support the substitute proposed to be offered by the Senator from Georgia which represents a 75-percent abatement. The House bill represents a 76-percent abatement. The Senate bill represents a net cash 88-percent abatement. So the only sin involved in this entire proposition, from the standpoint of the attacks made upon it, lies between the 75 or 76 percent on the one hand and 88 percent on the other.

Mr. DANAHER. And whatever consequences are to flow adversely are to be measured by 13 percent of difference.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said much about forgiving $9,000,000,000. He has apparently attempted to send out an impression to that effect to the country. A great portion of that $9,000,000,000 would be included in either one of the bills he is willing to vote for, as he has stated on the floor of the Senate, at least six, or seven, or eight billion dollars would be forgiven under a bill the Senator from Texas has agreed to support. So he cannot be very much worried about this tremendous amount which is going to be denied to the Treasury.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to make the point that there is an important principle involved in this proposed legislation, namely the principle of placing taxpayers on a current basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course.

Mr. LUCAS. And in view of the fact that there is so little difference between the three bills under discussion, so far as what is necessary to forgive in actual money, it seems to me that we should not have very much trouble in arriving at a vote upon the Senate committee bill, for in my judgment it is far the best of the three bills. But the great principle is the thing we are talking about. The Senator from Vermont placed his finger on something a moment ago when he asked whether we are rendering a service to the community, to the State, and to the Nation in a great period of stress, or whether we are interested in a couple of billion dollars. That is the whole question involved.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the passage of the pending measure is not going to result in the loss of a couple of billion dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, assuming that it did, it would be well worth it, in my opinion.

Mr. DANAHER. It is not going to do so. Let me point out that when Mr. Paul appeared before the committee, the following statement was submitted:

> The 1942 tax liabilities under present law are estimated at $9,815,000,000 before giving effect to the special provisions relating to the armed forces and at $9,451,000,000 after giving effect to these special provisions. The House bill would cancel $7,238,000,000. The Ruml-Carlson bill would cancel the entire $9,451,000,000 but would recoup through windfall provisions $1,133,000,000, resulting in a net cancelation of $8,319,000,000 after giving effect to these special provisions.

I stop reading at that point because I want to ask the Senator from Illinois to refresh his recollection, and to recall that when the bill came to us from the House, in the first windfall provision there was an exemption of $5,000. After we had gone into the matter at some length and argued it back and forth, we struck out the $5,000 figure, with the result that the Treasury statisticians came before us the following day and told us that the effect of so doing would reduce the rate of cancelation in the neighborhood of $1,300,000,000. In other words, the Treasury picked up more than the difference between the House bill and the Ruml-Carlson figures as originally submitted before the Finance Committee took that action. The net result, therefore, is that the Ruml-Carlson plan, so called, as modified by the Senate Finance Committee, has brought this problem down to a point where it is clearly in focus as most desirable, and without loss, let me say to the Senator from Illinois.

I mention the matter in extenso to the end that the figures may be in the RECORD and that our Senate colleagues will have a chance to study them.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut means without loss, I take it, in comparison with the other two bills.

Mr. DANAHER. Without loss, compared to the House bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut is correct, and the Senator offered the amendment in the committee which did exactly what he said was done in connection with the raising of an additional $2,000,000,000 over what the House bill provided, by merely changing the formula in the first windfall tax.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. While the Senator is making some of these other matters crystal clear, there is one other collateral point I wish to call to his attention. We are invited to understand by some of this criticism that we are reaching into the Treasury of the United States and taking some $9,000,000,000 out of it and distributing it as a Santa Claus largess to the people. Let us make it perfectly plain that there is not one single cash dollar coming out of the Treasury of the United States on account of this proposed legislation. The $9,000,000,000 is purely a bookkeeping credit. The $9,000,000,000 is in the pockets of 44,000,000 taxpayers. It is their $9,000,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. And they will have to pay it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And they will have to pay it; and all we are doing is to write a new formula under which they shall pay it, and there is not one living one of them who will pay one cent less in 1943 as the result, or in 1944, or 1945, or any other year, until they reach a declining income or until they die. That is the way we are reaching into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Except, let me say to the Senator from Michigan, whom I most sincerely thank for his contribution, we are protecting the men who have given up their businesses, their livelihood, and gone into the armed services at great personal and financial sacrifice to themselves. They, Mr. President, are given an additional credit over and beyond that which is accorded to the ordinary citizen, and in my judgment those in the armed services are entitled to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from Utah, if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] asked a very interesting question, and I thought the answer of the Senator from Connecticut was absolutely emphatic on that point. But after the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] came into the discussion it seemed to me that the Senator from Connecticut changed his answer somewhat. I do not know whether or not it was my fault in misunderstanding; but as I understood the Senator from Arizona, his question was this: Suppose a man makes $100,000 in 1942, in 1943, in 1944, and in 1945, and then in 1946 his income declines to a lower figure. As I understood the Senator from Connecticut, his answer was that for the year 1942 or for one of those years the Treasury would lose the income tax on one of the items of $100,000. Is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; that is correct, according to my understanding of the question. The reason for that, let me say to the Senator from Utah, is that we were considering a case which the Senator from Arizona suggested of a man who before 1942 never had earned anything, and who for the 5 following years earned a fixed, stipulated sum. Such a man certainly would have no base period of earnings by which in any sense he could receive a so-called excess-earning credit, or otherwise be penalized.

Mr. MURDOCK. One more observation, Mr. President. I am not sure that the Senator from Arizona has not made out an exceptional case; but even though it be exceptional, the exception might exist; might it not?

In the event it should occur, the Treasury of the United States would lose the taxes on 1 year's income.

Mr. DANAHER. In the specific case to which we are limiting our present discussion, I think the answer is yes. That is my understanding. But the Senator will remember that when the Senator from Illinois later asked me questions on substantially the same point, he was talking about a case in which there were base-period credits.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I understood that. I think the confusion was in my own mind, rather than in the minds of either one of my colleagues. But now by the very enlightening answer of the Senator, that confusion has been removed.

Mr. DANAHER. It may be enlightening. I do not know whether it is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is always enlightening, and usually is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the answer of the Senator is correct, it can only be on the theory that for the base period of 1938, 1939, and 1940, the income for any one of those 3 years was $100,000. In other words, as to a taxpayer who received a consistent income, the same all the way through, for those years, obviously the base period would be just the same, and there would be a loss of the tax on the income for 1 of those past years. I do not know how we are going to reach that type of person.

But what the second windfall provision does primarily is to reach the taxpayer who overnight has made an abnormal profit from war contracts.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is correct. What we really are seeking to do is to reach the wartime profiteer, if there be any, and we are trying to guard against any other inequities which might otherwise arise.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. If he has the same income over a number of years, we do fail to reach him; do we not?

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, no.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Under the circumstances just stated, if the war were to last until 1946, and if a man made $100,000 a year for that period of years, we would not reach him, and he would avoid paying taxes on the income received in one of those years. If he made $1,000,000 in each of those years, under the Senator's last answer, he would escape taxation on $1,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for making the observation, that comment is not an apt one. There are literally tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of men who have gone into the armed services, and who, for example, made even greater incomes for years and years. I have received two or three letters a day from men who formerly earned upward of $50,000 or $60,000 a year, and who now are in the Army and are being paid $50 a month. Mr. President, even assuming that the observation of the Senator from Arizona is apt, which I think is not the case, that observation cancels itself out.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The trouble with the observation of the Senator from Arizona is that he assumes that war profits were made in the base period 1938–40. No war profits were made in those years. We selected those years as years of normal income for the American taxpayers. In the example given by the Senator, in order to escape paying a year's taxes, the taxpayer would have to have had a base period of normal taxes back in 1938, 1939, and 1940.

Mr. DANAHER. Then I did not understand the Senator's question. I think the Senator from Illinois had it correctly as he and I discussed it, namely, that a man who never before 1942 had an income of any kind, and who in the year 1942 was employed for the first time, and earned $100,000, and earned a similar amount in the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946——

Mr. LUCAS. That was my question.

Mr. DANAHER. I am sure I am now correct in my understanding; and, therefore, what I said about a base period does not apply at all to my understanding of the section as written.

Whether the Senate would feel that in that particular there is a hiatus as to which we should take other action legislatively is a matter which is quite beside the point. Personally, I think we should not. I think that in the aggregate it washes itself out; but I most assuredly say that in the committee the second windfall provision received very serious criticism from various members. It is by no means necessarily sound. There is not any question that the high tax rates which otherwise would inure against all taxpayers take care of income whenever received, except for the year of abatement; and yet, Mr. President, it has seemed to me that from the all-over view of it, the second windfall provision will achieve a greater equity.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] asked me a question on a specific hypothetical case, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] later directed questions to the very same case. When I gave my answers I did not have at hand the exact language appearing at page 99, lines 18 and 19, of the bill.

I now wish the RECORD to show that the base year reference on page 100 has no reference whatever to the problem hitherto put, for on page 100 the base years

are 1938, 1939, and 1940. The fact is that in the event an individual had no base year earnings in any of those years, but nonetheless earned $100,000 in 1942, 1943, or 1944, as the Senator from Arizona puts it, there would be a minimum net taxable income credit of $10,000. The $10,000, therefore, against the income for 1942 or 1943, whichever is the lesser, would measure the excess tax which would have to be paid. In other words, there would be an excess tax levied against such windfall earner, and the amount would be greater in terms of tax than in the case I had earlier referred to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to have the Senator clarify one point which comes into the discussion collaterally. That is the application of the law to the soldier who had a large income in 1942 and whose income in 1943 is on the basis of $50 a month. Let us reduce his income to monthly terms. Under the proposal as I understand it, he would be obliged to pay a tax on the larger income at a time when he was receiving the smaller income.

Is some relief for soldiers provided in the bill, in order to take care of such cases?

Mr. DANAHER. It certainly is, let me say to the Senator from Vermont. Marked relief is provided especially for such persons. For example, as I recall—and I do not put my hand on the exact technical language at the moment—such a man would come within the general law which provides that, as to $14,000 of possible earned income credit, he would be given up to $3,000 of actual earnings as a credit, which is absolute; that as to the difference, he would have $11,000 of possible credit, assuming that his income were from investments or from some business back home; but on all income, however derived, above $14,000, he would have to pay an income tax. That is on the theory, of course, that he would have the business and would have the capital which had yielded the income, and that he would have had to pay the tax, regardless of whether he was in the service. So, by the credit to which I refer, we take care of the overwhelming plurality of cases. I am not specifically and technically accurate, because I do not have the language before me. But that is substantially it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is any discrimination or determination made as between enlisted men and officers?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. DANAHER. No; all of them are treated alike, regardless of whether they are commissioned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is a change from the present law.

Mr. BROOKS. I understood that it was, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to explain all the features of the bill or even to go technically and with strict accuracy into all such questions as that propounded by the Senator from Vermont. What I rose to do was to try to import a few facts into our thinking with reference to this whole subject, by way of reply to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I felt that it was an appropriate time for comment on the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Another important fact which the Senator might add in line with the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] relative to soldiers, is that we give the soldiers a much larger exemption for dependents under this bill than the civilian enjoys.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has referred to some of the amusing phases of the debate this afternoon. Without seeking to invade that field myself, nevertheless, since many a true word is spoken in jest, I wish to read two or three sentences from the observations of a taxpayer:

> To a person well grounded in the fundamentals of religious training the word "forgive" as applied to income-tax legislation is most disturbing.
>
> "Forgive" presupposes sin, misdemeanor, guilt, iniquitous conduct and/or harm to another. Thus, when our duly elected lawmakers talk about "forgiving" our last year's taxes, they are adding insult to injury, i. e., taking the position that it was sinful to have earned enough money to owe a tax.
>
> Carry the reasoning a step further and it means that it's sinful to get up a little earlier and work a little harder than the other fellow, which is contrary to the Scriptures and I don't believe it's true—although sometimes I wish I did.
>
> I am a long-suffering person, but when I elect these fellows and send 'em down to Washington to represent me, it gripes me no end for them to use the word "forgive" in connection with the money that I manage to scrape up and turn in to pay their salaries.

To repeat, many a true word is spoken in jest. The final virtue of the report of the Senate Finance Committee is that it refuses to penalize citizens who do get up a little earlier and work a little harder than the other fellow in order to put themselves in a position where they owe a little larger tax, and therefore obviously have a correspondingly larger abatement. In my judgment, that is an American objective worth protecting.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Commenting on what the Senator from Michigan said a moment ago as to the word "forgiveness" connoting a sinful act, let me suggest, in all reverence, that in our prayers we say, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment intended to be proposed by me as an amendment of the committee, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there are certain technical amendments which I should like to have passed on this afternoon, so that they may be included in the substitute. These amendments relate to various parts of the bill. All the amendments which I am now offering are technical. They have the approval of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 61, line 5, in the committee amendment, after the word "income", it is proposed to insert "under chapter 1."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 18, in the committee amendment, after the word "wages", it is proposed to strike out "to any individual."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 80, line 19, in the committee amendment, after the word "shall", it is proposed to strike out "be in lieu of the return required to be furnished by the employer in respect of such wages under section 147 and shall", and after the period in line 24 to insert "A duplicate of such statement, if made and filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall constitute the return required to be made in respect of such wages under section 147."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 85, line 13, in the committee amendment, after the word "for", it is proposed to strike out "taxable years", and insert in lieu thereof "the taxable year"; and after the period in line 13, to insert "If more than 1 taxable year begins in any such calendar year such amount shall be allowed as a credit against the tax for the last taxable year so beginning."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 86, line 8, in the committee amendment, after the word "for", it is proposed to strike out "the" and insert in lieu thereof "a."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 87, line 1, in the committee amendment, after the word "paid", it is proposed to strike out "on" and insert in lieu thereof "not earlier than"; and in line 2, after the

word "year", to strike out "or in the case of a nonresident alien individual, on the fifteenth day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 87, line 16, after the figure "(3)", it is proposed to strike out "in respect of any individual, estate, or trust" and insert in lieu thereof "of this subsection, or under section 322 or 1027."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 88, in the committee amendment, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out:

(d) Tax withheld at source: For the date of payment in respect of tax withheld at source under section 466 or under subchapter D of chapter 9, see section 322 (e).

And insert the following:

(e) Cross reference: The last subsection of section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to interest on overpayments) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax and of tax withheld at source on wages, see section 322 (e)."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 88, at the beginning of line 7, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I assume that these amendments are all solely perfecting amendments, and in no fashion affect the philosophy of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. They are all perfecting and technical amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, line 4, in the committee amendment, after the word "section", it is proposed to strike out "465" and insert in lieu thereof "1621"; and in line 21, after the word "section", it is proposed to strike out "465" and insert in lieu thereof "1621."

The amendment to the amendment was egreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 91, line 10, in the committee amendment, after the word "which", it is proposed to insert "excess."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 96, line 10, in the committee amendment, after the word "which", it is proposed to insert "so determined"; and in line 13, after the word "tax", it is proposed to insert "so determined."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 97, line 15, in the committee amendment, after the words "imposed by", it is proposed to strike out "such chapter" and insert in lieu thereof "Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 99, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "or", it is proposed to strike out "less" and insert in lieu thereof "greater"; and in the same line, after the word "year", to strike out "1942" and insert in lieu thereof "1943."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 103, line 11, in the committee amendment, after the words "prior to", it is proposed to strike out "such date" and insert in lieu thereof "September 1, 1943."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 107, line 3, in the committee amendment, after the figure "6" it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 108, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "release" it is proposed to strike out "on or."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer two further amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. These amendments are not strictly technical. I shall explain them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 68, line 6, in the committee amendment, after the word "week", it is proposed to strike out "at the election of the employer the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period may be used in computing the tax required to be withheld," and insert in lieu thereof, "the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer, in computing the tax required to be withheld, to use the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period."

And on page 74, line 20, in the committee amendment, after the word "week", it is proposed to strike out "at the election of the employer the amount to be withheld shall be determined under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, and for such purpose the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages." and insert in lieu thereof, "the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer to determine the amount to be withheld under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, in which case the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, these amendments are recommended by the Treasury. They are intended to meet this situation: The committee bill permits an employer, at his election, to withhold on a weekly basis in cases of an employee working for less than a week. In some cases such a system of withholding would, however, result in substantial underwithholding, and possible avoidance of tax. This is possible, for example, when the employee works regularly during the week, but for different employers. To prevent this, the amendments would permit the Commissioner to authorize weekly withholdings in proper cases. They would simply permit the Commissioner to authorize weekly withholdings under circumstances in which there would be no tax avoidance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, earlier in the day I indicated that I would offer amendments to section 6 of the pending bill. I now have the amendments before me in what I believe to be fairly satisfactory form. I am not offering them at this moment, but I ask to have them printed so that they may be available tomorrow for all Members of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator be willing also to have the amendments to which he has referred printed in the RECORD so that each Senator may refer to them immediately?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to have them printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. GEORGE to the committee amendment to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Page 97, line 19, strike out "and (2)" and insert "(2) the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by an amount equal to 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this subsection, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source), and (3)."

Page 98, line 12, strike out "such excess" and insert "the sum of such excess plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1943 (so determined), which shall be in lieu of the increase therein under clause (2) of subsection (a)."

Page 93, beginning with the word "the" at the end of line 14, strike out down to and including the word "Secretary" in line 19 and insert "in determining such increase the portion of such excess which is attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)), as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall be disregarded."

Page 98, beginning in line 20, strike out all of subsection (c).

Beginning on page 100, line 23, strike out down to and including the period in line 11 on page 101 and insert:

"(d) Extension of time for payment of half of 25 percent increase in 1943 tax under subsections (a) and (b): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with

the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to one-half of the amount of the 25 percent increase therein under subsection (a) or (b), in which case such portion shall be paid on or before the 15th day of the 15th month following the close of the taxable year."

Page 101, lines 13 and 14, strike out "of such increase" and insert "with respect to which the extension applies."

Page 101, line 18, strike out "on each installment" and insert in lieu thereof "on such portion," and in line 22 strike out "installment" and insert "portion."

Page 101, line 23, strike out "any installment" and insert "such portion", and in lines 24 and 25 strike out "and the remaining installments."

Page 102, line 1, strike out "any installment" and insert "such portion," and in line 3 and in line 5 strike out "installment" and insert "portion."

Page 102, line 7, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

Page 102, lines 7 and 8, strike out "(b) and (c)" and insert "(a) and (b)."

Page 102, in line 12, and in lines 14 and 15, strike out "(b) and (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) and (b)."

Page 102, in line 19, and in line 22, strike out "subsections (b) and (c)" and insert "subsection (b)."

Page 102, after the period in line 23, insert "The 25 per centum amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under subsection (a) or (b) shall not be held or considered to be a part of the tax for such taxable year for the purposes of sections 58, 59, 60, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) of the Internal Revenue Code."

Page 102, line 24, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)."

Page 103, line 3, strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)."

Page 104, line 5, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)."

Page 107, line 3, after "6", insert "(a) or."

Page 107, strike out lines 9 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"(B) the entire amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under section 6 (a) or (b) to the extent that such amount is so attributable; and

"(C) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; or

"(3) if such individual entered upon such service after the close of the taxable year beginning in 1943,

"(A) that portion of the amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under section 6 (a) or (b) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 which falls due (otherwise than by reason of an extension of time for payment) after entering upon such service, to the extent that such portion is so attributable;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all taxable years during the whole of which he was in such service."

VISIT OF DR. EDVARD BENEŠ, PRESIDENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that tomorrow at 12:15 o'clock p. m. the President of the Czechoslovakian Republic in exile will visit the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. GEORGE. From the Finance Committee—for the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]—who is absent because of illness, I submit a favorable report for the executive calendar on the nomination of Mr. Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry M. Brennan, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. (reappointment).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that all Army nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, except the nomination of Maj. Gen. Ben Lear to be lieutenant general. I ask that that nomination go over until Monday, and that it be considered at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc with the exception of the nomination of Maj. Gen. Ben Lear to be lieutenant general, which will be passed over until Monday next.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carleton F. Bryant to be rear admiral for temporary service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President may be notified immediately of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Czechoslovakia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Czechoslovakia now established in London.

SOLICITOR FOR LABOR

Douglas Maggs of North Carolina to be Solicitor for Labor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

John Lesesne DeWitt
Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr.

To be major generals

Charles Lawrence Bolté
John Reed Hodge
Thomas Bernard Larkin
William E. Kepner
Hugh Joseph Gaffey
Clements McMullen
Robert Gale Breene

To be brigadier generals

Julius Easton Slack
Joseph Eugene Harriman
Frederick von Harten Kimble
Leo Donovan
Thomas Seelye Arms
Dean Coldwell Strother
Oscar Bergstrom Abbott
John Bartlett Murphy
Glen Clifford Jamison
William Gaulbert Weaver
Robert Battey McClure
Paul California Wilkins
Cecil Ray Moore
George Corwin Beach, Jr.
Egbert Frank Bullene
Arthur William Pence
Sidney Erickson
William Oliver Reeder
Robert Falligant Travis
Edward Brigham McKinley
Edwin Davicss Patrick
Aaron Bradshaw, Jr.
Ludson Dixon Worsham
John Ferral McBlain
Henry Benton Sayler

John Henry Gardner
John Charles Palmer Bartholf
Harold Napoleon Gilbert
George Eitle Hartman
Emil Charles Kiel
Edmond Harrison Leavey
Harry Frank Thompson
Martinus Stenseth
Ralph Harvard Goldthwaite
Joseph Augustus Baer
Uzal Girard Ent
George Anthony Horkan
Calvin DeWitt, Jr.
Gilbert Xavier Cheves
Lucas Victor Beau, Jr.
James Washington Curtis
Glenn Oscar Barcus
John Andrew Porter
Edgar Peter Sorensen
Joseph Burton Sweet
Harold Arthur Barnes
Frank Camm
William Benjamin Kean
William Brooks Bradford

To be major general

Arthur Hazelton Carter

To be brigadier general

John Merryman Franklin
Boykin Cabell Wright

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Carleton F. Bryant to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from September 25, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

Lillian Heller, Odessa.
Theodore W. Palmer, Jr., Rehoboth Beach.

GEORGIA

Eldon A. McCollum, Baconton.

ILLINOIS

John W. Williams, Benton.
Evelyn A. Cook, Chadwick.
Edwin J. Heiligenstein, Freeburg.
John W. Foster, Toluca.
James Wheeler Davis, Troy.
Neal E. Gregg, Wenona.
Ernest V. Giehl, Wood River.

INDIANA

Glenn R. Woods, Grabill.
Richard C. Herrick, Hillsdale.
John B. Cogan, Vincennes.
Paul G. Smiley, Washington.
Clarence E. Jones, Yorktown.

IOWA

Marion E. Daries, Armstrong.
Opal V. Stevens, Bayard.
Leo D. Flannery, Bondurant.

KENTUCKY

Thomas A. Spalding, Bardstown.
Charlie Lawrence, Centertown.
John S. Hollan, Jackson.
Leo G. Muenninghoff, Shively.

MISSOURI

Francis F. Klughart, Fornfelt.
Francis E. Patterson, Koch.
Joseph J. Nacke, Meta.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Elizabeth H. O'Neil, Groveton.
Evelyn C. Earley, Nashua.

PENNSYLVANIA

Oscar H. Stillwagon, Ambler.
Martin A. King, Clarks Summit.
Stanley C. Croop, Hunlock Creek.
Stephen J. Gerlach, McAdoo.
Carroll F. Hockersmith, Shippensburg.
Mary H. Bard, Slippery Rock.
Mary L. McMahon, Waymart.

UTAH

A. Carlos Schow, Lehi.
Robert P. Leatham, Wellsville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Donald Norris, C. P., of Chungking, China, recent repatriate from Japanese prison in Hong Kong, offered the following prayer:

O Incomprehensible Creator, true fountain of light and only author of all knowledge, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to enlighten our understanding and to remove far from us all darkness of sin and ignorance.

Thou who makest eloquent the tongues of those who want utterance, direct our tongues and pour out upon our lips the grace of Thy blessing.

Give us a diligent and obedient spirit. Grant us method and facility in study. Crown our deliberations with a quickness of apprehension, and a capacity of understanding.

Inspire, O God, the beginnings, direct the progress, and perfect the achievement of our works of legislation.

Make known to us, O Heavenly Father, Thy holy will, so that what we hear or learn we may apply to Thy honor, and to the welfare of our beloved Nation. Through the merits of the passion and death of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Admiral Vickery on ship construction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three different items of interest edited by Joseph S. Kaufman, entitled "The Weekly Round Table," that appears in the Lynn Telegram, of Lynn, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, of the Senate of Alabama, with reference to the ratification of the peace treaty.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein several communications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement of the contributions of Americans of Slovak descent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Hartford Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF RENEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS ACT

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have placed in the hopper a bill to repeal the renegotiation of war contracts law. It is my conviction that this repeal bill will help win the war. The 90-percent excess-profits tax has made the renegotiation act unnecessary.

The repeal bill will help win the war by releasing the Profit Adjustment Board staffs for actual service in the war effort; by enabling our production plants to go full steam ahead instead of wasting their time and energy on renegotiation processes.

The repeal bill will help win the peace by disposing of a large and growing bureaucracy and at the same time enabling industry to prepare for peacetime conversion with jobs for our 10,000,000 soldiers and the many millions of war workers when our war plants must be junked.

I hope to comment on this bill under special order this afternoon and invite discussion.

SUBSIDIZING PRICES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation has, through Mr. Davis, asked for $1,000,000,000. Just to show you how badly they need it, he wants it to subsidize prices. I have some letters from Syracuse and Auburn, in my district, indicating that they just sent a ton of walnuts to the county home, in Onondaga County, free, gratis.

When they are spending our money to buy English walnuts in that way when there is a good market for them,

in a quantity that could not be used in a year, then come up here and ask for a billion dollars to subsidize the food program, do we want to have that kind of action and that kind of management presented to us?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night over station WHN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the record and include therein an article written for Collier's magazine by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PRIEST addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ISSUANCE OF SUPPLEMENT II, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, I should like to announce that Supplement II to the United States Code, 1940 edition, will be placed to the credit of the Members in the next day or two. This supplement, together with the Code Service Pamphlet No. 1, brings current the general and permanent laws of the United States, together with their code classification. The editors of the Code and the staff of the committee have performed their work efficiently and speedily. The dispatch with which this supplement has been made available has been due to the splendid cooperation we have received from the Government Printing Office which has done a splendid speedy job, in spite of the tremendous volume of work it is faced with. The current Code Service pamphlets which the Members receive periodically are made available through the courtesy of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co., the official editors of the United States Code. I am hopeful that the Members find this code service useful and interesting.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions adopted at Poland's Constitution Day celebration in Buffalo, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram just received from the president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to give notice to all who may be interested that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will begin hearings next Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock with reference to the request for further authorization of funds for housing under the act which emanated from that committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abe Fortas, who holds the position of Under Secretary of the Interior and also other important positions in connection with the Department of the Interior, submitted his resignation for the purpose of going into the military service. I notice from the papers that the President has declined to accept his resignation. I think the President acted well in doing so. Mr. Fortas is not only a very capable man but he is a man of very fine qualities of both heart and mind. He is thoroughly patriotic and, like the rest of us, is desirous of serving his country in the most effectual way. He has done a good job in the Government service and fills well a position of great importance to the welfare of the people. He should continue in it while conditions remain as they are at this time, despite his desire to go into the armed services. He can be of immeasurably greater benefit to the war effort in the position he now holds. I am glad to see the President retain him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Anderson, Calif.	Gerlach	Ploeser
Arnold	Gibson	Rogers, Mass.
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Shafer
Bell	Gore	Sheridan
Bender	Guyer	Simpson, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Slaughter
Buckley	Hébert	Smith, Maine
Celler	Izac	Smith, W. Va.
Cochran	Jennings	Snyder
Culkin	King	Stewart
Davis	McGehee	Taylor
Delaney	McGranery	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Magnuson	Treadway
Disney	Morrison, La.	White
Douglas	Norton	Winter
Elmer	O'Konski	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fogarty	O'Leary	Worley
Fulbright	O'Toole	
Furlong		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the act (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.) approved June 12, 1934, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 350 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1351 (a) (2)) is amended by inserting after 'because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts' the following: '(including the operations of international cartels)'."

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEST: Line 7, strike out "3 years" and insert "2 years."

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be generally conceded that the best interests of the country will be served by an extension of the trade agreements. However, it seems to be the opinion of a majority of the Members of the House that that extension should last only until the end of the war, or soon thereafter. The resolution as offered calls for a 3-year extension. It is hoped, and I am sure everyone is agreed on this, that the war will be ended in 2 years. If not, we may then extend the Trade Agreements Act to whatever time it may be felt necessary. The amendment that I propose merely provides that instead of extending the act for 3 years, it shall be extended for 2 years.

Let me call attention to one industry, the cattle industry of the United States. Seventy-four percent of the area of the United States is devoted to the raising of cattle and other livestock. Under the method under which we are now operating, there was an increase in cattle population in the United States in 1942 from 75,000,000 head to 78,000,000 head. In 1943 it is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that cattle will increase in the United States from 78,000,000 head to 81,500,000 head. Under our trade agreements, for example, with Mexico, which became effective only about 6 weeks ago, the import duty on cattle was reduced to 1½ cents per pound, and that agreement further provides that after the end of the national emergency, Mexico shall have a quota of 725,000 head of cattle a year, to import into the United States, at 1½ cents a pound. Land on this side of the Rio Grande, pasture land, is worth at least 20 times as much as it is in Mexico. The taxes in Mexico are about one-fiftieth of what they are on this side of the river. Labor over there is about 20 percent of the cost of what it is here, and the cattle industry, the greatest commodity that we have in this country, cannot compete with those prices.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In addition to what the gentleman has pointed out with reference to cattle, in the northwestern sections, such as Montana, Wyoming, the Dakotas, we have long winters, running into 4 to 5 months, where we have to feed our cattle hay, and the hay is very expensive—it costs from $5 to $10 per ton to put it up; also, we have high operating expenses, high taxes, and a high standard of living. We are paying men today to look after our cattle from $90 to $125 a month. We cannot compete with the South American countries, and we cannot compete with Mexico in the production of cattle. Those who fixed those tariff rates did not take into account the factors that we are now discussing.

Mr. WEST. That is correct. When Mr. Francis B. Sayre, of the State Department, was before the Committee on Ways and Means I asked him the specific question—whether he took those things into consideration—and he said "No." He had no idea as to the difference in the cost of production in the two countries and he was not interested. The result is that they are selling the farmers and agriculturists down the river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. How does the number of head of cattle that will be imported today under this quota compare with the cattle heretofore imported from Mexico?

Mr. WEST. Last year I understand that we imported from Mexico 600,000 head of cattle at 3 cents a pound. From information that I have, shortly before this treaty went into effect, some of the states of Mexico put on an export duty of one and a half cents a pound, with the result, as far as the trade agreements are concerned, that the 3 cents that formerly came into the Treasury of the United States, is now a cent and a half, and the other cent and a half goes into the treasury of the Mexican states, so that the consumer is not benefited by the deal at all. Then further, since this trade agreement went into effect, they have put an embargo on cattle raised along the Texas borders.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to get some good old Yankee trading in our system down in the State Department, so that instead of getting our breeches taken off, they might take the breeches off somebody else.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes; I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. What the gentleman has said regarding cattle applies, does it not, to fresh fruits and vegetables as grown in Mexico, Cuba, and in other foreign countries to the south of the tip of Florida?

Mr. WEST. That is correct. I expect to discuss that when I offer a later amendment. On that particular item of vegetables, particularly on tomatoes and peppers, as a reason for the reduction of the tariff that the State Department gave, they made statements that were either false or they were made in entire ignorance of the situation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Is not what the gentleman says about the reduction of the tariff on cattle equally true of every other American agricultural product which has to compete with a foreign agricultural product, produced at a fraction of the cost of production in this country?

Mr. WEST. That is true. The sad part of the story is that we loaned them most of the money with which to raise this stuff.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WEST. Yes; I will yield if the gentleman will be brief. My time is very limited.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just wanted to say that the same factors that raise the cost of production of cattle raise the cost of production of sheep and wool in this country. We cannot compete with those southern countries in the production of our sheep and our wool.

Mr. WEST. Not and maintain our present standard of living. We have to make peons out of the laborers if we compete with the people of those countries under the present trade agreements, wherein they have reduced the tariff as much as they have.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And we are paying today as high as $125 a month for men to herd our sheep in Montana, and we cannot get competent help at that price.

Mr. WEST. Yes. The people in the foreign countries are paying about $12 a month for that same service, and they expect the producer in this country to exist under the circumstances.

So I feel that if we adopt this amendment no harm can come, because when this war is over and we are hit by a depression we had better be in a position to renegotiate some of these trade agreements, or otherwise we will surely have to have some W. P. A. to take care of the farmers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

My friend from Texas remarks that I should say that I want to sell cattle cheap. I will tell him how we sold them under the last Republican administration, which he should know; an experience I shall never forget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. I shall be in opposition to all amendments to this resolution for the simple reason that in my opinion an effort is being made not to defeat this resolution by direct or frontal attack, but by flank movements, by amendments of a sort which will cripple the program that has worked so successfully since its adoption.

The adoption of this amendment will be considered by our allies and by many of our own people, in my judgment, as an abandonment of the principle of collaboration and cooperation in international affairs. It can be considered in no other way. The proposal is to reduce the time in which reciprocal trade agreements can be negotiated. There is a time limit in this resolution as there has been from the beginning of this

program. It has been adopted each time as a 3-year program. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, if it is a good thing for 2 years, what reason is there for it not being a good thing for 3 years? If it has not been a good thing for the time it has been in operation, what reason is there for extending it at all? We are to judge the program by the results that have been brought about, the things that have been accomplished.

Now, my friend from Texas talked about the price of cattle. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, not in chewing the bag. It is the practical, concrete results which we must consider. I say without fear of successful contradiction, and I will be glad if the gentleman from Texas will listen. The lowest price the farmer has ever received for his cattle and his sheep, his wool, his cotton, his tobacco, and all farm commodities was under the Smoot-Hawley Act. Everyone knows that. The highest price he has ever received has been since we have had this reciprocal trade policy. The price of cattle today is $10.62 per 100 pounds. Under the Smoot-Hawley Act—I am a cattleman myself on a small scale—it was $3.75 per 100 for the best cattle. Why did not the gentleman give those figures? All the time under the Smoot-Hawley Act the price of cattle went down and down. The price of sheep went down and down. Wool went down and down. All farm commodities went down. At the same time the national income declined to the lowest level in years.

Mr. WEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. WEST. You believe, do you not, that 2 years from now there will still be a Congress?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, yes; and I hope a hundred years from now.

Mr. WEST. And we will be in session?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I hope so.

Mr. WEST. If conditions are good then and these things are necessary, the Congress can take action at that time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The same thing can be said 3 years from now or 10 years from now. Why change it from 3 years to 2 years now when the extensions have been for 3 years all the time?

Mr. WEST. Only to protect ourselves.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is a very able member of our committee, is one man who has been consistent about this reciprocal trade program. He has supported it on final passage, but has contended for amendments.

On the other side I cannot point to such consistency. Many of those who support these amendments now have opposed the whole program in the past, opposed it when it was originally adopted, opposed it at its first extension and opposed it when it was extended the second time. They do not dare now to attack it directly, but they attack it by a flank movement, attempting to do by indirection that which they know they cannot do by direction. The program is so popular and has worked so well and it is fully approved by the business interests of the country, by the labor interests of the country, by the agricultural interests of the country, and by those in all walks of life. They supported it at our hearings. Since I have been a member of our committee I have never witnessed a hearing where the evidence offered was so preponderantly overwhelming. The testimony of those best prepared to testify, the intelligent judgment of the country was that this program had fully justified itself. Therefore, my friends, what reason is there today for trying to emasculate it, trying to defeat it, trying to scuttle it, not by direction, but by indirection?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Who has the responsibility for the administration of this program? Secretary Hull more than any other one man. If there is any one man in whom the entire country has confidence, a confidence justified by the things he has accomplished, if there is any one man who is outstanding as a statesman—it is Hull. No greater tribute could be paid him than was recently done by my distinguished associate on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], who in discussing the tax bill a short while ago referred to Secretary Hull as a man in whom we all have confidence. We do; we all have confidence in him because of his outstanding achievements, because of the wonderful things he has accomplished for the American people not only along economic lines, but for world peace.

Now, suppose we emasculate this program, suppose we cripple it by amendments, then whose responsibility is it? It will be ours; but if you give him what he wants, if we implement it as requested, if we leave it as it is and as it has worked out so successfully, then if it should not work the blame will be his; but conversely I repeat that if we should amend it in the way that he says will make it unworkable, in a way that he says will make it ineffective, then you cannot blame him if it does not work; the blame will be upon us.

I say if any one piece of legislation enacted under this administration or any other administration has fully justified itself it is the reciprocal trade-agreements program. It was stated yesterday and it has been repeated since that this policy has been endorsed, wholeheartedly, unequivocally endorsed, unconditionally endorsed, by 85 percent of the newspapers of the country. So, Mr. Chairman, the only forward looking, forward going thing to do is to vote down every amendment, because the result of these amendments will be to cripple the program.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I believe the amendment pending pertains to the length of time the program shall be extended, changing it from 3 years to 2 years. In speaking of the amendments will the gentleman kindly explain how it came to be 3 years instead of 4 or something else?

Mr. DOUGHTON. When it was originally enacted the term was 3 years. Then in 1937 it was extended for 3 years, and again in 1940 it was extended for 3 years, so we are proposing to extend it for 3 years in the pending bill. To limit it to 2 years would be the first backward step, the first step toward abandonment of the policy. Consider, Mr. Chairman, that we want to go forward with the policy that has so fully justified itself. You can condemn it only theoretically, you cannot condemn it on the record of its accomplishments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, to say that the extension of this trade act for another 3 years is essential to the war effort is to reflect upon the intelligence of this body. Certainly the gentleman who has just taken his seat will not contend that renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is as important to the war effort as the lend-lease, yet we extend the life of lend-lease 1 year at a time.

I concur fully in what the gentleman from Texas said. Conditions may be altogether different 2 years hence than they are now. We all pray God that the war will be brought to a speedy and successful conclusion before then. When peace comes, we are going to be confronted with a gigantic task of finding jobs for the 11,000,000 boys in uniform. They will not be satisfied with W. P. A., they will want jobs, and they will want jobs that pay good American wages, not jobs that force them to compete with the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient.

We all remember what happened immediately following the last war. There had been vast accumulations of surpluses that had been piled up in the various countries of the world. They could not get ships on account of lack of bottoms during the war, but once the war was over and all the shipping in the world became available for commercial purposes, they proceeded to dump their surplus products on the American market regardless of cost of production in order to establish dollar credit. If we are wise we will profit by what happened then. That did more to drive the Democratic Party out of power after 8 years than any single thing.

You will recall that Woodrow Wilson vetoed the Emergency Tariff Act, and, if I recall correctly, the gentleman from North Carolina supported him in that position, but the good sense of the Congress, casting partisanship aside, Democrats and Republicans alike, rallied to pass that legislation which saved us and resulted in opening up a new era of prosperity that endured for a number of years.

This is not a partisan question. We have Republicans on this side who for one reason or another are going to vote against the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." There are Democrats

who are going to vote for the amendments that will safeguard this measure, amendments that look into the future and not blindly in the present.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Will not the effect of the adoption of this amendment be to permit each Congress to have an opportunity to pass on the entire program?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has put his finger on it exactly, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that if the period is reduced from 3 to 2 years he will vote for this bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I expect to; yes; with the adoption of certain safeguarding amendments. Of course, things change very rapidly these days.

Mr. RICHARDS. And if no other amendments are adopted?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman ask me that question a little later in the afternoon, please?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I could not be more sincere than I am when I say that, in my opinion, it would be a serious mistake to adopt the pending amendment. This amendment provides for the reduction of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act from 3 to 2 years.

Let us for a moment bear in mind what this would really amount to and what it would mean, in view of the serious situation now existing throughout the world. The Congress adopted this trade-agreement program, and the act of 1934 was for a 3-year period. Then, in 1937, it was extended for another 3-year period by Congress, and, in 1940, extended for another 3-year period by the Congress. The pending resolution provides for another 3-year period; therefore, we have established and followed the policy all the way through of having this for 3 years. It was originally enacted for 3 years, and at 3-year intervals the Congress analyzes the program and continues it for 3 years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will not the gentleman admit that all previous extensions were made in time of peace?

Mr. COOPER. I will; and that is all the more reason why this extension in the middle of the most serious war in our history should be for the same period that they have been made in the past. I say that for this reason: Having adopted the policy and having followed it for 9 years, if we now say to our allies and to the other countries of the world, "We are going to change this policy that we have followed for 9 years; we are just going to extend the act for 2 years," they will ask, very naturally, "What does that mean? Does that mean that at the end of 2 years you are going to abandon the program entirely? Why did you not go on and follow the policy that you established originally? We must reach the conclusion that at the end of the war you expect to revert to the old isolation policy and abandon this policy of world cooperation. What do your assurances under the Atlantic Charter, what do your assurances under section 7 of lease-lend mean, if you are going to change your policy on this important phase of international cooperation and collaboration?"

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman spoke of precedents. How about the third-term precedent?

Mr. COOPER. I am afraid the gentleman from Minnesota is entirely aside from the question under discussion and consideration.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman states that if we changed our policy we would revert to the old isolationist policy. The gentleman does not intend to say to the House that when we adopted this reciprocal trade-agreement policy we were then adopting an isolationist policy?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly not. If I said anything I said just the reverse of what the gentleman from Montana apparently understood me to say.

We adopted this policy of cooperation with respect to international trade. We have followed that for 9 years and have extended the act each time for 3 years. Now if we change that and say we are just going to make it 2 years, what will be the natural attitude of the other countries?

They may naturally think that we are not going forward with the policy that we have followed for 9 years, but that we mean to change that policy. Mr. Chairman, we should not even run the risk of having our allies arrive at any such conclusion.

I insist that the amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the eyes of the world are upon us as we consider the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This is by far the most important legislation that Congress has considered during this session. To reject this legislation at this time or to so amend it as to emasculate it might seriously affect the conduct of the war and most certainly delay the day of victory. To defeat this measure or make it ineffective by amendment will most certainly deter the possibility of a lasting peace.

Upon our action on this important measure will depend the course of coming events in war and peace. To win the war we must retain the confidence and respect of our allies. Should we fail to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, our allies would have good cause to question our sincerity.

The Nazis over the short-wave radio have been advocating the defeat of this bill. The Axis propagandists are sharpening their knives to carve out the propaganda that would bring about dissension in the ranks of the United Nations should the extension of the Trade Agreements Act fall. It would be a grand victory for Goebbels should his advice be followed by the Congress of the United States. This would give him a grand opportunity the like of which he had never experienced to break down the morale of the United Nations and thereby greatly remove the day of victory, enhancing our loss in men and materials. Certainly even the most fervent isolationist Member of the House does not want that responsibility upon his head.

If we are to have a lasting peace after victory is won, the soundest foundation upon which we can possibly build it is upon reciprocal agreements. A resumption of the old cutthroat and dog-eat-dog system of international trade will only reap repeated and frequent wars. We owe it to the men in the armed forces fighting on the various fronts of the world, to the coming generations, and to ourselves to see that everything possible is done to avoid a repetition of a world chaos like the one we are experiencing today. If we are determined that we shall not have world conflagrations each succeeding generation, that we want to have a world in which there will be international cooperation and international prosperity, we can rest assured that the passage and continuation of the Trade Agreements Act is a long step in that direction.

The effect of this legislation is so broad and all-embracing that it requires our viewing it not from the standpoint of how it is going to affect our particular district or our particular constituents but what affect it will have upon our country as a whole, upon the civilized world as a whole. In times like these, it is often necessary to be unselfish, even to the extent of voting against what one's constituents may consider their best interest. Even if our constituents may feel their best interest is affected adversely we must weigh their interest against that of the Nation; or even the world. If their disadvantage is outweighed by the country's benefits, it is our duty to support the best interests of our country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Not now; I have not quite finished. If I have time when I have finished, I will be glad to yield.

In conclusion, I wish to read a statesmanlike letter I received from one of my constituents, a manufacturer, on this

subject. This letter most thoroughly covers the reasons for the passage of this act as is. The writer of the letter is Mr. T. D. Montgomery of Cutler-Hammer, Inc., and reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: In the conduct of the above company's business the writer has had the opportunity to observe and study the operations of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and is placing before you as a member of the Ways and Means Committee the following thoughts in hopes that they will receive your valued consideration.

Believing that the United States of America is able and capable and must from now on cooperate with other nations to effectively improve world conditions, we consider that the action which will be taken by Congress will have a far-reaching effect both immediately under present conditions and those encountered post war.

We believe the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act benefits the United States in the same manner that an equally good business policy benefits individual private producers and suppliers of consumer products and merchandise. It installs mutual confidence in day-to-day operations and shows a firm intention of carrying on in the future. It provides an open door for the discussion of grievances and shortcomings of past operations. Furthermore, like successful civilian business agreements, the acquaintanceship and understanding which are developed attendant to the negotiations and administrations of it are of the utmost importance in the creation and maintenance of friendship and good will.

It is not a matter of free trade, liberal international trade, high tariff or low tariff, nor is it a question of the great responsibilities and ramifications that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act implies for us.

It is a matter of our recognizing that we are no longer an undeveloped, immature nation, requiring the protection which we once needed, and realizing that by dealing in a practical fashion with world problems we will learn how to deal with them to our benefit, as well as to the benefit of other countries of the world.

Considering particularly our relations with friendly countries, think how difficult it will be to claim their friendship, cooperation, and good will in the light of our lack of ability to supply and ship to them the material they need if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is not in effect or is limited in scope and intention.

There is grave danger in changing the intended or implied responsibilities of this act. The danger is twofold. First, under present conditions we cannot explain to our neighbors and other friendly countries why it is necessary to repeal in any part the Reciprocal Trade Act without directly undermining our position with them.

Secondly, we cannot think of a better way of giving the Hitler propagandists just the ammunition they need to prove our policies cannot be depended upon.

We believe action taken on this act should be decisive to show our friends that we believe in them and in ourselves. The results of the last eight years' operations as against guesses of the future fully justify it.

Thanking you for your courtesy, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

T. D. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I think I shall not object, but the gentleman who last spoke was given unanimous consent to have twice the usual amount of time under the 5-minute rule. That is a rather exceptional thing, and in debates like this many of us wish to ask questions of those who are supposed to be familiar with the subject and have been given additional time.

I would like assurance that when request is made for double the usual time that those who are granted the requests will yield, to a reasonable extent, to those who wish to propound questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] that he will only consent to the gentleman proceeding for 10 minutes with the understanding that other speakers may have 10 minutes?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am not making that point. The gentleman who preceded the gentleman from South Carolina asked and was given unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes under the usual 5-minute rule. When he was asked if he would yield for a question he refused to yield on the ground that his time was limited. If it is going to be the procedure for everybody who asks for 5 minutes to have the double amount of time under the rule, I think they should be willing to yield for questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think they should ask for additional time.

Mr. MOTT. I am not going to ask that direct assurance from the gentleman who has just requested to proceed for 5 additional minutes, but if he does not yield I will not consent to further extensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make an attack on this hibernated, hyphenated, un-American, unconstitutional resolution.

Mr. Chairman, as I listened yesterday to the grown-ups of this House calling each other isolationists and internationalists I was wondering whether I was mistaken when I felt that we were all just plain American citizens.

So that there may be no further confusion let us define what an internationalist and an isolationist is. Internationalists are those misguided individuals who think more of foreign governments and foreign peoples than they do of their own. They are the ones that take up most of the time of the Dies committee. They prefer foreign kings, queens, princesses, and even ballerinas. They forget that we have not only better looking but better kings, queens, and princes of our own in every hamlet and village.

They are the "one worlders," the loudmouthed few who shout from housetops "Union now." They do not even know what they want to union with. They would throw our Constitution out of the window. They talk about democracy and the American way of life but believe in bureaucracy, dictatorship, and one-man government.

Unfortunately they would sell the American farmer, laborer, and small businessman in foreign market places. They wrap the flag of glory around themselves and try to monopolize the patriotism of this Nation that is common to us all. They would make the world think like WALLACE although they have utterly failed to make the Puerto Ricans think and act like Tugwell.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Will the gentleman give us a definition of the word "ballerina" that he used?

Mr. LEMKE. That is the thing that Willkie kissed.

While noisy, and while they virtually control all the avenues of publicity, this element consists of less than 2 percent of our people. That 2 percent will become extinct when our sons come marching home. These internationalists have been and are chasing false gods. Their rendezvous are night clubs and stork clubs. They prefer foreign ballerinas to American beauties.

The word "isolationist" is used by the internationalists to cover up their foreign designs—to destroy our American way of life. It is a name applied to those who believe in the honor, the integrity, and the strength of the United States; a name given to those who believe in the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe. It is a name applied to those who do not believe in an international W. P. A. nor in selling the American farmer and laborer in foreign market places.

These Americans believe in dealing fairly and honorably with all nations. They know that every nation will, after we have won this war, become more or less self-sustained. They believe in friendship among nations, but do not believe in a good-neighbor policy that has to be bribed and bought at the expense of the American people.

They believe in trading freely with those nations who have the same standard of living as we have. But they do not believe in bringing the American farmer and laborer down to the level of the Latin-American peon or the Japanese coolie. They consist of 90 percent of the American people.

I shall vote against the extension of this law. When this law was passed in 1934 I stated that it was sponsored by the international bankers and the international manufacturers. These two groups are interested in clipping coupons and selling manufactured products to foreign nations. This at the expense of the American farmer and the American laborer. They are more concerned with getting the almighty dollar than they are in the welfare of their own government and their own people.

I felt then that the so-called reciprocal trade agreement bill was unconstitutional. I feel so now. The Constitution provides that the President—

Shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

A trade agreement is a treaty, and any attempt to deprive the Senate of the

power to advise and consent to such an agreement is in violation of the plain English language of the Constitution. Even if we should attempt to ignore the plain mandate of the Constitution I doubt the wisdom of this kind of legislation. I do not believe it will serve the best interest of the American people. After all, the 96 Senators, coming from 48 States, are in a better position to protect and safeguard the people of this entire Nation than is the Secretary of State, who comes from one State.

When this question was first up for debate we heard a great deal about logrolling, but I prefer that the Members of Congress representing the people of different sections of our country, different industries, roll logs in order to get justice for all sections and for all industries in the making of a tariff law than to have the Secretary of State, who believes that it is necessary in order to preserve civilization to sell our farmer and laborer in foreign market places, roll logs.

I prefer logrolling to horse trading with foreign diplomats. This especially since our State Department is now and always has been the poorest horse trader of them all. It generally trades off two or three good young colts and gets an old worthless nag in exchange. This in the name of peace and Christianity. When did it become necessary for this Nation to buy or bribe other nations' Christianity or peace? Such a doctrine is not only lunacy but an insult to our intelligence and our dignity.

During the first 5 years that this reciprocal trade agreement law was in effect we imported $6,189,997,000 worth of agricultural products and substitutes. Again, that is the foreign valuation. The domestic valuation would be $12,379,994,000—equal to a check of $2,063 for every one of our 6,000,000 farm families.

During the same 5 years we imported 2,335,273 head of cattle and 758,466,496 pounds of meat and meat products. This was equivalent to another 1,896,166 head of cattle, making the total importation of meat equivalent to 4,235,439 head of cattle in 5 years. These, our own people should have raised, not foreigners.

We have no objection to that part of the international trade that is the natural result of our civilization and of our intercourse among nations, that which comes to us naturally and necessarily. But why buy products produced in foreign nations that we can produce ourselves? Why make a laughing stock of ourselves and trade away our domestic markets so that a few international manufacturers may sell a few more automobiles, machinery, and electrical equipment in foreign nations on credit—all at the ultimate expense of this Nation? Our international trade has not added to the benefit or wealth of our people. In fact, it has sapped our resources to the tune of $26,000,000,000.

The United States, because of its great natural wealth and unlimited resources of raw material, has become self-sufficient and is able to develop economic freedom for all. It can and must abolish poverty, not by mingling it with the poverty of other nations but by an ever increasing and higher standard of living, not of the few but of the many. This Nation need no longer concern itself with international shopkeeping. It will, of course, trade with its friends, for friendship's sake, as far as essential and necessary for their mutual well-being, but it will not drive bargains or sell part of its people in foreign market places.

In the name of war, Congress has done a lot of silly things. At times it has virtually abdicated. It virtually deserted its people in the hour of need. It surrendered to the bureaucracy.

Now we are told that the hope of civilization is that we again sell the farmer and the laborer in foreign market places. Yes; that is the hope of every grafter, grabber, loafer, and beggar in the world. In the name of war, we will lend-lease to foreign nations $100,000,000,000. In the name of war, we are going to take 20 percent of the salaries and fixed incomes from those who live on subsistent incomes.

In the name of the "four freedoms" our sons are going to win this war for ourselves and for foreign nations. Some of these have already indicated that they will again grab everything in sight. Be that as it may.

However, there is a limit to our generosity. We are not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus for other nations. We are not, in addition to feeding and financing half the world, going to give away our domestic markets so that a few international horse traders can again make millions out of the tears and the blood and agony of an agonized world.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this amendment it is necessary to bear in mind that Congress has delegated one of its most important powers to the Executive branch of our Government. Perhaps I cannot consider questions of this sort with as open a mind as one should have because I happen to have made a very careful study of the trend toward administrative absolutism; so, if I appear to be just the least bit prejudiced against delegating our functions to the Executive branch of our Government you will have to excuse me.

The thing that impresses me about this amendment is the fact that this Congress will not attempt to bind a succeeding Congress if it is adopted. It is trite for me to say that the world is in a state of flux. How can we foresee what effect our lend-lease program and the war itself will have on those nations that have in the past offered and will continue to offer after the war the sternest kind of competition to labor and industry of this Nation? I am thinking of the manufacturing sections of America and of those thousands of our workers who are dependent on manufacturing for a living. How do we know that we have not set up competitors in every nook and corner of the world? According to my information, much machinery and equipment has been sent to other countries. This machinery and equipment could well be used for the manufacture of articles that would affect the markets our goods should find. If we have, in the furtherance of the war effort, set up potential competitors, let us not commit ourselves to a policy that will make it difficult for us to effect a remedy before all of American industry is seriously injured or entirely destroyed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee for a brief question.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman raises the question about extending this act into another Congress. The 2-year amendment now pending would do the same thing.

Mr. WALTER. No; it would not.

Mr. COOPER. The date of the expiration of this act is June 12, 1943. Two years from that would be June 12, 1945.

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. COOPER. The new Congress would come in in January 1945.

Mr. WALTER. I realize that, but bear in mind that we were a long time getting this extension here on the floor, and it is very doubtful if a bill of similar nature could ever be reported any more quickly than was this because, as I understand, tremendous pressure was brought to bear to report this particular resolution as early as possible.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken on that.

Mr. WALTER. I have felt in connection with every delegation of authority we have made—and we have made a great many—that we have created in the central Government something that is going to take all the ingenuity and courage of many a Congress to come to break down. Once having delegated authority to the executive branch it is very difficult for us to retake it. Every bit of power that is delegated means effort, effort, effort in order to recoup the power once given. I have the greatest respect for our distinguished Secretary of State and have every confidence in his integrity and wisdom, but the power to negotiate these treaties is not delegated to Secretary Hull. Thus it is with every delegation of power.

It seems to me that we can right here and now let the world see that we in America are interested in America, interested in the future of America, and that this primary interest will be borne in mind by the representatives of the people when they are called upon to act in any question as vital as is this one. I am not so naive as to believe that our allies are going to get out of the political bed in which we are all lying today. All of us are under attack, many of our countries have been invaded. Nor am I so naive as to believe that those people who are so courageously fighting this war are doing it because of any kindly interest they have in my country. They are fighting in this war for the same purposes we are. Let us be courageous and practical about this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is obvious that I cannot pose as an authority on the detailed workings of the act which is now under consideration. I voted against it originally, actuated by

the belief that in certain fundamentals it was unwise. If my recollection is correct, I voted against previous extensions, perhaps on two occasions.

My position today may seem strange to a good many of my friends in the House. I expect to vote for its continuation solely for the reason that we are at war. I find justification, perhaps, in reaching that conclusion, in my belief that to a very, very large extent when we talk about the present workings of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we are really discussing a somewhat academic question, for this war has dislocated all trade relations. I do not think it can be contended that this act, whether or not we believe in it, is pursuing its normal course at this time.

I think I realize the importance of this performance here in the House today with respect to its psychological effect. I do not share, however, the fears of the gentleman from Tennessee to the effect that if we continue this act for only 2 years instead of 3 years it would have a destructive effect upon the morale of the United Nations. I think it would be understood by every sensible member of the United Nations that the House of Representatives in voting for the extension of this act for 2 years was doing so because in time of war we would better not touch it at all. When the war is over, however, it is obvious, it must be obvious to every sensible man on both sides of the aisle, that we must revalue and reestimate our situation. Certainly every other nation must revalue and reestimate its situation. The 2-year extension, in which I believe, makes it perfectly plain that this is what we have in mind.

As I understand, many amendments are going to be offered here. Every one of them, unless I am very much mistaken, will prove exceedingly controversial, tending to divide this House. Whether any of them shall pass I do not know. I have no poll. But I hold that the adoption of the amendment extending this act for 2 years instead of 3 years will help to resolve our difficulties and result finally in a performance in this House that will be impressive to the world as well as satisfactory to the great majority of its Members, without in any way pledging or obligating ourselves to any particular line of conduct when the war is over.

I believe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] has offered a proper amendment. I believe that if we adopt it, it will go far toward resolving our troubles here and result in an extension of this reciprocal trade-agreement bill by a larger vote than would otherwise be achieved.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. As a matter of fact, whether or not we all agree as to the equity and quality of all of the trade agreements which have been enacted in the past, and whether or not we agree, all of us, as to the advisability of the policies involved in the ways and means employed in bringing these treaties about. Certainly there is definite and sound judgment in the proposal contained in the amendment by my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. WEST]. This House has responded to these terrible times in a fine manner but we are approaching a position where in this great deliberative assembly, in some instances, too highly developed obduracy is blocking the wisdom of the conclusions which we reach following debate. In a thoroughly reasonable and rational manner, I hold that all of these major considerations should be discussed. I particularly stress my accord and my firm conviction in the truth of Representative WADSWORTH'S statement that these agreements will be extended by a larger vote than otherwise, if this amendment be agreed to. As a matter of fact, in the early days when this reciprocal trade-agreement bill came on this floor for the first time, the question of hemispheric unity was one of the major objectives, and the unity of peoples, engaged in facing an approaching crisis, the dimensions and shape of which we are today well acquainted with. A unanimity of action of this great House at this hour, at a time when major considerations along vital lines are being undertaken in other places, together with the facts which will be adduced, and which will be presented to us for our consideration and information, causes me on this occasion to call your attention to the fact that this amendment is not only in accord with the spirit of the times, but with the regular representative practices of this great body. To bind a successor Congress to a proposal of 1 year over the limit to which this Congress will serve is, to say the least, at this time open to some challenge as to its wisdom. The public confidence today, my friends, in my honest opinion, has never been so vitally important as it is at this moment. Anything which will solidify and unify and strengthen that public confidence is of major importance to not only the people of this country, but, as exhibit A, in its impact upon the minds of those who are shoulder to shoulder with us in facing this major battle for continued existence of civilization and freemen the world over.

I do not desire to take the whole time, but desire merely to add my support to the amendment limiting the continuity of the reciprocal trade agreements to 2 years, as a logical solution to the major difficulties which confront us in this debate, and I urge upon every thoughtful and highly patriotically minded Member in this House, and that includes all, that we give close attention to the high importance of doing this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MOTT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, not to be taken out of his time.

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot come to some agreement upon the length of debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, what does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let us make it 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. A previous speaker had something to say about honesty of purpose in voting on amendments, and he observed that we should not vote for the amendments merely for the purpose of hampering the passage of the bill. Now, I want to be perfectly honest in my support of this amendment. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas which limits the extension of the Trade Agreements Act to 2 years simply because an extension of 2 years is less objectionable in my opinion than an extension of 3 years, as provided in the pending resolution.

But in this regard let me say that even if this amendment were to be adopted, I cannot support the bill unless the Congress is willing to write into it another amendment, which will give the Congress of the United States some authority over the tariff-making power which, under the Constitution of the United States, is vested exclusively in the Congress and in no other agency of Government.

The gentleman from Texas made an excellent argument, not only for the limitation of this extension for 2 years, but made an equally sound argument, whether he intended to or not, against any extension of the bill whatever. He gave an example of what the reciprocal trade agreements have done to the cattle industry, and he showed clearly how the reciprocal trade agreements have injured that industry. He was right in what he said, and if the war had not come on, suspending all foreign trade, the cattle industry probably would be entirely ruined by this time as a result of the slashing of the tariff rates on cattle under the trade agreement with Mexico. And in answer to my question he said that very likely that would be the case with all other American agricultural commodities which, under the reciprocal trade agreements have to compete in this country with foreign agricultural commodities produced at a cost far below the actual American cost of production.

I hope I will not be considered provincial or local or selfish if I give you two or three examples of what these trade agreements have done to the agricultural industry in my own State, because I am sure that every Member on this floor, whether on the right side or the left side of the aisle, will find parallel cases in the agricultural industry of his

own State. It is not a provincial or local question. It is a Nation-wide question which has adversely affected every State and every community in this country.

My State is a great producer of cherries. For years we had no tariff on cherries, and foreign cherries, produced at a cost of less than half the cost of production in the United States, were sent into this country. Gradually the foreign producers took almost the entire American market and they put the cherry industry on the verge of ruin. After many, many years of effort we finally got a small tariff on cherries, which was about equal to the difference between the cost of production of cherries in Italy, for example, and in the United States. That by the way, is all that the advocates of a protective tariff have ever asked for; simply for a tariff equivalent to the difference between the cost of production of the article produced in a foreign country and the cost of a similar article produced in this country. The cost of production in any country depends largely upon the standard of living in that country, and it is because the standard of living in foreign countries is lower than it is in the United States that we must have a tariff sufficient to offset that difference or we cannot compete in our own market with the foreign product. As I say, after years of effort we received that little increase in tariff, and immediately the cherry industry in Oregon began to prosper, and it prospered similarly in every other State in this Union.

Now, when this administration came into power, a rubber-stamp Congress enacted the unconstitutional Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act—and I have never even heard a lawyer on the floor of this House seriously undertake to defend the constitutionality of that act—and under this act a reciprocal trade agreement was negotiated with Italy which would have cut this small cherry tariff in two. The treaty was in fact never concluded on account of an international dispute which arose between the two countries on another subject, but it was demonstrated to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, and they admitted it—that this reduction in the tariff would have made it impossible for us to produce cherries and to sell them here in competition with Italian cherries and still remain in business. Nevertheless, that is what the trade agreement negotiators intended to do and what they would have done, had not this unforeseen international dispute prevented them from doing so.

If time permitted I should like to give you examples of other trade agreements which were actually concluded and which actually did ruin some of the major industries of my State, and I shall cite those examples when occasion offers during the further course of this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for 5 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VOORHIS of California). The Chair will inform the gentleman that the time for debate has been fixed.

Mr. MOTT. The Chair is quite right. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I would not have taken this time were it not for the fact that previous to hearing arguments already made in support of this amendment I spoke to the chairman of the committee and stated that I wanted time.

After listening to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST and Mr. KLEBERG], and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and others who preceded me, I do not believe there is much left to be said in support of this amendment. Personally I am going to vote for the amendment.

There is one thing that Congress is being criticized for today more than anything else, and that is the delegation of authority to the departments and to the Executive, going to a point beyond the Constitution of the United States. I have searched the records of the Supreme Court and I have failed to find a decision of that court passing upon the constitutionality of these reciprocal trade agreements. I have never found where they directly acted upon it, but it is questionable whether the Congress has any right to delegate such authority to anybody, executive department or otherwise, and that is one of the things for which we are all being criticized.

I believe in reciprocity. I believe in trade with foreign countries. Trade is part of the life blood of this Nation. It has risen through trade with other countries, to a position of power in the world. I believe in being friendly with other nations. I believe in our policy of being friendly with the South American countries, with Canada, and all other nations in the world, but not to the point of destroying or devastating our own taxpayers in this country. I want you to remember that when the close of this war comes we will have a $300,000,000,000 debt to pay. May I ask from whom are you going to get that money? Are you going to get it from the taxpayers of some other country? No. We will have to get it out of the hides of the American people, out of the farmers, the businessmen, and the workers. They will be the ones who will have to pay this bill. It is to them that you will have to look. We must not forget that. In making these trade agreements that fact must not be lost sight of.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman give us any connection whatever between the extension of the trade agreements and the war?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course not. That argument never has impressed me, although I give sincerity to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for contending along that line.

In discussing this matter, I want it understood that I am neither an idealist nor a defeatist.

I would define an idealist as one who is so naive as to think that after this war is over the only solution to everlasting peace is for Uncle Sam to take over the management of the world and proceed to go up and down the earth like a Don Quixote with the dove of peace in one hand and a Midas' purse in the other, out of which we would indiscriminately hand out billions to civilize, equalize, and standardize the world—the doing of which would perhaps be our undoing for undoubtedly a program of any such nature would only succeed in breaking down our high standard of living. Besides, I feel that there is plenty of opportunity to civilize, equalize, and standardize right here at home and, like charity, our own people should be the first recipients of those benefits.

I would define a defeatist, on the other hand, as one who in despair at the truly great problems which will face mankind at the conclusion of this war, and which have to be successfully met if civilization is to prosper and endure, are prone to throw up their hands in hopelessness and thereupon crawl up in a shell with the intent and purpose of letting the rest of the world go by and go to ——, a practice which could be equally fatal to the welfare and destiny of this country.

No, there must be another solution, another more practical way to insure a just and lasting peace. And if one thing, more than any other, is necessary to preclude another such catastrophe as we are now embroiled in it is that this war not conclude with an imposed and short-lived truce.

As I say, I am neither an idealist nor a defeatist. I believe that a middle-of-the-road attitude is, as in most things, the best answer to the problem. However, I want to take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the American people the present apparent overbalancing of the scales in favor of the idealist side. I am neither willing nor prepared to see the United States become the W. P. A. of the world, and when I say that I do not want to be accused of belittling or discrediting the W. P. A. as set up by this administration in 1933. The W. P. A., then the P. W. A., was a necessity born out of the short-sighted policy of an administration that either did not care or did not see the natural consequences of the Government hands-off policy then being pursued.

After this war we are going to have problems enough of our own to solve without attempting to care for the needs of the world and this idea of letting down the bars and, as I have said, assuming a benevolent and "deep-pocket" attitude toward the rest of the world is too much for me to stomach. Nor do I think the American people sanction such a proposal. The words of the President still ring in my ears when in his January 1937 speech he said "a third of America is underclothed, underfed, and ill housed."

Such an attitude, as that expressed above, would mean the ruination of a State like Montana which ranks well among the leading States in the production of cattle, sheep, wool, wheat, and copper. We cannot compete with any of the Latin-American countries on any of those commodities, as far as costs are concerned. Our taxes are 100 percent higher and our wages are accordingly higher. Our winter season when livestock must be fed runs into the months—4 to 5 months. In the countries to the south of us no such winter feeding is required.

We must protect our home market—the farmers and the livestock men are among those who are going to have to pay the taxes. It is needless to say that we cannot collect taxes from foreign nations. We must take care that we do not wipe out the farmer and the cattleman.

It is my opinion that the descendants of the pioneers—those first Americans who in many instances were driven out of their native lands because they wished to be free to worship as they wanted, speak as they saw fit, and have the chance to raise themselves above the level of serfdom and who, leaving friends and relatives, came to America to dig and scrape and toil so that they might leave their children and their children's children a plot of ground, a little money, or a little education, that they could not have, so that their fight would be a little less hard and their lives a little more happy and secure—I say that the descendants of those pioneers, the farmer, the laboring class, most of whom are the highest paid workers in the world, the businessman, and the manufacturer and industrialist are not going to sit idly by and see the resources and wealth of this country scattered to the four winds. I and they remember only too well the little thanks—yes; even condemnation—Uncle Sam received after the last war for practically bankrupting itself in pouring out our wealth and resources to put the world back on its feet. We were Uncle Sam as long as we were dishing it out but when the spending stopped, as it had to, we were soon Uncle Shylock.

As I have said, I think there must be some sensible middle-of-the-road program that could and would work toward the forming of a new and better world. One that would insure a more lasting peace than heretofore—and mark my word, one had better be found; the world cannot long stand the shock and destruction of a world conflict every quarter of a century—a program that would give a little more to those who have not and a little less to those who have, but which in so doing would not jeopardize the standard of living that has been built up by the sacrifice and determination of those who have. Surely there is such a thing as being cooperative without being "suckers" and of wanting to help but not be "taken" in so doing. All of which brings me to the question at hand. The question to my mind is simply this: In a world just a few hours apart by air and one in which of necessity cooperation and friendship must be practiced more and more as those air hours shorten, just how much reciprocity is advisable and possible and who is to decide that question?

It is on this question—the extent of this reciprocity, or nonreciprocity if you prefer that, that I am forced to part company with many of the Members. It has been argued that could and should there be the possibility that a President or Secretary of State might not have a particular agreement of his effective unless and until ratified by the Senate, that that would hurt the feelings of some of our allies. Well, this is simply a business proposition and we should go about it in a businesslike way and it is not good business to let one person pledge the word of this country without any check upon that person.

I mean this as no reflection on the sincerity or honesty or patriotism of the President. It is just a case of putting "too many eggs in one basket"—of placing too much authority and responsibility on one man's shoulders. It is a policy, that should we continue to follow it, you may be sure will lead to no good end. And last but by no means least, it is in direct controvention with the Constitution of the United States. It was the intention of our founding fathers that the Senate would always act as a check on any and all agreements made between the President or Secretary of State and a foreign country. That was a wise provision and one which we should once again put into practice.

I think it is high time a little realism be evidenced on the part of the legislative body of this Government. Between the choice of absolute isolation on the one hand and complete absorption in a single world government on the other are many choices. I propose that the responsibility for those choices rest where it belongs, not on the shoulders of one man, but rather, on the elected representatives of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, without amendments. I know my voice will probably not carry much weight, but I just want to take this time to give the membership of the House the benefit of a few thoughts that I have on this subject.

This Congress has the greatest responsibility to the people of this Nation that any Congress has ever had in its history. I will agree with the gentlemen on my left of the aisle and I will not go along with any plan to make a W. P. A. of Europe or to spread the A. A. A. throughout the world. I will vote with you against any such proposal. But what I am interested in, and what every man and woman in this House today should be interested in, is the creation of something in this country and in this Government that will forever prevent another war such as we are experiencing. I submit to the Members on the left, with whom I have voted many times, that there is nothing in God's world that brought on this war or nothing that will bring on another war quicker than to allow the Congress to write trade agreements between nations.

I have letters in my office from various sections of the country expressing the hope that this renewal will not pass because it would affect their business in that particular section of the country. Another section or another business will be affected because of some other trade agreement. That is true. That is the reason we have to look at our trade-agreement program from a national standpoint and not from a sectional or a class standpoint. We Members of Congress cannot just think of dollars and business alone. The industrialists of this country will have to adjust their business and their industry to meet modern peace conditions.

I am one Member who will stand on the floor of this House and say that the industrialists of this country can do it themselves and they have a responsibility to society to do so. They have a responsibility to this Government.

They have a responsibility to the civilization of the world, to cooperate with other nations in order to preserve peace throughout the world. By voting against the renewal of these trade agreements we will possibly be voting to send our grandsons into another war in a short time because the sacrifices our sons are now making will be in vain. All because we are more interested in a few dollars from a selfish standpoint than in preserving peace.

Let us make this civilization of ours, if we are a civilized people, a living vital thing, not something to be talked about and cast aside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, were I of the opinion that extension of the reciprocal trade treaty law were essential to winning the war, I should willingly vote for the resolution before the House, even though I am strongly opposed to permitting the continuance of any system which serves to increase foreign competition with the American farmer. But I do not share in such an opinion. I am not influenced by the tremendous propaganda which has poured forth from the organized interests which have found trade treaties to the particular financial advantage of some of the strongest monopolies of our country.

Neither do I believe that a sane and sound post-war policy is dependent upon the passage of this trade treaty extension proposal. Like the huge Pentagon Building erected at a cost of $80,000,000 or more as a war project, the importance of winning the war at the earliest possible moment is too frequently urged as a basis of support for measures which have but remote connection with our war activities and the establishment of a permanent peace. The fact that all members are anxious to vote for war policies and for the most vigorous prosecution of the war until victory comes, may afford the reason for proposing this resolution as a war measure. That all members are equally anxious to favor a post-war program which will establish a lasting peace,

permits the trade-treaty policy to gain stronger support than were it given its proper consideration as a domestic issue.

It is claimed by some that only by the adoption of this resolution can Congress assure other nations of the world that trade barriers will be swept away by a peace program, and unfettered commerce will bring prosperity to all the world's 2,000,000,000 people, with prosperity assured to every person in every country. It is said that foreign countries will watch the vote on this measure to determine whether or not they will be permitted to gain a full share in the wealth and high standards of our own great land.

The purpose of trade treaties which have been negotiated behind the closed doors of our Department of State has been to lower tariff duties on imports into this country in order to promote export of our products in greater and more profitable volume to the 27 countries with which the agreements have been made. All tariff duties which the agreements modify have been fixed under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, the last general tariff enactment. That law has been on the books 13 years. It has been denounced as a cause of depression, the foundation for war, and all else that can be applied to such an enactment ever since. If the world needs to be assured of our good intentions toward world trade in a post-war program—and it only can be done by sweeping away all barriers to our own markets—why does not this resolution provide for the repeal of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in toto? Why whittle away at the tariff system by minor reductions, not exceeding 50 percent in tariff rates, when the repeal of the entire act is possible? Why delegate to a few men meeting in secret the power to amend the tariff duties in a manner which may benefit a few leading industries, including some of the very monopolies whose officials are under indictment, at the expense of our farming and dairying interests?

The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act affords protection to some important industries in particular. I was among those who voted against it at the time of its passage. I was not opposed to reasonable protection to our industries, but I demanded that it be framed so as to protect agriculture as well. Instead, its agricultural schedules were made just high enough to afford a ceiling on prices on farm products below actual costs of production, thus permitting the food monopolies to control and force down farm prices by bringing in such products from other countries.

Our farmers now are doing their full part in winning the war. Handicapped by lack of help and equipment, every farm family is pouring out its energies in long hours of arduous labor to feed our own people and our allies and make victory certain. They have long suffered of the depression which drove millions of farmers from their homes. They are doing their all to win the war.

They want to know what sort of provision will be made for them in any post-war program. They know that our farmers cannot compete with the flood of products which will pour into our markets from Argentina, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and many other countries when the war is over, and we have fed the starving people across the Atlantic.

They have felt the full effects of the Hawley-Smoot Act in failing to protect them against the low-cost products of other lands. For instance, the farmers of the great Mississippi Valley who produce over four-fifths of the Nation's food fully realize that they cannot produce corn at 6 cents per bushel, turkeys at 10 cents per pound, butter at 12 cents per pound, and meat and other commodities at relative prices, as they are and have been produced by Argentina.

The passage of this resolution will extend the opportunity of selfish monopolistic food processors to further lower the already inadequate protection of the present law.

Anxious as I am to be in accord with all Federal policies even remotely concerned with the war, I cannot bring myself to vote for a measure fraught with such dangerous possibilities to the farmers of the Northwest, who now are working 70 to 80 hours per week to meet the Nation's demands for their products.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it would not be enlightening or at all interesting for me to suggest to you that I favor the manner of dealing with the tariff subject by trade agreements and reciprocity. I have always thought that the idea of a McKinley tariff bill one year, a Smoot-Hawley tariff bill another year, a Dingley bill another year, and an Underwood bill another year was rather an awkward way of dealing with such an important subject and that something on this order should be had; but that is immaterial; that does not make any difference. I could be wrong about this as I could be wrong about many things.

I have been much impressed by the statement and the address made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who approaches this matter in an unbiased, unimpassioned way. I feel, however, that my good friend from the State of New York probably makes a little mistake in splitting hairs on the length of time that he would conclude that this Trade Agreements Act ought to operate. The difference between 2 years and 3 is only 1; it does not go beyond the Congress that would deal with the matter in either event, and while I would like very well to accept with some assurance the tacit prediction of the gentleman from Texas who offered this amendment that this war will be over in 1945, or 2 years from now, I am very much afraid his prediction is not well founded and that instead of being an importing nation for the next 4 or 5 years we shall find ourselves almost wholly a nation exporting goods and materials; and I think more than that that Mr. Spangler, the chairman of the Republican executive committee, brought us an idea that is worth our acceptance when he said that it is a moot question now and will be as long as this war lasts and for a time after this war is over; that in consideration of the high responsibility we have to the peace that we ought not to bother it. People might misunderstand us if we cut a year out of it. I do not think this difference of a year can justify our doing anything that aside from the probability of being misunderstood could let it be said by any stretch of the imagination that we were receding from our position on reciprocal trade. Let it not be said that we are withdrawing from the good-neighbor policy in this important crisis. Just a moment ago we heard the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN], who has been quite independent in his votes in this Chamber, appeal to this House not to do anything that would lead to any suggestion that we are withdrawing or going to withdraw from our allies in this fight or soon after it. That man does not know this minute where his boy is; he is somewhere in North Africa. Let that bring to us all the seriousness of the situation and our consideration of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of this body for whom I have a higher regard than the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. For the past 8 years I think he and I have voted alike on every vital issue, foreign and domestic; and I have frequently said that of those I knew I thought he was the best-qualified man in the Republican Party for the Presidency. But I disagree when he says he does not think our allies and foreign nations generally will not believe we have changed our position if we now vote to continue this program for only two years. I think foreign nations will take the interpretation placed on the proposed action by the author of the amendment. You heard the gentleman from Oregon say that after listening to the argument of the author of the amendment, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], he was convinced the gentleman from Texas had presented a splendid argument that the whole program was bad and should not be continued at all. The gentleman from Texas said this in conclusion:

> When this war is over and we are hit by a depression, we should be in a position to protect our farmers.

He anticipates that the war will last for two more years and you and I anticipate the same thing. Continuation of the agreements while the war lasts is nothing but a gesture, as the gentleman from New York stated, although a vital gesture of good will to our allies. Confine this program to 2 years and you have departed from our program of 1934, 1937 and 1940. You have changed your position. How would the gentleman from Texas then protect our farmers? How would he protect our manufacturers?

He would protect them by going back to the rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff because that is all we would have left.

Stonewall Jackson taught the military men of the world the value of a turning movement and a flank attack. In 1934, 1937, and 1940 we had a frontal attack on this bill. Now we are having a flank attack. I wish that more of those who oppose this program would be as frank and as intellectually honest as the gentleman from North Dakota, who stated:

I am making a frontal attack on this resolution. It is un-American, it is unconstitutional, and I am against it first, last, and always.

This, he told you, is a flank attack. It is not the mere dotting of an "i" nor the crossing of a "t" referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. It is shooting the vitals out of the program and no nation will be fooled, whether they speak English or not. Some people seem to think that a nation that does not speak English does not know what we are talking about. They do. This is a change in policy. It is nothing else but a change in policy. It is a crippling amendment and it will hurt us in the cooperation that we expect from our allies. The war is not over yet. We won a great victory in Africa, but the main fight is yet to come. Let us not send out in this great crisis word to those who are cooperating with us that the Atlantic Charter is just an empty gesture, that the lend-lease is for a temporary defense, that after the war is over this Congress is not going to support the policies of good-neighborly treatment, policies of international cooperation, that our President, our Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, that our Secretary of State, have been proclaiming to the nations of the world.

You heard the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] speak about what peace means. Recently he lost his fine son in a bombing attack over Palermo. The day he was shot down he brought down two Junker transport planes loaded with German troops coming in to kill our boys in Tunisia. Peace means something to a man who has lost his son in this war. There are millions of fathers and mothers whose eyes are upon us today and who are watching to see whether or not we are going forward with a program that will lead to enduring peace or going to make the first step back toward a program of isolation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 155, noes 132.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. WEST to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 196, noes 153.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 1?

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEST: Before the period in line 8, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no reduction shall be made in the duties of any competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products."

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, this amendment surely is self-explanatory. It merely provides that in no trade agreement we negotiate shall they be empowered to reduce the tariffs on any competitive product being manufactured, or agricultural product, where it would be possible to bring those competitive products into this country and sell at less than the cost of production in the United States.

Certainly no one can object to that kind of an amendment, especially if you expect to maintain the standard of living that we have in this country, and that applies to workers more than to anyone else.

You gentlemen from the cotton country think this over: When we negotiated the trade agreements in 1934 Brazil had a little over 2,000,000, perhaps 2,500,000 acres of cotton. Since we negotiated that trade agreement, in Brazil they have increased their acreage production to over 6,000,000. That cotton comes into this country without any duty. There is some cotton, but I understand Brazil does not raise that grade which does have a duty on it. That refers to some particular kind of long-staple cotton.

They bring into this country an average of over 100,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil a year, which is in direct competition with our products. They bring in—and bear in mind this is brought in with no duty on it—they bring in over 50,000,000 pounds of corn oil that is in direct competition with cottonseed oil and similar products in this country.

Now, is there anyone among us who is opposed to having a provision in this extention of the trade agreement providing they cannot reduce this tariff and bring these commodities into this country and sell them for less than your people can produce them?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not a fact that in negotiating these trade agreements that all these foreign fats and oils come in duty free?

Mr. WEST. That is true. They still do.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. It seems to me I recall that someone testified before the committee that Brazil could produce cotton for less than 3 cents per pound.

Mr. WEST. I was just going to touch upon that.

In answer to the question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] let us refer to the trade agreement with Mexico that has just been negotiated, in which they have reduced the tariff on cottonseed cake, on meal, soybean meal, and similar products to one-fifth of a cent. Can your people compete with that?

Mr. William Clayton, who is recognized as an outstanding authority in the world of cotton, says that the South cannot produce cotton for less than 5 or 6 cents per pound.

The Department of Agriculture made a survey and made a report that Brazil can produce cotton for slightly over 2 cents per pound. What are you going to do in the interest of the cotton people if you do not provide some protection, along the line of this amendment, that will protect them? What do you expect them to do? What do you expect of the cotton picker, the laborers on the farm? What can they do if they do not adopt this amendment?

This amendment applies equally to manufactured products, regardless of where they are manufactured in the United States.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What is the gentleman's information as to the cost of production of wool in the Argentine or the cost of production in South America?

Mr. WEST. Generally I think it runs about 20 percent of our cost of production.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That would be about 6 cents per pound?

Mr. WEST. Yes; or less than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal has been made that Congress should modify the Trade Agreements Act so as to require in effect that duties shall not be reduced below those which would equalize the differences in foreign and domestic cost of production.

Let us look into this proposal to determine what is involved. The cost-of-production formula, or the so-called flexible-tariff provision has been a part of the tariff law since 1922. It was adopted in the Fordney-McCumber Act, and has been in there since. It is in there now.

Its purpose was to provide a flexible means of adjusting tariffs to carry out a policy of fixing duties equal to the differences in the cost of production between domestic and foreign articles. It has been said that this method is cumbersome of operation. It is true that the Tariff Commission, which administered the flexible-tariff provision during the 8 years in which the Tariff Act of 1922 was in effect, and when operations under the flexible provisions were most active, completed reports on investigations covering 56 commodities, only 38 of which resulted in changes of duty.

It would be almost impossible to negotiate foreign-trade agreements if, after inviting all the countries in the world to negotiate with us for the purpose of mutual reduction of trade barriers, we said to each one of them, "We can make tariff reductions only in those cases where our current duty is higher than necessary to equalize the difference in your costs and ours, and even then only to the extent that such differences are equalized."

Who would deal with us on any such basis as that? What would we have to offer? It simply would not work.

We cannot negotiate trade agreements if we are going to insist upon the cost-of-production formula. It was originally excluded from application to trade-agreement items because it was incompatible with the trade-agreements program. To make it a part of the trade-agreements program would be a mistake.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is it not true that the experience of the Tariff Commission and the State Department is that it is impossible to ascertain from foreign countries the cost of production in those countries?

Mr. COOPER. It is practically impossible. As I have pointed out, during the entire 8-year period when this was the most actively pursued of any time in our history, following the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act in 1922, the Tariff Commission was able to report on only 56 items. It is impractical as far as the negotiation of these trade agreements is concerned. Every American interest is given most careful and thorough consideration. Public hearings are held. Everybody having an interest has the right to appear. The representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the State Department, and the Tariff Commission participate in the negotiation of all of these trade agreements.

If this amendment is adopted, it simply means that from a practical standpoint the negotiation of these trade agreements will be stopped. It is an effective way to kill the program.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the gentleman from Tennessee I am forced to the conclusion that the gentleman just does not understand the amendment that has been offered by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. No reference is made in this amendment to the cost of production abroad. It involves the landed cost of the article. We do not care what an article costs to produce abroad, what we are primarily worried about is what they are selling it for on the open market here in America. I believe that is the intention of the gentleman from Texas. Let me read the amendment again, if I may.

Provided, That no reduction shall be made in the duties of any competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products.

There is no reference whatever to the cost of production of the imported article. What the gentleman from Texas is seeking to prevent is the glutting of our markets following the armistice, the dumping of surplus materials on our markets, perhaps things that the countries abroad really should keep at home but which it is necesary for them to sell here in order to establish dollar credits.

I cannot, for the life of me, see how any American who is concerned with the welfare of the producers here in America can vote against this amendment. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] received a long telegram this morning signed by the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union imploring Congress to add a section to this law guaranteeing the American producer, whether on the farm or in the factory, at least cost of production. Certainly there is nothing unreasonable about that.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand this amendment, it does not even go so far as to put the foreign product on a competitive basis with the selling price of the American product. It merely requires as a basic minimum that the foreign product sales price should not be any lower than the cost of production of the American product, without making any allowance for profit or the rehandling cost on the American product Therefore, this is not a very great step, but merely a minimum step to stabilize the American market.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand, this amendment is one more move on the part of the gentleman from Texas to make sure that when the boys come home from the war our factories will be operating and they will be able to get jobs at living wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot overlook the fact that the consideration of this bill comes at a most trying and important period of this war. Within the past few days our armed forces, in conjunction with the armed forces of the other United Nations, have won an outstanding and historic victory in Tunisia. Each and every one of us is thrilled and filled with pride when we read of the contributions made by our own men and our own youth to that victory. You and I know that they fought for our country, not as Republicans and Democrats but as Americans. That is why I say that this bill comes up for the consideration of the House at a most trying part of the present war.

I think the people of the country are looking to you and me to view the consideration of this bill, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. I think that spirit exists. I noted it in the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I have noted it in the conversations I have had with Members during the past 2 or 3 days. In that spirit, I urge the House, while sitting as the Committee of the Whole, to defeat any future amendments that may be offered to this bill.

I realize there are many who voted for the last amendment who favor the extension of reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation and that their vote was not considered by them to be hostile to the legislation. I realize there are others, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who voted against it in the past, as he frankly said he did, but who are going to vote for it now because we are at war, and I noticed that the gentleman from New York voted for the 2-year extension, and did so with no hostile state of mind. There are others, I assume, who voted for it who are of the same state of mind, with no feeling of hostility to a continuance of the existing law in its present form. While I disagree with them personally on the 2-year extension, I do not interpret their action to indicate that they felt they were voting for an amendment that is hostile to the pending resolution.

We have now come to an amendment that is crippling in its nature, offered by my good friend, whom I respect, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. It carries out his own personal convictions and beliefs, which I respect in disagreement, but it is a crippling amendment just the same.

Recognizing the atmosphere of the world and of our own country at this time, realizing the great objective we have in mind, and knowing also that the people of our own country and the people of other nations are watching this legislation to see what type of amendments will be added, I hope on that deeper element and question involved that the Committee of the Whole will defeat any future amendments that are offered to the resolution. If adopted, this amendment will be crippling in its nature. It will be harmful to the effective operation of the law during the next 2 or 3 years. Other amendments that I know will be offered will be crippling in their nature. The 2-year amendment has now been adopted. Those who voted for it certainly did not think that it was hostile to the very purposes of the bill, but this amendment and other amendments will be hostile.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then I understand the gentleman to contend that in order to make the reciprocal trade policy successful, we should permit dumping on the American market.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I do not want to get into that argument with my friend, because I served with him for 12 years

on the Ways and Means Committee, and whenever I am sitting in a tough spot, there is nobody I would like to have at my side more than I would my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. And I will be there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope this amendment and any other such crippling amendment will be defeated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the reciprocal trade law was to bypass the provisions of the tariff act which required that in fixing tariff duties, the Tariff Commission had to take into consideration the difference in the cost of production between foreign countries and the United States. The reciprocal trade law, as I say, was to bypass that provision of law. Therefore, that particular amendment, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] proposes to restore the cost of production item and establish an American valuation on imports.

A great deal of credit has been claimed for the benefits of the reciprocal trade law during the past 8 years, but those who claim credit for it overlook some of the administration's policies that have run currently with the operation of the reciprocal trade law. I refer in particular to the gold and silver policy of this administration. I also refer to the devaluation of the American dollar. Our dollar was devalued by President Roosevelt down to 59 cents in the early part of 1934, thereby increasing the value of foreign currencies in terms of American dollars. In other words, foreign money, gold, and silver purchased more dollars and those dollars purchased more goods and paid more tariff duties. I recall a former Member of this House, no longer with us, who made at least $15 a head by buying cattle outside the United States because of our depreciated currency.

What is the policy that has been so beneficial so far as foreigners are concerned? Gentlemen will recall that in early 1933 gold was worth $20.67 an ounce. That was the historic price of gold all over the world. Shortly after January 1934, a change was made in our monetary policy by President Roosevelt with reference to gold and silver, and early in 1934, the President devalued our dollar to 59 cents and increased the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce—not for American citizens, but for people living in foreign countries, and said to the foreigners, "You can produce all the gold you want, you can dig it up and send it to the United States, and we will pay you $35 an ounce for it, and not $20.67 an ounce." What happened? The gold came in here from all the foreign countries of the world by boat, by train, and plane, and up to the 1st of January 1942 we had purchased around $17,000,000,000 worth of foreign gold at $35 an ounce. In other words, when you calculate the historic price of $20.67, that had been the price for 50 years, and figure the increase to $35 an ounce, you will see that we made a handsome present to the foreign gold producers in all of the other countries of the world. The gift or premium we paid them amounted to around $6,700,000,000, which was enough to pay the tariff duties on everything they could import into the United States for the next 25 years.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I cannot yield now. I am sorry. In other words, our generous price for foreign gold and silver practically placed us on a free-trade basis, and then some. We have made presents to foreign gold owners of nearly $7,000,000,000. This American gold-price policy raised the world price of all gold to $35 per ounce and increased its total value by $12,000,000,000.

That is a pretty good good-neighbor policy. What happened when those $17,000,000,000 worth of foreign gold came into the United States Treasury under the inflated price? Why, of course, that paid all tariff duties and we made it possible for all of these foreigners—and I am not speaking disparagingly about them, because I do not blame them for taking advantage of our generosity, to secure an abundance of American dollars with which to buy our goods, services, and securities with the money they received for the gold they had sold us for $35 an ounce. Yes, we have paid all tariff duties on everything that has been shipped in under these reciprocal trade agreements by the inflated price that we paid the foreigners for gold. I said a moment ago that the people in the United States did not get the benefit of that. They did not except those who had mines, and could mine and sell new gold, but if you have a $20 gold piece today, you will not get more than $20 in currency if you take it to a bank or to the Treasury. You will not get $35 for it. They would pay you only $20 for it, and then perhaps they would put you in the penitentiary in addition for having possession of it. A $20 gold piece contains nearly an ounce of gold.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is not this true, that as a part of the plan of the purchase of gold from foreign countries, those countries were to use the purchase price they received to buy goods in this country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, but it did not work out that way.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If it had, would not it have been a good thing for this country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, but it did not work that way because after paying the tariff duty on the products coming into the United States, they went into the securities market in New York and they bought securities at low prices, and made additional millions on increases in values of securities.

Now, just let me give you one illustration of how this gold policy worked. Take the case of our enemy, Japan. How did we treat Japan with reference to this gold policy? From the time it went into operation in 1934 and up to the day we went into war with Japan, we purchased around $700,000,000 worth of gold from Japan and we made them a present of over $280,000,000 when we paid the Japs $35 an ounce instead of $20.67 an ounce, which was all it was worth. And what did they do with our generosity? They bought scrap iron and steel, gasoline, copper, motortrucks and airplanes, and all other war materials. Why we built the entire navy for Japan with our unsound monetary policy. Yes; we should shed tears of shame for arming Japan and making her strong.

This gold and silver policy has not been touched on by those who approve the reciprocity trade law. I am satisfied that our monetary policy has done more damage to the economy of our country, is more responsible for the war we are in today than any other thing that could have been done by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the gold imports alone in all probability do account for any benefits claimed for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. One more question: Therefore that factor alone throws out altogether the evidence upon which the proponents of the extension of this act base their contention?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In my opinion, the gentleman is correct in his assumption.

I wish I had the time to discuss our foreign silver purchase program. We purchased more than one and one-half billion ounces of foreign silver at from 35 to 80 cents an ounce. The United States Treasury boosted the world price of silver to a point where it drained off all silver and silver coins from countries like China and India.

To further demonstrate the soundness of my argument that the administration's gold and silver programs are entitled to the benefits claimed for the reciprocal trade policy, I am including hereafter a table prepared by the Federal Reserve Board which gives total net imports of gold from January 1, 1934, to January 1, 1942. In studying the table of imports bear in mind that the President raised the world price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. We are still paying $35 an ounce for foreign gold. Also remember that the gold mines of the United States were closed down last year.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

(April 1943)

Gold movements—United States imports

[In thousands of dollars at approximately $35 a fine ounce]

Year or month	Total net imports	Net imports from or net exports (−) to—													
		United Kingdom	France	Belgium	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland	Canada	Mexico	Colombia	Philippine Islands	Australia	South Africa	Japan	British India	All other countries
1934 [1]	1,131,994	499,870	260,223	8,902	94,248	----------	12,402	86,829	30,270	16,944	12,038	1,029	12	4	76,820	32,304
1935	1,739,019	315,727	934,243	3	227,185	----------	968	95,171	13,667	10,899	15,335	3,498	65	----------	75,268	46,989
1936	1,116,584	174,093	573,671	3,351	71,006	2	7,511	72,648	39,966	11,911	21,513	23,280	8	----------	77,892	39,735
1937	1,585,503	891,531	−13,710	90,259	6,461	6	54,452	111,480	38,482	18,397	25,427	34,713	181	246,464	50,762	29,998
1938	1,973,569	1,208,725	81,125	15,488	163,049	60,146	1,363	76,315	36,472	10,557	27,880	39,162	401	168,740	16,159	[2] 67,975
1939	3,574,151	1,826,403	3,798	165,122	341,618	28,715	86,987	612,949	33,610	23,239	35,636	74,250	22,862	165,605	50,956	[3] 102,404
1940	4,744,472	633,083	241,778	977	63,260	161,489	90,320	2,622,330	29,880	23,999	38,627	103,777	184,756	111,739	49,989	[4] 288,468
1941	982,378	3,779	1	1	----------	1,747	899	412,056	16,791	24,448	42,678	67,492	292,893	9,444	9,665	[5] 100,485
1941:																
January	234,242	37	1	----------	----------	1,746	563	46,876	1,147	3,168	3,185	11,136	142,735	6,085	4,501	6,062
February	108,609	1,218	----------	----------	----------	----------	337	81,529	814	11	2,772	6,738	96	----------	----------	[6] 15,093
March	118,567	817	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	95,619	806	2,232	3,084	6,202	2,783	3,046	----------	2,551
April	171,992	21	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	20,216	1,147	2,934	3,587	4,720	122,261	313	----------	6,793
May	34,830	2	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	16,306	969	2,794	3,284	4,194	3,594	----------	----------	3,589
June	30,712	474	----------	----------	----------	1	----------	17,514	800	7	2,114	4,593	69	----------	131	5,009
July	37,041	542	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	19,224	1,080	2,128	4,970	5,199	88	----------	----------	3,811
August	36,973	79	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	10,842	843	2,230	5,098	6,742	137	----------	1,095	[5] 9,008
September	65,702	280	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	42,562	495	2,488	3,107	2,064	3,694	----------	----------	[6] 11,041
October	40,440	55	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	16,072	1,020	2,107	3,141	6,151	269	----------	2,327	[5] 9,365
November	50,374	121	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	24,917	6,336	2,110	1,830	5,980	40	----------	----------	[6] 9,039
December	52,896	163	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	20,377	1,273	2,236	5,506	3,713	190	----------	711	[6] 18,726

[1] Differs from official customhouse figures in which imports and exports for January 1934 are valued at approximately $20.67 a fine ounce.

[2] Includes $31,830,000 from Argentina.

[3] Includes $28,097,000 from China and Hong Kong, $15,719,000 from Italy, $10,953,000 from Norway, $10,077,000 from Chile, and $37,555,000 from other countries.

[4] Includes $75,087,000 from Portugal, $59,072,000 from Argentina, $43,935,000 from Italy, $33,405,000 from Norway, $30,851,000 from Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, $26,178,000 from Hong Kong, $20,583,000 from Netherlands Indies, $16,310,000 from Yugoslavia, $11,873,000 from Hungary, $10,802,000 from Chile, $10,775,000 from Brazil, $10,416,000 from Spain, $10,247,000 from Peru, and $28,935,000 from other countries.

[5] Includes $44,920,000 from Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, $10,963,000 from Central America, and $44,603,000 from other countries.

[6] Includes imports from Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as follows: February, $11,236,000; August, $3,407,000; September, $5,652,000; October, $5,550,000; November, $5,615,000; December, $13,460,000.

NOTE.—Figures for months subsequent to December 1941 have not been released for publication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. I wonder if the gentleman would yield? I hope no one will ask for more than 5 minutes hereafter, because if they do I shall object. We must get through today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am going to ask at this time for 5 additional minutes, and then we will start the agreement.

Mr. KNUTSON. With the understanding that after the gentleman from Virginia has spoken, we will object to anyone on either side asking for more than 5 minutes, I will not object now.

Mr. COOPER. That is what the gentleman agreed to before.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOTT. Reserving the right to object, I presume that if the gentleman is granted 10 minutes, if he is called upon to yield he will respond reasonably?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield in a reasonable way to a reasonable number of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the last amendment we voted on was comparatively simple. It involved a question of policy. This amendment now before the committee may appear simple, but it is very technical and complex. I want to put every Member of this House on notice now that the adoption of this amendment scuttles this program. Since there will be very few Democrats who will vote for this amendment, the Republicans, if they put it over, will have to assume the responsibility of scuttling this program, because that is what this amendment will do.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I just want to ask the gentleman if an amendment prohibiting bringing foreign articles into this country at a cost less than the Americans can produce them will scuttle the program, does not the gentleman think the program ought to be scuttled?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not, because the gentleman's premise is not correct.

Mr. MOTT. Or does the gentleman believe that foreign products should be brought in and compete on our markets at a cost below our cost of production?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is not the program at all. We have the antidumping laws in the A. A. A. program that are coordinated with this program and have never been repealed. We have an escape clause in this program that if a nation attempts to dump on us, they are shut out and they cease to get the benefit of the most-favored-nation treaty. Take the agreement with the United Kingdom. There were 350 competitive items in that agreement. It takes the Tariff Commission an average of 2 years to study domestic costs. If this amendment had been in the law when that agreement was negotiated, we would have had to investigate 700 years before we could have completed an agreement with the United Kingdom, which has meant so much to our commerce.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the gentleman knows that all of the antidumping laws, countervailing duty laws, and all of those still continue in effect?

Mr. MOTT. They continue in effect, but not one of them has ever been enforced, merely for the reason that produce was brought in here and sold for less than the cost of production, and it takes a great deal more to invoke the Antidumping Act than that.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. This amendment only protects those commodities in which there is an existing surplus. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman is absolutely wrong. This amendment prohibits any competitive product coming in. We might have some manufacturer as a side line making about 5 percent of what we consume of that particular item, and he is losing money on it, but he runs it as a side line because his cost of production is so high. Then he is a competitor for the 95 percent that we want to consume, and it cannot come in under this agreement. I say it would absolutely stop the negotiation of every treaty dealing with manufactured goods, because there would not be time enough left in your lifetime and mine to negotiate just one treaty.

Now, as to agricultural products, to show you how unsound it is, there has been a lot said about cattle. Nothing has

been said that under the quotas from Canada and Mexico the importation was limited to approximately 1 percent of the domestic consumption.

Mr. WEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sorry I do not have time to yield.

There has been much misinformation put out about this program. The Members will not read the hearings, they will not read the report, and only when we get to the point of voting on some amendment will they rush in here and either vote aye or no according to some preconceived idea.

Now as to the farm situation, what does cost of production mean? It cannot mean the lowest cost; oh, no; it is bound to mean the highest cost. It will vary from year to year. We had a terrible freeze this spring and it killed half our apples. It is going to cost about as much to produce the half crop as it would a full crop. Is that the year you are going to take as a cost of production? There are times when the national average for the production of wheat is only 10 bushels to the acre, and there are again years when you produce 20 bushels to the acre, but which year are you going to take to fix cost of production? In 1930 we had the worst drought in the history of the Nation; it was the commencement of our Dust Bowl. It ruined the Atlantic States. We had no hay. In Virginia it did not rain from May until September. Everything dried up. We wanted hay. Where did we go to get it? We went to Canada to get it and then we found that the Hawley-Smoot tariff had taken effect and we had to pay $5 duty on the hay and $10 freight; and the hay instead of costing us $15 cost us $30. At a time when your cost of production is highest because of weather conditions or other factors you cannot control, and your domestic supply is not adequate for your domestic needs, that is when this provision, this unwise scuttling provision, would take effect to the great injury of every consumer in the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. In determining domestic production cost, of course, we would establish a base period just as we have in the case of the income-tax law for corporations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is not in this amendment; there is nothing in this amendment that provides for any base period; nor is there a provision to make allowances for seasonal importations when we have no domestic product of its kind on the market; there is not any amendment to make allowances for weather hazards that all farmers are up against, and there is nothing in here to indicate how you are to find the cost of production.

The Tariff Commission, under the flexible provision of the Tariff Act, has had some experience in trying to determine cost of production of farm products where there was a competitive situation, and they tell me that that is the most difficult thing that they have ever had to deal with. Most farmers do not keep any records; they do not know what their cost of production is. It varies widely from section to section. On a Virginia hillside it costs us about $1.50 to raise a bushel of wheat, but out in Kansas and Nebraska, and out in Oregon and Montana there are times when they can raise wheat and make money on it at 75 cents a bushel. We have never known the time in Virginia when we could make money on wheat at 75 cents a bushel. Throughout Virginia our standard value is dollar wheat, but on the very flat, level land in the West, when they get the rainfall, they can produce 20 bushels to the acre, and with a combine they run over it, cut it, thresh it, and sack it all in one operation. We cannot compete with them. And so, Mr. Chairman, I tell you in all seriousness, the other amendment was bad enough as a policy amendment. I hope and pray my fears are not justified and that my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], may be right, that the other nations will not think we have gone back on our program of cooperation. This second amendment, however, is a dangerous amendment. It is entirely different. This amendment goes right to the heart of this program; it cripples this program, and I am telling you we will have a roll call on this. If you go to the country you have got to go to the country facing the responsibility that when the Manufacturers' Association asks you to continue this program, when the United States Chamber of Commerce asks you to continue this program, when 1,500 economists beg you to continue this program, when all the consumer groups of this country ask you to continue this program, and when those who are interested in a lasting and enduring peace ask you to continue this program, you are going to say to them if you go on record on this roll call for this amendment: "I turned my back upon you. I did not want this program; I was not willing to make a frontal attack on it, but I made a flank attack on it and scuttled it, world without end."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, can we arrive at an agreement on how long we should run on this amendment?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; see if we can reach an agreement.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about running until quarter to 4?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is all right.

Mr. KNUTSON. That will be 35 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue on this amendment and all amendments thereto until 3:45.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean I will be accorded 5 minutes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman can get his name on the list, I hope so.

Mr. GEARHART. With that assurance, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change that agreement to limit time and make it 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the membership of the House return to the real fundamental issue involved in this debate. The United States of America has been operating under the Federal Constitution for more than a century and a half. A part of that Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes and in connection with this power we find the power to impose tariffs on imported commodities.

The power of Congress relating to these two subjects has been recognized and exercised for over 100 years. This is not the first war in which this Nation has participated; in fact the United States has been through five that might be called real armed conflicts.

The people have been able to win these wars without violating these two fundamental principles of taxation and control over the tariff rates to be imposed on imported goods. Wars have to be financed. It is only through a sound economic structure that wars can be financed. I say to you that without a sound market—domestic market if you please—adequate revenue to finance a nation either in war or in peace cannot be obtained. Our domestic market must be made available to agriculture, industry, and to labor, and not surrendered to those who can land competitive products on our shores below the cost of similar goods produced in the United States.

Our people cannot finance global wars, feed the world, and survive without a domestic market upon which to maintain an economic structure from which to obtain revenue.

Does any Member on the floor believe that to protect our market under the formula mentioned and here presented for a vote will cause other nations now associated with us in this war to stop fighting? Is there a Member here who believes that any nation will question the steadfast purpose of this Nation to fight and win this war because the extension of the Trade Agreement Act is extended 2 years instead of 3? Such an argument is preposterous.

Is not this Nation now in the process of training an army of 10,000,000 men to fight on many fronts throughout the world? Our boys are now fighting heroically on the sea, on the land, under the sea, in the air for the liberation of the

nations which you internationalists insist will mistrust us, lose faith in the motives and purposes of the United States, if we dare to deviate from the plan of the New Deal. How much more will be required in wealth, human lives, and other sacrifices from the American people by the foreign nations to satisfy them of our good intentions?

If we want the respect and confidence of the peoples of the world, let us deserve it by indicating some pride in the position of responsibility which we hold under the Federal Constitution, and not use the war to grant more and more power to a bloated bureaucracy to legislate for us in violation of the Constitution. I would remind my colleagues that under a series of tariff acts throughout the past 150 years, there has been developed the United States of America, a nation so strong that it has been called upon to save civilizations of the world. Why believe that it will make this country stronger to destroy the principles which have made it great? I want my country strong enough to stand upon its own feet, do its own legislating, lay down its own policies; thus will it demonstrate that a people's government can function under and within the Constitution adopted by a free people to keep them free. I say that if we wish to shake the morale of our allies, let us keep on repudiating representative principles and yielding to the demand for one-man rule.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Is there anyone in this Chamber who can tell us what it costs to produce a pound of cotton, or how much it costs to produce a pound of beef, or of lard? No one answers. I therefore take it that there is no one who can answer that question.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] who offered this amendment, suggested a while ago that it costs between 5 and 6 cents a pound to produce cotton. All of the producers of cotton in my district would go broke if they undertook to produce cotton at that price. That is about one-fourth of what I think it will cost me to produce cotton that year. Surely there is not a member of this committee who could this afternoon speak with sufficient assurance as to the cost of production of cotton or any other commodity to enable the State Department to know that it was on safe ground in the negotiation of a trade agreement. How could we ever hope to negotiate a legal tariff bill or reciprocal trade agreement if we write a provision of this kind into the law? As a practical matter, this amendment is utterly impossible of operation. As a practical matter it simply means that we cannot proceed another day with the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I gladly yield to my friend and colleague.

Mr. WEST. You quoted me a while ago as saying that we could produce cotton for 5 or 6 cents a pound.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, that is the way I understood you.

Mr. WEST. You are mistaken on that point. I was quoting Mr. William Clayton, the outstanding authority on cotton in the world.

Mr. POAGE. I would not question Mr. Clayton's knowledge of cotton but I do not believe Mr. Clayton, or anyone else can grow cotton for 5 or 6 cents per pound and meet current labor costs.

Mr. WEST. That is what he said before the committee.

Mr. POAGE. Do you think he is right or wrong?

Mr. WEST. I think he is a little off.

Mr. POAGE. So do I. I know that it is fair to say that as a general thing the costs of producing cotton is far greater, but this illustrates how impossible it would be to reach any agreement as to what it costs to produce a pound of cotton. I do not claim to know; I do not think Mr. Clayton knows, and I do not know of anybody else who does know. Cotton is but an example. You would find a like dispute in regard to the cost of every item of trade—manufactured articles as well as agricultural products.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] has another amendment which he will shortly offer relating to the maintenance of parity prices. I will say in all fairness that I think it has great merit. Parity can be definitely determined. That gives us a definite formula which can be figured—a formula which I believe should be recognized by our Government, but this proposition now before us is as I see it, merely a proposal to destroy all kinds of tariff reductions. It can only have the effect of preventing international trade.

There never has been and there never will be international trade in competitive articles unless the imported articles cost less to produce in the countries where they are produced than in the country where they are sold. Of course, there is some importation of articles that are not produced locally in sufficient quantities to meet domestic demands, but such imports are not to that extent competitive. It is fundamentally impossible to import anything on a competitive basis unless it comes from a region of low cost of production into a region of higher cost of production. That is the only incentive for carrying on international trade. You would not have anything to move in channels of international commerce except noncompetitive articles if you prohibited movement from regions of low cost of production to regions of high cost of production, yet only by such movements can we attain the greatest efficiency of labor and therefore the highest standard of living all over the world, including the United States.

The gentleman who spoke a moment ago said that he was for stopping imports of competitive articles that could be more cheaply produced elsewhere. By so doing he would force American labor to work at high cost or uneconomic production. He said he wanted to give our boys an opportunity—an opportunity for what? Wasted work hours and wasted lives? I am sure he would not say it that way, but he would have us continue to devote our energies to the production of those things that cost more man-hours, more human lives in the United States rather than to let us devote our labor where it would be most productive and then buy other articles from those who can produce them cheaper than we can.

That is the fundamental question that is involved in this whole issue—whether we will be required to deliberately waste human labor and be forced to produce everything the Nation uses or whether we will devote our efforts to the most economic or productive channels and maintain the highest standard of living for ourselves and those with whom we trade.

The reciprocal trade-agreements program is good for the buyer as well as the seller, and surely we have learned by this time that we cannot be sellers if we refuse to be buyers. When we buy watches from Switzerland and sell cotton to Switzerland, we permit them to produce something with their labor that they can make more economically than we can, and at the same time we are certainly employing our own human and natural resources more economically than we would be doing if we tried to put the cotton farmer in a watch factory. The standard of living has been raised in both Switzerland and in the United States by such transactions, and yet if this amendment is adopted, we could no longer encourage such trade, as the Swiss watches obviously are competitive with American watches and obviously are produced cheaper in Switzerland than in the United States.

Does New Jersey want to impose a tariff on trade with Texas? There is some competition, and I am sure that articles move both ways that cost less to produce in the State of origin, but both States clearly profit by the exchange. Likewise, the United States can and will profit by an interchange of goods with other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment providing for a cost-of-production safeguard in the negotiation of trade agreements, for reasons which I shall state briefly, but first I want to notice the observation of the gentleman from Texas who just addressed the House. He said nobody knew what the cost of production was and nobody could find out. That, I thought, was a rather amazing statement by a gentleman from a great agricultural State, who ought to be thoroughly familiar with the established methods of ascertaining the cost of production of agricultural commodities.

Everyone knows that we have machinery in the Department of Agriculture through which we can tell exactly what the average cost of production of every agricultural article in the United States is at any time or what the cost of production in any locality is. Let me say further that the State Department and the Agriculture Department and the Labor Department can also furnish you the figures on the cost of production of any foreign agricultural article at any time. I, myself, have received those figures from them and have used them in argument before the Committee for Riciprocity Information.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Cotton, corn, and wheat are the three biggest crops in the United States. Can the gentleman tell me what the cost of production of any one of those crops is?

Mr. MOTT. Naturally, I could not tell the gentleman offhand and of my own knowledge at this particular moment, but the Department of Agriculture, whose business it is to compile and keep this information, can tell him whenever he asks.

Although this amendment does not go to the fundamental objection to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, because that fundamental objection is its unconstitutionality, its un-Americanism, and the utter surrender by the Congress of its constitutional tariff-making powers to the Executive, yet if this amendment is adopted it will at least do what its proponents claim for it. It will prevent foreign nations from sending goods into the United States and selling them on our own market at a price below our own cost of production, and thus bankrupting our own American producers.

The reason it is necessary to adopt an amendment of this kind is that these reciprocal trade-agreement negotiators have been lowering our tariffs to points below the American cost of production year after year in practically every trade agreement they have made. They have already reduced the tariff on most agricultural articles by 50 percent. When you reduce it by 50 percent, in most cases you have reduced it below the cost of production in the United States, and I tell you solemnly that that reduction would have ruined our whole agricultural industry had not the war put a stop to those importations.

I do not know just how hard some States have been hit by this program. Maybe some have not been hit as hard as we have. Maybe some gentlemen have not paid quite as close attention to the results of those agreements upon the industries of their States and communities as I have to the results on mine. I have appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with every agreement that has ever been made because they have all affected adversely the people of my own State.

A while ago in the debate on another amendment I gave an example of just what these trade agreements had done to an important agricultural product of ours. I want to give another. I want to tell you what it did to the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, an industry which supplies more than one-third of the domestic market for lumber in the United States and which in normal times furnishes one-half of the industrial pay roll of a population of 5,000,000 people.

Prior to the negotiation of the trade agreement with Canada and Great Britain, that industry was a reasonably prosperous industry. It did not make a great deal of money but it did survive the depression and it did keep these people at work. The reason for this was that we had a modest tariff on lumber of $4, which, although it did not quite equal the difference in the cost of production between the United States and Canada it did enable us to sell our lumber at a small profit and it did guarantee to us and to the lumber producers of the other States our own American market.

Then came the trade agreement with Canada and Great Britain. At that time in addition to the $4 tariff we had also a quota on the amount of lumber that could be shipped in from Canada and we also had a law which required the marking of foreign lumber with the name of the country of its origin so that an American buyer could tell whether or not he was buying United States lumber.

Then the negotiations came along, and what did the negotiators do? Let me say in the first place that everyone of them is a free trader. Let me say also to my Democratic friends that Democrats do not advocate free trade and that their party has not advocated it for 40 years. The only group of people in the United States who actually believe in free trade are those who are responsible for the negotiating of these so-called reciprocal-trade agreements which are nothing more or less than camouflaged free-trade treaties. And what did they do when they negotiated this agreement? They cut the lumber tariff in half. They abolished the quota. They took off the marking requirement. They ruined our lumber industry, and it did not revive until the war production era came along. During that disastrous intervening period, as a result of this agreement, we were stripped of every protection we ever had. The Canadian lumber took our market and controlled our prices. Canada shipped into the United States three times as much lumber as we shipped into Canada. We were not only deprived of our own domestic market but were denied the British market because of the Empire's preferential tariff rates to its Dominions. The Canadians beat down the price of our own lumber on our own domestic market to a point below the cost of production. Forty-one substantial sawmills in the Pacific Northwest, some of them among the largest in the world, closed down. Ghost towns appeared. Thousands of men were thrown out of employment. And this condition continued as a direct result of that trade agreement until the war production era was innaugurated and the lumber industry was revived solely by the grim necessity of war.

When the war is over the production of lumber for war purposes will cease. What then will happen if now the Trade Agreements Act is extended? The answer is obvious. The Canadian trade agreement will again operate upon us in exactly the same way it did before the war. It will flood our markets with Canadian lumber produced below our cost of production. It will dominate and again take over our market. It will again close our mills, throw our people out of employment, and ruin one of the greatest and most valuable industries of our country. The remedy for preventing a recurrence of this disaster is now in the hands of Congress in its consideration of this bill. Let us take advantage of this opportunity to avail ourselves of that remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and I think it would be well to read it again. I am going to take the liberty of reading it to you:

Provided, That no reduction shall be made in the duties of any competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products.

Nothing could be more fair than that, because it deals first with the question of competitive products. Theoretically, at least, when you sit around a table to negotiate a trade agreement, the fair thing to do, it seems to me, is to say, "We raise this particular thing that we would like to sell and you raise this particular product which you would like to sell to us and which we need." Then you work out an agreement, instead of allowing products that are highly competitive, products raised in many instances by labor that is paid nothing more than peon's wages, to come into this country. This is the way it was supposed to have been done, but it was not done that way.

Just before the war with Japan this situation arose. I saw gradually coming into this country cans of mandarines and satsumas on which they were paying 11 cents a day in canning plants. We were taking three-fourths of a million cases of them in this country and I fought to stop it.

I have investigated researches made a number of years ago and have dug up some of the old reports of the Department of Agriculture which showed that we could raise certain products in Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, and the other Southern States, but in a great number of instances the conclusion reached as to why we did not raise those products was that we could not compete with foreign labor.

There is a shortage of various types of fiber today, sisal, manila, and Jamaica sorrel, and similar things we need for cordage and rope. Every one of those could be raised in the United States. The only reason we do not raise them is that we could not compete with foreign labor, not with the efficiency of foreign labor but with the poor wages of foreign labor.

We talk about trying to help foreign nations. In many instances a reduction in the tariff under the reciprocal trade agreements does not help the neighbor country as a whole, it does not help the labor and the mass of the people in those communities. It helps a few. It becomes more profitable for vegetable growers to move just a few miles across the strait into Cuba and pay cheap labor and ship tomatoes, cucumbers, and eggplants into the United States than to raise those products on the east coast

of Florida when too many concessions are made under the trade agreements. Let us see what happened down there right after the reciprocal trade agreements? Our production decreased, and Cuba's increased, as the table shows, and that under the first few years what do we find? Cuba gained 53 percent in shipment of tomatoes and Florida lost 14 percent. In peppers Cuba gained 358 percent and Florida lost 21 percent and in eggplants Cuba gained 105 percent as against a loss of 40 percent in Florida. That was under the first 2 years of operation under the reciprocal trade agreements. What happened in Florida will happen elsewhere. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas providing cost of production prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed the House on the subject now under consideration, and the accuracy of some of my statements was questioned by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. I said that the reason these trade agreements are not reciprocal is that we did not require from the countries with whom we have made these agreements equal advantages to our commerce in those countries, that we gave to them in our country. The gentleman from Tennessee had this to say at the conclusion of my remarks:

> I just want to say that the fact is that we receive more concessions in one trade agreement than we have ever granted to all the countries of the world.

Mr. Chairman, my statement was based on the testimony of a former member of the United States Tariff Commission, which is to be found on page 510 of the hearings, in which he says:

> In connection with the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements, it was shown that practically every commodity imported from the countries with which negotiations were carried on, and which were subject to tariffs, were included in the general tariff revision program. A total of 1,180 reductions were in effect at the beginning of this year. Fully 63 percent of all dutiable imports were affected by the program, and the average reduction in the rate of duty was about 43 percent, out of a maximum permitted under the act of 50 percent in individual cases.
>
> In contrast it was shown that foreign concessions to the United States were few and far between and nominal in extent, and in most cases merely agreed not to increase discrimination against exports from the United States.

That is the testimony of a former member of the United States Tariff Commission, Dr. Coulter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman know that in the trade agreement with Great Britain alone, we received some 1,400 concessions for our products as compared with 1,180 that the gentleman talks about for all countries?

Mr. KNUTSON. And all of the items that Great Britain gave in to us on have not brought us any commerce to amount to anything.

Mr. COOPER. That is another statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we are operating under the point system, the gentleman from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Perhaps, but I particularly bring this to the attention of the House in order to correct a misconception that might have arisen from the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee yesterday. The truth of the matter is that these trade agreements have not been reciprocal, and we have heard testimony here today from both sides of the aisle on that subject.

What is wrong with this amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]? Why should we not have the cost of production and protection for our products to that extent? Why should we give authority to any official of the United States and permit, by bargaining with foreign nations, the importation into this country of foreign-made articles at less than the American cost of production? That is one way to ruin the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in considering this proposal to extend for another period of 3 years the Executive authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign nations, I am guided by but three considerations—the effect which such an extension might have upon the people whom I represent here in the Congress; the effect which it might have upon our country as a whole as indicated by the record of the administration in this connection during the life of the Trade Agreements Act; and the effect which a failure to grant an extension might have upon our international standing at a time when we are at war. Except in a very, very few instances, I have heard nothing from the people at home in regard to this proposition, which indicates that they either are not familiar with the operation of the act or are too busy with the workaday problems of the war tempo, or perhaps both. At any rate, I must exercise my own judgment in making this decision in the light of the facts and the record as they exist.

Early in the days of the New Deal, at a time when the Nation was in the throes of a great economic depression, the administration came to the Congress and asked for the authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign nations upon the basis of reciprocity, with the argument that to do so would increase our foreign exports and thereby improve our own internal economy. Accordingly in 1934 the first authority was granted by the Congress, strongly dominated by the New Deal Party. Although the original power was granted for a period of but 3 years, it has subsequently been extended on two separate occasions by Congresses which have been subservient to the administration. During that 9-year period a record has been made which can be scrutinized by us in determining our course for the future.

GENUINE RECIPROCITY NEEDED

First, permit me to assure you of my belief in and adherence to the principle of trade reciprocity between nations of the world. For over a generation reciprocity has been one of the basic principles of the Republican Party. The purpose of such a policy has been to open up new markets in the world to the goods of our manufacture or production in return for concessions granted on the products of other nations which we need, and which we ourselves do not produce. Reciprocity is a part of the national policy of protecting American industry and agriculture from foreign competition, as a result of which we have steadily built up our high standard of living and given employment to most of our people.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUNGLING

Criticism with the Trade Agreements Act centers not in the purposes of the act but rather in its faulty administration by persons who have had no practical experience in the business world and who seek to guide the destinies of this country in matters of foreign trade by the lessons which they have learned from the college textbooks. Like so many other of the New Deal agencies and activities which have set out upon a laudable objective but which have met with failure due to inefficiency, lack of experience, high-handed and autocratic methods, bungling and mismanagement, administration of the Trade Agreements Act has proven not exceptional to the general run of New Deal incompetence.

ACT OF DOUBTFUL CONSTITUTIONALITY

Mr. Chairman, there are many, including myself, who doubt the constitutional validity of an act delegating to the Executive the power to negotiate trade agreements which result in an adjustment of tariffs on the importation of foreign goods, without setting forth certain standards and limitations. This, the Trade Agreements Act does not do. The Constitution provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." To my mind, it is not only a violation of our oath of office but also a direct violation of the Constitution itself for the Congress to transfer to the executive department the power to regulate tariffs and I favor some limitation which retains in the Congress some measure of control over these agreements.

It has been suggested that the Congress retain the authority to disapprove any trade agreements by concurrent action of the two Houses, if done within 90 days after announcement of such agreement. Why should any person, even the most ardent adherent to the present system, protest such a provision? Of the 30 agreements now in effect, 26 were required to be ratified by the legislatures of the appropriate foreign governments. It is unthinkable that the American Congress should not have the same power of review or ratification which is exercised by the parliaments of the gov-

ernments with which we are dealing. It is no argument to say that congressional disapproval of an agreement will degenerate into a logrolling or "scratch a back" operation, for it would be only the most flagrant instance where the Congress would disavow an agreement within the comparatively brief period of but 90 days.

STAR-CHAMBER METHODS

Under present practices these agreements are made by the representatives of the governments of the respective countries, and, at least from our side of it, no interested American cititzen or producer is allowed to be heard. There are no open hearings or conferences; everything is done behind closed doors; tariff adjustments are made which affect the livelihood of countless corporations and workers without any opportunity given to them to state their claims. Such practice is a remnant of the Dark Ages, of the star-chamber methods, when the people were doomed to death or destruction without an opportunity of self-defense, but it has no part in the American scheme of things.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION FALLACY

Another point involved in the administration of the act, which has no legislative sanction, is the most-favored-nation clause contained in each agreement by which we agree that if any more favorable concession is made by us to another foreign government, that same concession will be made available to the government which is a party to the contract. Most of the other nations of the world accord to us alone any advantages of trade, but we, in pursuing this provision, grant to all other nations, except those with whom we are at war, all of the advantages we grant to the nation entering into an agreement with us. This, in effect, operates to cause the United States to give away all of its trade advantages to countries which are not granting us any advantages in return, so that when we come to negotiate with them again, we have no margin left with which to trade. Furthermore, many of the countries with whom we have agreements actually discriminate in their trade practices against American commerce, but under this most-favored-nation practice those same countries are benefited by any concession we might grant to another country. If any government policy was ever "screwy" or "cockeyed," this is one.

EFFECT ON OUR WORLD TRADE

Mr. Chairman, it would be well for us to consider the effect which this operation of the trade treaties has had on American foreign trade during the years it has been in existence, to measure the success or failure of the act.

It is only proper for us to inquire whether these agreements have increased our exports, which was the original purpose of the law. Because of the varying monetary standards of the countries of the world, the only fair measuring stick by which world-trade prices and values can be determined, is to use gold as the standard. With this as the yardstick, we find that in 1938, the gold value of exports of all the countries of the world was 40.6 percent of the 1929 level, while the gold value of American exports was 35 percent of that level. That same year, we ranked only fourteenth among the leading nations of the world in point of recovery in gold value of exports. During the period of 1932–39, the dollar value of American agriculture exports declined 9.2 percent and in volume declined 36 percent. According to the United States Treasury Customs Report figures, the dollar value of all our trade, agriculture and manufactured, was as follows:

Year	Exports	General imports
1932	$1,611,016,000	$1,322,774,000
1933	1,674,994,000	1,449,559,000
1934	2,132,800,000	1,655,055,000
1935	2,282,874,000	2,047,485,000
1936	2,455,978,000	2,422,592,000
1937	3,349,167,000	3,088,668,000
1938	3,094,440,000	1,960,428,000
1939	3,177,178,000	2,318,081,000
1940	4,021,564,000	2,625,445,000
1941	3,317,595,000	2,417,307,000

This record certainly does not indicate any measurable degree of success in the effort to improve our relative position with respect to exports and imports.

WHY IMPORT THINGS WE PRODUCE IN ABUNDANCE?

It is only common sense and good practice that a person or a nation should not buy two things when he has need for only one. As a practical illustration, let us consider the farmer who has five cows but has feed enough for and can handle the products of but two, it would be foolish for him to buy more cows. Or, if he has feed enough to take care of all his stock, it would be equally absurd for him to buy more feed. But if he needed more cows and you needed more feed, it would be good business for you to swap him the cows you do not need for the feed which you do need. That is just common sense. But what is the record of the New Deal with regard to the importation of those products of which there is produced a surplus in our own country? The following is a tabulation compiled by one of our colleagues which is illuminating:

Product	Imports (7-year total)	Gain to foreign farmers	Lost to American farmers [1]
Cattle.....number of head	2,568,610	$66,079,238	$99,079,238
Beef, pork, poultry.....pounds	885,993,786	163,974,550	219,974,550
Dairy products.....do	518,067,547	97,760,243	130,313,000
Wool and mohair.....do	1,425,060,292	290,103,938	385,000,000
Hides and skins.....do	1,972,141,987	329,276,751	439,034,751
Barley malt.....do	1,498,553,097	39,820,586	53,093,000
Barley.....bushels	19,430,020	16,855,522	22,470,000
Corn.....do	165,063,882	94,703,172	126,237,882
Oats.....do	20,327,193	6,307,511	8,407,511
Flaxseed.....do	120,343,301	135,293,478	202,293,000
Molasses.....gallons	1,580,046,530	75,043,141	100,057,000
Eggs and poultry products, value		17,610,216	26,410,216
Potatoes and other vegetables, value		129,903,449	173,903,000

[1] Last column shows United States dollar value American farmers would have received for imported products produced on their farms.

United States farm exports declined 9.2 percent 1933–39, and have now practically stopped. Competitive foreign farm imports to the United States increased 30 percent in same period.

The Agricultural Adjustment Agency required American farmers to take 40,000,000 acres a year out of cultivation to produce less. Total reduction, 7 years, 280,000,000 acres. Foreign farmers used over 400,000,000 foreign acres in the first 7 New Deal years to produce competitive farm crops, valued at billions of dollars, which were sold in the United States. The 1938 acreage in the United States for 45 main crops was 342,000,000 acres. New Deal generosity gave foreign farmers our markets for their products for more than 1 year's acreage out of the last 7.

Results of 7 years of New Deal planning: Glutted markets, low prices, and billions of dollars in lost income for domestic producers. American farmers will not be deceived. They now know that the first step for agricultural recovery is to protect our home market from cheap foreign competition and that this promised and necessary protection has not been given by the New Deal.

LIQUOR IMPORTS AND TRADE TREATIES

In this country there are millions of persons who feel that there is something highly spiritual and morally uplifting in the trade-treaty program. They feel that by engaging in trade reciprocity we can assist in improving the welfare of our fellow man whether he lives in Africa, China, or Iceland. This is a highly laudable motive. Those same people and millions more are equally interested in protecting the spiritual and moral welfare of our own people. Countless petitions have been received by me from time to time from persons in my district protesting the use of alcohol by our armed soldiers and even urging that a complete prohibition on the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be enacted.

From time to time, back through the years, the Congress, representing the sentiment of the temperate citizens, has placed a high duty on whisky, rum, gin, brandy, and other liquors, which has kept the flow of these intoxicants from flooding our country. It has taken a long time to build up this protection through high tariff rates but, in the comparatively short life of the trade-agreements program, much of the protection has been broken down. The administration has ignored public opinion in this country by reducing the tariffs on intoxicants, as follows:

Articles	Rate changed	Modified rate
	Per proof gal.	*Per proof gal.*
Whisky of all types	$5	$2.50
Rum:		
Cuban	4	2.50
Other than Cuban	5	2.50
Gin	5	2.50
Brandy	5	2.50
Cordials, etc	5	2.50
Bitters containing spirits	5	2.50
	Per gal.	*Per gal.*
Champagne	$6	$3.00

The average annual importation of liquors during the period 1931 to 1935 was 8,590,000 gallons. This was before the Trade Treaty Act. Since the trade treaties were permitted, the average yearly importation has amounted to 17,907,000 gallons. For the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive, under the New Deal trade treaty programs, a total of 89,537,000 gallons of liquor were imported.

This lowering of the tariffs on intoxicants was done by the Government without any notice to the thousands of civic and spiritual organizations in the country which are interested in maintaining temperance of the American people. What must they think of a government program which inevitably tends to break down the high moral standards which they seek to attain and which must be maintained. It is more imperative than ever that we give serious consideration to the sinister consequences of war which undermine and sap our moral fiber and stamina. War not only kills our men, it also destroys our morals. An immoral nation cannot long survive.

Mr. Chairman, there are other and equally serious phases of the reciprocal trade treaty program as carried out by the present administration which are objectionable and which should be corrected. The place to make those corrections is in the Congress and I propose to support the suggestions of the minority on the Ways and Means Committee, believing that by doing so we will strengthen rather than hamper the trade-treaty operations.

Even though these corrections should not be made by the Congress, I shall feel obliged to support an extension of the present act because of the serious implications which a failure to extend might entail. In time of war, we must maintain the good will and cooperation of as many peoples of the world as we possibly can. This is no time for us to gamble our whole future on the altar of national selfishness. While I believe that America must fulfill its obligation as a great nation of the world in the future peace that is to come, I do not believe that this means we must play the part of godfather to all countries and peoples.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, during the 4 years I have been a Member of the House I have never felt more discouraged than I do this afternoon. I am sure that when the American people realize what we are doing here this afternoon, they, too, will feel discouraged. I think the people of America are expecting us to look at this thing from a broader viewpoint, but instead of doing so one would have to truthfully say that the vision of this House is getting narrower and narrower all the time. God help us if we do not profit by the lessons of the past. God help America if we do not change our viewpoint. I am not a technical expert on tariffs, but it does not take a technical expert to see the very plain, obvious fact that if you adopt this amendment you scuttle and sabotage this whole program. If you adopt this amendment, it is no longer a reciprocal trade-agreements program. It is an America-first program, or, rather, an America-only program. That is, we will be saying to our neighbors that we will trade with you, but that under the rules and regulations we are going to have to get the best of the trade on every item if you do business with us. Is not this a fine attitude for America, the Nation which is to set an example for the rest of the world, to take?

If you did that with your neighbor, how far along would you get? I am afraid we are looking at this great program only from the short-sighted viewpoint of our little selfish interests. Let us remember that we cannot make all the rules and at the same time have somebody else play our game. It has been the history of tariff and trade agreements throughout the ages that, if you adopt a restrictive rule, the other country is going to do exactly the same thing. To protect themselves, the other countries would have to do so. If we say to Brazil, "You cannot send anything here and put it on the market unless it meets our cost of production," then Brazil will say the same thing to us, and we will not ship any automobiles down there. We will not be allowed to send any planes or other commodities which American ingenuity can make more cheaply than any other nation on earth. We would not be able to trade with any nation, because there would be no idea of trade unless one nation could receive an advantage on one product and another on another product.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not have time. So if you want to discontinue all of our foreign trade, just adopt this amendment, and that is exactly what you will do. That is not what the American people want us to do.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped we would look at this thing in this way: Why should we not take a little cotton into the United States from Brazil if by doing that we can sell thousands and thousands of automobiles to Brazil, in which more cotton will be used than we get from Brazil?

Let us import a little lumber if by doing so we can sell products which use lumber and the other things we can produce here. Let us import some corn if by doing so we can give more employment to Americans in our factories, who, because they make good wages will increase their diets and use more of our farm products, including corn. Let us import some minerals if we can then sell electric generators and other American machinery to the countries from which we got the minerals. This, and also the international good will that follows trade, is the idea of the trade-agreement program. This is what Mr. Hull, that great statesman who comes from my native State, has fought for throughout the years. The people want him to carry on. I implore you to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, one of the questions of long-standing controversy in this Nation, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is again before Congress today. As on previous occasions, when its extension has been before Congress, we find those whose industries or businesses have been aided by these trade agreements loud in their praise of these trade treaties, while those whose interests have been injured by the act are joined in protest against permitting its undesirable features to become permanent policy in the United States. Thus, the first law of nature, self-preservation, or the law of survival, if you please, is again operating to influence the votes of Members as they confront this issue.

It is unfortunate that we are compelled to consider the extension of this Executive authority to make trade agreements while we are in the midst of war, since it creates a highly artificial atmosphere in which to consider the operations of the act. The existence of war, furthermore, makes invalid many of the arguments for either the extension or the discontinuance of the act during normal times because, by the very nature of things, very few items are now being imported into this country. Consequently, our international trade during the war must inevitably continue to be controlled by the exigencies of war rather than by the operations of any tariff policy. And the terms by which the war is concluded and the arrangements which are or are not made for our participation in world affairs after the war will have a controlling effect upon our trade policy after peace has been secured and victory won. For that reason, our decisions here today are of less significance than they would be in normal times, because, regardless of what we do, the eventual trade and tariff policies of this country will rest very directly upon the eventual decisions on a much broader front which will be made determining our relationship with other nations after peace has come. Today, we can do little more than indicate principles and policies which we feel should prevail under conditions of normal trade and to give assurance to the other nations of the world that this country is eager and ready to engage in mutually profitable international trade on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Our votes and decisions today, therefore, have much less of a permanent significance than similar votes would have in times of peace. We cannot possibly indicate an approval or disapproval of permanent reciprocal trade agreements in the post-war world until and unless we know what type of post-war world eventuates from this conflict and whether the operation of such trade agreements will prove an acceptable and workable part of the economic exchanges of that time. Conditions at that time will have to govern our decisions concerning wise trade practices of the permanent future; the experiences of the past may help to light the path of

the future in that connection but they cannot guarantee the results to follow since we are all gazing into the crystal ball these days and none can foretell for certain what the pattern of the future will in finality reveal.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think the House acted wisely today in limiting the extension of these agreements to 2 years rather than to the traditional 3-year period which has always been their period of operation in earlier legislation. Two years from now we should be in better position to analyze the future than we are today. Two years from now we all sincerely hope that victory will have been won and that we shall be well along the road to the adoption of a pattern of permanent peace for all the world. Whether this pattern will give additional value to reciprocal trade agreements as they have been administered or provide additional reason for their discontinuance or modification only the unfolding vista of the future can reveal. Thus the limitation of this period of extension to two years will enable many more members to support the extension of this act today than would otherwise have been the case.

By the same token, Mr. Chairman, since we are today dealing with theories and principles more than we are with the realities of trade it might be a good plan to incorporate in the extension of these agreements some of the features which past experience has indicated should have a place in their administration. Should future developments indicate such features are unnecessary or unwise in the post-war world they could in turn be modified but until and unless such time comes we might do well to incorporate these lessons of experience in this legislation as we give it a renewed extension of life.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman WEST, a great and good Democrat from one of the strongest Democratic regions of the Union, is suggesting some of these desirable features this afternoon. This Congress, operating under the mandate of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which reads—

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States—

is today giving deliberation to what should be the governing basis upon which reciprocal trade treaties can best fulfill their objectives. The amendment under consideration proposes that—

> No reduction shall be made in the duties of any competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products.

This amendment does not cripple nor condemn the reciprocal trade-treaty program except when and if it would admit into this country products to be sold, competitively, with domestic products on such a basis as to force prices down to the point where American farmers, laborers, and manufacturers could not secure the cost of production for their products. Obviously, America can neither prosper nor remain solvent if its producers are to be forced to sell for less than it cost them to produce the manufactured article or to raise the foods and fabrics on our farms. This amendment simply would prevent such a sabotaging of American economy by any unwise trade-treaty provisions.

The financial security of this country, Mr. Chairman, is no greater than the collective financial security of its citizens and its producers. We must protect that if we are to avert national bankruptcy. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] seeks to protect that national solvency and individual financial security. It does nothing less nor nothing more. And it does it equally for laboring men, for farmers, and for manufacturers.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] has announced other features which he believes should be incorporated in this legislation as it is now extended for another 2-year term. Some of these appear to have high merit. For example, if the present cost-of-production amendment is defeated by those who believe the interests of American producers, workers, and businessmen can be ignored in the interests of promoting imports of cheap competitive foreign products, he will, I understand, offer an amendment which will specify, "no farm products can be imported under the terms of these treaties to sell in America for less than parity prices as determined by the Department of Agriculture." Unless we are to provide permanent subsidies to the farmers of America, Mr. Chairman, they must receive parity prices for the foodstuffs and fabrics which they produce. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] would assure that fact insofar as possible for tariff policy to do so and it would surely help provide parity levels for farm prices in this country.

Another approach offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] which will be of less importance if either of the foregoing amendments is adopted is an amendment providing that before agreements entered into under the terms of this act become effective Congress shall have the right to approve or reject any items which appear to be of such a nature as to bring disaster and misfortune to any segment of this country's economic activity. Congress would have 90 days under the provisions of that amendment to approve or reject such items in a given treaty. Thus while Congress would not write these trade agreements it would retain the power to protect its constituents against any possible gross inequities or glaring injustices.

Mr. Chairman, none of us in time of war wants to do anything which would in any way make it more difficult for the world to develop a working agreement for maintaining a permanent peace after the war is over. Some of us may therefore vote for the extension of these trade treaties today simply as a gesture of good will to foreign countries realizing that until the war is over any trade and tariff policy is meaningless since it cannot function in a world at war. However, it is likewise true that after the war is over steps must be taken to assure the fact that economic activity in America is not paralyzed or pauperized. Some 10,000,000 men and women in uniform will resume their peacetime pursuits and they will be entitled to good jobs at American wage and salary scales. American farmers will be entitled to a fair price for a full crop and a chance to earn an independence of their own. To absorb these millions back into our normal economic activities it will be necessary to permit producers of raw materials and manufacturers of finished products to operate at a profit and to employ laborers at decent American wage scales. If this is to be done, it will likewise be necessary that steps be taken to protect this country against any possible flood of foreign products at cutthroat prices which could force our own products from the markets as was done after the last war and force large groups in our population to look to public relief and the bread lines for a sustenance.

We must be realists, Mr. Chairman, as well as idealists in these troublous times. A prosperous America can consume and import much more of the world's goods than an America which has reverted to the W. P. A. We should aim at an exchange of trade with foreign nations at American price levels, rather than at world price levels. Let us keep our sights high. A wise tariff policy forms the common denominator for translating American price levels and world price levels into a mutually profitable exchange. An unwise American tariff policy which is too low can isolate us from the rest of the world's trade by reducing our purchasing power just as completely as an unwise American tariff policy which is too high can isolate us from the rest of the world's trade by barring its imports entirely from our shores. Let us seek to attain the wise and workable middle course which gives our domestic producers the protection which they actually need and permits us to enjoy a prosperity which enables us to consume as much as desirable of the world's products. Let us in brief try to lift the world to our levels and ideals rather than trying to force our levels and ideals downward to those of less fortunate areas in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use but a few minutes of the 5 minutes allotted. In listening to the debate, it came to my mind that I received a full page ad from a shoe factory in my district in Carlyle, Ill. They were urging the people of that country to buy bonds. In order to encourage them to buy bonds they set out the names of something like a hundred of the young men who worked in that factory who are now serving in the armed forces. I thought so much of that that I attached this page ad with its stirring sentiments of patriotism, and wrote a strong letter to the O. P. A., asking them not to take all the shoes off of the

essential list and shut out what the little Main Street merchant and the small manufacturers of the country were doing to help to finance this war to a successful conclusion.

While listening to the debate this afternoon, where those have said the cost of production is impossible to determine, it comes to my mind that it is a very easy matter for the people of Clinton County and of Carlyle, Ill., in my district, and in seven or eight other counties in my district where thousands of people are employed in the shoe industry, to determine the cost of production.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. These reciprocal trade-treaty agreements have closed down the shoe factories and put men to walking the streets because of the cheap products which came in from southern Europe. They came in as an unfinished product, all made except tacking on the heel. The heels were tacked on and the shoes were sold cheaper than they could be produced in my district.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman. Under the operation of the reciprocal trade agreement a few years ago in the city from which I come, Salem, Ill., hundreds of men were not able to obtain work in the factory there because the great Czechoslovakian shoe factories were sending in and selling at a price in the retail market that was lower than the cost of production, by paying the higher standards of American living that the American workmen enjoy in this country, which station in life has been built up for him largely by the applications and processes of the American tariff system that is being pushed out of the window and substituted by these reciprocal trade agreements.

I know of hundreds of young men in my town, men who have worked for me, some of the finest young men I know, who are serving in the armed forces on the various battlefields of this country. I am willing to take the responsibility, as has been suggested from one side of this House, of trying to keep from crippling their opportunity when they come home. I would rather scuttle some of the inequity that has been forced upon this country and its people by the reciprocal trade negotiations than to scuttle the opportunities of the boys from the shoe factories in my district who are fighting for the American way of life to be preserved for them when they return.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I assure you I would never impose myself upon the proceedings in this House if I could in conscience remain quiet.

I do believe this afternoon that it is necessary for us to think just a little before we act favorably on this amendment and other amendments that will be offered. We have reached the test now in the House of Representatives as to whether or not we are for the reciprocal trade program. We will have none if amendments like the pending amendment, as well as others that may be proposed, are adopted.

I think the reciprocal trade program has been vastly helpful to the people of the United States. I think it has been helpful not only to us but to those with whom we have traded. It has been a mutual thing. Our people have liked it, or at least a vast majority of them have, and our neighbors with whom we have traded have liked it. They want to see it go on. They do not want to see it crippled. The amendment that is now pending, and others that will be offered, are crippling amendments. I want to see the United States of America today and tomorrow, next month and next year, be willing to be a partner with and in the family of nations. I do not want anything to happen in the House of Representatives of the United States of America that will make the people of the world feel that when this war is over we are coming back to the shores of America, stick our heads in the sand, and not do a man's part in the world's great work. If we send to the world today a bill with this amendment on it and with others that will be proposed, our allies and our enemies are going to think that the United States of America is ready to withdraw from a council of nations.

If this war and its aftermath brings no more assurance to the people of the world than the action of the United States and some other nations after the last war, it will not be a quarter of a century until the prejudices and the hates of this world will again send the young manhood of America and other democracies throughout the earth to another war; and my plea to you today is for the duration, at least for 2 years and much preferably 3, we go along with this program and not be misunderstood, not disappoint the hope of the world. We are not only going to help the democracies of the earth win this war but we are going to do a man's part in trying to keep the peace of the world after this war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WEST) there were—ayes 95, noes 164.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WEST and Mr. DOUGHTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 177.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEST: Before the period of the resolution as amended insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no such foreign-trade agreement shall include provision for reduction in the existing United States tariff duty or import tax on any competitive foreign agricultural product when the average farm price of the comparable domestic product is less than the parity price therefor as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as you can readily see, is for the purpose of prohibiting the reduction of the tariff or the duties on agricultural commodities to where a competing article can be brought into this country and sold for less than parity.

Certainly you want the farmers of this country to have that much of a break. It is very unfortunate indeed that this bill should come up immediately following the negotiation of a trade agreement with Mexico, because the agreement has not been in effect a sufficient time for the people generally from the agricultural sections to realize how damaging it is. During the war, of course, it will not be so injurious. We believe that the war will be over within a few years. Then is when we are really going to feel the impact of these trade agreements. Take the case of tomatoes. In the case of Mexico, the State Department reduced the duty on tomatoes from 3 cents to a cent and a half a pound. It is my understanding that thereupon the Mexican Government imposed an export duty of one and a half cents a pound on those very same tomatoes; so we get no benefit so far as the consumer is concerned. Under the most-favored-nations clause of these treaties, Cuban tomatoes were automatically reduced to 1.2 cents a pound. Cuba gave nothing in return.

The market reacts in this way: If a shipload of tomatoes comes from Cuba to the New York market, regardless of the condition of the market here, that breaks the market, and that is true as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] said a few moments ago with respect to peppers. In justification of the reduction of the tariff on tomatoes in the Mexican agreement the State Department in its analysis of the agreement made the statement that the Florida farmer had averaged for the last 2 years 6 cents a pound for tomatoes. They also made the statement in justification of the reduction of the duty on peppers that the farmers of Florida had received an average for the last 2 years of 10 cents a pound for peppers. They confined it to that one section alone, but my information is that that is not true.

In my section of the country we produce comparable peppers with Florida and other growing sections. Down there last February a year ago they plowed under more than 100,000 bushels of peppers. They could not get 10 cents a pound. They could not get 10 cents a bushel for them. Still they make that statement in the trade agreement in explanation of and justification for doing as I have stated.

What have they done to the sugar boys in this country? Texas formerly produced sugar. Florida produced sugar, as did Louisiana and other States. They put them out of business.

We want to trade—sure we want to trade—but we do not want to sell this

country down the river, as some of these bureaucrats are doing, and when I say that I do not refer to Secretary Hull. I think there is not a finer or truer American in the United States than Secretary Hull. But he is otherwise engaged. He is engaged in negotiations pertaining to the war. He has no time for trade agreements. He has some bureaucrats who handle these negotiations. I am firmly convinced that Secretary Hull does not know what is going on in reference to trade agreements, and would not sanction it if he did.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment and I certainly hope that the Committee will adopt it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. Chairman, on its face the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas is very plausible. That is, it provides that no agricultural products shall be imported into this country at below parity prices.

Mr. Chairman, the reciprocal trade program has done more to aid in maintaining parity prices than any other measure. It has not only helped raise the prices domestically, but it has opened up foreign markets for exporting farm commodities that we must export.

On our export of farm produce to trade-agreement countries note what the figures show. Our exports of farm produce to trade-agreement countries in 1938–39, as compared with 1934–35, increased 49.9 percent, whereas our agricultural exports to non-trade-agreement countries decreased by 26.5 percent.

By negotiating trade agreements we have obtained concessions on 73.5 percent of the agricultural products which we export to those countries with whom we have these agreements. So we opened up markets for our surplus produce. We benefited agriculture thereby.

In reference to the question of parity, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to some facts, not to the substance of things hoped for, and evidently things never seen, as most of this argument is, but concrete facts. You talk about parity. Let us take the last year under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. In 1931 the total farm income was $6,371,000,000—parity 87—notice this, Mr. WEST. In 1932 it had fallen to such a starvation low level that many farmers were sold out of house and home and left to drift. Many of them were so desperate that they committed suicide. They could not sell their farm commodities for cost of production. Parity went down to 65 in 1932. That is what you did for parity under the Smoot-Hawley Act. In 1933 it was 70. In 1934, the first year we inaugurated this reciprocal trade program, parity on farm products went up to 90, and in 1935, under the reciprocal trade program, the first full year of operation, to 108—above parity.

These are the facts according to the record. In 1936 it was 114; in 1937 it was 121; in 1938, a low year, it went down to 95; in 1939 to 93; in 1940 to 98; in 1941 to 122; and in 1942 to 157.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the record condemns, experience condemns, the facts condemn the statement made by the gentleman. How do you expect to sell if you never buy? Consider the increased price that the American farmer receives for his commodities on account of the things we export. Suppose we sold no automobiles, no cotton, no tobacco, and suppose we exported none of our surplus products, then what would become of parity for the farmer? Everybody knows he would be on starvation like he was in the last years of the Smoot-Hawley Act.

The important thing with the farmer is the prices he receives for his crops and not the amount of farm commodities either exported or imported.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to speak on this bill or on any of these amendments, but I feel it is my duty to make a statement. I believe a great many of my friends would appreciate my making a statement in connection with the bill, and particularly the pending amendment.

May I say to the members of the committee that during the past in connection with the operation of these trade treaties in a great many instances they have not operated in the best interests of the farmers of this country. I am one of those who, being deeply interested in agriculture and the farmers of the country, thinks that something should be done about it. However, I want to call your attention at this time to the fact that we are operating in one of the greatest emergencies ever in the history of the country.

Our every effort at this time should be put forth in the winning of this war, and we should be very careful in our every act that we do not do anything that would tend to defeat the winning of the peace.

I want to ask the gentleman who introduced the amendment, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], as well as any other Member who has in mind voting for the amendment, this question: Do you believe that any country will be in position to import into this country agricultural products or any other products 2 years from now? I want to state frankly even if the war should end within 2 years, and I pray that it does, that with millions starving at this time we should not fear any serious quantity of imports of agricultural products.

The only thing that you could do by putting on this amendment, because it will not mean anything in this country for agriculture, for the next 2 years, is to throw into the face of our allies and other countries the idea that as soon as this war is over we are going to go back to our old-time high-tariff policy and that we are going to look after the interests of the United States, regardless of our well-established good-neighbor policy at this time.

Today, under lend-lease, we are sending tons of food to our allies and even at this time we have thousands and thousands of women, children, and men in many of the countries taken over by Hitler that are needing food now and they will be needing food and clothing even after this war comes to an end. I ask you whether or not we will be able to import into this country any products at lower prices than we will be able to demand for our farm products in that there is going to be a demand for more farm products than we are going to be able to produce. The adoption of this amendment would definitely tend to put fear in the hearts of our allies and the people of other countries. The amendment should be voted down. It would interfere with the orderly procedure on the part of this country at this time. The farmers have never received parity in this country, and in a great many instances, especially at this time with the high cost of everything that farmers have to buy, with the conditions of the labor market, the increased cost of labor on the farm, farmers are not getting anything like what they are entitled to, in a great many instances. In the meantime our consumers today are paying an extremely high, fixed price, because of the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed, and I think something should be done about that. We should not adopt this amendment at this time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by our Democratic colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], which prohibits the executive branch of the Government from reducing any tariff or duty on agricultural products coming into this country in competition with the agricultural products of the United States to such an extent as will permit these foreign products to sell in this country below parity prices being received for the same or similar farm products of our country.

The farmers of the Nation and their farm organizations and their friends in and out of the Congress have been fighting for years to secure parity prices for farm commodities produced in our own country. The farmers and their friends have in a large measure achieved this most desirable goal for American farmers.

This amendment forbids the lowering of duties or protection on imported farm commodities to such a point that will enable these farm commodities from Mexico, the West Indies, Central America, South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa to be sold in this country at less than the parity price paid American farmers for their commodities.

We all know the American farmer cannot compete with the prices of farm commodities produced by the peon labor of other countries of the world. Our standard of living is higher, our taxes are higher, the cost of our land is higher, and the cost of producing our farm commodities is higher.

Large sums of money have been paid out by our Government in the way of conservation and other benefits to achieve parity prices. The Congress has voted protective measures for American farmers and American farm workers. We are unwilling to see all of this destroyed by seeing so-called reciprocal trade agreements permit large quantities of these cheaply produced farm products to come into our country and sold at prices that will destroy the parity prices on American produced farm products.

Our first duty is to the American farmers and American workers. We should not permit our country to become the dumping ground for the world.

Mr. PACE and other able Democrats have pointed out the value of this amendment. The administration opposes it. I shall observe with interest to see how many Democrats coming from farming sections will vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to pause for a moment to see what this bill is about. It does not affect any trade agreement that has already been entered into, and I do not know how many score of them there are. This bill relates to a point of time. It states that the period during which the President is authorized to enter into these trade agreements shall be extended for 3 years, and that is all it really does. By the amendment we have limited this to 2 years.

The trade agreements that have already been entered into are like Tennyson's brook, they run on and on and on forever, world without end, until they are stopped under and by reason of something else than this resolution that is before us today. The trade agreements already entered into will be operative right along until terminated by virtue of action wholly outside the provisions of this resolution. For instance, there is an agreement with Argentina, which its consul said recently was a place which furnishes the eyes and ears to Japan. That agreement will run on and on until terminated by future action not now embraced by this bill or resolution. But there ought not to be any more such agreements made, unless they have certain safeguards and provisions written into the trade agreement itself. They ought to provide that foreign importations should not be allowed in such a way as to break down parity prices.

The farmer is entitled to parity and we are paying out of our Treasury huge sums of money to give him parity. Now you propose to enter into new trade agreements which will cause that appropriation from our Treasury to increase and increase, provided you allow him to get parity. It does not cost you consumers at home anything to pay the farmer parity.

I happen to have in my hand a package of corn flakes. I showed you many similar packages last session in talking on this subject. Do you know what the corn in that litle package of corn flakes costs? It costs $134.40 a bushel, but the farmer got only about 80 or 85 cents for it. And the corn oil—a valuable content of corn—was first extracted from the corn in the package. This corn oil would pay probably the entire cost of the packaging. Giving parity to the farmers will not increase that cost one penny, nor raise the cost of living in any appreciable degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, from the Well of the House on many occasions the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has made a very touching plea for help for the farmer, but I notice today when there is an opportunity to vote, his argument runs the other way. The farmers cannot live upon promises, nor can they produce without labor and machinery. We have been told time and again that the foundation of this war to a large extent rests not only upon the men in the factories but upon the men on the farms. The draft has taken hundreds of thousands of workers from the farms. High wages have taken other hundreds of thousands from the farms and into the factories.

There is a wide difference between the price which we must pay and the cost of the things the people want to eat and which the farmers produce, and we are told that within a few days we are to be asked to vote something like $500,000,000, as a starter, for a subsidy to bridge that gap between the cost of production and the sales price. Today the House will grant the crackpots further authority to hamstring the farmers by foreign competition.

Just why should the farmer keep on? The bureaucrats down here have taken the farmers' machinery and shipped it to other countries, as we know. You have cut down the farmer's chance to produce, yet all the time you are asking him to produce more and more, at less cost, and now, in addition, to produce in competition with the cheap labor of foreign countries. And why? Just because the President asks it. Last November the people said they had had enough of New Deal give-away policy. It is all right to go along with the administration when it advocates legislation which will aid the war effort or when it will benefit our country. It is about time we quit being a sucker for the rest of the world. We have been told here in the last 3 or 4 days, in substance, that if we do not like pea soup we are supporting Hitler, and if we do not like bean soup then we are supporting Hirohito. The sum and substance of it is that every time we oppose anything the New Deal bureaucrats want, against whom we have talked on the floor of the House day after day, every time we venture to make what we think is a constructive suggestion, we are told, "Oh, well, you are in favor of the enemies of the country; you do not want to win the war. You are for both Hitler and Hirohito." We are tired of it. We know better. Why not help the farmer now, instead of pushing him farther down in the hole and making it more and more impossible for him to go along and exist and produce? For once, let us think of our own country, our own people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. FULMER] told us, for the immediate situation this amendment means nothing because our problem is to get enough to eat, enough to feed our armies and our allies. We are wondering—and we shall discuss the matter in a national food conference that will commence in my district on the 18th of this month—whether we can produce enough food for 2 or 3 years after the war to prevent terrible distress and maybe revolution in the countries that we hope to relieve from the tyranny of the Axis Powers.

This is not a workable amendment. It is a crippling amendment and the purpose of it is to make this act unworkable, and it will do so. What is parity? You heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] speak on the subject. If this bill goes through the Senate, parity goes up immediately 12 to 14 percent. If John L. Lewis wins his fight and breaks the Little Steel formula and there is a general upsurge in wages and it is reflected in the cost of manufactured articles, then parity moves up again. Parity is a movable figure. There is nothing definite about it. It is a relationship geared to a given relation between farm products and manufactured articles at a given time. Parity may change two or three times during the 6 or 8 or 12 months spent in negotiating the trade agreement. So I say it is unworkable, and the purpose of it, like the other amendment, just defeated, is to keep this program from operating. If you will read the record, you will find the testimony of the Farm Bureau Federation that agriculture has been helped by this program and not hurt. We have heard a lot said about cattle. There was only 1 percent of domestic slaughter, under the quota, that could come in from Canada or Mexico. Last year cattle was 129 percent above parity; in March of this year 147 percent and in April 148 percent, going up all the time. We have a shortage of meat, and yet we hear complaints about how the cattle industry has been hurt. It has not been hurt. The figures we put in the hearings show that ever since the agreements have been in effect, the price of cattle has continued to rise.

In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, much of the criticism of the program was concerned with the effects which concessions have had—or the effects which it is feared that concessions may possibly have in the future—on certain agricultural industries, industries such as the cattle

industry, the dairy industry, and the fresh vegetable industry. These industries have this in common—that they fear the increase in competition of imports and that they have very little interest in export markets. Thus they do not have any hope of obtaining direct compensating benefits from expanded foreign markets for any losses they may sustain in the United States market because of reduced duties.

In the negotiation of the trade agreements, special care has been given to guard such industries against injury. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture have participated in all stages of the negotiations to make certain that they were conducted in consonance with domestic agricultural policies. Where it has been necessary to make concessions on competitive agricultural products, such concessions have been made carefully, not recklessly, and they have been hedged about with safeguarding provisions.

For example, in the Canadian and Mexican agreements the duties on cattle were not reduced the full 50 percent, and the reductions, as I have indicated, were applied to quotas equaling only about 1 percent of the total United States annual slaughter. Quotas on imports of cattle were suspended only for the duration of the wartime emergency. Concessions on the imports of certain of the fresh vegetables from Mexico and Cuba were limited by seasonal restrictions so as to avoid encouraging imports during months of heavy domestic supply from Florida and Texas. More generous concessions on certain of the vegetables were confined to the period of the emergency. The concessions to various countries on cheese were in no case for the full 50 percent. The concession made to Argentina on Italian types of cheese was accompanied by the provision that it may be terminated at the conclusion of the war on 6 months' notice.

It is true that American cattlemen, American cheese makers, and American growers of tomatoes, peppers, eggplant, and cucumbers are primarily interested in the United States market. But the demand for their products in the home market is not a fixed, unchanging quantity. The workers in the factories, in the offices, in the stores, and on the railroads can and do eat more beef, more cheese, and more fresh early vegetables when prosperity is general throughout the country. As the Secretary of Agriculture said at the hearings:

> All farmers—those who produce the main export crops and those who do not—also will stand in need of a strong and stable home market for their products. The way to assure a favorable domestic market for farm products is through full industrial employment at good wages. Thus the provisions of the trade-agreements program, which make for increased exports in industrial goods, are of direct concern to farm people.

Whatever policy is good for the country as a whole reflects benefits upon the various classes of farmers. No class can divorce itself or its interests from the welfare of the country as a whole. Therefore, the cattle and dairy men and the fresh vegetable growers in evaluating the trade-agreements program must not blind themselves to the indirect benefits they receive from an enlarged domestic market by seeing only that foreigners are enjoying some small share in it.

That cattlemen and cheese makers under the trade-agreements program have continued to enjoy the bulk of the home market is shown by the record. In terms of dressed weight equivalents the ratio of imports of live cattle into continental United States to domestic production of beef and veal was about 1.8 percent in 1920, 2.1 percent in 1928, 0.1 percent in 1933, 2.0 percent in 1937, 2.8 percent in 1939, and 2.2 percent in 1940. In the period 1936–40, the ratio of total imports of beef and veal—including the equivalent dressed weight of live cattle and the fresh beef equivalent of canned beef—was only 4 2 percent.

The percentage of domestic consumption of cheese supplied by imports decreased from 13.7 percent in 1929 to 7.3 percent in 1935; in the period 1936–40 it varied from 8.6 percent in 1937 to 4.0 percent in 1940. United States production of cheese of all types increased from 484,000,000 pounds in 1932, to 725,000,000 pounds in 1938; it further increased from 708,000,000 pounds in 1939, to 956,000,000 pounds in 1941, and 1,118,000,000 pounds in 1942. In 1942 and 1943 cheese makers sold their product at ceiling prices far above parity levels.

Other factors of more importance to the cheese makers and the cattlemen than the reductions in duties under the trade agreements were operating in this period. The European war which stopped imports of fancy cheese from such countries as France, Switzerland, Italy, and Netherlands, shut us off from the principal sources of imports. The droughts of 1934–36 resulted in a sharp decline in the number of beef cattle in the United States, resulted in increased prices, and stimulated imports. The tremendous upswing in purchasing power of the American people which has been associated with the defense program and the conduct of the war greatly stimulated the domestic demand for beef and for cheese. The cattle population of the United States increased sharply since 1938. On January 1, 1943, the number of cattle and calves on farms and ranches totaled 78,200,000 head, 13,000,000 more than in 1938 and nearly 4,000,000 more than the previous peak number reached at the beginning of 1934. Cattle prices advanced steadily during 1942 and 1943. Prices received by farmers for cattle this spring have been the highest on record.

No one has the wisdom to foresee or foretell all of the factors which will be of most importance to the cheese makers and the cattlemen after our victory over the Axis. It is a reasonable prophesy, though, that they will be most benefited—just as will the hog growers, the tobacco growers, and the cotton growers by those influences which make for a prosperous United States.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has replied to those who assert that American agriculture has been injured rather than benefited by the trade-agreements program. An exhaustive study of the subject, made by the Bureau, first, failed to disclose any measurable injury to American agriculture chargeable to trade agreements and, second, showed that substantial gains had been made.

This study revealed that during the period 1928–29 to 1933–34—prior to trade agreements—the total acreage equivalent of imports of competitive agricultural products decreased 2,900,000 acres as compared with a decline of 21,000,000 acres for agricultural exports. In the crop year 1937–38, the acreage equivalent of competitive agricultural imports was 531,000 acres less than in 1933–34, while that of agricultural exports was 7,014,000 acres greater than in 1933–34. In the crop year 1938–39, the acreage equivalent of the principal agricultural exports of the United States was 28,375,000 acres, which was nearly four times the acreage equivalent of the principal competitive agricultural imports in that year.

In 1938 and 1939, United States agricultural exports to non-trade-agreement countries averaged 15 percent less than in 1934 and 1935 as compared with an increase of 50 percent in agricultural exports to trade-agreement countries. Concessions have been obtained by the United States on industrial products which accounted for 29 percent of the total value of industrial exports in 1937 and concessions have been obtained on agricultural products which accounted for 48 percent of the total value of United States agricultural exports in that year. On the basis of 1937 data, concessions have been obtained by the United States from agreement countries on 73 percent of their agricultural imports from this country as compared with 48 percent of their nonagricultural imports.

Normally, nearly 50 percent of total United States exports consist of agricultural products. That producers of many major agricultural products are heavily dependent upon export markets is shown by the following data on the share of domestic production normally exported: Wheat, 50 percent; tobacco, 40 percent; dried apricots, 60 percent; cotton, 50 percent; prunes, 50 percent; pears, 20 percent; lard, 40 percent; raisins, 35 percent; and apples, 15 percent.

Farm prices and farm income go up when foreign trade increases and decline when foreign trade declines. Imports do not ruin farmers. The amount of agricultural imports responds, like farmers' income, to the over-all level of business and industrial activity, which, in turn, depends to an important degree on foreign as well as domestic markets. When this level is high there is a good demand for everything, which is the main condition for prosperity in both agriculture and industry. In the decade 1930–39, 1932 was the year with the lowest amount of agricultural imports. It was also the year when the farmers received the lowest prices and the lowest cash farm income exclusive of Government payments; 1937 was the year with the largest agricultural imports, the highest prices received by farmers, and the highest cash farm income exclusive of Government payments. The lesson

is clear that general prosperity is more important to the farmer than the amount of agricultural imports.

It would be little short of disastrous to go back to the old system of embargo tariffs and trade wars. The loss of foreign outlets for surplus agricultural products, which would ensue, would result either in enormous surpluses or drastic restrictions on production of such commodities. Producers of these surplus commodities would shift to the production of other commodities such as dairy products, beef cattle, and fruits and vegetables, producers of which would, in turn, suffer from lower prices. The loss of export trade through embargo tariffs and other trade barriers would curtail industrial production and reduce industrial employment, and American farmers would suffer by reason of the smaller purchasing power of American laborers.

Agriculture, like every other part of our economy will have post-war adjustments to make. Some of these difficulties can be foreseen now but only the future will tell the degree of change necessary. But for the opponents of the trade agreements to argue that this policy threatens disaster to agriculture in the post-war period is nonsense. Rather, there is every reason to believe that a policy which was flexible enough to help us readjust from the depths of our great depression and administered in those trying times with such care that it was a real aid to bettering the position of agriculture and our economy in general, will be of even greater value when peace comes again.

I quote from a letter to Chairman DOUGHTON from the Secretary of State, dated May 10, 1943, indicating the policy to be followed:

> Once more, let me emphasize that the trade-agreements program is not in conflict with, but is complementary to, the domestic farm program. Far from interfering with efforts to secure and maintain parity prices for agricultural products, it is calculated to assist, and in fact has assisted, to that end. It ought to be clear to anyone that a program which helps to reopen and expand export outlets for our great farm surpluses, as the trade-agreements program has done, must enable the growers of the great export crops which are so large a part of our total agricultural production, to obtain a closer approach to parity prices, for a larger amount of output, than would otherwise be possible. At the same time, by creating a better market at home for farm and other products, and in other ways, the program operates to the benefit of other branches of agriculture as well. Moreover, it operates in a manner calculated to reduce, rather than increase, the necessity for governmental regulation of production.
>
> In view of the foregoing, I have no hesitation whatever in stating that your committee's reaffirmation of its intention that the trade-agreements program "shall, as in the past, be administered in such a manner as to promote the progressive improvement of agriculture's position in the American economy" accords fully with my own views in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WEST) there were—ayes 101, noes 143.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WEST and Mr. DOUGHTON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 111, noes 150.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WEST: At the end of the last paragraph before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That hereafter no such foreign-trade agreement shall become effective before the expiration of 90 legislative days after the date of its submission to the Congress, and shall not thereafter become effective if during such 90-day period either branch of the Congress shall have adopted a resolution stating its disapproval of any such agreement, or any item or provision thereof; and *Provided further*, That if such disapproval relates to a particular item or provision of such agreement, such disapproval shall not constitute a disapproval of the remainder of such agreement."

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that vests in either House of Congress the right of veto of any trade agreement, or any item therein, provided they act within 90 days. Certainly it seems to me that the Congress should retain this power, which, in the event they come in with some ridiculous provision in some of the trade agreements that will absolutely wreck the country, we will have some say-so over it.

We do not neecessarily have to kill the entire agreement, because if the majority of the items are good, but one item is bad, then by resolution we can eliminate that bad item and accept the rest of it. It is true that some of he boys in the State Deparment indicated before the Committee on Ways and Means that they did not believe the Congress had enough brains in it to assume that responsibility. How do they negotiate these treaties? You cannot even find out who the negotiating parties are. They work behind closed doors and negotiate in secret. The first information you have is when they are consummated and announced to the public. There certainly is no objection to Congress retaining the power of vetoing these treaties. Take the matter of the oil expropriations that occurred in Mexico. Under this trade agreement executed with Mexico the duty on that oil was reduced to 11½ cents a barrel. At the same time the production cost of oil in this country rose about 50 cents a barrel.

Still they let this oil come in that has cost the Mexican Government nothing, nothing more than a decree to obtain it. American interests have gone down there and wildcatted and developed the oil fields and the government takes it away from them, and then it is sent in here in competition with our oil at 11½ cents duty per barrel. In my congressional district I have seven oil fields. Six of them at this time are closed down for lack of transportation. Of course, they are small independent dealers, and are being put out of business and at the same time under the trade agreements we are importing oil from foreign countries, and they use those facilities to import oil that should come from Texas or other oil-producing States. Congress should retain this power that rightfully belongs to it, should not give away our power of veto on trade agreements or any item in them. I see no objection to retaining that power. If we do not act within the 90-day period the treaties automatically become effective.

It is my information, although it has been disputed by some, that out of the 30 nations that we have negotiated trade agreements with, 26 of them retain that power, and they have to have parliamentary or legislative approval. We are as smart, surely. The Congress of the United States has in it as much brains as any foreign legislative body, and hence we should retain veto power. I ask support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach an agreement as to time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. If that is sufficient to give each of our speakers 5 minutes, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, how many does that include?

Mr. KNUTSON. Six Members have indicated they desire to speak.

Mr. COOPER. That does not include the 5 minutes I have already been recognized for, does it?

The CHAIRMAN. Seven Members were on their feet, not counting the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Thirty minutes is satisfactory, exclusive of the 5 minutes for the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would definitely destroy this program. It would substitute the treaty method for the trade-agreement method. We have tried the treaty method again and again. Failure has been the result. During its whole history the United States, in spite of numerous fruitless attempts, has succeeded in actually completing only three tariff reciprocity treaties, one with Canada, one with Haiti, and one with Cuba, each a special case of a country to which we were closely bound by geographical or political ties. The Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, in section 4, authorized the President to negotiate limited tariff adjustment treaties requiring Senate ratification; and under this legislation Mr. Kasson, as special commissioner, nego-

tiated 12 trade treaties. In spite of the prior congressional approval of the underlying policy and in spite of the strong recommendations of President McKinley and President Theodore Roosevelt, not a single one of these treaties came to a vote in the Senate. On the other hand, the method of Executive agreements, requiring no Senate ratification, advocated at various times by both the Republican and Democratic parties, has been tried and met with outstanding success. It was adopted by Congress in the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 and in section 3 of the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, and under those acts some 27 executive agreements were successfully concluded. Under the present act, we have since 1934 made 31 agreements with 27 countries.

I would like to invite attention to the fact that in 1932 the Collier Tariff Act was passed and was vetoed by President Hoover. The original bill principally related to a proposal that action by the Tariff Commission and the President under the flexible provisions of the tariff act should not become effective until approved by Congress. Now let us see what Mr. Hoover said about that in his veto message. He vetoed the Collier bill in 1932.

> If this bill is to have any practical result by reserving to the Congress incidental or occasional readjustment of the tariff, it simply opens the way for logrolling every time Congress is called upon to consider a report of the Tariff Commission recommending any specific change in rates or schedules.

Mr. Hoover vetoed the bill with that provision in it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite attention to the fact that a somewhat similar provision was in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. It might be interesting to observe what a distinguished Republican Member of the other body, Senator VANDENBERG, had to say. I quote from his speech:

> Would provide that these interim tariff changes shall come back to the ponderous Congress for final action, thus substituting Congress for the President as the flexing agent. But like most substitutes, it is a poor imitation of the real thing. It is sham and delusion. It is politics. The infirmities which now attach to general tariff making would reattach to this perennial submission of the tariff to congressional surgery.

There are some views expressed by very distinguished Members of the minority party. There can be no doubt that the practical effect of the adoption of this amendment would simply destroy this program.

It should also be borne in mind that businessmen in this country making contracts abroad for the sale of their products have to have some reasonable degree of certainty upon which to act. If they are going to have to wait 90 days to see what may result, they would be very much handicapped in their efforts to carry on their normal intercourse of trade with their foreign customers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, to me this is the most important type of amendment we are to consider. This whole business of trade-agreement extension is a symbol, we are told. It has no practical effect at the present time on the war effort or on anything else, but it is a symbol of post-war cooperation. I want this symbol in shape that I can vote for it, for I favor reciprocal trade and international cooperation. I do not want this to be a symbol of the repudiation of the representative system of Government in the post-war period.

This is not tariff making by Congress that is proposed by this amendment. This is the same sort of plan that Congress enacted for governmental reorganization only a few years ago, and every one of the majority party voted for it. It was found out that the Congress could not effectively initiate reorganization measures. It was also found out and determined in 1937 that the American people would not stand for unlimited power of reorganization in the Executive. So what did Congress do? It gave the Executive the power to set up a reorganization plan which went into effect unless the Congress vetoed it. That is the proposition made by this amendment that has just been offered; a 90-day congressional review.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. It had no effect then upon reorganizing the Government?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No. Five reorganization plans went through. Only one of them was contested, Reorganization Plan No. IV, and it was not defeated. What would happen under this amendment would be that the trade agreement would be negotiated and would be in effect automatically after 90 days unless there was something so wrong with the whole thing that the Congress turned it down; if there was some particular defect, it could be eliminated, but the agreement would still stand.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the reorganization act and the provision therein contained. That act required a concurrent resolution and required affirmative action on the part of both Houses of Congress. The pending amendment refers to either branch of the Congress and provides that upon the affirmative action of either the reciprocal trade agreements shall not become effective. Had an amendment similar to that now pending been written in the reorganization act that particular reorganization order that was contested would not have become effective because the House of Representatives voted against it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The principle involved here is the same, although the machinery is slightly different.

Now, let us get straight on this matter of symbols. We are talking a lot about what we want to have go out over the world as to our intentions in this post-war period; remember, this has nothing to do with the war; all of this looks ahead to after the war. I do not want it to go out to the world that the American Congress is a self-confessed failure in passing on trade policies for the post-war period. I do not want Britain to feel that we do not think we are as good as the British Parliament. I do not want Hitler to say that the people's representatives in the oldest constitutional republic are afraid to retain for themselves the power to participate in post-war planning for fear they will abuse that power.

Let us not follow the craven counsel that says that congressional review will wreck the whole program, because Congress is so uniformly and reliably selfish and short-sighted and narrow and corrupt.

Let us tell the world we have confidence in ourselves and in the next Congress; that America will cooperate, and that Congress will participate in building a better world where we can all live and let live, live and help live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think this question of whether or not Congress should review these trade agreements in detail should be examined from the standpoint of the difference between the American Congress and the legislative bodies of some of the other countries with which we have these agreements.

The making of a trade treaty is, as everyone who has given study to the subject knows, an Executive function. A treaty cannot be negotiated by a legislative body. We have ample proof of this in our own past history. If the so-called ratification of these agreements is thrown back into the Congress, this means that the Congress will write, or rewrite, the treaties, which in turn means that you will have no agreements at all.

If we had a parliamentary system of government wherein the Executive was directly responsible to the Legislature, I would approve of legislative ratification of all acts of the Government, as is the case in Britain or in Canada or in Australia or in any other country where the parliamentary system is in effect. There is, however, in our system of government a fundamental difference. We have what is known as the separation of powers. Our Executive is not directly responsible to Congress. That is what the separation of powers means.

I myself would prefer a system of government where you have executive responsibility to the legislature, but since you have not got it, Congress can act irresponsibly and Congress often does act irresponsibly. Look at what would happen in a country having the parliamentary system of government if that government negotiates an agreement and the legislature defeats it. That group in the legislature which defeated the policy of the government must then take over and carry the ball; the problem then becomes their baby; they cannot shift it; they cannot defeat the policy of the administration and then shift the

responsibility and let the country and the world go to the dogs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, as far as I can gather from the debates we are not attacking the matter of foreign trade nor challenging the principle of reciprocity. What we seem to be discussing here is: How can we make world trade work for a peaceful and mutually prosperous world? Mention has been made that our discussion is largely academic because no foreign trade, as such, exists today because of war conditions. It is my hope, therefore, that we can perhaps consider this legislation unemotionally. Surely, since progress is enlightened change, we ought to be able to alter the design somewhat because of 9 years of experience. During those 9 years, I have actually made consignment shipments to the United Kingdom and to the continent of Europe. During those 9 years I have shipped draft-attached sales to Canada and the Caribbean ports. I hope, therefore, that the observations of an American producer who believes in world trade might be of some value. I am moved to do this particularly because, it seems to me, we take no heed at all of the methods, in reciprocal-trade matters, that those with whom we propose to reciprocate employ. I admire their methods because they are forthright, as forthright as Mr. Churchill, in their determination to protect their own fertility and production. We must learn from those with whom we would cooperate—else the principle of mutual benefit becomes a matter of the exploitation of the naive or the ignorant. Take the case of Canada. I have shipped American-produced Bartlett pears to Canada during the life of this treaty. We are a little earlier than Canada and hence, this traffic is desirable. However, this export market rarely lasted for more than a week.

The minute that Canadian-produced pears were ready for the market, Ottawa slaps on, overnight, a prohibitive dump duty.

I admire them for it. They know that it is their own productiveness that, in the end, assures them a place in the world-trade sun. They must have something to trade. I admire the speed with which Ottawa acts, but why is it that Ottawa acts so fast? I believe that it lies in the fact that they have a type of government that falls if they fail in their domestic obligations, especially as it is affected by world trade. I understand that over 25 of the countries we deal with have governments of this sort.

Our executive department is not so aware of the results of either their action or inaction—only during the periods immediately before and after our periodic elections is there evidence of this feeling of responsibility. There is a tendency to rely upon the verdict of statistics rather than face immediate facts and situations. We have a tendency to move our executive bureaucracies into a realm where they are not directly responsible to the productive and industrious people of this country.

And, therefore, I feel we must do one of two things if we are to contribute to a healthy world trade based upon a mutual protection of production everywhere in the world. We must either modify our present foreign-trade policies to make them more responsive to the operative needs of our own producers—as Canada does, or we must change our methods of holding elections so that the Government will be as constantly alert to the daily needs of the people as in the case where governments fall if they fail in this domestic responsibility.

Since I do not think the latter is necessary, I shall favor improving the present nature of these treaties to give the people a direct voice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] is recognized.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is the crucial amendment to the pending resolution to extend the life of the reciprocal trade agreements and upon the adoption or rejection of this amendment should depend the question of whether the Trade Agreements Act should be extended.

The fundamental objection to the Trade Agreements Act is now and it always has been that it has taken the tariff-making power away from the Congress in violation of the Constitution and vested it exclusively in the Executive; that it has violated the Constitution in respect to the right of Congress, or at least to the right of one House thereof, to ratify treaties. The objection is fundamentally the same whether we consider these trade agreements merely as executive agreements or as treaties. If we consider them as Executive agreements under which tariffs are made, they are violative of the Constitution, because the Constitution vests the tariff-making power of this Government exclusively in the Congress. If we consider them as treaties, then they are likewise unconstitutional because the Constitution provides that no treaty shall be operative unless it is ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

In asking for the adoption of this amendment, and I may say at this point that if the amendment is adopted I shall support the extension of the act, let me say that the only thing the American Congress and the American people are asking for is the same right that is now exercised by the congresses or the parliaments of every other nation in the world, except three, in connection with these same reciprocal trade agreements. We have executed trade agreements with some 30 foreign nations. With the exception of Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, and Belgium, every one of these reciprocal trade agreements has always been and now is subject to the legislative action of the congress or the parliament of those countries, and not a single one of them has ever been put into effect without the ratification or approval of the legislative branches of those governments.

In 12 of the countries the agreements are put into effect provisionally, subject to subsequent foreign legislative action. In 14 countries, nearly all of which have a form of government based upon our own Constitution and a congress whose powers and duties are separated from those of the executive, as ours are, the agreements do not become effective and have no validity whatever until after foreign legislative action is taken.

Only in the United States, under this unconstitutional Trade Agreements Act, can a reciprocal trade agreement be put into effect without any reference to or approval by the legislative branch of the Government.

I would like to inquire of those who contend that trade agreements cannot be approved or trade treaties ratified by the Congress of the United States, why it is that all of these 27 other countries of the world with which we have made agreements, have been able to ratify or approve them through action of their legislative bodies? Do they contend that the Congress of the United States is less competent to pass upon the merit of a trade agreement than the Congress of Argentina or Brazil or Mexico? Or is it simply that, in accordance with the New Deal philosophy of government, they persist in denying to Congress the right to have anything to do with it? I think anyone who contends that the American Congress is not capable properly of reviewing an executive agreement and of accepting or rejecting it in accordance with its judgment, puts the American Congress in a position of dignity and responsibility below that of every other congress or parliament in the world, and I do not see how any Member of the American Congress can advance that proposition and still be consistent with his own respect and regard for the legislative branch of his own government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak only briefly on this matter.

Earlier in the afternoon when I made my remarks in opposition to the second amendment offered, I interpreted or undertook to interpret, the minds of many of the Members who voted for the 2-year limitation. I urged at that time the defeat of other amendments to be offered as they would be crippling amendments to the existing law. This particular amendment is one of the two amendments I had in mind that if adopted would be crippling.

If this amendment is adopted it would have a very harmful effect upon the reciprocal trade-agreement legislation during the period of its extension. With all due respect to my friends who are supporting it, this amendment would be crippling in its effect.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] very frankly said, and I admire him for it, that this is the most crucial amendment of any that has been offered. The gentleman has fairly stated the issue and to those who do not want

to put crippling amendments on to this resolution I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman mention any instance in any of the 27 countries where the authority of review by their legislative parliaments or congress has crippled or stopped the agreement of that country?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman realizes the distinction between a parliamentary form of government and a constitutional form of government.

Mr. MOTT. I am speaking particularly of those forms of government like our own where the executive and legislative branches are separate, as, for example, most of the countries of South America. They are not parliament forms of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Oregon certainly is not going to advance the argument in this House that the legislative bodies of South America are the same as the legislative body of the United States, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MOTT. Insofar as separation of powers is concerned, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman realizes there must be of necessity stronger government down there. I used guarded language so there would be no misunderstanding. In South America of necessity the President for all practical purposes constitutes the various branches of the existing government. I am sure the gentleman is not going to let his remarks remain in the RECORD that he places those legislative bodies on the same plane as the Congress of the United States, insofar as actual separation of powers are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts, said that this is a crucial amendment. He added that if the amendment were adopted he could vote for the bill. My distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], said he would like to put this bill in shape so that he could vote for it through the adoption of this amendment. Both gentlemen are absolutely right. If we adopt this amendment any Member of this House who has from the start opposed this program and who is at heart still against it can vote for this bill with perfect assurances nothing will ever be done. This is the kind of an amendment that Mr. Spangler had in mind when he appealed to the Republican membership of this body not to take the Republican Party out on a limb. This amendment of all the amendments that have been offered will come nearer killing the whole program than anything that has yet been proposed.

In the past we have negotiated an average of about five reciprocal trade agreements, per year.

After this war is over and we have liberated, as I hope we will, some of the smaller nations, there will be about 150 potential trading nations we ought to trade with. They will need our supplies, and we will need to expand our markets to maintain a national income that will support the debt that we will have by the time the war is over.

What is this amendment asking us to do? Ninety days on each trade agreement. Who can say how long it will take us to act on each trade agreement, with all the logrolling within and pressure groups from without? We would never be free from tariff, tariff, tariff, from the time we got here in January until we adjourned. It would be a physical impossibility to put even one trade agreement through, much less establish international trade with the trading nations of the world.

So I say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that they are absolutely right. If we just adopt this amendment, oh, yes, they can go along then because everything will be sewed up so tight that the most rabid protectionist in their districts could not complain that they had voted for a program of international trade.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Under the law of Brazil when a trade agreement is negotiated it must be submitted to the Congress and they have 10 months in which to ratify or to reject it. I ask the gentleman if that interferes with Brazil in negotiating its agreements?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Most of the foreign countries put their agreements into effect immediately. Some of them have to be ratified and some of them do not have to be ratified, but as has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, we are the only nation that operates under our kind of a constitutional representative democracy. For instance, in Great Britain, if the Parliament refuses to ratify an agreement approved by the Premier and the Cabinet, the Premier must resign, the Government falls, and an election would have to be held. That is not the case here. Under our laws, everybody knows that the President of the United States does not resign if we turn down some measure that he recommends. So I say to you if you want the Congress on record as killing this program, vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOTT) there were—ayes 110, nays 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 111, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment, which I expect to offer to House Joint Resolution 111, be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Page 1, line 8, before the period, insert the following: "or for such shorter time as the House of Representatives and the Senate by concurrent resolution may designate."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests: First that I may extend the remarks I made on the trade-agreements bill and insert a table; and second, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of other business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain tables and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that his excellency, the President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, will be received by the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 12:30 o'clock, and will address the House of Representatives at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time tomorrow, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow the consideration of House Joint Resolution 111 will be continued. Following that an authorization bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs will be brought up.

On Friday there will be considered a supplemental appropriation bill in connection with overtime pay.

That is the program for the remainder of the week. Whether or not it will take us over to Saturday I do not know, but that is the program through Friday.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman propose to bring in a rule on the bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs at the conclusion of the consideration of the pending joint resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I understand there is not much opposition to it.

Mr. FISH. No; there is not.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some documentary evidence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPEAL OF RENEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS ACT

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill for the repeal of the Renegotiation of War Contracts Act.

Within the past several months I have received numerous complaints from small industries to the effect that the law providing for the renegotiation of war contracts is in its enforcement causing a serious impediment to our war effort, with little or no financial saving to the Government. I wish to quote from some of those letters. Here is the first one:

It is true that as long as we are doing such an abnormal volume of business, running 24 hours a day, we show a generous profit before taxes; in fact we expect to have to take refuge in the limitation feature of a maximum 80 percent. But when the Government is going to take 80 percent of our profits before taxes, we can see no reason why our company should be subjected to the burdensome process of renegotiation. What is taken away in renegotiation will be largely a reduction in income tax going to the Treasury.

* * * In meeting the procedures set up by Washington, and which we believe were laid out for such concerns as General Motors, Chrysler, Douglas Aircraft, Curtiss-Wright, etc., they demand from us information that is not available from our books as set up. Every person on our office staff is literally buried with work trying to keep up with the expanded volume indicated above. We haven't room in our offices to put on any more additional help. Our president's private office, only 11 feet by 20 feet in size, has had to have four additional desks besides his installed in it with a girl at each desk. Not enough of our paper profits is being left us after paying taxes to enable us to contemplate building additional office space. What we have been able to hang onto has been used for additional factory space and machinery to increase production.

The result is that our top executives—president, vice president, and treasurer—are having to spend weeks of time which should be devoted to production activities compiling figures demanded by the renegotiation board. All three of these top executives are past 60 years of age and the mental and physical strain of meeting the demands of the War Production Board has been terrific and has almost had us licked. We have ignored doctors' orders regarding our health in order that we might have a clean conscience through having done our part. But patriotism and the desire to do our part in helping to win the war have spurred us on in the face of labor difficulties, priority regulations, etc. This renegotiation, on top of all the rest, is just about the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Let me quote from another small manufacturer the following:

We have been asked to separate our orders into various classifications for two purposes apparently. One, to determine which paid items or what volume is considered renegotiable and which is not renegotiable, in such a manner not only as to determine that but to prove to examiners that we have not left out any renegotiable items. This means we cannot just go through and list the renegotiable items which is a terrible burden in itself, but we must list and classify all orders and contracts. In the year 1942 our little company entered 12,837 orders. And it is a pretty big order to attempt to classify these. In the early part of 1942 we must look up to see when each one was paid for, because if it was paid for after April 28, 1942, it is renegotiable, but if paid for prior to that date, it is not subject to renegotiation. Then we are asked to separate out all business for defense plant corporations, because at the moment if they are not renegotiable, they might be at a later date, and they want the figures on that. Then they have asked us to separate out other agencies, such as schools, not subject to renegotiation, and then separate some foreign business not included in the lease-lend, and then commercial, and, of course, on this commercial business it goes without saying that many of those listed are subject to various interpretations and arguments.

What are excess profits? According to the renegotiation laws these are profits which are found to be excessive. Now, what kind of taxes is it that is drawn so loosely as that? No two examiners would likely have the same interpretation as to what excessive profits are. We have excess profits to be figured on the examiner, and any expert accountant can determine what they are, but the uncertainty of what a friendly or unfriendly examiner might determine to be excess profits on this renegotiable business is certainly just another one of those uncertainties hanging over our head.

And let me give you another from a small firm which has built up a sound substantial business in the course of 20 years:

Here is the way it works out: Our base income before excess-profits tax applies is $428,000. This amount is, of course, subject to normal tax of 40 percent, which leaves $256,800, which is not sufficient to continue to pay the $1.27 per share dividend. Now, if we should be fortunate enough to earn more than $428,000, we know first of all that even without renegotiation, 90 percent of the excess would be taken from us through excess-profits taxes. Last year we earned about $500,000 in addition to the $428,000 before income tax and before renegotiation. Now, had there been no renegotiation, we would have been allowed to retain $50,000 out of the $500,000, because 90 percent of it would be taken from us as excess-profits taxes. However, the renegotiators got the first crack at us and took $250,000 away, and then the rest was subject to 90-percent excess-profits tax. Now, the point is the Government would have recovered 90 percent of that $250,000 which was taken from us by renegotiation, anyway, and so the sum total of all the expense to the Government of the renegotiation agency, plus the added expense to our company of preparing all the data for submission to the renegotiation agency, resulted in only $25,000 recovery from our company to the Government.

A study of our particular case will reveal that it really meant but little to our company as to which agency of the Government, namely the Renegotiation Agency or the Internal Revenue Tax Division, recovered all this money from us because it only meant the difference between 100 percent by the Renegotiation Agency or 90 percent recovery by the Internal Revenue Tax Division. Irrespective of which division takes the money from us, we now face the fact that no matter how hard we work nor how much money we earn for the company before tax, there will not be enough left after taxes and renegotiation to continue to pay past average dividends to our stockholders and still have enough left to reinvest in the business so as to keep it a progressive, sound business which it has been for many years past.

Now follows a complaint from another machine tool industry in Detroit:

Renegotiation, as authorized by the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriations Act, is drastically interfering with war production—as of today, it is probably interfering more than any other single thing. This is a broad accusation and endless evidence can be presented in support of it, but we aren't going to bother you with data already at your disposal. Just give serious consideration to the following plain but very logical explanation:

Renegotiation is receiving the undivided attention of the administrative leaders and best brains in industry. These men know they will be treated fairly but they must prepare, present, and argue their case to protect their interests. Many are finding that not only their livelihood but the retention of their possessions is dependent upon the effectiveness of the case they present. Is it any wonder that the best brains are devoted exclusively to renegotiation instead of war production? Action stemming from natural instinct will not be denied.

Should prosecution of the war be delayed when the impairment can be remedied? It is questionable whether Congress intended the broad inclusion which supplementary Executive orders have expressed in their interpretation.

I could go on but will conclude with this narration of the destructive influence of the Price Adjustment Board's:

Moreover, the renegotiation law requires the building up of a large force of Government employees to administer it, and the spending of countless days and weeks on the part of the officers, employees, accountants, and attorneys of the many corporations en-

gaged in war work, to say nothing of the cost to both the Government and the corporations. This tremendous expenditure of effort should be directed toward the winning of the war rather than wasted in the useless and demoralizing work of renegotiation, which can have no other effect than to annoy and embarrass industry and to retard the war effort. "No limitation on profits is required other than that provided in the tax law itself. It must be obvious that under our present tax laws, with an income tax of 40 percent and an excess profits tax of 90 percent, the business corporations of the country will emerge from the present war in a greatly weakened, and in many cases dangerously impaired, financial condition. Their profits after taxes are not excessive, but quite the reverse, and their greatly increased inventories and accounts receivable, and the cost of post-war rehabilitation and reconversion of plants to peacetime operations are matters of grave potential danger.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think this is a good time to bring that subject before the Congress, whether it is in the form the gentleman has introduced it or otherwise, because the renegotiation situation is bringing out certain evident mistakes that are being made by those who are doing this job.

For example, I know of a certain very large industry in the general area of the country where I live that voluntarily reduced its contract with the Government by nearly a quarter of a billion dollars, that is, it reduced the price of the articles it was providing, which happened to be airplanes. By virtue of excellent management this company reduced the number of man-hours in the construction of an airplane by nearly 60 percent. I do not want to give the exact figures publicly, although I could do so. After they had done all that voluntarily, the renegotiation committee here insisted that they lower the price still further, although the price at which they are now furnishing these articles is lower than that at which comparable articles are furnished by other companies. The net result is that they are not allowed to retain sufficient current assets to meet a pay roll for longer than a week in the event the war ended and the business was shut off. In fact, they would have to blow the whistle and fire everybody out of the plant if that happened, because they would not have money enough to go along.

I believe we must allow these industries some fund to be set aside not for dividend purposes but for purposes of deflating them after the war is over. I am speaking particularly of those industries that have been blown up tremendously for war purposes. It is not fair to the communities in which they are located, it is not fair to the employees, and it is not fair to the concerns themselves that they are not given some fund with which to deflate in the same may they have already been inflated.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I believe he is citing an incident, perhaps an emphasized one, but of the kind that may be found all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942 was intended to accomplish a very wholesome objective. This objective was to prevent unconscionable profiteering on war contracts by providing for the renegotiation of that class of contracts. It must be borne in mind that at that time we did not have the 90-percent excess-profits tax.

No one will disagree with the original purpose of this legislation. In all cases where the contractor is making exorbitant profits on war materials, either because fraudulent advantage is taken of the Government, or through inadvertence, or through inefficiency or negligence of administrative officials there should be machinery to correct the wrong and prevent undue Government loss.

However, as is the case with much other wholesome and efficient legislation, maladministration by officials of the executive branch of the Government has created a far more vicious evil than that which is sought to be corrected. This seems to be the situation with reference to the renegotiation of contracts legislation and its application by the Price Adjustment Boards of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. Subsequent enactment of the 90 percent excess-profits tax law has accentuated this situation because through it we can attain the objectives of the Renegotiation of War Contracts statute in the constitutional American way.

While the term "excess profits" has a different connotation in the tax law, or should have at least, than the term "excessive profits" in the renegotiation law, the failure to recognize this distinction by the Price Adjustment Boards is one of the evils of their administration of the law. The act provides in subsection (c):

> The Secretary of each department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized from any contract with such department or from any subcontract thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I call attention to the fact that a large corporation with a very large capital and a history of large earnings might pay 50-percent excess-profits tax on exactly the same total that one of the other concerns that has purposely been blown up for war purposes would have to pay 80 percent on at the present time. It is unfair to the company that is doing the same business and taking all of the liabilities but does not have the past history of earnings that it should have to pay a higher portion of its profits in taxes than the company which has such a record.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, and I expect to refer to that just a little later.

It must be obvious that the excessive profits here referred to are marginal profits, that is to say, that articles are priced too high to the Government. In other words it must amount to actual or constructive gouging. It certainly could not be construed as meaning that an industry running 24 hours a day would not be entitled to make two to three times its normal and legitimate income from this increased volume of business. This is the excess profit contemplated by the excess-profits tax. Although this excess profit is considered honest and legitimate, the tax law says that being a profit flowing from the war, it shall not be retained but nearly all of it recovered by the Government through the excess-profits tax.

However, in seeking renegotiation the price adjustment boards do not confine themselves to those contracts from which in the "opinion of the Secretary of the Department excessive profits have been or will be realized" but it is apparent that these boards are renegotiating practically all contracts. Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal tells us that out of contracts amounting to thirty-five billions the sum of twenty-nine billions are in various stages of renegotiation, and one-half billion have been told that their profits are not excessive and will not need renegotiation. It is perhaps fair to assume that this is an average ratio.

Now if this is true, it casts a very, very serious reflection on the efficiency of the procurement officers of the Navy Department. It constitutes an admission that on 98 3/10 percent of their procurement they failed to buy at decent prices. Of course, this is not the fact. Our Navy Procurement is not so inefficient. The renegotiation of practically all contracts must be laid to the fact that the boards are collecting the excess-profits tax which is the function of the Treasury, instead of the excessive profits from gouging, which is their only jurisdiction. We are not informed whether the 1 7/10 percent which they say did not need renegotiation constituted losses or what part of them constituted losses and were for that reason of course not renegotiable.

The claimed recoveries, recaptures, and savings from renegotiation by the War and Navy Price Adjustment Boards are equally without foundation in fact. They are at least 90 percent untrue and misleading.

Under Secretary of War Patterson claims that within the first year of the operation of the act the War P. A. B. recaptured five hundred and sixty millions of cash refunds and $967,000,000 in price reductions. Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal claims to have recaptured nearly $1,000,000,000. This makes approximately two and a half billions of dollars. But they do not say that if the 90-percent excess-profits tax were to be applied to that two and a half billions, then two and a fourth billions of this amount would have come into the United States Treasury at all events without the necessity of having built up two or three more bureaucracies and without this terrific interference with our war production. This reduces their recoveries to only two hundred and fifty millions.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. Would not a great deal of trouble have been eliminated if they had a system of competitive bidding?

Mr. JONKMAN. Oh, there is competitive bidding.

Mr. ROLPH. It seems to me it must be lax, if there is this large sum of money that they can recover.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is, of course, a matter for the departments to explain. I am merely stating what appears to be the facts.

Mr. ROLPH. I compliment the gentleman on bringing this subject before the country. I have received a good many complaints from my district about these renegotiations that are taking place. A good many business houses do not know where they stand. I think some method should be worked out whereby business could go on smoothly without these problems of renegotiations coming along.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman favor a repeal of the renegotiation law?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman realizes that in the haste to get ourselves ready for war it was absolutely impossible to have competitive bids, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]. It was absolutely necessary that we do this by renegotiation of contracts, or in any way we could in order to get production. It is impossible to have competitive bids on this huge war program.

Mr. JONKMAN. But assuming that that is necessary, still if they have a reserve protection of 90 percent on excess profits, which include excessive profits although the converse is not true, they should still be able to work out a reasonable process.

But what becomes of this two hundred and fifty millions? In the first place, the question may be asked, Did they really save the taxpayer two hundred and fifty millions? However, assuming that they did, does it go into the United States Treasury? And what becomes of the two-and-a-fourth billions that the boards have recovered from the contractors? Do they go into the United States Treasury as a saving to the taxpayers? Not by a jugful. If I understand the process correctly, cash refunds are turned into the United States Treasury, but price reductions inure to the particular department and increase its appropriations by whatever they collect. This enables the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to by-pass Congress in securing appropriations. And they do this by robbing the United States Treasury and so fill their own bureaucratic pork barrels. In this connection it may become very pertinent to ask what becomes of these "pork barrel" funds. Where do they go? How is Congress to control their expenditure? What accounting system have we of where they come from and where they go?

Mr. PATMAN. And in the event that the gentleman should succeed in getting this renegotiation contract law repealed and a Ruml law should pass, or something similar to that, these war contracts would be in pretty good shape, having made such enormous profits in 1942, and through these renegotiations they got it back.

Mr. JONKMAN. I say they would not, under the 90-percent excess-profits tax and, of course, the Ruml plan does not apply to corporations.

With considerably over a hundred billion dollars worth of contracts to renegotiate, and I understand price reduction receives first consideration, it does not take a great deal of imagination to deduct that these three departments can themselves appropriate billions of dollars to themselves for such use as they see fit, without act of Congress and to the confusion of the Treasury Department, which would be entitled to these moneys as excess-profit taxes.

This would seem to be bureaucracy brought to perfection. It proves how bureaucracies, once having fastened themselves on the public, cling and find ways to feed themselves, for these boards are only in embryo, but with the billions under their absolute control the number of their personnel will soon be legion. And all this on work that the Treasury Department, and, if necessary, with the help of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, would be well equipped to handle.

In the lease-lend hearings the Army heads claimed that there was no tabulation of values of lease-lend in reverse because the necessary men could not be spared from the war effort for this work. The same principle, it seems to me, should be applied to P. A. B. for a stronger reason. Instead of the Maritime Commission, the Army and the Navy worse than wasting their time by slowing up production in industry, they should spend this time in an additional effort to win the war. This would enable war industry to also do a whole lot better job.

Another weakness in renegotiating is that the Price Adjustment Board has no fixed standard rule or law in determining what is a reasonable profit and what is an excessive profit, nor are they bound by any such law or rule. This is governed entirely by the whim and caprice of the individual Board or even the individual examiners and adjusters.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is not leaving the impression that there is any graft or corruption anywhere?

Mr. JONKMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. PATMAN. And does not the gentleman think it remarkable that an administration should spend tens of billions of dollars and not one person has ever been charged with graft?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am not discussing that question. I do think, however, that Congress, as I shall show, should have the control of these billions of dollars that are recovered.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that that is exactly the reason for the renegotiation contract law? It is because we do not have sufficient experience to determine the amount of profit that one should have, and, lacking in that experience and having no experience to draw on at all, is it not reasonable that we should go ahead and get production even if they make excessive profits, and have those excessive profits turned back into the Treasury?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not think that is the reason. The reason is that you cannot formulate such a rule as to what margin of profit a manufacturer should receive, as I shall show, without falling back into the vicious cost-plus percentage profits that we had during the World War, and started in with on this war?

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I would like to make an observation on the comment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. As I understand it, the original idea of these contracts was that they did not know the cost, not the question of profit. They entered into arrangements with a good many of these concerns, because neither the contractor nor the Government knew the cost of things. It was not a question of profit.

Mr. JONKMAN. Exactly. And as I said before at the time this renegotiation law was passed we did not have the 90-percent excess-profits tax. But now let us take a contract for $10,000,000 on which the profit is $2,000,000. That is a profit of 25 percent which I think is clearly excessive. But applying the 90-percent excess-profits tax will cut this down to $200,000, or 2½ percent. Certainly no one will claim that this is excessive profit.

Supposing that in cases of great carelessness or lack of information by procurement officials the profit was five million which would be a 100-percent profit. I have too great a respect for our procurement officials to think that it would occur even once. But supposing it did. The excess-profits tax would cut that right down to $500,000, or 6¼ percent, and therefore I claim that the excess-profits tax accomplishes everything that the renegotiation law sought to accomplish.

I want to be perfectly fair and mention that there is an additional kickback of 10 percent on the excess-profits tax to be used only for rehabilitation purposes. This might be claimed to double the above meager profits. However, this would not be a legitimate claim as this comes only after hostilities have ceased and manufacturers have no assurance that it can be used as they see fit.

Mr. ROLPH. I do not think that any business house in the United States is trying to make an unreasonable profit out of this war. I think both employers and employees alike in this country are making a wonderful contribution to the war effort in the records they are making in the construction of materials and in shipbuilding.

Mr. JONKMAN. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. On the point just mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH], if there was a

time when inexperience in the manufacture of some of these new products made it seem advisable to adopt a renegotiation act, certainly that time is now ended, and there is not any longer any necessity for this matter of "rubber" contracts that the renegotiation act makes of every contract. I think it might be well for all of us if we read once again the part of the Constitution that talks about the sanctit of contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his devotion to the principles of free enterprise that prompts him to offer this bill that would terminate the activities of these price adjustment boards at this time.

There is one other point I would like to bring out in connection with what has just been said. Something has been mentioned about cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts that plagued us during the first World War. I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if it is not a fact that under the procedure set up by these price adjustment boards, these contracts, in their last analysis, of necessity become cost-plus-percentage-of-cost contracts, because the volume of business done is one of the factors considered in arriving at the allowable profit to the business, and therefore there is no incentive, under this Renegotiation Act, as administered, for the efficient operation of the business, because in the final analysis the fee allowed a businessman will be dependent, among other things, upon the cost to him and the volume of business he has done.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman is absolutely right and I think that fact is admitted by members of the production adjustment boards who have testified on the subject matter.

In other words the whole matter is an absolute system of government by men or bureaucrats instead of government by law.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Under Secretary of the Navy states that—

> These price reductions and cash refunds have all been agreed to voluntarily by the contractors in recognition of the fact that without these adjustments their companies would have realized excessive profits.

In view of misleading statements already referred to it may be wondered how much truth there is in that indictment of all those war contractors.

A member of P. A. B. comes into the plant and the manufacturer informs him that his estimated profits on war contracts approximate $500,000. With or without a check-up the adjuster says: "Well, 90 percent of that is excess profits under the tax law and you will have to pay that anyway"—a false yardstick because it may be due to volume of business instead of margin of profit. We will take $250,000 reduction of the price and settle and otherwise you will have to pay whatever Washington decrees. If the manufacturer accepts, is that a voluntary settlement? If the manufacturer knows that the P. A. B. is not bound by any standard for fixing an excessive profit but can act arbitrarily on whim and caprice from which there is no appeal, in case he refuses, can he be said to be making a voluntary settlement? If the manufacturer knows that any degree of obduracy may be resented by the P. A. B. and cost him further business, which in turn may mean the closing of his plant, can he be said to be making a voluntary settlement?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. On that point may I cite a specific example of the very thing the gentleman seeks to bring out? Of course I will not use the name of the company or the amount involved, but after an experience with the Price Adjustment Board, the representatives of the industry said to me, "My idea of negotiation is for two men to sit down on opposite sides of the table and discuss frankly and openly the proposition involved, and let it be a matter of give and take, but we came down to the Price Adjustment Board and we were given 15 minutes to tell our case. When we got through they said, 'All right. You owe us $3,000,000.' There was not any give or take about it."

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for that example shows the vice of system.

If he accepts this figure to avoid upsetting his whole plant by the expense and worry of having to dig up facts and figures for which he has no facilities and to avoid taking all this energy from his war-aid effort, can it be said to be voluntary?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The yardstick, as I understand it, is that there shall not be any millionaires made by reason of this war. That is the yardstick. Is the gentleman willing to have people make millions of dollars out of this war, although it is by mistake in not having experience in making the goods or munitions or supplies needed, but by reason of a mistake they are making excessive profits? Would the gentleman be willing to have those people retain those profits?

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is establishing a premise and making his deduction from that premise. The premise does not exist as I explained in my answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]. Therefore the deduction does not follow. Always, the 90-percent excess-profits tax applies and protects the taxpayer.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose he still makes a million after that, would the gentleman be willing for him to retain that?

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, the gentleman can go on ad infinitum dealing in speculation, but we must deal with facts. After the application of the 90-percent excess-profits tax his million is only a very small margin of profit. The facts do not exist in reality to overcome the tremendous burden of hamstringing the war effort, and strangling industry that is settled on the country by the renegotiation processes as we are conducting them at the present time.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I do not believe it is a fair interpretation to make to state that anybody who has some suspicion about the ultimate operation of the renegotiation act, was attempting to justify the making of war millionaires. Certainly we all agreed that we do not want to see that, but what I, for one, am deeply concerned about is the ultimate welfare of our system of private industry in this country.

A short time ago in hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee we had a representative of the local staff of the Navy Department down there and we talked on this general subject. I asked him the question if the item of reserve for post-war reconversion into peacetime industry was one of the things taken into consideration in allowing a fair and reasonable profit to the company. He told me, "No, it is not." Therein lies the root of a lot of this trouble insofar as I, for one, am concerned. We certainly do not want to see business at the end of this war down on its knees and wholly at the mercy of a benevolent Government for the money with which to reconvert back to making its peacetime products. We had some small factories in my district that literally ripped out every machine in the plant and left the empty shell of a building, and the Government set them up in the war business. But that same Government is not going to allow that business a little reserve with which to move back into its ordinary peacetime industry when its job of making war materials is through.

That is one of the things I think we might be very deeply concerned about—where this whole thing may be taking us.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman and assure him that my grave concern over where this act is taking and leading the American people is my reason for seeking its repeal.

If his excess-profits tax were to be based on and was due to an excess volume of business and not an excessive margin of profit, can it be said that he is making a voluntary settlement because he knows he gypped his Government? Not a pleasant accusation for a manufacturer who has—perhaps with one or more sons in the Army—given his utmost to produce war goods, is glad to pay the 90-percent excess-profits tax and patriotically is satisfied to just come through with his plant intact and above that settles rather than have it said that he reneged on anything his country asks of him.

Aside from the direct paralyzing influence on the war-production effort, there are many additional handicaps in the renegotiation principle. Regardless of what its proponents may say, it in effect restores the objectionable cost plus a percentage of profit principle, which was so thoroughly condemned in World War No. 1.

Efficiency and economy in operations are discouraged as the high cost and inefficient systems cannot be negotiated for losses through such operations, but

only for the reduced profits. In other words it puts a premium on inefficiency and waste.

The threat of renegotiation and overhanging liability for refunds threatens the solvency and credit of especially the smaller industries. One renegotiation may not be final. There is nothing in the law to prevent renegotiation of an already renegotiated contract, which will keep especially small industries in a constant state of worry.

Improvements of products through research and development will be discouraged to the extent that outlays for these purposes are not allowed as legitimate costs and expenses.

Industries, if heavy refunds eat up their reserves and weaken their financial position, will not be able to meet the cost of conversion, nor provide employment in the post-war period—on the contrary we will find our economy in a state of paralysis. If our industries are paralyzed by junking their war machines with no funds for conversion, how are our ten millions of soldiers and other millions of war workers going to be provided with jobs?

To these might be added other objections, such as that the act operates on subcontractors furnishing standardized commercial products, while in many instances it is a matter of guesswork which subcontracts are within the purview of the act, and so forth.

The Renegotiation Act cannot be shorn of its dangers by amendment. We must junk it rather than let it junk our whole economy.

The officials of the P. A. B. admit or claim—whichever you like—that no standard or rule can be made as to what are reasonable or excessive profits. That means that it must remain an arbitrary or bureaucratic institution, a sample of government by men instead of laws. The Army and Navy boards claim that subcontractors furnishing standard commercial articles and raw materials should be exempt, but the Maritime Commission will not agree to this. An amendment to exempt industries having a half million or less in a calendar year has already been introduced, but this affects only a little outer fringe. And so I might go on but I think it is obvious that no amendment will cure its frailties. The Renegotiation Act should be repealed entirely. And time is of the essence.

If the procurement officials of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, with the reserve of protection furnished by the 90-percent excess-profits tax, are unable to purchase at reasonable prices there is something wrong with these procurement officers. If any citizen wished to buy a couple of guns and some ammunition and was assured that he would receive with them a certificate that 90 percent of the profits would be returned to him, and he had the facilities for checking on this, he would feel perfectly safe in letting a 16-year-old boy make the purchase, providing he knew what he wanted.

The repeal of this law will immediately promote the war effort by releasing the personnel of the P. A. B. to help win the war, by immeasurably speeding up our war-production plants; it will help win the peace by saving our industries and by pruning off not only one but several bureaucracies. I hope the bill to repeal will be enacted at an early date.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in response to inquiries I may say that the resolution from the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on subversive activities of governmental employees will be offered as an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill which will be taken up in the House on Friday and be voted on either Friday or Saturday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a resolution that I introduced today on the question of the increased price of oil demanded to aid in the effective prosecution of the war and to prevent monopoly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 5 minutes regarding the very fine care the Navy is taking of the wounded in this war.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted for printing in the RECORD, an article from Fortune magazine on the functions of Congress and particularly devoted to the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I am advised by the Printing Office that this article will take three and one-half pages and cost $157.50. In the light of this statement I renew my request that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish merely to announce in the light of the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] that the House Committee on Naval Affairs plans within the next few days to begin rather broad and extensive hearings into the general subject of renegotiation of contracts, and I hope that all Members of the House who are interested in this vital matter will express their interest and their feelings to the members of the committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the presentation by the Armstrong Cork Co. before the War Labor Board by Mr. H. W. Prentiss, Jr., president of that company, on April 20 last. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will take four pages and cost $180. In the light of this statement I renew my request that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. GAVAGAN), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, May 13, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

A meeting of the Committee on Flood Control will be held in the committee room on Thursday, May 13, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of hearing the testimony of Col. Lewis A. Pick, division engineer, Omaha, Nebr., on the recent floods along the Missouri River. Colonel Pick should give to the committee valuable information respecting the operations of the Fort Peck Dam and respecting flood control along the entire Missouri River.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country, which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are

hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8, and postponed until April 15, have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m., Friday, May 14, 1943, to consider H. R. 2113, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act, H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or waterfront facilities; with amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2664. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1997. A bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2634. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 2698. A bill to repeal section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, relating to renegotiation of war contracts and to promote the national war effort; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2699. A bill extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton of the 1941 and 1942 crops; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2700. A bill to amend Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943, with respect to the payment of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act without regard to income and resources arising from agricultural labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 233. Resolution relative to increase in price of oil demanded to help war effort and prevent monopoly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

735. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, San Francisco, Calif., relative to petitioning the President and the Congress to dissolve Executive Order No. 9328; to the Committee on Labor.

736. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 of the State of California, relative to hearing instruments for persons who are hard of hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

737. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 21 of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Secretary of the Navy to name a Navy cruiser of the United States Fleet, for the city of Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

738. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 30, of the State of California, relative to an increase of pay for employees of the Department of Employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

739. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 40 of the State of California, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a military and a naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

740. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of California, relative to old-age assistance, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to provide Federal participation at the present rate in the payment of aid in the amount of $60 to any eligible individual in any month, or, if this is not possible to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the State agency, in determining need, not to take into consideration other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance to the extent of $20 or such greater sum as the President and Congress may determine to be proper and just; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

741. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 32 of the State of California, relative to auditing the accounts of the Department of Employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

742. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of 115 citizens of McCracken County, Ky., supporting House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

743. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Worth Grange, No. 1421, Portersville, Butler County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the traffic and sale of intoxicants for the duration of the war as a necessary step in the conservation of our manpower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

744. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by parishoners of the Shrub Oak Methodist Church, Shrub Oak, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

745. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York League of Women Voters, New York City, urging defeat of the so-called equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

746. Also, petition of the Italian-American Labor Council, New York City, urging the enactment of House bill 1291; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

747. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the Andover (Mass.) Association of Congregational Churches and Ministers, urging the adoption of the plan of food relief which has been carried on in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

748. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition filed by Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Estal and others of Marshall County, Iowa, regarding the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in this quiet and sacred place, where freedom reigns and none dare molest or make afraid, we hear the moaning of the oppressed, "How long, O Lord, how long?" Make us, we pray Thee, Thy instruments for battering down the doors of the bastiles of tyranny, as against entrenched evil Thou dost unloose the fateful lightning of Thy terrible, swift sword. Nerve and steady our hands to strike the blow that shall shatter prisons and break asunder chains of coercion. Hearten those who in the darkness keep alive the holy flame. Give strength to endure to those whose dear ones are snatched from their grasp as hostages and whose lives are snuffed out by a system that cannot bear the light of truth. Sustain those who suffer from wounds and sickness. Be Thou the Shining Presence in every fear-shadowed area of life. Take to Thyself those who in the fiery hurricane of battle give their lives that freedom may live. Hasten the

day when righteousness shall be triumphant and peace shall bless our land and every land. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 12, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting several nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Moore	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Torrance County, N. Mex., praying for an appropriation to continue the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the First United Brethren Church, of Chanute, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COMMISSION OF LAKELAND, FLA.—SOCIAL SECURITY PARTICIPATION BY MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution adopted by the City Commission of Lakeland, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now a number of municipal governments operating utilities in the United States employing a large number of employees, and said employees are not covered by the Social Security Act and cannot receive any benefits thereunder; and

Whereas there are a large number of employees working for municipal governments in different phases of the municipal government who are not covered by the Social Security Act and can receive no benefits thereunder on account of old age or death; and

Whereas it further appears to the City Commission of the City of Lakeland, Fla., that it would be to the interest of the said citizens of the said city of Lakeland and would promote a more harmonious accord among said employees if they were placed in the category of the Social Security Act which would allow the employees to receive benefits by participating under said Social Security Act; and

Whereas said city commission further desires that the Congress of the United States amend said Social Security Act and does hereby petition the Representatives and Senators from the State of Florida to vote and urge the passage of such amendment which would allow any municipality if they so elected to participate and the employees of said municipality to further qualify and participate under said act when said municipality had elected to come under the act for its employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Lakeland, Fla., That the said city commission by this resolution go on record as favoring amendment to the present Social Security Act which would allow municipalities if they so elected to participate under the social-security benefits for their employees who are working in utilities or for the different phases and functions of the municipal governments, and further that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator; Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, United States Senator; Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, Representative from the First Congressional District; and the Honorable LEX GREEN, Representative in Congress, State of Florida, at Large.

Passed and approved as to passage at Lakeland, Fla., this the 28th day of April 1943.

H. W. GIBSON,
Mayor-Commissioner.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF SEBRING, FLA.—EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE TO PERSONNEL OF HENDRICKS FIELD

Mr. PEPPER also presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Sebring, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the establishment of Hendricks Field was authorized in June of 1941, and since that time the officials and citizens of the city of Sebring have been in daily contact with the Government personnel; and

Whereas due to the foresight, cooperation, and efficiency of the personnel of Hendricks Field, the many problems which arise by the establishment of a large army base in a small community have been handled agreeably, satisfactorily, and in all instances fair and just to the civilians of this community; and

Whereas this council, from its knowledge of the method and manner of administration by the executive officers of Hendricks Field has a very high regard for such officers; and

Whereas the city council, individually and as representatives of the citizens of the city of Sebring, are deeply appreciative for the cooperation and understanding given to the citizens of this community by the personnel of Hendricks Field and for the unselfish and loyal devotion of the executive officers of Hendricks Field to their war duties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Sebring, That we take this means of expressing our personal gratitude and the gratitude of the citizens of the city of Sebring for the meritorious services rendered to this community by the personnel of Hendricks Field and for the complete cooperation that has existed between the personnel of Hendricks Field and the citizens of this community since the establishment of Hendricks Field; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Col. Carl B. McDaniel, commanding officer of Hendricks Field, to the commanding general of the Southeast Training Center, Maxwell Field, Ala., and that copies be sent to Senator Claude Pepper, Senator C. O. Andrew, Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, and Hon. Lex Green, Washington, D. C., and Maj. Gen. Barton K. Yount, commanding general, Army Air Forces Flying Training Command, Fort Worth, Tex.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, all without amendment:

S. 391. A bill for the relief of Jack Lael Haas (Rept. No. 228);

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou (Rept. No. 229);

S. 954. A bill for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott* (Rept. No. 230);

S. 972. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417) (Rept. No. 231);

S. 1065. A bill to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 232);

S. 1086. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act

entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941 (Rept. No. 233); and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy (Rept. No. 234).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Helene Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Henry White; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1104. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1105, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1106. A bill to prohibit the allowance of credit in the computation of lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, for active service hereafter performed during the present wars and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MARKETS AFTER THE WAR (S. DOC. NO. 40)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with the illustrations, a most informative and instructive article entitled "Markets After the War—An Approach to Their Analysis," prepared by the Department of Commerce. An estimate of the cost has been obtained, and the document will comprise less than 50 pages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The order was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the manuscript entitled "Markets After the War," prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

EXPANSION OF WAR HOUSING PROGRAM (H. DOC. NO. 203)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: Since last I communicated with the Congress on the subject of war housing in May 1942, much has happened in the war and much has happened in housing.

It is a noteworthy fact in relation to the whole war effort that under the existing war-housing program more than 3,000,000 workers in intense war production have been provided or are being provided with necessary shelter. In addition to placements in existing structures, the present program embraces more than a million and a half units of construction, approximating twice the total volume of homes built in the United States in a better-than-normal building year. The size of this program, founded as it is upon minimum absolute need, affords some measurement of the disastrous impairment of war production that would confront us if war housing were not provided in sufficient volume and on time.

It is hard to build houses in time of war. It is even harder in time of war to combine the building of houses with maximum economy in the use of men, money, and materials. It is, therefore, encouraging to know that more than half of the necessary war-housing accommodations thus far projected is being provided through the more effective use of existing structures; that another substantial portion is being attained through the prudent and economical repair, enlargement, or "conversion" of existing dwellings so that they may shelter additional war workers; that only about two-fifths of the need is being supplied by new construction; and that more than one-half of this new construction is being financed with private funds.

Housing used to be divided among several agencies and several programs. Today, as a product of the reorganization and unification of the housing agencies 14 months ago, the National Housing Agency is pursuing one unified housing program under which all of our housing resources and techniques are being focused upon the winning of the war. There is no room now for any kind of housing but war housing.

I have been particularly gratified to see that this new spirit with regard to housing activities pervades the Congress. Certain recent and interesting reports of investigatory congressional committees have emphasized in a most striking fashion the acute continuity of the need for even more war housing in specified critical areas. Generally speaking, proposals in the Congress for the effective use of our manpower are linked with proposals for the adequate provision of war housing wherever needed.

The war is not over. War production and the employment of men and women in war plants have not reached their peak even where the plants are completed. The constant rearrangements in the nature and disposition of our total working force produced by the increasing inroads of Selective Service develops gaps that must be filled in part by the migration of women and older workers and consequently intensify old needs or develop new needs for war housing.

Even after making every reasonable allowance for the use of local labor supply, including the training of new types of workers, the best estimates indicate an in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers into areas of war-production activity during the fiscal year 1944. These workers must be housed or they cannot do their job.

It is not proposed to house even the majority of these workers with Federal funds. Almost two-thirds of them will be taken care of by placement in existing structures, and a large part of the balance will be served by privately financed construction encouraged and insured by the Government. The Congress will recall that to serve workers in-migrating during the fiscal year 1943, it recently increased the authorization of one branch of the National Housing Agency to insure private investment in war-housing construction by $400,000,000. Likewise, it is contemplated that recommendations for additional authorizations for private financing will be forthcoming, to serve a large portion of the workers who will in-migrate during the fiscal year 1944. This further expansion of private financing will maintain and confirm in the war-housing program the principles which point toward maximizing our utilization of existing resources, and particularly the resources of small enterprise, during the war. We are allocating to private initiative as large a segment of the war-housing program as it possibly can produce under war conditions and war risks.

But in order to meet that portion of the needs of 1,100,000 workers migrating to war centers during the fiscal year 1944, which cannot be met in any other way, some publicly financed war-housing construction is essential. The main vehicle for this purpose has been the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, known as the Lanham Act. The funds under this act, and under other acts to provide war housing, are practically all committed to serve needs arising during the fiscal year 1943. I am therefore suggesting to the Congress at this time the enactment of legislation providing an increase of $400,000,000 in the authorization contained in the Lanham Act, as amended. A substantial portion of these funds will be returned to the Government in the form of rents during the emergency and realizations thereafter. In making this recommendation, I am sure that the Congress and the National Housing Agency will continue to look upon all phases of the war-housing problem as part of a total and unified picture.

No expenditure of funds can be too large if that expenditure is necessary to win the war or to win it with a greater

economy in time and lives. But I cannot refrain from pointing out how small a fraction of the cost of the war is involved in all the appropriations of money and use of materials for war housing, particularly when measured against the contribution which the shelter of war workers is making toward the winning of the war. If the total outlays for war housing were regarded as part of the cost of the plants in which the workers produce, or the cost of the munitions and war implements which they fabricate, these outlays would shrink to very minor proportions in this proper perspective. But the cost to the war effort, in delay and blood and treasure, if decent and sufficient shelter were not provided for those who produce, would be great beyond calculation.

In view of the urgency of the need for more war housing now, I suggest that the proposed expansion receive the earliest consideration of the Congress. There is attached draft of a bill which, in addition to providing for an increase in the amount authorized, would accomplish certain other highly desirable amendments in existing legislation.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

REFUGEE CONFERENCE IN BERMUDA—LETTER FROM PETER H. BERGSON IN RE NEW YORK TIMES ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Peter H. Bergson, national director of the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR A JEWISH ARMY OF STATELESS AND PALESTINIAN JEWS,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1943.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the course of the last week, some of your distinguished colleagues have expressed, on the floor of the Senate, their dissatisfaction with the publication of their names in connection with an advertisement published by our committee.

To our complete surprise, a list of names of signatories of the proclamation on the moral rights of the stateless and Palestinian Jews, appended to a quotation from that document and placed in a separate box to the left of our May 4 advertisement in the New York Times has been interpreted as using those names for an unauthorized endorsement of the contents of that advertisement.

On behalf of all my colleagues on the executive board, and myself, I wish to assure you that this definitely was not our intention and that nothing was further from our minds.

We are extremely sorry that such an interpretation has been made and we wish to take this opportunity to express to you and your colleagues our sincere regrets. Please convey our apology to those of your distinguished colleagues in the United States Senate who have taken this view.

Please accept, my dear Senator, our highest consideration and esteem.

Respectfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
National Director.

MARFLEET LECTURES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two lectures on the subject The World War and the Post-War World, delivered by him at the University of Toronto, Canada, on February 26 and 27, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consider America's Accomplishments," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah, and published in the Women's Democratic Digest for April 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOURTH PRESIDENTIAL TERM—ADDRESS BY HON. M. M. NEELY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Matthew M. Neely, Governor of West Virginia, in support of the affirmative of the question, Should the President of the United States have a fourth term? which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF FOOD PRICES AND WAGES—BROADCAST BY RAYMOND GRAM SWING

[Mr. GUFFEY (by request) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by Raymond Gram Swing on Tuesday, May 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL INTEREST IN FREIGHT RATES—ADDRESS BY C. E. CHILDE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The National Interest in Freight Rates, delivered by C. E. Childe, member of the Transportation Board of Investigation and Research, on May 6, 1943, before a meeting of the Southern Policy Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

IDEALS AND PURPOSES OF THE SOUTHEASTERN STATES PRISON ASSOCIATION—ADDRESS BY THOMAS P. GORE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Ideals and Purposes of the Southeastern States Prison Association, delivered by Thomas P. Gore, warden of the penitentiary of the State of Tennessee, which appears in the Appendix.]

FATHER GEORGE HILDNER, MISSOURI'S "FIGHTING PRIEST"

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Justin L. Faherty, entitled "For God and Country," paying tribute to Father George Hildner, Missouri's "Fighting Priest," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials relating to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, one published in the Saturday Evening Post and one in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of May 13, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY EDVARD BENEŠ, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in exile, His Excellency Edvard Beneš, will arrive in a few moments to address the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President name a committee of four Senators to escort President Beneš into the Senate, and that the Senate then take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the President of Czechoslovakia and to escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency Edvard Beneš, President of Czechoslovakia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Czechoslovakia, including the Honorable Jaromir Smutny, Chief of the Cabinet; His Excellency Vladimir Hurban, Minister of Czechoslovakia; Dr. Eduard Taborsky, private secretary; the Honorable Jan Papanek, information service; Col. Oldrich Spaniel, military attaché, Czechoslovak Legation, Washington, D. C.; Brig. Gen. Edward W. Smith, United States Army, military aide; Capt. Walter E. Moore, United States Navy, naval aide; and Mr. G. T. Summerlin, Chief, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the President of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Beneš, will now address you.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. President, Members of the United States Senate, it is now a quarter of a century since Thomas G. Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic and my great predecessor, came, in the last year of the first World War, to Washington to inform American leaders how his Czechoslovak countrymen were fighting for their freedom and independence and to obtain the American support for their struggle. His mission in the United States met with favor and encouragement everywhere. He found a great understanding of, and sympathy with, the national aspirations of the Czechoslovak people in the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, in his Government, and the people. It was known that for centuries, beginning with the Middle Ages, this small nation in the

heart of Europe had been a glorious independent kingdom, the Kingdom of Bohemia—and a prosperous state—the state that first began the fight for religious freedom in Europe. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Prague, its capital, was a great center of learning, contributed largely to European cultural, spiritual, and material development, and played an outstanding role in European history and particularly in the history of the Holy Roman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Perhaps your Government knew, too, the famous declaration made by the German Chancelor Bismarck after his victory over Austria in 1886:

> Whoever is master in Bohemia is master of Europe. Europe must, therefore, never allow any nation except the Czechs to rule it, since that nation does not lust for domination. The boundaries of Bohemia are the safeguard of European security, and he who moves them will plunge Europe into misery.

In my estimation, there can be no better comment on the position of my country even today. The recognition of our cause here in this country in 1918 was also undoubtedly due to the unmistakable determination of our people to live as a free and independent nation. More than 150,000 Czechoslovak soldiers fought for their country's liberation in the First World War in Russia, France, and Italy. When the war was drawing to a close, the epic march of the Czechoslovak legionnaires across the Siberian plains to Vladivostok fired the imagination of the American people.

When the collapse of the Central Powers was imminent, Masaryk made our Declaration of Independence in Washington on October 18, 1918. It was promptly accepted and recognized by the American people and by their Government. That is why Czechoslovakia was considered and often called the god-child of the United States of America.

Czechoslovakia's 20 years' record as a free and independent democratic state is one of which we are justly proud. Surrounded on all sides by authoritarian countries and governments, she remained faithful to the democratic traditions which came to her very largely from the United States. Her social legislation and her educational system were progressive and advanced; her financial system was stable, her currency, one of the soundest in Europe; her general economic standard was very high, and her import and export trade greater than that of Italy. Until 1938 this Republic was one of the most prosperous and happy countries in Europe. Even the concentrated campaign of Nazi Germany, beginning in 1936, using corruption, lying propaganda, and threatening war and violence, failed to shake the inner harmony of the Czechoslovak Republic.

In her foreign policy Czechoslovakia resolutely and consistently followed the policy of peace, international arbitration and collective security. She fostered and encouraged friendship with her neighbors—Austria, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Rumania. She was the most loyal member of the League of Nations. She supported the Locarno policy, was an original signatory of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, and was ready to play the part demanded of her in any generally accepted system of collective security. In Geneva she resolutely opposed the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and China; I was President of the Assembly of the League of Nations when we voted the sanction against Italy upon her invasion of Abyssinia. Czechoslovakia was ready to oppose militarily the occupation of the Rhineland and Austria. Our Army and air force were ready and thoroughly efficient. Up to the year 1939 we did our duty completely, not only to our nation, but to Europe and democracy as well.

Czechoslovakia was in mortal danger from the moment that Hitler and the Nazi leaders came to power.

When Hitler saw that the policy of sanctions against Italy was not strictly applied and when the German remilitarization of the Rhineland was not opposed by force, he thought that the countless seeds of bitterness and mistrust sown by the dictators would permit him to reap a harvest of destruction of democracy in Europe and bring about the realization of his pan-German plan. The success of the annexation of Austria in March led to the September crisis in 1938.

My own view then was that Hitler's demands and attacks against Czechoslovakia should have been rejected even at the cost of a war. We were ready, but the western powers were not. By the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia, Europe and the world gained a year's time in which to prepare for the defense against the coming onslaught. In my opinion, the Second World War began with the criminal occupation of Prague. And from the very day of occupation, March 15, 1939, all Czechoslovak citizens have been at war with Germany.

Since 1938 the Czechoslovaks at home have endured great hardships, sorrows, and suffering. They know that many of their soldiers and airmen, who escaped from their enslaved homeland, lost their lives while fighting for its liberation in Poland and in France. They know that after the Franco-German armistice, Czechoslovak soldiers and airmen reassembled in Great Britain and that in the decisive battle of Britain, Czechoslovak airmen played an honorable part. They know, too, that Czechoslovak soldiers are now fighting in Russia and in Africa and manning the defenses of Great Britain. On the other hand, they see their own country being converted into an arsenal for a war against the United Nations. Many are now working as forced laborers in Germany and elsewhere. Those who resist the oppressors are either executed in masses or tortured in prisons and concentration camps. Their country is pillaged and Germanized, their national education completely destroyed. The undying memory of the martyred village of Lidice forbids us ever to relax in the world struggle now waged against the powers of evil and darkness. The all-out participation—after Pearl Harbor—of the United States in this fight for the freedom of the world has turned into certainty what until then had been the hope of the ultimate liberation for the Czechoslovak people and the other occupied nations.

Mr. President, permit me to say before this august body, in conclusion, with gratitude and appreciation:

It was here in this great democratic country that in October 1918 the freedom and new independence of my nation were solemnly proclaimed and its first free government recognized. When on March 15, 1939, Nazi Germany destroyed the new Czechoslovak liberty, and I personally, as member of the faculty of the University of Chicago, respectfully asked President Roosevelt to refuse to recognize this insulting and lawless act of violence, it was the Government of the United States which first among all great powers categorically repudiated this wanton aggression. It gave its full approval to the refusal of the Czechoslovak Minister in Washington to hand over his Legation to the Nazi authorities. The Government of the United States never recognized the German occupation of the Czechoslovak Republic. By this decisive act this great historic land of freedom defended the national liberty of my country at the most tragic moment of our modern history. Later your Government recognized our reconstituted government and independent country and accepted our republic as a free and equal member of the United Nations. Through all these acts the immortal spirit of the great American tradition, of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, rose to defend the highest undying principles of human and national liberty at the time when a small, democratic, peace- and freedom-loving nation was assassinated by a vulgar authoritarian aggressor.

The entire Czechoslovak nation expresses its warmest thanks and gratitude to the great American people, not only for all that they have done on behalf of Czechoslovakia but also for the enormous and outstanding contribution of your great country to the war effort of all the United Nations.

They do not doubt that this great struggle, in which the United States are playing so decisive a role, will end with one of the greatest victories in your and our national annals. They are greatly encouraged and proud that I have the privilege of addressing the Members of the Congress of the United States. I know that they will accept the promise I make to you, today, as theirs.

As President Masaryk in 1918, I, today, feel authorized to declare on behalf of my Nation, here in the Washington Capitol, that after the final victory in this great war is achieved, the Czechoslovak nation will reconstruct its old home rapidly and successfully by its untiring efforts, remaining faithful—as it always was during the difficult period of its long, checkered, and glorious history—to the democratic way of life, to the principles of spiritual and religious freedom, to the ideals of peace and peaceful international collaboration, considering itself again the godchild of the great and glorious Republic of the United States.

[Prolonged applause, Senators and the occupants of the galleries rising.]

Following his address, the President of Czechoslovakia and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—DENIAL OF SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGE TO CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I know that Senators will be interested in the reaction of the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee to the words uttered upon this floor last week in behalf of freedom of the press and the criticism of the action of the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Walker, as Postmaster General of the United States, in barring 70 magazines and newspapers from the mails and revoking their second-class mailing privilege.

In a desperate effort to protect himself from possible attacks from the larger publishers the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee has restored the privileges of 4 magazines. So 4 of the 70 are back; and strangely enough, these 4 represent the largest publishing firms, the names of the magazines being as follows: Front Page Detective, Headline Detective, Crime Detective, and True Confessions, published by Dell Publishing Co., Fawcett Publishing Co., and Hilman Periodicals. Actually many other magazines whose privileges have not been restored follow much the same policy as those to whom the privilege of being reinstated has been granted, but I know that the Senate will be interested in the fact that the richer publishers apparently had one distinct advantage over those of less financial means. It is strange that the publishers who were financially able to hire a high-priced attorney just incidentally happened to be able to get results.

Who represented these publications? Who, do you suppose, Mr. President, represented at least one of these publications? I give you one guess, and you have guessed it. A former chairman of the Democratic National Committee who happens to be a lawyer. Mr. President, the rumor is that this former chairman of the Democratic National Committee received an enormous legal fee for getting the present Chairman of the Democratic National Committee to take his advice and permit one of these magazines again to have its second-class mailing privilege. Senators can well imagine the terribly arduous task that the former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee had to convince the present Chairman of the Democratic National Committee as he whispered to him that this publishing company has 54 publications and that by readmitting True Confessions, which has a circulation of over a million copies, in all likelihood all the 54 publications will be supporting the Democratic candidates in 1944. It may be that that did not occur. I do not know. It may be that the former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee received his allegedly enormous fee from this millionaire publishing company merely by promising a campaign contribution, or perhaps he obtained it by promising that the publishing company would print certain campaign literature in its magazines during the coming campaign. I do not know, but I will let the Senate judge for itself as I proceed to tell what happened to another magazine that supported President Roosevelt in 1936 and did not support him in 1940.

No true American publisher wants to take charity from the National Democratic Party, because it would naturally follow that in accepting such a favor, he would also be declaring himself ready to take dictation from this group of politicians. But I firmly believe that this so-called gift is not one which Frank Walker or the party he represents should be able to give and take away. This subsidy is one which our great American Government has granted alike to all those who fall within its just rulings. I believe the present chairman of the Democratic National Committee has tampered with these rulings until the definition of the second-class law, which grants these privileges, has been interpreted to mean a charitable subsidy granted to those publications which unquestionably and unhesitantly are ready to support Frank Walker's political party.

There is nothing to prevent the chairman of the Democratic National Committee from using the second-class mailing privilege as a whip to beat the American publications into party lines. It was never intended by Congress when it passed the original law in 1879 that any one man should be given the power to wield such a whip. In the hands of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee the very laws of this Government are receiving a merciless lashing so that they may conform with his personal bias and his political beliefs. No Postmaster General in the entire history of this Nation has ever dared to abuse such a power and employ it for his political benefit.

Mr. President, in 1936 Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a candidate for reelection as President. Some of the party chiefs were fearful of the result. They wanted to make the result certain in Mr. Roosevelt's favor. They wanted newspaper and magazine stories. Thereupon, I am informed that Mr. Charles Michaelson, publicity man for the Democratic National Committee, consulted with Mr. Harold Roswell, publisher of the Police Gazette, who previously had announced that he was for the President's reelection. Mr. Michaelson and Mr. Roswell conferred. An article was prepared. I am told it was first submitted to Mr. Stanley High, then a man in high standing in the Democratic councils, and that thereafter it was submitted to others on the Democratic National Committee, with the result that it was deemed advisable to submit it directly to President Roosevelt at Hyde Park. I am informed that the article was then taken to Hyde Park and that the President read it and gave it his personal approval. I have a photostatic copy of that article before me, and I shall now read it into the RECORD.

At the top of the article there appears an endorsement of President Roosevelt by Jack Dempsey. Mind you, a quarter of a million copies of this article were paid for by the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Dempsey said:

I only wish that I could be an orator so I could go out onto the street corners and tell people the way I feel about President Roosevelt. I wish I had the words to write here how I feel about him and about his fight for reelection. To me he is the champion of champions, big enough to be the little fellow's friend and to go in there swinging for him when he needs it most. I don't know a single person, man or woman, who isn't better off in every way because of him, and I don't know of a single person, man or woman, who wasn't down in the dumps when he was elected. And now it seems like we're all on the road to prosperity, despite what his political opponents say. I'm heart and soul behind him, and I urge everyone—and I mean everyone—to pitch in and help him in the White House.

Sincerely,

JACK DEMPSEY.

At the top of this sheet, in a large headline, appears the following:

ALL VOTING FOR LANDON ARE FIRST-CLASS SUCKERS

It is signed "The Publisher."

The article reads as follows:

[From the National Police Gazette]

Anyone in the sporting world who votes for Alfred Mossback Landon for President of the United States is a first-class, grade A sucker—the kind of a guy who'd bet on Brooklyn.

The National Police Gazette minces no words in this matter—any more than it minces words in its opinion of any sporting event. * * * We of the Police Gazette reserve that right: The right to voice our opinions as we choose. If there are any objections; well, it's your dime. Keep it.

We believe that you, our readers, wouldn't have it otherwise. We believe that you want us to speak our mind. You may disagree. That's your privilege. But, at least, you'll have no misunderstanding.

For that reason, then, and because a lot of other publications of various sorts—from daily newspapers to monthly magazines—have been bluffed out, or bought out, we are in this campaign to reelect Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and we're in it to the last drop of good, black ink, the ultimate scrap of bright, pink paper. Herewith is the second statement from the pen of the Gazette's publisher:

(By Harold H. Roswell, publisher of the National Police Gazette)

"If you owned a big-league ball club with a chance for the pennant, would you entrust it to the undergraduate manager of a small-town high-school team?

"Would you turn over a race track to a dirt farmer; or, a $1,000,000 theater to a grocery clerk?

"Of course you wouldn't—who would?

"Well then, be darn sure to vote for Franklin Delano Roosevelt because if Alf Landon is elected President of the United States this November 3, it's going to be the greatest tragicomedy that ever came to afflict a horror-ridden world."

I will say in passing that I have been informed that the President of the United States personally passed upon this article before it was published, and

a quarter of a million copies of the article were sent all over the country.

The article continues as follows:

"Imagine a schoolboy on Man-o'-War. * * * Imagine an old maid at the wheel of Gar Wood's 125-mile-an-hour hell-cat speedboat. * * * Imagine a baby with a steamshovel.

"And then imagine Alf Landon, small-town politician, at the helm of the Ship of State.

"We may seem a little bitter about it. Well, we are bitter. It seems to be a pretty good time to be bitter. I, as publisher of the Police Gazette, which is intended primarily for sporting people, hope that by the time you finish reading this you'll be bitter, too.

"Let's put the so-called issue aside for a moment—we'll get to them presently—and consider the race on the basis of man for man.

"On the one hand is Alf Landon, citizen of Independence, Kans., disciple of all that is intolerant, snoopish, bigoted, whose sole claim to political distinction lies in that he balanced the State's budget at the expense of its school children, hand-picked for office by Hearst, Mellon, the du Ponts, Morgan, and Wall Street, because, forsooth, he is worthy of the title: 'A second Coolidge.'

"And on the other is Franklin Roosevelt, citizen of the world, humanitarian and friend, wise and able head of a going concern, which he rescued from bankruptcy and which he is steering into an era of security and prosperity such as has never been known, damned by Landon backers because, forsooth, he insists on wider opportunity, greater prosperity, and a fuller life for every man, woman, and child in the country.

"These are the two contenders—yours is the choice.

"Kansas is a great State. We have no quarrel with Kansas. It's a little dry, perhaps, and still echoes with the whacks of Carrie Nation's ax. It's good for jack rabbits, too, and the finest racing greyhounds in the country are bred and trained on Kansas prairies. We have no doubt but that Independence is a fine, bright, modern little city, but we hesitate to think of it as the Bethlehem of a new Messiah who is going to save the Nation from a wave of too much big-heartedness toward its underprivileged.

"As a matter of fact, a suspicion lurks around in the echoing shadows to the effect that Roosevelt is going to carry Kansas, anyway.

"We can and will, however, quarrel with that State's chief executive, who happens, by a chance that he, himself, does not yet quite understand, to be the Presidential candidate of the most reactionary group of hide-bound economic racketeers which ever passed a dividend.

"It is an amazing story, that of how the lightning came out of a clear Kansas sky to tap Alf Landon on the shoulder with the accolade of Grand Old Party approval. He, somehow, got the impression around that he was a good business executive.

"As he was taking his bows for that, the reason was not quite clear to the average citizen. Only now are his business methods being exposed.

"By a trick of legislative legerdemain he tossed the State's schools plump into the laps of each and every community in the commonwealth. 'If you can't support 'em, close 'em' was the edict from Topeka's gilded dome. And close 'em they did, though some stayed open through the subterfuge of cutting teachers' pay until it reached an all-time low of $25 a month.

"Then he went after the State's relief rolls.

"Now anybody with any sense at all knows that the great depression came simply and only because there weren't, under a Republican regime, enough jobs to go around. Millions needed relief. Millions got relief. And millions are still getting relief.

"In Kansas, under the lash of the budget-balancing whip of Topeka's Little Corporal, relief for needy families was reduced to $1.08 a week.

"Then, his budget balanced, and the Federal Government taking care of the rest of it, the miniature Mussolini rested on his laurels. But, not for long. Presently a dust cloud came over the horizon, resolving itself into a special train, carrying the Hearst brain-trust. They looked at Landon in purely clinical fashion, asked him the proper question, and, like the wise men of old, went forth with Oh, hosannas! to make known their discovery.

"Governor Landon is strictly a Hearst build-up—and if that isn't amusing, you should have seen Wall Street's face when it found that it had to take him and like him.

"The Cleveland convention is history. The bellowing of Col. Frank Knox, who used to be a sergeant in the Hearst army, is history of another sort.

"Echoed by John D. M. Hamilton, the Little Boy Blew, of the opposition.

"The Landon campaign, at the moment, is one of afterthoughts.

"The President suggests crop insurance—and Landon echoes with, 'I thought of that a long time ago.'

"The President suggests a drought program—and Landon says, 'Oh, yes; that's what I've been saying all along.'

"And he says, 'Relief must go on,' but he doesn't say how it can go on under the terms of the Republican platform.

"There's no equivocation in the Roosevelt platform. It is summed, for all that is 'for the greatest good of the greater number.'

"And what could be fairer than that?

"This magazine is published for sporting people and this statement is intended for sporting people, so let's consider the sporting angle of the national campaign.

"To begin with it is difficult to believe that Alf Landon knows the difference between a catcher's mask and a home run. It is difficult to believe that he has ever been to a racetrack, but he may have attended a county fair where the gee-gees ran in harness.

"It seems likely that he may know something about college football.

"Roosevelt, on the other hand, is a first-class sportsman, well-versed and interested in sporting events, eager to encourage them because he knows just how important they are to every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the Nation. Take away a nation's sports and you can bet your bottom dollar that revolution is just around the corner.

"What has happened to sports under the Roosevelt regime?

"One hundred thousand rabid fans stormed the Polo Grounds a few days ago to fight over the 64,000 seats available for a game between the Giants and the Cards.

"Forty-five thousand horse players jammed every nook and cranny at Narragansett Park on Labor Day, and 15,000 jammed Aqueduct where every program printed for the day was sold out before the beginning of the first race.

"The day of the $1,000,000 fight gate, only a memory of the halcyon era of Tex Rickard, is again upon us, and every major football game is already sold out.

"Basketball has become a major sport capable of selling out Madison Square Garden, and the hockey moguls are getting ready for their biggest financial season.

"That's what happened under Roosevelt, because people have money again—people have money, not individuals—and they're willing and eager to spend it on sporting events.

"What would happen to the sporting world if everyone suddenly became frightened and panicky, if the 'rugged individualists of Republicanism' started to work their will on the people, firing as they've been itching to do for the last 3 years, closing up little businesses to make way for monopolies, taking over the banks and finances of the Nation—all of which they're sure to do if Landon is elected.

"There is a new and happier spirit abroad in the land, too—a spirit of friendly tolerance, a keep-your-nose-out-of-your-neighbor's-affairs kind of an attitude.

"What will happen if that Kansas Savonarola, Landon, moves into Washington? Don't forget that they still have dry raids in Kansas.

"To sum up, and there's only one possible sum-up—

"Reelect Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

On the same page there is an article by Gen. Hugh Johnson entitled "Johnson Speaks a Piece."

Then on the front there is a photograph of President Roosevelt with the caption "Hail the Chief—President Roosevelt, great and able leader, is here shown engaged in his favorite sport, yachting."

Down below the picture appear the words:

Jack Doyle, Broadway betting commissioner, reports that odds on the Presidential race are now 8 to 5—with no Landon money showing for the long end. All Broadway gamblers, he reported, are taking the short end, betting heavily on the President. The odds are the same on New York State.

The President of the United States apparently did not deem the National Police Gazette obscene. The Democratic National Committee did not hesitate, because they bought and paid for one-quarter million copies of the National Police Gazette for October 1936, just before the election, and mailed it all over the United States to every village, to every town, to every city, to every hamlet. There was no talk then of barring the National Police Gazette from the mails of the United States.

NOW THE TROUBLE STARTS

When, then, did the trouble start for this magazine? In February 1940, when Mr. Harold Roswell, publisher of the National Police Gazette, decided that he had had enough of the Democratic Party and decided to support a Republican. In February 1940, there was published in the National Police Gazette an article entitled "Governor Saltonstall Will Fight Legalized Lotteries," written by Matt K. Perlow, together with a picture of Governor Saltonstall entitled "Governor Saltonstall Behind His Gubernatorial Desk. Note the seal of the State of Massachusetts in the back of his chair."

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the article published by this magazine in behalf of Governor Saltonstall, and I submit it to any Senator who may care to look at it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Police Gazette, February 1940]

GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL WILL FIGHT LEGALIZED LOTTERIES

(By Nat K. Perlow)

"Darnit," darned Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of Massachusetts, with naive candor, "if we legalize any more gambling, lotteries, or what not, we'll be putting it into the hands of politicians. Politics and corruption will creep into the lotteries."

"You know," he continued, "that legalized lotteries existed in America several generations back and they were repealed because unscrupulous political hands spoiled the pie. If legalized lotteries were to return they would be legalized rackets."

"But," we asked, "advocates of this plan suggest that the State can make tax money by adopting the idea."

Saltonstall smiled, debunking this angle.

"This would be the most immoral form of taxation. It is the people who can least afford it that play the number pools. Out of sheer desperation, believing that their luck will change, the poorest people gamble. It is the men, women, and children that can least afford it that will pay the taxes."

If, long-limbed, rawboned Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of Massachusetts, is the thoroughbred aristocrat blueblood, trimmings and all, that newspapers have tagged him, then the mighty Jack Dempsey is Little Lord Fauntleroy in diapers.

Staid Massachusetts, key to puritanical New England, is the last State in the Union where anyone would expect to find a "regular guy," of the New York pedigree, seated in the statehouse. Saltonstall does not sport the pretentious airs of dignity that less cultured and bred Governors assume. "Lev," as most everybody calls him, speaks the lingo of the masses, adjectives and all.

A Republican, Saltonstall lavishes his guests with the most democratic hospitality. Five minutes after we were seated in the spacious living room of his private home, an old wooden colonial mansion at 240 Chestnut Hill Road in Newton, we felt that the deed to the place was in our pocket. We sat near the blazing fireplace, rows of books filled the adjacent wall, and a document-laden desk stood nearby. We chatted informally for 2 hours.

Ever since Saltonstall took office last January a political, scandalous storm, has raged over the Bay State. Shocking exposures of graft and corruption during preceding administrations have disturbed New England placidity. On top of the inherited headaches has been Levvie Saltonstall, working diligently to restore confidence in the State government.

Most recently, reformers' fires have been directed at the pari-mutuels at race tracks (Massachusetts legalizes pari-mutuels at the dog and horse racing tracks). The numbers pool racket, for years a consistent headache to New Yorkers, has been flourishing throughout Saltonstall's domain. Some quarters have suggested legalizing lotteries, but Levvie has balked at the plan.

Saltonstall's administration has been one of the most humane, catering to the downtrodden. Massachusetts is one of the few States that pays 50 percent of its relief bill.

"I won't balance the budget on empty stomachs," says Saltonstall. Yet the Governor doesn't add that under his guidance the State finances are well on their way out of the red.

Although Leverett Saltonstall is a Republican Party stalwart his intellectual honesty and absolute sincerity is a marked contrast from other Grand Old Party bigwigs. Saltonstall is in harmony with many of Roosevelt's New Deal policies and objectives.

"Many of Roosevelt's policies are commendable. He has made some appreciable achievements." Saltonstall remarks, "but in a few of the cases bad executive directions have marred the objectives."

Saltonstall admires many of the President's personal qualities, although he formally met Franklin Delano Roosevelt only once. It was at Hyde Park, during a Governors' conference, that Levvie shook Frank's hand. Saltonstall, however, is very well acquainted with the other members of the Roosevelt clan. While abroad, a short time ago, the Governor was a house guest of Jimmy Roosevelt who had rented a home in Ireland during a vacation. In fact, Jimmy loaned Saltonstall his tennis shoes and went barefooted himself.

Like the President, Saltonstall graduated from Harvard. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1914, after being one of the school's greatest athletes, captaining the famed Harvard crew that won the Royal Regatta at Henley in 1914, playing right center on the hockey team, and engaging in other sports. Levvie is sentimental about his graduating year; for years his private cars, his latest being a 1937 Packard, have had license plates numbered 1914 dangling from the bumpers.

Twenty-four hours after Saltonstall was elected Governor he began to think it would have been better for him if he had lost. He was so depressed by the influx of patronage seekers cluttering all roads to Newton, all clamoring for jobs and favors.

"The worst thing about being elected Governor," Saltonstall will tell you, "are the patronage seekers and some politicians casting their eyes on favors. For 3 months straight over 100 people and 400 letters came in every day. It almost drove me nuts."

Saltonstall shifted the patronage hounds to his secretaries who diplomatically smothered their ambitions.

Unlike the assumed importance of lesser officials, Saltonstall has not yet flattered himself into marching around with a vanguard of burly bodyguards. He has no bodyguard. After his election, officials of the telephone company advised him to change his number to a private listing. He replied that he would keep on trying staying in the book a while longer and his name and number are still there.

"I get very few crank calls," the Governor reports.

Everybody in Newton knows the Governor. He strolls around the corner of his home at 9 each morning and catches the train for Boston. It takes him merely 15 minutes to reach the Huntington station. On the train, or along the way, he chats amicably with all who recognize him.

Saltonstall, until he became Governor, glided a razor across his beard himself. A few weeks after having been seated, Saltonstall was approached by a bashful, stammering, old Negro, attired immaculately in white. "Mr. Governor," the Negro began, "I shaved 14 Governors without missing one and it now looks like you'll break my record."

Now Saltonstall stops in the State barber shop to be prettied by John H. Charleston, who has been in the statehouse barber shop 42 years.

Saltonstall has many intimate acquaintances. His closest associate, always at his side, is Allan Larrivee, his official chauffeur, who incidentally is also a sergeant in the State police. Russell Gerould, his secretary, handles press relations; Carroll L. Meins, administrative matters; and Daniel J. Lynch, legislative problems. All are experts in their fields.

Saltonstalls' favorite hobby is reading. His study is studded with books. Only books on biography, history, crime, and politics can arrest the Governor's interest. During a recent illness he read attentively, Nicholas Murray Butler's biographical reminiscences, "Through the Years." Lately the Governor has been absorbed in tomes dealing with the problems of crime.

A stanch defender of the parole system, Saltonstall goes into a lather upholding its principle.

"Many of these people make mistakes," the Governor holds, "that we should recognize as being beyond their control. Unemployment breeds crime. We must rehabilitate the people that fail. While parole fails in some cases it has made more worthy accomplishments, far in excess of its failure."

Saltonstall is not a rabid movie fan. He sees about three pictures a year. He thought the much-publicized epic, "Gone With the Wind," was not a very good picture.

"Greta Garbo is beautiful," Levvie blushes on. "My kids named my favorite pet, a donkey, Greta Garbo. I guess she wouldn't mind," he says apologetically.

During his year in the Gubernatorial chair, the 47-year-old Governor has restored sane, efficient government in Massachusetts. He has put a stop to the pardon and parole racket, which had become a public scandal. He reorganized a demoralized department of education. Saltonstall placed the racing commission under the leadership of men with integrity. The State budget, long tinted in the reddest hue, is now seeing streaks of black. He gave Massachusetts an honest, incorruptible civil-service board. Saltonstall's administration in the Bay State is a milestone in its history of honest government.

There is something of the humbleness and spirit of Abe Lincoln in Leverett Saltonstall, and maybe some day soon the White House will be Levvie's station. He seems tailor-made for the job.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this article on Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, compared his stellar qualities with those of Abraham Lincoln. Carried away by his enthusiasm for the great man, the Gazette reporter was so rash as to suggest that Saltonstall had great Presidential possibilities. I can well see why Walker, the chairman of the Democratic Committee, should take exception to such a suggestion, and attempt to throttle a publication making it.

Later Gov. Arthur H. James, of Pennsylvania, in another issue, blamed crooked politics for many existing evils and corruptions. That must have hit home in many cases. Governor James' picture was also published.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the article to which I have just referred, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Police Gazette]

WHY PAROLE IS CORRUPT—GOVERNOR JAMES BLAMES CROOKED POLITICS FOR EVIL

(By Nat K. Perlow)

"That's an unfair question!" barked small, bespectacled Arthur H. James, Governor of Pennsylvania, seated behind his massive desk in the executive chamber. "My views on legalized pari-mutuels aren't important. That issue has been up in the legislature from time to time. It's for them to decide."

For several years now the question of legalizing pari-mutuels in the Keystone State has been brought up in the legislative chambers

and time and time again it has been buried in committee, defeated, and compromised out.

Zealous advocates, disgusted with the impractical puritanism of reformers, have literally been tearing their hair out of their heads pointing out that the State loses over $10,000,000 annually in vacation tourist revenue to neighboring Maryland, whose legislature thinks more in terms of dollars and cents than outdated scruples.

His excellency, an astute politician, has never limbered from his silence, and it is necessary to understand the strange political background of Pennsylvania to appreciate the Governor's wisdom.

"That's an unfair question," he keeps repeating, although every other Governor interviewed by the National Police Gazette willingly expressed his views on legalized gambling. Why? Well—

Much of Governor James' difficulty is due to the influence wily Moe Annenberg, indicted czar of racing information and powerful publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, wields over the State Grand Old Party. If James were to favor legalized pari-mutuels his opponents would label him Annenberg's stooge; if he were to oppose pari-mutuels he would probably alienate some powerful Grand Old Party biggies, so Governor James, a very practical politician, just keeps his mouth shut.

The Pennsylvania Governor weighs and reweighs every word before speaking. Some of his press conferences run the length of hours and although Governor James talks a great deal, he confides nothing of vital value to the gentlemen of the press. He is very much unlike the many Governors who candidly confide, off the record, almost everything to the newspapermen covering their offices.

However, Governor James is a very congenial and likeable person. The newspapermen are personally very fond of the Governor although some resent his lack of confidence in them.

Governor James is very much interested in parole. Ever since he served on the Pennsylvania Pardon Board during his Lieutenant Governor incumbency, 1926–30, he has cultivated a keen interest in the parole problem. It is one of the few subjects you can question Governor James on without having him irritably remark: "That's an unfair question."

"I favor parole." Governor James says boldly. "We have a very efficient parole system in Pennsylvania. There are a few amendments I have in mind that should contribute much to perfect the parole system in Pennsylvania."

"The only trouble with parole," the Governor concedes, "is in the administration of parole. It is necessary to keep corruption and politics out of the parole system. Politics will kill any parole system."

Governor James' idea of an ideal parole board is one that will appropriate the exclusive parole franchise in the State and be independent of any other State department. James even favors having the parole board set the sentence of a convicted law violator and merely have a judge for trial purposes only.

The Governor is a short, stocky, conservative gent. He looks more like a neighborhood storekeeper than the Governor of the second largest populated State in the Union.

"I like simple clothes," the Governor willingly reports, "my favorite color in suits is blue—like the one I have on," he adds, pointing to his dark blue single-breasted jacket.

All the Governor's clothes (five suits, three coats, a full formal attire, three pair of shoes, two dozen shirts, and only three ties) are in dark shades. Ever since the death of his wife, a major tragedy in his life, Governor James has only worn black ties.

The Governor has no valet. He shaves himself, shines his own shoes, and even presses some of his own clothes. He always drove his own car, a Pontiac, until ascending to the Governorship. Now, however, a uniformed State trooper chauffeurs His Excellency in an official State limousine.

Besides a daily walk the Governor does not indulge in any other exercises.

"I used to go fishing," the Governor reports, "but no more. Every time I went fishing the fish had a way of finding out."

The Governor reads very little. After he is through with his daily chores, reading numerous State reports, letters, and miscellaneous documents his eyes are weary. He, however, always manages to find time to read the latest Abraham Lincoln biographies. He has just started reading Carl Sandburg's latest works on Lincoln.

James always marches around escorted by a burly State trooper. "The Governor can't be without a bodyguard," LeRoy V. Greene explains. "Almost every time a lunatic escapes he heads straight for the Governor, since the Governor is one of the few who can free him. We caught a number of them trying to see the Governor."

Perhaps, no other Governor in office today has encountered as vehemently militant an opposition as Gov. Arthur H. James must face. Whatever he does, whatever he says, is carefully scrutinized and weighed by his adversaries. This is undoubtedly the reason Governor James cringes, goes into deep thought, then dismisses suspicious questions with "That's an unfair question."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in April 1940, Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut, a Republican, in an exclusive interview published in this magazine, discussed the ways and means of getting our unemployed back to work. He proposed lower taxes and encouragement to industry. The magazine also published his picture. I would not exactly say that such a suggestion met with the approval of Mr. Walker, or voiced what he or his party stood for. I have in my hand a copy of the article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Police Gazette of April 1940]

"LET'S GET OUR UNEMPLOYED RIGHT BACK TO WORK," STATES GOVERNOR BALDWIN IN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

(By Nat K. Perlow)

"I'm not opposed to gambling on any moral grounds," burly Ray Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut explains. "I see nothing wrong when men who can afford to lose, gamble, but," warns the chief executive, "if we legalize gambling, men and women who can least afford to lose, will start playing games of chance."

Although Connecticut's adjoining States, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New York, have all let down the bars on gambling, legalizing pari-mutuels at race tracks, there will be no legalized pari-mutuels, or any other form of gambling in Connecticut—not if Governor Baldwin can help it.

"Personally," the Governor adds, "I never gamble—I don't enjoy it. If some people like to play cards, or the races, let them," but again Baldwin adds, "only if they can afford to lose."

But, advocates of legalized games of chance should not feel defeated. If Ray Baldwin continues to hold sway in the old Connecticut State house, continuing to stimulate business recovery in the Nutmeg State, then Ray Baldwin will run out of his own argument—everybody in Connecticut will be able to afford to lose.

Governor Raymond E. Baldwin, massive, muscular chief executive of Connecticut, is about the most unusual gubernatorial specimen to be found in any statehouse in America. Unlike the many debt-priming Governors—this man Baldwin has shaven and trimmed the Connecticut ledgers out of the red. For the first 6 months of his initial administration, penny-wise Baldwin has not only balanced the treasury books, but filled the anemic exchequer with a $391,000 surplus. Baldwin, indeed, is a nonconformist duck.

Besides his prodigious feat in arithmetic, Governor Ray Baldwin (he always hated 'rithmetic, algebra, and geometry at school) has been courting industries into his State with "tax appeal." He has slashed taxes. "This is only the beginning," he says. Already 160 new industries, an increase of about 100 percent over the preceding 12 months, have established themselves in Connecticut. Over 42,000 jobs were made available—another 100 percent increase over last year. Now, the Governor has undertaken a vast employment project to put the unemployed back to work.

Governor Baldwin is a congenial gent, a bit unkempt in dress, slouched in a swivel chair behind a littered desk, stacked high with papers, reports, booklets, and a mass of other paraphernalia at the statehouse, an unpretentious chamber, a relic of the middle nineties, he gave his views on unemployment, gambling, and parole.

"It's all very simple," Baldwin remarked. "The only way to provide jobs is to encourage industries. And to encourage industry it is the responsibility of the Government to remove obstacles. High taxes is one of the dominant causes that hampers business."

When Ray Baldwin moved into the gubernatorial chambers one of the first things he did was to appoint a commission on the employment of men over 45 years of age, under the guidance of Carl A. Gray. For years it was charged that men over 45 are through in industries, that it is impossible for them to find employment.

"We found that not only men over 45 are having difficulty with employment," the Governor reports, "but also that it is youths from 18 to 25 who have the greatest difficulty in finding jobs. Industries call for experienced, skilled labor, and youths are unable to offer this requisite."

Baldwin and Carl A. Gray, commission chairman, undertook to correct the lack of vocational inexperience by encouraging industrial leaders in the State to tackle the problem of employment through local committees of their own choosing. Unemployed youths were placed in industrial establishments, paid while being grounded in skilled labor.

"You must train the younger men to handle skilled jobs," the Governor holds. "They must have experience to obtain decent employment. Unemployment may be government's problem, but employment is business' and industry's problem."

Every day at 11 a. m. the gentlemen of the press filter into Baldwin's unadorned sanctum. Never before in the history of the State has the press been accorded an open door right into the Governor's office. Ray Baldwin and the nine statehouse correspondents talk intimately, sometimes for hours when no pressing business is at hand, confiding "off the record" all the State secrets.

"He passes out cigars to the boys," says Moses Berkman, of the Hartford Times, in

the anteroom, "and anything any of the boys want is usually arranged. Nicest guy we ever had in the statehouse."

Ray Baldwin is far from being a fashion plate. He has a wardrobe of three suits, two coats, and, of course, a complete formal outfit. In his office, when he works late into the night, he removes his jacket, loosens his tie, and flaps open his collar. At home he lounges around in old clothes.

The Governor lives in a modest stucco home in Stratford. Since he became Connecticut's Governor his home has been an extension of the executive offices. When he is done with his daily chores at the statehouse he motors to Stratford, eats his dinner (the Governor loves corn beef and cabbage) then goes back to work in his study, reading reports, making notes, preparing State papers.

"The trouble with being Governor," the Governor says, "is that you have to be a Governor 24 hours a day. I work 18 and 19 hours a day, weekdays, Sundays, and holidays. Even when I sleep, the budget, the reports, and commissions pop around in my mind."

The Governor, since ascending the gubernatorial chair, has been divorced from a private social life. Only rarely does he break away to go fishing with Art Mitchell, an old boyhood friend, or Jim Gilkinson. Sometimes his persistent sons (he has three of them) carry their pop off to a local movie.

"The last picture I saw was months ago," Ray reports, "It was the Marx brothers picture, A Day at the Races."

Ray Baldwin has no favorite actor, or actresses. He knows too many of them personally to venture a selection. Baldwin was a boyhood chum of Barton McLane, the gruff voiced screen heavy.

"McLane was a very good looking boy," Baldwin confides. "All the girls in Middletown were wild about him. He also went out with my sister," the Governor goes on to reveal.

When the Governor has any leisure, he sinks back in his plush covered chair in his study, and reads biographical works. His favorite subject is Abe Lincoln. In his home he has a complete shelf of Lincoln biographies.

"I'm now reading Carl Sandburg's biography on Lincoln. It's a great book."

Although Baldwin now has an official State car with a uniformed State police sergeant to drive him, he frequently tells the driver to move over and takes the wheel himself. He has been driving for 20 years and has never had an accident.

One of the hardest unpleasantries Baldwin has encountered while being Governor has been sitting on the parole board.

"It's hard to make reason overcome emotions."

"Parole must be carefully administered. The welfare of the citizens must be placed above everything else, but instead of giving much time and thought to the parole problem we should concentrate on decreasing crime by providing jobs for the unemployed. A solution to the unemployment problem will solve a large portion of the crime and vice and parole problem. Let's get our unemployed back to work."

In Connecticut the theme of Baldwin's administration has been fashioned to lower taxes, encourage industry, provide employment, and guide the younger generations to their rightful stations. Baldwin is succeeding! More and more, every day, more industries are filtering into the Nutmeg State, more jobs are being made available. Ray Baldwin's labors are bearing their fruits.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it may be that Frank Walker, who is very much a Democrat, considered phrases in praise of Republicans as a form of obscenity. That is hard to believe, but no harder, actually, than any of the other fantastic and fanatical objections which the Post Office brought forth in their fight against the Police Gazette, one of the oldest and best known of all American publications. This publication has hired no high priced lawyer, nor cajoled Frank Walker and blindly abided by his political rule. It is fighting its fight on the merits of its case alone, and representing the desire for a free press in America. I mention the Police Gazette in this case because it is symbolic of modern journalism. It is a publication which is enjoyed by the two-fisted, red-blooded man who is a devotee of sport.

HISTORY OF POLICE GAZETTE

The National Police Gazette began in 1845. Its history is replete with battles; yes, battles—battles against gangsterism, battles against injustice, battles for right. It has weathered many a storm, and will weather this one for justice and decency.

Enoch Camp and George Wilkes, who founded the Police Gazette, operated it as a weapon with which they fought vice and crime. The editor, Mr. Wilkes, exposed plenty of gangsters of those early days, as was proven by the fact that he was beaten up a dozen times and shot at twice. The offices of the Police Gazette were attacked many times by gangsters. On one occasion, in 1850, so serious was the assault that six men, including Andrew Frost, the Gazette's star reporter, were killed. This policy of fighting gangsterism is carried on today. Every issue of this publication exposes some evil. Each one clearly shows that crime does not pay.

Richard K. Fox, who assumed the publication of the Police Gazette in 1876, gave away more than a quarter of a million dollars in medals, prizes, and stake money to popularize and promote sports and clean living; working on the theory that a clean mind dwells best in a healthy body, the Police Gazette today awards prizes for health and strength, and promotes physical fitness among the youth of the country. Last year a young sanitation employee of New York City won the award of "Mr. Police Gazette" for physical perfection. Is this not decent literature?

The Police Gazette faithfully reports feats of police heroism, and invariably points a moral in reporting crimes. This is the type of publication which Frank Walker seeks to suppress, even as he generously hands out second-class mailing privileges to favored publications which do not have nearly as much reason for existence.

But that is not all. This publication, whose second-class mailing privilege the chairman of the Democratic Party had the effrontery to revoke, was subsidized by the United States Government. Yes, Mr. President, during the Mexican War, in 1846, the United States Government subsidized the Police Gazette and ordered it widely circulated in every Army camp in the United States in order to apprehend deserters. Each month the Gazette published comprehensive lists, and devoted an entire page to descriptions and facts which would aid American citizens in helping to track down deserters. At the beginning of the present war, the publisher generously offered the columns of his publication for similar purposes without any financial consideration. I suggest to the chairman of the Democratic Party that such a function is useful and decent.

There has always been room in this country for this type of periodical, which clearly conforms with the second-class law, which specifies that a magazine, in order to enjoy a second-class mailing privilege, must be originated and published for the dissemination of information of a public character. I am at a loss to see what possible justifiable reason the chairman of the Democratic National Committee can put forth to substantiate his case against this magazine. If the magazine is not entitled to the privilege, the newspapers are not.

The Police Gazette meets the standards of the national organization for decent literature of the Catholic church, and is also approved by the New England Watch and Ward Society, the Protestant organization. The chairman's laxity in taking steps to prosecute publications which have willfully and intentionally abandoned their mailing privileges, merely switching their transportation to freight and express channels, proves that the administration is little concerned with reform. These magazines are still being sent out through freight and express channels, and the Postmaster General has taken no steps to prosecute those responsible for publishing and circulating them.

THE DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN IS ILLY TOLERATING OPPOSITION

I am told that one publisher has been threatened that he would never receive his mailing privilege no matter what he published because he publicly dared to criticize the actions of the Postmaster General and to insist on his constitutional rights.

The resultant evils arising from such a practice are great and manifold. Periodicals in this country were all intended to serve a purpose. That purpose is to disseminate information and to voice an opinion. I believe there is no possibility of free expression in this country today; not while Frank Walker holds publishers like puppeteers in one hand and threateningly wields the club of revocation of privileges and political censorship in the other.

Mr. President, I can quite understand Frank Walker's desire for the complete expression of favorable political views, but I say that he has no right to dictate the editorial policies of publications under the threat of granting or revoking the second-class mailing privileges.

I am fully aware that publishers are often greatly intimidated by political bigwigs who hold the reins of their office relentlessly, but I am inclined to think that no true American would accept a political favor in exchange for his idealism and integrity. Any publisher who

today is granted a second-class mailing privilege is obligated to Frank Walker and the National Democratic Committee. Knowingly or unwittingly he becomes the victim of a "pay-off in the dark." This is a ruthless "pay-off" which leaves him stripped of opinions and the power to exercise his editorial integrity. That is not the American way of life. The expression of opinion and truth are the American code.

The warping of opinions so that they coincide fully with those of the chairman of the Democratic Party is in perfect conformity with what is happening in the countries of our enemies, and that must not happen here.

Mr. President, I repeat that the United States Government has competent advisers to deal with the publishers of lewd and indecent magazines. We have laws upon the statute books which provide that men and corporations who peddle filth and send these magazines through the mails can be put in the penitentiary. If they peddle that kind of stuff to the youth of America, that is where these men belong. We spend millions of dollars each year in maintaining our courts of justice, and our thousands of attorneys and judges will make short shrift of any human vulture who aims to make money by contaminating the minds of our youth.

Why, I repeat, has not the Postmaster General, if he is acting in good faith and if he really wants to, wiped out obscene and indecent literature? If he believes the publishers of these 70 magazines are guilty, why has he not prosecuted them? He is here in Washington; the Attorney General of the United States is here in Washington; we have courts here in Washington; we have honest jurors in Washington. Why does not Mr. Walker simply pick up the telephone on his desk and call the Department of Justice? That is all he has to do. The Department of Justice is functioning, the courts are functioning, and the people of the United States are functioning, yet the chairman of the Democratic Party insults the intelligence of every good citizen in America by publicly barring those 70 magazines from the post office, knowing while doing so that they will be sent out to the people by express and truck and will be circulated among the youth of this country. And all the while he knows that he, by simply telephoning the Department of Justice can, if an evil exists, stop it all.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Postmaster General is not, at least in my judgment, doing his full and complete duty, I shall ask the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives to protect the youth of America, and for that purpose I ask consent to introduce at this time a bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended, relating to certain nonmailable matter. I ask that the bill may be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD at this point, together with a memorandum explaining the bill, which has been prepared by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received, properly referred, and printed in the RECORD together with the memorandum, as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 1105) to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 211 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) The following matter is hereby declared to be nonmailable, and shall not be conveyed in the mails, or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier:

"(1) Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, and every filthy book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other publication of an indecent character;

"(2) Every article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception;

"(3) Every article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for producing abortion;

"(4) Every article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for any indecent or immoral use;

"(5) Every article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing which is advertised or described in a manner calculated to lead another to apply it for preventing conception;

"(6) Every article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing which is advertised or described in a manner calculated to lead another to apply it for producing abortion;

"(7) Every article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing which is advertised or described in a manner calculated to lead another to apply it for any indecent or immoral purpose;

"(8) Every written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind, giving information, directly or indirectly, where or how, or from whom, or by what means any of the hereinbefore mentioned matters, articles, or things may be obtained or made;

"(9) Every written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind, whether sealed or unsealed, giving information, directly or indirectly, how or by what means conception may be prevented;

"(10) Every written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind, whether sealed or unsealed, giving information, directly or indirectly, where or by whom any act or operation of any kind for the procuring or producing of abortion will be done or performed, or how or by what means abortion may be produced;

"(11) Every letter, packet, package, or other matter containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing, device, or substance;

"(12) Every paper, writing, advertisement, or other matter representing that any article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing may, or can be used or applied for preventing conception;

"(13) Every description calculated to induce or incite a person to so use or apply any such article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing;

"(14) Every paper, writing, advertisement, or other matter representing that any article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing may, or can be, used or applied for producing abortion;

"(15) Every description calculated to induce or incite a person to so use or apply any such article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing;

"(16) Every paper, writing, advertisement, or other matter representing that any article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing may, or can be, used or applied for any indecent or immoral purpose;

"(17) Every description calculated to induce or incite a person to so use or apply any such article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing;

"(18) Every book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other written or printed matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination.

"(b) When the postmaster at the place of mailing has reason to believe that any matter deposited for mailing is of any of the classes described in subsection (a), he shall (1) immediately seize and hold such matter pending the proceedings in the district court as herein provided; (2) immediately notify the sender that such matter has been detained, indicating any language, picture, print, illustration, or characteristic, which, in his judgment, constitutes a violation of this section; and (3) transmit, within 10 days from the date of such seizure, notice thereof to the United States district attorney for the district in which such seizure is made. Within 30 days from the date of receipt of such notice, such district attorney shall institute proceedings in the district court for the forfeiture and destruction of the matter seized. In the event that such notice has not been transmitted within such 10 days or such proceedings have not been instituted within such 30 days, such matter shall forthwith be delivered or returned, at the option of the sender. In any such proceedings, on demand of any party, the facts in issue shall be determined by a jury. Upon the adjudication that the matter seized is of any of the classes described in subsection (a) the court shall order such matter to be destroyed. Upon adjudication that the matter seized is not of any of such classes such matter shall forthwith be delivered or returned, at the option of the sender. The judgment of the district court in such proceedings shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review in the manner provided by law for the review of judgments of district courts of the United States.

"(c) The postmaster shall from the time of any such seizure, retain in a separate file, open to the public, a copy, duplicate, or complete description of the matter seized, together with a copy of his notice to the United States district attorney, and in the case of written or printed matter, he shall, immediately on institution of any proceedings with respect thereto, transmit to the Library of Congress, where it shall be available to the public for inspection, a complete description, or, when possible and convenient, a copy of such matter, or of that part thereof which, in his opinion, brings such matter within a class described in subsection (a). Upon the termination of said proceedings, the postmaster shall promptly cause to be placed in such public file a record of the disposition and adjudication with respect to the seized matter, and shall promptly transmit a copy of such record to the Library of Congress, where it shall be placed with the description or copy of such matter.

"(d) Whoever shall knowingly deposit, or cause to be deposited, for mailing or delivery, any matter, or a copy of reproduction of any matter, which, within 5 years prior

to the time of such deposit, has been adjudicated to be nonmailable under this section, or whoever shall knowingly take, or cause to be taken, any such matter, from the mails for the purpose of circulating it or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or disposition thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The memorandum presented by Mr. LANGER in connection with the bill is as follows:

This memorandum is written in connection with a proposed bill. The purpose of the bill is to provide a court review where the Government seeks to exclude material from the mails on the ground that the matter contained therein is obscene. The general pattern followed has been that provided for the Customs Bureau (title 19, U. S. C. A., sec. 1305). The proposed bill is intended to be merely an amendment to section 211a, as amended, to the Criminal Code (title 18, U. S. C. A., sec. 334) which sets forth the type of matter the Government deems objectionable and nonmailable.

The procedure now in effect entrusts arbitrary powers in the hands of one individual, the postmaster. The most reasonable remedy is a provision for libel proceedings before a jury and a civil trial of the matter which the post office seeks to bar. This method, as pointed out above, has already been established as the procedure for the Customs Bureau and has proved very effective during the 13 years since it was inaugurated.

1. Section 211a, subsections 1–18, are merely restatements in separate paragraph form of the matter at present declared objectionable and nonmailable as set forth in title 18 United States Code, Annotated, section 334. It cannot be doubted that the Federal Government in the exercise of its police powers to preserve the health and morals of the country may declare material such as described in the bill to be nonmailable.

2. Section 211b provides that court review of matter deemed to be nonmailable shall be had in the district where the matter is mailed. In general the form followed is that set forth for the Customs Bureau in title 19 United States Code, Annotated, section 1305. In order that a prompt review may be had at the least expense to the sender, it has been provided that only the postmaster at the point of mailing may intercept such matter he may deem to be objectionable and to transmit it to the local United States attorney.

A provision which would give any other postmaster this power would be bad policy, as it might entail the necessity of defending the material at a great distance from where the mailer resided. Furthermore, if any postmaster other than the one at the point of mailing should have the right to intercept the material it would lead to a multiplicity of actions. Under the present provision a decision would be had in only one place, and a ruling, consequently, that the matter is mailable would automatically become binding upon any other postmasters at the points of destination.

An important characteristic of the action here brought is that the action is brought against the material and not against the sender thereof. The reason for this is that, as in proceedings brought against matters arriving from abroad, the nature of the action is in rem and not in personam. Consequently a ruling that a certain book or publication is not obscene would be res adjudicata in a proceeding against such book or article in another place. *U. S.* v. *One Obscene Book* (D. C. N. Y., 1931, 48 Fed. (2) 821).

3. Section 211c has been added for historical, educational and research reasons. Under the provisions of section 211b upon a finding that the matter mailed is obscene it is thereupon to be destroyed. No record would therefore be kept by which posterity could judge for itself the character of the matter. This provision would thereby prevent the complete destruction of what might be great masterpieces to later generations.

There is obviously no need for this provision in the section applicable to the Customs Bureau, where a similar penalty is imposed upon matter deemed proscribed by the statute. There would obviously be copies of the matter abroad which could be preserved for history. Furthermore, records of these decisions should be kept available to the public so that anyone in doubt could ascertain if a particular publication had been declared illegal.

4. The provision requiring that criminal penalties be limited to material deposited within 5 years of a civil adjudication declaring it obscene is to make the law flexible. Standards are changing so rapidly that no hard and fast rule can well be laid down. Matter condemned today is accepted next year—or it may be the other way around.

The other proposed remedies are obvious and need no argument to support them. With the exception of the 5-year provision and the requirement that records of adjudications be kept available to the public, these proposals are precisely the same as those already in effect concerning the importation of matter from abroad.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish all problems were as simple as the pending tax measure, House bill 2570. To me it appears to be a very elementary problem. Let us analyze it carefully. One of the greatest privileges a person can enjoy is to be a citizen of the United States. No other nation on earth offers the advantages which are found in America. It costs money for this Nation to give us the privileges and protection we enjoy, and the only way our Government has of raising that money is by taxation.

Our forefathers who set up our system of government made it so simple and so fair and honest that although one may be born in dire poverty, with no relatives or friends of prominence or influence, yet it is possible for such a citizen to rise from that abject and obscure position to a position of great wealth. Any nation which holds open such opportunities to each and every child born within its borders is certainly worthy of the cost of its maintenance.

To raise most of its money, our Government many years ago adopted a system of income taxes and has kept the system in operation ever since. Under this system every individual is permitted to engage in any lawful enterprise of his own choice for the purpose of making profit, with the full knowledge that a certain percentage of the profit shall belong to our Federal Government. Our Government is so fair and liberal with all its citizens that it permits them to continue their operations for 12 months before demanding any of its share of the profits. It then gives another 2½ months' time for each individual to figure exactly what the profits were for the 12 months' period. After this profit determination has been made and the percentage due the Government becomes known, then our Government in its desire to be fair and reasonable grants quarterly installment terms of payment of its share extending for 11½ months after the 12-month period during which the profit is earned. On these liberal installment terms of payment, the Government charges no interest whatever.

The system is so fair that, in case no profit is made, no payments are due the Government. So I say that it is not difficult for me to know my position on this tax problem. With privileges such as these, under no circumstances would I vote for any bill which would cancel 100 percent of my 1942 income taxes, or 75 percent, or 50 percent, or 1 percent, or one-tenth of 1 percent.

When our brave soldiers and sailors return home after they shall have fought this war and shall have won the victory which will protect our profit system of enterprise, along with other great rights and privileges, they will be able to look up the record and to see that the Senator now speaking did not vote to cancel his own income tax for 1942 or for any other year, while they were away from home fighting in the war and while our Nation was in greater need of money than ever before in its history. Neither shall I vote to cancel any portion of any other taxpayer's income tax for 1942, 1943, or for any other year or fraction of a year.

While our present income-tax system may not be perfect, Mr. President, and while the rates may be exceedingly high, yet it seems to me that the system is reasonably fair and equitable. I think about the only just complaint that could be made against it is that the rates are too high. That, however, is not the fault of our tax system; that is the fault of our appropriation system. Large appropriations have been made, and our Government is in debt deeper than ever before. It needs every dollar it can get in order to pay its debts. With these conditions existing, I do not intend to vote for any bill that will cancel income-tax obligations which, under laws enacted by Congress, have already accrued.

I have heard most of the argument on this question, Mr. President, and I am not going to question the contention or argument of any other Senator. It is the undisputed right of each Senator to say what he pleases and to vote as he chooses. But I have had sufficient business experience to know that the Government's share of my income for 1942 is a just and honest debt due to the Government, just the same as my rent and grocery bills for 1942 were just and honest debts; and I do not intend to try to escape the payment of that debt merely because I have been entrusted with the right to vote on such a plan in this Chamber. If it is not fair for me to vote to relieve myself of this honest, accrued, income-tax debt, it is not fair for me to vote to relieve any other taxpayer of his honest, accrued, income-tax debt, and I do not propose to do so.

The income-tax debt is recognized as a bona fide debt, to such an extent that practically all corporations and many individuals calculate the amount due each month, and set it up on their books and financial statements as a liability, the same as they do for their outstanding bonds, notes payable, and accounts payable.

There may be some who claim that over a period of years the Government will receive as much money from income taxes if we adopt the Ruml plan. That may be true; but to my knowledge no man has yet made the statement that under the Ruml plan each and every taxpayer during the same period of years will pay exactly the same amount of taxes he would have paid under our present laws. Therein, Mr. President, lies the inequity. Some would profit materially by the enactment of the Ruml plan, and others would be forced to pay more taxes than they would pay without its enactment. I have heard nobody deny that that is the fact. Why should we enact legislation which we know is positively inequitable?

Mr. President, I have heard it said that the whole plan is to enable taxpayers to pay on a current basis. Nothing has ever prevented taxpayers from paying their income taxes currently, and nothing prevents them from doing so now. Any day since 1913 that any taxpayer had a craving to pay his income tax currently he could have tendered the money to the United States Treasury. But I have not heard of anyone pounding on the Treasury doors demanding that he be permitted to pay his income tax every month or every week or every day, currently as he earned it.

No, Mr. President; I cannot believe that very many taxpayers in this country are demanding that they be permitted to pay their income taxes currently. There may be some persons who are demanding that the other fellow pay his taxes currently, but not themselves. There may be some sound reasons why the income tax on wages and salaries should be paid at the source. That type of income is of an entirely different character, because the amount is definitely known each pay day, whereas the exact amount of net income from business or professional transactions cannot be determined until after the close of the full period which, because of seasons or other factors, covers 1 year. It would be a very simple thing to set up a system of income-tax collection which would take care of income from wages and salaries. All it would be necessary to do would be to enact legislation setting up a withholding tax collection system covering all wages and salaries. The tax money would be deducted from each wage and salary payment and forwarded to the United States Treasury and applied on the taxes due by each individual as evidenced by taxpayer's income-tax reports filed on or before March 15 covering the previous year's operations, just the same as payments are now sent in quarterly by millions of taxpayers. The withholding tax collection on wages and salaries of each individual sent in during 1943 would apply on 1942 taxes, just the same as 1943 quarterly installments are now applied on 1942 income. At the end of 1943 adjustment would be made by having the individual pay the balance due or by having the Treasury refund to him any overpayment. Such a change would be a very simple, little one. It would not necessitate revamping the whole income-tax structure. It would not disturb the present Victory tax plan. It would not cancel any taxes accrued under the present laws. It would not cause anybody to pay 2 years' taxes during 1 year. It would not disturb any phase of the present system. It would only set up a weekly and monthly collection system on income taxes accruing from wages and salaries.

Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments to the pending committee amendment to House bill 2570, and ask that they be printed and lie on the desk, to be offered by me at the appropriate time for consideration. I also ask that the amendments be printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. O'DANIEL were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 85, line 13, after "calendar year", insert "to the extent not credited against the tax for a taxable year beginning in the preceding calendar year as hereinafter provided"; and following the amendment heretofore adopted to the committee amendment in such line, insert:

"The amount so withheld and collected during any calendar year shall also be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year beginning in the preceding calendar year as follows:

"(a) If the tax so imposed is paid otherwise than by installments, such recipient may credit against such tax the amount which he estimates as the amount withheld and collected during the first quarter of such calendar year.

"(b) If the tax so imposed is paid in installments, such recipient may credit against each installment the amount which he estimates as the amount withheld and collected for the quarter of such calendar year during which such installment is paid, and for preceding quarters to the extent not credited against any preceding installment.

"(c) If the aggregate of the amount so estimated as withheld and collected during such calendar year and allowed as a credit under subsection (a) or (b) exceeds the amount actually withheld and collected during such calendar year, such excess shall, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 56, be paid on or before March 15 of the succeeding calendar year."

On page 86, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and, beginning in line 24, strike out down to and including the period in line 4 on page 87.

Beginning on page 88, line 17, strike out all down to and including the period in line 14 on page 104.

On page 104, line 15, strike out "7" and insert "5."

On page 105, line 8, strike out "8" and insert "6."

On page 106, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and, beginning with the semicolon in line 21, strike out down to and including the word "service" in line 15 on page 107.

On page 107, line 22, strike out "9" and insert "7."

On page 108, line 10, strike out "10" and insert "8."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Am I to understand that the Senator's proposals do not make any change whatsoever in income tax liability?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And that withholding taxes collected in 1943 may be applied and are to be applied, under the Senator's plan, to the tax liability levied for the year 1942? Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me say that I wish to read the Senator's amendments, because his proposal is a very interesting one from my point of view.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BYRD obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Moore	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as briefly as I can, I wish to state to the Senate my reasons for voting as a member of the Senate Finance Committee in opposition to the pending legislation providing for 100-percent forgiveness in the payment of 1942 or 1943 income taxes. I do not believe, Mr. President, that during my experience in the Senate there has been a matter of legislation regarding which there could have been a more honest difference of opinion than there is with regard to the question we are now considering. I have reached my conclusions only after the most careful study.

I favor a pay-as-you-earn tax-collection plan. I favored such a plan when the last tax bill was adopted. At that time I offered an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee providing for a withholding tax of 15 percent, combined with a 1-year reduction in the proposed income rates which were then under consideration but had not been made effective sufficiently to lessen the impact of the collection of a withholding tax so as not to place any considerable hardship upon those who would be required to pay the withholding tax at the source. My amendment was defeated by one vote in the Senate Finance Committee. Had it been adopted, it is my belief that 80 percent of the taxpayers would now be on a current basis. The problem of now accomplishing a 100-percent pay-as-you-earn tax collection would have been greatly simplified.

There is a mutuality of interest in the proposal. It is of great interest and importance to the Treasury, as well as the Government as a whole, that taxes be placed on a pay-as-you-earn basis. I frankly admit that and acknowledge it. But it is even of more importance to the taxpayer that the collection of his tax be placed on a pay-as-you-earn basis. I believe, Mr. President, in view of this joint interest, that there should be a contribution on both sides in order to bring about a condition which would be desirable to both the taxpayer and the Government.

The plan as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, which I voted against, provides for a 100-percent tax forgiveness for 1 year, less the recovery that would be effected through anti-windfall provisions, which I will later discuss.

While I favor the pay-as-you-earn plan of tax collection, combined with such forgiveness as may be necessary to place this plan in operation without excessive hardship, I am unable to vote for a 100-percent forgiveness plan which is certain to result in the years to come in a very substantial loss to the Treasury by a cancelation of taxes on those who are able to pay, many of whom, in fact, have the actual cash in bank now to pay the tax thus forgiven.

If this able-to-pay class of our citizens desire to be placed on a pay-as-you-earn basis, they should be required to pay into the Treasury such an amount of their forgiven taxes as will be a substantial part of the tax which will be canceled.

Many citizens have been led to believe—and the statement has been made in the Senate—that the 100-percent-forgiveness plan will result in no actual loss to the Treasury. By some method of financial juggling taxpayers would be forgiven $8,500,000,000 of accrued taxes, and the Treasury would not suffer any loss.

A study of the matter should convince anyone that such would not be the case. If the 1942 or 1943 income taxes are canceled, abated, or forgiven, the result will be that a tax liability to the Government will be canceled. No one can deny it. It would be, in effect, a cancelation of a debt owed by the taxpayers to the Government.

It is, of course, true that this loss to the Government would not appear immediately, but it would diminish the tax revenue gradually in the years to come, so that ultimately the tax cancelation would be reflected in reduced Government revenue.

The effect of canceling 1 year's taxes would be to confer a gain on every taxpayer equal to his tax liability on his income. In the long run that gain would reflect itself in 1 year's less taxes to pay. In the short run that gain would reflect itself in the wiping out of a debt owed by the taxpayer, thus increasing his net worth.

By canceling the tax liability of all citizens on a 100-percent basis for 1 year, which, after allowance is made for the two windfall provisions, amounts to eight and one-half billions of dollars, under three conditions, which I shall discuss, there will be a direct forgiveness to the individual taxpayer and a direct loss to the Treasury by reason of this cancelation.

First, under the present law when a taxpayer dies, his estate must pay an accrued year's income taxes. Under the 100-percent forgiveness plan such accrued taxes are canceled, and, therefore, the Treasury loses. The taxpayer may spend it or lose it or give it away. There is a recoupment, assuming that the tax thus forgiven is not expended or given away and remains intact as a part of the estate, but this recoupment is not nearly sufficient to compensate the Treasury for the cancelation of 1 year's taxes.

Take, for example, an estate valued at $100,000 before the forgiveness of 1 year's taxes occurred. Assume then that this taxpayer earned in the year of forgiveness $460,000, and that all of this was kept intact during the remaining life of the taxpayer and was added in full measure to the estate. Under this situation a $100,000 estate would normally pay an estate tax of $4,800, inasmuch as $60,000 as we all know, is exempted. If $460,000 be added, making the estate $560,000, the total tax would then be $145,700, or an additional $140,900, as compared to the $460,000 of the tax forgiven. Therefore, in this instance the actual loss to the Treasury would be $319,100, or 69.4 percent of the amount forgiven. That is to say, in this instance, the taxpayer and his estate would benefit to the extent of $319,100.

Then take, for example, an estate of $560,000 before forgiveness, and consider that $250,000 was forgiven. Assume that this was kept intact during the lifetime of the taxpayer and added to his estate, making a total estate of $810,000. In that instance, the taxpayer would be required to pay $145,700 on the estate of $560,000 before forgiveness and, after adding the $250,000 forgiveness, making an estate of $810,000, he would pay an additional $87,500, but he would be forgiven $250,000, which would represent a loss to the Treasury and a gain to him. In that instance, the Treasury would lose 65 percent of the tax and the taxpayer would make a corresponding gain.

Take, for example, an estate of $60,000 with a forgiveness of $10,000 in taxes. In that instance, the Treasury would lose 95 percent.

So, Mr. President, this provision which it has been claimed would compensate the Treasury by the tax forgiveness will do so only in small measure. In the cases cited I do not think anyone can deny the loss that will fall upon the Treasury.

Let me discus other concrete examples under the second class of benefits to the taxpayers. The second definite condition when a taxpayer gains and the Treasury loses will be when a taxpayer received a regular and constant revenue and then suddenly, for one cause or another his revenue stopped. I will give some concrete examples.

Take a taxpayer who had a constant revenue of $1,000,000 beginning in 1938 and continuing up to and including 1944, and then this revenue ceased, perhaps because the property which paid the investment revenue may have become bankrupt, or because of the failure of his investments otherwise, or because of changes in the business situation in the country, or he might even have given away his estate in which event he would pay only a gift tax. But, whatever the cause may have been, assuming that the $1,000,000 income he had been receiving suddenly ceased, in that case he would be relieved of a tax of $854,000 in the event that his 1942 tax was the one which was canceled, because, under this proposal, the accrued taxes are canceled, and, that being the case, of course any cessation of revenue would result in a loss to the Treasury.

In the case of a $500,000 constant income in the period from 1938 through 1944, if this income suddenly ceased, which could happen from one of several causes, the taxpayer would gain and the Treasury would lose about $414,000.

Under the same conditions, in the case of a tax income of $250,000, which suddenly ceased from one cause or another, the Treasury would lose and the taxpayer would gain about $194,000. In the case of a $100,000 income the loss would then be about $64,060; in the case of a $50,000 income the loss would be $25,328; and in the case of $20,000 income the loss would be $6,452. Of course, the reason for this loss is that the accrued tax liability is canceled. Therefore, immediately when a taxpayer ceases to earn he realizes the benefit of the tax cancelation and the Treasury loses by reason of canceling the accrued tax liability. There is no windfall proposed or included in the bill which will reach this situation. It will undoubtedly occur in many instances. It may pay a man, for example, in anticipation of death, to give away his estate, and pay the gift tax only. Thereby he could save under the Ruml plan 1 year's taxes, less what he would pay in the gift tax; and let us remember that the gift taxes are 25 percent less than the estate taxes; that a taxpayer is permitted to give away $3,000 each year, and if he has five children he could give away $15,000 without taxation, with a lifetime exemption of $30,000.

Take, for example, a taxpayer who had a constant income of $10,000 in the 5 years from 1940 to 1944, but in 1945 had no income, what would be the result? This taxpayer, under the present law, would pay $8,289 by the payment of 5

full years of taxes. Under the Ruml plan, this taxpayer would pay $6,127, or 4 years' taxes. That is to say, he would not pay the tax currently for the year 1945 when he ceased to earn. Under these conditions, when a taxpayer who has been earning a current income suddenly stops earning, the Government will unquestionably lose 1 year's taxes. I may remind the Senate that this situation is very apt to occur in the readjustment period after the war.

Then take, for example, a taxpayer with a $10,000 income in 1940, 1941, and 1942, falling to $8,000 in 1943 and $6,000 in 1944, and with no income in 1945. Under the present law, such a taxpayer would pay a total of $6,509 and only $4,537 under the Ruml plan, representing a loss to the government of $2,154. In this case, the taxpayer would pay 5 years of taxes, under the present law, and only 4 years under the Ruml plan.

Take another example, a taxpayer with a $10,000 income in 1940, 1941, and 1942, rising to $15,000 in 1943 and $20,000 in 1944, with no income in 1945 would pay a total of $14,489 in taxes under the present law, and only $12,337 under the Ruml plan, a difference of $2,152, the amount of the tax canceled on his 1942 income of $10,000.

From these three cases it must be absolutely clear that tax cancelation eliminates 1 year's tax payments in these instances. In all three cases, the taxpayer would pay 5 years' taxes, under the present law, and only 4 years' under the Ruml plan.

Then take, for example, the income of a Senator—my own case, for example. For the year 1940 I earned $10,000 because of my salary as a Senator, as I did in 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944. Then, suppose that my term ceased by death, by resignation, defeat, or otherwise. I would then save $2,152 unless my Senate salary were augmented by some other form of income.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not the Senator assume that if he should cease to become a Senator he would probably make more money the following year than he did while he was a Senator?

Mr. BYRD. That is, of course, a possibility.

Mr. President, the third specific condition under which the taxpayer gains and the Treasury loses, and the one which, in my judgment, will result in the greatest gains to the taxpayer and the greatest loss to the Treasury is that after the war, when the prosperity created by the expenditure of the vast sums incident to the war shall have come to an end and we must readjust and reconstruct the business economy of this country on a greatly reduced basis, we will have a level of individual income much lower than it is today. That, I think, is inevitable. It is then that the taxpayers will gain the largest amounts and the Treasury will lose most heavily at a time when it can least afford to lose. For example, let us assume that an executive had a constant income of $100,000 beginning in 1938 and continuing throughout the war period, but in the readjustments incident to the post-war conditions his salary was reduced to $50,000 as a constant salary.

In that case this particular taxpayer would save $36,955 immediately, when the reduction occurred, and would save the remainder, or at least a part of the remainder, of $64,060 at death, less whatever additional estate taxes would be assessed against his estate.

We must remember, Mr. President, that it is proposed that we cancel the taxes on one of the two highest incomes this Nation has ever enjoyed, or perhaps ever will enjoy, either the 1942 or the 1943 income. It is perfectly possible that we will never enjoy an income in this country equivalent to the income of 1942 and 1943. Yet it is proposed in this pending measure that we cancel the taxes of one of those years.

It is estimated that the national income in this country in 1943 will reach the enormous figure of $140,000,000,000 as compared with $79,000,000,000 in the prosperous year, so-called, of 1929, and it is proposed that we cancel the taxes on whichever income is the lower, that for 1942 or 1943.

In the same situation, let us take a man with an income of $1,000,000 which is reduced to $500,000 by reason of the changed conditions in the post-war period. That man will have a net saving immediately, when the reduction occurs, of $414,000, and the balance of $852,000, less the additional estate taxes his estate may be assessed.

Of course, I recognize the great advantages of a pay-as-you-earn plan, and I realize that consideration should be given to the benefits which come to the Government as well as to the taxpayer. But the benefits are much more to the taxpayer than they are to the Government, and under the proposed legislation the Government would stand 100 percent of the loss that will occur to the Treasury and the taxpayer would stand none.

If Congress wants to cancel these taxes, and thinks it is an advisable thing to do in order that we may be put on a current basis, then let us come out frankly and tell the people of this country that taxes on those who are able to pay, who have the money in bank to pay, are being canceled, without requiring of them any substantial payment in order to obtain the advantage to the taxpayer of going on a current basis. Whatever may be the decision in regard to the proposed legislation, certainly the people of America should understand that this is a tax-cancelation proposal, and that there would be a benefit to the taxpayer, and a peculiar benefit to those who had the money in hand and were able to pay these taxes.

I recognize that perhaps no legislation has been proposed in Congress for many years that had the popularity back of it the so-called Ruml plan has today, but I do not believe the people of this country fully understand what would be the effects and what are the implications of the passage of a bill providing for 100-percent tax cancelation, and I make the prediction that when they do understand it, when they become fully conscious of it, this 100-percent cancelation will not receive the commendation many think it has today. At this time, when the Nation is faced with the most colossal expenditures in its history, we should hesitate a long time before we cancel taxes which are accrued and owing to the Government, which are just as much a debt as if I were to give my note at my bank, when there is just as much reason for me to pay my accrued taxes as to pay a bank note. We should give consideration to the loss which will occur to the Treasury if we cancel those taxes, and give consideration, too, to the distribution of the benefits to the taxpayers.

Mr. President, let me make this prediction, that if the bill shall be passed in its present form, canceling 100 percent of tax liability, an aggregate of eight and a half billion dollars, before the ink is dry on the signatures of the presiding officers of the two Houses the President of the United States and the Treasury of the United States will call upon the Congress to increase the existing tax rates in proportion to the cancelation and forgiveness we extend to the taxpayers under the bill. If that should occur, if there should be an increase in the rates, which are already exceptionally high in many instances, then the so-called benefits to the taxpayer would quickly sink into complete oblivion, and most taxpayers would be injured rather than benefited.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator feel that if there should be no cancelation, and if the bill should be rejected, the President and the Treasury would not still ask for an increase in tax rates?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator knows I am not in the confidence of either the President or the Treasury. I do not think it is necessary for him to ask me that question.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator had intimated as much in his previous remark.

Mr. BYRD. I said that it was my prediction, and it is my prediction. As to what amount of forgiveness should be granted, that is difficult to state. If the Senator wants my personal opinion as to the amount of forgiveness, I think a 50 percent forgiveness would be fair, 50 percent forgiven by the Government and 50 percent by the taxpayer, in order to put in operation a plan which would be mutually beneficial both to the Government and to the taxpayer.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not ask the Senator's personal opinion of the rate of forgiveness. What I asked was the Senator's prediction, if he chooses to give it, as to whether or not there is and will be need for an increase in the tax rates, irrespective of whether we pass the bill or reject it.

Mr. BYRD. I could not answer with respect to the attitude of the Treasury

and the President, because I am not in their confidence. I believe firmly that if the proposed cancelation is made on the basis of 100 percent, all the loss being on the Government, none of it being paid by the taxpayer, there will be a demand upon Congress to make good the loss.

Mr. DANAHER. On the basis of the Senator's prediction with reference to a 50 percent abatement—or forgiveness, to use the Senator's word—is it his prediction that the tax rates will have to be increased only 50 percent if we have a 50 percent abatement?

Mr. BYRD. I think the force of the argument for an increase of taxes will be much less effective on a 50-percent basis of cancelation than on a 100-percent basis of cancelation, if that is an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me pursue that thought for a moment, because I am very much interested in the Senator's phophecy about the Treasury's attitude. I will concede to him that the Treasury will take advantage of every possible prejudicial opportunity it can fabricate out of this situation, because it has done so for weeks and months. Does the Senator think, however, that if we were to pass the bill as it came from the House, which now, I understand, has the quiet acquiescence at least, of the Treasury—perhaps it is an acquiescence which is purely strategic, and based solely upon its inordinate desire in this unique instance to be sure that all the taxpayers of the United States are not treated equally—does the Senator think that the Treasury would be bound by that acquiescence not to use this excuse still to ask for an additional compensating tax to offset the loss incidental to the George substitute?

Mr. BYRD. An answer to the inquiry would be purely an opinion on my part. I do not know whether the Treasury would or would not, but as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, and as a Member of the Senate, I will say that a proposal made by the Executive to increase taxes would be much less impressive to me on a 50-percent or a 75-percent cancelation basis than on a 100-percent basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. If it should develop that the Treasury would in fact lose nothing by way of income for the year 1943, would the argument that we should increase the tax rates still impress the Senator?

Mr. BYRD. That is an assumption which I do not concede. It may be true for 1943, but not for future years.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Virginia is discussing the reduction of the 1942 liability by 50 percent, let us say, or 75 percent. It seems to me to be perfectly clear that a reduction by 75 percent of the lesser of 1942 or 1943 tax liability on individual income-tax payers would almost of necessity result in the stabilizing of the individual income taxes, at least during the next 2 years, and might be carried to the next 3 years, because under the proposal I am making there is added the 25 percent to the taxes of the next 2 years; that is 12½ due in March 1944 and 12½ due in March 1945. I do not think there would be any real danger that individual income taxes could be raised with that added burden on the taxpayer, but no one can pledge what he will do in a war situation like this. There would, it seems to me, be no chance, however, to increase the individual rates.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia is of the opinion that if, for example, a 75-percent tax cancelation were adopted and the other 25 percent spread over a period of 2 or 3 years, that would, to a large extent, safeguard those particular years from a general increase in taxes? Is that true?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator what the difference is between that and the situation which the Senator prophesies, namely, that if we pass this bill, we then may confront an increased tax recommendation from the Treasury? The very bill proposed by the able Senator from Georgia would increase everyone's income tax 12½ percent next year, and 12½ percent the following year, and I do not think that even the Treasury, in the midst of its wildest delusions, would recommend a larger increase than that in a subsequent tax bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may answer the distinguished Senator, I will tell him that there is a considerable difference. In the first place it is merely carrying over 25 percent of a fixed 100-percent liability. That is one difference. In the second place it is not an increase in the tax rates. Put the tax rates up and see how long it will take to get them down. They will not be lowered in 2 years. This liability can be carried over, however, and when that liability is discharged we will be back at least on the present high rate under which the country may have to live for a good long time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say that I agree with the able Senator from Georgia that there is a difference between a specific addition to the tax which terminates within 2 or 3 years as compared with an increase in rates, but so far as the poor taxpayer is concerned it hurts him just as much to pay 12½ percent increased tax next year even if he has a copy of the able Senator's statement before him to assuage his feelings.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I grant that, yes, but this is a war burden, and I do not think it is unduly burdensome for any man to pay this 25 percent and his regular tax out of 2 years' income. If the present rates are livable at all, if we can exist under them, certainly with 2 years' income we ought to pay an additional 25 percent. I know the payment is high, but I agree with the philosophy announced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to this extent at least, that tying in of the tax liability with the earnings as they are produced is a benefit to the Government and a benefit to the taxpayer. I believe that whatever is a benefit to the taxpayer is of course and necessarily a benefit to the Government. But I think there is a fair middle ground on which it ought to be possible to make the adjustment on a basis that will actually guarantee that the taxpayer will become current in his tax payment without throwing all the loss upon the Treasury at this time. Therefore I suggested that at least 25 percent of the 1942 tax, subject to the just windfall provision in the committee bill, ought to be collected. I think that on reflection few Senators will fail to agree that that is the sounder and better policy to pursue.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Michigan likewise overlooks the fact that the cancelation of 75 percent of tax will in many instances confer benefits on the same class of citizens who have to pay the additional 25 percent. There is no question about that. It is far better to have a temporary increase in payment of tax in order to discharge a debt which one owes the Government, than to have a general increase in tax rates.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That may be so as a matter of technique, but I wish to repeat, and then I will not interfere with the Senator's argument any further——

Mr. BYRD. I do not object to interruptions, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I repeat that I am not impressed by the threat that if there is a 100-percent cancelation of the tax for the lower of these 2 tax years, the inevitable result will be a Treasury recommendation for further increases in taxation by way of compensation for the cancelations, because I see very little difference as respects the cash situation of the taxpayer himself between the Senator's proposition, which is not to cancel entirely but only partially to cancel, so that the taxpayer then has to pay the addition, which is a new and extra tax, and the subsequent creation of a new assessment of an equivalent amount.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator recognize that under the George plan the taxpayer is paying 25 percent to cancel an obligation of 100 percent?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; and I also realize that if the bill is passed 99 taxpayers out of 100 will pay more taxes this year than they would if the bill were not passed.

Mr. BYRD. That is not true of 1945 and 1946 and of future years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is true of 1944 and 1945 if the report of the committee is to be relied upon, and the report of the committee was presumably drawn by experts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is assuming that income is going to go down in 1944, 1945, and 1946?

Mr. BYRD. No; I said it was going down in the post-war period.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly. But the time will also come when it will go up, and the Senator must realize that under the pay-as-you-go plan, when the national income is raised——

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio think that we will have a higher permanent national income in the future than we have now?

Mr. TAFT. I think undoubtedly 20 years from now the income of this country will be greater than it is even today, if the Senator wishes to know my opinion, and it is only an opinion. My point is that when income goes up the Government receives its tax money more quickly, because the Government receives the increased income immediately that year, than it would the following year.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not share the view of many, then, that after the war there will be a readjustment and a period when incomes are declining?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. I am only saying that——

Mr. BYRD. That is the time when the taxpayers under 100 percent forgiveness will get the benefit.

Mr. TAFT. We must also think of the period in the future when incomes are going up, and in those periods the Government every year will receive more money than it would receive otherwise. So I do not think the Senator can base his argument on the assumption of what will happen 20 years from now.

Mr. BYRD. Twenty years from now many present taxpayers will have passed on.

Mr. TAFT. I am looking at the situation from the point of view of the Government, not at the moment from the point of view of the taxpayers.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am not a member of the Finance Committee, as Senators know, and I must say that I have not had time thoroughly to study the problem. There seems to be a controversy with respect to the fundamental issue, namely, how much money will be obtained by the Treasury. The public generally has derived the idea that there is to be what is called a cancelation or a rebate. I have heard it said on the one hand that under the proposed plan, if it becomes law, there will be just as much money paid in 1943 into the Treasury as there will be if the proposed legislation is not passed. Some persons say more money will be paid in. It seems to me we are begging the question. Some say there will be a loss of $9,000,000,000. If the money goes into the Treasury, when is it lost?

The loss is going to happen sometime in the future. When? It cannot happen if the incomes go up. As I understand the situation, it can only happen when the individual taxpayer either loses his income or dies. If he dies in the middle of the year, his estate must pay the income on what he earned in the preceding 6 months, and must pay the estate tax besides. If the toboggan—I am speaking of the economic toboggan—goes down and the income of the country declines, there will be a corresponding benefit to the poor taxpayer. That development may result in not so many businesses or so many estates becoming bankrupt; and it seems to me that is an argument on the other side.

However, what I cannot understand, let me say to the Senator, and what I wish he would explain to me, is how he arrives at the $9,000,000,000 loss. The Senator assumes, apparently, an income of $140,000,000,000, of which $100,000,000,000 is in salaries and wages.

Mr. BYRD. Let me explain to the Senator that the $9,800,000,000 loss is from the cancelation of the tax liability.

Mr. WILEY. Well, that is begging the question.

Mr. BYRD. It is not begging the question at all, because that is what we would be doing. We would be canceling a tax liability of $9,800,000,000, less the recoupment from the so-called windfall provisions. That is the whole issue. That is not begging any question at all, as I see it; that is what we would be doing.

Mr. WILEY. When the Senator says "the tax liability," he is asking that out of $140,000,000,000 income, $100,000,000,000 of which is in salaries and wages already earned, we would collect the income the Senator claims is proposed to be canceled; and yet for 1943 it is said—and the Senator does not seem to deny it——

Mr. BYRD. I do not deny it for 1943.

Mr. WILEY. We would get more money into the Treasury in this way than we would otherwise.

Mr. BYRD. But what the Senator does not——

Mr. WILEY. Comprehend is the word, yes.

Mr. BYRD. I do not say "comprehend."

Mr. WILEY. Yes, that is the word.

Mr. BYRD. That what is done is to cancel the previous tax liability. If everyone continued to live and if every taxpayer continued to earn exactly on the basis on which he was earning when his income taxes were canceled, there would be no loss to the Treasury. But that will not happen.

But I did say—perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin was not in the Chamber at the time when I commenced my remarks——

Mr. WILEY. I was here, and heard all the Senator's remarks.

Mr. BYRD. I gave concrete illustrations whose applicability cannot be denied. I had them checked by the joint committee tax experts and the Treasury experts; and they agree—and when they agree I think they are correct, because usually they do not agree—that the money will be lost. Suppose the taxes for 1942 are canceled. That money is already due the Government; the income upon which it is based has already been earned. The proposal is that the highest tax—either the 1942 or the 1943 tax—shall be paid, and that the lowest tax shall be canceled.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Let us suppose that during a normal year the income of taxpayer A is $100,000, that in 1942 his income has been $1,000,000, and that in 1943 it is $500,000. Will the taxpayer pay a larger tax under the committee plan or under the plan of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BYRD. I should prefer to have the Senator from Georgia answer that question; but I assume that the taxpayer would pay a larger tax under the plan of the Senator from Georgia, which cancels 75 percent, as compared to 100 percent.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not agree with the Senator. I should like to have an explanation. Let us assume that the normal income of taxpayer A during the years set forth——

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean during the base years?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; let us assume that his normal income is $100,000 or $50,000 or $5,000; it does not make much difference about that. Let us assume that in 1942 his income is $1,000,000, and in 1943 it is $500,000. Under the committee plan will taxpayer A pay a larger tax in 1943?

Mr. BYRD. That is under the second windfall provision; I did not understand what the Senator meant.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me put the question categorically: Under the amendment proposed by the committee, would not taxpayer A pay a larger tax to the Government than he would pay under the plan of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BYRD. That is true. As I understand the Senator's question, the answer is as follows: In the base period, which is the years 1938, 1939, and 1940, if the particular taxpayer had an income of $100,000, and then later had an income of $1,000,000, he would pay a tax on $1,000,000, plus the difference between $100,000 and $1,000,000, plus $10,000.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Under that provision, the taxes the particular taxpayer would pay would amount to more than his income for that year; but that situation, let me say to the Senator, would apply to only a very small proportion of the taxpayers.

Mr. OVERTON. But the trouble is that that small proportion relates to the profiteers in 1942.

Mr. BYRD. Not necessarily so, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not?

Mr. BYRD. A man who was not in business in 1938, 1939, and 1940, but who in 1942 or 1943 was engaged in some business entirely disconnected from the war, and had an income of $100,000 in 1942 or 1943, would have practically to double his taxes in 1 year, although he had no war contracts at all.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me observe that that possibility is too remote to appeal to the Senate. We are dealing with the normal cases and the usual cases.

Mr. BYRD. Then, does the Senator think that today everyone who is making more money than he earned in 1938, 1939, and 1940 is making it out of war profits?

Mr. OVERTON. Not necessarily so.

Mr. WILEY. The national income has gone up.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me ask whether the so-called windfall would not work as a discrimination against certain persons?

Mr. BYRD. It would.

Mr. McFARLAND. For instance, take the case of two college boys. Let us say that when one of them graduates from college he starts playing baseball, and is paid $20,000 in 1940, and earns the same amount in both 1942 and 1943. Under the so-called Ruml plan, which the committee has endorsed, he would pay a tax of $7,531. The boy who graduates from college in 1942 and starts earning $20,000 a year, and earns $20,000 a year in 1942 and in 1943, would pay to the Government $12,286. Let me ask the Senator if he thinks such a situation is fair to those two boys?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there will be many very unjust discriminations under the second windfall provision proposed by the committee, unless we assume that every dollar of income now earned comes from war profits, because the plan proposed by the committee is based upon the base period of 1938, 1939, and 1940. The difference is taken between that income and the income canceled, and an additional tax is then assessed. If I thought that procedure would result in an adequate plugging up of the loophole, my opposition to the 100-percent provision, of course, would be greatly lessened, if not entirely eliminated. But it would not have that effect. Instead of that it would create any number of hardships for innocent persons—those who have had or who will have nothing to do with the making of war profits during the war period.

The amount of the forgiveness, abatement, or cancelation, whatever we may choose to call it, under the Ruml plan as reported by the Senate Finance Committee is $9,800,000,000. The two so-called windfall provisions will recoup this loss to the extent of $1,300,000,000—$900,000,000 by the first windfall and $400,000,000 by the second windfall—leaving a net cancelation of tax liability of $8,500,000,000.

It is absurd, in my judgment, to believe that this cancelation of taxes will not ultimately result in a loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury.

As has been pointed out, this loss is not compensated by an increase of the taxpayer's estate, because the gain to the taxpayer by the forgiveness of his accrued taxes may have been spent or given away in the meantime. The estate may not be large enough to be taxable, and, in fact, the income-tax rates bear no necessary relation to the estate-tax rates, so that even if the estate is subject to an estate tax, the loss from the cancelation would be only partially recaptured. The same situation can apply as a loss to the Treasury when a taxpayer retires or ceases to make money. If we could all live indefinitely, if our incomes would continue on a regular and steady basis, then the loss would not be significant; but the fact is, of course, that some day every taxpayer will die, and it is very probable that following the war there will be a general reduction of incomes, which will immediately occasion a loss to the Treasury by the cancelation of the accrued liability.

The first windfall provision, which would recoup $900,000,000, provides that the cancelation of taxes shall be on the lower of the years 1942 and 1943. That is to say, if the 1943 tax is higher than that for 1942, then the lower of the 2 years will be canceled, and the taxes will be paid on the higher year. We must not overlook the fact that to forgive all the 1942 or 1943 income tax would be to cancel one of the highest income taxes in all history. It is not likely that the average citizen of this country will have a higher income than he received during one of those 2 years. That is my personal opinion. Others might differ with me.

It follows that the higher the income tax that is canceled the greater the actual forgiveness is to the taxpayer and the greater the loss to the Treasury.

The second antiwindfall provision in the pending bill would recover to the extent of $400,000,000, but this antiwindfall provision would be applied in a manner which would work a great hardship and distress upon many classes of citizens engaged in productive nonwar business. It would not prevent 100-percent forgiveness to couponclippers and others who had a regular and steady income throughout the years 1938, 1939, and 1940, and who would pay nothing on their accrued tax which this legislation will cancel.

This antiwindfall provision provides that a taxpayer can select one of the three years 1938, 1939, or 1940 to be subtracted from the income of 1942 or 1943, and then the taxpayer will be compelled to pay on the difference between the year he selects and the high year of 1942 or 1943. This will be added to his current taxes and will result in many instances in an inequitable increase as compared to other taxpayers who receive complete forgiveness. For example, if the taxpayer had no income or was not engaged in business in one of the years 1938, 1939, or 1940, he would pay a double tax in 1 year less the taxes on a deductible amount of $10,000. The purpose of this amendment is explained by its advocates as being a provision to collect war profits. There is no Member of the Congress who is more anxious than am I to prevent war profits in the first instance and to collect a full proportion of taxes on such profits; but this provision does not necessarily apply to those who are engaged in work for their Government or who have war contracts for their Government; it applies to all citizens and will result in many discriminations and unjust hardships.

We have legislation now which provides for the renegotiation of war contracts, with arbitrary power on the part of the Army and Navy to reduce the cost of contracts when excessive profits are involved.

As the Ruml plan does not apply to corporations, this provision then is applicable only to individuals, while perhaps 90 or 95 percent of all the war contracts are held by corporations. Therefore, this provision cannot be effective in the reclaiming of war profits.

I want to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that under the present tax plan, after $100,000 is earned, the Government takes in taxes at least 90 percent. For example, on a $500,000 net income, the present tax is $442,362.58. On a $1,000,000 income, the present tax is $900,000. This provision will result in assessing in 1 year taxes in excess of the taxpayer's income.

If a man were retired from business and obtained all his income from business by clipping coupons, and he had a steady income during 1938, 1939, and 1940, the antiwindfall provision would not recover a single cent from him. On the other hand, if a person went into business and happened to make a profit, he would have a tremendous tax imposed on him.

Please understand, Mr. President, that I am not in any way advocating any provision which would not recoup to the fullest measure any excess profits made by war profiteers in this great emergency. However, we already have an income tax which takes $900,000 out of a $1,000,000 income, so there cannot be any great war profiteers under that tax. We have enacted legislation to renegotiate contracts, which I have supported with great pleasure.

I am prepared to support any and all measures which will prevent unjust or unreasonable profits by war profiteers. However, as I see it, this provision would not reach the situation. How can anyone justify this provision when a man of great wealth, who obtains his revenue, as I have said, from investments, is not required to pay a single dollar for the year's tax which is canceled? Because there was no variation in his income during the years 1938, 1939, and 1940, as compared with the year which is canceled, not a single dollar would be recouped from him under this provision.

Mr. President, if the Treasury of the United States were in a sound and affluent condition, if we had unobligated balances in our Treasury, if your debt were nominal, if we were not faced, as we are, with the most colossal expenditures in all history, there would be nothing improper or unwise, perhaps, in extending as a gift to the people of America the cancelation of 1 year's taxes. But our condition today is exactly the reverse. We are engaged in a bitter war, the most costly the world has ever seen. Not only must we arm ourselves and produce munitions of war to an extent never before even contemplated, but we have undertaken obligations, under the lease-lend policy, to produce and furnish unlimited supplies of war matériel to our allies, certainly without any assurance as to immediate repayment, and, in fact, without any assurance of ultimate repayment.

In the coming year the expenditures of the Federal Government for all pur-

poses are estimated to be $110,000,000,000. The revenue derived from present taxes is estimated to be about $30,000,000,000. We are therefore paying out of current revenue less than 30 percent of the total expenditures of our Government. Is this any time to forgive, to an extent greater than may be necessary, taxes which have already been accrued to the Government?

Taxes represent a debt owing from the citizen to his Government. On May 10 the Federal debt was, in round figures, $138,000,000,000. It is my conviction, Mr. President, that before the Budget is again balanced we shall be fortunate indeed if the Federal indebtedness does not exceed the astronomical figure of $300,000,000,000. I say this because we have unexpended appropriations—that is to say, appropriations which have been made by Congress and not yet disbursed by the departments—of $120,000,000,000. Congress has appropriated $120,000,000,000 which is now to the credit of the various agencies of the Government, but unexpended; and day by day we are asked to add to this vast total by making additional appropriations. Day by day we are adding to these unexpended balances so that if we add even to the present debt of one hundred and thirty-eight billions the unexpended balances already appropriated of one hundred and twenty billions, we will have a total of two hundred and fifty-eight billions, less, of course, the taxable revenue.

Many of the appropriation bills included in the Budget presented by the President, which will add greatly to these unexpended balances, have not as yet been acted upon by Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have understood that the Senator is in favor of the pay-as-you-go plan. If there were no forgiveness, would that mean that the taxpayer would have to pay 2 years' taxes in one?

Mr. BYRD. I am sorry the Senator has not listened to the Senator from Virginia, because I have never made such a suggestion. In response to direct questions, I have said that I am willing to cancel 50 percent of the tax liability because I recognize the fact that it is an advantage to the Government to place the collection of income taxes on a pay-as-you-earn basis. It is of advantage to the Government to have a withholding tax. However, I say that the taxpayers who are benefited by the 100-percent forgiveness should pay a fair share of that benefit into the United States Treasury.

Mr. WILEY. Now will the Senator answer my question? Let us assume that that is not done. I did not mean to irritate the Senator. I think the question was fair.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not irritate me at all. The Senator assumed that I favored collecting 2 years' taxes in one. I have never said anything which would suggest that I favor such a course.

Mr. WILEY. I did not say that the Senator had. I assumed that the Senator was in favor of the pay-as-you-go plan. Am I mistaken in that assumption?

Mr. BYRD. I favor the pay-as-you-earn plan.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator favors the pay-as-you earn plan, I ask him whether, if there were no cancelation, it would not mean the payment of 2 years' taxes in one?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, that is true, but that is not what I favor.

Mr. WILEY. I am trying to get to the bottom of this question from the standpoint of the taxpayer.

Mr. BYRD. It can be done in one of two ways, as the Senator knows. The Senator has as much intelligence as I have, and perhaps more. It can be done by cancelation or it can be done by paying 2 years' taxes in one or by paying 1 year's taxes in installments. We can go on a pay-as-you-go basis either way. The only question is as to which method we favor.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator is in favor of canceling 50 percent, then he is in favor of paying 150 percent of the taxes in 1 year.

Mr. BYRD. Not in 1 year.

Mr. WILEY. How would the Senator apportion it?

Mr. BYRD. It could be apportioned over a period of 5 years, or 10 percent a year, or in any way Congress might choose to do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Doughton bill, which I propose to offer as a substitute, provides that the 1941 rate shall apply for 1942, and then provides for a 3-year period of payment. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized, in hardship cases, to allow 3 years additional, or 6 years in all, to pay it.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator that I do not favor collecting all of the uncanceled obligation in 1 year. I favor giving a reasonable time to pay whatever amount is not canceled.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Yesterday there was some argument to the effect that the cancelation would contribute toward runaway inflation, or something like that. I wonder what the Senator's attitude is on that question. Does he believe that if we should pay as much money into the Treasury in 1943 as we would without cancelation, there would be any effect so far as inflation is concerned?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that that is not one of the objections which the Senator from Virginia has to the bill. I have no reason to think that it would have any material effect on so-called inflation.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. I think the atmosphere is being clarified.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to make myself very clear to the Senator. What I contend is that we are attempting to do something for the interest of the taxpayer and for the interest of the Government; it is to their mutual interest. The taxpayer should pay his share in bringing about the situation which we all desire to bring about, and the Government should pay its share. That is the assumption on which I am basing my argument. To me, at least, it is a fair and reasonable assumption.

Suppose two men were negotiating and were trying to reach a conclusion which would be profitable and advantageous to both of them, and one man was asked as in this case, to take all the loss, or pay all the penalty involved, and the other man did not propose to pay anything.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am quite interested in the suggestion of the Senator with regard to a reduction of 50 percent in the tax. I am not entirely satisfied with any of the programs which have been suggested thus far. I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to offer an amendment which would carry out the 50-percent reduction.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that if sufficient support could be had for it I would be glad to offer it. I think it would enable the collection of a withholding tax of 20 percent without any great burden being placed on the taxpayer. Yet it would not relieve completely many people who now have the money with which to pay their taxes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would relieve them up to 50 percent.

Mr. BYRD. That is true. It would relieve them up to 50 percent and would in my judgment permit the operation of the withholding tax of 20 percent without any particular hardship on those who have the money with which to pay it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment which the Senator from Texas says he will propose is on the basis of approximately 50–50.

Mr. BYRD. Let me add a few more words, Mr. President, about the financial condition. The President of the United States estimates that there will be a Federal indebtedness on July 1, 1944, of $210,000,000,000. This estimate very probably is too low, so that it is possible and probable that approximately a year from now our net indebtedness, exclusive of certain guaranteed indebtedness owing by the Government corporations will exceed $225,000,000,000. When this figure is reached, it will not be long before we will have an indebtedness of $300,000,000,000, and perhaps more. Then we must remember that at the conclusion of the war we cannot expect a balanced Budget for some time thereafter, although it is imperative, in my judgment, that we eliminate every nonessential expenditure, so as to reach at the earliest possible time a balanced Budget, as, otherwise, the solvency of our Nation, as rich as it is, will be seriously threatened.

In the face of these conditions, there has never been a more inappropriate time to cancel the taxes accrued and owing to the Federal Government by those

who are able to pay and can pay without undue hardship.

What, apparently, the advocates of the so-called Ruml plan, providing for 100-percent forgiveness, desire is to be placed on a current tax basis and have previous tax liabilities canceled without paying any penalty or any part of the taxes already accrued.

Mr. President, I have given the most careful consideration of which I am capable to this complicated question. I am thoroughly in accord with a pay-as-you-earn basis of tax collection, but I am not in favor of 100-percent forgiveness of the taxes of those who are able to pay.

It is of great benefit and value to the taxpayer to be placed on a current tax collection basis. Those able to pay for this privilege should be compelled to do so.

Many persons seem to think, Mr. President, that the credit of the United States of America is inexhaustible. I am one who believes there is a limit even to the credit of this, the richest nation on earth, and that to impair the solvency of the United States Government is to destroy those principles of government which have given to America greater progress, greater happiness, and greater freedom than any other nation in the world has ever enjoyed. There has never been a democracy in history that has been able to retain its democratic form of government and its freedoms unless it was able to maintain a solvent government.

Never before has the Government of the United States been so in need of revenue as it is today, and never before have the individual citizens of our country been in a better or more prosperous condition to pay heavy taxes than they are today. In 1942 the national income was $119,800,000,000, the highest up to that date in our history. The forecast for 1943 is for a national income of $110,000,000,000. When we compare this to the $79,000,000,000 income in 1929, which was the highest up to that time, we can form some conclusion as to the general prosperity today, due to the expenditure of war funds in every nook and corner of America. And let us not forget that this prosperity is financed in the main by borrowed money, by adding billions to the public debt for future generations to pay.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I hope the Senator will pardon me, but I am looking for more light.

Mr. BYRD. It is a pleasure to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened quite attentively to the distinguished Senator, and I should like to propound a question, because I believe the answer to it is of importance to the country. I believe the Senator can answer it and clear up a great deal of misunderstanding.

Is it a fact that in the so called cancelation, or abatement, of taxes no money would be paid back to anyone, and that the taxpayer could benefit only in the year of his death, or in the year when his income became less?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the distinguished Senator that, generally speaking, he is correct. Of course, nothing would be paid to the taxpayer because we would be canceling a debt. When one cancels a debt which is owing to him, he does not pay the debtor in cash, but merely cancels something which the debtor would otherwise be compelled to pay.

Mr. WILEY. As a matter of fact, in his so-called payments to the Government the taxpayer would receive no benefit so far as his cash, surplus, or otherwise was concerned, until first he reached a period in which his income was less, or his estate would get it when he died. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator must understand that in the taxpayer's financial statement he would receive a benefit because his tax liability, which is a debt, would be canceled. He would not have to include it in his financial statement, for example, because it would have been canceled by the Government.

It is true that it is only by a gradual process that loss to the Government occurs as a result of the cancelation of taxes. I have tried to explain it by saying that the loss would occur in three ways: First, as a result of the death of some taxpayers; second, as a result of some taxpayer suddenly ceasing to earn; and third, because of a reduced level of income of all taxpayers, which I expect to see during the readjustment period after the war. Those are the ways in which the loss would come to the Treasury.

It is inconceivable to me that if the American people knew all the facts they would be willing, in the face of the great need of the Government for additional revenue, to adopt legislation providing for 100 percent cancelation of tax liability. To do so, Mr. President, as I have said before, in my opinion, would mean that immediately a demand would be made by the President and by the Treasury Department to raise additional revenue by increasing the present tax rates so as to compensate for the loss to the Treasury as a result of the cancelation of the taxes of those able to pay. The increase would necessarily fall heavily on the smaller and middle-class incomes, because in the higher brackets the tax is already reaching the point of diminishing returns.

Mr. President, I am a taxpayer who is willing to pay something in order to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. I am not asking the Federal Government to bear the whole cost of putting taxpayers on such a basis. I am willing to pay my share, and I speak as a businessman, with the return I get from that source in addition to my income as a Senator. I am sure many other citizens feel as I do about this.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I again wish to say that while I am thoroughly in sympathy with the objective which the proposed legislation attempts to achieve, there has never been a more inappropriate time in all our history to cancel taxes owing to the Government by its citizens than now. With a $300,000,000,000 debt in prospect, which is more than twice as much as the assessed value of all the property in America, and about 75 percent of the total intrinsic value of all the property in America, as estimated by the Department of Commerce, it is certainly the duty of every Member of Congress to do all that may be within his power to avoid increasing the national debt beyond the imperative necessity of doing so.

Let us not forget that if we add to the debt now by canceling taxes at the most prosperous time in our history when the people are most able to pay, we shall be passing the debt on to the future, when conditions cannot be so prosperous as they now are, and we shall add to the difficulties of meeting the financial obligations of the Government during the inevitable period of post-war depression and liquidation which will follow the inflation today occasioned by huge war expenditures.

Mr. President, I have certain tables which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—*Effect of Ruml-Carlson plan on tax payments [1]—married person, no dependents, income of $10,000*

Year	Net income	Tax payments [2]		Balance after tax payments	
		Present law	Ruml plan [1]	Present law	Ruml plan [1]
1939					
1940	$10,000			$10,000	$10,000
1941	10,000	$528	$528	9,472	9,472
1942	10,000	1,305	1,305	8,695	8,695
1943	10,000	2,152	2,152	7,848	7,848
1944	10,000	2,152	2,152	7,848	7,848
1945		2,152		−2,152	
1946					
Total	50,000	8,289	6,137	41,711	43,863

[1] Assuming passage in 1943 of Ruml-Carlson bill canceling 1942 tax.
[2] Excluding Victory tax.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 6, 1943.

TABLE AA.—*Declining income, effect of Ruml-Carlson plan on tax payments [1]—married person, no dependents*

Year	Net income	Tax payments [2]		Balance after tax payments	
		Present law	Ruml plan [1]	Present law	Ruml plan [1]
1939					
1940	$10,000			$10,000	$10,000
1941	10,000	$528	$528	9,472	9,472
1942	10,000	1,305	1,305	8,695	8,695
1943	8,000	2,152	1,532	5,848	6,468
1944	6,000	1,532	592	4,468	5,008
1945		592		−592	
1946					
Total	44,000	6,509	4,357	37,491	39,643

[1] Assuming passage in 1943 of Ruml-Carlson bill canceling 1942 tax, excluding antiwindfall provisions.
[2] Excluding Victory tax.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 7, 1943.

Table showing amount of estate-tax liability on specified estates, and increased estate tax on such estates if specified amounts of forgiven 1942 tax are added, together with excess of tax-forgiveness over such increase in estate tax and percent of forgiven tax retained after payment of estate tax

Size of estate		Amount of tax forgiven added to estate	Amount of estate-tax			Excess of tax forgiveness over increase in estate tax	Percent of forgiveness retained
Before tax forgiveness	After tax forgiveness		Before tax forgiveness	After tax forgiveness	Increase in estate tax		
	$25,000	$5,000				$5,000	100.0
	30,000	10,000				10,000	100.0
$20,000	40,000	20,000				20,000	100.0
	50,000	30,000				30,000	100.0
	60,000	40,000				40,000	100.0
	65,000	5,000		$150	$150	4,850	97.0
	70,000	10,000		500	500	9,500	95.0
	80,000	20,000		1,600	1,600	18,400	92.0
	90,000	30,000		3,000	3,000	27,000	90.0
$60,000	100,000	40,000		4,800	4,800	35,200	88.0
	110,000	50,000		7,000	7,000	43,000	86.0
	120,000	60,000		9,500	9,500	50,500	84.2
	310,000	250,000		65,700	65,700	184,300	73.7
	560,000	500,000		145,700	145,700	354,300	70.9
	120,000	20,000	$4,800	9,500	4,700	15,300	76.5
	160,000	60,000	4,800	20,700	15,900	44,100	73.5
	310,000	210,000	4,800	65,700	60,900	149,100	71.0
$100,000	500,000	460,000	4,800	145,700	140,900	319,100	69.4
	810,000	710,000	4,800	233,200	228,400	481,600	67.8
	1,060,000	960,000	4,800	325,700	320,900	639,100	66.6
	1,310,000	1,210,000	4,800	423,200	418,400	791,600	65.4
	810,000	250,000	145,700	233,200	87,500	162,500	65.0
	1,060,000	500,000	145,700	325,700	180,000	320,000	64.0
	1,310,000	750,000	145,700	423,200	277,500	472,500	63.0
$560,000	1,560,000	1,000,000	145,700	528,200	382,50	617,500	61.2
	2,060,000	1,500,000	145,700	753,200	607,500	892,500	59.5
	2,560,000	2,000,000	145,700	998,200	852,500	1,147,500	57.4
	3,060,000	2,500,000	145,700	1,263,200	1,117,500	1,382,500	55.3
	1,310,000	250,000	325,700	423,200	97,500	152,500	61.0
	1,560,000	500,000	325,700	528,200	202,500	297,500	59.5
	2,060,000	1,000,000	325,700	753,200	427,500	572,500	57.3
$1,060,000	2,560,000	1,500,000	325,700	998,200	672,500	827,500	55.2
	3,060,000	2,000,000	325,700	1,263,200	937,500	1,062,500	53.1
	3,560,000	2,500,000	325,700	1,543,200	1,217,500	1,282,500	51.3
	4,060,000	3,000,000	325,700	1,838,200	1,512,500	1,487,500	49.6
	2,560,000	500,000	753,200	998,200	245,000	255,000	51.0
	3,060,000	1,000,000	753,200	1,263,200	510,000	490,000	49.0
$2,060,000	3,560,000	1,500,000	753,200	1,543,200	790,000	710,000	47.3
	4,060,000	2,000,000	753,200	1,838,200	1,085,000	915,000	45.8
	5,060,000	2,500,000	753,200	2,468,200	1,715,000	1,285,000	42.8
	5,560,000	500,000	2,468,200	2,803,200	335,000	165,000	33.0
	6,060,000	1,000,000	2,468,200	3,138,200	670,000	330,000	33.0
	6,560,000	1,500,000	2,468,200	3,488,200	1,020,000	480,000	32.
$5,060,000	7,060,000	2,000,000	2,468,200	3,838,200	1,370,000	630,000	31.5
	7,560,000	2,500,000	2,468,200	4,203,200	1,735,000	765,000	30.6
	8,060,000	3,000,000	2,468,200	4,568,200	2,100,000	900,000	30.
	9,060,000	4,000,000	2,468,200	5,328,200	2,860,000	1,140,000	28.5
	8,560,000	500,000	4,568,200	4,948,200	380,000	120,000	24.0
	9,060,000	1,000,000	4,568,200	5,328,200	760,000	240,000	24.0
	9,560,000	1,500,000	4,568,200	5,708,200	1,140,000	360,000	24.0
$8,060,000	10,060,000	2,000,000	4,568,200	6,088,200	1,520,000	480,000	24.0
	10,560,000	2,500,000	4,568,200	6,473,200	1,905,000	595,000	23.8
	11,060,000	3,000,000	4,568,200	6,858,200	2,290,000	710,000	23.7
	11,560,000	3,500,000	4,568,200	7,243,200	2,675,000	825,000	23.6
	12,060,000	4,000,000	4,568,200	7,628,200	3,060,000	940,000	23.5

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the consideration and drafting of the proposed income-tax law for this year have represented, probably, the most difficult task with which the Congress and its appropriately designated committees have, as yet, been confronted, for not only are we undertaking to write a fair and equitable revenue-raising measure but we are also attempting to recognize the demands of the people for a sound and necessary system of pay-as-you-earn taxation. In the consideration of this tremendous problem, the Committee on Finance has carefully and fully considered almost every manner of proposal designed to achieve these ends. It is my belief that the bill approved by the Finance Committee is the most equitable and fair bill that can be devised under the present circumstances.

Mr. President, in 1940 there were 3,896,435 income-tax payers; in 1941 there were 7,437,307; in 1942 there were 16,760,865. On the first day of January 1943, under the Revenue Act of 1942, there were 27,200,000 taxpayers in debt to the Federal Government for taxes on their 1942 income, an increase of 23,300,000 since 1940. In other words, our Government is a creditor to some 27,000,000 taxpayers who are in debt for the taxes on their 1942 income. It is my thought that we cannot afford to continue this shaky system of income-tax collection when we can adopt a pay-as-you-go tax plan without substantial loss of revenue.

THE SOLE OBJECT OF THIS LEGISLATION

It should be kept constantly in mind, Mr. President, in considering this problem that the sole object of the bill before us is to establish a system for the current payment of the individual income tax, usually referred to as collection at the source. The Treasury demands it, and all the evidence indicates that the overwhelming majority of taxpayers, small and large, have both welcomed and demanded collection at the source. Every bill which has been proposed has contained exactly the same system of withholding for this purpose. I think it is proper to reemphasize the need for current payment.

NEED FOR A SOUND CURRENT PAYMENT SYSTEM

Under the present collection system a taxpayer must pay a tax on income a year after it is earned and, in most cases, spent. Under the present high rates, great hardship results where a taxpayer loses his job, retires, enters the armed forces, or dies. For example, if a married taxpayer, without dependents, earned $2,000 in 1942 and lost his job in 1943 by reason of disability, he would still have to pay a tax debt in 1943 of $144. If a married person, without dependents, earned $5,000 in 1942, and died on December 31, 1942, his widow would have to pay in 1943 a tax on her husband's 1942 income of at least $770.

The large majority of taxpayers are unable to provide in advance for their payment of last year's taxes, and many others find it difficult to do so. Under the high rates necessitated by the war, it has become difficult for a constantly increasing number of taxpayers to meet their tax payments, which results in a hardship on them and loss of revenue to the Government. Many inequities in the present system of collection will be eliminated by providing a system by which taxpayers may pay their taxes in the year in which the income is earned. It will give substantial relief in the cases of hardship referred to under our existing system of collection.

Under our existing law the rates are presumed to be fixed according to the taxpayer's ability to pay in a given year. If a taxpayer is required to pay more than the burden fixed in the law in any one year, assuming the rates to be fair, then he is required to pay more than he is able to pay. This is obviously true as to taxpayers in all brackets. Therefore, it is provided in the Finance Committee bill that the system of collecting at the source shall be put in effect on July 1 by crediting all payments made in the current year 1943 on 1943 income-tax liability. All other methods proposed provide for paying in the current year 1943 and in subsequent years not only the tax of the current year, computed at the rates of the current year, presumed to be fixed as high as the taxpayer is able to pay, but also a part of the tax on a prior year—the year 1942. This increases the taxpayer's burden and violates the ability-to-pay principle, since it requires the taxpayer to pay in 1 year more than the law sets up as his burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing how the burden in the current year 1943 is increased under the House bill over the burden imposed by law for 1943.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Penalty
$3,000	$15
$4,000	45
$5,000	95
$6,000	165
$8,000	365
$10,000	645
$15,000	1,695
$20,000	3,195
$25,000	5,055
$50,000	16,490
$100,000	45,820
$500,000	219,795
$1,000,000	664,795
$5,000,000	3,424,795

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Penalty
$4,000	$24
$5,000	54
$6,000	116
$8,000	283
$10,000	540
$15,000	1,514
$20,000	2,964
$25,000	4,782
$50,000	16,140
$100,000	45,372
$500,000	319,312
$1,000,000	664,312
$5,000,000	3,424,312

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

$4,000	$3
$5,000	33
$6,000	67
$8,000	211
$10,000	435
$15,000	1,353
$20,000	2,733
$25,000	4,509
$50,000	15,790
$100,000	44,924
$500,000	318,829
$1,000,000	663,829
$5,000,000	3,423,829

TOTAL BURDEN TO BECOME CURRENT IN 1943 UNDER HOUSE BILL—SINGLE PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income	Income tax plus gross Victory tax	Penalty	Total
$3,000	$607	$15	$622
$4,000	877	45	922
$5,000	1,167	95	1,262
$6,000	1,476	165	1,641
$8,000	2,155	365	2,520
$10,000	2,914	645	3,559
$15,000	5,168	1,695	6,863
$20,000	7,896	3,195	11,091
$25,000	10,984	5,055	16,039
$50,000	28,558	16,490	45,048
$100,000	70,165	45,820	115,985
$500,000	442,363	319,795	762,158
$1,000,000	900,000	664,795	1,564,795
$5,000,000	4,500,000	3,424,795	7,924,795

OBJECTIONS TO THE HOUSE BILL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the plan of the House bill does not meet this problem for the following reasons:

First. It does not establish a current-payment system, which is the foremost need and the real object of all this proposed legislation.

Second. It adds to the taxpayer's burden in the current year a part of the past year's burden, thus violating the ability-to-pay principle.

Third. By canceling the past year's burden for some taxpayers but not for others, it results in unfairness as between different classes of taxpayers.

Fourth. It sets up a more complicated system of collection and adds to the administrative burden on the Government. Many taxpayers will have to undertake several complicated computations in determining their tax liability. Taxpayers who will have to make double computations year after year contribute about 60 percent of the total individual income tax, and still they will never get on a current basis.

The various partial abatement plans impose what almost constitutes an arbitrary burden on taxpayers to make up for the other collection which obviously should not be made. I say it constitutes an arbitrary burden because it bears little relation to current ability to pay. Before the taxpayers finish paying their overhanging debt under the Ways and Means Committee bill, 4 years will have passed since the income was received.

If we look more carefully at these substitute proposals, we can see that they contradict each other. They attempt to find a fair formula for carrying over a part of the tax debt. The bill approved by the House, and the Ways and Means Committee bill, each endorse the principle of complete forgiveness for some taxpayers and little or none for the big taxpayers. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has introduced a provision for a flat-rate abatement for all classes. If these various proposals are intended to present a principle of fair treatment, they deny each other. If one is true, the other is obviously obnoxious. There is no other principle of fairness except ability to pay. The Finance Committee bill makes the ability principle immediately valid for all taxpayers.

FINANCE COMMITTEE PLAN

The bill reported by the Committee on Finance provides that taxpayers shall pay the tax of 1943 or 1942, whichever is higher, but it credits all the tax paid to the current year, so that the taxpayer is out of debt to the Government.

Its so-called windfall provisions close the loopholes where a taxpayer had high incomes in 1942 and 1943 out of war profits.

It gages the tax according to the income of the current year, and thus more truly levies tax according to ability to pay.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not, under this plan, the present taxpayer will be relieved of a year of taxes when his income ceases. That is exactly what will happen. That is why we want to institute a current payment method, to avoid the hardships and loss of revenue that result in such cases.

We must realistically face the issue that to call for full taxation then is to insist upon our pound of flesh. The fact is that ordinarily taxpayers do not put aside a reserve out of which to pay taxes. In welcoming a system of current collection, all have conceded that taxes are a hardship when a taxpayer loses his job, retires, enters the armed forces, or dies.

Now, while I personally, in view of the high cost of living, would like to see more liberal exemptions provided in the pending bill, I am confident that even the most hard-pressed taxpayer will be more than proud to contribute his required share to the financing of the Government in this hour of grave crisis.

Up to this point, then, on both the provision for a pay-as-you-earn system, and upon the tax rates and the 20-percent withholding provision on that part of the income over and above the exemptions, the committee bill is substantially in agreement with all other proposals offered.

We come now to that part of the bill over which most of the controversy now rages, that is, how to handle the matter of the 1942 tax liability. Even on this question, the controversy is not one of principle, but one of degree. The principle of abatement has been universally accepted. It appears in every proposal which has been put forward. The only variance appears in the degree to which the principle of abatement is to be applied. The bill approved in the House calls for a 75-percent abatement, but it leaves a great number of taxpayers on a noncurrent basis. The committee bill, by means of certain windfall provisions, places every taxpayer on a current pay-as-you-earn basis, and yet it entails only an 88-percent abatement.

In the debate which has ensued a serious distortion of the facts has occurred through the introduction and continued use of the word "forgive." I want to make it absolutely clear that under the pending bill nothing is forgiven. Under this bill, no taxpayer will be required to pay less than he would under the old system. Indeed, in many cases, especially in the upper brackets, by reason of the windfall provisions included in the bill, many taxpayers will be required to pay more than would otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, every taxpayer will be required to pay a full income tax every year until he dies, and a review of vital statistics tables, estate taxes, and other such media will make it absolutely clear that the Government will collect every due dollar over the years. Rather than getting less money, the Government stands to collect more money this year and every year—and moreover to collect it on a regular current basis.

Mr. President, as I voted with the majority of the Senate Finance Committee in reporting the bill; so too, I shall vote for the enactment of the bill. I feel that by the adoption of this particular plan the public interest and the American people will be served in the most effective and representative way possible; for in accordance with the overwhelming desires of the American people, the bill—

First. Places all taxpayers who derive their incomes from wages or salaries on a current pay-as-you-earn basis.

Second. Removes the undemocratic and discriminatory feature of double taxation, which feature would render it virtually impossible for great numbers of American taxpayers ever to become current in meeting their income-tax obligations.

Third. Embodies certain windfall provisions which, buttressed by other existing legislative enactments, will effectively guard against profiteering or the undue enrichment of any citizen during wartime.

Fourth. Makes full and proper provision for the gallant members of our armed forces, by granting them an exemption of $1,500 over and above the present personal exemptions which are not extended to all other taxpayers by law.

Mr. President, the bill is as fair, impartial, and practical as sincere human effort can make it. I sincerely trust that the principles embodied in the bill will be approved in the tax law which is finally adopted, and that the entire plan will be placed in effective operation by July 1, 1943, in order that the American people and the American Government

may have the benefit of a sound pay-as-you-earn fiscal policy, a policy which has long been overdue, and a policy which will greatly ease the burdens which have been occasioned by an economy geared to wartime undertakings and wartime responsibilities.

REVENUE EFFECTS OF COMMITTEE BILL

I am not so concerned at the present time with the amount of tax liability canceled, or the amount of tax collections the Treasury may lose between now and doomsday as a result of the bill. I fail to understand why opponents of 100-percent cancelation speak of the loss to the Treasury of an asset which appears only on the Treasury's books. I think attention should instead be directed to the effect of the bill on Treasury revenues at the present time and during the war years, when additional funds are so sorely needed. I do not believe that the immediate revenue effect of the Senate Finance Committee bill has been fully appreciated. The plain fact, borne out by Treasury estimates which appear on page 15 of the committee's report, is that the Treasury receipts during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944, will, after the bill is enacted, be increased over present law receipts by over $2,000,000,000. By this bill we shall raise more than 10 percent of the additional $16,000,000,000 requested by the President. The increases in revenue, of course, are the result of the windfall provisions and the fact that liabilities on higher incomes will be collected sooner than under present law by reason of withholding at the source and current payment.

So long as incomes continue to rise, as no doubt they will rise during the war years, the committee bill will yield more revenue to the Treasury than would the bill passed by the House. This is a very important consideration, which completely overshadows the point that the Treasury may lose a paper asset over the lifetime of all taxpayers. Those who make this point seem to forget the fact that if additional revenue is needed 20 or 30 years hence, it can be provided in the customary manner, through legislative action.

BENEFITS IN POST-WAR PERIOD

We must prepare now for the time when this war will be over. As our war production expands and our Nation increases its Federal expenditures for the prosecution of this war, it becomes ever more necessary to make immediate plans to take care of this income-tax debt. It is estimated that our national income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, may reach $125,000,000,000. During that period the Federal Government plans to spend about $90,000,000,000.

When the war ends, Federal spending will drop some $20,000,000,000 annually. It is estimated that during the present fiscal year 30,000,000 of our citizens will be directly connected with our war effort. Twenty million of them will be employed in war industry, and 10,000,000 will be in the armed forces. No doubt at least 15,000,000 of those so engaged will have to find other work. During this transition period it is reasonable to assume that millions of employable people will be forced to live on their unemployment insurance. This means that their taxes, incurred on a high wage-level, will have to be paid largely from social-security benefits. This year the farmers of our Nation will be the recipients of an abnormal income. Present indications are that it will reach $15,000,000,000. This is the largest percent of the national income the farmers have ever received. Bountiful harvests and fair prices have brought this about. One must assume that this abnormally high income will not continue. Provision must be made to take care of the income-tax liability of the citizen who will be affected by the post-war transition.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at this time I offer an amendment to the pending committee amendment as amended. My amendment, if adopted, would spread the payment of taxes for 1942 over a period of 5 years. The first payment of these deferred taxes would be due on March 15, 1944, and would aggregate one-tenth of the sum due. Every 6 months thereafter, a like amount would become due by the taxpayer, so that an aggregate of 5 years will be allowed a taxpayer in which to pay and discharge his 1942 tax bill. No interest would be charged on these deferred taxes, unless the taxpayer becomes delinquent. Under my amendment all the tax payments which have been made during 1943 for 1942 taxes would be applied to 1943 taxes. The withholding tax provided for in the bill would not be affected and such sums as may be collected from July 1 to December 31 would likewise be applied to the payment of 1943 taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 97, line 12, it is proposed to strike out all of section 6, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. Deferment of 1942 liability.

(a) In general: Effective as of September 1, 1943, in the case of the taxable year 1942 of any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) the 15th day of the fifteenth month shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year for the purposes of sections 53 and 56 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) Extension of time for payment: At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall extend the time for the payment of the tax for the taxable year 1942 imposed upon any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) in which case such tax shall be paid in 10 equal installments, the first of which shall be paid on the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year 1943, and of the remaining installments one shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding 6-month period, except that any installment may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector.

(c) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax made during the taxable year 1943: Any payment made on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) during the taxable year 1943 shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made during the taxable year 1943 pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for the taxable year 1942 such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

(d) Use of term "taxable year": For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1942", and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1942 and 1943, respectively.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in the main I intend to support the committee bill. If 1 year ago today anyone had suggested so radical a change in the collection of taxes as is proposed by this measure his suggestion would have sounded completely out of order. War, however, does many things to nations which are engaged in it.

I think the sudden popularity with which the suggested Ruml-type bill has been received can be traced to a great many origins. I do not believe its popularity lies in the fact that people wish to be forgiven responsibility to their Government. I do not know of a period within my lifetime when I have heard so little complaint on the part of citizens generally with respect to the payment of their taxes as we have heard in the past year. I do not know of a time in the history of this country when its people have responded to their National Government with a more whole-hearted cooperation and desire to defend it with their money and their lives. But there has been a sudden upsurge in the demand for the Ruml type of bill. I think that has come about by reason of the uncertainties of war and the sudden mounting of the tremendous national debt, which confuses the people's thinking, and, if we were to tell the truth, confuses the thinking of ourselves who represent the people.

I do not know anyone who can give me the answer as to how we are going to meet our great national debt eventually, but individually the people of America are anxious to know that their obligation shall be such as to come within their ability to meet it. Because of the uncertainties of the future there has been a sudden popular demand to have a pay-as-you-go plan adopted, so that when the war ends, even if their jobs cease, if they are in the service, if their factories are closed, or no matter what the emergency or the contingency shall be at that time, the citizens of the Nation will not be obligated to the Government to such an extent that they will not be able fully to discharge their obligation. I believe the demand for the pay-as-you-go plan does not arise from a desire to evade obligation. The desire on the part of the people is to have a plan under which they can fulfill their obligation, under which they will not find themselves in such a position that they cannot respond to their obligation

to their Government when the time comes to meet it.

Mr. President, I am somewhat uneasy about using large incomes as the reason why we should not adopt the pay-as-you-go plan. The large incomes of this country are not so numerous. I realize that it has been popular in past years to pick out any successful man and hold him up as an evil influence, but if there ever was a time in the history of America when successful men were needed it is now. Never have the successful men of America responded to such a degree as they have in the present war effort. We cannot possibly raise a sufficient number of soldiers, equip them and transport them and put them in the line to meet, man to man, the full numbers of our Axis enemies without the efforts of all our citizens. The only way we can defeat our Axis enemies is by placing superior instruments in the hands of our soldiers who represent us and who fight with the free spirit of America.

From the assembly lines, from the factories, from the great research laboratories of our industrial institutions we have obtained better tanks, better guns, faster-moving and better-equipped planes in the sky. The successful men of America have responded to this demand and need for superior military equipment. Even today, while we are discussing this measure, successful men have left positions with our air lines, communication systems, industrial plants; many of the leaders of industry have responded to their country's call and are wearing the uniform, some of them giving up salaries as high as $90,000 a year to accept the wages of a soldier in order to help establish the great communication lines which are vital to military victory.

Mr. President, when we celebrate the complete defeat of the Axis troops in Africa, let us not forget that it was accomplished with the help of successful men who left their positions in industry and who, in this war theater, set up our communication lines. Let us not forget that successful men who responded to the Government's call and went into the service, helped make our victory possible. If ever there was a time when we should not ridicule large incomes as being an evil influence, it is now.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senate Finance Committee took the American view and said that every American should be treated equally. This is the time when we need every bit of energy, every bit of bravery, brains, and brawn in America, to carry on our war effort to final victory.

When we talk about the Ruml plan, this is no time to set up an isolated example and say that because of that one case we should not adopt the principle of the plan.

I say again that the desire of the people of the country to have a pay-as-you-go program is not a desire to evade their responsibility or their obligation. It is a desire to have a plan whereby America can measure up to its obligation and can fulfill it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I offered yesterday, and which has been printed and lies on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there has been no explanation of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the amendment was read at the desk. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment; because, as I understand it, it provides for a mere postponement of the payment of a whole year's taxes, with no abatement That is my interpretation of the amendment as it was read.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read again for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning on page 97, line 12, it is proposed to strike out all of section 6, and insert:

SEC. 6. Deferment of 1942 liability.

(a) In general: Effective as of September 1, 1943, in the case of the taxable year 1942 of any individual (other than an estate or trust, and other than a nonresident alien) the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month shall be substituted for the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year for the purposes of sections 53 and 56 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) Extension of time for payment: At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall extend the time for the payment of the tax for the taxable year 1942 imposed upon any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) in which case such tax shall be paid in 10 equal installments, the first of which shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of the taxable year 1943, and of the remaining installments one shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding 6-month period, except that any installment may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector.

(c) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax made during the taxable year 1943: Any payment made on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) during the taxable year 1943 shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made during the taxable year 1943 pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for the taxable year 1942 such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

(d) Use of term "Taxable year."—For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1942," and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1942 and 1943, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the remission, cancelation, or abatement of any taxes. I think it would be wicked on our part to remit at this time taxes in any form, especially in view of the fact that right now we need every dollar which can be gathered into the Treasury, by taxes or otherwise. Although our taxes are high we have been asked to provide for an additional 16 billions. I do not know what this war will cost, but I am told that before it ends we shall have spent more than it has cost to run our Government from its inception to date, including the expenditures we have made in other wars in which we have been engaged. To cancel now the tax obligations of the taxpayers of the nation would be wrong. We have no right to do so. They are due and should be paid.

Mr. President, the taxes for 1942 are due to our Government to the same extent that any note which any Senator might have signed in favor of a bank, in the past would be due. I do not know whether all Senators have made a study of the various bills and proposals submitted to the House, as well as of the proposals submitted to the Senate in connection with the so-called Ruml plan, but I do believe that it would be tragic for us to adopt the pending committee proposal or in fact any proposal that would have as its object the cancelation of any taxes.

Mr. President, I shall briefly discuss the various plans and proposals which were offered both in the House and in the Senate—plans which would have the effect of deferring and canceling taxes. The so-called Ways and Means Committee bill reached the floor of the House of Representatives sometime ago and it provided for the payment of the 1942 taxes at the 1941 rate. I am informed that the 1941 rate of taxes is on the average about 50% of the average 1942 rate. Under such a proposal the United States Treasury would lose $4,672,000,000. When that bill came up for discussion in the House it proved unsatisfactory to those who sought to dig deeper into the Federal Treasury, so a new bill was substituted and passed and sent to the Senate for action. Under the terms of the House bill the normal tax of 6 percent was wiped out, and in addition, 13 percent of the surtaxes was stricken from the 1942 tax bill. As adopted by the House, that bill canceled taxes due in the aggregate of $7,238,000,000. Think of it, almost $3,000,000,000 more than the Ways and Means Committee bill would be permitted to remain in the hands of the taxpayers.

That bill, as I have just indicated, was sent to the Senate and referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate. Was that committee satisfied in canceling as much as $7,238,000,000 of money justly due the Government? It was not, but worked out a scheme whereby the Federal Treasury would actually lose $9,815,000,000. Think of that, Senators. As I understand the pending measure, which is a substitute for the House bill, the whole

tax bill of 1942 or 1943 of a taxpayer would be canceled, whichever is the lower.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will propose an amendment to permit a 75 percent cancelation instead of the 100 percent permitted under the pending bill. Under the George amendment, the taxpayers would save and the Government would lose $7,361,000,000.

Now let us inquire how the savings to taxpayers would be distributed among them. We find that under the House version, which seeks to reduce taxes by eliminating the 6-percent normal tax and 13 percent of the surtaxes, as I have heretofore indicated, a person receiving a $2,000 income would effect a saving of $140.

Under the Ways and Means Committee bill the saving would be $100. Under the George amendment the saving would be $105; and under the Senate Finance Committee bill the saving would be $140.

On a $5,000 income the saving under the House bill would be $691, under the Ways and Means Committee bill it would be $388, under the George amendment $560, and under the pending bill $746.

On a $10,000 income the saving under the House bill would be $1,614, under the Ways and Means bill it would amount to $860, under the George amendment it would aggregate $1,614, and under the bill under discussion it would be $2,152.

It will be noted that as to all those taxpayers with an income of $5,000 or lower, as well as to those with an income not exceeding $10,000, the differences in saving to the taxpayers under the various measures are not great. But, Mr. President, when we come to the larger taxpayer, the taxpayer with an income of $100,000, or $1,000,000, we have a different picture. Under the House bill the saving would be $189,750 to the taxpayer whose income was $1,000,000; under the Ways and Means Committee bill—that is, the one which was defeated and for which the House bill was substituted—the saving would be only $121,126; but if we should adopt the pending bill the saving to a taxpayer with a $1,000,000 income would be $854,000. Think of that Senators, $854,000 now due the Government could be retained by a taxpayer whose income was $1,000,000 in 1942 if the pending bill were adopted. It is unconscionable and I am certain will not sit well with the American people.

In the future all these savings will have to be recouped in some way and more taxes added. We shall have to get the money from some source. As has been demonstrated by a number of Senators, we have almost reached the point of saturation in the case of persons with large incomes. We cannot tax them much more than we have taxed them in the past. Their tax burden today amounts to from 85 to 87 percent, as I recall the figures. Therefore, any losses which would be suffered by reason of enactment of the pending bill would have to be recouped in some way; and the persons who would have to pay those losses would be those in the lower income brackets. We cannot escape that conclusion, Mr. President. I think it would be unwise, unjust, and indefensible for the Senate to vote at this time to forego any taxes.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is very simple. It would not abate or cancel any taxes. It would not change the tendency to put all taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis. All money which has been paid by taxpayers for the payment of 1942 taxes would be applied to the 1943 tax indebtedness. In other words, all installments paid on March 15, 1943, for the 1942 taxes, as well as the installments which will be paid on June 15, would be applied to the 1943 taxes; and the 20 percent which would be collected from taxpayers from July 1 to December 31 would likewise be appled to the 1943 taxes.

Under my amendment, the 1942 tax bill would be divided into 10 equal payments. The first payment would be made on March 15, 1944, and succeeding payments of one-tenth of the 1942 tax bill would be made every 6 months thereafter. Thus the entire 1942 tax bill would be discharged by the taxpayer in 5 years, by the payment of 10 installments. The taxpayer would not pay interest on the deferred 1942 tax bill.

The adoption of this simple amendment would mean that the Treasury of the Unted States would receive the $9,815,000,000 which the pending bill proposes to give to the taxpayers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator's proposal contemplate that the Government would receive interest on the deferred payments?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not one penny.

Mr. O'DANIEL. On what theory would that credit be extended without interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my purpose to make the plan attractive and to avoid imposing interest charges on the taxpayer. I feel that that provision is fair, and it probably will make the bill more acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does not the Senator believe that there would be more inducement for the taxpayer to pay if interest were accruing?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision in the amendment to the effect that if the first installment, or any installment thereafter, is not paid promptly, the remaining installments will become payable immediately. I think that is sufficient inducement to encourage taxpayers to keep their payments current.

Mr. O'DANIEL. With interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. Interest would be charged on the indebtedness if the taxpayer fails to pay on time. The interest charge would commence as of the date of default. In other words, so long as a taxpayer pays his installments on the 15th of March and the 15th of September of each year for the next 5 years, beginning March 15, 1944, he will pay no interest at all. He will simply pay the face amount of his 1942 taxes. However, should he fail to pay the first installment, the second installment, or the third installment, then whatever installments remain after the first default would become due. Briefly, the remaining unpaid sum would become due, with interest from date of default.

Mr. President, I believe that the adoption of this amendment would solve the problem of putting the taxpayers of this country on a pay-as-you-go basis. Let us not make a $9,815,000,000 gift to the taxpayers. Those whom the pending bill proposes to help are well able to bear the burden. As I said a moment ago, any tax funds that are abated now will be sorely needed in the near future, and the taxpayers who will have to pay those taxes in the future will undoubtedly be those less able to bear them at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion of this amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Moore	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ellender	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the amendment at any great length. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is merely proposing to vote to postpone the 1942 tax for a period of 5 years. That, of course, might really amount to an abatement. Undoubtedly, it would amount to an abatement in a great many brackets, and on the part of a great many taxpayers, if the tax should be postponed for such a great length of time without bond or security or some safeguard to the revenue.

I believe the time has passed when we can contemplate getting on a pay-as-you-go basis without some abatement of the tax liability for the past year. I wish to make a brief statement at this time before the vote upon the amendment is taken.

We seem to be greatly confused about the Government losing something. It is said that the Government will lose a part of the taxes which have already been levied. Mr. President, I believe we are simply thinking in circles when we think that the Government is going to lose anything by what it does with its taxing system in order to make it a better system. The Government has the power at any time, any year, to levy additional taxes to make up for something it may imagine it has lost or something it never had.

We are not dealing with the relation between creditor and debtor. We are thinking around and around, in circles. The question is, What is a sound tax system for the American people? How can it be accomplished? If we can adopt a better taxing system for the American people, then it is mere child's play to talk about what the Government is going to lose, when the Government has the power, if the sentiment of the country will sustain it, to take every cent of income which every taxpayer makes now, and throughout the coming time.

So, Mr. President, as I see it, it is a question of getting on a sound basis. A pay-as-you-earn tax system is not a system which is one-sided by any means, that is, all for the benefit of the taxpayer or all for the benefit of the Government.

Let me ask candidly and frankly, How are we to collect taxes from 30,000,000 people who are working at high wages and who may be here today and gone tomorrow unless we collect them at the source?

Is it not fair that they pay a reasonable tax, a proportionate tax, based upon our progressive income-tax law?

Not only that, Mr. President, but how or why should we collect the tax from the soldier boy who has gone into the service and is now receiving from his Government less than his personal exemption on his income in 1942, which may have been as high as ten or fifteen or twenty or thirty thousand dollars?

The Government of the United States has not lost much money as the result of tax defaults over a long period of time, but the Government of the United States never before, in all its history, taxed 44,000,000 American citizens, and any official of the Treasury Department who does not know that under these conditions tax defaults will result in a constantly rising volume of losses, is not realistic.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering how the pending amendment would affect the question the Senator is discussing. If my amendment were adopted the bill would remain as it is written; the 20 percent would be collected commencing July 1, and the only effect of my amendment would be to do away with the cancelation of taxes, and simply defer the 1942 taxes, so that payment of them would be made in 10 equal installments beginning on March 15, 1944, and extending over a period of 5 years.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the Senator's amendment, and I think my remarks are pertinent to it; I express the hope that they are. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that with the high rate of taxes now imposed we cannot expect to double up for anything like 100 percent of the tax liability of any year.

Today my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] referred to the present as being the highest income-producing period in our history, and that any forgiveness or abatement at this time would result in the remission of tremendously large sums of money which may not again be available to the Treasury. In great part, I agree with my distinguished friend in his discussion and in his conclusions, but the very reason why it is necessary to go on a pay-as-you-go basis, to relate tax payments to the year of income, and let them go up and down together, is because of the high tax rates. If there were low rates nobody would worry about this problem; it would not then be a problem; but, Mr. President, now it is a problem when 44,000,000 people must pay income taxes; it is a problem when 30,000,000 of those taxpayers must pay currently as they earn, for they cannot pay after they have spent their incomes. If the Government were realistic, it would see that picture; it would face it frankly. We need now once and for all to go to a sound taxation system, and there is no sound taxing system that does not gear the tax liability to current income, so that when income goes up taxes, of course, go up, and when income shoots down, the people are saved from almost wholesale bankruptcy only because when their income goes down their taxes necessarily go down.

Leave the present system, Senators, if you want to do so; refuse to face the facts as they really are. Let these high taxes remain where they now are, let this war suddenly end, let incomes drop, and the man with a very moderate income will owe a back year's tax which he may not be able to pay out of his actual total income for as much as 2 or 3 years. Let those people who cannot pay become permanently in the debtor class, and large numbers of them will be unable to meet their tax payments. Some say, let the Government take the loss then, and it could take it from year to year, but that is not a good condition in which to put the people; it is not wise to put the people in the status of debtors who can never pay their honest debts to their Government.

Mr. President and Senators, this is not a trifling program devised by some shrewd politician. The Government of the United States ought to adopt a system that will tie irrevocably income and tax liability together, so that they go up and down together. The Government of the United States can do it.

Forgiving! What does it amount to when the Government can in any one year impose any tax on its people that it wants to impose? This is not a question of debtor and creditor. If, as a creditor, the Senator from Alabama forgives me something, he cannot make me pay it next year unless I become indebted to him again. In the narrow, technical sense only, is there the relationship of debtor and creditor between the Government of the United States and the taxpayer, because the Government has the absolute power to change, modify, shift, or increase its tax rates so as to meet its necessities.

I am not worrying about the Government losing anything. The only question is, is it desirable to get on a pay-as-you-go basis? Is it desirable to change the taxing system so that the people will not be 1 year behind in their debt to the Government?

A soldier who may be in the Solomons today, perhaps, in 1942 earned fifteen or twenty thousand dollars and owes four or five thousand dollars to his Government in taxes. He is out there now as a private and can never pay that debt. Suppose the case of a soldier on one of the South Pacific islands who has a little home back here, just a meager place, a shelter for his wife and his baby; who has got to go down and dicker with the tax collector and try to save the little home because his 1942 taxes would wipe it off the face of the map as clean as if a Texas cyclone struck it. Is that right? Can we put our taxpayers on a current basis without any damage and injury to the Government? If so, is it not wise to do it?

I am not proposing that we forgive all the tax of 1942, for I do not think it is wise to do so; I do not think that the business people of this country, when they think of it, will believe it is wise to do so.

I think that at least 25 percent of the 1942 liability can be carried over to March 15, 1944, and March 15, 1945. That would result in an increased burden on the taxpayer immediately, it is true, but if there ever was a time when the Government should get as much cash out of current earnings as possible, both to meet obligations of the Government and to check, so far as we can, the rapidly rising price spiral in this country, now is that time.

My distinguished friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], said that 50 percent should be collected. If that can be done, and the one desirable thing realized, to wit, putting the taxpayer on a current paying basis as his liability arises, then it should be done. I confess that my own study leads me to the conclusion that our taxpayers can stand the additional 25 percent, spread over 2 years, but I do not think they can stand the additional 100 percent over 2 or 3, or even 5 years, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested.

Therefore I oppose the amendment, Mr. President, and I earnestly hope that the Senate, without regard to any commitments, will try to approach the subject in a businesslike way, and if it is desirable to adopt a different system of collecting our Federal income taxes, let us do so now, when we have the opportunity.

There will be no loss to the Treasury insofar as collections are concerned, so long as incomes continue to rise. There cannot be. The actual dollars and cents which go into the Treasury from rising incomes will be larger in 1943 than they were in 1942, and they will be larger in 1944 than in 1943. Of course, our national income will fluctuate, but there cannot in any sense, as I see it, be any situation over a long period where there will be a loss to the Treasury.

When I say that I do not think we should abate the whole amount of the taxes, I mean that my judgment is that the proposal is so advantageous to both the taxpayer and the Government that the taxpayer should be willing to do as much as he can, if the Government needs the money, and we undoubtedly will realize a larger return in 1943 than if we remained under the present system of paying taxes on income a year after it has been earned.

Tax liability to the Government does not arise out of contract but under operation of law, and the Treasury is on a cash basis and counts its collections from revenue only as they come in. There is a vast difference, so far as citizens are concerned, between liability for the tax and the tax in the form of cash in the Treasury.

Senators, let us not deceive ourselves. The day will probably come at the end of the war period, unless we can somehow constantly advance our national income without any serious letdown, when, out of 44,000,000 taxpayers, the Government will fail to collect many taxes—many because American taxpayers will be unable to meet their tax payments—and it is never good policy on the part of government to bankrupt its taxpayers—to bankrupt its own customers and supporters.

Mr. President, that hour will come unless now, in this period of rising income, when we will not reduce the cash flowing into the Treasury, we go as far as we can, and make certain that our taxing program makes the taxpayer current so that out of his daily and weekly and monthly earnings he can pay daily, weekly, or monthly his obligations to his Government.

That is what this bill will do, if put into operation. It will make 30,000,000 of the 44,000,000 taxpayers current by means of withholding, and it will make the remaining 14,000,000 current by estimating the annual income and paying it within the year. That is the proposal.

I would not hesitate to abate 100 percent of the tax if I believed it was necessary in order to put the American taxpayer on a current basis with his Government, and I would do so under the firm conviction that that was the best course for the Government to pursue, and was certainly the best course for the taxpayer, if the Government should follow it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in very general accord with the philosophy and objectives expressed by the able chairman of the Committee on Finance, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. My difficulty is in knowing how to apply his reasoning. I have had a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining what the various proposals and amendments mean.

We know the taxpayers are divided into many classes and groups, dependent upon the amount of their incomes. There is a provision in the bill under which we would take 1942 or 1943 as the year for which taxes were to be collected, dependent upon which year's income was the largest, and of course that would shift the result very materially.

The Senator spoke of the bill and the beneficial effect it would have. I assume he is referring to the committee bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I said I did not think it was necessary to go as far as the committee bill goes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not sure what the Senator had in mind, and I am anxious to know, because he is aware of my confidence in him and in his judgment.

Mr. GEORGE. I am speaking of the committee bill so far as it relates to the method of collecting the current taxes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But as to the amount of the abatement, the Senator is not giving it his approval?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I have offered a substitute for it, because I do not think it is necessary to abate all the 1942 tax.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to ask the Senator specifically about his amendment, or substitute. I shall not read it all; I do not understand it all, because there are so many references in the amendment to sections which are not printed in it. Some are made parts of the amendment, some are taken out of some other bill, and it would certainly take an expert, exercising a great deal of care and study, to know exactly what it means, and as one who is not a tax expert, as I am not, I frankly confess I have been unable to determine just what effect the Senator's amendment would have. I have asked some of the experts about it, but I do not find exact uniformity of opinion among them.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment amends section 6 of the bill the committee reported, and it is technical, of course.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is technical, and so many provisions are adopted or eliminated merely by reference, without setting them out, that I am asking the Senator for information in good faith.

The amendment provides in the first paragraph that the taxes under a certain chapter "for the taxable year 1942 shall be increased by an amount equal to 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1942." I do not understand exactly how an increase of 25 percent in the tax constitutes an equivalent abatement or reduction of the tax liability for the taxpayer. It seems to provide an increase rather than a deduction. Frankly, I want some deduction. I agree with the Senator's philosophy.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, that it is an amendment to section 6 of the committee bill. The part of the section which is not amended discharges or abates the 1942 liability. But if the 1942 liability is larger than the 1943 liability, the effect of the amendment is to require the taxpayer to pay the tax for the larger year, and add 25 percent of the tax for the lesser year, the year 1943.

My amendment is intended—and this is the English of it—to abate 75 percent of the tax for 1942 or 1943 income, whichever is the lowest; in other words, collecting the tax for the highest year, and also to add to the year in which the tax is collected, 25 percent of the tax for the lesser year. This 25 percent additional amount will be paid in two installments of 12½ percent each, the first payable on March 15, 1944, and the second on March 15, 1945.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will call the Senator's attention to this provision on page 1 of his amendment. The provision does not specify that the year in which the tax is abated shall be the year of the lowest income—that may be provided somewhere else in the amendment—but, on the contrary, the amendment itself provides that 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1942 shall be abated.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment does say that, because 1942 is the year in which it is technically abated. It is abated, however, by technical provisions which make it look, in many instances, as though certain additions are being made to the 1943 year so as actually to bring the 1943 year up to what the 1942 year would be if the 1942 year were the higher of the two years. That language is fitted into this amendment.

The liability of any individual (other than an estate)—

And so forth—

for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 shall be discharged as of September 1, 1943.

That provision is left in the bill and is not changed by my amendment. That is the first antiwindfall provision of the committee bill. I am sorry that the matter has to be so technical, but the effect is clear. It is intended to abate the lower of either the year 1942 or 1943 and add 25 percent of the abated tax to the year in which collection is made, and to retain the windfall provision.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would be, as the Senator says, to add 25 percent to the other year?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And pay it all this year? Provision is made for payment of last year's tax in four installments. Is some change now proposed to be made?

Mr. GEORGE. No; the amendment provides that the 25 percent is to be paid in two parts, 12½ percent of it to be paid March 15, 1944, and 12½ percent added to the tax liability March 15, 1945.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then the effect of that would be to increase by approximately 25 percent the amount of taxes to be paid this year?

Mr. GEORGE. It is to be paid in 2 years. The payment is due this year, but 12½ percent is to be paid in each of the years 1944 and 1945, when the actual payments are to be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am certain that I understand the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia, but I should like to cite an actual example to see whether I am correct. Let us say that I had a tax assessment of $800 in 1942 and one of $1,000 in 1943. As I understand the Senator's amendment, I would be obliged to pay the larger of the two this year, 1943, or $1,000.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And then, in addition to that, I would pay a 25-percent additional tax on the $1,000.

Mr. GEORGE. On the $800.

Mr. LUCAS. On the $800; yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that would be paid over a period of 2 years beginning March 1, 1944.

Mr. GEORGE. One hundred dollars each year in that particular case; that is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator's amendment retain the provision contained in the committee amendment with respect to making the calculations based on the normal year?

Mr. GEORGE. No. That is the second windfall provision. I did not think it necessary to retain the second windfall provision which will operate very harshly in special cases, and in view of the fact that 25 percent of the tax for the abated year would have to be paid.

Mr. OVERTON. Sometimes we can understand an illustration better than an argument, especially when it comes to revenue legislation. I should like to propound to the Senator from Georgia the question I asked and the example I gave to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] when he was making his very able presentation. Let us suppose that the taxpayer had, during the normal base year, 1938, 1939, or 1940, $1,000 income, and that in 1942 he had $1,000,000 income, and in 1943 he had $500,000 income. Would he pay more under the amendment of the Senator from Georgia or under the committee amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. He would pay more under the committee amendment in that case. That is an extreme case.

Mr. OVERTON. It was merely an offhand example.

Mr. GEORGE. It is an extreme example. Let me say that while we often look to individual cases to determine the effect of a tax, I always try—I may be wrong about it but it seems to me it is the only sound way—to look to the general and total effect of the tax on all the taxpayers. Specific instances can be picked out under which the second anti-windfall provision in the committee bill to which the Senator is referring will operate most harshly and unfairly against the taxpayer. That is no reason why in any particular instance the remedy should be withheld, because in a particular instance some taxpayer might receive too much relief.

My own feeling with respect to the second windfall provision is that it will operate rather cruelly in a great many cases, and that since the taxpayer is called upon to pay a portion—let us say 25 percent, as I have suggested—of the abated year's liability anyway, the first windfall provision is all that is necessary, with, of course, the same provision in the committee bill providing relief for members of the armed forces.

Mr. OVERTON. I was going to make the observation that the example I gave was purely an offhand one, and was made without any reflection. I do not like to ask the Senator from Georgia to institute a comparison between the product of his own thought and that of the action of the committee; but what I have in mind and what concerns me is this: I remember that when about a year ago we had under consideration the question of renegotiation of contracts the able senior Senator from Georgia stated that the way to reach the war profiteers was through taxation; that so far as he was concerned, he intended to reach the war profiteers through taxation; and I think he said they could be taxed up to 90 percent of the profits they made.

In giving my illustration and in asking for a specific answer whether the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, as compared with the amendment proposed by the Senate committee, would favor such individuals, what I wish to know is simply this: Boiled down, would the committee amendment deal more harshly with war profiteers than would the amendment of the Senator from Georgia; or is the Senator from Georgia in a position to institute a comparison between the two?

Mr. GEORGE. It would not deal more harshly with the war profiteer as a war profiteer. It would deal harshly so far as certain results to many taxpayers who are not war profiteers are concerned. But much of the abnormality of income might have been due to the war, and much of it might not have been due to the war.

Mr. OVERTON. I have in mind the persons who have made abnormal profits since our entrance into the war. Would the committee amendment obtain more taxes from persons who have made such tremendous profits?

Mr. GEORGE. The arbitrary selection of the years 1938, 1939, or 1940 may not be a proper measure for determining normal profits. We fixed a definite period in the corporate excess-profits tax, but we had to provide relief for the hard cases.

It seems to me that if we take the higher of 1942 or 1943, plus 25 percent of the tax for the other year, we will fairly well reach the cases of war profiteers.

The individual tax rates also run very high. They run up to 88 percent, without including the Victory tax. A 90-percent ceiling has been imposed on the individual income taxes; but for a $250,000 income, the law would result in taking away from the taxpayer approximately $207,857.69 out of his $250,000 income.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. If we take the case of a man who had a $1,000,000 income from bonds in 1938, 1939, and 1940, and who had such an income up to this very date, the comparison would be in favor of another version, rather than in favor of the committee version; but that is not the final test of the matter, it seems to me.

Let us take another situation—that of a man who died in 1940. Let us assume that, following his death, large income-producing property was turned over to his orphaned children. Let us assume that in 1938, 1939, and 1940 they had no income whatever. Under the committee proposal, a very serious hurt would be inflicted upon those children, although there was no connection whatsoever between their income and wartime activities, and although there had been, in fact, no creation of new property, but merely the transfer of the property to persons who, until the year 1942, had been nontaxpayers.

In the particular case the Senator first suggested the tax would be most substantial under either proposal, but in that instance there might be a slight difference in favor of the committee bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia in elaboration upon his reply to the Senator from Louisiana, if it would not be fair to say that the second windfall tax provided for in the committee amendment would adhere only in cases in which the income of the taxpayer increased by $10,000 of net taxable income over the income in the base years.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is a correct statement, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana, as the Senator from Georgia frankly concedes.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I think I am also correct in saying that the Treasury expects an added yield from that increase, under the second windfall provision, of approximately $400,000,000 of additional taxes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, but it would be most inequitably distributed; and the Senator will live to see that happen if the second windfall provision ever goes into effect. It would be most cruelly applied in many cases.

The first windfall provision would raise approximately $900,000,000 and would do so, I think, on a fairly equitable basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As I read the Senator's amendment lying on our desks, it seems to me it would increase the taxes to be collected in 1943 by 25 percent of the taxes which would have been collected on the 1942 incomes; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, with this modification: The lesser year is

abated, and 25 percent of the abated year's tax is added to the tax for the higher year.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, to give application to a specific case, in further answer to the Senator from Louisiana, under the committee's second windfall program, in the case of a taxpayer earning $100,000 of net taxable income in 1943, the increase in the tax would be $57,640, which would be added to his tax liability, but which might be paid over a period of 4 years, with 4-percent interest on each annual installment.

Under the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia, the 1943 tax liability would be increased by $9,565, which would be payable in two installments of 50 percent each. Is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I have not done any figuring upon the particular examples; I was simply answering according to my best information, based upon the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. I think the Senator from Georgia will find that the figures are correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt about that, but under the second windfall provision, I can produce innumerable examples which would amount to the crucifixion of persons who would not have had any increase in income arising as a result of the war.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. Mention has previously been made that the windfall provisions are included in order to prevent abnormal profits and that the windfall provisions would apply to abnormal profits a higher rate of taxation than that which ordinarily would be applied. I am wondering if that would not work an injustice in cases in which the substantially peacetime income, let us say, had no relation whatever to war profiteering.

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would, because, after all, it is from the figures that we obtain the final result, and whether they arise because of war activity or whether they are wholly dissociated from war activity the result to the taxpayer is the same. I think that is quite true, and I think that is especially true in all cases of inheritance, or the taking over by bequest of income-producing property, and in many hundreds, or even thousands, of cases in which deferred salaries have already been paid in 1942, under pension systems or under agreements with the employer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator think it is fair to apply the same high rate to a windfall resulting from an increase in income which comes about in the normal way as would apply to increases which come about as a result of war profits? That is the point I had in mind. Is it fair to apply the same increase in rates?

Mr. GEORGE. That would be the effect.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would be the effect; but would it be fair to do it?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think it would be fair to do it.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. His amendment to the pending bill has not been printed and does not lie on our desks. I think it would be rather unfortunate, with the somewhat sparse attendance of the Senate at the moment, to vote on that amendment this afternoon.

In view of the statement of the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] about our armed forces being affected by the collection of taxes, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana what provision his amendment—which we cannot read in detail—would make respecting soldiers. Perhaps I can put it a little more clearly by asking if his amendment would in anywise affect the question to which the Senator from Georgia referred, of deferring or abating taxes on the members of our armed forces.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to the Senator from Washington that section 7 of the bill provides for an additional allowance for members of the armed forces. Section 7 (a) provides an exemption. It reads as follows:

(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500."

Then there is another provision, in section 8, which abates the taxes of members of the armed forces in case of death.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator indicate the page?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be found on page 104. Those two provisions are in nowise affected by my amendment. As I understand, there is a provision in the bill which cancels 1942 taxes of a soldier up to $14,000 on earned income. Let me say to the Senator that if my amendment in any way affects the provisions with regard to any member of our armed forces I desire to amend it so that the armed forces will be treated in the same manner as they are proposed to be treated under the terms of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are we to reach a vote on this amendment this afternoon? The hour is rather late. It is a quarter to 5.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope we can vote on the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that I have the floor.

It is now a quarter to 5, and the amendment, which was offered by me today, has not been printed. I offered it in good faith. I discussed the matter with a member of the Treasury Department yesterday and I gave him my views as to what should be contained in the amendment. The amendment could not be prepared until this morning. I offered it this afternoon. I am hopeful that the Senate will not force a vote this afternoon, but will permit the amendment to be printed so that Senators may have an opportunity to study it. I think it is a very important amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a statement, I have no desire to force a vote; but the Senator's amendment brings up the very genesis from which we started with the proposed legislation. I thought the amendment was well understood. If there is any question about the amendment being understood, it might go over; but we face this situation: If any withholding at the source is to go into effect July 1, the bill must clear both Houses of Congress and reach the President by Saturday or thereabouts. It is important that we move as fast as we can.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it could be cleared tomorrow. Consideration of my amendment will not occupy very much time.

Mr. GEORGE. We have a number of other amendments. Is the Senator especially anxious to have his amendment go over until tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator willing temporarily to withdraw his amendment so that we may dispose of a few other amendments, which will not take more than a few minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will agree to that provided that my amendment will be made the pending business when we meet tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator can temporarily withdraw his amendment and offer it the first thing tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us agree as follows: The Senate will defer consideration of my amendment, and after the amendments which the Senator desires to have considered are acted upon, my amendment will be the unfinished business tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator offer his amendment after we shall have disposed of the other amendments.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the debate on this amendment, let me suggest that a time be fixed for voting tomorrow, at half-past 12, so that there will not be a recurrence of the whole debate on this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there has not been much debate on my amendment. The debate has been on the bill itself.

Mr. WALSH. Could we not vote at half-past 12 or 1 o'clock on the Senator's amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. My amendment has not received much deliberation or discussion.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that is true; but in view of what the Senator from Georgia has pointed out as to the urgency of action, we ought to try to fix a time to vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can assure the Senator that I will not delay a vote on my amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Is the Senator willing to agree upon a time to vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will not agree on a specific time, but I will state to the Senator that I do not seek to prolong discussion on the amendment but ask only that it be thoroughly considered.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will withdraw his amendment temporarily, so that I may offer other amendments, I will agree that his amendment may go over until tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the understanding that after the disposition of the amendments to which the Senator refers my amendment will be the pending business tomorrow?

Mr. GEORGE. It would certainly be in order at any time.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the difference? I can see no objection to my suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not want to start a long debate again on one amendment when we have a number of other amendments. If it is to go over, I think there ought to be at least an understanding that we shall reach a vote by a certain time. I do not care to have a unanimous-consent agreement. As quickly as the Senator can explain the amendment tomorrow I think we ought to be able to take a vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion to the Senator. Regardless of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, and not referring to his amendment alone, we face the physical fact that if the proposed legislation is to be worth paying any further attention to, it must be completed this week. That is a physical fact. If all the amendments—and there are many pending—are to run the same sort of gantlet as does the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, we shall not be through with the bill until next week, and then it will be a case of "love's labor lost," no matter what the result is. I wonder if we may have a unanimous consent agreement now limiting consideration of all amendments, commencing tomorrow at noon?

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no objection to laying my amendment aside temporarily, with the simple understanding that when we meet tomorrow it will be the unfinished business. I cannot see any reason why that cannot be agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that within 40 minutes after the Senate convenes tomorrow a vote be had on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, if it is to be postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I like the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. At this time I think that if it is imperative that the pending bill should be disposed of this week or tomorrow, we should have an understanding limiting debate on all the amendments pending, or those which may be offered.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In that connection, I wonder if the chairman of the committee, and the distinguished minority leader, would think well of an agreement that no Member shall speak more than once, or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I am perfectly willing to accept any suggestion. I thought we would vote early tomorrow on the pending bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have no purpose to delay action on this bill, but I do not want to see the Senate placed in a position where the Members of the Senate cannot have adequate time for debate on amendments that may be offered. We do not know what amendments may be offered before the bill shall be voted upon.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Wisconsin would not be willing at this time to enter into any agreement with reference to a limitation on debate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would not. We have debated this bill for only 2 days.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is only 5 o'clock. I think we had better proceed. That is the only way in which we can get an answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have some statistics which I should like to read. I do not care to detain the Senate unnecessarily, but I think that I have made a very reasonable request.

The amendment which is now pending can be laid aside. I am willing to agree temporarily to that being done. If in the meantime the Senate should desire to dispose of any amendments this afternoon, that would be perfectly agreeable to me. I do not see why this amendment cannot retain its status and be taken up when the Senate meets tomorrow. I should like to have the Senate agree to that, rather than to make it necessary for me to stand here and read from statistics. I do not ask for a vote on my amendment this afternoon. I am frank to say, as I have already said, that I was unable to have the amendment prepared previous to this afternoon. It was handed to me about 2 o'clock. The moment that I could obtain an opportunity to submit the amendment, I did so.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think there is any opposition in the Senate to the amendment being voted upon tomorrow. The difficulty is that no time limit has been fixed. Without a time limit being agreed to we could have general debate and spend all day in discussing the merits of the bill, and the amendment of the Senator would not be reached at all. There has been some discussion of it today, and there may be some tomorrow, but if a time limit were fixed the Senator's amendment could be disposed of, and then we could proceed to general debate. If we should take all day tomorrow to discuss his amendment, that would be one thing. The Senator knows from experience here that everything else would be discussed except his amendment, but if a time were fixed I am sure every Member would be glad to have a vote upon his amendment sometime tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have any objection to a time limitation being placed on the debate relative to the amendment, but I understand that the majority leader has asked that a time limit be set, and an objection was urged.

Mr. WALSH. My remarks were directed only to disposing of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, and were not directed to other amendments. If a time is fixed for action on the Senator's amendment every Member would, I believe, be satisfied and would be glad to accommodate the Senator. The difficulty is that if a limit shall not be placed upon debate we could debate all day long on the general proposition and not reach a vote on the Senator's amendment for possibly 2 days.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator does not wish his amendment to be voted upon this afternoon, and I understand his reasons for it. I take it that he will not allow his amendment to be voted on this afternoon, and he has it within his power not to permit the amendment to be voted upon. In view of the situation, would not the Senator be willing temporarily to withdraw his amendment? I believe the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] have a few amendments which they wish to propose. Tomorrow the Senator from Louisiana could offer his amendment. When he has offered it, unless some limitation shall be placed upon the debate—and the only way such limitation could be placed would be by his consent—he could take as long as he wished in discussing it. There is no way in which to prevent him from discussing his amendment now, and there is no disposition on the part of any Member not to allow him to take up his amendment tomorrow. If he would refrain from making his speech now, we could proceed to dispose of other amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only difficulty is that I would like to have my amend-

ment voted upon before 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. In that connection I will say to the Senator, after conferring with the chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority leader, that it is my purpose to move to recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow, and if the Senate meets at 11 o'clock tomorrow the Senator's amendment could then be disposed of unless he should desire to take time in which to discuss it again.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no intention to take up much more of the Senate's time in a discussion of the amendment. It is a very simple amendment. All I desire to do is to give an opportunity to Senators to read and study it.

Mr. HILL. Then if the Senator will temporarily withdraw his amendment he could have it printed in the RECORD, which would give every Senator an opportunity to read and study it, and offer it again tomorrow. In so doing we could make a little headway this afternoon in disposing of some of these other amendments. There would be no difficulty in offering his amendment tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to agree that if the Senate recesses until 11 o'clock tomorrow a vote will be taken upon my amendment not later than 12:30 p. m.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I will not agree to that. I will not agree to an hour and a half of further discussion on this amendment. The Senator can follow that course if he wishes to.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said not later than 12:30. It may be that we would be able to vote upon it at 11:30. I certainly shall not occupy an hour and a half in discussing the amendment. I may not occupy more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have always tried to be very courteous, and the only thing I will say is that I shall insist on the Senate going ahead with its business. At a reasonable time tomorrow morning the amendment can be offered and voted upon. The Senator can offer his amendment at any time before the bill is finally disposed of.

Mr. ELLENDER. What objection would there be to temporarily setting aside the amendment and making it the unfinished business of the Senate tomorrow at 11 o'clock? What would be the objection to that?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall not ask the Senator temporarily to lay aside his amendment unless he wishes to do so. I will give him assurance that he can bring it up tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is only the Senator's assurance. Possibly other Senators will introduce amendments in the meantime with the result that the Senator from Louisiana will be out on a limb and his amendment may not be voted upon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I was going to say that I should be glad to join with the Senator in asking the Chair to recognize the Senator the first thing in the morning. I do not see what more the Senator could ask. He will have every opportunity to present his amendment. It is just a question of whether he is going to talk, or whether we will be able to dispose of some of the other amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Senator wants primarily to have the amendment printed in the RECORD overnight so that Senators who read the RECORD will have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amendment is already in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And will be in the RECORD whether or not the Senator discusses it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Why could not the Senator just yield the floor at this time, because any time tomorrow the Senator certainly would have an opportunity to call up the amendment and discuss it, and his purpose will be served by having the amendment read by Senators tonight or tomorrow, and having the vote postponed until tomorrow, and that certainly will be done if the Senator will yield the floor at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the rules, if I should withdraw my amendment at the moment——

Mr. LUCAS. I am not asking the Senator to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator has suggested is what I have been suggesting, that the amendment be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering other amendments which Senators desire to have disposed of, and after those amendments are disposed of, then my amendment is to revert to its present status. What is wrong with that? I cannot understand why that cannot be agreed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that the Senate suspend the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of considering other amendments, the consideration of that amendment to be resumed upon the completion of the consideration of the other amendments, and that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana be made the unfinished business.

Mr. GEORGE. I must object to that, because it is an unheard of proceeding. It is perfectly fair, if the Senator wishes temporarily to lay the amendment aside, and let us proceed, because he is not willing to have a vote, although it is just 5 o'clock. It is perfectly fair, and I agreed in the first instance that the amendment might be laid aside temporarily so that we could proceed and discuss such other amendments as might be offered, but I will not agree that it shall go over as a preferred amendment, with a preferred status.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to assume the attitude of being obstinate and stubborn, and with the assurance of the acting majority leader, as well as of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that my amendment will receive first consideration when we meet tomorrow, I shall be willing to have it set aside temporarily.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object to any agreement whatsoever, and will not consent to any suggestion whatsoever, to give this amendment a preferred status, beyond the assurance that the amendment may be brought up. That is not a procedure I have heard suggested before in the Senate, during my experience here.

If there could be an agreement to limit debate upon the amendment to 15 minutes on the part of any Senator, I should be perfectly willing to ask the acting majority leader to seek an adjournment or a recess until tomorrow. If we may have consent that all debate upon the amendment be limited to 15 minutes on the part of any Senator on the amendment or any amendment proposed to the amendment, I shall be willing to ask the Senate to take a recess, although there are impelling reasons why the pending bill should be speedily considered and passed, so that it may become effective by July 1.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no Senator be allowed to speak more than once on the pending amendment, or on any amendment to the pending amendment, and that no Senator be allowed to speak over 15 minutes on the amendment or any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute which I expect to offer, and the inquiry is whether under the Senate rules, if the Senator from Georgia should offer his amendment as a substitute and it should be adopted, it would then be in order for me to offer a complete substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a complete substitute for the bill is adopted, then a substitute would not be in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was my view that if a complete substitute were adopted, this would be in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the form in which the amendment of the Senator from Georgia has been submitted, it is not a substitute at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not for the whole bill. It is a substitute for section 6.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to prevent the Senator from Georgia having a clear-cut issue on the amendment. I prefer to offer my amendment in advance of the vote on his amendment, but I still want to give him a green light.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A perfecting amendment would have precedence over any substitute.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BONE. I should like to know whether the substitute which is to be tendered by the Senator from Texas will be the only substitute for the pending legislation offered in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot answer that question. The substitute which I have in mind is the House Ways and Means Committee bill, which was reported on April 30, and its general outline is that it adopts for 1942 the 1941 rates, and then for the taxpayers of 1942 it permits a 3-year interval for payment in installments.

Mr. BONE. I understand the nature of that proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the proposal I intend to offer as an amendment.

Mr. BONE. I am inquiring whether at this moment the proposal of the Senator from Texas will be the only proposal in the nature of a complete substitute for the pending Senate committee bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. We would have to call a quorum to ascertain that.

Mr. President, I send forward the amendment to which I have made reference, and ask that it be printed for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Texas will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Sumner T. Pike, of Maine, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1948. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

James Lloyd Elliott and Lloyd Frederic Summers to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective on date of oath; and

Sundry senior surgeons, surgeons, passed assistant surgeons, assistant surgeons, a senior dental surgeon, and a passed assistant dental surgeon, all for temporary promotion in the United States Public Health Service

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Laurance T. BuBose to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from September 21, 1942; and

Rear Admiral Charles P. Snyder, United States Navy, when retired on August 1, 1943, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Harry M. Brennan, a citizen of Louisville, Commonwealth of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., be confirmed. It is a position which he has heretofore held and filled with distinction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be forthwith notified.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 14, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12), 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles H. Carr of California to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice William Fleet Palmer, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of July 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 12), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Brennan to be a collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Frances R. Gresham, Autaugaville.

COLORADO

Louis M. French, Norwood.
Leah M. Kesecker, Redcliff.

MICHIGAN

Eernice S. Tiedeman, Washington.

MISSOURI

Helen K. Bridges, Arbyrd.

NEBRASKA

Darwin T. Murfin, Cairo.

NEW JERSEY

Henry G. Roberts, Bay Head.
Louis A. Reilly, Newark.

TEXAS

Hugh L. Williams, Blanket.
Horace Hamilton, Franklin.
Fountain Pitts Shrader, Frisco.
Clyde E. Perkins, Kirkland.
J. O. McBride, Leander.
Grace L. Fowler, Pflugerville.
Charles G. Conley, Quanah.
Vernon E. Newman, Tolar.

VERMONT

Ward L. Lyons, Bennington.
Kenneth A. Tudhope, North Hero.
John J. Cain, Orwell.
Patrick J. Candon, Pittsford.
Ethel B. Wilkins, Reading.
Mary E. Gover, Sheldon Springs.
Cecelia S. Joslyn, South Hero.
Irving E. Bronson, Swanton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father in heaven, whose mercies are exceedingly rich and abundant, Thou hast never forsaken the trusting soul in need. He who bears witness with calm and undaunted will against the wrong, need never count the battle lost. Above the expanse of problems make us humbly eager to serve our fellow men, fair and resolute in criticism and triumphant in faith.

O Christ, breathe into every motive and desire and prune the overaffections of the soul that we may learn how sweet the bitter and how strong our weakness. We pray that courtesy may be the aroma of our conduct, so helpful that it will lift us above the strata of strife. In our waking hours and daily tasks, in voiceless wonder let us come to Thee without fear, rejoicing that we are within the circuit of Thy being; O gather within Thy fatherly hands our time, our lives, and our souls. Wilt Thou bring to an end the dire works of darkness which have been thrust upon Thy appealing children? Bring them release, O Lord, from their prison walls and crush the black hands of spiritual anarchy. Almighty God, grant to our President and

all who are joined with him in conference the fullest measure of wisdom and strength to do Thy will and Thine shall be the praise forever through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 3, 1943:

H. R. 1114. An act to revive and reenact an act approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 947), as amended, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Columbia River, at or near Astoria, Oreg.;

H. R. 2370. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res 14. Joint resolution authorizing the execution of certain obligations under the treaties of 1903 and 1936 with Panama, and other commitments.

On May 7, 1943:

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On May 10, 1943:

H. R. 1936. An act to provide for the expansion of facilities for hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 658. An act to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act;

S. 981. An act to assist relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; and

S. 1041. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Federal Communications Commission.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Archives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article in reference to a former colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a former member of Congress to the editor of the Evening Star, in Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the News of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the other special orders and the business of the day has been concluded I may be privileged to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram from a western automobile organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short newspaper excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I was granted a special order to speak for 15 minutes today. I desire to release that special order for today and ask unanimous consent that after the business on the Speaker's desk and previous special orders have been disposed of on Monday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all the business of the day and all special orders have been disposed of on tomorrow I man be granted the privilege of addressing the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include brief editorials appearing in the Detroit Free Press on April 20, captioned "Hull has to be diplomatic," and the other entitled "Politics and MacArthur."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution which was adopted at Humboldt Park in Buffalo, N. Y., in regard to the Polish Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial from the Washington Post and in the other to include an open letter to the personnel of the Northwest Service Command from Brigadier General O'Connor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include two resolutions by the Louisiana Federation of Labor, one referring to pledging support of the President in the war effort and the other in reference to the National Federation of the Blind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

PATRIOTISM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a dispatch carried news to the country that Col. Elliott Roosevelt, the son of one of our illustrious Presidents, had been awarded the air medal for his achievements while participating in five operational sorties against the enemy.

The news dispatches inform the American public that Milan Lambertson, the son of one of our colleagues, had changed his mind insofar as his religious principles were concerned, as opposed to war, and had decided to allow the Government authorities to induct him into active service.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any further comment is necessary to the Members of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week, after other business has been disposed of, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PATRIOTISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] arose and stated that the son of a Member of this House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], had withdrawn his objection to entering the military service and had now become a member of the armed forces and made an invidious comparison between him and the grandson of a former President who had just been injured in the war.

I want to state that when he made that attack on the son of a fellow Member he did not represent the majority on our side of the House. No matter who he is, this young man is now in the Army, and it does not behoove any man to attack him.

I remember 25 years ago when we entered the World War, the greatest soldier of that war was said to be a conscientious objector. But he went into the Army just as this young man has done, and when he came out he was pronounced by Marshal Foch the outstanding soldier of the war. I refer to Sgt. Alvin York, of Tennessee.

Instead of criticizing this young man, let us hope that he may emulate that glorious example.

THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine any pandemonium as great as that which would sweep this country at the announcement of the clearing of the Press Gallery in the House of Representatives. I can conceive of no upset which would grip the entire Nation if the press were excluded from the proceedings of this House. Yet it is no more serious, Mr. Speaker, than to exclude them from the May Food Conference, which is a prelude to post-war planning at the end of this great struggle. It is no more serious to deny the public knowledge of the Food Conference through the press than it is to exclude the people from the galleries and newspapermen from the Press Gallery of the House of Representatives.

I hope those in authority will reconsider their hasty decisions and allow the American people to witness this most important conference.

WAR HOUSING—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 203)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Since last I communicated with the Congress on the subject of war housing in May 1942, much has happened in the war and much has happened in housing.

It is a noteworthy fact in relation to the whole war effort that under the existing war-housing program more than 3,000,000 workers in intense war production have been provided or are being provided with necessary shelter. In addition to placements in existing structures, the present program embraces more than a million and a half units of construction, approximating twice the total volume of homes built in the United States in a better-than-normal building year. The size of this program, founded as it is upon minimum absolute need, affords some measurement of the disastrous impairment of war production that would confront us if war housing were not provided in sufficient volume and on time.

It is hard to build houses in time of war. It is even harder in time of war to combine the building of houses with maximum economy in the use of men, money, and materials. It is therefore encouraging to know that more than half of the necessary war-housing accommodations thus far projected is being provided through the more effective use of existing structures; that another substantial portion is being attained through the prudent and economical repair, enlargement or "conversion" of existing dwellings so that they may shelter additional war workers; that only about two-fifths of the need is being supplied by new construction; and that more than one-half of this new construction is being financed with private funds.

Housing used to be divided among several agencies and several programs. Today, as a product of the reorganization and unification of the housing agencies 14 months ago, the National Housing Agency is pursuing one unified housing program under which all of our housing resources and techniques are being focused upon the winning of the war. There is no room now for any kind of housing but war housing.

I have been particularly gratified to see that this new spirit with regard to housing activities pervades the Congress. Certain recent and interesting reports of investigatory congressional committees have emphasized in a most striking fashion the acute continuity of the need for even more war housing in specified critical areas. Generally speaking, proposals in the Congress for the effective use of our manpower are linked with proposals for the adequate provision of war housing wherever needed.

The war is not over. War production and the employment of men and women in war plants have not reached their peak, even where the plants are completed. The constant rearrangements in the nature and disposition of our total working force, produced by the increasing inroads of selective service, develop gaps that must be filled in part by the migration of women and older workers, and consequently intensify old needs or develop new needs for war housing.

Even after making every reasonable allowance for the use of local labor supply, including the training of new types of workers, the best estimates indicate an in-migration of 1,100,000 war workers into areas of war-production activity during the fiscal year 1944. These workers must be housed or they cannot do their job.

It is not proposed to house even the majority of these workers with Federal funds. Almost two-thirds of them will be taken care of by placement in existing structures, and a large part of the balance will be served by privately financed construction encouraged and insured by the Government. The Congress will recall that to serve workers in-migrating during the fiscal year 1943, it recently increased the authorization of one branch of the National Housing Agency to insure private investment in war-housing construction by $100,000,000. Likewise, it is contemplated that recommendations for additional authorizations for private financing will be forthcoming, to serve a large portion of the workers who will in-migrate during the fiscal year 1944. This further expansion of private financing will maintain and confirm in the war-housing program the principles which point toward maximizing our utilization of existing resources, and particularly the resources of small enterprise, during the war. We are allocating to private initiative as large a segment of the war-housing program as it possibly can produce under war conditions and war risks.

But in order to meet that portion of the needs of 1,100,000 workers migrating to war centers during the fiscal year 1944, which cannot be met in any other way, some publicly financed war housing construction is essential. The main vehicle for this purpose has been the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, known as the Lanham Act. The funds under this act, and under other acts to provide war housing, are practically all committed to serve needs arising during the fiscal year 1943. I am, therefore, suggesting to the Congress at this time the enactment of legislation providing an increase of $400,000,000 in the authorization contained in the Lanham Act, as amended. A substantial portion of these funds will be returned to the Government in the form of rents during the emergency and realizations thereafter. In making this recommendation, I am sure that the Congress and the National Housing Agency will continue to look upon all phases of the war-housing problem as a part of a total and unified picture.

No expenditure of funds can be too large if that expenditure is necessary to win the war, or to win it with a greater economy in time and lives. But I cannot refrain from pointing out how small a fraction of the cost of the war is involved in all the appropriations of money and use of materials for war housing, particularly when measured against the contribution which the shelter of war workers is making toward the winning of the war. If the total outlays for war housing were regarded as part of the cost of the plants in which the workers produce, or the cost of the munitions and war implements which they fabricate, these outlays would shrink to very minor proportions in this proper perspective. But the cost to the war effort, in delay and blood and treasure, if decent and sufficient shelter were not provided for those who produce, would be great beyond calculation.

In view of the urgency of the need for more war housing now, I suggest that the proposed expansion receive the earliest consideration of the Congress. There is attached draft of a bill which, in addition to providing for an increase in the amount authorized, would accomplish certain other highly desirable amendments in existing legislation.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

A bill to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,600,000,000."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Numbered 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in an appropriation account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 4. That the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 22) and sections 114 and 115 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 204 and 205) or of any other law shall not be construed to prevent any Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, from leasing or renting any housing accommodations in the District of Columbia, in the city of Alexandria, in Arlington County or Fairfax County in the Commonwealth of Virginia, or in Montgomery County, Prince George's County, or Charles County, in the State of Maryland, owned or operated by the United States or in which it has any interest and for the tenancy of which he and his family would otherwise be eligible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address which I gave at a United Nations Today and Tomorrow meeting in Constitution Hall on May 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from the secretary of the St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand two newspaper clippings. One tells of a strike in the building of the pipe line to get oil for my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], who now sits smiling over here on the majority side. As you know, the Government is trying to get a 24-inch pipe line across the Mississippi River, and yet the administration's political ally, the American Federation of Labor affiliates, the International Union of Operating Engineers and the International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers' Union have held up construction since the 28th day of April.

The other clipping tells how 25 coal miners, who complied with the President's ultimatum and returned to work on May 1, were fined $5 each by Local 7674 of the United Mine Workers operating at the Tower Hill mine.

Here you have two illustrations which prove that the no-strike promise of the unions is not being carried out.

Let the majority party leadership figure out a solution for the situation created by these and similar strikes.

Perhaps the pay-off is found in the action taken by a C. I. O. affiliate in New York on May 11, when the general president of the C. I. O. Textile Workers Union of America, in opening a union convention, called upon the C. I. O. to "perpetuate in office" the New Deal.

With Americans dying throughout the world, a high price indeed is being paid for the political support of an organization whose affiliates time and again have interfered, and who are now interfering, with war production through slowdowns, work stoppages, and strikes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein correspondence I had with the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the press representatives being excluded from the Food Conference. I presume there are international questions involved to justify that action. I doubt, however, that the Members of the House can consistently criticize that procedure. For instance, here in the House of Representatives our great Committee on Appropriations is divided up into a number of subcommittees and we have recognized for a long time the practice of holding secret hearings before those committees. What is more important than the testimony before the committees, involving tens of billions of dollars? That testimony is secret, given in secret sessions and it is not made public until the bill is ready to be presented to the House. So, I suggest the practice that has been referred to with reference to the Food Conference is no more undemocratic than that followed by the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Is it not also possible that the conference may have before it many matters of a confidential nature and it would be unwise for them to be divulged to the public at this time?

Mr. PATMAN. I presume that is the reason for the procedure adopted. Probably it is contemplated that the printed food proceedings will be made public later in the same way and manner that the testimony before the Appropriations Committee is made public later on.

THE PRESIDENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to wait upon and escort the President of Czechoslovakia into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Czechoslovakia and his party entered the Chamber at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m., and the President of Czechoslovakia was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee of Representatives appointed for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my great pleasure and my high privilege, and I deem it a distinguished honor, to present to you a guest of the day, the President of a republic containing a great and a valorous people, a government which we hope some day will not be a government in exile.

Mr. President, speaking for the representatives of the American people, we are proud to be a haven for you in your condition.

Without further words, Members of the House of Representatives, I present to you a distinguished citizen of the world, the President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

The PRESIDENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA. Mr. Speaker, Members of the United States House of Representatives, it is now a quarter of a century since Thomas G. Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic and my great predecessor, came, in the last year of the First World War, to Washington to inform American leaders how his Czechoslovak countrymen were fighting for their freedom and independence and to obtain the American support for their struggle. His mission in the United States met with favor and encouragement everywhere. He found a great understanding of, and sympathy with, the national aspirations of the Czechoslovak people in the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, in his Government, and the people. It was known that for centuries beginning with the Middle Ages this small nation in the heart of Europe had been a glorious independent kingdom and a prosperous state, the state that first began the fight for religious freedom in Europe. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Prague, its capital, was a great center of learning, contributed largel to European cultural, spiritual, and material development, and played an outstanding role in European history and particularly in the history of the Holy Roman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Perhaps your Government knew, too, the famous declaration made by the German Chancelor Bismarck after his victory over Austria in 1886: "Whoever is master of Bohemia is master of Europe." Europe must, therefore, never allow any nation except the Czechs to rule it, since that nation does not lust for domination. The boundaries of Bohemia are the safeguard of European security and he who moves them will plunge Europe into misery. In my estimation, there can be no better comment on the position of my country even today. The recognition of our cause here in this country in 1918 was also undoubtedly due to the unmistakable determination of our people to live as a free and independent nation. More than 150,000 Czechoslovak soldiers fought for their country's liberation in the First World War in Russia, France, and Italy. When the war was drawing to a close, the epic march of the Czechoslovak legionnaires across the Siberian plains to Vladivostok fired the imagination of the American people.

When the collapse of the Central Powers was imminent, Masaryk made our Declaration of Independence in Washington on October 18, 1918. It was promptly accepted and recognized by the American people and by their Government. That is why Czechoslovakia was considered and often called the godchild of the United States of America.

Czechoslovakia's 20 years' record as a free and independent democratic state is one of which we are justly proud. Surrounded on all sides by authoritarian countries and government, she remained faithful to the democratic traditions which came to her very largely from the United States. Her social legislation and her educational system were progressive and advanced; her financial system was stable, her currency, one of the soundest in Europe; her general economic standard was very high and her import and export trade greater than that of Italy. Until 1938 this Republic was one of the most prosperous and happy countries in Europe. Even the concentrated campaign of Nazi Germany, beginning in 1936, using corruption, lying propaganda, and threatening war and violence, failed to shake the inner harmony of the Czechoslovak Republic.

In her foreign policy Czechoslovakia resolutely and consistently followed the policy of peace, international arbitration, and collective security. She fostered and encouraged friendship with her neighbors—Austria, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Rumania. She was the most loyal member of the League of Nations. She supported the Locarno Policy, was an original signatory of the Briand-Kellogg Pact and was ready to play the part demanded of her in any generally accepted system of collective security. In Geneva she resolutely opposed the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and China; I was President of the Assembly of the League of Nations when we voted the sanction against Italy upon her invasion of Abyssinia. Czechoslovakia was ready to oppose militarily the occupation of the Rhineland and Austria. Our Army and Air Force were ready and thoroughly efficient. Up to the year 1939 we did our duty completely, not only to our Nation, but to Europe and democracy as well.

Czechosovakia was in mortal danger from the moment that Hitler and the Nazi leaders came to power.

When Hitler saw that the policy of sanctions against Italy was not strictly applied and when the German remilitarization of the Rhineland was not opposed by force, he thought that the countless seeds of bitterness and mistrust sown by the dictators would permit him to reap a harvest of destruction of democracy in Europe and bring about the realization of his pan-German plan. The success of the annexation of Austria in March led to the September crisis in 1938.

My own view then was that Hitler's demands and attacks against Czechoslovakia should have been rejected even at the cost of a war. We were ready, but the western powers were not. By the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia, Europe and the world gained a year's time in which to prepare for the defense against the coming onslaught. In my opinion, the Second World War began with the criminal occupation of Prague. And from the very day of occupation, March 15, 1939, all Czechoslovak citizens have been at war with Germany.

Since 1938 the Czechoslovaks at home have endured great hardships, sorrows, and suffering. They know that many of their soldiers and airmen, who escaped from their enslaved homeland lost their lives while fighting for its liberation in Poland and in France. They know that after the Franco-German armistice, Czechoslovak soldiers and airmen reassembled in Great Britain and that in the decisive battle of Britain, Czechoslovak airmen played an honorable part. They know, too, that Czechoslovak soldiers are now fighting in Russia and in Africa and manning the defenses of Great Britain. On the other hand, they see their own country being converted into an arsenal for a war against the United Nations. Many are now working as forced laborers in Germany and elsewhere. Those who resist the oppressors are either executed in masses or tortured in prisons and concentration camps. Their country is pillaged and Germanized, their national education completely destroyed. The undying memory of the martyred village of Lidice forbids us ever to relax in the world struggle now waged against the powers of evil and darkness. The all-out participation—after Pearl Harbor—of the United States in this fight for the freedom of the world has turned into cer-

tainty what until then had been the hope of the ultimate liberation for the Czechoslovak people and the other occupied nations.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say before this august body, in conclusion, with gratitude and appreciation:—

It was here in this great democratic country that in October 1918 the freedom and new independence of my nation were solemnly proclaimed and its first free Government recognized. When on March 15, 1939, Nazi Germany destroyed the new Czechoslovak liberty, and I personally, as a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago, respectfully asked President Roosevelt to refuse to recognize this insulting and lawless act of violence, it was the Government of the United States which first among all great powers categorically repudiated this wanton aggression. It gave its full approval to the refusal of the Czechoslovak Minister in Washington to hand over his Legation to the Nazi authorities. The Government of the United States never recognized the German occupation of the Czechoslovak Republic. By this decisive act, this great historic land of freedom defended the national liberty of my country at the most tragic moment of our modern history. Later your Government recognized our reconstituted government and independent country and accepted our Republic as a free and equal member of the United Nations. Through all these acts the immortal spirit of the great American tradition, of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, rose to defend the highest, undying principles of human and national liberty at the time when a small, democratic, peace- and freedom-loving nation was assassinated by a vulgar authoritarian aggressor.

The entire Czechoslovak Nation expresses its warmest thanks and gratitude to the great American people not only for all that they have done on behalf of Czechoslovakia, but also for the enormous and outstanding contribution of your great country to the war effort of all the United Nations.

They do not doubt that this great struggle, in which the United States is playing so decisive a role, will end with one of the greatest victories in your and our national annals. They are greatly encouraged and proud that I have the privilege of addressing the Members of the Congress of the United States I know that they will accept the promise I make to you, today, as theirs.

As President Masaryk in 1918, I, today, feel authorized to declare on behalf of my nation, here in the Washington Capitol, that after the final victory in this great war is achieved, the Czechoslovak Nation will reconstruct its old home rapidly and successfully by its untiring efforts, remaining faithful—as it always was during the difficult period of its long, checkered, and glorious history—to the democratic way of life, to the principles of spiritual and religious freedom, to the ideals of peace and peaceful international collaboration, considering itself again the godchild of the great and glorious Republic of the United States.

At 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m., the President of Czechoslovakia and his party departed.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Rear Admiral L. O. Colbert, Director of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three particulars, on the subject of Austria, on the subject of the Bermuda Conference, and on the Cremieux Decree.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON: Before the period in line 8, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That hereafter no such foreign-trade agreement shall become effective before the expiration of 90 legislative days after the date of its submission to the Congress, and shall not thereafter become effective if during such 90-day period the Congress shall adopt a concurrent resolution stating its disapproval of any such agreement."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the amendment read so it is not necessary to make a detailed statement about it.

The purpose of this amendment is to recapture for Congress a portion of its constitutional right which it surrendered upon the passage of the original Trade Agreements Act in 1934. The amendment merely provides that any treaty agreed upon with another country shall lie on the desk for 90 days, to give Congress an opportunity to study its provisions. If we find that it is not to the interest of our country, we may nullify it by the passage of a concurrent resolution.

That in substance is the entire explanation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much said about crippling amendments. The Speaker of the House and the majority leader as well as others have warned the House against adopting crippling amendments to this resolution.

You may cripple an individual and still that individual may render useful service in some sorts of work, but in others he cannot accomplish very much. In my judgment, this is not only a crippling amendment but a fatal one. The straightforward and fair thing for those to do who want to kill this act would be to vote directly against the adoption of this joint resolution.

The representatives of what government would sit around a conference table with those of this Government if this resolution should be adopted? The basis of their negotiations would be too uncertain.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why would it make it more uncertain to give the American Congress the same right that most of the congresses have in the countries with which we have entered into agreements?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The negotiation of any agreement would become more uncertain if after the negotiators had reached an agreement it should become the subject of logrolling in Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will yield to the gentleman. The gentleman has been opposed to this act from the first. He voted against the original act and he has voted against every renewal of it. He is consistent, but not as consistent as he would be if he would endeavor in a straightforward way to kill the whole proposition. Everybody knows that the only purpose of this amendment is to so cripple the act as to make it ineffectual. Do you suppose representatives of this Government would sit down around the conference table if there was such uncertainty as to whether an agreement

would be adopted by some other government?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman does not have as much confidence in the integrity of the American Congress as he has in those congresses of South American countries? Why, the gentleman knows that what I say is true.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, I don't have the pharisaical idea that I have a monopoly on how to legislate properly. Sometimes I think that my friend from Minnesota is almost that way and assumes that in all these matters he has a superknowledge. He is a very able member of our committee, but we are talking now about this amendment. If Members want to kill this whole proposition, then I say adopt this amendment, and then the law will not be worth carrying on any further. We may just as well end the whole proposition as to adopt this amendment. My opinion is that that is the purpose of it, and those who are opposed to the program and have always been opposed to the program want to defeat it in any way that they can. They do not step up and try to defeat it with a frontal attack, but they do it by a flank movement, and I repeat, if this amendment is adopted, that will be the result of it. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as was so clearly pointed out by the chairman of the committee the adoption of this amendment would definitely destroy the program. I agree with the chairman that that is the real purpose to be served by offering the amendment. We have been hearing the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] all along in years past in the consideration of this matter, because he has opposed it all of the time. He is opposed to it now, and he has the right to be opposed to it.

He has been against it all of the time and, of course, is still against it. Bear in mind that this is a legislative program which was adopted by the Congress in the act of 1934. It has continued as a legislative program all through these 9 years, and every 3 years Congress checks up on it, and decides for itself whether it is to continue, whether it is to be carried forward. The distinction between the operation of the program in this country and other countries of the world is that the other countries do not have this authorizing legislation. Trade agreements are negotiated and then submitted to their legislative bodies, but their legislative bodies have not previously conferred discretionary power on the Executive to negotiate trade agreements of this type.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield briefly.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that under the constitution of every country in the world, including our own, the Executive has the right to negotiate treaties, and that also under their constitution they must be ratified by the legislative body?

Mr. COOPER. I do not yield further. The gentleman overlooks the fact that many countries of the world do not even have a constitution. Great Britain does not even have a constitution. We just have a different situation here.

In those other countries that have parliamentary systems quite different from our legislative system, these agreements are negotiated and then receive parliamentary consideration. But those countries have not previously passed legislation such as this, authorizing the negotiation of those trade agreements. That is a very clear distinction. As pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], those countries would not indulge in the time required to negotiate trade agreements with any such uncertainty as this. For all practical purposes, this is the same amendment that was offered yesterday for a 90-day veto power. It simply means that we could not carry forward this program. It could only result in the program being stopped just where it is. That is the purpose to be served by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. That is what he would like to see happen. He has been against the program all the time. He is against it now. Let us not deceive ourselves by thinking that this amendment could be offered in any friendly spirit, because that is not what he is trying to do. He is not trying to help the program. He is not trying to help the legislation.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Would it not be more forthright to offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause? Would that not have the same effect, as a matter of fact?

Mr. COOPER. Of course it would have the same effect, as was pointed out by the chairman. The fair thing to do for those who are opposed to the program, who always have been opposed to it, and who are opposed to it now, is simply to vote against the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this country has great commercial interests with the Republic of Czechoslovakia and with its Government now in exile in London. You listened with rapt attention to the remarks of a glorious statesman from a glorious country, Czechoslovakia. We have ties of honor with that country. We have great community of interest. I want you to compare the attributes, the attainments, and the honorable conduct of that gentleman, President Beneš, who has just addressed you as he, with great dignity, stood beside the Speaker, with the sort of papier-mâché monarch or pretender to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Otto von Hapsburg, who is presently in this country under a diplomatic passport issued by the Belgian Government. Why an Austrian pretender to the throne of Austria, Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia could get a Belgian passport as an attaché of the Belgian Embassy is beyond my comprehension. At best he is here as a refugee. He is an outcast—ostracized and repudiated by his own native land of Austria. A solemn decree of Austria cast out the entire Hapsburg entourage.

This Otto von Hapsburg would destroy everything that President Beneš stands for. I am going to ask the Members of this Congress to watch the scheming and the conspiracies and the machinations of this Otto von Hapsburg, operating as he does with his monarchial "stooges" in New York, Montreal and Washington. He has the temerity, in this land of freedom, in our great Republic, to hold court as a king, in the Essex House, for example, in New York City, where he demands and receives kingly allegiance from certain social satellites and cafe society lickspittles. Yea, he gets obeisance even from some high in authority in Washington. It is indeed passing strange. He even goes as far as to bestow titles and decorations upon those who would fawn upon him and abet and support his ambitions to go back to the so-called Austro-Hungarian throne. He drives a wedge between us and our allies in exile—Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Indeed there are those in this Government even who seek to reestablish the Austro-Hungarian Empire with this "Chocolate Soldier," Otto, as Emperor. They desire this set-up as a sort of sanitaire cordon against Russia. It is time to call a halt to the "shenanigans" of Otto von Hapsburg. Our respect for Dr. Beneš and his Republic should cause us to spew out this Hapsburg and put an end to his anti-democratic actions.

Mr. ELMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ELMER. Which side of this war shall we come in on?

Mr. CELLER. I am not talking about a war. I want to show my respect to Dr. Beneš and Czechoslovakia. I want the gentleman to exercise his usual intelligence and perspicacity and help me and others like-minded to scotch the ridiculous—shall I say tragic—ambitions of this Otto von Hapsburg, who would strike at everything that President Beneš stands for, because Hapsburg means the very antithesis of the "four freedoms." As far as the Czechs are concerned, represented by President Beneš, there is no choice between Hitler and Hapsburg. They both mean Prussian Junkerism, totalitarianism. The very name Hapsburg is anathema to the Czechs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out frequently, the administration in 1934 forced through Congress, using its top-heavy majority in the House and Senate, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution gives to the Congress alone the power to levy taxes and to levy and collect tariffs, and the Constitution gives to the Senate the exclusive power to ratify treaties. The Congress, by the Reciprocal Trade Act, surrendered its constitutional power to levy taxes, fix tariffs, and so forth,

and turned these powers over to the executive branch of the Government, and this act took away the right of the Senate to ratify treaties made by the executive branch of the Government.

We are now considering the extension of this Trade Act. The administration has asked it be extended for 3 years, but we have already voted to limit this extension to 2 years. The amendment now under consideration provides that where the executive branch makes one of these trade agreements or treaties that it be submitted to the Congress and that the Congress have 90 days in which to pass a joint concurrent resolution to veto such agreement, if, in the opinion of a majority of the House and Senate, such agreement or treaty is not to the best interests of the American people. If the House and Senate adopt such a joint resolution then in that event the agreement or treaty would not become operative.

The administration strongly opposes this amendment. In fact the administration has resisted every amendment offered to this act. They insist we must accept it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." Many of us favor this amendment because it will recapture some of the powers the Congress in violation of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, granted to the Executive. The Congress had no constitutional right to strip itself of these constitutional powers and delegate them to the Executive.

The Reciprocal Trade Act is a series of acts pushed through subservient Congresses by the administration. We have made about 30 different trade treaties under this act. Twenty-six of them were with countries that required the Congress, or legislative body, of those countries to ratify them before they became operative. This amendment would provide like action by our Congress before these trade agreements became operative.

I just listened with interest to the speech of our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. He pointed out that these countries with whom we made these treaties were operating under a different procedure. He pointed out in those countries there was no general authority given by the lawmaking bodies of those countries to the executives to make the agreements. The lawmaking bodies of those countries did not give to their executives the blanket authority that the Congress gave to our Executive in 1934 when the Reciprocal Trade Act was passed.

Of course, the Executive has the right to make agreements or treaties, but under our Constitution they must be ratified by a two-third vote of the Senate. In these 26 countries they waited until the treaties were made and were submitted to them for ratification. That is the course the Congress of the United States should have pursued. In these 26 countries they were unwilling to give to their executives this blanket authority. They retained the power within themselves until the treaties were made and submitted to them for ratification.

Let me repeat, a subservient Congress violated article I, section 8, of the Constitution, and granted to the Executive of this country these extraordinary powers and stripped themselves of the powers that belonged to them as the Representatives of the people.

What does this amendment do? It simply provides that after the Executive makes these treaties they must be submitted to the Congress. They must lie over for 90 days giving the House and the Senate, the Representatives of the people, the right to pass upon the agreement or agreements after they have been made.

The administration forces say this amendment will hamstring the administration and the Reciprocal Trade Act. How can that be contended? Are they unwilling to submit these agreements to the scrutiny of the House and Senate? Members of the House and Senate are the elected Representatives of the American people. They well know if any agreement is not in the interests of the American people. If any agreement is not in the interests of the American people, do not you think the Congress ought to have the right to look into such agreement and reject it?

Under this Reciprocal Trade Act the Executive is given the power to lower or remove tariffs on industrial and agricultural products brought into this country from foreign lands. The able Representative, Mr. WEST, a Democrat of Texas, and many other Democrats, have pointed out how viciously some of these agreements have and are affecting cotton, fruits, and vegetables, corn, wheat, meat, shoes, pottery, textile goods, and other products. Until the war came on they put many of our industries out of business and destroyed markets for many farm commodities.

With this situation confronting us, Mr. WEST offered an amendment prohibiting the lowering of the tariffs to such a point as would permit the importation of any farm commodities or other products coming into this country that were in competition with American farm or industrial products at a price below the cost of production in this country.

We have the highest standard of living of any country in the world. We have higher wages, shorter hours and better working and living conditions. The cheap labor in industry in many other countries, and the peon labor on the farms in other countries have always been a real threat to our standard of living and to the employment of the American people, and I cannot understand how any Member of the American Congress can favor the entry into this country of industrial or farm products that are in competition with our own industrial or farm products at a price less than the cost of producing such product in the United States. That amendment does not provide anything as a matter of profits for those engaged in industry and agriculture in this country. It merely provides that the Executive in making these trade agreements shall not lower the tariffs to the point where these articles of industry and the farms of foreign countries can come into our country and be sold at less than their cost of production here. The administration was able to defeat this salutary amendment.

A distinguished Democrat introduced another amendment which provided these arguments should not lower the tariff or duties on foreign commodities to the point where the products of the farms of foreign countries could be dumped into our country at less than parity prices paid to the American farmers for identical or similar products.

Myself and other friends of the farmers in the House and Senate have been striving for years to secure parity payments for the American farmers, and hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid out by the Treasury and out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country to achieve parity for the American farmers. The administration fought this amendment and it has already been defeated.

The administration has already made agreements under this act that have and will continue to defeat parity payments for many of the essentials and leading farm commodities, and evidently they desire to continue this policy, and for that reason they opposed this limitation. By refusing to accept this amendment and give this protection to the American farmers the administration is helping to break down parity prices for American farmers.

Inasmuch as the amendments that would provide at least cost of production for American products of industry and on the farms, and the amendment protecting parity prices for American farmers, have been defeated, a motion to recommit this bill will be made to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Provided, That no reductions shall be made in the duties on any competitive foreign agricultural or industrial products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products.

I voted for the amendment that would forbid the reduction in duties to the point where foreign industrial or agricultural products could come into this country in competition with our products at less than their cost of production in this country, and I voted in favor of the amendment to preserve parity payments for the American farmers, and I shall vote for the motion to recommit.

I cannot understand how anyone can oppose this motion to recommit. It merely provides that no reduction shall be made in the duties on any competitive foreign agricultural or industrial products which will result in the entry of such competitive products into our domestic markets at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products in our own country. Without such protection how can the American farmers compete with the cotton, hides, and tallows from Mexico, Central and South America; or butter, lard, cheese, cream, and so forth, from the low-wage countries of Europe; fruits, vegetables, and other farm products from

Cuba, India, China, and so forth, or shoes, clothing, and textiles from Europe and Asia. We cannot compete and without at least this much protection, when the war is over, our country will become the dumping ground for the world.

If this amendment provided in the motion to recommit is defeated, as these other amendments have been defeated, and as it appears the amendment before us to give the Congress the right to veto agreements which appear to be detrimental to our country, I shall vote against the extension of this act.

It is said business, labor, and so forth, are for this bill. Some of them have expressed approval provided there are safeguards. The requests for these safeguards have been denied.

I would be unwilling to give this power over industry, agriculture, wages, and standards of living to a Republican administration without the safeguards set forth in the amendments that have been offered.

The Republican Party has always stood for protection of American industry and American farmers and the wage earners on the farms and in industry, and when such an issue has been presented squarely to the American people the Republican Party has always won.

Who conducts the negotiations for these trade agreements? It is our distinguished Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull. He does not now nor never has believed in protection of industry and agriculture as favored by the Republican Party. In fact, he has opposed such policies throughout his public career. If there is anyone in public life in this country who favors the old Democratic policy of free trade and tariff for revenue only that person is Mr. Hull. He looks upon protection for our industry and our farms as trade barriers. It has been his policy to pull down the walls and open our gates to the world.

When these trade agreements are being made with foreign countries our people do not have an opportunity to be heard. These matters are determined behind closed doors in the State Department.

If the amendment before us is adopted giving the House and Senate an opportunity to veto these agreements that do not serve the best interests of the American people, the whole of this matter would be brought out into the open and the American people would have an opportunity to be heard before the committees of the Congress and their Senators and Representatives could be heard.

We have not had an opportunity to observe just what bad effects these agreements would have upon the economic life of this country. We do know they were adopted in 1934. The last year before they were adopted our balance of trade was hundreds of millions of dollars. Until the war between China and Japan got well under way the balance of trade in favor of our country dropped off tens of millions every year, and for 6 months before that war got well under way in 1937 and 1938 we had an adverse balance of trade of about $200,000,000. It was when we began to ship hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil, gasoline, steel, scrap iron, and other war materials to Japan, to Italy, and to Germany, and these war supplies that we found later on provided defense for our three enemies turned the balance of trade again to our country, and, of course, a little later on we began to supply France and Great Britain with large quantities of war supplies, and finally we began to ship our supplies to all parts of the world to carry on the war, billions of dollars in material going to various countries free. For about 2 years we have had no foreign trade except what we have given away to foreign countries, but when this war is over and the embargo created by the war is lifted, and these countries that have but little money to buy with begin again to produce and to dump their products into our country, then the American people will demand the repeal of these reciprocal trade agreements and that American industry and American labor and American farms be given protection against the cheap labor and the flood of industrial and farm products that will be dumped into this country.

Let us not forget that when Mr. Wilson took office in 1913 they pushed through, with the aid of Mr. Hull and others, a free trade or low tariff act. This country felt the effects of it at once. We had a great depression in 1913 and 1914 until the European War started, and, of course, the people in Europe were busy in destroying each other and their factories and farms and we had a great market during the war we thought, but in the end we found out we were giving billions of dollars of industrial and agricultural products to various countries of the world as we are now doing but not on as large a scale as now.

I came to the House immediately following the First World War, and I saw the result of the dumping of foreign products into our country in competition with agriculture, industry, and labor in this country. The situation became so serious the Congress passed an emergency tariff to protect American industry, labor, and farmers. Mr. Wilson vetoed the measure.

Now, that is the very thing that will happen when this war is over. I know these trade agreements will have very little effect one way or the other so long as this war continues, but when people quit destroying and go back to work then we will face disaster under this reciprocal trade policy of Mr. Hull and others.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman spoke of the speedy time with which the Congress was to act by concurrent resolution; just 90 days. I should like to call his attention to the fact that under the laws of Brazil the President of that country must lay the same treaty before the Congress of Brazil and let it stay there 10 months before it becomes effective. In Colombia it must lie over 8 months, and in Costa Rica 8 months. We are asking for only 90 days.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let me ask the House this question. This amendment merely gives the House and Senate the right to veto these agreements if they appear to be detrimental to our country. When one of these agreements comes up for your investigation, are you afraid you will not be able to rise up and vote for the best interests of the American people? In Brazil the lawmaking body has 10 months to veto any of these trade agreements with our country; in Colombia the Congress has 8 months; and in Costa Rica, in Central America, the Congress has 8 months to pass on treaties they may make with our country. The amendment before us only asks for 90 days.

If it was deemed wise for these 26 other countries with whom we have made trade agreements to have their Congress pass upon the treaties, what good reason could be assigned to deny this right to the American Congress of passing on such treaties, especially when article I, section 8, of the Constitution gives the Congress alone the power to levy tariffs, duties, and so forth, on goods which enter this country from foreign countries?

Believing that the original act itself violated the Constitution of the United States and believing we must preserve the Congress as one of the three great coordinate branches of the Government, and that the election last fall was a mandate from the American people that the Congress reassert itself and recapture these powers that have been granted to the Executive by subservient Congresses, if these protective amendments are not provided in the bill, I shall feel compelled to cast my vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize there is quite a demand to vote on this amendment. I do not think it is going to carry, but it should. As a new Member of this House I cannot understand why the Congress wants to give away more and more of its powers, delegate more and more authority to some bureau. I came here as a Member from Nebraska, my people asking that we regain some of the authority we have given away. I realize that in the last 10 years under the leadership of Members on the right-hand side of this House where they have had a large majority, year after year, there has been a tendency to delegate authority to some departments or bureaus. There has been nearly as many directives issued in this country as there have been laws passed by the Congress. I am wondering if the Members of this Congress want to become more and more impotent. You are here representing the people of the country, the people of your district. Is it the desire of the people who sent you here that you give away more of your authority and power, your rights, and your controls?

This amendment merely makes it possible for you, the Congress, the representatives of the people, to say, "No; we do not like this trade agreement with this particular country; we cannot agree

to it." Is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything undemocratic in such action? I say, Mr. Chairman, we are here as representatives of the people. If we continue the course we have pursued in the last 10 years under the overwhelming leadership of the right-hand side of the House, someone will some day introduce a resolution, or the Chief Executive himself may issue an order, dissolving Congress, because what rights have we left? I have wondered sometimes as I sat here day after day if we have much right left now, because even the laws that we pass here are not followed by some of the departments. I plead with you—this may be a partisan matter, and I have played some partisan politics—but I am asking the Members not to become as impotent as the unharnessed mountain torrent. For heaven's sake, let us start now to regain some of the rights we have delegated to bureaus and the executive branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and others have urged that the reciprocal trade law has come up for consideration and examination every 3 years. It is true that it has come up for consideration, but this time it is not coming up for an examination on its merits, for I know many Members on both sides of the aisle intend to vote for the measure because they do not want to do anything that will interfere with the unity of the nations who happen to be our allies at the present time. The merits of the legislation are not being considered at all.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] spoke yesterday and he has been quoted by several Members. He stated that he had opposed extension of the reciprocal trade law but that he would vote for its extension at this time only on account of the facts we were in war and he did not want to do anything that would disturb the unity of the Allied Nations. When this legislation comes up again 2 years from now it is my hope the war will be over and that we can then consider the legislation on its merits.

Some have charged, both in and out of Congress, that Congress is not competent to legislate on tariff legislation, therefore we must turn this constitutional power over to a bureaucratic group who will decide tariff rates and policies. It may be that such group is competent, but before long I venture to say to you that, instead of having a domestic bureaucratic group passing on this question, we will be asked to turn that tariff-making power over to an international group that will sit some place in the world and regulate the tariffs of the various countries of the world, including our country. Do you suppose this Congress will go along with that international group and surrender the sovereignty of the United States and the tariff-making power that is lodged in us under the Constitution? I do not know.

I am not willing to turn tariff-making power or any other constitutional power which belongs to the legislative branch over to the President or any other group, domestic or international.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have been a Member of this body a long time, but this is the first time I have ever heard a Member chided because he was trying to recapture for this body certain prerogatives that are vested in it by the Constitution of the United States. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have sunk to a new low level.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am satisfied that the American people want us to recapture our constitutional power to legislate for the interests of America. We are all in this war and we want to do everything we can to win it at the earliest possible time. But that is no reason why we should not continue as representatives of the people to legislate in their interest for the present and for the future. If we do not act in that manner we are not worthy of being called their representatives and we had better adjourn the Congress and turn all legislative authority over to the Executive and his appointees.

I am aware of the fact that the bill before us will pass by a large majority. The easy course for me and others to take at this time would be to surrender to the will of the Executive and continue the delegation of this legislative authority in the President. But I cannot take such a course. As a Representative in Congress, I have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and as long as I remain in this body as a representative of one of the finest districts in our country I will carry out my obligation to the American people according to the dictates of my conscience. I am convinced that my position on this legislation is the proper course for me to take when I consider the future welfare of my fellow Americans and their standard of living.

During the war period the reciprocal trade law may be purely academic. If the provisions of this law are to be used as trading stock for the post-war era, then I believe that Congress should have something to say about the sacrifices to be made by the American people. I believe in post-war planning to rehabilitate war-devastated countries and in taking proper steps to prevent another conflict, but I feel that we should know what we are doing, rather than to leave the making of economic, political, and social policies to a group of bureaucrats, to be settled by them in secret session, without conferring with the representatives of the people.

I have supported and will support every measure to win the war. Millions of American men and boys are fighting to save our American form of government and way of life. They are being called upon to sacrifice everything to gain this objective. Surely we, on the home front, should be willing and glad to carry out our obligation to safeguard at home what they are fighting for on the battle front. We must and will back them to the limit, and when victory comes and the boys return, they will find that we have done our job to save the things for which they fought.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time that Congress has been called upon to consider the reciprocal trade-agreement program. On each of the previous occasions I have opposed it. Because of world-war conditions I shall give it my support at this time.

When the reciprocal trade-agreement program was first presented to Congress in 1934, it was put forward as an emergency measure for aiding in bringing about economic recovery by expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. In the act of 1934 the authority granted to the President to make reciprocal trade agreements was limited to a period of 3 years. Everybody knew that this limitation was only to attract support for the legislation, and that the administration was confident of the continuation of the program as long as the New Deal controlled the Congress; otherwise, it did not matter. That was typical New Deal practice.

The limitation expired in 1937. During the intervening period the favorable trade balances of the United States decreased from $478,000,000 to $34,000,000. In 1937, as was expected, Congress was requested to extend the power and authority for a further period of 3 years. The reason then given for the extension was on the pious hope that it would contribute to world peace. The economic objectives which were the sounding board for the enactment in 1934 were not emphasized. The limitation again expired in 1940, and, as was expected, a request came for a further extension of 3 years. Nothing that had been done had contributed to world peace, but the request for further extension was based largely on the contention that it was necessary as a part of the foundation of any stable and durable peace.

The limitation granted in 1940 is about to expire, and Congress is asked to further extend the authority for a period of 3 years. It is urged that the act must be extended lest others be made to think that this Nation is preparing to withdraw from active participation in world affairs and pursue a policy of economic nationalism in the post-war era. This, to me, is an extravagant statement. We have in many ways demonstrated to our allies and the peoples of the world our purpose to cooperate in the efforts to establish and maintain an enduring peace. The outstanding examples of this attitude are the aids we are extending through the lend-lease program, the declarations of the Atlantic Charter, and the extent to which we are participating in the conflict. In the light of these assurances, can it be that the failure to continue any administrative powers in

the President with the purpose of reverting to the constitutional method of fixing tariff rates is any indication that we intend to withdraw from world affairs and shirk the obligations which are ours? There can be little hope for enthusiastic cooperation with other nations if our relations are bound by such a slender thread. I cannot believe that is so.

I have opposed this method of fixing tariff rates on economic and constitutional grounds. It threatens the stability of our home market for our own products, and it does violence to our scheme of government.

I have always been a protectionist—that is, I have always believed that our standard of living was higher than that of other nations; therefore, our cost of production was necessarily higher on agricultural and manufactured goods, and that a tariff on imports to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad was justified and necessary to maintain our standard of living and provide necessary employment to our own people. That has been our traditional policy, and under it our country has developed and prospered. The present administration is committed to a different policy, and the danger is that those who think along lines of free trade or tariff for revenue only may so reduce the rates of tariffs on imports as to open our market to unfair competition with foreign-made goods. Already, some 1,180 tariff rates have been reduced under existing treaties, affecting 63 percent of the total dutiable imports. In the case of the 160 major items listed by the Tariff Commission, one-half were reduced by more than 35 percent. The general level of rates on the items affected by trade treaties has been reduced from 56 percent ad valorem to 32 percent ad valorem—a net reduction of 43 percent. Thus, not only have a large proportion of our tariffs already been reduced under the trade treaties, but the reductions have been very substantial.

During the last few years it has been impossible to make any fair estimate of the value of the program because the war has placed a virtual embargo on foreign products, and our foreign trade has consisted almost exclusively of the export of war materials and supplies. This condition will continue for the duration of the war, and will be followed by circumstances which cannot now be contemplated and which will probably require an entirely different approach to our tariff policy. It will then be necessary to solve an economic upheaval in a world torn asunder. Many factors will demand consideration by all nations according to their respective interests. Not the least of these will be the part the airplane will have in transportation, and the radio as a means of communication. Also, the barrier of national self-interest will be easier to remove because there will be a better understanding of each other by the peoples of the Allied countries. Hence, our present-day discussion of reciprocal trade agreements and tariff legislation may turn out to have been entirely academic.

However, it is appropriate to give some thought to the proposed amendments. They recognize the limitations of the Constitution, and they preserve to the American people the right to participate in post-war tariff adjustments that are bound to be necessary.

The present method of adjusting tariff rates, which we are about to endorse and continue, does violence to our scheme of government. Under the Constitution all bills for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives. The reciprocal trade-agreement program affects the revenue. Under it rates of tax on imports are fixed by administrative act, and the House of Representatives is denied its prerogative. The President, under the Constitution, can make treaties with foreign nations only with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is argued that this provision of the Constitution does not apply to reciprocal trade agreements because the President does not make treaties, his activities being limited to agreements. This is a distinction without a difference. It is made only for the purpose of justifying this breach of our fundamental law. Every definition of a treaty distinguishes it from an agreement only in that it is an agreement between two or more States or sovereigns. In other words, by whatever name it may be known, a treaty or agreement with a foreign power should be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate if our constitutional provisions are to be complied with.

These limitations are part and parcel of our supreme law. They are calculated to preserve our governmental institutions, and the Congress cannot delegate its powers or act beyond the limitations of the Constitution except in time of war or grave public danger when the exigencies of the moment justify that the Constitution be virtually suspended by the grant of extraordinary powers to the President.

There is sound reason for these limitations. They have been the safeguards of our liberty and cannot be too jealously guarded.

In the great enterprise of making democracy workable—

Said Chief Justice Hughes—

we are all partners. One member of our body politic cannot say to another, "I have no need of thee." We work in successful cooperation by being free, each department to its own function, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions—exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power.

The reciprocal trade-agreement program disregards this fundamental principle and says to the Congress, "I have no need of thee."

The President himself has said that "everybody recognizes that general tariff legislation is a congressional function." There is an inconsistency between this statement of the President and the policy which denies to the Congress its prerogative to enact tariff legislation.

The excuse given for this high-handed disregard of fundamental principles is that the drafting of tariff legislation is too much for the Congress to undertake. When the time comes that the Chief Executive, suiting his own whims, can take from the Congress any or all of its prerogatives on the simple ground of the incompetency of Congress, measured by his own yardstick, then government of the people, by the people, and for the people will soon perish from the earth.

The purpose of the Constitution was to provide a government that would coordinate the interests of the several States and protect them against aggressors. The men who constituted the Constitutional Convention had for the most part participated in the war for freedom, and it was realized that in the defense of that freedom there had to be a more perfect Union than had existed during the period of the Revolutionary War. The Government that they created has survived for a century and a half and has met every crisis during that period. We are now in the midst of a world-wide conflict which will strain our patience and our facilities. It is such a situation as the founders of the Government contemplated. It is necessary under such circumstances to concentrate our activities, particularly those of international concern, in the Chief Executive.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has information that the citizen body does not have and which for military reasons should not be divulged. He has represented that the reciprocal trade-agreement program is necessary during this emergency. Under these circumstances the Congress should support him. This is my justification for voting for this extension. At the appropriate time the powers thus granted should and must be revested in and exercised by the coordinate branches of the Government to which they belong.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not taken any time during the 4 days that we have been debating continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I made up my mind several months ago that I was going to vote to continue this act under existing circumstances. It appears to me that it is pretty much academic, at least for the duration of the war.

I do want to express two thoughts before the debate comes to an end. First, I desire to express my agreement with the thought stated by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. Certainly there is nothing in the history of the United States which would cause any nation in the world to believe that we are not going to keep every promise we have made to any other nation in the world. In my opinion, there has been an overemphasis on the effect that our acts here in this House may have in the various capitals of the world.

The other thought that bothers me and which has bothered me as this debate went along is this: It has been said several times that either we must continue this Trade Agreements Act or we are going back to a period of isolationism. I do not know just what period

those who say we are going back to isolationism have in mind. It has been said we were isolationists in the postwar period. I would like to ask some Member who feels that way to tell us before the debate comes to an end, or to point out to me, some period in our history where we did as much to try to cooperate with the other nations of the world as we did between 1920 and 1933.

We sent commissions and delegations to Europe; we invited delegations to come here; we sat in and signed the Kellogg-Briand Act, we signed disarmament treaties and, I hope the good Lord will forgive us, we even sank our Navy as part of one of those agreements. But, whether we were right or wrong, in that period from 1920 to 1933, led pretty much by those who had served in the First World War and who were as anxious as anybody could be to see that we never went through another war, we did try. We may have failed, but we did try to cooperate and we gave more in the way of cooperation to the other nations of the world between 1920 and 1933 than in any other period of our history. As a matter of fact, and the record will bear this out, we kept on trying to cooperate with the nations of Europe until the Roosevelt administration wrecked the London Economic Conference which was our last effort in the direction of cooperation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under which the President has almost full and unlimited power to enter into agreements with any country and at the same time has the same power to decline to enter into such agreements is, as the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, once said "Too much power for a bad man to have and too much power for a good man to want."

It is unfortunate that the matter must be debated at the time when the great war creates a psychological situation which aids those who advocate the continuance of this act and which deters those who wish to point out to the people just what the real facts are.

Should Congress vote to extend the operation of this act, it will not be because of the merits of the case but it will be altogether because the people have been propagandized into a belief that a failure to extend this act at this time will militate against America's interests in the war. If the advocates of this extension were inclined to be fair and would shake themselves loose from their blind subservience to the New Deal they would recognize the clamor that has been going up from many businessmen in the Nation against the unfair and unjust treatment that they have received at the hands of the willful and autocratic administrators of this law. The most convincing proof that this act was written and prepared by New Deal smart boys and has been administered in an unfair way, is shown by the fact that although there are probably thousands of American businessmen who have been severely imposed upon and injured by the high-handed tactics of those who make and administer these so-called reciprocal agreements yet not one single person has been able to secure redress of his wrongs through the courts of our Nation. Many have sought this relief but to this time no lawyer has been able to get his aggrieved client into court.

There is a well-known axiom of law that every wrong has a legal redress. This act is an exception to that rule. The Governor of Ohio several years ago on behalf of and at the request of many labor groups and other groups in that great State ordered the attorney general of Ohio to make an investigation and to ascertain whether he, on behalf of the State of Ohio, or whether aggrieved parties in their own right, could bring their cases in to any court of the land for the purpose of having their wrongs redressed. The attorney general of Ohio reported that he was unable to find any method or means by which this redress could be accomplished. When this bill was passed Senator Harrison, then a strong proponent of the bill in the Senate, indicated clearly that the bill had been drawn with the special point in view that the people should not have a right to go into court because that might make their negotiations with some foreign countries more difficult. In other words, he placed the rights of foreigners before and ahead of the rights of Americans.

In support of my contention that many American businessmen have been seriously discriminated against by these trade agreements and by the manner and method by which they have been entered into, I wish to quote you some of the testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. J. M. Wells, who appeared before that committee in opposition to the further extension of these Trade Agreement Acts. Mr. Wells is one of America's leading pottery manufacturers and spoke as the representative of the United States Potters Association; and this is in part what he said:

> Also, we oppose it because in many, if not all, of the treaties already negotiated, American industry, labor, and agriculture have been sold down the river by our State Department. I know of no concession granted the United States in any treaty that would mean the elimination of work opportunities for any substantial number of workers in the treaty country. Foreign nations just do not treat their nationals that way. On the other hand, concessions made by our representatives had caused considerable unemployment in various industries before the war, but this was nothing compared to what the situation would have been, had there been no war. And this condition can only be intensely aggravated after peace comes and the factories of foreign countries are again in production on civilian goods. That, gentlemen, will be when we are trying to give full-time employment to our returned soldiers and sailors at American rates of pay.
>
> Let me give you as briefly as possible the experience of the pottery industry. When the treaty with Great Britain was being negotiated we were advised that there were under consideration certain reductions in the duties specified in paragraphs Nos. 211 and 212; No. 211 covering plain and decorated earthenware and No. 212 china. Under both paragraphs Japan had been for a number of years the largest exporter to this country. We were naturally at a loss in these circumstances to understand how the committee could be considering reductions in the tariffs under No. 211 and No. 212 in a treaty with England. All our efforts to obtain any information from our State Department were a total failure. We finally discovered what was planned through friendly importers of British wares, who had encountered no difficulty in obtaining full information from the British Embassy.
>
> Everyone knows that one of, if not the, chief objective of the State Department in negotiating these trade agreements is to lower the American protective tariff rates and to permit ever-increasing imports of competitive merchandise. The desire to increase American exports seems entirely secondary. Certainly there could be no better proof of this than the lopsided treaties that have already been made. This total disregard for American labor's work opportunities becomes even more glaring when the trades that have been made are measured in man-hours of labor, and that, I maintain, is the only proper way to fairly gage concessions in tariff rates.
>
> Spokesmen for the State Department have gone even further than admitting the trade treaties are a tariff-lowering device. They have said in practically so many words that these are the first steps toward a final objective of complete free trade.
>
> Just what can be their reason for furthering a policy that would be so completely destructive of the American living standard? Surely there is no one so gullible he still believes that the elimination of all or any part of the American tariff is going to make the world just one big happy family. If that myth was never exploded before, it certainly has been by the present conflict. I grant you the statement has been made by certain free-trade fanatics that the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act is largely responsible for this war. Nothing could have been more specious than the reasons given by Hitler for attacking Poland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries, and by Hirohito for Pearl Harbor, and yet it never occurred to either one of those nimble brains, in their mad scramble for plausible alibis, that they could justify their criminal actions to even their strongest supporters by blaming them on the American tariff policy.
>
> Let us note the difference between this indefensible desire on the part of our present administration to permit the indiscriminate dumping in this country of the products of the pauper and regimented labor countries of the world, and the attitude of Great Britain. In the last issue of the British Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review there is an account of a tour of the English pottery districts by the Honorable Hugh Dalton, Member of Parliament, and President of the British Board of Trade. The following is quoted from one of his statements to the potters:
>
> "An industry which can export goods of high quality, for the manufacture of which very small quantities of imports are required, will be performing a very great service to the country in the post-war days. You will be in that position, and I am quite sure you will be ready to render that service."
>
> And again, in the same article, quoting from the same speech:
>
> "Next, after whisky, pottery is the most important export branch, particularly because you make practically no demand on imports."
>
> There, gentlemen, is Great Britain's realistic approach to finding jobs for her returning soldiers and sailors. A minimum of imports, a maximum of exports. You will find no open door after the war to England, nor to any of her colonies, for the products of any country whose wage rates are below hers.

We all remember the tremendous "buy British" campaign that was in full swing before the war and that was supported entirely by Government funds. Be sure it will be continued in even higher tempo after the war.

Mr. Chairman, the following are some of the questions and answers that I propounded to Mr. Wells and will further prove my point:

Mr. JENKINS. I think you stated you employ a total of about 25,000 men?

Mr. WELLS. Yes. In the industry there are about 25,000 people employed at the present time, and that is the absolute maximum employment.

Mr. JENKINS. You stated that you are afraid to expand because you feel that if you do you will have just that much investment and capital to lose?

Mr. WELLS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. For instance, I was talking to quite a few big steel men yesterday, and the Government is driving them to increase their capacity, as it has for years, and they have, as everybody knows, increased their capacity; but your industry for years was starving along and going into bankruptcy, like a lot of people were, and then when the boom comes along, because of war conditions, you cannot realize on that with any degree of hope?

Mr. WELLS. That is right. We know that whatever investment we put in will be lost later on.

As indicated by that remark, in 1927 there were 53 firms who were members of our association, who were manufacturing dishes. Today there are 28. There have been 25 of them that have either failed or gone out of business.

Mr. JENKINS. In your industry you have never had any trouble with your labor?

Mr. WELLS. No. We have done collective bargaining in our industry on an industry-wide basis for nearly 50 years, and in that 50 years we have had only one strike of about 10 weeks' duration. That was about 20 years ago.

Mr. JENKINS. I wish you would go into a little more detail and explain just what this British situation has been, how it was brought about down here in Washington—the authorities—and just what was done. I am not clear on that.

Mr. WELLS. First of all, when it was suggested or we were advised by the information committee of the reciprocal trading agreement that our paragraphs were being considered for reductions in duties, we could not understand why, because we knew that the largest importer was Japan, and the policy of the committee making these treaties had been not to make any recommendations on any commodity to a country that was not the largest importer of that commodity. We made every effort we possibly could to find out, through that information committee and through the State Department, what it was they had in mind, and we could get nothing from them at all. Finally we got that information from some friends we had who were British importers and who had gotten all the information they wanted, not only from the British Embassy here in Washington but from their British committee who was working on this trade treaty. But we could get nothing from our representatives.

Mr. JENKINS. Here is the situation that you make out, and I think you are a living example of the effective argument that can be made against the statements of Mr. Hull and everyone else who has appeared in favor of these trade agreements, because they have argued all the time that they are properly administered and that everybody gets a fair chance and that the rates are fixed after thorough study and complete investigation.

As I understand it, you say that you got a notification that your paragraphs were to be considered, and you came to Washington, and you were never able to find out from them, or any of them, after your complete investigation, what was the reason back of what they were trying to do?

Mr. WELLS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. You know today what the purpose was or why they wanted to recanvass and change the rates in your paragraphs.

Mr. WELLS. Well, they claim that the information that they were able to obtain—and there was no way they could possibly collect the information, because it was not kept, and I am not saying that they are wrong—was that on certain items, like cups and saucers or other dishes which were charged for, on which there was a certain price at the factory, Great Britain was the greatest importer of those earthenware.

Probably they were right, but there were no figures they could get to determine that. They took the word of the British manufacturers on that, but they did not ask us.

By the same token, they took the word of the British manufacturers, which again was right—I mean they were correct—that the British were the greatest importers of this particular bone china, but bone china was grouped with the other in the Tariff Act. There was no differentiation made between bone china and other china. They said England was the largest importer. I think they probably were. But there were no figures to satisfy that contention. They had the word of the British for that. They did not ask us.

Heretofore in these debates the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] adverted to the testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. William Green of the American Federation of Labor. The record of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee shows conclusively under questioning by me that Mr. Green acknowledged that he was at that time speaking solely for himself and that he had not been authorized by his organization to make an appearance before the Ways and Means Committee and had not been authorized to make the statements which he was then making. He was speaking as William Green and not as the American Federation of Labor.

In proof of the feeling of the employees in the potteries of this country who are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor let me refer you to the hearings that I have heretofore referred to. These employers emphatically oppose the further extension of this legislation. They took pains to make known to the Ways and Means Committee their unqualified opposition.

I respectfully submit that Mr. Green was speaking for himself and not for the workingmen of the country.

I am sorry that my time is so limited, for there is no dearth of convincing arguments that can be made against the constitutionality of this act. And there is no trouble in producing adequate and convincing arguments and facts to refute all claims of benefits that have been derived by our country from the trade agreements already in force.

The people will some day wake up to the situation and will demand that Congress reclaim the power that has been unlawfully surrendered to the Executive through the passage of this act in its original form. This act now fits beautifully into the New Deal scheme of a united states of the world.

I am opposed to the enactment of this resolution continuing in the President's hands the right to continue to make these trade agreements. In these critical times, treaties with foreign countries should be made carefully and they should be made only in the manner provided by the Constitution, which is with the approval of the Senate of the United States. I am opposed to any program that will lead us into a united states of the world.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some of us view the amendment to the reciprocal trade measure permitting Congress to ratify or reject separate treaties in a way which has not yet been expressed. The measure as it stands seems to be popular at present but people hire lawyers to keep them out of difficulties and guard them against their own optimism and they require the same kind of service from their Congressmen.

The war-torn years during which these agreements have been handled during the past are scarcely a criterion for the future. We do know that, throughout American hitsory, the tariff raising or lowering device has been a means of helping some industries grow at the expense of others. Historians tell us, for instance, that slave labor, with all its sad consequences including war between the States was forced upon a protesting South by protective tariffs which raised prices of manufactured articles southern agriculture had to buy to such high levels that growers could pay their labor little or nothing. So we Congressmen ask what relief can our laborers or manufacturers or farmers or consumers get under this measure in the event some one treaty should be ruining them.

The procedure the complainant must follow, it seems, is painfully similar to that by which you get a quota or ceiling price altered at W. P. B. or O. P. A. The complainant really should be advised to hire a lawyer or lobbyist to write up the necessary briefs and present his arguments effectively, though, of course his Congressman, the poor man's lobbyist, would also try to help.

Failing to get justice from the executive department what could the complainant do? He could scarcely get a law repealing the proclamation implementing the offensive treaty because the President would surely veto any bill repealing a proclamation he himself had signed. There is no further chance for relief except to wait until the end of the 3 years and try to prevent renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Many, I think, have a false sense of security from the fact that Cordell Hull is at present in charge of this program. Think what would be done in this Congress if the administrator were a more typical appointee and cotton were being flooded into this country from new fields in Brazil at less than parity, or if there were an administrator favoring the pol-

icy of importing products from foreign countries where we have recently built factories where labor is cheap? If having the Executive make these negotiations of many items is such an improvement over the old system of letting Congress do it, surely it is unwise to leave this measure as it is so that accumulating pressure will soon destroy the whole program in order to get rid of one or two treaties. There are two kinds of power involved in this delegation, the power to negotiate tariff changes and the power to decide an economic policy which determines which industries shall be built up and which shall be laid low. The economic policy involved is one which it seems not only dangerous but highly impractical to delegate. The amendment permitting Congress to ratify or reject separate treaties seems, therefore, anything but a crippling amendment; on the contrary, it is a safety valve which will prevent the accumulation of pressure which will result in destroying the whole program.

We all want, above anything else, to be honorable in our dealings with foreign nations. Those of us who believe that this measure will not endure without a safety-valve amendment cannot honestly vote for the measure as it stands and thus lead foreign nations to think that we believe it will be permanent.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this program which we are undertaking to continue here. I believe in it. I think it is not only good for us, but it is good for the world.

But what I particularly want to address myself to is the constant statements that are being made here in the debate on this amendment that the purpose is to bring back to Congress some of the prerogatives under the Constitution which we have given away.

I do not believe there is any sensible Member of this House who thinks that Congress, in the future, can legislate on the details of the millions of things that have to be done in a great country like this or in a world such as we live in. We might just as well advocate that Congress exercise the power of the veto over every freight rate that is promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It would be just as sensible as what is proposed in this amendment; the same principle is involved exactly.

You might just as well say that the Congress is going to veto every order issued by the O. P. A. setting a price ceiling. All right. I am no more satisfied with the operations of the O. P. A. than you are, but I am talking about what we can do and what we cannot do as Members of Congress. There is no man in this body who is not now working more hours than he should for the good of his health, trying to do the best he can for the people he represents, and yet we are talking about loading upon ourselves the job of trying to find out whether a particular duty on a particular item is wise or unwise, is fair or unfair, and you know and I know that we cannot do it. This is the sensible way to do it, and the only purpose of this amendment, as has been so well pointed out by the gentleman from Tennessee, is to destroy the program, offered by the people who are opposed to the program.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman surely would not claim that the duly constituted Tariff Commission, of impartial tariff experts, cannot view the facts as well and lay them before the Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not mean they would not.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The same fine Tariff Commission referred to by the gentleman from Ohio participates in every one of these negotiations.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding. But the point I wanted to stress is this, that as a Congress, we have been delegating the authority that is given us under the Constitution; we are doing it at the present time, we are doing it every day, and as time goes on we will do it more in the future. This is no different from any other delegation. We delegate powers to the Food and Drug Administration for the protection of our health; we delegate powers to all the agencies of the Government, and we are going to continue to do so. We are going to do so even more in the future than we have in the past, because of the complexity of modern civilization, and it is an impossibility for the Members of Congress to go into the mass of details that must be studied in order to arrive at a decision in connection with a subject matter such as this.

I hope this House will reject this amendment and let the program go on in its present form.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot resist the impulse to say a word about this great constitutional question that has been brought up. You do not have to be a constitutional lawyer to be able to read and interpret plain language. That is what this essentially is. Boiled down, we went ahead on the basis that section 8 of article I gave us the power to legislate in this field, and we did it. We found that in a shrinking world, a world which instead of being a giant globe almost incapable of comprehension is now the size of a lemon, there were forces drawing us closer together and making it more and more foolish for the nations to legislate independently and severally. Therefore, Congress in its wisdom, acting under and in accordance with section 8 of article I, delegated this power to that agency of government which has the only voice of authority—so said the Supreme Court, and prior to the days of the New Deal was this deliverance made in the Curtiss-Wright case—to speak for this Nation in the matter of international affairs.

Congress said, "Quit standing in your own back yard and sticking out your tongue at us with these tariff barriers, and let us quit standing in our own back yard and sticking out our tongue at you by enacting prohibitive tariffs. Let us get together and, through the authorized agencies of government for international affairs, see if we cannot reciprocate. You lower some of your tariffs, and we will lower some of ours, so that world trade may flourish."

That is the whole thing. It is as simple as that. It has nothing in God's world to do with the Constitution. There is not a man on either side who can show me one iota of authority for the proposition that we have surrendered any of our rights except in accordance with our own free and sovereign will.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Why is it that those who are responsible for these reciprocal trade agreements have studiously and successfully thwarted every effort to test the constitutionality of this law in the Supreme Court or any other court of the United States?

Mr. HOBBS. I deny that. In my judgment, the gentleman's major premise is utterly false. I do not mean to say that it is intentionally so, of course, but it is a specious question that the gentleman raises. There has been no attempt to thwart any such adjudication, nor could there be.

I for one and numbers of other are going to vote against this iniquitous amendment, speciously advanced, which would mean the ruin of this extension for which most of you are going to vote——

Mr. JENKINS. Will not the gentleman agree that many people who have had business with this organization down here that operates on what we call the reciprocal trade agreements have studiously for months and for years tried to find some opportunity to test the constitutionality of it, and every time they have been blocked?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know that that is a fact.

Mr. JENKINS. That is a fact; that is the truth.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know that that is a fact. I do not think it is a fact, and according to my best information, knowledge, and belief I state that it is not a fact.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Alabama is correct, and the gentleman's statement is borne out by the record presented to the committee.

Mr. HOBBS. That is my information, but I do not have the first-hand knowledge of it that the gentleman from Tennessee has.

There are many of us on both sides who would welcome any such alleged test,

but there need not be any test when all that the Congress has done is to exercise the constitutional power it has in the best way, selfishly and for the world as well.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I call attention to the legislative history of this act. I think the gentleman will recall that the Senator from Mississippi the late Pat Harrison, offered an amendment in the Senate to close the courts to protest against these agreements, and he practically said at the time he offered the amendment that it was offered for that purpose. That is the amendment which takes away the right of a citizen who thinks he has been aggrieved to apply to the courts. The amendment was the one which repealed, insofar as the reciprocal trade agreements are concerned, section 516 (b) of the tariff law.

Mr. HOBBS. I stated in my former utterance that I was not familiar with the details of pertinent history. He may have done so, but that was not the question which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked. He asked if this organization downtown that is administering this law were not attempting to thwart such a test.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the question of whether trade agreements ordinarily are right or wrong. I am not going into that feature of it at this moment. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Minnesota, who is conducting the debate on the minority side. Ordinarily, I believe I would agree with him that this Congress should have the power to supervise these agreements, but as I have sat here for 2 days and listened to this debate I am convinced that this is not the time to do it.

This authority was granted in 1934, before I became a Member of this Congress. Now, at this moment, when we are starting to become united in this war—when we are starting to win in this war for the first time—I am not willing to cast my lot with anyone who will, in my opinion, disturb that unity.

For a long time we were divided on the question of what Russia wanted out of this war. We have that settled now. We settled that by saying that we had better wait until the war is over and see what there is to settle and we seem to be going along together once more.

Suppose in 60 days—and I do not think it will be longer than that—we are called upon to make some arrangement with Italy. Do we want to do it on the spur of the moment, do it right away, or do we want to come back here to the Congress and debate the question for three months? During the war there is no danger of our markets being flooded with foreign goods as is evidenced by our struggle to keep down the submarine menace in the Atlantic.

The power the President has to negotiate trade agreements may perhaps injure some of our industries but in time of war the lives of our men is more precious than property. Now is the time we want quick action—and not a 3-months' debate. In time of war we should not recede from our policy carried on with other nations in times of peace. I am opposed to the amendment offered by the able gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take the floor, and I realize that there is nothing that I can say that will change the opinion of any Member of the House. A recent speaker here said that he did not want to have anybody sticking out their tongues at us. I certainly do not want Hitler and Mussolini to be sticking out their tongues at us and saying that our great Congress of the United States, operating under the Federal Constitution, admits that it is a total failure, and that it simply shows that they are going back to their system of government—one-man rule. I do not know how you people feel about this legislation. I admit that I am somewhat old-fashioned. I was taught very early in my career to respect this great Constitution, this charter of liberties, under which we live, and when I was elected to Congress I expected to keep within the limits placed upon me and not encroach or attempt to encroach upon the rights of the people. Furthermore, when I came down here, before I could perform one official act for my people, I was required by them to come down into the well of the House and raise my right hand and take an oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

There is not a lawyer of standing in this House or one in the country who believes in his heart that the delegation of powers as we find them in the act of 1934 is constitutional. There is no standard set up at all. We are abdicating our functions, and we are doing it in an unconstitutional way. If we have lost all respect for our great Constitution on any plea because the world is at war, and therefore must violate it, then we are headed for the black pit of ruin. I know that the people of this country do not want one-man rule. They do not want Congress to abdicate its functions, and they are feeling the impact now of unconstitutional laws, of the encroachment upon their rights and liberties by a bureaucratic government, and they want no more of it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that this whole proposition has never stood the test of any judicial decision?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, it has not, and every barrier to having a test in the courts has been erected by the New Deal, and it has been done deliberately. If we are going to fight a great war and lose thousands upon thousands of men, as we know we are before this war is over, fighting for freedom, fighting for liberty, do we want our men to come back and find they have lost the very priceless things for which they have shed their blood and their comrades have given their lives? I, for one, shall not support this delegation of powers, this unconstitutional act.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, one gentleman here said a moment ago something about the history of this legislation. Nearly all legislation is born out of necessity, the mother of invention. The history of this legislation came right following the action when 165 great industries in America that had been using American labor, established branches all over Europe and elsewhere out of the United States and from 1 to 35 branches each, in order to avoid the retaliatory tariffs which had been imposed against them. We once sent American-made automobiles and tires all over the world but retaliatory tariff walls caused American industry to establish branches abroad and we lost the business for American labor as well as raw materials. That total and permanent loss is almost too great to be estimated. This loss came directly as the result of spite tariffs imposed by other nations because of our tariff barring them from our trade. Even Mr. Mellon, while in Washington, transferred a part of his aluminum works to the Dominion of Canada for the same reason. Yes, that is the history of the legislation, and it was a Congress composed of some kind of people that had brought about the necessity for reciprocal trade agreements and to stop the flood of American industry going away from our own country.

Mr. JENKINS rose.

Mr. CREAL. Oh, I have not the time to yield. People have been talking here now for 3 days, and I have only 5 minutes, and I shall not get another chance. Reciprocal trade agreements! You are going on the supposition, and act as if you thought the purpose of the agreements was to injure instead of help; you must presuppose, from everything that has been said, that somebody is acting for the express purpose of destroying some American industries. Why have a Tariff Commission?

Why not presuppose that when you fixed one that it would try to destroy our business? Why not suppose that we are going on, putting back American industry and not promoting it, but you have to presuppose, as has been done. I wonder who these gentlemen represent who oppose reciprocal treaties. You talk about representing a constituency. The United States Chamber of Commerce has long been regarded as the mouthpiece of big business, and the boy in the street knows that. They endorsed this, and did not say anything about limiting its time, or anything about a congressional veto. Organized labor, that has never gotten along with big business in recent years, endorsed it, and they did not say anything about a congressional veto or about a reduction in time of its extension. The agricultural people endorsed it. They did not say anything about congressional veto or reduction in time. Then I want to know, if you do not represent the farmer if

you do not represent the laboring man, if you do not represent the businessman, whom do you represent when you advocate either reduction in time or congressional veto? There are mighty few people left outside of that. Reciprocal trade agreements are everywhere in the customs of man, even without laws. An old woman lived on one side of a creek and she had a big apple tree. It was loaded down with apples until it broke the limbs. Across the creek was another old woman who had a plum tree, one of those big, wild-goose plums. They would go out and gather their plums and their applies, and one day they mustered up courage enough to get acquainted, and one woman said, "Don't you want some of my plums?" On second thought, the other gave her some of her apples. After that, every summer both of them had two kinds of fruit instead of one and it did not cost them anything. A boy 6 years old will trade a duplicate toy with a neighbor boy across the street for something he does not have. Reciprocal trade just comes from an outburst of nature. The reason this thing has never been tested in the courts, with all the lawyers and technicians, is that it has furnished such satisfaction that nobody ever had sufficient interest in wanting its repeal to have it tested. That is the best recommendation for it.

Yes, it is probably true that in some small way in some parts of our country that there was a visible, temporary hindrance. But at the same time the program for the entire Nation has brought other benefits to the same people that more than makes up for the one item they did not like.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents a very far-reaching question which this Congress eventually must answer. There is no appeal or review whatsoever from the agreements which are entered into, notwithstanding the fact that in effect they may put out of business hundreds of American industries and farmers. We have several comparable situations. It was announced this morning over the radio and in the press that the Office of Price Administration was setting up about 1,400 little courts all over the United States. Likewise, there is no method of review of any of the decisions or findings or orders or determinations of those little courts. Fourteen hundred Gestapo courts organized in the United States, which can take the bread and butter out of the mouths of American citizens by taking away from them their coupons with which they purchase rationed food.

Out in California a former circuit judge was appointed to one of these little Gestapo courts, and in respect to his own power, the power which he has in this little court, he is quoted as having this to say:

> I thought I had pretty broad powers when I was superior judge, but no court in American history ever had such powers as this.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States gave some consideration to fundamental rights of the American people in respect to the guaranties of freedom and liberty under the Constitution. For that reason, I am introducing today a bill which will establish within the Office of Price Administration, a Board of Administrative Review, with power to judge each case upon its merits. This board will be authorized to meet either as a board or individually or through commissioners. This Board will be given the power to set aside, modify or amend any of the rulings or orders of the Office of Price Administration, and any citizen may review any order of the Price Administrator or of that Board in the regularly constituted constitutional courts of the United States by petition to the circuit court of appeals in respect to prices or the district courts on the question of rationing.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why not have it reviewed by the Congress?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry, I do not yield.

Now, I hope the Congress will give consideration to this fundamental question as to whether in the delegation of this power we have not estopped citizens of the United States from obtaining a redress of their grievances in the regularly constituted courts. In clear defiance of the constitutional provisions, these acts are administered. In clear defiance of legislative intent and the Constitution and statutes, Executive orders take the rights, privileges, freedom, and liberty away from American citizens, and twice within the last 2 months this Congress has found it necessary to reclaim those powers by rescinding Executive orders. The time to do it in respect to this particular legislation is now, by the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the issue in the debate over the reciprocal trade agreement program is not nationalism versus internationalism, but nationalism versus sectionalism. We are living in a different kind of world—a world in which American interests are identified with those of many other great nations, and it should be apparent now that the idea of trading with other nations involves no conflict with the greatest and highest good of our own people. Those of us who favor continuation of this program are nationalists in the sense that we believe that all of the interests of the Nation—not just the interests of those that produce for the domestic market—must be conserved. Does anyone think that the national interests would be served by destroying the foreign market of our producers of exportable products, and does anyone question the fact that those markets are destroyed when we say to them that our markets are closed to their trade?

Are we going to say through fear of the minor readjustments in some types of agricultural production that might have to be made occasionally as trade conditions change that the millions of people in the United States who depend upon cotton and other exportable farm products are to see their foreign markets close, and their economic situation ultimately collapse? Are the American industries which depend upon foreign markets to be destroyed? If that is to be our policy we shall have to prepare for a shrinking home market. The domestic market is not independent of other nations. It simply cannot be supported without the outlets which world trade provides. When we talk about the domestic market as a stabilized institution we are talking about something that does not exist.

However, the domestic market can be made more stable through stimulation of world trade as envisioned in this program. The American producer of goods consumed in our country is enjoying a better market because the workers in industries and on farms dependent on the foreign market have a purchasing power they would never have had without the reciprocal trade program.

Everything that promotes trade is good and everything that retards trade is bad. If here and there some individual advantages are lost the Nation's gains as a whole greatly overshadow these losses.

Moreover, we know that the agents of this Government, acting under the President's direction, are not going to betray the basic interests of our country. We can exercise faith in them to continue the program with a broad understanding of our varied economic interests.

It has been said over and over again that the issue finally comes down to this point: Do we want to live in an isolated world or do we want to take our place in the society of nations as a functioning part of the world's economy.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the next to the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to this question as to whether or not we have the right to go into the courts on the matter of these trade agreements, I want to say that when this matter was called to the attention of Senator Harrison in the Senate, at the time of the passage of the original act, Senator Harrison had this to say when that question was raised:

> That is what we intend to do since we want no interference or delay from domestic interests.

He accomplished his purpose. When Governor Bricker, of Ohio, took office a little over 4 years ago he was asked by a delegation of representatives of trade unions, whose employment was being taken away from them by some of the reciprocal trade agreements, so-called, then in existence, to test the constitutionality of this act in the Supreme Court of the United States. He immediately asked the attorney general of Ohio to bring such an action on behalf

of the sovereign State of Ohio. The attorney general, after full and careful investigation of the law on the subject, advised him that there was absolutely no way in which the State of Ohio or any of its citizens could bring such an action in the Supreme Court of the United States or in any other court.

Not content with that, they sought the advice of a former Solicitor General of the United States and a former Federal judge, Hon. Thomas Thacher.

That gentleman, an authority on constitutional law advised them to the same effect. The truth of the matter is that this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as it was originally framed was designed to keep sovereign States and their citizens out of the courts. There is absolutely no way to get into the courts under the law as it stands at the present time. For all practical purposes the act sets aside the judicial authority of the United States and the rights of citizens to resort to the courts to protect their interests. As one Member has said, this authority gives these negotiators, whoever they may be—and try to find out who they are on any particular agreement that is under consideration; you cannot do it—the power to build up certain industries and to ruin others without regard to the rights of citizens, and the affected citizens have no redress. Certainly it seems to me the Congress of the United States ought to trust itself with the power and authority to review these agreements and to protect these citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the Harrison amendment, which has been referred to by some of the last speakers, the courts have absolutely been closed through all these intervening years to any citizen who might have been aggrieved by any of the 30 reciprocal trade agreements that have been heretofore negotiated. A citizen may have been seriously injured, his business may have been destroyed, yet, by virtue of the Harrison amendment, he has no recourse to the courts whatsoever.

Since we have legislated our constituents out of the courts it would be but fair, it would seem to me, to at least allow their representatives in the Congress to scrutinize and pass finally upon these agreements which affect vitally every man, woman, and child in this vast country of ours.

If "We the People"—that magnificent phrase which occurs so often in our constitutional literature, if that phrase is going to be made to mean anything at all, the representatives of the people should at all times have an opportunity to be heard. Suppose a treaty were made—and these are all treaties whether you call them Executive agreements, compacts, conventions, or something else—it would seem to me that if an agreement were executed and placed in effect which contained matters objectionable to the American people as a national group, their representatives should have the right to object to it and suspend its operation. This is all that the Knutson amendment would do; it would merely provide that after the agreement has been executed insofar as the executive departments are concerned, it should be presented to the representatives of the people for them to determine whether or not it is detrimental to the best interests of the American people, whether or not it is wholesome, whether or not the principles it contains are sound. Is there anything unfair about that? Is there anything un-American in such procedure? Of course there is not. The right to be heard in court is the very essence of Americanism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties for a period of 2 years. I am not in favor of a 3-year extension. We should not bind the next Congress with this legislation. I do not favor its extension beyond the war period.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this legislation. I think it should have been amended so that Congress would have at least something to say about agreements that may be made even during the war period. Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to the making of trade treaties without the consent of Congress. I believe all treaty-making powers, as well as of these reciprocal agreements, should, to some extent, be under the supervision and control of Congress. I have voted against the extension of such agreements on two other occasions. I would vote against this one today if it were not for the fact that our country is at war, and for the further reason that few, if any, agreements are being made now. As a matter of fact, we have very little foreign trade that would be affected during the war period by reciprocal agreements. I still think if any agreements are made they could be submitted for the ratification of at least one of the Houses of Congress, and that it could be done without very much delay. In other words, I feel that, after all, Congress should, as a matter of principle, have authority over agreements made with foreign countries. I do not share the view of some Members of this House who believe a requirement of congressional sanction would ruin the reciprocal trade treaty program. However, if this House does not see fit to amend the measure in that respect I shall vote for the extension rather than seem to hinder this country in making agreements that may be helpful in the prosecution of the war. Rather than take the position that no agreements may be made at all during the war period I shall vote for the measure with the inclusion of an amendment providing for a 2-year limitation.

Mr. Chairman, the question of foreign trade after the present crisis has subsided is bound to be one of the most important issues confronting this country. This Congress would do well to examine the problem pretty carefully with a view of working out plans that will be sure to protect our people against abnormal imports of products of all kinds that may injure or even ruin the producers of our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that regardless of political affiliation Congress should make sure that it does not grant unwarranted or unnecessary authority to any individual or group of persons to handle the question of making treaties with foreign countries except and unless such treaties have the approval of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KNUTSON) there were—ayes 93, noes 105.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. KNUTSON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 149, noes 170.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: At the end of section 1, strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That so much of section 2 of the act of June 12, 1934, as suspends the application of section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (relating to appeal or protest by American producers) to any article with respect to which such foreign-trade agreements have been concluded, or to any provisions of such foreign-trade agreements, is hereby repealed."

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make and those I previously made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very evident from a reading of it. Its purpose is to extend to the citizens of the United States, who may feel themselves aggrieved by any trade agreement negotiated under this act, as well as to sovereign States the right of appeal to the courts. As it stands and as this debate has disclosed, the act gives a citizen absolutely no redress whatsoever and if he is so unfortunate as not to have the opportunity to appear before the nego-

tiators preceding the negotiation of an agreement he has no recourse and there is not one-tenth of 1 percent of any industry affected in the United States that is given this right or that even has actual opportunity of knowledge that its interests are being bargained away. My amendment gives these people the right to appeal to the courts.

Certainly, if Congress is not willing to trust itself to protect the rights of citizens, it ought to be willing to trust the courts. So, if we are not willing to trust ourselves to act as a review court, let us make use of the legal machinery of this country and give to anyone aggrieved by the negotiation of these agreements the right to resort to the courts and have his interests judicially determined.

Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, the constitutionality of the program has been invoked this morning on two different counts. First, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has taken a constitutional right away from this Congress in conferring upon the President the right to lower duties as much as 50 percent. It is unfortunate that more Members of this House do not know more about tariff history, because if they did know more about tariff history they would know that that power was conferred upon the President in 1922 in the Fordney-McCumber Act and was continued in the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930. It was conferred upon the President because the Congress did not want to take the time to go into each individual item that the Tariff Commission had investigated and other agencies had investigated or that the President thought would be to the interest of this country to have lowered. Certainly nobody complains of the President getting some other nation to lower their tariff as against our exports.

The power to lower tariff rates was conferred upon the President in 1922, reconferred in 1930, and he has no more power in that respect under the Trade Agreements Act than he had under those two tariff acts. So if Congress gave away a constitutional right that it had it did so under the Republican administration in 1922.

Section 516 (b) was inserted in the Fordney-McCumber Act and carried forward in the Hawley-Smoot Act not to promote international trade but to implement first the highest tariff protection in history, the Fordney-McCumber tariff, and the still higher one later, the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

The Supreme Court in the case of *Norwegian Nitrogen Co.* v. *U. S.* (288 U. S. 294, 318), held that no one has a constitutional or legal right to the maintenance of a given protective rate or duty. It never was a common-law right; it never was in any statute. The right to litigate inserted in the Fordney-McCumber Act was put in there solely for the purpose of permitting domestic producers to litigate in the customs courts the question of valuation, under 516 (a) and classification under 516 (b). Those sponsoring that provision in 1922 had in mind keeping out imports. The adoption of such a provision in this act will be heading us in the opposite direction from which we plan to go or that we ought to plan to go, and that is to engage in mutually beneficial international trade. That is the reason when this act was framed in 1934 this provision of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was not carried into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the treaty-making power vested in the Congress rather than in the judiciary?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. The treaty-making power is vested in the President, subject to ratification in the Senate. These are trade agreements, and a lot of people have not gone into it technically enough to know the difference between a treaty and trade agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. While there may be some constitutional questions involved, there are not judicial questions involved in the treaty powers of the Congress, is that true? In other words, the individual citizen has no right to go into court to adjudiciate anything concerning one of the treaties made by this country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. You are exactly right. Never in the history of this Nation has Congress extended to American producers any right or privilege to litigate in the courts the customs treatment of imported articles, whether under a statute enacted by Congress or by virtue of a treaty or trade agreement with a foreign nation, because such customs treatment is injurious to their interests or threatens their future security.

We have always followed the English doctrine "the King can do no wrong," and a citizen cannot even sue his Government for a personal tort unless Congress authorizes him to do so. The purpose of this amendment is to hamper the program.

I hope the House will vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KNUTSON) there were—ayes 75, noes 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: At the end of the first section, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That hereafter no such foreign trade agreement shall take effect:

"(a) Before the expiration of 60 calendar days after the date on which such trade agreement is transmitted to the Congress, but only if during such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor such trade agreement.

"(b) If the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the 60-day period, a new 60-day period shall begin on the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session. A similar rule shall be applicable in the case of subsequent adjournments sine die before the expiration of 60 days."

Mr. COPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment you have just heard read, providing for a 60-day veto, is patterned exactly on section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1939, and is, with the exception of changing the words "reorganization plan" to "trade-agreement" in the exact words and is taken verbatim from the Reorganization Act, which passed this House by a vote of 246 to 153 in 1939.

I wish the gentlemen on my right would listen when I quote Lindsay Warren, now Comptroller General, who was then in Congress and sponsored the reorganization bill containing this amendment, who said:

> It received the largest percentage of Democratic votes that has obtained on any controversial measure in the House during the last 8 years.

Our distinguished Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] vigorously supported this on the floor. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] voted for this amendment in 1939.

I did not vote for it. I am offering it now as a compromise, as the lowest common denominator of congressional self-respect. I am offering it, not as a flank attack on the trade-agreements program, but as a last-ditch effort to meet the flank attack on the self-respect of Congress, which has seen every attempt to preserve some semblance of congressional right to participate in the post-war trade policy of our Government voted down on this floor.

Remember, the Reorganization Act which these gentlemen I have mentioned supported vigorously here against Republican opposition, did not by the amendment that I am offering now scuttle reorganization.

Under the reorganization law five reorganization plans were submitted to the Congress by the Executive. Only one of them, Reorganization Plan No. IV, was defeated in the House, but since it was not defeated in the Senate it, nevertheless, went into effect.

This amendment that I am offering would not make the change in the rules

provided in the Reorganization Act, and therefore any resolution of disapproval would be subject to the ordinary rules of the House and a possible filibuster in the Senate. Therefore, only an extremely unsatisfactory trade agreement would have a chance of being vetoed under this procedure. We could only turn down the whole agreement. No piecemeal review of items in a trade agreement is provided by the amendment.

The only difference between this and passing a new act would be that a mere majority would be sufficient instead of the two-thirds vote which might be required to pass such a new act over a Presidential veto.

There is an elaborate discussion of this amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1939—a discussion of the constitutional features. I am not raising any constitutional question as to whether we have the power to authorize Executive trade agreements without congressional review. I think there is a deep constitutional question, however, as to whether the Congress should use this power in this way, even if it has the power. Should we send out to the world, when we give the world a symbol of our post-war cooperation, the message that this Congress deems itself lower in rank, in worth, in dignity, and ability than the bodies in the 23 nations that require legislative approval of these agreements? Shall we use our power to divest ourselves of power? Remember this: Free governments usually die by suicide—by surrender of the people's representatives of their own powers to a leader who is not unpopular but popular. Germany still has a Reichstag. Russia has a popularly elected assembly.

In this instance all we are asking is not the right for Congress to write tariff laws, nor the right for one House to turn down one of these trade agreements, nor the right of both Houses to disapprove of a single item in an agreement, but a 60-day symbolic period, if you please, of review, which was previously written into the laws of the country by the majority—by the New Deal—a symbol which most certainly should be granted in this hour when representative government is on trial all over the earth. If we will only retain some such power, then the life of this legislation could well be extended beyond the war period.

I urge support of this simple symbolic amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio was, of course, just as wrong in his position on the reorganization bill as he is on this bill. There is certainly a vast difference between a purely Democratic measure relating to the shifting of employees or bureaus of this Government and a far-reaching international policy such as that embraced in this measure.

For all practical purposes this amendment is the same as the amendment offered a few moments ago which was overwhelmingly voted down, and we should not adopt this amendment. I ask that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS of Ohio), there were—ayes 89, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 1, line 8, after "1943" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no trade agreement with respect to natural or synthetic rubber shall be entered into pursuant to this act, if the terms of said trade agreement extend beyond the duration of the present war."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, there are many Members of the House who have been very much interested in a program to make greater use of farm products by using them in the production of synthetic rubber and alcohol, and for other purposes. The amendment I have offered would permit those in charge of making these agreements to make any agreement they wish with reference to rubber now while the war is on, but in the post-war world it would prohibit them from sabotaging our synthetic-rubber industry through the trade agreements.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to mention the fact that many people in the administrative branch of the Government are opposed to a continuation of the synthetic-rubber program in this country.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course the gentleman is well aware that in one of the trade agreements rubber is found on the free list now.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

The Vice President of the United States has been very hostile toward the production of synthetic rubber from farm products. He has repeatedly stated that he does not want such an industry to exist in the post-war world.

This is an amendment which will in no sense sabotage or destroy the trade-agreements program. It merely takes one item out of the consideration of those agreements. It is entirely a question of whether or not we want to defer action in regard to these industries of ours during the war, until such time as we may have an opportunity to prove the economic feasibility of the rubber plants that are built throughout the country.

I believe that by a greater use of farm products we can solve the agricultural problem so that it will not always be necessary to appropriate huge sums of money to make agriculture a worthwhile industry in this country. The estimates vary. Some people believe that eventually the products of perhaps 30,000,000 acres of farm land will be used to make rubber, plastics, and many other articles for whose development we are indebted to the advancement in chemistry along that line.

I am quite sure that if the philosophy of HENRY WALLACE prevails these rubber plants will not have any chance of continuing in the post-war world. It will mean that America will be forever dependent on other countries for our rubber. It will mean that American agriculture will have taken away from it that great opportunity to expand by a greater use of farm products, which is contrary to the theory of scarcity.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want this amendment to be placed in the bill for the very reason the gentleman who offers it says he does want it. I am quite sure that my own district would benefit more by the manufacture of synthetic rubber than would the district of the gentleman who offers the amendment, as synthetic rubber can be made from alcohol which is made from farm products. If no trades could be made about synthetic rubber then our plants now making synthetic rubber might be abandoned after the war. We hope they will not be abandoned but eventually make enough for us and have some to sell to other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 57, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offerd by Mr. KNUTSON: Before the period at the end of the first section insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That each such agreement entered into after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall provide that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article, such article is being imported in such quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the Government of the United States shall reserve the right to withdraw such concession in whole or in part."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the United States Chamber of Commerce throughout this debate. The majority has made

much of the fact that the Chamber has favored prolonging the life of the Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years. The United States Chamber of Commerce asked for certain safeguarding amendments. This is such an amendment as they ask for. In view of the solicitude displayed by the gentleman on the majority side for the views of the United States Chamber of Commerce, I am prompted to offer this amendment. I think it is a very proper one, because it instructs the State Department to insert an escape clause in every trade treaty hereafter entered into. I understand the last treaty that was made, the one with Mexico, contained such an escape clause. All trade agreements should contain such a clause in order to protect the best interests of the American people, both on farm, shop, and factory.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is entirely useless. This escape clause is embodied in all these trade agreements. That matter is safeguarded. This is just to harass the State Department, that is all. The gentleman from Minnesota is constitutionally and conscientiously opposed to the whole trade-agreement program, he is trying to sabotage it at every turn, and this is just another move in that direction.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the distinguished chairman will recall that when the spokesman of the United States Chamber of Commerce was before the committee, I mentioned the very point included in the gentleman's amendment, when his attention was called to the fact that the escape clause is included and especially his attention was called to the fact that the escape clause is included in the agreement with Mexico, he then said that that was all they were interested in. It is an administrative matter. He did not ask it to be put into the law, but only that it be continued as an administrative matter.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. This is another attempt to throw a cloud of suspicion over the Secretary of State, as if he did not have patriotism enough or honesty enough or interest enough in American labor and American agriculture to administer this program in a sincere way.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is the escape clause being put in—

ARTICLE XI

(Trade agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed December 23, 1942)

1. If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article enumerated and described in the schedules annexed to this agreement, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the Government of either country shall be free to withdraw the concession, in whole or in part, or to modify it to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury. Accordingly, if the President of the United States of America finds as a fact that imports of any article enumerated and described in schedule II or schedule III are entering the United States of America under the circumstances specified in the preceding sentence, he shall determine whether the withdrawal, in whole or in part, of the concession with regard to the article, or any modification of the concession, by the imposition of quantitative regulations or otherwise, is necessary to prevent such injury, and he shall, if he finds that the public interest will be served thereby, proclaim such finding and determination, and on and after the effective date specified in such proclamation, and so long as such proclamation remains in effect, imports of the article into the United States of America shall be subject to the customs treatment so determined to be necessary to prevent such injury. Similarly, if the Government of the United Mexican States finds as a fact that any article enumerated and described in schedule I is being imported into the United Mexican States under the circumstances specified, it may, if it finds that the public interest will be served thereby, withdraw in whole or in part the concession with regard to the article, or modify the concession by the imposition of quantitative regulations or otherwise, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

2. Before the Government of either country shall withdraw or modify a concession pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article, it shall give notice in writing to the Government of the other country as far in advance as may be practicable and shall afford such other Government an opportunity to consult with it in respect of the proposed action; and if agreement with respect thereto is not reached the Government which proposes to take such action shall, nevertheless, be free to do so and the other Government shall be free within 30 days after such action is taken to terminate this agreement in whole or in part on 30 days' written notice.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is already covered in the law.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. As a matter of fact, under this escape clause, it has been invoked in more than one instance already.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks at this point, I will say that in more than one instance the Government of the United States has invoked the escape clause to give relief when and where necessary.

I cite the instance of handkerchiefs with Switzerland:

Beginning January 1, 1941, the concession on handkerchiefs granted by the United States to Switzerland in the agreement—effective February 15, 1936—was modified, pursuant to article XVI thereof—the "third country" article—to exclude from the concession hand-ornamented handkerchiefs. China and not Switzerland had been the principal beneficiary of the concession on this type of handkerchief, imports of which had increased greatly and had caused concern to Puerto Rican producers.

Other instances of relief accorded industry and agriculture may be found by reference to State Department files which will show favorable actions on petitions from aggrieved parties and these concessions were obtained by the medium of either the escape clauses contained in the agreements or by renegotiation.

I remember one instance covering fox furs, the details of which I shall not discuss, and again regarding plate glass with Czechoslovakia where, by renegotiation with that country, duties were revised at the request of American industry. The agreements can be changed or amended, as I understand it, because of the flexibility of the act, by Presidential order or suspension or by invoking the escape clause or by renegotiation, all covered in the act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is more misinformation being put on on that side than I have seen in any debate. There is only one treaty that has the escape clause in it, and that is the one with Mexico, and I will bet a suit of clothes that I am right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be overwhelmingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Page 1, line 8, after the period, insert: "Or until such earlier time as the House of Representatives and the Senate by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from Ohio objected to the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. This remark is not to be construed as criticism, because the gentleman acted clearly within his rights; so in making this observation I do not want the slightest implication to be left that it was criticism of the exercise of the gentleman's right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It was only because of my deep feeling that it was a good amendment and I felt it should not be withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, under no condition would impugn the motives of the gentleman from Ohio. I assumed that he had a justifiable reason. That does not, nevertheless, change the fact that the gentleman did object, and I am sorry he did.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered means that on June 13, 1943, the day after this extension act becomes effective, a joint resolution could be offered in the House of Representatives to terminate the extension, whether it be this or some other act. That is what it means. Nothing in the world could stop any Member of either branch on June 13, 1943, the very first day the extension act becomes effective, from introducing a concurrent resolution for the purpose of repealing for all practical purposes the 2-year extension, assuming the pending bill becomes law, or the 3-year extension, assuming a 3-year extension became law, but in any event either 2 or 3 years. No one wants to do that except one who is absolutely opposed to any kind of legislation along this line. All amendments except the one fixing the time of the extension have been defeated. No one who favors the extension of the present law either for 2 years or 3 years should vote for this amendment, for it would be most crippling to the effectiveness of this law, and when I say "most crippling" I do not say that in any criticism of the author but as an observation of my own as to the effect of this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Briefly; for a question, yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. The question is this: Could not any Member of the House introduce a bill to repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the very day it goes into effect?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman understands, of course, that a bill to repeal is entirely different from the provisions of this amendment, which calls for a concurrent resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think it might be well for the gentleman to point out the distinction between a bill repealing an act and a concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Ohio realizes that.

Mr. KENNEDY. The one requires the signature of the President; the other does not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio realizes that.

All I want to say is that this amendment would be most disastrous to the bill. Anyone on either side of the aisle who believes the law should be extended should vote against this amendment. We have already adopted an amendment for a 2-year extension. I have not criticized anyone who voted for that amendment. I think I made it clear that I personally prefer a 3-year extension. I would like to see this policy made permanent legislation, for I believe it would be for the best interests of the country; and as between 3 years and 2 years, personally, I prefer 3, but I do not consider the 2-year amendment as essentially hostile.

This amendment will be crippling in its nature; it would be disastrous to any extension. We might as well vote flatly against the bill as to vote for the passage of the bill with this amendment. I hope therefore, without further argument, that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I regret to differ with my friend, the gentleman from Texas, but I am opposed to this amendment. While I am no lawyer I have studied the Constitution and given some thought to the veto power of the President under our Constitution. I doubt whether the gentleman's amendment, if passed, could effectively bypass the Presidential veto power. Therefore, I think the amendment would likely be futile. However, if it should be held effective, I doubt the wisdom of its application to this trade program. If it is unwise in this case, although the idea might be wise in another case, I would still be opposed to its application in this case.

I can think of important war programs, greatly increasing the President's power, which might wisely be subject to discontinuance without the President's signature or consent. However, this trade-agreement program is not a wartime program. It was originally adopted in days of peace and has been twice renewed while our Nation was at peace. It is a program intended to promote peace and ought to be so continued.

In the controversy aroused by this debate I am in a difficult position, for I come from a great State producing raw materials and not as yet highly industrialized in manufacture. Whatever possibility of harm to certain raw-material producers there may be in the reciprocal trade program my constituents, who are livestock men, farmers, or mining men, are subjected to possible competition to a large degree without the counteracting benefits of the program extending to my State. Yet so convinced am I of the possibilities of Nation-wide benefit and of promoting peace and friendly commerce which this program makes possible that I am supporting the program and voting again to renew its terms. I certainly want America to assume her rightful place in an ordered world, without playing Santa Claus, but by assuming a position of commercial and economic leadership in peaceful ways instead of narrow selfishness. I believe these trade agreements, properly administered, tend in the direction of peace and mutual profit.

Much of the adverse criticism which I have heard voiced here has implied that this program is a New Deal scheme to sell America down the river. Certainly it is true that the power to adjust tariff rates upward or downward to the extent of 50 percent was delegated by earlier Congresses to President Harding, President Coolidge, and President Hoover. I do not know whether those earlier Congresses hoped that the President would use such power very sparingly, or only in the case of upward revision, but I mention this to show that the policy itself was adopted long before the New Deal administration came into power. Possibly it all depends upon who is administering it as to how some regard it. I do feel that it all depends upon how it is administered as to whether it is wise. Friendly as I am to the program, I would oppose it bitterly if it were used by dangerous and selfish characters linked with foreign governments in an effort to sell America down the river.

I have heard much on the part of the opposition which seems to assume that those opponents took it for granted that the members who make up the Committee on Reciprocity Information to conduct these studies and the members who were negotiators of these trade agreements were avowed free traders and long-haired professors, conspiring with foreigners to the disadvantage of Americans. Now, if that be the case—the burden of proof rests upon those who make the assumption—then I would be opposed to continuing the program. However, I assume that these men are neither fools nor knaves. They are public officials charged with a weighty responsibility. I trust they are performing their duty with the best interests of America at heart.

How many times we have heard the charge made that Congress has delegated away its powers. Many amendments have been offered to this measure which were said to be attempts to recapture the power which Congress has supinely surrendered. Congress is a policy-determining branch of our Government. Our laws must be general rules; administrative details must be left to another branch of Government. The Constitution, which is our basic guide, and which we have all sworn to uphold, is even more general in its terms. For example, I read, "Congress shall have power to declare war." Under that power Congress has declared war against our present enemies; Congress has appropriated money to conduct that war, and Congress has made other general regulations concerning the conduct of that war, but shall we now say that Congress must carry on the war? Would you have the general staff displaced by our Military Affairs Committee?

That same Constitution says "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof," but a large part of that power has been delegated to someone else, and that someone else is not even a governmental branch of the administrative department. Yes; that same Constitution says "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce," but what a world of meaning those words convey. We have delegated the control of domestic commerce to an adminis-

trative agency and who of those talking about recapturing the power of the Congress would expect us here in this body to write the freight rates of our internal commerce and adjust them in detail? Now, Mr. Chairman, much of this power of regulation has been placed, and necessarily placed, in the hands of administrative agencies. I do not see how it could be otherwise. In the increasing complexities of modern economic life more of this power of regulation must be placed by Congress in somebody else's hands. The only thing we need to ask is, "What is the wisest general policy for the immediate future and for the long future?" and the next question is, "Are the details of this general policy in safe hands by those who are administering the policy which we have written into law?"

I understand some of the fears entertained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and I have some of those same fears. In the growing complexities of our Government I could point out developments with more potential power for evil than anything apparent to me in this program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps as a witness in this case I should first qualify myself.

Irrespective of what happens to this amendment I propose to vote for the bill. While I had no opportunity to testify before the Committee on Ways and Means I did file a memorandum indicating my support and indicating also my interest in some procedural changes, but whether they were adopted or not would be of no moment because I still would support this legislation. I am of the opinion, however, that the matter before us today is really fundamental; namely, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

First. Let me recite it is not new. That same provision is included in the Lend-Lease Act. I offered the amendment; it was refined by the Senate, and you will find it in section 3 (c) which provides that after June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943. That is instance No. 1 of the exercise of this instrumentality by Congress for the purpose of recapturing a power, if it desires to do so.

Second. We wrote that same amendment into the First War Powers Act effective on the 18th of December 1941, and that has been in effect now for 18 months.

Third. We wrote that same amendment into the Second War Powers Act approved March 27, 1942, which has been in effect for 15 months.

Here are three major pieces of legislation enacted by both the House and Senate and signed by the President which have this identical provision in it. Now, it differs from things that we have considered in the form of amendments thus far. Most of the amendments that were offered dealt entirely with the question of resubmitting a trade agreement after it had been negotiated.

The amendment now pending does not deal with trade agreements as such. It deals with the law under which trade agreements are made. It provides that the law may be terminated at the end of 2 years or such sooner date as both Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution may determine. You have got to make that distinction. We are not dealing with ministerial functions now, we are dealing with recapture of power, and if we want to do it fundamentally this is the place to do it. We are not dealing with a crippling amendment, as the majority leader indicates. It does not cripple this proposal at all. It does not affect morale at all. It gives us an opportunity in case of an emergent situation which may arise before the expiration of 2 years by concurrent resolution, which requires no signature by the Executive, to recapture this power. So this is one time in the whole discussion that we are dealing with a fundamental proposition.

Having written it into both of the War Powers Acts under which we made the President an economic dictator in time of war, having written it into the Lend-Lease Act under which the President is making leases, deals, contracts, and undertakings with all the nations that are associated with us in the war effort, who, then, would say that we are affecting morale or the war psychosis at the present time? Here is one time where Congress can express itself and say that through concurrent resolution of both Houses it can recapture this power in an emergent moment if there should be an excess or abuse. I regret that the gentleman wanted to withdraw this because I think it is fundamental. I think his premise is right. I think the amendment ought to be adopted because it will not cripple the trade-agreement program. It does not relate to the submission of individual agreements to the Congress and it is very fundamental in our legislative structure.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to those amendments, offered to House Joint Resolution 111, which have for their object a limitation as to the term of operation or powers, heretofore delegated to the President by previous legislative act which, by the adoption of this resolution, will be extended for a period of 3 years, from June 12, 1943.

I am in favor of this legislation, the extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, because, in my opinion, since its original enactment in 1934 it has been one of the greatest aids to the Department of State and President Roosevelt in their efforts to develop and extend our friendly relations with foreign governments.

Not only has the Secretary of State and other Government departments given approval to this resolution but, in addition, we have the favorable endorsement of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., the United States Chamber of Commerce, the New York State Chamber of Commerce, the representatives of the farm groups, and many other leading businessmen and students of economics.

I would like to direct attention to the purposes of the act. The following explains the legislation:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

THE ACT

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 authorizes the President:

"(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

"(2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties or other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article"—

As is appropriate to carry out agreements made.

The act provides, as a limitation on the authority—

"No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and the free lists."

The initial term of an agreement may not be longer than 3 years, and each agreement must be terminable at the end of this period or thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice.

This authority is granted "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States." It is to be exercised only if the President "finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States." It is to be exercised "by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets * * *."

Before any trade agreement can be entered into, the President must "seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate"; and in each case "reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement" must be given "in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views."

The act provides that when new duties are agreed to and proclaimed they "shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries whether imported directly or indirectly" with appropriate provision for suspension of trade-agreement benefits in the case of countries which discriminate against our commerce, or which take other action tending to defeat the purposes of the act. With the exception of the special provision in the act for the continuance of preferential arrangements with Cuba, which go back to 1902, the act thus continues the traditional trade policy of the United States not to discriminate between foreign nations but to extend equality of tariff treatment to all who do not discriminate against the trade of this country.

The Trade Agreements Act does not authorize the conduct of any portion of our export or import business by the Government of the United States. It seeks to lighten the

restrictions, both in this country and abroad, on the operations of private businessmen, and leaves the rest to private enterprise. The existing wartime conduct of large portions of our foreign trade by government is under other laws.

The authority of the President to enter into agreements under the act was originally granted for a term of 3 years only. It has been renewed twice since, each time for a like term and without change. It will expire June 12, next, unless renewed. The present resolution, if adopted, will renew it for another 3-year term.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

The act, it will be noted, did not create a special new commission to advise the President, but instead directed him to utilize the specified existing departments and agencies for advice and information in the administration of the act.

Pursuant to this provision in the act, an effective interdepartmental organization has been developed with a view to bringing to bear upon each detailed question all the facts available The interdepartmental trade-agreements organization is designed to draw on the full information and resources of the qualified Government agencies and to obtain the views and all pertinent facts which private interests desire to furnish on the items under consideration.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is composed of responsible officers of the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury, is the interdepartmental agency through which private interests present their views and information. The Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission serves as Chairman of the Committee and most of the members of this committee also serve as members of the Trade Agreements Committee, the interdepartmental committee which coordinates the work of all the interested Government agencies in the administration of the trade-agreements program.

When it has been determined to attempt negotiation of a trade agreement with any country, and before negotiations start, notice of intention to negotiate is published in the Federal Register, other governmental publications, and in the press. The notice names the country, and along with it is published a list of products on which concessions in the American rates will be considered. No concession is considered on any product which is not included in this list. Upon the announcement by the Secretary of State that a trade agreement is to be negotiated with a particular country, the Committee for Reciprocity Information sets a date (usually more than 30 days after the Secretary's announcement) for a public hearing before the committee and a date for the filing of briefs (usually a week or more before the date of the hearing). Both oral and written statements may be offered before the committee, and there are no restrictions on the character of the considerations that may be heard. Full opportunity is given to everyone concerned to present whatever facts or views he wishes. In addition to the holding of such regular hearings prior to the commencement of negotiations the committee stands ready at all times to hear interested parties on a formal or informal basis whenever they desire to present additional facts or arguments bearing on possible concessions. Many such informal meetings with interested private groups have been held after the formal hearings have been concluded.

The information so presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information is thoroughly organized and briefed for convenient use of the trade-agreements organization by the specialists on the staff of the Tariff Commission. Exact copies of formal briefs submitted and full transcripts of the hearings are available to and are carefully studied by each agency concerned.

Digests of all available information are prepared by the United States Tariff Commission and the Department of Commerce on all commodities that are under consideration. For items being considered for possible concessions by the United States, the digests furnish, among other things, a history of the United States tariff rates on the commodity together with ad valorem equivalents of the rates, a description, and an account of the uses of the commodity, the size, and characteristics of the United States industry, and of the foreign industry which produce the commodity, the import and export trade, conditions of competition, and other considerations.

As each of the agencies specified by the act is represented at every level of the preparatory work, all of the resources of each are utilized. The care with which this work is done is illustrated by the digests which the Tariff Commission has made public following the completion of each agreement.

Members of the Tariff Commission are on the main trade agreements committee, and the specialists of the staff and the full informational resources of the Commission are utilized at all stages of the negotiations. Representatives of the Commission are members of the country committees where the detailed work is done of preparing the information required by the trade agreements committee in its consideration of the trade agreement.

Similarly the Department of Commerce's full resources are utilized, particularly in furnishing technical information and advice concerning the nature of the concessions to be sought from the other government in the interest of American exports.

The Department of Agriculture, through its representatives on all committees, furnishes full information and advice on all items pertaining to both imports and exports of agricultural products.

The Treasury Department supplies information and advice on all questions pertaining to its field of interest, including customs revenues and customs administration.

The Department of State acts as the coordinating agency through which the findings and recommendations of the Trade Agreements Committee are presented to the Secretary of State and the President for consideration and approval. The international negotiations involved are carried out by the Department of State, assisted by the interested agencies of the interdepartmental organization. All negotiations are confined to and based on the approved findings and recommendations of the Trade Agreements Committee.

The interdepartmental organization does not shut itself off from contacts with private interests even after a trade agreement has been signed and has entered into force. The Committee for Reciprocity Information stands ready at all times to receive the views of interested persons or organizations concerning any aspect of the operation of agreements. Informal conferences or hearings are arranged whenever anyone has a complaint to make. Such complaints have been remarkably few, attesting to the care with which the agreements have been formulated. In several cases adjustments have been made either through supplementary agreements or pursuant to "escape" clauses in the agreements. Under this procedure any necessary future adjustments can be made.

It is clear that the successful administration of the trade-agreements program requires the combined efforts and resources of various departments and agencies in the Government. The committee is satisfied that the existing interdepartmental organization has brought the full resources of the Government to bear upon the problem in an effective and economical manner with the sole view of carrying out the policies prescribed by Congress in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. The results achieved under the trade-agreements program during the past 9 years of its operation fully support this conclusion.

RESULTS

Agreements entered into

During the past 9 years reciprocal trade agreements have been concluded with the following 27 countries, in the order in which the agreements were signed: Cuba, Brazil, Belgium and Luxemburg, Haiti, Sweden, Colombia, Canada, Honduras, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Nicaragua, Guatemala, France, Finland, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Mexico, and Iran. Negotiations are in progress with Bolivia and Iceland.

Over 65 percent of the total foreign trade of the United States is carried on with the countries with which reciprocal trade agreements have been concluded. The United Kingdom and Canada are, respectively, the largest and the second largest customers for American exports.

Under the act, agreements have been made, as follows:

Country	Signed—	Effective—
Cuba	Aug. 24, 1934	Sept. 3, 1934
Brazil	Feb. 2, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Belgium and Luxemburg	Feb. 27, 1935	May 1, 1935
Haiti	Mar. 28, 1935	June 3, 1935
Sweden	May 25, 1935	Aug. 5, 1935
Colombia	Sept. 13, 1935	May 20, 1936
Canada (superseded)	Nov. 15, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Honduras	Dec. 18, 1935	Mar. 2, 1936
The Netherlands	Dec. 20, 1935	Feb. 1, 1936
Switzerland	Jan. 9, 1936	Feb. 15, 1936
Nicaragua [1]	Mar. 11, 1936	Oct. 1, 1936
Guatemala	Apr. 24, 1936	June 15, 1936
France	May 6, 1936	Do.
Finland	May 18, 1936	Nov. 2, 1936
Costa Rica	Nov. 28, 1936	Aug. 2, 1937
El Salvador	Feb. 19, 1937	May 31, 1937
Czechoslovakia [2]	Mar. 7, 1938	Apr. 16, 1938
Ecuador	Aug. 6, 1938	Oct. 23, 1938
United Kingdom	Nov. 17, 1938	Jan. 1, 1939
Canada (second agreement)	....do....	Do.
Turkey	Apr. 1, 1939	May 5, 1939
Venezuela	Nov. 6, 1939	Dec. 16, 1939
Cuba (first supplementary agreement)	Dec. 18, 1939	Dec. 23, 1939
Canada (supplementary fox-fur agreement) [3]	Dec. 13, 1940	Dec. 20, 1940
Argentina	Oct. 14, 1941	Nov. 15, 1941
Cuba (second supplementary agreement)	Dec. 23, 1941	Jan. 5, 1942
Peru	May 7, 1942	July 29, 1942
Uruguay	July 21, 1942	Jan. 1, 1943
Mexico	Dec. 23, 1942	Jan. 30, 1943
Iran	Apr. 5, 1943	(4)

[1] The duty concessions and certain other provisions of this agreement ceased to be in force as of Mar. 10, 1938.
[2] The operation of this agreement was suspended as of Apr. 22, 1939.
[3] This replaced a previous supplementary agreement relating to fox furs, signed on Dec. 30, 1939.
[4] Will become effective 30 days after exchange of formal documents.

The success of the trade-agreements program

The trade-agreements program had to make its way against a general deterioration in international relations and the strong currents of barter trading and other nationalistic excesses which tended to paralyze foreign trade generally.

The United States was faced with a choice between the use of its economic power in an ultimately self-defeating effort to coerce other nations into maintaining trade with us or to offer them an example of leadership in reestablishing world trade on the basis of cooperative action. To the everlasting credit—and self-interest—of the United States, it chose the latter course.

The course chosen in 1934, and held to since then, has paid dividends of two kinds: Expanded trade, with all that it has meant in terms of income, pay rolls, and employment, and, at the same time, improved general relations with other countries, which have meant much to us in time of war and which will continue to mean much to us not only between now and complete victory of the United Nations over the Axis Powers but also in the years of peace.

I ask for your support and vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 120, noes 134.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 169.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 350 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1351 (a) (2)) is amended by inserting after 'because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts' the following: '(including the operations of international cartels).'"

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is now under consideration only adds six words, "including the operations of international cartels."

I will admit that it may not seem necessary to add these to this bill because it is admitted that the President has already the power of withdrawal from any treaty, in the case of discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts. But during the 9 years that this act has been in effect, the operation of international cartels, in fact an invisible government, has completely circumvented many of the provisions of the trade agreements.

I will read momentarily from a book entitled "Germany's Master Plan," which I believe is of interest to all Members of the House. It was written by Joseph Borkin and Charles A. Welsh, of the Department of Justice. I read from that book one paragraph to give you an idea of the nature of cartels:

By their nature, cartels are paternalistic and totalitarian organizations, and their policies consequently cannot be thought of as truly capitalistic. Capitalism is based on freedom of enterprise; cartels are based on rigidity, stabilization, and private economic planning. They are the forerunners of the managerial revolution. Because they must play safe and avoid risk, they cannot be progressive. They fear two things—competition and technological change—for their existence depends upon concentration of ownership and control over patents, raw materials, and resources.

Our Army and Navy Munitions Board includes among the 14 strategic materials necessary to national defense the following items:

Antimony, chromium, coconut-shell char, manganese, manila fiber, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, tungsten.

Of the 14 items, not less than 7 or 8 are under international-cartels control. These cartels are composed not only of private companies but, in many cases, companies under control of national governments, and they operate, as I have already stated, to circumscribe the trade agreements that are made by public governments and treaties entered into between public governments.

That they are operating now, even though we are at war, is perfectly obvious for the reason that the rubber cartel was renewed for 5 years from 1938.

I shall read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks that I made on Monday on this same subject. The London Economist, in its October 3, 1942, issue, stated that an agreement that was entered into between Great Britain, Bolivia, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the International Tin Committee is to carry on for an additional 5 years, from October 3, 1942, and further stated:

The new scheme, like its predecessors, is a scheme aiming at the prevention of surplus supplies.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is a committee amendment, and one on which there is no controversy, is merely intended to set up a flag in our trade agreements warning that in all future trade agreements the executive authority should take into account the operation of international cartels, which are not to the best interest of the United States and United States industry and may frustrate post-war rehabilitation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that there may be no misunderstanding, do I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment is a committee amendment?

Mr. DEWEY. It was reported by the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. And it is offered here as a committee amendment?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I ask this so that the Members of the House will understand the situation.

Mr. DEWEY. I hope this amendment will have the support of the House because it is not a controversial amendment. It is a permissive amendment. It merely waves a red flag and sets up a warning sign to look out for the operations of international cartels.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to express my own appreciation for the fact that this amendment is in the bill to the gentleman himself as well as his colleagues on the committee, and to say that I believe this problem of international cartels is one of the most serious ones we have seen in recent months and that we shall have to confront in the future.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to express the same appreciation. I think it is a wise step. I greatly appreciate it and approve of it.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 227, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves to recommit the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Before the period in line 8, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no reductions shall be made in the duties on any competitive foreign agricultural or industrial products

which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. KNUTSON and Mr. DOUGHTON.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 188.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 343, nays 65, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—343

Abernethy	Chiperfield	Fulmer
Allen, Ill.	Church	Gale
Allen, La.	Clark	Gamble
Anderson, Calif.	Coffee	Gathings
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cole, Mo.	Gavagan
Andrews	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Angell	Colmer	Gilchrist
Arends	Compton	Gillie
Arnold	Cooley	Goodwin
Auchincloss	Cooper	Gordon
Baldwin, Md.	Costello	Gore
Baldwin, N. Y.	Courtney	Gorski
Barden	Cox	Gossett
Barry	Cravens	Graham
Bates, Ky.	Crawford	Granger
Bates, Mass.	Creal	Grant, Ala.
Beall	Crosser	Grant, Ind.
Beckworth	Cullen	Gregory
Bell	Cunningham	Gwynne
Bender	Curley	Hale
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis	Hall,
Bennett, Mo.	D'Alesandro	Edwin Arthur
Bishop	Davis	Hall,
Blackney	Dawson	Leonard W.
Bland	Delaney	Halleck
Bloom	Dewey	Hancock
Bolton	Dickstein	Hare
Bonner	Dilweg	Harless, Ariz.
Boren	Dingell	Harness, Ind.
Boykin	Dirksen	Harris, Ark.
Bradley, Mich.	Disney	Harris, Va.
Bradley, Pa.	Ditter	Hart
Brooks	Dondero	Hartley
Brown, Ga.	Doughton	Hays
Bryson	Drewry	Hébert
Buckley	Durham	Heffernan
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Herter
Burch, Va.	Eberharter	Hess
Burchill, N. Y.	Elliott, Md.	Hill
Burdick	Ellsworth	Hinshaw
Burgin	Elston, Ohio	Hobbs
Bushey	Engel	Hoch
Butler	Fay	Hoeven
Byrne	Feighan	Holifield
Camp	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Canfield	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Cannon, Mo.	Fernandez	Hope
Capozzoli	Fish	Howell
Carlson, Kans.	Fisher	Izac
Carson, Ohio	Fitzpatrick	Jackson
Carter	Flannagan	Jarman
Case	Fogarty	Jeffrey
Celler	Folger	Jensen
Chapman	Forand	Johnson, Calvin D.
Chenoweth	Ford	Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Fulbright	Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Miller, Mo.	Schuetz
Johnson, Okla.	Mills	Schwabe
Johnson, Ward	Monkiewicz	Scott
Jonkman	Monroney	Sheppard
Judd	Mruk	Simpson, Ill.
Kean	Mundt	Slaughter
Kearney	Murdock	Smith, Maine
Kee	Murphy	Smith, Va.
Keefe	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
Kefauver	Murray, Wis.	Snyder
Kelley	Myers	Somers, N. Y.
Kennedy	Newsome	Sparkman
Keogh	Norrell	Spence
Kerr	O'Brien, Ill.	Springer
Kilburn	O'Brien, Mich.	Stanley
King	O'Brien, N. Y.	Starnes, Ala.
Kirwan	O'Connor	Steagall
Kleberg	O'Leary	Stearns, N. H.
Klein	O'Neil	Stefan
Kunkel	Outland	Stevenson
LaFollette	Pace	Stewart
Landis	Patman	Stockman
Lane	Patton	Sullivan
Lanham	Peterson, Ga.	Sumners, Tex.
Lea	Pfeifer	Sundstrom
LeCompte	Philbin	Taber
LeFevre	Phillips	Talbot
Lesinski	Pittenger	Tallé
Luce	Plosser	Tarver
Ludlow	Poage	Taylor
Lynch	Poulson	Thomas, Tex.
McCord	Powers	Thomason
McCormack	Pracht	Tibbott
McGehee	Price	Tolan
McGranery	Priest	Towe
McGregor	Rabaut	Treadway
McKenzie	Ramey	Troutman
McLean	Ramspeck	Van Zandt
McMillan	Randolph	Vincent, Ky.
McMurray	Rankin	Vinson, Ga.
McWilliams	Reece, Tenn.	Voorhis, Calif.
Maas	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
Madden	Richards	Wadsworth
Mahon	Rivers	Walter
Maloney	Robertson	Ward
Manasco	Robinson, Utah	Wasielewski
Mansfield, Mont.	Rockwell	Weaver
Marcantonio	Rodgers, Pa.	Weiss
Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Calif.	Welch
May	Rogers, Mass.	Wene
Merritt	Rohrbough	Whelchel, Ga.
Merrow	Rolph	Whitten
Michener	Rowan	Whittington
Miller, Conn.	Russell	Wickersham
Mansfield, Tex.	Rowe	Wigglesworth
Marcantonio	Sabath	Winstead
Martin, Mass.	Sadowski	Winter
May	Sasscer	Wolverton, N. J.
Merritt	Satterfield	Woodrum, Va.
Merrow	Sauthoff	Wright
Michener	Scanlon	Zimmerman

NAYS—65

Andersen, H. Carl	Hagen	Mott
Andresen, August H.	Heidinger	Norman
Barrett	Hendricks	O'Hara
Brehm	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Plumley
Buffett	Hull	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Johnson, Anton J.	Rizley
Day	Jones	Robsion, Ky.
Domengeaux	Kilday	Schiffler
Dworshak	Kinzer	Short
Elliott	Knutson	Sikes
Ellis	Lambertson	Simpson, Pa.
Elmer	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Gallagher	Lemke	Sumner, Ill.
Gearhart	Lewis	Vorys, Ohio
Gerlach	McCowen	Weichel, Ohio
Gillette	Martin, Iowa	West
Green	Mason	Wheat
Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson
Gross	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
	Morrison, La.	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—25

Clason	Guyer	Sheridan
Cochran	Jennings	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	Magnuson	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Morrison, N. C.	White
Douglas	Nichols	Willey
Englebright	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong	O'Konski	Worley
Gibson	O'Toole	
Gifford	Shafer	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Shafer.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Willey.
Mr. White with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the majority leader what the program is for tomorrow and the rest of the week, and also whether he can give us any information as to when the tax bill may be brought back from the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the deficiency appropriation bill will be under consideration. I understand there is likely to be one controversial matter, and that is an amendment which will exclude from the pay roll certain individuals whose cases have been passed on by the special committee of the Committee on Appropriations, in considering certain cases.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that controversial? I understood the committee is unanimous.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some member of the committee will be better able to advise the House in that respect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] says that the committee is unanimous.

Mr. McCORMACK. When a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is unanimous that is a very good sign.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. TABER. It is our idea that the House should go on record by a yea-and-nay vote on this matter. That is practically the unanimous opinion of the committee, and it is proposed that the committee shall instruct the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, to propose an amendment to accomplish that purpose in the Committee of the Whole, and that we will have a roll call on that amendment when the bill comes into the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, there is to be an amendment offered, as I understand it, in the Committee of the Whole, and the Committee itself will ask for a roll call.

Mr. TABER. Yes; that is it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to get that information, so that the House can have it. If the appropriation bill is

not disposed of tomorrow, it will go over until Monday. There are three bills which have been reported unanimously, as I understand it, by the Committee on Immigration, and those bills, or as many as can come up, will be under consideration on Monday. On Tuesday the naval appropriation bill will be under consideration, and that is likely to take 2 days, according to the best information I have, Tuesday and Wednesday. So far as the tax bill is concerned, if it passes the Senate this week, it is the agreement of the leaders—and I think my friend from Massachusetts will concur—that it will not be brought up before Tuesday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the Members may have definite information that the tax bill will not come up before next Tuesday, and if it passes the Senate between now and next Tuesday, it will be brought up Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the naval appropriation bill will follow that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman indicated that three immigration bills would be under consideration. Does that mean the Consent Calendar will be up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; these bills will come up under rules that have been reported.

Mr. JENKINS. And there will be no Consent Calendar and no Private Calendar on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the Consent Calendar may be considered. I am very glad the gentleman from Ohio asked that question. I had overlooked that fact. I think the Consent Calendar should be called on Monday, and we can probably dispose of the Private Calendar on Tuesday.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Has the majority leader given any consideration to bringing up the Bituminous Coal Act extension bill? The time is very short, and it is necessary to bring that up very soon. We have been hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee would report that bill out tomorrow, and we can then have a rule on it by Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that is reported out, it is a matter of primary consideration. That is a matter of such importance if it is reported out on Monday and can be brought up on Tuesday, it should be brought up. It should be brought out as quickly as possible.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, but I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts if we can work the matter out satisfactorily on the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is a moot question now, because it has not yet been reported out.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, I think it is a mistake to attempt to carry this over until next week, and for that reason I think I shall object. We are meeting in the morning in the Ways and Means Committee to report out an additional extension of 90 days on the Bituminous Coal Act. It is imperative that we act promptly.

If the Ways and Means Committee should report that bill out we can take it up on Friday. If not, it could be taken up on Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are going to meet tomorrow.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Well, all right. We could take it up on Saturday, then. I am frank to say it is rather important and I hope the majority leader will not be unreasonable about this. The Congress is here for the purpose of transacting the business of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am here every Saturday. When we go over from Friday to Monday it does not give anybody a day. Everyone of us is working hard. I do not apologize at all for asking permission to go over from Friday to Monday. You will be in your office working.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Yes, I am working every day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. But I will say to the gentleman if you report it out Friday, there has to be a rule granted and the rule must lie over for 24 hours.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman knows full well that this House extended that act by unanimous consent and you did not need any rule and you will not need a rule when you get unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. We can do it on Monday. However, there was a rule granted this morning.

Mr. FISH. Permit me to say you will have to get a rule on this bill. So it cannot be taken up before Monday in any event. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. In view of its importance and the anxiety on the part of the gentleman to get this bituminous coal extension bill out, if the Ways and Means Committee will meet tomorrow morning, I, as chairman of the Rules Committee, will call a meeting in the afternoon and I believe we will have enough votes to report out a rule and file it so that there will be no delay. It can be taken up then. By unanimous consent the rule can be adopted and action taken immediately. But, of course, it depends on the Ways and Means Committee acting tomorrow morning.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the chairman of the Rules Committee, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the reciprocal trade resolution on which we just voted this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks on the bill H. R. 7120.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight and in order to correct my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the point where the colloquy occurred between the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and myself relative to the implications of the escape clause in trade agreements, my own statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGÁN] be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a radio speech given by Gabriel Heatter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was not objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a telegram I received from two persons at Shelby, Mont., vitally interested in the oil industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include certain tables, figures, and statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a very thoughtful letter by Prof. Ernest Hahne, professor of economics at Northwestern University, on the subject of taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unnanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks made by me in committee and include therein certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized.

THE CRADLE-TO-GRAVE OR "WOMB-TO-TOMB" SECURITY ILLUSION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Noah Webster defines a mirage as "an optical illusion." My name being Noah, I make bold to define this cradle-to-grave security program put out by the National Resources Planning Board as a mental illusion, without logical foundation, based entirely upon fancy and futile hope. It is more fantastic than the Mississippi Bubble, that grotesque fantasy of yesteryear. This cradle-to-grave plan brings back to my mind the fable of the Pot of Gold at the Foot of the Rainbow. That folk legend used to puzzle me much when I was a little fellow. I now perceive that it contained the same philosophy as that embraced in this cradle-to-grave scheme—something for nothing. This so-called security program is an alluring mirage to those travelers across the desert of life who thirst for economic security without too much work and sacrifice. It is a mirage that holds out hope, but one which can never materialize in the satisfaction of human needs or wants.

Perhaps you may have noticed that the something-for-nothing philosophy contained in the report permeates the entire New Deal set-up and has attracted millions of our people as a mirage in the desert attracts the weary traveler by promising comfort and security that never materializes. However, the experienced desert traveler, after being fooled by mirages many times, finally learns to resist the lure of those optical illusions and does not permit them to influence him or to divert him from a straight course to his real destination. I am beginning to wonder if the American people, having been fooled time and again by New Deal illusions, will permit this new cradle-to-grave security illusion to influence them or to deflect them from their ultimate objective, namely, a safe, sane, efficient, economical administration in Washington to operate the Nation's business—an administration that will prosecute this war to a satisfactory conclusion at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the National Resources Planning Board that contained the so-called cradle-to-grave security program was signed by the chairman of the Board, Frederic Delano, an uncle of the President. It is called the Delano report. However, Frederic Delano was for years a hard-headed railroad executive who served as the president of the Wabash Railroad. He knows all about safety devices on railroads to protect railroad workers from injury, but very little about social devices to provide security for workers in general. For that reason, although his name is signed to the report, it was actually prepared and written by someone else. The report expounds a socialistic program of security that is beyond the experience and understanding of Frederic Delano. In fact, his whole life's activity, starting as a machinist in the railroad shops of Aurora, Ill., and working his way up the ladder to the presidency of the Wabash Railroad by his own initiative, gives the lie to any socialistic philosophy. Who then did prepare this cradle-to-grave security illusion?

The real author of the Delano Report is one Mrs. Eveline Burns, Ph. D., the Director of Research for the National Resources Planning Board. She is an English Socialist who came to America a few years ago with her husband, Dr. Arthur R. Burns, now Chief Adviser to the War Production Board. She is an important cog in the New Deal machine that grinds out socialistic schemes to destroy private property in America and to bring about state socialism. She is a brilliant woman, saturated with the philosophy of Karl Marx. This same Dr. Eveline Burns in 1932 collaborated with others in the preparation of a book entitled "Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program". In her contribution to this book she urged outright government control of both labor and property. I quote her exact words:

> Society will have to devise methods of preventing the indiscriminate use of resources by every optimistic producer * * * and of replacing the guesses of individual producers by a more orderly method of estimation of need. Such a method would imply the imposition of controls that would refuse individuals the right to make what use they wish of their own labor and property.

That last sentence is the essence of the Karl Marx program and also of this cradle-to-grave security program.

It is interesting to note at this point that the Drs. Burns are both natives of England and were British subjects until a recent phase of the New Deal era, at which time they became United States citizens, and very soon thereafter secured their high posts in these offices of the United States Government. It has been pointed out by Washington observers that the people of America are indebted for the Drs. Burns to the underground railroad, so to speak, operated jointly and expertly by the Honorable Felix Frankfurter, of the United States Supreme Court, and the Honorable Harold Laski, of the London School of Economics. The Drs. Burns are both former high functionaries of the London School of Economics, which has turned out in its day many a fine mess of confused master statisticians, enthusiastic Communists, and Socialist joiners. In fact, it may well be said that the London School of Economics has specialized in turning out brain twisters who are expert in producing calculated frustration on a mass scale by means of planned confusion designed to end up in regimented chaos.

Mr. Speaker, if you will take the time to study and analyze the Delano report, this cradle-to-grave security illusion, you will find the essence of the plan contained in the following paragraph taken from the report:

> Where a State refuses to comply with the Federal requirements in accordance with the Federal law or refrains from participation in the program, the Federal Government should have the power to operate the program within that State with Federal personnel until the State demonstrates its ability and willingness to reassume its responsibilities.

This paragraph means, if it means anything at all, that if the States refuse to cooperate they are to be policed by the Federal Government until they see the light. It means permanent rationing, price fixing, and Government control of all business. No wonder the Congress has so far turned a cold shoulder to the plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this cradle-to-grave security illusion, now dubbed on Capitol Hill as the womb-to-tomb plan, were an isolated plan, separate and distinct from the general socialistic program of the New Deal, I would stop right here after exposing the real author and the gist of the plan. However, that is not the case. It is not an isolated plan, but it is a definite part of an overall program to undermine and destroy our American system of government and our American way of life. I propose to prove that there is an organized effort being carried on to accomplish this objective by a group of new dealers now intrenched in government positions, and I propose to use their own words to establish my point.

Before doing that, however, I want to impress upon this House the fact that the President, when he submitted the Delano report to this Congress, recommended that we give it our serious consideration immediately. If we had followed his recommendation we would have placed this socialistic program ahead of the war effort; we would have given it first place in our thoughts; and we would have done exactly what the new dealers have been doing all along; namely, taking more interest in social reforms than in the war effort. Thank God this Congress did not follow his recommendation, but instead turned a cold shoulder to the plan, and has so far refused to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, behind the National Resources Planning Board and Frederic Delano, and even back of Mrs. Eveline Burns, are a group of new dealers in government service, holding important and responsible positions, who have been scheming out this socialistic plan, pulling the wires to bring it about, working out the phraseology, and putting together the jigsaw puzzle which finally emerged as a formula by means of which they hope and expect to do away with the institution of private property, to do away with the independence of our citizens, and to carry the Nation over into state socialism.

At this point let us bring some of these new dealers, these social planners, out into the open, parade them before our

eyes, and examine their social philosophy. Let us take up one exhibit after another, study the pattern of this New Deal socialistic program, and see for ourselves what goes on behind the New Deal smoke screen.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell was for years a very prominent and authoritative spokesman for the President and the New Deal administration. As spokesman for the President he made many revealing statements from time to time. Dr. Tugwell's statements as an official spokesman for the New Deal have never been repudiated. Quite the contrary, because every step taken by the administration along the road to national socialism, and every bit of New Deal legislation either enacted or proposed, has followed the line which Dr. Tugwell laid down. Here are some of Dr. Tugwell's statements:

The industrial system is like a ship with plenty of power but with no rudder, no compass, and no captain. It wallows haphazardly upon the sea of human experience.

That is our capitalistic system as Dr. Tugwell sees it.

And again:

There is no denying that the contemporary situation in the United States has explosive possibilities. The future is becoming visible in Russia; the present is bitterly in contrast; politicians, theorists, and vested interests seem to conspire ideally for the provocation to violence of a long-patient people. No one can pretend to know how the release of this pressure is likely to come. Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty; perhaps our constitutions and statutes will be revised; perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without too violent resistance.

Again Tugwell says:

Planning will necessarily become a function of the Federal Government; either that or the planning agency will supersede the Government, which is why, of course, such a scheme will eventually be assimilated to the States * * * the next series of changes will have to do with industry itself * * * business will logically be required to disappear This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant. * * * Planning also implies * * * control of prices and profit margins. (The Principal of Planning and the Institution of Laissez-Faire, 1931, pp. 89–92.)

Now hear what Dr. Tugwell has to say about labor:

Not only labor, as a group, but also other groups frequently stand against progress. (The Industrial Discipline, 1933, p. 135.)

So much for the chief prophet of the New Deal who is now trying out his socialistic theories on the helpless people of Puerto Rico, much to their wrath and discomfiture.

EXHIBIT NO. 2

Now let us take up Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, head of the Board of Economic Warfare, which agency, through its experts, had much to do, apparently, with the preparation of the great "womb-to-tomb plan." In his pamphlet America Must Choose, Mr. WALLACE said:

Much as we all dislike them, the new types of social control that we have now in operation are here to stay, and to grow on a world or national scale. We shall have to go on doing all these things we do not want to do.

Another quotation from the same source:

It may be necessary to make a public utility out of agriculture. * * * Every plowed field would have its permit sticking up on its post * * * it would be necessary to go to Congress to get a very large appropriation so as to have a police force of half a million men to keep down the racketeering.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

Now let us listen to Dr. A. A. Berle, Jr. Dr. Berle is now Assistant Secretary of State, and is another prophet of the New Deal. As an authoritative spokesman he stated to the Temporary National Economic Committee on May 23, 1939, in a monograph entitled "A Banking System for Capital and Capital Credit," as follows:

If, therefore, wealth is to be created by creation of Government debt, the scope of Government enterprise must be largely increased. Briefly, the Government will have to enter into the direct financing of activities now supposed to be private; and a continuance of that direct financing must be inevitably that the Government ultimately will control and own these activities. Put differently, if the Government undertakes to create wealth by using its own credit at the rate of four billions or so a year, and if its work is well done, the Government will be acquiring direct productive mechanisms at the rate of four billions' worth a year, or thereabouts. Over a period of years, the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States.

What is this, I ask, but the socialization of all industry?

EXHIBIT NO. 4

Now, let us see what Mr. Paul Porter has to say. Paul Porter, the present head of the Shipping Division of the War Labor Board, is another Socialist on the Government pay roll at a salary of $8,000 per year. In 1934 Porter wrote a tax plan for the Socialist Party of America which said, in part:

All natural resources of the United States, such as minerals, forests, and waterpower sites, all banks, insurance companies, and public utilities, and all basic industries such as mining and the manufacture of steel, automobiles, and textiles, shall be public property. * * * All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment affected shall be required to surrender them in return for Commonwealth bonds.

Porter's plan proposed the confiscation of all forms of property except dwelling houses and subsistence farms, Government limitation of all income, and a program that would force everybody to work for the Government. State socialism is the name we call it; nazi-ism is what they call it in Germany; fascism, in Italy; and communism, in Russia. And so, the socialistic pattern of the New Deal becomes plainly evident as we spread out before us the aims and objectives of the leading new dealers.

EXHIBIT NO. 5

Now, let us go to the President himself and trace from him the lines of this blueprint for a socialistic dictatorship as outlined in the monumental plan of the "womb to tomb" illusion. President Roosevelt in his Budget message of January 7, 1942, presented two important issues. They concerned a fundamental American principle—the control of the purse, and taxation only with representation.

In the name of military secrecy the President informed the American people that he could no longer present details of future war appropriations. Only total appropriations and expenditures would be published "so that the Nation may know the fiscal situation and the progress of the Nation's effort." The Nation obviously would not know much from those bare generalities. The President also suggested in his January 7 message that "our fiscal situation makes imperative the greatest possible flexibility in our tax system," and he recommended that "the Congress should consider the desirability of tax legislation which makes possible quick adjustment in the timing of tax rates and collections during an emergency period."

Without question this was one of the most dangerous and far-reaching proposals ever to come from the White House. Such a situation could be achieved only by the Congress delegating the authority over revenue to the executive branch of the Government.

It was obvious that the administration would sooner or later ask for this power for it is a necessary feature of a completely planned economy. The origin of the President's flexible tax proposal is to be found in a monograph entitled "Taxation, Recovery, and Defense." The following extract from that monograph places the origin of the idea, and at the same time indicates the degree of Executive control involved:

The fullest effect of this somewhat complicated tax program and fiscal policy cannot be achieved, providing vast sums of money as needed and preventing undesirable effects on the economy, unless the program is closely geared to the entire administrative policy and defense program. As this must necessarily be under the supervision of the executive branch of the Government, it seems desirable to have the Congress empower the Executive to apply one or another of these taxes and fiscal controls as they are required.

Those who prepared the monograph containing the foregoing startling idea numbered among them Gerhard Colm, fiscal expert in the Bureau of the Budget; Dr. Alvin Hansen, professor of political science at Harvard University, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board and consultant to the National Resources Planning Board. Other participants in this monograph were Marriner S. Eccles and his associates at the Federal Reserve Board, and Richard Gilbert, economist in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on citing individuals like Leon Henderson, former Director of the Office of Price Administration; Milo Perkins, Director of the Board

of Economic Warfare; Charles W. Elliott, Director of the National Resources Planning Board; Attorney General Francis Biddle; Eugene Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, and a host of others, all part and parcel of the gang entrenched in Government positions seeking to change our American way of life.

However, I will give you just one more quotation to prove that this "womb-to-tomb plan" for deluding the people is simply the outgrowth of the thinking which the new dealers have engaged in for the past decade. Dr. Alvin H. Hansen states it is proposed by the executive department to retain the vast powers over money, over taxes, the power of life and death over industry, and complete control of all phases of our national life. In the Chicago Journal of Commerce on June 27, 1942, Dr. Hansen was quoted as follows:

> Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish broad limits within which the administration may move. Congress will appropriate huge sums of money, surrender its power of directing when and how the money shall be spent. Other extraordinary powers such as, for instance, to effect wholesale social reforms will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of the extraordinary wartime powers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have given you only a few of the quotations which I have at hand from various members of the administration, from the President down, all showing the clear intention to continue the controls which have been set up under the necessities of war, and many controls not necessitated, but set up anyway, under the guise of a national emergency, into the post-war period as a permanent part of our Government economy.

No fair-minded individual reading such statements and declarations by these administration advisers who sat in with the National Resources Planning Board in the preparation of the cradle-to-grave security illusion can doubt that the plan, the definite purpose, the determined intention of the real framers of that program is to set up under cover of the war effort, and to maintain after the war, controls which can be characterized by no other designation than a paternalistic, socialistic dictatorship. As we review these declarations made by innermost officials of the New Deal clique, we begin to sense something of the sinister implications concealed in this monumental program for deluding the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what such a paternalistic, socialistic dictatorship will mean. It will mean a continuing of rationing for years after the war. It will mean that these bureaucrats will distribute the food and the other products of American sweat and energy wherever they choose, to whatever other peoples in the world they may select, and the American people will have to toil and sweat and like it. It will mean, if such a paternalistic, socialistic dictatorship is put over on the people of America under the guise of this cradle-to-grave illusion of "something for nothing," that those people in the dairy districts of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, the Midwest, Pennsylvania, and New York who, morning and evening, have to lean their cheeks against the flossy flanks of gentle Jerseys and work the four "faucets" will be compelled to pump two of these teats, or perhaps three, for peoples across the ocean while they retain the streams from but two, or possibly one for themselves. It will mean, Mr. Speaker, if such a paternalistic dictatorship is foisted upon this country, that, as the farmers of America follow down the corn rows sweating under the torrid summer sun they will be sweating out half their energy for crops to be disposed of by these bureaucrats instead of producing the fruits of labor for themselves.

The effect on industry will be calamitous. Under the guise of maintaining a normal flow of work, business will be taxed to provide a perpetual political W. P. A. Business will then have to be subsidized and, in the words of Eugene Casey, special executive assistant to the President:

> Business will accept legitimate enlightened guidance by intelligent, public-minded Government agencies in the same spirit that the people of the world will accept a policing of the world after a new peace has been born.

What will be the effect upon labor? The effect will be subsidies, money grants, and finally force to maintain Government control. But just as industry will find itself under the same sort of control and supervision as it is in Russia and Germany, so labor will eventually find itself under absolute Government control, as is now the case there. American labor should remember that Hitler's minions cannot strike; Hirohito's legions cannot strike; and neither can Mussolini's reluctant countrymen strike.

The effect on the farmers if such a paternalistic scheme is adopted, will be such regimentation and control as HENRY WALLACE foresaw when he said it would take a police force of half a million men to keep down agricultural racketeering, and that every plowed field would have to have its permit displayed on its post.

The effect on small business will be exactly as it has been in Russia and Germany. There will be no small business left except that controlled and regimented by the bureaucrats. In fact, the plain implication in the report is that the time of small independent business is past.

Mr. Speaker, even though security were possible or even probable under this cradle-to-grave plan, would such security be worth the price we would have to pay in lost liberty, in curtailed privileges and opportunities, in vanished freedom? My answer is "No." As Benjamin Franklin put it, we would be paying too much for our whistle. It was Benjamin Franklin who also said:

> They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Dies committee, I feel that our committee has barely scratched the surface in connection with the dangerous infiltration into our Government bureaus and departments of these enemies of our American way of life for the purpose of undermining and destroying this Government of ours. Our committee has the authority to investigate and expose all subversive organizations and members thereof who seek to overthrow our Government by force. "Socialist crackpots" in Government service, however dangerous they are during these critical days, do not come within the scope of our committee functions. They are not considered subversive, but rather as harmless crackpots to be tolerated and joked about. However, when we are engaged in the greatest war the world has ever known; when we should be straining every effort to achieve an early victory over a desperate and despicable enemy; when our boys are fighting and dying in the four corners of the world, I ask, Is this the time to appoint, to condone, or to tolerate socialist crackpots in important and responsible Government positions? Do you not think they should be weeded out now, and should not those elected officials who are responsible for their appointment be voted out of office at the first opportunity?

Mr. Speaker, just as "coming events cast their shadows before them," so also do coming campaign issues cast their shadows before them. In view of the "Delano report," the socialistic philosophy it contains, and the group in Government service who are back of this philosophy as shown by their statements, I believe the main issue in the 1944 campaign will be, "Get rid of the crackpots, Communists, and Communist sympathizers in Government service, and defeat at the polls all elected officials responsible for their appointment." On that issue I predict this Nation will return to a safe, sane, efficient, economical administration in Washington, an administration that will guarantee the continuance of the form of government handed down to us by the founding fathers, a form of government that has served us so well during the past 160 years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I had intended to make had our plans not unfortunately been changed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF CERTAIN PLANTS, PREVENTION OF STRIKES, LOCK-OUTS AND STOPPAGES OF PRODUCTION

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, on the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense (Rept. No. 445), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 796, relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the special order I had to address the House for 30 minutes today be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 658. An act to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 981. An act to assist relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn duty to announce the sudden death of a man who has served this House faithfully for many years. Only a few moments ago I learned of the passing today of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT of the second district of California.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT served the second district of California with honor, distinction, and devotion. His father served in this House from the same district, not immediately preceding him, but a few years before, there being one intervening Member in the continuity of service between Harry's father and himself. He not only served his district and his State well, but he held a place of high honor in his party, a place of trust and duty that he accepted with its full responsibility. My colleagues have seen him here on the floor in the capacity of Republican Whip, the duties of which office he performed with uniform courtesy and effectiveness. He was loved and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. I am shocked beyond expression to learn of his sudden passing. My heartfelt sympathy is extended to his wife and son. They will be sustained by the splendid record he has left behind him. I am sure we all say of HARRY LANE ENGELBRIGHT: "You served your district, you served your State, you served your Nation in a splendid statesmanlike manner, and your memory will long live with us."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the emotion surging within me at the death of a close friend of many years makes it impossible for me at this time to pay adequate tribute.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT came to Congress the same year with me, and through the years he has been one of my very closest and warmest friends. He was one of the most lovable and most loyal men who ever came to Congress. He was devoted to the public welfare. He had a broad national viewpoint, and his service here was actuated by one motive only: To serve well his beloved State and to contribute to the upbuilding and progress of the country he loved. He was a really great American.

In this grave hour when the world needs men, men of courage, men of character, men of determination to do that which is right we can ill afford to lose a man like HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. He was fortunate in being able to win the firm friendship of everyone. Whether the Member served on the Republican side, the Democratic side, or with the independents, he loved HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT and appreciated his sterling worth.

He was for many years the Republican whip, and for the past 5 years he and I have worked closely together. No man could have a more devoted friend, a more loyal and efficient coworker. The heavy work of his office he bore cheerfully.

This morning at 7:30 his good wife telephoned and told me Harry had been taken to the hospital but she hoped he would soon be back with us. Fate has decreed otherwise; so we mourn his loss, but I know that a man of the character of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, a man who lived the splendid life he did, never dies; his spirit, his example will live long in our memories. The inspiration from his life and service will ever urge us all to strive for the better things in life.

His good wife and his family in their hour of sorrow will find consolation in the fact the world is better for his having lived. We have all lost a friend and the country a public servant it could ill afford to lose in this hour of national peril.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the journey of life that all of us take, at its best an uphill journey, there are some pleasant sides and some joyful incidents which we all encounter. One of the joyful incidents of life to me is the friendships, the real friendships, that I make. By accident or otherwise we are all here as Members of this body, some elected last year, some elected in bygone years. Fifteen or sixteen years ago I was elected. Our late distinguished friend some years ago was elected by the people of his district. He and I would otherwise never have met. But our little worlds came in contact with one another here.

The fact I have had the pleasure of meeting him, knowing him, and enjoying his friendship is a memory that I will always treasure; it is something that I always cherished while he was alive. His friendship is a memory that I shall always treasure during the remainder of my life. Our distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] has well said that our late friend occupied "places of honor and trust." Never did a gentleman say more truer words in relation to another than did the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. Our late beloved friend, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, occupied a position of honor because he was honorable. He occupied a position of trust because he was trustworthy.

To me real friendship is the closest tie that can exist between two living beings outside of the sacred ties of the family life itself.

I imagine that in years hence, if I am blessed by the Supreme Being to live to a ripe old age, and I look back at life rather than forward, I will remember the real friends that I made, not some far-reaching bill which I might feel I was instrumental in passing, not some great speech that I thought I made in a passing moment of my imagination. But as I look back I will be thinking of the friends I made and where some of them are. I will know where those who have taken the journey into the Great Beyond are, but I will be thinking of them just the same and in accordance with the religious belief that I entertain I will be saying a prayer for them, as I have in the past. One of them I will be thinking of and one of those I shall miss and one of those I shall pray for will be one of the most courteous gentlemen I have ever met, who has gone to meet the Maker, our late friend HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. You and I know that his life was such that he will be judged right by the Supreme Being.

I extend my most profound sympathy to his loved ones.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is not going to be the same to us after today. As the majority leader so beautifully spoke about HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, we will remember the very courteous and cordial way in which he greeted us every time we came in the door. Monday morning is going to hold a great void for us because we will not have the announcement from the minority whip whom I learned to love very dearly since I came here.

I did not happen to know HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT before I came to Congress, although both of us come from the State of California and although his name is a household word in that State. It had not been my pleasure to know him before coming to Washington, but he took me in hand and treated me exactly like a brother. He introduced me to my colleagues in the House of Representatives and he made me feel very much at home.

I learned to love him and to admire him very much. My heart is very, very heavy this afternoon. I want to extend to his good wife and to his son my deepest, sincere affection in their very great loss.

This brings to mind some words of Edgar Guest that I would like to repeat at this time, which fit HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, in my opinion, so beautifully:

As long as men are on this earth
There will be tasks for them to do,
And ways for them to show their worth
For each day will have its problems new.

And men will dream of mightier deeds
Than they have ever done before,
And there always will be human needs
For men to work and struggle for.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the announcement we have just heard is most shocking. It is very difficult for one to express the reluctance of the acceptance of an announcement of this character.

I had the pleasure of knowing HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT for a good many years prior to my service in this House. I always held him in a very high esteem in prior knowledge, and since my service in the House with him I learned to have a deep affection for the trust and the characteristics that the man evidenced in his everyday life. He was a lovable character; he was a stanch and true friend. He was one of California's recognized outstanding Representatives in Congress. We on this side feel that California has lost one of its outstanding citizens and one of its finest men.

I pay tribute to him as an acquaintance, as a friend, as a man, and as a statesman. I extend to his family the deepest regret in their loss, and I petition our Master to receive him with the same graciousness that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT accorded to you and to me every day as we met him on the floor of the House and in our social contacts with him.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I had the honor and the privilege and the joy of serving on an important committee of this House with our departed friend for nearly 7 years and I do not think that I have ever met or became acquainted with a more loveable character, a more patriotic American, and a person who was more deeply concerned in the welfare of his country and in the performance of his duty than our good friend who has left us.

Our departed colleague was one of the first Members of Congress with whom I became acquainted on my becoming a Member of the House and it just so happens at various times I have lived at the same hotel with him. I learned to know him well. We became fast friends.

The great State of California will miss him, the country will miss him; the Congress will miss him, and personally I will miss him.

I take this means of extending my sympathy to his beloved widow and his son. It is my prayer that his soul will rest in peace.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am perhaps too overcome by the shock of the knowledge of his passing to attempt to express even a small part of my affection and my appreciation of the strong, gentle, quiet man whom we have known as HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. To all of us his going is a grievous thing. To those of us who knew him well, to whom he had given the exquisite gift of his friendship, the suddenness of his passing leaves an emptiness we do not want to face, even though we rejoice that for him there was no more than a short moment between the two worlds.

You will remember these lovely lines from Wadsworth:

Birth is but a sleep and a forgetting—
Trailing clouds of glory do we come.

Surely Harry has gone out wrapped in the clouds that saw his birth.

It is in such moments as these that we draw together, that we share each with the other some measure of that which our experience in life has brought us of the great truths that have upheld men down the ages. Out of one of the oldest of all Scriptures, the ancient Veda, translated with great beauty. I give you the following for your comfort and my own:

IMMORTALITY

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams!
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it all, dead though the house of it seems.
Nay, but as one who l..yeth
His worn-out robes away,
And taking new ones, sayeth
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of all of those who have been called to high service of their country I believe there is no one who is held in higher respect or warranted affection than was HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT.

I was shocked and saddened when the information in that indescribable way swept across the floor of this House of his passing. Though I heard plainly the first announcement that fell from the lips of the minority leader, I somehow could not believe that I was understanding aright.

My friend had passed: he had been called to his reward, the first Representative that I had come to know well 9 years ago. It was he who first communicated with me after my election to this body; it was with him I first conversed concerning the responsibilities I was about to assume. It was under his generous, careful guidance that I have made my weary way to this point in my career. I will remember him ever as a true friend. His true friendship through years of close association has been proved beyond question. It has not been always that I shared the same views with him with respect to public questions we have had to pass upon in this body, and in one of the bitterest debates I have participated he led the opposition. Though there was much at stake in that issue for each of us, I want to say to you now that nothing has ever occurred in that controversy or elsewhere which I cannot recall in grateful memory for the kindness he always exhibited.

For Harry my heart bleeds today. For Grace, who lingers behind awhile, I share her tears. A great man has left us. A great woman grieves today. All America shares our loss.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise at this time to pay my humble tribute to my friend and colleague HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT and to say that I shall always remember his nobility and kindness and that I shall miss him. May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that I shall present my humble petition to the Almighty that He shall rest and reward his weary and deserving soul.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, announcement of the death of our beloved friend HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT is a shock that is hard for some of us to bear. When the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, came in but a few moments ago to tell us that Harry had suddenly passed away, the word spread around the floor of the House of Representatives like a wind-blown flame, searing the hearts of us, for he was our friend.

HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, distinguished native son of California, has brought honor and prestige to our great State in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. The State of California has lost one of its greatest citizens. The United

States has lost a great statesman from its loyal service. We who have served with him have lost a real friend and wise counselor.

To his dearly loved wife, Grace, known to us all, go our deepest sympathy in this hour of trial. I can say no more for my own heart is too heavy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I came into the Congress at the same time as the gentleman from California, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. I had a deep affection for him and his wonderful, devoted wife from the time I first knew them. I never think of one without the other. They were so united. I mourn his passing more than I can say. His kindly, lovable spirit was and always will be an inspiration to all of us. His service was always one without selfishness and one of generous helpfulness. He worked far too hard, giving his wise counsel and assistance to anyone who sought it. I know fine measure after fine measure was steered through the House for Members, for the Congress, and for the country because of his guidance and his leadership. Always a patriot, always a gentleman, I never saw him cross, I never saw him disagreeable. He was always gracious, courteous, and fine whether in the victory or the defeat of his plans. I like to think of a spirit and courage like his. It is good for us in the Congress, when passions run high, and it is good for the country in days like these to think of a spirit like his. He gave his all for the land he loved so well.

He died, or all that could die of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, in the service of his country just as surely as the men who die overseas fighting the battle for the United States and for the world. God rest his soul, as He will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, as the shadows of the afternoon are lengthening, it is indeed a sad message that has come to us here in this body. The news of the passing of one who has been a genuine leader over a period of many years here in this Congress is a shock to each and every one of us, not alone to those of his party or to those of his State but to every individual. The death of HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT darkens this day far beyond the power of the setting sun.

A native of California, he came from perhaps one of the most rugged western districts that the land can boast, and he typified that district. A distinguished individual, upright and stalwart, he had the character that typified the pioneer of the West.

Because of his fine character, because of the great uniformity of his disposition, because of his pleasantness and his leadership, we are going to miss him and miss him greatly in the days and months that lie ahead. We grieve with his widow and we mourn with his son, but most of all we regret as a Nation the loss of the leadership of this great statesman. We can only pray that God in His mercy may grant him the reward that is due him for the exemplary life he has led.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the theme that has run through all these tributes to HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT this afternoon is that he was a man of an understanding spirit. I doubt if any man on the floor appealed to Members as having the depth of understanding and the respect for other people that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT did. That is why everyone is so moved, I suppose; why each of us finds it so hard to speak, yet wants to say something. The year I came here I was one of the few new men to come from the West. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT made me feel at home, as an older brother might have done. He understood me and my problems in representing a new, young country. Yet I found that he did this same thing for new Members from whatever part of the country they might come. To me, he personified what we think of as the finest in the traditions of the West, a man who appreciates the whole United States, yet understands the contribution which the West, as the young part of the country, has to make to the life of the Nation. Now he has made his contribution—a life of service, a life of splendid understanding service, a life of splendid interpretation in gracious, gentlemanly statesmanship. I counted him as my friend, as my understanding friend. I shall miss him more than I can say today, which means nothing to anyone else—except, I hope, that the deep sense of personal loss which each one has expressed may help to tell his family and his friends at home how greatly we loved him here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the reason I take the floor at this time is that I have known HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT and his family intimately for many years. We have lived at the same hotel. We have attended social functions together. I have had an opportunity to know that he was pure gold.

It would not be in good taste for me to say very much at this time, because Mrs. Englebright knows that I loved HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, and I can say for others, I think, that to know him was to love him. He was a man of the highest and finest character, a man who gave unstintingly of his strength for the benefit of his district and of his country.

These words of Phillips Brooks perhaps describe him to some extent:

> Sad will be the day for every man when he becomes absolutely contented with the life that he is living, with the thoughts that he is thinking, with the deeds that he is doing, when there is not forever beating at the doors of his soul some great desire to do something larger which he knows he was meant and made to do.

That feeling, that ambition, was forever beating at the doors of the soul of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. He has made an enviable record in Congress as did his distinguished father before him. All I can say, now that he has left us, is, God bless and keep him, and protect Mrs. Englebright, a devoted woman, a woman who is one of the Gray Ladies at the hospital. My affection and my sympathy go out to her son, who is fighting for his country in the Pacific Ocean; his son, who was worshiped by his father; his son, who is doing exactly what his patriotic father would wish him to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with hesitation that I step into the Well of this House on any occasion, because I know I am just a new Member in the California delegation.

In my frequent councils with the older Members I had contact with my colleague, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. Although he sat on the other side of the aisle, I found in him the same kindness and consideration when I appealed to him for advice and counsel as I have found in the dean of the Members on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from California, Mr. CLARENCE LEA. I hope it will not be considered presumption when I say at this time that I too share in the loss of this worthy colleague, who has represented his district so well. I extend my sincere sympathy to his widow and his son.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a very wise man said a long time ago that the measure of a man's greatness is determined in large part by his ability to face both triumph and disaster and to meet those two imposters just the same. In my opinion HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT exemplified the complete definition of greatness as defined by that philosopher.

I have seen him in the flush of success, and I have seen him in defeat. In his success he was gracious, charming, and understanding. In defeat he was optimistic and hopeful and heroic. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT occupied on the Republican side of the aisle the important position of minority whip, which certainly in his case was an erroneous label for a high office, because never in my experience in Congress when HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, in his responsibility, was marshaling the ranks of the party, did I find him exercising other than the influence that should be exercised. He never functioned as a whip; he always served as a leader. His highly successful leadership was always manifest by the inspiration of his character and idealism, and the respect which the members of his party held for the principles and ideals which he possessed. He was always judicious. He successfully fulfilled the highest expectations of the Republican Party that honored him by electing him to the high office of party whip, not only in his capacity as a legislator, and in his capacity as one of the leaders of the minority party in the House, but in his capacity as a friend.

When we met him in social activity and in nonofficial matters, around the

Capitol, or in his home, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT's influence was always indelibly stamped upon his associates, because of that charm and gracious character, which has been so repetitiously referred to here today, and which could be repeated ad infinitum, because no one could overemphasize his unusual breadth and depth of character. Certainly we will all miss him greatly. We sympathize deeply with Mrs. Englebright and her family, and America can take real pride in the fact that it is able to develop leaders of a political party who are as widely and universally respected by men of all parties as was our departed friend, great and good, gallant and gracious HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT.

Mr. Speaker, there was something almost symbolic in the manner in which the news of HARRY ENGELBRIGHT's passing spread across this floor a few minutes ago. It came while the House was busily engaged in the give and take of controversial statements by which legislation is shaped in this Republic. Men were bickering for position, arguing for advantage. And then, as the sad news was carried from Member to Member, the passing of Harry brought that calm dignity over the House that his presence always produced when he was with us. Harry's great strength lay in his ability to make his point and exert his influence without noise or excitement but by the calm integrity of his good judgment and through the force of his sterling character.

HARRY ENGELBRIGHT was a gallant and determined crusader for any cause which he believed to be right. He never ran from criticism nor yielded to clamor. I recall how patiently and how perseveringly he worked to maintain the peace of America in the long, hard trying days before Pearl Harbor. He never ceased or modified his opposition to steps which he feared might carry us unnecessarily closer to war; when writers and magazine correspondents berated him for his opposition to what he believed to be provocative legislative acts, he kept his head high and his eyes straight ahead, voting in accordance with the dictates of his clear conscience. With typical courage, HARRY ENGELBRIGHT fought bravely and well in a deep determination to avert war for America if such an alternative were possible. He was never one to choose the easy course when he believed the more difficult position contained the greater degree of rectitude.

In the death of HARRY ENGELBRIGHT, California loses an illustrious statesman, the Congress loses one of its most gallant and effective Members, and America loses a distinguished public servant whose record of accomplishment will long serve to inspire and encourage all who knew him to measure up as best we can to the high standards which he so faithfully exemplified.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult, indeed, to speak so soon after the staggering shock we have just received in the announcement of the death of our distinguished friend, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, for whom I entertained an affection that rose high above the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power.

Addison once said, "Eternity! thou pleasing, dreadful thought!"

We feel bewildered and helpless as we wander along this "bank and shoal of time," striving to fathom the unsolved mystery of death.

The cradle asks us whence, the grave asks us whither. A cynic once said, "Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage, and then is heard no more. It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

An agnostic tells us that "Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our unavailing cry."

Longfellow, one of the greatest Christian poets of all time, says:

Tell me not in mournful numbers,
Life is but an empty dream;
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
And things are not what they seem.

Life is real, life is earnest,
And the grave is not its goal;
Dust thou art, to dust returneth,
Was not spoken of the soul.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a Christian gentleman who so lived that when the summons came to join the innumerable caravan leading to that mysterious realm where each must take his chamber in the silent halls of eternity, he welcomed the grim tyrant, death, and received him as a kind messenger, sent by the order of Providence to translate him from this imperfect to that all-perfect glorious and celestial parliament above, over which the Supreme Ruler of the Universe presides.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked this afternoon when I heard of the death of our distinguished colleague, Hon. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. I wish to add my tribute to the others that have been paid him. I am deeply moved and find it difficult to express my feelings.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a dear friend. During the 2 years that I have served with him in this House I have learned to love him. Because we represented districts that had much in common we were together frequently, and I looked to him for advice and counsel.

Last fall when an order was issued closing the gold mines of this country he and I worked along with others to obtain a reconsideration. He was the best informed man on mining I have ever seen. He constantly urged increased production of strategic metals to be found in the western part of the United States.

He was always of a good disposition. I never saw him angry or impatient. He was kind and gentle in his contacts with others. I think the following words describe his services to this country:

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.

I pray that God may comfort his loved ones, and give them strength to bear this loss, which we have all sustained.

A GENTLEMAN IS GONE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have sat quietly and reverently during the well-deserved and very genuine tributes to a man who was not remembered today as a Republican or a Democrat, but simply as a strong personage in this House, now passed from his service here.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spoke of an agnostic who told of the narrow veil which separates life and death and about the cruelties facing men and women during that period. There was once a Member of this body, William Jennings Bryan by name, who said:

Death is but a narrow starlit strip between the companionship of yesterday and the reunions of tomorrow.

This latter thought is the type of expression that I believe fits admirably the life of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. I never talked a political matter through with him but often in the cloakroom on Capitol Hill and downtown it was my good fortune to know him and to value him as a friend. Other colleagues found in his character the same attributes.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT possessed in rare degree the spirit of gentleness. He must have understood the meaning of the following poem, for its lines seemed meant for him:

May every soul that touches mine,
Be it the slightest contact, get therefrom some good,
Some little grace, one kindly thought,
One aspiration yet unfelt, one bit of courage
For the darkening sky, one gleam of faith
To brave the thickening ills of life.
One glimpse of brighter sky beyond the gathering mist,
To make this life worth while
And heaven a heritage.

With his going from us, it is "as if exquisite music had ceased."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this occasion to pass without adding my tribute to that of the other friends of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, who had come to know and love him here in this body. I think whenever a man can serve here as long as he did and leave without an enemy, as HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT has left, it is about the greatest tribute that could be paid to any human being. I think that is true, as has been expressed by others this afternoon. He was lovable. He was conscientious. He was able. But, above all, he had the faculty of getting along with his fellow man in this place where we have so many contests and so many emotions. He made friends. He dealt fairly with everyone. He was always courteous.

We are going to miss him and miss him a great deal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection all Members who desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the unwelcome news came of the very sudden and wholly unexpected passing of our fine friend, our distinguished colleague, and our worthy statesman, Hon. HARRY G. ENGLEBRIGHT, every Member in the House of Representatives suffered a shock. It was only yesterday that Harry was on the floor of the House, toiling with us. Today, we are informed that he is no more—that he has gone to that land beyond.

This was a distinct shock to me, because when I came here as a Member of the House of Representatives, at the commencement of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I met my fine friend, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, as one of the first of the older Members upon my arrival; we were then living at the same place, and our contacts were both frequent and pleasant. Since that first meeting I have seen HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT almost daily; in his post as minority whip of the House of Representatives; I have had many contacts with him; in our work on the floor of the House, on the many and various legislative matters, we have had many personal conferences and close contacts; in the work in committees, it has been our happy privilege to meet and to there discuss pending matters in the House of Representatives.

Throughout our rather brief, yet constant, acquaintance I was greatly impressed with the sincerity of my loyal friend in his better days; he possessed that friendliness of disposition, which was outstanding, and he attracted the attention of those about him because of his devotion to duty. He was no laggard, but he was alert and abreast of the hour; he was no pessimist, but he was wholly optimistic, ever looking forward into the beauties of the future; he was ever cordial, greeting every Member of the House of Representatives with a smile, making each one feel that warmth of his character and the loyalty of his disposition. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a manly man; he was sincere, sturdy, loyal, and distinguished as a Member of this great law-making body; he was a natural leader of men; he was keen, capable, and learned; he was well equipped for the post which he had so admirably filled for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT in this body; he will be missed by his State and Nation; but, most of all, he will be missed throughout the coming years by that devoted wife and that worthy son. God grant them strength to meet the future, and may their burdens be made lighter by the sustaining arm of Him who protects us all. And, as we go forward facing the future, we will revere the memory of our friend, as we will miss him, and as a last farewell we say:

> Behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God, within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great surprise and sadness I have heard the announcement of the untimely death of our colleague from California, Congressman ENGLEBRIGHT. It does not seem possible that he has gone from among us, for he has so lately been at his work among us. His going is but a reminder to all of us that no man knows when the hour strikes and the call comes.

As a member of the Memorials Committee of the House, I was so pleased to note that the past year had taken a smaller toll of our membership than for several years past, but even as I reflected thus on the situation this sad news is announced like a bolt from a clear sky.

I have been on several committees with HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT and thus learned to know him well and thereby have had cause to value his ability and judgment. Coming as he did from the Golden State and I from a great mining State adjoining, we have had much in common. I always consulted him about mining matters. He was unusually well informed and always alert to fight the battles for the great mining industry. He was not alone interested in the precious metals for which his district and State are noted but he was also interested in facilitating the mining of the other metals associated with gold and silver, especially war metals and minerals.

He sat on the other side of the table from me, but he was on my side of all important questions concerning the great West. I shall miss him, as will his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The loss is not for California alone but for the whole West and the entire Nation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read (H. Res. 235), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the committee to attend the funeral on tomorrow.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, May 14, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10 a. m., Friday, May 14, 1943, to consider H. R. 2113, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m., on Friday, May 14, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1172.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Friday, May 14, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2209, H. R. 2210, H. R. 2241, and H. R. 2527, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, May 18, 1943, for consideration of housing bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act, H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

415. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 43d National Encampment of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Cincinnati, Ohio, August 30 to September 4, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

416. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Production Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $89,950,000 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution for the consideration of S. 796, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2701. A bill to provide for the expatriation of certain nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COSTELLO.

H. R. 2702. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Army and the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2703. A bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2704. A bill to grant jurisdiction to Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2705. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for any other purposes," cited as the "Emergency Price Control Act of 1942," approved January 30, 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 2706. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers of the Medical Administrative Corps of the Regular Army to grades up to and including that of colonel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2712. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowances for railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Henry White; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Alice Stein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Olympia F. Kern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

749. By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland: Petition from various citizens of Baltimore, favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of 80 citizens of Montgomery County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

751. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Minnie L. LeVaugh and nine other citizens of Monroe, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

752. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 69 citizens of Aliquippa, Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

753. By Mr. WELCH: California State Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, relative to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

754. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Rev. Cecil McMillion, of Walkersville, W. Va., and 24 other citizens of Lewis and Gilmer Counties, W. Va., requesting passage of House Resolution 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

755. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the State legislative committee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, State Council of Illinois, earnestly requesting the defeat of House bills 2428 and 2429; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

756. Also, resolution of the Eldorado Lions Club, of Eldorado, Ill., presented by George Wilson, secretary of said club, and composed of a number of representative citizens of that community, urging the continuation of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

757. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 43 persons, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.